

CARE International in Pakistan (CIP) Humanitarian Project in North Waziristan Tribal District (NWTB): End of Project Evaluation Final Report

Shelter roofing



Water collection point



Latrine



Water storage tank

November 2019

This report was produced at the request of CARE International in Pakistan by Dr. Niaz Murtaza (Team Leader), Aftab Ismail Khan, and Ahmed Ali Khattak. It was prepared by the consultants under an independent contract.

CONTENTS

Acronyms	2
List of Figures	3
Executive Summary	4
Project Overview	6
Evaluation Overview	7
Findings	10
Project Relevance	10
Project Effectiveness	14
Project Efficiency	22
Physical Verification	23
Project Management	24
Project Impact	25
Project Sustainability	27
Lessons Learnt and Good Practices	30
Case study	32
Conclusions and Recommendations	33
Annexes	35
Annex I. List of Key External Interviewees	35
Annex II. Key Interviewees’ Guide	35
Annex III. Focus Group Discussion Guide	36
Annex IV. Household Survey Questionnaire	39
Annex V. Evaluation Team	45

ACRONYMS

CBO	Community Based Organization
CIP	CARE International in Pakistan (CIP)
CNIC	Computerized National Identity Card
CSO	Civil Society Organization
FATA	Federally Administrated Tribal Area
FDMA	FATA Disaster Management Authority
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GLA	Government Line Agency
HDI	Human Development Indicator
HH	Household
IDPs	Internally Displaced Persons
IVAP	IDPs Vulnerability Assessment and Profiling
KAP	Knowledge, Attitude & Practices
KII	Key Informant Interview
KP	Khyber Pakhtunkhwa
NADRA	National Database and Registration Authority
NGO	Non-Government Organization
NMD	Newly Merged District
NWTD	North Waziristan Tribal District
OFDA	Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance
PDMA	Provincial Disaster Management Authority
PHED	Public Health and Engineering Department
PHPF	Pakistan Humanitarian Pooled Fund
PKR	Pakistani Rupees
PRDS	Participatory Rural Development Society
PWDs	Person with disabilities
SWTD	South Waziristan Tribal District
TDPs	Temporarily Displaced Persons
UNHCR	United Nations Human Rights Commission on Refugees
UNOCHA	United Nation Organization for Coordination of Humanitarian Assistance
WASH	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Evaluation analytical framework	7
Figure 2: Satisfaction with consultation before project inception	12
Figure 3: Satisfaction with project services and consultation during implementation	12
Figure 4: Satisfaction with complaint mechanisms and handling	13
Figure 5: Nature of community complaints	14
Figure 6: Satisfaction with the targeting of most needy families	15
Figure 7: Satisfaction with gender issues	16
Figure 8: Satisfaction with services for children and persons with disabilities	17
Figure 9: Quantity and quality of water and sanitation infrastructure	18
Figure 10: Quantity and quality of shelter services	19
Figure 11: Quantity and quality of hygiene kits and sessions	19
Figure 12: Current usage of all services	20
Figure 13: Ranking of services by most useful	21
Figure 14: Targets vs. Achievements by districts and activities	22
Figure 15: Impact due to water services	26
Figure 16: Hygiene impact due to project services	27
Figure 17: Sustainability of project impact	28

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Over five million persons from the tribal districts of ex-FATA region were displaced over the last decade. Over 90% of these persons have now returned and face massive humanitarian needs. CARE International in Pakistan (CIP) implemented a humanitarian project in NWTD through a local partner (PRDS) focused on WASH and shelter. In October 2019, CIP commissioned an independent evaluation of the project to assess its relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. The evaluation collected information through a desk review of key documents, 8 FGDs and 200 household interviews with men and women in the project locations, 8 key informant interviews and physical observations. Overall, the quality and impact of the project is high, which is especially commendable given the extremely challenging work environment and external constraints. The detailed findings are as follows:

Project Relevance: The needs assessment process was participatory and both men and women were consulted equally in the household surveys and FGDs done. The project subsequently established separate WASH committees for males and females in the selected villages to ensure adequate community participation and also recruited groups of hygiene promoters from within the communities. The project also instituted complaint mechanisms for communities. Overall, communities expressed satisfaction about the level of community participation and consultation. The highest level of satisfaction was expressed by male respondents and the lowest by females. But the project was successful in increasing the participation and consultation of women in project activities later. The main complaints about relevance related to certain inputs provided for shelter, e.g., plywood and the need for income activities. District government staff expressed satisfaction with the interaction and reporting of CIP and partner.

Project Effectiveness: Men expressed higher levels of satisfaction with quality across all services (above 80%) than women whose levels of high satisfaction did not exceed 30% for any service. Still a majority of women expressed high or partial satisfaction with all the services. The lowest levels of satisfaction were expressed for shelter and the highest levels were expressed with the quality and quantity for water. The activities related to consulting women and establishing women's WASH committees can be considered gender transformative as never before did women in these areas have such consultative status in community activities. Their equal access to other WASH services and the provision of targeted services addressing women's unique needs, such as within hygiene kits and sessions, can be considered gender sensitive and responsive. Overall, community satisfaction with the work on women's issues was high. All project targets were met and even exceeded in the case of latrine and hand pump work.

Project Efficiency: The main avenue for increasing time and cost-efficiency relates to working through local partners. Working through partners can yield cost savings in administrative expenses, increase time efficiency in procurement and help overcome the challenge of distance as local NGOs can more easily maintain camp offices near project sites.

Project Impact: Men reported higher impact (average around 90% Yes for all activities) than women across the different activities. The highest impact across both genders was reported for water services and the lowest for shelter services although the percentages for even those were around 60% positive on average across males and females. Water services reduced the time taken to fetch water and security for women considerably and also gave money savings as some families were paying to

get house use water. Women highly appreciated the hygiene information and reported a reduction in diseases in their families.

Project Sustainability: Over 80% of males and females who reported positive impact also reported that the benefits will last at least 2-3 years. The highest sustainability ratings were for water services (average around 95% across both genders) and the lowest for shelter services (around 65%). FGDs reveal the training and equipment given to people on maintenance and repair of water services were the main sources of perceived sustainability. Many people also felt that the hygiene promotion information will help them for the rest of their lives. The role of O & M committees is very critical in sustainability of hand pumps. In case of water supply schemes, the high cost of maintenance makes it difficult for communities to take over and sustain them. The spare parts will have to be fetched from Bannu or even further away from Peshawar, which will be difficult for O&M committees to arrange. Thus, the WASH and O&M Committees should be well connected to the PHED and district administration for sustainability. The four PHED water supply schemes have formally been handed over to PHED for onward operation and maintenance.

Project Management: The high degree of success in meeting program targets was made possible by a rigorous procurement process, close and constant liaison with district and security authorities; the recruitment of high-caliber staff and partner who worked with great diligence and put in long hours; the use of community-embedded hygiene promoters; and the effective mobilization of community through WASH committees. Reporting and M&E activities were of good quality.

Overall, the quality and impact of the project is high, which is especially commendable given the extremely challenging work environment and external constraints. The recommendations in this section largely relate to improving things which are already good or removing minor problems. The main exception to this observation relates to the lower level of satisfaction of women compared with men. The project was somewhat slower in engaging women than men in the early phases of the project, though this gap reduced later. There were also some issues with the inputs provided under the shelter components, such as tin sheets, which were less acceptable to women than men as women spend more time at home. The security situation in NWTD is more volatile. Also, the culture in NWTD is more conservative even compared with other NMDs. This also affects the ability of NWTD women to participate in project activities. The main recommendations for CIP for the future are as follows:

- Undertake studies in future projects to ensure that project committees are fully representative of all sections of the community in order to reduce possible conflicts
- Pursue possibility of cash provision for shelter and other services subject to permission from authorities
- Revisit the design and inputs for shelter to make them more suitable for the local climate
- Provide more technical inputs for people in making shelter and toilets
- Include elements on livelihoods and income in future projects for both men and women to ensure greater self-reliance
- Ensure more capacity building for village committees and link them with other agencies for accessing additional services
- Wherever possible, use partnership modality so as to build local capacity and obtain efficiency.
- Ensure more synergy, linkages and learning between staff of parallel projects to increase effectiveness and efficiency.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

Displacement of over five million persons occurred from the tribal and bordering districts of Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa (KP) province over the last decade¹. According to the WHO, over 950 000 people from the North Waziristan Tribal District (NWTd) were displaced to neighboring districts in the province². According to UNOCHA, over 90% of these persons have now returned, including over 100,000 families to NWTd, after the security forces cleared the area of militants after the 2015 operation^{3,4}.

CARE International in Pakistan (CIP) is one of the few INGOs working in NWTd and SWTD to help the returning families settle down in their communities. It had earlier completed a one-year PHPF - funded project in NWTd focused on WASH activities. It is now implementing a humanitarian project in NWTd as follows:

Project Title: WASH & Shelter Humanitarian Response Project in North Waziristan

Project Focus: Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) & Shelter

Project Duration: 14 months (October 2018 - November 2019)

Targeted areas: Miran Shah & Mir Ali tehsils, North Waziristan

Scope of Work:

- Rehabilitation & Improvement of 05 water systems in revenue villages of the target communities
- Installation of 20 hand pumps in villages/hamlets not covered by the main water supply schemes
- Construction of 300 household latrines in communities
- Distribution of 4,500 hygiene/dignity kits in communities
- Provision of 300 shelter roofing kit material to selected households
- Delivery of hygiene promotion sessions with male and female community members in target communities.

Donor: Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA)

Dollar Amount: USD 1,300,000

Beneficiary Numbers: 40,000 individuals

Implementing Partner: PRDS

EVALUATION OVERVIEW

In October 2019, CIP commissioned a final independent evaluation of the project to assess its relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability in terms of its goals and objectives and the associated indicators delineated in the project log frames. In addition, the evaluation focused on the cross cutting themes of protection, gender and inclusion, the projects' management quality and physical verification of quality of work completed. The evaluation was aimed to specifically provide key lessons learnt and recommendations to guide decision-making about future programming for post-disaster projects and contribute to knowledge, appropriateness and sustainability strategies of similar programs.

¹ Project Proposal, NWTd project


² WHO: Pakistan: North Waziristan Displacement July 17, 2014

³ Project Proposal, NWTd project

⁴ Fourth phase of TDPs' return to South Waziristan under way: The News, October 16, 2016

The evaluation team employed the analytical framework presented in figure 1 for the evaluation. According to this framework, the quality of project cycle processes determines the quality and final outcomes of the project. External factors also affect the quality and the success of the project. Thus, the evaluation started by reviewing the quality of project processes, i.e., planning (e.g., assessment quality, resourcing etc.); implementation (e.g., activity scheduling); coordination, monitoring (e.g., quality of monitoring framework, follow-up etc.); and closure (e.g., hand-over and follow-up). Then the evaluators reviewed project outcomes using the TORs and the project indicators. Based on the review of outcomes, external factors and program processes, the evaluator related specific strengths and weaknesses in project outcomes to specific strengths and weaknesses in project processes and to external challenges. Consequently, it gives suggestions for strengthening project processes and outcomes and overcoming external challenges for future.

Figure 1: Evaluation analytical framework



The evaluation team applied a mixed-methods approach using qualitative and quantitative techniques to collect data from multiple sources to ensure multiple levels of triangulation. This included data from project documents, key informant interviews, focus group discussions, and household surveys. The team consisted of a Team Leader, Co-Evaluator, Engineer, and male and female enumerators from NWT. The enumerators were trained and the instruments were tested in the field before field work. Information for the evaluation was collected from the following sources:

Review of project documents

The evaluation team reviewed key project documents, including project proposal, progress reports (narrative), internal monitoring/mission reports, case stories, yearly plan of operation, operational reports, progress reports, strategic framework, output/outcome indicators, etc.

Key Informant Interviews (KIIs)

The evaluation included semi-structured key informant interviews with the following:

- External: Other NGOs, school officials, and District Government Officials.
- Internal: CARE and Implementing partners staff (KII-IA/P)

Focus Group Discussion (FGDs)

Eight FGDs were conducted with males and females (4 each). Each FGD included 12-15 participants. The FGDs included open-ended questions based on the TORs questions and aimed to obtain rich information related to “how and why”.

Household Survey (HS)

The household survey used closed-ended questions focused on “what and when”. The survey tool was pre-tested in the field. This also provided opportunity for training of enumerators. The household

survey sample size was based on the number of beneficiaries for the project. The minimum sample size at 95% confidence level and 7% margin of error was 196. Stratified sampling was used based on gender and tehsils within both districts. The sample was broken 60-40% among males and females. Two villages were selected randomly from each of the two tehsils that the project worked in. 50 persons were interviewed from each of the eight villages. The beneficiaries were randomly selected from project beneficiaries list in each stratum, with 10-15% oversampling done to cater to non-presence of some beneficiaries in the field. In case of higher absences, the next persons in the list to the missing persons were interviewed.

Physical Observations

A qualified engineer physically verified a sample of the physical outputs provided by the project, including rehabilitated water schemes, hand pumps, latrines and shelter material. The physical evaluation was done in light of relevant national and international WASH standards and the standards mentioned in the project documents.

The evaluation was tasked to answer the following key research questions mentioned in the TORs under the different criteria:

Project Relevance:

1. How were the needs assessed during the design phase of the project? Were the key areas of focus for the interventions identified and did they meet the needs of the most vulnerable in target communities? If not, why not and whose needs were met?
2. To what extent has the program used an inclusive approach and ensured stakeholder participation to design the project components? To what extent was the program successful in being compliant to government policy and integration within the government system?
3. To what extent did the project solicit participation from the direct beneficiaries (both men and women of all social groups) to identify needs and determine strategies to address those?

Project Effectiveness and Efficiency:

4. To what extent was the logical framework (and indicators) appropriately designed? Did the LFA follow SMART definitions and measure key results and activities?
5. To what extent did the project meet its stated objectives? What were the key contributing factors for the project success? Were the implementation strategies relevant and useful?
6. Which activity was perceived most useful by the beneficiaries and the stakeholders? Which activity could have been improved? What was missing? Did the activities address the real needs of participants?
7. How did the project fare on the CARE Gender Marker (i.e. gender blind, gender sensitive, gender responsive or gender transformative)? To what extent was the programme successful in addressing gender- and age- specific needs of target populations?
8. To what extent was the project successful in reaching out to most vulnerable populations through its interventions?
9. What were the strengths and weaknesses of the approaches used?
10. What best practices/lessons can be learned for application in future programmes?
11. Under project activities, which tools were perceived as the most useful? Were the type and quantity of materials, if applicable, perceived to be sufficient to address the needs of the community?
12. Did the methodology meet behaviour change communication basic principles (e.g. call to action, simple, technically correct messages and culturally appropriate, gender and age sensitive)?

13. Was the timing of the delivery of the project appropriate e.g. materials arriving on time, trainings held as scheduled, etc.?
14. Were resources used in the most efficient way in terms of having the greatest benefit to improving results?
15. Could the current model have been implemented with the same or fewer resources with similar or greater results?
16. Compare the approaches of self-implementation by CIP and implementing through partners and see what the value addition is and challenges faced in either approach.
17. What were the factors that enabled implementation in highly insecure areas, what worked and what did not?

Project Management:

18. Did the project follow the M&E plan? Was it implemented in a timely and appropriate manner? Was the project able to adapt/was flexible to changing needs/priorities over time?
19. Was the monitoring information shared with all levels?
20. Was the level of reporting appropriate and did it provide sufficient feedback to management to allow management decisions to be made?
21. Did CIP engage sufficient and appropriate staff to effectively manage and implement the project?
22. Did CIP incorporate principles of Accountability to Beneficiaries into project implementation? If yes, what was incorporated and how? Was there any evidence of benefits?

Project Sustainability:

23. What components of the project are sustainable?
24. What were the best practices related to sustainability? Any recommendations on how to ensure sustainability that could have been considered?
25. Was the exit plan followed? If no, what was not followed and why? If yes, what was most successful? Was the exit planning done in a timely manner?
26. Is there any evidence of communities continuing activities or reinforcing messages?

Project Impact:

27. What impact did the project have overall?
28. What other unintended impacts or consequences did the project have beyond objectives (both negatively and positively)?
29. What contextual elements contributed to success or created challenges to optimizing impact from project interventions?

For analysis of primary qualitative data, the evaluation team employed a structured approach as follows:

- Summarize key informant interview and FGD notes, and code them according to themes relevant to the evaluation.
- Prepare tally sheets identifying the themes that emerge in the document review, FGDs and key informant interviews to facilitate systematic and rigorous data analysis aimed at identifying key evaluation findings.
- Compare responses of different stakeholder groups with each other and information provided in project documents in order to triangulate as effectively as possible.

The team analyzed the quantitative data by preparing cross-tabs and frequency distributions from the household survey, which were processed and analyzed using Excel. All qualitative and quantitative

data to be collected through the review was disaggregated by sex and location. Standard protocols were applied to ensure data quality, including adequate training of enumerators, cross-checking in data entry and rechecking by Team Leader for a sample of data. The evaluators took steps to ensure that the evaluation respects and protects the rights and welfare of the people and communities involved and to ensure that the evaluation is technically accurate and reliable, is conducted in a transparent and impartial manner, and contributes to organizational learning and accountability. The evaluation methodology relies on triangulation of sources and methods to ensure the validity and reliability of results.

A number of limitations were faced as follows:

- Due to the distances and security situation, access to communities was limited to around 5-6 hours per day.
- Furthermore, accessing the project's stakeholders (i.e., district and local government officials) was challenging due to their busy schedules.
- To counter these limitations the evaluation team coordinated closely with project teams in accessing project beneficiaries and other key stakeholders. Thus, despite the limitations, the team was able to interview almost all targeted persons, except law enforcement agencies which declined to participate in the evaluation.

FINDINGS

The massive displacement and destruction had created major humanitarian needs once the communities returned to their villages and towns. CIP's needs assessments showed that around 40% of the water schemes had been badly damaged and were non-functional while more than 90% of the population was unaware of proper hygiene and sanitation practices. Nearly 80% of the families lacked latrines and were reliant on open defecation. Families were returning to homes with missing roofs, door and windows and damaged structures which provided inadequate shelter. In response to these needs, CIP aimed to provide water and sanitation and hygiene promotion services and shelter services in the project. The aim was to water access, reduce time for collecting water, increase dignity, reduce diseases and increase protection from physical threats.

This chapter presents the findings for the different questions under the criteria laid down in the evaluation TORs. The specific questions in the TORs have been slightly rearranged to increase coherence and reduce duplication.

Project Relevance:

There were four relevance-related questions in the TORs. Three of them related to community participation, consultation and accountability and one related to adherence to government policies. The three related to community issues were as follows:

1. How were the needs assessed during the design phase of the project? Were the key areas of focus for the interventions identified and did they meet the needs of the most vulnerable in target communities? If not, why not and whose needs were met?
2. To what extent has the program used an inclusive approach and ensured stakeholder participation to design the project components? To what extent did the project solicit


participation from the direct beneficiaries (both men and women of all social groups) to identify needs and determine appropriate strategies to address those?

3. Did CIP incorporate principles of Accountability to Beneficiaries into project implementation? If yes, what was incorporated and how? Was there any evidence of benefits?

Relevance is largely an outcome of strong project cycle processes related to needs assessments and complaint mechanisms, as per the analytical framework for this evaluation. The needs assessment process for the project was participatory. The starting points for needs assessment for project designs were the Inter-Cluster Assessment reports jointly carried out by UN Agencies and Government Counterparts and CIP's own assessments in these areas in 2017 and 2018. The project proposal and the major overall focus of the project on WASH activities were based on these assessment reports. Once the proposals were approved by the donor, CIP and PRDS undertook further primary needs assessments in the form of pre-KAP (Knowledge, Attitude and Practices) surveys on the status of hygiene practices within the communities. The project also conducted the baseline separate from pre-KAP to determine the baseline values for the indicators. The findings then became the basis for developing hygiene promotion activities. The teams also undertook technical surveys to fine tune the details of project activities, such as the exact technical designs of the WASH activities, the exact locations of the physical infrastructure, the specific beneficiaries for the household-level services for toilets and shelter input. The reports of the pre-KAP surveys show that both men and women were consulted equally in the household surveys and FGDs.


The project subsequently established separate WASH and shelter committees for males and females in the selected villages to help mobilize the communities, undertake community-level decision-making for different project activities and ensure adequate community participation during project implementation. The committees were formed by initially having a large community meeting within each community to explain the project and encourage the community to select the committees. Subsequently, project staff held regular meetings with the committees to discuss on-going implementation and occasionally with the communities around major project events, e.g., selection of water points. The establishment of women's committees was a major achievement as this had not happened before given the local cultural restrictions in the project areas. The project also recruited groups of hygiene promoters from within the communities. While the committee members were nominated by the communities, it would be useful for such projects in the future to undertake a review of the backgrounds of the nominated committee members to check whether they represent all socio-economic groups within communities equitably. Even though this omission did not create any problems or tensions in this project, doing so can help minimize the risk of biases in future projects. Overall, communities expressed satisfaction about the level of community participation and consultation, although there was considerable variation in the level of satisfaction across males and females.

Figure 2: Satisfaction with consultation before project inception



Males expressed a higher level of full satisfaction (90%+) with community and household consultation before the project started (Figure 2). Much lower levels of satisfaction were expressed by females with only 16% expressing full satisfaction with community consultation and 49% with household consultation. But even there, the percentage of women expressing partial or full satisfaction was close to 100% for both questions. Similar levels of satisfaction were expressed (Figure 3) about provision of services that addressed their most important needs and consultation during project implementation, with males expressing higher levels of full satisfaction than females. But even among females, the percentage expressing full or partial satisfaction was above 90% on both questions. Encouragingly, while the percentage of women expressing high satisfaction with the level of initial consultation was particularly low at around 16%, the percentage of women expressing high satisfaction with consultation during the implementation phase was around 60%. This shows that the project success in involving women in project activities improved over the life of the project.

Figure 3: Satisfaction with project services and consultation during implementation




The information from the KIIs with CIP and PRDS staff and community FGDs helped shed additional light on the questions and some of the overall findings and the variations therein from the household survey as follows:

- The FGDs with males and females revealed that the WASH and shelter committees were found to be representatives of all sections of the communities and played a satisfactory role in mobilizing the community and representing their priorities to the project. The committees were consulted in length to determine the most pressing needs and identify the most deserving households.
- Male community members also expressed a preference for cash grants to build shelters instead of physical inputs so that they could build their shelters in line with local and household preferences. But at the same time, there was also a request for more technical assistance and access to skilled labour to help complete the shelters.
- Females in FGDs indicated that the project was somewhat slower in mobilizing women for the project initially as compared with men and that information about project meetings were not always available to all women in the communities. Committees in several communities for women were set up later than for men. Many women also mentioned the role of structural factors beyond the control of the project, i.e., cultural inhibitions and security situation, in discouraging them from participating in the project initially. However, performance along all these issues improved considerably over the life of the project.

The project also instituted complaint mechanisms for communities, including a dedicated complaint telephone line at CIP office, complaint boxes in communities and regular feedback meetings of project staff with committees. As with the dimensions above, a higher level of full satisfaction with complaint mechanisms and handling (Figure 4) was expressed by males (around 90%) than females (around 50%). But even there, the percentage of women expressing partial or full satisfaction was above 90% for both questions.


Figure 4: Satisfaction with complaint mechanisms and handling



While a number of complaint mechanisms were established, some issues were mentioned in FGDs and KIIs linked to each one of them. The patchy cell phone access in the project areas limited the efficacy of the telephone helpline as beneficiaries had to travel to public call offices in town to make complaints, which was especially difficult for women. The low literacy level, especially among women, restricted the use of complaint boxes. Some of the FGD participants, especially women, also were not aware of these formal complaint mechanisms. The regular meetings by staff during project implementation helped overcome the problems associated with the first two methods. But the issue here was that meetings were often held when people were busy with their livelihoods and house activities. For communities, the best timings are early in the morning or late in the afternoon so as not to conflict with their own work priorities.

Project data below in Figures 5 reveals that the vast majority of complaints related to requests for assistance. Only 4% of the complaints were by females. This may not necessarily be only a reflection of the greater satisfaction of females but also a reflection of difficulties faced by them in accessing the complaint mechanisms, as described earlier.

Figure 5: Nature of community complaints



4. To what extent was the program successful in being compliant to government policy and integration within the government system?

The information with respect to compliance with government policies came largely from project document reviews and KIIS with CIP and PRDS staff and government counterparts. The main governmental counterparts were the law enforcement agencies (LEAs), district administrative and technical staff in the areas of public health (PHED) and education and provincial disaster management authorities (PDMA). Among these, the LEAs declined to be interviewed. These sources of information reveal that there were no technical or programmatic policy requirements from the government about project activities. However, there were administrative access and reporting requirements. The project staff had to liaise extensively with the LEAs about the areas that were open to NGO activities and about daily security and access information. Project staff also had to liaise and keep informed district administrative and technical staff through regular meetings and periodic reports. Interviews with district and PDMA staff revealed overall satisfaction with the quality of reporting as well as project work. There was a request to further expand the scope of work to areas not covered to date in other villages and Tehsils.


Project Effectiveness

Effectiveness is largely an outcome of strong project cycle processes related to implementation and coordination, as per the analytical framework for this evaluation. The evaluation TORs included ten questions related to project effectiveness. Five of them related to satisfaction of communities with

project quantity, quality and inclusion of different groups in project activities, while the rest related to the suitability and utility of project approaches and strategies. The first three questions related to community satisfaction and effectiveness were as follows:

1. To what extent was the project successful in reaching out to most vulnerable populations through its interventions?
2. How did the project fare on the CARE Gender Marker (i.e. gender blind, gender sensitive, gender responsive or gender transformative)? To what extent was the programme successful in addressing gender- and age- specific needs of target populations?
3. Did the methodology meet behaviour change communication basic principles (e.g. call to action, simple, technically correct messages and culturally appropriate, gender and age sensitive)?

Figure 6: Satisfaction with the targeting of most needy families




The issue of project success in reaching out to most vulnerable populations through its interventions was analyzed in terms of the selection of the most vulnerable villages and then within them the selection of the most vulnerable households for household level services. The results from the household surveys in Figure 6 show that nearly 90% of the males expressed high satisfaction with the project criteria for identifying the most vulnerable persons and provision of services mainly to such persons. However, among females, this percentage was only 47% though another 46-48% was partially satisfied on these issues. Many participants in female FGDs said that some of their community members had migrated to elevated villages to escape hot weather and these households were left out of the project assessment while others were left out because of the limited budget of project. But this clearly does not reflect any dissatisfaction with the selection criteria as such. The selection of villages was done in consultation with LEAs and local district authorities. The security clearance from LEAs based on the security situation played a major role in the selection of villages and agencies were restricted to villages which authorities suggested as secure. But existing surveys by UN agencies and government counterparts show that needs were equally high throughout the district due to the major destruction and displacement. According to project staff, the agency did undertake an analysis to select the most vulnerable ones within the villages cleared by LEAs though no written report of such as assessment is available. Additionally, the project included a mix of locations in major towns as well as more distant villages away from the towns. In terms of selection of households within the villages, the larger water schemes provided water to the whole community. Where such

schemes did not reach the whole community, the project provided hand pumps to families which were not served by the larger water schemes. Thus, the main issue in terms of reaching out to the most vulnerable persons within communities related to the distribution of household-level services in the areas of shelter, toilet and hygiene kits provision to specific households. For this, purpose, the project developed detailed criteria for identifying the most vulnerable household based on poverty levels, presence of widows and persons with disability etc. These criteria were vetted by the WASH and shelter committees who then identified the most vulnerable persons based on them. This selection was then rechecked by monitoring staff through household visits. Thus, overall, an objective and thorough process was developed for this purpose.

Gender issues: Figure 7 reflects the extent to which the project addressed women’s needs well, improved their health and hygiene knowledge and gave equal attention the needs of women and men.

Figure 7: Satisfaction with gender issues




The results show that while more than 90% of women expressed satisfaction, this was almost equally divided between partial and high satisfaction. Between 85% and 90% of the males expressed high satisfaction with different gender related issues. The highest levels of satisfaction among women was

found on the question related to equal attention to women’s issues as men and improved health status of women where more than 50% of women expressed high satisfaction. FGD information shows that while women were satisfied with the quality of hygiene and health related services, they were less satisfied with shelter services which pulled their overall satisfaction levels down.

Thus, overall, community satisfaction with the work on women’s issues was commendable, especially given the serious local cultural restrictions on women’s rights. In terms of the achievements on the CARE Gender Marker, the project adopted strategies to address the needs of women equitably. This included doing needs assessments with and forming separate committees for males and females and providing specific services to women such as hygiene kits and hygiene promotion and ensuring that the details of community-level water services were decided in consultation with both men and women. The activities related to consulting women and establishing women’s WASH and shelter committees can be considered gender transformative as never before did women in these areas have such consultative status in community activities. On the other hand, their equal access to other WASH services and the provision of targeted services addressing women’s unique needs, such as within hygiene kits and sessions, can be considered gender sensitive and responsive. Similar satisfaction results were found across males and females related to the issues of children and persons with disabilities, as shown in Figure 8.

Figure 8: Satisfaction with services for children and persons with disabilities



1. Were the type and quantity of materials, if applicable, perceived to be sufficient to address the needs of the community?
2. Which activity was perceived most useful by the beneficiaries and the stakeholders? Which activity could have been improved? What was missing? Did the activities address the real needs of participants? Under project activities, which tools were perceived as the most useful?

Figure 9: Quantity and quality of water and sanitation infrastructure




Figure 9 provides information about the level of satisfaction with quantity and quality of water and sanitation infrastructure including the water systems, hand pumps and latrines. In terms of the variations in satisfaction across gender, in line with earlier trends, men (around 80%) expressed higher levels of full satisfaction than women (between 1 and 23%). But a majority of women expressed partial or full satisfaction with these services. Even though women reported lowest satisfaction, they did not raise any other specific complaints in the FGDs about them.

Shelter services were also provided by the project. Figure 10 again shows that the level of satisfaction with these services was higher among men (70%) there than among women (23%). But again a majority of women expressed full or partial satisfaction with shelter services. The main complaints in female FGDs related to shelter were the small size of the rooms, the use of inappropriate inputs like tins sheets and plywood; and the lack of support for skilled labor for completing the shelter.

Figure 10: Quantity and quality of shelter services






Figure 11: Quantity and quality of hygiene kits and sessions



With respect to the quantity and quality of hygiene kits and sessions, women again expressed the lowest level of full satisfaction (Figure 11). Women in FGDs appreciated the women-specific items included in the kits but felt that the number of items was not adequate for the large size of their families. They also mentioned that this was the first time they acquired information about hygiene issues which have helped them keep their houses and families cleaner and led to reduction in diseases.


Figure 12: Current usage of all services



In terms of the services, the lowest levels of satisfaction were expressed for shelter and the highest levels of satisfaction were expressed with quality and quantity for water and hygiene kits services. The lower levels of satisfaction with shelter was due to the issues related to size, inappropriate inputs and lack of support for skilled labor that were mentioned above. Figure 12 also shows that in terms of the current use of different services, the lowest use again is reported for shelter for the same reasons.

Opinions differed significantly across beneficiaries about which service was the most useful (Figure 13). Toilets were mentioned by the highest percentage of both men (39.7%) and women (50%) as the most useful service followed by water. Hygiene kits and education were seen as the least useful service by men and women followed by shelter. Hygiene kits were assigned low relative utility in FGDs due to their non-permanent nature and smaller monetary value. Shelter was assigned lower value than water and toilets due to the low acceptability of certain inputs like tine sheets and ply wood and the small size of the shelters.

Figure 13: Ranking of services by most useful



The five questions focused on effectiveness of program approaches were as follows:

1. To what extent was the logical framework (and indicators) appropriately designed? Did the LFA follow SMART definitions and measure key results and activities?
2. To what extent did the project meet its stated objectives? What were the key contributing factors for the project success? Were the implementation strategies relevant and useful?
3. What were the factors that enabled implementation in highly insecure areas, what worked and what did not?
4. What were the strengths and weaknesses of the approaches used?
5. What best practices/lessons can be learned for application in future programmes?

The log frame for the NWTDD had separate indicators for different sub-sectors like hygiene promotion, shelter and water and sanitation. However, the indicators were not specific and measurable in the absence of specific number or percentage targets as the donor format did not require this. But in

future, it is advisable to have log-frames which provide specific number and percentage targets. In the absence of these features, the logframe cannot be considered SMART.

Figure 14: Targets vs. achievements by activities

Activities	NWTD Project	
	Targets	Achievements
Repair of existing water supply schemes (communal)	5	5
Hand pumps installation/rehabilitation (communal)	20	24
Hygiene kits distribution	4500	4500
Hygiene sessions	300	360
Construction of pour flush latrines	300	340
Shelter support	300	300

Figure 14 provides an overview of the targets and achievements of the project for different activities. The table shows that the targets were met and even exceeded in the case of latrine and hand pump work in the NWTD project. This high degree of success in meeting program targets despite the highly challenging work environment was made possible by a number of good approaches, strategies and practices as follows:

- A rigorous procurement process that succeeded in identifying high quality vendors for the WASH activities. Thus, there was only one case where a contractor had to be terminated due to unsatisfactory work. Multiple vendors were used for different activities so as to reduce work load and eliminate the risks associated with putting one’s eggs in one basket.
- Very close and constant liaison with district and security authorities which minimized work stoppages by authorities and ensured continuous access to work sites
- The recruitment of high-calibre staff and partner who worked with great diligence and put in long hours
- The use of community-embedded hygiene promoters who were from the communities and lived there, thus partially compensating for the limited number of hours per day that regular staff could put in due to security and logistical constraints
- The effective mobilization of community through WASH committees

Project Efficiency:

1. Was the timing of the delivery of the project appropriate e.g. materials arriving on time, trainings held as scheduled, etc.?
2. Were resources used in the most efficient way in terms of having the greatest benefit to improving results?
3. Could the current model have been implemented with the same or fewer resources with similar or greater results?
4. Compare the approaches of self-implementation by CIP and implementing through partners and see what the value addition is and challenges faced in either approach.

FGDs show that the majority of males and females in both districts were satisfied partially or fully with the timeliness of project activities. However, significant delays (around five months) occurred at the start of the project due to delays in obtaining NOCs from PDMA to start the project. Such delays seem common in projects throughout Pakistan based on the evaluation team's interaction with other INGOs, and more so with projects in sensitive areas such as the NMDs. This issue can only be resolved through patient joint effort by INGOs in coordination with donors. Still, the project was not only able to complete almost all initial targets and even exceeded them in the case of some activities as shown in Figure 14.

Since the detailed budgets and expenditure reports were not available, the evaluation team is unable to give any opinion on the efficiency of resource use. However, a rigorous procurement process was followed for major items, which was in line with government regulations too.

Physical verification

The evaluation engineer visited four sites in two tehsils of North Waziristan. The information collected in field visit was used for triangulation of data obtained from reports, assessments and quality spot checks.

Water Supply schemes: The rehabilitated schemes are in running condition. The engineering design of water supply schemes is appropriate. The use of solar energy technology will make these schemes sustainable as electricity supply is often disrupted to most of water supply schemes. But there is also the possibility that excessive pumping may lead to wastage of water as well as drawing down of water table. So pumping has to be done in such a way to avoid wastage of this precious commodity especially in this region where water is already scarce and the water table is down. In the second phase if any, the communities should be sensitized to avoid direct connections from the lines used for supplying of water to the tanks. Communities in visited sites were not aware about these issues.

Hand pumps: Communities which were outside the range of existing water supply schemes were provided with hand pumps. This has helped save time of between 2-3 hours daily for women and children who usually had to fetch water from springs situated in far flung places. Quality assurance reports confirm that project activities from digging the bore hole till installation of the pumps have been monitored by qualified engineers. The water testing also confirms suitability of water for drinking. The hand pumps visited (5) are all in use.

Latrines: All latrines are built according to specification. Constant monitoring has ensured good quality of work. All latrines were appropriately located in the compounds and accessible to women, children and PWDs. The number of latrines is not enough for a compound in all locations where 7-10 people live and it may lead to unhygienic conditions during daily use. Open defecation has decreased in areas where a toilet has been provided, though precise estimates were not available from communities.

Shelters: The inspection of shelters revealed a few points about inputs and design. Firstly, the use of ply wood is not recommended for any future phase as they are not very well secured and locals have used better material which is locally manufactured and looks more aesthetic. Secondly, in some compounds the length of the room may need more than one girder to take load off the roof given the large size of the room. Thirdly, poor households could not afford good quality bricks or cement for bonding, which they were expected to provide themselves. In terms of actual use of the rooms, all of them were in use. But different uses of the room were observed. Some used it for animals, while other just used it for storage, at one place it was given to a newly-wed couple and in some places it was

about to be finished. But in all cases, people felt that the project had expanded shelter space available to them. People also expressed the desire for help with recruiting skilled labor as currently they were expected to provide for labor themselves.

Other overall observations were as follows:

- Overall CIP and partner have chosen suitable sites for rehabilitation of water supply schemes, hand pumps and latrines. There were conflicts among communities in selection of sites for communal water pumps and water tanks. The project staff had to make an extra effort to solve the conflict and complete the project in time with no major delays. Political interference did lead to uneven distribution of water supply schemes and pumps in some places. The district administration supports the Maliks and award them schemes of water supply, toilets and hand pumps and also influence the development partners to do so. But strong community mobilization has helped in reducing the impact of such issues considerably.
- The Market Rates System 2017 of KP Government has been used for equipment like hand pumps, pipes for main and distribution lines, flush for latrines, solar panels, steel fixings etc. which make them comply with minimum quality standards approved by the government.
- Elaborate water quality tests conducted show that all water points (at Source, Water tank and collection point) are fit for drinking as per the WHO recommendations and the critical parameters including pH, turbidity, conductivity, chlorine residuals and faecal coliform (CFU) were found within permissible limits. The results for hand pumps also all showed satisfactory results.
- The quality assurance done by the partner and CIP was rigorous and relevant performas were developed for physical inspection, follow up and rectification of faults which led to strong structures built for water tanks, toilets or hand pumps.
- In the field office in Bannu it was found that PRDS monitoring reports have covered engineering side very well, with constant updates on quality of construction materials, workmanship and rectification.
- The project activities will end in time. The savings from planned activities to fund additional infrastructure shows that funds were well utilized.

Project Management:

1. Did the project follow the M&E plan? Was it implemented in a timely and appropriate manner? Was the monitoring information shared with all levels?
2. Was the level of reporting appropriate and did it provide sufficient feedback to management to allow management decisions to be made?
3. Was the project able to adapt/was flexible to changing needs/priorities over time?
4. Did CIP engage sufficient and appropriate staff to effectively manage and implement the project?

The project undertook comprehensive M&E and reporting activities. This included an M&E plan which mandated regular visit reports by field staff (e.g., engineer and hygiene promoters) like Spot Check reports, Monitoring and Post-Distribution Monitoring Reports and Final Verification Reports

to the Field Project Managers of PRDS. These reports contained observations related to criteria like relevance, targeting, satisfaction and effectiveness as well as key recommendations based on the observations for improving future processes. The next level was monthly reports by Project Managers to CIP and PRDS head offices. These reports have to be vetted by the district authorities and also shared with provincial government counterparts and contain details of activities completed during the month and major issues faced there-in. There is also a section on recommendations which however was not well covered in many of the reports. A better use of this section would have been to flag management decisions or actions needed to sort out the problems. Finally, there were monthly reports to the donors.


The project was flexible and adaptable enough to finish the activities in time despite the initial delays due to NOC issuance and curfews. Harsh weather also delayed activities initially. Changes were minor and related to changes in the location of some water points based on community feedback. The project employed capable and qualified staff for various administrative, engineering and social mobilization tasks. The project was able to finish the bulk of the activities in time despite initial delays and with good quality. This is in itself a reflection of the sufficiency of the quality and quantity of staff.

Project Impact:

1. What impact did the project have overall?
2. What other unintended impacts or consequences did the project have beyond objectives (both negatively and positively)?
3. What contextual elements contributed to success or created challenges to optimizing impact from project interventions?


There has been significant positive impact of different services on the lives of communities. For example, for water related services, communities in the household survey reported an improvement in both the quantity and quality of water as well as a reduction in the time taken to fetch water. The highest impact was again reported by men while the lowest impact was reported by women (around 45% for all three issues (Figure 15). In FGDs, communities reported that before project completion, they were reliant on unsafe, dirty water from contaminated sources and the quantity was usually not enough to meet their full daily requirements for their families for cooking, bathing and drinking. People were also appreciative of the convenience introduced as the time taken to fetch water for women and children had reduced by up to 3 hours daily. Some families also reported money savings as they were buying expensive clean water earlier.

Figure 15: Impact due to water services



The other major impact was reported in terms of hygiene issues and reduction in diseases in families due to hygiene kits and sessions and the provision of toilet inputs (Figure 16). The impact was in terms of improved hygiene knowledge and its subsequent impact on reducing diseases in the family as well as the impact of toilets on hygiene status of the family. The best impact was related to the provision of toilet services where even a majority of women reported a positive impact (54%) while males reported much higher impact from such services. Information from FGDs reveal that women were introduced to the concepts of hygiene and cleanliness for the first time by the project and this information had changed the way they maintained hygiene in the household in terms of regular bathing, hand washing etc. FGDs also showed that the incidence of open defecation had gone down considerably in communities though exact figures in this regard were not available. Women also reported increased privacy and security due to the provision of toilets.

Figure 16: Hygiene impact due to project services




A few female FGD participants in Mir Ali and Miran Shah also indicated that the project has addressed the needs of persons with disabilities by providing ramps and grab-bars in toilets although the exact number of such toilets was not known to them. There were complaints about the use of certain inputs for shelter such as plywood by both males and females. The only negative impact of the project reported in the FGDs was the deprivation felt by households left out from the project services. But this was not seen as dissatisfaction with the project criteria but just a desire to see services increased in the future, if possible.


Project Sustainability:

1. What components of the project are sustainable?
2. What were the best practices related to sustainability? Any recommendations on how to ensure sustainability that could have been considered?
3. Was the exit plan followed? If no, what was not followed and why? If yes, what was most successful? Was the exit planning done in a timely manner?
4. Is there any evidence of communities continuing activities or reinforcing messages?

The percentages in Figure 17 relate to people who had reported a positive impact in the corresponding questions in Figures 15 and 16. In terms of sustainability, 80%+ of males and females who reported positive impact also reported that the benefits will last at least 2-3 years (Figure 17). The highest sustainability ratings were for water services (average around 95% across both genders) and the lowest for shelter services (around 65%). FGDs reveal the training and equipment given to people on maintenance and repair of water services were the main sources of perceived sustainability. Many people also felt that the hygiene promotion information will help them for the rest of their lives. However, people reported that the shelter inputs like tin sheets and plywood may not be culturally and technically sustainable.

Figure 17: Sustainability of project impact





A key factor in sustainability is the continuation of the WASH and O&M committees after the end of the project. The WASH and Shelter committees are led by active leaders. This project helped in transfer of technology to O&M Committees. The role of O & M committees is very critical in sustainability of hand pumps. There is a possibility that these may be abandoned due to minor defects. In case of water supply schemes, the high cost of maintenance makes it difficult for communities to take over and sustain them. The spare parts will have to be fetched from Bannu or even further away from Peshawar, which will be difficult for O&M committees to arrange. They may also be short of funding. Skilled labor is also not available in these areas. Thus, there is a possibility that due to the inability to fix minor or major repairs, the hand pumps and water supply schemes may become dysfunctional over time. Thus, the WASH and O&M Committees should be well connected to the PHED and district administration for sustainability of the project. PHED should ensure refresher training for the committees after the project phase out, so that these are not abandoned. The PHED has to take over these rehabilitated water supply schemes, especially ground water schemes, because of the high maintenance cost. The project formally handed over these schemes to PHED to ensure the future O&M.

LESSONS LEARNT AND GOOD PRACTICES

1. The experiences from the project show that it is possible to ensure gender transformation even during emergency work in insecure and highly conservative environments. It established separate men's and women's WASH committees to provide an avenue for community participation in project activities. This was the first time that women's committees were established in these communities and they helped to symbolically establish the right of women to participate in project activities on an equal footing with men. The committees worked effectively throughout the project duration and women were generally happy with their participation in project activities. Gaining the trust of community elders and leaders and local authorities is crucial for achieving success in this regard.
2. Project experiences show that it is possible to deliver high quality project services while working through local NGOs in insecure and logistically challenging work environments. Careful selection of qualified local NGOs through a rigorous vetting process and subsequent capacity-building and close monitoring are crucial for achieving success in this regard. Working through local NGOs can increase cost efficiency and reduce delays in emergency situations. Quality can be further enhanced by arranging more professional interaction between CIP and partner staff where both may be implementing parallel and similar projects in close proximity.
3. Where CIP field staff may be hampered by security risks and distances to spend only 3-4 hours daily in communities, the use of local community-based hygiene promoters can help in partially overcoming this constraint. The local knowledge of and trust enjoyed within community by such staff can help agencies undertake culturally appropriate project work. The key to success in using such staff is careful recruitment to ensure that such persons enjoy good reputation within communities and are not seen to be more closely linked to particular elites or sub-groups within communities.
4. Multiple complaint mechanisms may be required to provide ample opportunities to communities to make complaints and ensure accountability while working in insecure and isolated communities. Telephone complaint hotlines may not be universally accessible in isolated areas where cell phones are not operational. The use of community-based complaint boxes may help overcome this problem. However, illiteracy may not allow many within communities to use them. Regular meetings in communities may help overcome both constraints. However, the inability of project staff due to insecurity and distances to be in communities during the hours most convenient to communities, i.e., early in the morning or late in the afternoon, may reduce the efficacy of these meetings.
5. A rigorous procurement process helps both in meeting government and donor requirements and in identifying strong vendors which have the capacity to work in insecure and isolated environments. However, while this stringent process may be suitable for big-ticket and technically complex procurement, such as for rehabilitation of water schemes, the delegation of procurement for less complex and less expensive to partners could result in cost and time efficiency. It may also help improve the procurement process if a partner member is included in procurement committees for major items.

6. Given the lengthy NOC processes for working in tribal districts, adequate time must be allocated in proposal schedules for such processes. Such delays seem common in projects throughout Pakistan, especially in sensitive areas such as the NMDs. This issue can only be resolved through patient joint effort by INGOs in coordination with donors.

CASE STUDY

The Story of Shahbaz Gull from Darga Mandi, Sub-District Miran Shah, NWTB

Over 5 million people from the formerly Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) were displaced. In 2018, as the return of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) continued back to their areas of origin, overall needs of the returning IDPs in NWTB and SWTD included all basic services such as water, education, health, and livelihoods support. Identification of the most crucial needs included provision of WASH and shelter services in NWTB and WASH services in SWTD. Needs assessments in NWTB indicated dire needs and gaps in the areas of shelter, drinking water facilities, and hygiene and sanitation. Most of the existing water supply schemes (hand pumps) were completely damaged and non-functional. A vast majority of the population was unaware of proper hygiene and sanitation practices and exposed to water-borne diseases.

Shahbaz Gull (name changed to ensure privacy) from Dargha Mandi, Miran Shah, NWTB used to live with his wife and three daughters in Dargha Mandi, SWTD. In 2014, Shahbaz Gull and his family moved out of their village and took refuge in the adjacent district of Bannu. After reaching Bannu, Shahbaz Gull and his family took refuge in the IDP camp at Bakka Khel, Bannu. According to Shahbaz Gull, his stay in the camp was extremely difficult. “My wife, daughters and I survived three years in a very cramped, humiliating and restrictive environment”.

In 2018, after the government announced the IDP returns, Shahbaz Gull arrived at his village and found his house and land completely destroyed. Shahbaz Gull said he faced worse conditions than he faced in the camp. While he had food and a roof over his head in the camp, he was now faced with finding both in his village. According to Shahbaz Gull, before CARE provided the assistance, his wife and daughters used to travel long distance to fetch water on their heads; this was extremely hard to do and the weight of water used to strain the women’s necks. He said all the women and girls used to defecate out in the open and had to wait till it was dark. “We all used to feel very humiliated and insecure”. Similarly, they had an urgent need for rehabilitation and reconstruction of their houses as the damaged roofs, and missing doors and windows exposed particularly women, girls, and elderly to rain and wind.

According to Shahbaz Gull, CARE and its partner PRDS addressed the community’s most urgent needs in time and by involving and addressing the needs of the most vulnerable members of the community. He said, “They formed committees, representing the households, and identified the needs of all those who were exposed to hardship. CARE provided transitional shelters and tool kits, training in building shelters using salvaged materials, ensured dignity and privacy of vulnerable groups, including women, girls, persons with disabilities and elderly, by providing latrines, hygiene kits and education. We will always be thankful to CARE and PRDS for their generosity.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Overall, the quality and impact of the project is high, which is especially commendable given the extremely challenging work environment and external constraints. The project largely met its targets and even exceeded the targets in some activities despite the delays caused by the late issuance of the NOCs. Communities have expressed high degree of satisfaction with the relevance, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of project activities. Government counterparts also expressed satisfaction with program quality, reporting and communication. The recommendations in this section largely relate to improving things which are already good or removing minor problems.

The main exception to this observation relates to the lower level of satisfaction of women compared with men. At the outset, it must be recognized that this issue is a relative one and not an absolute one. So along most dimensions, the percentage of men who expressed full satisfaction ranged above 80% while the percentage of women who expressed full satisfaction was much lower. However, the percentage of women who expressed full or partial satisfaction ranged above 80% along many dimensions. There were some concrete project-related reasons related to this lower level of satisfaction among women. Firstly, the project was somewhat slower in engaging women than men in the early phases of the project, though this gap reduced later. Secondly, there were some issues with the inputs provided under the shelter components, such as tin sheets, which were less acceptable to women than men as women spend more time at home. But there were also some structural reasons for this issue too which were beyond the control of the project. The project areas in NWT D were cleared for return very recently only compared with other NMDs. Thus, the security situation is still not fully normal and this affects the mobility of women in NWT D and their ability to engage in project activities. Also, the culture in NWT D is more conservative even compared with other NMDs. This also affects the ability of women to participate in project activities.

- **Undertake studies in future projects to ensure that project committees are fully representative of all sections of the community**

Social and economic sub-groups exist in many communities. Community committees play a critical role in interfacing between communities and project staff and in identifying the most vulnerable beneficiaries. Thus, it is crucial that such communities be representative of all sub-groups in communities. While the project appropriately allowed communities to appoint persons on to the project committees and no problems were reported in this regard in this project, in future it would be helpful for project staff to use the services of community-based hygiene promoters to ensure that the committees do indeed represent all sub-groups.

- **Pursue possibility of cash provision for shelter and other services subject to permission from authorities**

There is a strong preference for cash to be provided instead of physical inputs for shelter work. Cash provision in the form of vouchers, electronic transfers and physical cash is used globally in emergency situations to increase cash. Within the NMDs, there is reluctance on the part of LEAs to allow cash provision due to fear that it may reach the wrong hands. However, aid agencies have developed a number of mechanisms to reduce this risk. There is a need for CIP along with other to undertake awareness-raising with LEAs to familiarize them with the positive value of cash provision and the mechanisms available to reduce risks associated with it.

- **Revisit the design and inputs for shelter to make them more suitable as per the preferences of people and local climate**

There was some dissatisfaction expressed with the provision of tins sheets and ply wood for shelter work by community members. Technically too, the choice of ply wood seemed inappropriate to the Evaluation Engineer. Thus, it is advisable for CIP to revisit the physical inputs given for shelter work for future.

- **Provide more technical inputs for people in making shelter and toilets**

The shelter and toilet work undertaken under the project was community-driven, with each family responsible for providing the labor for completing the work with the physical inputs given by the project. There was a request during FGDs to provide greater technical assistance to help ensure that the construction work done by families meets good construction standards since local masons often are not familiar with them. Thus, training sessions for masons are advisable before the start of the construction work. This will help in improving the quality of project work and its sustainability as well as increase local construction capacities.

- **Include elements on livelihoods and income in future projects for both men and women to ensure greater self-reliance**

There was a request by both males and females for CIP to provide livelihoods support in future since community livelihoods assets were largely destroyed during the conflict and the subsequent displacement. Livelihoods work will enhance local self-reliance and also help families to themselves invest in shelter improvement, among other things. Thus, it is advisable for CIP to undertake assessments on different livelihoods options for vulnerable families, especially women.

- **Ensure more capacity building for village committees and help them link with other agencies for additional services**

WASH committee played a crucial role in project success and were also provided with some basic capacity-building support, e.g., in running the committees and for operations and maintenance of the WASH infrastructure. However, more capacity-building and creating linkages between them and government departments and other aid agencies are advisable. The WASH and O&M Committees should be well connected to the PHED and district administration for sustainability of the project. To increase community ownership and ensure accountability and transparency, Project committees, activists and local elders should be briefed on Drawing, Design and BoQs of schemes before starting construction work. Land agreements/MoUs must be signed with land owners for installation of solar panels, water storage tanks, pump house and pipeline networking to diminish conflicts among the community members.


- **Wherever possible, use partnership modality so as to build local capacity and obtain efficiency benefits.**

The evaluation findings show that the quality of work in the partner-implemented NWTN project was largely good. Working through a local partner can help in partially overcoming the logistical challenge in NMDs as local agencies have less stringent protocols. Cost efficiency will be higher with partnership. Thus, with greater attention to and capacity-building for gender issues for partner and adequate monitoring by Care, partnership seems a better option than direct implementation.

ANNEXES

ANNEX I. LIST OF KEY EXTERNAL INTERVIEWEES

Names redacted for privacy



ANNEX II. KEY INTERVIEWEES' GUIDE

Project Relevance:

1. Did the key areas of focus for the project meet the needs of the most vulnerable in target communities? If not, why not?
2. To what extent has the program used an inclusive approach and ensured stakeholder participation to design the project components?
3. To what extent was the program successful in being compliant to government policy and integration within the government system? Did the project staff share all relevant information in a timely fashion with you?

Project Effectiveness and Efficiency:

4. To what extent did the project meet its stated objectives? What were the key contributing factors for the project success? Were the implementation strategies relevant and useful?
5. Which activity was the most useful by the beneficiaries? Which activity could have been improved? What was missing? Did the activities address the real needs of participants?
6. What were the strengths and weaknesses of the approaches used?
7. What best practices/lessons can be learned for application in future programmes?
8. Were the type and quantity of materials, if applicable, perceived to be sufficient to address the needs of the community?
9. Did the methodology meet behaviour change communication basic principles (e.g. call to action, simple, technically correct messages and culturally appropriate, gender and age sensitive)?
10. Was the timing of the delivery of the project appropriate e.g. materials arriving on time, trainings held as scheduled, etc.?
11. Were resources used in the most efficient way in terms of having the greatest benefit to improving results?
12. Could the current model have been implemented with the same or fewer resources with similar or greater results?
13. What were the factors that enabled implementation in highly insecure areas, what worked and what did not?
14. Did project provide any capacity-building support to government institutions? If so, was their quality and quantity adequate?

Project Management:

15. Did CIP engage sufficient and appropriate staff to effectively manage and implement the project?

Project Impact:

- 16. What impact did the project have overall?
- 17. What other unintended impacts or consequences did the project have beyond objectives (both negatively and positively)?
- 18. What contextual elements contributed to success or created challenges to optimizing impact from project interventions?

Project Sustainability:

- 19. What components of the project are sustainable?
- 20. What were the best practices related to sustainability? Any recommendations on how to ensure sustainability that could have been considered?
- 21. Was the exit plan followed? If no, what was not followed and why? If yes, what was most successful? Was the exit planning done in a timely manner?

ANNEX III. FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION GUIDE

The following fields should be added to the data file:

District Name	Tehsil Name	Village/Location Name	Form Number
(NW=1; SW=2)	(Ladha=1; Makeen=2) (Miransha=3; Mirali-4)		

WASH & Shelter Humanitarian Response Projects in North & South Waziristan – External Evaluation

Mandatory Informed Consent

Assalam-o-Alaikum (Greetings). Hope you’re having a good day. Thank you for the meeting. My name is _____. I am a member of the team for the evaluation of water and sanitation project implemented by CARE/PRDS. We would like to hear your views about the project. The information that you share with us will only be used for this evaluation and will remain confidential. You will not be quoted on any information you provide, without your prior written permission.

Do I have your consent to proceed with this interview? Yes/No _____ *[If no, stop interview]*

Are you aware of the WASH (SW) WASH & Shelter (NW) project? _____ *[If no, stop interview]*

FGD Data

No.	Description	
1	FGD start time	
2	FGD end time	
3	Date of FGD	
4	Name of moderator/Note taker	
5	Sex of Participants (Male=1; Female=2)	
6	Total number of Participants	

Project Relevance:

FGD Questions	Please identify 2-3 strengths for each item	Please identify 2-3 gaps/ suggestions for improvement
<p>1. Did the project consult the community properly about its needs before starting the project? Probe: Were all sections/sub-tribes, women elderly/disabled persons consulted? Was the method, timing, length of consultation appropriate?</p> <p><i>Kia munsooba shoroo kurnay say pehlay community ki zarooriat kay baray may us se poocha gaya tha?</i></p>		
<p>2. Did the project consult the community during implementation? Probe: Were all sections/sub-tribes, women elderly/disabled persons consulted? Was the method, timing, length of consultation appropriate?</p> <p><i>Kia munsoobay kay doraan community say mushwara lee-a gaya tha?</i></p>		
<p>3. Has the project provided services that meet the most important needs of your community? Probe: Any important needs not met adequately? Why?</p> <p><i>Kia is munsoobay nay aap ki community ki ahum tareen zarooriat ko poora kia hay?</i></p>		
<p>4. Did the project provide an opportunity to solve your complaints during the project? Probe: was the way of making complaint proper? Was there any problem which stopped people from making complaints?</p> <p><i>Kia aap ko munasib mawakay dee-ay ga-ay kay aap munsoobay kay baray may apni shikayat dur kara sakain?</i></p>		

Project Effectiveness and Efficiency:

<p>5. Has the project provided all the services that it promised?</p> <p><i>Kia is munsoobay nay waday kay mutabiq tamam sahooliyat furhaam ki hain?</i></p>		
<p>6. Is the quality and quantity of the services satisfactory? Probe: Water, hygiene kits, toilets, awareness raising session, shelter (NW only)</p> <p><i>Kia sahooliaat ka mayaar or tadaad tasuli baksh hay?</i></p>		
<p>7. Are the services all in use of the people now? If not why not?</p> <p><i>Kia sahooliaat logon kay istemaal may hain?</i></p>		
<p>8. Were the services provided on time? If not why not?</p> <p><i>Kia sahooliaat burwaqt dee gae thee?</i></p>		
<p>9. Were the services in line with local culture? If not why</p>		

not? <i>Kia sahooliaat makamee saqafat kay mutabiq hain/thee?</i>		
10. Has the project provided services to the neediest persons in the community? Probe: If not, who was left out and why? <i>Kia is munsoobay nay sahooliaat community kay mustahiq tareen afraad ko farahum kee hain?</i>		
11. Was the method for selecting households for household (e.g., shelter and toilet material) services fair? If not why not? <i>Kia infradi gharon ko sahooliaat (makaan or bait-ul-khala ka samaan) denay kay leey gharon ka intekhab kurnay ka tariqa munsifana tha?</i>		
12. Has the project addressed the needs of men and women equally? If not why not? <i>Kia is munsoobay nay murdon or auraton ki zarooriaat per barabar tawajo dee hay?</i>		
13. Has the project helped improve the health and hygiene knowledge and status of women? If not why not? <i>Kia is munsoobay nay sehat or hifzanay sehat ki muamilaat may khawateen kay ilm may izafa kia hay?</i>		
14. Has the project helped improve the protection of women? Reduced their workload? If not why not? <i>Kia is mansoobay say khawateen ki hifazat behtar hoo-ee hay? Un ki mushaqat may kami aa-ee hay?</i>		
15. Has the project met the needs of children and persons with disabilities well? If not why not? <i>Kia is munsoobay nay buchon or mazooreed afraad ki zarooriaat ko behtar tareekay say pura kia hay?</i>		

Impact and Sustainability

16. Have the water services helped improve your socio-economic status? Will their benefit sustain for long? If not why not? <i>Kia pani ki sahooliaat nay aap ki muasharati-o-maashi durjay ko behtar kia hay? Kia ye fawa-id mustaqbil may burqaraar rahain gay?</i>		
17. Have the toilet services helped improve your socio-economic status? Will their benefit sustain for long? If not why not? <i>Kia ghusalkhanay ki sahooliaat nay aap ki muasharati-o-maashi durjay ko behtar kia hay? Kia ye fawa-id mustaqbil may burqaraar rahain gay?</i>		
18. Have the shelter services helped improve your socio-economic status? Will their benefit sustain for long? (NW only) If not why not? <i>Kia makan ki sahooliaat nay aap ki muasharati-o-maashi</i>		

<i>durjay ko behtar kia hay? Kia ye fawa-id mustaqbil may burqaraar rahain gay?</i>		
19. Have the hygiene kits services helped improve your socio-economic status? Will their benefit sustain for long? If not why not? <i>Kia hifzan-e-sehat ki sahooliaat nay aap ki muasharati-o-maashi durjay ko behtar kia hay? Kia ye fawa-id mustaqbil may burqaraar rahain gay?</i>		
20. Have the awareness raising sessions helped improve your socio-economic status? Will their benefit sustain for long? If not why not? <i>Kia hifzan-e-sehat ki bedaari/taleem nay aap ki muasharati-o-maashi durjay ko behtar kia hay? Kia ye fawa-id mustaqbil may burqaraar rahain gay?</i>		
21. Did the project have any negative impact in community? If yes, please explain? <i>Kia aap ki community per is munsoobay ka koi munfi asr hua hay? Agar aysa hay to mukhtasaran bayan karain?</i>		
22. Three best points of the project?		
23. Three weak points of the project? (compulsory response)		
24. Do you have any suggestions about how the project could have improved the quality of the services?		
25. Do you have any suggestions about how the project could have improved the long-term impact of the project?		
26. Do you have any other comments? <i>Kia aap is kay ilawa kuch kehna chatay hain?</i>		

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND GUIDANCE

Aap kay waqt or rehnumaee ka shukria

ANNEX IV. HOUSEHOLD SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

**WASH & Shelter Humanitarian Response Projects in
North & South Waziristan – External Evaluation
Household Survey of Project Area
Questionnaire**

Mandatory Informed Consent

Assalam-o-Alaikum (Greetings). Hope you're having a good day. Thank you for the meeting. My name is _____. I am a member of the team for the evaluation of water and sanitation project implemented by CARE/PRDS. We would like to hear your views about the project. The information that you share with us will only be used for this evaluation and will remain confidential. You will not be quoted on any information you provide, without your prior written permission.

Do I have your consent to proceed with this interview? Yes/No _____ *[If no, stop interview]*

Are you aware of the WASH (SW) WASH & Shelter (NW) project? _____ *[If no, stop interview]*

Interview Data

No.	Description	
1	Interview start time	
2	Interview end time	
3	Date of interview	
4	Name of interviewer	
5	Name of Validator / Validation Date	
6	Name of Supervisor / Signature	

Respondent Identification

No.	Description	
1	Name of respondent	
2	Name of main tribe	
2	Address[Ask about Address]	
	a. Village	
	b. Contact Number[Optional]	

Common Codes

Do not want to answer	Do not know	Not relevant	Other
99	98	97	77

A. Socio-economic Characteristics of Respondent and Household

No.	Description/Instruction	Options/Codes	Field No. and Field Name	Response
1	Respondent's sex: جواب دہندہ کی جنس [Answer this question by observation only]	1 = Male (مرد) 2 = Female (خاتون) 3 = Transgender (خواجہ سرا/زنخا)	A1	
2	What is your marital status? آپکی ازدواجی حیثیت کیا ہے؟	1 = Single (غیرشادی شدہ) 2 = Married (شادی شدہ) 3 = Widow/Widower (بیوہ/رنٹوا) 4 = Divorced (طلاق یافتہ) 77 = Other (دیگر)	A2	
3	What is your relationship to the main earner of the household? گھرانے کے مرکزی کفیل کیساتھ آپکا کیا رشتہ ہے؟ [Main earner: a person who makes the largest monetary contribution to the household budget]	1 = Self (خود مرکزی کفیل) 2 = Spouse (شریک حیات) 3 = Child (اولاد) 4 = Parent (والدین) 5 = Grandparent (دادا یا دادی/نانا یا نانی) 77 = Other (دیگر)	A3	
4	What is your age? آپکی عمر کیا ہے؟	Age in years (عمر سالوں میں درج کریں)	A4	

7	<p>What is your highest completed level of education? آپکا مکمل کردہ اعلیٰ تعلیمی درجہ کونسا ہے؟</p> <p>[The education could have been in the regular system or the equivalent in the madrassa system.] [تعلیمی قابلیت فارمل تعلیمی نظام یا اسکے برابر درجے کے مدرسہ سسٹم میں ہو سکتی ہے]</p>	<p>0 = Never attended a school (کبھی سکول نہیں گیا/گئی) 1 = Less than 5 years (پرائمری سے کم) 2 = Primary (5 years of school) (پرائمری) 3 = Middle (8 years of school) (مڈل) 4 = Matriculation (10 years of school) (میٹرک) 5 = Intermediate (12 years of education) (انٹرمیڈیٹ) 6 = Graduate (14 years of education) (گریجویٹ) 7 = Post-graduate (16 years of education) (ماسٹرز) 8 = More than 16 years of education (ماسٹرز سے زیادہ)</p>	A5	
8	<p>What is the main source of income of your household? آپکے گھرانے کا سب سے اہم ذریعہ آمدن کیا ہے؟</p>	<p>1 = Salaried job in public sector (سرکاری شعبے میں تنخواہ دار نوکری) 2 = Salaried job in private sector (نجی شعبے میں تنخواہ دار نوکری) 3 = Self-employed in business (ذاتی کاروبار) 4 = Rented property (house, shop, etc.) (کرائے پر دی گئی جائیداد۔ گھر یا دکان وغیرہ) 5 = Agricultural land (زرعی رقبہ) 6 = Home-based enterprise (گھر کی سطح پر کیا جانے والا کاروبار) 7 = Skilled labor (پنرمندانہ مزدوری) 8 = Unskilled labor (غیر پنرمندانہ مزدوری) 9 = Child income (بچوں کی مشقت سے ہونیوالی آمدن) 77 = Other (دیگر)</p>	A6	

B. Project Relevance

No.	Description/Instruction	Options/Codes	Field No. and Field Name	Response
1	<p>Did the project consult all sections of the community properly about its needs in the design phase before starting the project? Kia munsooba shoroo kurnay say pehlay community ki zarooriat kay baray mayun se mushwara kiya tha?</p>	<p>No=1; Partially =2; Fully =3; No answer =4</p>	B1	
2	<p>Was your household consulted properly for this matter? Kia munsooba shoroo kurnay say pehlay aap kay ghar say mushwara lee-a gaya tha?</p>	<p>No=1; Partially =2; Fully =3; No answer =4</p>	B2	
3	<p>Has the project provided services that meet the most important needs of your household? Kia is munsoobay nay aap kay ghar ki ahum tareen zarooriat ko pooro kia hay?</p>	<p>No=1; Partially =2; Fully =3; No answer =4</p>	B3	

4	Did the project properly involve all sections of the community during the implementation of the project? <i>Kia munssobay kay nafaz kay doraan community ko shamil kia gaya tha?</i>	No=1; Partially =2; Fully =3; No answer =4	B4	
5	Did the project give adequate opportunities to make complaints to project staff in case of problems in implementation? <i>Kia aap ko munasib mawakay dee-ay ga-ay kay aap munsoobay kay baray may apni shikayat daraj kara sakain?</i>	No=1; Partially =2; Fully =3; No answer =4	B5	
6	Were such complaints promptly solved? <i>Kia is munssobay say mutuliq aap ki shikayat ka azala forun kia gaya?</i>	No=1; Partially =2; Fully =3; No answer =4	B6	

C. Project Effectiveness and Efficiency

No.	Description/Instruction	Options/Codes	Field No. and Field Name	Response
1	Has the project provided all the services that it promised? <i>Kia is munsoobay nay waday kay mutabiq tamam sahooliyat furhaam ki hain?</i>	No=1; Partially =2; Fully =3; No answer =4	C1	
2	Is the quality of the services satisfactory? <i>Kia sahooliyat ka mayar tasulli-bakhsh hay?</i>	No=1; Partially =2; Fully =3; No answer =4	C2	
3	Were the services provided on time? <i>Kia sahooliyat burwaqt mohaiya ki gaeen?</i>	No=1; Partially =2; Fully =3; No answer =4	C3	
4	Were the services in line with local culture? <i>Kia sahooliyat makamee saqafat kay mutbiq hain?</i>	No=1; Partially =2; Fully =3; No answer =4	C4	
5	Has the project met the needs of women well? <i>Kia is munsoobay nay khawateen ki zarooriyat ko achi tarah poora kia hay?</i>	No=1; Partially =2; Fully =3; No answer =4	C5	

6	Has the project improved the knowledge of women about hygiene matters? <i>Kia is munsoobay nay hifzanay sehat kay muamilaat may khawateen kay ilm may izafa kia hay?</i>	No=1; Partially =2; Fully =3; No answer =4	C6	
7	Has the project improved the health status of women? <i>Kia is munsoobay nay khawateen ki sehat kay mayaar ko behtur kia hay?</i>	No=1; Partially =2; Fully =3; No answer =4	C7	
8	Has the project given equal attention to the needs of men and women? <i>Kia is munsoobay nay murdon or auraton ki zarooriaat per barabar tawajo dee hay?</i>	No=1; Partially =2; Fully =3; No answer =4	C8	
9	Has the project met the needs of children well? <i>Kia is munsoobay nay buchon ki zarooriaat ko achi tarah pura kia hay?</i>	No=1; Partially =2; Fully =3; No answer =4	C9	
10	Has the project met the needs of persons with disabilities well? <i>Kia is munsoobay nay mazoor afraad ki zarooriaat ko chi tarah pura kia hay?</i>	No=1; Partially =2; Fully =3; No answer =4	C10	
11	Was the method for selecting households for household services (e.g., shelter and toilet material) fair? <i>Kia gharon ko sahooliaat (makaan orghusalkhanay ka samaan) denay kay leey muntakhib kurnay ka tariqa munsifana tha?</i>	No=1; Partially =2; Fully =3; No answer =4	C11	
12	Has the project provided household services to the most deserving households in the community? <i>Kia is munsoobay nay sahooliaat mustahiq tareen gharanon ko farahum kee hain?</i>	No=1; Partially =2; Fully =3; No answer =4	C12	
13	Was the quality and quantity of following project services adequate? <i>Kia mundurja zail sohooliaat ka mayaar munasib tha/hay?</i>	No=1; Partially =2; Fully =3; No answer =4		
	Was the quality and quantity of following project services adequate?			
	Water-related services	Quantity (No/partially/fully) (C13a)	Quality (No/partially/fully) (C13f)	Service currently in use (No/partially/fully) (C13k)

	Toilet	(C13b)	(C13g)	(C13l)
	Shelter material	(C13c)	(C13h)	(C13m)
	Hygiene kits	(C13d)	(C13i)	(C13n)
	Awareness-raising sessions	(C13e)	(C13j)	(C13o)
14	Which of the above listed services was/is the most useful? (Choose one) <i>Mundarja Bala sahooliaat may say sub say ziada kone si sahoolat ziada mufeed hay?</i>		C14 Water=1; toilet=2; shelter=3; hygiene kits=4; awareness sessions=4; no naswer=5	

D. Project Impact and Sustainability

No	Description/Instruction	Options/Codes No=1; Partially =2; Fully=3; no answer =4	Field No. and Field Name	Response
1	Has the project helped:	a. Increase water supply for your household? <i>Aap kay ghar kay pani ki farahmi miqdaar may izafa kia hay?</i>	D1a	
	<i>Kia is munsoo bay nay:</i>	b. If yes, will this benefit last for at least 2-3 years? <i>Agar han tu kia ye faida agray 2-3 saal taq kayum rahay ga?</i>	D1b	
2	Has the project helped:	a. Improve water quality for your household? <i>Aap kay ghar kay pani kay mayaar ko behtar kia hay?</i>	D2a	
	<i>Kia is munsoo bay nay:</i>	b. If yes, will this benefit last for at least 2-3 years? <i>Agar han tu kia ye faida agray 2-3 saal taq kayum rahay ga?</i>	D2b	
3	Has the project helped:	a. Reduce the time taken to fetch water for your household? <i>Aap kay ghar taq pani lanay kay waqt ko kum kia hay?</i>	D3a	
	<i>Kia is munsoo bay nay:</i>	b. If yes, will this benefit last for at least 2-3 years? <i>Agar han tu kia ye faida agray 2-3 saal taq kayum rahay ga?</i>	D3b	
4	Has the project helped:	a. Increase the knowledge of your household on hygiene issues? <i>Aap kay gharaylu hifzan-e-sehat ki maloomaat may izafa kia hay?</i>	D4a	
	<i>Kia is munsoo bay nay:</i>	b. If yes, will this benefit last for at least 2-3 years? <i>Agar han tu kia ye faida agray 2-3 saal taq kayum rahay ga?</i>	D4b	
5	Has the project helped:	a. Reduce diseases in your household? <i>Aap kay gharaylu amraaz/baymary may kumi laya hay?</i>	D5a	
	<i>Kia is munsoo bay nay:</i>	b. If yes, will this benefit last for at least 2-3 years? <i>Agar han tu kia ye faida agray 2-3 saal taq kayum rahay ga?</i>	D5b	

6	a. If your household received toilet material from the project has that helped improve the hygiene status of your household? <i>Agar aap kay gharanay ko ghosalkhanay ka mawad mila hay tu kia is say aap ki hifzan-e-sehat may behtari ai hay?</i>	D6a	
	b. If yes, will this benefit last for at least 2-3 years? <i>Agar han tu kia ye faida aghlay 2-3 saal taq kayum rahay ga?</i>	D6b	
7	a. If your household received shelter material from the project has that helped improve the protection status of your household? <i>Agar aap kay gharanay ko shelter ka mawad mila hay tu kia is say aap ki hifazat may behtari ai hay?</i>	D7a	
	b. If yes, will this benefit last for at least 2-3 years? <i>Agar han tu kia ye faida aghlay 2-3 saal taq kayum rahay ga?</i>	D7b	
8	Did the project have any negative impact on your household? If so please explain briefly <i>Kia aap kay gharanay per is munsoobay ka koi munfi asr hua hay? Agar aysa hay to mukhtasaran bayan karain</i>	D8	

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND GUIDANCE.

Aap kay waqt or rehnumaee ka shukria

[Please check the entire questionnaire for completeness]

ANNEX V. EVALUATION TEAM

Lead Evaluator – Niaz Murtaza, Ph.D.: Dr. Murtaza (Team Leader) has nearly 20 years’ experience in the emergencies and development sectors across 50+ countries globally. In his position as the International Program Manager, Emergencies for ActionAid International from 2006 to 2009, he had oversight over all of its global emergency and DRR work spread across more than 40 countries. He has also conducted six consultancy assignments with CARE in Pakistan and globally. He has a Ph.D. in Development Studies from University of California, Berkeley and has strong experience in participatory baselines, assessments, monitoring, evaluation, impact assessments and accountability work, with 30+ M&E assignments in Pakistan recently, including 10 in KP/FATA focused on WASH, shelter, livelihoods and relief activities. He is well versed with both quantitative and qualitative evaluation approaches. He has outstanding written and oral skills in English, having written more than 3 dozen evaluation reports, articles and other technical reports over 25 years, with a 100% on-time submission rate. Niazmurtaza123@gmailcom.

Evaluation Specialist – Aftab Ismail Khan: Aftab Khan has worked in development and emergencies sector for more than 20 years in designing, managing and conducting evaluations, reviews and studies; surveys; program development and coordination; project analysis, implementation and management; communications; needs assessments; and report writing. His thematic experiences include disaster management, reconstruction and rehabilitation, education, health, gender based violence in emergencies, social protection, gender mainstreaming, governance, infrastructure, environment, and poverty alleviation. He has served as an Evaluation Specialist (LTTA) for USAID Monitoring and Evaluation Program (MEP), Management Systems International (MSI), Pakistan, and led the evaluations of USAID’s

Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Reconstruction Program (KPRP) (\$85.19 million) and Housing Uniform Assistance Subsidy Project (HUASP) (PKR 5.2 billion). He has a MBA (IT) from Pepperdine University, Malibu, California, USA and is fluent in Pashtu.

Civil Engineer – Ahmed Ali Khattak: Extensive experience in the areas of: strategic planning; governance; monitoring and evaluation of reforms projects; context analysis, liaising with government departments/senior officials; and project design. Designed and monitored projects in: social sector development, infrastructure, governance, environment, regional development, planning & development, finance, public health engineering, irrigation, sustainable development, education, and health. B.Sc. in Civil Engineering, Masters in Development Studies, MS in Urban and Regional Planning and an MBA in Human Resource Management. Visiting faculty member at Iqra University Peshawar, Abasyn University and IM sciences; served as Manager MER Provincial Programme Office, Assessment and Strengthening Programme, RSPN; served as Director Monitoring and Evaluation, Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa; served as FATA Coordinator IUCN; served with P&D Civil Secretariat FATA; served for Asian Development Bank as Effectiveness Evaluation Specialist in Decentralization Support Program; served for National Rural Support Programme; served for AA Associates on Nowshera Chablat Additional Carriage way.