



Evaluation of the Livestock Fairs Intervention Project in Zimbabwe

Full Report

Oxfam GB Programme Evaluation

March 2007

Commissioned by: Oxfam GB Southern Africa

Evaluators: Nelson Marongwe, Kudzai Chatiza

Table of Contents

1.0. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	1
2.0. INTRODUCTION.....	3
2.1. BACKGROUND AND MOTIVATION	3
2.2 PROJECT BACKGROUND	4
2.3 PURPOSE OF THE ASSESSMENT	5
2.4 METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH	5
3.0 MAIN FINDINGS 3.1 EFFECTIVENESS OF THE LIVESTOCK FAIRS	9
3.2 APPROPRIATENESS AND RELEVANCE.....	13
3.2.1. <i>Identifying the sellers</i>	16
3.2.2. <i>Exploring Implementation Challenges</i>	17
3.2.3. <i>Delayed Payments</i>	21
3.2.4. <i>Administration of Vouchers</i>	21
3.3 IMPACT AND BENEFITS OF THE PROJECT	22
4.0 PROJECT SUSTAINABILITY.....	33
4.1. STAFF TURNOVER AND INSTITUTIONAL MEMORY	33
4.2. STORAGE AND MANAGEMENT OF PROJECT INFORMATION.....	34
5.0 PROJECT COSTS.....	35
6.0 CONCLUDING REMARKS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	37
<i>Figure 1: Proposed Project Trajectory.</i>	38
ANNEXES	44
ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE	44
ANNEX 2: EVALUATION TOOLS (QUESTIONNAIRE & FGD GUIDELINES);	48

1.0. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Oxfam GB has been implementing the Livestock Fairs project, which is part of its Protracted Relief Program (PRP) in Zimbabwe since July 2004. The PRP addresses livelihood and public health needs through a suite of interventions that include Livestock and Input Fairs, a Tillage Voucher Scheme, Community and Nutrition Gardens and Conservation Farming (training in moisture-conserving agronomic practices and agro-forestry). These interventions target poor households, which Oxfam categorizes into three: chronically poor, transitorily poor and the economically at risk. The program interventions emphasize reaching the most vulnerable using community-based targeting mechanisms. The project document states the targeting proportions for the Livestock Fairs intervention as 25% for the chronically poor and 75% for the transitorily poor. Able-bodied members of targeted/selected households above 18 and below 60 years of age participate in public works programs identified by their communities. Local supervisors keep track of participation, together with government extension staff. Oxfam monitors the activities as part of quality assurance to ensure that meaningful work is done before vouchers are issued. Livestock Fairs are done in February/March of each year and to date at least three have been done in each of the project communities.

The impact of the project can be looked at in relation to the changes in livestock ownership within the communities as well as the social capital that is built because of wealth possession. This is at output level, which can be measured in say 1 to 2 years. The actual numbers distributed are another indication of this level of impact (output). The increase in numbers of the distributed livestock can also be measured as a short-to-medium term difference attributable to the project. At the same time impact can be assessed in relation to the life changes enabled through use of the livestock. Examples of this include paying school fees for children and other more strategic investments with longer pay-off periods. The assessment focused more on the first (broadened ownership of stock and growth in numbers) and not on the more long-term impacts, which could be measured after four to five years with indicators like consistency in paying children's fees to allow progression in education (see also recommendation on M&E).

Fairs appear to have played a part in improving the prices of and developing livestock markets although in some cases e.g. Chionekano and Guruguru Wards (Zvishavane) communities complained that Fairs generally led to price increases making non-Fair trade difficult. Livestock Fairs allowed bulk selling and buying and the associated direct injection of cash into the communities, appreciated by beneficiaries, Government extension staff and local leaders (village heads and councilors). However voucher redemption delays eroded the values as a result of the prevailing inflationary environment. On balance, other (non-Fair) interventions by Oxfam experienced similar challenges. For instance, it seems that there was no adequate dialogue on the pricing of tillage services and communities complained of very low prices worsened by delayed payment.

Livestock Fairs improved access to small livestock to vulnerable households who have made breeding progress. Although the livestock numbers remain modest the assessment established that the households are utilizing the livestock for multiple purposes with payment of school fees emerging as a top priority. This should be seen as a strong form of social protection considering that households are investing in human capital for benefits that will only accrue in the future. Most households still have their livestock and are looking to further years of breeding. Both beneficiaries and sellers are experiencing the benefits from the project. Areas that require improvement cover production aspects of the project, disease control, and extension services provision, monitoring and evaluation of project impact, development of local markets and the provision of appropriate training to beneficiaries. This is particularly important if the impact and long-term sustainability of the project is to be enhanced.

The evaluation team recommends that Oxfam;

1. *Articulates a medium to long-term profound vision for the project.*
2. *Takes its project responsibility beyond simple inclusion of the poor into subsistence chicken and goat production to local market development, facilitation of linkages with other markets and broader economic empowerment for those that show promise.*
3. *Creatively supports the strengthening of public sector extension to aid and sustain the production processes of the new livestock owners.*
4. *Considers taking up relevant policy issues up the hierarchy to secure the initiatives that it is supporting on the ground.*
5. *Develops an exit and sustainability strategy (related to the vision discussed in Figure 1).*
6. *Invests in building the capacities of livestock recipients in a creative and appropriate way.*
7. *Develops and implements an M & E System where stakeholders and the community participate. The system should allow robust integration of specialist and Participatory Impact Monitoring where beneficiaries, community leaders and other stakeholders on the one hand and OXFAM M/E staff collect and co-analyze the data on the other. Related and to properly institutionalize tracking of life changes Oxfam, with technical assistance as appropriate, could consider setting up a system for collecting and analyzing panel data for a cohort of households over the next 5-6 years.*
8. *Seeks avenues to improve access to Veterinary Drugs.*
9. *Together with the community and key stakeholders should endeavor to address program implementation challenges faced in the project at present.*
10. *Revisits the depth and breadth of support while also reflecting on the optimum size of the suite of interventions that it brings to any given community.*
11. *Retains core program staff at least for the three-year project/program cycles.*
12. *Encourages buyers to show their capacity to look after livestock as they purchase.*
13. *Holds Fairs during weekends and school holidays nearer the drier months.*

The Fairs have brought a difference in the lives of both sellers and buyers i.e. numbers distributed, livestock uses and general livelihoods issues. However, the evaluation team urges Oxfam to provide additional structured post-Fair support to address challenges that new livestock owners face. This support is also necessary for beneficiaries and Oxfam's program partners. Offering the support will sustain the gains that the project is generating and ensure that the beneficiaries remain motivated to do more and thus climb out of the 'poverty pit' they are in.

2.0. Introduction

2.1. Background and Motivation

Starting from the year 2000, a combination of human induced and natural factors has given rise to turbulent and often unpredictable livelihoods in Zimbabwe. A land-mark event in the year 2000 was the adoption of land occupations as the dominant method of land acquisition in Zimbabwe. The subsequent formalization of land occupations into Fast Track Resettlement programme is often seen as the watershed that marked the intensification of human induced processes that have given birth to the economic, food and livelihood crises that prevail in the country. Declining macro-economic conditions have seen inflation rising to very steep levels, which perhaps have no precedent in a southern African context. For instance, year on year inflation was estimated at around 502% by November 2005, rising to about 1134% by June 2006. To date, inflation is estimated at close to 1300% (CSO 2005, 2006). The declining macro-economic conditions have also forced many companies to close their businesses, with the Confederation of Zimbabwe Industries showing that 500 companies closed business between the year 2000 and 2001 alone. The closure of companies and the scaling down of operations has resulted in massive retrenchments of urban-based workers, offloading them onto the rural areas. This has increased pressure on the land while at the same time reducing and at times completely cutting off remittances to the rural areas, an important form of support to sustainable livelihoods in rural areas.

Another outcome of Fast Track Land Reform has been the loss of employment by between 200 000 – 300 000 former farm workers who were previously employed by mainly white large-scale commercial farmers. A significant proportion of these retreated to their communal homes, again leading to increased pressure on the land and creating a livelihood crisis. Further to this, the launch of the Clean-up Campaign by the Government of Zimbabwe in 2005 resulted in the displacement of between 400 000 and 650 000, largely poor and vulnerable households (UN 2005), most of which ended up landing on their communal homes. A good number of these were the most vulnerable, especially people with disabilities and those who were HIV/AIDS positive, many of whom were on medication. For instance, an NGO working with people with disabilities in Harare estimated that the Clean-up Campaign in Harare alone displaced 140 households that constituted part of its membership, with 86 households being directly assisted to relocate to the rural areas.

On the other hand, persistent droughts constitute the core of natural factors that created increased distress to the national economy, with the most affected being farming populations in the rural areas. Thus since the 2001/2002 period, Zimbabwe has experienced 4 consecutive droughts, a situation that has jeopardized the livelihoods of close to 70% of the country's population. Despite the decline in HIV/AIDS prevalence rate among the 15-49 year age group (2005 – 2006 Demographic Health Survey), the pandemic continues to create economic and social pressure, with over 1.3 million children estimated to have lost one or both parents. The numbers of people who are food insecure have also continued to swell as a result of the multiple factors, with ZIMVAC (2006) indicating that some 1.4 million people in rural Zimbabwe would not meet their households' cereal requirements for the 2006/2007 marketing year.

In light of the above, Oxfam GB has implemented a Protracted Relief Programme (PRP) since July 2004, addressing mainly livelihoods and sanitation needs of selected populations in the Midlands province (Zvishavane and Chirumhanzu districts) and Masvingo (Masvingo and Gutu districts). Specifically, Livestock Fairs have been used to assist vulnerable households to build their small

livestock asset –base and improving household food and income security.

Oxfam’s Livestock Fairs intervention is largely situated in the framework of the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach to development. A livelihood is commonly understood as encompassing the capabilities, assets and activities that are required for making a living (Chambers and Conway 1992). Essentially, the emphasis is on the possession of human capabilities (e.g. education skills, health etc, access to tangible and intangible assets and the existence of economic activities). In this context, Livestock Fairs are a form of social protection, which is responding to risk and vulnerability that has been created by multiple processes operating at various levels. Broadly, Livestock Fairs fall into the category of livelihood promotion measures whose focus is to enhance real incomes and capabilities (Wheeler and Pelham 2006) of targeted households, through the provision of small livestock, especially goats and poultry. This report is an assessment (mid-term) of the impact of Livestock Fairs on the livelihoods of the beneficiary households. It was also designed to come up with recommendations for use by Oxfam GB’s Management team for improved livestock programming as a means to address acute food insecurity in Zimbabwe. Two independent consultants who had not been involved in implementing any part of the Livestock Fairs interventions undertook the assessment.

2.2 Project Background

Since the 1980s when Oxfam GB started its operations in the development sector, it has implemented several programmes in the water and sanitation, and food security sectors in Zimbabwe. Further, in response to the high incidence of droughts, Oxfam has scaled-up its interventions to include food aid and livelihoods related activities. It is in this context that the Protracted Relief Programme has been put into place. Oxfam GB is implementing the Protracted Relief Program (PRP) in Zimbabwe’s Midlands and Masvingo Province. The activities under this program are being implemented in the four Districts of Chirumhanzu (6 Wards) and Zvishavane (5 Wards) in the Midlands Province and Masvingo (2 Wards) and Gutu (4 Wards) in Masvingo Province. The interventions are in line with keeping Oxfam GB’s Team Purpose of *‘acting with poor people as a force for change in addressing the causes of poverty, suffering and injustice...’* (Oxfam GB, 2006¹). The PRP is a response by Oxfam GB (and its partners) to the challenges that people in Zimbabwe are facing. As already mentioned, the challenges are a result of the multiple crises induced by policy aberrations, economic decline, political instability and unfavorable weather conditions (drought and floods). These macro-conditions are affecting marginal areas and in these areas the chronically poor are affected the most. Poor and marginal areas in both rural and urban areas are characterized by declining crop and livestock production, high levels of unemployment, erratic income generating and livelihood coping mechanisms or opportunities, declining health and social conditions.

Since July 2004 Oxfam GB has implemented the PRP to address livelihood and public health needs. The suite of interventions in the livelihood basket includes Livestock and Input Fairs, Tillage Voucher Scheme, Community and Nutrition Gardens and Conservation Farming with training in moisture-conserving agronomic practices and agro-forestry components. These interventions target poor households, which Oxfam categorizes into three groupings of the chronically poor, transitorily poor and the economically at risk. The program interventions under

¹ Livestock Fairs Impact Assessment Terms of Reference.

the livelihood banner have placed emphasis on reaching the most vulnerable² using community-based targeting mechanisms. In fact there is an elaborate criterion for beneficiary selection and targeting that is stipulated in the Programme Manual. The project document states that the targeting proportions for the Livestock Fairs intervention is 25% for the chronically poor (unconditional voucher) and 75% for the transitorily poor (receiving vouchers in return for doing community works)³. Oxfam GB aims to build poor households' asset bases as a step towards these households' food and income security being improved. Livestock Fairs are done in February/March of each year and to date at least three have been done in each of the project communities.

Able-bodied project beneficiaries or members of targeted/selected households below 60 and above 18 years of age are expected to participate in public works programs⁴ identified by their communities. Local supervisors keep track of participation, together with government extension staff as well. Oxfam monitors the activities as part of quality assurance, ensuring that meaningful work is done before vouchers are issued. The link between the public works program and the Livestock Fairs in previous phases presented some initial conceptual challenges for the impact assessment, as some beneficiaries did not fit the criteria set in the project document. However, engagement with communities and Oxfam enabled the evaluation team to understand how this worked on the ground.

2.3 Purpose of the Assessment

The purpose of the assessment, as is stated in the Terms of Reference was to assess the impact of Livestock Fairs implemented by Oxfam under the Protracted Relief Programme (PRP). Specifically, it looked at two main issues, the effectiveness of Livestock Fairs and the impact of the intervention. In terms of effectiveness, the focus was on, among other things, appropriateness and relevance of the intervention. This included an investigation of issues relating to targeting, ability of Livestock Fairs to address the livelihoods needs of beneficiaries and the extent to which community participation has been promoted. The assessment of the impact looked at the benefits to both recipients and sellers of livestock, and the sustainability of the Livestock Fairs, and the overall Protracted Recovery Program (PRP). The key question on impact was: what has changed among beneficiaries and sellers as a result of Livestock Fairs.

Expected Out

The key output of the assessment was expected to be a “well-researched and concise report providing both an assessment and analysis of the impact of the Livestock Fairs”. Included in the report are a clear set of recommendations to Oxfam GB's management team for improved livestock programming as a means to addressing acute food insecurity in Zimbabwe and beyond. The identification of success stories was also part of the output package that was expected to guide the replication of the Livestock Fairs by Oxfam elsewhere in the country.

2.4 Methodological Approach

The assessment made use of data generated by the various components of the project. This largely included project documents, monitoring and evaluation (M & E) reports and financial records.

² Widows, orphan and vulnerable children, the disabled, households with chronically sick people, the elderly.

³ There were no noticeable changes in relation to this targeting framework.

⁴ Examples include road/bridge maintenance, gully reclamation, community conservation works e.g. dam/weir repairs and/or cutting waterweeds, repairing irrigation and garden infrastructure, installing drip kits etc

Fieldwork was also carried out and this generated primary data that complemented secondary data that had already been collected.

M & E Reports accessed and reviewed included the M & E Livestock Fairs Report (March 2006), the M & E Livestock Vouchers for Work Verification Report (April 2006), and the various Progress Reports. The Livestock Fairs Report provided monitoring and evaluation data on stakeholder involvement in the Livestock Fairs, process issues of arranging and conducting the fairs, data on the outcome of targeting/beneficiary selection, price-range of the different livestock and the actual process of trading and voucher reconciling process. The M & E Livestock Vouchers for Work Verification Report (April 2006) provided data on the number of beneficiaries targeted for livestock vouchers for work, inventory of the type of work, status and quality of the works. Generally, the two reports captured some data on accountability issues in the project. Further, the 2006 Assessment Report provided useful data that was also used in this assessment.

Fieldwork was done in six randomly selected wards, namely Charandura and Chinyuni in Chirumhanzu district, Guruguru and Chionekano in Zvishavane district and Munyikwa A and Mazuru in Gutu district. This represented about 23.5% of the total wards where the Livestock Fairs are being implemented. Fieldwork data collection was done using interviews with key stakeholders, questionnaire survey and Focus Group Discussions with beneficiaries as well. In Munyikwa A and Guruguru, separate FGDs were also held with community leaders. Interviews with key informants were done with Oxfam project staff at district level, team leaders for the livelihoods intervention, Veterinary Department officials based at district/ward levels and AREX staff. The data collection instruments used included an interview guide, FGD guidelines and a questionnaire. The research instruments used were shared with Oxfam staff at the national level prior to the implementation of fieldwork. Tables 1.1 and 1.2 give summary statistics of participants who were involved in the FGDs and the questionnaire survey.

Table 2.1: Details of Participants in the FGDs

District	Site	Number of Females	Number of Males	Totals
Chirumhanzu	Charandura	36	16	52
	Chinyuni	75	12	87
Gutu	Mazuru	36	24	60
	Munyikwa	60	24	84
Zvishavane	Guruguru	29	12	41
	Chionekano	33	35	58
Totals		269	123	392

Source: Field Data (January 2007)

Table 2.2: Implementation of the Questionnaire Survey

District	Site	Total Beneficiaries		
		Females	Males	Totals
Chirumhanzu	Charandura	17	5	22
	Chinyuni	17	8	25
Gutu	Mazuru	12	5	13
	Munyikwa A	13	2	16
Zvishavane	Guruguru	14	5	17
	Chionekano	8	8	18
Totals		81	33	114

Source: Field Data (January 2007)

Interviews with key informants were particularly useful in assessing relevant components of the Livestock Fairs. Input from key government officials that included AREX staff and the Department of Veterinary Services officials provided the opportunity for assessing stakeholder participation in project implementation, especially the provision of extension services and monitoring of project activities. Other key informants included traditional authority structures, especially chiefs and village heads; committees involved in price-setting at the Livestock Fairs and Oxfam area committee members. These provided mainly data on issues pertaining to beneficiary selection processes, planning and holding of Livestock Fairs, including process issues of price-setting and their views and perceptions pertaining to sustainability of project interventions. Oxfam staff based at the national, provincial and district levels provided appropriate secondary data (including available M & E data), views and perceptions on the performance of the project, together with the implementation challenges that they met.

Field work was done between 3 and 15 January 2007. Three days were spent in each district, with 2 days reserved for Focus Group Discussions and questionnaire implementation at the ward level. The third day in each of the districts was spent interviewing key stakeholders based at the district level. Although interviewing was done mid of the 2006/2007 farming season, attendance at the FGDs was impressive and fieldwork went on uninterrupted.

2.5 Design of the Evaluation

The assessment was designed based on criteria that looked at effectiveness, appropriateness and relevance of the intervention. Further, the assessment criteria also focused on the impact of the intervention and its cost effectiveness. Table 1.3 presents the criteria and questions used in the assessment and the respective data collection tools (See Annex 2).

Table 2.3 Criteria and Questions for the Assessment

Criteria and Questions	Data Collection Tools
Effectiveness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What are the socio-economic characteristics of beneficiary households (HHs) - How were the beneficiaries targeted 	Focus Group Discussions Questionnaire Survey Review of Documentation from Oxfam
Appropriateness and Relevance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How appropriate were the Livestock Fairs in improving the livelihoods and food security situation of HHs - How did the sellers and buyers benefit from the Livestock Fairs - How did Livestock Fair’s influence HH power relations - What other follow-up support was given to beneficiaries and was it sufficient 	Focus Group Discussions Questionnaire Survey Review of Documentation from Oxfam Interview with key informants beneficiaries
Impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What was the impact of the Livestock Fairs on buyers and sellers - What has happened to the local economy as a result of the distribution of livestock - How sustainable are Livestock Fairs 	Focus Group Discussion Questionnaire Surveys Interview with beneficiaries
Cost Effectiveness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How cost-effective were the Livestock Fairs 	Review of Oxfam Documentation

Source: Adapted from Harvey and Marongwe 2006:9.

3.0 Main Findings

3.1 Effectiveness of the Livestock Fairs

The communities in which Oxfam GB is implementing the Livestock Fairs project are generally the poor and marginal areas within the targeted Districts. In fact, the project areas are primarily located in Natural Regions IV and V, which makes them agriculturally unproductive under rain-fed conditions. As such issues of poverty and deprivation are evident, manifested by relatively high numbers of actual and potential beneficiaries. However this is not to suggest that there are incidences where non-poor households in deprived communities seek to benefit from programs that come into their communities despite being able to look after themselves. Some communities exhibit a high level of critical social awareness in relation to their poverty situation. It is however important to acknowledge from the beginning the reality that the ‘politics of attracting support’ from public and private voluntary institutions and actual experience with ‘singing poverty’ makes community selection and household targeting difficult.

A number of reasons affect this inclination towards seeking benefits from outside agencies. First is the fact that the assistance is available and as such is there for “the getting”. The second reason relates to the urge to participate in interventions in one’s community. This pressure to be included is borne out of the desire to deflect attention from oneself since self-exclusion from assistance programs is considered a sign of having enough. By taking part in or benefiting from programs households avoid drawing others to ask for assistance from them. The third reason is a conscious decision to benefit recognizing what the assistance will do to a household’s own livelihood. In other instances seeking to benefit is via persuasion or some form of social marketing by friends or relations with access to information on program interventions. These four are not necessarily exhaustive, but are some of the ones synthesized from the assessment of the Livestock Fairs, which in a lot of ways determine the extent of challenges faced with beneficiary selection.

For development agencies and their staff, targeting the very poor and vulnerable households or members of society is quite noble and is almost a universal objective. The challenge is however about operationalizing the selection criteria, a process that is often riddled with exclusion and inclusion errors. Justifying the selection of one group and the exclusion of others often brews conflict and at times hatred among households. This kind of discontent often grips the project community as evidence from the Focus Group Discussion in Chinyuni ward showed. The community representatives felt that the targeting of the sick and other categories of the vulnerable by NGOs was ‘excluding’ those community members falling outside those categories. This prompted one participant to ask ‘which community do the so called well-to-do live?’ Another went a step further and retorted: “*Care inouya yoti nherera, Oxfam yotiwo nherera, saka isu tiri vanhu venyika ipi.*” (All development organizations seek to target orphans and other vulnerable households in society. So who is going to assist us in this world?) Using local examples of projects meant for HIV and AIDS patients which had collapsed, participants at the Chinyuni meeting argued that it was important for project promoters to consider also the able-bodied. However in other wards like Mazuru and Munyikwa A (both in Gutu District) the participants at the community meetings indicated an appreciation of the work being done to help the vulnerable members of their communities. A sense of ‘our poor are being helped and Oxfam is doing a great job’ permeated

most of the discussions in these communities. They argued that the assistance from Oxfam meant that the community itself would therefore have less pressure in assisting the poor.

Table 3.1 gives summary statistics about the Livestock Fairs intervention. A total of 6 296 people benefited as sellers and 18 158 as recipients of livestock. These figures could be inclusive of people who benefited more than once. All the same, compared with a total figure of about 85 362 households in the 17 wards (see Table 2.1) where the Livestock Intervention was implemented, these figures represent a remarkable achievement. Quite a significant size of the total population was reached by the project and this needs to be commended.

Table 3.1: Summary Statistics of the Livestock Fairs Intervention

District	Ward Name	Ward No.	No. of HHs in ward ⁵ .	No. of sellers	No. of Beneficiaries ⁶ .
Zvishavane	Guruguru	1	1 902	228	1005
	Chionekano	2	3 482	389	1219
	Hombe	4	3 051	733	1 731
	Runde	5	2 872	355	1 217
	Shavahuru	9	3 196	315	626
Chirumhanzu	Mhende	3	4 928	594	1984
	Chengwena	4	2 162	492	1173
	Chinyuni*	7	3 994	634	-
	Charandura	8	7 748	652	1492
	Musoropamwe	9	6 399	969	3333
	Maware	10	1 365	398	-
Gutu	Mazuru	13	7 760	492	850
	Magombedze	12	7 188	562	931
	Munyikwa A	15	10 839	114	163
	Munyikwa B	16	6 503	207	346
Masvingo	Nyamande	28	4 849	580	682
	Nyikavanhu**	29	7 124	-	-
Totals			85 362	6 296	18 158

* Figures for beneficiaries not available

** File with records not located.

Source: Compiled from various sources (CSO 2002, Reports and Project Documents).

In defining the poor that deserve assistance there are some challenges faced. Some poor people were providing services including living at the homesteads of (ordinarily absent) well-to-do relatives while others may themselves be well-to-do but take care of OVCs from their poor relatives. In both instances the poor ‘care-takers’ and OVCs have no claim to the resources in the homes they inhabit and thus their livelihoods may not be better by living in such homes. The other view was that such OVCs do in fact benefit from resources at the homes they inhabit and hence should not be targeted. These are some of the nuances of ‘community poverty debates’ that the evaluation team was privy to. Some of these were used to indicate how beneficiary selection processes at community level had left out deserving cases. Generally, there was no consensus on

⁵ The figures refer to Households in the Wards as given in the CSO report quoted.

⁶ These figures are cumulative and were collated manually from various Oxfam records. It was difficult to separate by year because some of the entries were not dated. Addressing this may require revisiting the field to engage staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries so that these dates are entered.

such issues and this represent one area where community debate is required if targeting is to be seen as more effective.

Despite the nuances that are always associated with exclusion and inclusion errors of beneficiary selection, the Livestock Fairs were generally done well in targeting vulnerable households. Data from both the FGDs and questionnaire survey confirmed this. For instance, 27.3% of the beneficiaries (n=110) indicated that they had somebody who was chronically ill. The bed-ridden were ill for a period that ranged from 3 months to a maximum of 10 years. This indeed confirms that the targeting process was accurate as it managed to reach the chronically ill, who in essence were a key target of the intervention. Asked about why they think they were selected, all participants gave reasons that were in line with the selection criteria. In FGDs, participants were asked to speak about those who had benefited from their own villages and the reasons associated with the decisions. The answers pinpointed issues related to one having nothing in terms of assets, guardianship of orphans, widows with no decent means of earning a living etc. Specific examples were also cited during FGDs that showed that people with disabilities, who are normally some of the most disadvantaged and vulnerable in any given society, were also targeted in the selection criteria. This evidence corroborates the findings of the beneficiary verifications by Oxfam staff and the local leadership where home visits were actually done on 20% of the beneficiaries and found out that targeting was reaching the intended beneficiaries.

There are however issues relating to effectiveness in targeting that need to be re-examined. The question on: *'have you benefited from any other Oxfam intervention'* (other than Livestock Fairs) was responded to by 75 people in the questionnaire survey. Of these, 48 (64%) indicated that they had benefited from other interventions. It could be that other participants ducked the question as, through their own instinct, suspected that the results could be used against them in the oncoming livestock sales. What is worth noting is that Oxfam was implementing multiple interventions, and it seemed that communities had introduced their own secret 'by-laws' where the strategy was to make sure that one benefits at least from one of these. The question then is: does beneficiary selection matter in those cases? In Chionekano for instance, the Chief was very frank and advised his subjects to be truthful about beneficiary selection. He admitted that he and many other people whom he pointed at had received livestock but were "not that poor⁷." In Chinyuni, Guruguru and Chionekano, there were even many other NGOs⁸ working with the same communities, though of course using different interventions. In such situations, communities often devise their own methods of ensuring that each and every-one benefits from at least one of them. In the end, the issues about selection criteria might become less relevant and this was confirmed in Chionekano when one participant noted, "*Hapana anoda kusara,*" (no-one wants to be excluded). What seems to be emerging is that whilst targeting the vulnerable is welcome in any given society, what is required is to have a piece of the cake reserved for the "not so poor". In one way, the Livestock Fairs intervention is already addressing this. The sellers, who were the first beneficiaries, fall into

⁷ Indications were that they did not fit in any of the three categories as set for the Program but received livestock or benefited from other Oxfam projects as part of addressing community dynamics essential for successful project management.

⁸ Care International, World Vision, DACHICARE, Zvishavane Water Project etc.

this category. Those participating in the works programme are another category. What is perhaps required is a slight broadening of this category of project beneficiaries⁹.

Against a background of many poor people it came as no surprise that the number of people receiving assistance was perceived to be low in the communities visited. The comment that more people should be assisted and that more services including large stock should be included was made at all sites. This (the call for more) is a default community expectation but there are serious factors that we observed in the process. In the words of some of the focus group discussants ‘...it would seem that Oxfam is just proving that they could actually help us have livestock’. The implication of such sentiments is that the breadth and depth (or coverage and significance) of the assistance are being considered to be shallow by community leaders and extension staff. The Agricultural Extension Worker for Munyikwa A noted that ‘...the expectation is that at least 75% of the poor in a locality should be assisted’. AREX extension staff in Guruguru also echoed similar sentiments. The analysis drew parallels with the targets of toilets and boreholes (50 each) in most affected areas as reasonable. While the number for Livestock voucher beneficiaries was evidently higher the spread in the Ward resulted in some kind of ‘withering’ of the visibility and potential impact. The Ward Councilor for Munyikwa A supported this idea by saying ‘...we should not be afraid to even ask for 100% assistance...these are agencies awash with resources, we are in Regions 4 and 5, which are known as suited to animal production and therefore donor assistance should focus on small stock at 100% coverage’.

In addition to the above, the participatory processes being used to select beneficiaries also raised false expectations among communities. Thus, in some cases it is seen as not very sensitive when, as an illustration, a whole village meets to select two beneficiaries for receiving two goats and a dozen or so chickens. It creates high expectations and according to Munyikwa A community leaders the eventual beneficiaries may be despised by others. While this can be put to ordinary challenges of beneficiary selection it is critical for Oxfam to look at it within the context of its suite of services in a given Ward with a view to shrinking that basket while expanding the beneficiary base for the fewer initiatives selected in consultation with the community and assessed for socio-economic and technical feasibility. Village level selection itself was reportedly causing social tensions with cases of or simple fear of witchcraft being cited. While in most of the focus group discussions held there were about 70% of the participants who had benefited from mostly one and at most two of the OXFAM interventions, the evaluation team was left wondering whether the organization needs to develop criteria for assessing the optimum size of its ‘basket of services’ using Oxfam and community-level variables of effectiveness and efficiency.

A key development strategy of Oxfam is the mainstreaming of gender issues in all of its programmes. In the context of this assessment, this can be understood in terms of balancing beneficiaries between men and women, and having women in key decision-making positions. In terms of who received livestock at the household level, it was clear that women were in the majority (Table 2.2 refers). In 68.8% of the cases, it was reported that the livestock was allocated to women (as mothers) as opposed to 28.6% for men. This is an impressive achievement where

⁹ The proportions used in targeting of 25% chronically poor and 75% transitorily poor and economically at risk skirt the reality of working with the poor where one cannot completely ignore the ‘rich’. In percentage terms the not-so-poor could constitute 10-15% of the beneficiaries [one cannot address the problems of tenants without engaging with landlords, the poor and not-so-poor are in interconnected relationships that are mutually reinforcing, Berner et al 2005].

women’s empowerment, especially in livelihoods related issues, has been addressed at the grassroots level. When asked during group discussions on the kind of gender dynamics raised by the Livestock Fairs Project, especially the allocation part of it, there seemed to be consensus that all members of the households viewed the livestock as a family asset, and not as belonging to the person to whom it was allocated. The situation was the same for caring or looking after the livestock.

Although women were largely the beneficiaries, this dominance was later neutralized when it came to making decisions on who decided on when and what to sell. From Table 2.3 there is still some dominance by women, but not at the same level as that was observed in the question on who was allocated the livestock.

Table 3.2: Who was allocated Livestock at the HH Level?

Who was allocated	Frequency	Percent
Father	32	28.6
Mother	77	68.8
Mother & Father	3	2.6
Totals	112	100

Source: Field Survey 2007

Table 3.3: Who made the decision when selling?

Who made the decision	Frequency	Percent
Father	24	33.3
Mother	32	44.4
Father and mother	13	18.1
Family	3	4.2
Totals	72	100

Source: Field Survey 2007

In summary, the view of the evaluation team is that the Livestock Fairs were generally effective in the targeting process. The selection criteria was, by and large, adhered to. Also, the project did well in targeting women.

3.2 Appropriateness and Relevance

Appropriateness can be interpreted in relation to the compatibility of the livestock intervention with the general livelihoods of people in the project area. The key question would then be about the extent to which communities in the project area were not only interested, but also engaged in livestock production. To the extent that most sellers were indeed people coming from the same communities, this is evidence that the keeping of poultry, goats etc is common practice in the area. As data on the use of the livestock also shows, it is clear that the Livestock Fairs were not only an appropriate, but relevant intervention. Households quickly went on to breed their livestock, and where necessary, utilized the livestock to meet their basic food and non-food needs. This in itself is a good indication of appropriateness and relevance.

In addition to distributing quality breeding stock, the livestock distributed was generally of the right ages as it did not take long before breeding started. From Table 2.4, it is clear that within 2 months of the Livestock Fairs, breeding had already started in 50% of the households. From 6 months

afterwards, the percentage had increased to about 85%. This shows that the project has done well in providing breeding stock. A concern was however raised in Munyikwa A as it was noted that some households sold livestock that they knew did not breed for one reason or the other. Accusations of witchcraft and greediness on the part of some sellers who did not want their livestock to breed elsewhere where they would have been bought were made. The issue was raised in Munyikwa A only but could equally be relevant in other areas.

Table 3.4: How long did it take before Breeding Started?¹⁰

Length of Time	No. of Households Reporting Breeding	Percentage
<1 month	4	4%
1-2 months	46	46%
3-4 months	21	21%
5-6 months	14	14%
7-10 months	10	10%
>10 months	4	4%
Not Yet	1	1%
Total	100	100%

Source: Field Survey 2007

The appropriateness and relevance of the project can also be analyzed in terms of the use and utilization of the livestock received. Data from both FGDs and the questionnaire survey shows that households were primarily selling their livestock for the payment of school fees. Table 2.5 presents the uses to which the livestock was put. The uses were mainly through making sales, use as relish and exchanging for other services. Other services included mainly meeting household emergencies, especially payment of health fees, funeral costs, purchasing farming inputs and other livelihood related uses. From the table, it is clear that the dominant use was selling for the payment of school fees. It is only for the October-December 2006 quarter when the number of people selling for school fees was less than those using the livestock for relish. This is quite understandable given that over the festive period, households will generally be in a 'spending mood'.

The number of people selling per quarter generally increased from 35 in the January – March quarter to 61 in the last quarter of the year. This is also expected given that the project matures as time progresses, with more and more households utilizing their livestock as time progresses. What the data does not show is the total number of people who have at least not managed to use their livestock nor managed to use their livestock at the time of the assessment. There were also specific cases where households entered into transactions that involved the exchange of livestock for other services or products. From the questionnaire survey, 6 out of 114 households were involved in such transactions. The details of the transactions involved exchanging livestock for tillage and maize grain. In other cases, households exchanged cocks for hens. The use to which the livestock was put also demonstrates that project benefits were accruing to the whole household.

¹⁰ The table refers to responses given by beneficiaries of the different categories of livestock (goats, chickens etc).

Table 3.5: Livestock Use in 2006: Data from the Questionnaire Survey

Type of Use	Period				Total
	Jan-Mar	Apr-June	July-Sept	Oct-Dec	
Sold	5	13	25	24	67
Relish	9	10	12	33	64
Exchanged for other services	2	2	1	1	6
Other	9	6	4	4	23
Total	25	31	42	62	160

Source: Field Survey 2007

Box 3.1 further presents some of the findings from FGDs on the use of the livestock (see also Box 2.2).

Box 3.1: Evidence on the use of Livestock

1. Mai Chadenga, from Magayo Village in Chinyuni ward was given 6 chickens (she had nothing at the beginning). When they had increased in number, she sold 7 chickens and managed to buy 20kgs of mazie seed. At the time of the assessment she had 5 chickens left.
2. An unmarried man (Tsvimborume) from Masiyauta in Chinyuni ward was given a goat. The guy is terminally ill (asthmatic). He sold the goat in order to raise funds for purchasing of food.
3. A woman from Jani Village in Charandura ward sold 8 chickens at the Livestock Fair (she was a seller). At that time she was left with 2 chickens but they have since increased to 10. She had sold the chicken in order to raise money for buying a 50kg bag of fertilizer.
4. A woman from Chinyuni sold 20 chickens at the Livestock Fair in order to raise money for her mother's medical treatment.
5. A man from Munyikwa A was given a goat which had since given birth. During the 2006/2007 agricultural season, he had his fields ploughed in exchange for the young goat.

Source: Field Data 2007

What is particularly worth noting is that beneficiaries were not hesitant to reveal firstly that they have already used some of the livestock, and secondly how they had utilized the livestock. This is a strength on the part of the project as the beneficiaries confirmed that they really owned the livestock, as opposed to be seen as “Oxfam’s and hence could not be readily used”. Elaborating on that particular point, a woman from Mazuru ward remarked, “*Mwana haangadzingwi kuchikoro ini ndine chipfuwo chandakapiwa. Ndinotengesa ndowana mari yechikoro*” (A child cannot be sent back from school when I have livestock accessed through Oxfam. I will sell it to raise school fees).

From the examples in Box 3.1, and elsewhere in this report, even the sellers also benefited. The Fairs provided an opportunity for bulk stock sales that allow sellers to meaningfully invest the returns as opposed to periodic sales. In one case a villager sold 4 goats (out of a herd of 8) in order to raise cash for purchasing an heifer which demonstrates the livelihood improvements enabled by the Livestock Fairs. What however needs to be stressed is that most of those selling livestock did not possess huge numbers of livestock, and hence sales potentially resulted in sellers remaining with low numbers or even nil in some of the cases. Thus there is a possibility of one person moving from being a seller to a potential beneficiary. As such this might be an indication of the need to develop a deep and broad production base over a medium-term period. Also, the need to monitor

the livelihood statuses of sellers becomes evident from examples where one may sink into poverty due to selling all the livestock they own.

Box 3.2: Examples of household use/impact of the Livestock Fairs

[Box Removed]

Source: Extracted from OXFAM Reports 2006.

The figures in Table 3.6 show an increase in the population of two main types of livestock that were traded. Thus in the study sample, when the Livestock Fairs started in 2004, only 46 and 23 households owned chickens and goats respectively. The respective figures had however increased to 91 and 47 by December 2006. Where there was less emphasis by the project on rabbits, guinea fowls and turkeys, the increment remained very low and insignificant. In fact, for pigeons and ducks, the figure remained constant at a low 3 (out of a study sample of 114) for 3 years. This illustrates the low or zero investment by households in the study sample into livestock development, a situation that is likely to be a common trend in rural areas. With no external support in livestock development, it is evident little or no change is expected in livestock development. Also, the figures showing beneficiaries for chickens and goats did not rise exponentially, and this can be attributed to the fact that some of the households benefited more than once.

Table 3.6: Trend in Livestock Ownership

Type of Livestock	Number Owning By Year		
	2004	2005	2006
Chickens	46	66	91
Goats	23	28	47
Rabbits	5	5	9
Guinea fowls	5	6	6
Turkeys	6	8	10
Pigeons and Ducks	3	3	3

Source: Field Survey 2007

The comments presented in Box 3.2 illustrate the diversity of the use to which the livestock is being put, all of which support the livelihoods of communities. These uses are linked to payment of school fees and health needs; use of the poultry to secure tillage services as well as meeting other social obligations like payment of lobola. This further confirms the appropriateness of the Livestock Fairs Intervention. It was also the general feeling among participants that their social status image has improved in society as a result of possession of livestock.

3.2.1. Identifying the sellers

An important question for this assessment was about who were the sellers at the Livestock Fairs. There are no straight answers to this question. Potential responses can be related to the wealth status of the seller (e.g. were they the rich who were selling their livestock) or in terms of location (were they coming from the same wards). Other dimensions of socio-economic characteristics,

such as gender¹¹, can also help in identifying who the sellers were. So far, the assessment has alluded to many examples of sellers, and by and large, these were both men and women. An analysis of who the sellers were is also useful in judging the appropriateness and relevance of the project. The willingness of sellers to trade is another indicator of appropriateness and sustainability of the intervention.

In terms of the wealth status of the sellers, there were mixed experiences. If the figures on sellers who disposed of livestock in bulk are to be believed (see next sections), then it is evident that some of the 'rich' or relatively well-up households participated in the Livestock Fairs as sellers. There were also other specific cases identified in the assessment, though isolated, where some of the sellers were relatively well-up. For instance, a woman from Zvishavane who reportedly rears more than 600 indigenous chickens took part as a seller. There was also the case of a man who was trading hand-made shoes for chickens and was later selected as the best seller in Chirumhanzu district. However, in some cases, the sellers were not the well-up, and some could have been poor. Reference is made elsewhere in this report about sellers who disposed of all their livestock in order to meet a pressing family need¹².

In most of the cases, sellers were fellow residents in the same ward where the Livestock Fair project was being implemented. This was particularly so in five of the wards where the assessment was undertaken, with the sixth ward, Chinyuni in Chirumhanzu being unique in terms of its experience. In that particular ward, the research team established that most of the livestock sold at the Livestock Fairs was coming from surrounding resettlement schemes in the nearby Masvingo district. According to the participants to the FGD discussions, people in Chinyuni ward were very poor and hence could not raise any significant stock for sale, especially goats. After recognizing the limitations, the inhabitants went and mobilized their neighbours in the resettlement areas where such livestock was relatively abundant. Ultimately, the initiative resulted in increased numbers of livestock at the fair. In this particular situation, the question of who were the sellers assumed a new dimension where the sellers were other rural residents located outside the project area. Whilst the approach yielded positive results, and subsequently broadened the impacts of the project out of the project area, in future it is important to monitor such activities, especially its impact on prices¹³.

3.2.2. Exploring Implementation Challenges

There is however a number of areas observed during the assessment where improvement is required in the management of Livestock Fairs. This is important for purposes of improving upon project performance, and consolidating the project impact. In some wards, distances walked to and from the Fair centers were simply long, presenting challenges for the movement of livestock and human beings as well. The issues pertaining to delayed payments and the loss of value of money by the

¹¹ Available/reviewed project documents did not consistently reflect the gender characteristics of sellers. Use of names would have been unreliable.

¹² Cases that the evaluation team came across are discussed in the report e.g. a man who sold five goats to pay his lobola in Chinyuni Ward. We return to this in recommendations and suggest that pre-Fair assessments could capture the main reasons why sellers participate in the Fairs.

¹³ The evaluation team heard anecdotal evidence e.g. in Chinyuni and Chionekano indicating that the Fairs had an effect on prices [led to upward reviews in virtually all cases]. There is no possible comparison with other areas outside the Oxfam GB program sites as the team had no access to prices for the Livestock sold through the Fairs.

sellers perhaps constituted the greatest threat to the sustainability of Livestock Fairs. Generally, it was not possible for OXFAM staff to establish the exact quantities of livestock that would be brought for sale, creating a mismatch between available vouchers and the amount of livestock (by specie) brought to the sale.

The issue of large distances walked to and from the place where the Livelihood Fair were conducted were pertinent in three main wards, Chinyuni in Chirumhanzu and Chionekano in Zvishavane and Munyikwa A ward. Thus in Munyikwa A for instance, participants to the FGDs remarked that the furthest point in the ward was upto 15km from the place where the Livestock Fairs were held. This meant that the livestock earmarked for sale would travel 15km to the Livestock Fair and if bought by somebody from close to that area, would travel a further 15km on the return journey. Linked to the issue of distances traveled was the times at which Livestock Fairs were held and ended. In Munyikwa A, it was reported that some beneficiaries ended up traveling at night if the Livestock Fair ended late in the day. Some livestock reportedly died on arrival at the Livestock Fairs or on their return home owing to the large distances traveled. In Chinyuni ward, the Maenzanise VIDCO was reported as the furthest and in fact one goat died on arrival at the Livestock Fair. Ironically, the goat had been brought to the Livestock Fair on behalf of its owner, and those who had brought it ended up being asked to pay for the dead animal. In Chionekano ward, women from Mumbengegwi village complained of having to walk for 2-3 hours one way on their way to the Livestock Fairs. Based on these discussions, it was clear that minimizing the distances (through perhaps having more of them in a single ward) would help in reducing the cost (time and labour) of traveling on the part of both buyers and sellers. This has already been implemented in Mazuru ward and can be replicated elsewhere.

Also, the actual movement of the livestock to the fairs was considered problematic. Thus selling livestock in bulk confirmed that it was a huge task to move say 10 – 15 chickens or a significant number of goats to the Livestock Fairs on an individual basis. Also, matching demand and supply at the Livestock Fairs was generally not achieved. Goats seemed more popular at the Livestock Fairs but in most wards their numbers were simply not enough to meet demand. It had not been possible for the OXFAM project staff to quantify the volumes of livestock by type that would be brought to any given Livestock Fair.

In Mazuru ward for instance, it was noted that livestock vouchers distributed were less than the total number of livestock brought for sale, disappointing some of the potential sellers in the process. In Chinyuni ward, it was noted that goats were few in number and got finished early, disappointing those who wanted to purchase them. On following up with OXFAM staff at a later date, one woman was informed that the vouchers had expired. What seems to be emerging is that a proper assessment is required prior to the holding of the Livestock Fairs. This can be implemented as part of the M & E process so that Oxfam builds capabilities in market assessment and appropriate design of the Fairs in keeping with available Livestock. Community Mobilizers and local stakeholders can be very helpful in establishing sound data on which predictions of Fair size could be based to obviate problems of too many vouchers chasing too few livestock or vice versa.

The absence of a developed data-base/inventory of actual and potential sellers created the space for cheating as some sellers and buyers connived to extract cash from the OXFAM project. Based on discussions in FGDs, interviews with key informants especially Veterinary and AREX staff, and in

some cases OXFAM staff, it was confirmed that in some situations the livestock never changed/transferred ownership from sellers to buyers. Analyzing the Sellers and Beneficiaries Register, it became evident to the evaluation team that some sellers sold up to 10 goats at one time. Upon interrogation, it became clear that social networks were established simply to extract money that would be shared among buyers and sellers, with the livestock remaining with its owner. The Veterinary Officer for Charandura ward gave startling evidence of how the practice became widespread in the wards in Chirumhanzu.

It was noted that some well-up sellers would go around the community and mobilize their relatives to supply chickens 'for sale'. Meanwhile the wife/child or some other close relation would have been registered as beneficiaries. On the day of the Livestock Fairs itself, the livestock would be brought to the sale when already marked "SOLD". After the Livestock Fairs, the cash would be shared and the livestock returned to its owners. When the Veterinary official quizzed some of the beneficiaries and sellers on why they were taking their livestock back, the official was told "*mave kuda kuona officer. Mari ndeye OXFAM iyi,*" (Do not interfere. The money belongs to OXFAM). It was not possible for the assessment to analyze the extent to which this practice was spread in the project area. What is important however is that this is any aspect that needs proper monitoring in the future. One suggestion made from the community was inter-village or ward sells. Community Mobilizers can also ensure that this (cheating) is reduced before, during and after the Fairs through random home visits. However, there are counter-arguments to these suggestions including that some communities prefer to sell to people they knew for ease of tracking the livestock and also that they would be confident that they get the 'right' brands.

The March 2006 M & E Livestock Fairs Report confirmed that buyers and sellers came to the Livestock Fairs after they had already entered into agreement to sell to one another. "Most sellers were generally more comfortable in selling their livestock to beneficiaries from their areas for easy follow-ups. This to some extent increased the rate of trading as sellers and buyers would come to the Fair having entered into an agreement already only to agree on the prices at the fair." (p.5)] This can be interpreted as supporting the observations that some of the transactions could have been "artificial".

OXFAM staff also confirmed that there was indeed cheating in some of the cases. For instance when the cheating was identified in the Gutu wards, they made a ruling that those from the same village could not sell to one another. To their surprise, the buyers and sellers quickly dispersed as they were no longer eager to trade. In Guruguru ward it was mentioned in FGDs that some livestock never changed ownership. It was pointed out that some beneficiaries claimed to have bought goats but there were neither the goats nor shelter facilities for such goats at their homes. What this assessment could not establish was the scale at which the practice was undertaken. By and large, the issue was a sensitive one and participants seemed not very eager to discuss the problem. In Chinyuni ward, participants stated that they had to go and mobilize their neighbours in surrounding resettlement schemes to supply goats for sale as they were in short supply in their ward. In fact, the Chinyuni residents would ferry the goats and sell them on behalf of their colleagues in resettlement areas. It was not possible to assess whether or not there were underhand transactions that enticed people to enter into such kinds of deals.

There were also cases of in-house trading. In Charandura ward, the evaluation team noted that

there were identifiable cases where one person in the household stood as the seller and another as the buyer. This evidence of cheating was also identified by the Smith assessment of 2006. . One female AREX official summed it all “*Vamwe vaidira kuzvitengesera huku dzavo: Beneficiary ndini, seller murume wangu,*” (some people literally sold the livestock to themselves). An interview with a key informant, whose wife was a recipient of chickens, reaffirmed that in that ward, there were several cases of people who allegedly received livestock but it was never transferred to them. Such people also never bothered to put up shelter for their acquired livestock. Of course, these are loopholes that any project cannot foresee and can only be identified at a later stage. Broadly, the guidelines on who can sell and to who is an area that needs to be fine-tuned in the project. This represents another area where improvement is required in the planning and implementation of Livestock Fairs. This is however addressed in the last section of this report.

The evaluation team reached the conclusion that the level of community participation in the Fairs was satisfactory. This was largely because of the participatory nature of the process used including use or involvement of community structures in the project. However the extent to which the community takes full control and has developed confidence in running the project (pre, during and post-Fair activities) is still limited. Some of the beneficiaries and sellers alike noted that they still needed support from Oxfam to be able to organize successful Fairs. Regarding problems like cheating, FGD discussants indicated an unwillingness to deal with these and other conflict areas associated with the Fairs preferring to defer to Oxfam.

The determination of prices saw Oxfam, stakeholders and community representatives taking part in a Committee. However, the role that Oxfam played e.g. use of comparative information from outside the participating Wards and the fact that they are the funders seems to have been interpreted as dictating or dominating the pricing process (FGDs in Munyikwa A, Chionekano, Guruguru and Charandura). The individual voucher values, at least initially, were also misperceived as a determination of the prices. It therefore is the evaluation team’s considered view that creating a balance in terms of price determination between community empowerment (evidence and market-based) and retaining an affordability that does not steeply distort local prices is difficult. Oxfam has not done much in this area and the discussion above about the seller data-base developed on the back of participatory market assessments could help in addressing this critical area.

Feedback or complaints are channeled through traditional mechanisms (say through community structures or leaders) as well as the ‘suggestion box’ emplaced at fair venues on Fair days. Although the box provides anonymity discussants and key informants seemed unanimous in expressing people’s discomfort with its use. Some felt that anonymity was not guaranteed, a factor that might be keeping a lot of people away from using the box. Others felt that this was an unfamiliar method and as such people needed time to develop confidence in using the suggestion box. Another important factor relates to the relatively shallow project ownership that we read from statements like ‘...do not interfere, the money belongs to Oxfam’ quoted above (FGDs, 2007).

Continued project implementation will inevitably enable both the Oxfam and the participating communities to build rapport, capacities and an institutional adaptation critical for deploying innovative mechanisms for deepening community participation. In short the evaluation team is of the view that the divide between project and community mechanisms for managing project

interventions will progressively fade. Some of the recommendations suggested in section five (5) are made with this in mind.

3.2.3. Delayed Payments

Sellers and buyers have been seriously affected by delays in voucher redemption. It would seem the process between the Livestock Fair and actual payment of sellers takes too long. The meandering, step-by-step procedure of managing Livestock Fairs (as summarized in the Programme Manual) seems to be the main cause of concern. The series of steps include the consolidation of sellers and vouchers, data capturing of sellers' registers, verification of typed registers, cash requisition for payment of sellers and voucher redemptions and payments. Testimonies from the field indicated how OXFAM's image has suffered from this winding process, how uncomfortable buyers get when the sellers take as long as two to three months before being paid and how serious this could be in terms of project sustainability, particularly willingness of sellers to participate in the Fairs. Frankly, people were quite bitter about the delayed payments. Some sellers, as already mentioned, were positive about the opportunity for 'bulk-sales', which allow them to do meaningful things¹⁴ with revenue from stock sales but were equally concerned about the payment delays. This occurs at times when chickens and goats purchased at the Fairs begin to thrive in their new homes when the money for buyers will be losing its value. Sellers emphasized to the research team that when they participate in Fairs it is usually to offset immediate problems and thus delays affect their plans. While OXFAM in some instances has adjusted the payments upwards (Interview with Program Manager, Gweru 03/01/07), the evaluation team does not find this to be a 'charity-based' and not an adequate business-like response. It is expensive to both OXFAM and the beneficiaries (both sellers and buyers) considering there are direct financial and time resources invested in voucher redemption, which could be reduced by collapsing some of the 'background' stages involved and bringing them much more forward and as close to the Fair-venue as is possible. The delays caused serious social tensions in communities. Community leaders in Guruguru Ward (Zvishavane District) indicated that they were dealing with serious cases where sellers sought to re-possess their animals from buyers. One case is where a goat beneficiary was forced to return the animal and was later given the money when the seller redeemed the vouchers. In all the sites visited this concern was raised. While acknowledgement of the problem on the part of OXFAM is commendable it remains a serious challenge.

3.2.4. Administration of Vouchers

There were challenges relating to the administration of the vouchers and questions can be asked on the appropriateness and relevance of using vouchers in doing the Livestock Fairs transaction. Discussions with field based Oxfam staff and a review of some of the project documentation confirmed that there is a lot of paperwork involved. This was important for meeting the programme needs and the requirements by the finance department. Information was generally collected manually and required extra human and financial resources for inputting the data into the computer. Before actual payment could be made, field based verifications of the details of transactions had to be made. Based on the March 2006 M & E Livestock Report, the process of reconciling the vouchers was even more complicated. "In Zvishavane and Gutu District beneficiaries were not recording the price of each livestock in their wards as well as the voucher number. This made it difficult for the project staff to link the buyers to the sellers and verify the

¹⁴ A young male seller from Kamurai Village, Chinyuni Ward sold five goats to raise his bride-price money.

prices allocated to each livestock.”

Indivisibility of vouchers presented its own trading challenges. The vouchers were in specific denominations and once the negotiation for the price of a product had been done, getting change was no easy task. The M & E Report of March 2006 has noted this. “The voucher denominations also presented challenges as some sellers would end-up giving buyers a different voucher as change, while in some instances sellers would negotiate with buyers not to give them change or to give change after receiving payment from Oxfam ” (p.5). In Zvishavane (Runde) and Masvingo (Nyikavanhu and Nyamande) districts, the M & E Reports noted that some buyers had combined vouchers to purchase a single animal, but local project staff reversed this as this allegedly complicated the payment process. In the view of the evaluation team, this is an issue that needs to be revisited as there is precisely nothing wrong with beneficiaries joining their vouchers, a scenario that could give rise to joint modes of production. However, discussing with beneficiaries, it did not seem as if the indivisibility of vouchers was a major cause of concern to them. All the same, this exposed the weakness of vouchers versus other methods of effecting transactions, especially the payment of cash.

As part and parcel of facilitating the capturing of information from buyers and sellers that would be used in the processing of payment, buyers were also required to write relevant details on the vouchers, while the sellers were expected to do the same on their cards. This made certain assumptions on the literacy of the participants. In Chirumhanzu and Masvingo districts the approach was effective as it provided the space for, among other things, verification of over-pricing and other anomalies. In the two districts, “each seller was given a card to record all the animals bought and noting the buyers and prices as the trading proceeded. In addition, beneficiaries in these 2 districts were encouraged to record their full names at the back of their vouchers.” (p5). However, opposite results were achieved in Zvishavane and Gutu districts, a situation that can possibly be linked to the literacy levels of both buyers and sellers. Based on the questionnaire survey 5 households had never been to school, 5 attended Grade 1, 4 did Grade 2, 25 did between Grade 4 and 7 i.e. 30.7% of the respondents attained a maximum of Grade 7. People with this level of education generally find it difficult to complete forms more so if the forms are complicated although they are capable of signing. Even analysis of the signatures on the Oxfam forms reflects initials, ‘Xs’ and blanks further indicating challenges with signing, which is easier than completing a form. Notwithstanding the above challenges, Livestock Fairs were both appropriate and relevant. What is only required is to work on the identified implementation challenges.

3.3 Impact and Benefits of the Project

Having implemented the Fairs since July 2004 the change associated with the project can be discussed largely at the output and outcome level of the project management cycle. The kind of impact that is relevant in terms of this assessment relate to the short and medium term period, with the long-term change in improved food security and livelihoods expected later say four to five years. At this stage, project impact is discussed in quantitative terms, by merely looking at the change in the livestock asset base of the beneficiaries and growth of the livestock population. Impact can and is also discussed in terms of use of the livestock (see the preceding section). Thus cash injection into the community through firstly the sellers of livestock, and beneficiaries disposing livestock further down the line represent another form of impact at the local economy level. The assessment used some of the success stories, or rather more appropriately at this stage,

promising examples, to further demonstrate the impact of the project to date.

The first level of impact relates to the volumes of livestock traded and the numbers of buyers and sellers involved. There are however inconsistencies in terms of the total numbers of beneficiaries of the Livestock Fairs intervention. For instance, one document estimated that a total of about 14 173 households benefited from the Livestock Fairs. A manual count of the beneficiaries from available Oxfam records however has indicated that around 18 000 people benefited. However, this figure could be inclusive of beneficiaries who received livestock more than once and hence could be a little bit inflated. The Livestock intervention was funded from three main sources mainly DFID, Bruderhof Communities Fund and Oxfam Unwrapped Funds (Christmas and Spring Bids Goats and Chickens funds). The Bruderhof Communities Fund benefited about 2 800 households but the project documents do not disaggregate these by gender. Christmas and Spring Bids Goats and Chickens funds benefited about 5 973 households of which 4 285 (72%) were females. Whilst the various project reports do not show the precise numbers that benefited from DFID funds, it can be assumed that the remainder of 5 400 households represent the main beneficiaries of the funds (this is based on 14 173 as the total number of beneficiaries).

A visible impact by the Livestock Fairs intervention has been the creation of a market for use by beneficiaries and sellers to meet their food security, cash and other essential needs. Sentiments raised by FGD participants in all the 6 wards expressed strong appreciation of the Livestock Fairs, with participants unanimously calling for the extension of the intervention. Participants stated that selling livestock amongst themselves, in the absence of Livestock Fairs, was difficult as most of them would be poor and buyers would be hard to come by. In some circumstances, households would have been forced to sell at low prices in distress sales. Commenting on their own situation, participants in Munyikwa A in Gutu noted “Our only buyers here were local teachers, *asi mari yavanotaura hayiiti*,” (The prices they offer are too low). Thus in general terms, Livestock Fairs were associated with improved prices of livestock bought /sold at the fairs.

As already mentioned Fairs enabled bulk sales, a condition that is generally difficult to attain given the shortage of cash in most rural areas. Table 3.6 illustrates the number of sellers who sold more than 3 goats at one Livestock Fair. In one case, a seller from Chinyuni ward in Zvishavane district sold about 10 goats at the 2006 Livestock Fair. Based on the data provided in the Beneficiary Registers, large numbers of beneficiaries were selling bigger numbers of chickens at the Livestock Fairs. In one very exciting case in Chinyuni ward, a young man sold all his 5 goats at the Livestock Fair in order to raise cash for paying for lobola for his wife. Commenting on project appropriateness and usefulness, he noted in vernacular “Oxfam *yakanaka inoroodza*,” (Oxfam is doing splendid work. I have managed to pay *lobola* from the money raised from the Livestock Fairs). In Munyikwa A ward in Gutu district, another young man stated that he sold 4 goats at once at the Livestock Fair and managed to raise enough cash to buy a heifer. These examples demonstrate the far-reaching impacts the Livestock Fairs intervention is having on the livelihoods of people. Thus in the case of the households that managed to buy a heifer, it is clear that the OXFAM project is contributing to the attainment of household needs that are high up in the human needs hierarchy.

Table 3.6: Sellers who sold more than 3 goats at once during the Livestock Fairs

District	Site	Total No. of Sellers	Number of Sellers selling more than 3
----------	------	----------------------	---------------------------------------

			goats
Chirumhanzu	Charandura	652	64
	Chinyuni	159	13
Gutu	Munyikwa A	158	23
	Mazuru	124	17
Zvishavane.	Guruguru	49	1
	Chionekano	112	13
Total		1254	131

Source: Field Survey 2007

The quantitative impact of the Livestock Fairs project in the assessed districts is summarized in Table 2.7. The most traded type of livestock was chickens, followed by goats. The total number of chickens traded were almost 36 000 as opposed to about 9 500 goats. The table further illustrates the diversity of the livestock that was purchased and distributed. From the table, a total of about 10 different species were traded and this is quite remarkable. This is a clear illustration of the equity impacts of the project where livestock ownership was transferred from one group to the other. It is also useful to note that some 6 296 sellers were involved in the Livestock Fairs in the project area. Thus the production base for the livestock involved was broadened from the combined 6 296 sellers to around 18 000 beneficiaries in the project area for the three years of the project. This represents a positive for the project and all other things being equal, the expectation would be a boom in the production of livestock involved.

Table 3.7: Livestock Distributed

Ward	Chickens	Goats	Turkeys	Eggs	Guinea-fowl	Sheep	Rabbits	Peacock	Pigeon	Ducks
Shavahuru	3139	972	37	470	58	-	11	1	-	2
Mhende	3424	656	75	84	124	-	17	-	-	12
Musoropa	7744	1398	240	305	177	-	37	6	18	-
Hombe	4719	781	103	751	114	-	28	-	-	14
Guruguru	1 363	671	53	-	22	-	2	-	2	-
Magombedze	2 489	246	47	404	86	-	26	-	2	-
Chionekano	3070	882	116	995	16	-	10	-	-	-
Nyamande	3574	863	-	-	137	1	24	-	-	9
Maware	**	398	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
Chinyuni	**	634	20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Runde	1765	905	20	0	11	-	-	-	-	2
Munyikwa A	318	190	-	36	15	7	-	-	2	-
Chengwena	2 896	549	45	186	228	-	4	-	-	-
Munyikwa B	233	527	-	148	5	1	-	-	-	-
Mazuru	249	74	1	277	1	2	2	-	-	-
Totals	35 735	9 532	798	3 666	1045	11	165	8	24	43

Source: Decoded from Oxfam Beneficiary Registers, 2004 and 2005.

Impact of the Livestock Fairs

Although the fairs were generally held once a year, they have managed to generate significant interest among buyers and sellers and other stakeholders and the assessment established the existence of positive appreciation of the intervention amongst all these. The argument that Livestock Fairs allowed the bulk selling and bulk buying has already been mentioned. Such an approach is still a new approach to rural development in Zimbabwe and has the potential of being replicated in other parts of the country by Oxfam and other stakeholders. The direct injection of cash into the communities was well appreciated by beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries, local leaders especially village heads and councilors, as well as the Village Relief and Rehabilitation Committees set-up by Oxfam.

There was also general appreciation of the Livestock Fairs in improving the prices of livestock, which directly benefits sellers. This was explicitly noticed in Charandura and Chinyuni wards in Chirumhanzu and Mazuru and Munyikwa A wards in Gutu district. The exception was noted in Chionekano and Guruguru wards (Zvishavane) where the communities complained that the Livestock Fairs have generally led to price increases of the livestock concerned, making it difficult for them to trade on their own without the cash from Oxfam. Whilst the prices were considered as good at the time of the Livestock Fairs, by the time payment was made, the cash would have lost value as a result of the prevailing inflationary economic environment in the country. Given that many of the recipients of livestock had also benefited from other Oxfam interventions, it was common for participants in FGDs to draw parallels with other interventions. In this regard, there were significant complaints about the prices promised by Oxfam for the tillage services. It seems to the evaluation team that there was no adequate dialogue on the pricing of tillage services and communities complained of very low prices. The delayed payment even worsened the situation.

The assessment confirmed the existence of community-based processes of setting prices for

livestock at the fairs. The committee tasked with that responsibility was composed of representatives of buyers and sellers, farmers organizations representatives (where they existed), local leadership, extension staff at the local level (mainly AREX and Veterinary Department officials) and Oxfam staff. Prior to the Livestock Fairs, Oxfam would have carried out its own reconnaissance on the general prices of livestock in the area and this was designed to alert project management on what to expect on the Livestock Fairs.

Issues considered in setting the prices also related to the size of the livestock and that the animals were meant for breeding. The price range for the different livestock traded at the monitored sites is presented in Table 2.8. However during discussion, some participants seemed to suggest that there was no emphasis on the size of livestock when charging the prices. There were also some reservations in relation to how the prices were set as well as the people involve din price setting. Whilst price setting was generally seen as a community output, there were isolated cases where some participants attributed it to something ‘dictated’ to them by Oxfam. This showed that not all of the participants in the Livestock Fairs were that informed on such crucial aspects of the project. Also, the evaluation team is of the view that the role of Oxfam in setting of prices could have been confused by that Oxfam did chair the committees. On reflection, it might be very appropriate for Oxfam to cede the chairing of the committee to some other stakeholder represented in the committee in the future. More importantly, there is need for more dialogue on pricing among the various stakeholders, especially buyers, sellers and Oxfam project staff in the future.

Table 3.8: Prices of Livestock at the Monitored Sites

Livestock	Least price (Z\$)	Maximum Price (Z\$)
Goats	2 000 000	3 000 000
Chickens	400 000	700 000
Turkeys	1 000 000	1 300 000
Rabbits	400 000	600 000
Guinea Fowls	500 000	800 000
Ducks	500 000	600 000
Pigeons	150 000	200 000

Source: M & E Data 2006

The quantitative impact of the project can also be described in terms of the voucher values and quantities delivered to specific sites. The M & E Livestock Fairs Report of April 2006 produced summary statistics on the vouchers distributed to selected sites in the operational wards (see Table 2.9). This is a positive reflection on the amount of cash injected at the community level. Box 2.3 gives a summary of comments passed when discussing project impact with the beneficiaries.

Table 3.9: Voucher Values and Quantities Delivered to Monitored Sites

District	Name of Monitored Site	Vouchers Distributed to beneficiaries			
		DFID Small Livestock	Spring birds	Xmas Birds Chickens	Xmas Birds Goats
Zvishavane	Runde.	153	62	74	30
	Shavahuru.	191	87	102	42
	Hombe	192	87	102	42
Gutu	Munyikwa A	543	258	370	150
	Munyikwa B	278	224	190	80
Chirumhanzu	Musoropamwe	689	174	204	85
	Charandura	792	210	248	142
	Mazuru	208	37	45	18
	Mhende	311	133	158	65
Masvingo	Nyamande	230	142	180	80
	Nyikavanhu	310	191	215	82
Total					
Voucher Value		Z\$2 400 000	Z\$2 400 000	Z42 400 000	Z\$2 400 000

Source: M & E Data March 2006

Box 3.3: Comments Expressing the Diversity of uses to which Livestock is being put

- “Oxfam through the Livestock Fairs presented an opportunity for us to know where good breeds of livestock can be obtained. Now we can go and buy the livestock on our own without Oxfam” (a male beneficiary from Chionekano ward)
- “Chickens are ready cash for our school fees and health needs,” a woman from Chionekano ward.
- “I had a next-door neighbour who by all standards was very poor. He had no draft power and would also rely on zero tillage. He was given chickens under the project. For this agricultural season (2005/2006) he hired me to provide tillage in exchange for 3 chickens,” a male participant in Chinyika ward)
- “*Mari yeLivestock Fair inouya yakabatana. Kazhinji hazvigoneki kutengesa huku 10 nguva imwe asi Fair yakazvigona.*” (The money from the Livestock Fairs comes as a lump-sum. One can easily sell, for instance 10 chickens), a woman from Chinyuni ward.
- “*Huku dziri kuwanda asi dziri kupfundza matambudziko akawanda. Number yadzo inokwirrai ichidzika nekuti tinenge tichidzishandisa,*” (Chickens are being used for multiple purposes and hence the growth in numbers remains low), a woman beneficiary from Chinyuni ward.
- “*Iye zvino vakadzi vazhinji havana kusungirwa. Mbudzi dze Oxfam dzakanaka dzave kutopfudza dambudziko iroro,*” (Most wives have not had their lobola paid. The livestock received is helping in alleviating the problem), a male beneficiary from Chinyuni ward.
- “*Pamusha pedu pave nechiremerera nekuti pava nechipfuyo chinofamba. Tave kutofambawo zvine mutsindo*” (Now we can also command respect from neighbours because we now possess livestock), a male beneficiary at Mazuru ward.

Source: Field Survey 2007

Promising Examples

The Terms of Reference for this study specifically mentioned that the identification and documentation of success stories was a critical component of the assessment. Success stories are in essence a demonstration of the impact of the project at the household level. The Livestock Fairs

were started only in July 2004 and at the time of the assessment, the intervention was largely 2½ years old. In fact, most of the participants to this assessment were 2006 beneficiaries. It is the view of the evaluation team that it might be too early to talk about success stories, but more about promising initiatives. The intervention is still in its early stages and the best the assessment could do was to identify households which have showed a lot of promise. Even in those promising examples, the total number of livestock involved are still modest. In explaining why for instance numbers of chickens have not risen astronomically one woman noted that “*mabasa ehuku anowanda pamusha, saka number yadzo haingawandi,*” (Box 3.3 refers). This literally meant that the chickens were being used to meet the households’ multiple needs and hence the numbers of chickens could not rise exponentially. Be that as it may, a brief profiling of selected promising examples is used in this assessment to demonstrate the impact of the project.

There were also other promising examples that were brought to the attention of the assessment team. For instance, the Veterinary officer based at Charandura ward but catering for a number of other wards, mentioned the existence of a farmer¹⁵ who emerged as the best seller in the Mawere ward. A woman from Zvishavane has about 600 indigenous chickens as already mentioned. Many of the birds sold at the Livestock Fairs in Guruguru and Chionekano were originally purchased from the woman. The woman also possessed excellent knowledge on breeding and management of poultry and provided the model, which the Livestock Fairs intervention can seek to achieve and promote in the medium to long term periods.

Example 1

[Example Removed]

Example 2

[Example Removed]

Example 3

[Example Removed]

Example 5

[Example Removed]

Example 6

[Example Removed]

The few examples cited demonstrate the multiple uses to which small-livestock, especially chickens, were being put to. A common trend was the sale of the livestock to allow households to raise cash for the payment of school fees. It is also clear from the few examples that in the case of goats they generally took longer for households to realize benefits. In this regard, there is little evidence from this assessment on the impacts of Livestock Fairs that have already been generated through goat based interventions, let alone the positive identification of success/promising examples on goats. The examples further demonstrate the diversity of livestock available through the Livestock Fairs.

¹⁵ The sandal seller discussed elsewhere in this report

Whilst the livestock production base has been expanded, there have been setbacks experienced in some situations. In some cases, predators and diseases have simply wiped out some of the stock purchased by the beneficiaries. In other situations, chronic poverty has forced some of the households, to quickly dispose of their livestock. Data from the FGDs, interviews with key informants at the local level and the questionnaire survey has confirmed that some of the beneficiaries have already lost some or all of their livestock and were in fact looking forward to receiving more livestock from Oxfam. Diseases were common in all the 6 wards where primary data collection was undertaken. Based on discussions with beneficiaries and verified by Veterinary officials both at district and local levels, the most common types of poultry disease prevalent in the study area were fowl pox, coccidiosis and Infectious Coryza. Further to this, there were also external parasites, which resulted in the deaths of especially chickens and turkeys. The threat posed by the identified diseases had the effect of reducing the impact of the project on poverty alleviation and promotion of sustainable livelihoods. On the other hand, goats were particularly affected by the heart-water diseases, which are commonly referred to as ‘*Chindee*’ in the vernacular (Shona). This assessment did not establish the existence of any plan by either Oxfam or its implementing partners that were designed to deal with such known livestock diseases occurring in the project area. Table 2.10 further elaborated on specific situations where households lost livestock as a result of diseases.

Out of the 114 respondents to the questionnaire survey, 69 of these (60.5%) reported that their livestock had been attacked by disease at some point in time since receiving/purchasing them. Out of this, 60.7% had their livestock attacked once, while 39.3% indicated it happened more than once. Of the 69 households which reported that their livestock had been attacked by disease, 57 of them reported that they have lost some of the livestock due to death as a result of the diseases, 44 of them lost it in the year 2006. Asked about the main types of diseases attacking their livestock, or at least a description of the symptoms of the diseases, these matched the symptoms related to Chicken Pox, Coccidiosis and Infectious Coryza. By and large, this is in agreement with the analysis made by Veterinary officials on the type of diseases that attack livestock in the study area. The above statistics reinforce the argument that disease control is a fundamental issue that needs to be addressed if the viability and sustainability of the Livestock Fairs intervention is to be attained.

Table 3.10: Loss of Livestock to Diseases: Examples from the FGDs

Case No.	Ward	Details of Loss
1	Charandura	A woman from Zinyoro village bought 4 chickens at the 2006 Livestock Fair. She lost about 21 middle-aged chickens to diseases. Before the Livestock Fairs, she had only 2 chickens and at the time of the assessment she had 8 chickens. When she realized that her chickens were ill, she never thought of looking for advice from Veterinary Services Department as she neither knew where to contact them nor did she have the money to purchase medication.
2	Charandura	A woman from Domborengona bought 3 chickens at the 2000 Livestock Fair. The chickens hatched and were 25 in number before they were attacked by diseases. She lost 23 chickens after the fleet was attached by external parasites and she only had 2 chickens at the time of the assessment. She also did not seek any help from Veterinary officials “as they were nowhere to be seen” or as stated in the vernacular “ <i>Havambo wonekwi.</i> ”
3	Munyikwa A	A woman from Chigayo village sold 4 chickens at the Livestock Fairs. Before selling, she had about 20 chickens. She decided to sell precisely because she wanted to raise

		money for payment of school fees for her children. The remaining chickens were later attacked by external parasites and all of them dead.
4	Munyikwa A	A woman from Sakura Village bought 6 chickens at the Livestock Fairs. The chickens hatched until they were 30 in number. The birds were attacked by a disease with some losing their sight. At the time of the assessment she only had 3 chickens. She tried traditional medicines but this did not help. She had nil chickens at the start of the project. Another man from the same village bought a goat but the heart water disease attacked it and it died.
5	Chionekano	A woman from Matongorere village purchased a goat at the 2000 Livestock Fair. After about 6 months, the goat was attacked by the heartwater disease and it died. She tried traditional medication but it failed. Explaining why she could not get any veterinary services, he argued “ <i>mudhumeni anoda zvekuti ndikwire bhazi isu mari yacho hatina,</i> ” (I have no bus-fare).
6	Guruguru	A woman from Chikudo village was given a voucher for 4 chickens. She alleged that she bought the chickens when they were already infected by the fowl pox disease. All of the chickens died.

Source: Field Data 2007

In addition to diseases, there were also many other challenges met by the beneficiaries. Table 2.11 summarizes key sets of problems as identified in the questionnaire survey. Data from the FGDs and interviews with key informants also confirmed the same trend. What needs to be noted is that at the time of the assessment, nothing had yet been put in place to try and address such challenges.

Table 3.11: Problems faced in Relation to Stock Husbandry

Problem	Frequency	Percentage
Diseases	49	52%
Predators	10	11%
Lack of Medication	8	9%
Medicines Expensive	5	5%
Lack of feeds	3	3.5%
Others	19	22%
Totals	94	100%

Source: Field Survey 2007

Despite the constraints, many of the beneficiaries still had their livestock. From the questionnaire survey, only 4 out of 114 households no longer had their livestock. There was however more evidence during FGDs of those who no longer had their livestock. In each of the wards visited, there were at least a couple of such cases except for Guruguru where the participants in FGDs seemed not eager to discuss the issue. This was directly linked to the issues already raised where some households connived as buyers and sellers to pretend that they had traded when in fact this had not happened.

Box 3.5: Examples of Beneficiaries who no-longer have any Livestock

- A beneficiary from Matongerere in Guruguru ward was given a goat in 2006. After about 6 months the goat had already mated, the heartwater disease attacked it and it died. She had tried using Indigenous Knowledge System (IKS) in treating the animal but it failed.
- Another woman from Mutumbu Village in Guruguru ward areas was given a goat in 2006. After 6 months and when the goat had already mated, the goat just died. The woman could not identify any specific symptoms of the disease.
- A beneficiary from Chigayo Village sold about 4 chickens at the Livestock Fair and had about

16 chickens left. She wanted to use the cash for payment of school fees. At a later stage, her chickens were attacked by external parasites and all died (Chionekano ward).

- A male beneficiary from Mapfumo village in Chionekano ward bought a goat at the 2006 Livestock Fair. The goat died on its way from the Livestock Fair. He suspected that it could be due to the heat, excessive distance traveled or that the goat was already ill.

- A woman from Jani village, Charandura ward was given 2 goats in 2006, a male and a female. She had bought the two goats from her mother whom she stays with. The female goat was killed and eaten by baboons. Later on, the male goat was stolen from their premises.

- As already reported, a guy from Chinyuni sold all of his 5 goats at the Livestock Fair in order to raise funds for paying lobola for his wife. He was left with nothing.

Source: Field Survey 2006

Extension Services and Stakeholders Participation

The PRP project documents explicitly stated that extension support and capacity building would be provided to all beneficiaries in the Demonstration Projects, inclusive of Livestock Fairs. The intention here would be to increase the impact of the project while at the same time enhancing project sustainability. Interviews with key informants, especially the Veterinary Department officials and AREX staff showed that in all the 6 wards where the evaluation team visited, they were directly involved in the management of Livestock Fairs. Veterinary officials confirmed executing their roles at the Livestock Fairs. In all the cases, they were inspecting the health status of the livestock brought for sale and cited cases where they actually condemned some of the livestock, preventing their sale. The inspections were mainly meant to screen livestock with notifiable diseases, an example being the Newcastle disease. Whilst the inspection of livestock was meant to control the spread of diseases, it also helped in ensuring that no buyers purchased sick livestock, given that the emphasis of the intervention was on breeding. In situations where livestock movement permits were required, the officials would assist in providing them. At the Livestock Fairs, the veterinary officials also took the opportunity to give a briefing on poultry management and the importance of having the right feed. This was done in the large groups, prior to the actual trading.

It is the view of the evaluation team that the role of Government extension workers, especially AREX and Veterinary officials ended at the Livestock Fairs. Based on the discussions with beneficiaries, the extension workers themselves and Oxfam staff, revealed that little, if anything, has been done on extension provision in the post Livestock period. What beneficiaries did receive was an awareness on general issues pertaining to livestock management, including description of common diseases, type of feed appropriate etc. No training programmes and extension services were given to the beneficiaries on a planned and sustained basis. Thus, as already noted, 69 out of 111 respondents to the questionnaires (62.2%) indicated that their livestock had been attacked by diseases, 39.3% of them indicating that it happened more than once. Out of these, none had received or sought any form of support from the Veterinary Department. Asked why this has been the case, participants in FGDs remarked “*Havawonekwi,*” “*Mari yebhazi yekunovatsvaka tinenge*

tishina” and “*Nyangwe ukakwira bhazi kunovawona, unongonyorerwa chipepa chekunotenga nacho mushonga wega,*” (It is difficult to see the Veterinary Officials. Even if you see them, you will still be required to purchase the drugs on your own).

Discussing with the veterinary officials, it was evident that they were constrained materially and financially and hence could not do anything significant in terms of providing extension services. Though very willing to offer extension support to livestock beneficiaries, it was practically impossible to do so. In the view of the evaluation team, what is missing is the link and support between the Oxfam project and the Veterinary and AREX officials. Whilst the Oxfam approach was based on leaving the provision of extension support to appropriate government departments, this has not been formerly done, and even if this had been done, nothing would change on the ground as a result of the mentioned limitations. What is perhaps required is a formula that links the Livestock Fairs project and Government extension services, supported by both financial and material resources. Left like this, the sustainability of the project will also be threatened. These issues are addressed later in this report.

Also, the key government stakeholders at the local level noted that some of Oxfam’s internal policies were contributing to lack of cohesiveness between the project and them. Specifically, the condition that one cannot travel in Oxfam vehicles unless working on Oxfam business that day was seen as not promoting the spirit of cooperation. Commenting on the situation, one official noted “They only give us transport when they want our services. They leave me walking on the road any other time they do not want our services. The next time they come for my services I will turn down their transport and tell them I will foot to the meeting place”. These are issues purely internal to Oxfam but have a bearing on the kind of cooperation and working relationships between Oxfam and some of its key stakeholders. Oxfam management can further reflect on this!

This section has demonstrated that the project has made positive and significant impact on the livelihoods of beneficiaries and sellers. Generally, the livestock numbers are increasing. Beneficiaries have confirmed that they were also utilizing the livestock. However, a key area that needs attention relates to extension services provision and the provision of medication to the livestock when needed.

4.0 Project Sustainability

There are two main aspects that relate to the sustainability of the project. The first is the continued existence of the broadened livestock base that has been developed by the project. The second relates to the continued holding of Livestock Fairs mainly as a means of developing permanent methods of marketing livestock in the project area. This assessment has shown that most of the people who received the livestock still have it. There were challenges being faced including incidence of diseases and loss of livestock to predators. Access to medication locally was almost absent at the community level. These problems pose a serious challenge to the already established livestock base, making it mandatory that they be addressed to ensure prolonged sustainability. In general, the numbers of the livestock were still low and hence it is the view of the evaluation team that beneficiaries still deserve more support until such a time when livestock population at the household level reaches certain levels¹⁶. Such an intervention would be expected to see the graduation of a significant proportion of the targeted population from being beneficiaries to sellers on a more permanent basis.

The medium to long-term intentions of the project involved the creation of viable markets for the livestock. The Livestock Fairs represent one such avenue for developing local markets. At this stage of implementing the project, beneficiaries neither have the means nor the capacity to run Livestock Fairs. The point stressed in FGDs was that cash from Oxfam was still required to sustain holding of Livestock Fairs. The argument was, “*ko isu mari tinoiwana kupi kana Oxfam yainda,*” (where will we get the money to purchase livestock once Oxfam is gone?). More still needs to be done if the project’s dream of developing viable livestock markets is to be achieved. More private sector players are required, starting mainly with the local business enterprises, especially those running restaurants and other food outlets. The first step would be, as mentioned elsewhere in this report, to build a critical mass of livestock producers. This will create the basis for mobilizing a bigger market for the livestock.

4.1. Staff turnover and Institutional memory

The staff involved in running the Livestock and other Fairs are relatively new with a few exceptions. In Gutu for instance, all the staff were relatively new. In Zvishavane the Livestock Fairs team-leader was also new. In Chirumhanzu, the M and E Officer was relatively new as well. This is affecting institutional memory at Oxfam and in Gutu District the absence of records from their previous Implementing Partner (RUDO) has also made it difficult for Oxfam to effectively run its programs. As an illustration, there was the Rapid Assessment Report that was done prior to the implementation of the programme as a whole but nobody had a clue as to where it could be found. In Zvishavane the evaluation team was told that the person who was in charge of the assignment had since left Oxfam, and hence nobody could locate the document. This confirms that there are weak points in the management of institutional memory. There is also a risk that program fault-lines related to staff turnover may occur at two distinct levels. One is in terms of a community-Oxfam program partnership as communities usually seek to re-interpret project logic each time there are staff changes. The second level is in terms of organizational partnerships between Oxfam and stakeholders at community and District level. At both levels our concern is about consistent communication, interpretation and application of the project logic. It was not within the mandate of the evaluation team to explore why those who left did and do not believe in staff being retained at

¹⁶ For chickens 50 to 100 and for goats above 10.

all costs. It is however argued here that the extent of turnover (as indicated by the number of new staff) may need to be checked in future at least for the three-year project/program cycles that Oxfam uses. However, the evaluation team found it imperative to make light touch enquiries on some of the aspects that had a direct implication on project impacts and sustainability. For instance, the evaluation team became aware that most of the staff running the 3 year programme only had one year contracts renewable on an annual basis. This indeed is not only undesirable and unproductive, but fails to address critical issues of tenure security in employment, a key condition that must be put in place if the best out of human capital is to be realized. OXFAM GB is an organization of international reputation and needs to do better than this. As already observed, there is an easily noticeable loss of institutional memory as a result of the relatively high staff turn-over. Project effectiveness will certainly falter if project management staff is frequently changed. Indeed, OXFAM needs to have a re-look at some of these internal policies and procedures.

4.2. Storage and Management of Project Information

The storage and management of project information is an area that was less satisfactory. Summary and key project information on how many sellers and beneficiaries have been assisted by ward and total volumes of livestock traded by type and ward could not be easily extracted from the various project documents. The evaluation team could also not establish precise information on what the project targets were in terms of the actual numbers of households that were expected to benefit. Instead, there were different figures quoted in different reports. The evaluation team had to rely on the manual count to establish the “correct figures”. In addition to being time consuming and less accurate because of human error, there were also inconsistencies in the manner in which the information was recorded. Thus for instance some records just captured the numbers of beneficiaries, but do not indicate the type and numbers of livestock bought. Some of the files also did not capture the gender of beneficiaries. Other files had complete information, including the age and sex of beneficiaries, but the evaluation could not use the information, as it was largely not in electronic form. Oxfam can and needs to do better than this. The M & E section, together with district based project management teams need to take the lead in converting the data into useable form.

5.0 Project Costs

The Livestock Fairs intervention has received financing from three main funding sources namely DFID, Oxfam Unwrapped Funds and the Bruderhoff funds. The respective contributions by each of these were f76 896, f95 960 and f21 750. Funds for the project were spent in three main broad categories namely the purchase of the livestock, holding of the livestock fairs and project management costs. Project management costs refer mainly to all other expenditure related to the administration of the projects including staff time, transport into the field and stationery for the projects. However, the manner in which project management costs are financed does not allow expenditure related to the item to be explicitly stated. As such, the discussion on project costs is exclusive of project management costs. This represents a weakness in Oxfam's projects accounting process. For instance, vehicle maintenance, fuel costs and other direct costs for Livestock Fairs intervention are not captured separately and are there not reflected in project accounts as a cost to the project. Ideally, a project should have a budget that caters for all of its expenditure and this is useful for the total picture on project costs and performance to be captured.

Table 4.1 shows the actual expenditure related to the purchase of livestock. In the first year, a total of f17 453 was used to buy livestock. However, for the 2005-2006 period, the amount used had increased to f163 226 and this was largely attributed to the scaling-up of the intervention. In total, about f180 679 was spent, and this represents the amount of money that was paid to the sellers and stimulated the local economy in the project area. In general, there was a variation between the project budget and actual expenditure. For the variance for the 2004-2005, this was explained as being due to the delayed commencement of the project. The Oxfam Unwrapped Report for February 2006-April 2006 indicated there was f4 728 that was not spent for the reason that the vouchers were not traded. There is room for improvement in the future where all of the budgeted money is spent, especially on key project components like livestock purchase.

Table 5.1: Cost of Livestock

Financial Year	Budget Allocation (in pounds)	Actual Expenditure	Variance
2004-2005	£21 750.00	£17 453.00	£4297
2005-2006	£172 856.00	£163 226.00	£9 630
Totals	£194 606	£180 679	£13 927

Source: constructed from Project Records

There are also direct costs relating to the holding of the Livestock Fairs. The main expenditure items related to this included the labour costs associated with the holding of the Livestock Fairs, staff accommodation and per-diems in the field, transport costs, and the security costs. Security costs relate to the cost incurred in relation to payment to the security company for accompanying the cash to the field. For the 2004-2005 period, labour costs constituted £6 537, of which £5 161 was paid to RUDO, which was the implementing partner in Gutu and Masvingo districts. A total of £548 was paid as staff accommodation and per diems, while transport costs amounted to £974. There were no security costs in the 2004-2005 period as Oxfam took the cash to the field on its own. The actual costs of holding the Livestock Fairs over that period were £8 059. For the 2005/2006 financial year, labour costed about £8 255, staff accommodation and per-diems costed

£2 528, security consumed £3 099, while transport costed £1 598.00. In total, about £15 450.00 was spent on the actual process of holding the fairs during the 2005-2006 period.

Table 4.2 summarizes the main expenditure items for the Livestock Fairs intervention, minus the project management costs. From the table, 88.1% of the funds went to the direct purchase of the livestock, with the remainder of 11.9% being the expenditure for holding the Livestock Fairs. Based on this, it is remarkable that the bulk of the funds were used for what they were specifically intended for. As such, this also confirms the cost effectiveness of the intervention. However, in future, it will be useful for Oxfam to capture project management costs separately. This will allow a more realistic analysis of costs effectiveness of project interventions. As the figures currently stand, there is an over-estimation of the proportion of money that went to the purchase of livestock as project management costs are hidden elsewhere.

Table 5.2: Main Expenditure Line Items for the Livestock Fairs Intervention.

Expenditure Item	Cost in 2004/2005	% of Total	Cost in 2005/2006	%	Totals	%
Purchase of Livestock	17 453.00	68.4%	163 226.00	91.4%	180 679.00	88.1%
Holding of Livestock Fairs	8 059.00	31.6%	15 450.00	8.6%	24 509.00	11.9%
Project Management ¹⁷	????	????	????	????	????	????
Totals	25 512	100%	178 676.00		205 288	

Source: constructed from Project Records

¹⁷ It was not possible to establish actual figures as costs are captured using different cost centers i.e. direct Project Management costs not retrievable.

6.0 Concluding Remarks and Recommendations

On the overall, the Livestock Fairs intervention has done well in improving access to small livestock to some of the most vulnerable households. Not only have the vulnerable households accessed the livestock, progress has been made on breeding the livestock received. Even though the livestock numbers remain modest (it is only two years after the start of the project), this assessment has established that the households are indeed utilizing the livestock for multiple purposes. Payment of school fees has emerged as the dominant reason as to why people were selling their livestock. This in itself needs to be seen as a strong form of social protection as households invest in human capital in return for benefits that will only accrue in the future.

As already established in this assessment, most households still have their livestock and are looking to further years of breeding. Both beneficiaries and sellers, mainly at output level in project management terminology, are experiencing the impact of the project. The impact at the outcome level and the long-term period are, as is the norm, expected further down the line. Whilst recognizing that the project is about small livestock, which presumably multiply fast, thus implying the impact at outcome level can be measured comfortably after 2 years, this assessment has established that there are many constraints preventing that from happening. These (constraints) include multiple uses and diseases making the production base shaky at present. All the same, there are key areas where improvement is required for the better performance of the project. More is required in increasing the production aspects of the project, disease control, extension services provision, monitoring and evaluation of project impacts, development of local markets and the provision of appropriate training to beneficiaries. This is particularly important if the impact and long-term sustainability of the project is to be enhanced.

In the light of the foregoing, the evaluation team makes the following recommendations.

Recommendation 1: The project needs to articulate a medium to long-term profound vision.

This arises from the evaluation team's realization that there is limited post-fair support to stock recipients and other stakeholders. In this light it is recommended that Oxfam considers the model below, which will see an expansion as well as refining of some of its functions in the remaining year of the project. The suggestions are inspired by, among others, the following;

- a. Oxfam's intention to ensure that communities/households develop resilience to livelihood shocks (beyond recovering from current shocks).
- b. The project's 'pro-free-market' slant, which invites expectations of private sector participation in relevant activities.
- c. The inevitability of an Oxfam pullout considering that this is a project with a distinct time-table.
- d. The observation that Oxfam's work is incomplete in terms of helping its beneficiaries to fully understand the livelihood (food and income) security dynamics with small stock at the centre. The evaluation team had illuminating discussions in all sites on the question whether Oxfam should focus more on chickens or goats as the route out of poverty. The discussants provided useful and reasoned insights around proneness to predators, diseases, ease of disposal and management.

[Figure Removed]

Figure 1: Proposed Project Trajectory.

Recommendation 2: Oxfam should take its project responsibility beyond simple inclusion of the poor into subsistence chicken and goat production to local market development, facilitation of linkages with other markets and broader economic empowerment for those that show promise.

The above model increases the number of functions that Oxfam performs, the levels they are performed at and the stakeholders with which it interacts. Already at this stage of the project, there are promising examples where production has really taken off. It is these households that the project can target to provide more targeted and specialized support. It is such households that need more support to enable them to graduate from being beneficiaries to sellers. This in itself will be a major achievement on the part of the project. In each of the wards where the project is being implemented, promising examples (or even success stories) can be identified where more support can be provided to allow for production to be intensified. Future Livestock Fairs can then be planned and implemented around the successful beneficiaries cum-sellers. Such an approach would also need to target the broad range of small livestock that has been provided by the project. The approach by the Livestock Fair Intervention has been to provide the livestock and leaving everything else to the beneficiaries. On their own, the beneficiaries have largely not been able to invest more in the intervention in terms of improved shelter and better protection from predators, improved feed and accessing medication.

Chickens and goats are considered small-stock and beneficiaries seem not to have developed an inclination towards using them to improve their livelihoods including acquisition of other assets like large livestock (cattle, donkeys etc), which during the assessment some participants indicated as the next stage for Oxfam support. With the exception of some of the cited cases, most beneficiaries seem to be fluctuating between stages one and two of the model above. Irvines and Crest Breeders (national/regional players in the chicken and eggs business) have begun to implement contract-farming programs with smallholder farmers in areas like Mhondoro Communal Lands (Mashonaland West). Established food outlets like the 'WIMPY) are already serving dishes with indigenous chickens. There is therefore the opportunity to link sellers with markets at both local and national levels once the project becomes relatively successful from a production point of view.

Once the project has made progress in grooming and supporting successful beneficiaries, it should be possible to make informed estimates on the availability of livestock for sale in the project area. Based on such figures, organized local markets would need to be identified where sales can be made on a more reliable and permanent basis. These include local business enterprises especially restaurants and other local institutions such as boarding schools, clinics and hospitals. This will be part and parcel of developing the local economy, an important imperative of rural development.

Recommendation 3: The Oxfam project needs to creatively support the strengthening of public sector extension to aid and sustain the production processes of the new livestock owners.

This (in keeping with the above model) may be through strengthening the public sector extension or by bringing in appropriate levels of the private sector to interact with the new producers that Oxfam is ‘creating’ through the Livestock Fairs. The weak link between Oxfam and local extension agencies in the project Districts was observed to be a serious sustainability risk. This is a result of two factors. One is the under-funding and understaffing of government extension departments. The under-funding manifests itself in the form of lack of equipment and operational resources rendering most of the staff immobile. The second relates to an assumption made by the project that the community will be able to link up with extension staff and thus sustainably rear their stock. In the light of established constraints facing public sector extension agents Oxfam’s inability to think through and deliver post-fair support has affected project viability. In some cases the loss of stock acquired at the Livestock Fairs could have been avoided with careful support.

It is clear that the most important stakeholder in the Livestock Fairs intervention in providing extension is the Veterinary Department. Evidence from Gutu for instance showed that staffing levels for Veterinary and Department of Livestock Production and Development were being improved. What Oxfam needs to do is to work closely with the Veterinary Department in developing a plan for providing extension services to livestock beneficiaries. Discussions with veterinary officials in all the 6 wards visited confirmed that they were more than eager to avail their services. What constrained them most was lack of transport and other field-based expenditures that included meal allowances etc. The idea of providing bicycles, or even motorcycles, as cheap forms of transport can be reinforced to ensure that mobility of extension staff can be enhanced. The veterinary officials have also confirmed their willingness to be part of the monitoring systems at the local level and this can easily be combined with the extension service (see also section on M & E)

Internal policies at Oxfam as they relate to access to vehicles/transport by their project partners restrict such access to project-level interface. This creates a situation where partners consider Oxfam as ‘using them’ and not keen on developing a practical partnership considering the context they operate in. It would be in the project’s interest for Oxfam to become flexible and practical about how it facilitates public agencies and others of its development partners to do their work in areas where it has a presence in addition to when it needs them on its intervention. This will improve upon developmental relationships. This does not necessarily imply that Oxfam should either abandon its policies or not be cost conscious but that within reason, flexible support will improve relations while also addressing some of the macro-conditions exacerbating poverty. This will also enable Oxfam to lobby and advocate at relevant levels for the improvements necessary for effective development work to occur.

Recommendation 4: Oxfam should also consider taking up relevant policy issues up the hierarchy to secure the initiatives that it is supporting on the ground.

As an example the under-funding and under-staffing of key extension agencies could be a matter for discussion with the relevant Ministry (of Agriculture) as part of operationalizing the MOU. The evaluation team is persuaded that like strategic support to extension services, the linkages function will constitute a professionally exciting role for the Livelihoods Team Leaders as it provides opportunities for profiling Oxfam, networking and policy leverage using Oxfam’s field experiences. This kind of work will show the growth potential of the work that Oxfam is doing

beyond the grassroots, which will also serve to motivate/inspire its partners and stakeholders as well as the participating communities and individual households.

Recommendation 5: The project needs an exit and sustainability strategy, a need that is related to the vision that has already been discussed above.

The model focuses on consolidation of the work being done without precluding properly planned exit strategies anchored on public and private sector participation. Respondents and focus group discussants generally indicated that without Oxfam the Livestock Fairs would not continue. It will be important for Oxfam to consciously develop an exit strategy together with project communities and stakeholders. Such an exit strategy has to be linked to the problems around which the PRP was developed and in relation to the full suite of Oxfam services.

Recommendation 6: Oxfam should invest in building the capacities of livestock recipients in a creative and appropriate way.

There is need for investment in the provision of appropriate training to recipients of livestock. Such training needs to emphasize both breeding and the livestock management aspects. Other important issues relate to disease control. The training needs to be supported by the development and distribution of information materials on specific themes on livestock breeding and management. Thus for instance, pamphlets can be developed on livestock diseases, emphasizing on causes, symptoms and the treatment aspects. Such information materials would need to be published in both English and vernacular languages spoken in the project areas. Workshops can also be arranged at ward level to facilitate sharing of information on implementation challenges and other local veterinary practices.

It is critical for Oxfam to explore the full range of challenges facing first-time and other livestock owners. This appears to be a remote focus of Oxfam at present. This does not provide for effective ‘insertion’ of livestock in poor people’s homes and communities. It is suggested that the organization considers offering support in the form of, among others, facilitation of exchange of indigenous stock management practices (ethno-veterinary and other practices) through exchange visits, preparation and distribution of information leaflets or materials, which Oxfam co-develops with communities on the one hand and their extension staff on the other. This may also include re-packaging of existing information available within public, private and academic institutions. The Team Leaders may play this role of collating such information and localizing it (language and integration with ITK) for use in the Oxfam project areas as well as availing same to District extension staff for use in other parts of Oxfam’s operational Districts where it does not have a presence.

Recommendation 7: Oxfam should develop and implement an M & E System anchored in relevant stakeholders and applicable at the community level. The system should allow robust integration of specialist and Participatory Impact Monitoring where beneficiaries, community leaders and other stakeholders on the one hand and Oxfam M/E staff collect and co-analyze the data on the other. A panel data for a cohort of at least 100 households per District can be set up with technical assistance in the designing of data collection tools, data collection, analysis and report compilation.

The M & E System at the district level and below is still evolving. Smith (2006), in her assessment of Years 1 & 2 of the Protracted Relief Programme, noted that Oxfam's monitoring activities emphasized mainly on implementation monitoring, especially the Livestock Fairs. That assessment raised concern on Oxfam's capacity to do impact monitoring and to date, this argument still holds. Whereas M & E officers are now available at the district level, they still remain constrained to do impact monitoring on their own. In this regard, key stakeholders that include the community facilitators, the village rehabilitation committee and government extension workers, especially AREX and Veterinary officials, have a role to play in developing local M & E Systems, especially the impact monitoring part. At this stage, there is no proper database on beneficiaries that capture various beneficiary attributes like gender of sellers/buyers, age, main reason for participating in project etc. There is also no system of tracking the growth and even existence of the livestock received. In interviews with AREX and Veterinary officials, it was suggested that it would be useful if they were given even the list of beneficiary registers as a starting point. This would also assist them in providing extension and monitoring. In essence, there is the opportunity of using this group of stakeholders in undertaking impact monitoring at a low cost. Both beneficiaries and sellers of livestock would need to be tracked. In addition to monitoring population growth, M & E can also focus on collecting data on use, feeding practices, and incidence of diseases, livestock mortality etc.

It is the evaluation team's view that the life changes that are attributable to the Fairs will take a while (4-5 years) to start manifesting themselves. Critical longitudinal data needs to be collected in a systematic manner to validly trace the livelihood changes amongst beneficiary households. This can be done with the help of technical experts (say University researchers) to allow for socio-economic analyses relevant for Oxfam programming as well as national policy-making on social protection and broader development management approaches. At least 100 households per District could be sampled for inclusion into this Panel Data-set. University students on attachment could assist in routine M&E data collection whilst they are accomplishing their studies. Student attachments is an increasing trend amongst development institutions in Zimbabwe and the evaluation team see lots of opportunities at Oxfam for this to happen in strategic and mutually beneficial way for the institution and the students.

Recommendation 8: Oxfam, the community and key stakeholders should endeavor to address program implementation challenges faced in the project at present.

There are several issues that need to be tightened in order to improve the effectiveness of the Livestock Fairs intervention. These relate to reviewing the time for doing the works programme, improving on method of payment, intensifying support and re-visiting some of Oxfam's internal policies. Reviewing the time public works activities are done is important as they are taking people away from their fields. This reduces the time available for working in individual fields and therefore has the potential to further impoverish people. Related to this is the number and frequency of meetings that Oxfam does in communities and its choice of days during which they are conducted. It is important for the organization to explore most suitable days in consultation with project communities.

Combining the 'back-room' processes of voucher collation, verification and payment validation on the one hand and the actual fairs on the other in one process could drastically reduce voucher

redemption hold-ups. Two ideas are possible here. One is bringing the financial management tasks that are being conducted offsite (at times in Harare) as close to the Fair venues as is possible (decentralization). The second is actual combination of the Fairs and payment. Reducing the voucher redemption bureaucracy to the minimum and enabling the project to obviate the current problems where beneficiaries are threatened with stock withdrawal by sellers due to late payment will enhance Oxfam's image and overall project sustainability.

Recommendation 9: Revisiting the depth and breadth of support while also reflecting on the optimum size of the suite of interventions that OXFAM brings to any given community.

The number of beneficiaries per village has been limited especially in bigger villages. This is to be expected considering the high levels of poverty. However, from an impact perspective it makes sense for Oxfam to consider increasing the levels of support, the duration over which the support is offered and the number of beneficiaries in individual project wards. As noted elsewhere in this report the diversity of Oxfam interventions in some communities resulted in 'community-negotiated' selection of beneficiaries for individual projects.

Recommendation 10: The Livestock Fairs should be accompanied by processes that improve access to Veterinary Drugs.

Oxfam needs to find innovative ways of addressing the shortage of veterinary drugs in the market in its operational areas. This is consistent with the first Oxfam function in the model above. Two intervention levels present opportunities in this respect. First is in terms of the voucher system itself where Oxfam could ensure that a percentage of the total value is applied for the purchase of essential drugs for the relevant livestock (introduce drug vouchers). This requires careful analysis of the common diseases (nature, causes and symptoms etc), which Oxfam can co-facilitate (with communities and extension staff). The second level is in terms of addressing of drug availability strategically by setting a percentage of the support to a given District towards drugs to be availed through established channels at prevailing market rates. At present even if one consults local Veterinary Officer they are likely to have challenges of finding the drugs in their locality. The inclination is towards the former [voucher-linked] as it increases personal responsibility, whilst being mindful of its administrative challenges and the fact that it does result in 'community-wide' benefits. As part of increasing the physical access to drugs by beneficiaries, arrangements can also be worked with some of the shops operating at specific points/business centres in the respective wards. These can be supported to stock the drugs that treat some of the common diseases that attack livestock. A subsidy can also be worked to allow the price for drugs to be affordable.

Other recommendations

1. Within resource and other possibilities, the evaluation recommends that Oxfam should retain core program staff at least for the three-year project/program cycles. This can be done by addressing any factors causing staff flight following an analysis and/or having two to three-year contracts.
2. Buyers (and/or sellers) need to be encouraged to bring with them some stock-feed (e.g. a cup of sorghum for chicken, a 5kg bag of grass/leaves for goats) so that they feed their animals as soon as they buy them and before taking them home. At the same time the Fair-day training and

extension may also focus on animal nutrition and thus practically use the stock-feed brought by the prospective buyers. This may also be an essential proxy indicator for ability to care for the animals being acquired through the voucher system.

3. The mix and total number of interventions being implemented in the participating wards needs to be watched carefully for ease of management, obviating beneficiary overlaps and to enable identification of the most relevant types of interventions for the target groups.
4. Tracking systems for beneficiary progress need to be strengthened with use more of non-food security indicators e.g. investment in children's education for a core set of beneficiaries. Community-based peering could also help to ensure that moral pressure and horizontal support are brought to bear to support production processes.
5. Holding Fairs during weekends and school holidays nearer the drier months to ensure that participating households are able to manage the labor demands associated with participation

In the final analysis, the Livestock Fairs have brought a difference in the lives of both sellers and buyers of livestock in terms of numbers redistributed, uses of the livestock and general livelihoods issues. The buyers/beneficiaries' lives have been changed arising from the uses to which they are now putting their livestock. However, the evaluation team is of the view that there is need for additional structured post-Fair support that Oxfam needs to provide as part of addressing challenges being faced regarding livestock husbandry for new owners specifically and other stock owners generally. It is recognized that the support is thus necessary for both the beneficiaries and Oxfam's program partners to sustain the gains that the project is generating. Such an approach will also ensure that the beneficiaries remain motivated to do more and thus climb out of the 'poverty pit' they are in. Oxfam will thus do well to increase capacity support to its stakeholders and strategic local institutions.

Annexes

Annex 1: Terms of Reference

Oxfam GB Protracted Relief Program – Livestock Fairs Impact assessment

OXFAM GB PURPOSE: To work with others to overcome poverty and suffering

OXFAM GB TEAM PURPOSE: To act with poor people as a force for change in addressing the causes of poverty, suffering and injustice and alleviating their symptoms

1. Background:

Oxfam works with others to overcome poverty and suffering and is committed to improving emergency response times and preparedness, and increasing impact by strengthening the effectiveness and accountability of our humanitarian work.

Combined effects of the fast track land reforms that destabilised the farming sector, draughts, economic hardship, unemployment (above 75%) and the effects of the HIV and AIDS pandemic have had a devastating impact on the people of Zimbabwe. Effects of the economic hardship are also felt through the food basket for a low-income household of 6 members¹⁸ that has risen from Zim\$34,000 (US\$136¹⁹) in March 2006 to Zim\$141,706 (US\$565) in October 2006 limiting poor households access to food, households basic commodities and services.

According to the 2005-2006 Demographic Health Survey, HIV prevalence rate among adults (15-49 age group) has recently declined from 20.1% to 18.1% and its economic impact at both household and macro-economic level will continue to weight on the country for the years to come. The result - significant number of households have lost productive members, an estimated 3000 Zimbabweans dying every week from the disease and over 1.3million children without one or both parents. Life expectancy has also plummeted from 62 years in the late 1980's to slightly above 53 years in 2004²⁰.

The Zimbabwe rural food security and vulnerability assessment (ZIMVAC) in May 2006 indicated that approximately 1.4 million people in rural Zimbabwe will not meet their households cereal requirement during the 2006/2007 marketing year even if food/cereals were available in the market.

In this operational context, the livelihood security for the majority of the rural population is characterised by reduced access to food due to declining crop and livestock production levels, high unemployment levels and limited income generating activities, declining health status as people adopt damaging coping strategies. In view of these factors, Oxfam GB has participated in the Zimbabwe's Protracted Relief Programme (PRP) since July 2004, focusing on addressing livelihoods and sanitation needs in Midlands (Zvishavane and Chirumhanzu districts) and Masvingo (Masvingo and Gutu districts) provinces. Amongst other livelihood and public health interventions, livestock fairs have been implemented in the operational areas to assist vulnerable households to build their asset base and improve food and income security.

2. Objective:

To assess the impact of Livestock fairs implemented in the Zimbabwe programme since 2004 in Midlands and Masvingo Provinces, whether they have changed household's livelihoods and make recommendations to

¹⁸ Information source- Consumer Council of Zimbabwe

¹⁹ Exchange rate used for conversion Z\$250 to 1US\$

²⁰ Source; UN 2005

Oxfam-GB's Management team for improved livestock programming as a means to address acute food insecurity in Zimbabwe.

3. Specific Tasks:

Working with the Oxfam-GB Zimbabwe PRP Programme Manager and the Humanitarian Programme Coordinator conduct livestock fair impact assessment. This will involve planning the assessment, collecting and analysing data and provide a final report. Data should be disaggregated by gender as much as possible.

An assessment and analysis of the following key issues

3.1 Effectiveness of the livestock fairs

% and characteristics of beneficiary households that were targeted in the operational areas as compared to planned targeting

- What percentage of a given community benefited from the livestock fairs
- Who received the livestock (gender disaggregation and/ or household vulnerability characteristics e.t.c.)
- How were they targeted

Appropriateness and relevance

- What did the HH receive/purchase and how appropriate was it
- Who made the decisions (of what to purchase, quality, quantity and from who)
- Who were the sellers
- Who made the decision to sell the livestock and what was the motive
- Was the motive achieved as planned
- Do households still have the livestock
- What did the HH do with the livestock (e.g. sell, keep or eat e.t.c.) and who within the HH made this decision? What was the reason for the decision?
- If the HH sold the livestock, how much did they get for it? If they kept the livestock, has it reproduced? Have they since sold any offspring?
- Who in the HH benefited from the livestock?
- Households/individual member understanding and capacity to care and breed the livestock
- Any information and/or training provided (service providers & quality of training given)
- Follow up support given vs required by beneficiaries
- Who takes care of the livestock (age and gender) – effects on work load
- Livestock diseases and treatment including costs incurred
- Households access Livestock feed
- Community livestock production levels & usage vs targeted household's livestock production level & usage

Community systems vs project implementation strategy

- Extent of community participation in livestock fairs
- Project pricing mechanism vs community pricing mechanisms
- Project feedback or complaints mechanisms vs community feedback mechanisms
- Timing of operations
- Are the livestock fairs using the voucher system a preferred option of disposing livestock by sellers and beneficiaries

3.2. Impact of the intervention

- Did sellers benefit from the fairs? (also check their willingness to participate in the fairs and availability of livestock in the communities)
- Impact of the fairs on the community (positive and negative impact on household and/or household members, improved access by targeted households to livestock products, extent of dietary diversity etc)

- programme sustainability and exit strategy
- Was the programme goal and objective met
- What are the lessons learnt
- Any recommendations for complementary resources or opportunities and threats for project continuity.

3.3 Documenting success stories for show casing.

- With reference to 3.1 and 3.2 specifications, document case studies with success stories for show casing.

3.4 Resource management

- Cost effectiveness of the programme

4. The assessment Methodology;

1. Review of available secondary data/Project documents
2. Community interviews with livestock fair beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries
3. Interviews with key informants (veterinary officers, local leaders, ARES officers, trading households e.t.c.) using PRA, community approaches and other relevant methodologies.
4. Interviews with Oxfam GB programme staff implementing the programmes
5. Integrate analysis of secondary data with the primary data collected to make recommendations for Oxfam-GB.

5. Expected Output

A well-researched and concise report (approximately 25 pages) providing both an assessment and analysis of the impact of livestock fairs

Outline lessons learnt and Clear recommendations on the best practice for Oxfam-GB and its partners for improved livestock programming as a means to address food insecurity in Zimbabwe

6. Skills and Competence:

- A BSc/MSc or equivalent in Agriculture, Nutrition or related degree.
- Significant experience conducting food security assessments, M&E including data collection and analysis techniques.
- Understanding of the Zimbabwean context and sensitivities as well as available information sources.
- Cultural and gender sensitivity.
- Assessment, analytical and planning skills.
- Good oral and written reporting skills.
- Diplomacy, tact and negotiating skills.
- Development skills.
- Ability to travel within Zimbabwe and work long hours or in difficult circumstances.
- Well developed interpersonal and team skills and proven ability to be flexible.
- Good written and spoken English is essential as well as the ability to communicate in Shona.
- Sympathy with the aims and objectives of Oxfam GB.
- Commitment to humanitarian principles and action and to Oxfam GB's equal opportunity and gender policies.

7. Duration and Timeframe

Tentative schedule:

Activity	Number of days	Comments
Secondary Data review and tools development	4	Programme files and documents from 2004 availed to consultant
Travel fro Harare to field Offices	1	Accommodation arrangements by Gweru Administration
Interviews at Gweru, Mvuma, Zvishavane and Gutu with Oxfam staff, key informants and beneficiaries	10	Logistics arrangements and support from the Gweru office
Travel back to Harare	1	Harare and Gweru logistics to provide support
Report Writing by consultant	2	First draft sent to Lynnette and Lilian
Oxfam GB input on the report and return to consultant	3	Report with Oxfam comments sent back to Consultant for finalization.
Final Report Compiled by consultant	1	Final report sent to Oxfam
Total consultancy days	19	

Duration: 19 paid working days

8. Budget

Item	Unit Cost	Cost
Consultancy	US\$400 a day for 19 Days	US\$7 600.00
Questionnaire implementation	Oxfam to provide 2 field based staff per district	X 5 (5 seater required)
Accommodation & per diem	Oxfam GB to provide	X 3 ²¹
Transport	Oxfam GB to provide	X 5
Stationary	Oxfam GB to Provide	Specification will be provided
Totals		US\$7 600

The consultant's account details are to be advised (TBA):
Nelson Marongwe

²¹ The 3 includes consultant, research assistant and driver

Annex 2: Evaluation Tools (Questionnaire & FGD Guidelines);

HOUSEHOLD QUESTIONNAIRE.

Name of Enumerator..... Date.....

Village Ward..... District.....

1.0 HOUSEHOLD DETAILS

1.1 Name of Household.....No. of people who stay at the household premises.....

1.2 Marital Status of Household Head (HH) 1. married 2. widowed 3. divorcees 4. single women (never married) 5. others (specify).....

1.3 Who was allocated livestock at the HH level 1. Father 2. Mother 3 Mother and Father 4. Orphan being looked after by the HH.....5. Others (specify).....

1.4 Age of recipient..... Sex..... Highest level of education attained.....

1.5 Why do you think you were selected to benefit from the project.....

.....

1.6 Is there anybody terminally ill in the HH 1. Yes 2. No

1.7 If yes, state:

- i) relation to the HH Head.....
- ii) Type of disease.....
- iii) How long the person has been ill.....

2.0 DETAILS OF LIVESTOCK RECEIVED

2.1 Type of Livestock..... When livestock was received.....

2.2 Number of livestock received..... Number at present.....

2.3 Who made the choice of what type of livestock to be received.....

2.4 What factors influenced the choice of livestock received.....

.....

2.5 If you did not make a choice, would you have selected something different 1. Yes 2. No

2.6 Explain your answer.....

2.7 Before benefiting, what type of livestock did you have (complete table 2.1)

Table 2.1: Livestock possessed before OXAFAM intervention

Type of Livestock	No. Owned	Owner	Number at present
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			

2.8 Explain any difference in numbers.....

3.0 Breeding of Livestock

3.1 When you received the livestock, how long did it take before breeding started.....

3.2 How long does it take for the livestock to breed (from one set of offspring to the other).....

3.3 In your view, what factors influence the breeding cycle.....

.....]

3.4 Describe the type of extension support you received from:

i) OXAFAM.....

ii) AREX.....

iii) Veterinary Department

3.5 In your view, did the support meet you expectations 1. Yes 2. No

3.6 Explain your answer.....

3.7 Who in the HH is specifically tasked with caring for the livestock.....

3.8 Did anyone in the livestock received training on keeping the livestock received 1. Yes 2. No

3.9 If Yes, who was trained at the HH level..... Age..... Sex.....

3.10 Do you think the skills received have been applied to date? 1. Yes 2. No

3.11 Explain your answer.....

3.12 What aspects that relate to breeding would you want improved.....

.....

4.0 LIVESTOCK DISEASES AND TREATMENT

4.1 Has the livestock received suffered form any type of disease 1. Yes 2. No

4.2 If yes, how many times has it happened to date.....

4.3 Describe the type/types of illness

4.4 What did you do when the livestock fell ill.....

4.4 What costs did you incur in treating the livestock.....

4.5 How did you meet the cost.....

4.6 Have you ever lost any livestock to disease 1. Yes 2. No

4.7 If yes, how many have been lost to date and when

4.8 What has been the cause of the death of the livestock.....

4.9 Comment on the quality of breeding stock available during the Livestock Fairs.....

5.0 USE OF LIVESTOCK AND IMPACT

5.1 State how livestock received has been used for the last 12 months (complete Table 5.1)

Table 5.1: Details of Livestock Use

Month (2006)	Type of use (see codes)	No. of Livestock
Jan.		
Feb		
March		
April		
May		
June		
July		
Aug.		
Sept.		
Oct.		
Nov.		
Dec.		

Codes: 1. Sold 2. Relish 3. Exchanged for other services/products 4. Others (specify)

5.2 If you have sold any livestock, what was the reason for selling.....

5.3 If you have exchanged livestock for any other goods/products/services, describe the details of the transaction.....

5.4 If you have done any sales, complete Table 5.1

Table 5.1: Livestock Sales

Date sold	No. sold	Where sold (see codes)	How sold (see codes)	Average price	How cash was used

Codes for where sold: 1 In the village 2. Outside the village

Codes for how sold 1.Livestock Fairs 2. others (specify)

5.5 Were you happy with the price received for the sale of your livestock 1. Yes 2. No.

5.6 Explain you answer.....

5.7 When making a sale, who makes the decision.....who controls the cash.....

5.8 If you have never sold any of your livestock, why has it been like that.....

5.9 What has changed in your lifestyle as a result of the OXFAM project.....

5.10 State 3 main things that describe the impact of the project in your household.....

5.11 What has changed in the village as a result of the project.....

5.12 Is livestock for sale generally available in the village 1. Yes 2. No

5.12 Explain your answer.....

5.13 In your view, what negative things have been caused by the project.....

5.14 How can such negative things be minimized in the future.....

5.15 What do you say about the use of the voucher system in the Livestock Fairs.....

5.16 Do you think you can continue with the project on your own without OXAFM 1. Yes 2. No

5.17 If No, what conditions would like to be put in place to allow the project to continue after the withdrawal of OXAFM.....

5.18 Any other comment you would want to make.....

FGD GUIDELINES.

1. Number of Households in the Village
2. Number of Households which are female headed\
3. Number of Households that are child headed
4. Number of households that benefited from the project
5. Views of community on beneficiary selection
6. Number of Households with parents/children with disabilities in the village
7. Number of households with parents/children with disabilities who benefited from the project
8. Types of disputes encountered in selection of beneficiaries and how they were managed
9. Type of capacity building support that was given by:
 - a. OXFAM.
 - b. AREX.
 - c. Veterinary Services Department.
 - d. Other NGOs
10. Usefulness of extension support and application/relevance of skills gained
11. Operational challenges for the Livestock fairs (distances traveled, time of the week and labor requirements)
12. Community views on the use of the voucher system
13. Impact of the project on the local economy (local trade, prices of livestock, availability of livestock for sale, cash injection into the community etc.)
14. Quality of breeding stock availed through the livestock fairs
15. Willingness of sellers to trade
16. Profiling of HH considered as success stories
17. Profiling of Households facing difficulties in the project
18. What needs to be improved upon in project implementation
19. Sustainability of the project as viewed by the community

© Oxfam GB 2007

First published online by Oxfam GB in 2010.

This document is part of a collection of programme evaluations available from Oxfam GB in accordance with its evaluation policy.

This document was originally written for internal accountability and learning purposes, rather than for external publication. The information included was correct to the evaluator's best knowledge at the date the evaluation took place. The views expressed in this report are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect Oxfam's views.

The text may be used free of charge for the purposes of advocacy, campaigning, education, and research, provided that the source is acknowledged in full. The copyright holder requests that all such use be registered with them for impact assessment purposes. For copying in any other circumstances, or for reuse in other publications, or for translation or adaptation, permission must be secured and a fee may be charged. Email publish@oxfam.org.uk

For further information on the issues raised in this document email phd@oxfam.org.uk

Oxfam is a registered charity in England and Wales (no 202918) and Scotland (SC 039042). Oxfam GB is a member of Oxfam International.

www.oxfam.org.uk