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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Program description and rationale
Caritas Danmark funded an agricultural and rights-based livelihoods rural development program in Matabeleland South (ArchDiocese of Bulawayo) and Manicaland Province (Mutare Diocese) guided by the Zimbabwe Country Strategy (2014 – 2017) developed for this purpose. The overall goal of the program was “To achieve inclusive and sustainable development by strengthening civil society in rural areas”. The objective was to promote rights-based smallholder farmer livelihoods through sustainable agriculture using a group approach in farming. The rationale of the program is found in its three-tier design structure and implementation process which was believed to ensure holistic development. That is, the programme was designed and implemented in a way which was expected to bring positive changes (theory of change) at family/household, community and national/societal levels with more emphasis on the first two intervention components (household and community).

Evaluation objective
The evaluation sought to assess the program theory of change in line with the specific objectives of the programme at each level of intervention. The standard evaluation framework which include relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, outcome, impact and sustainability/durability of program effects guided the evaluation design and process.

Evaluation methodology
A mixed methodology was used to evaluate the program. Quantitative data was obtained through household questionnaire while interviews and focus group discussions provided qualitative data. Probability and non-probability sampling techniques were applied to select evaluation participants for quantitative and qualitative data sets respectively.

The primary data sources for the evaluation were households, smallholder farmer associations, program managers & officers, community leadership including traditional leaders, youths, Government stakeholders, civil society stakeholders, community peace ambassadors, community peace committees, students and church leadership.

Major findings
Briefly discussed below are some of the major findings of the evaluation.

Program Relevance
The evaluation found that the program was quite relevant in light of the development needs and priorities within the communities and the country as a whole. In particular were experiencing shortage of water, food as well as limited knowledge and exercising of one's rights within the context of livelihoods.

Programme design
Generally, the program was well designed especially its focus on bottom-up and inclusive development approaches. Although the 3-tier programme design had good intentions, this was not fully achieved because the programme was cut short by a year and also that the expected level of financial resources did not materialise.
Inclusive development
The program was largely responsive to the needs of the vulnerable groups in the communities who are women, youths, people with disability, children and the elderly. For example, of the 153 questionnaire respondents, 97% and 84% expressed that women and youths respectively were deliberately identified and selected to participate in the program.

Program effect at the 3-levels of intervention
The theory of change was achieved more at the family and community levels and less at national level.

Sustainability/durability of program positive effects
The community engagement evident in the program including traditional leaders and the youths as well as the capacity training provided in the various livelihood and peace building initiatives indicate that the results achieved to date are more likely to be durable. However, with limited Government focus on the CAADP, it is possible that the momentum generated through this programme in the communities can reduce going forward.

Conclusions and recommendations
Overall, the program contributed some noticeable positive changes/effects at household and community levels as indicated in the evaluation findings. The program is addressing major development problems identified and prioritized in the communities. To achieve more and sustain the agriculture-based livelihoods among rural communities, it will largely depend on the willingness and ability of the central and local governments to address socio-economic barriers and policy limitations in the country. Some of the key recommendations for consideration in future interventions by the Roman Catholic Church in Zimbabwe include: (a) strengthen collaboration with like-minded organizations; (b) enhance national level focus to influence policy direction; (c) improve market linkages and value addition; and (d) integrate peace and justice in all community development initiatives.
SECTION ONE

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Brief development program description and its rationale

Caritas Danmark funded an agricultural and rights-based livelihoods rural development program in Matabeleland South (Arch Diocese of Bulawayo) and Manicaland Provinces (Mutare Diocese) guided by the Zimbabwe Country Strategy (2014 – 2017). The overall C-DK development goal is “To achieve inclusive and sustainable development by strengthening civil society in rural areas”. Specifically, the objective for the Zimbabwe country programme is to “promote smallholder farmer livelihoods through development of sustainable agriculture and establishment of farmer’s organisations and furthermore of an enabling environment for sustainable development through peace and reconciliation”. Five partners were involved in the program implementation from 2014 to December 2016. For 2017, the three Diocesan partners continued with the program and these are Caritas- Bulawayo, Caritas-Mutare and Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace (CCJP)-Mutare with the same program focus on Family and community level program implementation while CCJP- Zimbabwe and Caritas-Zimbabwe (later ZCBC secretariat) were at national level. Table 1 below is a summary of the projects, focus, partners and the communities covered in the programme.

Table 1: Projects under the Zimbabwe rural development country Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Funding Partners</th>
<th>Project Focus</th>
<th>Implementing Partner</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved Livelihoods through water supply, market linkages and social protection to vulnerable members of the community (Co-funded)</td>
<td>Misereor</td>
<td>Livelihoods</td>
<td>Caritas Bulawayo MAMID</td>
<td>Bulawayo Arch-Diocese Bulilima district: wards 7, 11, and 12 Mangwe district: ward 1 and 13 Umzingwane district: ward 5 Empandeni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Food Security and Livelihood Promotion Program (CFSLPP)</td>
<td>Caritas Denmark</td>
<td>Livelihoods, food security capacity building &amp; Advocacy</td>
<td>Caritas-Mutare MAMID</td>
<td>In Mutare diocese Chimanimani district wards, 18 (Mhakwe) and 19 (Chikwakwa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Healing and Rebuilding</td>
<td>Caritas Denmark</td>
<td>Reconciliation, Justice and Peace and rights based Advocacy</td>
<td>CCJP-Mutare ZHR Church in Manicaland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith and Evidence Based Advocacy project</td>
<td>Caritas Denmark</td>
<td>Reconciliation, Justice and Peace and rights based Advocacy</td>
<td>CCJP- Zimbabwe Ecumenical Church boards Catholic Church Structure</td>
<td>National/Societal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy and coordination project</td>
<td>Caritas Denmark</td>
<td>Support to CAADP/ZAIP country process, Coordination, Support to partner level advocacy</td>
<td>Caritas Zimbabwe/ZCBC Secretariat MAMID-CAADP Focal office ISAC,ZNBC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ultimate beneficiaries of the programme were poor and vulnerable community members at household level with a special focus on women (including female heads of households), the youth, child heads of households and people with disabilities. To achieve the overall desired transformation, the program theory of change targeted three levels which are family/household, community and society/nation as shown in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Level</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Project specific objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Theme 1: Strengthening Family Livelihoods</td>
<td>To strengthen joint initiatives taken by poor rural families to pursue their rights to be food secure and to have sustainable livelihoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Theme 2: Strengthening Rural Organisation</td>
<td>To strengthen community based organizations, and emerging networks of organized rural populations in supporting local livelihoods and securing equal access to basic services through active engagement of local decision makers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society</td>
<td>Theme 3: Strengthening Rural Development</td>
<td>To strengthen community based organizations’ and their CSO partners’ advocacy on a national level for a sustainable economic growth that will include rural areas on an equal basis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the community/grassroots level, worked closely with like-minded coalitions, who included rural smallholder farmers and their associations, Community Justice and Peace Committees and government stakeholders particularly the Ministry of Agriculture, Mechanisation and Irrigation Development (MAMID). The key programme design strategy was the formation of smallholder farmer organizations and advocacy as well as capacity building activities undertaken by societal levels implementing partners up to the end of December 2016 and up to 2017 for household and community level partners.

The rationale for using a 3-tier program design was that achievement at community level will positively and directly affect the household and national level. Together, outputs and household and community levels help to strengthen or consolidate outcomes at national level through the imbedded evidence-based approach in the overall program design and implementation.

1.2 Evaluation purpose and objectives
The purpose of the evaluation was to assess the programme theory of change in line with the specific objectives of the programme. That is, to establish the extent to which the lives of smallholder farmers and other direct and indirect beneficiaries of the interventions under this programme at household, community and National levels were transformed.changed. Also, to analyse the level of community and other stakeholder participation and coordination, ownership of the implementation process and sustainability/durability of programme results beyond the support from Caritas Denmark and its partners. The standard evaluation framework which include relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, outcome/impact and sustainability/durability of program effects achieved was used with a focus to assess the program theory of change especially in light of the program phasing out on 31 December 2017.

The intended and unintended outcomes/programme effects, emerging good practices, lessons learnt as well as internal and external challenges experienced during the programme implementation had to be identified, analysed and reported. The assessment was guided by evidence-based evaluation principles to inform development related policies at local and national levels in Zimbabwe.
SECTION TWO

2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 Evaluation design
A mixed methodology was used to evaluate the program. That is, both quantitative and qualitative methods were employed using household interview-questionnaires, interviews, focus group discussions and observations. Furthermore, secondary data through documents review complemented the primary data obtained.

2.2 Sampling
Sampling was at two main levels namely the districts that participated in the program and the individuals in their capacity as primary beneficiaries as well as key informants at church and stakeholder levels.

a) Selection of districts which participated in the program

  Purposive sampling was applied to select all the three districts in Zimbabwe where the program was implemented namely Bulilima, Mangwe, Umzingwane and Chimanimani. The first three districts stated here are in Matabeleland South Province (Arch diocese of Bulawayo) while the last one is in Manicaland Province (Mutare Diocese).

b) Selection of primary data sources

Households
For the selection of the households to administer household interview-questionnaire, a probability sampling approach was applied determined by Raosoft\(^1\) online calculator and its formula is:

\[
 n = \frac{t^2 \times p (1-p)}{m^2}
\]

where
- \( n \) = required sample size
- \( t \) = confidence level at 95% (standard value of 1.96)
- \( p \) = estimated population of respondents in the study area
- \( m \) = margin of error at 5% (standard value of 0.05)

It was important to use the probability sampling since it allows for generalisation of findings from a sample to the population under consideration; in this case, at least to the level of the implementing ward.

Once the Raosoft determined the sample size, a systematic random sampling in Excel whose formula is \( \text{=rand()} \) was applied to get the actual households by name from the list provided within each district enumerated.

Individual beneficiaries for FGDs
A combination of purposive and stratified random sampling techniques were used to select evaluation participants for focus group discussions in their respective categories (members of the various livelihood projects in the communities and schools).

Key informants
Purposive sampling guided the selection of church leadership and staff, program personnel (coordinators and officers) and representatives of the program stakeholders.

---

\(^1\)www.raosoft.com/samplesize.html
2.3 Data collection tools and data sources

Figure 1 below shows the categories of people who were consulted and provided the data required for the evaluation.

Figure 1: Categories of people consulted in the evaluation

Outlined in Table 3 are the data collection tools used in the evaluation and the respective data sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collection tools</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household interview-questionnaires</td>
<td>Heads of households (male or female per household) among the program beneficiaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Guides</td>
<td>Church leadership (national and Diocesan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diocesan Coordinators and program Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Government Authority leadership (Provincial and District Administrators) and staff (Social Services and Agritex Officers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program strategic partners including Government officials from the Ministry of Agriculture and Mechanization (CAADP Focal Person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group Discussion Guides</td>
<td>Traditional leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Peace Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young Farmers at schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youths (members of the community gardens and honey producers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations checklists</td>
<td>These were conducted on community gardens, poultry and goat projects in Bulilima, Umzingwane and Chimanimani Districts as well as the school-based income generating projects (gardens and poultry). Also observed were the solar-powered boreholes and tanks which are sources of water for the gardens and schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content analysis guide</td>
<td>Project proposal, project documents, progress reports, national strategies and policies, presentations, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The actual number of evaluation participants consulted per each data collection tool are given in Table 4 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>districts and total number of people enumerated</th>
<th>Number of participants disaggregated by sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulawayo</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulilima</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chimanimani</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harare</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangwe</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutare</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umzingwane</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Table 4 above shows that out of the 372 evaluation participants, 238 (64%) were women while 134 (36%) were men. It further reveals that the majority of the participants were the FGD participants (179 = 48%) followed by questionnaire respondents (153 = 41%) and key informant interviewees (40 = 11%).

2.4 Data Analysis
The evaluation team used SPSS and NVivo software applications to analyse quantitative and qualitative data sets, respectively. The analysis followed a data cleaning process of both quantitative and qualitative data sets which was conducted to ensure achievement of quality in line with the requirements of the evaluation.

2.5 Validation process employed
Throughout the data collection process, the evaluation team validated their findings/interpretations during the team debriefing meetings as well as with the church leadership, staff and partners. Table 5 below is a schedule of the debriefing meetings the consultancy team held with the church leadership and staff throughout the evaluation process.

Table 5: Schedule of evaluation debriefing meetings conducted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debriefing meetings</th>
<th>Brief description</th>
<th>Date (2017)</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debriefing 1</td>
<td>Feedback on the Inception Report including the data collection tools</td>
<td>21 Aug</td>
<td>Harare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debriefing 2</td>
<td>Post pilot run meeting with the church leadership, national coordinator and Bulawayo Diocesan project coordinator</td>
<td>25 Sept</td>
<td>Bulawayo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debriefing 3</td>
<td>Exit meeting with the Arch Bishop, CDK In Country Coordinator and programme coordinator, and officers following data collection experience in Bulilima and Mangwe Districts as well as key informant interviews in Bulawayo. This will enable the evaluation team to share their overall experience in the field as well as seeking clarifications and validations provided.</td>
<td>29 Sept</td>
<td>Bulawayo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debriefing 4</td>
<td>A meeting with the Secretary General and his team to provide feedback following the Matabeleland South data collection experience. This will also be a validation meeting at policy level. After this meeting, the evaluation team proceeds to Manicaland Province.</td>
<td>2 Oct</td>
<td>Harare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debriefing 5</td>
<td>Exit meeting with Mutare Diocesan Management and In Country Coordinator to give feedback on the data collection experience in Mhakwe and Chikwakwa Wards of Chimanimani District and the key informant interviews conducted.</td>
<td>5 Oct</td>
<td>Mutare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debriefing 6</td>
<td>Meeting with the Secretary General, In Country Coordinator and his team to provide feedback following the Manicaland Province data collection experience. This will also be a validation meeting at a policy level. After this meeting, the evaluation team proceeds to with data capturing, data analysis and eventually reporting writing.</td>
<td>10 Oct</td>
<td>Harare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, the evaluation methodology employed in this evaluation was effective to effectively respond to purpose and objectives of the evaluation. The next section is a presentation of the evaluation findings.
SECTION THREE

3 EVALUATION FINDINGS

3.1 Introduction
This section is a presentation and discussion of the evaluation findings in line with their Terms of Reference provided (see Appendix A). The overall evaluation approach used was guided by the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Evaluation Criteria.

In general, the findings are arranged by specific interventions implemented; highlighting how each category of interventions contributed to the program theory of change (outcomes) including stakeholder analysis, program coordination, effectiveness and efficiency. Towards the end of the section, emerging good practices, lessons learnt, opportunities for scaling up the program and sustainability are discussed. Prior to discussion of all these aspects, program relevance and program design in terms of strategic fit with the Zimbabwe context are presented first.

3.2 Program relevance and strategic fit
In this program evaluation, relevance was understood to refer to the extent to which the intervention under review was suited to the needs and priorities of Zimbabwe development philosophy and the communities targeted. This is because the entry point of the program sought to address the priority needs of the people as stated in the development plans at village, district and provincial levels. In other words, the assessment of relevance focused on the country context and existing policies towards sustainable socio-economic transformation in response to the poverty levels in the country as illustrated in Figure 1 below.

![Figure 2: Poverty mapping in 2012](http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/)

Briefly discussed below are the specific aspects to which the program was relevant.

a) Relevance to community needs
The findings of the baseline studies conducted in the program target communities prior to its design and implementation clearly indicated a dire need to improve potable water supply, food, household income, inequalities, community peace building, conflict resolution, educational support especially for OVC. In the case of water, it was needed for human and livestock consumption as well as for horticulture and crop production. Furthermore, the level
of knowledge and skills in farming was found to be quite limited among the community members. The baseline studies also revealed that community members were not quite aware and knowledgeable of their rights to basic necessities in life. Due to political polarization in the country and the recent resettlement (since 2000) of communities who came from different geographical locations of the country, the baseline study findings also show that it is prudent for any community development project/program to integrate peace building mechanisms. Given this set of baseline information gathered with regard to community needs, the program was quite relevant because it focused on the needs identified and prioritized by the communities themselves in their village and ward development plans.

b) **Relevance to CAADP and other specific national and international development strategies**
Zimbabwe is a signatory to the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program (CAADP) which was ratified in Maputo, Mozambique in 2009. This means that any agriculture related development program that deliberately strengthens agricultural production especially of smallholder farmers in Africa is undoubtedly relevant CAADP. Not only was this program relevant and had a strategic fit in the CAADP which gave birth Zimbabwe Agriculture Investment Plan (ZAIP) it was also responsive to other national and international development efforts as enshrined in the Zimbabwe Agenda for Sustainable Social and Economic Transformation (ZIMASSET)\(^3\) and the Zimbabwe Food and Nutrition Security Policy (2017) and its national goal is given below.

"To promote and ensure adequate food and nutrition security for all people at all times in Zimbabwe, particularly amongst the most vulnerable and in line with our cultural norms and values and the concept of rebuilding and maintaining family dignity” (page 9).

Furthermore, the program was relevant to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and also to Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) particularly SDG1, "end poverty in all forms everywhere" and SDG2,"end hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture"

c) **Relevance to the Church’s Evangelisation Mission and Prophetic Voice**
Since its presence in Zimbabwe which dates back to 1879, the Roman Catholic Church prophetic voice in society has been through various strategies at all levels of society in the country. Key among them are education, food security, health and social inclusion work through promotion of peace and justice under the Catholic Commission of Justice and Peace (CCJP). The evaluation findings, backed by evidence from the Church leadership, show that the program fits well in the church’s reason for existence as was explicit in the program design and implementation to these mentioned aspects.

d) **Relevance to Zimbabwe’s constitutional framework**
Coming from a politically volatile situation where communities experienced violent conflict partly caused by political differences, the programme was relevant in its efforts to promote unity and co-existence among community members. Given the emphasis of the programme to harness community social capital to work together in their gardens and other community-based development initiatives for the common good further illustrates its relevance to the constitutional framework of Zimbabwe on peace building. In this regard, the program initiative on faith and evidence based peace advocacy found a natural fit in complementing the work of Chapter 12 Commissions of the Constitution of Zimbabwe Ammendment (No.20) Act 2013. In particular, the National Peace and Reconciliation Commission, the Zimbabwe Human Rights Commission and the Zimbabwe Electoral Commission.

\(^3\) Food Security and Nutrition Cluster, Section 7.1
e) School-based young farmers

The young farmers’ projects at schools which is one of the program’s components is contributing to the new Zimbabwe primary education curriculum\(^4\) which stresses, among other aspects, that children should have appreciation, knowledge and skills in agriculture. Furthermore, the program responded to the growing need to provide educational support for OVC by way of providing sustainable school-based projects in which children and parents participate in agricultural income generating projects.

Overall, it is the finding of this evaluation that the program was relevant and had a strategic fit in the international, continental and national development goals and strategies.

3.3 Program design assessment

In terms of design and implementation, the program was well designed as it sought to address the triple gap of food and nutrition security, rights-based development and community peace building. This program came at an opportune moment when the country had suffered from incessant droughts, human rights abuses and political polarisation. The way the program was designed enabled integration of these three elements through a carefully crafted evidence-based approach in a three-tier level namely family, community and societal/national. Thus, the evaluation found that the strengths of the program design are summarized as follows:

a) Involvement of government stakeholders who include Agritex and Livestock Production Department (LPD) Officers;

b) National peace advocacy, liaison and engagements with constitutional commissions, parliamentarians and the media;

c) Formulation and dissemination of peace information, education and communication materials such as justice and peace bulletin and page markers with peace messages;

d) Establishment of water point committees and pump minders and the fact that the members are local residents selected by the community members themselves based on, among other elements of selection criteria used, trust and commitment;

e) Training of water point committees and pump minders;

f) Provision of maintenance kits; this has reduced the average time it used to take to repair a broken-down pump from 3 months to 3 days;

g) Inclusion of CCJP in the program as a proactive strategy to address potential conflicts in the livelihood projects through the 10-point social teachings of the Catholic Church. The practical application of this strategy was the establishment of community peace committees (CPCs) comprising local peace ambassadors including traditional leaders. The CPC members were trained on how to identify conflicts and resolve them in the communities as well as to understand the importance of sustainable peace building mechanisms in a community. To illustrate the importance peace and justice played in the program, one of the key informants at the church level said, "a full stomach without peace is meaningless and disempowering";

h) Faith-evidenced and action-based advocacy demonstrated through the livelihood projects designed and implemented which include community nutrition gardens, small livestock production through the pass-on approach and the school-based agricultural projects;

i) Inclusion of community members regardless of their faith and other social identifiers; and

j) Rights-based approach applied in which the program emphasised advocacy on human dignity expressed through availability and access to quality services in order to achieve and sustain quality life.

\(^4\) Section 4.4.7 under Chapter 4 entitled ‘Learning Areas’
From the above strengths, it can be noted that the program design was not top-down but grassroots or community context based and this is commendable. However, the program design only had an intentional and practical inclusion of peace building and conflict resolution in Chimanimani District and not in Bulilima, Mangwe and Umzingwane Districts because CCJP was not present in Bulawayo Archdiocese. This is despite the fact that there are also historical, current and potential conflicts in these three districts where CCJP was absent in this program. Also noted as a limitation of the program was the perceived and reported inadequate leadership and resource support to CCJP activities in Chimanimani as compared to the Caritas Danmark livelihood activities.

In addition, while the 3-tier program design approach was noble, the reality shows that this was quite ambitious to expect results to be achieved at the three levels within a short four-year program implementation period. While the economic situation and political sensitivity was relatively better in 2014 when the program started, the program assumptions were not revisited/revised in response to the gradual worsening of the economic and political landscape in the country. These are issues probably beyond the ability of the program to respond due to a number of factors at the funding, national and related partners. For instance, the difficulties that began in 2015 in the country to get cash from the banks which is crucial to carry out program activities. Although changes to the program design was prudent, the evaluation found that the program could not have been re-designed because the phasing out of the program in December 2016 was already under discussion and this being a year earlier than originally planned. Similarly, the envisaged national peace and reconciliation process as ‘ambitiously’ advocated by CCJPZ, did not take place as planned. The only aspects achieved was the appointment of the Commissioners and the drafting of the Bill where CCJPZ also made some input which were considered by the drafters.

On the 3-tier program design principle, the evaluation found that the theory of change occurred relatively high at household followed by at the community level while societal level has been quite limited especially in raising awareness on CAADP to the government of Zimbabwe and its development partners. It should also be noted that to attribute changes at national level to a single program like this one is problematic because there are many other players in the agriculture sector as well as peace and justice initiatives in the country. Generally, it is advisable for organizations to strengthen consortia to collectively achieve theory of change at national level. This is the idea of the Investment in Smallholder Agriculture Coalition (ISAC) and National Budget Coalition but these are yet to be fully functional to achieve the intended results.

3.4 Value addition of Caritas Danmark

Based on the views obtained from the community members, representatives of program strategic partners, program coordinators, program officers, the church leadership and representatives of Caritas Danmark, the following is the value addition Caritas Danmark brought to the program:

a) Raised awareness on the CAADP
b) Contributed funds to the program activities and administration especially the national level on policy issues; an aspect which often receives limited focus among the NGOs in community-based development work;

c) Contributed to the 3-tier program design (family, community and national levels) noting that most community development actors’ program designs are do not go beyond grassroots level

d) Technical expertise and experience of similar programs in other countries;
e) Managed to bring together various Commissions of the church on a common development agenda. This explains why peace and justice issues were integrated in the program design and implementation in Chimanimani and a national faith & evidence based peace advocacy initiative by CCJPZ national office;

f) Involved all the 8 Dioceses on program updates and learning events even though some of the them were not directly supported by Caritas Danmark. The evaluation found that the idea of using this approach was to build a larger critical mass for advocacy and awareness building on issues of national agenda like the CAADP, drought and Climate change mitigation and early warning information.

g) Facilitated the signing of the Compact in February 2017

3.5 Analysis of stakeholder involvement and coordination

Generally, the cross-section of the stakeholders identified and involved was appropriate in line with the program objectives. From the church perspective, some ecumenical church boards were involved and they include Zimbabwe Council of Churches (ZCC), (Evangelical fellowship of Zimbabwe (EFZ), Union for Development of Apostolic Churches in Zimbabwe (UDACIZA) and Inter-Regional Meeting of Bishops of Southern Africa (IMBISA) for local and regional peace initiatives. Perhaps more could have been done to collaborate with more strategic stakeholders. For example, in the market linkages and value chain, the Agriculture Market Authority (AMA) and ZimTrade could have added value in this program. Furthermore, other like-minded organizations in the areas of agro-based livelihoods/food security could have been identified and collaboration established like Food Agriculture Organization (FAO), CARE International Zimbabwe and Towards Sustainable Resource Organization in Chimanimani (TSURO) Fambidzanai and Participatory Ecological Land Use Management (PELUM). On the aspect of peace building and conflict resolution organisations like Zimbabwe Human Rights Organisation and The Church in Manicaland where involved however, some of the organizations for consideration could have included such organisation like Community Conflict Management Transformation (CCMT) and Tree of Life. In addition, the Zimbabwe Human Rights Commission, Zimbabwe Electoral Commission and the National Peace and Reconciliation Commission.

While it is commendable that a critical mass of strategic partners was identified and involved, the coordination could have been improved if MOUs were involved. Although the idea of MoUs for ISAC and budget coalition partners was discussed, the intended MoUs were not yet developed and signed by the time of this evaluation. Furthermore, the evaluation found that stakeholder collaboration could have been enhanced if sufficient time to program implementation and financial resources were allocated.

The establishment of a Project Management Committee chaired by ZCBC to facilitate the sharing and learning throughout the program implementation was noble. The quarterly project Management Committee meetings meant for coordination of partners’ efforts and giving regular strategic direction were regularly held and yearly visits by the Programme Coordinator from Caritas Danmark were conducted. The evaluation team saw the reports and minutes which are evidence to this finding. On the other hand, all CCJP diocesan commissions throughout the country managed to meet every three months as planned to share peace situation reports.
3.6 Inclusive development dimension in the program

The evaluation found that the program was inclusive in terms especially the targeting used. This came out in the following categories of data sources: (a) community member; (b) community and church leaders; (c) youths; (d) stakeholders (government and non-governmental); as well as (e) program coordinators and officers. Discussion below from the household questionnaire findings highlight some aspects which illustrate that to a great extent inclusive development was applied in the program as shown in Figure 3 below.

![Figure 3: Extent of involving vulnerable groups in the program](image-url)

The findings outlined in Figure 3 above are briefly discussed below.

**Involvement of women in community development**

Out of the 151 community members, 147 (97.3%) responded that women were deliberately identified and are involved in the program under review. Also, 128 of 149 (85.9%) stated that women are involved in local governance issues. Furthermore, of the 141 who responded to the question on involvement of women in community peace building initiatives, 116 (82.3%) expressed that they actively take part. Another aspect assessed was the inclusion of female heads of households in community development and the responses given indicate that of the 152 respondents, 142 (93.4%) pointed out that they are involved in the program.

**Involvement of people with disability in community development**

Of the 143 who responded to this question, 86 (60.1%) stated that people with disabilities were intentionally identified and involved in the community development initiatives. This is currently an aspect with limited attention as was also revealed by the baseline study that only 3.6% of the respondents pointed out that households headed by people with disability are considered in community development initiatives. The evaluation has found that this situation has remained the same which means that the program under review has not addressed it.
Involvement of youths in community development and peace building
From the 150 community members who answered the question on youth involvement, 127 (84.7%) expressed that the youths were considered for involvement in the community development initiatives. The findings also show that 119 (79.3%) expressed that the youths in their respectively communities, especially in Chimanimani District, are actively involved in peace building initiatives. This is evident in their participation in music, drama, dance and various sports that are often organized as mechanisms/strategies to foster and sustain peace in the communities.

On the whole, it can be seen that from the findings presented above that women involvement is relatively higher than people with disabilities and youths. This might suggest that less efforts were put in this program on the inclusion of people with disabilities and the youths.

Involvement in child protection issues
Of the 153 heads of households who were asked if anyone in the household was a member of the Child Protection Committee in the community, only 29 (18.9%) affirmed. This reveals that households’ participation in matters of child social protection is still very low in the communities enumerated. The finding suggests that this is one of the areas which requires more attention by the Church going forward.

Consideration of the elderly in community development initiatives
While it does not mean that the elderly should be involved in terms of provision of labour, there are other ways they can be considered for them to benefit from development undertakings in their communities. For example, they can contribute their knowledge, ideas and wisdom based on their life experiences. At the same time, they can be considered to benefit from community development initiatives simply because they are a vulnerable group in society. The baseline study conducted prior to the design and implementation of the program under review found that only 12.6% of the respondents indicated that the elderly headed (over 60 years) households were considered beneficiaries of development initiatives in the communities and this evaluation has found no change in this regard.

In view of the preceding findings, it is noted that the program did well in the involvement of women and youths but not people with disabilities, the elderly and focus on child social protection.

3.7 Assessment of program outcomes
This section presents the extent to which the program brought some changes (positive or negative) at the three intervention levels (family, community and national).

3.4.1. Program Theme 1 and objective: Strengthening Family Livelihoods and the overall objective is to strengthen joint initiatives taken by poor rural families to pursue their rights to food security and sustainable livelihoods

In almost all the communities enumerated, it was reported that the food security and nutrition at family level had significantly improved compared to the situation that prevailed prior to this program.

Yields of main crop
Figure 4 below shows an upward trend in the yields of main crops across all the communities enumerated. In Bulilima and Mangwe the main crops are sorghum and millet while in Chimanimani and Umzingwane are maize.
A contribution to the marginal increase in crop yields which is attributed to the program include supply of water, conservation agriculture practices and the peaceful co-existence of community members which allowed them to spend more time and efforts on livelihoods rather than on conflicts.

Sources of livelihoods
Table 6 below shows that the communities enumerated have strong socio-economic ‘shock absorbers’ or vulnerability resilience as indicated by 14 sources of livelihoods outlined in Table 6 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of livelihoods</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remittances</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrowing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock sales</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trading</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual Labour</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own crop sales</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal employment</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardening</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock products</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bee Keeping</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISALS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Panning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Sources of livelihoods in the communities enumerated

It is noted in the findings indicated in Table 6 above that gardening as a source of livelihoods was mentioned by more people than any other category the number increased from 22 in 2014 to 43 in 2017. This reveals that the community gardens which was the main anchor of this program strengthened household livelihoods to some great extent. Also to note is the sale of own crops and livestock which remained stagnant over the four-year period analysed. This means that although communities have improved their livelihoods through the community gardens and livestock, the surplus after domestic consumption is not yet sufficient for sales.
*Household expenditure patterns*

The finding on the community sources of livelihoods is corroborated by the household expenditure patterns analysed for the period 2014 to 2017 as shown in Figure 5 below.

**Figure 5: Household expenditure patterns (2014–2017)**

The data in Figure 5 above reveal some trends which can be linked to the program positive effects. For example, number of households who spend their money to buy food reduces from 82 in 2014 to 59 in September 2017 which is an overall reduction of 28% over the year-year period of the program implementation. Another important aspect revealed is that the number of households’ expenditure on education and health has remained at a constant level over the four years analysed. From this finding, it can be inferred that the households have managed to maintain the education and health support they require or some households do not have enough income to address these two aspects of life. The limited household income is buttressed by the general household non-food stuff purchase patterns. Heads of households who stated that they purchase non-food stuff were 53 in 2014, slightly increased to 58 in 2015, reduced to 38 and 14 in 2016 and by September 2017 respectively.

**Meals and dietary needs**

The community members consulted through the focus group discussions and interviews expressed that, on average, they now have three (3) major meals peer day. The quotation below from Hingwe in Bulilima District emphasizes this point:

*We now eat 3 times a day. We can now afford to sell some vegetables to Botswana and exchange for goods (cooking oil). (FGD Hingwe).*

The above statement is buttressed by the responses outlined in Figure 6 below from the 153 community household questionnaire respondents on if they had breakfast, lunch and dinner in the past seven (7) days excluding the day they responded to the question.
The findings shown in Figure 6 above indicate that the percentages of respondents who affirmed that they had breakfast, lunch and dinner daily in the previous seven (7) days were 94.2%, 89.5% and 96.5% respectively. This is quite an improvement from the baseline study findings where in Chimanimani it was found that 50% of the households surveyed said that had one (1) meal per day while 40% stated that they had two meals per day. Only 10% expressed that they had three (3) major meals per day. In Bulilima and Mangwe Districts, the baseline study revealed that households had two (2) meals per day on average.

In this evaluation, the community members further expressed that nutrition deficiency related diseases are almost no longer a health problem in their communities. To emphasize this point, one woman in Batanani Community Garden in Bulilima ward 11 said that “our garden eliminated kwashiorkor because our children are now eating healthy vegetables.” During a focus group discussion in Umzingwane and Mandlambuzi, the same point emerged as quoted below.

“Vegetables and food are now readily available...malnutrition has been reduced because of the nutrition gardens we have here” (FGD: members of community garden in Umzingwane).

“I have observed that we widows and widowers have improved significantly in terms of our health and the general outlook and so is our children and this evidenced by the fact that Kwashiorkor and Miasmas”(FGD Farmers Association in Madlambuzi)

The evaluation also found that generally, households are increasing their intake of a variety of vegetables (cabbage, rape, tsunga, carrots, beetroots, onions, tomatoes, etc.), fruits and proteins and reducing intake of sugars, oil, fats and butter used in cooking food. Out of 153 community members interviewed (through the questionnaire), 123 (80.4%) and 74 (48.4%) stated that a variety of vegetables and fruits respectively have become a way of life in their daily dietary needs. This indicates health consciousness in the communities which is linked to the capacity building component of the program. As already noted earlier in this report, the key contributing factor to the improved food security and nutrition is the community gardens. Largely, the people describe the abundance and variety of vegetables they are now able to grow to strengthen their household food security and nutrition as short of a miracle given that the communities are ecologically dry areas. On the aspect vegetable variety, it came repeatedly that the community members never thought it is possible to grow beetroot, carrots, and onions in their own soil as they always thought these types of vegetables are only found in well established green grocery shops.
Food security challenge in the communities

While there is now abundance and variety of vegetables, there is still a food security gap in Matabeleland in terms of crops such as maize, sorghum and millet; these being necessary for sustaining community starch which is a critical component of the family diet in the communities enumerated. This situation is slightly different in Manicaland there is reported increase in maize yield from 0 to above 3 tonnes per hectare under conservation agriculture and above 5 tonnes per hectare under the gravity fed micro irrigation. Although people are now enlightened/aware of their rights to food security and other necessities in life, the starch component of food security remains a problem in the communities particularly in Matabeleland. There are some aspects that exacerbate the food security challenges and these include climate change situation, destruction of crops by elephants especially in Hingwe and Mandlambuzi communities of Bulilima District as well as Mhakwe in Chimanimani District. The following quotations highlight this point:

“Here in Bulilima, elephants destroy crops and we have made numerous reports to the chief, District Administrator, CAMPFIRE and National Parks management but the situation has not really improved” (FGD with farmer group in Hingwe)

“Elephants are destroying our homesteads and crops; this is a major problem” (FGD with Mandlambuzi Farmer Association)

3.4.2. Program Theme 2 and objective: Strengthening Rural Organization and the objective is to strengthen community based organizations, and emerging networks of organized rural populations in supporting local livelihoods and securing equal access to basic services through active engagement of local decision makers

Community-based organization and collective action

The strategy for livelihood projects was centred on community groups and this was evident in all the projects visited and the discussions/interviews conducted with the community members in all the four districts. A major positive change attributed to community groups approach fostered in this program is the strengthened collective action to community development which is increasingly becoming a peace building mechanism in itself. A community development model called nhimbe or ilima which is practised in these communities contributed immensely to the aspect of community peace building within the context of socio-economic development. This is because of its characteristics of peace building, mutual trust, reciprocity, solidarity, empathy and social inclusion as extensively studied and documented by Sithole (2014)⁵

Community peace building initiatives

The community peace building initiatives were implemented by CCJP Mutare in Mhakwe and Chikwakwa Wards in Chimanimani District. From the data obtained and observations made during the data process, the community peace building and conflict resolution efforts by the CCJP Mutare played an important role in promoting social cohesion and peace in these two communities. This was crucial because the communities are realistically heterogenous in their social makeup. This heterogeneity multi-fold including ethnicity, religion, political affiliations and economic status and generally these facets tend to increase chance for conflicts in a community. Although the same initiative was not implemented in Bulilima, Mangwe and Umzingwane, there are indications that this would have been an important aspect in these communities and others in the Matabeleland region. The statement from a focus group

---

⁵ Sithole P. (2014). Community-Based Development: A Case Study of Nhimbe Practice in Zimbabwe (www.cedreafrica.org)
discussion held with traditional leaders in Masendu community of Bulilima District illustrates this point.

“When there is peace, it is easy to develop in the community or nation at large. If we are united we achieve more than when we are divided” (Leaders Masendu Central)

In the four districts enumerated (Chimanimani, Bulilima, Mangwe and Umzingwane), one of the major sources of conflicts established through the baseline study conducted was over the scarce availability of water for domestic and agricultural uses. One of the recommendations from the baseline study was the need to capacitate communities on water management skills so as to protect the water sources and to avoid conflicts which may erupt due to communal use of the water points in the communities. Table 7 below outlines the strategies which were reported to be working well in Chikwakwa and Mhakwe towards community peace building. The evaluation team members were also told that drama, music and dance in both Wards improved participation by community members at the advocacy and peace building meetings and workshops.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community peace building Strategies (e.g. drama, etc.)</th>
<th>Ward in which it is reportedly working well in the Chimanimani District</th>
<th>Brief comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Know your Zimbabwe Constitution Tournament</td>
<td>Chikwakwa Mhakwe</td>
<td>People were taught about the Zimbabwe national constitution during community meetings. Education, Information and Communication (IEC) materials were also distributed to enhance understanding of the constitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports galas</td>
<td>Chikwakwa Mhakwe</td>
<td>Different sports including local/indigenous varieties were promoted as a way of increasing and maintaining social interaction and cohesion among community members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama, music and dance</td>
<td>Chikwakwa Mhakwe</td>
<td>Socio-economic realities informed conceptualization and design of dramas including conflicts and how they should be amicably resolved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love Your Neighbour Initiative</td>
<td>Chikwakwa Mhakwe</td>
<td>A show of love to neighbours and vulnerable groups in the community through charity work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop your community event</td>
<td>Chikwakwa Mhakwe</td>
<td>Done by the community peace ambassadors to develop the community through rehabilitation initiatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Community peace building strategies in Chikwakwa and Mhakwe

As can be seen in Table 7 above, drama, music and dance are community peace building mechanisms which are working well in both Chikwakwa and Mhakwe. As discussed in Section 3.6, the youths are actively involved in these community peace building initiatives which is a commendable trend given that in most cases the young people are easy targets for use to perpetrate violence in communities.

Rights-based development consciousness
The evaluation found that communities enumerated have increased awareness and knowledge on their rights to basic services and are now able to engage local leadership on matters that require development attention. To illustrate, it was reported in Bulilima and
Chimanimani that the community members successfully engaged their councillor to have their roads upgraded and also to have Agritex services regularly in their communities. This shows that the rights-based indicator in the program logical framework is being attained. There was also evidence of farmer groups engaging in collective marketing in honey, craft and sale of vegetables. However, more time was needed to allow the community farmer groups’ efforts to mature. For instance, in Chimanimani farmers had started market linkage with the Mutare urban’s Sakubva Fresh Product Association at the time the program ends on 31 December 2017.

Illustrations in engaging local decision makers
Figures 7 to 11 below highlight some significant stories in how community members have managed to engage local decision-makers to address challenges being experienced in the communities. The actions taken by the community members are attributed to the rights and human dignity empowerment which was one of the key components of the program under review.

Box 1: Sexual and psychological child abuse

In Chikwakwa Ward, a girl was facing unending harassment from her stepmother as her biological mother died. One day she decided to go to Rusitu where her maternal extended family lived. On her way in a village called Nyahodo, she decided to ask for a place to sleep because she was tired and it was getting dark. The man who offered help raped her. The girl managed to run away and told the neighbours, who later reported the offence to CCJP. CCJP approached Social Welfare Department at the Chimanimani District Offices. These efforts resulted in the girl given a foster parent in Tilbury community and the man was made accountable for his offence.

Figure 7: Social Welfare intervention on a child abuse case

Box 2: Extension services

In Ward 7 of Bulilima, a smallholder farmer group said that they had no extension services in their area and this was negatively affecting quality and quantity of their crops. After they received training about their rights to development, they then approached their local councillor and ask him to arrange that the community has a resident Agritex officer. The Agritex officer is now available for them although he still needs means of transport like a motor bike to be able to adequately provide the required services to all the communities in the Ward promptly.

Figure 8: Extension services advocated

Box 3: Food shortage related child abuse

In another community in Chimanimani District, two children would go for days without food. People reported the situation to the Social Welfare Department in the district and the two children got the needed assistance. They were given to a mother in Ngangu location. The said mother willingly volunteered to care for vulnerable children in the village.

Figure 9: Social Welfare intervention on a child abuse case

Box 4: Community conflict resolution

The community peace ambassadors in Mhakwe successfully resolved a dispute over the school borehole which occurred in 2014 between a village head and a school. The village seized a borehole from the school for his personal use and fortunately the conflict was resolved amicably in the same year (2014) as a result of the community peace ambassadors’ intervention.

Figure 10: Dispute over a school borehole
Box 5: Community conflict resolution

In 2014, a conflict over land boundary arose between the United Baptist Church (UBC) and the Mhakwe Primary School. Through the mediation by the Community Peace Ambassadors, the dispute was resolved peacefully in the same year.

3.4.3. Program Theme 3 and objective: Strengthening Rural Development and the overall objective is to strengthen community based organizations’ and their CSO partners’ advocacy on a national level for a sustainable economic growth that will include rural areas on an equal basis

Advocacy on budget allocation to agriculture sector

At national level, a group of women from Bulilima, Chimanimani and small holder farmer representatives from all the other 6 Catholic Diocese in the country went to lobby the Parliamentary Portfolio Committee on Finance in 2016 to increase national budgetary allocation to agriculture sector to at least 10% of the national budget as agreed at the 2003 the CAADP-Maputo Declaration. The Budget Coalition which comprises civil society organizations in the country have also been advocating for the government to allocate at least 10% of the national budget to the agriculture sector. One of the civil society key informants quoted below confirmed that budget advocacy was one of the key focus areas of the program under review.

“During budgetary meetings Caritas brought smallholder farmers to advocate for the 10% budget allocation to agriculture so as to improve food security. They also promoted research/evidenced based advocacy to the government” (KII NANGO).

As shown in Table 9 below, to date the efforts of both the smallholder farmer groups who participated in this program and the Budget Coalition have not yielded much to influence the Government of Zimbabwe to increase agriculture budget allocation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>National Budget (Billion)</th>
<th>Budget allocated to Agriculture (Million)</th>
<th>% Budget allocation to Agriculture</th>
<th>Variance against the 10% CAADP agreed minimum allocation to agriculture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>155.20</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>-7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>225.00</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>145.00</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>-7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>303.20</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual average</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>207.10</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>-7.856</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Budget allocation to agriculture (2014 – 2017)

As Table 9 above indicates, the average percentage of annual budget allocation to agriculture is 2.1% which means a significant 7.86% negative variance of the minimum agreed 10% at the 2003 CAADP-Maputo Declaration and this has been a general trend in the past 19 years as shown in Appendix B. In the previous four years (2010 – 2013), the average annual budget allocation was 7.87% leaving a relatively small negative variance of 2.13%. In the same period, 2010 had the highest allocation at 14% with 2011 and 2013 having the least allocation of 4.4% and 4.6% respectively. In the past 19 years inclusive (1995 – 2017), it is only in 6 years
(31.5%) had above 10% budget allocation to agriculture sector and these are 1995 (6%), 2004 (6%), 2006 (7%), 2007 (7%), 2010 (14%) and 2012 (8%). These statistics signify that the Government of Zimbabwe should put more efforts. This also suggests that there is a need to strengthen advocacy work on agriculture budget allocation.

**Achievement on the 10 stages of the CAADP process**

Despite the current low budget allocation to agriculture sector, Caritas managed to engage the Government of Zimbabwe to go through all the 10 stages of CAADP processes including the Compact Development and signing as well as participating in ITR and ZAIP processes. On this aspect, one of the key informants stated that “At one point, Caritas brought farmers to the Ministry of finance to share their needs with the ministry.” Although the awareness and understanding of the 10 CAADP stages were achieved through this program, implementation by the Government is quite limited which suggests that more advocacy efforts are still required.

Through this program efforts, in August 2016 ZAIP was translated from English into seven (7) indigenous languages namely Shona, Tonga, Shangani, Venda, Ndebele, Ndau and Kalanga. The evaluation found that this was an important strategy to ensure that the principles contained in the ZAIP are well understood by people in Zimbabwe up to grassroots level and this is quite possible when documented and expressed in one’s own native language. Generally, this also promotes buy-in, ownership and participation. Nevertheless, still more action is required from the Government through its Ministry of Agriculture and Mechanization as evident in the findings already discussed in Section 3.4.3 above.

At national level, CCJPZ lobbied the Zimbabwe Human Rights Commission to decentralize its offices so that they could be accessed by the generality of the Zimbabwe citizens. Since one of the conflicts in communities were caused by electoral processes, CCJPZ lobbied the Zimbabwe Electoral Commission to institute bio-metric voter registration process to minimize conflicts associated with electoral processes. Furthermore, CCJPZ lobbied the national peace and reconciliation bill drafters to minimize the powers of the responsible minister in the peace and reconciliation bill draft to avoid undermining its independence.

**3.8 Program effectiveness**

Given the needs identified in the communities, installation of solar-powered water pumps, design and implementation of community gardens and other related livelihood projects as well as fostering peace building mechanisms were effective means to achieve the desired outcomes in this program. Also, the strategy to collaborate with Misereor is praiseworthy in that it allowed for larger geographical project coverage as well as that clear roles and responsibilities were agreed and implemented. However, effectiveness or synergy effect of this collaboration was reduced due to limited time, lack of harmonization and alignment of resource management and reporting. For example, the two partners had separate: (a) resource management systems including bank accounts; (b) reporting systems including timeframes; and (c) remuneration packages for their staff regardless of the fact that the staff members are all employees of the church with clear policy on equality of remuneration of personnel in the same job description.
3.9 Program Efficiency

Five aspects of efficiency found in this program are briefly discussed below.

a) *Local contribution*
Project allowed community local contribution as the beneficiaries provided the much needed labour for the projects and already they are making contributions to take care for breakages in the event of borehole breaking down and purchase of seeds in the case of gardens. The local contribution has reduced need for external funding while achieving same intended outcome.

b) *Link to local structures*
On efficiency, the evaluation focused on how resources (human and non-human resources) were optimized to achieve the intentions of the program. The evaluators observed that the approach of working with local authorities and community leadership is resource efficient because some of the monitoring and enforcement of peace building were/are being done by the local people. The program also took advantage of many extension workers already on government pay roll hence increased Extension worker to farmer ratio that brings efficient in monitoring.

c) *Link to existing community development initiatives*
Given the limited resources availed for the program in proportion to the level of needs identified, this approach helped to save time and costs as no further administrative costs or efforts were required in identifying and siting community development initiatives. Furthermore, this promoted buy-in and ownership and these two aspects are crucial in any development initiative for impact and sustainability. Hence, the model adopted helped the program to leverage on existing community livelihood projects.

d) *Use of management information system*
The rationale of the management information system (MIS) in the program was largely to increase efficiency portability in data and information sharing through a web-based platform. In other words, data/information could be retrieved or viewed from anywhere and at any time with minimal transit costs.

However, when the first in-country national coordinator left, the utilization capacity decreased and this compromised achievement of efficiency that could have been gained through the use of the MIS.

e) *Resident program officers in the communities*
This applies to Chimanimani where there is a resident program field officer. The evaluation found that a resident officer reduces the cost of traveling for fieldwork and also increases understanding of the community context.

In Bulilima, Mangwe and Umzingwane Districts, there are no local based program officer(s). They are based in Bulawayo this and this arrangement requires more resources to coordinate program activities as the field officer has to travel an average of 300km round trip from Bulawayo on the routine program monitoring and meetings with local leadership and partners in Bulilima and Mangwe. In addition, it emerged that the program coordinator and/or program officers in Matabeleland South Province sometimes miss development meetings that were organized by the local authority.
3.10 Social dimensions for consideration in the communities
In Bulilima, Mangwe and Umzingwane Districts, it was reported that the value for education among young people is still quite low as most of them prefer to go to look for work in Botswana and South Africa than to go to school. Furthermore, alcohol and substance abuse are reportedly increasing in the communities to the extent that some steal money from their mothers or grandmothers from their hard work in the community gardens or other livelihood projects.

3.11 Emerging good practices
The following are some of the noted emerging good practices in the program:
  a) Program design was directly linked to existing development initiatives in the communities such as gardens, goat rearing and poultry (people-centred approach);
  b) Institutionalized education support for OVC in Empandeni Mission and Mangubo Primary School;
  c) School-based young farmers and this is contributing to the new curriculum which puts emphasis on vocational subjects particularly agriculture;

3.12 Opportunities for program scale up and replication
Going forward, there is an opportunity to increase collaboration with like-minded organizations in a consortium form to scale up in the same communities as well as to expand to other districts in similar circumstances of water problems, food and nutrition insecurity. Additionally, only if market linkages and value chain are strengthened, there is a great opportunity for horticultural produce in the national and international markets.

The value chain and market linkages components of the program has limited success mainly because of insufficient time allocated to the program to achieve the desired effect. Other barriers to market linkages identified in this evaluation include bad road networks, limited availability of cash in the banks and market in general, limited disposal income among the population and bureaucratic challenges being encountered in licensing products. As the evaluation noted, these barriers were beyond the scope and intention of the programme.

3.13 Lessons learnt
  a) A 3-tier (household, community and national levels) can work if equal effort and resource allocation are applied throughout the program implementation
  b) Integration of community peace building in program design is a noble idea and quite relevant to community-based development initiatives
  c) Involvement of local authorities and community leadership reduces the chance for project/program resistance as well as politically related suspicions
  d) Encouraging and strengthening value for education can be more effective if income generation projects are designed and supported at school level to assist OVC
  e) Partnership with like-minded organizations provides a strong platform for national level advocacy
  f) Engaging statute and influential institutions is critical in policy advocacy. Its more helpful to work with them and not to take a condemnation approach without one doing anything
  g) Importance of ICT in development initiatives – the church needs to have a dedicated ICT or M&E unit to promote MIS use in its development initiatives (cite the departure of in the in-country coordinator /Advocacy officer /and Programme Coordinator in Danmark who left immediately after they had received MIS capacity development) – and the system’s implementation weakened. The MIS remain very important for centralised monitoring of similar programs with national scope.
3.14 Program Sustainability

The discussion here is based on the understanding that *sustainability or durability of program positive effects* refers to the capacity and likelihood of a development initiative to sustain its positive change/effects to people’s lives (outcomes and impacts) beyond the external resource and technical support. The program is likely to sustain because of the following factors:

a) Program used the already existing Church structures which are permanent in the communities. Participating beneficiaries were largely bona fide residents including community leaders and they are likely to continue the activities even after program exit

b) Collective spirit built among the community members

c) Program focused on strengthening existing community development initiatives

d) Knowledge and skills were imparted to the community members

e) Inclusion of community leadership including in peace building initiatives as community peace ambassadors

f) Solar-powered water pumps

g) Gravity fed irrigation schemes in Chimanimani which means minimal or no financial resources required

In terms of institutional sustainability it will be important for ZCBC secretariat develop a national resource mobilization strategy for the development initiatives. This could include exploring a possibility that Catholic institutions in Zimbabwe and other proportionally contribute to a development fund managed under ZCBC Secretariat.

However, river and dam siltation threaten viability of Masimba and Mandlambudzi gardens and livestock. In addition, worsening climatic conditions in the country and globally means that agricultural are likely to be negatively affected in the future. As noted earlier, weak market linkages and value chain are issues that are likely to limit income generation. In Hingwe and Mangubo, elephants (some from Botswana) are a problem to the lives of people and crops.
SECTION FOUR

4 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Conclusion

Overall, the program contributed noticeable positive changes/effects at household and community levels as the findings discussed in the previous indicate. The program is addressing the major problems identified and prioritized in the communities and these are: (a) shortage of water which worsens food security and nutrition as well as hygiene and sanitation; (b) conflict; and (c) limited education support for OVC. Social inclusivity is quite evident in women and youth but limited on people with disabilities, the elderly and child social protection. The exclusion of peace building mechanism in Bulilima, Mangwe and Umzingwane Districts was a remarkable limitation in the program design. Sustainability/durability of the program positive effects presented is moderately likely because of the people-centred approach which characterized the program design, implementation, monitoring, reporting and learning. However, sustainability is linked to the ability and attention of the central and local governments to address socio-economic barriers and policy limitation to attain the desired outcomes in the CAADP and ZAIP. Below are some recommendations for consideration in the future interventions by the Roman Catholic Church in Zimbabwe.

4.2 Recommendations

Guided by the positive program effects, gaps/challenges, lessons learnt and emerging good practices from the project, the recommendations below are suggested:

4.2.1 Strengthen collaboration with like-minded organizations

The level of success shown in the program indicates that if a consortium approach is adapted with more like-minded organizations in food security and peace building, more can even be achieved going forward. Developing MOU or terms of reference increases accountability, political will by cooperating agents.

4.2.2 Continue and sustain advocacy activities

This is important to sustain the momentum and confidence among the communities, parliamentarians, constitutional commissions, media to advocate for improved services in their areas and these include road networks, water supply, education support, food security and market linkages.

4.2.3 Strengthen national level focus to influence policy direction

This program did relevantly well at household and community level but marginal at national level. There is need to strengthen the national level influence of policy direction in the areas of food security, peace and justice.

4.2.4 Improve market linkages and value addition

Market linkages and value addition remain limited. There is need to strengthen extension services in the rural areas which will greatly help to enhance quality and quantity of farm produce (crop and livestock). Furthermore, the central and local governments (local authorities) should ensure that market barriers are removed such as bad road networks, bureaucratic and legal framework challenges in licensing enterprises and products.

4.2.5 Scale up and replicate program in similar communities in Zimbabwe

Scale up the school-based/institutionalized OVC support as well as water supply to other places like Gwanda, Hwange, Tsholotsho, Chipinge South, Chiredzi and Rushinga.
4.2.6  **Integrate peace and justice in all community development initiatives**
As noted in this evaluation, CCJP was only in Mutare. It is strongly recommended to integrate peace and justice in all projects and programs in the future including the Archdiocese of Bulawayo. Caritas to continue working jointly with CCJP in all projects/programs because as this is the role of the Church to strive for peace and justice in all communities.

4.2.7  **Strengthen use of MIS in all projects and programs**
Continue with the current MIS in the current and future projects/programs. This can be used not only for Donor funded projects but can be harmonised to include all project undertaken by all commissions under the catholic Church.

4.2.8  **Clarify partnership agreements**
The need to have partnership agreement which are well documented is important and to ensure that the parties involved duly sign it. Going forward, Danmark Caritas and Misereor need to revisit their collaboration relationship. A basket funding model could be considered than the current arrangement. The partnership agreement also applies to the local partners from public, civil society and private sectors.
Appendices

Appendix A: Terms of Reference

TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)
END OF PROGRAMME EVALUATION
Caritas Denmark-Zimbabwe Country Programme,
2014-2017

1. Background
Caritas Denmark (C-DK) is supporting the implementation of the Zimbabwe Country Programme, guided by the Zimbabwe Country Strategy 2014 - 2017, through collaboration with the Zimbabwe Catholic Bishops Conference (ZCBC). The rural development programme is being implemented at different levels and in two Catholic Dioceses of the country. The rural development strategy seeks to address poverty and inequality guided by themes at three levels, namely: Family level, Community level and Society level.

In Bulawayo ArchDiocese, Caritas is implementing projects inwards 7, 11, and 12 of Bulilima district, ward 1 and 13 of Mangwe district and ward 5 of Umzingwane district in a project named “Improved Livelihoods through water supply, market linkages and social protection to vulnerable members of the community”. In the same diocese Caritas Danmark has entered into a co-funding agreement model with Misereor, this project is to be evaluated along side with the country programme.

In Mutare diocese, Caritas-Mutare implements the “Community Food Security and Livelihood Promotion Program” (CFSLPP) while the Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace (CCJP-Mutare) is at the same time implementing the “Community Healing and Rebuilding” project in the same wards, 18 (Mhakwe) and 19 (Chikwakwa) of Chimanimani district. In both dioceses the programme promotes first and second development levels which seek to promote small-holder farmers livelihoods through development of sustainable agriculture value chain, establishment and strengthening of rural organizations and networks to engage their local communities in joint initiatives for improved access to basic services and equal rights and furtherance of an enabling environment for sustainable development through peace and reconciliation initiatives.

At the third, societal level, CCJP-Zimbabwe (National Office) through the “Faith and Evidence Based Advocacy project” collects information on justice and peace issues from dioceses through church structures and uses it as evidence for advocacy at national level. CCJP also joins the ZCBC Secretariat and Caritas Zimbabwe (National Office) who works with the National Budget Coalition (NBC) and another coalition of organisations investing in Small-scale Agriculture (ISAC) in supporting the diocesan level partners through implementing advocacy and capacity building initiatives at national level. At this level, Caritas Zimbabwe also supporting and adding voice to the Zimbabwe Agriculture Investment Plan (ZAIP) which is a country based agenda the Africa Union’s (AU) Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program (CAADP) with the hope to influence National Budget formulation processes to “push” the Government “to allocate 10% of its national budget to agriculture as means to achieve 6% economic growth”, a commitment signed by the Zimbabwean government at the “Maputo declaration” in Mozambique at an AU summit in 2003. Outcome from national level advocacy is expected to benefit not only the Caritas Danmark supported Dioceses but rest of the country’s targeted small holder farmers in general.

2.0 Project goal:
To achieve inclusive and sustainable development by strengthening civil society in rural areas.

2.1 Project specific objectives

Family level:
Theme 1: Strengthening Family Livelihoods
Immediate Objective:
To strengthen joint initiatives taken by poor rural families to pursue their right to be food secure and to have sustainable livelihoods.

**Community level:**
**Theme 2: Strengthening Rural Organization**
**Immediate Objective:**
To strengthen community based organizations, and emerging networks of organized rural populations in supporting local livelihoods and securing equal access to basic services through active engagement of local decision makers.

**Society level**
**Theme 3: Strengthening Rural Development**
**Immediate Objective:**
To strengthen community based organizations’ and their CSO partners’ advocacy on a national level for a sustainable economic growth that will include rural areas on an equal basis.

### 3.0 Overall Objective of the Evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the progress made towards achievement of the specific objectives of the programme, its outcomes and impact on the lives of smallholder farmers who have been directly involved in the project activities at local and national levels, and furthermore, to assess the sustainability of achieved outcomes given the finalisation of the Caritas Denmark-supported Zimbabwe Country Programme as of end 2017. It will also gauge the level of community and other stakeholder participation, ownership of the implementation process and sustainability mechanisms in the programme design. The Evaluation shall also identify the intended and unintended outcomes, best practices, lessons learned as well as challenges arising from programme implementation. The evaluation should also highlight the impact the advocacy component has influenced policy at local and national level.

### 4.0 Evaluation Target Audiences

The project evaluation is intended to benefit multiple stakeholders that have been involved directly or indirectly in the project’s implementation process. In particular, the following stakeholders will be the key target audience:

- Project beneficiaries (smallholder farmers)
- Community leadership
- Ministry of Agriculture Mechanisation and irrigation development and other complimentary line ministries and departments
- Government of Zimbabwe
- Local Church and government authorities in target district
- Local and international organisations that are operating within in project Districts
- Funding Partner (Caritas Danmark)
- Back Donor (Government of Denmark)
- ZCBC, Caritas Zimbabwe and CCJP programme implementing agency

### 5.0 Specific Objectives of the Evaluation

#### 5.1 Project Relevance

The Evaluator will ascertain

1. The extent to which the Zimbabwe country program addressed policy issues affecting smallholder farmers in Bulilima, Mangwe and Umzingwane district of Arch diocese of Bulawayo and Chimanimani district of Mutare Diocese and at national level.
2. Whether the programme is relevant to the real needs of the intended beneficiaries
3. The contribution of the programme in fighting hunger and poverty and in creating better livelihoods for the poor rural smallholder farmers
4. Consistency of activities and outcomes with the objectives of the project and whether the objectives and implementation strategy was appropriate taking into account longer term needs and challenges among smallholder farmers and their communities
5. Whether the program design was appropriate with regards to community involvement and participation in the design process, goal setting, planning and implementation

5.2 Project Efficiency
The Evaluator will assess
1. The adequacy and efficiency of planning, monitoring and reporting systems, and use of both material and financial resources
2. Whether project resources were efficiently used in relation to the planned activities, outputs and outcomes.
3. Strategies and implementation methods used to ascertain the external and internal factor that facilitated or impeded the efficiency of the programme in achieving its intended results and targets.
4. How adequate were the available resources? Qualitatively and quantitatively? Were all the project resources utilized optimally?
5. Use of alternative low cost approaches that could have been used to achieve similar results? How could the efficiency of the project be improved without compromising outputs?
6. Assess the timeliness of implementing the project activities. How adequate were the reporting and monitoring systems of the programme? Have the project outputs been achieved with a reasonable cost?

5.3 Project Effectiveness
The Evaluator will
1. Assess if the project has achieved the objectives as stated in the project document, country strategy, log frame and project outline.
2. Ascertain the extent to which the project beneficiaries are being involved in decision making and how support has been provided by the programme.
3. Assess the scope of achievements of the programme against the set objectives, what are the achievements against set objectives?
4. Compare actual with planned outputs and how have outputs been translated into outcomes. Establishment of possible deviation from planned outputs and likely outcomes should be determined.

5.4 Project Impact
The Evaluator should
1. Ascertain changes being brought in the lives of the poor rural smallholder farmers as a result of the program.
2. assess changes in the living standards or the poor rural smallholder farmers using set quantitative and qualitative indicators for e.g. food is availability, empowerment, livelihoods and rights based indicators
3. Assess other possible short and long term changes in the communities, e.g. contribution to peace and reconciliation which is a component which was strongly supported by the Advocacy Program and CCJP.
4. Analyse changes in social relations within homes and communities
5. Assess changes in the status of smallholder farmers that have been brought as a result of the programme whether intended or unintended
6. Evaluate government support given to the Agriculture Sector in line with the CAADP Maputo declaration of 2003; at the same time assess the role played by the program in supporting CAADP processes in Zimbabwe.
7. Examine how equitably has the project benefited the; women, men, boys and girls youth and other sectors at all levels in society.

5.5 Project sustainability
The Evaluator shall
• Assess the sustainability of the programme to ensure continuation, maintenance and replication of the project outcomes. This should include institutional and/or organisational, social, technical and financial aspects of sustainability.

• Assess the ability of the smallholder farmers, their groups/associations to continue supporting themselves in maintaining higher level of livelihood standards obtained through the various program interventions.

• Assess effectiveness of the capacity building interventions in the community structures to ensure sustainability.

• Examine challenges that might affect sustainability of the programme and suggest solutions to overcome them.

• Assess the overall management and structure of the project. Are there plans, structures and skills in place to ensure there is sustainability of project benefits? How adequate are they? How is the community and local partners prepared to continue with the project outcome, to secure sustainability?

5.6 Discuss the lessons learnt, conclusion and recommendation
The Evaluator shall on the basis of the data gathered:

• Capture best practices and lessons learned from the Country Program. Caritas Denmark will share this information with ZCBC and key stakeholders including policy makers, other NGOs, farmers Associations as well as local and international organisations running programs addressing smallholder farmer issues in Zimbabwe and other countries.

• Draw conclusions and make recommendations.

• Assess the strength, areas of growth and challenges of the project and how they affect the project implementation and how they were handled.

• Identify opportunities for the project if any and how they were exploited/ neglected.

• Provide specific and practical recommendations and document lessons to be utilized for the future projects.

• The best practices that have been adopted and how can they be replicated in future projects or partners for adoption.

• Draw lessons learned specifically from co-funding programme initiatives.

5.7 Community participation/involvement
The Evaluator will

• Assess whether community members are knowledgeable and supportive to the project?

• Assess whether there has been any collaborations and networking with the different stakeholders?

• Examine whether there is evidence of community contribution and ownership of the different project interventions?

6.0 Evaluation Methods
Detailed evaluation methodology will be designed by the external Consultant in consultation with In-country Programme Coordinator who will also advise on the sample size, sampling strategy and procedures. The Evaluator is expected to use a variety of qualitative and quantitative methods to collect and analyse data in a participatory way. The detailed design of methodology must include the following key methods, but not limited to;

• Literature review of existing documents and review of context and poverty trends including the Country strategy, Project Proposals and LFA, the local level Baseline Survey report, bi-annual and annual review reports, work plans and monitoring and evaluation reports. Most Significant Change (MSC) stories, Minutes of PMC meetings.
• Key informant interviews with ZCBC Caritas Bishop President, ZCBC secretary general, CDk In-country Programme Coordinator, Diocesan coordinators Advocacy and Program officers, Investment in small scale Agriculture Coalition(ISAC)partners, Budget coalition partner, local authorities (traditional and elected) and local development institutions, CAADP focal person and other Government Ministries representatives at national, provincial and district and ward level
• Field visits, Observations and Focus Group Discussions involving primary project participants (i.e. smallholder farmers, extension officers), other social groups and key stakeholders.
• Data Collection ,collation and analysis
• Presentation of draft report to stakeholders
• Reflection and feedback on report
• Final draft report submission

7.0 List of partners/stakeholders to be involved in the evaluation
• ZCBC Bishop President for Caritas Zimbabwe
• ZCBC Secretary General
• In-Country Programme Coordinator
• Caritas and CCJP coordinators at National and diocesan level
• Programme, Managers/officers/M&Es/advocacy officers
• CAADP Focal Person-Ministry of Agriculture ,Mechanisation Irrigation Department
• Agritex/LPD/Irrigation officers at Provincial ,District and ward level
• District Administrators and Chief Executive officers of target districts
• Smallholder farmer Association leaders/representatives
• Community Peace Ambassadors/committees
• Small scale agriculture and budget coalition member organisations –e.g. National Association of Non Governmental Organisation (NANGO), Fambidzanai ,PELUM, Action Aid and others
• Traditional and political leadership
• Smallholder farmers in Bulilima, Mangwe ,Umzingwane and Chimanimani districts

8.0 Deliverables
• Inception report with detailed evaluation plan
• Debriefing meetings with In-country coordinators and Diocesan coordinators during evaluation process
• First draft report
• Final evaluation report
• Submission of hard and electronic copies of materials, data collected / analysed and other evaluation documents.

9.0 Reporting
9.1 First Draft Report
A feedback meeting will be held at national level around mid-October where the first draft report will be presented to Caritas Danmark

9.2 Final Report
The Evaluator will incorporate comments from the feedback meeting into the final report which will be produced and submitted to Caritas Danmark in electronic and 2 hard copies.

9.3 The Final Evaluation Report shall follow the structure below:
   i. Table of Contents
   ii. Acknowledgements
   iii. Affirmation
   iv. Glossary/Acronyms and Abbreviations
10.0 Quality assurance
1. Orientation and training of both internal and external data collectors, as well as the pilot testing of contextualized evaluation tools, KII and FGD tools should be given a thorough consideration; hence a considerable time should be planned for these tasks.
2. Data collection quality control mechanisms and data validation scheme should be imbedded in the evaluation design to ensure that the findings are valid and sufficient for informed decision making.

11.0 Time frame
1. The overall evaluation process is expected to take a maximum of ninety (90) days including preparation, data collection, and analysis and reporting.
2. The Consultant should be able to undertake some of the tasks concurrently to fit within the planned time-frame, without compromising the quality expected.
3. The assignment is expected to commence on 1 Aug 2017, with the final evaluation report expected by 1 Nov 2017, with a de-briefing meeting around mid-October in Harare, as written above. Any changes shall be agreed between the consultant and the In Country Programme Coordinator.
4. The table below highlights some milestones in the evaluation timelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Due date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signing of Contract, Briefing meeting</td>
<td>17th July 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk review begins, Development of tools</td>
<td>20th July 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception report submission and presentation</td>
<td>21st July 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback on inception report, Review of data collection tools</td>
<td>25th July 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of enumerators</td>
<td>28th July 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field work starts</td>
<td>1st August 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection, Data collation and analysis</td>
<td>1st September 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft report preparation and production</td>
<td>1st October 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debriefing Meeting-Draft report presentation</td>
<td>16th October 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of report</td>
<td>20th October 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report submission</td>
<td>1st November 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.0 Authority and Responsibility
The In country Coordinator will be responsible for the overall coordination of all the evaluation tasks with the Consultant at all levels however the Diocesan Coordinators will also assist intaking responsibility at community level. In addition, the In-country Coordinator, supported by Caritas and CCJP Coordinators at National and Diocesan level shall
1. Provide all the necessary technical and operational support required throughout the evaluation process.
2. Recommend the recruitment of a suitable external Consultant for approval and finalization of consultancy contract with Caritas Danmark's Zimbabwe Country Programme Coordinator in Denmark
3. Share all necessary documents with the Consultant to finalize the evaluation methodology and data collection tools.
4. Provide input for evaluation study methodology, data collection tools and report.
5. Ensure that input from implementing partners is circulated and shared with external Consultant and vice versa.
6. Guide and coordinate all the phases of evaluation, keeping constant communication with external Consultant throughout all phases.
7. Provide support to the external Consultant for the evaluation during field visits.
8. Closely follow up the data collection process, ensuring quality control, regular debriefing and meeting the timelines set for interview completion.
9. Inform evaluation audience for their involvement in the study and help in setting specific dates for the evaluation field schedule.
10. Be responsible for overall accountability of the evaluation process.

12.1 Caritas Denmark will be responsible for the following:
1. Making available the financial resources for the evaluation.
2. Approving and signing the contract of the evaluator upon recommendation of the candidate by the selection team drawn from ZCBC, Caritas Zimbabwe and CCJP Implementing partners.
3. Participating in the final de-briefing meeting in Harare around mid-October 2017.
4. Quality control and monitoring the evaluation process.

12.2 The Consultant will be responsible for the following:
1. Reviewing all relevant documents for the evaluation study.
2. Developing evaluation study design which includes survey methodology and the data collection tools (questionnaire; focus group guides, interview protocol, data entry templates, etc.), as appropriate, in consultation with In country Coordinator, reflect partner feedback on the methodology.
3. Designing the data entry template, procedures and systems.
4. Developing the field work schedule in consultation with In-Country Coordinator, CCJP and Caritas National and Diocesan Coordinators.
5. Conducting training for the data collectors and finalize the evaluation schedule.
6. Supervise the data collection process, give advice and ensure the quality of the data.
7. Conducting interviews (KII) and FGD.
8. Data collection, analysis and report writing.
9. Presentation of first draft report to stakeholders at national level, include partner feedback and finalize the report for submission.
10. Provide regular field debriefing to the In Country Coordinator, National and Diocesan Coordinators on the progress and report any challenge from the field.

13.0 Documents
The key documents to be reviewed for the evaluation study are but not limited to:
1. Project document (C-DK Zimbabwe country strategy, cooperation agreement incl project documents for all five partners, log frames and the consolidated log frame, risk assessment matrix).
3. Monthly, quarterly, semi-annual and annual reports.
4. PMC Meetings minutes.
5. Annual review reports.
7. CAADP compact.
8. ZAIP Documents.
10. Success stories.
11. Video clips.
12. National, provincial or district level secondary data or any other relevant documents and reports.

### 14.0 Qualifications of the Consultant

The evaluation exercise will be undertaken by an External Consultant who leads a team of expert members with relevant qualifications. The consultant will work in close collaboration with the In-country Programme Coordinator, National and Diocesan coordinators for CCJP and Caritas. The Consultant must have the following skills and qualifications:

The Team Leader must possess a post graduate degree in Development studies, Agriculture, advocacy, Peace building, other social sciences or related discipline (a PhD will be an added advantage).

1. Strong and documented experience in conducting participatory qualitative and quantitative assessments related to development and poverty reduction projects
2. Demonstrated experience in leading at least three similar project evaluation studies such as surveys and group interviews at national and international level,
3. At least 5 years’ experience in conducting country or large scale projects evaluation such as food security, livelihoods peace building and advocacy which are implemented by non-state actors
4. Familiar with CAADP/ processes in Zimbabwe is essential
5. Strong background in agriculture and national budget processes essential
6. Knowledge of the rights based approach to projects management and peace building
7. Knowledge of Result based management (RBM) and/or Participatory Monitoring and evaluation and learning (PMEL)
8. Ability to interact with host government and other stakeholders including Faith based organisations.
9. Strong organizational, analytical and reporting, presentation skills.
10. Attention to details and ability to meet deadlines, and proficiency in management information skills, qualitative and quantitative data analysis software/tools.

### 15.0 How to apply:

15.1 Qualified and interested parties are asked to submit the following:

- **i.** Letter of expression of interest
- **ii.** A detailed technical proposal clearly demonstrating a thorough understanding of this ToR
- **iii.** A profile of the Consultant firm including full name(s), physical addresses, telephone numbers and registration status
- **iv.** Description of the Methodology and Sample Size Determination
- **v.** Demonstrated previous experience in similar assignments and qualifications outlined in this ToR.
- **vi.** Proposed data management plan (collection, processing and analysis).
- **vii.** Proposed timeframe detailing activities and a work plan. Team composition and qualifications of each proposed team member (include CVs of each team member).
- **viii.** A **financial proposal with a detailed breakdown of costs** for the study quoted in United States dollars to include consultant fees, field data collection expenses and administration expenses
- **ix.** ZIMRA clearance certificate
- **x.** All applications should be sent electronically to Marius Zibgwii: zibgwim@zcbc.co.zw with attachments in pdf and a titled:

15.2 Submission Deadline: 5 July 2017

### 16.0 Terms of payment

**Caritas Denmark shall pay the consultant upon mutual agreement as follows:**

- **20%** of agreed fee upon signing of contract
- **30%** upon presentation of the draft report
- **50%** on submission of final report and recommendations, but subject to its acceptance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>National Budget (Z$ million &amp; US$ million)</th>
<th>Allocation to Agriculture (Z$ millions &amp; US$ millions)</th>
<th>Agriculture as % of the National Budget</th>
<th>Variance against the 10% CAADP agreed minimum allocation to agriculture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Z$25679.00</td>
<td>Z$1437.90</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(4.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Z$31199.15</td>
<td>Z$247.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(8.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Z$37335.30</td>
<td>Z$1465.30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(6.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Z$70607.00</td>
<td>Z$13110.60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(8.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Z$5198.60</td>
<td>Z$1331.20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(8.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Z$109197.20</td>
<td>Z$2173.20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(8.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Z$276450.00</td>
<td>Z$5520.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(8.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Z$21926.30</td>
<td>Z$16943.10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(6.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Z$783934.00</td>
<td>Z$40549.10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(5.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Z$7747638.50</td>
<td>Z$497615.30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(4.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Z$28363608.40</td>
<td>Z$1000155.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(6.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Z$430826273.00</td>
<td>Z$2198883.00</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>(2.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Z$41725656.00</td>
<td>Z$3053734.00</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>(2.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Z$790534586.00</td>
<td>Z$36683858.00</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>(5.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>US$1,000</td>
<td>US$23.5</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>(7.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>US$2,250</td>
<td>US$448.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>US$2,750</td>
<td>US$122.00</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>(5.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>US$4,000</td>
<td>US$337.20</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>(1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>US$3860.00</td>
<td>US$147.839</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>(5.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>USD 4.10</td>
<td>USD 155.20</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>(7.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>USD 4.10</td>
<td>USD 225.00</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>(8.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>USD 4.00</td>
<td>USD 145.00</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>(7.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>USD 4.10</td>
<td>USD 303.20</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>(8.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix C: Community mobilization guide for data collection

Community Mobilization Guide.

Appendix D: Tools used in the Evaluation

- FGD Guide - Community Leaders.docx
- FGD Guide - Peace Committees.docx
- FGD Guide - Youths.docx
- Household Observation Checklist.docx
- Household Questionnaire.docx
- FGD Guide - Children.docx