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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Evaluation
The final evaluation was commissioned to assess the OECD/DAC criteria relevance, efficiency, effect, impact and sustainability and to make recommendations for improvement of the next phase intervention starting April 2018.

The Intervention
Support 4360 Households which include people with disabilities living in high poverty areas of Bangladesh to lift themselves over the national poverty line. Income will be increased of moderate and extreme poor households through a disability-inclusive livelihood approach.

The Evaluation Team and Methodology
The data collection at field level has been done by the external Evaluator guided by the Project Coordinator in Kurigram Sadar and by the MEAL Manager in Sitakunda target areas. The methodological approach was based on assessing monitoring data (baseline and endline) and qualitative techniques, such as key informant interviews or group discussions with project staff, local officials and beneficiaries, leaders of the three Main Partner Organisations, and representatives of several Disabled People’s Organisations (DPO) - including one workshop with representatives 15 DPOs to assess their benefit collaborating with Handicap International (H.I.) and the lessons learned during the project implementation using a ‘WIKI’ survey approach. This collected data was used for the analysis, after a careful review of existing documents and consultation with former and current H.I. technical advisors, resulting in this report.

THE MAIN FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Relevance
The intervention logic and theory of change were fully aligned with the needs of the target groups, and UK AID’s, Handicap International’s and the country’s development strategies.

Efficiency
The project has made use of financial, material and human resources in a most efficient, economic and effective manner resulting in a high level of Value for Money. Implementation practices, especially the graduation process from extreme poverty, were based on previous projects and have been proved to be appropriate in other target areas and scalable in the Bangladesh conditions. The collaboration with DPOs and Mainstreaming Partners was efficient in joining efforts to lift additional households with disabled members out of extreme poverty while building institutional and technical skills among DPO staff and volunteers, and Partners’ field staff.

Effectiveness
The intervention has achieved all its intended outcomes and realised targets to a high degree: 98% of extreme poor beneficiary households in Kurigram Sadar have graduated to a poor status, and 100% of extreme poor beneficiary households which had graduated to a poor status during the previous project (SHIREE) in Sitakunda Upazilla have now reached a non-poor status. Capacity of 16 DPOs have been increased to a level that they are confident and able to advocate successfully for disabled people’s rights in their operational areas. Awareness and inclusion of disability in concept and policies among the three mainstreaming Partners has been increased and rehabilitation coaching skills built of their field staff.

Impact & Sustainability
The evaluation mission is confident that many if not most of the achievements will last, if perhaps not to the extent now realised. However, in case, as is the planning, project follow-up will continue for the next several years to assist recent graduates to move from poor to non poor the extent of the achievements will most likely increase and the sustainability rate will also be higher. This will also be likely
the case for the capacity building of DPOs and the embedding of the disability inclusion concept at mainstreaming Partners.

Table 1: Scale of Evaluation Criteria Fulfilled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High: 1) proper problem and needs assessment; 2) fair selection of beneficiaries, with priority for women; 3) good intervention logic</td>
<td>Good: 1) high VfM rates; 2) good application of policies, e.g. on gender; 3) appropriate use of innovative practices, e.g. MIW</td>
<td>High: 1) 98% graduation out extreme poverty and 85% graduation out of poverty; 2) awareness of disability inclusiveness at 3 Partners fully achieved – however, still needed support to put this in action; 3) intended level of capacity achieved at DPOs</td>
<td>Strong Potential for 1) graduating upwards for great majority of beneficiaries; 2) increased capacity of DPOs; 3) strengthened disability inclusion among Mainstream Partners</td>
<td>Strong Likelihood for 1) continued income increase and diversification; 2) continued improvement of women’s empowerment; 3) strengthened disability inclusion policies at Partners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATIONS

The project has scored high on all evaluation criteria – relevance, efficiency, effect, impact and sustainability and there are thus few if any recommendations that can be made to improve management, operation or policies. The following points are therefore more suggestions than recommendations for an even more efficient and effective approach.

Table 2: Summary of Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Primary Addressee</th>
<th>Method of implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. REPLICATION POTENTIAL</strong></td>
<td>Handicap International &amp; Partners</td>
<td>1) identification of additional suitable mainstreaming partners in target areas currently not targeted by H.I.; 2) negotiation with motivated candidate partners what they can contribute; 3) submission of a proposal to potential donors; 4) include a pilot programme to test the scale-up potential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. EMBEDDED REHABILITATION OFFICERS/ ACTION</strong></td>
<td>Project with Mainstreaming Partners</td>
<td>1) negotiation with the current partners what they can contribute in the next phase; 2) reaching an agreement on conditions such as time periods and contribution levels; and 3) documenting this in a memorandum of understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. RISK FUNDS</strong></td>
<td>Project with Risk Fund Groups</td>
<td>1) reaching consensus among group members about the need for such an emergency buffer fund; 2) using HI’s operational guide to set up the rules for operation in case of such emergency; and 3) guarantee by the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reasonable interest should be charged for the benefit of the group fund.

| 4. MONITORING AND INDICATORS | It is suggested to include qualitative studies, like KAP in the monitoring process during the implementation for updating on changed attitudes and practices. | Project with Donors | 1) to establish for which kind of practices more understanding is needed; 2) to define the study method and who would conduct the study when; 3) to prepare a ToR for this study including how the results will be used. |
| It is also suggested to simplify the baseline and endline assessments to the data that would likely be needed during the final evaluation, which usually is outcome based. | Project with Technical Advisor(s) | 1) to establish which indicators used at the current project have been of little or no value for management or evaluation; 2) to interact with the donor about the removal of indicators deemed of little added value; 3) to prepare a guide for baseline and endline on data collection and processing tools. |
| It is also suggested to keep track of the graduation data for performance-improvement purposes, but to use locally applicable tools and language so that field staff who not speak English well can properly apply these tools. | Project with field teams | 1) to re-define which data is most essential to keep track of progress towards graduation; 2) to establish at which intervals such data would need to be collected; 3) to assess who best could get such data (not to forget thinking about the beneficiaries themselves); 4) to make a plan of action with guidelines. |
| 5. INSTITUTIONAL MEMORY | Include in the Monitoring & Evaluation Plan a list of documents to be kept available for external reviewers and evaluators, and update this list and the document source during the implementation. | Project Managers | 1) to include in the monitoring plan an action to list and store relevant project documents; 2) to keep this list and storage updated; 3) to make these documents available to reviewers. |
1. **INTRODUCTION**

1.1 **THE EVALUATION**

Handicap International or as now called Humanity & Inclusion (HI) is an independent and impartial aid organisation working in situations of poverty and exclusion, conflict and disaster. The organisation works alongside people with disabilities and vulnerable populations, taking action and bearing witness in order to respond to their essential needs, improve their living conditions and promote respect for their dignity and fundamental rights. HI promotes an inclusive approach by focusing on access to services “for all” whenever possible rather than developing specific actions for vulnerable groups including people with disabilities. HI has been operating in Bangladesh since 1997 and the programme key focuses are on rehabilitation, disaster risk reduction, promoting disability rights, economic development and/or livelihood etc. HI - Bangladesh first piloted the disability-inclusive poverty graduation model during 2011-2014, funded by DFID/ SHIREE, and refined the model under DFID’s Global Poverty Action Fund (GPAF) between the year 2015-18. HI - Bangladesh is going to implement phase-3 of the disability-inclusive graduation model from April 2018 to March 2022.

1.1.1 **PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION**

The purpose of the final evaluation as stated in the terms of reference (ToR) is ‘to assess the project implemented by HI according to the criteria defined in the ToR, identifying good practices and providing recommendations for the follow-up project starting in April 2018’. The findings from this evaluation will guide the project implementation team to better define the operational strategy for the next phase.

The following main questions guided the evaluation:

a. **To assess the changes, effectiveness, relevance & efficiency of the project by:**
   - Evaluate the changes (impact, effects) and effectiveness, including against the indicators developed in the project logframe, particularly output, outcome and impact level indicators comparing with baseline status;
   - Measuring the relevance and efficiency of the intervention aligned with project objectives.

b. **To assess the capacities of projects’ relevant stakeholders for its’ sustainability:**
   - Assess the level of cooperation the project established with relevant project stakeholders and partner and ensured their participation;
   - Identify the level of capacity of existing DPOs/Self-Help Groups, government departments with their roles in the community to take the responsibilities in absence of HI;
   - Identify the level of inclusiveness and ownership of mainstream partners, INGOs, DPOs and relevant institutional stakeholders.

The ToR included a total of 41 questions organised under each of the five OECD/DAC evaluation criteria (Relevance, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Impact and Sustainability). These questions have been answered in the Findings Section of this report with some questions moved to another than the original criterion if this seemed more relevant, and combined with other findings of the evaluation. For clarity most of the specific questions have been put in a box pointing to the section with the finding that gives the most relevant answer.

1.1.2 **POLICY CONTEXT**

Handicap International (H.I.) promotes an inclusive approach by focusing on access to services “for all” whenever possible rather than developing specific actions for vulnerable groups including people with disabilities. HI has been operating in Bangladesh since 1997 and the programme key focuses are on rehabilitation, disaster risk reduction, promoting disability rights, economic development and/or livelihood etc. HI, Bangladesh first piloted the disability-inclusive poverty graduation model during 2011-2014, funded by DFID/ SHIREE, and refined the model under DFID’s Global Poverty Action Fund (GPAF) between the year 2015-18. HI Bangladesh is going to implement phase-3 of the disability-inclusive graduation model from April 2018 to March 2022.
1.1.3 THE EVALUATION TEAM

Evaluator - Mr. John Vijghen

Mr. Vijghen has a degree in Cultural Anthropology and conducted many studies, evaluations and other assignments and evaluations in Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar, Thailand, Vietnam, the Philippines and more Asian countries related to community development, disability, health care, social inclusion, education and especially on child protection issues, including aspects of migration, human trafficking and child exploitation, rural development and poverty alleviation, and juvenile justice. Mr. Vijghen is fluent in Dutch, English, German, fair in French and understands Khmer. The Evaluator was not assisted by a national consultant but accompanied by HI headquarter staff who acted as guides and translators. Because both staff did not work directly at the project locations their presence during the fact finding process was not deemed a bias; actually, the presence of this informed staff made the data collection process more substantial as they could point out issues and practices. Mr. Vijghen has in the past often conducted project evaluations in this manner without assistance.

Guide for Kurigram – Mr. Rashidul Islam, Project Coordinator
Guide for Chittagong – Mr. Shakhawat Hossian, MEAL Manager

1.1.4 STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT

Above we have described the purpose, scope and focus of the evaluation with any limitations in the data collection process, the intervention activities under review, its logic and assumptions, and the policy context. The next chapter describes the intervention under review with its logic, indicators and other information. The following chapter describes the methodology of the evaluation which includes the field visit schedule (annex X), the methods used for data collection and the kind and number of respondents, and any problems to get relevant data encountered. In the following chapter the findings will be presented for each of the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria (Relevance, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Impact and Sustainability). Although DFID’s recommended report structure puts Effectiveness before Efficiency we have opted to reverse this order following the OECD/DAC recommended order which also fits better the flow of the report. The last two chapters are Conclusions with achievements summarised followed by the Recommendation chapter.

1.2 THE INTERVENTION UNDER REVIEW

Handicap International (Humanity & Inclusion or HI) implements the project to be evaluated, which aims to increase income of 4,360 poor/extreme poor households, having at least one person with disability, with a focus on reducing sub-national and target-group specific income disparities in achieving relevant sustainable development goal (SDG) targets. Direct beneficiaries are supported on a graduation pathway which will empower them to pull themselves out of poverty, with measurable impact during the project time-frame. The target groups of poor/extreme poor households, including people with disabilities will move to a higher income stratum, depending on their initial status, along with improving functional autonomy and social participation. Those in extreme poverty will increase income levels, moving above the national extreme poverty line of about $1/day, with reference also to the BRAC Graduation criteria.

Project target areas are in Kurigram Sadar Upazilla in Kurigram district and in Sitakunda Upazilla in Chittagong district. The project follows three modes of implementation, mirrored in the three outputs:

- Direct implementation in collaboration with Disabled People’s Organisations (DPO);
- Mainstreaming disability into Mainstream Partners’ livelihood projects/activities;
- DPO capacity development and contributing to the sustainability of the action of the model.

1.2.1 LOGIC OF THE PROJECT STRUCTURE

HI identified major challenges for inclusiveness of persons with a disability and devised an intervention which expects the desired change for persons with a disability in income status and quality of life though livelihood generation inputs and skill development. Mainstreaming the inclusion of persons with a disability in three Partner Organisations’ livelihood generation projects and capacitating 16 DPOs should also result in higher income and improved quality of life for people with a disability in the respective target areas of the Main Partners and DPOs. The project defined one outcome through three outputs:
Table 3: Description of the expected outcome and outputs of the intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project goal</th>
<th>Reduced poverty for poor rural and peri-urban people living in Bangladesh (contributing to SDG 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>People with disabilities and their family members living in poverty and extreme poverty are able to increase their income and graduate out of poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 1</td>
<td>Targeted HHs including people with disabilities in Sitakunda/ Kurigram Sadar are engaged in disability-inclusive graduation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 2</td>
<td>Households including people with disabilities among the target groups of mainstream development organizations benefit from a disability-inclusive livelihood model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 3</td>
<td>The capacity of Disabled Peoples Organizations is developed to facilitate access to livelihood and build towards a future sustainability mechanism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: these texts have been copied from the recent developed intervention logic flow chart and might differ from the original text in proposal or logical framework, although the meaning remains the same.

1.2.2 COMMENTS ON INTERVENTION LOGIC AND PROJECT PROPOSAL

The project design document follows the UK AID’s template for proposals, which is not standard conform the OECD/DAC in terms of goal, objectives, outcomes and outputs. However, once the essential descriptions are lifted from the various template sections an intervention logic emerges which seems clear and logical:

The goal of the project is: To support 4360 Households which include people with disabilities living in high poverty areas of Bangladesh to lift themselves over the national poverty line. Income will be increased of moderate and extreme poor households through a disability-inclusive livelihood approach.

This action presents 4 components: (1) sustaining HI’s SHIREE project outputs through follow up of previous beneficiaries to avoid fall back; (2) replicating an improved project approach in a neighbouring area with high needs; (3) scaling up the previous project phase using the SHIREE model to set disability-inclusive benchmarks and mainstreaming these within development organisations; (4) setting in place a country-wide sustainability mechanism by supporting DPOs as an entry point to access people with disabilities.

Three outputs are intended:

- **Output 1: Direct implementation in collaboration with DPOs.**

Output 1 will follow a direct implementation approach in Sitakunda and Kurigram Sadar upazilla’s in collaboration with DPOs to address immediate needs, while further honing the technical expertise of HI in operationalising the disability-livelihood linkage. 2 DPOs will be selected in Sitakunda/Kurigram Sadar to shadow and build a collaborative partnership with HI;

The following relevant DfID indicators are listed in the Proposal:

- % change in proportion of rural population below national poverty line;
- Proportion of households with increased knowledge and skills in disaster preparedness and response;
- % of citizens access to (health; education; security and justice) services.

However, the first and third indicator are not realistic as the addressed target population is very small compared to the total rural population, while also national statistics are unreliable. Only the second indicator is therefore measured in this report.

- **Output 2: Mainstreaming.**

Output 2 will follow a mainstreaming approach, building capacity of 4 development organisations¹ to apply HI’s disability-inclusive graduation model and permit people with disabilities to have the same success rate in income generation as others; and scale up this model using mainstream development organisations. 10 DPOs will be selected in Rajshahi division, supporting development organisations in operationalising a referral mechanism for people with disabilities.

---

¹ Collaboration with one Partner was ended during Year two because of a non-compatible livelihood strategy.
The following relevant DfID indicator is listed in the Proposal:
- % of CSO staff understand their role/ are trained;

> **Output 3: DPO capacity development.**

Output 3 will develop DPO capacity to guarantee the model’s sustainability and will focus on conducting a capacity development process of DPOs to generate a sustainability mechanism for project outputs. 4 DPOs in addition to the 2 and 10 DPOs for outputs 1 and 2, will be selected based on pre-established criteria, their needs will be assessed and a capacity development plan will be defined and implemented through formal and on the job training.

The following relevant DfID indicator is listed in the Proposal:
- % of CSO staff understand their role/ are trained.

### 1.2.3 OUTCOME LEVEL INDICATORS

The following outcome level indicators are included in the logical framework. These indicators have been measured throughout and by the end of the project lifetime and are compared with the data collected during the baseline survey to establish the change achieved. The table below lists each indicator in the first column with the Evaluator’s comment in regard of the SMART’ness of the indicator in the third column:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr*</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Comment by Evaluator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Graduation from poverty</td>
<td>The indicator is measuring a main achievement of the project, is <strong>clear and informative</strong>. The project has kept track of the number of graduates. However, this graduation criterion should not apply to those beneficiary households which do not have any capacity to sustain in their own living (e.g. sole elderly).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Number and percentage of (Extreme) poor households that have graduated from (extreme) poverty according to the disability-inclusive graduation index</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Number and percentage of households with members with disabilities supported by mainstream development organisations and DPOs that have improved their income status</td>
<td>The indicator measures an achievement which is not due to inputs/efforts of the project. Therefore, a measurement of the <strong>increase</strong> of disabled beneficiaries in proportion to the total number of beneficiaries since the cooperation began is more informative about the projects’ actual contribution. The part of the indicator in <em>italics</em> should be deleted or better defined if used for future projects (without threshold the indicator is meaningless).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Percentage of girls and women reporting an increase in their self-esteem compared to their self-assessed baselines</td>
<td>The project has no special or particular activities to increase girls/women’s self-esteem. Therefore, even if an increase is measured no causal link can be claimed. However, the project provided training and individual counselling, and other support to women and girls which likely improved their self-esteem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Number and percentage of households that have at least 2 positive disaster coping strategy in place</td>
<td>The project has no special or particular activities on disaster coping strategies. Therefore, even if an increase is measured no causal link can be claimed. The team leader of Kurigram area noted in his Annual report 2017-18 that there were: ‘<a href="http://example.com">not specific tasks and budget for Education, Water &amp; Sanitation and disaster preparedness’</a>. However, using the awareness raising fund, the project provided sessions on disaster preparedness and strategies to protect assets from natural disaster.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2 SMART stands for Systematic, Measurable, Appropriate, Realistic and Time bound.
## 1.2.4 IMPLEMENTATION APPROACH

The direct beneficiaries have received personalized social support, which includes access to livelihood, rehabilitation, social protection and psycho-social services. To ensure changes are envisaged at a sufficient scale and in a sustainable way, HI has engaged in a collaborative partnership with three mainstream development organizations to build on their existing networks, while deepening a territorial approach in Sitakund/Kurigram and using DPOs as key actors able to accompany people with disabilities through the graduation approach.

The project follows three modes of implementation, mirrored in the three outputs:

1. Direct implementation in collaboration with DPOs;
2. Mainstreaming disability into mainstream partners’ livelihood projects/activities;
3. DPO capacity development and contributing to the sustainability of the action of the model.

The 36-month timeframe of the current project is linked to the duration of the graduation cycle for several waves of beneficiaries, as per interventions implemented in comparable geographic areas. Output 1 will follow a direct implementation approach in Sitakund Upazila under Chittagong District and in Kurigram Sadar Upazila under Kurigram District in collaboration with DPOs to address immediate needs.

---

**Graph 1: Graduation from Extreme Poverty**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>Increase in Disability-inclusive Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Change in practices of targeted mainstream development organisations based on disability inclusive dimensions including participation in decision-making, recognition of diversity, tailored approaches and removal of barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The indicator is measuring a main achievement of the project, is <strong>clear and informative</strong>. However, the project claims to have kept track of the changes during the project implementation, but this has not been included in annual progress reports. Therefore, any change found or reported by the mainstream organisations during the evaluation could not be validated by the Evaluation or other independent sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Level of achievement of capacity development milestones by Disabled Peoples Organisations and the strength of their relationship with key external stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The indicator is measuring a main achievement of the project, is <strong>clear and informative</strong>. However, the project claims to have kept track of the changes during the project implementation, but this has not been included in annual progress reports. Therefore, any change found or reported by the Disabled Peoples Organisations during the evaluation could not be validated by the Evaluation or other independent sources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*the number refers to the list used in the projects’ logical framework, final version.*
At the same time, the technical expertise of HI will be further developed in operationalizing the disability-livelihood linkage to scale up this model through the three mainstream development organizations (output 2) and develop DPO capacity to guarantee the model’s sustainability (output 3). (See Graduation Model graphic above).

The intervention applies HI’s personalized social support approach to livelihoods, whereby people with disabilities are supported to:

a) Identify their strengths, rights, skills and interests;

b) Define and prioritize their needs;

c) Formulate and implement household/business plans.

Two DPOs are acting as collaborative partners of HI in the two direct implementation areas, shadowing HI staff, to guide them towards sustaining project outputs in the future. In the direct implementation areas the project employs Community Livelihood Workers (CLW) at the community level to support and assist the beneficiary households. The 16 CLWs are supervised by the respective field teams in the implementing areas and are working and monitoring closely and frequently with the community and beneficiaries’ households.

**1.2.5 Key Assumptions and Risks of the Project**

The following assumptions and risks were identified by the project of which all were validated during the fieldwork phase; no additional risks did emerge during the implementation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5: Validation of assumptions and risks identified by the project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assumption or Risk Identified in the Design</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural disasters impact on the implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited transport infrastructure makes access to services difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taboos/misconceptions lead to persons with disabilities being hidden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women unable to access services or participate due to social and cultural taboos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political instability limits movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities are not interested in participating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream organisations are not engaged in disability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1.2.6 Implementing Agencies**

**Handicap International in Bangladesh**

Component 1 (Direct Implementation with DPOs) is implemented by HI in Kurigram Sadar Upazilla, Kurigram district and Sitakunda Upazilla, Chittagong district. One DPO in each target area collaborates with HI. The field team in Kurigram Sadar is composed of 14 staff, not including a DPO Capacity Development Project Officer who is based in Dhaka. A majority of staff and the team leader is with HI since start of the project in 2015. The interaction by the Evaluator with the team seems to demonstrate competency and motivation to improve the lives of the project beneficiaries.

The field team in Sitakunda is composed of 14 staff who in majority are with the project or H.I. since start of the first phase project (SHIREE) in 2015, except for the Mainstream Rehabilitation Officer and the Psycho-
social Counsellor who, while based in Kurigram - shares time in Sitakunda; he joined the team only recently. Also this team seems competent and demonstrated a strong motivation to help disabled people (See the Organigram below for details in staff composition).

Four Disability Officers (recently renamed Rehabilitation Officers) are embedded with the Mainstream Partners supervised by the Mainstreaming Project Manager.

![Organigram of Project Staffing](image)

**Figure 1: Organigram of Project Staffing**

**Disabled Peoples Organisations**

A total of 16 DPOs are selected to collaborate with the project (See Annex D for the list). Two DPOs operate in each of the projects’ direct implementation areas, five DPOs are operating in the three mainstream Partners’ target areas and nine DPOs operate in other geographical locations, including hard to reach areas. The project hold regular meetings with and provide training to the whole group of DPOs, in that manner not only furthering the project’s objectives but also building a network of DPOs which share different experiences.

The DPO named **Kurigram Protibondhi Kallayan Sangstha** (KPKS) is the direct counterpart of H.I. in Kurigram Sadar. They have experience of advocating for healthcare, education and social safety of persons with a disability. The DPO named **Federation of DPOs Sitakunda (FoDS)** is the direct counterpart of H.I. in Sitakunda. They have experience to advocate with employers and local government at the Upazilla level to train on livelihood skills and ensure free health services for disables peoples.

**Mainstreaming Partners**

are Islamic Relief, operating in Rangpur and Thakurgaon Districts and Helvetas operating in Gaibandha District, both like Kurigram part of Rangpur Division. Young Power in Social Action (YPSA) operates in the whole of Chittagong District.

**ISLAMIC RELIEF WORLDWIDE** is an independent humanitarian and development organisation. Founded in 1984, with headquarters based in Birmingham, UK, we have a presence in 44 countries. Inspired by Islamic values, they support the world’s most vulnerable people in the fight against poverty and suffering. Islamic relief do this regardless of race, political affiliation, gender or belief, and without expecting anything in return. Islamic Relief has been working in Bangladesh since 1991, when they provided emergency relief and supported communities to rebuild in the wake of a devastating cyclone. Since then, they have expanded their programmes to focus on both humanitarian and development challenges. These include addressing livelihoods, food security and community development – as well as child protection and welfare, health and nutrition, water and sanitation, education, disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation.
HELVETAS is an international network of independent affiliate member organisations working in the field of development cooperation and emergency response. As a network, it promotes the fundamental rights of individuals and groups and strengthens governments and other duty bearers in their service provision. This vision is the basis for mission to help disadvantaged men, women and communities in developing countries. HELVETAS works in more than 30 countries in Africa, Asia, Latin America and Eastern Europe in the domains of water & infrastructure, environment & climate change, rural economy, skill development & education, and governance & peace. In Bangladesh, HELVETAS started in 2000 with initiatives in the fields of sustainable land use and natural resource management. Besides improving rural livelihoods through direct support to agriculture, horticulture and animal husbandry, interventions today also address good governance through local government structures, the development of value chains and rural markets as well as issues around water.

**YOUNG POWER IN SOCIAL ACTION**: Being inspired by the spirit of the International Youth Year some socially conscious youths of Sitakunda Upazilla under Chittagong District of Bangladesh began to motivate and organize the youth community to establish a development organization resulting in 1985 in YPSA. The national NGO envisions a society without poverty where everyone’s basic needs and rights are ensured. YPSA exists to participate with the poor and vulnerable population to bring about their own and society’s sustainable development. YPSA operates in all Upazilla’s in Chittagong District.

### 2 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The methodological approach is based on the evaluation criteria of the OECD/DAC with a mixed-quantitative and qualitative methodology. The project conducted a baseline survey soon after start of the project and concluded an endline survey during the final month of the project. The Evaluator got the tabulated data of base- and endlines for each target area and measured the change for a majority of the indicators. A thorough document review of relevant project related reports and studies has been done to prepare for the fieldwork and analysis parts of the evaluation. A two-week in-country field visit has been conducted with four days in Kurigram Sadar and three days in Sitakunda, followed by a workshop with 15 DPOs using a WIKI-survey approach (participant DPOs prepared each a list of what they thought were most pertinent questions; those questions which scored highest during a plenary debate were given to each DPO for answering). Finally, a HQ project team meeting was arranged to be briefed on the field visits and to clarify issues.

#### 2.1 DATA COLLECTION METHODS

The methods used for the in-country evaluation have been interviews, focus group discussions and observations. A half-day workshop with DPO representatives was conducted to inform the evaluation mission about practices, achievements and capacity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Document review of 52 project related writings and 7 other relevant reports</td>
<td><strong>Review</strong> of all available and relevant documents pertaining to the project covering the April 2015 – March 2018 period, relevant policy and/or strategic documents regarding inclusive disability, disability policies in the country and study of statistical data and/or other documents, such as project completion report, training manuals or monitoring information, and base/endline survey data obtained during the fieldwork phase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 12 Key Informant &amp; 7 Group Interviews</td>
<td><strong>Semi-structured interviews</strong> have been conducted with project staff, stakeholders, beneficiaries, local government officials and service providers, or technical advisors during the fieldwork mission or analysis phase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 2 Briefing &amp; De-briefing Meetings</td>
<td><strong>Orientation briefing</strong> has been conducted in Bangladesh at start of the fieldwork phase with project staff and HI representatives. A <strong>debriefing</strong> meeting has been conducted at the end of the fieldwork phase HI representatives. <strong>Briefing and debriefing meetings</strong> have been held with the Field staff of the two target areas at the start and end of the target area field missions to obtain project information and validate certain findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 Focus Group Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7 Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7 Case stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Project Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1 DPO Workshop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Respondents and Sample Selection**

The project areas were in two Districts each in one *Upazilla*, namely Kurigram Sadar and Sitakunda. The main purpose of the field visits was to meet with the field teams, with elected local government officers and/or elected entities, with collaborating DPOs and to talk with several beneficiaries and observe their situation. The purpose to meet with:

- the field team members was to assess their capacity, motivation and practices;
- elected local government officers and/or elected entities was to assess their disability inclusion measures and motivation to provide access to public services for persons with a disability;
- collaborating DPOs was to assess their role, actions and capacity to assist people with disabilities;
- beneficiaries was to assess success and failure factors for the graduation process, but also to get a direct feeling of the benefit of the project activities for the beneficiaries.

After arrival, the Evaluator requested the field team leader to group all office-based staff together for a briefing on their roles, tasks and capacity. He was also requested to make appointments with elected local government officers and/or elected entities and/or service providers and with the collaborating DPO. Further, he was asked to select two to three beneficiaries to be visited during the three-day visit period. This latter selection should include one successful case and one not successful case of graduation from extreme poor to poor. In Kurigram Sadar and in Sitakunda this resulted in three case stories of which one was an example of a case were the beneficiary would not have a chance to graduate out of extreme poverty through income generation due to lack of capacity (e.g. alone-living elderly lady with severe mobility constraints or elderly mother with mentally challenged teenage daughter). Each of these six cases are discussed in the findings part of this report.

**2.2 Data Analyses**

The data analysis has applied a mix of qualitative and quantitative methods. The interpretation of field visit data has been partly validated through a meeting with Dhaka-based project staff at the last field mission day whereby preliminary findings and conclusions were presented and debated. Baseline and endline monitoring data of the complete beneficiary population will be compared to measure the change for the sets of indicators for each target area (Kurigram Sadar and Sitakunda) by the Evaluator. Information obtained during the field visits or from other sources, like progress reports, will be checked against the monitoring data.

During the evaluation the current DFID’s 4E approach to VfM\(^3\) has been introduced, whereby:

E1 = Economy: degree to which inputs are purchased in the right quantity and at the right price.
E2 = Efficiency: degree to which outputs are delivered efficiently (considering time and cost-efficiency).
E3 = Effectiveness: degree of quality of the intervention (considering time and cost-effectiveness).
E4 = Equity: degree to which the results of the intervention are equitably distributed.

---

\(^3\) VfM data is only useful if it is analysed and reported in a timely and appropriate fashion and feeds into the overall programme management. It should not be seen as a separate activity but an integral part of programme monitoring. The calculations here presented are only examples to illustrate the VfM approach but should not been seen as representative for the actual overall VfM of the project.
The project field team in Sitakunda was instructed to make several calculations to establish the VfM degree of some intervention practices. Unfortunately, as they were not used to this method, only one calculation was received by the Evaluator, which nevertheless demonstrated the added value by the inputs.

2.3 Methodological Limitations

The main limitation is due to the inability to visit a representative sample of beneficiaries or those which are not selected by the field teams. The few cases visited or the selection of these cases by the field teams might have resulted in biased findings, although the Evaluator has the impression that this is not the case in any of the visited areas. Another limitation is finding examples for a Value for Money (VfM) approach. In Kurigram Sadar the field team was questioned by the Evaluator to demonstrate how VfM could be proved; in Sitakunda the field team was asked to provide two VfM examples. However, as these teams are not used to apply the 4E’s VfM approach their contributions are limited.

Another limitation is the lack of in-depth reporting on implementation mechanisms and practices. The requirements by the donor in this respect are limited and restricted by the mandatory template for annual reporting but nevertheless include some narrative reporting. However, the quarterly reports and annual compilations for each component (direct implementation, mainstreaming partners and DPOs) list the achievements in terms of targets and include a list of ‘lessons learnt’ or ‘challenges’ but do not include any narrative about the implementation. The reports also not describe in more detail what each lesson meant in terms of implementation and whether the lesson has resulted in adjusted practices; similarly for the challenges it is not described in the report what the effect was on the actual implementation. This lack of narrative about the implementation has a negative effect on the depth of the evaluation reporting in terms of efficiency.

3 Evaluation Findings

3.1 Relevance

The intervention logic and implicit theory of change of the project was based on prior project experiences and on the existing national strategy for inclusion of disadvantaged or minority groups, including Persons with Disabilities (PwD).

All assumptions determined at the start of the project were valid to a large extend:

- **Disability-inclusive graduation model can be replicated/scaled-up**: the fact that the Mainstream Partners adopted the model proved this.
- **Political instability does not prevent implementation of activities**: The fact that the project could operate without interference proved this.
• **Mainstream Partners** are willing and able to participate in the project, to provide data and to track disability indicators: the fact that they did so proves the point.

• **Disabled Peoples Organisations (DPO)** are operational in the target areas and willing to participate in capacity development processes: DPOs were working in the H.I.’s and the Main Partners’ target areas but had limited access to Hard2Reach areas as planned. All DPOs participated in the projects’ capacity building activities.

• **Existence of livelihood opportunities for people with disabilities and their family members to increase their incomes:** finding opportunities has been a bigger challenge in Kurigram Sadar than in Chittagong due to the better economic prospects in that area.

• **Positive impact of the project on women’s and girls’ empowerment:** the relevant indicators proved this.

### 3.1.1 Needs Assessment

| Extent to which the objectives are consistent with beneficiaries’ requirements, country’s needs and priorities of DPOs & Partners |

Needs of the persons with a disability, DPOs and the projects’ Partner Organisations have been properly identified as demonstrated by the respondents met during the evaluation. Project beneficiaries met said to have been benefitted much by the projects’ support, both in terms of income generation and in coping with their disability, including linking with public or NGO service providers and provision of assistive devices.

DPO management and volunteers met expressed their satisfaction with the capacity building activities received through the project. This fits with the monitoring data obtained by the project through the satisfaction surveys conducted by the project in April 2017 in all target areas.

The Mainstreaming Partners described the cooperation with the project and H.I. as very fruitful for their organisation and benefitting people with disabilities in their target areas. Although the concept of disability inclusion was known by all three agencies, the cooperation has made it more directly clear that poor persons with a disability or poor households with a disabled member should be prioritised by their projects. The embedded Rehabilitation Officer facilitated that their project staff knew how to instruct able household members in providing rehabilitation treatments to their disabled members, but also how to instruct them with other coping mechanisms.

### 3.1.2 Coherence and Logic

The project intervention was coherent and logically sequenced with a start-up period and a transition phase. The theory of change of the project links inputs like livelihood generation assets with skill development and rehabilitation treatment which in turn builds self-confidence through which the beneficiaries are able to sustain themselves and participate in their community. The project defined the root problem as: ‘Income-related needs are high for people with disabilities, with project data showing employment skill needs at over 75% and rehabilitation needs which limit capacity to engage in employment at 52%. Data indicates lower income increases for female-headed households. […] The quality of rehabilitation care in Bangladesh is very low and its absence prevents income increases – as rehabilitation is a gateway to accessing employment or increasing income (p.8).’

The proposed target area was changed – in agreement with the donor - prior to the implementation from including the neighbouring Upazilla of Sitakunda to moving to Kurigram Sadar Upazilla in Kurigram district of Rangpur division. The main argument was the better opportunity to test the graduation model: ‘If direct implementation for the purposes of refining this model remains in Chittagong division, it does not necessarily show that the model has scale-up potential in other areas of Bangladesh. Therefore the model should be tested in another division of Bangladesh (IMP-04-PL-1819 GPAF Grant Set-Up submission form, p18).’
An evaluation of alternative geographic areas was carried out by Handicap International in Bangladesh in November 2014. The criteria for selection were as follows: (i) prevalence of extreme poverty (ii) Prevalence of disability (iii) Existence of potential DPO collaborative partners (iv) Level of access to services and social protection (v) Vulnerability to disaster. Based on the prevalence of extreme poverty, Kurigram district was selected on the basis of reference documents and interviews with INGOs operational in the area. Kurigram district is in addition one of the districts included in the proposal to DFID, as part of the intervention with mainstream development organisations. Following this, the three upazillas with the highest prevalence of extreme poverty (Nageswari, Ullipur and Kurigram Sadar) were assessed by an assessment team, including a physiotherapist and an occupational therapist, according to the criteria, through a field visit, including meetings with local authorities, service providers and beneficiaries. Very few organisations have existing disability data and the available local government data is not accurate, which shows an even greater need for the intervention of Handicap International in the area and limited the accurate assessment of this criteria. However, as a result of the assessment Kurigram Sadar was selected as the most appropriate area for intervention. Although all had high rates of poverty, Kurigram Sadar was the only Upazilla with an existing DPO upon which to build sustainability mechanisms (ibid).

The proposed and applied operational approach and strategies has been vindicated by the nearly maximal graduation out of extreme poverty rates (98%) and has thus been appropriate to achieve the intended outcomes.

The logical framework includes many indicators at activity (output) and few at objective (outcome) level (see for comments to the latter category table 2). The project has measured all these indicators which were to a certain extent useful for project management, but only a relative small number have been useful to measure achievements (See section Effectiveness below).

3.1.3 Strategic Alignment

The intervention is in line with the disability sector strategy of the government of Bangladesh and the country’s current policies regarding disability inclusion, such as the Disability Rights and Protection Act (2013) and with the provisions on disability in the Sixth Five Years Plan on Accelerating Growth and Reducing Poverty which aims to improve both disability prevention and treatment of persons with disabilities. The strategy points out the need for inclusiveness of PwD in livelihood generation activities, among others. The project noted in their second year’s progress report: ‘Putting into practice the commitment to ‘leave no one behind’, the project aims at ensuring that every individual can enjoy rights and opportunities by supporting extremely and moderate poor households, with a particular attention to the inclusion of people with disabilities, and vulnerable women (p.x)’.

The project is also fully aligned with UK AID’s and UK Government strategies and priorities regarding disability in humanitarian development, in particular with the 2014 introduced Disability Framework which puts in place teams and structures to support a more ambitious disability strategy.

3.1.4 Relevance in terms of SDGs

Relevant targets of the SDG 1 read:
1.1 By 2030, eradicate extreme poverty for all people everywhere, currently measured as people living on less than $1.25 a day.
1.4 y 2030, ensure that all men and women, in particular the poor and the vulnerable, have equal rights to economic resources, as well as access to basic services, ownership and control over land and other forms of property, inheritance, natural resources, appropriate new technology and financial services, including microfinance.
1.5 By 2030, build the resilience of the poor and those in vulnerable situations and reduce their exposure and vulnerability to climate-related extreme events and other economic, social and environmental shocks and disasters.

The project is strongly contributing to the eradication of extreme poverty of their disabled target group, and to support them to claim right at employment and entitlements. The project also, but to a limited extend, assists
the target group to be more resilient to natural and economic disasters by raising awareness of measures that can be taken and sometimes by improving physical structures to better withstand flooding.

The project strives to improve access to healthcare services, education and proper housing for households or individuals with a disability, which is in line with parts of SDGs 4, 8 and 10.

3.2 Efficiency

The efficiency of the project implementation is indicated by the realisation of all intended activities as per plan and allocated resources; and also by the use of resources - financial, material, human and cooperation with partners and/or other actors, like government and civil society service providers – and by the management, monitoring & reporting, and operational practices. In the following sections each of these elements of efficiency will be discussed for each of the project components on the basis of available documents and the fieldwork findings.

3.2.1 Activities Completed

A number of original proposed activities have been cancelled or replaced by other activities during the application process. Most of these changes were practical with the exception of the removal of a Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices (KAP) study. This study was cancelled in order to finance the development, training for and implementation of a monitoring data collection tool. The argument for this change was that ‘... as the project will largely involve tracking the disability-inclusive graduation index, this will be better served through effective real time data collection systems, incorporating both qualitative and quantitative elements, allowing for data to be gathered on an ongoing basis. This is favoured over a qualitative KAP study, which would give a snap-shot of the project at moments in time, rather than showing the evolution of households over time (IMP-04-PL-1819 GPAF Grant Set-Up submission p.3-4)’. Although the project indeed rigorously has tracked the graduation index and provided quantitative data, a qualitative KAP study could have provided the project which a much needed understanding of how beneficiaries perceive the support received, how they adapt their attitudes and practices of income generation and rehabilitation of their disabled family members, and how they communicate with community members, local authorities and service providers.

The logical framework list a number of activities to be conducted for each of the three outputs, namely 7 activities under output 1 for component Direct Implementation; 7 activities under output 2 for component Mainstreaming Partners; and 6 activities under output 3 for component DPO Support. The tables below indicate the degree of completion and appropriate use of budget allocation for each activity by end of project.

Table 7: Project Activities under Direct Implementation Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Realised/Completed</th>
<th>Degree of Completion</th>
<th>Use of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Ben. selection, baseline assessment</td>
<td>600 hhd, 1200 baselines</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>£682 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Ben. Livelihood &amp; rehab. Assessment</td>
<td>1200 assessm, 600 plans</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>No costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Rehabilitation support</td>
<td>1300 receive care</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>£17,196 99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Livelihood support</td>
<td>1200 LLH plans in action</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>£307,965 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Female-headed hhd support</td>
<td>300 hhd supported</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Livelihood act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Awareness, advocacy &amp; referral linkages</td>
<td>1800 participants, 500 referrals</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>£12,904 96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Disaster risk prepared</td>
<td>1080 hhd prepared</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Awareness act.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All planned activities as listed in the logframe are completed and targets have been realised. While some budget lines have been under- or overspend this has been within the accountancy margins allowed.
Table 8: Project Activities under Mainstreaming Partners Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Realised/Completed</th>
<th>Degree of Completion</th>
<th>Use of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>PwD of mainstream development organizations benefit</td>
<td>1. Technical support action plans</td>
<td>3 Partners supported</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Staff capacity building</td>
<td>378 staff/volunteer trained</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>£11,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Disability indicators obtained</td>
<td>2500 hhd tracked</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>No costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Referral mechanism</td>
<td>2000 referrals</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>£9,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Rights</td>
<td>31 DET trained</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>£6,441</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All planned activities as listed in the logframe are completed and targets have been realised. While some budget lines have been under- or overspend this has been within the accountancy margins allowed.

Table 9: Project Activities under DPO Support Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Realised/Completed</th>
<th>Degree of Completion</th>
<th>Use of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Capacity of DPOs is developed to facilitate access to livelihood</td>
<td>1. Capacity Development Planning</td>
<td>Annual plans completed</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Capacity Dev. Implementation</td>
<td>60 staff trained</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>£10,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Making It Work</td>
<td>16 good practices spread</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>£17,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Awareness and advocacy</td>
<td>16 DPO w/strategies; 16 DPOs implement these</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>£156,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Peer Support</td>
<td>16 DPOs follow-up ben.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>No costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Linkages</td>
<td>Mapping, barrier assess done, 16 DPOs refer ben.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>£157,536</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All planned activities as listed in the logframe are completed and targets have been realised, except for activity 3.4. While some budget lines have been under- or overspend this has been within the accountancy margins allowed.

3.2.2 Resource Usage

The use of resources is directly related to project activities like support to beneficiaries, training and the like. Therefore all executed activities under the direct implementation component of the project have been listed in the following table. The table presents the sets of activities, the supporting actor and the implementing agency.

Planned activities were in majority carried out and in or close to the planned time frame for the funds that were allocated, except for some activities which were revised for various reasons. For example, the purchase of cows or buffalos became during the project lifetime more costly and budget ceilings needed to be increased.

Overall, the project has not exceeded the allocated budget for any main activity but also not underused the allocations beyond the accountancy margins. The project aimed at 4,280 households with a disabled member to graduate out of extreme poverty by end of the project. These households were distributed as follows: 600 in Kurigram Sadar; 600 in Sitakunda; 3,000 at the Mainstream Partners and 80 to look after by DPOs (Based on the Mid-term review the target was increased to 4x35 = 140).

The following table illustrates the budget allocation and actual expenditure per component for the actual number of households supported with a cost estimate per beneficiary household which graduated conform the achievement criteria. It is immediately clear that beneficiary costs differ much per component or in this case per acting agency: beneficiaries cost double through DPOs and only 1/6th through the mainstreaming partners. However, these figures are incompatible considering the variation in graduation criteria of the Direct Implementation by H.I. which uses the poverty graduation index and the partners or DPOs which are using ‘increased income’ without a threshold or other validation criteria. Therefore, it is suggested to review these costs per beneficiary only in comparison with interventions which used the same or identical graduation criteria, such as the previous phase of the project in Sitakunda.
Table 10: Budget Allocations for Main Components versus Beneficiary Graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>Expended</th>
<th>%-usage</th>
<th>Number of Beneficiaries</th>
<th>Direct Cost per Beneficiary*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Direct Implementation</td>
<td>£373,889</td>
<td>£373,889</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,185 hhd</td>
<td>£316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Mainstreaming Partners</td>
<td>£40,153</td>
<td>£40,153</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,779 hhd</td>
<td>£23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 DPO Support</td>
<td>£151,000</td>
<td>£151,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>464 hhd</td>
<td>No direct support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* calculated by expended amount divided by number of graduates (expended/# beneficiaries=direct cost per beneficiary not including capital, staffing or overhead costs)

The main aim of the project was to graduate the targeted disabled persons and their dependents or household members out of extreme poverty. At least a 95% positive result was anticipated at start of the project: ‘February/March 2014 showed the success of the model with income increases for 94.5% (Proposal p.6)’. This doesn’t take into account the number of beneficiaries who do not have any capacity to generate income, such as disabled single elderly or single mothers burdened with the care for disabled children, and thus will never graduate. It is the opinion of this Evaluator that this category of beneficiaries should have been separated from the target group for graduation so that the actual graduation results will be presented.

3.2.3 Mainstreaming Partnership Development

Partnership was a key aspect of managing the project throughout its lifespan, and so the project collaborated with national and disabled people’s organizations. The selection of these partners was based on the area of their operations, their livelihood generation strategy and the commitment to include disabled persons in their target group population. Through interviews with the leaders of the three partner organisations the evolution of the cooperation between H.I. and the three partners became clear; both sides were interested to work together – the partners because H.I. could provide the technical support they lacked (rehabilitation skills) and H.I. because in this way the concept of inclusive disability could be developed within and through the partners in their target areas. That the latter issue was considered by one of the partners a big benefit for their organisations is illustrated by a quote of one partner interview: ‘First our mindset was that people with a disability never can deal with a micro credit. Now we have 447 disabled persons with a micro-credit and we aim to increase this number to 5,000 by 2012.’

Cooperation mechanisms developed by the project were properly understood by all cooperating agencies, such as the role the embedded Rehabilitation Officers would play or the responsibility for policy development and supervision of inclusive activities of their projects, but despite this coordination meetings between partners for review sessions or steering committee meetings could sometimes not be arranged. In such cases the project met with each partner separately and disseminated the results among all committee members.

3.2.4 DPO Partnership Development

The following statement of the project indicates the extent of the DPO development: ‘The supported 16 DPOs (including the female wings of 7 targeted DPOs) have improved their capacities to become strong advocates, provide direct support services (e.g. peer support) and meet the needs of (extremely) poor disabled people in rural areas. This capacity building process has strongly encouraged DPOs to establish connections with government services, civil society as well as development actors (GPAF Year 2 Annual Report p.12)’. The four DPOs met at their office during the evaluation expressed their improvement in management and operation, but also their strongly improved networking with local government and public service providers, due to the support by the project.

However, they also mentioned their constraints to reach people with a disability in remote rural areas. The Mid-Term Review report noted: ‘DPOs had to significantly extend their geographical reach to distant districts, which raises questions on their capacities to provide support beyond project completion and the sustainability of the referral mechanism in place (p.27)’.

A ‘WIKI’ survey was conducted with representatives of 15 of the 16 DPOs at H.I.’s Dhaka office during the evaluation, facilitated by the Lead Evaluator. The benefit of such method is that not only the answers provide
insight in the addressed themes but also the questions as these are formulated by a majority of the participants (see for details the Methodology section). Questions were proposed under two themes, namely 1) what were the benefits of the cooperation with the project, and 2) what were the lessons learned. The table below lists the main questions selected by the participants for Lessons Learned on Management and Operation and also those answers which reflect a consensus opinion (see Annex E for the full list with individual DPO answers).

The selection of questions show the DPO representatives focus on employment and social service options, which means that in their management and operation practices they not emphasise their own capacity to manage their organisation or conduct activities. In view of the findings of project staff and MTR that organisational capacity is still limited this might reflect also a limitation to know their own needs for improving their organisational skills.

Table 11: DPO selected Questions for Lessons Learned with Consensus on Answers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Consensus Answers by 15 DPOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Can employment opportunities for persons with a disability (PwD) be created through local resources?</td>
<td>Yes, through advocacy and networking with local service providers and by using savings, loan from different institutes, local grants, capacity building training, leasing land, fish culture, cow rearing, duck rearing, grocery shop, road side tree planting, handicraft etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  What obstacles are there to get a bank loan or social services, like disability allowances?</td>
<td>PwD did not get micro-credit loans, or local government favoured only friends but advocacy by DPO changed this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  What are the barriers for PwD to get a job?</td>
<td>Low level of education, idea among employers that PwD are not able to work properly, no access to proper work place for PwD, GO/NGO not provide job for PwD as per quotum, lack of skilled PwD to act as trainer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Why do stakeholders not give time to deliver services?</td>
<td>Most stakeholders considered job-creation for PwD a waste of time or they had another agenda or were not aware of disability rights before the project, but that has been changed through advocacy and sensitization on the rights of PwD.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The consensus answers reveal that all DPOs are the opinion that they are capable to find employment and income generation options for people with a disability. They also found ways to advocate and overcome obstacles for PwD to get micro-credit loans which most DPOs mention is no problem anymore. Barriers for PwD to be employed are various, but mainly due to the idea that PwD are not capable to work properly or because there is no adapted work environment for PwD. Also duty bearers have changed their attitudes and practices positively towards PwD through the advocacy and sensitisation work of the DPOs.

3.2.5 Value for Money

The total budget for the project amounted to £ 1,400,000 of which 75% was financed by UK AID and the remaining 25% by H.I. This amount was sufficient to complete the planned activities, this despite a change of target area. Although the proposal was aimed at a second sub-district in Chittagong District a change was proposed and approved to Kurigram Sadar sub-district in Kurigram District. The main arguments were a) higher poverty rate than in Chittagong and b) more opportunities to mainstream the disability inclusion concept. This change in location has not affected the total project budget or its expense categories.

The project has introduced many cost-effective practices, such as hiring vehicles for fieldwork activities instead of purchasing a project vehicle. This not only reduces costs as no...
maintenance budget need to be kept but also no driver-related costs are made. Training sessions were held mostly at village level, this for convenience of those beneficiaries who have mobility constraints and to maximise training time but also to save on travel allowances and venue costs. Purchase of cattle was done at larger markets were due to the higher availability of animals better prices can be negotiated, while purchase of grocery goods for small shop keepers was done at Union shops as their prices are lower than at city shops. Toys needed for rehabilitation exercise purposes were mostly self-made by field staff using inexpensive materials. Wheelchairs were purchased from Dhaka as these could be locally maintained. An office wifi subscription was taken for all the personal computers instead of using individual modems to save money.

The Mid-Term Review included a cost-benefit calculation which showed a higher cost for PwD than for non-disabled persons or households, but nevertheless in view of the special condition of many PwD was deemed to be cost effective. The following table gives an illustration of the cost of graduating out of extreme poverty and the input used by the project to achieve this.

Table 12: Cost per Beneficiary for Graduation out of Extreme Poverty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduation out of Extreme Poverty - VfM indicators</th>
<th>Individual Example *</th>
<th>All Beneficiary Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Direct Human Resource inputs</td>
<td>36,347 BDT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Livelihood adaptation, rehabilitation and assistive technology</td>
<td>5,154 BDT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Livelihood related support (asset transfer, cash stipend, risk fund, skills development)</td>
<td>21,000 BDT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 DPO support</td>
<td>1,921 BDT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Other costs</td>
<td>49,000 BDT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Total</td>
<td>113,422 BDT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Total in GBP (conversion rate £8.55 for 1,000 BTD)</td>
<td>970 GBP</td>
<td>934 GBP**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Direct Delivery Percentage (1 – 4/6*100)</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Taken from draft Mid-Term Report November 2017

** Total project budget is £1,400,000 with £110,926 for Mainstreaming Partners and £182,178 for DPO Support, leaving £1,106,896 for Direct Implementation, Staffing, Capital and Overhead. £1,106,896 divided by 1,185 BHH is £934

The Sitakunda field team prepared an example of cost-efficient/effective practices using a calculation technique instructed by the Lead Evaluator which is based on the current 4E VfM assessment methodology of DFID, which describes the relationship between inputs, outputs, outcomes and impacts (see Beam Exchange: Module 7. Assessing value for money).

Training and Asset VfM exercise

At Sitakunda project several beneficiaries participated in a cow rearing skill training which costed 1,080 BDT. They received after the training a cow from the project, purchased at 10,000 BTD. The beneficiary was responsible to provide food and healthcare (e.g. vaccinations) which is estimated at a value of 1,000 BDT per year. The profit from cow rearing was 8,500 BDT per year. Net result 7,500 BDT. Assuming a lifetime of 3 year the one cow increased its value from 10,000 BDT to 22,500 BDT or a 125% added value.

In terms of economy and efficiency the project scores well, making sure that assets and goods will be purchased at the best price possible without compromising on quality (e.g. the beneficiary or a family member selects the cow and negotiates the price at the market but a special committee including field staff checks whether health is good and price is reasonable). The example above illustrates the cost-effectiveness. As all beneficiaries able to generate income can make their own selection of various income generation activities the degree of equity or fairness seems more than satisfactory. In all, the project seems to score high for all four E’s of the VfM tool.
3.2.6 Management, Monitoring & Reporting, and Operational Practices

The project developed a Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) system that is based on the output and performance indicators listed in the logical framework. The M&E Summary Template, the report form to document the targets set for each year and its achievements, is kept diligently and used for management purposes. However, for measuring results only the graduation data is relevant for the direct implementation component, while for the capacity building of DPOs and the mainstreaming of inclusive disability at the Partners’ organisations mainly qualitative indicators are useful to measure results.

The limitation is not with the M&E Plan but with the impact and outcome indicators which not measure project results, such as the proportion of people lifted out of poverty in the project area. For example, the target for year three is ‘(a) less than 20% living below poverty line and (b) less than 9% living below extreme poverty line’ for the indicator ‘Proportion of rural and peri-urban population living below (a) the national poverty line and (b) the extreme poverty line’. The baseline level was ‘(a) 24.8% living below poverty line and (b) 12.4% living below extreme poverty line’. However, considering that only in the target Upazilla already more than 35,000 people live of which 12.4% or 4,350 people are extreme poor and the relative small size of the target group of 600 households or likely less than 2,000 people, it is unrealistic to assume that lifting the latter group out of poverty will measurably affect the poverty rate in the area. It would make more sense to focus impact and other indicators only on the project’s target group of persons with a disability.

The quarterly or annual project progress reports for each of the three components (direct implementation, mainstreaming partners and DPO support) as well as the minutes of the annual review and steering committee meetings were insufficient to adjust the implementation processes as needed or to assess the efficiency of the implementation, the former a conclusion that was vindicated by the Mid-Term Review: ‘Project reviews are organized on a quarterly basis in HI Dhaka office and the minutes of every meeting are recorded. However, the turnover among expatriate staff and the prolonged absence of technical & operational coordinators have negatively impacted on the quality of the information exchanged in those meetings, and therefore on project performance and management. Despite well-identified challenges and gaps, the project team was not in capacity to propose and make some significant adjustments in the project strategy, approaches and budget’ (Mid-Term Review report, draft November 2017 p. 27).

Making it Work

The Making it Work (MIW) methodology was adopted by all actors involved, such as DPO staff and local government committees beside of course by the field team staff. This methodology uses replication of good practices to realise disability inclusion. One element in the project is the formation of MIW committees at the district level4. The 16 partnering DPOs in 13 districts are working through multi-stakeholders committees, called ‘advisory sub-committees’. These 13 districts’ sub-committees validate the locally identified good practices on inclusive livelihood and forward these to the MIW National Advisory committee for final validation. These sub-committees also assist the local DPOs in conducting evidence-based advocacy and in ensuring the replication of those good practices, allowing people with disabilities to access their rights and entitlements.

---

4 HI Bangladesh formed Advisory committees during the implementation of two previous projects: a regional project “Advocating for Change for Persons with Disabilities in South and South-East Asia” funded by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development, BMZ, from January 2013 to June 2014, and a project implemented in partnership with the Bangladesh Legal Aid and Services Trust (BLAST), titled ‘Access to Justice for People with Disabilities in Bangladesh’ funded by the European Union (EU) from March 2013 to February 2015. During these two projects, district-level advisory sub-committees and national-level advisory and technical committees were formed. Technical committees were related to education, employment and justice.
respondent spontaneously mentioned or in answer to a question explained how they applied this methodology and what the benefit was for their operations. Statements were limited to ‘improved networking or communication with stakeholders’, and the like. This has lead the Evaluator to explore more about the practical value of the MIW through calls with H.I. International technical advisors and the projects’ program coordinator.

The benefits of the MIW methodology for DPOs were to be able to use evidence-based advocacy and good practices to convince local employers and factory owners to employ people with a disability. Local service providers who were a member of a MIW committee supported the DPOs during these lobby activities with employers. Government line departments and other relevant bodies provided loans and/or social protection motivated through their membership of the MIW committees. Some MIW members act as advisors to DPOs.

One example of a Good Practice that was used for advocacy is the following documented story: ‘Most of the jute and fiber factories in Faridpur offer great employment opportunities to healthy local people. But people with disabilities didn’t get a job in such factories. Local DPO Astha and Surjodoy realized that they should sensitize the factory owners on the potential of people with disabilities and their right to employment. In 2010, Astha and Surjodoy invited a factory General Manager to participate in an advocacy meeting with different stakeholders on disability sensitization and accessing employment. After the session that General Manager was committed to create a favourable environment and to employ people with disabilities in their factories. As this General Manager was the vice-president of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry in Faridpur other factory employers also became sensitized. As a result of this advocacy, recruitment was made on an equal basis in line with the current rights and protection act of 2013. Now 20 people with disabilities including 7 women with disabilities are employed and receives wages like other people (Good Practice I, p.1).

3.2.7 Gender Focus

The project raised awareness of beneficiary households and community leaders on the reproductive health care and sources of public and civil society organisations’ services, and disseminated messages on the negative impact of early marriage. Economic assets with a higher value than for other beneficiaries were provided to women. Awareness raising activities targeted beneficiary households and teenage girls to increase girls’ school enrolment rates. A stronger emphasis was placed on recruitment of female staff resulting in a significant increase of the women employment rate. For example, by April 2017 about 40% of the volunteers (7 out 17) and 20% of the project staff (4 out 20) were women.

Also indirect has the project an effect on gender mainstreaming and women empowerment, as noted by the GPAF Year 2 Annual Report: ‘The project has a direct collaboration with 2 female wings of the DPOs located in Rangpur and Faridhpur Districts in order to engage with female members and encourage membership of women with disabilities. 5 other DPOs supported by the project have female wings. For example, DPO Federation in Sitakandu has a female wing to support women with disabilities, especially in terms of legal assistance (domestic violence). And 70% of the members of the 13 MIW sub-committees formed at District level
are women (p.27)’. Representatives of one of these female wings were met during the evaluation and they demonstrated their relative independence of the mother DPO and explained well their role and activities.

3.3 Effectiveness

The project plans included three outcome levels with defined activities to achieve the results (see intervention logic flow chart – annex X). The mission’s approach included verification of the realisation of the intended outputs of the project as formulated in the proposal document. The evaluation mission has found that nearly all activity outputs have been realised as planned for the budgeted amounts. It was also found that all three outcomes have been achieved to a full or high degree as indicated by the projects’ monitoring data; this finding has also been confirmed during the evaluation.

3.3.1 Graduation from (Extreme) Poverty or Income Increase

The direct implementation component of the project was almost 100% successful in graduating extreme poor to poor in Kurigram Sadar (first phase) and 100% successful in graduating poor to non-poor in Sitakunda (second phase) if those few beneficiaries without income generating capacity are excluded. A 94.5% graduation success rate was anticipated in the proposal for the extreme poor to poor process in Kurigram Sadar and a 85% rate for the poor to non-poor process in Sitakunda (the latter adjusted in the logframe after the mid-term review on April 2017). With graduation rates of 98% respectively 100% the conclusion is justified that the project has exceeded its target for the Direct Implementation component.

As the results of the Mainstream Partners or DPOs are not under direct control of the project it seems unrealistic to link results to matching targets. However, the number of households with a person with a disability - which were lifted out of extreme poverty by the mainstreaming partner by end of the project - demonstrates success as otherwise most of these households would not have been included in the partners’ target group. The following mainstreaming partners realised income increase for in total 2,580 households (Islamic Relief 629, Helvetas 900, YPSA 250, Concern World Wide 801). Also 10 DPOs realised income increase in their target areas for in total 185 households.

Table 13: Beneficiaries Supported by DPOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of DPO</th>
<th># DPO</th>
<th>Target #</th>
<th>Achieved #</th>
<th>Self employment</th>
<th>Wage employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hard-to-Reach</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>140 BHH</td>
<td>185 (48 female)</td>
<td>133 (82%)</td>
<td>52 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstreaming</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>279 (145 female)</td>
<td>233 (84%)</td>
<td>46 (16%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender Policy

The need of women who are disabled or care for a family member with a disability, especially if they are a female headed household without adult able males, is recognised by the project by selection as beneficiary and through special measures, like higher stipends than given to others or more support with generating income.

The project design formulated the projects’ gender policy as follows: ‘An integrated programming approach ensuring gender sensitivity will overarch the project: maintaining gender segregated data; prioritising women within selection criteria; engaging female community workers; tailoring follow up to ensure women’s active participation in economic activities, with special attention to women with care-giving responsibilities; engaging women as active advocates for disability rights, within DPOs’ (p.12). Indeed, female community livelihood workers (CLW) were sought and while the male ratio of CLW is higher this is not due to lack of efforts by the project. Also female wings of seven DPOs are supported financially and technically by the project.

The project reported on attention for the gender approach: ‘The project raises awareness of BHHs and community leaders on the reproductive health care, sources of services and disseminates messages on negative impact of early marriage for girls’ wellbeing. In Year 2, total of 3,898 individuals (2,205 male/3,898 female)

---

5 2% of beneficiaries, often individuals, not exceeding 15 cases, are without any possibility to generate income due to age, illness or need to care for dependents. These cases should actually not be counted as failures to graduate as it was clear from the start that they never could graduate.
were reached through community awareness sessions on prevention on child marriage and reproductive health care. During the reporting period, thanks to local level advocacy and with the help from local authorities and DPOs, 5 early marriages were prevented and those girls are continuing their education (Annual Report Year 2 p.14).

The project reported also on its attention to education for girls: ‘Awareness raising activities target the parents from BHHs as well as girls to increase enrolment rate and continue girls’ education. Specific supporting measures are taken as part of the project implementation such as rehabilitation to increase functional autonomy and confidence-building, education stipend. In Year 2, total of 141 girls from 1,200 BHHs attended secondary schools; 38 are girls with disabilities (ibid)’.

3.3.2 Access for Beneficiaries to Public Services and Employment

The project reports increased access for people with a disability to public healthcare or welfare, or even to education and the job market. For example, the project reported: ‘The relationship of partner DPOs with relevant stakeholders has improved significantly due to capacity building and local level advocacy activities. This in turn has created a more supportive environment for DPOs to improve access of people with disabilities to wage employment, social protection schemes, rehabilitation, and other public/private services (Annual Report Year 2, p.9). Responses from DPO representatives during the evaluation mission, both in Kurigram and Chittagong district, pointed to a strongly improved network with local governments and increased awareness of the plight of people with a disability to generate income for their families. Contrary to the past they said that it was now not difficult to link persons with a disability with for example the Welfare Office at Union or Upazilla to demand their entitlements, such as the disability allowance. One illustration of this good networking was the meeting organised by the DPO in Sitakunda with the Baraiyadhata Union Parishad Chairman. He made himself available at short notice on a weekend day and explained with enthusiasm how many former disabled beggars now were working instead, or how 55 disabled students, aged 7 to 40 years) attended a Special School initiated by him with volunteer teachers. They get basic knowledge in writing and do painting, singing etc.

This statement by an elected official and several case stories documented during the evaluation mission confirm the effectiveness of the projects’ efforts and mechanisms to assist disabled persons with their income generation activities. A graduation rate of 98% out of extreme poverty is by itself proof that the project’s capacity building and support activities are effective. However, the case stories make clear that the attitude and personality of the disabled person often is the deciding factor in becoming a successful entrepreneur, and less successful case stories show that personal circumstances are essential factors in the income generation. For example, if the beneficiaries do not have any capacity to work – like case nr. 3 because the mother is too old and the daughter is intellectually challenged, or case nr. 5 where the alone-living beneficiary is very old with a constricted mobility. Even extreme circumstances affect the income generation capability negatively, for example when an urgent health complication forces the beneficiary to sell his income for their families. Contrary to the past they said that it was now not difficult to link persons with a disability with for example the Welfare Office at Union or Upazilla to demand their entitlements, such as the disability allowance. One illustration of this good networking was the meeting organised by the DPO in Sitakunda with the Baraiyadhata Union Parishad Chairman. He made himself available at short notice on a weekend day and explained with enthusiasm how many former disabled beggars now were working instead, or how 55 disabled students, aged 7 to 40 years) attended a Special School initiated by him with volunteer teachers. They get basic knowledge in writing and do painting, singing etc.

This statement by an elected official and several case stories documented during the evaluation mission confirm the effectiveness of the projects’ efforts and mechanisms to assist disabled persons with their income generation activities. A graduation rate of 98% out of extreme poverty is by itself proof that the project’s capacity building and support activities are effective. However, the case stories make clear that the attitude and personality of the disabled person often is the deciding factor in becoming a successful entrepreneur, and less successful case stories show that personal circumstances are essential factors in the income generation. For example, if the beneficiaries do not have any capacity to work – like case nr. 3 because the mother is too old and the daughter is intellectually challenged, or case nr. 5 where the alone-living beneficiary is very old with a constricted mobility. Even extreme circumstances affect the income generation capability negatively, for example when an urgent health complication forces the beneficiary to sell his income for their families. Contrary to the past they said that it was now not difficult to link persons with a disability with for example the Welfare Office at Union or Upazilla to demand their entitlements, such as the disability allowance. One illustration of this good networking was the meeting organised by the DPO in Sitakunda with the Baraiyadhata Union Parishad Chairman. He made himself available at short notice on a weekend day and explained with enthusiasm how many former disabled beggars now were working instead, or how 55 disabled students, aged 7 to 40 years) attended a Special School initiated by him with volunteer teachers. They get basic knowledge in writing and do painting, singing etc.

Reduced Attention for Hard to Reach Beneficiaries

However, DPOs in other target areas especially those which wanted to target hard to reach beneficiaries, have difficulties to do so because of the remoteness of the target areas. The constraints are very long travel times and also insufficient budget for these travels. The project has opted to resolve this constraint by adopting a recommendation of the Mid-Term Review: ‘Long distances between DPOs offices and BHHs affected the delivery of activities. Some locations take a half day to be reached. The sub-grants provided to DPOs were not sufficient to meet unexpected travel costs. As per the mid-term review, DPOs were advised to concentrate mostly on the initial intervention locations’ (Annual Report Year 2 p.11).

This meant in effect that these DPOs are after the mid-term review only focussing on beneficiaries who are living in or near their office location. Therewith the project has cancelled the aim listed in the proposal to target: ‘160 extreme poor and poor HHs including people with disabilities supported by DPOs in hard-to-
reach vulnerable districts in accessing employment (p.9). It is questionable whether this change in approach better should have been made at the start of the project instead after nearly two years of operation.

3.3.3 Capacity Building of Partners

The project has built capacity among field-level staff and volunteers of the three mainstreaming partners and the 16 DPOs on the Making It Work approach to realise employment and increased income for disabled beneficiaries, but also on rehabilitation and coaching practices. While the first capacity was important to lift disabled beneficiaries out of extreme poverty the latter capacity is especially appreciated by mainstreaming partners because it added a special skill to their field staff which they didn’t have before the cooperation with HI. Now, as several spokesmen of the main partners said, their staff can include disabled persons or households with a disabled member as they can instruct how to provide rehabilitation services which improves not only the health condition of the disabled child or adult but also reduced the burden in effort and time on the households’ income earners.

For example, by introducing proper rehabilitation exercises to the mother of a disabled child and by providing an appropriate assistive devise this mother can run her tailor shop well and even has time to deliver tailoring lessons to other village girls (See case nr. 1 in Annex F). That some beneficiaries needed a push support by the project but after that propelled themselves further and despite their handicap and other difficulties became a successful entrepreneur is illustrated by the following case:

```
How effective were the capacity building activities for the Partners?

The Tailor
He is a tailor since 2008 and learned to be it since 2000. In 2013 he started his tailor shop. The Tailor moves around in a wheelchair that can be transformed in a tricycle. He wanted to learn tailoring. In search for the best shop to learn the trade he found one next to his sister's house. The tailor shop where he learned had also offered to provide him with food during his working hours, but instead he asked to get 10 taka from which he saved 300 take per month.

After the first month he had learned how to make a women's blouse. The earnings from making repairs to clothes he could keep and these 350 taka he gave to his sister for his livelihood costs. At this time he knew well how to tailor and made dresses which could fetch 100 take a piece. Some customers were so pleased with his work that they tipped him 100 taka! However, the shopkeeper let him only sew blouses which could only fetch 30 taka. He wanted to sew 'kamies' which would fetch 60 taka and therefore he went in search of another shop where he could make 'kamies' and earn 300 take per day.

As he was serious to marriage his former neighbours' daughter his prospective wife's family asked the daughter whether she was willing to marry a disabled man. She agreed knowing him to be a very industrious income earner and the family told him that the dowry would be 50,000 taka but he managed to bring that down to 35,000 taka and a goat. When he married he was 24 years old. Now he has a daughter of 7 and a son of 5 years.

The Tailor wanted to start his own shop and he still had his own sewing machine of the old shop. But the savings he had were not enough. He became involved in meetings on disability rights organised by a local NGO (YPSA) and also participated in discussions to form risk fund groups organised by HI. Although initially he was not so interested they made him chairman of one group. This increased his confidence. HI provided him with an electric sewing machine and cloth material, also gave him the wheelchair-tricycle. He started his own shop and used his old sewing machine at his house to give sewing training lessons for local women.

The Tailor's success was due to his persistence and hard work, but was also made possible by the assistance of the project. The road to his workplace needed repair so that he could use his wheelchair-tricycle and the project provided some of the funds. However, he didn't accepted much assistance as he wants to remain independent and able to take care of his own livelihood generation.

Case story nr. 5 (See Annex F for full or other case stories)
```
3.3.4 Synergy - Links with other Programmes

The project was ‘born’ out of several previously implemented interventions, SHIREE also co-financed by UK AID. The project proposal mentions that in addition to the above mentioned intervention the design also was influenced by a ‘project implemented from 2009 – 2013 across Bangladesh, Enhance Mainstreaming Disability into Current and Future NETZ’s Initiatives funded by NETZ with the specific objective of making people with disabilities economically productive and integrated within mainstream development activities; and an ongoing project implemented from 2013-2014, Advocating for Change for Persons with Disabilities, funded by BMZ working through 20 DPOs across Bangladesh to enhance DPO capacity to generate change (proposal p.6)’.

The project reported in its Annual Report Year 2 p.17-18 that:

- the Leprosy Mission International Bangladesh (UK based INGO) sent a team of 11 members from their project “North-West Bangladesh Ultra Poverty Initiative Project of Leprosy Mission International Bangladesh” to participate in an exposure visit at the Kurigram project site on 20-21 December 2016. The aim was to share learning on disability inclusive poverty graduation methodology and its application by the organisation.
- A team of 4 staff members from the project made an exposure visit to an inclusive livelihood project (funded by USAID) in HI Nepal on 13-17 March 2017 to learn about the approaches applied by the inclusive livelihood project which is currently being implemented by HI Nepal. The team included the Project Officer, 2 Livelihood Officers and 1 Disability Officer. The team identified several concrete recommendations, especially in improving evidence-based advocacy and linkages with the private sector.
- HI’s Technical Adviser (TA) on Inclusion participated in the 2nd Community Based Rehabilitation (CBR) World Congress held on 27-29 September, 2016 in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia with the participation of over 1,000 representatives from 78 countries including policy makers, community-based rehabilitation practitioners, persons with disabilities, NGO representatives, and media. The theme was “CBR: Empowering and Enabling”. The TA delivered a presentation of HI’s disability inclusive poverty graduation approach.

Thus while currently no other linkages exist with other donors’ projects the foundation of the project is based on various approaches and links are maintained with other interventions.
3.3.5 Good Practices & Lessons Learned

Lessons learnt and recommendations of the project’s internal mid-term evaluation conducted in November 2016 were shared with the project teams, partner DPOs, mainstream partner organisations, Making It Work Committee members, local level authorities (in 2 project sites) and technical advisors in H.I.

The answer to this question of the ToR is simply ‘no’. See for addressing gender issues 4.3.1. On climate adaptation the Annual Report Year 2 notes that the ‘project promotes development of livelihoods which are disaster resilient and adapted to local environmental challenges. The environmental footprint of these livelihoods (and other project) activities have a relatively low impact due to largely relying on low-tech local technology’ (p.25). It also mentions that ‘HI undertakes a pilot initiative in 2017 to measure environmental impact of its activities funded by IKEA in Teknaf, Bangladesh (p.25)’. The aim of the pilot is to prepare guidelines to H.I. Bangladesh on how to further reduce negative environmental impacts of its activities.

Services and technology offered by the project and partners were culturally and locally appropriate, and also affordable for the beneficiaries. For example, several wheelchairs can be converted in tricycles which allows the beneficiaries to use them as transport and sometimes even as a means to generate income (see photo on the front page). Maintenance of this vehicle can be done locally. Income generating activities are all based on local customs and use of local products; for example, handicraft uses materials found/to buy in the communities.

The following case represents a strong Lesson Learned for the project.

The Amputee

His left leg was amputated because of a traffic accident, but he earned a reasonable income selling vegetables from his small shop earning 150 to 200 taka a day. The goods for this grocery store were provided by the project to enable his income generation. However, a sudden infection on his right leg (which also was wounded by the accident) required him to go to the hospital where the surgeon diagnosed gangrene and concluded that amputation of the second leg was the only option.

As the operation was to be done immediately he didn’t inform the project. The operation went good and he was sent home, at which time the grocery seller informed the project’s community livelihood worker several times about his situation. However, after a month without any action by the project he sold all his goods to cover the medical expenses – mainly for medicines.

This grocery seller, who has a young wife and two small children, was chosen for a visit by the Evaluator. Only when the visit took place the project’s field staff realised that the grocery seller had lost his means for generating an income. It became also clear that the family had no money left and that the man was suffering much pain as they could not afford to buy medicines for him. While the wife got a job as house servant which earned her a 4,000 taka per month her care for her husband took priority.

Urged by the Evaluator the field team went to the pharmacy with the wife to buy medicines for the pain, and later informed the local elected official - chairman of the Union Parishad - about the grocery sellers' situation. He said to take immediately action but that the hospital has an emergency fund to cover medical expenses for extreme poor people, like this man. He asked ‘Why was this fund not used?’ The field team members present said not to know but to find out.

The lesson learned here was that the project should have intervened as there is an emergency fund for such urgent situations, so that no income generation means should need to be sold. Also, the government hospital’s emergency funds should have been used as well.

Case nr. 7 (See Annex F for other case stories)
3.4 IMPACT & SUSTAINABILITY

This section describes the extent to which the objectives of the project have been achieved and whether positive outcomes are likely to continue after ending the external support.

3.4.1 Income Generation

Both the project and the DPOs provided beneficiaries with opportunities to generate an income, preferably through more than one means. The main result is measured by two indicators:

- **Outcome Indicator 1**: 98% or 701 of 716 extreme poor households (including 265 women-headed households or 38% of total beneficiary households) have graduated from extreme poverty according to the disability-inclusive graduation index (Target Year 3 was 85%).

  100% or 484 poor households (including 136 women-headed households or 28%) graduated from poor to non-poor in Sitakunda Upazilla.

- **Outcome Indicator 2**: 90% or 2,058 of 2,298 households with members with a disability have improved their income status (Target was 80%). Of these 88% or 1,779 of 2,019 households were supported by the three mainstream development organisations (Target was 80%) and 279 households were supported by the ten DPOs (Target was 200).

The overall assessment by the project is that a great majority of graduates in Sitakunda or Kurigram Sadar will continue to earn sufficient income to avoid falling back to their previous low income levels. This assumption is based on the assets amassed by beneficiary households and the diversification of income sources; almost all households have livestock or are running a small business which generates regular incomes. This assertion has been confirmed during the evaluation mission through responses by local government officials, service providers, DPO representatives and – although a few – case studies. Such a positive assessment for sustainability of the beneficiary households supported by the three mainstreaming organisations or the ten DPOs can’t be made for lack of substantial information about the beneficiary’s livelihood status (the reporting period of these organisations differs from the project reporting period which ended on 31 March 2018).

The following case is an example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Match Maker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The 35 year old disabled man smiled broadly when he told that his job was to find suitable candidates for marriages - he is a Match Maker despite moving around in his wheelchair cum tricycle. When asked if people did find this strange and whether his disability made his job more difficult he answered that season. The Match Maker’s disability is a deformity on both his legs due to a traffic accident when he was 20 years old and has now two children, a 7 year old boy and an 8 year old girl, who both are going to school. A time ago his wife left him but came back later to stay again. At that time the Match Maker was homebound and without job, did not get any respect from community members and without money. He was dependent on his parents and neighbours. Few years ago a community livelihood worker of H.I. visited him and ask him many qustions about his disability, his assets and family situation. After that he was invited to join group meetings were they spook about income generation activities and savings. The project gave him a cow in 2015 and a wheelchair/tricycle in 2016. They get the cow he went to a local animal market with a neighbour who advised him what cow best to buy. He spent the full grant amount of 20,000 taka after the field team had approved his choice. The project also provided a stipend to feed the cow and a training on how to take care.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 Note: the indicator has been adjusted from ‘Number and percentage of households (and individuals) that demonstrate progress towards graduation from moderate poverty’. This revision was necessary because the livelihood model was used instead of the graduation model, which means that people with disabilities will be provided with livelihood generation opportunities to increase their income, but the effect of the support will not be measured through the graduation indicators.
After fattening the cow he sold it and bought a new cow and a goat with the proceeds. He consumed or sold the milk. The Match Maker compliments his income by looking for marriage candidates for families in his community - the match making business. This became possible because his tricycle allows him to move around in the villages; he learned the trade from an old match maker and he is good at it. Besides this he joined a fish breeding group - his fourth income source not counting the disability allowance he gets from the local government (arranged with help from the project). Except for the allowance all his incomes are seasonal or irregular, that is why he need many income sources. The Match Maker smiles happily when he moved away with his tricycle to meet his next marriage couple.

Case nr. 2 (See Annex F for other stories)

3.4.2 DPO Capacity Building

DPOs received various kinds of training and capacity building support. Although it is evident and expressed by the DPOs during the workshop held in Dhaka during the evaluation mission that they have improved their management and operational skills, it is difficult to measure the degree of capacity gained for each of the organisations. The project monitored this improvement through an indicator as follows:

- **Outcome Indicator 4**: DPOs achieved 87% (Target Year 3 was 75%) in their capacity development in Finance and Accounting, M&E, Resource Mobilization and Proposals Development. In addition, they increased their understanding of UNCRPD and Disability Act 2013 and have strengthened their professional communications with external stakeholders.

The Lead Evaluator met with representatives of Kurigram Protibondhi Kallayan Sangstha (KPKS) in Kurigram Sadar, Prottasha Protibondhi Nari o Shisu Unnyan Sangstha (PPNSUS) and its women wing in Rangpur, and the Federation of DPOs Sitakunda (FoDS) in Sitakunda who all expressed satisfaction with the capacity building and institutional support they received from the project. These DPOs now are able to advocate effectively for upholding rights of persons with a disability, for example FDS brought 20 legal cases of land claims, women/child abuse and asset disputes to court, of which 12 cases were won. The DPOs also have skills and power to push local governments to provide disability or education allowances or to sensitize local government and private employers to offer employment options for disabled persons. One librarian position was given to a disabled person in Kurigram by the Upazilla officials after advocacy by the DPO.

3.4.3 Mainstreaming Partners’ Change in Practices

The project aimed to mainstream inclusive disability among the three Partners. Although only one rehabilitation officer has been embedded at each partner they have changed the attitude and practices of the field staff so that people with disabilities are no longer been seen as incompetent or worse. This has also been motivated by the project through measurement of the following indicator:

- **Outcome Indicator 3**: Staff from 3 organizations are now in a position to identify and refer people with disabilities, understand the need for a personalized approach for people with disabilities and collect data on disability.

The three leaders of the Partners met during the evaluation were without reserve enthusiastic about the collaboration with the project and H.I. and noted that their organisations now have embraced the concept of inclusive disability.

3.4.4 Women’s Empowerment

An intrinsic element of the project’s livelihood support approach is furthering the empowerment of the female beneficiaries and their family members. This is monitored by the project measuring the following indicator:

- **Outcome Indicator 5**: 96.5% of girls and women reported increase in self-esteem compared to the baseline (Target Year 3 was 80%). This is determined by women’s ability to benefit from the same
opportunities as others people, including to engage in problem solving, to be able to communicate and interact with others beyond their household, to have easier access to service, to engage in paid employment, and to be able to support their family.

The best illustration of the actual empowerment brought about by the project is the following case story:

### The Tailor Teacher

The five-months old girl was carried by another child who let her fall on her head. Her mother noticed a problem immediately but waited 1.5 month to go to the hospital as she had no money for the transport and was afraid to tell her husband who used to beat her. He left her when Moni’s sister was born; at that time Moni was 4 year old. Now is Moni 14 years old but intellectually and physically challenged due to brain damage. Moni’s younger sister is 10 year old and goes to school. The two sisters sleep together at night.

3 years ago H.I.’s project selected the household as beneficiary and took over assistance from another NGO. The mother got instructions on how to exercise her daughter's limps and neck, and she got a special chair which facilitated Moni’s seating. Now Moni can sit upright in her chair and even keep her head up. However, Moni’s condition could even be better with more exercises but the mother has too little time for the exercises as she is running her tailor shop and teaching local girls and women how to sew clothes. Her younger daughter sometimes encourages her mother to exercise her sister’s limbs more.

The H.I. project provided cloth for the business but the mother bought herself a sewing machine. She works from her house where she built a lean-to for the tailor shop. Trainees bring their own sewing machines but work during their internship for free and even pay fees for the tailoring lessons. In three year time the Tailor Teacher has lifted herself out of extreme poverty with some assistance from the project.

Case nr. 1 (See Annex F for complete and other stories)

### 3.4.5 Disaster Risk Preparedness

Although preparation for disasters is one of the six outcome indicators the project has no specific activities or budget to do this. During the grant application process it was decided to cancel Courtyard discussions on disaster, early warning, Climate change and resilience and to relocate the allocated funds to ‘community awareness-raising sessions, under community work on rehabilitation and rights in order to have a fully integrated approach to awareness raising (including livelihood, rehabilitation and DRR together) (IMP-04-PL-1819 GPAF Grant Set-Up submission form, p.2)’. Some field staff complained about this lack of activities.

Despite this cancellation the project claims achievement on the basis of the measurement of the indicator:

- Outcome Indicator 6 indicates that 97.5% of BHHs have at least 2 positive disaster coping strategies in place (Target Year 3 was 60%).

### 3.4.6 Risk Fund and Transition Phase

The project reported on the status of the risk fund operation: ‘100% BHHs in both project sites are now covered by the group risk fund. These 1,200 BHHs have formed 53 Self-help Groups (SHGs). Each group has received BDT 2,800/HH, whereas each SHG is also raising regular savings and deposits them into joint bank accounts (Annual Report Year 2 p.8). No constraints have been reported but it seems that not all groups are fully aware of the implicit function of the fund as an emergency buffer. For example, representatives of three Risk Groups met by the Lead Evaluator in Sitakunda, could not well explain what to do when a member wanted to take a loan that exceeded her own deposit because of an emergency; or what to do with the interest earned on the group deposit. Also, the concept of graduation from extreme poverty to poor to not-poor could not be formulated by any member. But they were clear about the reason for being a member of the...
Risk Group, namely saving money for emergencies, such as illness, house repair or for business. All members wanted to continue with running their groups.

4 CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions in regard of the five OECD/DAC evaluation criteria and the Evaluation Questions listed in the ToR are presented in this chapter followed by recommendations. A scoring for the evaluation criteria has been made but should be regarded only as a basic indication of the achievements as the context defines the actual level of accomplishments of the project.

Table 14: Scale of Evaluation Criteria Fulfilled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Good:</strong></td>
<td><strong>High:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strong Potential for</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strong Likelihood for</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) proper problem and needs assessment; 2) fair selection of beneficiaries, with priority for women; 3) good intervention logic</td>
<td>1) high VfM rates; 2) good application of policies, e.g. on gender; 3) appropriate use of innovative practices, e.g. MIW</td>
<td>1) 98% graduation out of extreme poverty and 85% graduation out of poverty; 2) disability inclusiveness at 3 Partners fully achieved; 3) intended level of capacity achieved at DPOs</td>
<td>1) graduating upwards for great majority of beneficiaries; 2) increased capacity of DPOs; 3) strengthened disability inclusion among Mainstream Partners</td>
<td>1) continued income increase and diversification; 2) continued improvement of women’s empowerment; 3) strengthened disability inclusion policies at Partners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1 Relevance

The projects’ intervention logic and theory of change are based on prior experiences with inclusive disability projects in Bangladesh and in that sense well ‘grounded’. The problem and needs assessment are realistic and the beneficiary selection has been fairly done on the basis of the established criteria, which focus on extreme poor households with disabled members and which favours female-headed households. The main partners have been selected on their poverty graduation approach and their motivation to adopt the inclusive disability concept, which has been proven true for three of the four original selected partners. Collaboration with one partner was ended during the project implementation period due to a graduation method which did not fit with the disabled target group. The 6 DPOs have been selected on the basis of their presence in H.I.’s or the Partners’ operational target areas while the other 10 DPOs were selected as their operational base was in areas with a high prevalence of extreme poor households with a disabled member.

😊 The Evaluation confirmed a high relevance of the project

4.2 Efficiency

The evaluation found that the implementation practices of the project to realise graduation out of extreme poverty of households with a disabled member were efficient and appropriate. This also demonstrates the scale-up potential of the graduation model as Kurigram Sadar has been intended to be a test area. The cooperation and collaboration with the three main partners has been efficient in terms of economics and use of resources, with the projects’ main input the embedded Disability Officers under the coordination of the Mainstreaming Project Officer, both for H.I. and for the respective Partners. The collaboration with the 2 DPOs at H.I.’s target areas and the 3 DPOs at the Mainstreaming Partners’ target areas has benefitted both parties in terms of resource usage and economy of operation. The DPOs are often better able to conduct time-consuming awareness and advocacy activities, or to build networks with service providers and local government than H.I. or the Partners. Finally, the project has made sincere efforts not to waste funds and to economise on costs, with many examples showing a good value for money.

😊 The Evaluation confirmed an efficient use of resources and a good Value for Money result
4.3 Effectiveness

The project has achieved all its six intended outcomes to the full extent, with 637 extreme poor households with a disabled member in Kurigram Sadar lifted out of poverty and 563 previously extreme poor households with a disabled member in Sitakunda graduated to poor during the SHIREE project, now graduated to not poor. The concept of inclusive disability has taken firm root at the three Main Partners and hundreds of disabled households have been lifted out of extreme poverty through this collaboration. Perhaps even more importantly, through the embedded Disability Officer the field staff of the Main Partners have become aware of the potential of disabled persons and has gained skills in rehabilitation coaching. All 16 DPOs have improved their management and organisational skills to lead their organisation, and have been able to extent their networks with local government and service providers. They are now recognised as proper representative organisations for the disability sector by local governments and other local actors, taking part in committees and events.

The Evaluation confirmed a high level of effect in each of the three outcome areas.

4.4 Impact & Sustainability of Achievements

The lasting impact of realised achievements and its sustainability in the future outside the project can only be ascertained after several years, but the evaluation mission is confident that many if not most of the achievements will last, if perhaps not to the extent now realised. However, in case, as is the planning, project follow-up will continue for the next several years to assist recent graduates to move from poor to non poor the extent of the achievements will most likely increase and the sustainability rate will also be higher. For example, 85% of graduates of the SHIREE project who were extreme poor and moved to poor have now under the project moved to being non poor. That is an example for the current graduated poor households in Kurigram Sadar.

The three Mainstreaming Partners not only express by their leadership but demonstrate by their results and intentions that disability is now inclusive in their projects. For example, YPSA under the project lifted 250 disabled households out of (extreme) poverty; they intend to increase that number by Year 2021 to 5,000 households! They also include in the future rehabilitation services and coaching in their programming.

The capacity built at the 16 DPOs and the outgrow of their organisations will likely last to a high extent, even if leaders or staff and volunteers with special skills, like accountants, will move on as is normal in any organisation. Also the reputation they have built and status acquired among the local government and in civil society that they represent and advocate for the rights of persons with a disability will likely last for yfears in the future.

The Evaluation confirmed a high potential for lasting effect in each of the three outcome areas.
5 **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Terms of Reference requires ‘providing recommendations for the follow-up project starting in April 2018’. These should be in the fields of management, operation and policies. However, as the project has scored high on all evaluation criteria – relevance, efficiency, effect, impact and sustainability – there are few if any recommendations that can be made to improve management, operation or policies. The following points are therefore more suggestions than recommendations for an even more efficient and effective approach.

1. **REPLICATION POTENTIAL**

A major argument for changing the original target area has been creating an opportunity to pilot the graduation model in a very different part of the country. Among the expected results of the final evaluation was confirmation that the graduation model could be repeated elsewhere and possibly scaled-up. The evaluation indeed can confirm that the graduation model is suited to be repeated, not only in the economical better situated area of the Chittagong division but also in the lesser economical developed Rangpur division. However, as the size of the operation in the new area of Kurigram Sadar was similar to the Sitakunda intervention no conclusion can be made in regard of the scale-up potential.

- **It is recommended to continue repeating the graduation model in other areas in the country, and if feasible to scale-up the operation gradually to determine the potential for scaling-up.**

The method for replication and scaling-up would be 1) identification of additional suitable mainstreaming partners in target areas currently not targeted by H.I.; 2) negotiation with motivated candidate partners what they can contribute; 3) submission of a proposal to potential donors; 4) include a pilot programme to test the scale-up potential.

2. **EMBEDDED REHABILITATION OFFICERS/ACTION**

The Rehabilitation or as they used to be called Disability Officers who were embedded with the mainstreaming Partners’ organisations have been salaried by H.I. and also most of their work-related costs were covered by the project. While this is an effective practice during a pilot phase the full adoption of the inclusive disability concept requires that such positions become an integral part of the Partners’ projects.

- **It is suggested for the next phase and future projects to limit the period that costs of embedded Rehabilitation Officers will be covered by the project or H.I.**

The method for achieving this would be 1) negotiation with the current partners what they can contribute in the next phase; 2) reaching an agreement on conditions such as time periods and contribution levels; and 3) documenting this in a memorandum of understanding.

3. **RISK FUNDS**

The current model of risk funds, in any case as was understood by representatives of three risk groups in Sitakunda, has not a function to resolve emergencies of individual members through the collective fund but only to use any individual savings deposit for such emergency. However, most emergencies will require a much higher amount than any individual member is able to amass in several years.

- **It is suggested that the project convince group members to change funds rules so that members can borrow more than their own deposit in case of an emergency, whereby a reasonable interest should be charged for the benefit of the group fund.**

The method for achieving this would be 1) reaching consensus among group members about the need for such an emergency buffer fund; 2) setting up the rules for operation in case of such emergency; and 3) guarantee by the project, at least for the foreseeable time, that in case a member can’t pay back within a reasonable period (e.g. because of loss of income generation means or death) the project or H.I. will compensate this until the end of the next phase.
4. MONITORING AND INDICATORS

The project has monitored progress in terms of graduation, women empowerment, capacity building of DPOs and many other aspects throughout the project, with at the begin a baseline and at closure an endline assessment. However, this evaluation has not had much use of these data as the endline assessment was not yet completed at time of the evaluation mission, and the majority of data is performance based which is of little value to assess the extent of achievements at outcome levels.

A finding of the evaluation was that the data collection process is very time consuming for project staff, despite the use of mobile tools (not in Bangla language!). Another finding was that a qualitative KAP study which was originally included in the design was cancelled in favour of the quantitative graduation index tool. However, the evaluation mission would have been more informed on changed attitudes and practices by the results of a KAP than by the graduation figures, which only indicates the quantitative level of achievement.

- It is suggested to include qualitative studies, like KAP in the monitoring process during the implementation for updating on changed attitudes and practices.

The method to realise this is 1) to establish for which kind of practices more understanding is needed; 2) to define the study method and who would conduct the study when; 3) to prepare a ToR for this study including how the results will be used.

- It is also suggested to simplify the baseline and endline assessments to the data that would likely be needed during the final evaluation, which usually is outcome based.

The method to realise this is 1) to establish which indicators used at the current project have been of little or no value for management or evaluation; 2) to interact with the donor about the removal of indicators deemed of little added value; 3) to prepare a guide for baseline and endline on data collection and processing tools.

- It is also suggested to keep track of the graduation data for performance-improvement purposes, but to use locally applicable tools and language so that field staff who not speak English well can properly apply these tools. However, in selecting the indicators first the merit of it should be determined in terms of use for management decisions so that data will not be collected for the sake of collection.

The method to realise this is 1) to define which data is essential to keep track of progress towards graduation; 2) to establish at which intervals such data would need to be collected; 3) to assess who best could get such data (not to forget thinking about the beneficiaries themselves); 4) to make a plan of action with guidelines.

5. INSTITUTIONAL MEMORY

While the project provided the Evaluator with many project-related documents at start of the mission, a number of essential or informative documents could only be obtained later and through other sources. In part this was a result of replacement of management staff and a limited hand-over process as the new manager came after the former one had gone. A change of technical advisor is also cause for a less-optimal document library.

As such changes are not unusual efforts should be made to keep the project documentation up to date and complete. For example, the Evaluator needed to know why one of the original proposed target areas was changed during the application process. This is well documented in the grant application form but this document is not among the documents provided at start of the mission. Similarly, detailed information about the use of the Making It Work methodology was not available in any progress document and required that the Evaluator contacted H.I.’s HQ staff.

- It is suggested to include in the Monitoring & Evaluation Plan a list of documents to be kept available for external reviewers and evaluators, and update this list and the document source during the implementation.

The method to realise this is 1) to include in the monitoring plan an action to list and store relevant project documents; 2) to keep this list and storage updated; 3) to make these documents available to reviewers.
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ANNEX A: Terms of Reference

Consultancy - Final Evaluation on “Disability inclusive poverty graduation of extreme poor and poor households in Bangladesh” project.

Job from Handicap International - Humanity & Inclusion
— Closing date: 26 Feb 2018

1. About HI
Handicap International[1] (HI) is an independent and impartial aid organisation working in situations of poverty and exclusion, conflict and disaster. The organisation works alongside people with disabilities and vulnerable populations, taking action and bearing witness in order to respond to their essential needs, improve their living conditions and promote respect for their dignity and fundamental rights. HI promotes an inclusive approach by focusing on access to services “for all” whenever possible rather than developing specific actions for vulnerable groups including people with disabilities. HI has been operating in Bangladesh since 1997 and the programme key focuses are on rehabilitation, disaster risk reduction, promoting disability rights, economic development and/or livelihood etc. HI, Bangladesh first piloted the disability-inclusive poverty graduation model during 2011-2014, funded by DFID/ SHIREE, and refined the model under DFID’s Global Poverty Action Fund (GPAF) between the year 2015-18. HI Bangladesh is going implement phase-3 of the disability-inclusive graduation model from April 2018 to March 2022. It is expecting that the findings from this evaluation will guide the implementation team to better define the operational strategy for next phase.

2. Project summary
The project will increase income of 4,360 poor/extreme poor HHs, having at least one person with disability, with a focus on reducing sub-national and target-group specific income disparities in achieving relevant SDG target. Direct beneficiaries are supported on a graduation pathway which will empower them to pull themselves out of poverty, with measurable impact during the project time-frame. The target groups of poor/extreme poor HHs, including people with disabilities will move to a higher income stratum, depending on their initial status, along with improving functional autonomy and social participation. Those in extreme poverty will increase income levels, moving above the national extreme poverty line of about $1/day, with reference also to the brac Graduation criteria (for more information about graduation criteria please visit http://tup.brac.net/targeting-ultra-poor; in particular the document ‘Understanding the ultra poor graduation approach’). For those in moderate poverty, income will be increased, moving above the national poverty line of US$2 per day. The direct beneficiaries have received personalized social support, which includes access to livelihood, rehabilitation, social protection and psycho-social services. To ensure changes are envisaged at a sufficient scale and in a sustainable way, HI has engaged in collaborative partnership with mainstream development organizations to build on their existing networks, while deepening a territorial approach in Sitakund/Kurigram and using DPOs as key actors able to accompany people with disabilities through the graduation approach.

The project follows three modes of implementation, mirrored in the three outputs:
(1) Direct implementation in collaboration with DPOs;
(2) Mainstreaming disability into mainstream partners’ livelihood projects/activities;
(3) DPO capacity development and contributing to the sustainability of the action of the model;

The 36 months timeframe of the current project is linked to the duration of the graduation cycle for several waves of beneficiaries, as per interventions implemented in comparable geographic areas; output 1 will follow a direct implementation approach in Sitakund Upazila under Chittagong District and Kurigram Sadar Upazila under Kurigram District in collaboration with DPOs to address immediate needs, while further honing the technical expertise of HI in operationalizing the disability-livelihood linkage to be positioned to scale up this model using mainstream development organizations (output 2) and develop DPO capacity to guarantee the model’s sustainability (output 3). The intervention applies HI’s personalized social support approach to livelihoods, whereby people with disabilities are supported to
a) Identify their strengths, rights, skills and interests;
b) Define and prioritize their needs;
c) Formulate and implement household/business plans.

Two DPOs are acting as collaborative partners of HI in HI direct implementation area, shadowing HI staff to guide them towards sustaining project outputs in the future. The 16 Community Livelihood Workers (CLWs) are housed within HI offices in the respective implementing areas and are working closely with the community and beneficiaries’ households to be able to guide and monitor the beneficiaries frequently.

Additional details on each implementation model:
i) Direct implementation in collaboration with DPOs in Sitakund and Kurigram: HI operates in 2 locations for implementing disability inclusive graduation model, respectively in Sitakund Upazila under Chittagong district and Kurigram Sadar Upazila (sub-district) of Kurigram district. Maintaining operational control with HI allows for a quality focused approach, required to further hone the disability-inclusive graduation model piloted in Sitakund meaning effectiveness is higher. Building on a tried and tested theory of change, with strong evidence-based results, in geographic areas where HI has already a strong presence, reduces investment costs and increases value for money, including using livelihood asset procurement procedures that have been developed and refined over a 3-year period. Working with HI staff is higher cost than local NGO staff, however, technical disability staffs are not available within local NGOs and frontline workers are not sensitized to disability inclusive approaches. Focusing on building up the capacity of DPOs through mentoring, as actors best placed to liaise with people with disabilities is an effective approach. Although the cost per beneficiary is high for people with disabilities in terms of the levels of human resources required to follow a personalized approach, the output is maximized as it ensures people with disabilities achieve the same rate and level of income increase as others.

ii) Disability-inclusive livelihood through mainstream development organizations: Alternative scale ups considered to reach the same level of beneficiaries, including replicating the disability inclusive livelihood approach in further districts across Bangladesh, however there was more efficiency and effectiveness in building on existing mainstream development organization’s initiatives and providing technical support to integrate the approach. The current mainstreaming organizations are HELVETAS Swiss Intercooperation, Islamic Relief Bangladesh and Young Power in Social Action (YPSA). There has been collaboration with Concern Worldwide (CWW) and International Development Enterprise (iDE) in year 1 and 2. The partnership no longer continued in year 3 and this because of the CWW’s donor project ended, and HI discontinued the partnership with iDE as a result of mid-term evaluation recommendation as the iDE used to work with market system rather supporting direct beneficiaries. Working through mainstreaming organization is economic as only disability-specific staff are required (4 Disability/Rehabilitation Officers) and the intervention is based on existing structures and geographic foot-holds of the mainstreaming organization. Funding a mainstreaming organization to include disability is a unique entry point, as recent experiences working in consortium with mainstream organizations have shown a reluctance to go for real disability components within livelihood programming, due to the risk of increasing cost per beneficiary, which has reduced the effectiveness of disability programming within mainstream development organizations to date.

iii) Capacity development of DPOs: In terms of effectiveness, DPOs have a unique access to people with disabilities at community level and are the most effective advocates for their cause, in liaising with local actors. The input of this capacity development process will be maximized over time, shown by effectiveness of previous capacity development actions, in order to put a country-wide sustainability mechanism in place.

2.1 Project impact and outcome
Impact: Reduced poverty for poor rural and peri-urban people living in Bangladesh (contributing to SDG 1)
Indicators: Ø Proportion of rural and peri-urban population living below (a) the national poverty line and (b) the extreme poverty line; Ø Proportion of employed persons in Bangladesh (disaggregated by gender and formal/informal employment)
Outcome: People with disabilities and their family members living in poverty and extreme poverty are able to increase their income and graduate out of poverty in Kurigram Sadar, Sitakunda, districts within Rangpur/ Rajshahi division and other hard to reach districts in Bangladesh
Indicators: Ø Number and percentage of households that demonstrate progress towards graduation from extreme poverty and moderate poverty (disaggregated by location); Ø Number and percentage of households that demonstrate progress towards increasing income status; Ø Change in practices of targeted mainstream development organizations based on disability inclusive dimensions including participation in decision-making, recognition of diversity, tailored approaches and removal of barriers; Ø Level of achievement of capacity development milestones by Disabled Peoples organizations and the strength of their relationship with key external stakeholders; Ø Percentage of girls and women reporting an increase in their self-esteem compared to their self-assessed baselines; Ø Number and percentage of households that have at least 2 positive disaster coping strategy in place (disaggregated for female-headed households)

3. Evaluation Summary
Project name: Disability inclusive poverty graduation of extreme poor and poor households in Bangladesh
Project duration: ** 36 months (April 2015 – March 2018)
Evaluation Type: Final Evaluation
Evaluation Purpose: To assess the project implemented by HI according to the defined criteria as well as providing recommendations for the follow-up project.
Methodology: The methodology will be proposed by the external consultant and it will be agreed by HI.

Stakeholders:
- People with disabilities and their family members
- Disabled People Organization
- Department of Youth Development
- Department of Social Services
- Department of Women Affairs
- Agricultural Extension
- Department of Livestock Services
- Protibondi Seba O Sahejjo Kendro
- UCEP
- Technical Training Center (TTC)

Evaluation Start and end dates:
Start date: 20th February, 2018
End date: 15th March, 2018

4. Evaluation Purpose and Objectives
4.1 Evaluation purpose: The main purpose of evaluation is to assess the project implemented by HI according to the criteria defined here below, identifying good practices and providing recommendations for the follow-up project starting in April 2018.

4.2 Evaluation objectives and criteria
a. To assess the changes, effectiveness, relevance & efficiency of the project by:
   Ø Evaluate the changes (impact, effects) and effectiveness, including against the indicators developed in the project logframe, particularly output, outcome and impact level indicators comparing with baseline status; Ø Measuring the relevance and efficiency of the intervention aligned with project objectives
b. To assess the capacities of projects’ relevant stakeholders for its’ sustainability (for the list of stakeholders please refer to section 3 of this ToR); Ø Assess the level of cooperation the project established with relevant project stakeholders and partner and ensured their participation; Ø Identify the level of capacity of existing DPOs/SHG, government departments with their roles in the community to take the responsibilities in absence of HI Ø Identify the level of inclusiveness and ownership of mainstream partners, i/NGOs, DPOs and relevant institutional stakeholders.

5. Specific evaluation questions by criteria
5.1 Relevance: Problems and Needs
The extent to which the objectives of the project are consistent with beneficiaries’ requirements, the country needs and the priorities of DPO and implementing organizations.
1/ The extent to which stated objectives correctly address the identified problems and social needs
2/ The extent to which objectives have been updated/changed in order to adapt to changes in the context
3/ The extent to which the project implemented the most appropriate strategies/approaches
4/ Choice of main Government and non-Government implementing partners/entities (includes Department of Youth Development, Department of Social Services, Department of Women Affairs, Agriculture Extension, Department of Livestock, Protibondi Seba o Shahejjo Kendro, TTC, UCEP, DPO, Islamic Relief International, HELVETAS Swiss Intercooperation and YPSA)
5/ Methods to identify/select potential beneficiaries;
6/ Actions taken to approach employers and sensitize them.
7/ Appropriateness of the Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs) of achievement as in the logical framework
8/ Realism in the choice of quantity of inputs – financial, human and administrative resources (notably, was the allocated; original budget relevant with regard to the project activities design and their implementation?)
9/ The extent to which the project respect the needs of women with disabilities and women headed households and mobilized relevant resources to empower them.

5.2 Effectiveness: Achievement of Purpose
The extent to which the project’s results are attained and the specific objectives achieved, or are expected to be achieved.
1/ The appropriateness of the Monitoring & Evaluation process and the mobilization of the resources required for its implementation to assess the project’s results; does the M&E system ensure participation of people with disabilities?
2/ To what extend the actual results match the performance targets set out initially (if not, highlight the possible explaining factors and recommendations to address gaps in the future would a subsequent phase be possible);
3/ The extent to which the target groups have access to the results/services (identify remaining barriers if any, gender related constrains), as apparent by key stakeholders, in particular persons with disabilities, vulnerable and risk people.
4/ How effective were project implementation strategies in realizing the objectives of increasing access to DPO and employment through:
   Effectiveness of identification and referral systems;
   Effectiveness of service delivery (e.g. counselling and information by service provider etc.)
5/ Effectiveness of capacity building activities for implementing partners (partner INGO/NGOs, and DPO, community livelihood workers, that is to say the extent to which the results/services are reaching the minimum quality (criteria to be suggested by the evaluator)
6/ Effectiveness of capacity building of people with disabilities and their control over the livelihood assets.
7/ Whether any shortcomings were due to failure to take into account cross-cutting or over-arching issues such as gender, disaster resilience, capacity of implementing organizations, etc.

5.3 Efficiency: Sound management and value for money
How well the various activities transformed the available resources into the intended results in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness. Comparison should be made against what was planned.
Does the project have appropriate and efficient financial monitoring tools? 
To what extent the program has utilized its resources (e.g. time, money, human resources, implementing partners and government partners) efficiently?
The extent to which the costs of the project have been justified by the benefits, whether or not expressed in monetary terms;
The extent to which cooperation mechanisms were understood and actively supported by all stakeholders (inter-institutional structures such as DPO, partners and the key stakeholders, etc.)
The extent to which the partnership modalities facilitated/ constrained the implementation of the activities

5.4 Impact: Achievement of Wider Effects
The extent to which the objectives of the project have been achieved as intended, in particular, the project planned overall objective i.e. Reduced poverty for poor rural and peri-urban people living in Bangladesh (contributing to MDG 1)
The appropriateness of the Monitoring & Evaluation process and the mobilization of the resources required for its implementation to assess the project’s impact;
The extent people with disabilities have been economically empowered through successful employment (self or wage);
Have the project initiatives helped the beneficiaries to choose the appropriate IGA;
How effective are the referral linkages and networking established among the relevant stakeholder organizations involved in DPO, Making It Work (MIW) committee;
Are there constraints limiting potential impacts of the project, and suggestions on how it could have been addressed/could be addressed in a future project
What are the impacts of the project (especially of its capacity-building component) on the targeted DPOs, mainstreaming partners;
The extent to which the project effectively has used the Making it Work (MIW) methodology (For further information on MIW, please visit: www.makingitwork-crdp.org) at national and local level to advocate for inclusive livelihood activities.

5.5 Sustainability: Likely Continuation of Achieved Results
An assessment of whether the positive outcomes of the project and the flow of benefits are likely to continue after external funding and/ or non-funding support interventions (referral linkages, coordination) ends, on the basis of the following:
The level of ownership of objectives and achievements by the project stakeholders, and likelihood for them to maintain the implementation of project activities;
Methodology of forming risk fund group, ownership and autonomy of the members and the sustainability.
Institutional capacity – the extent to which the project is embedded in local institutional structures, i.e., implementing partners, DPO;
Technical sustainability – whether the technology, knowledge, process or service introduced or provided fits system, culture, traditions, skills or knowledge in this specific context; alternate technologies are being considered where possible; the degree to which the beneficiaries have been able to adapt to and maintain the technology, knowledge, process or services acquired without further assistance.
Financial sustainability – whether services provided are affordable for the beneficiaries or likely to remain affordable after the funding ends; whether there is a potential for funds to be generated to cover recurring costs once the project funding ends;
Policy support – existence and changes in policies at the Government level;
Accessibility - the extent to which persons with disabilities, vulnerable people and their family members have sustainable increased capacity to move extreme poor to poor.
Does the project consider a well-developed sustainability strategy in the PCM and smooth exist of the project, in particular exit from Sitakund and hard to reach DPOs.

6. Evaluation Methodology
The details of the evaluation methodology will be proposed by the evaluator in the technical proposal, which will be finalized with HI team.
List of documents will make available before field mission, which are
a) Project proposal and budget
b) Interim reports
c) Mid-term evaluation report
d) Baseline and endline report
e) DPO capacity assessment and progress report
f) MIW documents
g) Other project reports, database, tools; requested by the evaluator

7. Authorities and Responsibility
7.1 Role of Evaluator(s)
Profile of Principal Investigator/Team leader/Consultants (Detailed CV to be submitted):
His/her specialization in statistics / Social Science / Economics/ Sociology / Development Studies /Livelihood Management
He/she has proven experience in multi-sectored project evaluation or in household livelihood assessment, experience on DFID's graduation model is a plus
He/she is willing to work in remote area with poor and extremely poor people, preferably in Bangladesh or the region; and Preference will be given to his/her previous experience of working with vulnerable groups including people with disability and livelihood/graduation.

7.2 Evaluators' General Tasks
Read background documentation and review secondary information in regards to evaluation
Develop evaluation plan and design evaluation methodologies and evaluation plan/schedule and share with HI team. Develop quantitative & qualitative questionnaires, checklist/guide questionnaire in English incorporating appropriate questions for information items and include proxy indicators so that complex outcome indicators (e.g. socio-economic indicators) can be derived from. Ensure to have indicators disaggregated by gender and age specific and sharing with HI team for feedbacks. Finalize the survey methodology, sample size, data collection techniques. Drafting report and share with the HI team members. Participate in interim and final briefings. Finalize report after incorporating feedback and share with HI management for final verification before submitting the final report. Submit the final report and all primary data, tables and databases based on which report have been produced.

7.3 HI's role
Support organizing all logistics related to the mission. Organize all meeting with relevant stakeholders. Share all relevant documents and reports. Organize local transportation and its expenses (except local flight, which costs around €80).

How to apply:
7.3 Submission of Evaluation Proposal:
The evaluation proposal should contain two separate parts: Technical Proposal and Financial Proposal.
A copy of previous work on similar assignment is requested as well (this will be used by HI only for assessing the capacity of the candidate and will not be shared with third parties).
The technical proposal should specify:
· Analysis of the ToR showing the consultants’ understanding of the subject to be evaluated;
· Proposed analytical and investigative methodology showing how the consultants intend to proceed;
· Qualification and experience of the consultant in socio-economic studies/evaluations;
· Career resumes of consultants containing the following items:
q Academic training and technical skills;
q Knowledge of the systems, mechanisms and instruments of cooperation interventions;
q Skills in the field of public policy evaluation;
Knowledge of the country and region of the intervention and, if appropriate, of the local language;
The financial proposal should specify:
· Salary/honorarium of professional/experts and other support staffs including social costs (VAT, tax etc);
· Travel and accommodation costs.
· Please note that HI will not provide additional per diems.
· If the consultant prefers local translator form outside of HI team, it needs to be budgeted
Please send your application to jobs@hibd.org specifying the subject “GPAF Final Evaluation” by February 26, 2018

7.4 Mode of payment
All payments should be account pay Cheque and vat/tax should be deducted by at source. HI may make payment instalments as follows: 30 percent advance after signing contract, 40 percent after draft summary and findings sharing and a final 30 percent after the receipt and acceptance of the Final Report. VAT and Tax would be deducted as per Government rules.

8. Contact person
Rashidul Islam, Project Coordinator, HI Bangladesh Programme;

9. Confidentiality and copyright
All documents shared with the Consultant and with his team are confidential to HI Bangladesh and should not be used outside of HI Bangladesh without prior permission. Information received by the Consultant from HI Bangladesh and Project fields should be treated as confidential. The evaluation report will be owned by HI Bangladesh and disseminated to or shared with authorities, as the organization feels necessary. After the final submission of evaluation report, the consultant should be submitted all field level hard copy data, Soft copy and all provided documents during evaluation purposes. Therefore, all materials created by the evaluator under the TOR will become the intellectual and physical property of handicap International /

10. Principles and values
The evaluator should comply with HI’s ethical rules and protection policies, in particular the Child Protection (CP) and Protection against Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (PSEA); these policies will be the integral part of the final contract. The evaluation should also bear the image of HI and ‘do-no-harm’ to the beneficiaries and should maintain transparency and impartiality with project participants and stakeholders. The evaluator should respect the core humanitarian principles to evaluate the project. S/he should ensure fullest participation of local actors and their views should reflect in the outcome. The evaluator is obliged to follow HI security policy throughout the mission; an induction will be given immediate after arrival.

11. Time frame
The evaluation will be completed within a period of 25 calendar days. The schedule will comprise of three general phases:
· Finalizing the evaluation methodology and tools (the methodology will be finalized in consultation with HI team).
· Training of data collectors, data collection and entry and validation
· Synthesizing findings, recommendations and writing report phase, sharing draft & final.

12. Deliverables
Evaluation Report (not exceeding 30 pages)
Evaluation Report Annexes
FGD records and survey tools.
ANNEX B: List of Documents Reviewed

Project documents

Annual Monitoring reports (Compiled Kurigram, Sitakunda, April 2017 – March 2018)
Annual Plan Y3
Annual Review Meeting Minutes, December 2017
Baseline final database & analysis
Baseline Survey Questionnaire for Beneficiary Households of GPAF Project
Beneficiary Satisfaction reports (Kurigram, Sitakunda, April 2017)
Disability-Inclusive Poverty Graduation Index, Operational Guidelines, June 2015
Focus Group Findings, Sitakunda, April 2017

GOOD PRACTICE I: How to create disability friendly environment and ensure inclusive employment in a factory

GPAP Impact Proposal – HI Bangladesh Full Proposal (IMP-03-PL-1819)
Grant Set-up Management Queries IMP-04-PL-1819
Internal Mid-Term Evaluation report, Nov 14-28, 2016 (draft and final)
IMP-04-PL-1819 Logframe Annex A Final Bangladesh
Livelihood Procurement Guidelines, May 2013
Logframe Y2
Mainstreaming Partners Information
Making It Work Overview (PPP)
Meeting Minutes Steering Committee, 1st – 2nd- 3rd resp. 2016, 2017, 2018
Monitoring & Evaluation Summary Template (GPAF)
Overview Disability Inclusive Poverty Graduation of Extreme Poor and Poor Households in Bangladesh
Project progress reports (Kurigram & Sitakunda annual & quarterly; Mainstreaming & DPO quarterly)
Proposed Budget, January 2014
Quarterly Monitoring reports (Compiled Kurigram, Sitakunda, 2017-18 and 4 Quarters 2017-18)
Results Workplan
Risk Fund Management – Operational Guidelines
Theory of Change, Poverty Graduation Project, draft March 2018
ToR of the MIW Advisory Group, HI Bangladesh
UK AID Direct Annual Review Y2 – Narrative and Results
What is the MIW Methodology?, HI
Other documents

Beneficiary Feedback in Evaluation, DfID February 2015

BRAC’s Ultra-Poor Graduation Programme, not dated

DFID’s Approach to Value for Money (VfM), July 2011


Impact Evaluation of Development Interventions, a practical guide, Howard White and David A. Raitzer, Asian Development Bank 2017

Module 7. Assessing value for money, Beam Exchange, 8 April 2018

OPM’s approach to assessing Value for Money, Julian King January 2018
### ANNEX C: Field Visit Schedule & List of Respondents

#### FIELD VISIT SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 M (arch)</td>
<td>Orientation by Project staff</td>
<td>Dhaka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Meeting with Field Team Kurigram; Interview with Officer Urban Social Services; Second meeting with Field Team.</td>
<td>Kurigram Sadar</td>
<td>Airflight to Saipur, car to Kurigram Sadar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Visit to Beneficiary (case nr. 1); Visit to Beneficiary (case nr. 2); Interview with Livestock Officer; Third meeting with Field Team; Interview with DPO KPKS rep’s.</td>
<td>Kurigram Sadar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Interview with Union Parishad Chairman; Visit to Beneficiary (case nr. 3); Interview with CLW in charge; Visit to Beneficiary (case nr. 4); Fourth meeting with Field Team; Interview with Field Team Leader Islamic Relief.</td>
<td>Kurigram Sadar</td>
<td>Travel to Rangpur by car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Interview with Apex Body rep’s of Islamic Relief programme; Interview with Rehabilitation Officer embedded with Islamic Relief; Interview with DPO working with Islamic Relief.</td>
<td>Rangpur</td>
<td>Car to Saipur, airflight to Dhaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Document reading and field reporting</td>
<td>Dhaka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Meeting with Field Team; Interview with Union Parishad Chairman.</td>
<td>Sitakunda</td>
<td>Airflight to Chittagong, car to Sitakunda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Visit to Beneficiary (case nr. 5); Visit to Beneficiary (case nr. 6); Visit to Beneficiary (case nr. 7); Discussion with Field Team; Interview with rep’s of three Risk Fund Groups.</td>
<td>Sitakunda</td>
<td>Discussion with Field Team about medical emergency protocol (due to case nr.7).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Interview with DPO rep’s; Interview with UNO Sitakunda Upazilla; Interview with Welfare Officer Sitakunda Upazilla; Interview with 7 CLW;</td>
<td>Sitakunda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Meeting/Activity</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Field reporting</td>
<td>Dhaka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Interview with rep. Helvetas WIKI Survey workshop with DPOs</td>
<td>Dhaka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Interview with rep. Islamic Relief; data collection at HQ; Debriefing Project staff &amp; Dep. Dir. HI</td>
<td>Dhaka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LIST OF RESPONDENTS**

(In chronological order)

**H.I. Dhaka**

Project management and staff individual interviews

**Kurigram Sadar**

Field staff group interview
Beneficiary case 1, female case in-depth interview
Community Livelihood Worker, female individual interview
Beneficiary case 2, male case in-depth interview
Livestock Officer, Kurigram Sadar Upazilla individual interview
DPO KPKS representatives group interview
Union Parichad Chairman, male individual interview
Beneficiary case 3, female case in-depth interview
Community Livelihood Worker, male individual interview
Beneficiary case 4, female case in-depth interview

**Rangpur**

Field staff of Islamic Relief, group interview
Rehabilitation Officer, female individual interview
Apex body representatives, 3 female group interview
DPO representatives (including of women’s wing) group interview

**Sitakunda**

Field staff group interview
Union Parishad Chairman, male individual interview
Beneficiary case 5, male case in-depth interview
Beneficiary case 6, female case in-depth interview
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee Type</th>
<th>Method of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary case 7, male</td>
<td>case in-depth interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Fund Group, representatives of 3 groups</td>
<td>group interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPO representatives</td>
<td>group interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNO Upazilla Sitakunda, male</td>
<td>individual interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare Officer Upazilla Sitakunda, female</td>
<td>individual interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Livelihood Workers, 2 female, 5 male</td>
<td>group interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chittagong</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representatives of YPSA (CEO, Directors, Fin. &amp; Progr. Off)</td>
<td>group interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dhaka</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative of Helvetas, Deputy Country Director</td>
<td>individual interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative of Islamic Relief, Programme Coordinator</td>
<td>individual interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representatives of 15 DPOs</td>
<td>Wiki survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex D: List of Disabled Peoples’ Organisations (DPO)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl no</th>
<th>DPO name</th>
<th>Working Area</th>
<th>Relation with HI or MP</th>
<th>Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kurigram Protibondhi Kallayan Sangstha (KPKS)</td>
<td>Kurigram Sadar Upazila</td>
<td>Collaborating in Kurigram Sadar</td>
<td>KPKS established in 2006 as a Disabled Peoples’ Organizations (DPOs) working in Kurigram Sadar, located at Kurigram Sadar, Kurigram, Bangladesh. Have experience on advocacy, health, education and social safety net etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Federation of DPOs Sitakunda (FoDS)</td>
<td>Sitakunda Upazila</td>
<td>Collaborating in Sitakunda</td>
<td>FoDS established on 27/12/2007 as a DPO working in Sitakunda, Chittagong, Bangladesh. Have experience on Advocacy meeting with Employers, Training on livelihood development. Have experience with upazila level Advocacy meeting to ensure health service for disable peoples. Meeting with Govt. Officials to ensure free treatment for disable peoples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Progoti Protibondhi Unnyan Sangstha (PPUS)</td>
<td>Sadar, Lalmonirhat</td>
<td></td>
<td>Progoti established in 2005 as a DPO located at Gokunda Union, Sadar, and Lalmonirhat. Experience in People with disabilities on different awareness links to Go &amp; Ngo Opportunity, Advocacy project from ADD: inclusive education, No more called with the disability, respect to person with disabilities, reduced abuse to women with disabilities, Chairman and members are sensitized on disability. Accessed to primary teacher (disability quota).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rangdhonu Zila Protibondhi Odhikar Sangstha (RZPOS)</td>
<td>Sadar, Rangpur and Poshasher &amp; Sundorgonj upazila of Gaibandha</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rangdhonu established in 2005 as a DPO working in Gaibandha and Rangpur District. Have experience in arranging supports from networking organizations and local resources for PWDs, self-employment, Rehabilitation for Persons with Disabilities Following the Rana Plaza Collapse in Bangladesh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Prottasha Protibondhi Nari o Shisu Unnyan Sangstha (PPNSUS)</td>
<td>Sadar, Mithapukur, Pirgaucha of Rangpur and Sadul-lapur of Gaibandha</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prottasa registered with Department of Woman Affairs of Women and Child Welfare Ministry of Government of Bangladesh, under the registration number 201 dated 7th July 2009, located at Rangpur, Bangladesh. Experience in Arranging supports from networking organizations and local resources for PWDs, self-employment, Discussion meeting, Round table meeting,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Samota Protibondhi Odhikar Sangstha (SPOS)</td>
<td>Badargonj Upazila of Rangpur</td>
<td>Somota established in 2007 as a DPO located at Bodorgonj upazila in Rangpur. Experienced on Discussion meeting, Seminar, Workshop, Zila &amp;Union coordination meeting, awareness meeting with stakeholders etc. Different activities for increase awareness on disability rights. Income Generating Activities - Cow rearing, small business, Mudi shop, Tailoring, Goat selling etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Samprity Protibondhi Unnyan Sangstha (SPUS)</td>
<td>Sadar Upazila of Thakurgan.</td>
<td>Samprity, registered with Department of Social Services. Registration number 2063/09 dated 05/01/2009. Located at Dinajpur. Experienced on Arranging supports from networking organizations and local resources for PWDs self-employment. Group discussion with disable person, family members and neighbors, Door to door home visit. Arrange school committee meeting and between students Memorandum, Discussion meeting, Round table meeting, Seminar, Workshop, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Odhikar Chai Protibondhi Unnyan Sangstha (OCPUS)</td>
<td>Sadar and Saghata Upazila of Gaibandha</td>
<td>Odhikar Chri established in 2005 as a Disabled Peoples' Organizations (DPOs) working at Gaibandha Sadar, Gaibandha, Bangladesh, Advocacy, training, awareness build-up. Income Generating Activities, Seminar, self-help group meetings, leaders and Executive Committee meeting, General Committee meeting, legal aid support from ADD International.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bogra Zila Bandhan Protibondhi Sangstha (BPS)</td>
<td>Polashbari upazila of Gaibandha and Bogra</td>
<td>BPS established in 2005 as a Disabled Peoples’ Organizations (DPOs) registration number 1409/09 under social welfare department, working at Bogra Sadar, located in Bogra, Bangladesh. Discussion meeting, Round table meeting, Seminar, Workshop, Zila &amp; Union co-ordination meeting etc. Meeting with teachers, parents, students and education concern persons.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Organization Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Nandan Zila Protibondhi Sangstha Nandan</td>
<td>Natore</td>
<td>Nandan, established in 2000 as a DPO working at Natore Sadar, located in Natore, Experienced in Human rights Awareness rising, Education, Advocacy, Rehabilitation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Protibondhi Punorbason O Manobadhikar Samity (PPMS)</td>
<td>Bera, Sadar</td>
<td>PPOMS established in 2004 as a DPO working at Pabna Sadar, located in Pabna, Bangladesh. Legal advice, litigation, mediation. Linkage with education office and school for children with disabilities, Garments producing shirt, pant, dress, and training of sowing, Goat rearing, cow rearing, and small trade.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Khoksha Upazila Protibondhi Kallyan Sangstha (KUPKS)</td>
<td>Khoksha upazila, Kushtia</td>
<td>Khoksha Upazila Protibondhi Kallyan Sangstha (KUPKS), established in 2007 as a DPO working in Khoksha Upazila, Kushtia. Experienced in wage employment, small business, safety net program and advocacy with local level stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Tharanga Protibondhi Unnyan Sangstha (TPUS)</td>
<td>Magura</td>
<td>Torongo established in 2006 as working at Magura. Experience in Collaborative education, employment, training, keeping livestock, garments admission, provided IGA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Astha Protibondhi Nari Parishad (APNP)</td>
<td>Faridpur</td>
<td>Astha established in 2005 as a DPO working at Faridpur Sadar, Faridpur, Bangladesh. Experience in arrange training for women with disabilities and help them to choose their own business, we have bought cows and distribute among the women with disabilities for rearing, we also have support them economically for starting small business. Upazila and District level for awareness building of person with disabilities. We also have arranged SHG meeting, yard meeting, to build awareness of people with disability including general people about disability and their rights.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Protibondhi Shawnirvhor Sangstha (PSS)</td>
<td>Bagha, Godagari, Sadar, Poba upazila of Rajshahi</td>
<td>PSS established in 2003 as a Disabled Peoples' Organizations (DPOs) working at Rajshahi Sadar, Rajshahi. Experienced on Discussion meeting, Round table meeting, Seminar, Workshop, Zila &amp; Union co-ordination meeting etc. Arranging supports from networking organizations and local resources for PWDs self-employment. Grocery, Animal husbandry etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bogra Disable People Organization to Development (Bogra DPOD)</td>
<td>Nandiagram, Bogra</td>
<td>Bogra DPOD established in 2004 as DPO working at Bogra district, Bangladesh, Registration Number Bogra-1121/04. Experienced on Advocacy, Awareness rising, Education, Livelihood/IGA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ANNEX E: Meeting with DPOs for project evaluation

**Date:** 21 March, 2018, **Venue:** HI Head Office, Gulshan, Dhaka

### WIKI survey:

**1. Benefits:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DPO Name</th>
<th>1. What kind of DPO capacities have increased through project intervention?</th>
<th>2. What are the benefits received by DPO through implementing this project?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kurigram Protibondhi Kallyan Sangstha (KPKS)</td>
<td>Previously they were not used any format. Now they used format for referral and budget in excel sheet. Increased networking with public &amp; private stakeholders.</td>
<td>Increased communication and relation with service providers. Increased people with disabilities confidence and they are united now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation of DPOs Sitakunda (FoDS)</td>
<td>Not present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astha Protibondhi Nari Parishad</td>
<td>Increased networking and capacity development skills</td>
<td>Involve people with disabilities to engage in employment through networking, courtyard awareness and peer support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taranga Protibondhi Unnyan Sangstha</td>
<td>Executive committee oriented about organizational policies, increased capacity on implementing rights and protection act, financial control and business development</td>
<td>Strengthen DPO capacity and well known publicity and advocacy &amp; awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khoksha Upazila Protibondhi Kallyan Sangstha</td>
<td>Received capacity building training, increased financial management and activity implementation. Created employment opportunity for people with disabilities</td>
<td>Implement rights of people with disabilities and reduce discrimination. People with disabilities are engaged in IGA, children with disabilities get change to enrollment in school, reduce abuse of women with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natore Zila Protibondhi Sangstha Nandan</td>
<td>39 people with disabilities got employment opportunity and 500 referral and peer support.</td>
<td>They added in different district level committee. Employment in PRAN factory, added in disability allowance committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangdhonu Zila Protibondhi Odhikar Sangstha</td>
<td>Prepared different policies. Increased capacity to write project proposal</td>
<td>Increased networking and got financial support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prottasha Protibondhi Nari O Shisu Odhikar Sangstha</td>
<td>Making different organizational policies, initiative to prepare NGO affairs bureau registration apply, ability to do advocacy and increased capacity</td>
<td>DPO continue their activities through project. Received small grant from Govt. Women Affairs Dept., Self-employment opportunity created for DPO staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samata Protibondhi Odhikar Sangstha</td>
<td>Everyone know about DPO in Upazila</td>
<td>Increased DPOs publicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samprity Protibondhi Unnyan Sangstha</td>
<td>Increased social identity and capacity of organizational staff. Capable to work one district to other district</td>
<td>Created opportunity for employment, DPO registration, working area coverage and good relationship with local government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progoti Protibondhi Unnyan Sangstha</td>
<td>Increased networking and advocacy and human resource as well</td>
<td>Increased capacity and networking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Odhikar Chai Protibondhi Unnayan Sangstha**

Received so many training and learned on how to leading an organization.

Completed organizational registration through HI financial support

**Bogra Zila Bandhan Protibondhi Sangstha**

Amendment all organizational policies, local resource mobilization, increased advocacy capacity

Increased advocacy strategy, updated cash book in excel sheet, involved in rights and protection act committee

**Bogra Disabled People Organization to Development (Bogra DPOD)**

Increased knowledge on transparency, capacity, reporting and accounts (cash, ledger book), Activate and reform rights and protection act committee meeting at district & sub-district level

Prepared different organizational policy such as financial, travel, procurement, recruitment, sexual exploitation policies etc. and local resource mobilization and strategies for employment.

**Protibondhi Shawnirvhor Sangstha (PSS)**

Increased DPO’s publicity, networking & communication and capacity as well

Increased awareness and DPO’s name is now very well-known at project implementing area.

**Protibondhi Punorbasong Manobadhikar Sangstha (PPMS)**

Increased Networking, DPO’s Identity, Awareness through workshop, courtyard, referral & peer support

Created wide area networking, employment opportunities, reduced poverty, received training

### 2. Lesson Learned of Management and Operation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DPO</strong></th>
<th><strong>1. Can employment opportunities be created for people with disabilities through using local resources?</strong></th>
<th><strong>2. Are there any obstacles to getting services from bank such as bank loan and social services, disability allowance etc.?</strong></th>
<th><strong>3. What are the barriers faced by people with disabilities to involve in employment?</strong></th>
<th><strong>4. How much DPO capacity has increased?</strong></th>
<th><strong>5. Why Stakeholders are not providing time for getting services?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>KPKS</strong></td>
<td>Yes, govt. land lease, pond lease and tree plantation in road side etc.</td>
<td>Yes, not provide loan as PWD are not provide loan back</td>
<td>Create proper working environment and remove barriers. Small opportunity can create huge capacity</td>
<td>DPO’s mentality has changed. They can do any kind of work.</td>
<td>Stakeholders thought, its time waste, not well known. To get services, we need to improve the communication linkages with respective dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FoDS</strong></td>
<td>NOT PRESENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asthasth</strong></td>
<td>Yes, example bamboo and cane making, small cottage &amp; handicraft etc.</td>
<td>Before implementing, it was huge. But now not facing any problem</td>
<td>They thought, PWD will not capable to do work as having disability</td>
<td>Now increased networking with different institutes</td>
<td>Before this project, they were ignore but now they are sensitized through workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taranga</strong></td>
<td>Through savings, cooperative, land lease, loan from different institute, capacity building</td>
<td>Union parished, upazila parisd and political leader wanted to provide support to their well-known person.</td>
<td>Less capacity of PWD and negative mind setup of employer, no working</td>
<td>Can capable to do work alternatively</td>
<td>Stakeholder are not sensitized, communicate with top management and given reference about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Employment Opportunity</td>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khoksha</td>
<td>Employ through handicraft product such as paper making, tissue bag making etc. Provide IGA support through advocacy.</td>
<td>Bank didn’t interest to provide loan as persons with disabilities are not paying back loan. Not now they got confidence about paying back loan.</td>
<td>As less education, less facilities in office-no ramp, no wash room facilities. Enough capacity increased as they engaged in employment at local level. As not conducted properly advocacy with stakeholders. Now they are sensitized about disability rights.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nandan</td>
<td>Mange employment opportunity at different organization</td>
<td>As not properly presented the topic. Need to advocacy and ensure their presence through regular communication.</td>
<td>Types, educational qualification, experience, working environment through advocacy. DPO members are engaged in different committee and prepare document. To adjust with their time and regular communication required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangdhonu</td>
<td>Got land and pond lease for small business</td>
<td>Yes, bureaucratic problem and bribe. Due to lack of awareness of employer, they are less interest to provide job, not enacted law.</td>
<td>Have increased experience in other district and created new DPO. Not conducted advocacy at right time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prottasha</td>
<td>Created self-employment opportunities through local resource mobilization</td>
<td>Bank wants land papers to provide loan. Bank officers are not provide correct info. We don’t have proper information. Not maintain quota in govt. job. Less educational qualification, due to having disability.</td>
<td>Increased working area coverage in other district. Not attended in proper time. Need to communicate in right time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samata</td>
<td>Yes, through advocacy and good relationship with stakeholders</td>
<td>Some of bank officer not following the rule of law of Bangladesh bank, social service loan need to maintain many procedures. Advocacy and good relation can solve the problem. Ignoring due to having disability, faced obstacles and people are less supportive.</td>
<td>Present condition is better than before. Advocacy with stakeholders and make them sensitized with good relation build up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samprity</td>
<td>Yes, Union Parishad, shop, bank and through training we can created employment</td>
<td>Bank officer are not informed to provide loan, sometime faced problem to go to bank in 2-3 upstairs and faced difficulties. Sometimes we did not find qualified PWD to provide training such as tailoring, computer operation, electrical, house wiring etc.</td>
<td>Previously we worked in one district and now sifted in another district. Stakeholders wanted to get some extra facilities from event.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Problem</td>
<td>Solution</td>
<td>Observation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progoti</td>
<td>Yes we can use local resource and create employment opportunity.</td>
<td>There is rumor about PWD will not give back the loan. So, they faced obstacles.</td>
<td>PWD can-not able to work, they are not capable, they don’t understand, less education, less capacity.</td>
<td>Now they understood and capable to do work.</td>
<td>They are not oriented about the disability issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odhikar Chai</td>
<td>Example: bank and social service loan, and do business on fish culture, cow rearing, duck rearing and grocery shop.</td>
<td>Sometime service provider wanted to get bribes and faced discrimination to get services.</td>
<td>Donor organization and GO/NGO are not employed due to disabilities and also not provide information.</td>
<td>Has increased capacity to organize many events. Now we can write ledger book, bill voucher, man power etc.</td>
<td>Now aware about disability rights and have to commit in meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandhan</td>
<td>Yes, Agricultural activities and pond lease from fish culture.</td>
<td>To present the problem and overcome.</td>
<td>Disability, less educational qualification, type of work.</td>
<td>DPO self-help group informed about services and where they can get it.</td>
<td>As stakeholders are involved in different event, need to plan for engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogra DPOD</td>
<td>Yes, using local resource, we can create employment opportunity such as pond lease, tree plantation in roadside etc.</td>
<td>Now not facing any problem.</td>
<td>Employer thought, people with disabilities are not able to do the work, not listening properly.</td>
<td>DPO capacity has increased 95%, need to continue advance level capacity building.</td>
<td>They wanted honorarium for coming in a meeting. But after good relation can avoid that situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS</td>
<td>Yes, Using organizational vehicle for rent and create employment through local resource.</td>
<td>They faced problem before working in this project, now less obstacle faced.</td>
<td>Due to disability and less education, they faced problem in employment.</td>
<td>DPO has increased enough capacity.</td>
<td>Now they are providing much time as communicate in proper/right time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPMS</td>
<td>Created employment opportunity through local resource mobilization. E.g. cow &amp; goat rearing, bamboo &amp; basket, tree plantation, fish culture.</td>
<td>No problem facing now. Received services from social service dept. through advocacy and network.</td>
<td>Educational qualification is the main barrier.</td>
<td>Increased capacity through working with HI.</td>
<td>As less sensitization about disability. Now they oriented and give time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX F: SEVEN CASE STORIES

Case nr. 1: The Tailor Teacher

The five-months old girl was carried by another child who let her fall on her head. Her mother noticed a problem immediately but waited 1.5 month to go to the hospital as she had no money for the transport and was afraid to tell her husband who used to beat her. He left her when Moni’s sister was born; at that time Moni was 4 year old. Now is Moni 14 years old but intellectually and physically challenged due to brain damage. Moni’s younger sister is 10 year old and goes to school. The two sisters sleep together at night.

At time of the accident the family lived in a nice rented semi-concrete house with two rooms. Soon the family moved to another house, built on their own land, where the mother with her two children still lives. This house is built from bamboo with metal sheets for wall and roof. Soon after the move the husband left his family. The mother started to pay instalments to her husband to get ownership of the land on which her house stands. Although she has paid it in full she still need to get the ownership papers.

A NGO project provided rehabilitation assistance for Moni who could only lie down and not move her legs or head muscles. The NGO learned the mother how to exercise Moni’s muscles and her condition became a bit better, she could sit up sometimes, until the mother became sick and stopped the exercises. At that time, 3 years ago H.I.’s project selected the household as beneficiary and took over assistance from the other NGO. First thing to do was to make a plan for rehabilitation and livelihood generation. The mother got instructions on how to exercise her daughter’s limps and neck, and she got a special chair which facilitated Moni’s seating. Now Moni can sit upright in her chair and even keep her head up. However, Moni’s condition could even be better with more exercises but the mother has too little time for the exercises as she is running her tailor shop and teaching local girls and women how to sew clothes. Her younger daughter sometimes encourages her mother to exercise her sister’s limps more.

The H.I. project provided cloth for the business but the mother bought herself a sewing machine. She works from her house where she built a lean-to for the tailor shop. Trainees bring their own sewing machines but work during their internship for free and even pay fees for the tailoring lessons. In three year time the Tailor Teacher has lifted herself out of extreme poverty with some assistance from the project.

Case nr. 2: The Match Maker

The 35 year old disabled man smiled broadly when he told that his job was to find suitable candidates for marriages – he is a Match Maker despite moving around in his wheelchair cum tricycle. When asked if people did find this strange and whether his disability made his job more difficult he answered that season. The Match Maker’s disability is a deformity on both his legs due to a traffic accident when he

The Match Maker married himself when he was 20 years old and has now two children, a 7 year old boy and an 8 year old girl, who both are going to school. A time ago his wife left him but came back later to stay again. At that time the Match Maker was homebound and without job, did not get any respect from community members and without money. He was dependent on his parents and neighbours.

Few years ago a community livelihood worker of H.I. visited him and ask him many qustions about his disa-bility, his assets and family situation. After that he was invited to join group meetings were they spook about income generation activities and savings. The project gave him a cow in 2015 and a wheelchair/tricycle in 2016. The get the cow he went to a local animal market with a neighbour who advised him what cow best to buy. He spent the full grant amount of 20,000 taka after the field team had approved his choice. The project also provided a stipend to feed the cow and a training on how to take care.

After fattening the cow he sold it and bought a new cow and a goat with the proceeds. He consumed or sold the milk. The Match Maker also leased some land to cultivate rice for his family’s consumption – he got two crops a year. He compliments his income by looking for marriage candidates for families in his community – the match making business. This became possible because his tricycle allows him to move around in the villages; he learned the trade from an old match maker and he is good at it. Besides this he joined a fish breeding group – his fourth income source not counting the disability allowance he gets from the local government
(arranged with help from the project). Except for the allowance all his incomes are seasonal or irregular, that is why he need some many income sources, but all together they feed his family and makes him independent from charity as before he was selected by the project as a beneficiary.

The Match Maker smiles happily when he moved away with his tricycle to meet his next marriage couple.

**Case nr. 3: Destined for Poverty**

The beneficiaries are a 60 to 70 year old mother with her 22 year old handicapped daughter who is intellectual challenged born with a malformed arm. They live on a compound in a small thatch-roofed one-room house with her son and his family nearby in another house on the compound. A third unrelated family occupies a house on one side of the compound making the setting look like a small community with a square in the middle.

The project selected this woman and her daughter as they were extremely poor without any income, and provided her with a cow which was chosen by her son at the maximum grant of 20,000 taka. However, the cow did not get a calf and they sold her for 24,500 taka – a profit of 4,500 taka before the cost of feeding and care. With the proceeds they bought another cow for 19,000 taka. They did not take a goat as the old mother or her daughter needed to take care of it and a cow requires less attention.

Despite this asset they did not graduate out of extreme poverty, because neither the mother or the daughter can work to earn an income. They also suffered damage on their house due to flooding and used some of the profit of caring for a cow to let make repairs. Their situation is better than before, also because of the effect of being selected as a beneficiary which raised their status in the community, but they still remain very poor. The project plans to support them during the next phase to get the government disability allowance to increase their monthly income.

**Case nr. 4: The Busy Mother**

The mother is relative young, around 40 years, caring for her two daughters of 15 and 13, and her two sons of 7 and 5 years old. The oldest daughter is intellectual challenged. She also takes care of her own mother who is 60 years old. She has no husband around and no steady work – only manual work when she finds it.

All of her meagre income is spend for food and household essentials, medicine for her mother, education expenses for her children and feeding of her animals – and recently on repair of her house which was damaged by flood. The education expenses are 2,000 taka every month. There is nothing to spare, but she is a member of the Risk Fund Group and has to deposit at least 50 taka every month.

The project provided a cow, which now got a calf. The Busy Mother who has to run her household and therefore has little time left to work for money, also keeps two goats and some chicken. Despite this industrious attitude the mother did not graduate out of extreme poverty – she simply has not enough time for a steady job, even if it would be offered to her. Education expenses break her back, but she does not get an education allowance from the local government although she seems eligible.

**Case nr. 5: The Tailor**

He is a tailor since 2008 and learned to be it since 2000. In 2013 he started his tailor shop. The Tailor moves around in a wheelchair that can be transformed in a tricycle. His mother died in 1996. At that time he was studying at a Madrasha school grade 8 and caring for the family’s goat and poultry. His father remarried and his ant told him to learn a skill - he choose tailoring. He went to a shop to become an apprentice without a salary, he even had to pay a teaching fee. Other shops did the same. In search for the best shop to learn the trade he found one next to his sister’s house. However, there was a condition that he buys his own sewing machine and would leave it at the shop for 1½ year until he would have finished his training. He discussed with his sister how he could do this and she offered to stay in her house and eat with her family but there was no money to buy the sewing machine. When he asked his brother-in-law to formalise this in writing he changed his mind and said to offer only ½ kilogram rice a day and a sleeping place. The Tailor agreed and sold his chickens and goat to buy the sewing machine; he started to learn how to tailor. The tailor shop where he learned had also offered to provide him with food during his working hours, but instead he asked to get 10 taka from which he saved 300 take per month.
After the first month he had learned how to make a women’s blouse. The earnings from making repairs to clothes he could keep and these 350 taka he gave to his sister for his livelihood costs. At that time he was about 17 or 18 years old, he could not remember exactly how old he was. In the meantime he fell in love with his neighbours’ daughter and wanted to ask her for marriage but he needed money for that. He had put some of his savings in a sharing agreement with a tailor and wanted to start his own shop and he still had his old sewing machine of the old shop. But the saving he had were not enough. He became involved in meetings on disability rights organised by a local NGO (YPSA) and also participated in discussions to form risk fund groups organised by HI. Although initially he was not so interested they made him chairman of one group. This increased his confidence and perhaps was a reason to set up his own shop, using his old sewing machine and another one he bought with his savings. HI provided him with an electric sewing machine and cloth material, also gave him the wheelchair-tricycle. He started his own shop and used his old sewing machine at his house to give sewing training lessons for local women.

His workshop was a bamboo shed but he wanted to have a properly build workplace and rented one of stone against a deposit of 20,000 taka. He could afford that as only the month before he had earned 36,000 taka by making school dresses (the local government wanted him to get this assignment to support him in his endeavours). He also has now a cow, goats and lives in a proper house with his family.

The Tailor’s success was due to his persistence and hard work, but was also made possible by the assistance of the project. The road to his workplace needed repair so that he could use his wheelchair-tricycle and the project provided some of the funds. However, he didn’t accepted much assistance as he wants to remain independent and able to take care of his own livelihood generation.

neighbour to raise three goats, but that was not enough at all. At this time he knew well how to tailor and made dresses which could fetch 100 take a piece. Some customers were so pleased with his work that they tipped him 100 taka! However, the shopkeeper let him only sew blouses which could only fetch 30 taka. He wanted to sew ‘kamies’ which would fetch 60 taka and therefore he went in search of another shop where he could make ‘kamies’ and earn 300 take per day.

As he was serious to marriage his former neighbours’ daughter his prospective wife’s family asked the daughter whether she was willing to marry a disabled man. She agreed knowing him to be a very industrious income earner and the family told him that the dowry would be 50,000 taka but he managed to bring that down to 35,000 taka and a goat. When he married he was 24 years old. Now he has a daughter of 7 and a son of 5 years.

**Case nr. 6: The Teacher Arabic**

The grandmother who is over 70 years old lives alone in a small one-room shed with walls from bamboo and rusted metal sheets for a roof which is full of holes. Her spinal cord has been bent so much over the years that she can’t walk normally but shuffles around or if someone helps her to sit in her wheelchair she can drive around.

Her daughter lives in a village nearby but visits her only occasionally but fortunately some of her granddaughters live nearby and help her daily, what also some neighbours do. Without their help she would be helpless. The project has assisted her by constructing a concrete ramp so that she can drive in her house – however, this ramp is constructed to be flood-resistant and has a rather steep inclination which she can’t overcome to wheel her chair up against it. Others need to help her … and often she shuffles around on her heels instead of using her wheelchair.

The project also provided her with a toilet and washing place but she needs help from her granddaughters or neighbours to use these.

The grandmother used to teach Arabic and still is teaching this language at mornings near her house. She earns some money for this but otherwise she has no income. Other kinds of work are no option as she is too severe handicapped.

**Case nr. 7: Lesson Learned**

His left leg was amputated because of a traffic accident, but he earned a reasonable income selling vegetables from his small shop earning 150 to 200 taka a day. The goods for this grocery store were provided by the
project to enable his income generation. However, a sudden infection on his right leg (which also was wounded by the accident) required him to go to the hospital where the surgeon diagnosed gangrene and concluded that amputation of the second leg was the only option.

As the operation was to be done immediately he didn’t inform the project. The operation went good and he was sent home, at which time the grocery seller informed the projects’ community livelihood worker several times about his situation. However, after a month without any action by the project he sold all his goods to cover the medical expenses – mainly for medicines.

This grocery seller, who has a young wife and two small children, was chosen for a visit by the Evaluator. Only when the visit took place the projects’ field staff realised that the grocery seller had lost his means for generating an income. It became also clear that the family had no money left and that the man was suffering much pain as they could not afford to buy medicines for him. While the wife got a job as house servant which earned her a 4,000 taka per month her care for her husband took priority.

Urged by the Evaluator the field team went to the pharmacy with the wife to buy medicines for the pain, and later informed the local elected official – chairman of the Union Parishad – about the grocery sellers’ situation. He said to take immediately action but that the hospital has an emergency fund to cover medical expenses for extreme poor people, like this man. He asked ‘Why was this fund not used?’ The field team members present said not to know but to find out.

The lesson learned here was that the project should have intervened as there is an emergency fund for such urgent situations, so that no income generation means should need to be sold. Also, the government hospital’s emergency funds should have been used as well.