



# Environmental projects in a child-focussed NGO

Facing new evaluation challenges for  
development projects

Peter Weston



# World Vision and its context

A Christian relief, development and advocacy organisation

“Our vision for every child, life in all its fullness; Our prayer for every heart, the will to make it so.”

Community Development programs

Long-term

Multi-sectoral

Community-based

Adaptive to context

- Evaluation guided by the compendium of indicators for ‘Child Well-being Outcomes’



# Adapting child-focussed evaluation for Environmental Projects

## Dilemmas and evaluation adaptations

1. **Temporal barriers:** livelihood benefits of environmental projects occur after the project evaluation
2. **Inconsistency** in monitoring and evaluation plans
3. **External demands** on the development sector: 'evidence' and 'compliance'.
4. Increasingly erratic inter-annual weather behaviour is confounding baseline/end-of-project comparisons (especially for food security projects).
5. WV's traditional evaluation approach favours measuring direct cause/effect changes, whereas environmental change has a profound but indirect impact on child wellbeing.



*Evaluation in Senegal*





# I. Temporal barriers:

livelihood benefits of environmental projects occur **after** the project evaluation

Identification of **PROXY** indicators to capture trends



*Eroding hillsides, Burundi*



## Adapting child-focussed evaluation for Environmental Projects

### Dilemmas and evaluation adaptations

*1. Temporal barriers (cont.): livelihood benefits of environmental projects occur after the project evaluation*

### Other proxy indicators of environmental change

- Health of household animals (daily volume of milk; number of eggs, market value of animal, number of animal deaths
  - As a proxy for change in amount of tree and grass forage, and shade
- Number of non-participants adopting promoted practices- as a proxy for farmers' assessment of likely benefit to household resilience
- How secure do households feel about their land tenure – As a proxy for the likely willingness for farmers to invest in long-term land and soil restoration
- What changes (positive or negative) do residents expect in their livelihoods in the next 5 years?
  - Children's critique of adults' land management practices

- Children's optimism for the community and farming



*Children discuss greening in Mali*





## 2. Inconsistency in monitoring and evaluation plans



*Organic vegetable production, Ethiopia*

- **Centralising support for M&E plans, baseline and end-of-project indicators**
- **Development of internal M&E guide**
- **Collaboration to expand ‘the Compendium of ‘Child Well-Being’ indicators to include environment/child nexus**



### 3. External demands on the development sector:

A. 'compliance'

B. 'evidence'

A. Compliance:

**Modify 'development'  
indicators to adapt to  
carbon market  
reporting indicators**



*Once were forests, Rwanda*





### 3. External demands on the development sector:

A. 'compliance'

B. 'evidence'

A. Compliance

B. Evidence

**Piloting 'Social Return on  
Investment' (SROI)  
methodology**



Community forest  
committee  
members, Senegal





# Adapting child-focussed evaluation for Environmental Projects

## Dilemmas and evaluation adaptations

1. **Temporal barriers:** livelihood benefits of environmental projects occur after the project evaluation
  2. **Inconsistency** in monitoring and evaluation plans
  3. **External demands** on the development sector:
    - A. 'compliance'
    - B. 'evidence'
  4. Increasingly erratic inter-annual **weather behaviour is confounding baseline/end-of-project comparisons** (especially for food security projects).
  5. WV's traditional evaluation approach favours **measuring direct cause-effect changes**, whereas environmental change has a profound but indirect impact on child wellbeing.
1. Identification of **proxy indicators** to capture trending
  2.
    - Initial **centralised support** for M&E plans, baseline and end-of-project indicators.
    - Internal **M&E guide** for enviro project design.
    - Collaboration to expand the WV Compendium of 'Child Well-Being' **indicators to include environment/child nexus.**
  3.
    - A. Modify 'development' **indicators to adapt** to carbon market reporting indicators
    - B. Social Return on Investment (SROI)**





# Evaluating food security in environment projects

Challenges and opportunities

Carolyn Kabore



*Evaluation in Burundi*



# Overview of presentation

- Introduce food security project models currently on WVAs evaluation 'strategic evidence building' agenda
- Discuss one model – Farmer Managed Natural Regeneration (FMNR)
- Describe our experiences with evaluation of FMNR projects – using a case study from Senegal
- Describe challenges and opportunities



# Validated food security project models in our current portfolio

- Farmer Managed Natural Regeneration (13 projects)
- Local Value Chain Development (5 projects)
- Business Facilitation (5 projects)
- Permaculture household gardens (2 projects)
- Energy saving stoves (2 projects)





# Farmer Managed Natural Regeneration – we know it works

- Certain indigenous tree species are highly compatible with cropping, e.g. *Faidherbia albida*
- Researchers and farmers have demonstrated increased in yields for cereal crops grown under ‘fertiliser trees’
- Trees also provide shade and yield timber, firewood, fruits, seeds and fodder, and these products contribute to household economy



# Farmer Managed Natural Regeneration projects in practice

- In our projects, farmers visit other farmers in regions and witness how the landscape has been transformed by FMNR
- Farmers learn how to identify and manage valuable tree species that regrow from old root systems, or sprout from seeds
- Farmers develop locally adapted protection, pruning and coppicing methods
- The approach spreads quickly from farmer to farmer – no assets or external resource required





# Senegal food and livelihood enhancement initiative project



**A project - funded by AusAID  
Started in 2008 and evaluated in 2011**

09 06 2011

# Approach to setting the evaluation objectives

- Terms of reference including the evaluation objectives are set by local project stakeholders
- An inception workshop with 70 stakeholders generated 50 evaluation objectives
- These were grouped into four key themes
  - Project logic
  - Partnership
  - Sustainability





# Key evaluation questions...

- Does successful uptake of FMNR increase household food security?
- To what extent has the project raised community awareness, built capacity and resulted in positive practice change
- What were the unanticipated consequences or outcomes?



# Evaluation approach...

- Comparison of indicator values at baseline and end of project
- Use of secondary and primary data sources
- Mixed methods design
- Household survey – sample size 700 households with multistage cluster sampling
- Group discussions and key informant interviews
- Site visits by FMNR technical expert
- Facilitated drawing and discussions with children



# Surveyed indicators included...

- Household demographic characteristics, education and training levels of farmers
- Household farming resources and practices
- Range of indicators for household food security
- Measurement of farmer awareness, knowledge and capacity and practice of FMNR





# FMNR & no FMNR, survey results...

- Comparison of data did not reveal significant differences in food security indicators such as:
  - Average months food security
  - Number meals per day
  - Food types consumed
  - Coping mechanisms
  - Income and expenditure
- There was a small increase in average yields for cereal crops but a decrease in yields for cash crops grown by farmers who practiced FMNR



# Challenges...

- We know that the practice of FMNR does result in better yields and complementary benefits
- Qualitative analyses support the benefits of FMNR
- Physical evidence – more trees - is hard to ignore
- However – because quantitative evidence for increased food security is not convincing – other evidence tends to be ignored



# Conclusion...

- For environmental interventions aimed at increasing household food security we need to:
  - Research and develop more reliable indicators and methods
  - Link with local researchers to learn more sophisticated approaches to data collection and analyses
  - Or push back on what is deemed to be 'solid evidence' for these types of projects





## Current opportunities...

- Social return on investment study of an FMNR project in Ghana
- Socio economic study of FMNR in Ethiopia in association with International Centre for Agroforestry (ICRAF)
- Development of geographical information systems (GIS) to manage evidence around physical changes in the landscape

