



**REPORT ON BASELINE ASSESSMENT OF THE FAGNOITSE
PROJECT**

District of Ambovombe

Final version



November 2018

SUMMARY

<u>OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECT AND THE BASELINE STUDY</u>	3
<u>METHODOLOGY AND DATA SOURCE</u>	4
1.1. APPROACHES	4
1.2. METHODOLOGY	5
1.3. TOOLS FOR COLLECTING AND PROCESSING INFORMATION	6
1.4. DATA PROCESSING PLAN	6
<u>OPERATIONS TIMETABLE:</u>	6
<u>STUDY LIMITATIONS</u>	7
<u>FINDINGS</u>	7
4.1. HOUSEHOLDS' SOCIO-ECONOMIC FEATURES IN THE VARIOUS AREAS	7
4.1.1. TYPOLOGY OF HOUSEHOLDS	7
4.1.2. HOUSEHOLDS' MAIN ACTIVITIES	8
4.1.3. PROPERTY SITUATION	8
4.2. PROJECT INDICATORS INITIAL SITUATION	ERREUR ! SIGNET NON DEFINI.
<u>APPENDIX</u>	33

OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECT AND THE BASELINE STUDY

As a result of the combined effects of the El Niño phenomenon and prolonged drought in southern Madagascar, this part of the island faces severe food insecurity and economic vulnerability hampering its capacity to cope with shocks. According to the recent update of FEWS NET¹ (April 2018), Madagascar is considered as in crisis for the period running from October 2017 to June 2018 because of poor rainfall forecasts, resulting in below-average harvests and limited food access. The latest monitoring report of the food security cluster² (April 2018) shows that 820,299 people are in need of food assistance, including 586,076 people considered as in “crisis” and 234,223 who have reached the “emergency level” as regards exposure to food insecurity in southern Madagascar. Irregular, uneven and insufficient rain during the farming season (December 2017 to March 2018) raised concerns about the population's ability to store food and survive until next harvest. Despite food distributions (mainly school meals provided by WFP) and food production interventions (conducted by FAO and other agencies), drought has put extreme pressure on local communities and has led to an increase in the number of people suffering from food insecurity.

The disruption of work and income opportunities and livelihoods has also caused serious gaps in income generation, loss of productive assets and adoption of harmful coping mechanisms. The recent WFP/FAO Crop and Food Security Assessment Mission (CFSAM, December 2017) showed that loss of productive assets, such as the sale of production means, equipment and tools, has prevented people from producing food and generating income. In the absence of targeted assistance due lack of funding, people with moderate malnutrition may face severe malnutrition during the dry season. Vulnerable groups need immediate assistance in addition to an intervention aiming at increasing their resilience to shocks over the long term.

CARE is proposing, through the OFDA South project, a specific humanitarian intervention in the Ambovombe district for a period of 12 months in 6 communes in the Ambovombe district, including: *Imanombo, Ambanisarika, Tsimananada, Marovato-Befeno, Ampamata, and Jafaro* to save lives among the most vulnerable groups, prevent an aggravation of food insecurity and promote resilience building measures in parallel to the humanitarian response. The overall outcome of the project is to alleviate the drought-affected populations’ suffering in southern Madagascar through food production restoration, improved livelihoods and improved access to water. The project proposes to quickly and sustainably carry out actions in three areas:

1. **Improving agricultural production and food security** by providing adequate inputs (improved/drought-resistant seeds/plants), tools, training on climate resilient techniques (12,000 people); training and setting up of storage facilities for seed and crop security (12,000 people); provision of small ruminants/poultry, feeding/fodder vouchers, technical training (6,000 people);
2. **Supporting economic recovery and market systems** by restoring livelihoods (6,000 people); support for the development of new businesses through the setting up of savings and credit groups (12,000 people) and support for agricultural processing/fisheries products (12,000 people); business plan development (9,000 people);
3. **Promoting access to water and hygiene** through the setting up/operationalization of 120 water transportation management committees, the supply of ox carts and barrels (12,000 persons); supply of water storage equipment (900 people), provision of awareness-raising/information sessions on hygiene, food and nutrition (36,000 people), and provision of WASH kits (water cans, buckets, cups, bars of soap) (3,000 people).

¹ <http://fews.net/fr/southern-africa/madagascar>

² <http://fscluster.org/madagascar/document/madagascar-infographie-communes-avril>

However, prior to the interventions, the project commissioned a baseline assessment in November 2018, in a view to provide project stakeholders with detailed information on the baseline situation through qualitative and quantitative baseline values of impact, outcome and output indicators in line with the project's logical framework. The baseline values were analyzed by gender and detailed information on household behaviors, attitudes and practices (KAP survey) was collected. The baseline identifies the starting point of the various indicators (before-project situation) and will be compared to the end-of-project situation. This will allow for undertaking qualitative and quantitative assessment of each component's contribution to achieving the project's goals. These goals are part of CARE's programmatic vision, whose challenge is to accelerate the recovery and resilience-building of the most vulnerable drought-affected communities in southern Madagascar, including their livelihoods, food security and health.

In addition, this assessment also enabled the consultant to develop the project's monitoring and evaluation system, based on the baseline established and presented in this document.

The document provides for three key elements: i/the main findings from information collection with their interpretations, ii/an analysis of the baseline with conclusions and the value of indicators, iii/the monitoring and evaluation mechanism to be put in place for monitoring indicators. In the last section, conclusions and recommendations are provided. This section summarizes the main conclusions presented in the previous sections of the report and makes recommendations based on an analysis of each conclusion.

METHODOLOGY AND DATA SOURCE

1.1. Approaches

The approach and intervention mode for the evaluation consisted in targeted sampling surveys, targeted interviews, and focus groups. Two types of data were collected: qualitative surveys and quantitative surveys through individual interviews, semi-structured interviews and/or focus group discussions.

Qualitative surveys

Qualitative field research was conducted through structured interviews with target fokontany populations and local authority representatives. These interviews aimed at gathering information on the baseline in the intervention zones as regards their socio-economic and cultural situation, the indicators' baseline value and information that could help the project on its programming. The interviews were conducted by the Team Leader and his assistant.

Quantitative surveys

The quantitative data were collected mainly through interviews with project beneficiary households. The interviews were conducted in the form of individual surveys and/or focus groups. The consultant used questionnaires for each category of people and entities to interview. (cf. Household questionnaire)

The interviews and surveys were aimed at assessing the project's baseline through a participatory analysis by the project's various key stakeholders (about intervention strategies and activities they will undertake).

Sampling

The methodology proposed by the consultant's team is the two-stage cluster sampling method. As the primary sampling unit is the fokontany, 24 fokontany sampled for the baseline assessment and representing 10% of the project intervention fokontany had been defined by the project team beforehand. The consultant team defined the secondary sampling unit using the random sampling technique.

The sampling method was based on a simple random sampling, with the household being the statistical unit. It involves randomly selecting n individuals from the study population. The following formula was used to calculate the sample size:

$$n = \frac{t^2 N}{t^2 + (2e)^2 (N - 1)}$$

n = sample size

N = size of the population

t = margin coefficient deduced from the confidence level; for a confidence level of 95%, t = 1.96

e = error margin for the value we want to estimate (e = 5% in our case).

Thus, the sample size was 486 households but for the sake of compliance, the sample was set at 480 households. In order to ensure representativeness, the sample's distribution by fokontany depended on the number of households per fokontany. Households to be interviewed were selected using the "simple random walk" technique.

Given the time allowed for the assessment (30 days), the big distance between two intervention communes (Imanomba and Ampamata) and their regional capital, the difficulty of accessing these areas as well as safety concerns that required constant support of the project teams, the consulting team limited intervention fokontany to only one per commune in these two communes. The total number of sample households remains unchanged for the entire study area.

The distribution of target fokontany in the six project beneficiary communes were as follows:

Communes	Fokontany	# households
Imanomba	Lamitihy	25
Ampamata	Ambatomasy II	25
Jafaro	Ankobo I Manorihy	23
	Besaloa Bas	30
	Mandily II	30
Marovato Befeno	Marovato Befeno	30
	Namalaza II	30
	Marovato Tsingara II	24
	Amborokahake Bemosesy	23
Ambanisarika	Ambanisarika Center	30
	Maronolo Ambarosoa	30
	Sifiry II	30
	Androrohoro II	30
Tsimananada	Mokofo II	30
	Ankileandro Ambanisarika	30
	Amboro Marofoty	30
	Ambitike II	30
TOTAL		480

1.2. Methodology

The baseline assessment used a method combining three techniques, namely:

- *Livelihood assessments*, focusing on individuals.
- The assessment method based on the *Household's Economy Approach* (HEA), focusing on the various ways through which a given population makes a living and obtains its food and non-food income.

- *Program and/or project-specific baseline evaluation*, based on the evaluation criteria, such as: project relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and impact.

Under these three methods, primary data were collected in depth through focus groups and semi-structured interviews of key informants and households. The data collection process was dynamic and interactive, and included both quantitative and qualitative information.

Furthermore, the information to be collected was supplemented with survey items that will allow for measuring (at a given time “T” during the project) whether the project’s expected outcomes, defined beforehand, have been achieved. These results include:

1. ***Improving agricultural production and food security*** by providing: adequate inputs (improved/drought-resistant seeds/plants), tools, training on climate resilient techniques (12,000 people); training and setting up of storage facilities for seed and crop security (12,000 people); provision of small ruminants/poultry, feeding/fodder vouchers, technical training (6,000 people);
2. ***Supporting economic recovery and market systems*** by restoring livelihoods (6,000 people); support for the development of new businesses based on the setting up of a savings and credit group (12,000 people) and support for agricultural processing/fishery products (12,000 people); business plan development (9,000 people);
3. ***Promoting access to water and hygiene*** through the setting up/operationalization of 120 water transportation management committees, the supply of ox carts and barrels (12,000 persons); supply of water storage equipment (900 people), provision of awareness-raising/information sessions on hygiene, food and nutrition (36,000 people), and provision of WASH kits (water cans, buckets, cups, bars of soap) (3,000 people).

1.3. Tools for collecting and processing information

An evaluation matrix was the working tool used during the mission. It was supplemented with other collection tools, namely: interview guide specific to each type of target (focus group, resource persons, etc.), focus groups facilitation guide, questionnaires for household surveys and information summary sheets. See the appendices for the various data collection tools used for the study.

1.4. Data processing plan

After data collection in the field, data was entered on the software SPHINX. In order to facilitate further information analysis, data consolidation was carried out by the mission’s statistics specialist. The work consists in checking by observing each household’s responses in order to identify the data entering errors and any inconsistency that may bias the collected data. Then, the consolidated information was reviewed, analyzed and interpreted by the entire consulting team.

OPERATIONS TIMEFRAME

The consultancy was implemented according to the ToRs, following the timeframe provided in appendix XX.

- Nov. 5 - Contract signature
- Nov. 5-6 – Development of tools and drafting of the documentation phase report
- Nov. 7 – Validation of assessment tools
- Nov. 8 - Departure of the consulting team to Ambovombe
- Nov. 9 - Recruitment of surveyors
- Nov. 10 - Training of surveyors
- November 11 to 20 - Implementation of the field study

COMMUNE		FOKONTANY	Nov. 11	Nov. 12	Nov. 13	Nov. 14	Nov. 15	Nov. 16	Nov. 17	Nov. 18	Nov. 19	Nov. 20
Imanombo	1	Lamitihy										
Ampamata	2	Ambatomasy II										
Jafaro	3	Ankobo I Manorihy										
	4	Besaloha Bas										
	5	Mandily II										
Marovato Befeno	6	Marovato Befeno										
	7	Namalaza II										
	8	Marovato Tsingara II										
	9	Amborokahake Bemosesy										
Ambanisarika	10	Ambanisarika Center										
	11	Maronolo Ambarosoa										
	12	Sifiry II										
	13	Androrohoro II										
Tsimananada	14	Mokofo II										
	15	Ankileandro Ambanisarika										
	16	Amboro Marofoty										
	17	Ambitike II										

 Travelling  Field data collection

21st to 25th Nov. - Analysis - processing and drafting of the interim report

Nov. 26 – Submission of the draft report

Nov. 28 – Restitution of findings

Nov. 29 - Finalization and submission of the final report

Nov. 30 – Submission of report to CARE USA

STUDY LIMITATIONS

Reliability of information collected. The survey was conducted on a self-reporting basis. The survey's limitations are mainly relating to possible inaccuracy of the data collected through simple interviews of the head of the household and/or his/her spouse, especially in the case of quantitative data relating to a long previous period and in focus groups for collecting qualitative information.

FINDINGS

4.1. Households' socio-economic features in the various areas

4.1.1. Typology of households

Size of households. Households in the study areas are comprised of 5.8 people. Forty-eight percent (48%) of households have more than six members. The size of female-headed households is smaller than those headed by men (5.6 versus 6 for male-headed households). This average size is largely below the average regional size in 2017 according to the DTM Report No. 2 Grand Sud of Madagascar Androy Region (8.9 people).

Gender of the head of household. Among surveyed households, 63.5% are headed by men and 36.5% by women.

Marital status. Customary marriage ranks first in the study area with 77.3% of surveyed households. Among people surveyed, 11.9% are single and only 0.4% are under a civil (legal) marriage.

Education level of heads of households. The survey has shown that the heads of household's education level is distributed as follows: 69.3% are uneducated, 25.3% completed the primary level, 5.3% completed the secondary level and 0.1% reached the higher level. It was noted that female heads

of household are less educated than their male counterparts. For all respondents, the proportion of male heads of households with primary education are 27.3% against 23.4% of female heads of household. Among female heads of households, 73.4% have no education compared to 65.2% of male heads of households.

Housing and house equipment features. Almost all surveyed households (96.1%) own their homes. The rest are not owners but live there for free. 99.1% of the huts are made of local materials.

Ownership of goods/assets. Pots, plates and cutlery make up the main household goods. Almost 9 out of 10 households have them, but in very small numbers. Among them, 53% have a bed while the others sleep on the floor and 4.8% of households have a radio. In addition, the rate of ownership of cellphones among households is 4.9%.

In terms of transportation, the survey shows that only 2.2% have a bicycle and the rest use public transportation (bush taxi) or ox carts to get around.

As for agricultural tools and equipment, ownership rates are very low. They consist of a few spades and machetes. No respondent had a plow or a cart.

4.1.2. Households' main activities

The household interviews showed that households make their income from three (03) main activities:

- Agriculture (96.5%) consisting in the sale of harvested products. It is practiced by 91.7% of female-headed households
- Livestock farming (89.6%) consisting in the direct sale of animals from their herds to generate cash and/or the sale of livestock products (dairy products, processed products made from milk, meat, egg, etc.). It is practiced by 91.7% of female-headed households
- Small trade (36%) consisting in the sale of food products and market gardening products (green leaves, tomatoes, etc.). It is practiced by 33.7% of female-headed households.

Main activities	Imanombo	Ampamata	Jafaro	Marovato Befeno	Ambanisarika	Tsimananada	TOTAL
Agriculture	100.0%	92.0%	83.1%	100.0%	99.2%	100.0%	96.5%
Livestock	76.0%	76.0%	81.9%	97.2%	99.2%	84.2%	89.6%
Small trade	76.0%	20.0%	32.5%	23.4%	82.5%	10.8%	36.0%

According to these findings, male-headed households practice more agriculture, livestock and small trade than those headed by women. The reason is that, unlike men, women are lacking resources (land, financial means, workforce, etc.) to undertake agriculture, livestock and trade. Female-headed households are lacking resources preventing them from developing these income-generating activities.

4.1.3. Property situation

Among households, 88.3% own land (85.7% of women and 89.8% of men), 6.5% rent land from landowners (6.9% of women and 6.2% of men).

Property status by gender of the heads of household	Women	Men	TOTAL
Landowner	85,7%	89,8%	88,3%
Rented	6,9%	6,2%	6,5%
Loaned land	4,0%	6,6%	5,6%
Not willing to reply	9,7%	2,0%	4,8%
50% crop-sharing	2%	2%	2%
Other	0,0%	1,0%	0,6%
Mortgaged land	0,0%	0,3%	0,2%

The situation by commune is as follows:

	Imanombo	Ampamata	Jafaro	Marovato Befeno	Ambanisarika	Tsimananada	TOTAL
Landowner	64.0%	88.0%	81.9%	88.8%	96.7%	89.2%	88.3%
Rented	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.6%	1.7%	5.8%	6.5%
Loaned land	16.0%	0.0%	2.4%	1.9%	5.8%	10.0%	5.6%
Not willing to reply	20.0%	0.0%	1.2%	2.8%	0.0%	0.0%	1.9%
50% crop-sharing	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
Other	4.0%	12.0%	15.7%	2.8%	2.5%	0.0%	4.8%
Mortgaged land	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%

4.2. Baseline value of project indicators

Sector 1 Agriculture and food security

Indicator: Number and percentage of CARE-assisted people affected by a disaster or crisis who have received sufficient food in quantity and quality and/or have adopted adequate nutritional practices.

This is the number of households receiving specific sectoral assistance through CARE and its partners.

According to the project's M&E plan, this indicator's target value is planned to be collected at the end of the baseline study. However, as stated by the name of the indicator, it will measure the "number of people affected by a disaster who have obtained food in sufficient quantity and quality". This means the baseline value will not inform on the situation because only the result of the activities undertaken by the project will justify it.

Target value: 18,000 people (3600 households)

Baseline value: 0

Subsector 1.1: Improve agricultural production/food security

Indicator 1	Number of months of household food self-sufficiency through improved agricultural production programs
-------------	---

Target value: at least 02 months

Baseline value: 01 month

Compared to the previous farming season, nearly half of the households (45.4%) reported poor harvests and only 1.5% had good harvests.

Production level	Men	Women	TOTAL
Very good	2.3%	1.0%	1.5%
Good	9.7%	15.4%	13.3%
Fair	24.6%	22.0%	22.9%
Poor	37.7%	49.8%	45.4%
Very bad	17.1%	9.5%	12.3%

The commune of Ambanisarika recorded the worst harvest in the last season with 85.8% of households reporting poor crops.

Production	Imanombo	Ampamata	Jafaro	Marovato Befeno	Ambanisarika	Tsimananada	Together
Very good	4.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.9%	1.7%	1.7%	1.5%

Good	28.0%	24.0%	16.9%	18.7%	0.8%	13.3%	13.3%
Average	36.0%	12.0%	3.6%	51.4%	0.0%	33.3%	22.9%
Poor	24.0%	32.0%	33.7%	20.6%	85.8%	42.5%	45.4%
Very poor	8.0%	20.0%	28.9%	5.6%	10.0%	8.3%	12.3%

This situation is generally due to the lack of rain during the farming season for 71.7% of households. Then comes the lack of seeds (70.2%), the lack of farming equipment (65.2%), and the lack of knowledge on appropriate farming techniques (32.7%).

The lack of rainfall during the last season has had a fatal impact on the farming households' crop production level as well as the coverage of their food needs with their own crops. Nearly half of the households (47.7%) had a maximum of one month of food self-sufficiency. Only 38% had between one and two months and 14.3% more than three months.

The length of the period covered is not the same for men and women. A large proportion of female-headed households (57.5%) have a maximum coverage of one month compared to 29.4% of male-headed households. Similarly, for two to three months coverage, there are only 33.6% of female-headed households against 46.3% for male-headed households.

Length of period covered by household crops	Men	Women	Together
<1 month	2.5%	7.0%	5.4%
1 month	26.9%	50.5%	42.3%
1-2 months	46.3%	33.6%	38.0%
3-4 months	24.4%	7.6%	13.4%
>5 months	0.0%	1.3%	0.9%

The commune of Ampamata has the highest proportion of households (39.1%) with less than one month of coverage. The communes of Marovato Befeno and Ambanisarika each have 78.4% and 51.7% of households with a 1-month maximum coverage.

Length of period covered	Imanombo	Ampamata	Jafaro	Marovato Befeno	Ambanisarika	Tsimananada	Together
<1 month	4.2%	39.1%	2.6%	3.9%	0.9%	6.8%	5.4%
1 month	12.5%	4.3%	24.4%	78.4%	51.7%	27.1%	42.3%
1-2 months	54.2%	39.1%	39.7%	13.7%	35.3%	56.8%	38.0%
3-4 months	29.2%	17.4%	28.2%	3.9%	12.1%	9.3%	13.4%
>5 months	0.0%	0.0%	5.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%

Indicator 2	Number of people benefiting directly from improved agricultural production and/or food security activities *
-------------	--

Target value: 12,000 people including 7,200 women

Baseline value: 0

This is the number of beneficiaries of USAID/OFDA-funded activities aimed at improving agricultural production and food security. This includes family members of those directly involved in agricultural production and/or food security activities. Activities may include, without being limited to, training activities, demonstration plots, activities in the field, information campaigns, provision of inputs relating to the improvement of agricultural production, or food security. The target is 12,000 people. The counting of this figure will start with project implementation.

Frequency of household meals

During this month of November 2018, 30.2% of households had two meals per day, 27.2% three meal per day and 28.1% more than three meals per day. In other words, more than half of households (55.3%) had three meals or more during the month of November 2018. Despite this figure, only 45.9% of women ate three times or more per day compared to 60.6% of men. Similarly, 54.2% of women (versus 39.3% for men) eat less than two meals per day. Priority is not given to women in the study when it comes to household meals in male-headed households. In female-headed households, women tend to eat less in order to prioritize their children.

Number of meals per day	Men	Women	Together
Do not eat	0.3%	0.6%	0.4%
One meal	15.3%	11.8%	14.0%
Two meals	23.7	41.8%	30.2%
Three meals	29.3%	23.5%	27.2%
More than three meals	31.3%	22.4%	28.1%

The situation is all especially worrying in the five communes except Marovato Befeno because almost half of the households eat less than twice a day only in November, a sign of food insecurity in this area during the lean season.

Number of meals	Imanombo	Ampamata	Jafaro	Marovato Befeno	Ambanisarika	Tsimananada	Together
Do not eat	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.8%	0.4%
One meal	0.0%	44.0%	43.8%	8.7%	4.3%	5.0%	14.0%
Two meals	44.0%	0.0%	15.0%	3.8%	42.2%	55.0%	30.2%
Three meals	12.0%	24.0%	30.0%	17.3%	52.6%	13.3%	27.2%
More than three meals	44.0%	32.0%	11.3%	70.2%	0.0%	25.8%	28.1%

The reasons for this high proportion of households eating less than three meals day were mainly the lack of financial resources to purchase food (35.2%) coupled with production insufficiency (34.8%) and the lack of production (31.7%) which decreased household cash inflow from the sale of agricultural products.

Reasons for taking less than three meals	Frequency
Lack of resources to buy food	35.2%
Insufficient agricultural production	34.8%
No agricultural production	31.7%
No resources to buy food	26.9%
No food stock	11.5%
Exhaustion of food stocks	10.8%
Lack of water for cooking	6.0%
Soil infertility	1.9%
Other	0.6%
Shortage of food on the market	0.2%

Household dietary diversity score (HDDS)

The survey asks interviewees to recall all foods (meals and snacks) eaten during the previous day, both during the day and at night. The score is between 0 and 12 for the HDDS.

Among households, .2% had a low HDDS, 12.6% had a medium one and only 6.2% had a high one.

The following table provides an overview of the households' consumption of some food categories. The importance of starchy foods with 68.7%, sweets (62.1%), dairy products (59.2%), oils and fats (52.9%), legumes (49%), and fruits and vegetables rich in vitamin (48.5%) is noted. Meat and fish and other fruits and vegetables have the lowest shares.

% of household fed							
less than 3 food groups	81.2%	Low HDDS					
between 4 and 5 groups	12.6%	Medium HDDS					
more than 6 food groups	6.2%	High HDDS					
Food categories	Ambanisarika	Ampamata	Imanombo	Jafaro	Marovato Befeno	Tsimananada	Together
Starch	49.6%	82.0%	64.0%	84.3%	76.2%	68.4%	68.7%
Fruits and vegetables Vit A rich	53.8%	56.0%	30.0%	55.5%	63.5%	27.0%	48.5%
Dark vegetables	46.3%	28.0%	30.0%	24.1%	44.0%	42.6%	39.1%
Other fruits and vegetables	10.0%	4.0%	8.0%	3.6%	1.9%	7.5%	6.0%
Offal	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%	2.4%	0.0%	6.6%	2.3%
Meat and fish	20.9%	24.0%	2.0%	26.5%	12.2%	6.2%	15.4%
Eggs	34.2%	0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	12.1%	1.7%	12.3%
Legumes	59.2%	48.0%	16.0%	42.2%	90.7%	14.2%	49.2%
Dairy products	82.4%	60.0%	32.0%	56.6%	83.2%	21.7%	59.2%
Oils and fats	68.3%	48.0%	28.0%	47.0%	49.5%	50.8%	52.9%
Sweets	62.5%	60.0%	40.0%	53.0%	82.3%	55.0%	62.1%

Indicator 3	Number of hectares farmed with improved agricultural methods *
--------------------	---

Target Value: 1,297 Ha

Baseline value: 88 Ha

This indicator measures the number of hectares farmed with improved agricultural methods through USAID/OFDA-funded activities. For USAID/OFDA, the term “improved agricultural method” refers to methods to improve productivity and soil/water/nutrient quality at the same time in order to protect the system in the long term. These may include soil and water conservation measures (such as no tillage cultivation, conservation agriculture), mechanical treatment or soil improvement or enrichment.

Since the majority of the households surveyed are poor, they average 82 Ares of land per family (standard deviation of 202 ares), with an average of 135 Ares for men and 52 Ares for women. Indeed, farming is practiced at the family level on a small-scale. The surface area farmed averages 40 Ares (standard deviation of 58 Ares), with 54 Ares for men and 33 Ares for women. This being said, nearly half of the land available is not exploited either due to the lack of water for irrigation or lack of resources for farming (seeds, farming equipment, efficient agricultural techniques, etc.). The communes of Marovato Befeno and Ambanisarika have the largest portion of land farmed with respectively 91.4% and 73.6%. However, in Jafaro, the land use percentage is very low (only 34.4%).

Land	Available land	Land farmed	% farmed
Imanombo	52.2	25.4	48.7%
Ampamata	76.6	43.3	56.5%
Jafaro	174.6	60.1	34.4%
Marovato Befeno	15.1	13.8	91.4%
Ambanisarika	52.4	38.6	73.6%
Tsimananada	117.5	56.7	48.3%
TOTAL	82.1	40.7	49.6%

Study results analysis shows that 93.2% of farming households use traditional agricultural methods consisting of unimproved agricultural practice (use of unimproved seeds, no use of adequate agricultural techniques, no use of pest control system, etc.).

With regard to the seeds to be distributed by the project, the area to be covered amounts to 1,297 ha. As a result, only 6.8% are using improved farming method, i.e. 88 Ha.

Subsector 1.2: Seed system security

Indicator 1	Number of months of household food self-sufficiency resulting from seed system security programs *
-------------	--

Target Value: at least 02 months

Baseline value: 01 month

Food self-sufficiency means physical and economic access to adequate food for all household members.

The number of months is an estimate of the ability to produce, buy, store or maintain a level of food consumption, without external assistance or inputs.

Nearly half of the households (47.7%) had a maximum of one month of food self-sufficiency. Only 38% have between one and two months old and 14.3% more than three months old.

The length of the period covered is not the same for men and women. A large proportion of female-headed households (57.5%) have a maximum coverage of one month compared 29.4% of male-headed households. Similarly, there are only 33.6% of female-headed households who achieve two to three months of coverage against 46.3% for male-headed households.

Length of production coverage period	Men	Women	Together
<1 month	2.5%	7.0%	5.4%
1 month	26.9%	50.5%	42.3%
1-2 months	46.3%	33.6%	38.0%
3-4 months	24.4%	7.6%	13.4%
>5 months	0.0%	1.3%	0.9%

Indicator 2	Number of people benefiting directly from seed systems/agricultural input related activities *
-------------	--

Target value: 12,000 including 7,200 women

Baseline value: 0

This indicator pertains to the number of people who directly benefit from seed system strengthening activities, as well as the members of their immediate households who are expected to benefit from improved livelihoods and increased food security as a result of seed system security improvements.

This indicator will be collected during project implementation.

Indicator 3**Percentage of households accessing sufficient seeds to plant**

Target value: 60%

Baseline value: 29.8%

Access to sufficient seed indicates that a household has seeds in hand (owns stocks) or has the capacity or the resources to obtain them elsewhere (neighbors, markets, agro-dealers) in time to plant in the farmer's normal planting area. This is a general measure of seed security at the household level taking into account all the channels through which farmers procure seeds to meet their needs, including receipt of seeds as part of relief operations.

Overall, households mainly grow:

- food crops such as cassava, sweet potatoes and very few grow rice to ensure household food security;
- legumes (beans, lima beans...), and off-season crops such as market gardening, which are generally sold for household income.

Type of crops grown by households	Women	Men	Together
Other	29.7%	40.3%	36.50%
Green leaves	4.6%	6.6%	5.80%
Lima beans	24.0%	11.1%	15.80%
Big peas	22.9%	21.0%	21.70%
Bean	31.4%	26.2%	28.10%
Rice	0.0%	0.3%	0.20%
Taro	7.4%	4.6%	5.60%
Yam	46.3%	60.7%	55.40%
Sweet potato	67.4%	73.4%	71.30%
Cassava	90.9%	94.1%	92.90%

Type of crop	Imanombo	Ampamata	Jafaro	Marovato Befeno	Ambanisarika	Tsimananada	Together
Cassava	84.0%	88.0%	80.7%	99.1%	95.8%	95.8%	92.9%
Sweet potato	72.0%	48.0%	38.6%	90.7%	86.7%	65.8%	71.3%
Taro	12.0%	0.0%	1.2%	2.8%	5.0%	11.7%	5.6%
Yam	68.0%	24.0%	10.8%	72.9%	56.7%	73.3%	55.4%
Rice	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
Bean	52.0%	12.0%	6.0%	12.1%	41.7%	42.5%	28.1%
Big peas	16.0%	40.0%	41.0%	11.2%	17.5%	19.2%	21.7%
Lima beans	24.0%	12.0%	22.9%	2.8%	15.0%	22.5%	15.8%
Green leaves	4.0%	8.0%	3.6%	20.6%	0.0%	0.0%	5.8%
Other	44.0%	32.0%	21.7%	20.6%	53.3%	43.3%	36.5%

Only 29.8% of households draw their seeds from the last harvest; 82.3% procure at the market, and 13.5% come from neighbors and families. This being said, households spend a lot of money to procure seeds in the hope of getting a better harvest at the end of the season. By storing seeds from the last harvest, households would make a significant gain.

Source of seeds	Men	Women	Together
Purchase at the market	80.6%	83.3%	82.3%
From harvest	37.7%	22.0%	29.8%
From neighbors and family	13.7%	13.4%	13.5%

Loaned and repaid in-kind after harvest	7.4%	7.2%	7.3%
Other	1.1%	2.3%	1.9%

Source of seeds	Imanombo	Ampamata	Jafaro	Marovato Befeno	Ambanisarika	Tsimananada	Together
Purchase at the market	80.0%	76.0%	51.8%	83.2%	95.0%	91.7%	82.3%
From the harvest	32.0%	34.0%	27.1%	33.2%	25.0%	25.8%	29.8%
From neighbors and family	20.0%	12.0%	20.5%	7.5%	21.7%	5.0%	13.5%
Loaned and repaid in-kind after harvest	4.0%	4.0%	3.6%	9.3%	16.7%	0.0%	7.3%
Other	4.0%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	5.8%	1.9%

Indicator 4	Variation in percentage of post-harvest losses associated with storage activities
--------------------	--

Target value: 20% decrease

Baseline value: 73.9%

This indicator measures post-harvest losses incurred during the storage phase for food crops and seeds. Loss is defined as the inability to use harvest for the purpose intended, whether for sale, consumption or planting.

In relation to securing seeds and food, 78.1% households use a safe area of the house. Nevertheless, there are still 21.5% who place them in an unsafe area of the house and 5.4% in the fields.

Seeds/food storage	Imanombo	Ampamata	Jafaro	Marovato Befeno	Ambanisarika	Tsimananada	Together
In a safe area of the house	76.0%	80.0%	75.9%	93.5%	89.2%	55.0%	78.1%
In an unsafe area of the house	24.0%	4.0%	6.0%	7.5%	25.0%	44.2%	21.5%
In the fields	4.0%	4.0%	2.4%	3.7%	11.7%	3.3%	5.4%
Outside the house	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	2.5%	1.0%
Other	4.0%	12.0%	2.4%	1.9%	6.7%	5.0%	4.6%

Seed storage practices are similar for households headed by women and men.

Seed/food storage	Men	Women	TOTAL
In a safe area of the house	78,30%	78,00%	78,10%
In an unsafe area of the house	21,10%	21,60%	21,50%
Outside the house	0,60%	1,30%	1,00%
In the fields	8,60%	3,60%	5,40%
Other	3,40%	5,20%	4,60%

Among farming households, 73.9% reported loss of crops during storage.

Storage loss	Men	Women	Together
Yes	72.3%	74.9%	73.9%
No	27.7%	25.1%	26.1%

This proportion of storage losses is higher in the communes of Marovato Befeno and Ambanisarika. However, these two communes record the highest storage rate in safe areas of the house at respectively

93.5% and 89.2%. Losses are due to pests and rodents who destroy the seed stocks and food. According to the respondents, they do not have the resources to procure pest control products. Losses are much lower in the commune of Jafaro (48.5%).

Storage loss	Imanombo	Ampamata	Jafaro	Marovato Befeno	Ambanisarika	Tsimananada	Together
Yes	70.8%	60.9%	48.5%	96.8%	91.9%	62.8%	73.9%
No	29.2%	39.1%	51.5%	3.2%	8.1%	37.2%	26.1%

The average loss level is around 27.3%. The level of loss is higher among women (28.9%) than men (24.5%). This is always due to lack of resources and knowledge of pest control techniques during storage especially for women. This proportion is higher in the commune of Ambanisarika (54.1%) especially for women, reaching 80.7%.

Storage loss level	Men	Women	Together
Imanombo	14.3%	14.6%	14.5%
Ampamata	24.0%	16.2%	17.9%
Jafaro	23.2%	15.8%	18.8%
Marovato Befeno	24.6%	17.6%	19.4%
Ambanisarika	30.1%	80.7%	54.1%
Tsimananada	22.2%	25.2%	24.0%
TOTAL	24.5%	28.9%	27.3%

Subsector 1.3	Livestock
----------------------	------------------

Indicator 1	Number of people benefiting from livestock activities *
--------------------	--

Target Value: 6,000 including 3,600 women

Baseline value: 0

This indicator measures the number of people who receive goods, participate in or are directly assisted by USAID/OFDA-funded project interventions that help them raise domestic animals providing products such as meat, fibers or traction.

This indicator will be measured as the project implements actions with target population.

Indicator 2	Number of animals distributed through the action
--------------------	---

Target Value: 2,400 animals

Baseline value: 0

This indicator measures the number of animals received by beneficiaries through the project.

This indicator will be measured as the project implements actions with target population.

Indicator 3	Number of animals owned per individual *
--------------------	---

Target value: 2 goats, 2 sheep, or 4 to 5 chickens

Baseline value: 0

This indicator measures the number of domestic animals owned by people directly benefiting from project interventions. An animal is considered to belong to a person if he is the owner.

According to the study, 89.6% of households in the area practice livestock, of which 55.2% are women.

Practice livestock	Men	Women	Together
yes	34.4%	55.2%	89.6%
no	4.1%	6.3%	10.4%

This practice involves all households in the commune of Ambanisarika and almost all households in the commune of Marovato Befeno.

Practice by commune	Imanombo	Ampamata	Jafaro	Marovato Befeno	Ambanisarika	Tsimananada	Together
yes	84.0%	84.0%	84.3%	99.1%	100.0%	88.2%	92.5%
no	16.0%	16.0%	15.7%	0.9%	0.0%	11.8%	7.5%

As regards the average head count per household, the number varies across the communes. Overall, there is a high concentration on small ruminants breeding (goat and sheep) as well as chicken and turkey farming.

Average number/commune	Imanombo	Ampamata	Jafaro	Marovato Befeno	Ambanisarika	Tsimananada	Together
Zebu	3.8	3.9	4.4	3.7	4.7	4.1	4.2
Goat	4.6	9.1	9.7	6.5	8.5	5.1	7.2
Sheep	3.5	6.1	5.1	5.0	5.0	5.1	5.0
Turkey	3.1	3.3	3.3	6.4	3.7	1.8	4.0
Chicken	5.0	6.6	8.1	5.9	9.2	5.4	7.1
Duck	2.6	-	8.0	3.4	10.3	2.9	3.5
Other	-	4.0	4.0	4.0	-	2.5	3.0

In general, responsibilities in keeping farm animals is shared among all household members. The person in charge varies depending on the type of livestock:

- Cattle: traditionally in the south, it is the man who is the main person in charge for keeping the zebu herd. Then, the whole family comes after him;
- Goat and sheep: it falls to the children to keep and oversee herds in the fields;
- Turkey, chicken, ducks are usually under women's care.

	Father	Mother	Father and mother	Children	Family
Zebu	59.7%	4.7%	0.9%	4.4%	30.3%
Goat	19.7%	5.7%	2.9%	39.0%	32.7%
Sheep	15.0%	5.6%	2.8%	40.5%	36.1%
Turkey	0.0%	68.3%	3.3%	1.7%	26.7%
Chicken	3.4%	45.1%	3.9%	3.7%	43.8%
Duck	0.0%	63.8%	2.1%	0.0%	34.0%
Other	0.0%	38.5%	30.8%	0.0%	30.8%
Together	21.5%	19.8%	2.9%	20.3%	35.5%

Indicator 4	Number of people trained in livestock *
--------------------	--

Target value: 600 including 360 women

Baseline value: 0

This indicator measures the number of people who have directly received project-funded training on topics relating to the breeding of domestic animals in order to provide products such as meat, milk,

fiber and traction. Training is defined as sessions in which participants are trained according to a defined curriculum and learning objectives. Sessions that may be informative or educational, such as meetings, but without a defined curriculum or learning objectives, are not counted as training. Only people who have completed all the training are counted for this indicator.

Subsector 1.4	Pests and pesticides
----------------------	-----------------------------

Indicator 1	Number of people trained on appropriate crop protection practices *
--------------------	--

Target value: 2,400 people including 1,140 women
Baseline value: 0

Regarding the practice of pest control, 87.4% say they do not apply pest control it in their fields. Usually due to their lack of resources, practicing households use 98% of biological methods that consist in using organic products such as hot pepper mixed with ash or other products to repel or kill pests.

Crop protection practice	Men	Women	Together
yes	7.4%	5.2%	12.6%
no	44.3%	43.1%	87.4%

The situation in the different communes shows that the percentage of households not using means of pest control is practically the same across all communes.

Practice by commune	Imanombo	Ampamata	Jafaro	Marovato Befeno	Ambanisarika	Tsimananada	Together
yes	14.8%	12.3%	11.3%	10.2%	13.3%	14.2%	12.6%
no	85.2%	87.7%	88.7%	89.8%	86.7%	85.8%	87.4%

With these data, the project has a snapshot of pest control practice and can identify training actions to be initiated at the commune level.

Indicator 2	Number and percentage of hectares protected against diseases and pest attacks
--------------------	--

Target value: At least 75%
Baseline value: 0

This indicator will be measured as the project implements actions with target population.

Indicator 3	Number and percentage of people practicing appropriate crop protection procedures *
--------------------	--

Target value: At least 80% of target households
Baseline value: 12.6%

According to the study results, 12.6% of households practice crop protection from pests in the six communes.

Indicator 4	Reduction of post-harvest losses in percentage
--------------------	---

Target value: At least 30%
Baseline value: 12.6%

Among households, 92.3% reported experiencing crop losses due to crop destruction by pests in the fields. Pests are one of the main causes of production decline, compounding the lack of water and farmers' archaic farming practices.

The average level of production loss per household is 47.6%.

Households recording crop loss in the fields	Men	Women	Together
Yes	91.2%	93.4%	92.3%
No	8.8%	6.6%	7.7%

Loss by commune	Imanombo	Ampamata	Jafaro	Marovato Befeno	Ambanisarika	Tsimananada	Together
yes	92.2%	92.7%	92.5%	91.4%	93.6%	91.5%	92.3%
no	7.8%	7.3%	7.5%	8.6%	6.4%	8.5%	7.7%

Loss level	Men	Women	Together
<10%	4.2%	4.7%	4.5%
10-20%	17.0%	15.2%	16.1%
20-50%	59.5%	61.1%	60.3%
50-70%	16.1%	17.2%	16.7%
+70%	3.2%	1.8%	2.5%

Sector 2

Economic recovery and market systems

Indicator: Number and percentage of people affected by a disaster/crisis supported by CARE who have recovered household goods, assets and/or income opportunities.

Target value: 18,000 (3,600 households) including 7,200 women

Base value: 0

This is the number of households/persons who have received specific assistance from CARE.

The crisis caught households off-guard and they had to adapt to the context to survive. Thus, they had to resort to restrictive survival strategies. The survival strategy consists of the set of negative actions undertaken by households to survive/self-sustain in a given context or difficult situation. During the study, in order to cope with the lack of crop harvest during the last farming season, households applied different types of survival strategies to different extent, depending of the status of the head of the household.

Survival strategy	Imanombo	Ampamata	Jafaro	Marovato Befeno	Ambanisarika	Tsimananada	TOTAL
Sale of household goods	96.0%	60.0%	39.8%	86.0%	84.2%	85.8%	76.7%
Loans from family members	56.0%	84.0%	68.7%	93.5%	90.8%	42.5%	73.3%
Sale of farming equipment	56.0%	0.0%	2.4%	22.4%	25.8%	70.0%	32.3%
Other	12.0%	16.0%	49.4%	5.6%	1.7%	10.0%	14.2%
Loans from the rich of the village	20.0%	12.0%	6.0%	6.5%	15.0%	13.3%	11.3%
Early harvest of agricultural products	12.0%	0.0%	2.4%	3.7%	11.7%	10.0%	7.3%
No response	4.0%	0.0%	2.4%	2.8%	5.8%	3.3%	3.5%
Migration	16.0%	0.0%	1.2%	2.8%	1.7%	5.8%	3.5%
Begging in the street	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	0.6%

Survival strategy according to the gender of the head of household	Percentage	Male-headed Households	Female-headed Households
Sale of household goods	76.7%	68.0%	81.6%
Loans from family members	73.3%	68.0%	76.4%
Sale of farming equipment	32.3%	37.1%	29.5%
Loans from the rich of the village	11.3%	13.1%	10.2%
Early harvest of agricultural products	7.3%	10.3%	5.6%
Migration	3.5%	2.9%	3.9%
Begging in the street	0.6%	1.1%	0.3%
Other	14.2%	20.6%	10.5%
No response	3.5%	4.6%	3.0%

Female-headed households use more negative coping strategies to support household members, mainly the sale of household goods and loans from family members. On the other hand, since women have almost no farming equipment, they sell less than men. In the same way as for loans from the rich of the village, having no or little source of income than men, they are hesitant to take loans to the rich of the village for fear of not being able to repay. Migration to the fokontany/commune/region is also beginning to affect female heads of households as to they move away to

find employment or income sources that can meet the needs of their households. Previously, this concerned men only but due to the worsening food insecurity context from year to year, women are also migrating in order to support their families.

Subsector 2.1 Livelihoods restoration

Indicator 1 Number of people assisted in livelihood restoration activities *

Target value: 12,000 including 7,200 women (2,400 households)
Baseline value: 0

This indicator measures the number of people who have directly benefited from project assistance (such as in-kind contributions, money, vouchers or training) to restore their livelihood.

This indicator will be measured as the project implements actions with target population.

Indicator 2 Percentage of beneficiaries reporting net income from their livelihoods *

Target value: At least 75%
Base value: 7.5%

Net income is defined as income above costs in this context and can be considered as a synonymous with “profitability”. This indicator measures the percentage of people who report that their income more from project supported livelihood activities exceeds their costs (inputs, rent, transportation, costs).

The average annual household income is MGA 668,000 (USD 190) or about 55,000 Ariary (MGA 15) monthly with a standard deviation of MGA 830 000 (USD 237). Among households, 84.4% live with an income not exceeding MGA 1,498,000 per year.

	Women	Men	TOTAL
Imanombo	266,667	194,769	229,280
Ampamata	423,000	630,929	544,292
Jafaro	416,675	491,071	454,332
Marovato Befeno	1,213,750	1,138,614	1,156,468
Ambanisarika	982,861	938,577	952,561
Tsimananada	262,708	212,206	233,103
AVERAGE INCOME	595,412	710,691	668,180

Male-headed households have 20% more income than female-headed households (MGA 710,691 for men and MGA 595,412 for women). This situation is again associated with the lack of production factor for women compared to men in the area.

For this year, 92.5% of households report a decline in their income, of which 93.1% are female-headed households. Among households, 78.4% associate the decline in income to the poor harvest during the last cropping season (74.8% of households headed by women and 80.5% of households headed by men).

Households report inga decline in their income	Yes	No
Imanombo	88.0%	12.0%
Ampamata	96.0%	0.4%
Jafaro	94.0%	6.0%
Marovato Befeno	91.6%	8.4%

Ambanisarika	96.7%	3.3%
Tsimananada	88.3%	11.7%
TOTAL	92.5%	7.5%

Subsector 2.2	Development of new livelihoods
----------------------	---------------------------------------

Indicator 1	Number of people assisted in developing new livelihood activities *
--------------------	--

Target value: 6,000 including 3,600 women

Baseline value: 0

This indicator measures the number of people directly benefiting from project assistance (in-kind contributions, money, vouchers or training) to start a new activity they had never done before to make a living.

This indicator will be measured as the project implements actions with target population.

Indicator 2	Percentage of beneficiaries actively practicing their new livelihoods*
--------------------	---

Target value: At least 80%

Baseline value: 0

This indicator measures the number of people still practicing the new occupation, at least from time to time, to earn income at the end of the program. This indicator should be measured towards the end of the programming period.

This indicator will be measured as the project implements actions with target population.

Indicator 3	Percentage of beneficiaries reporting net income derived from livelihood *
--------------------	---

Target value: At least 70%

Baseline value: 0

This indicator measures the percentage of people who report that their income derived from project supported livelihood activities exceeds their costs (inputs, rent, transportation, costs).

This indicator will be measured as the project implements actions with target population.

Sector 3 Water, sanitation and hygiene

Indicator: Number and percentage of people affected by a disaster or crisis supported by CARE and having access to safe drinking water and/or having access to adequate sanitation facilities and/or using appropriate hygiene practices.

Target value: 30,000 people including 18,000 women

Baseline value: 0

In the project area, 72.1% of households affected by drought draw their water from unsafe infrastructure.

Water source		Drink
Safe infrastructure	Safe wells	20.0%
	Pump	7.9%
Unsafe infrastructure	Unsafe well	35.4%
	River	0.4%
	Water source	8.8%
	Transportation cart	21.3%
	Other	6.2%

Subsector 3.1 Water supply

Indicator 1 Number of people directly using improved water services funded by OFDA *

Target value: 4,200 people including 2,520 women

Baseline value: 0

The result of the study on the percentage of people per commune that draws water from unprotected sources could guide the project as regards areas of intervention.

According to the information in the study, only 27.9% of households use protected water sources at the beginning of the project (Safe wells and Pump). This situation will improve as the activities of the project roll out.

Water source	Imanombo	Ampamata	Jafaro	Marovato Befeno	Ambanisarika	Tsimananada	TOTAL
Safe wells	57.7%	0.0%	2.4%	10.3%	4.3%	49.2%	20.0%
Pump	0.0%	32.0%	32.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.9%
Unsafe wells	30.8%	40.0%	16.5%	61.5%	26.5%	40.3%	35.4%
River	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.8%	0.4%
Spring water	0.0%	20.0%	38.8%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	8.8%
Transportation cart	7.7%	0.0%	4.7%	21.8%	53.8%	8.9%	21.3%
Other	3.8%	8.0%	4.7%	5.1%	13.7%	0.8%	6.2%
Total protected source	57.7%	32.0%	35.3%	10.3%	4.3%	49.2%	27.9%

Indicator 2	Average number of liters/person/day collected from all sources for drinking, cooking and hygiene purposes*
--------------------	---

Target value: 10 liters/person/day

Baseline value: 3 liters/person/day

This indicator measures average daily per capita use (in liters/person/ day) of all water collected (safe or unsafe) for consumption, cooking and hygiene purposes.

According to information from household interviews, a household consumes on average:

- 9.7 liters of water for cooking or 1.6 liters per person per day
- 5.7 liters of water for drinking or 0.9 liters per person per day
- 2.9 liters of water for hygiene or 0.5 liters per person per day

This makes an average of 3 liters of water per person per day. This is very low compared to the standard of 10 liters per person per day.

Practice by commune	Imanombo	Ampamata	Jafaro	Marovato Befeno	Ambanisarika	Tsimananada	Together
Cooking	11.6%	9.4%	8.5%	9.7%	5.1%	13.6%	9.7%
Drinking	6.9%	5.7%	4.9%	5.3%	3.5%	7.7%	5.7%
Hygiene	2.9%	2.9%	2.8%	2.9%	1.7%	4.2%	2.9%

Indicator 3	Percentage of households targeted by the WASH program collecting all water for human consumption, cooking and hygiene purposes from improved water sources
--------------------	---

Target value: At least 70%

Base value: 27.9%

This indicator measures the proportion of the population collecting water for drinking, cooking and hygiene purposes from improved water sources only.

According to the study's result, only 27.9% of the population collect water from improved sources within their fokontany or in adjacent villages.

Water source		Drink
Safe infrastructure	Safe wells	20.0%
	Pump	7.9%

This proportion is very low in the commune of Ambanisarika and Marovato Befeno where some villages are located far remote from improved water sources.

Water source	Imanombo	Ampamata	Jafaro	Marovato Befeno	Ambanisarika	Tsimananada	TOTAL
Safe wells	57.7%	0.0%	2.4%	10.3%	4.3%	49.2%	20.0%
Pump	0.0%	32.0%	32.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.9%
Total	57.7%	32.0%	35.3%	10.3%	4.3%	49.2%	27.9%

Indicator 4	Percentage of water user committees set up and/or trained by the WASH program that active at least three months after the training
--------------------	---

Target value: 100%

Baseline value: 0

This indicator will be measured as the project implements actions with target population.

Subsector 3.2	Hygiene promotion
----------------------	--------------------------

Indicator 1	Number of people benefiting from direct hygiene promotion (excluding media campaigns and without double counting) *
--------------------	--

Target value: 12,000 including 7,200 women

Base value: 0

This indicator will be measured as the project implements livestock distribution or support actions with target population.

Indicator 2	Percentage of people targeted by the hygiene promotion program who know at least three of the five critical moments for hand washing *
--------------------	---

Target value: At least 70%

Baseline value: 23.8%

This indicator measures individuals' knowledge of the most effective hand-washing practices to prevent the spread of germs in the fecal-oral cycle. The five critical moments for hand-washing are defined as follows: after defecation/use of the toilet; before eating; after changing nappies or cleaning a child's buttocks; before preparing the food; and before feeding a baby.

According to the study results, only 23.8% of target households know at least three of the five critical moments to wash their hands. This is because water is a scarce commodity in these areas and in the south in general. As a result, households think they should not waste water with washing their hands, especially since hygiene awareness is almost non-existent in these areas.

Female-headed households are more aware (25%) than male-headed households (21.3%).

Knowledge of key messages	Men	Women	Together
1	28.70%	15.80%	19.80%
2	50.00%	59.20%	56.30%
3	18.50%	23.30%	21.80%
4	2.80%	1.70%	2.00%
Knowledge of more than 3 messages	21.30%	25.00%	23.80%

The commune of Tsimananada is the most ignorant with only 10.2% of households having knowledge of more than three messages. On the other hand, the commune of Imanombo has 43.5% of households knowing at least three key messages.

Knowledge of key messages	Ambanisarika	Ampamata	Imanombo	Jafaro	Marovato Befeno	Tsimananada	Together
1	22.1%	10.0%	4.3%	16.7%	7.4%	33.3%	19.8%
2	44.2%	70.0%	52.2%	55.6%	68.1%	56.5%	56.3%
3	33.7%	20.0%	43.5%	16.7%	19.1%	10.2%	21.8%
4	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	5.3%	0.0%	2.0%
Knowledge > 3 messages	33.7%	20.0%	43.5%	27.8%	24.4%	10.2%	23.8%

Indicator 3	Percentage of households targeted by the hygiene promotion program with no traces of feces in their living areas
--------------------	---

Target value: At least 70%

Baseline value: 56.5%

This indicator measures the hygiene promotion efforts' effectiveness in reducing the practice of open defecation in immediate living areas.

At the beginning of the project, almost 1 in 2 people do not use latrines to defecate. Open defecation is still practiced with a higher proportion among female-headed households.

Use of latrine to defecate	Men	Women	Together
Yes	48.6%	61.1%	56.5%
No	51.4%	38.9%	43.5%

The practice is especially widespread in the communes of Jafaro (80.5%), Tsimananada (63%) and Ampamata (54.2%). On the other hand, a large majority already use latrines in the communes of Marovato and Imanombo.

Use of latrines to defecate	Imanombo	Ampamata	Jafaro	Marovato Befeno	Ambanisarika	Tsimananada	TOTAL
Yes	72.0%	45.8%	19.5%	92.4%	68.9%	37.0%	56.5%
No	28.0%	54.2%	80.5%	7.6%	31.1%	63.0%	43.5%

Indicator 4	Percentage of households targeted by the hygiene promotion program who store their drinking water in clean containers
-------------	---

Target value: At least 90%

Baseline value: 73.1%

This indicator measures the effectiveness of hygiene promotion efforts to reduce the practice of open defecation in immediate living areas.

At the beginning of the project, almost two people out of three store their water in containers that are washed daily (38.6%) or monthly (26.3%). This is already a high rate at the beginning of this project, but the project's actions in this direction will further improve the situation to ensure that the majority of people wash their water containers every day.

Water Storage System/Gender of head of household	Men	Women	Together
Water cans	45.6%	43.6%	44.3%
Bucket with lid	7.0%	14.0%	11.6%
Bucket without lid	29.1%	23.5%	25.4%
Barrel	18.3%	17.9%	18.0%
Other	0.0%	1.0%	0.6%

Nevertheless, despite the existence of a fairly secure storage system, 66.7% of households say they do not use a water purification system.

Use of a water purification system	Frequency
Yes	33.30%
No	66.70%

Among people who do not use a water purification system, 45.6% say that it is already in their habit to drink or use the water as it is.

Reason for not using a water purification system	Frequency
The water is already clear	3.40%

No reason to purify it	0.60%
It is our habit	45.60%
Other	1.30%
No resources to purify it	26.00%
Do not know how to do it	23.20%

Among households, 73.1% report having washed their water containers of which 38.6% daily and 26.3% monthly.

Do you wash your water storage containers?	Frequency
Yes	73.10%
No	26.90%

Frequency of washing water containers	Frequency
Daily	38,60%
Two times per week	14,30%
Weekly	19,60%
Monthly	26,30%
Two times per month	1,20%

Subsector 3.3	WASH NFI
----------------------	-----------------

Indicator 1	Total number of people receiving WASH NFI assistance through all channels (without double counting) *
-------------	---

Target value: 3,000 including 1,680 women
Baseline value: 0

This indicator will be measured as the project implements actions with target population.

Indicator 2	Percentage of households reporting that they are satisfied with the quality of the WASH NFIs received through direct distribution (kits), vouchers or cash
-------------	--

Target value: At least 90%
Baseline value: 0

This indicator will be measured as the project implements actions with target population.

Indicator 3	Percentage of households targeted by the hygiene promotion program who store their drinking water safely in clean containers
-------------	--

Target value: At least 90%
Baseline value: 73.1%

This indicator measures the prevalence of safe household water storage practices that reduce the risks water contamination after collection.
According to the study, 44.3% of households store water in water cans, 25.4% in buckets without lids or in barrels without lids.

Water Storage System/Gender of head of household	Men	Women	Together
Water can	45.6%	43.6%	44.3%
Bucket with lid	7.0%	14.0%	11.6%
Bucket without lid	29.1%	23.5%	25.4%
Barrel	18.3%	17.9%	18.0%
Other	0.0%	1.0%	0.6%

Nevertheless, despite the existence of a fairly secure storage system, 66.7% of households say they do not use a water purification system.

Use of water purification system	Frequency
Yes	33.30%
No	66.70%

Among the people who do not use a water purification system ,45.6% say that it is already in their habit to drink or use the water as it is.

Reason for not using a water purification system	Frequency
The water is already clear	3.40%
No reason to purify it	0.60%
It is our habit	45.60%
Other	1.30%
No resources to purify it	26.00%
Do not know how to do it	23.20%

Among the households, 73.1% reported having washed their water storage containers, of which 38.6% daily and 26.3% monthly.

Do you wash the water storage containers?	Frequency
Yes	73.10%
No	26.90%

Containers washing frequency	Frequency
Daily	38.60%
Twice a week	14.30%
Weekly	19.60%
Monthly	26.30%
Twice a month	1.20%

STATUS OF INDICATORS

Indicator	Target Value	Baseline Value	Comments
Sector 1: Agriculture and food security			
Indicator: Number and percentage of CARE-assisted people affected by a disaster or crisis who have received sufficient food in quantity and quality and/or have adequate nutritional practices	18,000	0	
Subsector 1.1: Improve agricultural production/food security (2400 mn)			
Indicator 1: Number of months of household food self-sufficiency through improved agricultural production programs	2 months	1 month	
Indicator 2: Number of people benefiting directly from improved agricultural production and/or food security activities	12,000 including 7,200 women	0	
Indicator 3: Number of hectares farmed with improved agricultural methods	1,297 Ha	88 Ha	
Subsector 1.2: Seed system security			
Indicator 1: Number of months of household food self-sufficiency resulting from seed system security programs	2 months	1 month	
Indicator 2: Number of people benefiting directly from seed systems/agricultural input related activities (disaggregated by location, gender and age)	12,000 including 7,200 women	0	
Indicator 3: Percentage of households accessing sufficient seeds to plant	60%	80.0%	
Indicator 4: Variation in percentage of post-harvest losses associated with storage activities	20%	73.9%	
Subsector 1.3: Livestock			
Indicator 1: Number of people benefiting from livestock activities (disaggregated by location, gender and age)	6,000 including 3,600 women	0	
Indicator 2: Number of animals distributed through the action (disaggregated by animal type)	2,400	0	
Indicator 3: Number of animals owned per individual (disaggregated by animal type, location, gender, age of owner)	2 goats 2 sheep Or 4 to 5 chickens		
Indicator 4: Number of people trained in livestock (disaggregated by location, gender and age)	600 including 360 women	0	5 committees X 120
Indicator 5: Total value in USD of donations exchanged by beneficiaries			
Subsector 1.4: Pests and pesticides			

Indicator 1: Number of people trained on appropriate crop protection practices *	2,400 people including 1,140 women	0	
Indicator 2: Number and percentage of hectares protected against diseases and pest attacks	At least 75%	0	
Indicator 3: Number and percentage of people practicing appropriate crop protection procedures *	At least 80% of target households	12.6%	
Indicator 4: Reduction of post-harvest losses in percentage	At least 30%	12.6%	
Sector 2: Economic recovery and market systems			
Indicator: Number and percentage of people affected by a disaster or crisis supported by CARE who have recovered household goods, assets and/or income opportunities	18,000 with 7,200 women		3,600 households
Subsector 2.1: Livelihoods restoration			
Indicator 1: Number of people assisted in livelihood restoration activities (disaggregated by location, gender and age)	12,000 including 7,200 women	0	2,400 households
Indicator 2: Percentage of beneficiaries reporting net income from livelihood (disaggregated by location, gender and age)	At least 75%	7.5%	
Subsector 2.2: Development of new livelihoods			
Indicator 1: Number of people assisted in developing new livelihood activities (disaggregated by location, gender and age)	6,000 including 3,600 women	0	1,200 households
Indicator 2: Percentage of beneficiaries actively practicing their new livelihoods (disaggregated by location, gender and age)	At least 80%	0	
Indicator 3: Percentage of beneficiaries reporting net income derived from livelihood (disaggregated by location, gender and age)	At least 70%	0	
Sector 3: Water, sanitation and hygiene			
Indicator: Number and percentage of people affected by a disaster or crisis supported by CARE and having access to safe drinking water and/or having access to adequate sanitation facilities and/or using appropriate hygiene practices (disaggregated by location, gender and age)	30,000 people including 18,000 women	0	
Subsector 3.1: Water supply			
Indicator 1: Number of people directly using improved water services funded by OFDA (disaggregated by location, gender and age)	840 * 5 = 4,200 including 2,520 women	0	Water Transportation Management Committees 120 * 7

Indicator 2: Average number of liters/person/day collected from all sources for drinking, cooking and hygiene purposes (disaggregated by location, gender and age)	10	3	
Indicator 3: Percentage of households targeted by the WASH program collecting all water for human consumption, cooking and hygiene purposes from improved water sources	At least 70%	27.9%	
Indicator 4: Percentage of water user committees set up and/or trained by the WASH program that active at least three months after the training	100%	0	
Subsector 3.2: Hygiene promotion			
Indicator 1: Number of people benefiting from direct hygiene promotion (excluding media campaigns and without double counting) (disaggregated by location, gender and age)	12,000 including 7,200 women	0	120*20*5
Indicator 2: Percentage of people targeted by the hygiene promotion program who know at least three of the five critical moments for hand washing (disaggregated by location, gender and age)	At least 70%	23.8%	
Indicator 3: Percentage of households targeted by the hygiene promotion program with no traces of feces in their living areas	At least 70%	56.5%	
Indicator 4: Percentage of households targeted by the program who safely store their drinking water in clean containers	At least 90%		
Subsector 3.3: WASH NFI			
Indicator 1: Total number of people receiving WASH NFI assistance through all channels (without double counting) (disaggregated by location, gender and age)	3,000 including 1,680 women	0	
Indicator 2: Percentage of households reporting that they are satisfied with the quality of the WASH NFIs received through direct distribution (kits), vouchers or cash	At least 90%	0	
Indicator 3: Percentage of households who store their drinking water safely in clean containers	At least 90%	73.1%	

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section outlines the main conclusions set out in the second part of the report and presents the recommendations based on the analysis of the situation.

CONCLUSIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
<p>Food insecurity The main signs suggesting community vulnerability are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - lack of stocks at household level - decreasing access to food - adoption of highly precarious survival strategies such as changes in eating habits, sale of cooking utensils or even migration. <p>Food production</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - poor agricultural productivity due to very little surface area farmed, poor agricultural practices and difficulty to obtain adequate inputs. <p>Access to water The proportion of targeted households (38%) with access to drinking water from an improved source is below the average for the entire Ambovombe District (48%). In addition, the very limited means to ensure water resources management (or lack of water supply) prevents the population from applying good hygiene practices.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Responding to the most vulnerable populations' immediate needs: food and water. 2. Supporting people to improve agriculture by intensifying climate-smart agricultural techniques: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Distribution of seeds and agricultural inputs - Distribution of farming equipment - Capacity building on local climate-smart farming techniques 3. WASH: Community support through provision of improved water source or distribution of water voucher. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support in awareness campaigns/training on hygiene. - Mass awareness campaign

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Baseline assessment Emergency Assistance Project for Vulnerable Populations Affected by Drought in Southern Madagascar - Ambovombe District

I. CONTEXT AND JUSTIFICATION

As a result of the combined effects of the El Niño phenomenon and prolonged drought in southern Madagascar, this part of the island faces severe food insecurity and economic vulnerability hampering its capacity to cope with shocks. According to the recent update of FEWS NET³ (April 2018), Madagascar is considered as in crisis for the period running from October 2017 to June 2018 because of poor rainfall forecasts, resulting in below-average harvests and limited food access. The latest monitoring report of the food security cluster⁴ (April 2018) shows that 820,299 people are in need of food assistance, including 586,076 people considered as in “crisis” and 234,223 who have reached the “emergency level” as regards exposure to food insecurity in southern Madagascar. Irregular, uneven and insufficient rain during the farming season (December 2017 to March 2018) raised concerns about the population's ability to store food and survive until next harvest. Despite food distributions (mainly school meals provided by WFP) and food production interventions (conducted by FAO and other agencies), drought has put extreme pressure on local communities and has led to an increase in the number of people suffering from food insecurity.

The disruption of work and income opportunities and livelihoods has also caused serious gaps in income generation, loss of productive assets and adoption of harmful coping mechanisms. The recent WFP/FAO Crop and Food Security Assessment Mission (CFSAM, December 2017) showed that loss of productive assets, such as the sale of production means, equipment and tools, has prevented people from producing food and generating income. In the absence of targeted assistance due lack of funding, people with moderate malnutrition may face severe malnutrition during the dry season. Vulnerable groups need immediate assistance in addition to an intervention aiming at increasing their resilience to shocks over the long term.

CARE is proposing, through the OFDA South project, a specific humanitarian intervention in the Ambovombe district for a period of 12 months in 6 communes in the Ambovombe district, including: *Imanombo, Ambanisarika, Tsimananada, Marovato-Befeno, Ampamata, and Jafaro* to save lives among the most vulnerable groups, prevent an aggravation of food insecurity and promote resilience building measures in parallel to the humanitarian response. The overall outcome of the project is to alleviate the drought-affected populations' suffering in southern Madagascar through food production restoration, improved livelihoods and improved access to water. The project proposes to quickly and sustainably carry out actions in three areas:

1. ***Improving agricultural production and food security*** by providing adequate inputs (improved/drought-resistant seeds/plants), tools, training on climate resilient techniques (12,000 people); training and setting up of storage facilities for seed and crop security (12,000

³ <http://fews.net/fr/southern-africa/madagascar>

⁴ <http://fscluster.org/madagascar/document/madagascar-infographie-communes-avril>

people); provision of small ruminants/poultry, feeding/fodder vouchers, technical training (6,000 people);

2. **Supporting economic recovery and market systems** by restoring livelihoods (6,000 people); support for the development of new businesses through the setting up of savings and credit groups (12,000 people) and support for agricultural processing/fisheries products (12,000 people); business plan development (9,000 people);

3. **Promoting access to water and hygiene** through the setting up/operationalization of 120 water transportation management committees, the supply of ox carts and barrels (12,000 persons); supply of water storage equipment (900 people), provision of awareness-raising/information sessions on hygiene, food and nutrition (36,000 people), and provision of WASH kits (water cans, buckets, cups, bars of soap) (3,000 people).

At the beginning of the project, CARE will conduct a baseline assessment performed by external evaluators using qualitative and quantitative methods. The assessment will be designed to collect baseline information that will help project stakeholders draw rigorous conclusions about project performance (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability) at the end of the project. The survey will also collect data from several control communities outside the project area.

II. OBJECTIVES

2.1. General objective of the assessment

The overall objective of this assessment is to provide the project implementation stakeholders with detailed information on the baseline situation by proposing (qualitative and quantitative) baseline values based on the impact, outcome and output indicators in accordance with the project's logical framework and analyzed by gender.

This baseline will identify the baseline value of the various indicators (before-project situation) and will be compared with the situation at the end of the project. This will allow for undertaking qualitative and quantitative assessment of each component's contribution to the achievement of project objectives achievement aiming at accelerating the recovery and building the resilience of the most vulnerable communities affected by the drought in the Ambovombe District, namely as regards their livelihoods, food security and health.

Having a baseline will also allow for setting up the project's monitoring and evaluation system. As such, the consultant will propose a monitoring and evaluation framework for the project (by clarifying the sources, the roles and responsibilities, the data to be provided and the frequency of data collection).

2.2. Specific objectives of the assessment

In order to obtain detailed and reliable information, the assessment should focus specifically on the identification and/or analysis of:

- Socio-economic and cultural context leading to food insecurity in the concerned district;
- The occurrence of food insecurity among households while presenting their food consumption score, the type of negative survival strategy adopted and the proportion of households affected;
- Households' current food production compared to a normal period, i.e. period without food crisis;
- Access, storage mechanism and variation of water utilization among households;
- Situation/participation of girls and women, especially those heading households, in terms of land ownership, production and access to information;
- The agrarian structure primarily adapted to the location and to climate change in order to achieve food security in the intervention zones;
- The existence of local preparedness and prevention strategies to address hazards, especially drought;
- The level of involvement in Drought Risk Reduction of others stakeholders, including local authorities in the south, and especially in the district of Ambovombe.

III. EXPECTED RESULTS

At the end of the assessment, the service provider will submit a draft report and a final report taking into account all the stakeholders' feedback, including:

- A detailed analysis of the intervention district's socio-economic and cultural situation, while providing recommendations on possible obstacles or success factors for project activities;
- A detailed analysis of the occurrence of household food insecurity while presenting the periodic food consumption score and the proportion of households using negative survival strategies;
- A detailed analysis of the agrarian structure and food production compared to a normal period;
- A detailed analysis on water management and women's responsibility in its use;
- A list of indicators with their baseline values, allowing for easily measuring the project's impacts, outcomes, and outputs in the intervention zone;
- A project monitoring-evaluation mechanism including updated risk analysis (by clarifying roles and responsibilities, data to be provided, indicators calculation methods, frequency of data collection, etc.);
- Collection of baseline information to capture project impact indicators baseline values.

The service provider will also provide possible recommendations as regards the implementation of the project (approach, frequency, actors, etc.) based on the assessment's results.

IV. INTERVENTION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

The service provider is required to prepare, present and defend the methodological approach that he/she considers appropriate to meet the assessment's objectives. In any case, he/she will have to adapt his/her methodology according to the above mentioned general and specific objectives. The information collection and processing methods, the sampling plan, the schedule of any field trip, all quantitative and qualitative data collection tools and all other documents relating to the assessment must be validated beforehand by the Monitoring and Evaluation Officer and the project's technical team before their implementation.

The assessment will be conducted in 24 sample fokontanys from the six project intervention communes whose list is available in Appendix II, representing 15% of the project targeted fokontany.

4.1 Main phases of the assessment

The assessment will comprise three main phases:

- **Desk review phase (05 days):**

During this phase, the service provider is required to read all relevant project documentation. This step will allow him to validate the assessment questionnaires and make significant and required changes to the methodology presented. This phase should start after contract signature.

The main documents to which the provider must refer in addition to other documents he may request include:

- Project proposal;
- Other project related documents;
- Other documents relating to drought in the South, Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change;

Based on the information reviewed, the service provider will submit within **5 days** after contract signature a **desk-review report (15 pages maximum)** comprising:

- Feedback on the logical framework;
- Feedback on assessment issues/questions
- A presentation of each assessment question, indicating the information already available and their limitations, the preliminary answers, the remaining items to be addressed and the

remaining assumptions to be tested and the description of a complete method to answer the questions;

- A detailed *work plan*, which will include:
 - a rectification methodology (if necessary) of the assessment;
 - a list of individuals and/or institutions to be interviewed;
 - a list of tools to be used during the field phase;
 - a final timeframe, itinerary and names and responsibilities of the members of the assessment team.

The work plan should be implemented with sufficient flexibility to address with any last-minute challenges that may occur in the field. As soon as a significant deviation from the agreed work plan or schedule is believed to threaten assessment quality, it should be discussed immediately with the Monitoring and Evaluation Officer and the project technical team.

- **Field assessment phase (15 days):**

In accordance with the methodology previously validated by the Monitoring and Evaluation Officer and the project technical team, the service provider will implement the data collection and processing plan. The field phase will begin upon approval of the desk review report by the Monitoring and Evaluation Officer and the project technical team.

- **Processing, analysis and draft report drafting phase (05 days):**

After the collection phase, the service provider will process and analyze the information collected. At the end of this phase, the service provider will submit in softy copy a *draft report* on the assessment's main findings in accordance with the format given in the appendix before the restitution phase.

- **Restitution and final report drafting phase (05 days):**

At the end of the intervention, the service provider will have to conduct a restitution session in the presence of all the project stakeholders, during which he/she will present the assessment findings. The service provider is responsible for preparing the Power Point presentation, which is considered as an assessment deliverable in the same way as the report. The restitution session will focus on:

- Presentation of the main findings of the assessment;
- Presentation of the list of indicators with their baseline values;
- Presentation of a monitoring-evaluation mechanism including the analysis of updated risks (by clarifying the roles and responsibilities, the data to be provided, the indicators calculation methods, the collection periodicity, etc.);
- Presentation of recommendations on project implementation (approach, frequency, stakeholders, etc.).

Based on feedback received during the restitution, the consultant will draft the *final report* and will submit it no later than **02 days** upon reception of project feedback and should be structured according to the standard format in the appendix while providing for some flexibility to allow for incorporating additional important item if any. The report is subject to quality requirements, the text of the report should be illustrated, as needed, with maps, graphs and tables.

V. PERFORMANCE PERIOD

The service performance period is set at 30 working days (including desk review, methodological aspects, information gathering activities, results analysis, drafting of the assessment report and assessment's findings restitution) as follows:

PHASE	DAYS	LOCATION
Preparation work (administrative aspect, familiarization, documentation, methodology, tools)	05	TANA
Field phase (interviews, surveys, observation)	15	COMMUNES - FOKONTANY
Processing and writing of draft report	05	TANA
Restitution of the assessment's findings and final report submission	05	AMBOVOMBE/TANA
TOTAL	30	

VI. SPECIAL CONDITIONS

- **Recruitment and training of the survey team** by the service provider should be done in Ambovombe to ensure better quality of the household surveys (*possibility to collaborate with CARE's administrative officer in Ambovombe for recruitment preparation*);
- Any change in the program or itinerary must be **indicated and validated beforehand** by the project's Technical Coordinator,
- CARE will be in charge of the logistical organization of the **assessment result restitution workshop** in Ambovombe and will pay for the round-trip airfare from Tana to Ambovombe of one person from the consultant's team for the restitution.

VII. SERVICE PROVIDER'S PROFILE

The provider can be:

- A group of individual consultants, or
- A consulting firm

The service provider should include among the staff assigned to the consultancy, people with:

- Very good knowledge on assessment of drought-response projects;
- Solid experiences in quantitative and qualitative data processing methods;
- Practical experiences in conducting project assessment;
- Excellent knowledge of statistical data processing software (SPSS, SPHINX, STATA, etc.);
- Excellent French writing, analysis and synthesis skills;
- Excellent knowledge of the dialects in the area of intervention.

The team recruited by the provider, in addition to being multidisciplinary, must have:

- Strong organizational and teamwork skills;
- Proactivity and rigor;
- Strong planning and anticipation capacity;
- Flexibility;
- Proven experiences in community approach;
- Strong experiences in conducting household food situation assessments and the DRM;
- High availability and flexibility for the service performance period;
- At least three years of higher education.

VIII. PROPOSAL

The proposal should contain:

- A presentation note
- A technical proposal
- A financial proposal

8.1 Presentation note

The following documents must be provided by the candidates in the presentation note:

- A cover letter;
- A certificate of completion for the past experiences that are the most relevant for the service requested.

8.2 Technical Proposal

The technical proposal should include:

- The consultant's understanding of the mission;
- Summary of comments and suggestions on the terms of reference;
- The curriculum vitae showing a general description of the offered services and the consultant's expertise;
- Knowledge of the area and theme of intervention;
- The methodology to be used to carry out the assessment;
- The table of activities broken down by objectives.

8.3 Financial Proposal

This proposal will include details of the consultant's financial proposal broken down by heading.

Interested consultants are invited to send their electronic technical and financial proposals to the email address MDGCARERH@care.org by **October, 30th 2018 at 5 pm** (Ref: Initial Evaluation of the OFDA Ambovombe/CARE project) .

APPENDIX. I

FORMAT OF THE REPORT (interim report and final report).

The report shall not exceed 50 pages, exclusive of appendices, and shall ARIAL font, 11 points and line spacing 1). It will include:

I. A Summary

It summarizes the main findings of the assessment and lists the conclusions and associated recommendations for each analysis section. Written in a condensed, clear and precise way, it must not exceed five pages.

II. A body of report

The body of report should include:

- An introduction describing the project's activities in the intervention area as well as the context;
- References to the methodology used in implementing the assessment;
- Findings and discussions on the assessment in general and on specific issues;
- A section explaining the main findings of data collection along their interpretations;
- A section presenting the baseline analysis with the related conclusions and the indicators' baseline values;
- A section explaining the monitoring and evaluation mechanism to be put in place for the monitoring of the indicators.

III. Conclusions and recommendations

This section should summarize the main conclusions of the second section of the report and set out the recommendations based on the analysis of each conclusion.

The conclusions must be followed by recommendations. Th recommendations must be realistic and actionable. The value of the assessment will be measured by the quality and credibility of the recommendations.

IV. Appendix

This part will include:

- The terms of reference for the assessment;
- The evaluators' CVs;
- List of people/organizations consulted;
- Documentary references;
- Other technical appendix (statistical analyses, etc.);

ANNEX. II**Study area**

COMMUNE		FOKONTANY
Imanombo	1	Lamitihy
	2	Vohimary
	3	Antsakoamalangy
	4	Laborano
Ampamata	5	Ambatomasy II
	6	Ampanaperandrotse Haut
	7	Ampanaperandrotse II
	8	Antafeanampela Ankilimanitsy
Jafaro	9	Andahivokazy II
	10	Ankobo I Manorihy
	11	Besaloha Bas
	12	Mandily II
Marovato Befeno	13	Marovato Befeno
	14	Namalaza II
	15	Marovato Tsingara II
	16	Amborokahake Bemosesy
Ambanisarika	17	Ambanisarika Center
	18	Maronolo Ambarosoa
	19	Sifiry II
	20	Androrohoro II
Tsimananada	21	Mokofo II
	22	Ankileandro Ambanisarika
	23	Amboro Marofoty
	24	Ambitike II

Data collection tools

EVALUATION INITIALE DU PROJET OF DA3

NOVEMBRE 2018 - CARE

Questionnaire Ménage

1. INFOS SUR LE MENAGE

1. KAOMININA

- 1. Imanombo
- 2. Ampamata
- 3. Jafaro
- 4. Marovato Befeno
- 5. Ambanisarika
- 6. Tsimananada

2. Fokontany

- 1. Lamitihy
- 2. Vohimary
- 3. Antsakoamalangy
- 4. Laborano
- 5. Ambatomasy II
- 6. Ampanaperandrotse Haut
- 7. Ampanaperandrotse II
- 8. Antafeanampela Ankilimanitsy
- 9. Andahivokazy II
- 10. Ankobo I Manorihy
- 11. Besaloa Bas
- 12. Mandily II
- 13. Marovato Befeno
- 14. Namalaza II
- 15. Marovato Tsingara II
- 16. Amborokahake Bemosesy
- 17. Ambanisarika Centre
- 18. Maronolo Ambarosoa
- 19. Sifiry II
- 20. Androrohoro II
- 21. Mokofo II
- 22. Ankileandro Ambanisarika
- 23. Amboro Marofoty
- 24. Ambitike II

3. Tanana

4. Anaran'ny hadi hadiana

5. Maha lahy na maha vavy ny hadi hadiana

- 1. Lahy
- 2. Vavy

6. Sata ara-panambadiana

- 1. Manambady ara-panjakana
- 2. Manambady amin'ny fombandrazana
- 3. Tokantrano maso
- 4. Misara-panambadiana
- 5. Maty vady
- 6. Mpitovo

7. Raha vavy ka vady araka ny fombandrazana ianareo, vady faha-firy ianao ?

8. Isan'ny olona ao amin'ny tokantrano

Nombre de personnes dans le ménage/Isan'ny olona ao antokantrano

9. Lahy < 5 taona

10. Vavy < 5 taona

11. Lahy 6-13 taona

12. Vavy 6-13 taona

13. Lahy 14-17 taona

14. Vavy 14-17 taona

15. Lahy 18-59 taona

16. Vavy 18-59 taona

17. Lahy antitra > 60 taona

18. Vavy antitra > 60 taona

19. Isan'ny vehivavy bevohoka

20. Isan'ny reny mampinono

FOTO-PIVELOMANA

21. Inona no foto-piveloman'ny tokantranonareo? Alaharo araka ny foto-pivelomana fototra

1. Fambolena
2. Fiompiana
3. Jono
4. Fanaovana saribao
5. Varotra madinika
6. Asa tanana
7. Rafitra
8. Asam-panjakana
9. Asa tsy miankina amin'ny Fanjakana
10. Fitangosana vokatra
11. Hafa

Ordonnez 3 réponses.

22. Raha HAFA, tanisao

23. Inona ny tena loharano fidirambolan'ny tokantrano?

- 1. Varotra vokatra ny fambolena
- 2. Varotra biby fiompy
- 3. Varotra vokatra avy amin'ny biby
- 4. Varotra vokatra ny jono
- 5. Varotra vokatra ny fihazana
- 6. Varotra tany
- 7. Varotra kojakoja tao an-trano
- 8. Varotra fanaka tao an-trano
- 9. Mpikarama amin'ny fambolena
- 10. mpikarama isan'andro
- 11. Mpamily fiara/Gardien...
- 12. Sehatra asa madinika
- 13. (Mpanajitra, Mpanandrafitra...)
- 14. Fonksionera
- 15. Fisotroan-dronono
- 16. Mpivarotra
- 17. Vola omen'ny olon-kafa
- 18. Fitrosam-bola
- 19. Fangatahana/Fanampiana
- 20. Hafa

Vous pouvez cocher plusieurs cases (8 au maximum).

24. Ohatrinona ny vola miditra amin'ny tokantrano avy amin'ny loharano fidirambola mandritry ny 12 volana farany ?

25. Misy fotoana ve ahitana fa midina ny vola azo avy amin'ny loharano fidirambolanao ?

1. Eny 2. Tsia 3. Tsy voakasik'izany

26. Raha Eny, dia inona ny antony ?

1. Tsy nisy vokatra 2. Ratsy sy kely ny vokatra
 3. Ratsy ny varotra 4. Tsy misy asa

27. Inona no tena fanaon'ny tokantrano rehefa tsy manambola intsony ao antokantrano?

- 1. Mamarotra ny fitaovan-tokantrano
- 2. Mamarotra ny fitaovam-pamokarana
- 3. Mifindra monina
- 4. Fiotazana ny vokatra alohan'ny fotoana
- 5. Mitrosa amin'ny havana
- 6. Mitrosa amin'ny mpanankarena eo an-toerana
- 7. Mangataka an-dalambe
- 8. Hafa

Vous pouvez cocher plusieurs cases.

FAMBOLENA

28. Namboly ve ny tokantranonareo tamin'ity taom-pambolena 2018 ity?

1. Eny 2. Tsia

29. Ahoana no fomba ahazoanao tany hiasana ?

- 1. Tompon'ny tany 2. Mpanofa tany
- 3. Miasabokatra 4. Tanim-panjakana
- 5. Tany indramina 6. Tany atao antoka
- 7. Hafa

Vous pouvez cocher plusieurs cases.

Firy ny velaran-tany fambolena anananareo? (Fenoy ny ALAVANY sy ny SAKANY ahazoana ny VELARANY)

30. Alavany

31. Sakany

32. Velarany (Alavany x Sakany)

Firy ny velaran'ny tany ambolena amin'ireo?

33. Alavany

34. Sakany

35. Velarany (Alavany x Sakany)1

36. Inona avy ireo karazana voly nambolenareo tamin'ity taom-pambolena ity?

1. Vary 2. Mangahazo 3. Voamanga
 4. Ovy 5. Saonjo 6. Tsaramaso
 7. Voanjobory 8. Kabaro 9. Antake
 10. Anana 11. Hafa

Vous pouvez cocher plusieurs cases.

37. Raha Hafa, tanisao

38. Avy aiza ny masomboly ampiasainareo?

1. Ampahany t@ Vokatra
 2. Novidiana teny an-tsena
 3. Avy amin'ny mpiray tanana/Havana
 4. Notrosaina t@ olona ka averina @ vokatra
 5. Hafa

Vous pouvez cocher plusieurs cases.

39. Raha Hafa, tanisao

40. Ahoana ny fomba hitehirizanareo ny masomboly?

1. Ao an-trano @ toerana voaharo
 2. Ao an-trano tsy voaharo
 3. Eny antokontany
 4. Eny antsaha
 5. Hafa

Vous pouvez cocher plusieurs cases.

41. Raha Hafa, tanisao

42. Nanao ahoana ny vokatr'in'ny fambolena tamin'ity taona ity?

1. Tena tsara 2. Tsara 3. Antonony
 4. Ratsy 5. Tena ratsy

43. Raha ANTONONY na RATSY na TENA RATSY, inona ny antony nahatonga izany?

44. Inona no ampiasanao ny vokatra azonao tamin'ny taom-pambolena farany?

1. Nohanina
 2. Namidy
 3. Notahirizina hampiasain'ny tokantrano
 4. Ny ampahany namidy/ny ampahany notahirizina
 5. Nampiasaina handoavana hofan-tany
 6. Hafa

Vous pouvez cocher plusieurs cases.

45. Raha Hafa, tanisao

46. Raha notehirizina, nisy fahasimbana ve ny vokatra notehirizina?

1. Eny 2. Tsia

47. Raha ENY, firy isan-jatony ny fahasimbana?

48. Inona no mety ho sakana tsy ahafahanao manatanteraka tsara ny asa fambolena?

1. Tsy fahampian'ny masomboly
 2. Tsy fahampian'ny fitaovana
 3. Tsy fahafantarana ny teknikam-pambolena
 4. Tsy fananana tany
 5. Tsy fananana vola entina hikarakarana ny tany
 6. Tsy fahampian'ny rano
 7. Hafa

Vous pouvez cocher plusieurs cases.

49. Raha Hafa, tanisao

FIOMPIANA

50. Miopy ve ny tokantrano misy anao?

1. Eny 2. Tsia

Raha eny, firy ny biby fiopy anananao ?

51. Omby
52. Osy
53. Ondry
54. Vorotsiloza
55. Akoho
56. Gana
57. Kisoa
58. Hafa

Iza avy no tompon'andraikitra amin'ny fikarakarana ireo biby ireo?

	1	2	3	4	5
59. omby1	<input type="radio"/>				
60. osy1	<input type="radio"/>				
61. Ondry1	<input type="radio"/>				
62. Vorotsiloza1	<input type="radio"/>				
63. Akoho1	<input type="radio"/>				
64. Gana1	<input type="radio"/>				
65. Kisoa1	<input type="radio"/>				
66. Hafa7	<input type="radio"/>				

Ray (1), Reny (2), Ray sy reny (3), Ankizy (4), Ny rehetra (5).

67. Nanao ahoana ny vokatrin'ny fiompiana tamin'ity taom-piompiana ity.

1. Tena tsara 2. Tsara 3. Antonony
 4. Ratsy 5. Tena ratsy

68. Raha ANTONONY na RATSY na TENA RATSY, inona no antony?

SECURITE ALIMENTAIRE

69. Impiry isan'andro ianareo no nisakafo nandritra ity herinandro ity?

1. Tsy nihinana 2. In-1 3. In-2
 4. In-3 5. >3

70. Raha latsakin'ny in-3, inona no antony?

1. Tsy misy ny vokatry ny fambolena
 2. Tsy ampy ny vokatry ny fambolena
 3. Tsy manam-bola hividianana sakafo
 4. Tsy ampy ny fidiram-bola ahafahana mividy sakafo
 5. Lany ny tahirimbokatra
 6. Tsy misy ny tahirim-bokatra
 7. Tsy misy zavatra ho vidiana
 8. Tsy mamokatra intsony ny tany
 9. Tsy manam-bola hividianana sakafo
 10. Tsy misy rano handrahoana sakafo
 11. Hafa

Vous pouvez cocher plusieurs cases.

71. Raha hafa lazao?

72. Nahampy anareo firy volana ny vokatrin'ny asa fambolena na ny asa fivelomanareo tamin'ity taona ity?

1. <1 volana 2. 1 volana 3. 1-2 volana
 4. 3-4 volana 5. >5 volana

73. Volana inona avy no maitso ahitra aty aminareo ka sarotra ny resaka ara-tsakafo?

1. Janv 2. Févr 3. Mars 4. Avr
 5. Mai 6. Juin 7. Juil 8. Aout
 9. Sept 10. Oct 11. Nov 12. Déc

Vous pouvez cocher plusieurs cases.

Inona avy ireo karazana sakafo nohaninareo tao antokantrano tamin'ny herinandro lasa teo?

- | | |
|--|---|
| | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 74. Mofo-sakafo vita @ apemba, vary na tsako? | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 75. Ovy- balahazo- ovy ala, na zavatra mamody hafa? | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 76. Taboara, karaoty, bageda, misy vitamine A mavo anatin'ny? | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 77. Ravintraka maitso toy ny ravikaza, ravibageda, ravintsaojio, anamamy ? | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 78. Legioma hafa? | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 79. Manga, papaye, voankazo misy vitamine A | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 80. Voankazo hafa ? | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 81. Ombikena (foie, rognon...) ? | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 82. Hena omby , lambo , ondry osy, vorona, akoho, ? | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 83. atody ? | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 84. Fia maina na lena miaraka amin'ny crustacée? | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 85. tsaramaso, lentille, antake, lojo, voanemba, voanjobory.. ? | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 86. Vokatra ronono, habobo... ? | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 87. Menaka , dobera, ? | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 88. Siramamy sy tantely ? | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 89. Autres aliments tels que condiments, kafe sy dite ? | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> |

Sakafo voalohany (1), Gouter (2), Sakafo faharoa (3), Gouter (4), Sakafo fahatelo (5), Fanampiny (6).

WASH

Aiza no hakanareo rano?

- | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 90. Sakafo | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 91. Fisotro | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 92. Hidiovana | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Vovo misarona (1), Vovo tsy misarona (2), Rano mandeha (3), Paompy (4), Loharano (5), Kalesy mpanatitra rano (6), Hafa (7).

93. Raha Hafa SAKAFO, tanisao1

94. Raha Hafa FISOTRO, tanisao

95. Raha Hafa FISASANA, tanisao

96. Inona ny fitaovana hitehirizanao rano ao antokantrano?

1. Bidon/Jericane 2. Seau misarona
 3. Seau tsy misarona 4. Barika
 5. Hafa

Vous pouvez cocher plusieurs cases.

97. Raha Hafa, tanisao

98. Mampihatra fanadiovana rano ve ianareo ao an-tokantrano?

1. Eny 2. Tsia

99. Raha eny, inona no fomba ataonao anadiovana rano?

1. Asiana sur'eau 2. Fampiasana produit hafa
 3. Ampangotrahana 4. Tatavanina
 5. Atapy @ masoandro 6. Tsy mahafantatra

Vous pouvez cocher plusieurs cases.

La question n'est pertinente que si Fomba fikajiana2 = "Mitokana"

100. Raha tsia, Hazavao ny antony tsy hampiasanao io ventikevitra io tsy hanadiovanao rano?

1. Efa madio ny rano
 2. Tsy ilaina diovina
 3. Efa nahazatra
 4. Tsy afaka mandray fanampihankevitra irery
 5. Lavitra
 6. Tsy manana fitaovana
 7. Tsy nisy nilaza
 8. Hafa

Vous pouvez cocher plusieurs cases.

La question n'est pertinente que si Fomba fikajiana2 = "Itambarana"

101. Manadio ny fitehirizana rano ve ianareo ao antokantrano?

1. Eny 2. Tsia

102. Raha eny, impiry no manasa izany?

1. Isanandro 2. In-2 isan-kerinandro
 3. Isan-kerinandro 4. Isam-bolana
 5. In-2 isam-bolana

103. Raha TSIA, inona no antony

Firy litatra ny rano ampiasain'ny tokantranonareo isanandro?

104. Sakafa

105. Fisotro

106. Fisasana

107. Totaliny

Firy litatra amin'ireo no ampiasain'ny vavy?

108. Sakafa1

109. Fisotro1

110. Fisasana1

111. Totaliny1

HYGIENE

112. Araka ny fahafantaranao, inona avy ireo fotoana tokony hanasana ny tanana ao an-tokantrano?

1. Alohan'ny hisakafo
 2. Avy mangery sy mamany
 3. Alohan'ny hampinono
 4. Rehefa avy miasa
 5. Rehefa avy mamitra na manolo zaza
 6. hafa

Vous pouvez cocher plusieurs cases.

113. Raha HAFA, tanisao

114. Mampihatra ny fanasana ny tanana ve ianareo ao an-tokantrano?

1. Eny 2. Tsia

115. Raha tsia, Hazavao ny antony tsy hanasanareo tanana?

1. Tsy misy rano 2. Voafetra ny rano laniana
 3. Sarodrano 4. Tsy nisy nilaza
 5. Hafa

Vous pouvez cocher plusieurs cases.

116. Raha HAFA, tanisao

117. Mampiasa lavapinga/gabone ve ianareo rehefa anao maloto?

1. Eny 2. Tsia

118. Raha eny, kabone otran'ny ahoana no ampiasanareo?

1. Mitokana 2. Itambarana

119. Raha TSIA, aiza ianareo no manao ny filanareo?

1. Eny amoron-drano
 2. Any anaty ala
 3. Eny antokontany
 4. Eny rehetra eny
 5. eny amin'ny toerana voatokana ao an-tanàna

PROJET OFDA 3
DISTRICT D'AMBOVOMBE
Laza consulting
Novembre 2016

POINTS/QUESTIONS D'EVALUATION A TRAITER DANS LES ENTRETIENS EN FOCUS GROUP

1. SITUATION DE L'INSECURITE ALIMENTAIRE DANS LES MENAGES

Mode d'alimentation – mode de survie – impact sur la vie de la communauté - impact sur la scolarité des enfants

2. AVIS SUR STRUCTURE AGRAIRE ADAPTEE FACE AU CHANGEMENT CLIMATIQUE

Agriculture pluviale ? Quelles cultures vivrières ? Groupes agricoles ? Potager individuel ?

Types d'élevage ? Responsabilités dans la gestion des cheptels ? Problèmes rencontrés ? Solution envisageable ?

Système d'épargne communautaire ? Accès aux crédits ? Situation des femmes ?

3. SITUATION/PARTICIPATION DES FILLES ET FEMMES (CHEFS DE MENAGE) DANS LA POSSESSION DE BIENS FONCIERS, DANS LA PRODUCTION ET DANS L'ACCES A L'INFORMATION

Pouvoir des femmes dans la prise de décisions concernant la gestion des cultures, l'accès à la terre et les biens de production ?

De quoi disposent les femmes sur les terres ?

4. ACCES A L'EAU ET L'HYGIENE

Quel type d'infrastructures d'approvisionnement en eau ?

Rôle et responsabilités des membres du ménages dans la collecte – gestion et utilisation de l'eau

Comités de gestion de l'eau

Mécanisme de stockage et d'utilisation des eaux dans les ménages ?

5. ACCES AUX SERVICES DE BASE

Installations sanitaires

Education à l'Hygiène

Services SHR

EVALUATION THEMES/ISSUES TO ADDRESS IN THE FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEWS

1. HOUSEHOLDS' FOOD INSECURITY SITUATION

Feeding mode – survival mode – impact on community life – impact on children's schooling

2. OPINION ON AGRARIAN STRUCTURE ADAPTED TO CLIMATE CHANGE

Rain-fed agriculture? What food crops? Agricultural groups? Individual garden?

Livestock type? Responsibilities in managing herds? Problems faced? Possible solution?

Community savings system? Access to credit? Women's situation?

3. GIRLS AND WOMEN'S (HOUSEHOLD LEADERS) SITUATION/PARTICIPATION IN TERMS OF LAND PROPERTY OWNERSHIP, OF PRODUCTION AND ACCESS TO INFORMATION

Women's decision-making power as regards crop management, access to land and productive assets?

What do women have on the land?

4. ACCESS TO WATER AND HYGIENE

What type of water supply infrastructure?

Household members' roles and responsibilities in water collection – management and utilization

Water management committees

Water storage and utilization mechanisms in households?

5. ACCESS TO BASIC SERVICES

Sanitation facilities

Hygiene education

SRH services