

## **Mid-Term Evaluation Report on AIDS Impact Mitigation Project**



**By**

**Muyiwa Oladosu, PhD  
Uche Igwe  
Consultants, Winrock International**

February, 2009

Winrock International, Abuja, Nigeria

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

This evaluation would not have been possible without the help and cooperation of WI project staff including Dr. Chalya Lar (Chief of party) who provided management guidance and support, Wale Adeogun (M&E Specialist) who coordinated the whole process, and Dr. Lami Samail, Timothy Zakka, and Amenze Igbiniedion who facilitated the process of the fieldwork, and Mercy Ameh who gave needed administrative support. Our thanks go to Dr. Ochiawunma Ibe the USAID project CTO, Isa Iyortim, and Philomena Irene who granted time for interview and the fieldwork process. We thank Uchenna Okafor-Agbi, and Dominic Etuko, representatives of ICAN, and NIM respectively who served as observers during the fieldwork, and Tawanda Madhangi AidsAlliance UK representative whose short visit during the planning process was well appreciated. Many thanks to our IPs/IAs staff who created conducive environment for the fieldwork and mobilized beneficiaries ahead of time. Worthy of thanks are the beneficiaries of the AIM project who were very responsive to our interviews and provided useful information. Lastly is the staff of MiraMonitor Consulting Ltd., including Chenenye Ezekwueme, Yahaya Shuaibu, and Gloria Affiku who assisted during the data translation, transcribing, and report writing stages.

## ACRONYMS

AB	Abstinence and Be faithful
ABC	Abstinence Be Faithful and Condom Use
AIDS	Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
AIM	AIDS Impact Mitigation
BCS	Basic Care and Support
COP	Country Operational Plan
CSO	Civil Society Organization
CSW	Commercial Sex Workers
FBO	Faith Based Organization
FCT	Federal Capital Territory
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
FMoWA	Federal Ministry of Women’s Affairs
NGO	Non Governmental Organization
HIV/AIDS	Human Immunodeficiency Virus/Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
HQ	Headquarters
IA	Implementing Agency
ICAN	Institute of Chartered Accountants of Nigeria
IP	Implementing Partner
IPs/IAs	Implementing Partners/Implementing Agencies
IGA	Income Generating Activity
JJR	Jehovah Jireh Resources
NIM	Nigerian Institute of Management
M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation
MTE	Mid Term Evaluation
OP	Other Prevention
OSY	Out of School Youth
OVC	Orphans and Vulnerable Children
PABA	People Affected by AIDS
PLWHA	People Living with HIV/AIDS
RAPAC	Redeemed AIDS Program Action Committee
SCD	Society for Community Development
TYECE	Teens and Youths Educational and Capacity Enhancement
UBE	Universal Basic Education
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USG	Ummah Support Group
WHED	Women Health Education Development
WI	Winrock International
WOGEND	Women Gender Developers
WOTCLEF	Women Trafficking and Child Labor Eradication Foundation

# CONTENTS

Title Page	i
Acknowledgements	ii
Acronyms	iii
Table of Contents	iv
Executive Summary	v
Chapter One	
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Evaluation Goal	2
1.1.1 Evaluation Objectives	2
Chapter Two	
2 Evaluation Methodology	3
2.1 Phase 1	3
2.1.1 Selection of States and IPs/IAs	3
2.1.2 Fieldwork	4
2.1.3 Sampling of Beneficiaries	4
2.1.4 Interviews for IPs/IAs,WI and USAID	4
2.2 Phase 2	5
2.3 Limitations of the Evaluation	6
Chapter Three	
3 Findings	7
3.1 Orphans and Vulnerable Children	7
3.2 Basic Care and Support	9
3.3 Abstinence and Be Faithful	10
3.4 Other Prevention	12
3.5 Effectiveness Program Strategy	13
3.5.1 Programming Strengths and Weakness	14
3.6 Supportive Environment and Other Issues	16
Chapter Four	
4 Conclusions and Recommendation	18
4.1 Service Areas	18
4.1.1 Orphans and Vulnerable Children	18
4.1.2 Basic Care and Support	18
4.1.3 Abstinence and be Faithful	19
4.1.4 Other Prevention	19
4.2 Programming Strategies and Effectiveness	20
4.2.1 Effectiveness of Service Areas	20
4.2.2 Monitoring and Evaluation	20
4.2.3 Capacity Building	21
4.2.4 Selection of Beneficiaries	21
4.2.5 Continuity and Sustainability	21

4.2.6	Staff Salaries and Welfare	22
4.2.7	Perceptions about the Beneficiaries	22
4.3	Reflecting on Cooperative Agreement	22
4.4	Overall Conclusion	23

## **Appendixes**

A: Evaluation Instruments

B: Methodology for Mid-Term Evaluation

C: List of Documents Reviewed

D: Persons Contacted

E: Reports on IPs/IAs

## **Executive Summary**

The mid-term evaluation (MTE) was aimed to assess the performance and accountability of the AIM project implementation between October 2006 and August 2008. The MTE was conducted in two phases; the first between 1<sup>st</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> December, 2008 was on planning for the evaluation, followed by fieldwork which included 11 group interviews for IPs/IAs, and WI staff, 4 key informant interviews for WI/USAID staff, and 73 key informant interviews, and 13 FGDs for the project beneficiaries. The second phase of the evaluation was between 12<sup>th</sup> January and 16<sup>th</sup> February, 2009 and was focused on data translation, transcription, analysis and interpretation, and report writing and presentation of findings.

The findings showed that in general, the project reached the targeted sub-groups of the population with specific needed services. The majority of OVC beneficiaries were able to read and write; most caregivers who were involved in IGA reported productive economic activities, and most CSWs who participated in the AB program reported behavior change in term of reduction in the number of sexual partners, increased use of condoms, and increased desire to transition to another trade. Strategies need to be fine-tuned to: (1) enlighten stakeholders on the actual aim of the Acada program in order to reduce over expectations on benefits and enlist more commitment in the long-run; (2) IGA recipients need more funds to improve their income generating capacity and stabilize them in the long-run; and (3) CSWs need additional financial or logistics support to give more of them the needed push to transition fully to their new chosen trade.

Programming has been effective in reaching more target groups at a reduced cost between the two years considered. More effective programming can be achieved by evaluating each IPs/IAs and ensuring that they are only engaged in the service areas that they have the most comparative advantage. Likewise, the service areas need to be realigned and streamlined to reduce gaps and strengthen linkages across program areas and across IPs/IAs thus, increasing efficiency the AIM project in the long-run.

Capacity building especially of the IPs/IAs has been the strongest point of the AIM project. IPs/IAs reported substantial improvement in their ability to implement projects ranging from improved program strategies to increased knowledge in financial management, M&E and general administration. Future direction may be focused on increasing hands-on TAs, and periodic refresher courses, and more effort should be directed towards stepping-down training to branch offices and field staff who have direct contact with beneficiaries. Other key programming issues include; the need to provide more funds for M&E, the need to review and improve the salaries and welfare of staff, and the need to improve work environment by providing more amenities to enhance communication, and quality of work.

In sum, the MTE has revealed strengths and weaknesses of the AIM project. Insights on the implementation between the two years suggest that the project is heading in the right direction satisfactorily.

# Chapter One

## 1. Introduction

The AIDS Impact Mitigation (AIM) Project is funded by USAID with an overarching goal of improving the quality of life and alleviating the conditions of people living with HIV/AIDS (PLWHA), people affected by AIDS (PABA) and the most at risk, disadvantaged sub-groups of the population of Nigeria.

The AIM project began in October 2006 geared to achieve two major objectives:

- 1) To strengthen the capacity and sustainability of indigenous national and regional multiplier CSOs within Nigeria to manage and support their local chapters and other CSOs and initiatives.
- 2) To strengthen and support the capacity of FBOs, CBOs, and NGOs to design, implement, monitor, evaluate, and expand delivery of HIV/AIDS prevention, care and support services in their communities<sup>1</sup>.

The AIM project enables indigenous organizations to be more responsive to the basic needs of peoples and families in their communities through four main program areas:

*Orphans and Vulnerable Children (OVC):* The focus is on improvement in health and nutritional status of OVC (aged 0-5 years) and their caregivers; the establishment of community-based education centers known as “Acada Learning Center” which provides basic numeracy and literacy skills to out-of-school OVC aged 8-14 years; and reintegrate them into formal education.

*Basic Care and Support (BCS):* This service area aims to achieve optimal quality of life for PLWHA, PABA, and their families through financial or material support on income generating activities. Basically the AIM project provides social care including training on enterprise development, vocational training, grants for business set-up and bookkeeping.

*Abstinence and Be Faithful (AB):* This service area focuses on changing behavior of commercial sex workers (CSWs) through risk reduction, partner reduction, and reduction in dependency on sex trade. CSWs are targeted with three best-practiced HIV prevention services which includes; community awareness campaigns, peer education and on-the-job support for peer educators, and interventions enabling self-efficacy to transition to another trade by providing support on income generating activities (IGAs) and training on essential life support skills.

*Other Prevention (OP):* This service area targets out-of-school youth (OSY) especially barbers and hairdressers with three best-practiced HIV prevention strategies namely; providing specific HIV awareness campaigns, peer education activities using government

---

<sup>1</sup> USAID. Modification to Capacity Building for AIDS Impact Mitigation (AIM): A project to support widows, single mothers, CSWs, and OVCs in Nigeria. September, 2006

approved training curriculum, refresher training and on-the-job support for peer educators, and community outreaches that promotes ABC advocacy and condom distribution to OSY.

The AIM project four service areas are implemented through three main parties:

- Winrock International (as the prime partner and contractor to USAID)
- Implementing Partners (IPs) usually of a wider national scope, referred to as multiplier organizations, and Implementing Agencies (IAs), usually of a smaller scope and spread across the country.
- Professional bodies mainly; Institute of Chartered Accountants of Nigeria (ICAN), and Nigerian Institute of Management (NIM). These professional bodies build the capacity of IPs/IAs through training on project management skills and financial accounting.

This report is the outcome of a Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) of the AIM project focusing mainly on program implementation in COP 06 and COP 07.

### *1.1 Evaluation Goal*

The goal of this evaluation is to assess the performance and accountability of the AIM implementation project from October 2006 to August 2008.

#### *1.1.1 Evaluation Objectives*

Emanating from the goal are specific objectives of the MTE outlined below:

- Measure progress made to so far, in the implementation of the AIM project;
- Ascertain if the AIM Project have been effective as planned on target beneficiaries;
- Establish if funds committed to the project have been efficiently utilized to achieve the project objectives;
- Provide verified information about the implementation process adopted by AIM project's IPs/IAs against the standard prescribed by the project;
- Identify specific areas of successes in the project implementation, the factor(s) that contributed to their achievement and measures required to sustain them;
- Identify areas where gaps currently exists in the project implementation and proffer possible solutions to them;
- Measure efficiency of the project so far, by conducting a target-beneficiaries' assessment of the AIM Project and submission of a report on the same;
- Based on findings from the evaluation study, recommend to the AIM Project management ways of improvement on the achievements (if any) of the Project<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup> Winrock International. Plan for Mid-Term External Evaluation of Winrock International AIM Project. November, 2008.



## Chapter Two

### 2. Evaluation Methodology

The mid-term evaluation (MTE) was in two phases. The first was between 1st and 22<sup>nd</sup> December, 2008, and the second was from 12<sup>th</sup> January to 16<sup>th</sup> February 2009. Participatory approach was employed in the two phases of the evaluation. The approach included consultations with the key stakeholders including Winrock International (WI) staff, USAID staff, IPs/IAs staff and volunteers, AIM project beneficiaries and ICAN/NIM observers. The participatory approach also involved review of relevant documents such as cooperative agreement, WI and IPs/IAs annual reports, and other vital documents. It also employed key informant interviews, and focus group discussions (FGD) to elicit relevant qualitative information from various key stakeholders.

#### 2.1 Phase I

The first phase of the evaluation included planning for data collection including hiring of consultants, design of the methodology to be employed in data collection, and fieldwork itinerary. Three consultants and a volunteer (from AIDS Alliance, UK) with diverse expertise and experience conducted the first phase of the evaluation. The fieldwork itinerary was finalized in consultation with key AIM project staff and other stakeholders. Likewise, the data collection instruments were pre-tested and finalized in consultations with the key stakeholders. Ten instruments were developed separately with slight variations to elicit information from all the AIM project stakeholders including beneficiaries. The instruments included questions on background characteristics of respondents, PEPFAR national response on HIV/AIDS and OVC issues in Nigeria, achievements of the project so far, strengths and weaknesses of programming focusing on the four program areas—OVC, BCS, AB, and OP, and capacity building of IPs/IAs staff and beneficiaries. Other topics covered in the data collection instruments are knowledge and understanding of the USAID/WI programming, financial and administrative, monitoring and evaluation guidelines, requirements and procedures, implications of providing four areas of service vis-à-vis a few, and other issues that may have influence on the implementation of the AIM project (Appendix A).

##### 2.1.1 Selection of States & IPs/IAs

Four states, FCT and Kano from the Northern, and Lagos and Edo from the Southern parts of the country were purposively selected from 11 states implementing the AIM project. The criteria for the selection of states included having at least two IPs/IAs or a head office. In order to have a balanced evaluation of the AIM project as a whole, eight IPs/IAs were purposively selected to represent a combination of strong and weak programs (Appendix B).

### 2.1.2 Fieldwork

Fieldwork began with the pre-testing of interview guidelines using similar sub-groups as those of the fieldwork in Abuja (from RAPAC, Abuja). Feedback from pre-test and comments from other stakeholders were used to fine-tune the instruments that were employed in the data collection which was implemented between 10<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> December, 2008. Four consultants participated in the data collection exercise which employed mainly qualitative techniques including in-depth interviews and focused group discussion (FGD). The consultants visited the IPs/IAs in the states in pairs of two, one group to the two southern states (Lagos and Edo), and the other group visited the two selected northern states (Kano and FCT). The northern team was accompanied by an ICAN representative, while a NIM representative accompanied the team to the two southern states, both as observers. Also, two USAID representatives participated in the fieldwork, one observed in the north and the other in the south. WI staff directly working with the selected IPs/IAs assisted the evaluation team with logistics and administration of the fieldwork.

### 2.1.3 Sampling of Beneficiaries

In this evaluation exercise, only beneficiaries were sampled to obtain diverse and representative number of FGD participants and key informant interviewees across program areas. Key personnel of IPs/IAs responsible for the AIM project were interviewed in a group. Similarly, WI AIM project team staff were interviewed in a group (except the Chief of Party who was interviewed separately). A few key USAID representative directly involved in the AIM project were interviewed individually. Also, Acada teachers were interviewed individually.

The evaluation team employed systematic sampling to select the required number of FGD participants and key informant interviewees using lists of beneficiaries provided at the IPs/IAs office as sampling frames. A sampling interval (nth) was determined by dividing the number of beneficiaries in each program area by a predetermined number required for the program area. In order to forestall possible IPs/IAs bias in the selection of beneficiaries for the evaluation, they did not have fore knowledge of the beneficiaries who participated in the MTE. IPs/IAs were only asked to prepare an updated list of the beneficiaries while selection of MTE participants was done on the spot at the point during evaluation team visits to the IPs/IAs offices. Beneficiaries were over sampled to ensure that those unavailable were easily replaced during fieldwork.

### 2.1.4 Interviews for IPs/IAs, WI, and USAID

**Table 2: Status report on proposed vs. actual grouped interviews and key informant interviews of IPs/IAs, WI, and USAID key staff**

	Grouped Interview		Key Informant Interview	
	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual
RAPAC	1	1	-	-
USG	2	2	-	-

WOTCLEF	2	2	-	-
SCD	2	2	-	-
TYECE	1	1	-	-
WHED	1	1	-	-
WOGEND	1	1	-	-
JJR	1	1	-	-
WI	1	1	1	1
USAID	-	-	3	3
Total	11	11	4	4

Table 1 shows the proposed and actual interviews for IPs/IAs, WI, and USAID key personnel. In total, 11 grouped interviews were conducted for IPs/IAs in the four selected states, one grouped interview for key project staff of WI, a key informant interview for the Chief of Party, and three key informant interviews for USAID staff directly involved in the AIM project.

**Table 2: Status report on proposed vs. actual key informant interview and FGD of beneficiaries**

	Key Informant Interview		FGD	
	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual
Edo	20	19	1	3
FCT	28	22	1	2
Kano	16	18	1	6
Lagos	20	14	1	2
Total	84	73	4	13

In general, more participation was elicited from the program beneficiaries than planned. This may be due to the high level of mobilization of the beneficiaries by the IPs/IAs staff about the MTE. Many beneficiaries showed-up at venues of interview/FGD irrespective of whether they were invited or not. In total, 84 key informant interviews were proposed, and 73 were actually conducted. And 4 FGDs were proposed, while 13 were actually conducted. Due to the large turnout of beneficiaries, especially those of the OVC and BCS, many who were originally slated for key informant interviews were asked to participate in FGD instead, with each session composing of at least 7 participants.

## 2.2 Phase II

Phase two of the evaluation exercise involved transcribing of taped interviews, data capture, and analysis of data, report writing, and presentation of findings to key stakeholders. Paraphrased texts (in italics) are presented in the findings section as evidence to support or buttress emerging point or issue. Data analysis also extensive review of relevant documents listed in Appendix C. Also, detailed list of persons contacted during the course of this MTE are in Appendix D. Two of the four consultants who participated in the first phase were involved in the second phase.

### *2.3 Limitations of the Evaluation*

The evaluation team did not visit all the IPs/IAs that were involved in the AIM project during COP 06 and COP 07. There is no way of knowing whether findings from the few that were not visited would have substantially influenced the outcome of this evaluation. It is most likely that this is the case since clear emerging themes were obtained in the results across IPs/IAs representing strong and weak programs. There were instances where IPs/IAs had discontinued working in a service area at the time of evaluation. The evaluation team observed that beneficiaries for the discontinued service areas were difficult to locate, and IPs/IAs staff had difficulty motivating the beneficiaries to participate in the MTE. The implication of this is low turnout of beneficiaries in the discontinued service areas. Also, there were few instances of difficulty in the interpretation of instruments to local dialects but this did not substantially affect the fieldwork process or the outcome of the evaluation.

## Chapter Three

### 3. Findings

Findings of this MTE focus only on program performance in COP 06 & COP 07 for the AIM project as a whole with respect to: achievements and successes in the provision of services to beneficiaries, and challenges; programming effectiveness and strategies, capacity building of IPs/IAs, and constraints, knowledge and understanding of IPs/IAs on WI/USAID guidelines and strategies, service areas of comparative advantage, continuity of programming, and other vital issues for the project success. Specific findings on each of the eight IPs/IAs that participated in the evaluation are included in Appendix E.

#### 3.1 Orphans & Vulnerable Children (OVC)

*Achievements on OVC.* Achievements and successes were examined with respect to how IPs/IAs were able to meet their targets, what IPs/IAs and beneficiaries say about services received, and perceptions of the evaluation team in general.

**Table 3: COP 06 & COP 07 indicators of access to OVC services by set targets and actual numbers achieved**

Indicators of Access	Target	Achieved	Difference
<b>OVC</b>			
Number of OVC served by community-based programs	(320)* 4,224	(354) 4,630	(34) 406
Number of OVC served with three or more services (primary direct)	4,224	3,641	<b>- 583</b>
Number of OVC served with less than three services (supplemental direct)	0	848	
Number of caregivers and service providers trained to provide care and support to OVC	(16) 700	(17) 937	(1) 237
Number of OVC receiving food and nutritional supplementation through OVC programs	3,075	3,354	279

Note: \* COP 06 figures in parenthesis.

Table 3 presents the overall performance of OVC on targets set for both COP 06 and COP 07. The difference column shows that overall, the AIM program surpassed expected targets for the two years considered even when targets were increased several times for the indicators common to the two years. And most of the IPs/IAs staff interviewed reported meeting their targets for the two years. The only exception was on number of OVC served with three or more services (less by 583). This was one of the new indicators introduced in COP 07 to measure OVC access to multiple services, and may have proven a bit of challenge for IPs/IAs to reach when it was introduced.

The results from FGD and interviews of both the Acada students and their teachers suggest that emphasis of the AIM project on the education of OVC have achieved considerable positive results in the community, and in the lives of the children. Most of

the IPs/IAs staff and Acada teachers interviewed reported increased awareness of the plight of OVC in their community. Also, there has been increased number of OVC attending numeracy and literacy classes like other children in the community. The majority of OVC and their teachers reported that children who were formerly out-of-school are now benefiting from the literacy and numeracy classes (Mathematics and English Language). A female USG Acada student aged 12 corroborate this point is paraphrased thus.

*I can read and write now, before this time I do not go to school and I can not read or write but I can write and read very well now. And I am very happy.*

Aside improved learning, most OVC interviewed reported receiving school materials, food items, and money (20 Naira) on a daily bases to support them while in school. The statement from a FGD participant among SCD OVC aged 7-14 (included males and females) buttressing this assertion is paraphrased below.

*We have received food support like rice, beans, meat and sugar and educational support like uniforms, good teaching of mathematics, and English, sandals and writing materials.*

Although most of the Acada teachers interviewed agreed that the compressed curriculum enabled the students to learn faster than their counterparts in public schools, they were divided on whether the curriculum is meeting the needs of the students. While some teachers opined that the curriculum is adequate, others reported that it is not adequate, and that not all the students are benefiting. The two opinions are paraphrased below. Below, is the assertion from two WOGEND teachers on the adequacy of the Acada curriculum for teaching all the pupils:

*(1) Pupils who enroll into the Acada centre do not know anything at all, so the teachers start from the scratch and start teaching them the basics, from A-Z, they teach them counting. From there they know how to read, write, and count. Can say the curriculum is meeting the educational needs of the children because two of the children from the Acada are presently in the secondary schools and so many of them in different levels in the primary schools.*

*(2) The curriculum is comparatively better because it makes the children gasp and learn faster and better and it's different because of it compressed nature.*

A different comment from a SCD Acada teacher is paraphrased thus:

*The curriculum does not suite all the children. There are some that their level is above primary one and some primary two; there are others who have to begin from the scratch. The curriculum is based on primary one level that is the one given to us,.....”*

Further discussions with WI staff about the divergent views of the Acada teachers on the curriculum suggest that the selection process of prospective OVC may be an issue. The students were supposed to have been selected based on a standard score with only those

scoring below 50% admitted to the center. It does not seem as if all IPs/IAs used the standard process of selection consistently.

*Challenges on OVC.* Though the Acada program has been successful in meeting the educational needs of OVC, there are challenges that need to be addressed to make it better. The first main concern is the integration of the Acada students into primary schools. Reports from IPs/IAs staff, Acada teachers, and the students themselves show that factors influencing transition include inadequate funding, and low standards in the public schools. Other challenge with the Acada program is the short length of study time at the center, and the inadequacy of the curriculum to meet the needs of all OVC. Where funding is available, ACADA students make smooth transition to further their studies as two Acada teachers one from SCD, and the other from WOGEND suggest in the statements below.

*Twelve children have left the Acada centre and have been enrolled into the government schools.*

*Some of the children are now in the secondary and others in different classes in the primary schools. For instance, two in secondary schools and sixteen in the primary schools. One thing that is very vital is that those from the ACADA centre do perform better than those in the public schools.*

It seems that the ability of the government agency either state or local to absorb the Acada students is important in the transitioning of OVC to public school as the paraphrased statement by another SCD Acada teacher below suggests.

*Those that passed through the centre last year are all home none of them is integrated to formal school yet and the reason given so far by their caregivers is basically inadequate money.*

### 3.2 Basic Care & Support (BCS)

**Table 4: COP 06 & COP 07 indicators of access to BCS services by set targets & actual number achieved**

Indicators of access	Target	Achieved	Difference
<b>BCS</b>			
Number of service outlets providing HIV-related palliative care (excluding TB/HIV)	(14)* 21	(14) 21	(0) 0
Number of individual provided with HIV palliative care (excluding TB/HIV)	(280) 1,500	(354) 1,559	(74) 59
Number of individuals trained to provide HIV palliative care (excluding B/HIV)	(690) 2,300	(1046) 2,369	(356) 69

Note: \* COP 06 figures in parenthesis.

*Achievements on BCS.* BCS is a key aspect of the AIM project since its inception. Table 4 shows that the project achieved stated targets in all three indicators of BCS and even surpassed set targets in two of them. The qualitative aspect of the achieved target was

obtained from the FGD and the in-depth interviews conducted for the single mothers and widows.

Overwhelmingly, IPs/IAs staff and beneficiaries reported that the AIM project has helped to reduce poverty in their communities. They also reported that the IGA training and grants empowered the beneficiaries who in turn were able to make a living and feed their children including supporting them in school. Business education training for beneficiaries mainly focused on basic bookkeeping, and project management. The following paraphrased statements from a JJR single mother sums up the benefits received especially in terms of training through the support.

*They thought us book keeping, how to take care of our money, how to sell and keep our profit. They tried to teach how to operate a machine, but we couldn't go on again. ....They thought some of us tie and dye, hall decoration. Also, about hygiene, living positively and some other things.*

The following paraphrased statement represents in a nutshell the views expressed during one of the FGDs with WOGEND beneficiaries.

*The support have really helped us because before this time, we had nothing to do but now we sell groundnut oil, and use the profit to provide our basic need.*

*Challenges on BCS.* Despite the successes reported on the economic empowerment front, the service had its own drawbacks. Thought the caregivers reported improvement in the ability to take care of their family, some of them have asked for more support to enhance their capital and increase their ability to take care of their family. Also, the need to include more widows and single women in the AIM project was requested by many of those interviewed. And the withdrawal of supplemental food stuff to the OVC aged 0-5 was something they requested to be revived.

An important observation corroborated by WI staff is the obvious weak link between the OVC Acada students program and the BCS. Most of the beneficiaries of the BCS were supposed to be caregivers who later support their children in the Acada centers to ensure smooth transition to public schools, but this crucial link was hardly in existence.

### **3.3 Abstinence & Be Faithful (AB)**

**Table 5: COP 07 indicators of behavior change of CSWs by set targets & actual number achieved**

<b>Indicators of Behavior Change</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Achieved</b>	<b>Difference</b>
<b>Abstinence and Be Faithful</b>			
Number of CSWs reached with community outreach that promotes HIV/AIDS prevention through abstinence and/or being faithful.	1,236	1,341	105
Number of former CSW trained to promote HIV/AIDS prevention through abstinence and/or being faithful	133	133	0



(balanced ABC messaging)			
--------------------------	--	--	--

*Achievement on AB.* The AIM project met expected targets for COP 07 as Table 5 above shows. Number of CSWs reached with HIV/AIDS prevention outreach increased from 1,236 to 1,341, and the program trained the required number of peer educators.

The majority of the CSWs contacted during the FGD and in-depth interview sessions opined that they have changed their behavior significantly with respect to reduction in the number of sexual partner, and have increased use of condoms. Reports from the interviews conducted suggest that some have discontinued the trade to get married, or to start another trade<sup>3</sup>. The statement paraphrased below from a RAPAC CSW beneficiary during one of the FGDs conducted sums up the benefits thus:

*We have received training on business generating activities that will give us employment and enable us to quit our present jobs. We were trained on beads making, cake making, and phone business. We were trained to be consistent in condom use.*

Here is another paraphrased statement from a CSW interviewed at WHED corroborating knowledge and behavior change as a result of exposure to the AIM program.

*I learnt to make Kampala, and I am very happy that I can make Kampala, but the majority problem is that the chemicals are very difficult to get, we have to travel to Jos to get them. The program also trained me not to over labor myself because before now I do over labor myself. I have learnt the usefulness of using condoms, now if possible I double it. Now it is just as if some thing have been removed from my eyes, I now understand clearly.*

*Challenges on AB.* While the majority of CSWs reported that they were sensitized about changing their trade and have been provided with the skills to do so, the majority also reported difficulty in making the necessary transition though they have the willingness to do so. The majority requested having a shop to enable them put to economic use the tools that the project gave them. Those who have already started another trade reported that the income from the new trade does not equate what they use to make in sex work, and that they now find it more difficult to meet their daily expenses.

In the paraphrased statement below, a participant from the FGDs conducted for CSWs in the WOTCLEF program reinforces the difficulty in making the transition to another trade despite the willingness to do so.

*I left the trade (sex work) 10 months after getting the equipments but its been hell for me. I don't have a shop to start the business. I have even approached WOTCLEF staff to look for job for me. If I can get money to rent shop it will go a long way for me.*

---

<sup>3</sup> It was difficult to schedule interview with former CSWs that are now married as they did not want to be identified. Anecdotal evidence suggest that their husband were not aware of their former trade.

In the paraphrase below, another RAPAC AB beneficiary stresses the importance of a shop in the transition process.

*The only thing I can think about is to provide a shop (in response to other services that they need) where I can sell so that when I wake up in the morning, I know that I am going to my shop. We prefer business card, more finances for our businesses and funds to rent shop.*

### 3.4 Other Prevention (OP)

**Table 6: COP 07 indicators of access to other opportunities by set targets & actual number achieved**

Indicators of Access	Target	Achieved	Difference
<b>Condoms and Other Prevention</b>			
Number of targeted condom service outlets (barber shops, hairdressing saloons etc).	76	133	57
Number of OSY reached through other behavior change beyond abstinence and/or being faithful (peer education, IPC, condom education).	2,860	3,457	597
Number of OSY trained to promote HIV prevention through other behavior change beyond abstinence and/or being faithful.	64	175	111

*Achievements on OP.* On the OP service area, Table 6 shows that the project met its targets of reaching 2,860 OSY with prevention messages, and met other targets as well. The performance of the project in terms of meeting its objectives of serving as a link to reaching OSY sub-population in general is a mix bag. The mix bag is well represented in the paraphrased statements of the only interviewee, a woman who benefited in the USG OP program.

*Yes, what I have gained I share with my fellow hairdressers because we usually have meeting here and anything I learn from there I also teach them here from time to time. But those people that taught us those things did not come again, so that is my problem. If they come again, we would be very happy. Now the way I use my tools is different from the time I have not attended the program. I tell hairdressers that come my way and I cannot remember the exact number of people that I have told. I told them about the program in the meeting and encouraged them to be attending the program.”*

*Challenges on OP.* The major challenge is that of follow-up with peer educators on subsequent periodic activities. It was clear during the evaluation that IPs/IAs did not adequately follow-up with the beneficiaries visited with other activities to continuously engage them and maintain their interest in the program. It was very difficult to identify the OP participants in the respective locations visited as many of them have relocated elsewhere or left the shop to another one, and IPs/IAs staff did not have follow-on contact information. These observations echo that of the only interviewee in her statement above.

### 3.5 Effectiveness Programming Strategies

**Table 7: Percentage distribution of finds obligated in COP 06 and COP 07 according to recipients**

NAME OF IP/IA	COP 06		COP 07		COP 06 & 07 TOTAL (US\$)
	Oblig. (US\$) & total persons reached	(%)	Oblig. (US\$) & total persons reached	(%)	
TYECE	15,462.49	14.83	88,767.03	85.16	104,229.52
JJR	24,809.77	24.86	74,985.44	75.14	99,795.21
WOGEND	11,711.50	15.02	66,272.45	84.98	77,983.95
SCD	25,381.74	17.43	120,240.05	85.57	145,621.79
USG	24,992.31	10.52	212,613.39	89.48	237,605.70
RAPAC	28,546.00	12.19	205,593.06	87.81	234,139.06
WOTCLEF	-	-	66,053.79	100	66,053.79
WHED	-	-	59,382.00	100	59,382.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>130,903.81</b>	<b>13.70</b>	<b>961,807.21</b>	<b>86.30</b>	<b>1,024,811.02</b>

Table 7 shows the percentage distribution of funds obligated to the various IPs/IAs. In general, the AIM program received substantially more funds in COP 07 compared to COP 06 (86.3% vs. 13.7%). The increase in funds for the project is reflected in the obligated funds for the IPs/IAs for the two years as well.

**Table 8: Financial effectiveness with respect to total funds, and number of persons-cost of service provided according to IPs/IAs**

NAME OF IP/IA	COP 06			COP 07			COP 06 & 07 TOTAL (US\$)
	Oblig. (US\$)	Total persons reached	Person -cost of service (US\$)	Oblig. (US\$)	Total persons reached	Person -cost of service (US\$)	
TYECE	15,462.5	305	50.7	88,767.0	1761	50.4	104,229.5
JJR	24,809.8	246	100.9	74,985.4	1241	60.4	99,795.2
WOGEND	11,711.50	95	123.28	66,272.45	1434	46.22	77,983.95
SCD	25,381.7	194	130.8	120,240.1	1642	73.2	145,621.8
USG	24,992.3	204	122.5	212,613.4	3744	56.8	237,605.7

RAPAC	28,546.0	288	99.12	205,593.06	3816	53.88	234,139.1
WOTCLEF	-	-	-	66,053.8	250	264.2	66,053.8
WHED	-	-	-	59,382.0	187	317.6	59,382.0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>130,903.8</b>	<b>1332</b>	<b>98.3</b>	<b>961,807.2</b>	<b>14075</b>	<b>68.3</b>	<b>1,024,811.0</b>

Person-cost of service provided is a concept synonymous to person-years lived used in the construction of Life Tables to estimate life expectancy. The person-cost of service provided is the total amount spent divided by the number of persons who received service/s considering the number of times exposed to service since each service exposed to has some cost implications. It is used in this evaluation as a crude measure of cost-effectiveness with respect to exposure to services. The concept is quite different from cost per target commonly referred in programming.

A review of the person-cost of service provided in Table 8 for the AIM project as a whole for the two years suggest that more people were provided with service from the COP 07 obligated funds than for the COP 06 obligated funds. Person-cost of service provided was more in COP 06 (\$98.3) compared to COP 07 (\$68.3), a difference of \$29.95 person-cost efficiency irrespective of the type of service received. Similarly, person-cost of service for IPs/IAs reduced but at different degrees between the two years.

It is important to note that the person-cost of service concept used in this report is a crude measure of funds effectiveness since it did not adequately adjust for the number of exposure to services (e.g. primary direct vs. supplemental), and variation in the cost of implementation per service area.

### ***3.5.1 Programming Strengths and Weaknesses***

*Capacity Building & Staff Welfare.* Training of the IPs/IAs staff is one of the major strengths in programming employed in the AIM project. All the IPs/IAs staff interviewed confirmed series of training in all four program areas (including food and nutrition), finance, and M&E. The training involved formal training and on the job technical assistance. The IPs/IAs staff reported that the beginning of each COP year starts with a meeting involving them and WI to discuss programming strategies and capacity building needs. The ICAN, and NIM representatives, individual consultants, and WI staff have been used to enhance the quality of training at various occasions. Aside training the front line staff of the IPs/IAs, the ICAN and NIM representatives and consultants help to develop standard manuals that were effective in stepping down skills to staff and volunteers of multiplier organizations at the state levels. Beneficiaries that were interviewed confirmed that the trainings stepped down to them included vocational, financial, and managerial skills to enable them conduct their business successfully.

Findings from the IPs/IAs staff suggest that they would need more regular trainings and TAs especially on M&E. Reports suggest that the quarterly trainings and TAs at the

IPs/IAs level have not been done on a regular basis due partly to limited funds. Findings also suggest that adequate stepping down of training at branch offices, and to respective beneficiaries of multiplier organizations have not been adequately implemented.

Concern about salary and benefits was like a recurring decimal right from the WI office to IPs/IAs HQ staff and down to their branch offices. The perception of the evaluation team is that the challenge increases from WI staff to volunteers who form the majority of the IPs/IAs staff strength and the major interface with beneficiaries. These volunteers in most cases bear the brunt of the work with little understanding of the program process. It seems that an upward review of salary and benefits across the different layers may improve motivation and performance on the job especially at the grassroots level where much sacrifice is expended.

*Understanding WI/USAID Guidelines and Procedures.* The level of the standard imbued in capacity building of AIM project personnel was reflected in how much understanding they showed on standard guidelines and procedures during the evaluation. Most IPs/IAs key staff were able to explain the three service areas—i.e. primary direct beneficiary vs. supplemental beneficiary USAID targets. The financial staff at the HQ of the IPs/IAs where most financial activities occurred explained the differences between allowable vs. non-allowable expenses, the need to have quotation on expenses above \$500 (3 quotations to choose one), and that all expenses must be backed by receipts. The IPs/IAs staff also explained the challenges inherent in the financial process, including the rule that all purchases must be United States products which may not be readily available as first choice.

The M&E Staff of most IPs/IAs explained that quarterly and yearly reports must be collated using the WI/USAID standard templates. Overall, it seemed that the financial staff of the IPs/IAs interviewed demonstrated more knowledge of the WI/USAID standard procedures and requirements than other staff during the evaluation.

It was observed that WI did not conduct external evaluation of the IPs/IAs to corroborate the internal self audit reported as in-built in the accounting system. Some of the financial staff reported that the financial system was not flexible enough and that there were cumbersome financial requirements like the constantly changing bill invoice that needed to be addressed. Also, the financial staff reported that the regulations for budgeting were too stringent, and the falling dollar value in the two years affected available financial resources.

Some of the M&E staff reported that the regulations for gathering and collating data started getting better from COP 07. Those who had institutional memory reported that in COP 06, there were no standard M&E template but this has improved over time. But there is much room for improvement especially in the frequently changing M&E tools. A key gap identified by program staff interviewed was the lack of skill for proposal writing. This area of capacity building would need more attention in order to upgrade IPs to the level where they can write acceptable proposal for funds directly accessed from USAID.

*Transparency in Implementation.* The IPs/IAs staff interviewed reported that WI had a transparent grant awarding process which they described as fair starting right from call for expression of interest to contract signing and implementation. The staff also described the financial system as transparent requiring fair bidding for expenses above \$500. Tied to this was the strategy of involving independent bodies like the Oceanic bank in the loaning process.

*Sustainability of Programs.* A key aspect of effective programming in the future is what is put in place for continuation after the project cycle comes to an end. Findings from this evaluation show that involvement of the government especially state and local governments created a congenial environment for the AIM program to survive and cushioned the financial weight of the program on the IPs/IAs in general. Linked to government support is community involvement and ownership for the program. A classic case of community involvement was in Rano local government of Kano State where the Emir in conjunction with the people in the locality contributed over 65% of the funding of the Acada center in the community.

Also, findings suggest that continuity is enhanced by the exposure of IPs/IAs to multiple funding sources. This increases the chances of stable funds to implements the projects. Some of the IPs/IAs currently are exposed to other funding sources while others need concerted effort to improve on fund sources. It is important to note that participatory method of locating and building ACADA centers is a key strategy for enlisting community ownership of the project. This strategy was observed in a few IPs/IAs, and would need to be introduced to other IPs/IAs strategy to ensure continuation of the projects in the long-run. Findings from the interviews conducted suggest that some IPs/IAs are engaging in some income generating activities to boost flow of funds.

*Service Areas & Comparative Advantage.* In order to increase efficiency in the delivery of services to the beneficiaries, the evaluation team asked IPs/IAs staff about their preference and areas of comparative advantage. Findings suggest that some IPs/IAs liked to provide service in all four areas while others liked to stick to a few program areas. There was no factual justification for IPs/IAs who liked to engage in all the four areas, while those liked a few reported that it was because they had challenges in the AB and OP service areas. There is the need to carefully review service portfolios of each of the IPs/IAs to realign them with program areas where they have the most expertise, experience, and comparative advantage.

### ***3.6 Supportive Environment and Other Issues***

The evaluation team interviewed other key players facilitating the implementation of the AIM project including a representative each from Nigerian Institute of Management (NIM), Federal Ministry of Women Affairs (FMoWA), and Universal Basic Education (UBE).

*NIM Representative:* The representative currently participates in the partnership between WI and NIM on capacity building of the IPs/IAs since 2006. The representative reported

that the IPs/IAs capacity have improved significantly since the beginning of the project especially in compliance with the USAID project management and grant utilization process. Also, the representative opined that the AIM project through the IPs/IAs has impacted positively on the communities served. The NIM representative suggested the inclusion of more IAs to extend benefits of the project to more communities.

*FMoWA Representative:* The government personnel interviewed is a member of the AIM project advisory board with a key function of selecting the IPs/IAs for the project. The staff corroborated reports from other stakeholders that the AIM project fits well into the National HIV/AIDS response. The staff suggested more publicity and advocacy of the AIM project in order to increase more community participation, taking into account specific needs of female headed household. The government personnel corroborated the IPs/IAs request for capacity building of IPs/IAs staff implementing the project at the community level especially. The representative mentioned the lack of state functioning OVC forum as a major weakness not providing the enabling environment, and platform for networking with similar projects in the communities.

*UBE Representative:* The UBE representative interviewed also is a member of the AIM project advisory board. The representative corroborated the views of other stakeholders on the lack of synergy between stakeholders (i.e. between UBE and AIM project etc) at the state level. This may be due to a lack of platforms such as OVC forums at the state level to serve as enabling environment for networking between different stakeholders working on similar issues in the field. The representative stressed the need for more publicity of the AIM project and increased funding, and ownership at the community level.

## Chapter Four

### 4. Conclusions with Recommendations

The MTE examined the performance and accountability of the AIM project for COP 06 and COP 07. The purpose is to provide useful feedback for effective programming and success in the remaining part of the project. The evaluation which included four of the 11 states involved in the project implementation obtained information from eight IPs/IAs and their beneficiaries in four main service areas—OVC, BCS, AB, and OP. This chapter provides insights on the findings and recommendations for future improvement in specific areas of the project implementation.

#### 4.1 Service Areas

##### 4.1.1 Orphans & Vulnerable Children

*Conclusions.* Findings suggest that the teaching at the Acada centers had substantial positive impact on the lives of the OVC beneficiaries. OVC beneficiaries were able to read and write before leaving the centre and many were able to transition to public schools. Findings also suggest the need to review the scope of the Acada program with possible scale-up to extend length of the program and the curriculum to accommodate other subjects with a view to enabling the students move straight from the center to secondary school or higher studies. This suggestion may be borne out of a lack of clear understanding of the objectives of the Acada center among IPs/IAs staff, beneficiaries, and other stakeholders alike.

*Recommendations.* The suggestions on scale-up may have emanated from misperceptions of what the Acada program was meant to achieve. There is need for enlightenment campaign among key players in communities to let them know that the program is a stop-gap for out-of-school youth to transition to regular school and not a comparable alternative. It important to educate key players on the main aim of the Acada program in order to moderate expectations on performance and thus, commitment to see it succeed in the future. Aside, enlightenment campaign may help to improve support for the program among government agencies responsible for teaching and learning in the states and LGAs.

Funding was a major reason for some OVC beneficiaries not able to transition to public school. Aspect of funding that has been much neglected is the link between IGA beneficiaries of the BCS and students in the Acada centers. A key reason for the weak linkages between the two is the narrow definition of BCS recipients to include only women who have HIV/AIDS. With the level of stigma and discrimination existing in most societies in Nigeria, it is difficult to identify women living with the disease in a community. It may be more useful to broaden the definition IGA recipients to include all women affected by the disease. This will reduce the constraints in linking IGA recipients with their children in Acada centers without stigmatizing them or making the center look like is only for children of women with HIV/AID. Also, a requirement for most children



admitted to the Acada center should be that their mothers are IGA recipients. These two strategies will help to close the gap in funding necessary for the Acada students to transition to public schools.

#### *4.1.2 Basic Care & Support*

*Conclusions.* The IGA programs have been successful in empowering recipients to meet their individual and family needs. Beneficiaries reported been knowledgeable in business management and accounting and are making good turnover and profit compared to lack of productive activity before they joined the program. The only request is for more funds to scale-up their business. They requested that the F&N that was once part of the BCS should continue because it helped improve their children's nutritional level.

*Recommendations.* The main issue with the IGA recipients is the need for more funds to increase their capital outlay to bring more financial stability to their lives and that of their families. WI/USAID need to workout strategies with the IPs/IAs to increase financial support for the IGA beneficiaries. Aside, more financial support will ensure sustainability of the program and its effects in the future. There is the need to review existing strategies on the Oceanic bank loan facilities. The review should specifically address why IGA beneficiaries are not accessing the facilities as they should despite obvious request for such during the evaluation. Another option that can be explored is to form groups among the IGA recipients with the main purpose of helping each other by generating capital through monthly contributions by members.

With respect to F&N, it important that WI and IPs/IAs inform the BCS beneficiaries about plans on the way through another USAID partner to fill the gap. It is important to also educate beneficiaries that nutritional supplement is not an incentive the program but a stop-gap with the aim that they are able to take-up feeding of their children once they are economically empowered enough.

#### *4.1.3 Abstinence & Be Faithful*

*Conclusions.* The success story with the beneficiaries of the AB program is that behavior change with respect to risky sexual behavior including reduction in the number of sexual partners, use of condoms, and the desire to change trade has occurred among the majority of the beneficiaries interviewed. Also, most of them reported that they received training on a new trade and the corresponding equipment to start the trade. What has not occurred amongst the majority of the recipients is the self-efficacy and the enabling environment to transition fully to another trade.

*Recommendations.* CSWs need help to be able to take the next crucial steps in the transition process to another trade. One of the critical steps that they would like to take is securing a shop to maximize income from the equipment given to them. The shop may also satisfy their desire for physical relocation away from the brothel. It may be necessary for WI/USAID to provide more funds to help the beneficiaries get shops where they can relocate to practice their new trade. Other options that may be explored to defray cost

include negotiating with LGAs to get shops for the beneficiaries at reduced cost or negotiating payment spread over a period that the beneficiaries are able to afford. An added advantage of helping the AB beneficiaries locate into a shop is that they can be tracked and used as lifetime peer educators and success stories to new and upcoming beneficiaries.

It is advisable to pilot shop assistance help with a few highly motivated and well screened AB beneficiaries, and monitor over a year or two to observe their responses in terms of discipline in finances, and determination to succeed. This small group should then be used as a test case for correcting lapses or oversight in the modes of operation and for determining possible scale-up in the future.

#### *4.1.4 Other Prevention*

*Conclusions.* Although the OP program reported the most number of targets achieved in terms of sensitization about HIV/AIDS and condom distribution, it is the most unsuccessful in terms of strategies for tracking and follow-up activities with recipients.

*Recommendations.* The current strategy may not have been effective in ensuring continuous engagement of the beneficiaries to meet the objective of the program. It may be more effective to identify key gatekeepers to the communities of barbers and hairdressers that may be more involved than others in the program and serve as bridge to the community in terms of IEC on HIV/AIDS, general information exchange, and condom distribution. Findings suggest that the age of the OP recipients may need to be reviewed. Older members of the profession (barbers and hairdressers) are likely to be more stable and perhaps, assume more leadership and modeling roles than the youth defined in the current OP<sup>4</sup>. It may be a good idea to identify key older beneficiaries and use them as gatekeepers since they are likely to be more stable in the community, and may be more effective in coordinating younger beneficiaries in their respective meetings. The IPs/IAs staff need to engage beneficiaries with more follow-on activities, including relevant self-help projects, and advice on how to be successful in their chosen profession.

## **4.2 Programming Strategies and Effectiveness**

### *4.2.1 Effectiveness of service areas*

*Conclusions.* Overall the AIM project was successful in reaching assigned targets, and seemed to have been more effectively implemented getting more value to the Naira in COP 07 than COP 06. This was clear using the crude measure of person-cost of service exposed. A closer observation suggests that some service area were more challenging for some IPs/IAs than for others. Likewise, some monitoring indicators (like the number of OVC served with three or more services) were more challenging to attain.

---

<sup>4</sup> The only beneficiary interviewed in the evaluation was a woman over 35 years of age whereas the program is supposed to mainly target OSY. This woman can be a role model to the younger members of the profession.

*Recommendations.* Future programming needs to focus more on comparative advantages of each of the IPs/IAs in order to bring out the best from them at the least cost. It is good to note that initial steps have been taken by WI in this direction. There are some IPs/IAs who currently are involved in all the four service areas but would prefer to focus on a few areas. Also, each service area has its own nuances with respect to the target population that need to be recognized and factored into future programming for effectiveness.

Findings suggest that targeting of beneficiaries need to be more focused and directed to the sub-population that the program intends to benefit. The evaluation team observed a few cases where those benefiting from the program were by definition not supposed to have been selected. The process for selecting beneficiaries needs to be carefully reviewed to correct the situation. New strategy may include closer monitoring of the process by WI staff and on the spot random checks of beneficiaries' demographics and current profile.

An important aspect of effective programming, which is currently weak or none-existent among IPs/IAs, is a platform for networking to leverage on each other's program areas of comparative strengths and experience. WI should champion the creation and effective coordination of these platforms across regions and states of the country where AIM project is implemented. Platforms should be in the form of meetings and shared visits to each other's projects.

#### *4.2.2 Monitoring & evaluation*

*Conclusions.* Findings suggest that the M&E system improved considerably between COP 06 and COP 07 but there are gaps to fill in terms of simplifying tools and funding to do effective monitoring at the beneficiary level.

*Recommendations.* WI/USAID need to increase funding for M&E at the grassroots. This was a major challenge echoed by all IPs/IAs in the evaluation. Basic M&E entails having mobility to enhance movement, combined with well trained volunteers to work with permanent staff to do routine visits and collect vital information directly from the beneficiaries.

#### *4.2.3 Capacity building*

*Conclusions.* This is one of the strongest success stories of the AIM project. All IPs/IAs interviewed repeatedly stressed the improvement in their capacity over the years. They reported increased capacity in programming, management, financial accounting, M&E and general administration. Some IPs who started from ground zero are now preparing for the requirements for direct funding from USAID. Also, there were evidence of step-down of trainings at branch offices, but this needs some fine-tuning to achieve the desired effect at the grassroots level.

*Recommendations.* Implications from the capacity building successes is that there should be more frequent hands on TA to improve quality of work and should be open to other staff rather focus on the personnel specialized in the area. Also, there is the need for

refresher training to ensure that long serving staff are not moribund while those who are new can benefit as well. More step-down training need to be conducted more often to reduce the gaps observed in this evaluation.

#### *4.2.4 Selection of beneficiaries*

*Conclusions.* In general, the target populations for the different service areas have been reached and impacted as evidence from the findings of the evaluation show. But there were situations suggesting that the criteria for selection were not followed properly.

*Recommendations.* Findings suggest that targeting of beneficiaries need to be more focused and directed to the sub-group of the population that it wants to reach. The evaluation observed that screening of eligible OVC for the Acada program was not done properly hence there were disparities in the levels of Acada students in the class. Also, there were few cases where beneficiaries of a program were by definition not supposed to have been involved. The process of selecting beneficiaries for the different service areas need to be carefully reviewed to correct the situation. New strategies may include closer monitoring of the process by WI staff and on the spot random checks of beneficiaries' demographics and current profile.

#### *4.2.5 Continuity & sustainability*

*Conclusion.* It is clear from the findings that effort to ensure continuity of the program is currently been put in place but not as pronounced as it should be. It is also clear from the evaluation that some IPs/IAs have done more work on this than others.

*Recommendations.* It important that IPs/IA start putting effort to ensuring continuity of the services that they offered to the beneficiaries after the project ends. Effort on continuity must be participatory eliciting the support of government officials and local leaders at the various levels. Concerted effort need to be made to ensure active engagement and participation of these significant others in society. Key IPs/IAs management staff may need to be trained to acquire special skills necessary to create conducive political environment and elicit support of influential decision makers in communities where they operate.

#### *4.2.6 Staff salaries and welfare*

*Conclusion.* Findings of this evaluation suggest that staff at various levels right from WI to the volunteers at the grassroots were dissatisfied with their salary and benefits. Related to this are unfavorable work environment including small office space, lack of or insufficient computers, and other facilities like the Internet.

*Recommendations.* Staff salaries and welfare issues need to be taken seriously by WI and the management of IPs/IAs because this has adverse effect on staff productivity. It is important for WI to have discussions with IPs/IAs management about their staff strength

and challenges with a view to reaching a compromise on how to enhance staff benefits and motivation in general.

#### *4.2.7 Perceptions about the beneficiaries*

The evaluation team observed that the discontinuation of a service area ends the relationship between IPs/IAs and the beneficiaries. This policy or programming strategy need further review because aside the feeling of abandonment, there may be other psychosocial untoward effect on the beneficiaries. Programming needs to start seeing beneficiaries as an investment that needs to be nurtured and preserved rather than as a means of reaching required targets. Programming that sees beneficiaries as investment will have more impact on the quality of life of the sub-groups concerned.

#### ***4.3 Reflections on the Cooperative Agreement.***

The evaluation team observed sharp differences in the targets in the cooperative agreement vis-à-vis those in the COPs. Also, there were differences in the budgeted figures and the amount obligated for the two years. This may be due to changes in funding policies and modalities and changes in perceptions of the situations on ground.

Some stakeholders interviewed suggested that WI has not fully accepted the overlapping nature of some of the areas. For example, the BCS component implemented by the project is not quite in line with the actual definitions of what palliative care should be. Also, the sub-groups under the BCS were often the same as those in the OVC caregiver category. And the food and nutrition program is not as distinct as it should be since it synergizes with other service areas. Although each service area has a separate funding source, a more efficient strategy may be to streamline and combine some of the service areas. For example, it may be more efficient to combine the BCS service area with the OVC caregiver component. Likewise, it may be a good idea to integrate food and nutrition (F&N) services into the OVC service area as well.

It seems that in COP 06, the prevention strategies for AB and/or OP services areas were not clearly articulated at the beginning at it too some time to provide the needed direction on this, which may have affected the actual implementation in that year. Also, the definition of the BCS beneficiaries to include only PLWHA may be narrow and negating the long term goal of the project which is to reduce stigmatization and empower this group. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the weak link between OVC Acada students and corresponding BCS beneficiaries to ensure that IGA benefits translates to funds for the Acada students may be due to this narrow definition.

#### ***4.4 Overall Conclusion***

Given the insights provided by this evaluation, it is safe to conclude that the AIM project performed satisfactorily in COP 06 and COP 07 especially with respect to building the capacity of IPs/IAs, and gradually moving them on a track to seeking direct funding from

USAID and other donors. Service to the target populations achieved the desired results especially in the OVC and BCS service areas. Most OVC beneficiaries were able to read and write, and most IGA recipients became economically empowered and productive. Programming effectiveness improved between the two years with respect to value for the Naira, and implementation strategies. There is room for improvement in fine-tuning implementation of the next phases of the project.

## **Appendixes**

**Appendix A: Evaluation Instruments**

**Appendix B: Methodology for Mid-Term Evaluation**

**Appendix C: List of Documents Reviewed**

**Appendix D: Persons Contacted**

**Appendix E: Reports on IPs/IAs**

## Appendix A: Evaluation Instruments

### OVC Caregiver FGD/In-debt interview Guide

Your age/range: .....

Gender/distribution—M/F:.....

Years taking care of OVC/range:.....

1. How many children aged, 0-5 are you looking after (Age/Gender)?
2. What is the name of the organisation which has been supporting your child/ren?
3. When did you start receiving support from this organisation and what kinds of support have you received so far (probe specific support)?
4. What challenges were your children facing before you started receiving this support?
5. How beneficial are the supports that you have received so far from this project? Please explain?
6. Are there any challenges that you have with respect to the support that you are receiving/received (probe access, quality, etc)?
7. Are there any suggestions to help provide better services to you and your child/ren? (probe for specific services)



**OVC Key Informant Interview (7-14)**

Age of child:.....

Gender of child:.....

1. What is the name of the organization that has been supporting you?
2. How long ago did you start receiving support from this organization?
3. What was your situation before you started receiving support from this program?
4. What support have you been receiving from this organization (probe how frequent)?
5. When did you start attending lessons at the ACADA Learning Centre?
6. What have you benefitted from the ACADA School?
7. Any other service that you would like to receive from the ACADA centre or for your life in general?

## Key Informant Interview Guide (Headmaster/Teacher)

What is your age:..... Gender:.....

Qualification:..... Year of experience.....

1. What organization has been supporting children in your school? (Name, and year started)
2. How many children have joined the ACADA centre through the project? (By Age and Gender)
3. How effective was the ACADA Curriculum in meeting the educational needs of children?
4. What are the main highlights of the ACADA Curriculum? And how does these compare with other learning curriculum in your school?
5. How beneficial is the ACADA learning to children that you have taught so far? Please explain?
6. Do you know whether some children have transitioned from your centre to formal schools? How many?
7. Any suggestions on how to improve the ACADA learning centre (probe: curriculum, facilities, children learning etc).

**Key Informant Interview (OVC Desk Officer)**

Your position:.....

Years of experience.....

1. Have you ever heard about the AIM-funded project operating in your area?
2. If yes, what has been the level of your collaboration with this project? Explain?
3. What are the major achievements of this project in your area of jurisdiction?
4. Does your state have OVC form? How regularly do they meet? (probe representation of the AIM project)
5. How does the activity of the AIM project fit into the National OVC Plan of Action?
6. Any other suggestions on how to improve on the AIM program implementation?

## AB Program: CSWs FGD/Key Informant Interview

Age/range:

Years in the trade/range:

1. What is the name of the IA/IP through which you have been receiving support from?
2. How were you selected for inclusion into this project? When did you start participating in this project?
3. What form(s) of support did you receive from this project (probe financial value, risk reduction, partner reduction, and consistent condom use)?
4. Is the support received enough to enable you go out of sex work? Explain?
- 4.5. Are there any other services you would like this organization to provide? (Probe for specific services)
- 5.6. What did you like most about this project? Please explain?
- 6.7. What would you like to be done differently about this project?

## **Key Informant Interview Guide: Barbers and Hairdressers**

Age of respondent:.....

Sex of respondent:.....

1. What is the name of the IP/IA through which you have been receiving support from?
2. How were you selected for inclusion into this project? And when did you actually start participating in this project?
3. What do you think the project was trying to achieve by your participation in the various activities?
4. What have you benefitted from participating in this project?
5. Have you been able to pass on any information you received from the project to your fellow peers, what exactly have you been telling them?
6. Any suggestions on how best to reach youth, barbers and hairdressers in your community?

## **Key Informant Guide: Single Mothers and Widows**

What is your age:.....

Interviewer, note whether single mother or widows:.....

1. What is the name of the IP/IA through which you have been receiving support from?
2. How were you selected for inclusion into this project? When did you actually start participating in this project?
3. How has this project been beneficial to you? Probe for specific benefits (knowledge, attitude change, training etc)
4. Are there any other services you would like this organization to provide (Probe for specific services)?
5. What do you think are some of the challenges that need to be addressed by the project ...?
6. Any other suggestions or ways to provide better services to single mothers and widows like you?

## **WINROCK AIM PROJECT MID TERM EVALUATION 2008**

### ***A. INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR WINROCK PARTNERS***

Name of the interviewers:

Date and location of the interview:

Name of IPs/IAs:

Name of the interviewee(s):

Designation of the interviewee(s)

How long have you been in this organization?

Contact information of the interviewee(s) (phone and email)

### **General Information**

1. Briefly describe on how you were selected to participate in the AIM project?
2. To what extent does your activity on the WINROCK-AIM Project contribute to the PEPFAR and National response on HIV/AIDS and OVC targets for Nigeria?

### **Program Management**

1. What are the main achievements of your project implementation so far? Specifically from the services point of view? Probe specifically on how well they have been reaching their targets?
2. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the AIM project especially with respect to your involvement since inception? Please give details on specific services that you are involved in such as AB, OVC, BCS, OP, etc?
3. What would you suggest for addressing some of the weaknesses?
4. Have you received any TA from staff of the WINROCK AIM project since inception? Explain specific areas that you received TA?
5. Have you received training on program management after award of grants? List specific areas and by whom?
6. Have you provided training for beneficiaries of your program? List what type of training and how useful these are to your beneficiaries?

7. In your opinion, how can this program be sustained and/or expanded for other beneficiaries to benefit?
8. Any other suggestions on how to make your program implementation more effective in the future?

### **Grants & Financial Management**

1. What is your understanding of the WINROCK AIM project financial and administrative regulations? (Please explain key components)
2. Which area of the financial and administrative procedures do you find challenging and how?
3. Which areas of the financial and administrative procedures do you find difficult to achieve?
4. How would you explain the grants selection process of WINROCK AIM project? Explain any challenge/s that you may have encountered on the process and how to resolve it?
5. Have you received any training on financial/grants management from WINROCK AIM project (probe whether by ICAN or NIM)? Do you think these trainings have led to improvement on your work? Please explain?
6. Are you involved in training other sub-grantees about financial/grants management? Mention specific areas of training (by ICAN or NIM)?
7. Are there any areas in financial/grants management that need improvement? Please list specific areas and explain?
8. Have you been audited by WINROCK AIM projects staff or their representative? How did this go? (sight copies of report, how many times, who did it, challenges etc)
9. Any other suggestions on how to improve the AIM financial/grants management system?

### **Monitoring & Evaluation**

1. Describe the M&E system used in monitoring the AIM project implementation?
2. Is the M&E system in line with standard guidelines from USAID? Please explain if there are any differences?



3. Do you have any challenge/s in complying with the implementation of the reporting guideline from WINROCK AIM project? Please explain?
4. Have you attended any M&E training from WINROCK AIM project? What type of training have you attended and how is this beneficial to doing your work?
5. Have you provided M&E training to your sub-partners since the inception of the project? Please explain specific training provided?
6. Has the M&E training improved the performance of your sub-partners on reporting? Explain more on specific areas of improvement?
7. How often in the last two years have you received reports from your sub-partners? Could you comment on the type of reports that you received?
8. Are there other comments or suggestions on how to improve on M&E and reporting system of the AIM project?

## **WINROCK AIM PROJECT MID TERM EVALUATION 2008**

### ***A. INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR WINROCK AIM PROJECT COUNTRY TEAM***

Name of the interviewers:

Date and location of the interview:

Name of the interviewee(s):

Designation of the interviewee(s)

How long have you been in this organization?

Contact information of the interviewee(s) (phone and email)

#### **General Information**

1. Briefly describe the process of your selection of the implementing partners/agencies for the AIM project? To what extent are the partners complying with the USAID rules and regulations?
2. To what extent does the activity of the WINROCK-AIM Project contribute to the PEPFAR and National response on HIV/AIDS and OVC targets for Nigeria?

#### **Program Management**

3. What are the achievements of the AIM Project, specifically from the services point of view? Probe specifically on how well IPs/IAs have been reaching their targets?
4. What are the strengths and weaknesses of programming since the implementation of this project? Please give details on specific services such as AB, OVC, OP, etc?
5. What would you suggest for addressing some of the weaknesses?
6. Have you provided any TA to your IPs/IAs since the start of the AIM project?
7. Have you conducted any capacity building for the IPs/IAs after award of grants? List specific areas and to who?
8. In your opinion, how can this program be sustained and/or expanded for others to benefit?
9. Any other suggestions on how to make your programming more effective in the future?

#### **Grants & Financial Management**

10. What is your understanding of the USAID financial and administrative regulations? (Please explain key components)

11. Which area of the financial and administrative procedures do you find challenging and how?

12. Which areas of the financial and administrative procedures do you think your IPs/IAs find difficult to achieve?

13. How would you explain your grants selection process? Explain if there are any challenge/s that you may have encountered on the process and how to resolve it?

14. Have you provided any training on financial/grants management to the IPs/IAs? Do you think these trainings have led to improvement on their work? Please explain?

15. Are there any areas in financial/grants management where the IPs/IAs need improvement? Please list specific areas and explain?

16. Have you done financial audit of the IPs/IAs projects? How did this go? (sight copies of report, how many times, who did it, challenges etc)

17. Any other suggestions on how to improve the AIM financial/grants management system?

### **Monitoring & Evaluation**

Describe the M&E system used in monitoring the AIM project implementation?

18. Is the M&E system in line with standard guidelines from USAID? Please explain if there are any differences?

19. Are there any challenge/s from your IPs/IAs in complying with the implementation of the reporting guideline that you gave them? Please explain?

20. Have you attended any M&E training? What type of training you have attended and how is this beneficial to doing your work?

21. Have the AIM project provided M&E training for project IPs/IAs since the inception of the project? Please explain specific training provided?

22. Has the M&E training improved the performance of your IPs/IAs on reporting? Explain more on specific areas of improvement?

23. How often in the last two years have you received reports from your IPs/IAs? Could you comment on the type of reports that you received?

24. Are there other comments or suggestions on how to improve on M&E and reporting system of the AIM project?

## GUIDE QUESTIONS FOR THE MTE OF THE WINROCK AIM PROJECT

### USAID-CTO

1. Have the reports of the activities of the AIM Project shown a programmatic understanding of the goals and objectives set out to be achieved?
2. In your capacity as the CTO of the project, do you think the strategies presently being adopted (including those recently advised by USAID) for each of the programme component are adequate enough to meet the overall objectives of each programme component? (Probe for specific program area)
  - OVC, BCS, AB, OP
3. Do you think the achievements of the project as indicated in the target populations reached over the last two years have shown a proper utilization of the funds disbursed to Winrock-AIM Project by USAID? Please explain?
4. Have the project being adhering to the USAID rules and regulations (compliance, such as timeliness and accuracy of reports)?
5. What are your present views of the implications of the absence of a state project office over the implementation of the activities and monitoring of the IP/IAs and some of the beneficiaries? (any specific implications?)
6. What is your opinion about the Result Based Management (RBM) System put in place by the WINROCK-AIM Project?
7. Any other suggestions that could enhance effective implementation of the AIM project?

## **Appendix B: Methodology for Mid-term Evaluation**

This evaluation will employ participatory approach including consultation with key Winrock staff, key informant interviews, FGD, and document reviews. Four states are purposively selected from the eleven states where Winrock has IPs/IAs. The four states are those with high concentration of IPs/IAs or serve as head office. The selection of beneficiaries was done by systematic sampling using lists of beneficiaries from IPs/IAs as sampling frame.

### *States Selection Criteria*

1. States that have at least two IPs/IAs and/or a head office.
2. States were selected to ensure that most IPs/IAs will be visited at least once during the evaluation.
3. States were selected to ensure combination of IPs/IAs with strong and weak programs.

*Selected States:* Edo, FCT, Kano, and Lagos

### *Selection of IPs/IAs*

All partners in the selected states will be interviewed on all program areas that they were involved in COP 06 and COP 07.

### *Selection of Beneficiaries*

Beneficiaries will be systematically selected from each of the program areas that the IPs/IAs were involved with, in COP 06 and COP 07. Systematic sampling will be employed using list of beneficiaries as the sampling frame. A sampling interval (nth) will be determined based on a predetermined number of beneficiaries to be selected from a service area list. A random start will be determined using the Table of Random Numbers. Beneficiaries will be over sampled in each of the program areas to ensure that those that are difficult to locate during fieldwork can be easily replaced. List of selected beneficiaries will be used to assign some for FGDs and some for key informant interviews.

### *Groups to be interviewed*

1. Key Winrock staff directly involved in programming, M&E, and grants.
2. CTO/Activity Manager at USAID and other team members.
3. Key IPs and IAs staff both at headquarters and site offices where applicable.
4. Beneficiaries (OVCs, Guardian/Caregivers, CSWs, Acada, Teachers, OSY, Barbers/hairdresser, and Women Trained in IGA, etc).

### *Number of Key Informants & FGD*

1. Winrock International ( 4 – 6 staff)
2. USG Mission Office/Nigeria (3—CTO, and two program staff)

3. Partners (IPs/IAs) one group interview (including program officers, M&E, and Account Staff)
4. Beneficiaries (in-depth interview): Edo = 20, FCT = 28, Kano = 16, Lagos = 20
5. Beneficiaries (FGD) Edo = 1, FCT = 1, Kano = 1, Lagos = 1
6. Govt. Key Personnel: one per state

*Distribution of States by Consultants*

Consultants are grouped into two, one to visit IPs/IAs in the south and the other to visit IPs/IAs in the north. The groups are provided below.

- Muiyiwa and Tawanda— FCT & Kano
- Francis and Uche— Edo & Lagos

**Partner’s Location by Zone & State, and Program Areas**

*North West Zone States*

- Kano
  - Ummah Support Group (OVC/BCS/AB/OP),
  - Women Gender Development (HQ—OC/BCS),
  - Women Trafficking & Child Labor Eradication Foundation (AB/OP)

*South-West Zone States*

- Lagos
  - Redeemed AIDS Program Action Committee (HQ—OVC/BCS/AB/OP)
  - Jehovah Jireh, Resources (JJR)
- Oyo
  - RAPAC
  - Dorcas Eunice Foundation (OVC/BCS/AB/OP)
  - Jehovah Jireh Resources (HQ)

*North-East Zone States*

- Bauchi
  - Ummah Support Group
  - Women Trafficking and Child Labor Eradication Foundation

*North-Central Zone States*

- Benue
  - RAPAC
- Nasarawa
  - Ummah Support Group
- Federal Capital Territory
  - RAPAC

Society for Community Development (HQ—OVC/BCS/AB/OP)  
Ummah Support Group (HQ)  
Women Trafficking & Child Labor Eradication Foundation (HQ)  
Women’s Health Education & Development (HQ)

*South-East Zone States*

- Anambra
  - Rural Women Foundation (HQ)
  - Virtue Initiative (HQ)
  - Women’s Health Education Development
  
- Imo
  - Society for Community Development
  - Women’s Health Education Development

*South-South Zone States*

- Edo
  - Society for Community Development
  - Teens and Youth Educational Capacity Enhancement (HQ)
  
- Cross River
  - RAPAC



## **Appendix C: LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED**

### **USAID**

- USAID. APR07 PEPFAR Data Collection Reporting Tool. October, 2006-September, 2007.
- USAID. Annual Progress Results (APR) 2008 Data Collection Tool (DCT)
- USAID. Itinerary for MTE Exercise. December, 2008
- USAID. Evaluation Questions for the Mid-Term Review of the Winrock/AIM Project.
- USAID. Cooperative Agreement No. 620-A-00-00004-00: Capacity Building for AIDS Impact Mitigation (AIM). October, 2006-October, 2010.

### **Winrock International.**

- Winrock International. Capacity Building for AIDS Impact Mitigation (AIM): Basic Care and Support Success Story. October, 2007.
- Winrock International. Capacity Building for AIDS Impact Mitigation (AIM): Downstream Documentation. October, 2007.
- Winrock International. Capacity Building for AIDS Impact Mitigation (AIM): IGA Success Story. October, 2007.
- Winrock International. Capacity Building for AIDS Impact Mitigation (AIM): Wrap-Around Activities. October, 2007.
- Winrock International. Year 1 Aim Implementation Workplan (October, 2006-September, 2007).
- Winrock International. Aim Project Implementation Workplan (October, 2007-September, 2008).
- Winrock International. Modification to Capacity Building for AIDS Impact Mitigation (AIM): A Project to support widows, single mothers, CSWs and OVCs in Nigeria. September, 2006.
- Winrock International. AIM Projects Cooperative Agreement/Approved COP Target Analysis Table
- Winrock International. AIM Project Financial Pre-Award Assessment
- Winrock International. AIDS Impact Mitigation (AIM) Project: Monthly Reporting Form
- Winrock International. OVC (Acada Learning Center) Activity Record Sheets/MOV
- Winrock International. Bullet Points on Accomplishments, Challenges, M&E, Upstream: Orphans and vulnerable children.
- Winrock International. Bullet Points on Accomplishments, Challenges, M&E, Upstream: Adult Basic Care and Support.
- Winrock International. Program Area Synopses/Points on Accomplishments, Challenges, and Upstream Support: Prevention/Abstinence and being faithful (AB).

- Winrock International. Program Area Synopses/Points on Accomplishments, Challenges, and Upstream Support: Prevention/Condoms and other Prevention activities (OP).
- Winrock International. Quarterly Report. Capacity Building for AIDS Impact Mitigation (AIM) Project, Nigeria. (January, 2008-March, 2008). April, 2008.
- Winrock International. Peer Education Monitoring Tally Sheet.
- Winrock International. AIM Project. Interview Guide for Winrock Partners.
- Winrock International. AIM Project. Key Informant Interview Guide: Barbers and Hairdressers
- Winrock International. AIM Project. Key Informant Interview Guide: OVC Desk Officer
- Winrock International. AIM Project. Key Informant Interview Guide: Headmaster/Teacher
- Winrock International. AIM Project. OVC Key Informant Interview (7-14)
- Winrock International. AIM Project. OVC Caregiver FGD/Indebt interview Guide
- Winrock International. AIM Project. Interview Guide for Winrock AIM Project Country Team.
- Winrock International. AIM Project. Guide Questions for the MTE of the Winrock AIM Project.
- Winrock International. AIM Project. AB Program: CSWs FGD/Key Informant Interview
- Winrock International. AIM Project: Key Informant Guide: Single Mothers and Widows.
- Winrock International. AIM Project. Beneficiaries: Other prevention Program: OSYs (Barbers and Hairdressers)
- Winrock International. AIM Project. Key Informant Interview Guide (Headmaster/Teacher).
- Winrock International. AIM Project. Beneficiaries: BCS: Single Mothers and Widows
- Winrock International. AIM Project. AB Program Component: CSWs
- Winrock International. AIM Project. OVC Caregiver Questionnaire
- Winrock International. AIM Project. OVC Questionnaire (7-14)
- Winrock International. Winrock AIM Project Implementing Partner Agencies. Qualitative Questionnaire Guide
- Winrock International. Winrock AIM Project: Qualitative Questionnaire Guide.
- Winrock International. Winrock AIM Project: Draft Guide for the MTE of the Winrock AIM Project
- Winrock International. Winrock AIM Project. Guide Questions for the MTE of the Winrock AIM Project
- Winrock International. Methodology for Mid-Term Evaluation

## **Implementing Partners & Implementing Agencies (IPs/IAs)**

- Women Gender Developers (WOGEND). Human Resources Policies and Procedures Manual. June, 2007
- Women Gender Developers (WOGEND). Accounting Policies and Procedures Manual. June, 2007
- Ummah Support Group. End of COP07 Report (November, 2007-October, 2008) November, 2008
- Ummah Support Group. End of COP06 Report October, 2007
- Women's Health, Education and Development (WHED). HIV/AIDS Education and Economic Empowerment for Sex Workers in Anambra, Imo and FCT (October, 2007-August, 2008). September, 2008
- WOGEND. Monthly Progress Summary Report Sheet. February, 2008.
- Teens and Youth Educational and Capacity Enhancement (TYECE). End of COP Close out Report for COP 07
- Women Health and Education Development (WHED). IGA Equipment Grant Award Ceremony for Sex Workers in Abuja. November, 2007
- Women Health and Education Development (WHED). AIM Project: Monthly Income Tracking Sheet. October
- Women Health and Education Development (WHED). AIM Project. Grant Credit Beneficiary Record Form. November, 2007.
- Women Health and Education Development (WHED). Peer Education Monitoring Tally Sheet.
- Ummah Support Group (USG). Training/Other Activity Sheet. March, 2008.
- Ummah Support Group (USG). AIM Project. Award of Grant to the Widows in Giri Community. July, 2007.
- Women Gender Developers. AIM Project: List of Grant Beneficiaries. June, 2007.
- Ummah Support Group (USG). Aim Project: OVC Care Givers IGA Beneficiaries.
- Ummah Support Group (USG). AIM Project. OVC/ F & N Beneficiaries
- Ummah Support Group (USG). AIM Project: BCS (Widows & Single Mothers) List of IGA Beneficiaries.
- Ummah Support Group (USG). AIM Project Vulnerability Issue (AB). List and Addresses of IGA Beneficiaries
- Dorcas Eunice Foundation. Final on AIM Project for COP 07
- Virtue Initiative. AIM Project COP Summary Report. November, 2007 – October, 2008
- Women Trafficking and Child Labor Eradication Foundation (WOTCLEF). Financial Statement. December, 2007
- Women Trafficking and Child Labor Eradication Foundation (WOTCLEF). Final Report: Advocacy and Awareness Creation on the Reduction of HIV/AIDS and Economic Empowerment of Commercial Sex Workers in Bauchi, Kano and FCT Abuja. October, 2008.
- Women Trafficking and Child Labor Eradication Foundation (WOTCLEF). COP07 Close-out Report September, 2008

- Redeemed AIDS Program Action Committee (RAPAC). Annual Programmatic Report for COP 07 2008

## APPENDIX D: PERSONS CONTACTED

### **Winrock International Staff**

Dr. Chalya Lar	Chief of Party
Wale Adeogun	M & E Specialist
Kelechi Argoson	Finance Manager
Usman Zhokwo	Grants Manager

### **Winrock International Staff (Facilitators)**

Dr. Lami Samaila	Desk Officer BCS
Timothy Zakka	Desk Officer AB/OP
Amenze Igbinedion	Desk Officer OVC
Mercy Ameh	M & E Assistant

### **USAID Interviewed Team**

Dr. Ochiawuma Ibe	CTO
Isa Iyortim	Program Officer
Philomena Irene	BCS Program Officer

### **Winrock Consultants/Observers**

#### **FCT & Kano**

Muyiwa Oladosu	Lead Consultant
Charles Ayo Toriola	Consultant
Uchenna Okafor-Agbi	ICAN Observer
Tawanda Madhangi	Volunteer AIDS Alliance, UK
Yahaya Shuaibu	Assistant to Lead Consultant
Chinenye Ezekwueme	Assistant to Lead Consultant

#### **Lagos & Edo**

Uche Igwe	Consultant
Anthony Igbokwe	Consultant
Dominic Etuko	NIM Observer

### **Winrock Staff Interviewed**

Kelechi Agorson	Finance Manager
Zhokwo Usman	Grants Manager
Wale Adeogun	M & E Specialist
Timothy Zakka	Project/Program Assistant

### **Women Gender Development (WOGEND), Kano**

Salisu Kaila	M & E Officer
Surajo Lawan	Accountant
Mohammed Abubakar	Volunteer
Aminu Idris	Volunteer

Dogara T. Goshit	Program Assistant
Aishatu Y. Mohammed	Nutritionist
Jamila Yahuza	Volunteer
Safiya Ibrahim Badu	Asst. Manager
Naimah D. Ahmed	Volunteer
Ladidi Jibrin	Volunteer
Hauwa Ya'u	Volunteer
Aisha A. Mohammed	Acada Teacher
Usman Aliyu Baba	Acada Teacher
Auwalu Umar	Acada Teacher
Ibrahim Tijani	Acada Teacher
Farida Mohammed	Acada Teacher
Ummu Muhammed	Volunteer
Afiniki Kudi	Beneficiary
Imrana M. Yakassai	Program Manager
Ummi K. Muhammed	Volunteer

### **Women Health Education Development (WHED)**

Irene Patrick	Executive Director
Asinobi Uche Ogbonna	Project Accountant
Segun Aiyetan	Project Manager

### **Women Trafficking and Child Labour Eradication Foundation (WOTCLEF)**

#### **Abuja**

Veronica Umaru	National Coordinator
Johnson Archibong	IT Officer
Abdullahi Salihu	Admin/Accountant
Bukar Ruth	Youth/HIV/AIDS Officer

#### **Kano**

Tasiu Yusuf	Program Officer
Hajia Maryam Mijinyawa	Secretary

### **Society for Community Development (SCD), Abuja**

A. Atsegbua	CEO
Akhigbe Vivian	Accountant
John Dada	M & E Officer
Sani Ibrahim	Project Staff

### **Ummah Support Group (USG)**

#### **Abuja**

Alhaji Sadiq U. M. Rabi	AIM/UMM Project Manager
Omoniyi Abdulwahab	Accountant
Fati Abdulsalam Bala	M & E Staff
Musa M. Jere	D. Coordinator

Mallam Ibrahim Doma	National Coordinator
Fatima Musa	Program Assistant
Danjuma Abdullahi	Member, USG Board of Trustee

**Kano**

Garba Halluru	M & E
Mohammed Bello Zubair	OVC Desk Officer
Bilkisu Adelodun Orilonishe	Accountant
Ubale A. Rano	Asst. Programt Manager
Bello Abdu Magaji	Program Manager

**Redeemed AIDS Program Action Committee (RAPAC)**

Johnson Abiodun	Assistant Program Manager
Robinson Omare	
Josephine Olomu	M & E
Odutolu Olugbenga	M & E
Ejiko Gbenga	M & E
M. A. Iymi	
Busoal Duncan	Finance

**Jehovah Jireh Resources (JJR)**

Benson Madu	M&E Officer
Emmanuel Boduwa	Accountant
Macaulay Ojoraro	Program Manager
Enamekere Umoh	Volunteer
Abimbola Jones	Program Manager

**Teens and Youths Educational and Capacity Enhancement (TYECE)**

Daniel Obanusa	Program Manager
Nsikan Udo Edet	Program Manager
Abdullahi Murtala	M & E
Oye Ajarat	M & E Assistant

**Nigerian Institute of Management (NIM)**

Dominic Etukedo	NIM Consultant/Member
-----------------	-----------------------

**Federal Ministry of Women Affairs (FMoWA)**

MacJohn Nwaobiala	Deputy Director/Head of OVC
-------------------	-----------------------------

**Universal Basic Education (UBE)**

Alhaji Bello Kaigara	Head of Procurement & Project Coordinator
----------------------	---

## APPENDIX E: REPORTS ON IPs/IAs

### Redeemed AIDS Program Action Committee (RAPAC)

Program: Winrock AIDS Impact Mitigation (AIM) Project

States: Lagos, Oyo, Cross Rivers, Benue and FCT

Original Start and End Date: October, 2006 to October, 2008

Total Funding: US\$ 234, 139.06 (COP 06- 28, 546.00 USD, COP 07- 205, 593.06 USD)

Sub Partners/Implementing Agencies:

The Wholistic Outreach, & The Redeemed Christian Church of God (RCCG).

#### *Evaluation Team Visit Summary:*

The evaluation team two consisting of Uche Igwe, Anthony Igbokwe, and Ochiawuma Ibe (observer) visited the RAPAC office at the Redemption Camp, Lagos-Ibadan express road. The team had a group interview with key project staff consisting of the assistant program manager, the finance officer, and three M&E officers. The evaluation team conducted in-depth interview and FGD with program beneficiaries in Ikorodu, Festac, Mushin, and Surulere communities in Lagos state.

#### *Program Description and Key Results:*

**Table 1: COP 07 Service areas by amount obligated**

	<b>Program Areas</b>	<b>COP 07 \$US</b>	<b>%</b>
1	Orphans and Vulnerable Children (OVC)	49, 325.20	24
2	Food & Nutrition (F&N)	39, 202.00	19
3	Abstinence and Be Faithful (AB)	39, 088.16	19
4	Basic Care and Support (BCS)	53, 662.40	26
5	Condom and Other Prevention (OP)	24, 315.30	12
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$205, 593.06</b>	<b>100</b>

RAPAC is one of the two pioneer implementing partners of the AIM project since COP 06. RAPAC Lagos, Ibadan, Calabar, Markudi, and Abuja are participating in the AIM project. Table 1 above shows that BCS gets the highest financial support (26%), followed by OVC (24%), and F&N, and AB (both 19%), while the least is OP (12%).



## ***Highlights of Programming: Successes and Challenges***

Key highlights of the RAPAC operations are:

- Provided support to OVC aged 0-5 years through food and nutrition programs.
- Established community-based education centers to provide basic skills in numeracy and literacy for out of school OVC aged 7-14.
- Used church and community-based platforms to reach beneficiaries such as OVC, caregivers, and single mothers and widows.
- Provided IGA and business training to caregivers who were living with HIV/AIDS.
- Provided CSWs with peer education strategies (FGD that promotes HIV prevention through abstinence and be faithful messages).

### ***Key Lessons Learnt:***

- The unique approach of strengthening community structures through direct grassroots CBO.
- Capacity-building of project staff in program and M&E, and entrepreneurial training of beneficiaries.
- Referral system created for school children to access services at other USAID partners.

### ***Successes***

- Successful re-integration of 61 OVC into formal primary and secondary schools in all the project sites.
- Poverty reduction and economic empowerment through IGA training and equipment grants.
- AB and OP program intervention has improved knowledge about HIV/AIDS.
- Capacity building of project staff in program, human resources, finance and M&E.

### ***Challenges***

- Had challenge coping with incessant change of program strategies and deliverables.
- Had problem with integrating the OVC into formal schools.
- Inadequate funding hampered working with IAs in more areas of programming.
- Had challenges understanding and using M&E indicators/tools.
- Lacked adequate baseline data to support programs.
- High turn-over of program staff due to poor remuneration.

### ***Evaluation Follow-up Recommendations:***

- There is need for more funds to scale-up program activities to branch offices across the country. Also, there is the need to increase TAs in M&E to reduce the challenge experienced in that area.

## **Ummah Support Group (USG)**

Partner: Nigerian Supreme Council for Islamic Affairs

Program: Winrock Aids Impact Mitigation Project (AIM) Program

States: In more than 13 states of the country

Original Start and End Date: October, 2006 to October, 2008

Central Funding: Total US\$ 237,605.70 (COP 06 = 24,992.31 USD, COP 07 = 212,613.39 USD)

### Sub-Partners:

In Nigeria: The support Group has worked and collaborated with different Organizations like FCT Committee on AIDS (FACA).

### ***Evaluation Team Visit Summary:***

The field team members included Muyiwa Oladosu, Ayo Toriola, Uchenna Okafor-Agbi (observer), Lami Samaila (facilitator/observer), Yahaya Shuaibu , and Chinenye Ezekweme visited USG office in Abuja, and Kano. Had group interview in Abuja key project staff namely; national program manager, national program coordinator, national M&E officer, chief accountant, national program assistant and a field officer. The team also had group interview in Kano with the state M&E officer, state OVC desk officer, account officer, state program manager and the assistant program manager. The team had key informant interviews and FGD with beneficiaries at the cities.

### ***Highlights and Successes***

#### *Key highlights*

- Capacity strengthened to respond to the needs of OVC.
- Worked to provide quality, comprehensive and meaningful care and support to OVC.
- Improved access to basic care and support for widows and single mothers infected or affected by HIV/AIDS.
- Facilitated behavioral change among CSWs through programs that promotes reduced dependency on transactional sex i.e. consistent condom use, HIV prevention messages, and IGA for alternative means of livelihood.

#### *Key successes*

- Provided OVC with access to numeracy and literacy.
- Provided caregivers with means of livelihood to cater for themselves and their family
- Brought CSWs into an organized set up with ID cards to enable easy reach.

- Provided sub-recipients with funds
- Observed all the criteria laid down by the AIM project.
- Involved relevant stakeholders at all levels to boosted our success base.

### ***Challenges***

- More OVC and widows and single mothers requested services with few funds to cater for them all.
- Had challenges of providing close M&E vis-à-vis meeting the need of beneficiaries.
- Had difficulty tracking CSWs who provided false identification and migrate to other locations.

### ***Recommendations/Conclusion:***

- More funds should be provided to meet the increasing demand for services.
- More capacity building is needed to be able to attain direct funding status.
- Capacity of more sub-recipients should be built to be able to respond to the needs of OVC.

## **Women Trafficking and Child Labor Eradication Foundation (WOTCLEF)**

Program: Winrock Aids Impact Mitigation (AIM) Project, COP 07

States: FCT, Kano and Bauchi

Original Start and End Date: October, 2007 – September, 2008

Total Funding: US\$ 66, 053.79

### ***Evaluation Team Visit Summary:***

The team that visited WOTCLEF at Abuja consisted of Muyiwa Oladosu, Ayo Toriola, Lami Samaila (facilitator/observer), and Chenenye Ezekwueme. A group interview was conducted for national coordinator, administrative/accountant officer, information technology officer and the youth & HIV/AIDS officer. The team also visited the project site at Mpape, Abuja where a FGD was conducted for CSWs. In Kano, the team that did the fieldwork included Muyiwa Oladosu, Ayo Toriola, Uchenna Okafor-Agbi (observer) Timothy Zakka (facilitator/observer), Chenenye Ezekwueme, Yahaya Shuaibu, and Isa Iyortim (observer). The state coordinator was out of the country at the time of the evaluation, hence only two volunteers were present for interviewed. The team conducted FGD CSWs at Gadan-Tambarawa, in Kano state.

### ***Highlights of Programming: Successes and Challenges***

#### **Key Highlights:**

- Provided skills acquisition training in tailoring, knitting, hair-dressing and catering for 200 commercial sex workers with 187 getting equipment grants.
- Provided HIV/AIDS prevention and behavior change messages to 337 CSWs through FGD.
- Used NYSC platforms to recruit volunteers and peer-educators for community awareness campaigns.
- Provided condom service outlets alongside prevention and behavior change campaigns. Conducted periodic FGDs to assess knowledge and behavior change of CSWs about HIV/AIDS.

#### ***Key Lessons Learnt:***

- Had opportunity to use Winrock-AIM project platform to network with government agencies, NGOs, CBOs and FBOs.
- Won the trust of CSWs through personal mentorship.
- Built capacity of project staff through experience and exposure to standard materials and techniques.
- Created referral linkages CSWs to access other HIV/AIDS and STIs services.

### ***Successes***

- Trained 200 CSWs in IGA skills and awarded equipment grants to 187 of them.
- Reached 200 CSWs with the three basic strategies.
- Improved HIV/AIDS knowledge of 1000 individuals and increased their willingness to go for testing.
- Twelve out of 37 CSWs in FCT and 8 out of 75 in Bauchi state disengaged from the trade.
- Reached 707 people with inter personal communication (IPC).
- Empowered additional 7 CSWs outside the project budget.
- Institutional capacity was built during the course of the project. Had trainings and technical assistance in program, finance, human resource and M&E.

### ***Challenges***

- Initially had problem understanding program implementation strategies.
- Had difficulty of retaining project staff thereby, hampering transfer of knowledge.
- Had problems with lagged time of skills acquisition of beneficiaries.
- Had difficulty of retaining volunteer staff at the project sites. There are no clear motivations and reward system for the volunteers.
- State office is managed by only volunteers that lacked pre-requisite program training.
- Religious and social restrictions on CSWs hampered access to the beneficiaries in Kano state.
- Religious and cultural beliefs posed as threat to increase the knowledge of CSWs about HIV/AIDS, STIs and correct condom usage.

### ***Conclusions & Recommendations:***

- There is the need for continuous step-down training for state/site office staff, especially when volunteers form the main staff.
- Staff attrition/turnover challenges may be reduced by devising a means of reward or motivations to volunteers or make them permanent.
- There is the need for more M&E and technical assistance to state/site project staff. Training will increase more professionalism and may also be a form of motivation in getting commitment from volunteers.

## **Society for Community Development (SCD)**

Program Areas: Education, Governance, HIV/Reproductive Health and Gender

Original Start and End Date: April, 2007 to October 2008

States located: FCT and Edo State

Central Funding: \$29,547

### ***Evaluation Team Visit Summary:***

The evaluation team composed of Muyiwa Oladosu, Uche Igwe, Anthony Igbokwe, Ayo Toriola, Chenenye Ezekwueme, and Lami Samaila (observer) visited head office located in Kubwa, Abuja. Uche Igwe, Anthony Igbokwe, and Dominic Etuko (observer) visited Edo state. Key interviewees were the program manager, M&E officer, finance officer and other program staff. The team also conducted interviews and FGD with the beneficiaries in both states.

### ***Highlights of Programs***

#### ***Key Highlights***

- Was able to provide different types of livelihood training and support to single mothers and widows.
- Was able to provide education and support to OVC and integrate them into public schools.
- Was able to have behavioral change among CSWs by creating HIV/AIDS awareness, promoting AB messages, and training them in different IGAs.
- Was able to use barbers and hairdressers to disseminate HIV/AIDS prevention messages, and to provide condoms.

#### ***Key successes/Achievement***

- Increased awareness of OVC issues in the communities involved.
- Trained a sizable number of OSY as peer educators and as distribution channel for condoms.
- Helped CSWs to transition to alternative IGAs.
- Gave OVC access to education through the Acada centers and integrate them into public schools.

#### ***Key challenges***

- Not enough funds for M&E activities.
- Funds release not in a timely fashion.
- Unhealthy competition among WI partners.
- Difficulty in accessing CSWs because of their high mobility.

### *Conclusion and Recommendation*

The AIM project beneficiaries reported that their lives have changed significantly and requested continued support.

- Need for increased funding of the services.
- Need help for beneficiaries to have access to bank loans.
- More direct WI staff M&E supervision is encouraged.
- Need to reduce stigma and discrimination of Acada beneficiaries by advocating same uniform for both Acada and public schools students.
- WI should form effective network with implementing partners through idea sharing, relationship building.
- More IPs step-down training is needed especially on M&E.
- There is the need for feedback report from WI.
- WI should encourage IPs on the need to source for alternative resources for sustainability.
- The psycho-social, F&N support given to OVC should be continued and sustained.



## **Teens and Youths Educational and Capacity Enhancement (TYECE)**

Program: Orphans and Vulnerable Children (OVC), Basic Care and support (BCS), Abstinence and be faithful (AB), Other Prevention.

States: Edo State

Original Start and End Date: October, 2006 – October, 2008

Central Funding: COP 06 = 15,462.49; COP 07 = 88,767.03.

### ***Evaluation Team Visit Summary:***

The evaluation team that visited Auchi in Edo State included Uche Igwe ,Anthony Igbokwe, and Dominic Etukedo (observer). The team had a group interview with key project team including the program manager, program officer and two M&E officers. Apart from the interview with the project team the evaluation team interviewed some beneficiaries located in different parts of Edo State (Auchi and Okpella).

### ***Highlights of the program.***

#### 1. Key highlights

- Provided quality, comprehensive and meaningful care and support to OVC.
- Improved access to basic care and support for PLWHA and PABA by providing them with basic business management skills and in-kind grant.
- Facilitated behavioral change amongst CSWs through programs that promote reduced dependency on transactional sex by the provision of balanced ABC HIV prevention messages and IGAs for alternative livelihood.
- Increased dissemination of prevention and behavior change messages.

#### 2. Key successes and achievements.

- Capacity Building of staff has created room for a good programmatic understanding of project implementation.
- Successfully provided direct support to 440 OVC within COP 07.
- Offered supplementary support to 37 OVC who have been reintegrated into public schools.
- Trained 154 caregivers to provide care and support to the identified OVC.
- Established three Acada centers during COP 07.
- Recruited 75 OVC into the ACADA learning program, with 74 graduating (one died).
- Provided 75 OVC with psychosocial support throughout the year.
- Referred all 440 OVC to the National Population Commission for their birth registration and certificate.

- Provided IGA grants to 88 caregivers in COP 07.
- Provided referral linkages for 10 PLWHA to other USG IPs to access prevention kits, care and treatment.
- Provided equipment grants to 164 PLWHA for their IGAs.
- Reached 138 CSWs with the three strategies of: community outreach, FGD, and peer education.
- Selected and trained five OSY as peer educators to promote messages through correct and consistent condom use, and reached 226 OSY with messages in COP 07.
- Recorded disengagement of a CSW after receiving IGA grant.

### *3. Challenges.*

- Experienced high mobility of barbers and hairdressers.
- The funds available for M&E are insufficient and as such affected the reporting, also frequent change of M&E reporting tools.
- How to sustain the Acada centers after the expiration of the AIM project.

### ***Evaluation Follow-up Recommendations:***

- Frequent changes on the M&E tools and personnel should be addressed, because of its adverse effects on monitoring.
- The absence of an accounts officer Edo State should be addressed in line with USAID financial regulations.
- Innovative ways of sustaining the various service areas should be devised particularly the OVC program. WI should assist the communities in looking for available human and material resources required for sustainability.
- The capacities of the IPs/IAs need to be improved in the area of sustainability strategies.
- Need to encourage community participation at the initiation and implementation stages of the OVC program to ensure sustainability in the long-run.
- Need to encourage more HIV testing/screening of women in the community.

## **Women Health Education and Development (WHED)**

Program: HIV/AIDS Education, and Economic Empowerment for Sex Workers

States: Anambra, Imo and FCT.

Original Start and End Date: October 2007 to September 2008

Central Funding: US\$ 59, 382.00

### ***Evaluation Team Visit Summary:***

The evaluation team included Muyiwa Oladosu, Ayo Toriola, Chenenye Ezekwueme, and Yahaya Shuaibu visited the WHED office in Jikwoyi, Abuja and had group interview with project key staff namely; the executive director, project accountant and the project manager. Four beneficiaries were interviewed in the project office.

### ***Highlights of the programs: Successes and Challenges***

#### *Key highlights:*

- Improved the income generating ability of CSWs; equipment grants given to 60 CSWs in Anambra, 60 in Imo and 30 in FCT.
- Promoted HIV/AIDS prevention among CSWs; 400 in Anambra, 400 in Imo and 200 in FCT.
- Distributed 40,000 Condoms in Anambra, 40,000 in Imo and 20,000 in FCT.

#### *Key successes /achievements:*

- Trained over 200 CSWs on IGA skills in the 3 project states
- Two CSWs disengaged from the trade in FCT.
- Awarded equipment grants to over 150 CSWs.
- Improved HIV/AIDS knowledge of over 7,000 individuals (CSWs, their clients and community members)
- 50% reduction in the number of sex partners among CSWs.
- Outstanding support from Anambra state government during advocacy visit.
- Political commitment from commissioner for Women Affairs and HRH the chief of Amansi, Awka Anambra State.
- Partnership with Habitat for Humanity and United Hands USA to build low cost houses for CSWs.

#### *Challenges:*

- Demolition of illegal structures in the FCT led to displacement of CSWs thereby hampering identification and follow-up.
- Ban on sale of condom in Anambra state had effect on condom use among CSWs in the site.

- Lack of functional HCT centers in Anambra State led to low referral linkages.
- Inadequate training for the peer educators.
- CSWs peer educators reported being scorned and not taken serious when giving AB messages to their peers and others.
- Resistance on forming cooperatives by the CSWs.
- High mobility and attrition of CSWs is a major challenge in tracking progress of beneficiaries of IGA grants.
- Lack of accommodation for CSWs who want to quit the trade.
- Low literacy level of peer educators and complicated M&E tools affects program monitoring and reporting.
- Former CSWs trained as peer educators were not really ‘peers’ of current CSWs leading to resistance from the leadership.
- Inflexibility of WI budgets.

***Evaluation Follow-up Recommendations:***

- Inconsistency in reporting was observed between WHED’s performance report and that of WI. This inconsistency in reporting needs to be addressed.
- There is an apparent lapse in the organization’s M&E system which needs to be rectified. This may include training and TAs in the M&E.
- The project team more participatory approach in the development of M&E tools and in program implementation plans.

## **Women Gender Developers (WOGEND)**

Program areas: OVC and BCS

State located: Kano

Original and Ending date:

Central funding: COP 06 = 11,711.50 USD; COP07 66,272. 45 USD

### **Evaluation team visit summary**

The evaluation team composed of Muyiwa Oladosu, Ayo Toriola, Uchenna Okafor-Agbi (observer), Timothy Zakka (facilitator/observer), Chenenye Ezekwueme, Yahaya Shuaibu, and Isa Iyortim (observer) visited the WOGEND office in Kano and had interview with the program officer, M&E officer and financial Manager. The evaluation team also interviewed the OVC and BCS beneficiaries in different parts of Kano.

### ***Key Highlights of the Program***

- The OVC program planned to reintegrate 16 of the COP'06 Acada graduates into formal schools in Kano state.
- The OVC program aimed to provide literacy and numeracy skills to OVC who were not given the opportunity to attend formal schools.
- Planned to improve the general health of OVC through education, nutrition and economic strengthening of their caregivers.
- Aimed to achieve enrolment of 405 OVC aged 0-5 for nutrition intervention and training of their caregivers on different IGAs.
- Planned economic empowerment for 140 PLWHA/PABA through IGA training and grant awards.

### **Key Successes/Achievement**

#### **OVC**

- Established 3 Acada centers and enrolled a total of 65 OVC aged 8-14 years in Nassarawa LGA, Kano state. And 16 OVC were reintegrated into formal schools.
- Identified 452 OVC aged 0-5 and conducted a baseline on nutritional level/growth of these kids, and trained 251 caregivers on how to formulate balance diet using locally available food resources, and were given food supplements.
- OVC caregivers where trained on different IGAs; like how to make soap, pomade, tie & dye, food processing and scent making, and business development and also awarded equipment grants. Trained 135 PLWHA and supplied equipment grants.

### *Key Challenges*

- Encountered problem implementing OP in COP'06 due to religious restrictions in the area.
- Not able to meet the increasing number of people needing services.
- Have difficulty reintegrating OVC Acada graduates into formal school due to low standard in public schools.
- The financial rules and regulation of WI made no provision for contingency expenses, and a challenge to receipt minor expenses.
- Employee turnover due to low salary package for project staff
- Funds not enough to recruit additional staff and rent bigger officer space.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

- To make OVC Acada learning center more relevant and sustainable, the length of study should be increased from one academic session to two years.
- The WI financial rules and regulation should be simplified to make room for contingency expenses especially those that cannot be receipted.
- Quarterly staff audit should be conducted by WI, to ascertain the number of staff and technical capability of the IPs/IAs.
- There is the need to limit IGA training to only those that available funds can support.

## **Jehovah Jireh Resources (JJR)**

Program areas: Acada Learning Center

State Located: Lagos, & Ibadan

Original Start and End Date: July 2007 to October 2007

Central Funding: COP 06 = 24,809.77 USD; COP 07 = 74,985.44 USD

### ***Evaluation Team Visit Summary:***

The evaluation team that visited JJR in Lagos includes Anthony Igbokwe, Uche Igwe and Ochiawunma Ibe (observer). As at the time of the evaluation, JJR program has been closed down in Lagos state. But the project team came in from Ibadan to organize the beneficiaries of the OVC and BCS programs for the exercise. A group interview was conducted with the program team which consisted of the M&E officer, accountant; program manager, and former M&E Officer.

### ***Key Program Highlights***

- Planned to launch and provide care for 80 OVCs through the establishment of two Acada centers for 40 OVCs each in Oyo and Lagos states respectively.
- Planned to provide grant to widows and single mothers for income generating activities in both states.
- Planned to provide intervention package in Oyo state on peer education and community awareness campaign for CSWs.
- Planned to provide behavioral change intervention among OSY in Oyo state such as barbers, hairdressers and their clients through skill training and peer education.

### ***Key Successes/ Achievement***

- Establish three Acada centers to improve numeracy and literacy skill of 72 OVC aged 8-14 in the states.
- Reintegrated 41 OVC aged 8-14 years into formal school.
- Provided 15 caregivers of OVC aged 0-5 with IGAs.
- Provided 100 trained PLWHA with different IGA skills.
- Reached 80 CSWs with community outreach that promotes HIV/AIDS prevention.
- Trained 10 CSWs on how to promote HIV/AIDS prevention program in Oyo state.
- Reached 269 OSY with community outreach promoting HIV/AIDS prevention in Oyo state.
- Trained 9 OSY peer educators in Oyo state

### ***Challenges***

- The opportunity for OVC in Lagos program lost due to closure of program there.
- Grants not enough for program activities slated for implementation.
- Financial manager had challenges recording minor expenses that cannot be receipted.
- It was difficult following quotation/buying procedure using WI financial regulation.
- Inability to give grants to all the beneficiaries after IGA training.
- The need for refresher courses for M&E and financial management staff.

### ***Conclusion and recommendation***

- Regular training of staff in the form of refresher courses, and TAs needed to strengthen their workforce especially on M&E, and financial management.
- Extra budgetary allocation needed for M&E to be more effective.
- Health education could be incorporated into the acada curriculum.
- The F&N component of the OVC program should be continued as it served as incentives for the OVC to attend school.
- Grants should be made available to cover the number of beneficiaries trained for IGA.
- The WI financial procedure should be simplified to take consideration of minor expenses incurred in the course of the project.
- More supportive supervision should be provided by WI for proper implementation of the program areas.