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### Acronyms & Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMK</td>
<td>Angkor Mikroheranhvatho Kampuchea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDAC</td>
<td>Cambodia Centre for Study and Development in Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDPO</td>
<td>Cambodian Disable People’s Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFW</td>
<td>Community Field Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRC</td>
<td>Cambodian Red Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVT</td>
<td>Community Vocational Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWARS</td>
<td>Cambodia Wars Amputee Rehabilitation Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Decision Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoA</td>
<td>District of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoSVY</td>
<td>District of Social, Veterans and Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoWA</td>
<td>District of Women Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPM</td>
<td>Deputy Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPM</td>
<td>Deputy Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EdM</td>
<td>Entrepreneur du Monde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPH</td>
<td>Economic Project Holder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCD</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHI</td>
<td>Household Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Handicap International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRC</td>
<td>International Committee of the Red Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGA</td>
<td>Income Generating Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAP</td>
<td>Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFOs</td>
<td>Livelihood Field Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFIs</td>
<td>Microfinance Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEC</td>
<td>Organisation Enfants du Cambodge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Project Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PME</td>
<td>Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PwDs</td>
<td>Persons with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QQL</td>
<td>Questionnaire Quality of Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIGA</td>
<td>Towards Sustainable Income Generating Activities Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPC</td>
<td>Thaneakea Phum Camboadía Ltd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPO</td>
<td>Transcultural Psychosocial Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBNK</td>
<td>Institute to serve facilitator of Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VF</td>
<td>Vision Fund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

The 2 following schemes synthesise the core findings (impact and challenges) of this Mid-Term Evaluation.

Impact Evaluation Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strong Management (Project Manager and Deputy Project Manager)</th>
<th>Strong Team Cohesion Team Work (OEC/HI)</th>
<th>Most Tools and Methodology are Efficient and allow good monitoring</th>
<th>Efficient Decision Committee (for selection of beneficiaries)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Overall Tools and Methods are applied properly by the Team

Good support provided to beneficiaries for Business Ideas and Business Plan

On the whole the support provided responds to the socio-economic needs of selected beneficiary

Most beneficiaries are able to run sustainable TIGAs and 66% have increased their household income

TIGA promotes better access to livelihood opportunities to its beneficiaries

TIGA Challenges Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIGA Selection Criteria: Only People not accessing MFI Services</th>
<th>Bad Roads Difficult Mobility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost all households access MFI services in the target regions</td>
<td>Exclusion of vulnerable people based on ambiguous assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More time spent on field visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More time needed to select and visit beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beneficiaries Selection Process Delayed

Less Time for Follow-up

More time spent for finding beneficiaries

Less Focus on Vocational Training & Apprenticeship Programmes

Time Pressure to speed process and achieve Quantitative results

More focus on Quantitative than Qualitative Progress
1. Evaluation Framework

1.1. Project Background

Since April 2008 Handicap International France (HIF) along with its local partner Operations Enfants du Cambodge (OEC) has been implementing a European Commission funded project promoting the improvement of the living conditions of disabled people and landmine victims in the Province of Battambang. The project entitled: “Towards Sustainable Income Generating Activities for Landmine/UXOs victims of Battambang Province” (TIGA) comes in line with a previous similar project implemented by HI from 2006 to 2007.

TIGA Project Basic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>30 months (April 2008 to September 2010)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Objectives

**Global:**
- To reduce the social exclusion and poverty;
- To improve the capacities of local actors to meet the need of people in disabling situation.

**Specific:**
- To increase the access to livelihood opportunities;
- To reinforce the capacities of the local NGO partner to run sustainable socio-economic projects.
- To improve on the long term the living conditions of beneficiaries in 4 districts of Battambang

Target Group

**560 people in disabling situation** in 16 different communes of 4 districts

52 staff of local NGO working on Victims Assistance

Main Activities

- Identification and dissemination of information about vocational training services
- Assessment s and feasibility studies with beneficiaries
- Provision of trainings and Professional Kits for Livelihoods activities (IGA, Small Business)
- Public Awareness Campaigns
- Awareness Workshop for communities’ stakeholders
- Promotion of Business Experiences and Success Cases
- Facilitation/provision of support material and services
- Dissemination of directory
- Capacity Building actions for local NGO partner (OEC)
- Trainings/ promotion of disability rights, counselling and sustainable methodologies

Expected Results

- Landmine Victims and other people with disabilities have better access to Livelihoods
- Beneficiaries and service providers improved their reciprocal knowledge and information
- In the field of Mine Action the local partner NGO has its capacities to run sustainable socio-economic projects reinforced

1.2. Evaluation Objectives

The core goal of this Internal Mid-Term Evaluation is to assess TIGA project’s achievements and challenges (after 15 months of implementation) and accordingly identify lessons learned and provide recommendations.

The specific objectives of this Evaluation are to:

- Assess the overall progress and quantitative and qualitative impact of implemented activities
- Assess efficiency of tools and livelihoods methodology
- Assess the satisfaction level of selected beneficiaries who have been receiving support from the TIGA project since the past 6 months.
- Identify key lessons learned
Assess the sustainability of the activities implemented
Provide Recommendations on future tools and practical approach to ensure successful finalisation of the project

1.3. Evaluation Methodology

According to the objectives set above, and in order to guarantee a quantitative and qualitative evaluation, the following methods were applied:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Tools/Methodology</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1. Analysis of baseline Indicators and Methodology** | • TIGA database (candidate analysis, IGA analysis, professional kits delivered, etc)  
• TIGA proposal  
• 1 year Report for Donor (TIGA)  
• First Interim Narrative for Donor Report (TIGA)  
• Previous TA Handover Report  
• Monitoring Report (previous TIGA, 2007)  
• TIGA project Manual (including tools)  
• Training Reports  
• Other Reports (e.g. MFI meeting minutes, etc)  
• OEC HI Partnership Contract | **Quantitative**  
• Collect baseline information and data.  
• Assess project’s progress  
• Assess quantitative impact  
• Understand the project’s context, objectives and expected results and outcomes |
| **2. Field Visits** | • 4 days field visit (interview 20 beneficiaries, LFOs, CFWs)  
• 1 day field Visit to assess infrastructure projects  
• 2 day field visit – DC meeting  
• Peer to Peer Training on Chicken Raising | **Qualitative**  
• Assess beneficiaries satisfaction  
• Assess project impact  
• Assess problems and challenges faced  
• Understand how the project’s methodology is applied |
| **3. Questionnaires Developed of Used for Evaluation** | • Quality of Life Survey (80 beneficiaries interviewed by CFWs)  
• Internal Monitoring (57 beneficiaries interviewed by DPM)  
• Mid-Term Assessments Tool (database – 78 beneficiaries interviewed by LFOs) | **Qualitative & Quantitative**  
• Assess beneficiaries satisfaction level  
• Assess project impact (quantitative & qualitative) |
| **4. Meetings** | • Meeting for SWOT analysis with all TIGA team  
• Meeting with 2 MFIs  
• Meeting with NGOs: ICRC, CRC  
• Meeting with TIGA’s PM | **Qualitative & Quantitative**  
• Assess impact and progress  
• Assess difficulties faced by Team  
• Assess relevance of tools and methodology  
• Assess relations with other relevant stakeholders |
| **5. Focus Group Discussion** | • 1 Focus Group Discussion (20 beneficiaries present) | **Qualitative**  
• Verify beneficiaries satisfaction level  
• Assess problems and challenges faced |

Please refer to Annex 1 in order to access the Evaluation work-plan and applied tools (Questionnaires)

- **Methodology Challenges**

→ Although the questionnaires were designed in a simple manner, many beneficiaries needed a long explanation to understand the purpose and meaning of the questions asked.
Since most of the beneficiaries do not keep a record regarding their annual and monthly income it is very difficult to measure accurately whether there was an increase in their household income or not. An increase in the household income is one of the most important indicators used for measuring the impact of the project activities.

It is difficult to measure beneficiaries satisfaction levels because the beneficiaries are aware that the people interviewing them are part of the TIGA project (the car or motorbikes used to access the beneficiaries house are all identified with logos). Being so when asked questions such as: “Has your quality of life improved?” most beneficiaries might feel compelled to answer positively in order to be polite towards HI staff. No matter how we explain them the purpose of the interview this risk is always present.

- Methodology Strengths

Even if the applied methodology has its limitations the variety of tools and means used to obtain information can ensure considerably the objectivity, impartiality and accuracy of the information provided. The following list summarises the evaluation methodology strengths:

- The information inserted in the database system is entered by the database operator on a weekly basis. The information inserted is doubled checked by the LFOs and CFWs as well as by the Project Manager and Deputy Project Manager on a regular basis.

- The sample used to measure the quality impact and satisfaction level of the project is high, consisting of a total of 235 interviews with different beneficiaries (20 conducted directly by the evaluator, 57 by the Deputy Project Manager during the internal monitoring process, 80 by the CFWs – Quality of Life Survey, specifically developed for this evaluation, 78 by the LFOs – Mid-Term Assessment Tool). Moreover, the interviews were conducted by different people with very different positions, decreasing the risk of partiality.

- The Focus Group Discussion, which gathered a total of 20 beneficiaries, also had a very positive outcome allowing beneficiaries to express their ideas and opinions more freely. The group factor diminished the fears and allowed beneficiaries to express their ideas and share them with others. Moreover, no staff known by the beneficiaries to be related to the project was present at the meeting.

- The SWOT analysis, as well as individual discussions with all TIGA team members, was surely one of the most relevant and useful methods to evaluate the impact, efficiency and relevance of the tools and methodology used for implementing the TIGA project.

- The 2 days field visit to assist to the Selection Process of beneficiaries through the Decision Committee Meetings allowed checking in loco the application of the methodology developed for the TIGA project as well as the qualitative impact of the selection process.

- Individual meetings with relevant stakeholders were also very useful for assessing the impact and relevance of the TIGA Project.

1.4. Report Structure

Besides the Evaluation Framework (Introduction) the project is divided into 3 core Chapters:
Chapter 2 Evaluation Findings
Chapter 3 Sustainability and Lessons Learned
Chapter 4 Conclusions and Recommendations

Each Chapter follows a specific structure according to its objectives. No standard structure is common to the 3 Chapters. There is an introductory summary at the beginning of each Chapter.
2. Evaluation Findings

This Chapter introduces the core findings of the Mid-Term Evaluation. The evaluation findings focus firstly, on assessing the progress and impact of the project’s main activities (sub-chapter 2.1), secondly, on analysing the relevance and efficiency of the project’s methodology (sub-chapter 2.2).

2.1. Progress & Impact

As per the overall project objectives the achieved results are in line with the expected quantitative outcomes. 85% of the total 560 target beneficiaries have been successfully identified having received basic trainings (Nutrition and Hygiene & Sanitation). 76% of Professional Kits have already been delivered. The local partner NGO has received a major part of the trainings envisaged to improve their capacities in running socio-economic projects. Several awareness raising activities have taken place. A referral system for facilitating and providing rehabilitation, medical and psychological services has been set-up. Access to Vocational Trainings and Apprenticeship programmes is facilitated through the project.

Table 1 – Overall Progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selected Communes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected villages</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected Beneficiaries</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>85% of target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male beneficiaries</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>51% of selected beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female beneficiaries</td>
<td>Min. 252 (45%)</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>49% of selected beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landmine Victims</td>
<td>392 (70%)</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>71% of selected beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other PwDs</td>
<td>168 (30%)</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>29% of selected beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Kits delivered</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>76% of target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries received Trainings¹</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>100% of selected beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries received Social Support²</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>22% of selected beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Trainings and Apprenticeship</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3% of selected beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness workshops</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100% of target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries referred to MFI</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>66% of selected beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nonetheless, taking into account the project’s methodology and action plan there is a delay in the selection of beneficiaries and provision of professional kits.

As per the internal action plan all 560 target beneficiaries are expected to be selected by end of September 2009 and 505 Professional Kits are expected to be delivered by the same date. Considering that the TIGA team has only 1 month to select the remaining 83 beneficiaries and deliver 120 Professional Kits a slight delay may occur (based on the average monthly work achieved by the TIGA team up to date).

Even if there is no delay in achieving the set of quantitative objectives the time pressure has already impacted negatively the quality of the services and support provided. An analysis of this

¹ This refers to all Trainings offered by the project: Vocational Trainings, Community Vocational Training, Apprenticeship Programs and Peer to Peer Trainings.
² This refers to all Social Support Services: Accessibility, Health, Pregnancy, Rehabilitation, Emergency
situation is schematised on the Executive Summary and, is examined in detail on the next sub-chapter (2.2).

Still, the overall impact of the activities implemented up to date has been very successful. A breakdown of the progress and impact of these implemented activities is analysed in detail in the bellow sub-sub-chapters, focusing on 5 core project deliverables: 1) Professional Kit, 2) Trainings, 3) Accessibility and Social Support, 4) Capacity Building of Partner NGO, 5) Awareness Raising and Dissemination of Information.

2.1.1. Professional Kits

- Progress Analysis

Professional Kits are the grants provided to beneficiaries corresponding to goods used for enhancing or starting up an IGA (machinery, tools, raw material or any other assets/materials). The distribution of Professional Kits for start-up or enhancement of an IGA is a major part of the TIGA project, representing a third of the expected outcomes and a considerable share of the project’s budget. During the reporting period 386 Professional Kits had been provided to 386 different beneficiaries. The Professional Kits were all distributed by the LFOs according to the procurement procedures and the project’s methodology (including a minimum of 5% contribution in labour or kind by the beneficiaries).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delivered Professional Kits</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>81% of selected beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farming Professional Kits</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pig raising</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>44,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry raising</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>17,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish raising</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planting</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>19,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice Growing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Farming</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Farming Professional Kits</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Repairing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Repairing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorbike Repairing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpentry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Processing</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair Cutting</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaving</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Non-Farming</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection of Professional Kits

A higher number3 of beneficiaries chose to start-up new IGAs instead of enhancing their current IGA. According to findings this is related to 2 main factors:

1. Some beneficiaries prefer to increase their households variety of IGAs in order to guarantee more sustainability in case one of the main sources of revenue fails

2. Some beneficiaries prefer to start-up an IGA and receive a Professional Kit with a higher value instead of receiving an average of 70 USD for enhancement IGA.

---

3 According to initial project plan
Table 3 – Professional Kits: Start-up and Enhancement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Original Target</th>
<th>Value (original)</th>
<th>Value (updated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start-up Professional Kits</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>150 USD</td>
<td>140 USD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement Professional Kits</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>70 USD</td>
<td>80 USD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After consulting the TIGA team the Project Manager has made a slight change in the values of the Start-Up and Enhancement Professional Kits in order to give an adapted response to the needs of the beneficiaries and at the same time respect the budget restrictions. This adjustment has facilitated the project implementation and responded successfully to the requirements of targeted beneficiaries. This adjustment is not in contradiction with the project’s methodology or the expected outcomes.

According to findings, the distributed Professional Kits were freely chosen by the beneficiaries in consultation with their family members and the LFOs.

**Figure 1 – Why did you choose this activity?**

![Pie Chart](source: Internal Monitoring (sample 57 interviewed beneficiaries)]

There were, however, in some cases beneficiaries who would have preferred, at a first instance, to enhance or start-up other IGAs or choose different Professional Kits. Two major reasons can explain why these beneficiaries could not receive support for start-up or enhance their first choice IGA: 1) economic constraints (average of 70 to 150 USD per Professional Kit and no possibility of high contribution from beneficiaries’ side) and 2) family pressure.

For example, it often happens that families are afraid to let their female relatives’ access Vocational Trainings or Apprenticeship programmes conducted far from their village. This situation restricts the choices of many young female beneficiaries who, due to these constraints, opt for another IGA not representing their first initial choice.

**Variety of Professional Kits**

The above circumstances can also explain the fact that 76% of Professional Kits were used for supporting Farming Activities. Another reason is that the target population is mainly settled in rural areas explaining the considerable number of farmers among TIGA project’s beneficiaries. Moreover, since 70% of beneficiaries are landmine victims with an average age of 40-50 years old, they represent a group less prone to change its livelihood activities (traditionally linked to farming).
The fact that pig-raising represents 44% of those farming activities also shows that most of the professional kits are used as a secondary source of income. Pig raising and poultry raising are not main sources of revenue in rural Battambang. Being so, it is clear that at least 50% of the Professional Kits delivered were used for enhancing or starting-up secondary IGAs and not the those IGAs corresponding to the main sources of revenue of the targeted households.

Pig raising and poultry raising are also a fairly easy activity to implement not requiring a high contribution in kind from the beneficiaries (most of the contribution, in these cases, is provided in labour through construction of cages and use of natural resources available in the farms).

In some cases, the LFOs may have also influenced indirectly the high rate of IGAs on pig raising and poultry raising supported by the TIGA project. The next sub-chapter (2.2) explains in detail this factor.

Figure 2 – Variety of Professional Kits Delivered

- **Impact**

Out of 78 interviewed beneficiaries, 54% stated they had improved their Quality of Life after 6 months of receiving the Professional Kit. Nevertheless, it is important to notice that the improvement in the Quality of Life may not be directly related to the delivery of the Professional Kit. Quality of Life may have been improved due to the social support services and trainings provided. For this reason Household Income and Food Security are better indicators in order to measure the true impact of the distribution of the Professional Kits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household Income Increased</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income Decreased</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Income Stagnated</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Stock Improved</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Stock Decreased</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Stock Stagnated</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life Improved</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life Decreased</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life Stagnated</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Mid-Term Assessment Tool used after 6 months of deliver of Professional Kit (TIGA Database)

---

4 From all interviewed beneficiaries none received its main income from pig raising or poultry raising.  
5 Quality of Life Assessment
The results on Table 3 show a considerable improvement in the food stock and household income and are in line with the expected outcomes (“By the end of project, the income of 70% of target group has increased”, in TIGA project proposal).

It is also worth noticing that during the Focus Group Discussion, the majority of beneficiaries stated that after receiving the Professional Kit their income increased and as a consequence their Quality of Life improved due to:

- More savings to access health care services
- More savings allowing improving the house conditions and the water storage system
- Increased food stock
- Enhanced other IGAs
- Increased capacity to purchase water and wood for home consumption

There are several reasons that can explain why some beneficiaries have faced no improvements in their household income or their food stock. Although the reasons depend mostly on case to case circumstances, by and large, stagnation can be explained by 4 main factors:

1. In certain cases, 6 months is too short to measure if the household income increased
2. The beneficiary suffered a set-back (bad harvest, livestock died, accident or natural disaster)
3. Secondary IGAs have less impact in the household income
4. Beneficiaries were not able to provide accurate information on their Annual Income in order to allow a precise comparison (before/after delivery of Professional Kit)

- Challenges
As mentioned above, the delay in delivering the Professional Kits and selecting beneficiaries has put a strong time pressure on the LFOs. This pressure allows less time for follow-up visits.

For example, some beneficiaries did suffer set-backs (poultry died, pigs got sick, accidents, etc) and did not receive any targeted advice from the LFOs. This happened because the LFOs had not enough time to visit these beneficiaries.
2.1.2. Trainings for Beneficiaries

- Progress Analysis

The TIGA project has a complex set of trainings which can be divided into 2 main categories:

1. General short-term trainings (1/2 to 6 days)
2. Long-Term Vocational Trainings and Apprenticeship programmes (3 to 9 months)

Each of these trainings has very different objectives and aim at different outcomes.

Table 5 – Trainings Facilitated & Provided to Beneficiaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Nº of beneficiaries</th>
<th>Target (Internal)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vocational Training Centre (CWARS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Repair</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair Cutting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorbike Repair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailoring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CWARS Trainings</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14% of target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apprenticeship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beauty Salon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorbike repair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Tailoring</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>17% of target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Trainings (provided directly by HI &amp; OEC staff)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>100% of selected ben.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene &amp; Sanitation</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>100% of selected ben.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Management Training</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>4% of target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Vocational Trainings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry Raising</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig Raising</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Raising</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planting</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice Growing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL Agriculture Trainings</strong></td>
<td>317</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100% of target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peer to Peer Trainings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig Raising</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry Raising</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL Peer to Peer Trainings</strong></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>39% of target (internal)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As described before, the context of rural areas (where farming prevails as a main source of revenue), the profile of the target population (63% of beneficiaries are above 40 years old) and the constraints related to local culture and practices explain partially the low amount of long-term trainings provided (vocational training and apprenticeship) to TIGA beneficiaries.

For example, even if the costs related to the CWARS training are fully covered by the TIGA project (transportation, fees, food and accommodation), LFOs found very few beneficiaries willing to undertake these long-term trainings far from their villages (CWARS trainings take place in Battambang). This situation can also be related to the fact that CWARS trainings are exclusively open for PwDs and not their family members or relatives.
The above, however, does not explain why so few beneficiaries were not willing to learn new skills from local people living relatively close to their homes (Apprenticeship Programmes). This might, on the other side be explained by the poverty levels of targeted beneficiaries. According to the projects’ methodology, when given the choice to learn new skills for free the beneficiaries are asked to contribute with materials and tools necessary to start-up a new business (beauty salon, motorbike repairing, etc). Many beneficiaries are scared or do not have enough capital to invest on the start-up of non-farming businesses, therefore, preferring to receive a Professional Kit for pig or poultry raising (according to them a sure source of revenue, even if minor). Referral to MFIs would have been the most logical approach to deal with these fears. Nonetheless, referral to these services has been very hard to achieve among the target population. Moreover, LFOs have not been enforcing systematically the referral to MFI services (this factor is analysed in detail on Chapter 2.1.5.)

In addition, the fact that LFOs are concentrating more time in selecting beneficiaries leaves them with less time to research on available apprenticeship opportunities at the commune and district levels. If the LFOs are not able to suggest different apprenticeship opportunities there will be less beneficiaries applying for these.

The low number of beneficiaries receiving Business Management training is explained by the late implementation of this component (as per internal plan). Taking into account the project’s logic, business management training should have been provided before the delivery of the Professional Kits or right after it. However, only by mid-August, after more than 11 months since the first Professional Kits had been delivered, did the first beneficiaries received business management training.

Due to a strategic change in the project plan, the TIGA team decided to increase the number of trainings available for Community Vocational Trainings (Agriculture) in order to compensate for the low number of long-term trainings provided. From 67 places available for Agriculture Trainings the TIGA project has already facilitated trainings to 317 beneficiaries (corresponding to 99% of beneficiaries having a farming IGA).

- Impact

Unfortunately it is too early to measure the impact of the 3 following trainings:

1. **CWARS** – all CWARS trainings are still ongoing being, therefore, too early to measure its impact.
2. **Business Management Training** - only 20 beneficiaries were provided with BMT and this happened during the evaluation period. Being so, it was not possible to collect information on its impact. However, due to the considerable delay the impact of these trainings will most probably be less effective, considering that more than half of the beneficiaries have already started implementing their IGAs for at least 6 months.
3. **Apprenticeships Programs** – out of 10 Apprenticeship Programs only 1 interviewed beneficiary provided information on the impact of a tailoring apprenticeship program. The beneficiary attended a 3 months training to enhance her capacities and after 3 months was able to tailor new modern cloths appealing to the youngest generations. Her household income suffered a slender increase due to the training received.

**Peer to Peer Trainings**

Peer to Peer trainings seem to have the most popular and effective impact among beneficiaries’ practices and attitudes. By attending a Peer to Peer training on chicken raising it was possible to assess the enthusiasm and willingness of the participants in learning from a success case. The fact that beneficiaries were learning *in loco* made the training easier, allowing the participants to ask practical questions. Most of the participants have stated they had learned new innovative and useful practices regarding chicken raising during the Peer to Peer training.

**Nutrition, Hygiene & Sanitation**
Out of 20 interviewed beneficiaries all confirmed they had changed their Hygiene and Sanitation practices and followed the nutritional advices provided by the CFWs. However, according to CFWs, many beneficiaries did not really change their practices. During the SWOT analysis meeting the CFWs stated that most beneficiaries cleaned their kitchens and pig or chicken cages when they knew the LFOs or CFWs were coming. But, when CFWs visited the beneficiaries by surprise they would assess different attitudes and practices regarding hygiene and sanitation. Being so, it is difficult to assess the real impact of these trainings in the quality of life of beneficiaries. No KAP assessments are available to evaluate the true impact of these trainings. There were, nonetheless, some beneficiaries that without being asked stated that the trainings provided had a very positive impact in their daily life.

Community Vocational Training in Agriculture Techniques
Community Vocational Trainings in Agriculture were provided by DoA to 317 beneficiaries who chose to start-up or enhance a farming IGA. The trainings were divided into different categories according to the farming choices of the beneficiaries and had lasted 1 to 8 days (depending on the farming activity). The impact of these trainings has been crucial for the successful implementation of the TIGA project. Although, the knowledge acquired through the trainings is not always followed strictly by the beneficiaries it is the standard pillar supporting the implementation of farming IGAs through the TIGA project. Building cages for livestock, providing vaccination, planting different types of seeds, etc, are just few of the elements which facilitate the implementation and follow-up of the farming IGAs.

During the Focus Group Discussion several beneficiaries stated that the fact that they could not read or write made the learning process more difficult. But, in the end, all confirmed they were applying the training methods on a daily basis. Some beneficiaries also stated that they would have liked to learn more innovative techniques and that the DoA trainings provided very basic information with which they were already familiar with. For this reason, the feedback on peer to peer trainings seems to be more positive.

- Challenges
  → It is very hard to change the habits and practices of the beneficiaries regarding agriculture techniques and Hygiene and Sanitation practices.

  → The Community Vocational Trainings on Agriculture are deemed to be too theoretical and lack practical exercises (since they are not provided in the farm but in a classroom). Interviewed beneficiaries complained about this factor.

  → Business Management was provided too late and its impact may not be guaranteed among the first batch of selected beneficiaries. Although, LFOs have a good knowledge in business management they lack experience in providing training in business management (up to date only 1 out 8 LFOs had his training capacities tested).

2.1.3. Social Support

- Progress Analysis
The Social Support component of the TIGA project aims at facilitating access or provision of basic home repairing, infrastructure accessibility (toilets, ramps, etc), rehabilitation, medical or psychological services. The objective of this component is to prevent social problems affecting the lives of selected beneficiaries (approved by the DC). The purpose not being that of promoting dependency but ensuring beneficiaries can be referred to basic services available in their communities as well as benefit from some basic services provided by HI (home repairing and accessibility).

Only Medical and Emergency support services have a defined target as per project proposal (refer to Table 7).
The referral progress has been slow in what concerns support services. The only exceptions are the services directly provide by HI (accessibility and home repairing) which have already exceeded the initial budgetary plans.

**Table 6 – Social Support Provided (Referral System)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>Percentage*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Repair</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Pregnancy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation (ICRC)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral to other Services</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL of Social Support Services</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*of 477 selected beneficiaries

**Table 7 - Social Support - Target**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries with social needs are referred to relevant services</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/Medical Support</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Support</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As per Table 6, one can easily realize that referrals were used only to provide a minimum of standard basic services. It is also striking to observe that a very restricted variety of service providers were referred to. One can conclude that CFWs have not been using systematically the Directory of Services and seem to follow only the standard referral procedures.

To avoid overlapping, an analysis of the methodology applied for the social support component is done under Chapter 2.2.

**Home repairing**

Home repairing has been provided to poor beneficiaries who scored low on the Quality of Life Assessment (concerning the home conditions component). The beneficiaries visited who received home repairing support used it to:

1. Reinforce their roofs by substituting its fragile structures by zinc roofs
2. Reinforce their house walls (made of branches and greenery)

According to findings, all home repairing services were assessed to respond to the essential needs of the beneficiary households respecting, therefore, the criteria related to the Quality of Life Scoring.

**Accessibility**

All the process of provision of accessibility services has been closely followed by HI’s Accessibility Engineer. A contribution is asked from the beneficiaries (in labour or in kind) but each case is analysed individually by the Engineer, Project Manager or Deputy Project Manager in order to facilitate the access to these service and to ensure a fair contribution based on the financial capacities of each beneficiary.

Moreover, innovative and adapted solutions are found for the specific needs of the beneficiaries. For example, beneficiaries who have no capacity of mobility (even with the support of a wheelchair) are provided with adapted toilets inside or as close as possible to their house in order to minimize the distance factor. The Engineer studies case by case the beneficiaries’ different mobility constraints as well as different possibilities in order to provide the best solutions for their needs.

---

6 The HI Directory of Services for the Province of Battambang has been printed under the previous TIGA project (2007). A new directory will be available at the end of 2009 with updated information.
Up to date the majority of accessibility services were provided through the construction of adapted toilets. However, other services such as ramps to access the house or the farm (or any other IGA implemented in the surrounding area) were also provided. The whole selection process is closely followed up by the Project Manager and Deputy Project Manager. The quality of services provided is high and complies with basic hygiene and sanitation standards.

**Rehabilitation**

All rehabilitation services are facilitated by referring beneficiaries to the ICRC Rehabilitation Centre in Battambang (transportation is covered by the TIGA project). The only way to verify the number of beneficiaries accessing these services is through the referral form provided by HI to the beneficiaries. These forms are later signed by ICRC proving that the beneficiaries have accessed their services. ICRC does not keep any records of the number of TIGA beneficiaries accessing to their services.

TIGA staff has access to the schedule of ICRC’s mobile team (which visits the different communes every 6 months in order to provide counselling or repairing support devices) and can inform the beneficiaries about this schedule. According to meetings the cooperation between ICRC and TIGA is assessed to be positive and runs successfully.

In some cases CFWs need to provide counselling to beneficiaries in order to ensure the benefits of accessing rehabilitation services (which are provided for free by ICRC). Some CFWs are more successful than others in achieving their task of explaining the importance of accessing these services. According to findings, there were few cases of beneficiaries who refused to access these services for fear or misunderstanding.

**Support Pregnancy & Health services**

The support services for pregnancy depends on the number of beneficiaries in need of these services. There is consequently no need to give further explanations to justify the low number of people using these services. On the other hand, referral to health services has been assessed to be very low, even if there is a considerable demand from beneficiaries’ side. This can be partially explained by analysing the methodology applied (please refer to Chapter 2.2) but also because the collaboration with local health services have been difficult to forge. During the SWOT analysis several CFWs reported that local health centres were asking beneficiaries to pay them a bribe so they would sign the referral form to be handed to HI. Moreover, several beneficiaries have complained to be the last ones attended at the health centres if using the HI referral form.

- **Impact**

According to expected outputs at “least 75% of referrals/support provided should give appropriate results for beneficiaries”. Up to date, and according to information collected, all beneficiaries who received the social support services confirmed the positive impact of these services.

**Home repair & Accessibility**

According to findings these services had a very positive impact in the quality of life of beneficiary households. At least 5 different households benefiting from these services were visited during the evaluation process. The impact of these services was assessed to be relevant and in accordance with the project’s objectives. By having improved the quality of roofs and walls the beneficiaries are no longer exposed to the rain and can keep their assets safe. The impact is successful because it serves the real needs of the beneficiaries. There were no reports of beneficiaries accessing these services without having an obvious and flagrant need for this support.
Similarly, the accessibility services were all of very high quality having a positive impact in the quality of life of the beneficiaries.

Success Stories on Accessibility services
Beneficiaries who once had to go deep into the forest or fields can now have access to adapted toilets near their homes. It often happened to many beneficiaries with mobility problems to get stuck in the mud during the rainy season (especially those who cannot use proteases and depend on other less practical devices). This was deemed humiliating for them because they had to ask for support from one of their relatives. These beneficiaries were scared to get stuck in the mud in order to be able to accomplish their hygiene routine. Other beneficiaries, using wheelchairs, used to depend fully on someone to help them on their daily needs. Now, with an adapted toilet beneficiaries stated their quality of life had improved significantly.

Rehabilitation
Referral to ICRC Rehabilitation Centre services also had a very positive impact in the lives of beneficiaries. Access to new and adapted devices allowed a considerable majority of interviewed/visited beneficiaries to feel more confident and capable to run their IGAs. Moreover, by facilitating mobility, beneficiaries could feel more accountable for the success of their IGAs, not relying on the justification that their mobility problems did not allow them to run the IGAs as any other person.

Pregnancy & Health Services
Even if some problems were encountered, as explained above, the impact of these services was positive. The beneficiaries were able to save money which otherwise would have been spent in medical services. By saving money the beneficiaries felt more confidence to reinvest their savings to further reinforce and expand their businesses.

- Challenges
  ➔ Difficulty to cooperate with local health centres, which ask beneficiaries to pay for bribes in order to sign their referral forms and use discriminatory practices.
  
  ➔ Some criteria related social support methodology is not adequate and needs to be revised (please refer to Chapter 2.2)
  
  ➔ According to findings some CFWs lack the capacity to liaise with other service providers, not finding innovative ways of referring the beneficiaries to available services.
  
  ➔ Compared to the more economic/livelihoods components, this component has been neglected within the project priorities

2.1.4. Capacity Building Local Partner NGO (OEC)

- Progress Analysis
One of the main TIGA project objectives is to reinforce the capacities of the local NGO partner to run sustainable socio-economic projects. As per internal planning and proposal all planned
Trainings have been provided to OEC on due time (except, as previously mentioned, the Business Management training which was provided too late according to planning).

### Table 7 - List of Trainings Provided through TIGA Project to OEC Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Description</th>
<th>Training Provider</th>
<th>Nº Participants</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disability Right-Based Approach</td>
<td>CDPO</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>10/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability &amp; Impairment Concept</td>
<td>HI, Disability Technical Advisor</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>04/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refreshment Disability</td>
<td>HI, Disability Technical Advisor</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>07/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Issues and Basic Counselling Skills</td>
<td>TPO</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Monitoring &amp; Evaluation</td>
<td>VBNK</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>07/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming Activity</td>
<td>CDAC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>07/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refreshment Farming Activity</td>
<td>CDAC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>06/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Management</td>
<td>HI, Livelihoods Technical Advisor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>06/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihoods Methodologies</td>
<td>HI Livelihoods Technical Advisor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>08/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the job training of OEC staff has been provided on a daily basis. The progress is visible through a strong team spirit (between all TIGA staff) and a think alike strategy applied by all LFOs (OEC and HI). This cohesion shows that the knowledge and experience of HI Project Manager and HI LFOs has been transferred to the OEC staff. It is now hard to distinguish who is who within the team (HI or OEC) regarding the application of the project’s methodology and tools. To underline this idea, it is worth noticing that HI and OEC team work in pairs. Each district has 1 HI LFO and 1 OEC LFO. This strategy has also reinforced the team spirit and knowledge sharing.

As planned, monthly meetings take place with the complete TIGA team (OEC and HI). Weekly meetings also take place and are facilitated by the OEC Project Assistant and Deputy Project Manager in order to guarantee the follow-up and planning of the weekly progress.

- **Impact**

All training reports available are optimistic and refer the knowledge of OEC staff as satisfactory or even outstanding.

The activities implemented by OEC LFOs have improved considerably due to the trainings provided by CDAC (Farming Activities). The learning approach and techniques used during the CDAC trainings have allowed the LFOs to learn many new innovative techniques which are very useful to advise the beneficiaries. All LFOs had a positive feedback regarding this training and confirmed the utility of the trainings in improving their knowledge and capacities in implementing socio-economic projects.

Similarly, as per training assessment and meetings with OEC staff, the trainings on Planning, Monitoring & Evaluation, Business Management, and Livelihoods Methodology received a positive feedback and were deemed useful for the knowledge improvement of the OEC staff.

### Success Story

The most visible impact is that OEC is presently designing 3 different proposals to be soon submitted to different donors. 1 of these proposals, focusing on socio-economic development, relies on the Livelihoods Methodology of the TIGA project. Moreover, OEC decided to include in the proposal methodology a target population of 20% of PwDs. The training on Planning, Monitoring & Evaluation was estimated very useful to enhance the capacities of OEC staff in proposal writing.

The Monthly and Weekly meetings have been crucial for the successful implementation of the project, allowing for knowledge sharing and brainstorming sessions and consequently contributing to OEC capacity building.
• Challenges
» The trainings were not accessible to all OEC TIGA team (please refer to Sub-Chapter 2.2)
» On the job training of some of the OEC staff is sometimes difficulty because OEC and HI offices are separated. For example, the Project Assistant (OEC) spends less time with the Project Manager compared to other TIGA staff. Usually, the PA and PM only meet once a week. As a consequence, the Deputy Project Manager (HI) is often more familiar with the problems and challenges faced then the Project Assistant.

To avoid overlapping more details on the challenges faced regarding OEC partnership are given on sub-Chapter 2.2.

2.1.5. Awareness Raising & Dissemination of Information

• Progress Analysis
The activities related to Awareness Raising and Dissemination of Information took place mostly at the beginning of the project’s implementation and some activities continue to be implemented (ongoing process).

The main expected result of these different activities is: “Beneficiaries (right-holders) and services (duty-bearers) improved their reciprocal knowledge and information sharing”

Table 8 – Awareness Raising & Dissemination of Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Activities</th>
<th>Achieved?</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 special events 3 December</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>1 Event - 150 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 awareness workshops</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>220 participants. 68% showed progress on knowledge on disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare a Directory of Services</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribute Directory of Services</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Information Education and communication material distributed to beneficiaries households | Yes | 150 leaflets about TIGA distributed
Leaflet on Vocational Training printed and distributed
1,370 posters related to IGA and family health
printer. 477 distributed
400 T-shirts were designed for the awareness workshops |
| MFIs are sensitized to give access to people with disabilities | Yes | Leaflets distributed to MFIs
MFIs invited to activities promoted under TIGA project in order to introduce their services |
| Beneficiaries are referred to MFI services                | Partial   | Only some beneficiaries who attend the Agriculture Trainings            |
| Strengthen Networking among relevant stakeholders        | Partial   | Some informal contacts were made with MFIs in the Province
Vocational Training leaflets distributed to relevant stakeholders
Collaboration with MoWA to support a campaign on awareness for inclusion women in development activities – 743 participants |

The referral process to MFIs is done in a very particular and informal way. LFOs contact MFIs' representatives at the district level and invite them to provide information to TIGA beneficiaries about their services at the end of the Community Vocational Training sessions. There is no formal agreement or any data collected regarding this procedure. The other beneficiaries (who do not attend Community Vocational Trainings around 17% of beneficiaries) are not provided any information about MFI services.

7 560 posters on family hygiene and sanitation, 560 on nutrition, 95 on food processing, 50 on chicken raising, 10 on hair cutting and 95 on pig raising.
LFOs are not providing any direct information to the beneficiaries regarding MFI services. Although, LFOs did receive trainings on MFIs services they do not apply these. There is therefore no formal way of referring beneficiaries to MFIs. There is also no methodology available to guide the LFOs in this task.

- **Impact**

It is too early to fully assess the impact of this project component because the planned activities have not been totally implemented yet. Moreover, since most of the awareness raising campaigns and meetings with relevant stakeholders took place several months ago, it is difficult to assess now the impact of those campaigns. More time would be needed to properly assess this component because it implies interviewing a high amount of different stakeholders (NGOs, authorities, etc) which are not related to the TIGA project directly.

The 2 NGOs visited during the evaluation period were not fully familiar with the TIGA project objectives and referral system.

The 2 MFIs visited confirmed they had been approached in order to provide information on their services to TIGA beneficiaries as well as to the TIGA staff. No mention was made regarding any changes in their practices/policies concerning inclusion of people with disabilities.

Only 5 out of 320 beneficiaries attending the information sessions on MFI services have actually accessed these services (there is no tool to assess this component, the number provided is only an estimation collected indirectly by LFOs through the monthly follow-up tool).

The awareness raising workshops had a satisfactory impact with 68% of participants improving their knowledge on disability issues. Since the aim was to achieve 75% of improvement, refreshment training sessions are planned for the future (although no dates specific dates have been set yet).

- **Challenges**

→ Referral to MFIs is done in a very informal manner not allowing measuring its progress and implementation
→ There is no methodology or tools available to assess the impact of referrals to MFI services
→ No mechanism is available to assess the impact of dissemination of information component (leaflets), no list of stakeholders who received these leaflets.

### 2.2. Relevance and Efficiency of Tools and Methodology

This sub-chapter focuses on analysing the impact, efficiency and relevance of the TIGA project tools and methodology. It is divided into 5 chapters in order to cover the most important components related to the TIGA project methodology. It is not an exhaustive description of all tools and methods applied but an analysis of the key positive and negative aspects of the applied methodology. The methodology is mainly summarised in the Project Manual. Each of the bellow chapters is divided into 3 main categories: a) background information; b) relevance; c) challenges/problems faced.

#### 2.2.1. Selection Criteria & Process

a) Background Information

**Criteria**

According to the TIGA Project Manual, the following criteria apply for the selection of beneficiaries:
Table 9 – Basic Criteria for Eligible beneficiaries (TIGA project)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Live in one of the 4 districts and 19 communes targeted by the project 8 (this is proved by the village chief)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be at least 18 years old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have an idea to start or enhance an IGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No access to MFI or Bank services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the basic vital needs covered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not be a family member of any of the TIGA staff or DC members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be a person with disabilities or a landmine victim (people directly impacted by mines, families of landmine victims or disabled people, communities affected by mines)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The selection of the 16 communes was based on several sources of information provided by relevant stakeholders (local authorities, ICRC). The criterion for selection of these communes was mainly that of targeting the areas where one could find a higher concentration of PwDs.

The other criteria set above were decided between the relevant HI senior staff (not in consultation with OEC). The objective of these criteria being that of selecting PwDs being Poor, Not so Poor and Vulnerable People (as per Project Manual) considered to be the ones capable of running a sustainable IGA.

Another objective was that of targeting PwDs not accessing MFI services in order to later refer them to these same services. This objective came in line with the findings from the previous TIGA project (2007) which stated that only a minority of PwDs had access to MFI services.

Another explanation given by the project coordinator for the inclusion of this criterion was that of avoiding overlapping activities with MFI organisations, since some of these had stated they would not desire to mix their services with those of TIGA.

Selection Process

1. CFWs are in charge of finding beneficiaries for the TIGA project. They contact the village chiefs, local authorities and NGOs in order to get lists of names of PwDs or landmine victims (families). They also rely on information provided directly by villagers and other PwDs or landmine victims. Once they collect this information they approach potential beneficiaries and do a first home visit to verify if these people comply with the above mentioned criteria. This said, all this process is neither defined in the project manual nor in any other TIGA document. There is no specific methodology for this process (no rules, no tools, no data, no directions provided) and there is no method to monitor how the process actually takes place. To be informed about this process one has to ask this information to the Project Manager.

2. Once the CFWs have done a first screening, based on the criteria set above (no tools available for this process neither), they decide to refer, or not, the potential candidate to the LFO. Subsequently, the LFO visits the potential beneficiary and fills the Candidate Analyses Form (this is the procedure, but not always the practice – some cases of CFWs filling these forms have been reported). This form collects basic socio-economic information on the household. It also allows the LFO to understand whether the potential beneficiary has business ideas and the capacity to run a sustainable IGA. The potential beneficiary is asked to propose an IGA he would like to enhance or start-up. After assessing the feasibility of the proposed IGA the LFO decides to if he will further continue the selection process for that potential beneficiary.

3. Once the IGA has been chosen, the LFO completes the IGA Analysis Form along with the potential beneficiary. The IGA Analysis Form is more or less the equivalent of a business plan.

---

8 Samlot (communes: O’Sam, Tarsagh, Sam Lot, Sung), Rattanak Mondol (communes: Sdao, Traeng, Plov Meas, Andoek Hep), Thmor Kom (communes: Chrey, Tarpoung, Tar, Moen, Kauk Khmon), Bavel (communes: Kdol Tarhaen, Lavea, Prey Khpos, Ampil Fram Doem).
4. The LFO takes the information collected for appreciation and approval, or not, by the Decision Committee (the DC meeting takes place once a month, an average of 5 profiles per LFO are analysed by the DC in these meetings). The Decision Committee is the body entitled to decide the attribution or not of TIGA services to the different candidate profiles presented by the LFOs. The DC is composed of 5 permanent members (2 TIGA members, 2 authorities from DoSVY, DoWA or DoA and 2 external partner). The DC members analyse the profiles and take a joint decision to refuse or accept the candidate as a TIGA beneficiary.

5. If the DC approves the profile, HI and the beneficiary (EPH) sign an Agreement.

b) Relevance

Criteria on MFIs and Target Beneficiaries

According to findings (SWOT analysis, MFI meetings, Meeting PM, MFI Report, FCD, DC meeting) the following criteria were assessed to be contra-productive or of less relevance according to the objectives and expected outputs of the TIGA project:

1. No access to MFI or Bank services
2. Target population: poor, not so poor and vulnerable people (even though it is not a criteria per se it is part of the methodology)

According to the present TIGA methodology there are no clear Poverty Indicators. Being so, the division between: extremely poor, very poor, poor, not so poor and vulnerable people (as per Figure 3), is not accompanied by any scoring which allows to classify the beneficiaries into these different categories. However, the Questionnaire on Quality of Life sets the score 35 as the poverty line (please note the scoring applied is reversed: higher score means more vulnerability, lower score means less vulnerability).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Number of People</th>
<th>Percentage of beneficiaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score 35 -30 (less vulnerable)</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score 35 - 40</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score 40 - 43</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 - Quality of Life Scoring

If we consider the logic applied and analyse the QQL, we can state that not so poor and vulnerable people usually score bellow 35 (which is why they are usually excluded from social support services, as explained on sub-chapter 2.2.2). The other categories score above 35 (extremely poor, very poor and poor). Taking this into consideration and to better understand the real target population of the TIGA project the following schemes may apply:

Figure 3 – Target population according to present TIGA methodology

---

9 This is not exactly the information stated on the Project Manual it is, however, the practice. The project Manual refers that the DC decides who is attributed the Professional Kit. However, the TIGA project attributes many other services such as Vocational Trainings, Apprenticeship programs, etc. Candidates for these services also have to be approved by the DC.
The above scheme seems more precise because it matches the descriptions with defined scores and can also replicate the reality of the TIGA project.

Regarding the criteria on MFIs, 3 main factors contradict the 2 reasons\textsuperscript{10} given for justifying the applied methodology:

1. A large majority of households with PwDs already access MFI services (the PwDs themselves may not access directly but their household does and this criterion is presently applied to the household and not the PwD specifically).
2. There is only 1 single report referring to meetings held in Phnom Penh with 4 different MFIs (AMK, TPC, VF, EdM). In this report only 1 of the 4 MFIs is stated to have expressed reluctance to mix its services with TIGA services.
3. According to the 2 meetings with MFIs (at the Provincial level), held for the purpose of this evaluation, the feedback was very positive and the MFI representatives (MFI Branch Managers) only referred positive sides to having their clients accessing the TIGA services (including the Professional Kit).

Understanding the specific socio-economic context of poor and vulnerable households in rural Battambang might help to understand the role played by MFIs in this Province, as well as TIGA project’s position amid these 2 contexts.

→ There are at least 3 different MFIs working in each of the districts in which the TIGA project is being implemented. Therefore, most of the people\textsuperscript{11} being able to access MFI loans have already been informed of their services and are free to access those services without any referral support from the TIGA project.

→ People who do not access MFI services in the target districts don’t do it for 2 main reasons: 1) they do not want to borrow money from an MFI because they do not want to put their property at risk or to receive weekly visits (this reason being often referred by beneficiaries); 2) they have no collateral (which is usually the situation of extremely poor people which, according to the present TIGA methodology, are not even part of the target group).

→ According to findings very poor people are able to run a business and access MFIs (which contradicts the idea of the TIGA project stating that only poor, not so poor or vulnerable people can have a business motivation). Moreover, the findings show that some of TIGA beneficiaries are indeed very poor (as per Table 10, 2% of selected beneficiaries are very poor). Considering these, the statement that very poor people have no business capacities does not seem to be applicable.

→ Very poor, poor, not so poor and vulnerable households can access MFI services because the only general requirements are: 1) have property (collateral); 2) a fixed residence and; 3) a

\textsuperscript{10} As previously mentioned, the justification for the non-inclusion of PwDs accessing MFI services are: 1) Most PwDs do not access MFI services; 2) Fear of overlapping with MFI services since it might be contra-productive.\textsuperscript{11} All the people interviewed during this evaluation process were familiar with MFI services and heard of them before knowing anything about the TIGA project.
business idea. What is interesting to verify is that the TIGA project itself applies very similar criteria: fixed residence (which means having a land or a house, therefore property) and a business idea. The objective is the same: choosing clients/beneficiaries who can run a sustainable business (if the underlined motivation is that of avoiding deferral or failure is not relevant in this case). If the objective is the same and the criteria are similar the target group of both TIGA and MFIs will certainly be identical.

→ By analysing the practice of the TIGA project one can assess that it is not helping those that have difficulties to access MFIs nor those who do not have collateral and, therefore, have no chance to step out of their poverty conditions by accessing MFI services (Table 10). The TIGA project is supporting people who have business capacity and have all the conditions to access MFI services. If they do not do it, it is often not related to MFI criteria but to their personal choice.

→ Considering the above, it is easy to explain why, from 477 beneficiaries, only 5 decided to access MFI services. People that were not accessing MFI services for personal reasons will not start doing it thanks to the TIGA project.

→ Lastly, according to findings, some TIGA beneficiaries were not accessing MFIs because they had no need for credit or financial support to enhance their businesses. Conversely, people who access MFIs are clearly in need of support, it is that need that drives them to rely on credit services. One might ask: considering they accessed MFIs why were they not able to step out of their poverty situation? From meetings with MFIs it is clear that not all beneficiaries are able to increase their income simply because they accessed MFIs (often they lack knowledge, business management skills which are not provided systematically by any of the MFI organisations). Moreover, some people access MFI services to support emergency situations (especially related to health needs), sometimes becoming poorer than before.

The criterion of selecting only households not accessing MFI services is thus excluding many beneficiaries with business motivations and in need of socio-economic support. Besides, the TIGA project is selecting some beneficiaries who although having good business ideas had no special need for an economic support. The TIGA support can become, in these cases, a “bonus” for their household economy. In other words the following is happening:

There are several vulnerable households (some poorer than others). Some households face difficulties and are in need of credit or are unable to keep savings to support their IGAs. In these cases when they need to enhance an IGA or to access basic services (health or food stock) they decide to access MFI services. The other households, not so poor, have enough credit to enhance their IGAs and feel no need to access credit services. In this situation and due to the MFI criterion, the TIGA project methodology is sometimes excluding the more vulnerable ones and supporting the less vulnerable.

Selection Process
The initial selection process lacks a more precise and measurable methodology. CFWs have received very little training and without any tools might not be conducting a fair and precise screening.

The tools and methodology used by the LFOs (Candidate Analysis and IGA Analysis Forms – please refer to Annex 2 and Annex 3) collect all needed information to assess the socio-economic conditions and capacities of potential beneficiaries.

The overall selection process was assessed to be very relevant for ensuring a fair selection. During the DC meetings, it was noteworthy to observe the depth in which each profile was analysed and discussed. The DC members try to promote as far as possible the selection of apprenticeship programs (which can have a long term sustainable impact) instead of traditional pig and poultry raising. They often suggest the LFOs to revise with the beneficiaries their priorities
in choosing a specific IGA in order to ensure that each beneficiary is really choosing the best IGA adapted to his/her skills and capacities.

c) Challenges/Problems faced:
The following challenges are directly related to the application of the criterion on MFIs:

1. Since most of the target beneficiaries access MFI services, the LFOs took a long time to find and select beneficiaries for the TIGA project. As a consequence the whole selection process has been delayed. Since there is a time constraint (need to select all beneficiaries and provide all Professional Kits by end of September 2009) the LFOs have less time for follow-up visits and for supporting apprenticeship programmes. This situation impacts negatively the quality of services provided. Some of the beneficiaries that were interviewed had been visited only 4 times in 7 months of project implementation.

2. Time pressure often forces the LFOs to require more support from the CFWs. In certain cases the CFWs are the ones filling the Candidate Analysis Form (which requires collecting a lot of financial information). The worrying factor is that CFWs never received any training on Business Management and were never trained on how to use the developed tools related to the livelihoods component of the project.

3. The community members and some stakeholders (DC members) do not understand why TIGA applies this criterion which often favours less vulnerable households in depreciation of more vulnerable households (even if totally capable of running a business). Moreover, the impact on beneficiaries’ income will not be as strong as if the project was targeting those households which are in real need of support.

2.2.2. Referral methodology for Social Support Services

a) Background Information
The complete referral methodology regarding provision of medical support (pregnancy, health care, rehabilitation) and home support (home repair and home and business accessibility) is described in detail on the Project Manual. However, referral to other services (besides the ones mentioned) such as emergency, psychological counsel, education, etc, are not part of the available methodology. Consequently, referral to these other services depends very much on the capacities, skills and motivation of each CFW. Some CFWs provide vast information and advice on available services. Others stick strictly to the main services.

Table 11 – Eligibility Criteria for Social Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Documents</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Matters</td>
<td>Only direct beneficiary (EPH) is eligible Benefiticiary QQL score is over the poverty line (35 points standard) Beneficiary suffers from serious sickness (according to specific criteria) Beneficiary resorts to public health centres (not private)</td>
<td>Prescription from certified Doctor Invoice from Pharmacy Invoice from Hospital Social Services Delivery</td>
<td>55 USD max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Pregnancy</td>
<td>Beneficiary or wife Beneficiary QQL score is over the poverty line (35 points standard) Beneficiary or wife is pregnant Beneficiary resorts to public health centres (not private)</td>
<td>Prescription from certified Doctor Invoice from Pharmacy Invoice from Hospital Social Services Delivery</td>
<td>50 USD max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Beneficiary needs assistive devices Beneficiary needs physiotherapy and or orthopaedic services</td>
<td>Transportation allowance Referral Form Social Service Delivery</td>
<td>Based on real transportation expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Repair</td>
<td>Beneficiary QQL score is over the poverty line (35 points standard) Score related to the category F of the QQL is 1 or 2 Beneficiary is the house owner</td>
<td>Material providers invoice TIGA support delivery</td>
<td>55 USD max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home &amp; Business Accessibility</td>
<td>Beneficiary is the house owner Result of accessibility assessment</td>
<td>Material providers invoice Labor Invoice TIGA support delivery</td>
<td>500 USD max</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CFWs are responsible or all the social support component of the TIGA project. In order to build their capacity the CFWs have attended the following trainings: Disability Right-Based Approach, Disability & Impairment Concepts and Psychological Issues and Basic Counselling Skills.

b) Relevance
Overall the methodology applied is efficient and allows a close monitoring of the activities. Specific tasks regarding the standard referral processes (mentioned in the Project Manual) are well defined and guarantee financial transparency. Other referral processes (not mentioned in the Project Manual), however, lack guidelines or precise methodology.

Considering that the main objective of the social support component of the TIGA project is to reduce risks of IGA failure, the following criteria are deemed contra-productive:

- Only the direct beneficiaries (EPH) of the TIGA project can benefit from health care
- Accessibility services are available only for the direct beneficiary (EPH)

At least 2 of the interviewed beneficiaries faced severe socio-economic problems because they used all their savings to provide emergency health care to their children. It is worth noticing that the TIGA project provides the Professional Kit to parents of children with disabilities. If only the parents (considered direct beneficiaries - EPH) can access the health services the TIGA project is not helping to reduce the risks of IGA failure. The sustainability of the IGA depends on the household socio-economic dynamics and not only on the direct beneficiary.

The same applies for accessibility services. Due to severe physical constraints sometimes the PwDs cannot be the direct beneficiaries of the provided Professional Kit. The Professional Kit is therefore provided to someone in the family (mother, father, husband or wife). If the accessibility services are only available for the direct beneficiary the project is refusing help to the person with disabilities.

c) Challenges/problems faced

- According to information collected during field visits as well as meetings with CFWs and PM, not all CFWs have enough communication capacities to liaise with local relevant stakeholders (they would need more trainings to enhance these capacities).

- The above mentioned “contra-productive” criteria are not followed strictly by the TIGA team, however, since the methodology exists they have to ask for especial authorization from the DPM and PM every time they face situations as mentioned before.

- As mentioned on sub-chapter 2.1.3 obtaining some justification documents can become a hard task because of corruption levels at the local health centres (health centres’ staff ask the beneficiaries to pay them a bribe in order to provide them justification documents).

- By analysing the decision making process and the line management priorities it is clear that social support is not a priority in the implementation of the TIGA project. Subsequently, development of training programmes for enhancing the capacities of CFWs or planning of workshops or SWOT analysis sessions dedicated exclusively to this component have not been mentioned or organised. This marginalisation of the social support component has also excluded the CFWs from the decision making process.

2.2.3. Partnership with OEC and Human Resources (Overall)

a) Background Information

Partnership OEC
The Partnership contract between HI and OEC regarding the TIGA project was signed in April 2008. The Contract defines the following:
- Management methods and procedures of the project
Rights and undertakings of the parties in the implementation of the project

Overall the articles on management methods and procedures are a copy of the TIGA proposal objectives. Administrative and financial obligations of each part are set in general terms in order to comply with donor requirements. The only specificity is that OEC has to provide a monthly financial report based on actual expenses to HI. HI is then responsible for transferring the funds to OEC provided the financial report is deemed accurate. Moreover, OEC has to provide a yearly budget to HI. OEC and HI guarantee to undertake the technical obligations set in the project methodology, being that the methodology is defined by HI.

The Partnership contract does not define a clear human resources methodology. However, Annex 4 schematises the role and positions of OEC and HI staff within the TIGA project.

Most of the decisions related to administrative and human resources issues were decided during a joint workshop between OEC and HI at the beginning of the project implementation.

No process was undertaken in order to assess OEC’s needs and knowledge. The trainings to be provided to OEC had already been determined during the proposal writing period. No further changes or adapted strategies were developed for the purpose of enhancing OEC’s capacity in running socio-economic projects.

Human Resources

The TIGA team is divided into different groups. First, there are 2 senior management groups: HI and OEC (with different offices based in Battambang). Second, there are mixed groups (HI and OEC) which are divided into 4 different districts (1 group per district). Each district has a sub-office/guesthouse where the LFOs are accommodated during the week and where they meet with the CFWs.

Each time the CFWs and LFOs come to Battambang they are divide between 2 offices: HI and OEC. OEC staff has to come often to HI office in order to help the Database operator to enter the information collected into the database system.

All LFOs and CFWs travel by motorbike. During the raining season, time spent travelling to and from the different districts can double.

Table 12 – Travel Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Itinerary</th>
<th>Average travel time by motorbike</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Battambang – Samlot</td>
<td>3.5 hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battambang – Rattanak Mondol</td>
<td>1.5 hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battambang – Bovel</td>
<td>2 hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battambang – Thmor Khol</td>
<td>45 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All forms (financial, referral, etc) are filled in the field by the CFWs and LFOs. The LFOs and CFWs have to come to Battambang in order to:
- Enter the information into the database (with the Database Operator)
- Print and make photocopies of needed forms (including purchase requests)\(^{12}\)
- Receive advance cash for all expenses (Professional Kits, Home repair, Referrals, etc)

In terms of financial procedures, the LFOs and CFWs are responsible for collecting quotations and fill related purchase requests. The Project Manager is only allowed to validate purchase requests up to 500 USD (not cumulative). Any amount above this value has to be authorized by relevant people (Finance Manager and Country Director) in Phnom Penh.

\(^{12}\) No computers, printer or photocopy machines are available at the district level.
It is also worth noticing that, LFOs have a high workload being responsible for:

- Selecting beneficiaries
- Filling the candidate analysis and IGA Analysis form (which are difficult to fill and need time and patience because most beneficiaries are unable to provide accurate information about their income)
- Assess the sustainability of IGAs chosen by beneficiaries
- Provide advices on business management
- Assist in preparing a Business Plan
- Organise Trainings
- Attend the DC meetings
- Do follow-up visits
- Collect quotations for Professional Kits
- Fill all forms necessary for purchasing the professional kits
- Purchase and deliver the Professional Kits
- Liaise with relevant stakeholders (local authorities and MFI organisations)

In comparison, CFWs are only responsible for the social support component. Moreover, the CFWs do not have to go to Battamang every week (therefore not losing so much time as LFOs on travelling). In this context it seems natural that CFWs assist LFOs in conducting some of the above activities.

b) Relevance

The methodology applied has clearly improved the capacities of OEC LFOs and other senior staff in running sustainable socio-economic projects (as stated on sub-chapter 2.1).

It would have been advisable to have conducted an assessment on OEC needs in order to design a more targeted capacity building strategy.

As previously mentioned, the line management has not focused much time to evaluate, monitor and improve the social support services. Subsequently, CFWs which are all part of the OEC team, have received very few relevant training compared to OEC LFOs. For example, during the SWOT analysis session CFWs stated not having understood why they were not allowed to receive training on Business Management. Taking in account that CFWs are reasonably involved in some livelihood components of the TIGA project it would have been logical to provide them this training. The strict methodology combined with marginalisation of the social support component has not encouraged the capacity building of the 8 OEC CFWs.

c) Challenges/Problems faced

- The fact that OEC and HI staff are divided into 2 different offices sometimes affects the communication with OEC Project Assistant (who is presently also undertaking other functions besides that of PA for the TIGA project). Consequently, the DPM (HI staff) seems to have a more central role amid the TIGA project. Since the DPM has daily contact with the PM and the LFOs he seems to be in a privileged position in terms of communication with the project staff.

- The project methodology and line management define strict guidelines in order to separate the roles of LFOs and CFWs (it is worth noticing that CFWs are all part of OEC staff). Yet, in practice, these 2 roles are very interdependent. CFWs are often involved in other tasks besides that of ensuring social support. Capacity building of CFWs, however, has been assessed to be very low compared to the needs and requirements.
3. Sustainability & Lessons Learned

3.1. Sustainability
The following TIGA mechanisms were assessed to contribute to the sustainability of the activities implemented:

Æ A contribution in labour or kind is requested from all beneficiaries as a pre-condition to benefit from the Professional Kit. For example all beneficiaries who receive the standard Pig Raising Professional Kit, corresponding to 2 piglets, are responsible for constructing the pig cage according to the minimum hygiene and health standards as per Agriculture training sessions provided by the DoA. This entails at least 4 days of work, 2 bags of cement, wood and other materials needed for building the pig cage.

Æ Beneficiaries can freely choose what IGA they would like to implement as long as it is deemed to be sustainable IGA. The simple fact that the beneficiaries can choose the IGA also contributes to ensuring its sustainability.

Æ Long-term Vocational Training Programmes and Apprenticeship Programmes require beneficiaries to dedicate a long period of time to attend the trainings on daily basis during 3 to 9 months. By itself, development of technical skills is already a sustainable approach.

Æ The design of a detailed Business Plan with the support of the TIGA team helps to predict risks and find solutions for problems and challenges.

Æ The provision of Business Management Training also facilitates the successful implementation of a business, diminishing the risks of failure and, consequently, promoting sustainability.

Æ All short term trainings provided for agriculture activities as well as peer to peer trainings contribute to promote successful practices, new sustainable techniques and long-term solutions for certain problems and challenges faced (e.g. vaccination, basic health measures to prevent diseases or plagues related to agriculture activities, etc).

Æ The DC selection process promotes knowledge sharing between DC members and encourages LFOs to advise the beneficiaries on selecting long-term sustainable IGAs. For example, during the monthly DC meeting one of the LFOs introduced the profile of a young girl with polio, the IGA suggested was pig raising. All DC members agreed that a young lady with no more than 21 years old could learn new skills in order to access more sustainable means of livelihood. The DPM went to speak with the girl again and found out she would really like to learn new skills but was not sure her family would agree. In the end a solution was found and the girl will soon start an apprenticeship for a 6 months period. This is just 1 example out of many others with the same features.

Æ If the social support component is applied properly to serve the objective of reducing the risks of IGA failure it will also contribute to the sustainable impact of the TIGA project.

The following TIGA contexts may hinder the sustainability of certain IGAs promoted by the TIGA project:

Æ As previously mentioned, the TIGA project supports the enhancement or start up of many “secondary” IGAs (these represent at least 70% of the IGAs selected). Secondary IGAs are those that do not represent more than 5% to 10% of the household annual income and do not contribute systematically for the household’s daily and monthly expenses. By providing pig or

---

13 Please note that the beneficiaries can chose what kind of Professional Kit they want. Some beneficiaries might prefer to receive material to build the pigs cage instead of receiving 2 piglets. The example given is simply to illustrate the most standard situation.
poultry raising Professional Kits nothing guarantees that the beneficiaries will use these as an IGA. Some beneficiaries may use these Professional Kits as a subsistence activity for household consumption and not necessarily for generating income.

➔ In addition, if these same beneficiaries do not receive proper Business Management training (as it has been the case because the Business Management training sessions only started in the month of August 2009) the sustainability factor may be hindered.

➔ The fact that LFOs have been very busy with the selection process has left them with less time to provide crucial advice on sustainable approaches. This may also hamper the sustainability of certain IGAs promoted by the TIGA project.

➔ If certain social support methods (described in the Project Manual) are followed literally this component will not avoid the risks of IGA failure, therefore, not contributing to the IGAs sustainability.

➔ As previously mentioned not all beneficiaries follow the guidelines and practices taught during the several trainings provided. The difficulty in changing habits and traditional agriculture practices may also influence the failure of some IGAs.

It is too early to measure the sustainability level of the TIGA project. Besides, during this evaluation process there were no means available to measure the number of failed IGAs (the database system does not collect this information and the mid-term assessment tools used did not register any cases of failure). Similarly, it would be too early to assess the level of failed IGAs within the TIGA project. The majority of IGAs provided through the project take time to be fully implemented and to generate visible results. A Final Evaluation will be more suitable to assess the sustainability component.

3.2. Lessons Learned
According to the evaluation findings the following points can summarise the lessons learned based on the 15 months implementation of the TIGA project:

a) What worked well for the project and the team?
➔ On the job training of OEC LFOs improved their technical and practical knowledge (specifically through the strategy of mixing pairs of OEC and HI staff working in collaboration on daily basis)
➔ Team building meetings strengthened team spirit
➔ Successful provision of innovative Agriculture Trainings (CDAC) to LFOs who are now capable of providing basic advice on agriculture techniques to the beneficiaries (who are mainly farmers)
➔ A Decision Committee composed of several relevant stakeholders ensured an impartial and transparent selection process\(^{14}\) and above all knowledge sharing and application of innovative approaches to implementation of livelihood activities.
➔ A precise Project Methodology compiling the majority of information, tools, criteria and directions related to the different project components, has proved to be very useful.
➔ Overall a vast selection of trainings was provided to the LFOs influencing positively their daily work and quality of deliverables
➔ Community Vocational Training on Agriculture Techniques was very well received among beneficiaries and helped to set standard basic practices among most of the beneficiaries
➔ Peer to Peer trainings worked very well for promoting more practical trainings in order to ensure sustainability and knowledge sharing
➔ The TIGA socio-economic strategy (combining provision of Professional Kits with trainings and access to social support) has produced a positive impact in the beneficiary household income and quality of life.

---

14 This of course also depends on the methodological criteria which may not be always fair.
Trainings provided to OEC staff (including senior staff) have produced a very positive impact in their overall capacity for running socio-economic programmes. More specifically, the PME training on proposal writing has impacted visibility the capacity of OEC.

b) What did not work well for the project and the team?
- The criterion on non-inclusion of beneficiaries accessing MFI services has impacted negatively the work of the TIGA team.
- Certain criteria on accessibility to social support services were deemed not suitable to achieve the expected project’s objectives and outcomes
- Several crucial criteria (mentioned before) were not re-adapted to the challenges and difficulties faced
- The few changes made on the criteria took too long to be approved by line management having a lower impact in the whole implementation process
- No enough training and accompaniment has been provided in order to enhance the CFWs capacity in disseminating information and liaising with social service available in the targeted communities
- The fact that the Livelihoods Technical Advisor, responsible for the development of the methodology and tools, had to leave earlier slowed all the process of revision and re-adaptation of the methodology advise
- The general impression is that the recommendations provided by the first Livelihoods Technical Advisor in the handover report have not been followed closely by the line management. This created difficulties for the TIGA team.

15 To be precise, page 7 of Handover report of livelihoods Technical Advisor already mentions most of the problematic features identified in this Evaluation: criteria may be too strict; collaboration with referral partners is not clear; no method applied by CFWs to realize the first screening and home visits; certain methods applied may not be relevant to the specific context, need to understand better which apprenticeship trainings are available since this component has been neglected.

c) What surprises did the TIGA team have to deal with?
- Bad roads and difficult access during raining season delayed the implementation process
- Too much work load concentrated in the LFOs role due to the delay (time pressure)
Due to the above factor, CFWs started supporting the LFOs. However, trainings and management strategy was not adapted to this new change.

Corruption among health service centres hindered the efficiency of health support to TIGA beneficiaries

Livelihoods Technical Advisor left earlier than predicted

Conversely to the findings of the TIGA 2007 report, most households with PwDs access MFI services.

d) What project circumstances were not anticipated?

Amount of workload relying on LFOs (due to all project context and design)

Prepare in advance the Trainings Agenda and Schedule would have avoided considerable delays in the provision of certain key trainings (as the case of the Business Management Training).

All sort of difficulties faced due to the designed methodology were not anticipated. No periodical revision of methods and tools was envisaged.

No assessment of OEC training needs was envisaged.

No clear HR and Admin rules regarding partnership with OEC were prepared. Solutions were found throughout the project implementation on an ad hoc basis.

The time pressure and constraints put on implementation of the livelihoods component marginalised the role of the social support component within the project. No clear Agenda focused on ensuring the quality of social support services as well as the monitoring of these services.
Recommendations & Conclusion

In quantitative terms the TIGA project has ensured, up to date, a very positive progress and no recommendations are deemed necessary. However, in order to guarantee a more qualitative implementation the following recommendations are provided:

Æ Even though it is very late and the selection process of beneficiaries is coming to an end, revising the criterion on MFIs is recommended for the reasons previously mentioned
Æ A more rapid response from the line management (Phnom Penh and Lyon) to revise tools and methods applied will also ensure a more qualitative implementation of the project. It will also build trust and confidence within the TIGA team. It is important that the team feels their worries and problems are taken into consideration and that solutions are found on time.
Æ The TIGA Project Manual section related to social support needs to be updated according to new challenges faced (the specific changes to be made are mentioned along the evaluation report)
Æ Define precise screening tools (for first selection of potential beneficiaries) in order to ensure that the CFWs are applying relevant criteria and are following a transparent procedure
Æ Prepare training plan for enhancing capacities of CFWs in communicating with relevant stakeholders
Æ Take the time to undertake a more in-depth study/survey on all available apprenticeship possibilities to ensure there are enough options available for the beneficiaries at the commune and district levels. Since the LFOs are too busy to do this, the CFWs could make this research (in case they are provided with proper training).
Æ In line with the above, it is recommendable to provide CFWs with training on business management, livelihoods approaches and communication skills. Since there is no budget line for these trainings it can be provided by the TIGA Project Manager or any qualified HI staff.
Æ Design a precise plan on Peer to Peer trainings which can be very useful to guarantee the sustainability of the TIGA project. While doing this, it is advisable to try and cover as many different IGAs as possible and not only focus on the main agriculture IGAs (like pig and poultry raising).
Æ Make sure an internal strategy is designed in order to support the LFOs to deal with their heavy work-load. This will ensure a qualitative follow-up process. A solution would be to train the CFWs to conduct certain activities now undertaken by the LFOs. For this to happen it would be advisable to make adapted changes to CFWs’ job descriptions.
Æ Make sure the LFOs are providing a good quality Business Management Training to the beneficiaries. This can be achieved by inviting a local business management trainer to assess the training capacities of the LFOs.
Æ Reinforce the monitoring system of referral to MFIs. Up to date there is no formal method to refer beneficiaries to MFIs. Being so it is not possible to measure the impact of this referral.
Æ LFOs should have a minimum knowledge on the services provided by MFIs in order to provide basic information to the beneficiaries. If they are not yet familiar with MFI practices, more training is recommended.
Æ A workshop or meeting can be organised in order to encourage CFWs to provide more information on available social services to beneficiaries. As previously mentioned some CFWs only provide information that is mentioned on the Project Manual. But if CFWs are well informed on the different social services available they can always refer (in an informal manner) the beneficiaries to these other services.

Lastly, it is worth noticing that although no chapter or sub-chapter was dedicated to analysing the monitoring and evaluation tools available for the TIGA project, this component was not forgotten. This evaluation determines that since the 2 main monitoring tools have been recently updated it is too early to measure its impact. As mentioned throughout the evaluation the database system developed allows a coherent and relevant follow-up of most of TIGA project’s components.