

Attention: This form must be completed for each PP evaluation and submitted together with the evaluation report.

FOR THE EVALUATION MANAGER AND ADA PPM TO FILL IN (Part 1)							FOR THE EVALUATOR/S TO FILL IN (Part 2)					
ADA PP Number	ADA Organizational Unit managing the PP	PP Title	CRS Code/s	Country/Region of PP	Evaluation Manager	Project Budget	Evaluation company/evaluator	Timing of evaluation	Completion date of evaluation (xx/xx/xxxx)	Assessment of results - key aspects	Score (choose only one answer for each aspect assessed)	Justify score. Include finding and reference page/s in evaluation report.
2074-00/2019	L&R	Increasing Food and Nutrition Security for Women in the District of Sofala Province, Mozambique	31120-agricultural development	Mozambique		3,800,000	Forcier Consulting	end-term	24/10/2023	1. The extent to which the planned output/s (as defined in the project document/logframe/Theory of Change) has/have been achieved taking into account the causal link between inputs and outputs.	L (Largely achieved)	<p>Based on the project theory of change and project logframe, the following justifies the a scoring of results at output levels:</p> <p>1. The first food distributions took place in December 2020 and the last in April 2023, a month prior to the project's evaluation. The project aimed at reaching 1500 households (Total of 8492 individuals) with the food distributions and this target was 100% achieved (see Evaluation Report page 31). Despite successful implementation, heavy rains affected quality of food and beneficiaries considered the quantities of the food basket not enough for an entire month.</p> <p>2. Intervention communities were assisted with household and community assets. The intervention group had a higher mean harvest than the control group for mostly vegetables and legumes that provide micronutrients and protein for the households. Nonetheless, there is a relatively low success rate in growing the orange fleshed sweet potato within intervention locations. (see Evaluation Report page 32)</p> <p>3. The introduction of hermetic bags and solar dryers, alongside the associated PHL training, has been well-received, with stakeholders, including female beneficiaries, acknowledging their significant role in enhancing food preservation techniques and potentially elevating household food security and women's economic empowerment (See Finding 2).</p> <p>4. There is increased awareness and knowledge on SRH, prevention of polygamy, early marriages, and WASH, reaching even beyond the primary audience. (see Finding 3)</p>
										2. The extent to which the planned outcome/s (as defined in the project document/logframe/Theory of Change) has/have been achieved taking into account the causal link between outputs and outcomes.	L (Largely achieved)	<p>The GTNS project has had a positive impact on enhancing dietary quality and micronutrient adequacy in the intervention villages, notably influencing an improvement in the food consumption scores and augmenting households' dietary diversity and nutrient intake when compared to control villages. However, coping strategies did not significantly differ between the two groups, except in the context of crisis coping, highlighting the effectiveness of the interventions in improving nutrition and food security outcomes in the targeted villages (Finding 1). These findings are reinforced by the beneficiaries' perspectives, particularly from discussions with women in focus group sessions. These beneficiaries have reported a notable shift in their dietary habits. This change is attributed to the increased diversity of foods they now consume, a transformation driven by enhanced agricultural productivity, particularly in horticulture. This surge in productivity is a result of the project's support, which encompasses the provision of agricultural inputs, the adoption of improved agricultural and cooking techniques, sustained by knowledge regarding the significance of dietary variety.</p> <p>The overwhelming majority of intervention households had received both PHL training and hermetic bags demonstrations. But despite this, intervention villages experienced a higher rate of PHL. 32.1 percent compared to 28.1 percent in control villages (P-value: <0.05), suggesting that additional time may be needed for the integration of technologies such as hermetic bags and solar dryers to begin making a difference at outcomes levels in terms of reducing PHL rates (Finding 2), Page 44-Page 49</p> <p>Despite the perceived improvement in health and SRH services usage in the intervention group as noted by the implementers, the actual data indicates only moderate improvements. The minor disparities between the intervention and control groups in terms of seeking health advice for children might be a result of pre-existing or concurrent health sector initiatives, not solely the GTNS project interventions.</p> <p>A considerable proportion of women, both in the intervention and control groups, exhibited a concerning level of acceptance towards violence in various situations, indicating deeply entrenched gender inequality in both groups. Surprisingly, the acceptance rate was higher in the intervention group compared to the control group across all the scenarios presented, signaling that transformative change in gender dynamics is a gradual process and has not been significantly impacted by the interventions in the intervention group within the timeframe of the study. (Finding 5)</p> <p>The young people were not fully engaged in the GTNS project, as evidenced by the minor discrepancies in nutrition practice</p>
										3. The extent to which the PP contributed to the objectives at impact level (as defined in the project document/logframe/ToC).	P (Partly achieved)	<p>Overall, the project had positive impacts and introduced beneficial new activities, but there is need for better coordination and longer timeframes to foster significant changes in decision-making dynamics and preventing marriages and polygamy (Finding 10)</p> <p>The GTNS project has made significant efforts and achieved some progress in improving child nutrition outcomes but has encountered persistent challenges in reducing stunting and wasting levels among children under five years old due to entrenched societal, economic, and environmental factors (Finding 11)</p> <p>The project laid solid sustainability groundwork through extensive capacity building in the community, fostering a strong awareness of the importance of gender transformative approach to addressing malnutrition. Challenges remain in resistance to change among specific demographic groups (like adolescents) and more time required to effect irreversible change in social and gender norms (Finding 13)</p>
										4. The extent to which the outputs, outcomes and impact achieved contributed to results related to the relevant cross-cutting issues. Please add a justification for each relevant cross-cutting issue.	L (Largely achieved)	<p>Gender: GTNS is targeting women in the planned interventions, includes women in the consultation processes, data in the progress reports, analysis has been disaggregated by gender, data collected from the beneficiaries are also disaggregated by gender.</p> <p>Social inclusion: GTNS is including in its activities and consultation processes vulnerable groups in order to better address their needs, although the participation of adolescents was limited.</p> <p>Environment: Whenever applicable GTNS is considering environment protection standards particularly in the food for assets interventions such as promotion of fuel efficient stoves. Output 1.1 focuses on establishment of gender and nutrition-sensitive assets at community and household level to increase access to a diverse variety of foods, including animal-source proteins, and to contribute to climate risk management (Annex 8, Project logical framework). The asset activities aimed at contributing to disaster risk reduction (focus on community assets) and climate adaptation (focus on the homestead). For example, sweet potato was considered to be a good approach to mitigate the effects to climate change (Evaluation report page 61). Again, the FFA component was geared towards climate-resilient agriculture, as well as technology to minimize post-harvest losses. Part of the stakeholders (WFP and the donor, pathfinder, CEFA government partners) recognize that there are gaps that should be addressed in the provision of some of the assets to respond to climate change (Evaluation findings page 70)</p>

