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Executive Summary:
The Sudanese Red Crescent Society, Kassala branch, and German Red cross were implementing a 29 months project titled: Integrated Rural Food Security in Kassala, under the slogan of “Kassala Without Poverty” this slogan was used, in Arabic, to mobilize the communities.

The project funded by BMZ. The project was implemented in four communities in rural Kassala locality.

The project hierarchy of objectives were as follows:

The overall objective of the project was:” The food security and nutrition status has improved and the agricultural production and living conditions are diversified and adapted to climate risks in Kassala State Sudan”, and the project objective was: “An improved integrated food security, agricultural productivity adapted to climate risks and the living conditions are diversified in the target communities in Rural Kassala”

Generally, the approach for the implementation of this assignment has been appreciative, participatory and learning centered.

Secondary and primary data has been gathered from different relevant sources. For secondary data: Available relevant documents at different level of potential stakeholders have been reviewed

To ensure triangulation of the collected qualitative and quantitative secondary data and to probe more deeply and bridge information gaps that may encountered during secondary data review, primary data has been collected from different levels of key by using a variety of techniques and tools, mainly, Household questionnaire and Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) techniques and tools.

No limitations or constraints were encountered. As a result, the field work was implemented as scheduled.

This evaluation was conducted by an external team. The evaluation team conducted its work independently, without...
any undue influence from either SRCS and GRC or other project partners

Key questions of the evaluation were structured the global evaluation criteria as follows:

1. **Relevance:**
   (The appropriateness of project objectives to the real problems needs and priorities of the intended target groups and beneficiaries that the project is supposed to address, and to the physical and policy environment within which it operates.)

2. **Efficiency:**
   (Comparing alternative approaches to achieving an output, to see whether the most efficient approach has been used and that value of money has obtained’)

3. **Effectiveness:**
   (Measures the extent to which an activity achieves its purpose, or whether this can be expected to happen on the basis of the outputs’)

4. **Impact Prospect:**
   (Progress towards achieving the wider effects of the project in terms of social, economic, technical, and environmental aspects, on individuals, gender, and age-groups, communities and institutions. Impacts can be intended and unintended, positive and negative, macro (sector) and micro (household).

5. **Sustainability:**
   (The likelihood of a continuation in the stream of benefits produced by the project after the period of external support has ended. Key factors that impact on the likelihood of sustainability include: (i) ownership by beneficiaries; (ii) policy support/consistency; (iii) appropriate technology; (iv) environment; (v) socio-cultural
issues; (vi) gender equity; (vii) institutional management capacity; and (viii) economic and financial viability)

In addition to Accountability to Beneficiaries:

(level of effective communication between the project and the beneficiaries and the involvement of the beneficiaries in decision making related to the project implementation

Key Findings:

• Though the communities were not consulted at the project initiation phase, in which project interventions were determined, but, findings of the baseline and KAP surveys, which were conducted prior to the implementation of the project, were validated the need of the target communities for this project intervention.

• This project is in line with the government’s effort and strategies to realize food security and poverty alleviation in the area

• This project is in line with SRCS strategic plan 2011 – 2020 in terms of vision, mission and values

• GRC, as project budget holder, has a proper electronic financial system which provides adequate financial management and comprehensive reporting facilities

• All procurements were made through quotations that guaranteed fair prices and high quality.

• Interventions were implemented based on comprehensive information

• The project run with a minimum required number of qualified staff as some implementation tasks were properly delegated to the partners and community leaders

• The use of qualified trainers from within project partners reduced the cost of training and consultancy expenses when compared with the cost of training and consultancy provided by training firms.

• The project has comprehensive monitoring system which is properly implemented

• There is a synergy effect between the project intervention in nutrition and other nutrition project implemented by another national NGO
• 90% of the HH have increased their food availability through “Community Garden and home garden

• 92% of the households consume vegetables compared with 6% at the baseline level

• 4 Community gardens are established by the project and the community has been benefitted by the gardens. Compared with 0 at baseline level

• 90% of the sample get vegetable either from community garden and garden in their house. Compared with 0 at baseline level

• 95.5% family have knowledge of organic fertilizer. They have the ability to use their knowledge about compost in the cultivation of the family garden. compared with 0 at baseline level

• the project succeeded to empower women by providing appropriate training to support their economic activities, to improve their household income and to actively participate in community structures and decision-making. This is a remarkable accomplishment given that the target communities are very conservative communities and previously women were not allowed to participate in public events

• The issue of the sustainability is very much emphasized and addressed during the project implementation phase, towards the end of the project life span an exit and learning review workshop was organized in participation of the community leaders and government stakeholders, in which government institutions and target communities were linked to work together to ensure the sustainability of the stream of benefits, provided by the project, after the end of the project life span
• Strengthening and empowerment of community structures were an integral part of the project intervention. However, these community structure still need to reach an adequate level of financial and institutional sustainability.

• Through the comprehensive monitoring system adopted by the project, and the daily contacts between the project staff, government stakeholders, and the communities during the project implementation phase, all concerned community based project stakeholders were fully aware of the details of the project interventions, community consultation and participatory decision-making process were very well addressed.

This project invested, significantly, in promotion of:

• **Human capital:** By provision of capacity building support, as a way of putting people and especially women, at the centre of development, thereby increasing the effectiveness of development assistance.

• **Social capital:** strengthening communities structure

• **Natural capital:** introduction of new irrigation systems (drip irrigation) a water saving techniques given the scarcity of water in the target area, and introduction of organic manure as innovative livelihood option and environmental friendly product

• **Physical capital:** Establishment of well-constructed community gardens, Renovations of community water tanks, provision of generator for pumping water to main water tank

• **Financial capital:** provide skills training for community members, particularly women, which avail diversified source of HH income

**Lesson Learnt:**

• Involvement of the project stakeholders in the project cycle management would promote sense of ownership of the project interventions and encourage mobilizing local resources to support the implementation of the project activities.

• Qualifying community based volunteers to be able to conduct training at the community level would provide a sustainable source of knowledge and skills at community level and reduces the cost of training when conducted by external trainers.

• The partnership between SRCS and GRC, as technical support provider, enhanced opportunities for local capacity building and initiatives.

• Using cash grant to establish business, by some of the beneficiaries, as families' initiative which was supported by the project, reflect the flexibility of the project to adopt and encourage local initiative.
Main Recommendations:

1. Community consultation must involve all project cycle management from project initiation to project closure
2. For more conceptualization of the participatory approach and to enhance the knowledge, skills, attitudes and practices of SRCS and government stakeholders towards the rationale of adopting participatory approaches in project cycle management, a comprehensive Participatory Rural Appraisal training course must be organized by SRCS for their staff and the potential government stakeholders for future interventions
3. The issue of sustainability is very well tackled by the project, a written exist strategy has been prepared per each activity and discussed with all stakeholders, so, it is recommended for SRCS to replicate this as a good practice in their future interventions
4. To guarantee the continuation of some of the services provided by future the project, introduce cost recovery policy.