ACA - Asia & Central Asia

Implementation of the European Union Delegation to Pakistan's 2019-2020 Projects Evaluation Plan

Final evaluation: Improved Land Tenancy in Sindh

EuropeAid/140026/DH/SER/PK/1

SERVICE CONTRACT: ACA/2019/409-077 & ACA/2019/409-102

FINAL REPORT

Prepared by:
Koen Versavel, Jorge Vivar, Mohammad Afzal Khan, Daud Khan

February 2020

The project is financed by the European Union

The project is implemented by IBF International Consulting led Consortium

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AESA	Agro Eco System Analysis
AWD	Alternative wet-dry
CDLD	Community Driven Local Development
CO	Community Organization
CO2	Carbon dioxide
CSA	Climate Smart Agriculture
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DCO	District Coordination Officers
DCC	District Coordination
DEX	Direct Execution
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
EU	European Union
EUD	European Union Delegation
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FFS	Farmer Field School
FIES	Food Insecurity Experience Scale
FO	Farmers Organization
FYM	Farm Yard Manure
GCF	Green Climate Fund
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
GPS	Global Positioning System
HBW	Home-based workers
IEC	Information, Education and Communication
ILTS	Improved Land Tenancy in Sindh
ITC	International Trade Centre
LLL	Laser Land Levelling
LTA	Land Tenancy Agreement
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
N/A	Not available
NEX	National Execution
NGO	Non-governmental organization
NIM	National Implementation
NRM	National Resources Management
MIP	Multi-Annual Indicative Programme
OO	Overall objective
P&DB	Planning and Development Board
P&DD	Planning and Development Department
PCRWR	Oakistan Council for Research on Water Resources
PHM	Post-harvest management
PID	Provincial Irrigation Department
PMG	Producer Marketing Groups
PO	Peasants Organization
PSC	Programme Steering Committee
PPRP	Peoples' Poverty Reduction Programme

ROM	Results Oriented Monitoring
RSP	Rural Support Programme
SIDA	Sindh Irrigatioin and Drainage Authority
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Time-Bound
SME	Small and Medium Enterprises
SO	Specific Objective
SOLA	Solutions for Open Land Administration
STA	Sindh Tenancy Act
SUCCESS	Sindh Union Council and Community Economic Strengthening Support
ToT	Training of Trainers
UN	United Nations
VGGT	Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the context of National Food Security
VGRC	Village Grievance redressal Committee
WOS	Women Open Schools
WUA	Water Users Association

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Relevance

The Action responds to the needs of the target groups and end beneficiaries. It is in line with the Pakistan 2020-2025 One Nation-One Vision strategy, designed by the Ministry of Planning, Development and Reform, and with the EU-Pakistan Multi-Annual Indicative Programme (MIP) 2014-2020. The project contributes to Sustainable Development Goal 1 (No Poverty), 2 (Zero Hunger), 10 (No Inequality) and 13 (Climate Action). FAO's implementation approach is based on the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (VGGT), elaborated by FAO (2012). These guidelines establish the basic principles, internationally accepted standards and practices for the good governance of tenure of land, forests and fisheries. The Action is also in support of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Peasants and Other People Working in Rural Areas, adopted by the Human Rights Council on 28 September 2018. The final beneficiaries (12,600 households in 80 villages) are Haris and landlords in eight districts of Sindh Province. The three main areas of intervention present clear needs in the field of the strategic framework, land tenancy agreements, and in terms of poverty reduction through increased productivity.

The Action is adapted to the present institutional and human capacities of the partner government and other key stakeholders. A certain level of capacity was already present in the target districts and villages as other previous projects have been executed in the area in the area of the ILTS intervention. The Action was adapted to build on top of that capacity (the Rural Support Programme (RSP) programme i.e. Sindh Union Council and Community Economic Strengthening Support (SUCCESS) and Peoples' Poverty Reduction Programme (PPRP). The social capital (community and village organisations) was used by ILTS. FAO did not conduct a capacity assessment of these structures in the beginning of the project but instead carried out assessment studies, the most important one conducted by the Sindh Agriculture University. One of the main findings related to the capacity in the field is that the community and village level organizations are not properly organized and registered, whereas Local Support Organizations are well organized at Union Council level. The recommendation in the assessment is to build capacity of the present organizations and strengthen their institutional capacity. Thus, FAO has worked on those aspects. We have observed in the field the formal structure of the organizations Village Grievance Redressal Committees (VGRC), how they are used to conduct regular meetings and keep records of those meetings /disputes they encountered and resolved. The FFS/WOS have further firmed up during the whole process of engagement with FAO. The evaluation team finds that the capacity of local organizations, while indeed and as can be expected far from perfect, nevertheless allowed for well-informed exchanges on ILTS intervention topics. FAO has used a capacity development strategy that according to the statistics that the evaluation team could peruse has resulted in increased productivity, which demonstrates that the Action is adapted to the present human capacities of the Haris. Adaptation to the financial capacities, in particular the Haris, is not necessarily acquired. The increased productivity and income may be construed as an improvement, but they are still poor and often lack the required financial capacity to invest their share or even pay equitably for the use of machinery. The knowledge transfer is relevant but other core elements require to be addressed, such as the availability of capital to finance inputs, equipment and works. The ILTS project will address these issues in the remaining implementation time frame, namely with a micro-finance approach.

Commitment and ownership is quite variable. Still, the project is trying something quite bold with a small amount of money. The idea of promoting institutional change (written agreements and VGCs) by economic incentive (training) is a laudable one, and a kind of revolution by stealth. The fact that this is going ahead, even in a small group (small landlords in 8 districts) is noteworthy. For many decades the land tenancy issue has been intractable because of a cultural, political and historical context. We now see two major developments: the production by FAO of a "Strategy to Mainstream the Principles and Practices of Responsible Governance of Tenure in Legislation, Administration and Policies of the Land Sector in Sindh Province" in October 2019 and a decision of the High Court of Sindh Circuit Court at Hyderabad, ordering the Government of Sindh to take remedial action and amend the Sindh Tenancy Act. While none of these two will produce immediate results, they are very encouraging signs of a certain commitment to change that did not exist not so long ago. FAO will focus during the

remainder of project implementation, in this field, on (a) looking for finding champions for change at different levels on the political front, raise awareness, and sensitize them on the VGGT strategy paper and advocate on its 22 recommended actions (b) continue its engagement with policy makers (c) advocacy on said reforms.
In the field, ownership to the project's ambitions varies hugely, with minimal buy-in at the political level and the big landlords; acceptance at the Planning and Development Board, Government of Sindh; positive attitude at district administration level; big landlords displaying a negative attitude; and small and medium landlords as well as Haris very committed.

The evaluation team experienced significant difficulties obtaining workable, reliable data. This finds its causes in management issues and a sub-standard monitoring function but also in a faulty logical framework. FAO developed a new log frame on the basis of recommendations made in a March 2019 ROM Report, had it approved by its headquarters 6 months later and never submitted it to the EUD for approval. This new version still has considerable flaws: the overall and specific objectives were altered; in most instances, the technical wording of the indicators is incorrect; several indicators combine elements that ought to be treated separately, as their relevance is not identical or their measurement different. For the remaining time frame, it will be beneficial to have a log frame agreed on that satisfies the EU standards re: results framework, even if this comes late in the implementation time frame. The evaluation team does not design a new log frame. This is for FAO to do on the basis of our observations and recommendations. At present the project is sitting on raw data that is mostly overlooked which could be used to guide the development of complementary indicators to guide the project and to validate its approach and methodologies. The project needs to steer away from activity driven execution to exploring the effects of all its inputs that could provide an insight on the impact, and this can be done using a new set of indicators.

Efficiency

The implementation mechanisms are largely fine, in as far as the management structure and contractual arrangements is concerned. FAO has adopted the direct execution modality for ILTS. The standard modality for carrying out FAO's technical cooperation activities worldwide is Direct Execution (DEX) by FAO. However, within the context of UN reforms FAO is committed to moving towards national execution by the Government to the extent possible. The reason why FAO has opted for direct implementation is the sensitivity of land tenancy in Sindh, capacity issues and above all the observation that most of the feudal lords are part of the political elite, i.e. Government and its provincial departments. The direct execution translates into a simple structure with the country office in Islamabad, where a programme manager maintains oversight and the resident representative and her deputy are fully knowledgeable of the project; a provincial office in Karachi, which is not project-specific and is only used as a logistical back-up; a local office in Hyderabad with one project manager, a monitoring and evaluation officer, a financial officer, two agronomists and sixteen social mobilizers. The human resources at Hyderabad and district levels are overburdened because of the large geographic coverage and the low number of staff.

At the time of the mid-term evaluation, only one programme steering committee meeting has taken place. FAO has convened more meetings but availability of key stakeholders was not guaranteed. In the sensitive context and given the disagreements between FAO and EUD about the project's effectiveness, the frequency of the meetings is well below what is required.

Civil society is not involved to the biggest extent possible. There is space and willingness on behalf of civil society to be incorporated more into the social mobilization network. Input form civil society is foreseen in the strategic framework that was produced under Result 1. Such inclusive approach will be beneficial for the sustainability of the Action.

In strategic terms, the resources provided for ILTS do not fully correspond to the needs of action. This is evident from the field observation that there are areas which requires investments : water infrastructure Improvement , quality inputs (seed quality has been reported by beneficiaries to be problematic), technological innovations for land use planning, climate smart technologies to address the soil salinity issues, water scarcity, soil erosion, lack of credit for inputs and machinery, poor marketing channels with middle-men and contractors taking large margins, and limited facilities for storage of perishable crops and dairy products. ILTS cannot cover all those equally important issues that form all together an integral part of a solution of the agricultural issues Sindh Province is facing. Furthermore, the inputs are only for demonstration of improved practices and technologies, whereas

investment in strategic areas is also required for the creation of models for replications both at policy and operational level. If the productivity that has been demonstrated in the economic analysis (see section on effectiveness) continues to be significantly higher than in farming plots that do not benefit from the Action, there is a good potential for the project to constitute value for money. However, all results must be considered tentative at this stage and to be corroborated at the time of the impact evaluation.

There are significant delays. The project was due to start in January 2017 and the necessary arrangements had been made to get the project approved from the provincial Government of Sindh. However, it took over seven months to get the project's approval despite the support provided by the Planning and Development Department. The sensitive nature of the project and its potential implications on the longstanding relationships between peasants and landlords and impact on the traditional socio-economic fabric of the rural population are the main issues that prevented a swift approval by the relevant government authorities.
After seven months the project's approval was granted by the Sindh Chief Minister culminating in a ceremony held 12 months after the planned start date. The above factors resulted in a backlog of delays which prevented the project from achieving the targets as per the original work plan. As a result, project activities have been planned according to the number of remaining months, and applied some corrective measures. After this delay the project has been implemented without further major time scale setbacks.
FAO has calculated that a one year no-cost extension (which corresponds to the incurred delay) will allow them to achieve the objectives.

It is only partly possible to submit an informed opinion on the cost-efficiency. FAO has not provided a full financial report that incorporates headquarters and field expenditure; instead, a table with locally incurred expenses has been provided with an accounting that was closed on December 31st, 2019. As to the cost-efficiency of the local expenditure, we note that the expenditure has been budgeted mostly per activity. This carries the risk of double-charging or multiple-charging. It is often impossible to know how expenditure has been incurred with the financial information that was provided by FAO. Several large budget lines are not detailed. Out of a budget of local expenditure of 2,419,055 €, there is 1,033,570 € as non-itemized unverifiable budgeting, topped up with 120,400 € un-earmarked fee days. In conclusion, the evaluation team is not properly informed on the state of expenditure on the following grounds: (a) the data came in full two weeks after the end of the field phase and after a number of back and forth between the evaluation team and the implementing agency ; (b) they are incomplete, since headquarters expenditure is not accounted for (almost 50% of the budget) ; (c) half of the expenditure is overly generically presented and does not allow for itemized verification ; the timing of the submission of the partial financial report way after the evaluation field phase. Under normal circumstances an evaluation mission has a full financial report available before the start of the field phase, so that specific punctual verifications can be made on the spot, without trespassing into the territory of a financial audit. The lack of timely available financial data has prevented the evaluators from carrying out this critical aspect of the evaluation.

As a result, commissioning a study into the financial data is highly desirable. This is most significant and relevant from the perspective of the very essence of this project. The financial inputs are key to a proper understanding of the value for money. If the question is asked whether it is worth investing 4 million € into land tenancy and increasing productivity, and this question is linked to very specific financial data that are not readily available to the same extent that fundamental data are not available in the mainstream monitoring system of the project, then the implementing agency fails to demonstrate the value for money and it becomes acceptable if not imperative to delegate that responsibility to external expertise. A

The monitoring function is severely deficient. The absence of data has constituted a major challenge for the evaluation team. The majority of data has been produced after the end of the evaluation field phase. The ILTS project lacks the qualities that are required to fully justify/validate its methodology and technical approach to improve governance of land in Sindh province. FAO is an experienced implementer of projects in the socio-agricultural sectors, and an institutionalized system for the above, or a tailor-made one, should have been set up from the get-go. It is understood that the ILTS project also faced some problems with its first M&E expert. Nevertheless, currently there is only one person in charge of the M&E system spending approximately 50% of her time on the field. The M&E requirements for this project are demanding and understaffing this area has been a key obstacle to prevent the evaluation team to be able to obtain all the data required for its analysis, something that

should have been part of the information already analysed or semi analysed and awaiting for the evaluation exercise. Moreover, the M&E team should have suggested appropriate changes to the logical framework matrix (LFM) prior to any outside evaluation having taken place, as it became apparent during this evaluation exercise that its own M&E duties could not be fulfilled with the present log frame. Improvement of the M&E function will not only come from investing in human resources but also by increasing resourcefulness and extending responsibilities to non-M&E personnel in the field all the way down to decentralising data gathering to the final beneficiaries. An appropriate and simple data gathering system from the very bottom up is required to feed the data that is required to analyse the effective progress or lack of progress allowing for a rapid and timely response mechanism. Such a grass roots data system has not been institutionalized. Also field staff appeared not to have instructions to collect vital information for project management. Local government officials are aware of the project, representing a satisfactory level of ownership, but their role in M&E was not evident. Local civil society organizations' role in the monitoring was also not evident at this stage.

Effectiveness

The Village Grievance Redressal Committees (VGRCs) are still in their inchoative state, due to the delays that were incurred. 60 committees have been formed, whereas 80 is the target. Each committee is composed of three Haris and two landlords. The speed of resolution is very high, often within one day. The VGRC mediation option is faster and easier than the Panchayat. The number of cases so far is quite low. As per the statistics provided by FAO, 37 cases have been brought to VGRCs and an all have been resolved. Interestingly, all cases so far address Hari-Hari conflicts. It was the initial intention (or assumption), at the time of project formulation, that the committees would be addressing Hari-landlord issues. So far, that has not happened. The reason is most likely that the committees are not yet fully institutionalized and not all of them are set up. Possibly, the composition of the committees plays a role as well: landlords may not be as keen as Haris to bring a case to a VGRC given that the majority of members of the committees are Haris.

By October 2019, some 5,800 famers spread over the eight districts have been trained on use of improved techniques ranging from land preparation to post harvest handling; of these 1,550 have also signed tenancy agreements. Training is provided through Farmer Field School (FFS) and Women Open Schools (WOS) which run through the cropping season. In order to design the curricula of the FFS/WOS, participatory rural appraisal were conducted; and meetings and focus group discussions were held with farming communities, community-based organizations, farmers groups and village organizations. The analytical work was followed by FFS design workshops. The main techniques currently being promoted by the Project through the FFA/WOS are: Laser Land Levelling (LLL); Alternate Wet and Dry (AWD) Rice cultivation; Direct Seeded Rice; Zero Tillage; Raised Bed Cultivation; Zero Tillage; Management of Farm Yard Manure (FYM); Multiple Cropping; and Agro-Forestry. Line sowing is promoted for rice and integrated pest management for all crops. Demonstration plots are an integral part of the FFS/WOS training methodology as they allow participating farmers to physically observe the impact of different techniques being promoted. Such demonstration plots, typically one acre each, have been established at each FFS/WOS in all eight districts.

An Economic Analysis study, issued in October 2019, shows that yields, revenues and profits are substantially higher among Haris who were Project beneficiaries, as opposed to those Haris who did not participate in the Project. Discussions and field visits by the Evaluation Team confirm the adoption of improved techniques and higher production and incomes.

There are also a number of other benefits to Haris who have signed agreements with landlords. These include land for kitchen gardening and for fodder for their animals; and written receipts for inputs purchased by the landlord which tends to make transactions more transparent. Other benefits of a two-year written agreement for the Hari stem from the fact that the family feels more secure, children tend to be sent to school; Haris are allowed to take occasional off-farm employment; and landlords more often provides shelter during times of disaster, transport to health facilities, and support to settle different issues, including those related to police matters.

Landlords also feel more secure with a written agreement. The Hari cannot leave arbitrarily in the middle of the cropping season, nor can he make complaints to the courts claiming to be a bonded labourer. Moreover, once they have signed a contract for two years, landlords are more willing for

Haris to participate in trainings, interact with others farmers and test innovations that might enhance productivity.

There is no overall assessment of how the project has impacted environmental sustainability and in particularly soil fertility. A number of technologies, such as use of Alternative Wet and Dry cultivation of rice and reduced burning of crop stubble, reduce emissions. Other techniques such as zero tillage, IPM, enhanced use of farmyard manure, planting of trees and hedgerows contribute to improving local soil and water quality.

The techniques promoted increase incomes of Haris by 20-40%. Despite these increases, Haris remain poor earning less than US$1 per day per person. In order to make a significant impact on poverty, farmers need to move to high value crops. Multiple cropping systems with mixed vegetable in the spring/Kharif period, and wheat/vegetables/oilseed/sugarcane systems in Rabi, can increase incomes of Haris by 200-300%, enhance employment and improve their nutrition. However, adoption of multiple cropping is slower than other techniques as it requires more labour, better planning and management, use of specific machinery and higher input costs.

Sustainability

The project has good potential for sustainability as it has carried out a participatory approach about the main areas of the project including the contents of the trainings, the design of the tenancy agreements and the components for the kitchen gardens. The FFS courses are built on easy to adopt techniques and for locally produced crops with locally sourced materials.

The knowledge transferred to the landlords, farmers/Haris is very likely to remain with them and continued to be used as it is in their interest to apply it as it provides them with the potential to increase their productivity and net profits. Similarly, with the kitchen gardens, the technologies are sustainable as well as the costs to keep the vegetable and fruit gardens functioning.

At a higher level, the project has managed to increase the governance that existed between Haris and landlords by providing a simple yet efficient template of a tenancy agreement. This, together with the knowledge gained, provides an incentive to work better and with increased results. The outcome is increased yields and net profits. This is a sustainable relationship as long as all the variables remain within a certain degree of change. The agreements will be tested in the months to come when an unexpected natural adversity hits the crops. Even though there are provisions for this, it remains to be seen how sturdy and well understood the agreement is to withstand important deviations.

Environmentally resilient crops have been adopted as well as other agricultural methods which are less harmful for the environment or even beneficial, providing the farmers not only with viable and more efficient crops but with a smaller agricultural environmental footprint and increased sustainability.

At the local level the project counts with the support of the local authorities and the agricultural extension departments. Members of the district authorities have been trained in order to provide with an increased medium-term sustainability base for an eventual wind down of the project.

The private sector is yet to be engaged and the farmers are also yet to learn how to collectively leverage on marketing their products, but if done and adopted successfully it has the potential to increase the sustainability of the project while contributing to the governance of the local agricultural base and increase the net earnings of the final beneficiaries.

The role of women is one of the main focuses of the project. Taking into consideration the adverse regional conservative characteristics of the area, the project has been able to bring women to play a prominent role in their local communities as members of the VGRC as well as providing the technical means for some to implement the kitchen gardens while simultaneously begin to tackle a grave undernutrition problem that afflicts particularly the Singh region.

2 CONTRACT REFERENCES

This mid-term evaluation covers the European Union Delegation Agreement FOOD/2016/381-388 between the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the European Union. This agreement entered into force on 15 December 2016. Final date for implementation is 31 July 2022. Implementation operational duration is 4 years.

The total cost of the Action is estimated at 4,188,400 €. The contracting authority has undertaken to provide an EU contribution up to a maximum of 4,000,000 €.

The mid-term review is part of the Implementation of the European Union Delegation to Pakistan's 2019-2020 Projects Evaluation Plan, governed by a service contract with IBF International Consulting SA entitled "Service contract for the European Union External Actions No ACA/2019/409-077 & ACA/2019/409-102.

3 PROJECT BACKGROUND

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), under its strategic objective to eliminate hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition, is implementing a European Union funded four-year project entitled "Improved Land Tenancy in Sindh" since March 2017. The aim of the project[1] is to "improve and formalise land tenancy, while restoring and protecting rural livelihoods, especially for women and vulnerable groups (dependent on traditional landholding and farming systems affected by droughts, floods, insecurity and malnutrition) by adhering and promoting the principles of Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (VGGT) in eight districts of Sindh province". The districts covered under this project include Dadu, Jamshoro, Larkana, Matiari, Mirpur Khas, Sujawal, Tando Allahyar and Tando Muhammad.

Sindh province has the highest incidence of absolute landlessness, the highest share of tenancy and lowest share of land ownership in the country. The governance of tenure ensuring secure access to land and water, in particular for female and male smallholder farmers, is considered a critical issue for inclusive, pro-poor agricultural development and improving food and nutrition security. Haris or landless farmers in Sindh usually have access to land as tenants through verbal agreements between them and the landlords. These farmers often end up as vulnerable "bonded" workers otherwise known as debt slavery. For effective compliance of tenancy agreements, the landowners, Haris, and district revenue officials need to be made aware of the respective legal obligations and penalties in case of non-compliance. This would require creating stakeholder awareness about compliance with the provisions of the Sindh Tenancy Act (STA) 1950, adoption of more formal, binding tenancy agreements, procedures for registration with the Revenue Department, and its interfacing with the revenue records maintained by the Sindh Revenue Board.

Haris are also reliant on landlords for any information on agricultural practices and technologies, usually outdated and unsustainable in the current agro-ecological context. The lack of fair share-cropping arrangements is one of the causes inhibiting the improvement of the traditional low productive farming practices.

Keeping in mind the failure of the Hari Committees to enforce formal agreements between landlords and Haris in the past, the introduction of seemingly benign informal agreements would be a socially acceptable approach, provided that both parties are made aware of their advantages. The Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (VGGT), coupled to improved agricultural productivity and better gender equality, are expected to improve tenure security for farmers. VGGT are a set of internationally accepted practice standards in tenure governance, which can guide decision-making and policy development regarding matters related to tenure security in the context of arrangements between landlords and Haris.

The Sindh Tenancy Act and its subsequent amendments (the most recent of which was 2008-2013) regulate the individual relationship between landowner and tenant and their sharecropping

[1] Project background as per FAO project description

arrangements and establish the rights and obligations of each party. The administrative regulations at the district level dictate how the different service providers should engage with them.

The landlords keep the accounts in a non-transparent manner; they often over-value inputs and under-value outputs. Tenure contracts tend to be oral, with a minimum contract period of one year. In this way, sharecroppers' extremely low literacy rate inhibits their control over any entities. Tenants fall into debt through advances they receive from the landlords in cash or in kind to meet costs of cultivation or to cover regular household consumption requirements. The expectation is that the account is settled at the time of the harvest, but in reality, the debt accumulates from one year to the next as the share of production is not enough to survive, let alone pay off their debts. The tenants are not allowed to leave their landlord unless they clear the accumulated debt, and therefore become bonded labour.

4 RELEVANCE

4.1 Does the action presently respond to the needs of the target groups / end beneficiaries?

The Action is in line with the Pakistan 2020-2025 One Nation-One Vision strategy, designed by the Ministry of Planning, Development and Reform (www.pakistan2025.org). It is the professed ambition to refresh the framework for national development to create a robust platform and to place Pakistan in the league of Upper Middle Income countries by 2025[2]. This strategy is a compilation of the consensus views of national and international stakeholders regarding the future direction of the country, setting out future goals and expectations, to be translated into a concrete road map and coherent strategy for balanced human, social, and economic development. It is meant to provide a conceptual platform for the revival of sustainable and inclusive growth, enabling the country to achieve international development goals within their respective time frames, including the Millennium Development Goals and any new goals to be endorsed by Pakistan in the international arena. [3] All Government responsibilities pertaining to rural development and related sectors, including agriculture, irrigation and livestock, have been devolved to the provinces under the 18th Amendment to the Constitution starting from mid-2011. [4] Specifically, the food security that is at the core of the FAO project is addressed in Pillar IV of the Vision 2025.

Pakistan Vision 2025 recognizes that sufficient, reliable, clean and cost-effective availability of energy, water and food is indispensable to ensure sustainable economic growth and development. Water and food are fundamental elements of food security, and the Vision 2025 acknowledges the gaps in these areas, while simultaneously making efforts to respond to the looming threat of climate change (which is another key aspect of the Improved Land Tenancy in Sindh Province (ILTS) FAO project). [5]

The objective is to reduce the food insecure population from 60% to 30%, and to improve efficiency of usage in agriculture (essential for food production and a major issue in Sindh Province, the implementation area of the Action) by 20%. [6]

The Action is also in line with the EU-Pakistan Multi-Annual Indicative Programme (MIP) 2014-2020. Rural development is the largest priority sector in this MIP. Specifically, the Action is relevant to specific objective 3 of the rural development sector i.e. the augmentation of the nutritional status of women and children in rural areas and households affected by severe under-nutrition; and to the expected result 4, reduction of undernutrition. The MIP promotes full integration of structurally poor and backward regions into the mainstream national development agenda of Pakistan by enhancing opportunities for economic growth and sustainable livelihoods in rural areas. The support aims at, inter

[2] Source : Pakistan2025 One Nation-One Vision, Executive Summary, p. 1, www.pc.gov.pk

[3] Source : ibid., p.3 (edited in relevant parts).

[4] Source : EU-Pakistan Multi-Annual Indicative Programme 2014-2020, p. 11.

[5] Source : ibid., p.9 (edited in relevant parts).

[6] Source : ibid., p. 14.

alia, improving resilience. [7]

The Action contributes to Sustainable Development Goal 1 (No Poverty), 2 (Zero Hunger), 10 (No Inequality) and 13 (Climate Action).

FAO's implementation approach is based on the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (VGGT), elaborated by FAO (2012). These guidelines establish the basic principles, internationally accepted standards and practices for the good governance of tenure of land, forests and fisheries.

The Action is also in support of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Peasants and Other People Working in Rural Areas, adopted by the Human Rights Council on 28 September 2018. This Declaration contains a large number of itemized specific rights, most of which are applicable on the Haris in Sindh province as target group of this Action.
The final beneficiaries (12,600 households in 80 villages) are Haris and landlords in eight districts of Sindh Province: Dadu, Jamshoro, Larkana, Matiari, Mirpur Khas, Tando Allah yar, Tando Muhammad Khan, and Sujawal.
The three main areas of intervention present clear needs.

(a) On the strategic framework : the 1950 Land Tenancy Act was outdated and needed to be updated in spite of some amendments (the most recent ones in 2009 and 2013); the wider context of the agricultural technical progress had to be incorporated into a new strategy that takes into account the shortcomings of the 1950 Act. For instance, the agriculture production process has transitioned from a labour intensive to semi-mechanized one; this is a ground reality that the STA does not reflect.
(b) The Land Tenancy Agreements (LTA), in this report further often referred to as "the contracts", aim to provide the following benefits: land security for up to two years; legal status of the contracts in a court of law; collateral for availing microfinance and other social safety nets; and the explicit definition of roles and responsibilities of landlord, Haris, and their share in overall output and inputs costs for the agriculture. Tenancy agreements between landlord and Haris are largely unwritten and essentially customary; this was exploited by the landlords both in terms of final output and in terms of secure tenancy rights of Haris. The sharing of expenditure of production cost was not being followed in letter and spirit: the estimated effective share of Haris in the gross margins should be 50%, but due to non-compliance of the provisions for sharing the costs, it ranges between 42.0% and 48.9% across various crops. Whether the LTA makes a difference in the field will be examined in the effectiveness section.
(c) In terms of poverty reduction: the Farmer Field Schools aim to increase productivity and an increase in income, which is a core and undisputed need of the target groups. The Sindh Agriculture Policy 2018-2030, approved by the Sindh Cabinet on April 16th, 2018, acknowledges that the agriculture in Sindh has not performed to its potential and that growth has mainly been the result of higher use of resources and inputs rather than higher productivity. The increase in productivity is precisely one of the core objectives of the Action. [8]

4.2 Is the action adapted to the present institutional, human, financial capacities of the partner government and/or other key stakeholder(s)?

A certain level of capacity was already present in the target districts and villages as other previous projects have been executed in the area in the area of the ILTS intervention. The Action was adapted to build on top of that capacity. FAO has followed the agreed lines with EUD and built the project implementation on gains achieved by the Rural Support Programme (RSP) programme i.e. Sindh Union Council and Community Economic Strengthening Support (SUCCESS) and Peoples' Poverty Reduction Programme (PPRP). The same villages were selected in consultation with SUCCESS, and the social capital (community and village organisations) was used by ILTS. The ILTS project focus

[7] Source : EU-Pakistan Multi-Annual Indicative Programme 2014-2020, p. 10.

[8] Source : Sindh Agriculture Policy 2018-2030, approved by Sindh Cabinet on 16/04/2018, p.4.

remained on sharecroppers/Haris and small and medium level landlords. ILTS is thus implemented in 80 villages where the EU funded SUCCESS and the Government of Sindh-funded PPRP were being implemented. Both programmes are based on the Rural Support Programme social mobilisation approach to Community Driven Local Development (CDLD). In this social context, the Action is building on other kinds of organisations, namely, the Farmers Field Schools (FFS), the Women Open Schools (WOS) and Village Grievance Redressal Committees (VGRC). The WOS are based on almost the same leadership created by the two RSP actions.

FAO did not conduct a capacity assessment of these structures in the beginning of the project but instead carried out assessment studies.

The first one was conducted by the Sindh Agriculture University in Tandojam (in the suburbs of Hyderabad), entitled "Assess Peasants Organizations', Farmers Organizations' and Community Organizations' Disaster Risk Reduction and Safety Nets Related to Food and Land". The main objective of the study was to do the gap analysis of existing farmer organizations and prepare recommendations for capacity building in the area of DRR in the context of food security and land. One of the main findings related to the capacity in the field – which is the topic of the evaluation question addressed here – is that the community and village level organizations are not properly organized and registered, whereas Local Support Organizations are well organized at Union Council level. Climate change, its effect and basic awareness of the organizations were subjects which the targeted organizations were not aware of. The study concludes that although alternative community organizations are available where there is representation of the peasants and small growers, and these organizations have plans in their agenda to work for the agricultural development in the area, they are, nevertheless, institutionally weak. The recommendation in the assessment is to build capacity of the present organizations and strengthen their institutional capacity. [9]

The second one, equally conducted by the Sindh Agriculture University in Tandojam, was entitled "Institutional assessment of Peasants Organizations, Farmers Organizations, Water Users Associations and Community Organizations". The overall purpose of the study was to conduct the institutional assessment of the existing community organizations (i.e. POs/FOs/WUAs, and if these organizations do not exist, then CO/VO/LSO), map their strengths, weaknesses and improvement areas in order to develop plans and strategies for future effective coordination and in implementing EU supported activities in target areas. The relevant finding is that "Women Community Institutions (CO/VO/LSOs) formed under the SUCCESS Programme- duly recognized and notified by district government- are working actively for integrated rural development, food security and natural resource management in collaboration with FAO formed farmer field schools (FFS), Women Open Schools (WOS) and Village Grievances Redressal Committees (VGRCs) in 80 villages of ILTS Project areas." [10]

Thus, FAO has worked on those aspects. We have observed in the field the formal structure of the organizations Village Grievance Redressal Committees (VGRC), how they are used to conduct regular meetings and keep records of those meetings /disputes they encountered and resolved. The FFS/WOS have further firmed up during the whole process of engagement with FAO. The evaluation team finds that the capacity of local organizations, while indeed and as can be expected far from perfect, nevertheless allowed for well-informed exchanges on ILTS intervention topics.

The target peasants and Haris under the ILTS are socially excluded and have limited capacities: often they are illiterate, and they lack knowledge of improved technologies and practices (particularly the improved agronomic aspects of soil management, production of different cross and climate change resilient technologies). FAO has used a capacity development strategy that according to the statistics that the evaluation team could peruse has resulted in increased productivity, which demonstrates that the Action is adapted to the present human capacities of the Haris. So far, the project has formed 232 Farmer Field Schools (FFS) for men and women in the targeted districts reaching 5800 farmers (2800 men and 3000 women). The FFSs and WOSs represented a laboratory where men and women's ideas, practices, difficulties and way forward were discussed, tested, modified and assessed in a participatory way. Indeed, as a result of the capacity building, evidence in the field suggests significant

[9] Source : Assess Peasants Organizations', Farmers Organizations' and Community Organizations' Disaster Risk Reduction and Safety Nets Related to Food and Land, June 2019, p.8-9.

[10] Source : Institutional assessment of Peasants Organizations, Farmers Organizations, Water Users Associations and Community Organizations, December 2019, p.8.

number of replications and upscaling by the farmers themselves. The targeted landlords, on their side, are investing in the newly-introduced practices as they experience an increase in crop productivity and in turn enhanced profit margins. In other words, the Haris are more skilful and implement the newly acquired knowledge in the field to increase their productivity and thereby their income, which in turn convinces the landlords to invest more resources.

Adaptation to the financial capacities, in particular the Haris, is not necessarily acquired. The increased productivity and income may be construed as an improvement, but they are still poor and often lack the required financial capacity to invest their share or even pay equitably for the use of machinery. The knowledge transfer is relevant but other core elements require to be addressed, such as the availability of capital to finance inputs, equipment and works. The ILTS project will address these issues in the remaining implementation time frame, namely with a micro-finance approach. The training provided by the project has helped Haris adopt a number of technologies which has increased incomes. A number of these technologies are already well known and were being applied by other farmers in the area. Moreover, related machinery and equipment are available. What the FFS has successfully done is help those Haris who have not so far adopted these technologies, make the change. This has been done by providing the step-by-step practical training and demonstration. Costs and returns are understood and landowners and Haris are willing to share cost, returns and risks. However, larger changes – such as the move to specialized vegetable production or multiple cropping – which would substantially change farm incomes and employment are still limited. Such changes require greater inputs, as well as stronger value chain/market linkages and, given price fluctuations, an enhanced capacity to bear risk.

The Action's institutional stakeholders at the level of Government of Sindh include:

(a) The Planning and Development Department (P&DD), which takes overall responsibility for overseeing the implementation of the action's interventions. The P&DD has overall responsibility for coordinating development efforts in the Province, including management of the budgets. The Project relates to a politically sensitive issue and is relatively small compared to other projects they handle; as a result, it has not received strong implementation support as evidenced by the low number of meetings between FAO and this Department.
(b) The District Revenue Departments under the Revenue Board. The District Revenue Department is one of the key Departments at local level dealing with issues related to revenue collection and land records. One of the key officials of the Department is the *Tapedar* who is responsible for keeping land records and for following land sales and purchases. The land records, maintained by the *Tapedar* should include the name of the Hari cultivating the land, who under the law, then acquires certain rights. However, in most cases this is not done and the landlord, with the *Tapedar's* agreement, declares himself as the cultivator.
(c) The District Agriculture and Livestock Offices. There are two key officials at District level representing the Departments of Agriculture Extension and of Livestock. The District level Deputy Directors work along with lower level staff responsible for field activities. Both Departments are generally weak due to limited human capacity, poor organizational skills, and lack of facilities such as transport and training materials for extension workers.
(d) District Irrigation and Forest Offices (Department of Irrigation and Power and of Forest). The Provincial Irrigation Department (PID) is one of the largest and most critical departments of the provincial Government with responsibility for 11 major canals with dense subsidiary networks, as well as of the drainage system. Another three canals and their networks are managed by the Sindh Irrigation and Drainage Authority (SIDA). Both PID and SIDA face a number of organizational challenges. There are continuous and ongoing efforts to improve their capacity given their key importance in the agriculture of the province, In contrast the Forestry and Wildlife Department is one of the smaller departments of the Government of Sindh. It focus tends to be mainly of management of rangelands, the limited forests in the province and of wildlife protection. They have few activities in the agriculture development in the project area.
(e) District Coordination Officers (DCOs). District Coordination Officers are the key administrative official at District level and have wide-ranging responsibility covering law and order, collection of revenue, developmental programs and coordination. The DCOs, who are recruited through a rigorous and competitive process, tend to be strong managers. However, their impact and effectiveness is much determined by the socio-political configuration in the areas under their jurisdiction.

4.3 Are all key stakeholders demonstrating effective commitment (ownership)?

The Sindh Tenancy Act was not amended to address big lacunas and problems (in spite of the 2008-2013 amendments). This is a cause of injustice for peasants in their relationship with landlords. Sindh's political, social and administrative structure is historically controlled by feudal and landlord families; thus, pro-peasant amendments in the laws were not possible. Therefore, in the past, all attempts made to improve the tenants' conditions through land reforms and redistribution have fallen short, mainly due to the lack of political will.

The High Court of Sindh Circuit Court at Hyderabad has ordered amendments to the STA in its landmark ruling CP.No.D-451 of 2016 (Ghulam Ali S/o. Kamal Khan Leghari Vs. Province of Sindh & others). 2016 is the year the case was brought to Court; the date of announcement is 1 October 2019. Amendments to the law shall be made within "*least* practicable period not exceeding four months". In its ruling, the High Court orders the Government (including the Chief Secretary, Commissioner, DCs, Board of Revenue, Acs, red.) to make necessary amendments in the Sindh Tenancy Act, 1950 so as to bring it in line with the Constitution of Islamic Republic of Pakistan, 1973, as well as with *peasant rights* detailed in the UN'S Declaration on the Rights of Peasants and Other People Working in Rural Areas, a resolution adopted by the Human Rights Council on 28 September 2018. [11]

The Court added, inter alia (in relevant part), that such a law should not only describe *rights* and *obligations* of *peasant* in respect of *lands* but should also include mechanisms to eliminate *discriminative behaviour* towards *Haris / peasants;* to *assure not mere guarantee of* fundamental rights *but* enjoyment thereof; *assure restrain on* sudden eviction as well *illegal* eviction (including compensation); *assure easy access to judicial system as well law enforcing agencies.* [12]

FAO's position is that "this decision will have long-lasting marks on the overall scenario of land ownership and tenancy rights and will change the whole picture of the tenancy fabric of Sindh" [13]

Implementation of this order will now constitute the next hurdle. In a first move, the Government of Sindh will now have to respond to the Court.

At the same time FAO has produced a "Strategy to Mainstream the Principles and Practices of Responsible Governance of Tenure in Legislation, Administration and Policies of the Land Sector in Sindh Province" in October 2019. The strategy has proposed following reform agenda:

(1) Laws[14] : amend the Sindh Tenancy Act 1950; amend the Sindh Land Revenue Act 1967 and Sindh Revenue Board Act 2010; amend the Land Acquisition Act 1894; and amend the Registration Act 1908. (2) Administration of laws and policies[15] : implement the Sindh Tenancy Act 1950; modernize the Registration Act 1908; expand communications with villagers; educate officials; promote greater coordination and transparency of government activities; ensure Women's Development Department more closely involved in land issues. (3) Policies[16]: consolidate existing policies on public land to create an over-arching policy ; expand and develop existing policies on information sharing, particularly spatial data, as the basis for more open access to information; develop a specific policy on women's access to land, particularly public land ; and ensure that land issues are adequately addressed in climate change and natural disaster policies.

[11] Source : High Court of Sindh Circuit Court, Hyderabad. CP.No.D-451 of 2016 (Ghulam Ali S/o. Kamal Khan Leghari Vs. Province of Sindh & others), p.65.

[12] Source : ibid., p.63.

[13] Source : email Mohsin Azam, 14 January 2020.

[14] Source : Strategy to Mainstream the Principles and Practices of Responsible Governance of Tenure in Legislation, Administration and Policies of the Land Sector in Sindh Province, p.15-21.

[15] Source : ibid., p.21-29.

[16] Source : ibid., p. 29-32.

FAO will focus during the remainder of project implementation, in this field, on (a) looking for finding champions for change at different levels on the political front, raise awareness, and sensitize them on the VGGT strategy paper and advocate on its 22 recommended actions (b) continue its engagement with policy makers (c) advocacy on said reforms.

While it is true that the STA is not adapted anymore to modern day society, there are very strong underlying currents that inhibit change. The problem is political and not one of merit and forcing change might backfire. One of these inhibiting factors is that the major stakeholder is the landlord; if he does not agree to change, then there will be no change in legislation, i.e. because many landlords are part of the political class. The reality in the field will be less easy than the delivery of a High Court Order (the deadline for governmental action having almost passed) and a Strategy Paper. Achieving change is very difficult in this highly sensitive area, and the evaluation team has found various hugely diverging levels of commitment:

- the additional Secretary in Karachi, Mr Skeikh Shakil Ahmed, confirmed that our meeting was only the third one that concerned this project, which is not a high frequency;
- At Karachi level, there is a discourse against NGOs who are accused of using Haris as their tool for their own interests, and they use the word "bonded labour", which in the eyes of the upper class is inaccurate: it should be called "share cropping". The Development, Planning and Development Board states that implementation on the 1952 Act could not be done due to political reasons and vested interests of the politicians in Sindh, who themselves are big landlords. Same views were expressed by the Additional Secretary (Technical) of Agriculture Department.
- on the whole, reform is politically very difficult to digest, the authorities in Karachi openly (and repeatedly) state
- This said, there is no opposition by authorities on signature of LTAs. FAO adopted a consultative approach in the preparation of informal tenancy agreements and involved government revenue and other key departments in the process to get their buy in endorsement;
- The Chairperson P&DB (Planning and Development Board), Government of Sindh, appreciated the initiative and termed it a good beginning for tenure security in the province. She has directed the revenue department to make the LTAs a regular feature in non-ILTS districts.
- the district administration's attitude is positive as observed in field exchanges
- when the landlords are asked about their assessment of FAO's project, they do not invoke the contract as primary advantage, but the increased productivity
- Big landlords have a largely negative opinion on Haris and claim there is no need for them anymore as agriculture has increasingly become more automated (less need for manual labour inputs) and the idea of sharing on equal parts the harvest profits with Haris is unfeasible to them. Some have inherited Haris' families as they have inherited the land from their parents and they only feel a moral obligation to keep "old, unproductive and unreliable" Haris on their land but reluctant to treat them as equal partners.
- small and medium landlords (i.e. the majority of landlords ILTS is working with) are committed because they are satisfied with higher productivity and a lower risk of seeing tenants/Haris abandon their fields (as a consequence of the LTA provisions)
- The members of the FFS and WOS display high positive involvement and engagement (both Haris and landlords); they are the most motivated to follow training and to implement the planned land governance measures.
- The Haris are very committed, mostly as a result of better yields and increased productivity and increased land security (up to two years as per the terms of most of[17] the LTA).

[17] The agreement can be amended to accommodate the needs of certain landlords and Haris. This particular clause has been amended in specific cases, with both parties agreeing to it, by shortening the period from 2 years to one harvest season.

4.4 Indicators

4.4.1 Are the indicators well defined and relevant to measure the achievement of the objectives?

A log frame is not merely a technical document with indicators that serve a monitoring and evaluation purpose but are an integral part of any management system. The indicators pertain to the fundamental substance of, in this instance, FAO's work. Progress (and indeed relevance of activities) can only be adequately measured and/or decided if project management precisely knows what the baseline, target and current value is. The evaluation team experienced significant difficulties obtaining workable, reliable data. It was not until the very last day of the field phase that FAO submitted a log frame with current values, whereas the evaluation had been announced in October and detailed evaluation questions had been shared through the inception report.

In the ROM Report that was made available in April 2019, extensive comments are provided on the log frame. The general sense of these comments was that the set of indicators does not suit the purpose of assessing the main results and related effectiveness, which could hamper the capacity of the action to demonstrate the overall feasibility of the intervention logic, and that there is room for improvement for indicators of any level of the log frame, particularly the ones related to land governance. The report adds that the indicators linked to the three results are missing or not sufficiently addressed, making it almost impossible to verify the validity of the intervention logic. [18]

The ROM Expert formulated a new set of indicators that in substance constituted a new logical framework in spite of this falling outside of the ROM mandate. The responsibility for the log frame lies with the implementing agency, which develops it – possibly with the assistance of external recommendations. FAO considered the indicators and developed a new log frame that was accepted by its headquarters in October 2019, six months after the ROM Review. This was not submitted to the EUD.

The assessment of progress in this evaluation therefore, naturally, follows the "old" logical framework, i.e. the only one that has been formally accepted as part of the contractually binding project documents through the Delegation Agreement between the EUD and FAO.

Still, the proposed indicators have severe flaws. For the remaining time frame, it will be beneficial to have a log frame agreed on that satisfies the EU standards re: results framework, even if this comes late in the implementation time frame. As said above, the evaluation team does not design a new log frame. This is for FAO to do on the basis of our observations and recommendations.

First and foremost, the evaluation team is of the opinion, in line with standard EU project management and Project Cycle Management guidelines, that the overall and specific objectives should not be altered in the course of implementation as doing so could result in having a different project altogether since its final aim has been altered. The overall objective in the new log frame (not submitted) is formulated as « Targeted population of Sindh with emphasis on vulnerable and marginalized people have improved food security situation, responsible land governance system, with reduction in poverty and hunger ». In the « old » log frame, this objective read « The Action will contribute to improved food security, improved livelihoods and poverty alleviation in Pakistan, as well as sound management of natural resources, in particular for female and male smallholder farmers ». This means that the newly formulated OO takes away « improved livelihoods » and « sound management of natural resources ».

The specific objective has also been changed in the log frame that was proposed in the March 2019 ROM Report. In the proposed new log frame, the SO reads : « Targeted households and government implements CSA practices and VGGT guidelines, resulted in increased

[18] ROM Review March 2019, BCS-Monitoring questions section 1.7, p.8.

farm productivity and secure tenure rights », whereas in the old version it was « Governance of land and water in Sindh Province is improved in line with VGGT and with a particular focus on female and male smallholder farmers and other disadvantaged populations » doing away with the focus on female and other disadvantaged populations, including Haris.

In most instances, the technical wording of the indicators is incorrect. Some instances illustrate this:

- "% decrease in the food insecurity experience scale (FIES) of the targeted households" is better formulated as "level of food insecurity etc."
- « % increase in the income of the targeted household/group » is better expressed as « level of income of the targeted households » (while omitting the unnecessary phrasing « group »)
- "Strategy for the application of VGGT in Sindh Province » should be written as « status of » (followed by « baseline: non-existent; target: existent; current value: existent ».
- « Integration of VGGT principles in informal tenancy agreements » reads better as « level of integration etc. »
- « Institutional support to government/ line department in application of VGGT in Sindh Province » is better formulated as « level of institutional support »

Several indicators combine elements that ought to be treated separately, as their relevance is not identical or their measurement different. Some examples:

- "number of studies conducted on Sindh tenancy act, landlord and sharecroppers' relationship and village profiling and disseminated » is to be disaggregated between (a) the STA ; (b) the relationship between Haris and landlords ; (c) village profiling. There should be two separate indicators on (a) conducted » and (b) disseminated ».
- « number of government, academia, UN, NGO officials & staff familiar with VGGT and CSA practices » cannot be treated under one single indicator as all stakeholders concerned inevitably have varying levels of familiarity. There should also be two separate indicators for VGGT and CSA.
- « number of men and women smallholder farmers, peasants (*Haris*& landlords) trained in CSA, VGGT and productive agriculture practices » is best disaggregated between Haris and landlords ; and between CSA, BGGT and productive agriculture practices »
- « number of informal Producer Marketing Groups (PMGs) established and trained » should be divided between « established » and trained »
- « number of village grievance redressal committees (VGRC) formed and operational » is best split between « formed » and « operational »
- « number of exposure visits/capacity development on land governance » is best expressed separately between « exposure visits » and « capacity development »
- « number of officials and representatives of district authorities, FOs, peasant & farmers' organizations, COs and WUAs familiar with the application of in DRR and safety net in line with VGGT" equally requires disaggregation between target groups.

4.4.2 Suggestions for a new logical framework

The following comments can be taken into consideration by FAO for the development of a coherent logical framework that captures the essential data of the Action, even at this advanced stage of implementation. It is standard practice in evaluation work to recommend log frame revisions even when significant implementation time has lapsed.

Suggestions to help the project go forward for the next few months. The indicators should be invariably linked to the project's original (initial) specific objective and its three outputs. They also need to be relevant to the ongoing implementation and useful for project management purposes. The indicators need to be SMART: specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time bound. However, qualitative indicators under these categories are always useful to measure the condition of the results obtained. Certain assumptions and risks need to be taken into consideration to assess the viability of the proposed indicators. Equally, sub indicators need to be devised to help gauge and fine tune the direction of the outputs.

At present the project is sitting on raw data that is mostly overlooked which could be used to guide the development of complementary indicators to guide the project and to validate its approach and methodologies.

Some examples:

a) All things being equal, the percentage change of yields between trained farmers and non-trained farmers as well as the percentage change of net profits between trained farmers and non-trained farmers could be started to be systematically measured.
b) The percentage change of yields and/or net profits between farmers with the new tenancy agreement is also very relevant and crucial for the justification of the project methodology and to solidify the Economic Analysis' findings and on-the-field observations by the evaluation team between an increase in training, the signing of the contracts and an increase in yields.
c) With the aid of the 2018 (August) baseline study, other variables can be used to indicate other important changes in the diet and nutrition levels for the Haris' families. These should be linked in principle to an increase in income in the short term.
d) One of the most contentious topics is the level of indebtedness that is experienced by some Haris. This level of indebtedness has a direct effect on disposable income and directly on the quantity and quality of some or all food a household is able to afford. The level of existing debts of Haris to landlords or other relevant stakeholders, where appropriate, could offset any gains on increases in net earnings. Similarly, increases in debts should be closely monitored and used as a sub indicator.
e) At output level the retention rate of participants to the FFS and WOS and other trainings, capacity building, workshops, could be used as an indicator of its appropriateness and relevance in the local context.
f) The record keeping by women who have opted to establish and maintain a kitchen garden could be used as a series of indicators in terms of quality of food consumed, extra income by selling the surplus, and also for women who do not have them, as easier and cheaper source of quality food as it was informed that the prices offered by their neighbour's vegetables' surplus are cheaper than at the local markets.
g) Post training test statistics from all participants are always useful, and can have a disaggregation between local government officials and NGO results on the one hand, and on VGGT trainings to practitioners on the other. The generation of these numbers can provide the project with an analysis on the appropriateness of the information being offered and make the necessary adjustments if needed whilst maintain the quality of the products offered by the project.
h) Setting new time-bound indicators to observe the catch-up strategy on quantitative targets. Setting milestones that can provide a sense of real-time progress can help identify potential delays. If a no cost extension is to be considered, then indicators of these kinds should be used as soon as possible to suggest the likeness of achieving the set quantitative targets.
i) As a project which has placed emphasis on the role of women, the project could develop gender sensitive indicators tied to the role of women on the kitchen gardens. Not just to isolate the performance of the gardens but the effect they have over the household. Similarly, a more formal land tenancy agreement with landlords could signify a net increase in the labour required to meet the obligations of the Haris. This could have an implication on the role of women in their households and affect the distribution of time between agricultural activities and household chores and childcare, etc.
j) Indicators that take into consideration the type of terrain and other agricultural related variables that affect yields (i.e. salinity, propensity to droughts). Yields or changes in production cannot be measured uniformly throughout the Singh province without taking into consideration marked differences in these variables. Methods to offset adversary conditions can be used as sub-indicators, such as locally applied remedies to deal with high salinity levels and then subsequent changes in yield levels.
k) The percentage or number of (separately) farmers, Haris, landlords, women, who keep a log of the inputs and outputs would be a strong indicator of participation levels, ownership and sustainability. The concerted feedback from final beneficiaries would provide invaluable data for the above-mentioned purposes.

Finally, the project needs to make way from activity driven execution to exploring the effects of all its inputs in some niche areas that could provide an insight on their progress. For example, on the baseline study carried out in 2018 adult literacy was measured in each district. The relation between the landlords and Haris is said to be more disadvantageous the more illiterate is the latter. Productivity indicators in districts such as Mirpur Khas, the district with the lowest literacy levels, compared with those of Jamshoro (literacy rate of 85%) would certainly produce valid and relevant data. Other

examples like this could be mined but it requires a disciplined and consistent monitoring system where all stakeholders play a role and contribute in a systematic manner.

5 EFFICIENCY

5.1 Have the chosen implementation mechanisms (incl. choice of implementation modalities, entities and contractual arrangements) proved to be conducive for achieving the expected results?

FAO has adopted the direct execution modality for ILTS. The standard modality for carrying out FAO's technical cooperation activities worldwide is Direct Execution (DEX) by FAO. However, within the context of UN reforms FAO is committed to moving towards national execution by the Government to the extent possible. [19] The reason why FAO has opted for direct implementation is the sensitivity of land tenancy in Sindh and above all the observation that most of the feudal lords are part of the political elite, i.e. Government and its provincial departments. Before establishing whether a project will be developed under a NEX/NIM arrangement (execution by the Government), it must be ascertained that the selected Government entity has adequate capacity and is committed to carrying out the project. On that basis, handing over project implementation to the structure that is most likely to obstruct the objectives or prefers maintaining the status quo was seen as the least desirable option. Capacity issues also are at play (see section 1.2). As a result, FAO is technically and fiduciary accountable for the achievement of all expected project results. While FAO as intergovernmental organization has built a strong relationship with Sindh government over the years and maintained its neutrality, the decision to opt for direct execution is considered appropriate by the evaluation team.

At the same time, FAO is using government premises for its field based offices either agriculture extension or livestock which provided the organization an opportunity to get governmental buy-in, build their capacity and help them reach to the most vulnerable communities.

The direct execution translates into a simple structure with the country office in Islamabad, where a programme manager maintains oversight and the resident representative and her deputy are fully knowledgeable of the project; a provincial office in Karachi, which is not project-specific and is only used as a logistical back-up; a local office in Hyderabad with one project manager, a monitoring and evaluation officer, a financial officer, two agronomists and sixteen social mobilizers. The human resources at Hyderabad and district levels are overburdened because of the large geographic coverage and the low number of staff.

At the time of the mid-term evaluation, only one programme steering committee meeting has taken place. FAO has convened more meetings but availability of key stakeholders was not guaranteed. In the sensitive context and given the disagreements between FAO and EUD about the project's effectiveness, the frequency of the meetings is well below what is required.

FAO is working with community and village organizations that were capacitated by the SUCCESS project. This has facilitated the field work, although of course capacity can still be low in the rural areas where this project is being implemented.

FAO has engaged with academics, which speak with authority on the issue of land tenancy and have been witnessed during field work to be fully appraised of the project.

Civil society is not involved to the biggest extent possible. There is space and willingness on behalf of civil society to be incorporated more into the social mobilization network. Input form civil society is foreseen in the strategic framework that was produced under Result 1. Such inclusive approach will be beneficial for the sustainability of the Action.

[19] Source : Guide to the Project Cycle - Quality for Results, FAO, 2012, p. 20

5.2 Do the resources funded by the action and actually made available correspond to the needs of the action?

In strategic terms, the resources provided for ILTS do not fully correspond to the needs of action. This is evident from the field observation that there are areas which requires investments : water infrastructure Improvement , quality inputs (seed quality has been reported by beneficiaries to be problematic), technological innovations for land use planning, climate smart technologies to address the soil salinity issues, water scarcity, soil erosion, lack of credit for inputs and machinery, poor marketing channels with middle-men and contractors taking large margins, and limited facilities for storage of perishable crops and dairy products.

ILTS cannot cover all those equally important issues that form all together an integral part of a solution of the agricultural issues Sindh Province is facing. Furthermore, the inputs are only for demonstration of improved practices and technologies, whereas investment in strategic areas is also required for the creation of models for replications both at policy and operational level.

This section needs to be read in conjunction with section 5.4 on cost-efficiency. In that section, it is explained (inter alia) that the budget lines that are allocated to the Farmer Field Schools are not sufficiently detailed to allow for an informed justification on correspondence between resources and needs, at least not on that particular topic. In other areas, such as human resources and operational costs, the budget provisions are adequate and in line with what are required, e.g. the salaries for staff are commensurate with what is habitually applied in international organisations, the office equipment and overheads are within acceptable norms.

Human resources at field level appear to be under-resourced. One project manager in Hyderabad is not sufficient to cover the geographic intervention area; this may in fact constitute one of the reasons why so few management data are available, since this function is primarily concerned with daily operations without the required time to keep track of the larger picture. In addition, *the employment of* 2 agronomists for 80 villages is insufficient. Equally, the number of social mobilizers, initially 8, has been expanded to 16 but this is still over-stretching the field capacity.

If the productivity that has been demonstrated in the economic analysis (see section on effectiveness) continues to be significantly higher than in farming plots that do not benefit from the Action, there is a good potential for the project to constitute value for money. However, all results must be considered tentative at this stage and to be corroborated at the time of the impact evaluation.

5.3 If there were delays, how important were they and what were the consequences? What were the reasons for these delays and to what extent have appropriate corrective measures been implemented?

The project was due to start in January 2017 and the necessary arrangements had been made to get the project approved from the provincial Government of Sindh. However, it took over seven months to get the project's approval despite the support provided by the Planning and Development Department. The sensitive nature of the project and its potential implications on the longstanding relationships between peasants and landlords and impact on the traditional socio-economic fabric of the rural population are the main issues that prevented a swift approval by the relevant government authorities. The project proposal circulated among concerned departments at different levels and important suggestions were incorporated. After seven months the project's approval was granted by the Sindh Chief Minister culminating in a ceremony held 12 months after the planned start date.

Due to the delicate project topic, it was very difficult and time consuming to identify suitable experts willing to engage with the project.

The above factors resulted in a backlog of delays which prevented the project from achieving the targets as per the original work plan. As a result, project activities have been planned according to the

number of remaining months, and applied some corrective measures: the number of FFS/WOS has been increased per season to achieve the target of 504 groups of FFS/WOS; and two experienced Extension Specialists have been transferred from Punjab to the Hyderabad office.

After this delay the project has been implemented without further major time scale setbacks.
Similarly the targets in terms of the signing of the tenancy agreements have also fallen behind as the process culminates in the signing of a simple four page document, but the social mobilization to bring the parties together and make them aware of the benefits and responsibilities is in itself a time consuming process. The remaining number to reach the project's target of 4800 (currently 1550) will be a challenge.

FAO has calculated that a one year no-cost extension (which corresponds to the incurred delay) will allow them to achieve the objectives.

5.4 Have the outputs been produced/delivered in a cost-efficient manner?

It is only partly possible to submit an informed opinion on the cost-efficiency. FAO has not provided a full financial report that incorporates headquarters and field expenditure; instead, a table with locally incurred expenses has been provided with an accounting that was closed on December 31st, 2019. The initial information provided was a table with the total contribution received, the total expenditure and the cash balance, which is insufficient to respond to the evaluation questions that have a financial bearing.

In the absence of full financial data, we cannot provide a full informed opinion or recommendation on a possible no-cost extension in terms of length and its overall justification. This will have to be negotiated between FAO and the EUD. Habitually an evaluation submits a recommendation on this topic, and indeed often the decision on an extension is postponed until a ROM Review or an evaluation can provide in-depth information. This, in this case, is not possible.

We note of course that as per article 1.6 of the Special Conditions of the Delegation Agreement, the project is subject to the provisions of the Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement (FAFA). In its article 2.1, FAFA states: "Reporting, narrative as well as financial, shall cover the whole of the Action described in the relevant contribution-specific agreements and their attached budgets, regardless of whether this Action is wholly financed or co-financed by the Commission. The narrative reports shall be commensurate with the "Description of the action" and focus on results attained during the reporting period, the financial reports shall present the expenses with the same level of details as the "Budget of the action" had." And in its article 2.2: "The Commission may not always request a specific format for budgets in contribution-specific agreements and reports, provided that a sufficient level of detail is provided in the United Nations' proposals and standard reports." And in its article 2.5: "For contribution-specific agreements exceeding 12 months, the minimum requirement of the Commission is a yearly narrative and financial report."

Nothing prohibits FAO from deviating from these rules and provide ad-hoc financial reports in the framework of e.g. an evaluation. In the context of this particular project and the above-mentioned questions, the headquarters reporting/accounting was not available yet – in spite of the evaluation having been announced in October 2019.

As to the cost-efficiency of the local expenditure, we note that the expenditure has been budgeted mostly per activity. This carries the risk of double-charging or multiple-charging. It is often impossible to know how expenditure has been incurred with the financial information that was provided by FAO. Some examples can substantiate this point:

a) District rapid rural appraisals are costed at 800 € each. It is not clear whether the human resources, vehicle use, fuel etc. are incorporated into this lump sum. Considering that human resources, vehicles and fuel are budgeted elsewhere, there is a risk of double-charging.
b) Village profiles are costed at 200 € each. The same observation is valid here: if the profiles were carried out by FAO staff in the organization's vehicles, then what is the cost?

c) Project reporting costs at a lump sum of 6,400 € is clearly unnecessarily budgeted as this is done by FAO staff, who are budgeted under human resources.
d) Participatory mapping of landholdings, costed at 2,000 € per village (160,000 € in total).
e) Needs assessment for PHM and small agri-business development, budgeted at 800€ each.

Separately, several studies in chapter 5 of the budget are costed at levels around 20,000 €, which could at least partially be budgeted under human resources. Budget line 5.3.1 covers 301 fee days at 400 € per day for technical and specialised implementation support, which equally belongs in the human resources chapter, even if they are external consultants.

Finally, several large budget lines are not detailed. Line 3.4.5 sets aside 554,400 € for agricultural inputs in the Farmer Field Schools. Line 5.2.10 foresees 176,050 € for studies (while several studies are itemized separately already), capitalisation and dissemination of the action's results (which is quite ironic given the excessive difficulties the evaluation team has experienced in accessing data). In addition to line 3.4.5, the Farmer Field Schools benefit from another budget line, namely 6.12 at 267,120 € and in line 6.13 a lump sum of 36,000 € for "self-monitoring of the FFS implementation" (which is highlighted given the lack of data and monitoring capacity in this project).

Other (smaller) budget lines appear prima facie acceptable, mostly related to small office supplies, meeting costs in villages, etc.

Out of a budget of local expenditure of 2,419,055 €, there is 1,033,570 € as non-itemized unverifiable budgeting, topped up with 120,400 € un-earmarked fee days.

In conclusion, the evaluation team is not properly informed on the state of expenditure on the following grounds:

a) The data came in full two weeks after the end of the field phase and after a number of back and forth between the evaluation team and the implementing agency.
b) The evaluation team were at first presented with an inappropriate brief summary of received contributions rather than with full detail.
c) They are incomplete, since headquarters expenditure is not accounted for (almost 50% of the budget).
d) Half of the expenditure is overly generically presented and does not allow for itemized verification.
e) The timing of the submission of the partial financial report way after the evaluation field phase and in spite of the evaluation having been announced with uncharacteristically long advance notice suggests a certain level of unpreparedness about the sharing of the financials. While that cannot be proven beyond reasonable doubt, the above elements point in that direction. What can be proven is that under normal circumstances a monitoring or evaluation mission has a full financial report available before the start of the field phase, so that specific punctual verifications can be made on the spot, without trespassing into the territory of a financial audit. The lack of timely available financial data has prevented the evaluators from carrying out this critical aspect of the evaluation.

As a result, commissioning a study into the financial data is highly desirable. This is most significant and relevant from the perspective of the very essence of this project. The financial inputs are key to a proper understanding of the value for money. If the question is asked whether it is worth investing 4 million € into land tenancy and increasing productivity, and this question is linked to very specific financial data that are not readily available to the same extent that fundamental data are not available in the mainstream monitoring system of the project, then the implementing agency fails to demonstrate the value for money and it becomes acceptable if not imperative to delegate that responsibility to external expertise.

The evaluation team has received financial information that under normal circumstances should have been made available prior to the field phase. It is the evaluation team's opinion that given the above circumstances the data is not sufficiently backed up with objective information to take them at face value. Indeed the evaluation team has not been given the opportunity during the field phase to inquire about the financial data as they were made partially available and, in essence, almost on the day of the report submission.

5.5 Is the action adequately monitored by implementing partners, partner government(s) and other key stakeholders, including the Provincial Assemblies themselves?

A project which relies on the transfer of information between the implementing agency (FAO) and its middle and final stakeholders and beneficiaries, needs to be able to rely on a system that regularly and systematically provides this information for project management purposes. A solid reporting structure is comprised by engaging all stakeholders in the feeding of information, particularly in one where the flow of information is vertical and crosses cultural and language barriers. There are many variables that can hamper this flow of information and there are also many other ways to attempt to identify them and circumvent them. For this a solid Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system is essential. However, the M&E system commences even before the execution of the project starts. The design of the project needs to anticipate the needs of the project and respond with the appropriate distribution of resources and executing structure to help attain the project outputs, outcomes which will lead to the successful achievement of the specific objective. The resulting information's main beneficiaries are not the external evaluations exercises or even the financing institutions behind the projects, but the project management itself. This information is part of the flood of resources which are required to feed the adjustment of the logical framework matrix, which is a management tool and needs to be updated, when required. When it is required, the collected information is the justification to make those changes, big and small, budgetary or non-budgetary, etc.

The current ILTS project lacks some of these qualities which are required to fully justify/validate its methodology and technical approach to improve governance of land in the Singh province. FAO is an experienced implementer of projects in the socio-agricultural sectors, and an institutionalized system for the above, or a tailor-made one, should have been set up from the get-go. It is understood that the ILTS project also faced some problems with its first M&E expert. Nevertheless, currently there is only one person in charge of the M&E system spending approximately 50% of her time on the field. The M&E requirements for this project are demanding and understaffing this area has been a key obstacle to prevent the evaluation team to be able to obtain all the data required for its analysis, something that should have been part of the information already analysed or semi analysed and awaiting for the evaluation exercise.

Moreover, the M&E team should have suggested appropriate changes to the logical framework matrix (LFM) prior to any outside evaluation having taken place, as it became apparent during this evaluation exercise that its own M&E duties could not be fulfilled with the present log frame. This is partially exemplified by the quality of the last progress report (2019) which is mostly activity-oriented in spite of the project having effectively started over a year prior to this (taking already into consideration its approximately one-year delay). In addition, the absence of a baseline study that would have provided some data on year one of the project was not referred to for reporting purposes in the second progress report even though the study had been finalized in August 2018.
Improvement of the M&E function will not only come from investing in human resources but also by increasing resourcefulness and extending responsibilities to non-M&E personnel in the field all the way down to decentralising data gathering to the final beneficiaries. Currently the project is not maximizing its M&E resources by not including all possible contributors into its system. Good ownership of the project is also demonstrated by final beneficiaries who contribute in other tasks other than receiving the benefits of the project. An appropriate and simple data gathering system from the very bottom up is required to feed the data that is required to analyse the effective progress or lack of the project's progress allowing for a rapid and timely response mechanism. Therefore, it could be observed that a grass roots data system, which is crucial in a project of this kind, has not been institutionalized. The farmers, landlords, and women with kitchen gardens observed during the evaluation were not keeping information suitable to provide the project with information that would allow it to draw specific conclusions and learn lessons.

Nevertheless, there is also some information which has been suitably collected but that has not been analysed yet. For example, during the data gathering of the tenancy agreements, some of that information could have been processed to draw parallels or marked differences between districts, crops, etc. The agreements that do not have a standard 50 and 50% sharecropping arrangement could be compared to the ones that do and bring those conclusions forward. Semi processed

information like this, which could be cross referenced and analysed, could make a large difference in the management and reporting of the project.

Field staff can also be highly useful as part of the M&E system. In spite of staff having at least one master degree, they appeared not to have instructions to collect vital information for project management. This was confirmed when farmers, landlords and women responsible of kitchen gardens were observed not to keep basic and uniform records of their crops.
Local government officials are aware of the project, representing a satisfactory level of ownership, but their role in M&E was not evident. Local civil society organizations' role in the direct or indirect implementation of the project was also not evident at this stage.

6 EFFECTIVENESS

6.1 Is the progress of each output conforming to plan?

6.1.1 Summary of progress

Progress is not according to plan because of the one year delay at the start. As indicated elsewhere in this report, FAO are contemplating to request a one year no-cost extension.

This section provides a detailed state of play with respect to the activities that are being implemented.

In summary:

Result 1:

- Baseline conducted in all 8 districts
- Study of regulatory frameworks conducted
- mapping if landlord/sharecropper existing relations done
- strategic plan: developed and now needs to be implemented. This requires time. The plan dates to October 2019 only, so it is not too early to expect it to be implemented.

Result 2:

- 80 villages selected after rapid rural appraisals
- 80 socio-economic and bio-physical profiles prepared of said villages
- 608 persons trained in the principles of VGGT
- 60 Village Grievance Committees established (target is 80)
- Land tenancy agreements: 1515/4800 contracts signed. 2000 more are under preparation and to be signed by March 2020 (registration process is on-going).
- Farmer field schools: 232/504 FFS established, 144 in progress, total 376/504.
- Number of beneficiaries: 5,800 households (target is 12,600)
- Number of district and provincial officials trained: 75 (target 75)

Result 3:

- Number of peasant organizations identified: 76 (target 160)
- Number of farmer's organizations identified: 68 (target 8)
- Number of WUAs identified: 24 (target 80)
- needs assessment for institutional strengthening of the above organizations done
- Study on water quality for multiple use water services conducted

6.1.2 Result 1. Legal, institutional and administrative framework for responsible land and water governance, including environmental aspects, is implemented by considering local requirements

.

Activity 1.1. Undertake a study to review the regulatory frameworks related to land tenancy, including STA, and all other relevant Acts and legal instruments, to ascertain the factors that inhibit its governance, administrative measures to discourage its non-compliance, redressal mechanisms to resolve disputes between landowners and Haris, and its relevance in the changing environment of farming systems and ground realities; with recommendations for the application of VGGT to address any gaps and weaknesses under subsequent activities of the Action - for review and adoption by all concerned stakeholders (e.g. provincial government policy makers, revenue administration, academia and researchers, CSOs, legal experts and representatives of landowners and Haris) through a series of roundtable discussions, consultative meetings, workshops, etc.

1. A Baseline Study of ILTS-project target areas was conducted in all 8 target districts.
2. A study was conducted to review the regulatory frameworks related to land tenancy, including STA, and all other relevant Acts and legal instruments, to ascertain the factors that are inhibiting its governance and administrative measures to discourage its non-compliance, redressal mechanisms to resolve disputes between landowners and Haris, and its relevance in the changing environment of farming systems under climate change and ground realities. A detailed set of recommendations were formulated. These recommendations are being considered by all concerned stakeholders (e.g. provincial government policy makers, revenue administration, academia and researchers, CSOs, legal experts and representatives of landowners and Haris) through a series of roundtable discussions, consultative meetings, workshops, etc.

Activity 1.2. Carry out a diagnostic study to document the different current sharecropping agreements and arrangements between landowners and tenant farmers/Haris. and their impact on farm productivity; the information will also examine the variations in the nature of agreements influenced by factors such as farm size, type of crops, ethnicity, social or political affiliation, awareness level, satisfaction level and the dispute resolution process - for review and adoption by all concerned stakeholders (e.g. provincial government and district authority decision-makers, CSOs, local legal experts and landowners and tenant farmers/Haris) through a series of roundtable discussions, consultative meetings, workshops, etc.

A study was conducted to map the landlord and sharecropper existing relations in Sindh. This study was endorsed by the concerned district authorities. For this purpose 8 endorsement workshops were conducted in the ILTS districts. Workshops took also place in Hyderabad and Karachi.

Activity 1.3. Prepare a strategy paper outlining the application of VGGT to strengthen the governance, compliance and redressal mechanisms of the regulatory frameworks of STA and other concerned Acts, including international best practices for systems that deal with rights of use, manage and control of land, water, fisheries and forests, a methodology for "land hearings", a specimen informal tenancy agreement, simplified farm accounting formats and guidelines to be appended to the informal tenancy agreements, roles and responsibilities of village and district-level grievance redressal committees, etc.

FAO prepared a comprehensive VGGT strategy paper. 22 actions are recommended to amend STA & land tenure rules, regulations & procedures and presented to the Government of Sindh

Activity 1.4. Undertake a review of the "VGGT strategy paper" in the second half of the Action and, based on lessons learned, make recommendations for any future amendment of STA and other concerned Acts and revisions to their respective land tenure rules, regulations and procedures. Again, with approval of PSC, project activities might be revised to reflect the findings and recommendations of the revised paper.

Review process in progress. Future action for consolidation: Awareness raising and sensitization of community, civil society, business community and government on VGGT strategy implementation and advocacy for its adoption into legal, institutional and administrative framework.

6.1.3 Result 2. Enhanced capacity of stakeholders in land management from Sindh Province and targeted districts in order to promote VGGT and improve landholding security of men and women peasant farmers and Haris

.

Activity 2.1. Undertake rapid rural appraisals for each target district to identify 80 villages and some 320 rural community organizations willing to be part of the target group of the Action. 2.1.1 Number of rapid rural appraisals: baseline 0, target = rapid rural assessments conducted in 8 districts, current value = rapid rural assessments conducted in 8 districts.

2.1.2 Number of villages identified: baseline 0, target 80, and current value 80.

2.1.3 Number of COs identified: baseline 0, target 320, and current value 168

Activity 2.2. Prepare socio-economic and bio-physical profiles of 80 selected villages in order to describe and map natural resources, land use, farming systems, farm size distribution, land tenure arrangements, demographic patterns, food and nutrition security, income sources and poverty levels, productive and physical infrastructure, local administrative structures and ethnicity, vulnerability to natural hazards and coping mechanisms, livelihood opportunities, location of service providers, etc. - all documented to serve as baseline reports.

Baseline 0, target 80, current value 80.

Activity 2.3. Train more than 700 persons in the principles and applications of VGGT and their application in strengthening the relationships between landlords and peasant fanners/Haris through implementation of the abovementioned "VGGT strategy" and internationally recognized standards and good practices. This activity would also include regular exposure visits to project sites/success stories by concerned policy and law makers of the Sindh Provincial Government and eight district authorities.

2.3.1 Number of persons trained: baseline 0, target 700, and current value 608.

2.3.2 Number of exposure visits: baseline 0, target N/A, current value 2.

2.3.3 Number of persons attending exposure visits; baseline 0, target N/A, current value 60.

2.3.4 Number of DCCs strengthened: formation of DCCs is in process.

2.3.5 Capacity level of DCCs: strengthening of DCCs is in process

Activity 2.4. Train relevant government and NGO sector service providers in participatory mapping processes- using SOAO's "solutions for open land administration (SOLA)" software GPS (Global Positioning System) positioning and map editing tool. Current value: This activity has been proposed to be replaced with the establishment of the VGGT implementation unit proposed to be established at P&D Department, Government of Sindh.

Activity 2.5. Digitised cadastral maps of 80 target villages (prepared by the Government of

Sindh's Revenue Department with technical support from Asian Development Bank, ADB) through mapping of landholdings (including field boundaries, water availability, water quality, soil salinity, etc.) and GIS (Geographic Information Systems) mapping systems in order to identify the operator for each parcel of land/plot survey number (with special reference to gender perspectives) - highlighting any disputed/contentious tenancy agreements for follow-up action. Current value: no figures provided.

Activity 2.6. Raise awareness of landlords and Haris to the benefits of: (i) respecting landholding boundaries, and (ii) the sustainable management of natural resources - both unde1taken as part of the participatory mapping process. Current value: This activity has been proposed to be replaced with the establishment of the VGGT implementation unit proposed to be established at P&D Department, Government of Sindh.

Activity 2.7. Establish (with consensus), guide and further strengthen 80 village-level grievance redressal committees to resolve any conflicts and disputes between landlords and peasant farmers/Haris.

2.7.1 Number of grievance committees established: baseline 0, target 80, and current value 60.

2.7.2 Number of grievance committees guided: baseline 0, target 80, and current value 60.

2.7.3 Number of grievance committees operational: baseline 0, target 80, current value 60.

2.7.4 Number of members of grievance committees: baseline 0, target 400, current value 300 (120 women and 180 men).

2.7.4 Number of cases brought before grievance committees: baseline 0, target N/A, current value 65

2.7.5 Number of cases resolved by grievance committees by landlords: baseline 0, target N/A, current value 65

Activity 2.8. Signing and registration of 4,800 informal tenancy agreements between landlords and peasant farmers/Haris

2.8.1 Number of tenancy agreements: 1515 informal tenancy agreements were prepared and signed by the tenants and landlords; registration is in process. 2000 more informal tenancy agreements are under preparation and to be signed by March 2020 (registration process is ongoing)

Activity 2.9. Document legal and institutional reviews, "VGGT strategy paper", participatory maps and success stories/lessons learned; prepare and disseminate policy briefs, pamphlets, brochures, posters, atlases, videos and other information, education and communication materials; and organize briefings of national, provincial and district-level decision makers and media events. *Current Value:* SUCCESS Stories: ILTS Beneficiary's success story featured on the FAO corporate website in January, 2020 (http://www.fao.org/fao-stories/article/en/c/1257294/) ; VGGT strategy developed and endorsed by the Programme Steering Committee (PSC) and presented to Government of Sindh ; VGGT book translated into local language ; VGGT Brochure made and disseminated among community members and other stakeholders ; Brief video made on informal tenancy agreement and posed on the website ; Other IEC (Information, Education and Communication) material made and disseminated on sessional crops to raise awareness of Haris and growers. ; 02 World Food days (2018-2019) organized in Hyderabad in coordination with FIRST program; One round table conference organized in Hyderabad participated by various stakeholders and government officials.

Activity 2.10. Identify 504 groups of men and women peasant farmers willing to test and demonstrate VGGT applications and new and improved CSA technologies and practices through FFSs/WOSs training.

2.10.1 Number of FFS: baseline 0, target 504, current value 232 established and completed; additional 144 in process. Total 376.

2.10.2 Number of beneficiaries: baseline 0, target N/A, current value 5800 peasant farmers (3000 women and 2800 men).

Activity 2.11 In collaboration with District Agriculture and Livestock Offices and selected COs, design district level FFS programmes whereby groups of 20 to 30 men and women Haris, peasant farmers and progressive landlords to test, demonstrate and replicate VGGT applications and new and improved CSA technologies and practices. Current Value: 01 on-job TOT workshop for field facilitators, Government line-department officials and CSOs on FFS/WOS training approach, CSA and best management practices for rice and cotton was conducted in April 2018. 5 TOT (Training of Trainers) training workshops were conducted for Rabi season containing CSA and best management practices in February and March 2019. Twenty two (22) district level FFS workshops were conducted in eight districts. Purpose of these FFS workshops was to design FFS and WOs program designing at field level. Total 525 farmers and other stakeholders participated in design of annual district FFS programs.

Activity 2.12. Develop appropriate curricula for training master trainers and FFS Facilitators; and prepare agricultural extension and training materials. A curriculum development workshop was conducted in 2018 under ILTS-project to develop appropriate curricula for the training of master trainers and FFS facilitators and prepare agricultural extension and training material. 5 Major curriculums were developed for Cotton, Rice, Wheat, Rabi Vegetables and Kharif Vegetable Crops under Climate-Smart Agriculture approach. 1 curriculum for LFFS is under development process. IEC Material for agricultural extension and training materials developed and disseminated among the farmers and growers on Wheat, cotton and Rice, Rabi Vegetable and Kharif Vegetable crops.

Activity 2.13. Identify relevant provincial and district-level government and NGO agricultural support service providers and train 75 concerned subject matter specialists/master trainers in applied research and participatory extension approaches for the promotion of VGGT, CSA and PHM.

Number of relevant provincial and district-level government and NGO agricultural support service providers trained in in applied research and participatory extension approaches for the promotion of VGGT, CSA and PHM: baseline 0, target 75, and current value 75 (planned for February 2020).

Number of lecturers and students whose awareness has been raised in applied research and participatory extension approaches for the promotion of VGGT, CSA and PHM. Current Value: A FAO Resource Centre has been established in the Sindh Agriculture University in this connection. Planning is in progress. The Action would further support this capacity development activity with the establishment of CSA demonstration plots at the Sindh Agriculture University (Tando Jam) - not only for the training of subject matter specialists/master trainers and FFS Facilitators but awareness raising of lecturers and students.

Activity 2.14 Identify and train 120 local FFS Facilitators (selected from local government extension workers, NGO social mobilisers/technicians, new graduates of agricultural universities and lead/champion farmers of "graduated" FFSs) in community and farm-level VGGT, appropriate CSA technologies and practices and FFS/WOS methodologies for adaptive research and participatory learning.

Baseline 0, target 120, current value 95 FFS

Activity 2.15 Mobilise and implement 504 FFSs and WOSs (of 12,600 men and women Haris, peasant farmers and progressive landlords) to test, demonstrate and replicate new and improved CSA technologies and practices, VGGT applications and improved nutrition (including provision of agricultural tools and inputs and small cash transfers for adaptive research sub-activities).

FFS and WOSs: Baseline 0, target 504, current value 232

Beneficiaries: Baseline 0, target 12,600, current value 5,800 (3,000 women and 2,800

men).

Activity 2.16 ***Participatory*** monitoring of FFSs/WOSs by specialist agricultural support service providers; and organization of annual district-level graduation ceremonies and provincial-level farmer's congresses to review lessons learned. Current Value: 48 Participatory monitoring visits of FFSs/WOSs have been conducted. Ceremonies planned in March, 2020 after the completion of Rabi Season.

6.1.4 Result 3. Enhanced capacity of district authorities, local institutions and CSOs to promote and contribute to transparent and rights-based land governance (VGGT and community-based disaster risk reduction - DRR)

Activity 3.1. Identify 160 peasant organizations, eight farmers organizations and 80 WUAs, and assess their needs for institutional strengthening; and further assess the capacity of FOs and eight participating district authorities to promote VGGT, NRM (National Resources Management) and DRM

Indicator 3.1.1 Number of peasant organizations identified. Baseline: 0. Target: 160. Current value: 76.

Indicator 3.1.2 Number of farmer's organizations identified. Baseline: 0. Target: 8 Current value: 68

Indicator 3.1.3 Number of WUAs identified. Baseline: 0. Target: 80. Current value: 24

Indicator 3.1.4 Status of needs assessment for institutional strengthening at peasants organizations. Baseline: needs assessment not done. Target: needs assessment done Current value: A needs assessment has been done on Institutional Strengthening of Peasant Organizations, Farmers Organizations and Water User Associations (WUAs).

Indicator 3.1.5 Status of further assessment of capacity of FOs and 8 participating district authorities to promote VGGT, NRM and DRM. Baseline: further assessment not done. Target: further assessment done. Current value: (done) a comprehensive study has been conducted under ILTS-project on Institutional Assessment of Peasant Organization (POs), Farmer Organizations (FOs) and Water User Associations (WUAs)

Activity 3.3. Develop eight district-level "farmers' organization information management systems" for disseminating and exchanging information on VGGT, NRM and DRM as well as irrigation water balancing and quality, etc. Current value: This activity has been replaced (proposed) with the exposure/experience sharing visits of the senior government officials and parliamentarians

Activity 3.5. Test water quality for "multiple use water services" (particularly for the use of groundwater in salinity-prone target areas), and informing and advising respective WUA members of any implications - again, with special reference to landlord/Hari relationships and gender perspectives. Current Value: A detailed study was conducted by ILTS-project through Pakistan Council for Research on Water Resources (PCRWR)

6.1.5 Activities remaining to be done

For the remaining time frame, the following activities are still to be implemented. In Result 2 they relate to the PMG activities; they are planned for 2020. Terms of reference have been approved by FAO Regional Office and technical clearance has been granted):

Activity 2.17. Identify 1,200 more entrepreneurial Haris and peasant farm families (particularly "women home-based workers (HBWs)") and progressive landlords from completed/graduated FFSs and WOSs *(Activity 3.6)* and assess their needs to improve PHM practices and willingness to develop their home and group-based agri-business skills and participate/form and invest in PMGs.

Activity 2.18. Prepare joint feasibility studies/value chain analyses and undertake participatory development of home and group-based business plans for women HBWs and 80 PMGs (i.e. collective processing and/or marketing of quality fresh fruits and vegetables, vegetable seeds and fruit-tree seedlings, chickens, eggs and goats, milled flour, fruit and vegetable pickles, dairy products, etc.).

Activity 2.19. Establish and support 80 informal PMGs (ensuring equitable membership of women HBWs) through: dialogue and meetings, training of representatives and members in group administration and small business management [16]; provision of small processing, storage and marketing equipment, materials and/or facilities (through agreed cost-sharing and/or revolving fund mechanisms); training of group representatives and/or men and women village technicians in the operation and maintenance of equipment and/or facilities; and development/strengthening of public- private-community partnerships to broker supply and marketing contracts and establish informative market information systems with private sector traders, retailers, wholesalers, processors, etc. - following the recommendations of the aforementioned business plans.

Activity 2.20. Organise PMG members (particularly women HBWs) into savings and micro-credit groups; train them in business management and micro-finance systems; identify existing micro- finance schemes capable of supporting PMGs; and facilitate micro-finance products such as savings, credit and insurance through linkages to the appropriate pa1tner micro-finance providers.

In Result 3, the following activities are scheduled for later this year:

Activity 3.2. Based on the institutional assessment of Activity 4.1, train representatives of eight district authorities and 168 targeted peasant and farmers organizations in the principles and application of VGGT, NRM and DRM through culturally sensitive and locally proven participatory approaches, with special reference to gender perspectives.

Activity 3.4. Strengthen capacity of FOs and 80 WUAs in water governance through the demonstration and extension of equitable water delivery systems and water conservation/saving techniques, with special reference to landlord/Hari relationships and gender perspectives - leading to more equitable sharing of irrigation water. Improved skills in on-farm water management and increases in the number of water applications in a particular cropping season.

Activity 3.6. Undertake provincial, district and local consultations, focus group discussions and a technical review of target CSOs and COs to assess the performance and effectiveness of existing community and household-based safety net and ORR practices in the agriculture sector with special reference to landlord/Hari collaboration and gender perspectives.

Activity 3.7. As follow-up to participatory mapping of landholdings (Activity 2.5) and implementation of FFS/WOS (Activity 3.6), test and demonstrate 16 new and improved community-based and land, water and forestry-focused DRR measures appropriate to the target communities, landlords and Haris, with special reference to gender perspectives (e.g. safe storage of seeds, grains and fodder and establishment of farm forests, windbreaks and farm boundary markers, soil and water conservation and flood, stream-bank and irrigation channel protection measures and multi-purpose raised platforms).

6.2 Is the quality of outputs (including those of CD support) satisfactory?

6.2.1 Grievance committees

The Village Grievance Redressal Committees (VGRCs) are still in their inchoative state, due to the delays that were incurred during the first year of implementation. 60 committees have been formed, whereas 80 is the target. Each committee is composed of three Haris and two landlords. Customary law is still prevalent in the project implementation area, which means that first any disputes will be resolved at community level, and if that does not work it will escalate to the Village Grievance Redressal Committees. The speed of resolution is very high, often within one day.

The VGRC mediation option is faster and easier than the Panchayat, which is a large gathering that makes matters complicated, in that they convene much less frequently than a VGRC and take a long time to convene (the latter can be convened for one particular dispute) and that the time allocated to an individual case in a Panchayat meeting is insufficient for it to be considered to have received a fair "trial". This follows the traditional adagium in the justice sector that it is better to have a poor agreement between parties than a good court order: the formal justice system does not allocate sufficient time to small disputes. The VGRCs (in the project area) are thus starting to play a role in conflict resolution using customary laws as previously practiced under the Panchayat system. If the VGRCs had not existed, the Panchayat would have continued to address the issues, but the target population has understood quite well that the VGRC approach is quick and more conflict-free, and they have accepted the system easily.

The number of issues so far is quite low. As per the statistics provided by FAO, 37 cases have been brought to VGRCs and an all have been resolved. The cases concern land (18), water (12), social relations (cattle grazing on another person's land, theft, Etc.)(7). the vast majority of complainants (petitioners) is male (33), and only 4 are female.

Interestingly, all cases brought to VGRCs so far address Hari-Hari conflicts. It was the initial intention, at the time of project formulation, that the committees would be addressing Hari-landlord issues. So far, that has not happened. The reason is most likely that the committees are not yet fully institutionalized and not all of them are set up. Possibly, the composition of the committees plays a role as well: landlords may not be as keen as Haris to bring a case to a VGRC given that the majority of members of the committees are Haris.

The VGRCs will be formalized with the Women Development Department or Social Welfare Department to make them more sustainable. During the remaining implementation time frame, ILTS has scheduled to conduct a study or analysis to ascertain the performance of the VGRCs, the existing gaps and how and where they should be linked for achievement of results and sustainability. Based on field observation, sustainability appears to be high as the persons on the committee will remain in place after the end of the project. They are part of the community and do not expect any remuneration. The only caveat is that Haris should register the contract with the district administration, in order for it to be recognized by all parties. That registration is currently being done under impulse of the implementing agency.

6.2.2 Productivity augmentation - introduction

Training for farmers started in January 2018. By October 2019 training had been provided to 5,800 famers spread over the eight districts. By the end of Rabi 2020 (March 2020, another 3,600 famers will have been trained. A series of improved techniques were taught and demonstrated ranging from land preparation to post harvest handling. Field visits by the evaluation team confirm that a number of participants of Farmer Field Schools have adopted some of the techniques promoted by FAO on their own fields. The most popular technologies include Laser Land Levelling (LLL), improved soil management, raised-bed cultivation, alternative wet-dry (AWD) rice cultivation, reduced tillage and agro-forestry.

The FFS were working in a favourable environment as many of the techniques being promoted have already been adopted by other farmers in the concerned districts. As a result there are strong demonstration effects which the project builds upon by providing step by step practical guidance. It was also clear during field discussion by the evaluation team that famers tend to adopt techniques that address their most urgent needs, issues and constraints. Techniques such as LLL and AWD tend to be popular as they have a quick and visible impact on the chronic water shortage problem. Zero tillage is also popular as it reduces the time and cost of land preparation between Kharif and Rabi. However, it is more popular in the rice growing areas where there is more residual soil moisture, and where weeds are less of a problem than in cotton growing areas. In the cotton belt (Mirpurkhas, Tando Allah Yar, Matairi and Jamshoro) erratic rainfall patterns and periodic flooding, and associated problems such as disease outbreaks, are becoming more common due to climate change. This is leading to of replacement of cotton, which is the preferred crop, by sugarcane. Raised-bed cultivation is popular in these areas as it allows the cotton crop, to cope with the erratic rainfall patterns, as well as with flooding.

6.2.3 Economic analysis

In order to assess the impact of the project on production and incomes, a study "Economic analysis of the ILTS Project Interventions on the Farming Communities" was conducted by a Professor at the Sindh Agriculture University at Tando Jam. This study was based on a survey of 54 tenant farmers in five villages. Of these, 29 of were beneficiaries of the project and had completed two growing seasons and 25 were not beneficiaries of the project. The survey data was collected through questionnaires by field enumerators. The Economic Analysis study, issued in October 2019, shows that yields, revenues and profits are substantially higher among Haris who were project beneficiaries, as opposed to those Haris who did not participate in the project. The impact on yields, costs and incomes of different crops is summarized below.

Crops	Wheat	Rice	Sugarcane	Cotton
Increase in Profitability	25%	37%	30%	85%

On an overall basis, the Economic Analysis study found that income of Haris who were project beneficiaries was Rs. 210,753/annum as compared to Rs. 126,259/annum for non-project beneficiary farmers – some 66% higher. A part of this difference – some 20% is due to higher land holdings and cultivated area among project beneficiaries - 5.07 acres against 4.22 acres for non-beneficiaries. There may be other differences between project and non-project farmers such as quality of land, access to inputs and credit, water availability, and the technical skills of those working the land. However, such possible difference cannot be assessed.

Taking the estimate of the Economic Analysis study of an increase in incomes of 40% (66% less 20% due to different size of holdings), Haris participating in the project would have an extra Rs. 50,000 (Euro 300) per famer per year from agricultural production. In comparison direct costs of FFS/OWS is Euro 183,000 or about Euro30 per farmer – this indicates a very favourable cost benefit ratio. If, instead of taking only the direct costs of the FFS/OWS, the total cost of the project, including overheads, project management, reporting etc. (about Euro2 million) is considered, cost per farmer is Euro 345 which exceeds estimated benefits.

The Economic Analysis Study was designed to make a mid-term review and not as a basis for final impact assessment. As a result, the sample size was small and it is difficult to draw statistically robust conclusions about the possible eventual outcomes of the project. All results must be considered tentative at this stage and to be corroborated at the time of the impact evaluation. However, field visits by the evaluation team and discussions with farmers confirm the adoption of techniques provided by the project, and consequent increases in profitability.

6.2.4 To what extent do the practices promoted by FAO contribute to better production, better income and better environmental sustainability (fertility in particular)

In addition to reviewing the data from the Economic Analysis study, the evaluation team had meetings with male and female Haris who had participated in FFSs, both at the project headquarters in Hyderabad and in four villages in three districts. During these meetings, the impact of the project was discussed and there was strong consensus of the positive impact of the project on incomes.

Discussions by the evaluation mission indicate that in addition to higher incomes accruing from their share of higher farm production, there are a number of other benefits to Haris who have signed agreements with landlords. The agreements include a clause for provision of land for the Haris house, as well as land for kitchen gardening and for fodder for their animals. Although no quantities of land are specified in the pro-forma agreements, most Haris have now got agreed land set aside for these purposes. In addition, one of the conditions in the agreements is that the landlords have to provide written receipts for inputs to the Hari. This tends to make transactions more transparent and prevent abuses, such as the landlord claiming that in addition to direct input costs he had to incur interest charges that the Hari has to share. Other benefits of a two-year written agreement for the Hari stem from the fact that the family feels more secure, children tend to be sent to school, and Haris are allowed to take occasional off-farm employment. The Economic Analysis study also showed that in the case of famers with agreements, landlords more often provides shelter during times of disaster, transport to health facilities, and support to settle different issues, including those related to police matters.

Discussions with landlords, both at the project headquarters and in the field suggest that they too feel more secure with a written agreement. The Hari cannot leave arbitrarily in the middle of the cropping season, nor can he make complaints to the courts claiming to be a bonded labourer – this apparently is a problem for landlords as courts tend to be highly sensitive to such complaints. Moreover, once they have signed a contract for two years, landlords are more willing for Haris to participate in trainings, interact with others farmers and test innovations that might enhance productivity.

There is no overall assessment of how the project has impacted environmental sustainability and in particularly soil fertility. However, a number of technologies that are being adopted will have a positive impact. The use of AWD for rice substantially reduces the emissions of methane from rice paddies – research shows that methane is reduced by over 35%. Similarly, zero/reduced tillage eliminates the burning of crop stubble, and hence CO_2 emissions and the destruction of soil fauna. It also reduces the use of heavy ploughing that causes deterioration in soil structure and loss of soil moisture which is particularly important at the time of rabi planting.

Other techniques also contribute to improving local soil and water quality. The use of Integrated Pest Management (IPM) and use of natural pesticides reduces use of chemicals that tend to persist in the soil and water; enhanced use of farmyard manure, composting and organic mulching improve soil structure; the greater planting of hedgerows and trees on the field bunds reduces wind erosion and increases the number and variety of fauna in the fields.

6.2.5 Monocrops versus multicrops

The term mono-cropping in the project area refers to the rice/wheat cycle (prevalent in four districts) and the cotton/wheat cycle (prevalent in the other four districts). The term mono-cropping is also applied to sugarcane although with 3-4 ratoonings, it is more of a perennial.

Multi-cropping or relay cropping is used to indicate the inter-row planting of several crops in the same field. The specific mix of crops depends on the soil, water and light requirements of the different crops as well on their planting, growing and harvesting times. The two main multi-crop packages being promoted are:

- wheat on raised bed with onions on the slope of the raised bed, sugarcane in the furrow and rapeseed/canola on the bunds;

- cotton on ridges and when the plants are mature and bolls are ready for picking, sugarcane is planted in the furrow and wheat seed broadcast; and
- a mixture of vegetables on raised beds with rapeseed/canola on the bunds.

The techniques promoted by the Project, and adopted by many farmers, increase incomes of small landlords and of Haris by 20-40% depending on the techniques adopted. Despite these increases, Haris remain poor. Incomes from crops, livestock and off-farm employment, even for the better-off Haris, rarely exceed PKR400.000 (US$2,500). Given a family size of seven, this amounts to about US$1 per day per person.

The move to multiple cropping with mixed vegetable in the spring/Kharif period, and wheat/vegetables/oilseed/sugarcane systems in Rabi, can increase incomes of Haris by over 200% while also improving their nutrition. It would also substantially increase employment as labour requirements for such multiple cropping systems are 50% higher than conventional systems (about 100 person days per year per acre as opposed to about 50 person days for wheat/rice systems, 66 person days for sugarcane and about 75 person days for wheat cotton systems

Such increases in income and employment would lift Haris out of poverty. However, adoption of multiple cropping is slower than other techniques as it requires more labour, better planning and management, use of specific machinery and higher input costs. Moreover, harvesting has to be done by hand. This is not an issue for some crops such as onions, other vegetables and cotton which are already harvested by hand. However, for wheat it means that harvesters cannot be used and in the case of sugarcane trucks, trolley and tractors find it more difficult to enter the fields.

6.2.6 Farmer field schools

The main farm-level problems impacting production and incomes in the project districts relate to water and drainage. There is a chronic lack of water particularly in the tail-end of the canal system. Waterlogging is an issue in the upper reaches of the irrigation system. In some areas this is leading to increasing salinity and sodicity. An emerging issue relates to climate change which is leading to higher temperatures with longer summers; heat waves including during winter; later Monsoon rains and generally more erratic rainfall; delayed release of canal water; and more frequent extreme events in the Indus Basin which can lead to substantial variations in water flowing into the Province.

Other problems which constrain incomes relate to lack of credit for inputs and machinery; poor marketing channels with middle-men and contractors taking large margins; and limited facilities for storage of perishable crops and dairy products.

In order to ascertain the most critical issues facing farmers in the Project areas participatory rural appraisal were conducted; and meetings and focus group discussions were held with farming communities, community-based organizations, farmers groups and village organizations. Major production problems identified in this process include land and water issues (lack of reliable surface water and low quality underground water, land degradation, and salinity and water logging); lack of quality inputs and services (limited availability of quality seeds, non-availability of soil and water testing facilities, lack of farm machinery at critical times, and most critically lack of credit); poor knowledge of critical farm practices (land preparation and cultivation methods, especially in the face of climate change, and post-harvest handling);limited access to markets and market trends and opportunities; and land tenure issues (arbitrary ejection, non-transparent cost sharing and unwillingness of landlords and Haris to spend extra money or effort on inputs and land improvement). Women farmers appear to be particularly disadvantaged with regard to knowledge of cultivation methods.

The analytical work was followed by FFS design workshops. The main techniques being promoted by the Project are: Laser Land Levelling (LLL); Alternate Wet and Dry (AWD) Rice cultivation; Direct Seeded Rice; Zero Tillage; Raised Bed Cultivation; Zero Tillage; Management of Farm Yard Manure (FYM); Multiple Cropping; and Agro-Forestry. Line sowing is promoted for rice and integrated pest management for all crops.

A Farmer Field School (FFS), along with Women Open Schools (WOS), were established to help Haris to adopt improved techniques. The FFS/WOS approach involves weekly sessions through the

cropping season, usually 20-24 weeks. Each FFS/WOS has 25-30 participants. Technically competent community mobilizers (one male and one female per district), backstopped by two agriculture technical experts, conduct the FFS/WOS. The crops covered are those grown in the area and topics are aligned with the crop calendar. The Agro Eco System Analysis (AESA) is at the core of the sessions. This consists in the critical analysis of the agroecological components and their functions with reference to a learning/experimental/demonstration plot. On these plots, the Project provides incremental inputs, in particular improved seeds and fertilizer, and farm machinery if needed.

Special topics are also introduced in the FFS and WOS on specific aspects relevant for the location. In the case of WOSs these focus mainly, but not only, on kitchen gardening and livestock management and sustainable production of healthy vegetables, nutrition, health and hygiene.

So far 232 FFSs have been completed and another 168 are ongoing which would bring the total to 400 FFSs by mid-2020.

6.2.7 Demonstration plots

Demonstration plots are an integral part of the FFS/WOS training methodology as they allow participating farmers to physically observe the impact of different techniques being promoted. Such demonstration plots, typically one acre each, have been established at each FFS/WOS in all eight districts. The techniques demonstrated depend on the season and local context. In all plots, the Project has paid for laser levelling, improved Seeds, fertilizer (50 Kg SOP Potash, DAP and 100kgs Urea), and, depending on the technology being demonstrated hire of machinery such as Zero Tillage Drill, Happy Seeder (DSR), Multipurpose Furrow/Ridge Maker and Moldboard plough.

As mentioned, the FFS/WOS do not promote highly innovative of experimental technologies. Rather they try to help Haris and small landlords make several improvements which have been tried and tested, including in nearby farms.

It is not possible to meaningfully quantify the impact of the different techniques promoted by the Project as these are vary from farm to farm depending on local conditions. For example, Laser Land Levelling reduces wastage of water. However, impacts are different –where canal water is available, it would lead to more land being cultivated and hence higher production. In contrast in areas which rely more on groundwater, reduced crop water reduction may result in lower pumping. However, many of these techniques are already being adopted in the project area, other parts of Sindh and in the Punjab and this strongly suggests that they increase farm productivity and incomes. Nevertheless some orders of magnitude based on experience from farms in the Project area and elsewhere are provided below.

Technique	Suitable for:	Major Impacts
Laser Land Levelling	All crops	▪ Water saving of up to 30 % ▪ Increased germination of 10-15% ▪ Reduced use of fertilizer of 20%
Alternate Wet and Dry Rice Cultivation	Rice	▪ Water saving of up to 20-25 % ▪ Increased crop yield up to 20% when adopted with line sowing ▪ Reduced methane emission
Direct Seeded Rice	Rice	▪ Water saving of up to 30% ▪ Reduced labour requirements of 60-70 % as transplanting is not required. ▪ Increased yields of 15-20% if planting is done by drill. ▪ Deeper root growth and hence more tolerance to water and heat stress. ▪ Reduced methane emission

Zero Tillage	Wheat, particularly in the rice belt.	▪ Earlier planning of wheat and better moisture from previous rice crop can increase wheat yields up to 30% ▪ Reduced time and cost for land preparation. ▪ Better carbon sequestration ▪ Increased tolerance to heat stress
Raised Bed Cultivation	Cotton and for all other major cash crops	▪ Increased yields of up to 30%, particularly in water logged and saline/sodic lands ▪ Water saving of up to 20% ▪ Enhanced capacity, particularly for the cotton crop, to cope with erratic rain falls/floods.
Management of Farm Yard Manure	All crops	▪ Reduced use and cost of fertilizer ▪ Improved soil structure, provides micro-nutrients and increased water retention capacity ▪ Increased crop yield up to 20% ▪ Reduced emission of methane
Multiple Cropping	Vegetables, sugarcane, wheat and cotton	▪ Increased income of up to 100-200% (mixed planting of wheat, vegetables and sugarcane in rabi; and cotton, vegetables and sugarcane in kharif). ▪ Enhanced household nutrition and resilience due to mixed cropping of food and cash crops. ▪ Improved soil fertility/health and eco-system. ▪ Improved capacity to cope with climate change induced weather events including erratic rainfall, and disease and pest attack.
Agro-forestry (Multipurpose Hedgerows)	All crops	▪ Reduced risk of lodging of wheat or rice which can cause yield losses of 10-20%. ▪ Protects Cotton, Sugar cane and other Vegetable cash crops from risks of erosion and disease infestation ▪ Reduced risks of disease pest attacks ▪ Enhanced incomes from sale of timber and fodder for livestock ▪ Improved soil fertility/health ▪ Increased carbon sequestration
Integrated Pest Management	All crops but particularly cotton and vegetables	▪ Reduced cost of pesticides/fungicide substantially ▪ Improved ecosystem with less pesticide residues in soil and water ▪ Improved health of farm workers, particularly cotton pickers

6.2.8 Preliminary results, if any, in terms of agricultural techniques having been adopted/adapted or just tried once by farmers, and about possible agronomic results (yields, production costs)

Discussions with farmers and the Economic Analysis study suggest that farmers who have participated in the project have adopted new techniques and this is contributing to lower use of inputs (particularly water), higher yields and enhanced incomes. Some such as LLL, AWD and raised-beds appear to be well mainstreamed in the area, as well as in other parts of the Sindh, Punjab and KP (Khyber Pakhtunkhwa). Moreover, relevant machinery and equipment, such as laser levellers, ridgers and seed drills, along with tractors, are available. This seems to suggest that use of these techniques will continue to be used.

However, in the case of multi-cropping, which require more management, higher input costs and more labour, it is not clear if this will be adopted by more farmers or even if farmers who have adopted it

would continue. Most likely progressive landlords who work more closely with Haris are prepared to take on the costs and associated risks.

6.2.9 Land tenancy agreements

While written agreements have existed for some landlords and some farmers, these proved to be a small and unspecific piece of paper without other parties, such as witnesses, involved and they did not contain a formal agreement on dispute resolution. At times the agreement was kept on record only by the landlord with no copies available to the farmer/Haris or other parties. In short, these agreements, when they existed, fell short of being a reliable document that could help equate the relationship between landlords and Haris.

Now FAO has introduced a Land Tenancy Agreement on the scale of eight districts. It is important to understand the context of this document. The agreement by itself would not and could not be expected to remedy or attempt to remedy the landlord-farmer business relationship that has been customary for many years and by several generations, and even less will it in and of itself increase the productivity. There are elements in the contract that contribute to such an increase, but they must be seen jointly with the transfer of knowledge that is being provided in ILTS. The agreement is not a breakthrough in this social and economic context, but part of a series of joint efforts being made that together attempt to achieve higher equality and fairness to both parties and distribute wealth for both in a manner that the landlords do not react adversely to this new arrangement. The LTA must not be seen in isolation; this would negate or ignore the work behind the process of getting parties into an agreement.

The process has taken into consideration all the primary and secondary parties involved. Since it has not been customary to have this kind of agreement in the past, it is reported that is has not been an easy feat to get both parties to agree to this new arrangement. Even when agreements have been signed, the main concern was the understanding of its contents by the Haris when signing the agreement with a thumbprint. The thumbprint signals that in many cases, and to different degrees, the farmers are illiterate and prone to be taken advantage of as the text in the agreement might be not fully understood. To remedy this, the agreement requires witnesses (people known by both parties) to be part of every signed agreement. In addition, the establishment of the grievance committees allows the agreement to specify that if a dispute cannot be settled between the two parties, then the VGRC will be the body that will look into each case on the basis of the contract. Villagers in the target area have reported that disputes of this kind have decreased as a result, although no statistics are available.

It was found that the agreements and the awareness information capacity that goes behind each one of them, has served to reinvigorate or reset the relationships between the landlords and farmers. In the end the agreement is a business contract but for the farmers it is more than that since it provides a sense of stability. It allows for the farmers to be certain that any extra work they do or inputs they are required to provide, will be used on land they will benefit from for the next two years, in most cases.[20] It allows for him to invest with a greater sense of security and provides the certainty that the extra work that might go to grow a better or more productive crop, he will benefit fairly from it. In this environment the knowledge gained from the farm field schools is applied creating a new synergy at times when the relationship between the two parties was at a stalemate, based on mistrust and in cases trying to get the most of it by investing a minimum.

For the landlords, the agreement provides a sense of security by knowing that the Haris or farmers have also a vested interest in working harder and investing in the agreed inputs. A sense of partial relief is afforded since the agreement, as standard, allows for the tenant to remain in the landlord's land for two years and the landlord does not have to worry about unforeseen departures and risking losing his investment on a given crop. The Haris are allocated a piece of land earmarked for livestock in addition to agricultural land enabling them to continue relying on income derived from this source while increasing the probabilities of him staying on the property. It was also reported by the landlords that even though some of the agreements have more or less the same conditions that were in the oral

[20] The evaluation team looked at the 1476 agreements already filed at FAO offices in Hyderabad (27 Jan 2020) and concluded that most of the agreements included the clause of the 2-year tenancy. It also observed that most had been signed by thumbprints but also, every single one of them, had attached a copy of the Pakistani national ID card for each party involved. The distribution per district is as follows: Larkana: 102, Dadu: 194, Jamshoro: 133, Matiari: 89, Tango Allahyar: 186, Mirpur: 222, Tango Muhammad Khan: 190, Sujawal: 280.

agreements or in some cases, smaller written agreements, the formalization process and the incentives it provides, together with the new techniques adopted in the FFS, now they were getting real 50%, for example, of inputs by Haris. This is particularly specific about the labour inputs since many farmers had complained about the poor work or lack of work by the Haris as part of their in-kind contribution to the crop sharing agreement in the past. It could be observed, some landlords commented, that even though the labour input remains the same as in previous verbal agreements, there was a real change in the man-hours and quality of work being done. In other words, there is an increased incentive to provide the necessary quantity and quality work as with greater transparency the joint effort is a win-win business relationship.

6.2.10 Farmers Managed Watercourses

This activity aims to strengthen the capacity of FOs and 80 WUAs in water governance through the demonstration and extension of equitable water delivery systems and water conservation/saving techniques, with special reference to landlord/Hari relationships and gender perspectives - leading to more equitable sharing of irrigation water, improved skills in on-farm water management and increases in the number of water applications in a particular cropping season. The activity has not taken place yet due to the delays incurred by the project. It will be implemented in the remaining time frame.

6.2.11 Enhanced capacity of 120 Peasants Organizations, 2 Farmer Organizations and 60 WUAs

This activity has not taken place yet due to the delays incurred by the project. It will be implemented in the remaining time frame.

6.3 Are the outputs (including CD) still likely to lead to the expected outcomes?

The question whether the outputs are still likely to lead to the expected outcomes translates into an assessment of the potential final impact. The EU's monitoring and evaluation methodology does not include such an assessment anymore in mid-term reviews or monitoring of on-going projects because the strategic level information at which this question is expected to be answered is not available during implementation. Still, it is interesting to provide a provisional assessment.

The work carried out by the project up to now points to the gradual accomplishment of the project's specific objective or outcome. Through an increased governance (specific objective- SO) and transparency in the relations between some Haris and some farmers, together with more cost-efficient and effective farming practices, the project has been able to increase farm productivity and hence enhance the living standards (overall objective -OO) of its final beneficiaries. While the knowledge provided to the farmers/Haris and women in the 8 districts is one of the main axis of the project, the project's specific objective is not about increasing productivity but about improving governance levels. The project's studies (output 1) have been formulated to provide the benefits of the project with a better perspective into the medium- and long-term viability and increase the quality of life of the farmers without land. The studies and outputs, in terms of recommendations on regulations, are intended to provide a legal basis and continuity in the future for the improvement of the relations and rights between the Haris and landlords.

On a shorter-term basis, on local governance, the farming agreements are not a catalyst in the relationship between Haris and farmers but a governance vehicle to maximize the benefits of the knowledge (output 2) gained from the project. The trust process being built up by its participants increases the cooperation and incentives to work with the other party. The new agricultural techniques enter into a more synergic relationship and expand its feasibility opportunities. It can thus be said that this increase in governance has led to an increased number of farmers/Haris with recognised evidence of tenure whilst most of the people in this group are experiencing an increase in their farm productivity. A fact that is bound to grow as more farmers and landlords are gaining knowledge and signing new agreements, and one that the project will need to strive to verify with sturdier M&E mechanisms.

Although it is still too early to assess this important factor, it can be said that bonded labour will continue to exist as long as there are not recourses for the Haris to exit a cycle of low incomes and expenditure equal or higher than their real earnings. A shift in production and an improved and clearer relationship between landlords and Haris are a step towards this ultimate goal. However, an increase in their earnings might not be enough to free themselves from this situation as their debts might take time to pay. On the other hand, the project is providing a governance platform where this negative cycle can gradually be broken, and to continue after the project ends, as the Haris have access to fairer share of the profits and can eventually pay off their debts. FAO does not have an official forecast for this yet. In fact, FAO cannot provide an informed forecast at the time of this evaluation, since the monitoring system is sub-standard and essential data for this is either not available or partially unavailable.

At the SO level, there is better visibility, in that there are a number of Haris who have now recognized evidence of tenure security and in that there is some evidence of increased farm productivity. However, the delays that have been incurred are such that the targets will not be achieved by the end of implementation without a no cost extension; and the empirical data that the evaluation exercise has used to demonstrate an increased productivity is only valid for a small sample of beneficiaries, that we cannot extrapolate to the 8 districts in which the project is being implemented. We have extensively substantiated the limits to the observations and have also linked these to the scarcity of data available at FAO.

The number of Haris with some evidence of tenure has increased, but only one third of the objective has been reached in terms of going through the process prior to signing of the tenancy contracts (with an additional 40% in the pipeline). The increase in farm productivity is not proven to be sustained on the basis of the data available and the timeline at hand, but there is potential for the increase to be sustainable, as explained in detail in the effectiveness section. This does not automatically mean that the prevalence of bonded labour is decreasing as a result of the project, since the point has been substantiated in this report that not only increased productivity and land tenure are determining factors; the Haris remain poor even with increased productivity and they are could still incur debt for the procurement of farming inputs, which has the potential to keep them in poverty conditions and potentially in bonded labour even though the contracts improve their working conditions.

A final impact evaluation is budgeted. FAO now has the elements in hand, on the basis of this report, to properly document what is required for a fully informed impact assessment to be done. A lot of work is required to that effect.

Last but not least, if no extension is agreed upon (and this report cannot make an informed recommendation on a possible duration thereof in the absence of detailed financial information, as argued in the section on cost-efficiency), the outputs probably would not lead to the full extension of the expected outcomes.

7 SUSTAINABILITY

7.1 Are key stakeholders acquiring the necessary institutional and human capacities to ensure the continued flow of benefits?

There is an economic incentive for the knowledge gained by both Haris and landlords to continue to be used after the project's end. The knowledge is simple enough to be remembered and since the project did not provide (except for the demonstration plots) any type of inputs for individual farmers and Haris (FFS) or women on the Women Open Schools, their capacity to maintain their productivity levels (all things being equal) will continue or even be improved as they hone their skills. The largely positive feedback from these are attributable to the community facilitators who are screened, as per their terms of reference of their contracts, and have proven to be apt at their tasks to identify, organize and transfer the required knowledge to the final beneficiaries. In part the project was able to attract competent and academically apt facilitators as their €600 a month wages could have played a key role in this. On the other hand, it is too early to know if the district authorities would be able to afford to

keep them engaged after the end of the project. Nevertheless, as stated above, the facilitators will not need to be present to continue engaging the people who have received training. The knowledge is bound to stay and even replicated, as it is already happening, by their neighbour and other nearby people as they observe that the improved agricultural techniques are bringing results to the beneficiaries of the project. Although having the same facilitators who have gained the trust of the local people, and are now familiar with their strengths and weaknesses, would be highly advantageous but unknown at this point. The feedback from the final beneficiaries is that they are satisfied with the work the facilitators have been carrying out.

The provincial government authorities were present in all visited sites, exhorting their support to the objectives of the project. Some of the initiatives taken by the project had to a certain extent been taken up by the authorities but due to budget constraints, these have not been able to continue. Hence the support by the authorities FAO in the districts. As mentioned above with the community facilitators, it is not yet known if the local authorities would be able to afford continuing with the project activities after the end of the project. It was expressed that it would be their wish to do so should there be a budget for it. Regardless, the project has also been training local government officials which seemed knowledgeable about the project's objectives in different places where the evaluations team visited and also have been capacitated on new agricultural techniques which are bound to stay with them after the execution period. The only concern is the rather frequent staff turnover in local government offices and dependencies.

The continued use and potential institutionalisation of the land agreements does have a positive outlook given the fact that it has been largely beneficial for both parties. However, unforeseen circumstances, such as weather-related disturbances in the agricultural cycles might disrupt this relationship. There are provisions to deal with weather related eventualities, but these are yet to be tested. The agreements are not the cause for an improvement on agricultural yields, but they are part of the sustainability of the relationship between Haris and landlords who now have increase knowledge on agricultural practices. The agreements are an instrument to stimulate and encourage trust between them. Together they produce a better and more fruitful relationship which, all things being equal, places more food on their plates. There is every reason to believe that the contracts, under the present forma, will continue to be used. In the longer term, these could be institutionalized, once the agreements have expired and need to be renewed and gone through this testing period or until the end of the project. Even if institutionalisation does not materialise, as long as governance prevails and this is conducive to a more economically profitable relationship between the landlords and Haris, they will serve the purpose they were designed to be used for. Even when there is room for conflict, the mechanisms put in place for this by the project seem to be capable and swift enough to enforce the agreements and other local matters. The institutionalisation of the agreements is not an immediate desired result of the involvement of the local or regional authorities, but for sustainability purposes they would benefit if incorporated into the local agricultural extension engagement with the farmers and Haris.

It has be borne in mind that there is the potential that a more formal agreement, i.e. institutionalized, backed by the local or regional authorities, might have a negative reaction from landlords who might see it as a loss on the rights and in favour of the Haris', potentially ending up with no agreement and disrupting the trust built-up up until then.

The only point to pay attention in the future is the fact that FAO keeps a copy of all agreements. While it is not a party to the list of witnesses in the agreements, FAO bears leverage on the formality of these informal agreements. Without FAO as an overseeing entity it remains to be seen how informal these agreements would be and how much less serious these would seem for the parties involved.
While there is ample room for increasing agricultural practices among the Haris and farmers, the present model allows for the communities to continue enjoying the benefits of their enhanced knowledge without the need to resort for help from the local authorities. Community facilitators as well as the final beneficiaries are supported by the social structure of the local communities which might facilitate the horizontal transfer of knowledge between final beneficiaries. During the training the participation of the landlords and Haris was on equal footing. The curriculum was the same for both parties as they attended the same sessions.

The strategy followed to influence and improve local government extension services has been to engage these extension services for the delivery of the agri-advisory services through the farmer field schools. They have built the capacity of the local departments and employed their local knowledge for

the promotion of different practices in the project's area. Similarly, the project engaged community facilitators in their own communities with sustainability in mind. Additionally, the GoS is also implementing farmer field schools in the 8 districts of the project where replication can be easier when the project ends. Also, the Building Resistance Resilience in Pakistan funded by DFID, implemented by FAO, will continue in some areas of the Singh province, building farmer capacities.
Given the low level of additional monetary inputs to apply the project's benefits the project enjoys a satisfactory level of sustainability with existing beneficiaries and a satisfactory potential replication level with non-beneficiaries.

7.2 To what extent has crop production been diversified, or what is the potential/forecast thereof?

Most of the technology promoted by the project aims to improve efficiency, raise production and enhance incomes. At times this includes diversification into higher value crops, in particular vegetables and fodder for livestock ; FAO has demonstrated multiple cropping (wheat, onion, sugarcane) intercropping (wheat and canola), and cash crops like seasonal vegetables, cotton and chilies were introduced.

There is a tremendous potential for Sindh to increase output of higher value products for the national and regional markets. Such crops include banana, mangoes, guavas and early season vegetables. However to realize this potential a number of complementary actions are needed such as improved value chains, credit and quality control and certification.

FAO is also working on post-harvest losses management, value addition and creating market linkages for sustained gains.

Precise forecasts *on food security and livelihoods* are at this stage, with the relatively small amount of information, not feasible. This report contains recommendations for the implementing agency to gather reliable data in a comprehensive manner, which can constitute the basis for an informed forecast on those broader issues of food security and livelihoods.

7.3 Have the relevant authorities taken the financial measure to ensure the continuation of services after the end of the action?

The 2019-2020 Annual Development Plan for Sindh departments of Agriculture, Livestock & Fisheries, Food, Forestry& Conservation, and Irrigation foresees Rs 3.750 billion for agriculture and Rs 22 billion for irrigation. The global allocation for agriculture as proposed by the Sindh Government is Rs8.4 billion for the agriculture sector, but that includes Rs4.7 billion in foreign assistance, therefore leaving the provincial budget figure at Rs 3.750 billion. These figures are earmarked for the provincial budget for fiscal year 2019-2020. [21]

Government reviews of overall levels of public expenditure on agriculture suggest two weaknesses[22]. Firstly, actual expenditures are generally well below allocations, which is in part due to slow and late release of funds and partly due to financial, procurement and expenditure issues within the departments. Secondly, much of the annual allocations, as well as actual spending, is allocated to ongoing projects which have already been approved.

Allocations for specific schemes are as follows (**in PKR million**)[23] :

- agricultural research : Rs 384.316
- agriculture extension : Rs 407.577

[21] https://pnd.sindh.gov.pk

[22] Government of Sindh Allocation of Funds for ADPs

[23] Summary of Agriculture, Supply & Prices Department Annual development Programme 2019-2020, as published on https://pnd.sindh.gov.pk

- bureau of supply and prices : Rs 0
- Sindh Seed Corporation : Rs 100.460
- agricultural mechanisation : Rs1205.241
- agriculture water management : Rs 1352.406
- agriculture training and research : Rs 275

These figures are provided for the entire Province of Sindh, and can therefore not be confirmed to be assigned to any of the eight target districts in the ILTS project.

Budget lines in areas of interest to ILTS include (same source):

- dissemination of agricultural information among the farming community , through demonstration plots and farmer field day : Rs 38.989 million
- capacity building of field extension staff : Rs 60.220 million
- Strengthening of Planning & Monitoring and Information Cell : Rs 25 million
- Controlled Environment Technologies for High Yield Vertical Agriculture Rs 250 million
- Provision of Agricultural Land Sindh Development Machinery & Equipments (On Subsidized Rate) : Rs 675 million
- Transforming the Indus Basin with Climate Resilient Agriculture and Water Management Agriculture : Rs 150 million

An unconfirmed newspaper article [24] reports that in the coming year, the provincial government is considering lining 1,850 watercourses through the Sindh Irrigated Agriculture Productivity Enhancement Project (SIAPEP) ; that it has proposed subsidy on the provision of 400 thrashers, 400 rotavators, 400 zero tillage, 500 auto loaders, 20,000 power sprayers and 500 tractor trollies to farmers ; and that it will help build 200,000 metres of on-farm drainage structures and help in levelling 125,000 hectares of land through precision land levelling equipment. It will also help in drip irrigation, high-tunnel farming by 870 farmers over 150 acres of land. But again, these figures are provided for Sindh Province and not for the 8 target districts.

7.4 Is there a sound strategy in the project to mobilise the private sector?

During the upcoming months ILTS will work to establish the Producer Marketing Groups (PMGs)from community based small enterprises based around different commodities to build their capacities at all levels (primary, secondary and tertiary). This will enable farmers to meet end users compliance requirements,and develop linkages with low and high-end markets. Additionally, it will capacitate farmers on collective buying of inputs and sale of outputs (i.e. aggregating leveragefor the sale, transport of produce – a leverage which only needs to be organized and can have an effect on the OO of the project), something that up until now has not been taken up at the local level. It is reported that this will be blended with information and communications technology(ICT) to enable farmers to react to weather related issues, engage in real time with the private sector and for general agriculture outreach. Most of the work is yet to be carried out and it will depend on the coming months on the level of engagement of other partners and the follow up provided by FAO to be able to appreciate the level of sustainability that these inputs will provide to the ILTS.

The initiatives taken by the project are reported to be continued under the FAO–GCF programme. In July 2019, the Board of the Green Climate Fund (GCF) approved an FAO project designed to transform Pakistan's Indus River Basin by improving agriculture and water management to make this region more resilient to climate change.[1]The Green Climate Fund has provided FAO with a grant of nearly $35 million for this work, while the provincial governments of Punjab and Sindh are committing an additional $12.7 million in co-financing to be managed by FAO. The core of this project involves coordinated actions to pool data, information and knowledge, through the use of technology and institutionalizing routine processes to disseminate this knowledge to agriculture and water management authorities, extension workers and ultimately to farmers. The knowledge, together with

[24] The Express Tribune, June 15th, 2019.

improved access to credit, should enable farmers' adoption of proven good practices such as Climate Resilient Agriculture (CRA) and On Farm Water Management (OFWM). In addition to working closely with provincial government agencies, the project reports that it will also work with partners and local agricultural service providers (e.g. input providers, young agro-technicians) to understand, and respond to, the changing market dynamics involved in the climate-resilient transformation of Indus Basin agriculture.

Moreover, the GRASP project –a Pakistan EUD initiative to be implemented by the International Trade Centre (ITC), FAO and others, will improve the access of the farmers to market by engaging with private sector small and medium enterprises (SMEs). The project has three main components[2] :

1- Improve the institutional and policy environment for small firms by enhancing policy dialogue, reforming policies, making the firm registration process more efficient and improving quality infrastructure. GRASP will also improve coordination through value chain roadmaps, business development strategies and new private sector-led alliances.

2- Support small-scale farmers and producers in a holistic way by promoting climate-smart agriculture, improving dissemination of market information through digital tool and improving access to financing

3- Boost the competitiveness of small-scale firms by building inclusive supply chains, providing access to finance, grants and technical assistance, and improving quality. There will be a special focus on improving sustainability by enabling firms to acquire the appropriate technology.

---

[1] Source: Press statement, 7 July 2019, www.fao.org

[2] Source: www.intracen.org

7.5 Are the practices promoted likely to contribute reverting environmental degradation (particularly loss of fertility) and ensure climate change adaptation?

The project does not have a clearly defined project's environmental strategy that dictates its interaction with the beneficiaries. The project does not have (yet) environmental related indicators which could set a project wide strategy. However, there are a series of environmental agricultural practices which are conducive to counter environmental degradation and increase yields. (E.g. reduced soil degradation, reduced water losses, increase nitrogen use efficiency, reduced pollution from pesticides and fertilizers, insects' discrimination, and increased landscape diversity). These measures have been widely adopted throughout the project's geographical scope with encouraging preliminary results. Despite lacking a project wide strategy, the project does have project wide policies that it is implementing as a result of local needs and as stated in its original design.

For example, and to observe the effect the project might have on the environment, loss of fertility in the project districts is influenced by a number of factors. The project has succeeded in promoting a number of techniques that encourage on-farm fertility. These include zero/reduced tillage; reduced burning of crop residues; and use of farmyard manure. All of these improve the structure and organic content of soils. However, the biggest threats to long-term soil fertility in Sindh are posed by waterlogging and salinity. These problems largely relate to irrigation and drainage management and are outside the scope of this Project.

The extent to which project's agricultural practices call for specific strategies on how to manage its effects on the environment are exemplified for example with regard to climate change. A number of techniques promoted and adopted reduce Green House Gas Emissions. In particular, AWD rice cultivation and composting of farm-yard manure address two of the largest emitters of methane. Similarly, reduced burning of crop residues reduces CO2 emissions. Other techniques tend to help farmers adapt to climate change. Of these the most importance is the cultivation of cotton on ridges. Cotton is one of the most critical crops in Pakistan. Erratic rainfall, poor seeds and pest attacks have serious affected cotton production and in fact Pakistan is currently importing cotton to feed its spinning and weaving industry. The cultivation of cotton on ridges allows the cotton crop to deal far better with erratic rainfall as excess water flows into the furrows where it can be effectively stored for some time in the soil. Other techniques, such as zero tillage, conserve soil moisture and fertility in the face of rising temperature.

As in the case of soil fertility, the biggest impact of climate change in Sindh relates to water flow in the Indus basin. As Sindh is in the lower part of the basin, it is affected by all changes ranging from glacier melt to extreme rainfall events and cloudbursts. Addressing these impacts of climate change will require major infrastructure investments which are not in the scope of this project.

It can be concluded that the measures promoted by the project and adopted by some of farmers and landlords participating in the project will not only help provide a better, cost efficient and environmental friendly yields, but also provide a contribution, at the local level and to the environment in general to environmental sustainability. Local, regional and global climate changes are having an effect on the Indus basin area and the project's policies are conducive to minimizing and eliminating the effects its beneficiaries can adversely have on climate derived change.

7.6 Have the necessary measures been taken into account to enhance the role of women?

The project focuses on providing the tools to empower women in an adversary environment where women face several limitations, from discrimination to limited mobility due to local customs. This limited mobility also restricts the activities they perform including work options, access to markets, etc. In spite of the project being having identified the main issues of gender inequality in the area of the project, there seems to be no gender strategy that seeks to tackle structural changes to remedy this. However, it has to be borne in mind that the target area contains areas with a conservative attitude where restrictions on women's rights exist; nevertheless, the project has developed policies that are likely to help ameliorate their economic conditions.

Women are being empowered by renewing the concept of kitchen gardens. The concept is not new to all, but it has encouraged many households to invest in harvesting in a small piece of land and grow vegetables which they can consume or even sell the surpluses to other neighbours. This concept has proven to be popular as women usually would have to travel to the markets to buy vegetables which are reportedly of inferior quality and prices that do not reflect the cost of production. So, there is an economic and time saving interest to get involved in developing a kitchen garden. On the other side, a more structural and sustainable interest is the reason to encourage women attending the Women Open Schools to invest in these gardens. Nutrition levels in rural Pakistan are inferior to global standards and particularly the statistics for the Sindh province show the highest number of undernourished children in the country. An increase in nutrition could be left to an increase in productivity in the land Haris and farmers work. The extra income could then be used to buy more vegetables and fruit. However, this link would not necessarily work in favour of enhanced nutrition as men have different priorities than women in terms of expenditure priorities. This leaves the person responsible with feeding the households, women, with the option to have an easier access to better and more nutritious food source.

As mentioned above, an investment is required to start or upgrade the kitchen gardens. This means that not everyone has the means to have one. However, there are surpluses that are sold or given to other members of their families, neighbour's or sold but at much cheaper prices than those obtained at the local markets and enhanced quality. The collateral benefit of the kitchen gardens goes beyond the immediate households and is also benefiting other households in terms of providing a richer source of food, saving money, and for the sellers, an additional source of income. This extra income provides women with a marginal extra income that empowers them to do as they see fit in terms of hygiene, family nutrition and other subtle matters that have been traditionally difficult for them to manage due to their economic dependency. This is also of particular importance to other vulnerable people, including pregnant women whose children tend to be born with nutrition deficiencies with adverse health consequences later on in life and higher than average infant mortality rates, particularly in the Singh region.

Nevertheless, the project is collecting some information regarding the participation of women in the project but it could take further advantage of its proximity to them and collect information which could be cross referenced to an increase in production and profits between the landlords and the farmers. Similarly, it could also engage these women at appropriate levels in its efforts to enhance its M&E system and gather vital information which might be linked directly or indirectly to the project's core outcomes. For example, it could look at the effect an increase in income has on the quality of their food intake. In an effort for the farmer to meet their share of inputs, women might be more engaged in agriculture and this could have an effect on what they have time to cook or be able to do with their children as a result. Data on older women heads of households and other vulnerable people needs to be gathered and analysed.

The inclusion by the ILTS of women in the VGRCs is also an important step towards balancing the traditional social power men have had over their communities. The project has made an effort to also draw female participants on its trainings for NGOs and government workers as they representation in both spaces is generally underwhelming.

8 CONCLUSIONS

Conclusion 1. Relevance. The Action is relevant as it responds to the needs of the target groups and end beneficiaries. It is in line with the Pakistan 2020-2025 One Nation-One Vision strategy, with the EU-Pakistan Multi-Annual Indicative Programme (MIP) 2014-2020, with several Sustainable Development Goals, with the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land (VGGT), and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Peasants and Other People Working in Rural Areas, adopted by the Human Rights Council on 28 September 2018. The three main areas of intervention present clear needs in the field of the strategic framework FAO has prepared, the land tenancy agreements, and poverty reduction through increased productivity.

Conclusion 2. The Action is adapted to the present institutional and human capacities of the partner government and other key stakeholders. A certain level of capacity was already present in the target districts and villages as other previous projects have been executed in the area of the ILTS intervention. The evaluation team finds that the capacity of local organizations is far from perfect. Nevertheless, it allowed for well-informed exchanges on ILTS intervention topics. FAO has used a capacity development strategy that according to the statistics that the evaluation team could peruse has resulted in increased productivity, which demonstrates that the Action is adapted to the present human capacities of the Haris and landlords. The action is not fully adapted to the financial capacities of the Haris.

Conclusion 3. Commitment and ownership are quite variable. At macro-level there is now the FAO-designed "Strategy to Mainstream the Principles and Practices of Responsible Governance of Tenure in Legislation, Administration and Policies of the Land Sector in Sindh Province" in October 2019 and a decision of the High Court of Sindh Circuit Court at Hyderabad, ordering the Government of Sindh to take remedial action and amend the Sindh Tenancy Act. While none of these two will produce immediate results, they are encouraging signs of a certain commitment to change that did not exist not so long ago. In the field, ownership to the project varies hugely, with minimal buy-in at the regional/political level and the big landlords; acceptance at the Planning and Development Board, Government of Sindh; positive attitude at district administration level; and small and medium landlords as well as Haris very committed.

Conclusion 4. The M&E framework is insufficient. This has severely and negatively impacted the evaluation work, and has not been conducive to evaluation purposes. We are missing several fundamental statistics, which we have partially recuperated during field work. It also has the potential to severely affect the management and reporting of the project and prevent it to fully demonstrate impacts on the final beneficiaries, as well as to react in time to any changes or deviations during its execution. There is ample room for reporting to be upgraded. A new log frame and indicators have been developed, following ROM recommendations made in March 2019. The new logframe was accepted by FAO in October 2019 but not yet submitted to EUD. The proposed new log frame's indicators are not good either. This report provides detailed suggestions on how to make changes to the log frame and indicators.

Conclusion 5. Efficiency. There has been only one programme steering committee meeting held so far. There have been delays in the project start of slightly under one year. This evidently and naturally has had an impact on effectiveness. There are insufficient human resources in the field for all the project activities to be implemented properly. The current team of 1 project manager in Hyderabad, 2 agronomists, 16 social mobilisers is insufficient for a project of this complexity spread over eight districts. This results in lack of follow-up of project activities in the field and of critical project statistics not being available (to be read along with M&E). Civil society is not involved to the extent it should be. There is space and willingness on behalf of civil society to be more incorporated into the social mobilization network. It is only partly possible to submit an informed opinion on the cost-efficiency. FAO has not provided a full financial report that incorporates headquarters and field expenditure. It is often impossible to know how expenditure has been incurred with the financial information that was provided by FAO. Several large budget lines are not detailed.

Conclusion 6. Progress of the work. The project is on track to achieve its intended SO but it will require extra time to meet its quantitative targets. A strategic plan has been developed and now needs to be implemented. The Plan dates to October 2019 only, so it is not too early to expect it to be implemented. In summary: 1515/4800 contracts signed and 2000 in the pipeline, with the balance to come in the next Rabi season. Farmer field schools: 232/504 FFS established, 168 in progress. Balance 104 in two more seasons (currently 5,800 HH/12,600 HH). 700 government officials trained. FAO is confident that the targets will be met if there is an extension.

Conclusion 7. Effectiveness. The project has improved socio-economic conditions of Haris, as well as that of small landlords, who have participated in the project. Despite the increases in income, Haris remain poor. A reduction in poverty will require a greater move to high value crops but this will require addressing a number of constraints related to high costs of inputs, risks and marketing. Livestock is the key asset of Haris and contribute some 40-50% of farm-related incomes. The project, and in particular the Agreements, have helped ensure that Haris can set aside land for production of fodder for their animals. FFSs have also provided some techniques to improve livestock feeding. However, given the important role of livestock in the income, wealth and nutrition of Haris, and in particular of women, the FFS need to focus more on this in the future. Some of the CSA techniques being adopted by farmers reduce GHG emissions. However, adoption is driven by farmers' need to address immediate issues such as water shortages and erratic rainfall. The positive impact of adopting these techniques on emissions does not play a role in their decisions.

Conclusion 8. Effectiveness. The land tenancy agreements cannot be viewed in isolation. They are not the primary reason for the reported increased in productivity, but they provide a trust platform, a new governance vehicle to apply the new learnt techniques at the FFS by increasing transparency, accountability and responsibilities for both parties on an equal footing. It is very probable that only with the new knowledge provided by the FFS an increased in productivity could be manifested. The agreement provides a consolidation and sustainability factor that can withstand unforeseen changes in the business relationship. At the same time, it is a community-based commitment to adhere to the agreed terms. The Village Grievance Redressal Committees (VGRCs) are still in their inchoative state, due to the delays that were incurred. 60 committees have been formed, whereas 80 is the target. Each committee is composed of three Haris and two landlords. The speed of resolution is very high, often within one day. The VGRC mediation option is faster and easier than the Panchayat. The number of cases so far is quite low. So far, the disputes that are reported only concern Hari-Hari cases.

Conclusion 9. Sustainability. The project has the potential to have a satisfactory level of sustainability particularly if it does not end in December 2020. At the final beneficiaries' level, the knowledge and benefits of the project will remain and continue to be replicated by them indefinitely. However, an extension would permit the project to extend its coverage and meet its benefiaries' targets. An increase in local governance, by facilitating the land tenancy agreements, and the recurrence to VGRCs, provides a platform for the knowledge gained to gain further sustainability. On the other hand, in spite of the good relations the project has built with local authorities and relevant government institutions, the continuation of certain services, like the FFS and the WOS and the VGRCs is still unknown, or at this point too early to make a statement about their future institutionalisation.

Conclusion 10. Gender. The ILTS project is addressing gender inequality in a conservative part of Pakistan and has been able to engage women successfully to empower them and marginally improve their economic conditions whilst tackling an undernutrition problem which is endemic in the Sindh area.

9 RECOMMENDATIONS

Relevance. @FAO : Redesign the log frame (most importantly upgrade to SMART indicators) for the remaining time frame, to align it with EU standards. This report provides detailed recommendations in the relevance section.

Efficiency. @FAO: (1) Increase the frequency of programme steering committees; including one as soon as possible after completion of this evaluation (LFM should be ready by then). (2) Consider a no-cost extension, the duration of which is to be negotiated between EUD and FAO. The latter estimates that a one year extension is financially feasible. The evaluation team submits that the delays are not attributable to FAO and that therefore an extension is justified, provided they present and agree on a

feasible work plan to/with the EU demonstrating that the action's objectives have feasible milestones and can be reached well within the proposed timeframe. The evaluation team cannot provide an informed recommendation on the duration of any extension in the absence of full financial data. (3) Increase human resources at field level.

Efficiency. @ FAO: Dramatically improve M&E staffing and system. Present a robust and feasible M&E plan. Reports need to be results-oriented and cease to be activity completion oriented. Collect specific statistics on project activities, including productivity, income increase, farmer school attendance, adoption of new techniques, etc. Develop a new risk analysis matrix to identify potential pitfalls and anticipate which indicators can be measured or cannot be reasonably attained, including a more detailed list of assumptions and mitigation measures.

Effectiveness. @ FAO. Expand training and facilitation efforts to include access to credit, strengthening market linkages and creating risk-sharing mechanisms. The FFS (developed under the ILTS) and the LSOs (developed through SUCCESS) could play a key role in this but would need to adjust their focus and, in the case of FFS, their curriculum. The LSOs and the FFS also need to better link up with other ongoing projects in the province and with the concerned Government Departments, in particular the Agriculture Research Department and the Agriculture Extension Department. There should also be an effort to establish “farmer markets” in big cities such as Karachi, Hyderabad and Sukkur with the possibility of growing and selling certified organic products. Work more with banks, and traders, contractors and other private sector agents.

Effectiveness. @FAO FFS. Increase capacity building on improvement of livestock management – if possible setting up specific Livestock FFSs. Training would have to largely focus on female member of Hari families. Help link FFS and LSOs with the Livestock Department to help improve health and breeding services. This would improve productivity as well as reduce illness and death of animals, which is one of the key risks facing Haris.

Effectiveness. @FAO. Explore links with the private sector to set up carbon-offset mechanisms. Encourage firms that produce GHGs in the province, under their CSR window, to give support to farmers who adopt GHG reducing techniques.

Effectiveness. @FAO. Continue to revise the Land Tenancy Agreement template (after the establishment of a robust M&E system that can inform any such revisions). Work on more specific agreements in relation to local needs, e.g. amendments related to certain crops, varying fertility challenges, natural disasters and specific cultural differences.

Effectiveness. @FAO. Provide a forecast (debt/income analysis) on the Haris income expenditure cycle to determine exiting bonded labour.

Effectiveness. @FAO. Constitute an impact assessment committee that oversee the collection of all relevant field data for a final impact assessment. Budget appropriate human resources for this in view of the determination of value for money at project's end and subsequent EU programming.

Sustainability. @FAO Make provisional plans to attempt to provide a minimum level of sustainability should a no cost extension not are granted. Even though it is out of its hands the project needs to provide more assurances on the continuity of its services after its execution.

Sustainability. @FAO One of the adverse effects of improving disposable income is that there is usually an increase in the consumption of highly processed food (cakes, snacks, juices) with long term adverse health effects, particularly in children. Raise awareness at the WOS and if it is possible monitor any negative food patterns that can offset the benefits of the kitchen gardens. Pakistan has one of the highest increases of diabetes II in the world. It is mostly an urban situation that is also spreading to rural areas.

Gender. @FAO. Utilize data derived from women and WOS and incorporate the women into the extended monitoring system. The project needs to cross reference data between its different outcomes like kitchen farms, Haris/landlords increase in production, potential increase in workload for females in order to meet tenancy agreement contractual obligations, etc...

Gender@FAO and EUD. The advice of the EUD gender specialist has been offered to FAO in the debriefing session. It is advisable to take this opportunity to adopt a more gender focus approach for the project and develop more gender oriented indicators.

10 LESSONS LEARNT

Indicators: Accurate Indicators need to be part of the initial proposal and then an integral part of each aspect of a project, i.e. budgeting, timeframes, staff allocation, local capacities, limitations, etc. Some of the indicators discussed with the FAO team during the evaluation and some of the soon to be developed ones can also be part of similar projects. Institutional knowledge needs to play a role particularly in an institution like FAO where some recurring themes are similar regardless of the projects or countries where the intervention takes place. This would ensure proven indicators can then be used without having to invest resources and time in redeveloping them.

Logframe and M&E: A logframe is a living management tool that needs to be constantly updated and not be used sporadically. In order for it to be a successful management tool the information required to feed the knowledge to assess the progress of the project or the accuracy of the existing indicators, needs to be duly and systematically collected and, as soon as possible after the beginning of the execution. Monitoring discipline is required, and all stakeholders need to take part in the exercise according to their abilities. If they need capacity development to do so this can be done when they are engaged during their participation as beneficiaries or otherwise. It is never too late to get a system started as the value it will have towards the ongoing implementation and for the end of the project (reporting purposes) will very important.

M&E: It is well worth to use the current evaluation process as a lesson learnt. For future evaluations it is advantageous to anticipate what kind of information the evaluation exercise will require. It is also time saving to prepare or update key data which in any case will be used eventually for reporting purposes internally and external donors. It is important for a project to be able to demonstrate the work and effort they are deploying but this cannot be effectively done if the above is not taken into consideration and increases the likelihood of watering down the communication of the benefits of the project.

Land Tenancy Agreements-1 : The agreements tend to be misunderstood for what they can achieve. The project needs to raise awareness about their use, their limitations and that they are part of a set of tools that, if used by itself, it does not provide much added value, but it can have a synergetic effect under the right conditions.

Land Tenancy Agreement -2. Formal agreements are attractive to a medium to small landlords (5-20 acres). Many of these landlords have alternative off-farm employment and have little time to cultivate the land, even with hired labor. Written agreements help avoid disputes which are onerous and time consuming for these landlords. In return they are willing to give up some control and rights to the Haris. This experience could be, after further study and refinement, extended to other parts of Sindh. The recently approved Sindh Women Agriculture Workers Bill also envisages written contracts. Lessons from ILTS of combining legislation and incentives would be useful.

General observation: Sindh had high levels of poverty, food insecurity and malnutrition. There are a number of factors that underlie this including poor management of water and soils; lack of inputs including quality seeds, fertilizer, chemicals and credit; poor marketing channels with middle-men and contractors taking large margins; and limited facilities for storage of perishable crops and dairy products. Government, with assistance from many donors including the EU, is implementing several projects to address these issues. Much of the land in Sindh has traditionally been under sharecropping and often the system is exploitative towards the Haris. There is existing legislation that envisages better rights for Haris, including registration of tenancy agreements. However, these requirements have been generally ignored as the landlords saw no benefits in granting rights to Haris while Haris were not politically powerful enough to push for their rights. The ITLS aimed to address this issue in a novel manner by linking institutional change (written tenancy agreements) with economic incentive (training in improved cultivation techniques). The fact that there has been some success is noteworthy.

High-value crops: Training, which has focused on well proven technologies, has helped increase incomes of both Haris and landlords. Despite these increases Haris remain poor. In order to make an impact on rural poverty, much more will need to be done to move small to medium scale farms towards cultivation of high value crops for which there are growing markets in and outside Pakistan. *This will require more attention to improving inputs supplies, addressing market constraints, and managing risks.*

Green-house gases : Small scale farmers are adopting techniques, for example improved rice cultivation methods and better use of farmyard manure, that reduce GHG emissions. They do so as these technologies reduce costs or address their urgent needs and issues such as water shortages. *It would be useful to explore linkages with some GHG trading mechanism that could further incentivize further adoption of such technologies.*

Scope: Given the resources allocated to run the project, the execution and the objectives were ambitious from the geographical coverage point of view. In future it would be advisable to reduce the territory covered in order to be able to penetrate into deeper analysis and be able to collect and manage the information that is required to provide an insight into the changes sought.

Gender: The project is making an effort to include women in several areas of the project but it would be advantageous to have had a project-specific or even to have utilized an institutional gender focused strategy that would explain and justify to greater detail the approach taken by the project on issues that are gender sensitive. For example, in order to comply with the new tenancy agreements, it is possible that some women will have to work longer hours on the fields helping their husbands and dedicating less time to household chores. This would probably merit a mitigation strategy, or study the impact this could have on younger children, pregnant women, elderly women, health issues, reproductive health, young girls' schooling hours/attendance, etc.

11.2 Annex 2: Evaluation matrix

Questions	OECD-DAC criteria	Indicator	Data Collection Methods	Data sources	Comments
1.1 Does the action presently respond to the needs of the target groups / end beneficiaries?	**Relevance**	Extent to which the intervention has been designed on the basis of identified needs at local, regional and national levels. Extent to which the design of the project has been addressing local specific gaps in terms of land and food security issues. Adequacy of the project objectives to target the most vulnerable, taking into consideration gender issues and imbalances. Viability of the project's strategy. Extent to which the project's objectives are aligned to priorities defined in the i.e. National Strategy Paper, EU-Pakistan Multi-annual Indicative	Document review Key informant interviews, final beneficiaries, (EUD (OM), FAO, local, regional and national government stakeholders), international donors, national press. Focus groups and individual interviews with beneficiaries and stakeholders	Needs assessments Project documents Previous evaluation/ROM reports Documents from World Bank, FAO, WHO, UN Women, UNFPA, GoP, EU-Pakistan Multi-annual Indicative Programme (MIP) 2014–2020, Country Strategy Paper for 2007-2013, 2014-2020 Regional Multiannual Indicative Programme for Asia	In terms of design, what is the difference and added value for a final beneficiary to have a formal land tenancy agreement, taking into consideration that the majority of Haris are illiterate. Relevance of the land tenancy agreements when law enforcement is low (considering the bargaining power of the farmers is limited due to their precarious economic and social status compared to the landowners and the political class).

Questions	OECD-DAC criteria	Indicator	Data Collection Methods	Data sources	Comments
		Programme (MIP) 2014–2020, etc.			
1.2 Is the action adapted to the present institutional, human, financial capacities of the partner government and/or other key stakeholder(s)?	**Relevance**	Adequacy of the action in terms of taking into consideration local capacities and limitations at the stakeholders' level, local authorities, regional and national stakeholders. Adequacy by the local stakeholders to efficiently enforce the local, regional and national sectorial normative framework related to the objectives of the project.	Document review Key informant and final beneficiaries' interviews and focus groups	EUD Del (OM) Websites by the regional, national institutions linked to agriculture, development, social issues, health, economy, etc. Needs assessment FAO Bellwether information	This will include an assessment of the focus on knowledge transfer and its relevance. The issue at hand here is whether the increased yield reported is economically viable and replicable. And more fundamentally, is if knowledge transfer enough to trigger productivity increases or if other core elements require to be addressed, such as the availability of capital to finance inputs, equipment and works.
1.3 Are all key stakeholders demonstrating effective commitment (ownership)?	**Relevance**	The level with which the Pakistani authorities, at the local, regional and national level, consider the objectives of the project a priority. Level of commitment by all	Document review Document review Key informant interviews Meetings' minutes	National policies EUD, FAO, national development papers, progress reports (2017 and 2018), Interviews with ministry officials, landowners, and	The Sindh Tenancy Act (STA) 1950 was not amended to address big lacunas and problems (in spite of the 2008-2013 amendments). This is a cause of injustice for

Questions	OECD-DAC criteria	Indicator	Data Collection Methods	Data sources	Comments
		parties, including donor, executing authority, official and informal partners, including non-governmental organizations.		other stakeholders in the land tenancy and agricultural sectors.	peasants in their relationship with landlords. Sindh's political, social and administrative structure is historically controlled by feudal and landlord families; thus, pro-peasant amendments in the laws were not possible. Therefore, in the past, all attempts made to improve the tenants' conditions through land reforms and redistribution have fallen short, mainly due to the lack of political will. The evaluation team will have a fundamental discussion with FAO and other stakeholders as to the relevance and commitment of the "ruling class". The evaluation will assess if the political economy of land issues in Sindh is conducive to make

Questions	OECD-DAC criteria	Indicator	Data Collection Methods	Data sources	Comments
					possible relevant changes in wealth allocation between landlords and Haris.
1.4 Indicators assessment	**Relevance**	a) Inidcators' degree of definition and relevance to measure the achievement of the objectives b) availability of all related data c) Number of relevant indicators which are sex-disaggregated d) Number of baselines set up and updated for each indicator e) Number of realistic target values set	Document review, and interviews (FAO, EUD)	Project description of the action, log frame, contracts, risk matrix, internal monitoring system, project staff, baselines, risk analysis, beneficiaries.	The April 2019 ROM Report makes specific recommendations on indicators. We will again assess the quality of the – hopefully revised – indicators. This is fully linked with the assessment of the monitoring and evaluation function within the Action.
2.1. Have the chosen implementation mechanisms (incl. choice of implementation modalities, entities and contractual arrangements) proved to be conducive for achieving the	**Efficiency**	Extent to which the chosen implementation mechanisms (including choice of implementation modalities, contractual arrangements) are conducive for achieving the expected results Extent to which the execution modality is conducive to the achievement of results. Extent to which the internal	Document review Key informant interviews (EUD, FAO, government stakeholders, final beneficiaries, local NGOs, etc.). Random checks on expenditures, purchases, etc.	Workplans, Contracts/MoUs agreements with partners Budget document Financial reports Narrative reports	

Questions	OECD-DAC criteria	Indicator	Data Collection Methods	Data sources	Comments
expected results?		implementing mechanisms are adequate, including management mechanisms, decisions making structures, accountability, transparency, etc. Extent to which the information generated by the project flows efficiently among all relevant stakeholders. Extent of autonomy by the Project Implementation Unit or management unit.		Monitoring framework and tools Management plans Description of the action	
2.2 Do the resources funded by the action and actually made available correspond to the needs of the action?	**Efficiency**	Degree to which the resources correspond to the needs of the action Degree and timeliness of availability of other non-EU financial sources	Documents review Individual interviews with financial personnel, accounting, FAO and DUE.	Workplans, Contracts/MoUs agreements with partners Budget document Financial reports	In other words (and this corresponds also to a design matter), is it worth to invest 4 million € along the Action's guiding principles? What is the project coverage in terms of inputs distribution?
2.3 Delays' assessment	**Efficiency**	a) Number of delays and degree extent of their importance and consequences on the project. b) Extent of appropriate corrective measures implemented.	Document review, staff interviews, field observations.	Logframe, original workplans vs revised workplans, progress reports, internal monitoring system reports, project staff	There appears to be a delay of approximately one year. In this section, we will assess whether the analysis done during the March 2019 ROM review

Questions	OECD-DAC criteria	Indicator	Data Collection Methods	Data sources	Comments
					was accurate, and we will propose corrective measures, perhaps not necessarily merely a contract extension.
2.4 Have the outputs been produced/delivered in a cost-efficient manner?	**Efficiency**	Extent to which outputs been delivered in a cost-efficient manner. Timely provision of inputs and support by the implementing partners and support by all stakeholders' institutions.	Documents review Interviews with project management, finance and accounting personnel	Progress reports, Financial reports, activity reports, stakeholders' internal reports. Response of correspondent institutions to reports. EUD, FAO, GoP at local, regional and national level.	So far it was not possible to provide an informed opinion because of the serious delays and the very low burn ratio. The evaluation team is hopeful that more tangible financial figures will be available.
2.5. Is the action adequately monitored by implementing partners, partner government and other key stakeholders?	**Efficiency**	Extent to which the action is adequately monitored and the existence a M&E system capable of reporting, based on results on the progress of the project and alert on time of any necessary deviations and unplanned circumstances. Level of quality and objectivity of internal reports. Existence of formal quality assurance systems	Documents review Interviews with (FAO, EUD) project management, finance and accounting personnel. GoP staff at local and regional level.	Progress reports, Financial reports, post activities' reports, stakeholders' internal reports. Response of correspondent institutions to reports. Tests or transfer of knowledge methodology reports. Capacity building exercises reports or	This is based on the This is based on the April 2019 ROM Report conclusion that no formal M&E system existed at that time. This is not merely a matter of M&E, but rather a question of strategic importance that provides in-depth understanding of whether project management is

Questions	OECD-DAC criteria	Indicator	Data Collection Methods	Data sources	Comments
		in place.		modules.	aware of what this project is delivering in substance. This goes hand in hand with the relevance questions.
3.1. Is the progress of each output conforming to plan?	**Effectiveness**	Extent to which progress has been achieved/is being achieved according to plan. Degree of achievement of the main objectives in accordance to the framework of the project. Number of women benefiting from land holding security arrangements. Number of Haris/households/farms having adopted new agricultural practices Number of schools established in each district Number of Haris and Landlords participating in schools	Field observation Key informant interviews Document review Individual and Group interviews Focus groups with final beneficiaries Individual interviews with final beneficiaries/Households	Final and intermediate beneficiaries/households. Project documents (LFM updated version) Partners FAO, GoP. management and staff Field Monitoring reports, Narrative reports, ROM and other evaluation reports. Chronogram, workplan.	The evaluation team will follow the work plan, bearing in mind the delays. In addition, we will investigate the number of beneficiaries (people involved in FFS and OWS) in relation to the total number of potential beneficiaries / farmers in each intervention area/unit. a) Data have been shared for Dadu and Mirpur Khas. Data for other districts will be sought. b) In the year 2 Report it is narrated that farmers field schools (FFS) and women open schools (WOS) approach have been

Questions	OECD-DAC criteria	Indicator	Data Collection Methods	Data sources	Comments
					adopted to engage landless Haris and to develop their capacities for increased crop production, through crop diversification and improved agriculture practices to ensure food security, nutrition and enhanced livelihood opportunities. During the evaluation we will assess together with FAO how many such schools were established in each district and what was the participation from Haris side and Landlord side. More broadly, the mission will assess the relevance of FFS as put in place by FAO for this project as well as their effectiveness and efficiency to achieve to increase crop productions through crop diversification and improved agriculture

Questions	OECD-DAC criteria	Indicator	Data Collection Methods	Data sources	Comments
					practices.
3.2. Is the quality of outputs satisfactory?	**Effectiveness**	Extent to which the grievance committees operate beyond informal status. Level of actual delivery or performance compared to what they are designed for as per the project documents. Extent to which they have solved land issues on the field vs issues being resolved without them. Level to which the reported productivity augmentation is limited to demonstration plots where FAO has invested inputs and materials vs being an action-wide phenomenon that can be attributed to the Action. Extent of productivity and profitability analysis of farming systems as a whole at household level, before and after the new	Document review Group and individual interviews (EUD, implementing partners) Focus groups with beneficiaries	Outcome/output analysis Outcome indicators of implementing partners Project reports Internal tests results. Grievance committees, final beneficiaries, yields' records, households, FFS, demonstration farms beneficiaries and neighbouring farms, WUAs, arbitration Committees, DCC. Landowners Land tenancy agreements	Correlation between inputs and outputs. Farms with and without signed agreements. Preliminary results, if any, in terms of agricultural techniques having been adopted/adapted or just tried once by farmers, and about possible agronomic results (yields, production costs).

Questions	OECD-DAC criteria	Indicator	Data Collection Methods	Data sources	Comments
		practices have been introduced. Extent to which the practices promoted by FAO contribute to better production, better income and better environmental sustainability (fertility in particular). Number of agricultural production problems/potentials that have been identified and extent to which technical messages have been designed in response to that. Number of demonstration Farms established for farmers' training in order to obtain higher crop yields. Percentage increase in output vis-à-vis cost of inputs. Number and kind of agricultural techniques having been			

Questions	OECD-DAC criteria	Indicator	Data Collection Methods	Data sources	Comments
		adopted/adapted or just tried once by farmers. Percentage change in agronomic results (yields, production costs). Level of changes in wealth distribution between the initial situation vs the present one after adopting the written agreements. Extent of changes brought about by the Farmers Managed Watercourses in each district and farmers training for maintenance of the lined watercourses Level of enhanced capacity of 120 Peasants Organizations, 2 farmers Organizations and 60 WUAs to manage natural resources and resolve disputes. Extent to which the Arbitration Committees are delivering on their role as outlined in the project documents.			

Questions	OECD-DAC criteria	Indicator	Data Collection Methods	Data sources	Comments
		Level of the presence of Haris in the 3 member committees. Level of potential sustainability of the arbitration committees after FAO is no longer present. Increased number of Haris with recognized evidence of tenure. Number of Haris and landlords supported by the project with a sustained increase in their farm productivity. Level of reduction on bonded labour as a result of the project. Projection for the rest of the project's execution and beyond.			
3.3. Are the outputs still likely to lead to	**Effectiveness**	.	Field observation	Outcome/output analysis	Assessment of FAO's forecasts on the

Questions	OECD-DAC criteria	Indicator	Data Collection Methods	Data sources	Comments
the expected outcomes?		Number of Harris with recognized evidence of tenure increased. Number of Haris and landlords supported by the project have a sustained increase in their farm productivity. Extent of prevalence of bonded labour decreased as a result of the project.	Development of relevant performance indicators and sub indicators Document review Group interviews Focus groups with final beneficiaries and Individual interviews with final beneficiaries Key informant interviews	Use of proxy indicators if required. Outcome indicators of implementing partners Project reports Internal tests results. FAO and final beneficiaries, local authorities.	prevalence of bonded labour.
4.1. Are key stakeholders acquiring the necessary institutional and human capacities to ensure the continued flow of benefits?	**Sustainability**	Extent to which the key stakeholders are acquiring or improving – due to the project's intervention- capacities that will guarantee the benefits of the project after it ends. Degree of involvement and capacity of the institutions responsible for land tenancy governance.	Field observation Key informant interviews Document review Group interviews Focus groups with final beneficiaries Individual interviews with	Project documents, progress reports Local authorities' documents Financial estimates Estimates and assessments by final beneficiaries	The evaluation team will inquire whether FAO have taken Provincial Agriculture Department on board for continuity of the trainings. Farmers field schools (FFS) and women open schools (WOS) approach have been adopted to engage landless Haris and to develop their capacities

Questions	OECD-DAC criteria	Indicator	Data Collection Methods	Data sources	Comments
		Level of the sustainability of the grievance process. Extent of the capacity of the community facilitators, who are trained along with the FFS / WOS development to ensure technical advisory support after the project end, for it to be available after project's end. Degree to which they are recognized as legitimate community workers that can validly represent the interests of those in the communities they serve. Extent of established linkages and level of support with/from the provincial government. Level of potential for their work to continue beyond the project's end in terms of remuneration and affordability.	final beneficiaries	Assessment of output costs	for increased crop production, through crop diversification and improved agriculture practices to ensure food security, nutrition and enhanced livelihood opportunities.

Questions	OECD-DAC criteria	Indicator	Data Collection Methods	Data sources	Comments
		Potential of the continuity of the signed agreements between Haris and Landowners introduced by FAO. Extent of the capacity and enhancement of the community facilitators who are trained along with the FFS / WOS development to ensure technical advisory support after the end of the project. Extent of the participation from Haris' side and Landlord's side on the schools that were established in each district. Level of sustainability of this training? Quality of the strategy to influence and improve local government extension services			

Questions	OECD-DAC criteria	Indicator	Data Collection Methods	Data sources	Comments
		based on taking stock of the achievements of FFS.			
4.2 To what extent has crop production been diversified, or what is the potential/forecast thereof?	**Sustainability**	Number of farms using less monocropping Types of other crop production used by farms Percentage change in production levels that can indicate level of sustainability of newly adopted agricultural practices.	Documents' review Interviews with final beneficiaries, households, local associations, chambers of commerce, local markets associations.	Farms' records Farms' associations FAO documentation Local records of agricultural production Crop management data Household data	Assessment of FAO's estimates for enhancement of food security, nutrition and livelihood opportunities
4.3. Have the relevant authorities taken the financial measure to ensure the continuation of services after the end of the action?	**Sustainability**	Extent to which the relevant authorities have taken financial measures to ensure the continuation of services after the end of the action. Level of inclusion of project's	Sectorial policies and relevant authorities mapping. Breakdown of project costs per products, results, outcomes.	Outputs and inputs stocktaking. Local and regional authorities' budgets	

Questions	OECD-DAC criteria	Indicator	Data Collection Methods	Data sources	Comments
		objectives in local and regional government budgets or budget proposals. Likelihood of the Provincial Government of Sindh to decide on budgetary appropriations already, by project's end. Number of local authorities in the 8 districts to have made or planning to make budgetary appropriations.	Local and regional Budget reviews		
4.4. Is there a sound strategy in the project to mobilise the private sector in order to contribute to improve extension services, to facilitate or improve access to money, inputs, markets?	**Sustainability**	Degree of involvement of the private sector in the project (i.e. production and/or distribution chains) Degree of potential role for the private sector in the continuation of benefits of the project after the EU/FAO contribution ends.	Project documents Analysis of expenditure on projects inputs by private entities. Interviews with relevant stakeholders	Progress reports Local associations or local and regional chambers of commerce	
4.5. Are the practices promoted likely to	**Sustainability**	Extend to which environment sustainability steps have been	Document review	Project documents, DoA, progress reports,	This is especially important in climate-change prone

Questions	OECD-DAC criteria	Indicator	Data Collection Methods	Data sources	Comments
contribute reverting environmental degradation (particularly loss of fertility) and ensure climate change adaptation?		adopted by the project at design level and if they have been adapted Degree of the potential effects the project might have on the environment. Extent to which the agricultural practices of the project call for a specific strategy on how to manage its effects on the environment.	Interviews with project management, and other relevant stakeholders.	institutional reports on environmental challenges. Interviews with relevant institutions and individuals, including final beneficiaries.	Pakistan, with water availability in the next years not guaranteed. Since climate change is one of the top EU priorities, any agricultural project, and arguably even more so one implemented by a lead agency in the sector, imperatively needs to address environmental sustainability.
4.6. Have the necessary measures been taken into account to enhance the role of women?	**Sustainability**	Degree to which the necessary measure to strengthen the role of women have been taken into consideration. Extent to which the project developed a gender strategy to address local gaps in gender imbalances.	Document review. Interviews with male and female stakeholders at all levels. One on one/group meetings with female final beneficiaries as well as with male final beneficiaries	Project documents, progress reports, gender studies. Final beneficiaries UN Women, UNFPA, UNICEF, and other non-governmental organisations, including any local or regional women's rights organisations.	The evaluation team will make a critical analysis of the gender strategy that FAO applies This is especially relevant in the Pakistani context, which is socially conservative and not conducive to female participation in society.

11.3 Annex 3: Indicative Logical Framework Matrix

Intervention Logic	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Source and Means of Verification	Assumption
Overall Objective; Impact: The Action will contribute to improved food security, improved livelihoods and poverty alleviation in Pakistan, as well as sound management of natural resources, in particular for female and male smallholder farmers	- Proportion of moderate or severe food insecure people, based on the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES); - Prevalence of stunting and wasting among children under 5 years of age.	- 40% of Sindh population experience moderate or severe food insecurity, and 12.7% experience severe food insecurity (2016) - 40.5% of children under 5 in Sindh are stunted and 17.5 % are wasted (2011)	- 39.8 % of Sindh population experience moderate or severe food insecurity, and 12.65% experience severe food insecurity by the end of the project; - 40.3 % of children under 5 in Sindh are stunted and 17.1 % are wasted by the end of the project.	- National Food Security Assessment -Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS)	
	Proportion of population living below the national poverty line, by sex and age	40% of rural population in Sindh Province are "poor", i.e. living on less than USD 1.90 per day (2012)	- 39.8 % of rural population in Sindh Province are "poor" by the end of the project	Pakistan Poverty Alleviation Fund poverty score cards	
Specific Objective; Outcome Governance of land & water in Sindh Province is improved in line with VGGT and with a particular focus on female and male smallholder farmers and other disadvantaged populations (e.g. *haris*)	Number of smallholder peasant farm & *hari* families with recognised evidence of tenure	Not determined	4,800 peasant farmers & haris in possession of informal land tenancy agreements registered with local authorities – honoured by their respective landlords by the end of the project	Project Baseline and Completion Reports Copies of agreements	Government of Sindh is committed to responsible land governance on all administrative levels and willing to implement procedures (and consider legislation) There are no external factors (e.g. severe floods and droughts, political instability, etc.) affecting rural growth and stability
	Number of smallholder peasant farmers & haris, as well as landlords, with a sustained increase in their farm productivity	Not determined	12,600 vulnerable peasant farm families/haris & well-targeted progressive landlords increase crop & livestock productivity by 15-20% and net farm income by 10-15%, compared to average, through CSA by the end of the project	Government of Sindh's Ministries of Agriculture & of Livestock records Project Baseline and Completion Reports	

Intervention Logic	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Source and Means of Verification	Assumption
Output 1: Legal, institutional and administrative framework for responsible land & water governance, including environmental aspects, is implemented by considering local requirements	Strategy paper for the application of VGGT in Sindh Province	Enforcement of 2009 Amendment to STA does not address *haris*' rightful access to land Stakeholders of land tenure in Sindh Province are not aware of VGGT	Strategy paper for the application of VGGT in Sindh Province prepared & adopted by stakeholders Recommendations for amendment of STA & land tenure rules, regulations & procedures prepared & presented to the Government of Sindh (in light of VGGT lessons learned)	Project institutional & administrative assessment reports VGGT strategy paper Records of Sindh Province Revenue Board Project Inception, Progress, Mid-term Review, Terminal and Completion Reports	There is sufficient political will and commitment to drive the practical use of VGGT applications
Output 2: Enhanced capacity of stakeholders in land management from Sindh Province and targeted districts in order to promote VGGT and improve landholding security of men and women peasant farmers and *haris*	Number of government & NGO officials & staff familiar with the application of VGGT Meaningful participation of local stakeholders, female and male smallholder farmers, in decision making & mapping processes. Number of experiences (from all four Expected Results) documented & made available through different channels	Concerned government agencies & NGOs lack the capacity to promote VGGT & improve landholding security Frequent disputes over landholding boundaries, especially since the use of tractor-based cultivation & the floods of 2010, 2011, 2012, 2014 & 2015 Verbal tenancy agreements and lack of trust between landlords & peasant farmers/*haris* Lack of grievance redressal mechanisms to resolve disputes between landlords and peasant farmers/*haris*	700 government & NGO officials & staff received training in the application of VGGT 80 village landholding maps prepared & adopted through participatory methods (including FAO's SOLA software) 80 village-level grievance redressal committees established & functioning 4,800 informal tenancy agreements facilitated Experiences documented & communicated to national and international stakeholders, media outlets, etc.	Records of Sindh Province Revenue Board & District Revenue Departments Project socio-economic & bio-physical baseline studies VGGT strategy document, participatory village maps & informal tenancy agreements Village-level grievance redressal committee meeting minutes Project training reports Project Inception, Progress, Mid-term Review, Terminal and Completion Reports	Basic administrative capacity is available to enact responsible land governance Openness of government to consider customary rights of *haris* as legal There is sufficient political commitment to acknowledge and register participatory village maps. village grievance redressal committees & informal tenancy agreements as legal entities

Intervention Logic	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Source and Means of Verification	Assumption
	Number of government & NGO officials & staff familiar with VGGT, CSA, PHM & food nutrition Number of men & women smallholder farmers (*haris* & landlords) aware of VGGT and adopting & practising CSA, PHM & food nutrition technologies & practices Number of men & women smallholder farmers (*haris* & landlords) investing in small agri-businesses	Unsustainable farming systems with low crop & livestock productivity for both landlords & tenants Concerned government agencies & NGOs lack the capacity to promote CSA, PHM & food nutrition through adaptive research & participatory extension approaches (i.e. FFSs) High post-harvest losses and lack of income generating opportunities (especially for women HBWs)	75 government & NGO master trainers & 120 local men/women FFS Facilitators received training in VGGT, CSA, PHM & food nutrition 504 FFSs & WOSs (of 12,600 participants) implemented to test, demonstrate & replicate new & improved VGGT, CSA & food nutrition technologies & practices 80 men & women PMGs established & functioning (1,200 members), and linked to micro-financing schemes	Pakistan BoS – Agricultural Statistics (provincial & district-level) Records of Sindh Province Ministries of Agriculture, Livestock, Irrigation, Forest & Women in Development Project socio-economic and bio-physical baseline studies Project training reports, FFS minutes & PMG business plans Project Inception, Progress Mid-term Review, Terminal and Completion Reports	Poor and impoverished men and women farmers are willing to risk & invest in new & improved technologies and contribute & organise themselves into groups Political commitment for the adoption of adaptive research & participatory extension approaches Marginalised rural women are not restricted from participating in WOSs and developing small agri-businesses
Output 3: Enhanced capacity of district authorities, local institutions FOs, and CSOs to promote and contribute to transparent and rights-based land governance (VGGT and community-based DRR)	Officials & representatives of district authorities, FOs, peasant & farmers' organisations and WUAs familiar with the application of VGGT, NRM & DRM Community-based VGGT-related DRR measures adopted by COs	District authorities, FOs,, peasant & farmers' organisations and WUAs lack the capacity to promote VGGT, NRM & DRM CSOs & COs of target districts lack awareness in community-based & land, water and forestry-focused DRR	Officials & representatives of eight district authorities & 168 peasant & farmers' organisations received training in the application of VGGT, NRM & DRM Eight district-level "farmers' organisation information management systems" established & functioning 25 FOs and 80 WUAs received training & demonstration in application of water governance 16 community-based DRR measures demonstrated & documented	Records of Sindh Province Ministries of Agriculture, Livestock, Irrigation, Forest & Women in Development Records of district authorities, and peasant and FOs and WUAs Project socio-economic and bio-physical baseline studies Project training reports Project Inception, Progress Mid-term Review, Terminal and Completion Reports	There is sufficient political will to empower CSOs such as peasant and WUAs There is sufficient political commitment for FOs to acknowledge and practise water governance guidelines Poor and impoverished men and women rural people are willing to risk and invest in community-based DRR measures

11.5 Annex 5: Documents consulted

European Union Delegation Agreement FOOD/2016/381-388 between the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the European Union

- specific conditions
- description of the action
- logical framework (formally approved version and new non-approved version)
- budget
- financial report 31 December 2019 (local expenditure)
- financial report 31 March 2019

Baseline study, University of Hyderabad

ROM Review March 2019 : D-38101_Monitoring questions_Final_20190424[1] and D-38101_ROM Report_Final_20190424[1]

ILTS 1st Annual Report April 2017-March 2018

ILTS 2nd Annual Progress report - 14 May 2019

Sindh Agriculture Policy 2018-2030, Approved by Government in April 2018

Sindh Government's Land Distribution Program: Issues & Challenges Study Report 2009, Participatory Development Initiatives with support from Oxfam

Regulatory Framework Sindh Tenancy Act, Sindh Development Studies Centre, University of Sindh, Jamshoro (2018)

Review Of Current Sharecropping Arrangements in Sindh, Economics Research Centre (AERC), University of Karachi, 2018

Strategy to Mainstream the Principles and Practices of Responsible Governance of Tenure in Legislation, Administration and Policies of the Land Sector in Sindh Province, Pakistan. FAO October 2019

Bseline Study, ILTS, Sindh Development Studies Centre, University of Sindh, Jamshoro (2018)
Economic analysis of the ILTS project interventions on the farming communities, Prof. Dr. Aijaz Ali Khooharo, Ocotber 2019

$5m project aims to empower Sindh's landless farmers - Newspaper - DAWN.COM, 5 Feb 2018

A Guide to Formalization of Customary Land Tenancy Agreements , Tahir Hasnain, National Land Management Specialist, Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of United Nations PCU – Hyderabad, Pakistan

Sindh Governments Land Distribution Programme : Issues and challenges, Oxfam, 2009.

Strategy for Enhanced Land Tenure Security, Implementation strategy, Mr. Tahir Hasnain Shah, National Land Management Specialist FAO – PCU, Hyderabad, Pakistan

Study Report Review of Sindh Tenancy Act (Study of Regulatory Framework), University of Hyderabad

PAK1301HSF_Eval_Final_2016, Evaluation Livelihood Restoration and Protection and Sustainable Empowerment of Vulnerable Peasant Communities in Sindh Province, May-June 2016, John G. Connell (international) and Raja Hasrat (national)

Pakistan2025 One Nation-One Vision

EU-Pakistan Multi-Annual Indicative Programme 2014-2020

Sindh Agriculture Policy 2018-2030, approved by Sindh Cabinet on 16/04/2018

Assess Peasants Organizations', Farmers Organizations' and Community Organizations' Disaster Risk Reduction and Safety Nets Related to Food and Land, June 2019

Institutional assessment of Peasants Organizations, Farmers Organizations, Water Users Associations and Community Organizations, December 2019

High Court of Sindh Circuit Court, Hyderabad. CP.No.D-451 of 2016 (Ghulam Ali S/o. Kamal Khan Leghari Vs. Province of Sindh & others)

Guide to the Project Cycle - Quality for Results, FAO, 2012

https://pnd.sindh.gov.pk

Summary of Agriculture, Supply & Prices Department Annual development Programme 2019-2020, as published on https://pnd.sindh.gov.pk

The Express Tribune, June 15th, 2019

Press statement, 7 July 2019, www.fao.org

www.intracen.org

11.6 Evaluation 6: Evaluation questions

This section contains a brief summary of the responses to the evaluation questions.

1. Relevance

1.1 Does the action presently respond to the needs of the target groups / end beneficiaries? Answer : The Action responds to the needs of the target groups and end beneficiaries. It is in line with the Pakistan 2020-2025 One Nation-One Vision strategy, with the EU-Pakistan Multi-Annual Indicative Programme (MIP) 2014-2020, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Peasants and Other People Working in Rural Areas contribute to Sustainable Development Goal 1 (No Poverty), 2 (Zero Hunger), 10 (No Inequality) and 13 (Climate Action). It is relevant to FAO's VGGT. The three main areas of intervention present clear needs in the field of the strategic framework, the land tenancy agreements and in terms of poverty reduction through increased productivity.

1.2 Is the action adapted to the present institutional, human, financial capacities of the partner government and/or other key stakeholder(s)? Answer : The Action is adapted to the present institutional and human capacities of the partner government and other key stakeholders. A certain level of capacity was already present in the target districts and villages as other previous projects have been executed in the area in the area of the ILTS intervention. The Action was adapted to build on top of that capacity (the Rural Support Programme (RSP) programme i.e. Sindh Union Council and Community Economic Strengthening Support (SUCCESS) and Peoples' Poverty Reduction Programme (PPRP). The social capital (community and village organisations) was used by ILTS. The community and village level organizations are not properly organized and registered, whereas Local Support Organizations are well organized at Union Council level. FAO has worked on those aspects. We have observed in the field the formal structure of the organizations Village Grievance Redressal Committees (VGRC), how they are used to conduct regular meetings and keep records of those meetings /disputes they encountered and resolved. The FFS /WOS has further firmed up during the whole process of engagement with FAO.

1.3 Are all key stakeholders demonstrating effective commitment (ownership)? Answer : Commitment and ownership is quite variable. Two major recent developments increase commitment : the production by FAO of a "Strategy to Mainstream the Principles and Practices of Responsible Governance of Tenure in Legislation, Administration and Policies of the Land Sector in Sindh Province" in October 2019 and a decision of the High Court of Sindh Circuit Court at Hyderabad, ordering tghe Government of Sindh to take remedial action and amend the Sindh Tenancy Act. While none of these two will produce immediate results, they are very encouraging signs of a certain commitment to change that did not exist not so long ago. In the field, ownership to the project's ambitions varies hugely, with minimal buy-in at the political level and the big landlords ; acceptance at the Planning and Development Board, Government of Sindh ; positive attitude at district administration level ; big landlords displaying a negative attitude ; and small and medium landlords as well as haris very committed.

1.4 Indicators: Are the indicators well defined and relevant to measure the achievement of the objectives? Answer: The project has an unsatisfactory set of non-SMART indicators which should have been updated or modified much earlier during the execution period. The updated version suggested after the ROM mission took a few months to develop but was not presented to the EUD. This new version is still deficient with new OO and SO, something that shifts the aim of the project but also goes against project cycle management guidelines.
a) Are all related data available? Answer: Unfortunately, the data is either partially collected, processed or at the time of the mission, not available.
b) Are all indicators sex-disaggregated, if relevant? Some indicators are sex-disaggregated, and they keep count of male and female participation separately. New indicators need to take this into consideration.
c) Are baselines set and updated for each indicator? There was not baseline study done before or at the start of the project. It seems that the baseline study carried out a few months after the start of the project was not taken very much into consideration.

d) Are targets values set and are they realistic? It seems that without the delay the experienced at the start of the project, the numerical targets could have been reached by the end of the original intended period.

2. Efficiency

2.1 Have the chosen implementation mechanisms (incl. choice of implementation modalities, entities and contractual arrangements) proved to be conducive for achieving the expected results? Answer : The implementation mechanisms are largely fine, in as far as the management structure and contractual arrangements is concerned. FAO has adopted the direct execution modality for ILTS. The direct execution translates into a simple structure. The human resources at Hyderabad and district levels are overburdened because of the large geographic coverage and the low number of staff. At the time of the mid-term evaluation, only one programme steering committee meeting has taken place. Civil society is not involved to the biggest extent possible. There is space and willingness on behalf of civil society to be incorporated more into the social mobilization network.

2.2 Do the resources funded by the action and actually made available correspond to the needs of the action? Answer : In strategic terms, the resources provided for ILTS do not fully correspond to the needs of action. This is evident from the field observation that there are areas which requires investments : water infrastructure Improvement , quality inputs (seed quality has been reported by beneficiaries to be problematic), technological innovations for land use planning, climate smart technologies to address the soil salinity issues, water scarcity, soil erosion, lack of credit for inputs and machinery, poor marketing channels with middle-men and contractors taking large margins, and limited facilities for storage of perishable crops and dairy products. ILTS cannot cover all those equally important issues that form all together an integral part of a solution of the agricultural issues Sindh Province is facing. Furthermore, the inputs are only for demonstration of improved practices and technologies, whereas investment in strategic areas is also required for the creation of models for replications both at policy and operational level. If the productivity that has been demonstrated in the economic analysis (see section on effectiveness) continues to be significantly higher than in farming plots that do not benefit from the Action, there is a good potential for the project to constitute value for money. However, all results must be considered tentative at this stage and to be corroborated at the time of the impact evaluation.

2.3 Delays.

a) If there are delays, how important are they and what are the consequences? Answer : There are significant delays. The project was due to start in January 2017 and the necessary arrangements had been made to get the project approved from the provincial Government of Sindh. However, it took over seven months to get the project's approval despite the support provided by the Planning and Development Department. The sensitive nature of the project and its potential implications on the longstanding relationships between peasants and landlords and impact on the traditional socio-economic fabric of the rural population are the main issues that prevented a swift approval by the relevant government authorities.

b) To What extent have appropriate corrective measures been implemented? Answer : Project activities have been planned according to the number of remaining months, and applied some minor corrective measures ; they count on an extension as correcrive measure. After this delay the project has been implemented without further major time scale setbacks. FAO has calculated that a one year no-cost extension (which corresponds to the incurred delay) will allow them to achieve the objectives.

2.4 Have the outputs been produced/delivered in a cost-efficient manner? Answer : It is only partly possible to submit an informed opinion on the cost-efficiency. FAO has not provided a full financial report that incorporates headquarters and field expenditure. As to the cost-efficiency of the local expenditure, we note that the expenditure has been budgeted mostly per activity. This carries the risk of double-charging or multiple-charging. It is often impossible to know how expenditure has been incurred with the financial information that was provided by FAO. Several large budget lines are not detailed. Out of a budget of local expenditure of 2,419,055 €, there is 1,033,570 € as non-itemized unverifiable budgeting.
The lack of timely available financial data has prevented the evaluators from carrying out this critical aspect of the evaluation. As a result, commissioning a study into the financial data is highly desirable.

2.5 Is the action adequately monitored by implementing partners, partner government(s) and other key stakeholders? Answer : The monitoring function is severely deficient. The absence of data has constituted a major challenge for the evaluation team. The majority of data has been produced after the end of the evaluation field phase. The M&E requirements for this project are demanding and understaffing this area has been a key obstacle to prevent the evaluation team to be able to obtain all the data required for its analysis, something that should have been part of the information already analysed or semi analysed and awaiting for the evaluation exercise. Improvement of the M&E function will not only come from investing in human resources but also by increasing resourcefulness and extending responsibilities to non-M&E personnel in the field all the way down to decentralising data gathering to the final beneficiaries. A grass roots data system has not been institutionalized. Field staff appeared not to have instructions to collect vital information for project management. Local government officials are aware of the project, representing a satisfactory level of ownership, but their role in M&E was not evident. Local civil society organizations' role in the monitoring was also not evident at this stage.

3. Effectiveness

3.1 Is the progress of each output conforming to plan? Answer : Progress is not according to plan because of the one year delay at the start. In summary : Result 1 : baseline conducted in all 8 districts ; study of regulatory frameworks conducted ; mapping if landlord/sharecropper existing relations done ; strategic plan developed and now needs to be implemented. Result 2 : 80 villages selected after rapid rural appraisals ; 80 socio-economic and bio-physical profiles prepared of said villages ; 608 persons trained in the principles of VGGT ; 60 Village Grievance Committees established (target is 80) ; land tenancy agreements : 1515/4800 contracts signed. 2000 more are under preparation and to be signed by March 2020 (registration process is on-going) ; farmer field schools : 232/504 FFS established, 144 in progress, total 376/504 ; number of beneficiaries : 5,800 households (target is 12,600) ; number of district and provincial officials trained : 75 (target 75). Result 3 : number of peasant organizations identified : 76 (target 160) ; number of farmer's organizations identified : 68 (target 8) ; number of WUAs identified : 24 (target 80) ; needs assessment for institutional strengthening of the above organizations done ; study on water quality for multiple use water services conducted.

3.2 Is the quality of outputs (including those of CD support) satisfactory?

a) Grievance committees. Answer : The Village Grievance Redressal Committees (VGRCs) are still in their inchoative state, due to the delays that were incurred. 60 committees have been formed, whereas 80 is the target. Each committee is composed of three haris and two landlords. The speed of resolution is very high, often within one day. The VGRC mediation option is faster and easier than the Panchayat. The number of cases so far is quite low. As per the statistics provided by FAO, 37 cases have been brought to VGRCs and an all have been resolved. Interestingly, all cases so far address hari-hari conflicts. It was the initial intention (or assumption), at the time of project formulation, that the committees would be addressing hari-landlord issues. So far, that has not happened. The reason is most likely that the committees are not yet fully institutionalized and not all of them are set up. Possibly, the composition of the committees plays a role as well : landlords may not be as keen as haris to bring a case to a VGRC given that the majority of members of the committees are haris.

b) is the reported productivity augmentation limited to demonstration plots where FAO has invested inputs and materials, including technical assistance; or is it an action-wide phenomenon that can be attributed to the Action? This refers to the observation that FAO reports increased productivity in this Action that is severely delayed in implementation, whereas common agricultural standards suggest that productivity increase cannot be the result of a one-year cycle, and less probable in the entire project area. Answer : Training has been provided to 5,800 famers on improved cultivation techniques. Field visits by the Evaluation Team confirm that a number of Haris have adopted techniques that address their most urgent needs, issues and constraints including Laser Land Levelling (LLL), improved soil management, raised-bed cultivation, alternative wet-dry (AWD) rice cultivation, reduced tillage and agro-forestry.

c) Economic analysis: Are there productivity and profitability analysis of farming systems as a whole at household level, before and after the new practices have been introduced? Answer : A survey shows that incomes are about Euro 300 higher among Haris who were Project beneficiaries, as opposed to those Haris who did not participate in the Project. In comparison direct costs of training is about Euro30 per farmer; total costs including overheads, project management, reporting etc. is Euro 345 which exceeds estimated benefits. This may change as such costs tend to be higher during the early years of the project.

d) To what extent do the practices promoted by FAO contribute to better production, better income and better environmental sustainability (fertility in particular) ? Answer : In addition to income increases due to training (see above), Haris who have signed agreements also derive other benefits including provision of land for their family use; more transparency with regard to input purchase; assistance during times of emergency; and support to settle disputes. A number of adopted technologies will reduce GHG emission, for example from rice paddies and livestock. Others such as zero/reduced tillage will improve sol fertility.

e) The prevalence of monocrops vs multi-crops. Answer : Multiple cropping with more high value crops can substantially raise incomes and reduce poverty. However, adoption of multiple cropping is slower than other for techniques as it requires more labour, better planning and management, higher input costs and greater market-related risks.

f) Farmers field schools : The main farm-level problems in the project districts relate to water and drainage and these are being exacerbated by climate change. The training curricula, designed through participatory approach aims to improve cultivation methods and address critical problems such as lack of water and erratic rainfall. So far 232 FFS/OWS have been held.

g) Demonstration Farms are established for farmers' training to obtain higher crop yields. Were such farms established in all 8 districts? What was the percentage increase in output vis-à-vis cost of inputs (like pesticides, fertilizers, good quality seeds and tractors, harvesters, land levelling machines etc.)? The data of crop yield in adjoining land outside the demonstration farms needs to be inquired for comparison. Answer : Demonstration plots have been established one acre plots at each of the 232 FFA/OWSs, and are used to help Haris and small landlords to practically demonstrate improvements The impact on production and incomes varies according to the farms. However, general adoption of improvements such as laser levelling and raised bed cultivation across Pakistan suggest that these are economically robust.

h) Preliminary results, if any, in terms of agricultural techniques having been adopted/adapted or just tried once by farmers, and about possible agronomic results (yields, production costs). Answer : New techniques adopted are contributing to higher yields and enhanced incomes. They are also being gradually mainstreamed in other parts of Pakistan with relevant machinery and equipment, such as laser levellers, ridgers and seed drills becoming available. This seems to suggest that these techniques will continue to be use

i) Land tenancy agreements. Answer : The agreement by itself cannot be expected to remedy or attempt to remedy the landlord-farmer business relationship that has been customary for many years and by several generations , and even less will it in and of itself increase the productivity. There are elements in the contract that contribute to such an increase, but they must be seen jointly with the transfer of knowledge that is being provided in ILTS. The agreement is not a breakthrough in this social and economic context, but part of a series of joint efforts being made that together attempt to achieve higher equality and fairness to both parties and distribute wealth for both in a manner that the landlords do not react adversely to this new arrangement. The LTA must not be seen in isolation ; this would negate or ignore the work behind the process of getting parties into an agreement.The process has taken into consideration all the primary and secondary parties involved. Since it has not been customary to have this kind of agreement in the past, it is reported that is has not been an easy feat to get both parties to agree to this new arrangement. Even when agreements have been signed, the main concern was the understanding of its contents by the Haris. Villagers in the target area have reported that disputes have decreased as a result, although no statistics are available. It was found that the agreements and the awareness information capacity that goes behind each one of them, has served to reinvigorate or reset the relationships between the landlords and farmers. For the farmers it i provides a sense of stability. It allows for the farmers to be certain that any extra work they do or inputs they are required to provide, will be used on land they will benefit from for the next two years, in most

cases. It allows for him to invest with a greater sense of security and provides the certainty that the extra work that might go to grow a better or more productive crop, he will benefit fairly from it. In this environment the knowledge gained from the farm field schools is applied creating a new synergy. For the landlords, the agreement provides a sense of security by knowing that the Haris or farmers have also a vested interest in working harder and investing in the agreed inputs. A sense of partial relief is afforded since the agreement, as standard, allows for the tenant to remain in the landlord's land for two years and the landlord does not have to worry about unforeseen departures and risking losing his investment on a given crop.

j) Farmers Managed Watercourses in each district and farmers training for maintenance of the lined watercourses : activity to be carried out in the remaining time frame of implementation.

k) Capacity enhancement of 120 Peasants Organizations, 2 farmers Organizations and 60 WUAs to manage natural resources and resolve disputes : activity to be carried out in the remaining time frame of implementation.

3.3 Are the outputs (including CD) still likely to lead to the expected outcomes? Answer : This question translates into an assessment of the potential final impact, which is not to be measured in a mid-term evaluation. We provide a provisional assessment. The work carried out by the project up to now points to the gradual accomplishment of the project's specific objective or outcome. Through an increased governance and transparency in the relations between some haris and some farmers, together with more cost-efficient and effective farming practices, the project has been able to increase farm productivity and hence enhance the living standards . The trust process being built up by its participants increases the cooperation and incentives to work with the other party. The new agricultural techniques enter into a more synergic relationship and expand its feasibility opportunities. It can thus be said that this increase in governance has led to an increased number of farmers/haris with recognised evidence of tenure whilst most of the people in this group are experiencing an increase in their farm productivity. A fact that is bound to grow as more farmers and landlords are gaining knowledge and signing new agreements, and one that the project will need to strive to verify with sturdier M&E mechanisms. Although it is still too early to assess this important factor, it can be said that bonded labour will continue to exist as long as there are not recourses for the Haris to exit a cycle of low incomes and expenditure equal or higher than their real earnings. The project is providing a governance platform where this negative cycle can gradually be broken.
A final impact evaluation is budgeted. FAO now has the elements in hand, on the basis of this report, to properly document what is required for a fully informed impact assessment to be done. A lot of work is required to that effect. Last but not least, if no extension is agreed upon (and this report cannot make an informed recommendation on a possible duration thereof in the absence of detailed financial information, as argued in the section on cost-efficiency), the outputs probably would not lead to the full extension of the expected outcomes.

4. Sustainability

4.1 Are key stakeholders acquiring the necessary institutional and human capacities to ensure the continued flow of benefits? Answer : It was observed that the majority of the final beneficiaries, the Haris and landlords and women participating in WOS seem to have absorbed the bulk of the information transferred to improve their agricultural skills. There is an economic incentive to continue doing what is providing them with better crop yields. Along the transfer of knowledge line, the local facilitators and other actors like local government officials, seem also to have an increased knowledge and awareness of the project's benefits. The continued use and potential institutionalisation of the land agreements does have a positive outlook given the fact that it has been largely beneficial for both parties. However, unforeseen circumstances, such as weather-related disturbances in the agricultural cycles might disrupt this relationship.

4.2 To what extent has crop production been diversified, or what is the potential/forecast thereof? Answer : Most of the technology promoted by the project aims to improve efficiency, raise production and enhance incomes. This also includes diversification into higher value crops, in particular vegetables and fodder for livestock. FAO has demonstrated multiple cropping (wheat, onion, sugarcane) intercropping (wheat and canola), and cash crops like seasonal vegetables, cotton and chilies have also been introduced.

4.3 Have the relevant authorities taken the financial measure to ensure the continuation of services after the end of the action? Answer : The 2019-2020 Annual Development Plan for Sindh departments of Agriculture, Livestock & Fisheries, Food, Forestry& Conservation, and Irrigation foresees Rs 3.750 billion for agriculture and Rs 22 billion for irrigation. The global allocation for agriculture as proposed by the Sindh Government is Rs8.4 billion for the agriculture sector, but that includes Rs4.7 billion in foreign assistance, therefore leaving the provincial budget figure at Rs 3.750 billion. These figures are earmarked for the provincial budget for fiscal year 2019-2020. Allocations for specific schemes are as follows (**in PKR million**)[25] :

- agricultural research : Rs 384.316
- agriculture extension : Rs 407.577
- bureau of supply and prices : Rs 0
- Sindh Seed Corporation : Rs 100.460
- agricultural mechanisation : Rs1205.241
- agriculture water management : Rs 1352.406
- agriculture training and research : Rs 275

These figures are provided for the entire Province of Sindh, and can therefore not be confirmed to be assigned to any of the eight target districts in the ILTS project.

4.4 Is there a sound strategy in the project to mobilise the private sector in order to contribute to improve extension services, to facilitate or improve access to money, inputs, markets? Answer : Most of the work in this area is still forecast to be realised in the months to come as a result of the initial delays. However, ILTS reports that it will work to establish the Producer Marketing Groups (PMGs) from community based small enterprises based around different commodities to build their capacities at all levels (primary, secondary and tertiary). This will enable farmers to meet end users compliance requirements, and develop linkages with low and high-end markets. It will also capacitate farmers on collective buying of inputs and sale of outputs (i.e. aggregating leverage for the sale, transport of produce – a leverage which only needs to be organized and can have an effect on the OO of the project).

4.5 Are the practices promoted likely to contribute reverting environmental degradation (particularly loss of fertility) and ensure climate change adaptation? Answer: There are a series of environmental agricultural practices which are conducive to counter environmental degradation and increase yields. (e.g. reduced soil degradation, reduced water losses, increase nitrogen use efficiency, reduced pollution from pesticides and fertilizers, insects' discrimination, increased landscape diversity). These measures have been widely adopted throughout the project's geographical scope with encouraging preliminary results. The project has succeeded in promoting a number of techniques that encourage on-farm fertility. These include zero/reduced tillage; reduced burning of crop residues; and use of farmyard manure. All of these improve the structure and organic content of soils. However, the biggest threats to long-term soil fertility in Sindh are posed by waterlogging and salinity.

4.6 Have the necessary measures been taken into account to enhance the role of women? Answer : Women are being empowered by renewing the concept of kitchen gardens. The concept is not new to all, but it has encouraged many households to invest in harvesting in a small piece of land and grow vegetables which they can consume or even sell the surpluses to other neighbours. This concept has proven to be popular as women usually would have to travel to the markets to buy vegetables which are reportedly of inferior quality and prices that do not reflect the cost of production. Additionally, the inclusion of women in the VGRCs is also an important step towards balancing the traditional social power men have had over their communities. The project has made an effort to also draw female participants on its trainings for NGOs and government workers as their representation in both spaces is generally underwhelming

11.7 Annex 7: Revenues, costs and returns from major crops with and without project (Rs/Acre)

	Hari (with project)	Hari (control group)
WHEAT		
Revenue	28,835	25,319
Costs	13,500	13,100
Net Income	**15,335**	**12,219**
COTTON		
Revenue	56,529	37,132
Costs	15,700	15,200
Net Income	**40,829**	**21,932**
RICE		
Revenue	38,877	32,146
Costs	15,800	15,300
Net Income	**23,077**	**16,846**
SUGARCANE		
Revenue	66,458	53,700
Costs	29,000	24,879
Net Income	**37,458**	**28,821**

Source: Economic Analysis of the ILTS Project Interventions on the Farming Communities, October 2019

11.8 Annex 8: Returns and labour requirements

Returns from Multiple Cropping (per Acre)

Crop	Yield/acre (40kgs)	Price (Rs/40kgs)	Revenue (Rs '000)	Costs (Rs '000)	Returns (Rs '000)
Sugarcane	900	160	144	65	79
Wheat	20	1,100	22	8	14
Onion/Other Vegetables	200	1,000	200	55	145
Canola	1	3.000	3	1	2
Total			431	129	240

Returns from Improved MonoCropping

(per Acre)

Crop	Yield/acre (40kgs)	Price (Rs/40kgs)	Revenue (Rs '000)	Costs (Rs '000)	Returns (Rs '000)
Wheat	40	1100	44	25	19
Cotton	30	2700	81	35	46
Rice	55	1100	61	26	35
Sugarcane	750	160	120	70	50
Total Rice/Wheat	-	-	105	51	54
Total Cotton/Wheat	-	-	125	60	65

Labour Requirements

(per Acre)

Cropping System	Person Days/Acre
Multiple Cropping (Onion, Wheat and Sugar Cane)	100
Wheat	24
Cotton	35
Rice	40
Sugarcane	66

Source: FAO Agronomists and Missions Estimates

11.9 Annex 9: Differing opinions from within the Evaluation Team

Q: Is the project adapted to the present institutional, human, financial capacities of the partner government and / or other key stakeholder(s)?

At the start of field visit, Evaluation Team had meetings in Sindh Government Secretariat with Member Development, Planning and Development Board and his associates. They informed that Sindh Land Tenancy Act 1952 is already there which is aimed to improve the economic and social condition of Haris who do not own any piece of land working on the land of the Landlords in the Sindh Province. Implementation on the 1952 Act could not be done due to political reasons and vested interests of the politicians in Sindh who themselves are big landlords. This ACT now needs to be amended as the old agricultural practices have gone through many changes over 70 years period. However Sindh High Court has taken notice of the delay on its implementation and have asked the reply from Sindh Government regarding its implementation. Same views were expressed by the Additional Secretary (Technical) of Agriculture Department in subsequent meeting. None did mention that Land Tenancy

Agreement of FAO could serve a good substitute of the Act legislated by the province. None had mentioned about increase in productivity because of Land Tenancy Agreement and training in FF S/ Demo Plots.

The project is duplicity of what is already available in the judicial and social system and with the agriculture department of the provincial governments. Given to above, the answer to the question is NO and little chance of its sustainability.

Q: Are all key stakeholders demonstrating effective commitment (ownership)?

The answer is NO. The main stakeholder is the Sindh Government, specially Agriculture Extension Department and Revenue Board. As stated above, none did mention that Land Tenancy Agreement of FAO could serve a good substitute of the Act legislated by the province. None had mentioned about increase in productivity because of Land Tenancy Agreement and training in FFS.

Others mentioned under STAKEHOLDER MAP in the Inception are entirely irrelevant so the question of demonstrating any commitment by them does not arise.

FAO could in arrange our meeting in Revenue Board Sindh which is relevant to the Land Tenancy and instead of that they arranged our meetings with irrelevant NGOs in Karachi and Hyderabad.

Q: The grievance committees – do they go beyond an informal status? What is their actual delivery or performance compared to what they are designed for as per the project documents? Have they solved land issues in the field, and would these issues not have been resolved without them ? A close look to the villages where those committees have already had to intervene as mediators will be necessary.

The grievance committees are designed to resolve disputes arising from Land Tenancy Agreement. FAO was repeatedly requested to share the information about dispute resolution they claim so that it could be verified during our field visit. That information, interalia, contracts signed between Haris and Landowners, training at FFS and FAO input cost at Demonstration Plots as per given Performa. During our meetings at 3 villages, the head of grievance committee narrated the nature of disputes which were about water thefts and tress passing of cattle and NONE relating to dispute arising from contracts signed between Haris and land owners. Such disputes used to be resolved by the Panchayet before and will continue to be resolved after the closing of this project.

- this type of agreements in verbal commitment as well as in black and white are in practice in all the provinces including Sindh. Written agreement signed between any kinds of parties is accepted in the Civil Court under Contract Act of 1942.
- number of issues relating to Land Tenancy agreement were shared neither by FAO nor by the locals during our field visit.

Q: Farmers field schools and the demonstration plots (expected to convey a set of specific technical messages intended to respond to the specific context of the intervention area in order to solve agricultural production problems and/or to take advantage of untapped existing potentials relevant information related to this, i.e. what agricultural production problems / potentials have been identified and what set of technical messages has been designed in response to that. This includes providing the complete work plan for the FFS, explaining the training program features as well as the amount and the nature of subsidies and donations that the project is giving, together with the analysis done by the project on the possible or actual evolution of production costs with the new techniques. To be also specified which part of this programme (which activities) has already been implemented in which areas.

I had the chance to talk to Haris as well as landowners. To increase agricultural production, major demand from both was:

- To increase in irrigation water supply and that was possible if some grant or subsidy is given for installing the tube wells;
- Provision of quality seeds and subsidy in agricultural input like fertilizers and pesticides and availability of agricultural implements at subsidized price;

Regarding establishing of 232 FFS and 168 in progress imparting training to farmers in eight districts, I have the reasons to doubt this figure because they avoided to share the requested information that could be verified during field visit.
FAO also did not share crop production cost at Demonstration Plot so that a comparison could be made. Now they are claiming FAFA coverage for not sHarisng the actual expenditure on interventions.

Q: Demonstration Farms are established for farmers' training to obtain higher crop yields. Were such farms established in all 8 districts? What was the per centage increase in output vis-à-vis cost of inputs (like pesticides, fertilizers, good quality seeds and tractors, harvesters, land levelling machines etc.? The data of crop yield in adjoining land outside the demonstration farms needs to be inquired for comparison.

Establishing Demonstration Farms and giving awareness to the farmers through such farms is the responsibility of the Agricultural Extensions Department as well in all provinces including Sindh. The Departments are already providing such services. It was better if the programme was implemented in association with Agriculture Department for capacity enhancement as well as for sustainability. During the field visit, I had noted that crop condition of Demo Farms was not better than that in the adjoining area without inputs from FAO. Had FAO shared the information about their inputs on Demo Farms and FFS, we could do cost / benefits comparison.
I would recommend that time extension to FAO be pre-conditioned to sHarisng of the cost information on the Performa given to them and they would not claim FAFA coverage when asked to share their expenditure details with EUD or with team for the final evaluation.

Q: Land tenancy agreements. Initial situation - what were the main features –prior to the project- of these agreements and particularly their result in the sHarisng between landowners and sharecroppers of the wealth created by the productive process and the new situation after adopting the written agreements, in particular again regarding what changes in wealth distribution the new agreements are supposed to bring. Among the agreements signed and to be signed, there might be different categories according to their expected results that might be worth analyzing.

The situation is the same as before the Land Tenancy Agreements. Haris and landowners are stiil working on the verbal agreements as before. In the interviews during field visit, land owners (medium as well as small) expressed their reservations regarding signing of Tenancy Agreement with Haris. None of the Haris could produce the copy of signed contract. Even FAO did not share information in this regard that could be verified by Evaluation Team during field visit.
Landowners were scary to sign the agreement lest the Haris goes to the Civil Court and gets stay order.
I have reasons to doubt FAO figure regarding signing of the Land Tenancy Agreements between Haris and landlords. I would recommend that, from now onwards, in Land Tenancy Agreements, at least one of the two witnesses to the agreement should be member of FAO field staff who should clearly write his name, his position in FAO and his / her National Identity Card number on the card. FAO should be able to do that when they are supplying this document for signing between Haris and landowners.

Q: Farmers Managed Watercourses in each district and farmers training for maintenance of the lined watercourses imparted to them will be investigated.

In the past Agriculture Departments (On Farm Water Management Wing) of the provinces had helped construction of concrete lined watercourses with financial assistance of Asian Development Bank. Under the programme construction inputs were procured by On Farm Water Management Wings and labour input was provided by the beneficiary farmers on the watercourse. Training was also given to the farmers for maintenance.
During field visit FAO staff were requested to take the Team to any of the Farmers Managed Watercourse which are supposed to be concrete lined and also to share information about FAO inputs for cost / benefits comparison but that was not done. Nothing could be verified with regard to farmers managed watercourses and farmers training to maintain them.

Q: FAO claims they enhanced capacity of 120 Peasants Organizations, 2 Farmers Organizations and 60 WUAs to manage natural resources and resolve disputes. We will inquire if these organizations existed before FAO came in and how FAO have increased their capacity.

During field visit no meeting was arranged with any of the above listed organizations whose capacity had been enhanced by FAO. Agriculture Extension Department and Livestock Department of the Sindh Government were performing, interalia, the same functions before FAO came in. These departments will continue to perform these functions even after closing of FAO programme. FAO had avoided to share this information for our verification during the field visit. In the absence of the information and without its verification I am unable to endorse FAO claim.


ibf
INTERNATIONAL
CONSULTING