

# **International Fund for Agricultural Development**

## **Pakistan**

### **Country Programme Evaluation**

#### **Impact Assessment Study of Four Project Areas in Two IFAD-assisted Projects In NWFP and Punjab**

*Draft Final Report*

**Submitted by LEAD Pakistan (\*)**

**20 September 2007**

(\*) This report was prepared by Tariq Husain with the assistance of Kamran Durrani (Project Manager), Nadeem Ahmad (Statistical Analyst) and a team of female and male enumerators.

## Table of Contents

---

	<u>Page</u>
<b>Acronyms and Abbreviations</b>	iv
<b>1 BACKGROUND AND DESIGN OF STUDY</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Impact Orientation of IFAD-assisted Projects	1
1.2 Previous Evaluations and Self-Assessment	2
1.3 Scope and Methodology of Study	4
1.4 The Macro Context of the Study	5
<b>2 SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1 Basic Data on Respondents and Their Households	8
2.2 Differences Between and Within Project Sub-samples	9
<b>3 ANALYSIS OF TRENDS IN THE PROJECT AREAS</b>	<b>11</b>
3.1 Scheme of Analysis	11
3.2 Signs of Distress and Inequality	11
3.3 Signs of Stagnation	12
3.4 Signs of Progress	13
3.5 Conclusions About Trends	14
<b>4 ATTRIBUTION OF PROJECT IMPACTS</b>	<b>15</b>
4.1 Scheme of Analysis	15
4.2 Limitations in Reaching the Majority of Beneficiaries	16
4.3 Impact on Household Physical and Financial Assets	17
4.4 Impact on Household Income	19
4.5 Impact on Public Services	20
4.6 Impact on Human Assets	21
4.7 Impact on Food Security	22
4.8 Impact on Social Capital and Empowerment	23
4.9 Impact on Environment and Communal Resources	24
4.10 Sustainability of Impacts and Institutions	24
4.11 Gender Differences in Perception of Impact	26
4.12 Summary of Findings on Rural Poverty Impacts	27
<b>5 SUMMARY OF METHODS, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>29</b>
5.1 Methodology	29
5.2 Findings from the Overall Sample	29
5.3 Summary of Project Impacts	30
5.4 Main Conclusions	32
<b>References</b>	<b>33</b>

... continued on next page

**Annexes**

I. Terms of Reference for Impact Assessment Study	34
II. BVDP Physical Progress Report, June 2007	36
III. NWFP Barani Physical Progress Report, June 2007	38
IV. Questionnaire for Household Survey	45

**List of Boxes**

1. Summary of Relevant Findings from the IEE of IFAD, 2004	2
--	---

**List of Tables**

1. Components and Financial Allocations in Two Selected Projects	2
2. Number of Respondents Included in the Sample Survey	4
3. Pakistan. Growth Rates in Real Gross Domestic Product, 2001-02 and 2006-07	6
4. Pakistan. The Incidence of Poverty in 2000-2001 and 2004-05	6
5. Pakistan. Growing Income Inequality, 1988 – 2002	7
6. Basic Data on Respondents and Their Households	8
7. Assessment of Project Impact—Household Physical and Financial Assets	18
8. Assessment of Project Impact—Household Income	19
9. Assessment of Project Impact—Public Services	20
10. Assessment of Project Impact—Human Assets	21
11. Assessment of Project Impact—Food Security	22
12. Assessment of Project Impact—Social Capital and Empowerment	23
13. Assessment of Project Impact—Natural Environment	24
14. Sustainability of Impacts and Institutions	25
15. Summary of Plausible and Significant Impacts in the BVDP	31
16. Summary of Plausible and Significant Impacts in the NWFP Barani	31

## Acronyms and Abbreviations

---

AsDB	Asian Development Bank
BVDP	Barani Village Development Project
CDF	Community Development Fund
CGAP	Consultative Group to Assist the Poor
CO	Community Organization
CPE	Country Programme Evaluation
CWP	Country Working Paper
EVEREST	Evaluation of IFAD's Regional Strategy for Asia and the Pacific
ERR	Economic Rate of Return
GOP	Government of Pakistan
IEE	Independent External Evaluation of IFAD
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
MTDF	Medium Term Development Framework
MTR	Mid Term Review
MVSP	Mansehra Village Support Project
NRM	Natural Resource Management
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NWFP	North West Frontier Province
NRSP	National Rural Support Programme
OE	Office of Evaluation
PCR	Project Completion Report
PFCADP	Pat Feeder Command Area Development Project
PI	Regional Division for Asia and the Pacific
PKR	Pakistan Rupees
PPAF	Pakistan Poverty Alleviation Fund
RSP	Rural Support Programme
SRSP	Sarhad Rural Support Programme
TOR	Terms of Reference
VDC	Village Development Committee

## 1. BACKGROUND AND DESIGN OF STUDY

---

### 1.1 Impact Orientation of IFAD-assisted Projects

1. The project evaluation methodology used by the Office of Evaluation (OE) seeks to evaluate impact on rural poverty in terms of six impact domains and three overarching factors, some of which can be further sub-divided. At least one impact domain (impact on institutions, policies and the regulatory framework) and one overarching factor (innovation and replicability/scaling up) cannot be analyzed readily with the kind of household focus that has been adopted for this study. With this qualification, the impact domains that are normally of interest to OE may be outlined as follows:

- Impact on physical and financial assets
- Impact on human assets
- Impact on social capital and people's empowerment
- Impact on food security
- Impact on the environment and communal resource base
- Impact on institutions, policies and the regulatory framework
- Overarching factors: sustainability; innovation and replicability/scaling up; impact on gender equality and women's empowerment

2. Not surprisingly, these impact domains are very closely related to the components and interventions financed through IFAD-assisted projects. Between 1979 and the start of the Country Programme Evaluation (CPE), IFAD had approved 21 loans to Pakistan. The last of these loans, approved in 2006, was exceptional in that it was dedicated to the reconstruction needs of communities affected by the earthquake of October 2005. Of the remaining 20 loans, 12 were for area development projects, four focused on credit and four on irrigation, agriculture and livestock development. All the area development projects approved since 1990 have included components for irrigation, agriculture and livestock development, as well as savings and credit, roads, social mobilization and women's development. Thus, area development projects represent the broadest scope of impacts that can be registered through an IFAD loan.

3. Two area development projects were selected for inclusion in this assessment in line with the Terms of Reference (TORs) for the study (Annex I)<sup>1</sup>. Both of them are located in the rainfed areas of the country, which IFAD includes among the less favoured areas in which it has tended to concentrate over the years. More specifically:

- (a) The Barani Village Development Project (BVDP) in Punjab was approved in 1998, closed in 2007 and covered six tehsils (sub-district administrative units).
- (b) The second project is in the North West Frontier Province (NWFP) and is cofinanced by the Asian Development Bank (AsDB). Called the NWFP Barani Area Development Project (NWFP Barani), it was approved in 2001 and covers 10 districts of the province and one tribal agency. Its Mid-Term Review (MTR) took place in 2007.

4. Each of these projects represents a wide range of rural and agricultural development interventions that are found in most of the IFAD-assisted area development projects in Pakistan. The interventions, with corresponding targets, are listed in the most recent physical progress reports for these projects, which are reproduced in Annex II (for BVDP) and Annex III (for NWFP Barani). Taken as a whole, each project is expected to generate the rural poverty impacts indicated above in paragraph 1. Project components and corresponding financial allocations are summarized in Table 1.

---

<sup>1</sup> The TORs proposed in the Approach Paper for the CPE were modified somewhat at a later stage; Annex I reproduces the final TORs.

**Table 1: Components and Financial Allocations in Two Selected Projects**

Project	Rural roads <sup>2</sup>	Small scale infra-structure <sup>3</sup>	Agric. Develop./ NRM/ Livestock	Rural finance/ microenter-prise <sup>4</sup>	Community and women development	PMU/ institutional support
NWFP Barani <sup>1</sup>		39.97	22.01	11.12	12.83	11.13
BVDP			16.10	3.21	4.72	1.12

Notes:

<sup>1</sup> These allocations include the contributions of IFAD as well as the cofinancier, namely, the AsDB.

<sup>2</sup> Feeder roads are included in NWFP Barani under small scale infrastructure.

<sup>3</sup> In BVDP, infrastructure is included under agricultural development as well as community and women development.

<sup>4</sup> The line of credit provided in NWFP Barani for microfinance could not be utilized and was reallocated for infrastructure during the Mid-Term Review in July 2007. In BVDP, the revolving fund for credit worked well and has been entrusted to the National Rural Support Programme at the close of the project in June 2007.

## 1.2 Previous Evaluations and Self-Assessment

5. Three evaluations of IFAD operations have taken place in Pakistan between 1995 and the 2007 CPE, but OE did not undertake a field-based evaluation since 1995. The last OE evaluation (IFAD 1995) was a Country Portfolio Evaluation, as broad in scope as the 2007 CPE, albeit, with a very different methodology in which each sector represented in the portfolio (e.g., irrigation, credit, etc.) was analyzed in the prevailing policy and socio-economic context. The emphasis was on selected issues, such as beneficiary participation, targeting, sustainability and key technical issues, rather than rural poverty impact. The lack of sustainability, including sustainability of impacts and beneficiary organizations, was highlighted as a particular problem in this evaluation.

6. Lack of sustainability was also highlighted by the Independent External Evaluation (IEE) of IFAD, under which a Country Working Paper (CWP) was prepared for Pakistan in 2004<sup>2</sup> (ITAD 2004). Some of the other main findings of the CWP are summarized in Box 1. One finding, in particular, has implications for methodology, and that is the recognition, reproduced in Box 1, that “beneficiaries ... attribute most benefits to the projects.” This point is further discussed below in the section on methodology.

**Box 1: Summary of Relevant Findings from the IEE of IFAD, 2004**

Overall, IFAD projects were found to have substantial effectiveness, although the efficiency of PFCADP, with an overall ERR well below 10 percent, was modest and there are serious questions about the sustainability of both projects. Beneficiaries appreciated what the projects had done and attribute most benefits to the projects (the expected performance of [NWFP Barani] being assessed largely on what transpired with the precursor Mansehra Village Support Project (MVSP)). They particularly appreciated this first opportunity to contribute to decisions about community investments. For the first time women feel some modest degree of control over their welfare, although the achievement on gender is only the beginning of the beginning. Notwithstanding substantial achievement of objectives, there are a number of project and programme weaknesses, and consequently opportunities, mainly with respect to sustainability, targeting, implementation, innovativeness, and the role of IFAD.

7. The IEE had selected two projects for qualitative and quantitative surveys, namely, the NWFP Barani and the Pat Feeder Command Area Development Project (PFCADP). The PFCADP was

<sup>2</sup> Pakistan was one of the 10 countries selected for field work during the IEE.

completed in 2003, but the activities of NWFP Barani had barely started by the time the IEE took place. Therefore, the evaluation team decided to adopt the Mansehra Village Support Project (MVSP) as a proxy for NWFP Barani, on the grounds that the former was the precursor to the latter. The MVSP was approved in 1992 and closed in 2000. As both projects had been closed for some time before the CWP was prepared, the evaluation was able to observe the lack of sustainability more clearly than evaluations of ongoing projects would normally allow.

8. In 2006, OE completed an Evaluation of IFAD's Regional Strategy for Asia and the Pacific (EVEREST), which also included the preparation of a CWP for Pakistan. In this case, however, the CWP was not based on any field work but included interviews with project officials, among others. On the basis of these and a desk review, the EVEREST CWP provided an assessment of impacts for three projects, including the BVDP<sup>3</sup>. On a scale of 1-4, with 4 being the highest, the CWP rated BVDP as 4 in terms of its overall impact on rural poverty. Subsequently, however, all ratings that were based only on desk work were discarded from reckoning in the EVEREST<sup>4</sup>.

9. A comprehensive self-assessment that discusses impacts is also available in addition to the evaluations mentioned above. Called "A Strategic Review of the IFAD Programme in Pakistan," this was prepared by IFAD's Asia and Pacific Division (PI) in 2007 and shared with the CPE team as PI's input for the CPE. It spans the period since the beginning of IFAD operations in Pakistan and relies mainly on Project Completion Reports (PCRs) for its impact assessment. It does not refer to the impact assessments and related issues highlighted in any of the above-mentioned evaluations, other than to quote two favourable observations from the 1995 evaluation.

10. The main impacts and outcomes highlighted in PI's self-assessment for Pakistan (Chapter II of the report) may be summarized as follows:

- (a) reaching three million rural households (through the closed projects only)<sup>5</sup>, and generating average increases in income of 14% to 143%;
- (b) an economic rate of return (ERR) to investment of 15%-59%, but much lower (15%-19%) in rainfed areas compared with irrigated areas<sup>6</sup>;
- (c) a large increase in social capital, accompanied by the empowerment of the poor and their participation in planning and resource mobilization;
- (d) including women in development, empowering them and enhancing their status, in particular, by means of organization, credit and the recruitment of female staff in technical departments of the government;
- (e) a large increase in human capital, resulting from the training of more than 100,000 men and women (this number is for closed projects only);
- (f) improvement in poor people's access to markets, brought about by roads, greater bargaining power and training and credit;
- (g) improvements in the condition of natural resources, including reduced waterlogging and salinity, and development of forestry, agro-forestry and horticulture, with a particular focus on rainfed areas. In one case, a "dramatic reduction in litigation within the farming community" was also reported as a result of inequity being reduced in water supply;

---

<sup>3</sup> The other projects assessed for impact were the Northern Areas Development Project and the AJK Community Development Project, both of which were also ongoing projects.

<sup>4</sup> It was observed that all such ratings, from Pakistan as well as other countries, were systematically higher than those assessed on the basis of both desk review and field work.

<sup>5</sup> The Government's 2001 Household Income and Expenditure Survey estimated that there were 7.3 million households in the two categories classified as poor (but excluding the ultra poor) and vulnerable, each category accounting for about one-half of this total. This means that about 3.6 million households were poor in 2001. Given the limited scale of operation of IFAD in relation to the country as a whole, it is highly doubtful that the three million beneficiaries of IFAD-assisted projects were either entirely or mainly drawn from the poor.

<sup>6</sup> However, the ERR estimated by the IEE CWP (Box 1 above) is 10% for the PFCADP, which was operating in an irrigated area. The IEE based this estimate on an independent survey, which is not the norm in PCRs.

- (h) positive impact on crop yields, cropping intensities and diversification in the agriculture sector, supported by a range of new technologies, services and credit; and,
- (i) pro-poor policy impact as well as innovation in the field of credit/microfinance.

### 1.3 Scope and Methodology of Study

11. The lack of evaluative evidence in general, and of independent impact data in particular, provides the main rationale for undertaking this impact assessment study. The TORs for the study (Annex I) envisage sampling beneficiaries and control groups in two administrative units of each of the two selected projects. The choice of projects, and of administrative units within the project areas, was motivated by the following line of thinking:

- (a) BVDP is the third IFAD-assisted area development project in the barani areas of Punjab, the first two being the Barani Area Development Project (approved 1980) and the Second Barani Area Development Project (approved 1990). From the point of view of IFAD as well as the government, this project may be expected to reflect the learning that has taken place over 25 years in designing, supervising and implementing multi-sectoral rural development projects.
- (b) The NWFP Barani is an expansion and upscaling of two earlier projects, one of which, the NWFP Barani I (approved 1992) was financed by the AsDB and operated in four districts, and the other, the MVSP (also approved 1992) was financed by IFAD and worked in only one district. Thus, this project too is based on long experience—15 years—of working with multi-sectoral projects. Unlike the BVDP, however, it is spread over 10 districts and one tribal agency, which adds a high degree of complexity to project management.
- (c) Haripur district in NWFP Barani was also included in the first phase of this project, starting *circa* 1995. It represents, therefore, an area that has experienced about 12 years of social mobilization, supported by a wide range of other interventions. In the same project, Battagram district is a very recent addition to the community-based multi-sectoral approach.
- (d) Of the two tehsils selected from BVDP, Gujar Khan is one of the more accessible, prosperous and dynamic parts of the barani areas of Punjab, while Pindi Gheb is relatively more remote and backward.

12. In line with the TORs, the survey sampled an equal number of project beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries (or control group) in each of the four selected administrative units. The total sample size was 484 respondents (Table 2), equally divided between female and male respondents in each project:

<b>Table 2: Number of Respondents Included in the Sample Survey</b>			
Project and Administrative Unit	Beneficiaries	Control Group	Total
<b>BVDP:</b>			
• Gujar Khan	61	59	
• Pindi Gheb	62	59	
<i>Sub-total</i>	<i>123</i>	<i>118</i>	<i>241</i>
<b>NWFP Barani:</b>			
• Haripur	62	60	
• Battagram	61	60	
<i>Sub-total</i>	<i>123</i>	<i>120</i>	<i>243</i>
<b>Total</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>238</b>	<b>484</b>

13. The large majority of the villages were selected randomly based on information provided by the two projects, in order to represent the overall geographical coverage of a project in a particular tehsil or district. The official Survey of Pakistan maps were consulted in the field for selecting these villages. It was also realized, however, that there are some villages in which the project is



implementing the majority of its components. With the help of project staff, one or two villages from among this category were selected in each project area. In addition, one or two villages were also selected where a project had introduced the highest number of interventions within a component. For the control group, villages were selected that had no prior NWFP Barani/BVDP (or similar project) activity in the past. Particular attention was given to selecting villages that had general conditions similar to those of the beneficiary villages

14. The questionnaire for the survey (Annex IV) was organized around the following five parts:
  - (a) Part 1 explained the 1-6 rating scale (as elaborated in OE's CPE methodology, with 1 standing for a negative change) in English and Urdu for the benefit of the enumerators.
  - (b) Part 2 contained control data for various steps of the data management process.
  - (c) Part 3 was for collecting some basic data on the respondent and the household. Most of the variables here concern the socio-economic characteristics of the respondent-household and its access to key services. These data are analyzed in Chapter 2 of the report.
  - (d) Before asking respondents about the benefits of the project, enumerators used Part 4 to ask beneficiaries as well as the control group about the changes they had experienced in various impact domains during the last five-to-six years; these are analyzed in Chapter 3 of the report. As noted above, this has been a period of rapid economic growth, declining levels of poverty and increasing inequality in Pakistan.
  - (e) Part 5 was for beneficiaries only, and it asked them to rate the changes they attribute to the project in terms of various impact domains; these responses are analyzed in Chapter 4. The same impact domains and rating scale have been used in Parts 4 and 5 of the questionnaire, except that questions on sustainability were added in Part 5.
  
15. As indicated above, attribution may be a problem insofar as project beneficiaries are expected to over-state benefits or incorrectly attribute them to the project. This problem was noted, but left unresolved, in both the project areas covered by the IEE (ITAD 2004), in the following words:
  - (a) In the PFCADP: "The study beneficiary survey shows that the beneficiaries themselves perceive that the income gains are largely attributable to the project. However, this might be expected from respondents from groups expressly formed to benefit from a project. Since there was little else under implementation in the project area at the time, and since the command area is located in an arid area, attribution might appear somewhat easier than in most projects."
  - (b) In the MVSP: "As a proxy for attribution, the Mansehra, or any other, project experience is probably of little value. However, for what it is worth the majority in Mansehra did attribute the benefits almost entirely to the project."
  
16. Baseline surveys that might have helped address the attribution problem were not available for the CPE. Location-specific secondary data on the impact domains are also not available. Although NWFP and Punjab have carried out wide-ranging Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys with the assistance of UNICEF and the Federal Bureau of Statistics:
  - (a) These surveys include a wide range of information on all districts of a province but do not focus on the kind of rural poverty impacts that are central to the OE evaluation methodology.
  - (b) The information is for a single year (e.g., 2001 for NWFP and 2003-04 for Punjab), which does not help with any kind of trend (e.g., "before" and "after") analysis.

#### **1.4 The Macro Context of the Study**

17. Under the circumstances, the best (and admittedly imperfect) cross-checks available are from higher-level secondary data. These are useful, in particular, in highlighting trends in economic growth in recent years, the incidence of poverty and the extent of inequality. Growth has been broad,

and it has extended to all the major sectors of the economy (Table 3). It has also been associated with a turn-around in agriculture between 2001-02 and 2006-07.

<b>Growth Rate in:</b>	<b>2001-02</b>	<b>2006-07</b>
Gross Domestic Product (GDP)	3.1%	7.0%
Agriculture (major crops)	0.1% (-2.5%)	5.0% (7.6%)
Industrial Sector	2.7%	6.8%
Services Sector	4.8%	8.0%

Source:  
Pakistan Economic Survey 2006-07, Statistical Appendix, p. 11

18. Agricultural growth has the greatest impact on poverty reduction in Pakistan. The poverty head count decreased from 34.5% in 2001 to 23.9% in 2005 (Table 4). According to official statistics aggregated by agro-climatic zones by Malik 2005:

- In the rainfed areas of Punjab, the poverty headcount in 2002 was 26%, and only 14% of household income came from livestock and agriculture. This zone of Punjab accounted for only 3% of the rural poor of the country.
- In the agro-climatic zone of NWFP that includes Battagram and Haripur, the 2002 poverty headcount was 47% and the zone's share 14% among the rural poor of the country. The rural economy is a little less diversified than in Punjab barani, with livestock and agriculture providing 23% of household income.

Category	Definition in Relation to Adult Equivalent Poverty Line			Percent of Population in Category	
	In Percent Terms	In Rupee Terms <sup>1</sup>		2000-2001	2004-2005
		2000-2001	2004-2005		
Extremely poor	< 50%	< Rs 361.7	< Rs 439.3	1.1%	1.0%
Ultra poor	> 50%, < 75%	Rs 361.7 – 542.6	Rs 439.3 – 659.0	10.8%	6.5%
Poor	> 75%, < 100%	Rs 542.6 – 723.4	Rs 659.0 – 878.6	22.5%	16.4%
Vulnerable	> 100%, < 125%	Rs 723.4 – 904.3	Rs 878.6 – 1098.3	22.5%	20.5%
Quasi non-poor	> 125%, < 200%	Rs 904.3 – 1446.8	Rs 1098.3 – 1757.3	30.1%	35.0%
Non-poor	> 200%	> Rs 1446.8	> Rs 1757.3	13.0%	20.5%
Poverty level:	<i>As defined in Note 1</i>				
◦ Urban areas				22.7%	14.9%
◦ Rural areas				39.3%	28.1%
◦ Overall				34.5%	23.9%

Note:  
<sup>1</sup> The adult equivalent poverty line was Rs 723.4 in 2000-2001 and Rs 878.6 in 2004-05.  
Source:  
Pakistan Economic Survey 2006-07. Islamabad: Government of Pakistan, Finance Division, Economic Adviser's Wing.

19. There is also a concern, however, that inequality has increased since the late-1980s, when structural adjustment was put into force in Pakistan, and also during the more recent period of rapid growth, much as it did in the 1960s (Table 5). Thus, the overall context within which IFAD-assisted projects have been working in recent years is one of a high rate of economic growth, a declining incidence of poverty (including rural poverty) and apparently increasing inequality.

<b>Table 5: Pakistan. Growing Income Inequality, 1988 – 2002</b>			
Socio-economic group	1988	1999	2002
Richest 20% of the population	44%	47%	48%
Poorest 20% of the population	8.8%	7.8%	7.0%
Source: Planning Commission, Government of Pakistan, <i>Medium-Term Development Framework 2005 – 2010</i> .			

## 2. SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE

### 2.1 Basic Data on Respondents and Their Households

20. This chapter analyzes basic data on the respondents and their households (Table 6) drawn from Part 3 of the questionnaire (Annex IV). Some of the important characteristics of the respondents, their households and access to services may be summarized as follows:

- (a) About one-third of the respondents felt that their household was in the lower half of the village in terms of overall well-being. An overwhelming majority (71%) owned cultivated area of less than 1 ha each. Only 23% of the sample drew most of its income from agriculture, with 37% drawing most of their income from salaries and wages.
- (b) Almost half the respondents (47%) were illiterate and 29% lived in poor quality dwellings (tents/ramshackle/katcha houses). Surprisingly, however, 92% of the houses had access to electricity for lighting, though 93% depended on wood or cow dung as fuel for cooking.
- (c) More than one-half of the sample (52%-63%) lived within 1 km of a pakka road and a school for girls, and got their drinking water from a tap or pump of some kind. For 40%, however, the nearest health facility was more than 3 km away, reflecting perhaps the fact that Basic Health Units are intended to serve several villages within a Union Council.

**Table 6: Basic Data on Respondents and Their Households**

Variable	Percentage falling in the following three categories:		
Respondent's age (years)	<i>Up to 25 years</i> 19%	<i>26-50 years</i> 44%	<i>51 years and above</i> 38%
Respondent's education (years)	<i>Illiterate</i> 47%	<i>Up to 5 years</i> 14%	<i>More than 5 years</i> 39%
Family size (persons)	<i>Up to 3 persons</i> 7%	<i>4-6 persons</i> 33%	<i>More than 6 persons</i> 60%
Condition of house (%)	<i>Kutch/jhuggi/tent</i> 29%	<i>Semi pakka</i> 54%	<i>Pakka</i> 18%
Main source of lighting (%)	<i>Kerosene lamp</i> 8%	<i>LPG cylinder</i> 0%	<i>Electricity</i> 92%
Main fuel for cooking (%)	<i>Wood/cow dung</i> 93%	<i>Kerosene/coal/gas</i> 6%	<i>Electricity</i> 1%
Main source of drinking water (%)	<i>River/stream/pond</i> 10%	<i>Well/tubewell</i> 37%	<i>Tap/any kind of pump</i> 52%
Nearest pakka road (km)	<i>Up to 1 km</i> 54%	<i>1-3 km</i> 26%	<i>More than 3 km</i> 20%
Nearest health facility (km)	<i>Up to 1 km</i> 22%	<i>1-3 km</i> 38%	<i>More than 3 km</i> 40%
Nearest girls' school (km)	<i>Up to 1 km</i> 63%	<i>1-3 km</i> 28%	<i>More than 3 km</i> 9%
Average agricultural land (ha)	<i>Up to 1 ha</i> 71%	<i>1-2 ha</i> 12%	<i>More than 2 ha</i> 17%
Percent income from agriculture	<i>Up to 50%</i> 77%	<i>51%-75%</i> 8%	<i>More than 75%</i> 15%
Percent income from salaries	<i>Up to 50%</i> 63%	<i>51%-75%</i> 14%	<i>More than 75%</i> 23%
Percent households in village better off than respondent's household	<i>Up to 50%</i> 65%	<i>51%-75%</i> 21%	<i>More than 75%</i> 15%
Note: <sup>1</sup> The totals across the three columns may not add up to 100% because of rounding off.			

21. Several observations from the sample indicate that the two projects, taken together, focused on the relatively better off households in their project areas. More specifically, the statistically significant differences between the beneficiaries and the control groups in neighbouring areas are as follows:

- (a) More of the control group (44%) than the beneficiaries (29%) felt that they were worse off than the majority of the village.
- (b) More of the control group (52%, as opposed to 41% for beneficiaries) were illiterate, and the average educational level was higher among the beneficiaries.
- (c) More of the control group (25%, as opposed to 15% beneficiaries) lived more than 3 km from a pakka road.
- (d) And more of them (13%) depended for drinking water on rivers, streams and ponds than did the beneficiaries (8%), but this is a small (less than 10%) numerical difference.
- (e) Access to electricity for lighting was available to 95% of the beneficiaries and 88% of the control group. This too is a small difference in numerical terms.

## **2.2 Differences Between and Within Project Sub-samples**

22. A comparison between the samples drawn from the two project areas suggests that respondents from the NWFP Barani area were somewhat poorer but better served by public services than those in the BVDP area. The statistically significant differences are that in the NWFP Barani:

- (a) More of the respondents see themselves as belonging to the lower half of the village in terms of overall well-being.
- (b) Their average cultivated area is 0.9 ha, only 56% of the average of BVDP respondents.
- (c) They rely to a greater extent on income from salary rather than other sources.
- (d) They are closer to health facilities and girls' schools.
- (e) The average household size (8.2) is larger, with more men and more women, than in the BVDP area (average of 7.4).

23. Within BVDP, a comparison between project beneficiaries and respondents in the control group shows the following statistically significant differences:

- (a) Beneficiaries had a higher average educational level (although literacy levels were not significantly different).
- (b) They had greater access to electricity for lighting.
- (c) They also had more diversified sources of income and depended less on agriculture.

24. As expected, there are some important differences between the Gujar Khan and Pindi Gheb tehsils in the BVDP area. The statistically significant ones are:

- (a) Lack of literacy is less of a problem in Gujar Khan (30%) than in Pindi Gheb (55%).
- (b) Gujar Khan had better quality dwellings, safer sources of drinking water, greater access to electricity, and easier access to pakka roads, health facilities and girls' schools.
- (c) In Pindi Gheb, however, the average cultivated area was larger.

25. In the NWFP Barani sample, more of the beneficiaries than those in the control group perceived themselves to be poor in comparison with the village as a whole. As in BVDP, however, the beneficiaries were also more fortunate than the control group in some ways. The significant differences are that:

- (a) Beneficiaries had higher levels of literacy.
- (b) They had easier access to pakka roads, girls' schools and the safer sources of drinking water.

(c) They depended less on salary income than did the control group.

26. Not surprisingly, the significant differences noted between Haripur and Battagram show the former to be ahead in some ways. More specifically, Haripur reported:

- (a) better quality of dwellings;
- (b) higher literacy levels; and,
- (c) easier access to pakka roads and health facilities<sup>7</sup>.

27. Based on the above-mentioned observations, the sub-samples are consistent with what is generally known about the development status of the four administrative units included in the survey. There are some indications, however, that project beneficiaries represented a more privileged segment of the population than the control group. The indicators pointing consistently in this direction are literary/education and access to one or more public services such as electricity, pakka roads, health facilities and girls' schools. In NWFP Barani, however, more of the beneficiaries than the control group perceived themselves to be poor in comparison with the village.

---

<sup>7</sup> Among project beneficiaries in all four administrative units included in the survey, respondents from Haripur reported the best access to pakka roads and health facilities.

### 3. ANALYSIS OF TRENDS IN THE PROJECT AREAS

---

#### 3.1 Scheme of Analysis

28. This chapter analyzes data from Part 4 of the questionnaire. This part of the questionnaire asked respondents—beneficiaries as well as the control group—to rate changes observed during the last five-to-six years. The questions were on *changes in conditions* in general, rather than on project impact. Respondents rated the changes on a scale of 1-6, in almost the same way in which they were subsequently asked to rate project impact (refer to Part 1 of the questionnaire). The impact ratings, however, reflect the attribution of benefits to the project by the beneficiaries. Separating the assessment of trends from project impact analysis may be useful for two reasons, namely:

- (a) understanding the developments that have taken place as a result of changes in the macro context as well as location-specific initiatives (including the two projects); and,
- (b) enabling cross-checking between the two sets of responses, as well as available secondary data, in order to fine-tune the attribution of benefits through triangulation.

29. The survey asked 56 questions through Part 4 of the questionnaire. These covered all the impact domains mentioned in paragraph 1 (except sustainability, which was addressed only in Part 5) that can be investigated through a survey of this kind. More specifically, Part 4 included:

- 12 questions on changes in the ownership of household physical and financial assets;
- nine questions on changes in the income and expenditure patterns of the household;
- 13 questions on changes in access to public and private services in and around the village;
- six questions on changes in selected indicators of the condition of household human assets;
- eight questions on changes in food security, as evidenced by the production and consumption of food; and,
- eight questions on changes in the environment and communal resource base.

30. The analysis below revolves closely around the 1-6 rating scale. The scheme of analysis is to present three sets of signals observed in the project areas, as described below:

- (a) The first part of the presentation is on *signs of distress and inequality*, as observed in the sub-sample for each project. This part highlights important negative changes (a beneficiary rating of 1) in the condition of members of the community.
- (b) The second part is on *signs of stagnation*. This focuses on ratings of 2 (no increase in the last five-to-six years) and 3 (negligible increase<sup>8</sup>). Such responses are highlighted if negligible or no change was reported by at least 50% of the respondents in the overall sample.
- (c) The third and last part of the analysis reports *signs of progress*. This part draws upon beneficiary ratings of 4, 5 and 6 (some increase, high level of increase and very high increase, respectively). Progress is acknowledged if at least 20% of either the beneficiaries or the control group in the sample rated a change as 4, 5 or 6.

#### 3.2 Signs of Distress and Inequality

31. In the BVDP sub-sample:

- (a) None of the project beneficiaries reported a decrease in the area of land owned, but 3.4% of the control group did so.

---

<sup>8</sup> “Negligible increase” was translated into Urdu in the questionnaire as *na honay key barabar izafa*. Translated back into English, this means “an increase that is equal to not existing.”

- (b) 9% of the control group also reported a decrease in the ownership of cows and buffaloes; this was significantly higher than the 2% decrease reported by the beneficiaries. At the same time, 41% of the sub-sample increased their ownership of these livestock.
- (c) Moreover, 20% of the control group (but only 7% of the beneficiaries) decreased their holdings of savings and jewellery in the last five-to-six years<sup>9</sup>. During the same time, 60% of the sub-sample increased their holdings of these assets.
- (d) During the same time period, 28% of the sample (with almost no difference between beneficiaries and the control group) could not increase their overall consumption or purchase of food<sup>10</sup>. But approximately two-thirds of the sub-sample reported increases in overall food consumption as well as in the consumption of milk, vegetable and chicken.
- (e) Some deterioration in the communal resource base was also reported: 10% reported this for the overall condition of the forest, and 7% for the grazing areas used by the village.

32. The signs of degradation of natural resources are more widespread in the NWFP Barani sub-sample, but the overall picture in terms of distress and inequality among households appears to be more reassuring than in the BVDP area<sup>11</sup>. More specifically, in NWFP Barani:

- (a) Deterioration in the overall condition of the forest was reported by 29% of the respondents, in grazing areas by 17%, in soils by 10% and in the green areas of the village by 14%. In all these cases, the reported deterioration was more pronounced among the control group.
- (b) 10% of the respondents reported a decrease in the ownership of cows and buffaloes.
- (c) 9% could not increase their food consumption during the last five-to-six years.

### 3.3 Signs of Stagnation

33. This section highlights indicators of well-being, taken from Part 4 of the questionnaire, in which at least 50% of the respondents reported negligible or no change during the last five-to-six years. This threshold defines the term “stagnation” as used here. The findings in relation to the BVDP sub-sample are as follows:

- (a) Respondents reported stagnation in the ownership of 11 out of the 12 physical and financial assets included in the questionnaire (savings and jewellery being the exception). This might reflect the difficulty faced by most villagers in accumulating assets, even in favourable economic conditions, over a period of five-to-six years.
- (b) Although overall income increased for a large majority of the respondents, income from business and from salaries and wages stagnated. This is hard to explain in view of the economic growth experienced by the country as a whole, unless residents of this project area depend on marginalized non-agricultural occupations that were largely bypassed by recent growth.
- (c) The respondents also faced stagnating service delivery in 10 out of the 13 public and private services included in the questionnaire (the exceptions were roads and schools for both boys and girls). This is consistent with the fact that access to rural areas is increased slowly, especially by the public sector, even in times of growth.
- (d) Children’s health and the education of both girls and boys experienced widespread improvements, but the three other indicators related to human assets showed stagnation. It is

<sup>9</sup> At least some of the liquidation of assets such as land, cattle, savings and jewellery would be due to conditions of distress, particularly among the categories called “extremely poor” and “ultra poor” in Table 4 which accounted for about 8%-12% of the population during 2001-2005.

<sup>10</sup> The official rural poverty headcount for Pakistan estimated in 2005 was also 28% (Table 4). The official poverty line is food-based (that is, based on the rupee equivalent of a specified intake of calories).

<sup>11</sup> It should be noted, however, that effective project interventions are also a source of inequality between the beneficiaries and the non-beneficiaries. In the NWFP Barani, there are statistically significant differences between the two groups in 31 out of 56 variables, and in BVDP there are significant differences in 15 variables. These are analyzed in Chapter 4.



hard to explain why access to information is reported to be stagnating, when recent years have seen very large country-wide expansions in cellular phone connections and the electronic media network.

- (e) Only two out of the eight indicators of food security were reported to be stagnating. This is consistent with the recent pattern of agricultural growth in the country.
- (f) There was stagnation, however, in all eight indicators pertaining to the environment and the communal resource base. This is consistent with several studies undertaken since 2000<sup>12</sup> that report either deterioration or no improvement in the country's bio-physical indicators.

34. Compared with the BVDP area, the overall sense of stagnation is somewhat more pronounced in the NWFP Barani area. This is consistent with the 2002 estimates of poverty in the respective agro-climatic zones (Malik 2005) reported above in paragraph 18—26% for barani Punjab and 47% in NWFP. Relevant features of the picture in NWFP Barani are summarized as follows:

- (a) Respondents reported stagnation in the ownership of all 12 physical and financial assets included in the questionnaire.
- (b) Although overall income increases were reportedly widespread, there was stagnation in income from agriculture and business.
- (c) The respondents also faced stagnating service delivery in 11 out of the 13 public and private services included in the questionnaire (the exceptions were roads and girls' schools).
- (d) As in the BVDP area, the education of both girls and boys experienced widespread improvements; however, the four other indicators related to human assets showed stagnation.
- (e) Only three out of the eight indicators of food security were reported to be stagnating.
- (f) Somewhat surprisingly, environmental degradation is reportedly not as widespread as in the BVDP area: only five out of the eight indicators are noted to signify stagnation, and widespread improvements are reported in the disposal of solid waste, availability of clean water and, most surprisingly, the overall condition of forests.

### 3.4 Signs of Progress

35. This section, in contrast to the two preceding ones, acknowledges progress in the conditions faced by the respondents during the last five-to-six years. Progress is acknowledged if at least 20% of *either the beneficiaries or the control group* in the sample rated a change as 4, 5 or 6 (some increase, high level of increase or very high increase, respectively). The following signs of progress are found in the BVDP sub-sample:

- (a) At least 20% of the respondents reported increases in the ownership of eight out of the 12 physical and financial assets included in the questionnaire, with about 50% reporting an increase in electrical appliances (perhaps reflecting the cellular phone revolution of recent years).
- (b) As many as 76% of the respondents reported an increase in overall income, with more than 20% reporting increases in all the specific categories (agriculture, business, and salaries and wages) included in the questionnaire. At the same time, 77% reported an increase in total expenditure, with almost 60% experiencing increases in expenditure on health and fuel and electricity.
- (c) At least 20% of the sub-sample benefited from improvements in eight out of the 13 public and private services included in the questionnaire, with more than 50% benefiting from improved road access and girls' and boys' schools.
- (d) There were signs of progress in all six indicators of human assets, with more than 50% respondents reporting improvements in children's health and the education of both boys and girls.

---

<sup>12</sup> These include Miles 2000 and the Government of Pakistan's 2005 State of Environment Report (GOP 2005b).

- (e) Food security for at least 20% of the respondents showed an improvement in all eight relevant indicators, with more than 50% respondents reporting increases in the production of cereals and milk, purchase of food, and consumption of milk, vegetable and food in general.
- (f) Improvements in environment and communal resource base were few—in only three out of eight indicators; two of these (drinking water and sanitation) have been the focus of attention from the highest levels of the government in recent years.

36. In terms of the signs of progress, the BVDP sub-sample shows very few noteworthy differences in comparison with NWFP Barani. In the latter:

- (a) At least 20% of the respondents reported increases in the ownership of four out of the 12 physical and financial assets included in the questionnaire; none of these improvements, however, extended to a majority of the sub-sample.
- (b) As in BVDP, 76% of the respondents reported an increase in overall income, with more than 50% experiences increases in salaries and wages. At the same time, 88% reported an increase in total expenditure, with more than 50% experiencing increases in expenditure on health and fuel and electricity.
- (c) At least 20% of the sub-sample benefited from improvements in nine out of the 13 public and private services included in the questionnaire, with more than 50% benefiting from improved access to girls' schools and drinking water.
- (d) As in BVDP, there were signs of progress in all six indicators of human assets; more than 50% respondents reporting improvements in women's health and, as in BVDP, in the education of both boys and girls.
- (e) Food security for at least 20% of the respondents showed an improvement in all eight relevant indicators, although increases in food production were not as widespread as in BVDP. In consumption, however, as in BVDP, more than 50% of the sub-sample reported increases for milk, vegetable and good in general.
- (f) Five of the eight indicators showed signs of progress in relation to environment and the communal resource base. In three of these (forests, rangelands and the green areas of the village), the trend is dominated by project beneficiaries, who reported significantly greater improvements than the control group.

### 3.5 Conclusions About Trends

37. The findings presented above relate to a period of five-to-six years preceding the CPE. This is roughly the duration for the government's medium-term planning, and the about the same length of time that an IFAD-assisted project has available for implementing its activities<sup>13</sup>. The findings from this chapter suggest that:

- (a) Stagnation rather than progress in terms of impact indicators has been by far the dominant force in the project areas over the period in question.
- (b) Progress over this period has spanned a wide range of indicators, but is limited to a small proportion of the rural community; however:
- (c) Increases in income and expenditure have been widespread, even as 10%-20% (or more) of the community lived in distress, liquidated assets and could not improve its food consumption.
- (d) Localized initiatives (including development projects) can stimulate rural development (as evidenced by the reported differences between project beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries). This could also, however, be a source of inequality in the community.

---

<sup>13</sup> The tenure of the Federal and provincial governments in Pakistan is also five years, while local governments are elected for four years.

## 4. ATTRIBUTION OF PROJECT IMPACTS

---

### 4.1 Scheme of Analysis

38. This chapter analyzes data from Part 5 of the questionnaire. It is based on 63 questions related to the impact domains (seven more than in Part 4) and 24 focusing on the sustainability of impacts and institutions. Part 5 had 14 more questions than Part 4 on social capital and empowerment, five less on expenditures and two less on the environment. In relation to project impacts, it included:

- 12 questions (the same as in Part 4) on changes in the physical and financial assets owned by the respondent's household;
- four questions on changes in the levels of the household;
- 13 questions (the same as in Part 4) on changes in public and private services;
- six questions (the same number as in Part 4, but with one question different) on changes in selected indicators of the condition of household human assets;
- the same eight questions on changes in food security as in Part 4;
- 14 questions impacts on social capital and empowerment; and,
- five questions on changes in the environment and communal resource base. These are less than slightly different from the questions contained in Part 4 on this subject.

39. One part of the following analysis looks at the *limitations experienced in reaching the majority of project beneficiaries*. This is similar to but not the same as the analysis of stagnation in Chapter 3: it focuses on beneficiary ratings of “2” (no benefit) and “3” (negligible benefit<sup>14</sup>). Such responses are highlighted if negligible or no benefit was reported by at least 50% of the beneficiaries. Preliminary analysis showed that a majority of the beneficiaries had not attributed any benefits to the project in 53 out of 63 impact indicators for the BVDP, and 39 for the NWFP Barani. These observations have been further scrutinized below.

40. The second part of the analysis is similar to the *analysis of progress* in Chapter 3: progress is acknowledged if at least 20% of the beneficiaries gave an impact rating of 4, 5 or 6 (some benefit, large benefit or very large benefit). In this scheme of things, beneficiary responses suggested that there had been progress in 41 out of 63 impact indicators for the BVDP, and 45 for the NWFP Barani. Further analysis of these observations is reported below, by taking up one impact domain at a time and reviewing the data for corresponding indicators.

41. With reference to the method of analysis, the crude percentages reported in paragraphs 39 and 40 have been reviewed below in light of the following criteria for robustness in attribution:

- (a) **Significance**. In many of the indicators, no statistically significant difference could be found between beneficiaries and the control group, based on the analysis of Part 4 of the questionnaire. And in some cases, the difference between the two groups was statistically significant but numerically small (defined here as less than 10%).
- (b) **Plausibility**. Several of the attributed benefits could not be related either directly or indirectly (e.g., through income, production and consumption effects on health and education) to project interventions. And sometimes, a comparison between beneficiaries and the control group showed that the latter reported greater improvements than the beneficiaries during the last five-to-six years, which is a perverse result in terms of the logic of attribution.

---

<sup>14</sup> “Negligible benefit” was translated into Urdu in the questionnaire as *na honay key barabar faeda*. Translated back into English, this means “a benefit that is equal to not existing.”

## 4.2 Limitations in Reaching the Majority of Beneficiaries

42. A comparison between Annexes II and III shows that the NWFP Barani offers many more interventions than the BVDP. Even then, it is surprising to find so few indicators of well-being in which BVDP touched the majority of the beneficiaries<sup>15</sup>: for 53 out of the 63 impact indicators listed in the questionnaire, a majority of the beneficiaries reported negligible or no benefit due to the project. For 40 of the indicators, more than two-thirds of the beneficiaries reported in these terms, with several indicators showing a disillusionment rate of 80%-90%. These observations suggest that an overwhelming majority of the beneficiaries could not find much to attribute to BVDP.

43. In more specific terms, the BVDP sub-sample of beneficiaries pointed out the following limitations:

- (a) With numbers ranging between 60% and 90+%, the beneficiaries reported that the project had not contributed to an increase in any of the 12 household assets listed in the questionnaire<sup>16</sup>.
- (b) 51% of the beneficiaries reported that household income (from all sources taken together) had increased as a result of the project. The response, however, was not statistically different from the percentage of the BVDP control group which also reported income gains during the last five-to-six years.
- (c) A large majority of the beneficiaries did not attribute greater benefits or improvements from public services to the project in 11 of the 13 relevant indicators (the exceptions being loans, delivered through NRSP, and roads). Although 50% of the beneficiaries attributed an improvement in roads to the project, this is not a plausible attribution because the project did not have a roads component. Moreover, this percentage of beneficiaries is almost equal to the 48% of the control group that also reported an improvement in roads.
- (d) A majority of the beneficiaries did not attribute any benefits in terms of the six indicators of human assets.
- (e) A large majority (about 70%-90%) did not attribute any benefits to the project in terms of increases in food production and consumption.
- (f) A large majority (between 60% and 90+%) reported negligible or no benefit on nine of the 14 indicators of social capital and empowerment (but refer also to paragraph 59), including those that relate to: (i) village systems for managing natural resources; (ii) government's responsiveness to women and the poor; and, (iii) linkages with NGOs and the private sector<sup>17</sup>.
- (g) A large majority did not feel that the project had brought about any benefits from natural resources.

44. As indicated above, beneficiary responses depict a more extensive range of benefits in the NWFP Barani than in the BVDP. The main differences—or possible advantages—observed in the NWFP Barani are as follows:

---

<sup>15</sup> As noted in paragraph 13, the sampling scheme included the purposive selection of one or two villages in which a project had introduced the maximum number of its main components, and another one or two villages in which it had introduced the maximum number of interventions within a main component.

<sup>16</sup> One of these indicators is land ownership, and the impact of the irrigation component of BVDP is captured under the productivity of land, which improved noticeably, as reported below (paragraph 61).

<sup>17</sup> The last point is surprising in view of NRSP's active presence in the project. It may be explained by recognizing that development is generally equated with infrastructure development in local perceptions. NRSP was responsible for infrastructure only through a small Community Development Fund (CDF). This Fund allowed NRSP to help 423 Village Development Committees (VDCs) identify and implement small infrastructure projects (source: NRSP's 2006 progress report for BVDP). This covered 43% of the 979 VDCs that were established and had prepared village development plans; but it left out 57% of all VDCs. In the sample survey, 65% of BVDP beneficiaries reported negligible or no benefit from linkages with NGOs; this is close to the percentage of VDCs (57%) which did not benefit from the CDF.

- (a) The project offers a broader range and greater number of interventions. The range includes social sector interventions in health, education and drinking water supply, as well as several focused interventions in agriculture and natural resource management.
- (b) The beneficiaries give more credit to the social mobilization efforts of the NGO—the Sarhad Rural Support Programme (SRSP)—and, either because of this or because of the attitudes of local authorities—feel that the project has increased the government’s responsiveness to women and the poor people.

45. More specifically, the NWFP Barani sub-sample pointed out the following limitations of the project (some of which have been compared and contrasted with the BVDP):

- (a) As in BVDP, but with numbers ranging between 80% and 90+%, the beneficiaries reported that the project had not contributed to an increase in any of the 12 household assets listed in the questionnaire.
- (b) 76% of the beneficiaries attributed an increase in household income to the project; this, however, is very close to the 71% of the NWFP Barani control group which also reported income gains during the last five-to-six years. Similar findings came up in the BVDP.
- (c) In a finding that is very nearly the same as in the BVDP, a majority of the beneficiaries did not attribute greater benefits from public services to the project in 11 of the 13 relevant indicators (the exceptions being girls’ schools and drinking water, and in the former indicator the difference from the control group was numerically small)<sup>18</sup>.
- (d) A majority of the beneficiaries did not attribute any benefits in children’s health and women’s free time to the project. However, beneficiaries credited the project with improving four other human assets indicators. This is plausible in view of relevant interventions, but the difference between beneficiaries and the control group is significant for only two of these.
- (e) With the exception of one indicator (out of eight), a majority did not attribute any benefits to the project in relation to changes in the production and consumption of food; the exception is the production of cereals, for which the project has introduced several interventions. But the overall finding is very close to that from the BVDP.
- (f) In sharp contrast to the BVDP, a majority of the beneficiaries credited the project with benefits on 10 of the 14 indicators of social capital and empowerment, the exceptions being linkages between the community and the private sector, and systems for managing: (i) loans and savings, which never really took off as envisaged at design; (ii) forests and grazing land; and (iii) agricultural marketing.
- (g) A majority felt that the project had brought about improvements in the quality of water.

46. The findings above may be surprising in view of previous reports that used informal methods of collecting data from a very small number of beneficiaries, or did not have control groups and did not adopt relevant robustness criteria. But they are consistent with the conclusions given in Chapter 3, which analyzed the sample as a whole (including the control group). The conclusion from this section is the same, that is, “Stagnation rather than progress is by far the dominant force in rural development over the period in question;” and “Progress over this period can span a very wide range of variables, but is limited to a small proportion of the rural community.” The next few sections focus on specific aspects of the progress generated by the two projects, as reported by the beneficiaries.

### 4.3 Impact on Household Physical and Financial Assets

47. Table 7 reports data on the 12 household asset indicators assessed for impact by the beneficiaries of the two projects, together with a comparison of the responses of beneficiaries with the respective control groups. Unlike the 50% cut-off point in the previous section, this and the following sections of the chapter use a 20% threshold as a sign of progress (as described in paragraph 40), in combination with the criteria of significance and plausibility (as defined in paragraph 41). A blank

---

<sup>18</sup> Roads are a near-exception, as 49% of the beneficiaries reported at least some benefit from roads.

cell in the column for project impact shows that less than 20% of the beneficiaries attributed some impact to the project. Blank cells in columns comparing beneficiaries and the control group show<sup>19</sup>:

- (a) either the threshold was not met by the beneficiaries and the control group (that is, for a cell to be blank the responses by both groups would have to be below the threshold);
- (b) or the difference between the two groups was not statistically significant (that is, the cell would be blank even if both groups met the threshold but the difference was not significant).

<b>Table 7: Assessment of Project Impact—Household Physical and Financial Assets</b>			
Impact Domains and Indicators	Percent Reporting Improvement:		
	In Development Trends During Last 5-6 Years <sup>1</sup>		As a Result of Project <sup>2</sup>
	Control Group	Beneficiaries	Beneficiaries
<b>BVDP</b>			
1. Land			
2. Size of house			
3. Quality of house	35	53	
4. Means of transport			
5. Electrical appliances			
6. Farm machinery			
7. Cows and buffaloes	34	43	30
8. Goats and sheep	36	47	31
9. Poultry	20	37	20
10. Fruit and other trees			
11. Savings and jewellery	27	65	33
12. Business assets			
<b>NWFP Barani</b>			
1. Land	8	24	<i>Less than 20% of the beneficiaries gave a rating of 4, 5 or 6 for project impact</i>
2. Size of house			
3. Quality of house	28	36	
4. Means of transport			
5. Electrical appliances	22	45	
6. Farm machinery			
7. Cows and buffaloes			
8. Goats and sheep			
9. Poultry			
10. Fruit and other trees			
11. Savings and jewellery			
12. Business assets			
Notes:			
<sup>1</sup> These responses are taken from Part 4 of the questionnaire, which was administered to project beneficiaries as well as the control group of non-beneficiaries. This is the percentage of respondents who rated a change as 4, 5 or 6, that is, some increase, high level of increase or very high increase. Only statistically significant differences between beneficiaries and the control group are reported, and only if the response of either the control group or the beneficiaries added up to at least 20% of the sub-sample across the three rating options.			
<sup>2</sup> These responses are taken from Part 5, which was administered only to project beneficiaries. This is the percentage of respondents who rated an impact as 4, 5 or 6, that is, some benefit, large benefit or very large benefit. Responses are reported only if they added up to at least 20% across the three rating options.			

48. For the BVDP sub-sample, Table 7 shows that at least 20% of the beneficiaries attributed a positive impact to the project in terms of their ownership of cows and buffaloes, goats and sheep, poultry, and savings and jewellery. All four attributions of progress are plausible in view of the

<sup>19</sup> A grey-filled cell in any column shows that the question was not asked in either Part 4 or Part 5 of the questionnaire.

interventions introduced by the project<sup>20</sup>. However, the difference between beneficiaries and the control group is 9% for cows and buffaloes, and this is small in terms of numerical significance.

49. The sub-sample for NWFP Barani reveals an interesting contrast to the BVDP: no signs of progress are reported for any of the household assets indicators. This is understandable in view of the relatively recent start of project activities. The case of Haripur, however, is somewhat different from most of the other districts in the project, including Battagram. The difference, as noted in Chapter 1, is that Haripur also benefited previously from the (AsDB-assisted) first phase of the NWFP Barani. It is not surprising, therefore, that 20%-30% beneficiaries in Haripur reported increases in the ownership of poultry, cows and buffaloes, goats and sheep, and fruit and other trees.

#### 4.4 Impact on Household Income

50. Household income is not included as an impact domain in OE's evaluation methodology. It was included in this study, however, in order to form an informed opinion about the income effect of the project on other impact domains (e.g., those related to food security and household assets). Table 8 shows that there was no statistically significant difference in the proportion of BVDP beneficiaries and the control group reporting increases in income in the last five-to-six years<sup>21</sup>. In the NWFP Barani sub-sample, income from agriculture might have increased on account of the project for at least 20% of the beneficiaries: the project has invested in a wide range of technical interventions as well as roads that have evidently improved access to agricultural inputs and markets. It would be questionable, however, to attribute progress in overall income (from all sources) to the project: the difference between the proportion of beneficiaries and the control group is only 5%.

<b>Table 8: Assessment of Project Impact—Household Income</b>			
Impact Domains and Indicators	Percent Reporting Improvement:		
	In Development Trends During Last 5-6 Years <sup>1</sup>		As a Result of Project <sup>2</sup>
	Control Group	Beneficiaries	Beneficiaries
<b>BVDP</b>			
1. Income from agriculture	<i>None of the reported differences between beneficiaries and control group are statistically significant</i>		26
2. Income from salaries and wages			
3. Income from business			37
4. Income from all sources			51
<b>NWFP Barani</b>			
1. Income from agriculture	29	57	54
2. Income from salaries and wages			25
3. Income from business			
4. Income from all sources	71	81	76
Notes: As in Table 7.			

<sup>20</sup> With reference to savings, it may be mentioned that community organizations have accumulated PKR 334 million in collective savings (according to NRSP 2006). This translates into PKR 4,116 (approximately USD 70) for each female and male member of these organizations.

<sup>21</sup> This finding might be questioned by those who would attribute a significant impact on incomes to microfinance. Based on a large survey (PPAF 2007), the Pakistan Poverty Alleviation Fund (PPAF) has estimated that household incomes would have increased by at most 12% in a year on account of microfinance loans extended by its partner NGOs. This may appear to be a large increase, but inflation during the year may be at least 7-8%, while the population growth rate in rural areas may be close to 3% per annum. The net result would be only a marginal improvement in the incomes of the beneficiaries, if that.

## 4.5 Impact on Public Services

51. At least 20% of the beneficiaries of the BVDP attributed some benefit to the project in seven indicators related to public services (Table 9). Four of these (covering roads, health and education) cannot be matched with any of the project interventions (Annex II), but attribution for the three others is plausible. In two of these (veterinary facilities and extension services), the percentage of beneficiaries reporting benefits is not greater than the percentage reporting such an increase among the control group. Thus, the only indicator that shows an unmistakable sign of progress is the one (No. 8 in the table) that highlights the NRSP's microfinance intervention in the project.

52. The absence of irrigation from benefits reported by the beneficiaries is somewhat puzzling, given that the survey included some villages where project staff reported the existence of the main components. The only explanation that can be offered at this time is based on certain assumptions and probabilities: assuming that each of the 3,431 irrigation schemes reported in Annex II benefited one household, and that each of the 81,140 members of community organizations represents one household, 4.2% of the organized beneficiaries would have benefited from irrigation. This is very close to the 4% of the sampled beneficiaries who reported some benefit from irrigation.

<b>Table 9: Assessment of Project Impact—Public Services</b>			
Impact Domains and Indicators	Percent Reporting Improvement:		
	In Development Trends During Last 5-6 Years <sup>1</sup>		As a Result of Project <sup>2</sup>
	Control Group	Beneficiaries	Beneficiaries
<b>BVDP</b>			
1. Roads	48	60	50
2. Health facilities			29
3. School for boys	47	67	41
4. School for girls	<i>None of the reported differences between beneficiaries and control group are statistically significant</i>		32
5. Drinking water			
6. Irrigation			
7. Electricity			
8. Banks for “development trends”; loans for benefits			68
9. Veterinary facilities	15	36	23
10. Fertilizer stores			
11. Agricultural markets			
12. Extension services	29	36	27
13. Internet outlets			
<b>NWFP Barani</b>			
1. Roads	20	56	49
2. Health facilities			35
3. School for boys	42	39	33
4. School for girls	52	60	57
5. Drinking water	43	87	91
6. Irrigation			
7. Electricity	33	16	
8. Banks for “development trends”; loans for benefits			
9. Veterinary facilities	20	50	49
10. Fertilizer stores			30
11. Agricultural markets	4	29	27
12. Extension services	10	46	44
13. Internet outlets			
Notes: As in Table 7.			



53. The impacts attributed in Table 9 to the NWFP Barani suggest that at least nine important changes in public services took place among the beneficiaries as a result of this project. But three of these (related to health and education) are not significant in terms defined in paragraph 41. Of the remaining six, four (roads, drinking water, veterinary facilities and extensions services) are directly related to the interventions introduced by the project (Annex III) and are also significant in statistical and numerical terms. One other that is significant (benefits from agricultural markets) cannot be related directly to project interventions, but can be viewed plausibly as a project benefit because of the large investment made by the project in roads.

#### 4.6 Impact on Human Assets

54. Somewhat surprisingly, at least 20% of the beneficiaries of the BVDP attributed some benefit to the project in developing all the household human assets mentioned in the questionnaire (six indicators, defined in terms of health, education, and skills and crafts). Four of the indicators (No. 1 to No. 4 in Table 10), however, do not correspond to the interventions offered by the project. There could have been indirect effects from income, production and consumption that might have generated beneficial impacts on these four indicators. There is no compelling evidence, however, that such indirect beneficial effects were generated by the BVDP (refer to paragraphs 50 and 57).

55. Of the remaining two attributions in Table 10, a positive impact in terms of the skills and crafts of the beneficiary is plausible in view of the large number of training courses (and coverage) sponsored by the project. It is not equally certain that the project also brought about any real and significant benefits in terms of women's free time (indicator No. 5 in Table 10). Indeed, the project included a number of activities for women (Annex II) that may be expected to increase the time spent by women on vegetable and livestock production.<sup>22</sup>

<b>Table 10: Assessment of Project Impact—Human Assets</b>			
Impact Domains and Indicators	Percent Reporting Improvement:		
	In Development Trends During Last 5-6 Years <sup>1</sup>		As a Result of Project <sup>2</sup>
	Control Group	Beneficiaries	Beneficiaries
<b>BVDP</b>			
1. Children's health	48	64	42
2. Women's health	34	55	35
3. Girls' education			40
4. Boys' education			45
5. Women's free time	27	51	42
6. Level of skills and crafts			41
<b>NWFP Barani</b>			
1. Children's health	33	54	40
2. Women's health	39	59	53
3. Girls' education	59	69	58
4. Boys' education	57	54	53
5. Women's free time	20	39	35
6. Level of skills and crafts			51
Notes: As in Table 7.			

<sup>22</sup> It is possible that women's more active participation in community organization, microfinance and the production activities they prefer is being equated with "free time."

56. In the NWFP Barani sub-sample also, at least 20% of the beneficiaries attributed some benefit to the project for all six of the human assets indicators. In view of the interventions offered by the project (Annex III), this is plausible for the four indicators of health and education as well as the one for skills and craft<sup>23</sup>. But the difference between beneficiaries and the control group is statistically and numerically significant for only two of these (women’s health and skills and craft, both of which are supported by a range of project interventions). A positive impact in terms of women’s free time is not plausible, for reasons discussed above in the context of the BVDP (paragraph 55).

#### 4.7 Impact on Food Security

57. In the BVDP sub-sample, seven of the eight indicators of production and consumption are not statistically different between beneficiaries and the control group, while the difference in the eighth is not numerically significant (Table 11). This may seem surprising in view of the large number of project interventions in agricultural extension. The limitation of these interventions is they were not supported by any system of input supply or marketing. In these circumstances, extension alone cannot be expected to have more than a limited impact on food production and consumption. Moreover, as shown in Table 9, there was no significant difference in access to extension between beneficiaries and the control group.

<b>Table 11: Assessment of Project Impact—Food Security</b>			
Impact Domains and Indicators	Percent Reporting Improvement:		
	In Development Trends During Last 5-6 Years <sup>1</sup>		As a Result of Project <sup>2</sup>
	Control Group	Beneficiaries	Beneficiaries
<b>BVDP</b>			
1. Production of cereals	<i>None of the reported differences between beneficiaries and control group are statistically significant</i>		24
2. Production of fruit and vegetables			
3. Production of milk			29
4. Purchase of food			29
5. Consumption of food			32
6. Consumption of chicken			20
7. Consumption of milk			30
8. Consumption of vegetables	60	67	25
<b>NWFP Barani</b>			
1. Production of cereals	26	54	52
2. Production of fruit and vegetables	18	53	44
3. Production of milk	<i>None of the reported differences between beneficiaries and control group are statistically significant</i>		
4. Purchase of food			49
5. Consumption of food			47
6. Consumption of chicken			
7. Consumption of milk			27
8. Consumption of vegetables	77	74	37
Notes: As in Table 7.			

58. In the NWFP Barani sub-sample, two indicators—for the production of cereals and fruit/vegetable—show differences between the two groups that are statistically and numerically significant. Both impacts are plausible (except for fruit production) in view of the range of interventions implemented by the project (Annex III), the fact that beneficiaries reported significant

<sup>23</sup> Among the former, some would question the plausibility of attributing an impact on boys’ education, because the relevant project sub-component is called Improving Village Based Girls’ Education; however, this sub-component promotes non-formal schools, and these are generally open to both boys and girls.

impacts in terms of access to extension, inputs and markets (Table 9), and that a large component of the project provides investment in village feeder tracks and district roads.

#### 4.8 Impact on Social Capital and Empowerment

59. As noted earlier, a large majority of the BVDP beneficiaries reported negligible or no benefit on nine of the 14 indicators of social capital and empowerment, including those that relate to: (i) village systems for managing natural resources; (ii) government’s responsiveness to women and the poor; and, (iii) linkages with NGOs and the private sector. The project did, however, generate progress in 12 of the 14 indicators, in that at least 20% of the beneficiaries showed particularly strong appreciation for improvements in the systems for establishing village priorities, managing village schemes and managing loans and savings (Table 12). A majority also acknowledged that the project had increased the community’s responsiveness to women and the poor.

<b>Table 12: Assessment of Project Impact—Social Capital and Empowerment</b>			
Impact Domains and Indicators	Percent Reporting Improvement:		
	In Development Trends During Last 5-6 Years <sup>1</sup>		As a Result of Project <sup>2</sup>
	Control Group	Beneficiaries	Beneficiaries
<b>BVDP</b>			
1. System of deciding village priorities			63
2. System of managing village schemes			62
3. System of managing loans/savings			72
4. System of managing water in the village			24
5. System of managing forest and grazing			
6. System of agricultural marketing			
7. System of agricultural input supply			22
8. Responsiveness of government to community			38
9. Responsiveness of government to women’s problems			36
10. Responsiveness of community to women’s problems			54
11. Responsiveness of community to poor people			55
12. Responsiveness of government to poor people			32
13. Linkages between community and NGOs			32
14. Linkages between community and private sector			26
<b>NWFP Barani</b>			
1. System of deciding village priorities			89
2. System of managing village schemes			92
3. System of managing loans/savings			47
4. System of managing water in the village			93
5. System of managing forest and grazing			44
6. System of agricultural marketing			41
7. System of agricultural input supply			54
8. Responsiveness of government to community			70
9. Responsiveness of government to women’s problems			63
10. Responsiveness of community to women’s problems			68
11. Responsiveness of community to poor people			63
12. Responsiveness of government to poor people			55
13. Linkages between community and NGOs			56
14. Linkages between community and private sector			34
Notes: As in Table 7.			

60. The NWFP Barani, as indicated above, presents a sharp contrast to the BVDP in terms of the impact on social capital and empowerment: in this project, beneficiaries reported signs of progress on all 14 indicators of social capital and empowerment (Table 12). Moreover, a majority of the beneficiaries credited the project with benefits on 10 of the 14 indicators. Exceptions to the majority’s appreciation are linkages between the community and the private sector, and systems for managing: (i) loans and savings, which never really took off as envisaged at design; (ii) forests and grazing land; and (iii) agricultural marketing. As in the BVDP, private sector linkages appear particularly weak.

#### 4.9 Impact on Environment and Communal Resources

61. In the BVDP sub-sample, at least 20% of the beneficiaries identified only one resource (soil) which reportedly benefited from the project (Table 12). This is plausible in view of the several interventions offered by the project under two main components, namely, Soil and Water Conservation and On Farm Water Management, both of which emphasize irrigation (Annex II). Two of the impacts attributed by beneficiaries in the NWFP Barani are also plausible in view of project interventions. The exception is the reported benefit to grazing lands, for which there is neither a project intervention nor any obvious indirect reason for improvement, and the productivity of soils, which did not differ between beneficiaries and the control group.

<b>Table 13: Assessment of Project Impact—Environment and Communal Resources</b>			
Impact Domains and Indicators	Percent Reporting Improvement:		
	In Development Trends During Last 5-6 Years <sup>1</sup>		As a Result of Project <sup>2</sup>
	Control Group	Beneficiaries	Beneficiaries
<b>BVDP</b>			
1. Trees and forests			
2. Grazing lands			
3. Productivity of soil	11	28	26
4. Quality of water			
<b>NWFP Barani</b>			
1. Trees and forests	13	38	49
2. Grazing lands	9	24	25
3. Productivity of soil			61
4. Quality of water	46	90	94
Notes: As in Table 7.			

#### 4.10 Sustainability of Impacts and Institutions

62. The questionnaire included 24 questions on beneficiary perceptions of the prospects for sustainability, focusing on three particular areas, namely, household incomes, public services (including credit) and social capital formation. The responses given by project beneficiaries are summarized in Table 14; responses on sustainability were tabulated only if at least 20% of the beneficiaries of one of the two projects reported some benefit.

63. Contrary to the concerns expressed in previous evaluations (summarized in Section 1.2), beneficiaries in both projects exhibited a high degree of optimism regarding the prospects for sustainability. In particular:

- (a) 70%-80% of the beneficiaries were confident that increases in agricultural income and overall income would be sustainable. This may not be surprising in view of the sustained economic growth that has taken place in recent years, and which has included a pronounced turnaround in agriculture.

<b>Table 14: Sustainability of Impact and Institutions</b>		
Impact Domains and Indicators	Percent Assessing Prospects for Sustainability Positively <sup>1</sup> :	
	BVDP	NWFP Barani
<b>Changes in Household Income</b>		
1. Income from agriculture	71	80
2. Income from salaries and wages		59
3. Income from business	93	
4. Income from all sources	79	76
<b>Changes in Public Services</b>		
5. Roads	89	88
6. Health facilities	74	69
7. School for boys	90	79
8. School for girls	82	93
9. Drinking water		98
10. Irrigation		71
11. Electricity		
12. Loans	94	
13. Veterinary facilities	87	61
14. Fertilizer stores		68
15. Agricultural markets		72
16. Extension services	93	78
17. Internet outlets		
<b>Changes in Social Capital</b>		
18. System of deciding village priorities	81	94
19. System of managing village schemes	78	83
20. System of managing loans/savings	91	65
21. System of managing water in the village	64	97
22. System of managing forest and grazing		78
23. System of agricultural marketing		66
24. System of agricultural input supply	92	57
Note: <sup>1</sup> This is the percentage out of those respondents who reported a positive change in the corresponding indicator. This percentage was not computed if less than 20% of the respondents reported a positive change.		

- (b) An even larger majority believed that benefits attributed to the public services introduced by the project would be sustainable. The reason for this across-the-board perception may be an information gap: few beneficiaries would know the arrangements that have been made, or would be made (especially in the case of the ongoing NWFP Barani) for operating, maintaining and repairing public facilities. In the case of loans, however, many or all of the BVDP microfinance beneficiaries may be expected to know that NRSP plans to continue the service even after the closure of the project.
- (c) A large majority in both projects also believed that social capital formation is sustainable in several dimensions, including the systems that have been introduced for deciding village priorities and managing village schemes, loans, drinking water and agricultural input supply.

64. There are, however, some perceptible differences between the two projects, which may be highlighted as follows:

- (a) The BVDP beneficiaries showed much greater confidence in the sustainability of the credit system, and rightly so in view of how differently the microfinance component has turned out in the two projects.
- (b) The NWFP Barani beneficiaries expressed greater hope in the sustainability of other aspects of collective management introduced by the project. This optimism could reflect the fact that this is a relatively new project.

#### **4.11 Gender Differences in Perception of Impact**

65. The findings reported above are based on a sample that included an equal number of male and female respondents in each of the administrative units of the two project areas. As may be expected, however, a number of significant differences between male and female responses were noticed. These are discussed below for indicators in which all three of the following conditions have been met:

- (a) A relevant component or indirect effect of the project supported the attribution of benefits to the project.
- (b) At least 20% of either male or female respondents gave a rating of 4, 5 or 6 to the impact indicator.
- (c) The difference between the responses of the two groups was statistically significant as well as greater than 10%.

66. In the BVDP sub-sample, there was no difference between male and female responses regarding impact on the ownership of land and the quality and size of the house. In NWFP, however, none of the men but more than 30% of the women reported some impact on the size and quality of the house. The same kind of difference was observed in terms of impact on the electrical appliances owned by the household, but not in relation to livestock and poultry. In contrast, more women than men in the BVDP reported increases in the ownership of poultry, cows and buffaloes, and goats and sheep. But in both project areas, women attributed a far greater impact than men on savings and jewellery. And the difference was reversed in relation to the productivity of soils: many more men than women (by a margin of at least 2:1) reported benefits in the two projects.

67. In NWFP Barani, many more women than men attribute an impact on health and education facilities; the difference is almost 2:1 for the impact on girls' schools. The situation is reversed for public services such as roads, veterinary facilities, fertilizer stores and extension services. There is no significant gender difference, however, in attributing an impact to microfinance in either project. Moreover, in the BVDP there is no other significant gender difference at all, for indicators that registered some impact for at least 20% of men or women.

68. By a large margin, going up to 2:1 for the education indicators, more women than men in NWFP attribute an impact to the project in health and education. But more men than women reported that women had more free time, and beneficiaries had greater skills and crafts, as a result of the project. The situation in the BVDP, however, is the opposite: by a margin of at least 3:1, more women than men felt that the project had provided more skills to the beneficiaries and more free time to women. In both projects, it is clear that perceptions of women's free time are correlated with perceptions of skills and crafts: women and men alike attribute more "free time" for women if they perceive more benefit in terms of the beneficiary's skills and crafts.

69. There was a clear and consistent difference in perceptions regarding production and consumption impacts (that is, food security). In both projects, more men than women attributed benefits in the production of cereals, fruit and vegetable. But more women than men (in the BVDP) felt that milk production had increased as a result of the project (the difference was not statistically

significant in NWFP). And many more women than men in both projects reported impact on the purchase and consumption of food, including consumption of chicken, milk, fruit and vegetable.

70. In the BVDP there was no difference between men and women in perceptions regarding the impact on village management systems. In NWFP, however, women were considerably more appreciative than men in assessing the system of managing loans and savings<sup>24</sup>. But the assessment was reversed in relation to the systems of agricultural marketing and managing forests and grazing. In both projects, many more women than men appreciated the project's impact on increasing the government's responsiveness to women's problems, increasing the community's responsiveness to women and the poor, and establishing linkages to NGOs and the private sector. In the BVDP, these gender differences in perception reached magnitudes of 2:1, 3:1 and more; in NWFP, the differences were smaller but still considerable.

#### **4.12 Summary of Findings on Rural Poverty Impacts**

71. Neither of the two projects managed to increase ownership of household physical and financial assets for the vast majority (ranging from 60% to 90+%) of the beneficiaries. It is plausible, however, to register progress in the BVDP in terms of three impact indicators: at least 20% of the beneficiaries report increases in the ownership of goats and sheep, poultry, and savings and jewellery.

72. In BVDP, the only plausible impact which the majority of the beneficiaries experienced in terms of public services was through the NRSP-managed credit programme. There is no other indication of progress. In NWFP, it is plausible to register impacts for the majority of the beneficiaries in relation to roads, girls' schools, drinking water and extension services; at least 20% of the beneficiaries have also reportedly benefited from improved veterinary facilities. In addition, two other impacts (improved access to fertilizer stores and agricultural markets) attributed by at least 20% of the beneficiaries can also be viewed plausibly because of the large roads component.

73. In both projects, a majority of the beneficiaries plausibly credited the project with improving beneficiary skills and crafts. In NWFP, there is also reason to believe that women's health might have improved as a result of the project. But there are no other signs of progress when it comes to impacts on human assets in either project.

74. A large majority (about 70%-90%) of the BVDP beneficiaries did not attribute any benefits to the project for increases in food production and consumption, while the only impact registered by the majority in NWFP is in the production of cereals. Another sign of progress was also observed in NWFP: at least 20% of the beneficiaries plausibly reported an impact on the production of vegetables.

75. In the BVDP, a large majority (between 60% and 90+%) reported negligible or no benefit on nine of the 14 indicators of social capital and empowerment, including those that relate to: (i) village systems for managing natural resources; (ii) government's responsiveness to women and the poor; and, (iii) linkages with NGOs and the private sector. A majority did acknowledge, however, that the project had increased the community's responsiveness to women and the poor. In sharp contrast, a majority of the NWFP beneficiaries credited the project with benefits on 10 of the 14 indicators<sup>25</sup>. In both projects, however, the signs of progress are more extensive: at least 20% of the beneficiaries registered impacts on social capital and empowerment in 12 out of 14 indicators in the BVDP, and all 14 in NWFP.

76. A large majority of beneficiaries did not feel that the BVDP had brought about any benefits from natural resources, but at least 20% of the beneficiaries identified soil productivity as a benefit

---

<sup>24</sup> This presumably refers to small community-based revolving funds, as the microfinance component did not take off.

<sup>25</sup> The contrast may be due to the province, the RSP in question or a combination of the two factors.

resulting from the project. And at least 20% in NWFP plausibly credited the project for impacts on trees and forests, the quality of water and the productivity of soil.

77. It may be noted that the observed gender differences in perception of impact are not surprising, except perhaps in the magnitude of some of the differences. The main differences are as follows:

- (a) Men consistently gave a more appreciative assessment than women when it came to impacts related to land, other natural resources, roads and markets. Women, on the other hand, were more appreciative of impacts in the health and education indicators.
- (b) Men gave more credit to the project than did women for impact on the production of cereals and fruit and vegetable. But women far outnumbered men in reporting an impact on poultry, livestock and milk production. And they were also consistently and considerably more appreciative of project impacts on food consumption.
- (c) Many more women than men appreciated the project's impact on increasing the government's responsiveness to women's problems, increasing the community's responsiveness to women and the poor, and establishing linkages to NGOs and the private sector.



## 5. SUMMARY OF METHODS, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

---

### 5.1 Methodology

78. This study is based on a sample survey of 484 respondents, equally divided between women and men, and between beneficiaries and a control group, drawn from the project areas of the BVDP and the NWFP Barani. Both the control group and the beneficiaries were first asked to assess changes (development trends) they had experienced during the last five-to-six years in indicators corresponding to the impact domains of OE's evaluation methodology. The beneficiaries were asked subsequently to rate project impact for almost the same set of indicators, plus several others for social capital and empowerment. The study also developed a picture of the development context by analyzing development trends and using secondary sources, including government documents and previous IFAD evaluation reports.

79. The analytical methods used in the study include two new directions based on OE's CPE methodology. One of these consists of *interpreting the rating scale of 1-6* in simple language with the help of certain thresholds (defined below). The essential elements of this are described as follows:

- (a) Respondents' rating of 1 (negative change) is understood as a *sign of distress* for affected households in the sample.
- (b) Beneficiary ratings of 2 (no benefit) and 3 (negligible benefit) are aggregated in order to estimate whether the project had no impact on the majority (at least 50%) of the beneficiaries in a given impact indicator. This is referred to as a *sign of stagnation* in this study.
- (c) Higher ratings are aggregated in order to identify *signs of progress* for some of the beneficiaries. Progress is acknowledged if at least 20% of the beneficiaries rated a change as 4, 5 or 6 (that is, some benefit, large benefit or very large benefit, respectively).

80. Preliminary analysis showed that:

- (a) A majority of the beneficiaries had not attributed any benefits to the project in 53 out of 63 impact indicators for the BVDP, and 39 for the NWFP Barani.
- (b) There were signs of progress in 41 indicators for the BVDP, and in 45 for the NWFP Barani.

81. The second set of methodological innovations helped review these findings in a more realistic manner. This added *robustness in attributing impacts* to the project by using the following criteria:

- (a) **Significance.** This requires that: (i) there should be a statistically significant difference between the responses of beneficiaries and the control group; and, (ii) there should also be a numerical difference of at least 10% between the responses of the two groups.
- (b) **Plausibility.** This requires that: (i) it should be possible to relate the attributed benefits either directly or indirectly (e.g., through income, production and consumption effects) to project interventions; and, (ii) there should be no perversion in terms of the logic of attribution as, for example, when a comparison between beneficiaries and the control group shows that the latter reported greater improvements than the beneficiaries during the last five-to-six years.

### 5.2 Findings from the Overall Sample

82. As many as 92% of the overall sample (beneficiaries plus the control group) had access to electricity for lighting, and more than one-half lived within 1 km of a pakka road and a school for girls, and got their drinking water from a tap or pump of some kind. Only 23% of the sample drew most of their income from agriculture. However, about one-third of the respondents felt that their household was in the lower half of the village in terms of overall well-being. Almost one-half (47%) were illiterate and 93% depended on wood or cow dung for cooking fuel. Moreover, 28% of the

sample (with no difference between beneficiaries and the control group) could not increase their overall consumption or purchase of food in recent years<sup>26</sup>. Based on these observations, *the project areas seem to be under-privileged in relation to most of the population of the country*.

83. A comparison between the sub-samples drawn from the two project areas suggests that respondents from the NWFP Barani area were somewhat poorer than those in the BVDP area; this is consistent with secondary sources. Although there are differences between the two projects, *a number of indicators suggest that the projects, taken together, focused on the better off communities or households in their project areas*. Statistically significant differences between the beneficiaries and the control groups in neighbouring villages existed in the following indicators: respondent's rating of well-being in relation to the village as a whole, literacy and distance from a pakka road. In addition, statistically significant differences favouring project beneficiaries were also observed in indicators of distress (reduction in recent years in the ownership of land and cattle, and reduction in savings and jewellery); these differences were more pronounced in the BVDP.

84. The main development trends that emerged from the sample may be summarized as follows<sup>27</sup>:

- (a) Stagnation rather than progress in terms of impact indicators has been by far the dominant force in the project areas during the last five-to-six years.
- (b) Signs of progress during this period have spanned a wide range of indicators, but progress was limited to a small proportion of the rural community.
- (c) Signs of distress, as evidenced by liquidation of assets (land, cattle, savings and jewellery), were found in up to 10% of the sample (and a higher proportion of the control group).

### 5.3 Summary and Analysis of Project Impacts

85. A majority of the beneficiaries of the BVDP experienced impacts on seven of the 63 impact indicators identified in the study (Table 15). Of the seven, however, five represent aspects of social capital and only two have a bearing on the goods and services available to a household. With a lower threshold corresponding to 20% of the beneficiaries, four additional indicators of impact on goods and services, and seven others related to social capital, are also recognized.

86. *The NWFP Barani comes out ahead in both kinds of indicators, those that have a bearing on the goods and services available to a household, and those that relate only to social capital and empowerment*. In the former category, it has impacted a majority of the beneficiaries in six of the 63 indicators used in the study, with an additional five showing signs of progress by impacting at least 20% of the beneficiaries (Table 16). The major reason for finding a broader range of impacts in this project is its design, and particularly the inclusion of roads and social sector interventions (health, education and drinking water) in the project.

87. There is also, however, another discernible difference in comparison with the BVDP, and that is in terms of social capital and empowerment: NWFP beneficiaries reported more positive impacts on the majority than the BVDP beneficiaries, and their responses were also more consistent with the notion of empowerment. The difference may be due to the provinces, the design of the project, the approach adopted by the RSP engaged by the project, or a combination of these factors. Available information suggests that the RSP approaches to social mobilization are not highly differentiated from each other, except that NRSP emphasizes microfinance to an extent that no other RSP has been able to do so far. The institutions of the two governments—Punjab and NWFP—are also characterized by

---

<sup>26</sup> The official rural poverty headcount for Pakistan estimated in 2005 was also 28%. The official poverty line is food-based (that is, based on the rupee equivalent of a specified intake of calories).

<sup>27</sup> These findings are based on respondent recall of changes occurring over the last five-to-six years; this is roughly the duration for the government's medium-term planning, and the about the same length of time that an IFAD-assisted project has available for implementing its activities.

**Table 15: Summary of Plausible and Significant Impacts in the BVDP**

Impact Domain and Indicators	Plausible and Significant Impacts:	
	Reported by a Majority of the Beneficiaries	Additional Impacts Reported by At Least 20% of Beneficiaries
<i>Household Physical and Financial Assets</i> Goats and sheep		Yes
Poultry		Yes
Savings and jewellery		Yes
<i>Public Services</i> Loans	Yes	
<i>Household Human Assets</i> Level of skills and crafts	Yes	
<i>Social Capital and Empowerment</i> System of deciding village priorities	Yes	
System of managing village schemes	Yes	
System of managing loans/savings	Yes	
Responsiveness of community to poor people	Yes	
Responsiveness of community to women's problems	Yes	
System of managing water in the village		Yes
System of agricultural input supply		Yes
Responsiveness of government to community		Yes
Responsiveness of government to women's problems		Yes
Responsiveness of government to poor people		Yes
Linkages between community and NGOs		Yes
Linkages between community and private sector		Yes
<i>Environment</i> Productivity of soil		Yes

**Table 16: Summary of Plausible and Significant Impacts in the NWFP Barani**

Impact Domain and Indicators	Plausible and Significant Impacts:	
	Reported by a Majority of the Beneficiaries	Additional Impacts Reported by At Least 20% of Beneficiaries
<i>Public Services</i> Roads	Yes	
Drinking water	Yes	
Extension services		Yes
Veterinary facilities		Yes
Agricultural markets		Yes
<i>Household Human Assets</i> Women's health	Yes	
Level of skills and crafts	Yes	
<i>Household Food Security</i> Production of cereals	Yes	
Production of vegetables		Yes
<i>Social Capital and Empowerment</i> System of deciding village priorities	Yes	
System of managing village schemes	Yes	
System of managing water in the village	Yes	
System of agricultural input supply	Yes	
Responsiveness of government to community	Yes	
Responsiveness of government to women's problems	Yes	
Responsiveness of government to poor people	Yes	
Responsiveness of community to women's problems	Yes	
Responsiveness of community to poor people	Yes	
Linkages between community and NGOs	Yes	
Linkages between community and private sector		Yes
System of managing loans/savings		Yes
System of managing forest and grazing		Yes
System of agricultural marketing		Yes
<i>Environment</i> Quality of water	Yes	
Trees and forests		Yes

more similarities than differences, except that Punjab has more resources.

88. *The most plausible explanation for differences in the range and nature of impacts generated by the two projects lies in project design.* First, it is obvious that the more interventions a project (such as the NWFP Barani) has, the more impact indicators it would span. In NWFP, IFAD was fortunate to have a larger partner (AsDB) with fewer restrictions on the interventions it could support (health, education and rural roads being particularly relevant in this connection). Second, the study suggests that some interventions (e.g., agricultural research and extension) would not generate significant impact without interventions in other areas (e.g., input supply, marketing and roads). Third, there is interplay between social capital and interventions that directly impact well-being through goods and services. In the final analysis, the two sets of interventions can be seen to be symbiotic: the broader range of interventions in NWFP addressed more of the community's concerns and, thereby, provided additional stimulus to the real and perceived benefits of social capital.

89. In concluding the discussion on impacts, it may be noted that *the gender differences in perception of impact that are reported in this study are not surprising, except perhaps in the magnitude of some of the differences.* The main differences are as follows:

- (a) Many more women than men appreciated the project's impact on increasing the government's responsiveness to women's problems, increasing the community's responsiveness to women and the poor, and establishing linkages to NGOs and the private sector.
- (b) Men consistently gave a more appreciative assessment than women when it came to impacts related to land, other natural resources, roads and markets. Women, on the other hand, were more appreciative of impacts in the health and education indicators.
- (c) Men gave more credit to the project than women did for increasing the production of cereals and vegetables. But women far outnumbered men in reporting impacts on poultry, livestock and milk production. And they were also consistently and considerably more appreciative of project impacts on food consumption.

#### 5.4 Main Conclusions

90. *The findings of this study suggest that estimates of impact obtained through missions, PCRs and previous evaluations have over-stated the range and extent of project impacts.* The reason is that this study avoided over-optimistic impact attribution by:

- (a) comparing responses from the control group with those of the beneficiaries;
- (b) introducing criteria for robust assessment of the benefits reported by beneficiaries; and,
- (a) adopting clear thresholds to differentiate between progress and stagnation.

91. Based on the analysis of context, including the overall sample, it would be reasonable to infer that the areas in which the two projects operated are under-privileged in relation to most of the country. At the same time, a number of key indicators suggest that *the projects, taken together, focused on the better off people in their project areas; this was more pronounced in the BVDP.*

92. The impacts identified by pursuing the methodology identified above are limited in range and extent, and more so in the BVDP. *Beneficiary perceptions of "feel good" factors (social capital and empowerment) were highly appreciative, while those concerning the "get better" indicators (goods and services for the household) were generally feeble or non-existent.* The study suggests that one reason for this is that the accumulation and improvement of most household and community assets that generate rural poverty impacts is not possible during a five-to-six year period, at least in Pakistan. Another reason is that impacts on rural poverty depend on a holistic approach as well as real synergies between interventions, which are not adequately reflected in project design.

## REFERENCES

---

- GOP (Government of Pakistan). 2005a. *Medium-Term Development Framework 2005 – 2010*. Islamabad: Government of Pakistan, Planning Commission.
- GOP (Government of Pakistan). 2005b. *State of Environment Report 2005*. Islamabad: Government of Pakistan, Ministry of Environment, Pakistan Environmental Protection Agency.
- GOP (Government of Pakistan). 2007. *Pakistan Economic Survey 2006-07*. Islamabad: Government of Pakistan, Finance Division, Economic Adviser's Wing.
- IFAD. 1995. "Pakistan Country Portfolio Evaluation." Rome: IFAD, Office of Evaluation.
- IFAD. 2007. "Evaluation of IFAD's Rural Finance Policy;" Rome: IFAD, Office of Evaluation.
- ITAD. 2004. *Independent External Evaluation (IEE), Pakistan Country Working Paper*. Brighton, UK: ITAD Ltd. for IFAD.
- Malik, Sohail J. 2005. *Agriculture Growth and Rural Poverty: A Review of the Evidence*; Islamabad: Asian Development Bank, Pakistan Resident Mission, Working Paper No. 2.
- Miles, Simon. 2000. *Pakistan: Environment Sector Review*. Toronto: Canadian International Development Agency, Pakistan Desk, Asia Branch.
- PPAF. 2007. *PPAF Microcredit Financing: Assessment of Outcomes 2005*; Islamabad: GALLUP Pakistan for PPAF.

## **Annex I: Terms of Reference for Impact Assessment Study**

### **Main Elements of the Study**

1. The impact assessment study will consist of:
  - (a) a desk review based on available national and provincial statistics, focusing on the project areas of two selected IFAD-assisted projects, namely, the Punjab Barani Village Development Project (BVDP) and the NWFP Barani Area Development Project (NWFP Barani), which are two of the larger multi-sectoral rural development projects supported by IFAD in Pakistan; and,
  - (b) a household-based sample survey of beneficiaries and control groups in the two projects areas.

### **Study Area**

2. The study area proposed for field work would consist of:
  - (a) two diverse *tehsils* of the BVDP; and,
  - (b) two districts of NWFP in which the NWFP Barani Project is working.

### **Study Team**

3. The study will be managed by a national organization, namely, LEAD Pakistan, that will bring together the expertise required for the impact assessment. The team is expected to consist of the following:
  - (a) There will be an overall Team Leader, who should be an economist and evaluation specialist with extensive experience in rural poverty issues and multi-sectoral rural and agricultural development programmes. The responsibilities of the Team Leader are outlined in greater detail below and summarized in the Level of Effort table given at the end of these TORs.
  - (b) A well-trained Statistical Analyst is required to work with the Team Leader to analyze household-level data, preferably using SPSS. This person should be supported by relevant IT personnel and data management systems.
  - (c) A well-trained team of female and male enumerators is required for household-level data collection. Arrangements should be made for training and supervising the enumerators, and entering and cleaning the data efficiently.

### **Elaboration of Tasks**

4. Desk review. The Team Leader will review the following data sources, as well as any other similar ones that are available, in order to highlight key socio-economic and service delivery indicators for the populations served by the two projects:
  - (a) data published by the Federal Bureau of Statistics;
  - (b) data from the Multiple Indicators Cluster Surveys (MICS);
  - (c) baseline or other data collected for the two projects; and,
  - (d) project progress and supervision reports.

5. **Sampling.** The Team Leader will propose and finalize with OE the sampling methodology for the household survey. It is expected that:

- (a) The household survey would cover 50-60 project beneficiaries and about the same number of non-beneficiaries in each selected *tehsil* or district. Thus, the overall sample would consist of about 200-240 beneficiaries and a similar number of non-beneficiaries.
- (b) Wherever possible, the sample of beneficiaries may be drawn from the list of beneficiaries compiled by a project and/or any wealth-ranking exercise a project might have undertaken.
- (c) The methodology used in preparing the Pakistan Country Working Paper (CWP) of IFAD's Independent External Evaluation (IEE) would be reviewed in the process of finalizing the sampling methodology for the CPE.

6. **Survey.** The Team Leader will propose and finalize with OE the survey instruments that will be used in the household survey. S/he would pre-test the instruments and help train the enumerators and Social Researchers. It is expected that the instruments used in the IEE's CWP for Pakistan would be reviewed in the process of finalizing the survey instruments for the CPE.

7. **Data Analysis.** Household-level data will be analyzed with particular reference to the impact domains of the standard CPE methodology used by OE. The Team Leader will guide the Statistical Analyst in this regard. The Team Leader will agree the final report outline with OE in advance.

#### Timing and Estimated Level of Effort (in person days)

	Week	Team Leader	Enumerators	Statistical Analyst
Desk review and tentative report outline	1	4		
Design of sampling methodology	1	1		
Approval of methodology and tentative TOC	1			
Survey:				
▪ Design/approval of survey instruments	1	3		
▪ Pre-testing and finalization	2	2	4	
▪ Training	2	2	8	
▪ Field work	2-4	4	100	
Data management:				
▪ Data entry	3-4			
▪ Data cleaning/editing	3-4	3		6
▪ Data analysis/tabulation	5-6	4		10
Draft report	7	6		
Review of draft report	8			
Final report	9	2		
Total level of effort		31	112	16

#### Deliverables

1. Tentative report outline/TOC
2. Sampling methodology
3. Survey instruments
4. Draft report
5. Final report

**Annex II:**  
**BVDP Physical Progress Report, June 2007**

<b>1</b>	Name of Project	Barani Village Development Project				
<b>2</b>	Total Revised Cost (Rs. In Million)	1836.743				
<b>3</b>	Donor Share (Rs. In Million)	955.665				
<b>4</b>	Govt. Share (Rs. In Million)	317.688				
<b>5</b>	Beneficiary Share (Rs. In Million)	563.390				
<b>6</b>	Date of Effectiveness	01-09-1999				
<b>7</b>	Terminal Date	30-06-2007				
<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Revised Project Target</b>	<b>Ach. Up to June 2006</b>	<b>Targets for 2006-07</b>	<b>Ach. up to June, during 2006-07</b>	<b>Cumulative</b>
<b>National Rural Support Programme (NRSP)</b>						
1	Formation of Community Organizations	3700	3916	0	0	3916
2	Formation of VDCs	900	974	0	0	974
3	Community Development Fund (Rs. In Million)	225.000	187.600	37.400	37.510	225.110
4	Credit Revolving Fund (Rs. Million)	274.418	302.350	50.000	171.560	473.910
<b>Soil &amp; Water Conservation Component</b>						
1	Mini Dams With Pump Set & Delivery Line	300	317	50	45	362
2	Pond With Pump Set & Delivery Line	300	232	68	60	292
3	Lift Irrigation Schemes	100	102	58	65	167
4	Soil Conservation Works (Acres)	5556	5663	150	0	5663
5	Establishment of Nursery	39	48	0	0	48
<b>On Farm Water Management Component</b>						
1	Dug Well with Irrigation System	2200	1894	575	558	2452
2	Shallow Tube well with irrigation system	100	71	77	87	158
<b>Agriculture Extension &amp; BATI Component</b>						
<b>A</b>	<b>Agriculture Extension</b>					
<b>1</b>	<b>For Female Workers</b>					
	1. Establishment Of Kitchen Gardens	3148	2735	492	533	3264
	2. Fruit & Vegetable preservation	4677	4743	300	322	5053
	3. Establishment Of Fruit Plant Nurseries	48	47	0	0	47
	4. Training of Women in:					
	i) Nursery Operation	479	484	0	0	484
	ii) Fruit Tree Plantation	2714	2593	300	393	2977
	iii) Fertilizer Application	2179	2309	0	0	2309
	iv) Seed Treatment & Storage	2875	2844	300	351	3178
	v) Integrated pest management	2463	2294	250	329	2598



2	<b>For Male Workers</b>					
	1. Laying out of Demo. Plots	3572	3291	281	360	3651
	2. Establishment Of Fruit Plant Nurseries	98	98	0	0	98
	3. Farmer Days	2333	1961	288	410	2347
	4. Shows & Exhibitions	47	45	02	02	47
	5. Demo. Blocks (One Acre)	1381	1271	110	125	1396
	6. Integrated activities at water Resources					
	a. Orchard Development (8 Kanals)	242	130	112	107	236
	b. Vegetable cultivation (2 Kanals)	242	121	121	121	242
	c. Fodder cultivation (4 Kanals)	242	107	135	133	240
3	<b>Short Training (Tehsil Level)</b>					
	1. On Crop Production (Persons)	3157	3138	0	0	3138
	2. On Vegetable Growing (Persons)	1680	1403	277	285	1688
	3. On Fruit Production (Persons)	1380	1309	71	123	1432
4	<b>Forest Works</b>					
	1. Compact Plantation	1200	900	300	300	1200
	2. Linear Plantation	360000	186500	174000	204000	390500
	3. Soil Conservation	1600	1000	1380	1474	2474
	4. Pasture Development	1600	820	0	0	820
<b>B</b>	<b>BATI</b>					
5	<b>Refresher Courses</b>					
	1. Lady Agricultural Officers	12	06	06	06	12
	2. Female Field Assistant.	12	10	06	04	14
	3. Female Field worker	34	28	12	11	39
	4. Male Community Extension Activists	507	358	149	149	507
	5. Female Community Extension Activists	464	342	122	122	464
	<b>Livestock &amp; BLPRI Component</b>					
	<b>Breeding</b>					
	Procurement of Bulls	680	669	60	66	735
	Procurement of Bucks	60	30	30	37	67
2	<b>Training</b>					
	1. Female CLA Induction Course (Six Days)	1600	2845	258	334	3179
	2. Male CLA Induction Course	1200	1013	187	65	1078
	3. Male CLA Refresher Course	550	544	06	08	552
	4. Male CLA Advance Course	150	104	48	0	104
3	Urea Molasses Mineral Blocks	75090	70290	6000	5600	75890
4	Sheep/Goat Fattening (unit of 10 heads)	184	186	0	0	186
5	Distribution of Poultry Unit (24 Birds/Unit)	3000	2290	710	722	3012
6	Field Days	930	1122	218	204	1326
7	<b>Drenching/Spraying</b>					
	1. Sheep & Goat (Doses)	100000	106892	10000	18446	125338
	2. Cattle & Buffalo (Doses)	100000	100441	15000	21446	121887

**Annex III:  
NWFP Barani Physical Progress Report, June 2007**

<b>1</b>	Name of Project	NWFP Barani Area Development Project				
<b>2</b>	Total Revised Cost (Rs. In Million)					
<b>3</b>	Donor Share (Rs. In Million)					
<b>4</b>	Govt. Share (Rs. In Million)					
<b>5</b>	Beneficiary Share (Rs. In Million)					
<b>6</b>	Date of Effectiveness					
<b>7</b>	Terminal Date					
<b>Sr. No.</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Revised Project Target</b>	<b>Ach. Up to June 2006</b>	<b>Targets for 2006-07</b>	<b>Ach. up to June, during 2006-07</b>	<b>Cumulative</b>
	<b>VILLAGE LEVEL DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT</b>					
	<b>Village Level Development</b>					
<b>1</b>	<b>Improving Women's Status</b>					
	Gender and Development Forum Meetings	810	172	128	123	295
	Improving Health Services for Women	180	103	55	0	103
	<b>Capacity Building of Women's Organizations</b>					
	Training LHVs/FMTs in Public Health School ongoing	180	103	55	0	103
	Training LHVs/FMTs in Public Health School New	-		77		-
	Training TBAs in Primary Health Care	21	32	12	12	44
	Refresher Course for TBAs	21	15	23	23	38
	Health Awareness Campaign and Networking	5,824	1,342	657	611	1,953
<b>2</b>	<b>Improving Village Based Girl's Education</b>					
	Girls Education Awareness Campaign	5,824	1,315	657	611	1,926
	Health Outreach program	2	-	2	2	2
	Medical Camp	-	24	3	3	27
	Non-Formal Schools Ongoing	-	72	71	71	143
	Non - Formal Schools New	-		36	33	33
	Training Women as PTC (Diploma)	140	122	59	0	122
	Gender Awareness Training for Teachers	7	6	2	2	8
	<b>Community Mobilization</b>					
	Formation of MCOs	2,912	2,575	500	865	3,440
	Formation of WCOs	1,750	1,268	492	535	1,803
	Formation of WVOs	500	200	374	271	471
	Formation of MVOs	832	490	572	480	970
	Registration of CCBs	-	25	0		25
<b>4</b>	<b>Training for Village Institutional Strengthening</b>					
	<b>Master Trainers: Advanced Activists</b>					
	Women Advanced Activists	10	9	0	0	9
	Men Advanced Activists	11	17	0	0	17
	<b>Village Office Bearers</b>					
	Women Village Office Bearers	197	77	92	84	161
	Men Village Office Bearers	330	139	166	151	290

	<b>Activists</b>					
	Women Activists	101	30	15	14	44
	Men Activists	160	57	31	29	86
	<b>Women/Men Community Managers' Conferences</b>	1,704	329	165	151	480
5	<b>Training: Skills</b>	665	262	131	108	370
	<b>AGRICULTURE EXTENSION</b>					
	<b>Agriculture Extension</b>					
1	<b>Establishment of Seed Farm at Saria Naurang</b>					
	Tractor Garage and Implements Shed	1	1	-	-	1
	Seed Store	1	1	-	-	1
	Seed Shed	1	1	-	-	1
	Land for seed farm	27	27	-	-	27
2	<b>Establishment of Women Offices</b>					
	Construction of women staff office space	11	8	3	2	10
	Furniture for Women Officers Work Space	11	8	2	-	8
3	<b>Plot Demonstrations</b>					
	Maize Demonstration Plots (input package)	922	452	216	236	688
	Wheat Demonstration Plots (Input package)	1,298	645	326	335	980
	Sorghum Demonstration Plots (input package)	148	16	50	50	66
	Millet Demonstration Plots (input package)	148	15	50	50	65
	Guara/potato	-	16	9	9	25
	Lentill/Pulses/Rice / Mung	-	16	11	11	27
	Gram Demonstration Plots (input package)	564	217	142	142	359
	VOs cost of Compost Making Demonstration	840	350	255	246	596
	Canola demonstration Plots (input package)	192	49	61	63	111
	Groundnut demonstration Plots (input package)	148	115	39	39	154
	Sesum	-	21	10	10	31
	Sunflower	-	41	41	44	85
	Fish Demo Farm	-	4	5	5	9
4	<b>Training</b>					
	Training of Extension Workers	46	26	11	11	37
	Field Days	480	268	107	100	368
	<b>AGRICULTURE RESEARCH</b>					
1	<b>Civil Work</b>					
	Seed Store, ARS Dhodial, Mansehra	1	-	1	0	-
	Hot Bin Mansehra	1	-	0	0	-
	Green House, Dhodial, Manshera	1	1	1	1	2
	Seed Store in Kohat	1	-	1	1	1
	Seed Shed, ARS Sarai Naurang, Bannu	1	1	0	0	1
	Onion Bulb Storage, ARS Dhodial, Mansehra	1	-	1	0	-

2	<b>Adaptive Research Trials</b>					
	Maize Adoptive Research Trials	174	160	45	45	205
	Wheat Adoptive Research Trials/SMP (Mansehra)	106	132	78	78	210
	Sorghum Adoptive Research Trials	36	16	9	9	25
	Millet Adoptive Research Trials	39	17	10	10	27
	Fodder Adaptive Reseach Trials	36	30	14	14	44
	Gram Adaptive Research Trials	84	39	20	20	59
	Canola Adaptive Research Trials	90	50	23	23	73
	Groundnut Adaptive Research Trials	36	44	20	20	64
	Soyabean Adaptive Research Trials	52	27	24	24	51
	Adoptive Research Trial /Model Orchard for Kohistan	52	24	20	20	44
	Tea Cultivatoin/Off Season Veg (Atd/Man)	-	-	0	0	-
	Mushroom Cultivation/Strengthening of Fruit Nursery (Mansehra) New	3	15	6	5	20
	Mung	-	2	5	5	7
	Guara	-	2	5	2	4
	Sunflower	-	12	18	18	30
	Introduction/ManARment grape wiveyard	-	1	1	1	2
3	<b>Training</b>					
	Field Days	486	179	145	141	320
	District Research/Extension Advisory Conferences	260	65	84	84	149
	Research Institution Networking Seminars	14	4	4	4	8
	Datepalm solar drying/processing machine			3	3	3
	<b>HORTICULTURE EXTENSION</b>					
1	<b>Civil Works</b>					
	Establishment of Hot Bin at Fruit Nursery, Baffa, Mansehra	1	0	0	-	
2	<b>Vegetable Demonstration</b>					
	Off-season Vegetable demonstration	734	249	144	144	393
	High value Vegetables demonstration	120	128	72	72	200
3	<b>Fruit Group Development</b>					
	Top working of Wild Zizyphus (Ber) / Olive	25	499	258	263	762
	Date Palm Demonstration	120	72	19	14	86
	Trickle Irrigation for Orchards	-	12	17	15	27
	Citres/Olive/Lichi Orchards/Grapes/Pomegranate/ Guava/ Apple/Peaches/Cherry	-	64	45	56	120
4	<b>Establishment of Fruit Plant Nursery in Kohistan</b>					
	<b>Training</b>					
	Training of Hort. Ext. Workers in Vegetable Production	36	22	11	11	33
	Field Days for Training in Vegetable Production	228	115	57	53	168
	Training of Women in Vegetable Production	45	23	8	7	30
	Training in Fruit Nursery Management	38	21	0	0	21
	Training in Kitchen Gardening	12	55	26	26	81

	Training in preservation and packaging of dates	-	2	0	0	2
	Training of Women in Fruit and Vegetable Preservation	208	90	60	60	150
<b>SOIL &amp; WATER CONSERVATION COMPONENT</b>						
1	<b>Spurs</b>					
	GI wire	306	187	102	100	287
	GI wire ongoing	-	-	8	2	2
	Cemented Spurs	186	89	49	61	150
	Cemented Spurs ongoing	-	-	2	2	2
2	<b>Protection Bunds</b>					
	GI Wire	276	178	110	124	302
	GI wire ongoing	-	-	4	4	4
	Cemented	228	176	77	99	275
	Cemented ongoing	-	-	3	3	3
3	<b>Check Dams</b>					
	GI Wire	288	84	59	82	166
	Cemented	330	111	59	82	193
4	<b>Water Ponds</b>	204	131	108	135	266
	Water pond ongoing	-	-	9	9	9
5	<b>Inlet/Outlet/Spill way</b>	234	89	66	84	173
<b>FORESTRY DEVELOPMENT</b>						
1	<b>Establishment of Women Offices</b>					
	Construction of women staff office space	6	5	1	0	5
	Furniture for Women Officers Work Space	6	5	0	0	5
2	<b>Training</b>					
	Participatory Methods	6	3	2	2	5
	Captive Birds (Kits for Bannu)	-	1	0	0	1
	Village Land Use Planning	6	2	2	2	4
	Gender Planning and Monitoring and Evaluation	12	4	4	4	8
	Technical	6	8	0	0	8
	Bee Keeping	20	16	4	4	20
3	<b>Nursery Demonstration and Development</b>					
	<i>Afforestation</i>					
	Communal and Private Mazri Growing/Local - South	-	5,328	1,250	1,250	6,578
	Care and Maintenance of Mazri/Communal Plantation	-	4,118	10,563	10,475	14,593
	Communal and Private Afforestation North	6,800	3,815	2,270	1,790	5,605
	Communal and Private Afforestation South	6,800	2,945	1,800	1,525	4,470
	Farmer Plantation	45,620	5,712	3,207	2,927	8,639
	Sarkanda/Kana growing (Saccharum Munja)	-	200	0	0	200
4	<b>Specialist Services</b>					
	Community Forestry Specialist (Consultant)	-	-	0	0	-

LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION AND EXTENSION						
1	<b>Establishment of Women Offices</b>					
	Civil Works	11	8	3	1	9
	Furniture Female Office	11	8	4	1	9
2	<b>Breed Improvement/Artificial Insemination</b>					
	<i>Breed Improvement Activities</i>					
	Buffalo Semen	26,400	7,024	3,038	3,125	10,149
	Jersey & Fresian Semen	28,200	40,263	17,550	17,377	57,640
	Supply of Liquid Nitrogen	-	220	3,300	1,100	1,320
	Goat Bucks	4,180	1,958	1,140	1,217	3,175
	Sheep Rams	2,480	665	350	350	1,015
	Equipment and Materials / Semen Lab	-	1	1	0	1
2	<b>Animal Health</b>					
	Vaccination of Animals	404,730	563,484	216,000	218,739	782,223
	Vaccination of Birds	742,000	1,105,848	345,000	373,942	1,479,790
	De-worming Medicine	700,000	462,762	207,000	197,311	660,073
3	<b>Fodder Demonstration</b>					
	Fodder Demonstration Plots (input package)	210	127	50	52.5	179
4	<b>Training and Field Days</b>					
	Training for Women in Commercial Poultry Management	20	23	11	9	32
	Setting up of pilot poultry farm for trainees	20	23	11	9	32
	Training of women in domestic poultry production	324	71	41	36	107
	Staff Training in Artificial Insemination Techniques	8	3	1	1	4
	Training of Village Livestock Extension Workers	26	4	-4	-4	-
	Refresher course for LEW	26	0	6	6	6
	Training for Vet officer in Frozen Semen	1	1	1	1	2
	Training for women livestock management	1	1	0	0	1
	Cattle Show/Workshop	-	4	5	4	8
	Field Days/Campaigns for L/S & Poultry Improvement	420	261	117	117	378
5	<b>Research: Pastoralist Support Study</b>					
		-	-	0	0	-
IRRIGATION						
1	<b>Small Irrigation Schemes</b>					
	<i>Construction Costs of Small Irrigation Works</i>					
	Tubewell Irrigation Schemes Ongoing	16	-	0	0	5
	Tubewell Irrigation Schemes New	-	-	11	4	4
	Dugwell Irrigation Schemes (large) Ongoing	45	28	54	36	64
	Dugwell Irrigation Schemes (large) New Low Yield	-	15	0	0	15
	Dugwell Irrigation Schemes (small) New	99	7	23	7	14

	Dugwell Irrigation Schemes (small) Ongoing	-	10	9	7	17
	Diversion/surface Irrigation (small) New	125	9	16	4	13
	Diversion/surface Irrigation (small) Ongoing	-	13	14	9	22
	Diversion/surface Irrigation (large) New	16	-	4	1	1
	Diversion/surface Irrigation (large) Ongoing	-	1	10	3	4
	<b>Pond Irrigation Schemes</b>	63	15	0	0	36
	Construction Ongoing	-	11	14	13	24
	Construction New	-	4	16	8	12
2	<b>Training for O&amp;M</b>					
	Training for O&M of Tubewell Schemes /low yield	90	1	15	4	5
	Training for O&M of Dugwell Schemes	126	44	84	26	70
	Training for O&M of Diversion Schemes	540	5	44	15	20
	Training for O&M of Pond Schemes	480	6	29	12	18
	<b>DRINKING WATER SUPPLY &amp; SANITATION</b>					
1	<b>Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation</b>					
	Gravity Based DWSS	177	29	-	32	61
	Construction (small) Ongoing	-	18	22	14	32
	Construction (small) New	-	11	25	17	28
	Construction (Large) Ongoing	14	-	7	1	1
	Construction (Large) New	-	-	5	-	-
	<b>Hand / Pressure Pumps</b>	910	275	245	279	554
	<b>Hand/Pressure Pump Ongoing</b>	-	318	79	71	389
	<b>Tubewell/Dugwell Based DWSS</b>	17	19	-	-	46
	Construction (Large) Ongoing	-	3	8	3	6
	Construction (Large) New	-	-	4	1	1
	Construction (Small) ongoing	-	11	33	22	33
	Construction (Small) New	-	5	15	1	6
	<b>School Demo Latrine New</b>	205	53	12	10	63
	<b>School Demo Latrine Ongoing</b>	-	138	39	32	170
2	<b>Training</b>					
	Training for O&M of Gravity Based DWSS	660	7	59	10	17
	Training for O&M of Hand Pump DWSS	1,400	150	324	132	282
	Training for O&M of Tubewell Based DWSS	42	18	60	33	51
	Training for O&M of Latrine	205	41	51	27	68
	<b>RURAL ROADS</b>					
1	<b>Feeder and Link Roads</b>					
	<b>Village Feeder Tracks</b>	600	41.5	374.55	134.95	176.53
	Feeder and Link Tracks- Ongoing	-	33	128.76	67	99.97
	Feeder and Link Tracks- New	-	-	92	36.59	36.59
	Low Specification BTR Ongoing	-	9	115.79	25.69	34.30
	Low Specification BTR New	-	-	38	6	5.67
2	<b>District Council Link Roads</b>	275	-	190.10	-	-
	Black Topped Roads- Ongoing	-	-	126.80	-	-
	Black Topped Roads- New	-	-	63.30	-	-
3	<b>Training for O&amp;M</b>					
	Training for O&M	667	1	32	6	7

	<b>MICRO HYDEL</b>					
1	<b>Micro-Hydel Schemes</b>					
	Micro-Hydel Scheme	40	-	-	-	-
	<b>Civil Works</b>					
	Civil Works: Ongoing	-	1	16	10	11
	Civil Works: New	-	-	8	-	-
2	<b>Training for O&amp;M</b>	148	-	24	3	3
	<b>INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT (DIU)</b>					
1	<b>Institutional Support (DIU)</b>					
	<b>Project Management</b>					
	<b>Training</b>					
	Departmental Reorientation Training	30	-	-	-	-
	Departmental Reorientation Field Trip	30	-	-	-	-
	District Council Training	80	-	-	-	-
	Training Women Staff in Gender & Development	5	-	-	-	-
	Accounting Process Training	1	-	-	-	-
	Domestic Study Tour for DIUs/DPOs	5	-	-	-	-
2	<b>Sector Technical Support</b>					
	<b>Women's Hostels</b>					
	Construction	11	2	9	4	6
	Land Contribution	11	3	8	-	3
	<b>Furnishings of Constructed Hostels</b>					
	<b>Rent of Hostel Accommodation (during construction)</b>	-	-	-	-	-



**Annex IV:**

**International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)**

**Pakistan Country Programme Evaluation (CPE) 2007**

**QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE IMPACT ASSESSMENT STUDY conducted by LEAD PAKISTAN**

**PART 1: RATING SCALES**

<b>Rating</b>	Rating Scales for Reporting Changes in Impact Domains- for beneficiaries as well as non-beneficiaries <b>(haalat mein tabdeeli)</b>	Rating Scales for Reporting Project Benefits - <b>for beneficiaries only</b> <b>(project ka faeda)</b>	Rating Scales for Assessing Prospects for Sustainability - <b>for beneficiaries only</b> <b>(faedey ki paedari)</b>
<b>6</b>	Very high increase <i>buhat ziada izafa</i>	Very large benefit <i>buhat ziada faeda</i>	Almost certain to be sustainable <i>paedari taqreeban yaqeeni hai</i>
<b>5</b>	High level of increase <i>accha khasa izafa</i>	Large benefit <i>accha khasa faeda</i>	Good prospects of sustainability <i>paedari ka accha imkan hai</i>
<b>4</b>	Some increase <i>thora buhat izafa</i>	Some benefit <i>thora buhat faeda</i>	Could be sustainable <i>paedar ho sakta/ho sakti hai</i>
<b>3</b>	Negligible increase <i>na honay key barabar izafa</i>	Negligible benefit <i>na honay key barabar faeda</i>	Probably unsustainable <i>ghaliban paedar naheen</i>
<b>2</b>	No increase <i>koi izafa na hua</i>	No benefit <i>koi faeda na hua</i>	Unlikely to be sustainable <i>paedari ka imkan buhat kam hai</i>
<b>1</b>	Negative change <i>kami hoi</i>	Negative impact <i>nuqsan hua</i>	Highly unlikely to be sustainable <i>paedari ki koi umeed naheen</i>

**PART 2: CONTROL DATA**

<b>This information is not for data entry.</b>					
Enumerator's Name	Reviewed by Field Unit Leader-Initials	Quality Review in Office - Initials	Data Entered in Computer by:	Data Cleaned by - Initials	Respondent's Name/Address
Date of Interview	Date	Date	Data	Date	

**PART 3: BASIC DATA ON RESPONDENT AND HOUSEHOLD**

<b>1. District/tehsil Code</b>	1 = Gujar Khan 2 = Pindi Gheb 3 = Haripur 4 = Battagram	<b>2. Type of Respondent</b> 1 = Beneficiary 0 = Non-beneficiary	<b>3. Female or Male?</b> 1 = Female 0 = Male	<b>4. Age in years</b>  <b>5. Education in years</b>	<b>Household Members</b>	
					6. Female	7. Male
					8. Adults>18:	

*Use -9 whenever information is missing or the question is not relevant.*

<b>9. Condition of house</b>	1 = jhuggi	<b>10. Main source of lighting</b>	1 = kerosene lamp	<b>11. Main fuel for cooking</b>	1 = wood/cow dung	<b>12. Main source of water</b>	1 = river/stream
	2 = kutchra		2 = LPG cylinder		2 = kerosene/coal		2 = village pond
	3 = semi pakka		3 = natural gas		2 = LPG cylinder		3 = well/tube well
	4 = pakka		4 = electricity		4 = natural gas		4 = tap/hand pump

<b>Distance of house (in km) from nearest:</b>	<b>13. pakka road</b>		<b>Land owned in acres:</b>		<b>Percent. of income from:</b>			<b>21. Percent. of households in village who are better off than respondent:</b>
	<b>14. health facility</b>		<b>16. Total</b>	<b>17. Agric.</b>	<b>18. Agric.</b>	<b>19. Salary</b>	<b>20. Other</b>	
	<b>15. girls' school</b>							

**PART 4: ASSESSMENT OF CHANGES EXPERIENCED IN LAST 5-6 YEARS IN VARIOUS IMPACT DOMAINS**

*Use the 6-point Rating Scale for Haalat mein Tabdeeli*

**Changes in Physical and Financial Assets Owned by Respondent's Household**

<b>22. Land owned by respondent's household</b>	<b>23. Size and quality of the house</b>	<b>Household's ownership of:</b>								
		<b>24. Means of transport</b>	<b>25. Electric appliances</b>	<b>26. Farm machinery</b>	<b>27. Cows/ buffalo</b>	<b>28. Goats/ Sheep</b>	<b>29. Poultry</b>	<b>30. Fruit/ other trees</b>	<b>31. Savings / jewellery</b>	<b>32. Business assets</b>

**Changes in Income and Expenditure Levels of Respondent's Household**

<b>33. Income From agriculture</b>	<b>34. Income from salaries/wages</b>	<b>35. Income from business</b>	<b>36. Income from all sources</b>	<b>Expenditure on:</b>				
				<b>37. Total</b>	<b>38. Food</b>	<b>39. Ag inputs</b>	<b>40. Medical</b>	<b>41. Fuel/elect</b>

**Changes in Access of Respondent Household to Public Services in/around the Village**

<b>42. Roads</b>	<b>43. Health facilities</b>	<b>44. Schools for boys</b>	<b>45. Schools for girls</b>	<b>46. Drinking water</b>	<b>47. Irrigation</b>	<b>48. Electricity</b>	<b>49. Banks</b>	<b>50. Veterinary facilities</b>	<b>51. Fert. stores</b>	<b>52. Agric. Markets</b>	<b>53. Extension services</b>	<b>54. Internet outlets</b>

**Changes in the Condition of Human Assets**

<b>55. Children's health</b>	<b>56. Women's health</b>	<b>57. Girls' education</b>	<b>58. Boys' education</b>	<b>59. Women's free time</b>	<b>60. Access to information</b>

**Changes in Food Security (Production and Consumption)**

<b>61. Production Of Cereals</b>	<b>62. Production of fruit &amp; Vegetables</b>	<b>63. Production of milk</b>	<b>64. Purchase of food</b>	<b>65. Consumption of food</b>	<b>Consumption of:</b>		
					<b>66. Chicken</b>	<b>67. Milk</b>	<b>68. Vegetable</b>

**Changes in the Natural Environment of the Community**

<b>69. Disposal of solid waste</b>	<b>70. Drainage of water</b>	<b>71. Availability of clean water</b>	<b>72. Quality of air</b>	<b>73. Green areas in village</b>	<b>Overall condition of:</b>		
					<b>74. Forest</b>	<b>75. Grazing</b>	<b>76. Soils</b>

**PART 5: CHANGES WHICH BENEFICIARY THINKS ARE DUE TO THE PROJECT**  
*Use the Rating Scales for Project ka Faeda and Faeday ki Paedari, As Appropriate*  
*Enter -9 in all cells for non-beneficiaries*  
*When the project benefit rating is 2 or 1, enter -9 for paedari*

**Changes in Physical and Financial Assets Owned by Respondent's Household**

<b>77. Land owned by respondent's household</b>	<b>78. Size and quality of the house</b>	<b>Household's ownership of:</b>								
		<b>79.Means of transport</b>	<b>80.Electric appliances</b>	<b>81. Farm machinery</b>	<b>82. Cows/ buffalo</b>	<b>83. Goats/ Sheep</b>	<b>84. Poultry</b>	<b>85. Fruit/ other trees</b>	<b>86. Savings / jewellery</b>	<b>87. Business assets</b>

**Changes in Income Due to Project, and Sustainability of Impact on Income**

<b>88. Income from agriculture</b>	<b>89.Paedari</b>	<b>90. Income From Salaries/wages</b>	<b>91.Paedari</b>	<b>92. Income from business</b>	<b>93.Paedari</b>	<b>94. Income from all sources</b>	<b>95.Paedari</b>

**Changes in Public Services Due to Project, and Sustainability of Services**

<b>96. Roads</b>	<b>98. Health facilities</b>	<b>100.Schools for boys</b>	<b>102.Schools for girls</b>	<b>104.Drinking water</b>	<b>106.Irriga-tion</b>	<b>108. Electri-city</b>	<b>110. Loans</b>	<b>112.Vetnary facilities</b>	<b>114. Fert. stores</b>	<b>116. Agric. markets</b>	<b>118.Extension services</b>	<b>120. Internet outlets</b>
<b>97.Paedari</b>	<b>99.Paedari</b>	<b>101.Paedari</b>	<b>103.Paedari</b>	<b>105.Paedari</b>	<b>107.Paedari</b>	<b>109.Paedari</b>	<b>111.Paedari</b>	<b>113.Paedari</b>	<b>115.Paedari</b>	<b>117.Paedari</b>	<b>119.Paedari</b>	<b>121.Paedari</b>

**Changes in Human Assets Due to Project**

<b>122.Children's health</b>	<b>123.Women's health</b>	<b>124. Girls' education</b>	<b>125. Boys' education</b>	<b>126.Women's free time</b>	<b>127. Level of skills/crafts</b>

**Changes in Food Security (Production and Consumption) Due to Project**

<b>128. Production of cereals</b>	<b>129. Production of fruit &amp; Vegetables</b>	<b>130. Production of milk</b>	<b>131. Purchase of food</b>	<b>132. Consumption of food</b>	<b>Consumption of:</b>		
					<b>133.Chicken</b>	<b>134.Milk</b>	<b>135.Vegetable</b>

**Changes in Social Capital and Empowerment, Due to Project**

136.System of deciding village priorities	138.System of managing village schemes	140.System of managing loans/savings	142.System of managing water in village	144.System of managing forest/grazing	System of agricultural:	
					146.Marketing	148.Input supply
137.Paedari	139.Paedari	141.Paedari	143.Paedari	145.Paedari	147.Paedari	149.Paedari

150.Responsiveness of Government to community	151.Responsiveness of Government to women's problems	152.Responsiveness of community to women's problems	153.Responsiveness of community to poor people	154.Responsiveness of Government to poor people	Linkages between community and:	
					155.NGOs	156.Private sector

**Changes in Environment and Common Resource Base, Due to Project**

157.Trees and forests	158.Grazing lands	159.Productivity of soil	160.Quality of water	161.Village cleanliness	162.Protection from erosion by water