



Evaluation Summary



International
Labour
Office

Evaluation Unit

Improvement of livelihoods for vulnerable in urban and peri-urban areas of Galkayo – Midterm Evaluation

Quick Facts

Countries: Somalia

Mid-Term Evaluation Date 29th June 2013-17th July 2013

Mode of Evaluation: Independent,

ILO Office:

ILO Technical Backstopping Office:

Evaluation Manager: Kidist Chala, ILO Addis Ababa

Evaluation Consultant: Charles Munene

Project End: 1st August 2011- 31st July 2014

Project Code: SOM/10/03/EEC

Donor & Project Budget: EU (EUR 3,899,696)

Keywords: Local economic development

Background & Context

Summary of the project purpose, logic and structure

The overall objective is to provide an enabling environment for investment and public private partnership (PPP) in management of public goods and services and improvement of livelihoods in Galkayo. This is to be achieved through i) strengthening of private sector enterprises and enhancing employment opportunities and social protection through labour intensive infrastructural and environment works ii) establishment and support for public private partnerships (PPP) in management of public goods and services iii) enhancement of self employment opportunities and social protection and iv) environmental awareness and protection for sustainable use of natural resources.

Notably a vibrant and viable private sector in Somalia must lie at the core of socio-economic recovery, characterized by improved entrepreneurship and developed small and medium enterprises (SMEs) sector. The SME sector in Galkayo is weak, receives little

support and therefore does not attract investors. Businesses have little or no access to financial support. Available market infrastructure is poor, and generally disorganized. Participation by private sector in economic development of the town is low, underutilized and largely unfelt. Therefore, capacity of the market systems to create employment and wealth is low. These conditions have led to few investments and increased unemployment.

The project is funded by the European Union over an implementation period of 36 months ending 31st of July 2014. The total cost of the project is EUR 3,899,696. It is being implemented by ILO in partnership with FAO and TS. ILO is the lead agency but also is responsible for the labour intensive infrastructural and environmental works and formation of market forums. FAO is in-charge of designs, construction and or rehabilitation of meat markets and livestock markets and it is also supporting environmental awareness and protection activities. TS are supporting the establishment of PPPs in management of public goods and services and adoption of better revenue collection, accounting and information management systems by local authorities. The project is being implemented in Galkayo North and South, but environmental awareness and production interventions covered Puntland as a whole.

Present Situation of the Project The project is in the second half of a total 36 months beginning 1st August 2011 to 31st July 2014. Project interventions commenced in August 2011 with project introduction and consultations with the local authorities. Preliminary works, such as feasibility studies, pushed actual works to 2012. Rehabilitation of the main Galkayo tarmac road, construction of classic gravel road and construction of the market/production centers were prioritized implemented and completed as at 31st January 2013. Rehabilitation and extension works on the Galkayo meat

market in the North was 75 percent done as at the time of the evaluation. The Midnimo market in the south earlier identified for rehabilitation was taken up by another organization, necessitating a change. Construction of a new market in a newly identified site in the South was yet to begin, and so was the construction of two slaughter houses in the North and South.

Actual roll-out of PPPs has not been done due to delays in completion of related infrastructures (meat markets and slaughter houses). However, substantial ground work has been laid through stakeholder sensitizations and consultations. This is important in preparing the community for the new approach. Both local authorities were receiving support for the establishment of revenue collection and management systems. They have received basic IT equipments for running of Accounting Information Management System (AIMS), in addition to 2 working stations to support a Business Information Management Systems (BIMS). They also continued to receive training on the systems. Market assessments aimed at identifying local resources have been done, priority sectors (light engineering and fruit processing) identified, market forums formed in the North and South and training of the forums done by the end year 1. All planned activities in relation to environmental awareness and protection had been completed.

Changes in political personalities in both North and South caused slight delays in commencing the project activities. Further, insecurity in the South has continued to delay commencement of most activities such as construction of roads, meat markets and slaughter houses.

Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation

This is an independent mid-term evaluation which serves two purposes. First, it gives an independent assessment of the progress to date in achieving project objectives and delivery of results, strategies and implementation modalities chosen, partnership arrangements, constraints and opportunities. Secondly, it provides recommendations for the rest of the implementation period in terms of strategies and institutional arrangements.

The evaluation covered the eighteen (18) month implementation period beginning 1st August 2011 and ending 31st January 2013. The evaluation benefited from inputs from project stakeholders and staff in Nairobi, as well as field visits and consultations with stakeholders in Galkayo and Garowe. The evaluation assessed all the key outputs that have been produced since the start of the project by all implementing partners. The primary clients of the evaluation are the three implementing

partners, the donor as well as other relevant stakeholders. The evaluation process was participatory. The implementing agencies, beneficiaries, stakeholders and other parties involved in the execution of the project will use, as appropriate, the evaluation findings and lessons learnt. Any proposed changes to the project will also be discussed with and reported back to beneficiaries and stakeholders (in particular central and local authorities).

Methodology of evaluation

The evaluation employed a triangulated methodology involving review of relevant project materials¹, and field data collection using qualitative approaches. Qualitative approaches were deemed appropriate for the following reasons. First, they allow for deeper examination of issues under focus within relatively shorter time duration. Secondly, a preliminary assessment of the impact of construction works on employment had been carried out and quantitative data collected and thirdly, the volatile security situation in Galkayo limited extent of movement and interaction with community stakeholders. The field mission took place from the 14th of June to the 22nd of June 2013. Data collection was guided by a checklist of issues² that fed into the evaluation objectives. Interviews were carried out using key informant interviews and focus group discussion techniques and further complimented by actual site visits and informal discussions with beneficiaries and other stakeholders met and conveniently sampled on site. Different stakeholders were interviewed in Nairobi, Galkayo and Garowe³. Data analysis was thematically done, where findings were grouped into themes and sub-themes in line with the evaluation objectives.

The volatile security situation in Galkayo was the most significant challenge faced by the evaluation team. There were significant limitations on the extent of interaction with project beneficiaries and other local stakeholders. It was, for example, not possible to visit any project sites in South Galkayo, meaning the team did not have an opportunity to verify what was reported through actual visits, interviews with local administrators and with other stakeholders. Time allocated for the field visits was also short, which further reduced the extent of consultations done.

Main Findings & Conclusions

The project design was cognisant of the underlying context, and it responded well to the needs of project

¹ List of materials reviewed is shown in the Bibliography

² A checklist of issues that guided data collection is appended to the report

³ A more detailed list of all people interviewed is appended to this report

beneficiaries and Galkayo in general. Synergies with other existing projects from the planning stage ensured the problem was properly understood and practical and effective interventions chosen. This is complimented by involvement of stakeholders at the institutional and community levels, as evidenced by the stakeholder consultations prior to commencement of interventions. Partnership between the three organisations is strategic in ensuring effective execution of the interventions with each organisation taking responsibilities relating to their areas of expertise. Project staffs based in the field helped in technical backup while those in Nairobi supported in overall project coordination. Finally, use of labour intensive strategies resulted into immediate job creation and capacity enhancements that will surpass the project period.

Infrastructural works have resulted into, capacity building, jobs creation and establishment of new businesses ventures. In total, roads and market/production centre works created 6,642 workdays⁴ against a target of 8,800, the difference being what would have been created in the south. An additional 42 direct jobs, 48 indirect jobs and 17 induced jobs were created. Rehabilitation and extension works on the Galkayo meat market were underway at the time of this evaluation. This had, by this time, created 4,680 workdays and 156 short term jobs. Notably, creation of long term jobs and employment of women were still very low.

PPPs were yet to be operationalized owing to delays in completion of the related projects. However, both the local authorities and the community had been sensitised on the PPP concept. Consequently, a PPP committee had been formed in the South and a restricted committee in the North. Drafting of the PPP roadmap was ongoing, but drafting of PPP arrangements was pending. Even though, challenges were expected in collection and management of slaughter fee and identification of acceptable slaughter-house locations. LAs had been equipped and officers trained on Accounting Management Information Systems (AIMS) and Business Management Information Systems (BIMS). A data base of potential tax payers had been generated through a survey. Adoption of the systems however faced some resistance, and lack of commitment by the local authority in the South. These challenges are being managed through consultations.

⁴ 2,808 from classic road, 1,548 from Galkayo road and 2,286 from market/production centre

Market assessments had been done, market forums established in both North and South and both trained. However, impressions of the evaluation team based on interactions with the representatives of the market forum in the North were that, the forum substantially relied on the project for direction, meaning they were yet to fully understand and take up their roles. Their list of their priorities for example delivery vans, fridges, cooling systems, fruit cleaning equipments, and revival of the vocational training centres were ambitions with and unlikely to be met in the short-term. They will therefore need support in identification of practical and achievable interventions, laying more emphasis on locally available resources and circumstances. Over expectations from the project will lead to apathy in the activities of the forums. Interventions on environmental awareness have all been completed. These have formed a sound basis for more effective and inclusive environmental management because the laws and policies were developed on the basis of wide consultations.

The main internal factors that adversely affected the project include, delays in signing of agreements by partners which resulted in further delays in the project, coordination challenges resulting from movement of a project officer. These were resolved through consultations and recruitment of another project officer respectively. Other factors included low interest by finance officer in the North to adopt the accounting systems, and lack of all technical data required such as tariffs, investment costs and projections in meat consumption. The main external factors include the division of Galkayo into two administrative units which continues to complicate the project implementation. This has been exacerbated by the level of insecurity and political instability. Both Mayors have been changed since the project started which leads to disruptions in the flow of information and coordination of activities.

Recommendations & Lessons Learned

Main recommendations and follow-up

1. All partners will need to urgently focus their attention to South Galkayo where little has been achieved. Meat markets, slaughter houses and roads works and accounting systems need to be implemented in the South.
2. TS will need to undertake more training and stakeholder sensitization on first, the value of and implementation arrangements for the PPPs. This is based on the realization that collection and management of slaughter fee and locations of slaughter houses would still face challenges. Secondly, better understanding and appreciation of AIMS and BIMS is crucial prior

to their implementation. Resistance faced from sections of the local authority staff is mainly manifesting from the fear of the unknown.

3. The ILO will need to develop strategies that support creation of more long term jobs. This is important for sustainability of the results. Potential for this lies in opening up the infrastructural works for business, skills training, activating the market forums, and extending EIIPs in Galkayo to include regular non-technical labour intensive roads maintenance by contracted common interest groups.
4. Both ILO and FAO need to urgently establish systems and procedures that ensure employment of more women in the supported works. Light duties such as controlling of traffic and other culturally acceptable tasks can be done by women. More widely, ILO will need to ensure that jobs created meet internationally accepted standards.
5. FAO will need to forge more closer partnerships with the relevant ministries such as the Ministry of Livestock and Animal Husbandry, especially in designing and development of livestock markets, which initial assessment, based on the site visited in the North, show that they lack provisions for some key amenities such as washrooms, office, watchmen booths, and livestock feeding areas.
6. All partners should ensure that displacement of people from their working areas to pave way for infrastructure development is avoided at all costs. Where it must take place, then adequate planning should be done following wide consultations with the all stakeholders, including those to be affected by such relocation.
7. There is need to re-evaluate the project targets in light of the remaining period.

Important lessons learned

1. Active involvement of stakeholders in key to the success of a project interventions
2. Mutual agreement by all parties and proper identification of public land is essential to the development of public utilities.
3. Changes in revenue collection and management systems will be more effective and acceptable to the people when they better understand what they are likely to gain from the changes.
4. Effective coordination of projects is instrumental to the success of projects

especially when they bring together different partner organizations

5. Projects being implemented in insecure environments such as Galkayo need to have flexibility as the situation changes sporadically.
6. Labour intensive methods are effective ways of injecting cash to the community and building peoples' capacity.

Emerging Good practices

1. Use of labour intensive approaches in infrastructural development in Galkayo. The norm is use of capital intensive approaches to the detriment of job creation. It was in conformity with the laid down regulations and standards in infrastructural development, and is cost effective. This approach is candidate for a good practice.
2. Consistent involvement of the primary stakeholders; It may be easier for people to overlook the capacity of stakeholders in a situation like Galkayo. They may easily be viewed as lacking capacity to engage with the issues and treat them as passive beneficiaries. There were good efforts in most interventions to involve local institutions and other stakeholders. This improved accuracy in planning and made the implementation more efficient. It is a recipient to sustainability of the project and the same can be replicated in any other setting.
3. Mainstreaming sustainability measures in project activities. The use of local labour, capacity enhancement on a broad range of stakeholders, establishment of local level structures such as the market forums and PPPs all stand out as interventions, within the project result areas, that are not only meeting the project objectives but are also contributing to sustainability of interventions.