

**Scottish Government**

**Malawi Development Programme 2015-2018**

**End of Year 3 Report – Part 1 of 3**

This narrative report should be submitted together with your updated logframe and financial report.

**PLEASE READ ATTACHED GUIDELINES BEFORE COMPLETING THE FORM**

<b>1. Basic Project Information</b>		
Complete the information below for management purposes. Please indicate in the relevant section whether any changes to your basic project information (e.g. partners, geography, project dates or budget) have occurred during this reporting year. Explanations should be provided in section 3.		
1.1	<b>Project Reference Number</b>	M/15/S/015
1.2	<b>Reporting Year</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> April 2017 to 31 <sup>st</sup> March 2018
1.3	<b>Project Year (e.g. Year 1)</b>	Year 3
1.4	<b>Name of Lead Organisation (Grant Holder)*</b>	Tearfund
1.5	<b>Name of Partner(s)*</b>	Ministry of Hope (MOH)
1.6	<b>Name of Project*</b>	Khwamba Sustainable Livelihood Improvement Project (KSLIP)
1.7	<b>Project Description*</b>	To reduce poverty and extreme hunger for 30,000 people by empowering vulnerable households through livelihoods improvement and strengthening of the local governance and development structures.
1.8	<b>Project Country/ Region*</b>	Dowa District/ Central Malawi/ Southern Africa
1.9	<b>Project Start &amp; End Date*</b>	<b>Start:</b> 1 <sup>st</sup> April 2015 <b>End:</b> 30 <sup>th</sup> Sep 2018 (includes 6 month extension)
1.10	<b>Total Project Budget*</b>	£500,193 (+£38,365 extension)
1.11	<b>Total Funding from IDF*</b>	£538,558 (incl extension)
1.12	<b>IDF Development Priorities</b> Please tick the box next to the development priority/priorities that your block grant aims to address	<input type="checkbox"/> Health <input type="checkbox"/> Education <input type="checkbox"/> Civic Governance  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Economic Development <input type="checkbox"/> Renewable Energy
1.13	<b>Supporting Documentation</b> Check box to confirm key documents have been	<b>Up-to-Date Logical Framework (LF)</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> summarising progress against relevant milestones for project activities, outputs, outcomes and impact. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<b>1. Basic Project Information</b>			
Complete the information below for management purposes. Please indicate in the relevant section whether any changes to your basic project information (e.g. partners, geography, project dates or budget) have occurred during this reporting year. Explanations should be provided in section 3.			
	submitted with this report	Please indicate (check box) if you have proposed amendments to your LF since your last report. If so, please detail any changes in Q3.2 <input type="checkbox"/>	
		Please indicate (check box) if the LF submitted has been approved by the Scottish Government. <input type="checkbox"/>	
		<b>End of Year Financial Report</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
		<b>Proposed Revised Budget (if applicable)</b> Still to be submitted <input type="checkbox"/>	
	Please list any further supporting documentation that has been submitted	Other, please detail:	
		A Transformational Case Study	
1.14	<b>Response to Previous Progress Reviews</b>	<b>Scottish Government's comments on previous reports (State which):</b>  There were no items to follow up from the last Mid-Year report.	<b>Action taken since received:</b>
1.15	<b>Date report produced</b>	13 <sup>th</sup> April 2018	
1.16	<b>Name and position of person(s) who compiled this report</b>	<p>[REDACTED], Project Coordinator, Tearfund Malawi</p> <p>[REDACTED], Projects Manager, Tearfund in Malawi</p> <p>[REDACTED], Country Representative, Tearfund in Malawi</p> <p>[REDACTED], Finance Manager, Tearfund Malawi</p> <p>[REDACTED], KSLIP Coordinator, Ministry of Hope</p> <p>[REDACTED], MOH Acting Executive Director, Ministry of Hope</p> <p>[REDACTED], Scottish Project Officer, Tearfund</p> <p>[REDACTED] Head of Program Management, Tearfund</p>	
1.17	<b>Main contact details for project, if changed</b>	[REDACTED] remains the main contact	

**Signed by:** [REDACTED]

**Date:** 30<sup>st</sup> April 2018

**Designation on the Project:** [REDACTED], Tearfund Scotland

<b>2. Project Relevance</b>	
2.1	<p><b>Project Beneficiaries</b></p> <p>Does the project remain relevant to the context and the beneficiaries with whom you are working? Please justify this in a short paragraph below.</p> <p>The project remains relevant to the context and the beneficiaries with whom Ministry of Hope and Tearfund are working in Traditional Authority Msakambewa, Dowa</p>

	<p>District.</p> <p>Firstly, it is an under resourced area. The Mapping Report (Feb 2018) study by Non-Governmental Organisation Board’s (NGO), a Malawi government arm, shows that communities of Msakambewa “have the lowest concentration of Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) programmes at only 6% with funding portfolio of K210 million out of overall budgets of K3.7 billion for all NGOs in the district”<sup>1</sup> substantiating the importance of the KSLIP project in area.</p> <p>Secondly, it is successful for those in need, focusing on agricultural development and livelihoods which are of critical importance to beneficiaries in that area. The support by KSLIP since June 2015 has resulted in significant increase of crop yields (for example maize and groundnuts) and reduction of food insecurity and poverty, primarily in the vulnerable households of self-help group (SHG) members but also non-members.</p> <p>Thirdly, the project outcomes are sustainable and support lasting change. Members of the SHG Federation asserted that <i>“much as KSLIP’s support has resulted in the increase of maize, groundnuts and soya beans, its presence for some years to come will consolidate transformation development outcomes in the area”</i>.</p> <p>Fourthly, it is inclusive and empowering. The project has been directly working with and supporting include vulnerable people, including women, the elderly and people with disabilities. Social and district structures of governance also have been key stakeholders to manage and sustain agricultural technologies and off-farm innovations. <i>“Speaking in public was a challenge and I could not take leadership positions in the society. The project built our capacity to socially understand God-given potential to lead and transform our social and economic lives”, [REDACTED]</i> (January 2018).</p>
2.2	<p><b>Gender and social inclusion</b></p> <p>Please describe how your project has worked to ensure that women and girls, and other vulnerable groups (as appropriate) benefit from the project. Describe any challenges experienced in reaching vulnerable people and how these have been overcome.</p> <p>Gender and social inclusion remains the desired approach in the implementation of KSLIP.</p> <p>The participatory development approach (PDA) ensured that women, particularly female-headed households, elderly, orphans, persons with disabilities (PwDs) and youth were included and participated in SHGs, Natural resources management (NRM), conservation agriculture, and making and using locally made fertilisers for increased crop production (see, <i>specific outputs in this report</i>). Beneficiaries have commented on this e.g. [REDACTED] explained, <i>“Women’s wellbeing outcomes have improved by participating in SHGs, the emphasis has also been encouraging the participation of elderly, people with disabilities (PwDs) and youths”, [REDACTED]</i>, [January 2018]. <i>“At the beginning of the project it was difficult to convince PwDs and elderly to participate in development activities, but through careful sensitization by KSLIP staff, various committees and members of the communities opened up in year 2 (2016-2017) for inclusive development. Everybody is equal.”</i></p>

<sup>1</sup> See, NGO Board’s Mapping Report (February 2018) on NGO programmes and resources in all Traditional Authorities in Dowa District. Mandated by the Act of Parliament, the Board registers and regulates the operations of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) in Malawi.

	<p>In this reporting period (year 3 2017-2018) the project has benefitted 8,203 participants directly, of which 5,364 are women (65.4%): 25% of these are female-headed households. Indirect beneficiaries include 24,835 children of which 12,783 are girls, 298 people with disabilities (168 women and 130 men) and 805 are classed as elderly (503 women and 302 men).</p> <p>An important successful element in this project is the reduction of the dependency ratio – defined as active to inactive members of the family. This has reduced from 1:4.6 to 1:3.9 (Tearfund monitoring June/July 2017). This implies that the project resulted in improving the socio-economic status of households and that previously dependent family members have become active participants, as [REDACTED] explains. “My uncle was helplessly depending on me in almost everything financially until he joined Mtendere SHG”, [REDACTED] [July 2017].</p>
2.3	<p><b>Accountability to stakeholders</b></p> <p>How does the project ensure that beneficiaries and wider stakeholders are engaged with and can provide feedback to the project? What influence has this had on the project? What challenges have been experienced in collecting and acting on beneficiary feedback?</p> <p>The project engaged participants and wider stakeholders at three levels: local, district and national.</p> <p>1. Local Community engagement</p> <p>At local community level, the project engaged Traditional Authority (T.A) Msakambewa traditional leaders, village development committees (VDCs) and area development committees (ADC), with representatives of each, in quarterly review meetings with project staff. SHG Federation and Zonal leaders were engaged similarly in monthly meetings. These meetings provided an opportunity for everyone to speak and present any feedback or concerns or ideas directly to project staff. There is always a good level of discussion and most people contribute.</p> <p>The umbrella structure works in representing the views and concerns of beneficiaries who are SHG members. They are asked for input into planning of interventions and their feedback is taken on board through the representative structure. Each SHG selects 2 representatives to go to cluster level and they democratically select a leader. Cluster leaders then go to zonal level and then onto Federation. KSLIP staff receive project wide feedback through the different levels but they also ask and receive feedback directly during monitoring visits.</p> <p>Members of the SHGs, clusters and Federation are trained to participate fully in meetings. Importantly, leadership is rotated for the same purpose. There is mutual trust and cohesion for equal participation and contribution in discussions.</p> <p>Quarterly and interface meetings helped the project to share updates and targeting of beneficiaries (e.g. seeds of tree biotypes, watering cans, polythene tubes) for transparency. It also helped to resolve challenges in the course of project implementation. “This project is unique given the fact that the meetings we hold provide stepping stones for improvement and no wonder the project’s outcomes are shared responsibility”, said [REDACTED], Media Visit (March 2018). The engagement is a drive for sustainability of the project’s outcomes.</p> <p>Examples of where feedback has influenced the project:</p>

- A concern was raised about the use of the bicycles not being accessible to all who could benefit. This was resolved with help of project staff and community leaders
- Some wheelbarrows that had been distributed for nurseries were reported to be in individuals' homes instead of at the nursery and so this was addressed.
- The community fed back that there was a need for fruit trees to be planted as well as non-fruit seedlings and so the following year this was incorporated in the project planning, budget and distributions.
- The original plan for afforestation was through SHG nurseries, however feedback suggested other groups could also be a part of this activity. This was built into the plans for the next farming cycle. Churches, schools and community forests also received seeds and began raising trees the next year in their own nurseries too.

Government officers and NGOs at this level have supported community-based trainings and monitoring activities in line with their mandate. Other stakeholders at local (community) level included in meetings include members of the communities, SHGs, SHG leaders<sup>2</sup>, religious leaders, village natural resources management committees (VNRMCs), government extension officers, and NGOs: E-3 World Wide, and NASFAM. Vulnerable people are deliberately encouraged into these local structures and engaged as participants in various activities of the project (see, *section 2.2*).

Engagement with government and NGO staff has helped with setting joint priorities and the implementation of similar activities, reducing duplication and sharing lessons to enable advancement of technologies in use. *"We learnt locally-made fertiliser which we have tried in our maize gardens and replicated the message to farmers in the entire extension planning area (EPA)"*, explained Government's Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Water Development (MOAIWD) Extension Development Officer (AEDO) [REDACTED]. Also, the Department of Forestry Patrol staff supported the assessment of tree biotypes in churches, graveyards (as sacred places) and communal forests (*Details are being analysed for end of project report*).

#### District Level engagement

District-level engagements have been through the quarterly Dowa District Executive Committee (DEC) meetings, quarterly Dowa District Extension Coordination Committee (DESCC) meetings and yearly Dowa District Agriculture Fair. KSLIP staff presented reports in these meetings and was this year appointed a member of Dowa District Task Force on Fall Armyworm (FAW) eradication<sup>3</sup>.

#### National Level engagement

Reports and learning have been shared at a quarterly Malawi-Scotland Partnership (MaSP) meeting and a National MaSP Symposium at Bingu International Conference Centre (BICC).

<sup>2</sup> Leaders of SHGs fit into hierarchical structure: SHG, Cluster, Zonal and Federation. At SHG level, chairperson is not permanent but rotational every session to allow members to learn leadership roles including convening meetings.

<sup>3</sup> FAW affected 18.1% of the maize in Msakambewa communities at the time of dry spell and plant height was on average knee level; the prevalence reduced to 7% when rainfall resumed and maize plants were flowering. Farmers used indigenous knowledge on type of plant materials that were processed and aqueous solution applied against FAW. Detailed observation, qualitative and quantitative data analysis and report will be considered for scientific understanding and recommendations.

	<p>The project believes that transparency and accountability initiatives (TAIs) are recipes for trust, positive relationships and trustworthiness among project staff, participants and wider stakeholders for sustainability, hence their importance throughout the project.</p> <p>Challenges with engagement</p> <p>The engagement with stakeholders has not been without challenges, sometimes causing distortion of feedback. The educational qualifications of most of the members and leaders of various committees are on average junior class 3. This has sometimes affected the confidence of participants and affected the interpretation of information and extension to wider communities they serve. Government staff have high workloads and each cover a large geographic area which has impacted their availability to provide backstopping support in monitoring exercises and project activities. District-level staff conducted a monitoring visit to the project in year 2 in order to understand the impacts of the projects but did not have time to visit again this year so it has been rescheduled to year 4. As all NGOs look upon them for support, this can impact their ability to respond.</p>

<b>3. Progress and Results</b>		
This narrative report on project performance and results will be reviewed together with your revised and updated Logical Framework (or if not yet approved your original Logical Framework). See Guidelines (Annex 1) for details.		
3.	<b>Changes to Project Status</b>	
1	Has the focus or delivery of your project changed significantly over the last financial year? If so, please explain how and why, and attach copies of all relevant correspondence with the Scottish Government.	
	The focus of the project remained the same, no changes were made.	
3.	<b>Changes to the Logical Framework</b>	
2	If changes have been made to the logframe since the previous financial year, please describe these below. Please also provide evidence (e.g. copies of correspondence) that these changes have been agreed with the Scottish Government. If you would like to make changes to your logframe, but these have not yet been approved by the Scottish Government, please describe and justify in detail the requested changes below – and highlight the proposed changes in the revised logframe.	
	<b>Result Area/ Indicator</b>	<b>Proposed/ Approved Change</b> (please clarify and evidence below)
		<b>Reason for Change</b>
	Activity 1.1b	<p>Conduct training of 120 Lead Farmers on Conservation Agriculture in Winter Cropping (3 training sessions of 40 each).</p> <p>This change was approved for year 3 as part of the extension proposal. Approved by [REDACTED] on 4/12/17</p>
		Activity important for winter cropping and land use and management in irrigation farming to minimizing environmental degradation.

<b>3. Progress and Results</b>			
This narrative report on project performance and results will be reviewed together with your revised and updated Logical Framework (or if not yet approved your original Logical Framework). See Guidelines (Annex 1) for details.			
	Activity 1.3d	<p>This new activity was to conduct a survey on the number of meals per HH consumed during the lean period (Jan-Mar 18) as well as some other variables.</p> <p>This change was approved for year 3 as part of the extension proposal. Approved by [REDACTED] on 4/12/17</p>	To get a better indication of the number of meals consumed by people during the lean period to enhance the M&E of the project
	Activity 1.2b	<p>Activity 1.2b Conduct research on the efficacy of locally-made fertiliser</p> <p>This change was approved for year 3 as part of the extension proposal. Approved by [REDACTED] on 4/12/17</p>	To build on research conducted in year 2. The research was designed to answer some of the questions raised in the year 2 fertiliser research.
	Activity 3.2	<p>Changed to 3 training sessions and 6 refresher sessions</p> <p>This change was approved for year 3 as part of the extension proposal. Approved by [REDACTED] on 4/12/17</p>	To reflect the different mix of people receiving training/ refresher training as a result of inclusion of self-replicating groups
	Activity 4.3b (adapted for year 3 only. Year 4 remains the same)	<p>Purchase broadcast slots with MBC for project dissemination</p> <p>This change was approved by [REDACTED] on 29/03/18</p>	<p>Local writers and photographers were to be engaged in year 3 to do 2 field visits to write up case studies that could be used for dissemination. However, following a media trip to the project, the team requested to postpone this activity until year 4 and instead to use £1,520 of the budget to purchase broadcast slots with MBC as that was a more effective opportunity for dissemination. [REDACTED] also approved £1577 would be carried over for activity 4.3b in year 4.</p>
<b>3.</b>	<b>Gaps in Monitoring Data</b>		
<b>3</b>	If baseline or monitoring information is <u>not</u> available, please provide an explanation below. Where monitoring data has been delayed (since previous report), please provide an indication of when and how it will be made available to the Scottish Government.		

### 3. Progress and Results

This narrative report on project performance and results will be reviewed together with your revised and updated Logical Framework (or if not yet approved your original Logical Framework). See Guidelines (Annex 1) for details.

Some end of year data for the impact and outcomes variables was planned for collection in the end of project evaluation. Because a 6-month project extension was agreed, the evaluation was moved from March to August 2018, to ensure it captured impacts across the whole project, not just the first 3 years. Full data sets will be available and indicators reported on in the final project report.

#### 3. Project Outputs

4 In the table below, please list each of your project outputs, and provide further detail on your progress and results over this reporting period. Describe any delays or other challenges that you have experienced and how these have been addressed, and provide information about any unexpected results. Progress should be supported with evidence (such as links to monitoring data in line with logical framework, case studies, web-based information, reports etc.) where possible.

#### Output 1: Increased crop production and crop diversification at household level

Output Indicator	Progress against Planned Milestone/ Target
<p>1.1 Percentage increase in average agricultural yield for target farmers at household level</p>	<p><b>Milestone: Predicted 100% increase of maize/hh/ha and predicted 50% increase of ground nuts/hh/ha from baseline</b>  <b>Achieved: 484.3% increase of maize yields and 516% increase in groundnuts from baselines</b></p> <p>The main harvest results being reported are from July 2017 (2016-2017 season). In 2016-2017, maize yields for target farmers (SHG members) increased to 3,375 kg/hh/ha. This represents a 484.3% increase from baseline. Groundnut yields increased to 1,638 kg/ hh/ha, an increase of 516% from baseline.</p> <p>This assessment was conducted by Tearfund in July 2017. The end of project evaluation in August-September 2018 will be carried out by an independent consultant to verify and compare the findings of July 2017.</p> <p>The greater than expected increase in maize yields is primarily attributed to the adoption of locally-made organic fertiliser by 78% of the SHG farming families. Farmers have also followed recommended agricultural practices such as the use of good seeds, planting with the first rains and weeding, and they now have ability to buy agricultural inputs for food and cash crops. Of the total farmers who adopted the use of the fertiliser, 5,898 households (4,162 females and 1,736 males), made the organic fertiliser themselves, which represents 92.6%.</p> <p>The other reason for increased crop production and yields is also due to the support provided by the government extension workers, 4 KSLIP staff and 549 lead farmers. They are all trained with support from the project and are facilitating the implementation. According to MTE (2017), 85% of farmers reported that the project was their main provider of agricultural information.</p> <p>To support the farmers sustain the gains in increased agriculture yields, in year 3 the project facilitated 1 training session (Activity 1.1) and 5 refresher sessions for 880 Lead farmers (328 females and 552 males) on further aspects of</p>

### 3. Progress and Results

This narrative report on project performance and results will be reviewed together with your revised and updated Logical Framework (or if not yet approved your original Logical Framework). See Guidelines (Annex 1) for details.

	<p>Conservation Agriculture. In turn, lead farmers rolled out the trainings in 60 sessions to all project participant farmers (Activity 1.2a). In addition, 4 training sessions on CA for winter cropping (Activity 1.1b) were delivered and targeted 379 Lead farmers (268 females and 111 males). These training sessions will further enhance the land use, enabling multiple harvests in a year.</p>
<p>1.2 Percentage of target farmers growing at least two or more main food/cash crops</p>	<p><b>Milestone 3: 75% (2,700 females and 1,800 males)</b> <b>Achieved: 90% (4,541 females and 2,430 males)</b></p> <p>In year 3, a rapid assessment report (December 2017) shows that 90% of farmers diversified crops in their gardens by growing at least 2 or more main food/cash crops (7359 farmers - 4,812 females and 2,547 males).</p> <p>The assessment also shows that 73.5% of farmers are practicing mixed or intercropping. The importance of this element of success of the project is that crop diversification and inter or mixed cropping serve and save farmers in times of a crop failure due to such risks as droughts, pests and diseases. Thus, food supplies, price stabilization and cash returns can be compensated by crops that have survived by means of diversifying and spreading the risk. By mixing or intercropping maize with legumes, land is efficiently used and soil fertility improved for overall improved land, labour and capital productivity.</p> <p>In year 3 the project further supported the farmers to manage their crop harvests in order to maximise opportunities for cash crops and improve diet diversification at household level. 1 training and 5 refresher sessions on post-harvest crop management (Activity 1.3) for 750 Lead farmers (315 females and 435 males) were facilitated in collaboration with government agriculture officers to protect crop produce from rodents and insect pests' infestations. Specific topics included: crop storage, food processing and utilization, market linkages, food budgeting at household level and six food groups. Training on market linkage aimed to consolidate farmers' information and knowledge on collective production and marketing for quality commodities and bargaining for better prices. The trained lead farmers replicated the same information to wider members of the communities in 10 training and 50 refresher sessions (Activity 1.4).</p>
<p><b>Output 2: Increased community and household capacity to sustainably manage natural resources</b></p>	
<p>2.1 Number of Tree Nurseries established for community led planting and management.</p>	<p><b>Milestone 3: 60 in year 3, Cumulative: 120</b> <b>Achieved: 180 in year 3, Cumulative total of all tree nurseries established by end of year 3 is 590.</b></p> <p>As previously reported and explained above, the exceeded target is a result of a change of approach to the activity bringing afforestation to a very local level with a greater degree of community ownership.</p> <p>A further 180 nurseries were established during year 3 and participants in natural resources management (NRM) raised 982,441 successful tree seedlings across the cumulative 590 tree nurseries (Activity 2.3), for planting in</p>

### 3. Progress and Results

This narrative report on project performance and results will be reviewed together with your revised and updated Logical Framework (or if not yet approved your original Logical Framework). See Guidelines (Annex 1) for details.

year 3 (Activity 2.4).

The cumulative total of tree seedlings planted (Activity 2.4) under KSLIP represents approximately 33% of the total trees planted in Dowa District by all partners and stakeholders.

Within the project there are various institutions, in addition to SHGs who have become positively engaged in NRM activities and have raised tree seedlings (see Table 2 below).

**Table 2: Tree seedlings raised in various institutions**

Institution	Total tree seedlings raised
Schools	37,050
Churches	51,150
NRM Committees(VNRMCs)	179,940
Self-help groups (SHGs)	714,301
<b>Total</b>	<b>982,441</b>

Sickle bush, paw-paws, mangoes, lemons and guavas were raised by farmers using self-collected seeds, which makes seed supplies sustainable post-project.

In response to beneficiary feedback, in year 3, 11,000 fruit seedlings were purchased and distributed to SHG members (2,070 mangoes, 2,597 paw-paws (papaya), 3,143 oranges and 3,190 guavas) for planting (Activity 2.4), bringing the total number of trees planted to 993,441. Provision of fruit tree seedlings is to replace those trees previously cut for fuelwood to use in kilns to burn bricks. This happened before the communities were taught about the importance of natural resource management. The fruits are a source of vitamins and minerals essential for the protection against diseases, and also provide proteins, carbohydrates and oils, and income.

One potential challenge with tree planting exercises can be a low survival rate. A rapid assessment of the trees planted in this project (undertaken January-March 2018) has shown a survival rate of 81% for trees planted in the 2016-2017 growing season. This is attributed to effective Natural Resource Management (NRM) also because of the effectiveness of review meetings with various institutions in the communities.

2.2 Number of small holder farmers supported to adopt environmental ly sustainable

**Milestone 3: A further 1,000 farmers (Cumulative: 6000 i.e. 3600 females and 2400 males)**  
**Achieved: A further 34 farmers (Cumulative: 8203 i.e. 5364 females and 2839 males)**

The objective in year 3 was to strengthen already reached smallholder farmers and institutions such as members of the communities, schools, churches (religious groups), SHGs and VNRMCs<sup>4</sup> (see, Table 2) in NRM. There were a

<sup>4</sup> Village Natural Resource Management Committees

### 3. Progress and Results

This narrative report on project performance and results will be reviewed together with your revised and updated Logical Framework (or if not yet approved your original Logical Framework). See Guidelines (Annex 1) for details.

agricultural practices	<p>few additional SHGs that joined the project this year hence the slight increase of 34 farmers from year 2.</p> <p>8,203 farmers have received training/ refresher training in year 3 to support them to adopt environmentally sustainable agriculture practices through capacity building training in natural resources management, conservation agriculture, winter cropping, and promotion of locally made organic fertiliser (Activities 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2 and 2.4).</p> <p>A recognised impact is that farmers have made and applied local fertiliser in their maize gardens, and key principles of conservation agriculture<sup>5</sup> have been adopted for soil and water conservation, soil fertility and adaptation and mitigation of the effects of climate change. <i>“We are sitting on gold but we do not know”</i>, said project participant [REDACTED]. <i>“Soil improvements achieved by using locally-made fertiliser in irrigable lands can improve crop productivity and increased income – our gold indeed”</i></p>
------------------------	--

#### Output 3: Increased economic empowerment at household level through enhanced entrepreneurial skills and access to loans

3.1 Number of people accessing credit for business enterprises	<p><b>Milestone 3: A further 1,000 (Cumulative = 6000 (3,600 females and 2,400 males))</b>  <b>Achieved: A further 161 (Cumulative = 8,003 people (5,223 females and 2,780 males))</b></p> <p>The project has supported 338 SHGs (vs target of 300), with a total of 8,203 members; 8,003 of them are using their loans for business enterprises i.e. 97.6% of the smallholder farmers directly benefitting from KSLIP interventions at end March 2018. By the end of year 3, the total amount of loans accessed for business enterprises was MK84,950,532 (c£84k).</p> <p>The majority of beneficiaries used the dividends as capital to procure farm inputs for the 2017/18 agriculture season. This will enhance their agricultural businesses. Loans were also used to purchase assets such as livestock, ox-carts, hoes, wheelbarrows and shovels. The different types of businesses SHG members are participating in are further under Outcome Indicator 1.</p> <p>Table 3 summarizes the increase in the number of SHGs, membership in SHGs, and savings and loans across the years under KSLIP in Traditional Authority Msakambewa, Dowa District.</p> <p><b>Table 3: Per year figures for self-help-groups, members, savings and loans, KSLIP, Dowa District</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>KSLIP SHG Variables</th> <th>Year 1 (2015/ 2016, 12 months)</th> <th>Year 2 (2016/ 2017, 12 months)</th> <th>Year 3 (2017/2018, 12 months)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Total number of active SHGs</td> <td>316</td> <td>336</td> <td>338</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			KSLIP SHG Variables	Year 1 (2015/ 2016, 12 months)	Year 2 (2016/ 2017, 12 months)	Year 3 (2017/2018, 12 months)	Total number of active SHGs	316	336	338
KSLIP SHG Variables	Year 1 (2015/ 2016, 12 months)	Year 2 (2016/ 2017, 12 months)	Year 3 (2017/2018, 12 months)								
Total number of active SHGs	316	336	338								

<sup>5</sup> The principles of conservation agriculture (CA) are minimum tillage or soil disturbance, good soil cover through mulching or cover crops such as cow peas and crop rotation.

### 3. Progress and Results

This narrative report on project performance and results will be reviewed together with your revised and updated Logical Framework (or if not yet approved your original Logical Framework). See Guidelines (Annex 1) for details.

	<p>Number of female members</p> <p>Number of male members</p> <p>Total savings plus interest made in all groups that year (Malawi Kwacha)</p> <p>Total loaned in all groups that year (Malawi Kwacha)</p> <p>Average weekly savings per SHG member (all groups average in Malawi Kwacha)</p> <p>Average loan value given out in that year</p>	<p>4607</p> <p>2250</p> <p>MK18,041,243</p> <p>MK10,915,984</p> <p>MK200</p> <p>MK5,000</p>	<p>5343</p> <p>2826</p> <p>MK65,213,053</p> <p>MK49,934,350</p> <p>MK300</p> <p>MK10,000</p>	<p>5364</p> <p>2839</p> <p>MK145,022,246</p> <p>MK84,950,532</p> <p>MK400</p> <p>MK30,000</p>
	<p>Source: Data from Federation.</p> <p>Note: The year implies designated financial year in KSLIP design document – April of one calendar year to March of the next calendar year.</p>			
3.2 Number of people (small holder farmers) supported to establish or improve economic activities.	<p><b>Milestone 3: A further 2,000 people (1,200 females, 800 males) Cumulative = 7000 people (4,200 females and 2800 males)</b>  <b>Achieved: A further 34 farmers (Cumulative = 8,203 people (5364 females and 2839 males))</b></p> <p>In year 3 the priority for output 3.2 has been to consolidate the success and gains achieved, through strengthening the knowledge and abilities of the 8,203 participants of the project.</p> <p>2 training sessions for 207 cluster leaders (130 females and 77 males). and 9 refresher sessions for 720 Lead agents (480 females and 240 males) were therefore facilitated (Activity 3.2). Originally 6 refresher trainings were planned but to reduce travel distances for participants, 9 smaller sessions were held instead, spread more widely across the area. There are a further 2 training sessions postponed to year 4 which may also be split further.</p> <p>Central to the sessions were SHG management and promotion of credit plus activities. Refresher sessions revisited SHG concept, entrepreneurship skills, credit plus activities, record keeping and documentation. The trained lead agents rolled out to fellow SHG members in 10 training and 110 refresher sessions. <i>“We have started community-based child care centre (CBCC) for early childhood development (ECD) as a credit plus activity. The foundation of our children’s education is expected to be strong,”</i> [REDACTED], Nyundo Cluster [March 2018].</p>			
<b>Output 4: Increased capacity of the Community Development Structures and the local</b>				

### 3. Progress and Results

This narrative report on project performance and results will be reviewed together with your revised and updated Logical Framework (or if not yet approved your original Logical Framework). See Guidelines (Annex 1) for details.

#### Partner and Government staff to support the livelihood improvements beyond the length of the project.

**4.1** Number of STSHG Management Committees; ADCs and VDCs Strengthened and Trained in Project Management and Sustainable Livelihoods Skills

**Milestone 3:** 300 STSHG Management Committees; 1 ADC; 20 VDCs  
**Achieved:** 252 STSHG Management Committees, 1 ADC and 30 VDCs, plus 14 religious groups.

The project trained 318 leaders (141 females and 177 males) in project management and sustainable livelihood skills. The participants consisted of 252 Sustainable transformational self-help group management committees (STSHGMCs), 26 ADC Executive members, 28 VDC members and 12 Church pastors.

The training was organized to sensitize and refresh the leaders on quality standards in the project cycle management and their roles in development activities. These structures have been active in the project spearheading review meetings, monitoring activities of SHGs and discussing with the project staff on progress made, challenges and recommendations for effective project cycle management. This is all a positive part of the exit strategy and will support sustainability.

**4.2** Number of partner Staff and government extension workers receiving training on sustainable livelihoods techniques and project management skills

**Milestone 3: 13 (MOH partner:2 Female, 5 Male, government:2 Female, 4 Male)**  
**Achieved: 9 (3 females, 6 males) (Cumulative = 16)**

MOH Partner staff participated in several trainings. Different combinations of the same staff of 9 people attended. All 9 MOH staff (3 females and 6 males) participated in a project concept processes training facilitated by Tearfund. Two MOH male staff participated in Tearfund Malawi Strategic Planning workshop. Two MOH staff participated in M&E training run by Tearfund's regional M&E officer.

In addition to the above organised by Tearfund, the MOH KSLIP Coordinator and Tearfund Projects Coordinator participated in a national symposium on Conservation Agriculture (CA) organized by Canadian Grain Bank at Platinum Hotel in March 2018, and Tearfund made a presentation on Church and Community Mobilization and CA. This was a learning event for sharing research findings and technical reports on CA via projects implemented in Southern African countries (SACs). The lessons were important to complete the end of CA in KSLIP and are also be applicable for future projects.

Although there were no formal trainings during year 3 specifically for government staff, previous training sessions have helped solidifying partnership with government extension workers and DEC members to provide services and to support them to monitor KSLIP sites for learning. The ongoing review meetings are also an opportunity for continual learning.

**4.3** Number of stakeholder meetings held

**Milestone 3: A further 7, Cumulative 21**  
**Achieved: A further 13 Cumulative 32**

### 3. Progress and Results

This narrative report on project performance and results will be reviewed together with your revised and updated Logical Framework (or if not yet approved your original Logical Framework). See Guidelines (Annex 1) for details.

for information dissemination and awareness of improved livelihoods initiatives

The purpose of the meetings held with stakeholders is for information dissemination and awareness of improved livelihoods to wider communities. In year 3 alone, 4 local-level, 5 district-level and 4 national-level stakeholders' meetings have been held.

#### 4 Local level meetings:

The first local-level meeting involved chiefs, pastors, church leaders and SHG Federation members to discuss year 2 progress and joint planning for year 3 activities. The second was to mobilize them to participate in NRM, particularly consulting on preferred tree biotypes for planting in the communities and management practices such as regeneration of existing tree biotypes. The third meeting updated on progress in Q1&2 and the fourth meeting briefed participants about the extension and the assessment of the number of meals per day eaten during the lean period. Advantages of these meetings since the project began were summarized by [REDACTED]: *"My communities have been lucky to have a project that mobilize stakeholders for review and general meetings to discuss the progress, challenges and recommendations going forward. No wonder, livelihood of my people has changed for the better; this is indeed transformational development."* [Comment during media visit, March 2018].

#### 5 district level meetings:

At district level, KSLIP staff presented quarterly reports in 3 Dowa DEC meetings to update on progress. The chairperson of the DEC recently commented: *"We always thank Ministry of Hope that is implementing KSLIP with support from Scottish Government and Tearfund for regular updates in these DEC Meetings. Let other NGOs emulate,"* [REDACTED] [November 2017].

The meetings help to increase collaboration and support joint planning and facilitation of trainings by stakeholders. For example, as a result of one of the meetings, the Ministry of Agriculture pledged and supported farmers with pesticides to contain FAW in maize crop for both rain-fed and winter cropping in the area<sup>6</sup>.

The project was also invited to and participated in 2 Dowa District Agriculture Extension Coordinating Committee meetings. One of these meetings was the Agriculture Fair where 6 farmers under KSLIP exhibited their agricultural produce, representing available sales from all SHGs.

The project would like to hold a further district level meeting in year 4 for dissemination of end of project evaluation result. This is currently unbudgeted and underspend funds are requested to carry forward.

#### 4 National level meetings:

During year 3, KSLIP participated in 4 national meetings: MaSP meetings

<sup>6</sup> The use of pesticides is complemented by farmers' indigenous knowledge of plant biotypes that can be processed into aqueous solution applied in the tips of the maize plants that eradicate FAW as integrated pest management (IPM).

<b>3. Progress and Results</b>	
This narrative report on project performance and results will be reviewed together with your revised and updated Logical Framework (or if not yet approved your original Logical Framework). See Guidelines (Annex 1) for details.	
	including the national symposium, the Canadian Grain Bank conference (as detailed above) and also a CISANET meeting on seed technology and quality for crop production.
<b>Outcome: Improved sustainable livelihoods for vulnerable households in Dowa District</b>	
3.5	<b>Project Outcomes</b> In the table below, please list your project outcome, and provide further detail on your progress and results over this reporting period. Please describe any delays or other challenges that you have experienced and how these have been addressed, and provide information about any unexpected results. Progress should be supported with evidence (such as links to monitoring data, case studies, web-based information, reports etc.) where possible.
<b>Outcome: Improved sustainable livelihoods for vulnerable households in Dowa District</b>	
<b>Outcome Indicator</b>	<b>Progress against Planned Milestone/ Target</b>
1. <i>Number of people using loans for business enterprise activities</i>	<p><b>Milestone 3: A further 3000 people (Cumulative = 5900 i.e. 3240 females, 2660 males)</b>  <b>Achieved: A further 161 people (Cumulative = 8003 people i.e. 5,223 females and 2,780 males)</b></p> <p>8,003 people (5223 females and 2780 males) are using loans for business enterprise activities. By end of Year 3, 97.6% of SHG members indicated that loans are used for business enterprise activities.</p> <p>Types of enterprises include tea room canteens, retail shops, small scale bakeries, butcheries, crop commodity vending, vegetable selling, fish trade and selling of second hand clothes (see also, <i>KSLIP end of year 1 and 2 reports</i>).</p> <p>Members of SHGs receive technical support from the project to help them acquire business skills on small scale enterprises.</p> <p>As a result of people participating in business enterprise activities, have increased their assets, experienced improved crop production and improved nutrition, more people have paid tuition fees for secondary school-going children and have improved their housing conditions (refer also, <i>KSLIP Year 1 and 2 reports</i>). Quantification of assets and their British Pound values has been illustrated in the mid-year report Oct 2017.</p>
2. <i>Percentage of households in Dowa district affording at least 3 meals per day during the lean period of January to March.</i>	<p><b>Milestone: 21%</b>  <b>Achieved: The assessment was conducted Jan-Mar and data is being finalised but not yet ready.</b></p> <p>An independent consultant was commissioned to conduct an assessment in the lean period of January, February and March 2018 by carrying out periodic surveys throughout the 3 months. March data is yet to be finalised and will be presented in the final project report.</p>
3.	<b>3.6. Project Impact</b>

### 3. Progress and Results

This narrative report on project performance and results will be reviewed together with your revised and updated Logical Framework (or if not yet approved your original Logical Framework). See Guidelines (Annex 1) for details.

6 In the table below, please list each of your project outcomes, and provide further detail on your progress and results over this reporting period. Please describe any delays or other challenges that you have experienced and how these have been addressed, and provide information about any unexpected results. Progress should be supported with evidence (such as links to monitoring data, case studies, web-based information, reports etc.) where possible.

**Project Impact: Reduction in poverty and hunger in Dowa District contributing to MDG1 and the Government of Malawi target of 27% of the people living on less than 1USD per day by 2020.**

Impact Indicator	Progress against Planned Milestone/ Target
1 <i>Percentage of households that are food insecure in Dowa District</i>	<p><b>Milestone: 82% (also end of project target).</b>  <b>Achieved: Data will be collected as part of the end of project evaluation and triangulated with secondary sources where available.</b></p> <p>Food insecurity in KSLIP impact area decreased from 88.2% at baseline in 2015 to 74% in December 2016 (Mid Term Evaluation, 2017). It was 68% at MTE for households participating in SHGs. These results will be compared with end of KSLIP evaluation. Food insecurity among members of SHGs has reduced because resource-poor households have begun to access loans to buy, process and consume food commodities and procure agricultural inputs such as seeds for planting and inorganic fertiliser to increase the production of locally-made fertilisers for increased crop production and diversification.</p>
2 <i>Percentage of households that are below the poverty line in Dowa District.</i>	<p><b>Milestone 3: 57% (also end of project target).</b>  <b>Achieved: Data to be validated as part of end of project evaluation.</b></p> <p>At project design stage an anticipated data source for this indicator was The Integrated Household Survey 2017 but when it was published (Nov 2017) the data on poverty was not included as anticipated and therefore not available. We have been advised that this data should be available at district level within the next 6 months however the project will also be collecting its own data as part of ETE (end of project evaluation) within the impact area, although it will not be District wide.</p>

### 3. Risk Management

7 If progress towards delivering activities and outcomes is slower than planned or there have been delays in the delivery of the project, please explain: a) What the issues have been and whether they were highlighted on your risk register? b) What actions have been taken in response to these issues?

Issue/ Risk	On risk register?	Action Taken	Outcome
Exploitive practices by vendors paying low prices for crops and	No	Discussions with local actors and ongoing monitoring and surveillance.  Tearfund and NASFAM (an organisation which supports farmers to find reliable markets) discussed better crop prices,	Monitoring and sensitisation on pricing are underway now and farmers are preparing to harvest

### 3. Progress and Results

This narrative report on project performance and results will be reviewed together with your revised and updated Logical Framework (or if not yet approved your original Logical Framework). See Guidelines (Annex 1) for details.

<p>agricultural produce to small holder farmers in the District.</p>		<p>reliable markets and the need to advocate with Ministry of Trade and Industry (to minimise barriers to international trade) which provides better prices for legumes. So far NASFAM has attended annual general meetings for Malawi farmers' union where trade issues were discussed.</p>	<p>and sell their cash crops like ground nuts. Soya beans and surplus maize.</p> <p>Members of the communities are currently following the advice from NASFAM and KSLIP on where to sell their produce to maximise profits.</p>
<p>Risk of country-wide infestation of armyworms</p>	<p>No (but was in the risk register for the extension application)</p>	<p>Following the infestations, farmers in KSLIP impact area were advised (in collaboration with Ministry of Agriculture staff in the district) to early monitor the infestation in winter cropped maize, and report to KSLIP and Ministry of Agriculture.</p> <p>The project has taken a record of the number of farmers affected and has also discussed options for treatment including local methods and this has been shared through SHG clusters to all the groups.</p> <p>Where applicable, information is being shared and lessons are being learnt from the Mhujju Fall Army Worm Research Project being conducted by Tearfund and SOLDEV and funded by The Scottish Government Climate Justice Innovation Fund.</p>	<p>Farmers promised to continuously monitor and provide information to KSLIP and Government through Lead Farmers about any infestation on any crop by pests.</p> <p>Currently, for Dowa District there is little danger of reduced crop yields or productivity as rains were generally reliable this year and overall infestation levels by pests reduced as maize crop plants matured.</p>

### 4. Sustainability

<p>4.1</p>	<p><b>Partnerships</b> Provide a brief description of the roles and responsibilities of all partners, including in M&amp;E. Have roles and responsibilities changed or evolved? Please provide a brief assessment of your partnership, including its strengths, areas for improvement and how this will be addressed. This section should be completed by lead partners based in Scotland and Malawi.</p>	
	<p><b>NAME OF PARTNER</b></p>	<p><b>ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES</b></p>

	Ministry of Agriculture	<p>Supported the project by providing people to support trainings such as Conservation agriculture and Post-harvest management. Supported farmers with pesticides to control Fall army worms. Conducted periodic crop assessments.</p> <p>The strengths of this partnership are that the project was able to use approved technologies as guided by the Ministry. A challenge is that both sides have busy schedules which sometimes leads government extension workers missing some key meetings therefore it would be good to plan better in the future to ensure that they are participating in all the planned activities.</p>
	Ministry of Forestry	<p>Supported the project in training lead farmers and village natural resources management committees (VNRMCs) in natural resources management (NRM). Supported farmers on how to manage and regenerate their existing woodlots. Provided technical advice on how to manufacture fuel efficient stoves.</p> <p>The strengths of this partnership are that the project was able to follow recommended practices in community natural resource management. Again, better planning would ensure that they are participating in all the planned activities.</p>
	Tearfund	<p>Provided technical services to the project. Ensured quality standards are followed and ensured compliance to donor contractual obligations.</p> <p>The strength of this partnership is that the project is implemented smoothly as a result of regular interactions of Tearfund and SOLDEV. The areas of improvement would be that both parties stick to agreed deadlines to ensure that things are done on time. This requires constant checking and updating of realistic workplans that take into considerations all things taking place at field level.</p>
	Dowa DEC	<p>Reviewed project reports and updates. Participated in project coordination meetings. Provided technical advice.</p>
	Lilongwe University of Agriculture and Natural Resources	<p>Conducted research on the efficacy of locally made fertilisers which the project pioneered. The relationship is following a formal agreement and is going well. It is developing the science behind the ingredients used to make locally made fertiliser.</p>
	MASP	<p>Best Practices are shared and learned among partners with support by government leads. This has helped other national partners to know about the project and replicate the technologies/lessons in their respective districts.</p>
4.2	<p><b>Exit Strategy</b> Describe the key components of your exit strategy and outline progress towards achieving it. Provide any other achievements or progress towards ensuring that your project remains sustainable in the longer term (including in relation to local ownership)</p>	

and capacity, and resourcing). Describe any challenges and how these will be addressed.

The exit strategy has been considered since the initial design of the project and has been embedded within project activities throughout, mainly by way of ensuring sustainability of activities and technologies. In November 2017 Tearfund project staff and MOH Partner staff, together with the Scottish Project Officer, held a workshop to review the KSLIP project and plan for the final year. The workshop sessions focused on reviewing the exit strategy, progress towards exit and identifying any areas that needed further attention or amendment to ensure a positive closure, handover and exit.

The key components of the exit strategy are:

*Pathways and capacity building.*

Pathways for project exit, transitioning and long-term sustainability within the project include the involvement of government extension workers and the use of the SHG model which is grounded in self-owned and self-controlled, democratic principles. Various local structures of governance have been trained in SHG model, locally-made organic fertiliser and agricultural technologies to ensure knowledge is shared and the structures will continue to work together in the future (see, *section 4.1 and 4.2*).

*Technology transfer.*

The SHG model and adopted innovations such as conservation agriculture, locally-made organic fertiliser and the establishment of knowledge transfer through lead farmers, can all be sustained for and by the next generation. They are practices which will continue beyond the end of the project because of the realised benefits of the interventions that people have personally experienced.

*Formation of umbrella structure.*

The establishment of the SHG Federation with learning from India (which links SHGs with firms such as banks) will support sustainable development. Members of the Federation in KSLIP impact area have already been trained in leadership, good governance and group dynamics. The group will be linked legally to the National Cooperative Association of Malawi, the processes of which has already been initiated by MOH. The Federation's structural, institutional and environmental arrangements will mandate it to empower SHGs, independently supervise and produce financial and narrative reports.

*Handover*

Given that Federation and government extension workers collaborate within KSLIP, the two institutionalised structures are gradually learning alongside the interventions to dovetail with the project and ultimately handover to the Federation with support of government extension workers. The process will continue in the extension (1<sup>st</sup> April, 2018 to 30<sup>th</sup> September, 2018). There is a planning meeting in April 2018 between Tearfund and Partner MOH to plan the final timetable of handover meetings and actions and draft the communications plan.

*Village Chiefs/DEC*

The involvement of the local leaders at each level has been key to the success of the project. For example, Senior Chief [REDACTED] commended how the project has transferred knowledge to the local people to tackle hunger and poverty. He indicated that his message to his community was that they need to learn and use the knowledge since this was better than being given handouts in case they are faced with a drought. The actions that the Chief has taken has been very helpful to the project as the majority of the community members have chosen to take part in the

	project activities which has led to the success of the project in terms of breath and depth of achieving its intended results at the same time laying a foundation for project sustainability championed by local leaders.
--	--

<b>5. Learning and Dissemination</b>	
5.1	<p><b>Lessons Learned</b> Describe briefly any lessons learned during this reporting period, and how it will influence the project and your work moving forward.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Involvement of both men and women is important because the social marriages influencing development in this area are embedded in patrilineal society. Women married to this society leave their parents' homes to husbands' homes. As such, involving women alone is like enslaving them such that when marriage union ends, all properties are left at the husband's home. That is the reason the project is modifying SHG model to involve men as well in conservation agriculture, saving and business management. The SHGs have an overall effect in improving relationships which is key for sustenance of marriages. This was learnt during monitoring visits as SHGs share how the project is modifying some of the negative cultural beliefs.</li> <li>2. Working with local and international media houses helped disseminating innovations to wider-communities across the whole</li> <li>3. Facilitating DEC and local stakeholders to visit the project enhances reciprocal learning and continuous improvement of the project cycle management for positive impacts for the population being served. The project will continue organizing review and/or coordination meetings for this purpose. Currently other NGOs are looking for to partner with Tearfund to scale up conservation farming and local fertiliser making<sup>7</sup>.</li> <li>4. Development of the database has proven successful in ensuring that up to date data is available for effective and efficient project management. The project will continue updating the database with relevant information/ data.</li> <li>5. One of the lessons learnt was that farmers were received conflicting messages from the ministry of agriculture, allegedly advising them to burn all crop residues as a way controlling fall-army worms which resulted in fewer farmers practising mulching in 2017/18 farming season. However, the Ministry of Agriculture denies telling farmers this advice. The project sought to address this misinformation.</li> </ol>
5.2	<p><b>Innovation and Best Practice</b> Summarise briefly any examples of innovations/ innovative approaches or best practice demonstrated by your project during this reporting period. Please explain why these are innovative or best practice, and detail any plans to share these with others.</p> <p><b>1. Locally made fertiliser</b> One of the innovations in the project is the production of locally-made fertiliser for soil improvements and maize crop yields. The technology is implemented along conservation agriculture techniques. Locally-made fertiliser is collectively cheaper than the use of chemical (inorganic) fertilisers (e.g. £5.64 vs £24.70) Tearfund and Lilongwe University of Agricultural and Natural Resources (LUANAR) have been conducting a comprehensive test on the efficacy of locally-made organic fertiliser for the second year running. The tests include chemical, socio-economic, costs and productivity in maize crop and the findings are being widely disseminated for comments amongst Government of Malawi, Research Station, donors and non-governmental organizations (international and national).</p>

<sup>7</sup> There was overwhelming call for partner NGOs that attended the Canadian Grain Bank in Conservation Agriculture to partner with Tearfund, visit KSLIP and Tearfund Partners' CA trials. A Zimbabwean NGO has been linked to Tearfund Zimbabwe for partnership.

5.	<b>Learning and Dissemination</b>
	<p>Christian Aid, MaSP Secretariat and Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning visited KSLIP project areas during DEC Coordination Meeting in year 2. Christian Aid Chief of Party said <i>“The aim was to learn about locally-made organic fertiliser so that we can integrate it into our programme within crop productivity component. A Member of Parliament in Chikwawa District, told us about this innovation. We have seen and learnt. This is phenomenal”</i>.</p> <p>In year 3 Tearfund and LUANAR presented a preliminary paper on the <i>“efficacy of locally-made fertiliser on maize productivity at Msakambewa, Dowa District”</i> during the 2017-2018 MaSP National Symposium at BICC in February 2018. At the same event, CEPEES<sup>8</sup> Country Manager presented a video clip of how locally-made fertiliser is produced, scooped a prize but asserted that <i>“we learnt this from you, Tearfund and Ministry of Hope”</i>. Tearfund and MOH are happy that the innovation is benefiting many farmers through many NGOs in Malawi.</p> <p>2. Self Help Groups</p> <p>Another innovation and best practice is the use of SHGs. Reference has been made in previous project reports as to the socio-economic benefits of this approach such as social capital, poverty reduction, food security, health, education, and productivity. In March 2017 and March 2018, the Malawi Broadcasting Corporation Television, Zodiac TV, Times TV, Maziko radio and The Daily Times newspaper have been disseminating these innovations to the public for wider learning, based on their visits to the project impact areas (see below).</p>
5.3	<p><b>Dissemination</b></p> <p>Summarise briefly your efforts to communicate project lessons and approaches to others (e.g. local and national stakeholders in Scotland and Malawi, academic peers etc.) Please provide links to any learning outputs.</p> <p><b>Hosting Media Visits</b></p> <p>The project hosted 9 journalists (2 females and 7 males) from 5 media houses in March 2018 to capture success stories and best practices and disseminate them to wider-communities beyond the project area.</p> <p>Following this, KSLIP feature stories have been produced in national newspapers, such as the Nation Newspaper and Daily Times, <a href="https://www.times.mw/fighting-poverty-via-self-help-groups">https://www.times.mw/fighting-poverty-via-self-help-groups</a><sup>9</sup>. News stories have also been aired on television and broadcast on radio stations<sup>10</sup> for wider community learning.</p> <p>The stories are reaching the intended audience to learn:  <i>“I watched Malawi Broad Casting (MBC) Television last Thursday at 06:30 hours Malawi Time and saw you...women were praising groups (SHGs) for economic empowerment. How can that trickle to us women in the City?”</i> Senior Police Officer at <b>[REDACTED]</b>, Lilongwe (April 7, 2018). Again, some people called Tearfund staff commending the impressive work they had watched on MBC TV.</p> <p>In addition to the above free broadcasting, the project has paid for re-runs of the</p>

<sup>8</sup> CEPEES is abbreviation for Cooperative Enterprise Pathways for Economic and Environmental sustainability in Malawi.

<sup>9</sup> Taonga Tsabola featured an article, ‘*Fighting poverty via self-help groups*’, The Daily Times, April 28, 2018, p. 8, 41.

<sup>10</sup> Maziko Radio station and television include Malawi Broadcasting Corporation (MBC) and radio, Times TV and radio, and Zodiac TV and radio stations.

<b>5. Learning and Dissemination</b>	
	<p>30min feature programmes on Times TV (3 times) and MBC (8 times). The project is receiving very good feedback from viewers.</p> <p><b>Conducting research for publishing</b>  Tearfund, MOH and LUANAR have partnered and established trials for testing the efficacy of locally-made fertiliser. Results for these trials for year 2 have been disseminated widely during MaSP Symposium (see, section 5.2) will be used for learning and replication in year 4. “<i>The inclusion of students in the research is an important element because they will sustain the positive lessons of the findings for the future generation</i>”, [REDACTED], Youth Network and Counselling (YONECO) [REDACTED] comment.</p>
5.4	<p><b>Wider Influence</b>  Briefly describe any intended or unintended influence on development outcomes beyond your project. For example influence on local and national policy, contribution to debate on key development issues, uptake by other projects etc.</p> <p>The project is implementing locally-made fertiliser trials to establish the efficacy of this innovation. The results will be shared with Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Water Development (MAIWD). The Input Subsidy Programme is on the path to be reviewed. Inorganic fertiliser is too expensive for resource-poor households to use as inputs for crop productivity in Malawi. Therefore, the results will perhaps enable Government of Malawi through MAIWD, partners and stakeholders to opt for locally-made organic fertiliser in the national policy framework. Countries outside Malawi can also review their policies on fertilisers for the benefits of resource-poor households in agricultural productivity. Christian Aid are planning to uptake the use of this fertiliser in their programme in Southern Malawi after a visit to KSLIP.</p> <p>The self-Help Group (SHG) model is an intended pathway for socio-economic development. Incorporating social capital theory and credit plus, SHG members and other advocates, encourage members of the communities to save and borrow money for business enterprises as well as buying agricultural inputs, paying school fees and writing materials for secondary school-going children, and accumulating household assets. The social funds formed by SHGs support vulnerable individuals and households in their communities. This was not planned for but is a positive spill-over to helping others. Credit plus is a platform for communities to discuss developmental gaps, find their own solutions to the problems and address them collectively. For example, if a road is impassable due to a bridge, they discuss, agree on resources to mobilize and maintain the infrastructure without waiting for external resources. Disseminating the importance of this model, we would hope that others would adopt it in their communities.</p> <p>With involvement of the media, the SHG model and locally-made fertiliser will be disseminated widely and the project hopes it will influence policy formulations and changes.</p>

<b>6. Financial Report</b>
<p>The narrative report below should be provided in conjunction with the Budget Spreadsheet report (see Annex 2). Please fill in the Budget Spreadsheet to: (a) confirm actual spend for the year and justify any significant disparities between programmed expenditure and actual expenditure within the financial year, (b) detail programmed spend for next year.</p>

Please note that any carry-over of funds to the next financial year should have been agreed with the Scottish Government by January 31<sup>st</sup> of the current financial year.

6.1 **Project Underspend**  
Please note whether the project has reported a significant underspend, and whether the Scottish Government has agreed to this being carried forward. If this has been agreed, please provide copies of or links to relevant correspondence. Please indicate whether the underspend is the result of currency fluctuations or other issues with project delivery.

In Year 3 the planned budget expenditure was £173,728 and actual expenditure was £166,018 (96% expenditure). There is an overall project budget underspend of £7,710 of which exchange gains account for £5,502 and savings are £2,208.

Cost savings have also been made and are described in section 6.2. There are 5 underspent budget lines at the end of year 3 which the project requests funds to be carried forward to complete activities in year 4. These are:

- Activity 1.3d – data on the remaining variables will be included in the end of term evaluation (ETE), £1000 of underspend on this line is required to carry forward and add to ETE year 4 budget line
- Activity 3.2 – 2 remaining training sessions to be held as heavy rains prevented access, requiring use of remaining £2,000
- Activity 4.3 – one district level stakeholders meeting postponed to year 4, requesting balance of funds of £854 on that line to be carried forward
- Activity 4.3b – to engage writers and photographers with a delayed start date, £430 of remainder is required
- Tearfund Malawi overheads – country office rental increase will be backdated to January. The amount was budgeted for but contract not yet signed so payment is delayed, £300 required to carry forward ready for back-payment.

At the end of year 3 there were a number of overspends included within the variance total. The majority were unavoidable and have arisen because of 3 main reasons. Different budget lines have been affected differently:

1) Forecasting of the underspends was based on 3+9 forecast (months of actuals against projections). On some budget lines, the actuals for Q2 were slightly more than the predictions hence the overspends.

2) The revision of the exchange rate from 850 to 920 also has an effect as Q1 actuals were incurred at 916. This also has a slight contribution of exchange losses leading to the overspends.

3) The revised budget was submitted early October 17 and was approved in December however this meant that by the time the revised budget was adopted, most Q3 expenditure had been incurred based on the old budget.

There has also been an overspend on staff costs. This has been due to

	<p>oversights by the project at time of budget revision. These are:</p> <p>1) For the extension proposal combined with underspend proposal, a revision of the budget exchange rate from 850 to 920 was applied to all budget lines, including Scottish salaries by mistake, which are originally in GBP. This has caused an under-budgeting /overspend of £374 in year 3.</p> <p>2) As for National Staff costs, the overspends are also due to the revision of the budget rate from 850 to 920 and also a forecast of exchange gains by end of year 3. Too much of the forecasted gains were removed from this budget line and left it short of the required amount, hence an overspend of £1,136</p> <p>The error on Scottish staff costs has also been carried forward into year 4 budget but the National staff costs are sufficient. Considering the exchange gains at end of year 3, despite the budget rate upward revision, the project kindly requests an allowance of these overspends in year 3 and to use £305 of underspend to carry forward to cover Scottish staff costs in year 4.</p> <p>Therefore, the total amount requested to carry forward is <b>£5,464</b></p> <p>The project budget was revised in October 2017 to a rate of exchange of 920. However, the rate has continued to rise and in April 2018 it is 1010. In anticipation of underspends from year 4 exchange gains, the project is considering options to enhance some existing activities and will propose a revised year 4 budget based on the feedback to the requests in this report.</p>
6.2	<p><b>Cost Effectiveness and Efficiency</b> Please detail any efforts by the project to reduce project costs, whilst maintaining the quality of the project – for example through managing projects costs, efficient resourcing, working with and learning from others etc.</p>
	<p>The project made efforts to make savings by ensuring that where possible costs were shared with other projects for example overheads and office costs.</p> <p>M&amp;E training conducted in the year was shared with another Scottish Government funded project.</p> <p>Monitoring visits of Tearfund finance and programmes staff were combined to reduce travel costs for some visits.</p> <p>The approach of some activities was changed to hold meetings and trainings in the community rather than at district level. This reduced the travel and conference costs.</p>
6.2	<p><b>Co-finance and Leverage</b> Please provide details of any co-finance or leverage that has been obtained for the project during the reporting period, including how the funds/ resources will contribute to delivering more and/or better development outcomes.</p>
	<p>There are many indirect costs incurred in delivering a project, including head office costs such as audit, finance and logistics. Results from an independent audit conducted by the US government calculated Tearfund’s indirect costs to be 14.18% for April 2014 onwards. Under Scottish Government guidelines, these costs cannot be</p>

	charged to the project therefore Tearfund is contributing this support as a benefit in kind. <sup>11</sup>
--	--

<b>7. IDF Programme Monitoring</b>					
The list of IDF programme indicators are listed below. With reference to Q46 on your application form, please report on progress for the IDF programme indicators that you have committed to tracking in your original proposal, including the 'Poverty and Vulnerability Indicators', which are obligatory for all Scottish Government funded projects.					
<b>1. IDF Programme – Poverty and Vulnerability (compulsory)</b>					
1.1	<b>Indicator 1.1 Total number of people directly benefitting from the project</b>				
	Baseline	Female	Male	Total	Brief description (e.g. small-holders)
	0	5,364	2,839	8,203	Members of 338 self-help groups.
	State the evidence that supports the progress described				
KSLIP Mid-year report year 3; Tearfund assessments; Mid-term evaluation (2017); Records in SHGs and KSLIP database.					
1.2	<b>Indicator 1.2 Total number of people indirectly benefitting from the project</b>				
	Baseline	Female	Male	Total	Brief description (e.g. small-holders)
	0	3,896	4,932	8,828	Adults. The 8203 SHG members are supporting 33,663 family members as indirect beneficiaries
	0	12,783	12,052	24,835	Youths
State the evidence that supports the progress described					
KSLIP Narrative Report Year 1, 2 and 3; Mid-term evaluation (2017); Records in SHGs and KSLIP database.					
<b>5. IDF Programme – Sustainable Economic Development</b>					
5.1	<b>Indicator 5.1 Number of people supported to establish or improve business/ economic activities</b>				
	Baseline	Female	Male	Total	Brief description (e.g. agriculture marketing)
	0	5,364	2,839	8,203	Members of self-help groups
	State the evidence that supports the progress described				
KSLIP Annual Report Year 1, 2 and 3 and case studies. Project reports.					
5.2	<b>Indicator 5.2 Number of people accessing credit</b>				
	Baseline	Female	Male	Total	Brief description (e.g. widows)
	1380 (828 Females and 552 Males)	5,364	2,839	8,203	Members of the self-help groups
	State the evidence that supports the progress described				
KSLIP Annual Report Year 1, 2 and 3/ logframe; Project reports					
5.4	<b>Indicator 5.4 Number of small holder farmers supported to adopt environmentally sustainable agricultural practices</b>				
	Baseline	Female	Male	Total	Brief description (e.g. vegetable farming)
	0	5,364	2,839	8,203	Members of self-help groups
	State the evidence that supports the progress described				
Lead farmers, institutions (churches, schools and sacred places), homestead, agricultural land and watersheds are reforested; locally-made fertilizer innovation promoted (see, KSLIP Annual Report Year 1, 2 and 3; Mid-term evaluation (2017); Records in SHGs and KSLIP					

<sup>11</sup> The NICRA is calculated by Tearfund periodically based on the audited financial statements of Tearfund UK. The NICRA calculated is then audited by US AID. As such, the rate differs overtime depending on the level of 'indirect costs' recorded in Tearfund's UK financial statements.

**7. IDF Programme Monitoring**

The list of IDF programme indicators are listed below. With reference to Q46 on your application form, please report on progress for the IDF programme indicators that you have committed to tracking in your original proposal, including the 'Poverty and Vulnerability Indicators', which are obligatory for all Scottish Government funded projects.

database.

**5.5 Indicator 5.5 % increase in agricultural yield**

Baseline	Female	Male	Total	Brief description (e.g. maize)
Maize 577.8kgs of Maize /hh/ha and 266 kgs of Groundnuts/hh/ha			484.3% maize and 516% for groundnut	Increase by that margin for maize and groundnuts from baseline respectively

State the evidence that supports the progress described

KSLIP Annual Reports and logframe; Project reports

## Annex 1: Guidance Notes: End of Year Report

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This report is to be completed by all project managers/leaders at the end of the financial year.</li> <li>• Please complete this form electronically.</li> <li>• Once complete please send this reporting form, by email to your Scottish Government project manager.</li> <li>• The report should be submitted by the end of April following the financial year to which the report relates.</li> </ul>	
Question	Guidance
<b>Basic Project Information</b>	
1.1	The project reference number was given to you by the Scottish Government in your grant offer letter – please refer to it in all correspondence. This is a number unique to your project and helps the Scottish Government track information relating to your project within the system.
1.2	Insert the financial year for which you are reporting
1.3	Insert the year of your project (i.e. Year 1, 2 or 3)
1.4	Insert the name of your lead organisation responsible for managing the grant (based in Scotland). Please make a note if this has changed during this financial year. Reasons for changes should be reported in section 3.
1.5	Insert the names of your partner organisations in Scotland and Partner countries. Please make a note if this has changed during this financial year. Reasons for changes should be reported in section 3.
1.6	Insert the name of your project in the space provided. This should correspond with the name given in your grant offer letter. Please make a note if this has changed during this financial year. Reasons for changes should be reported in section 3.
1.7	Provide a brief project description as per your grant offer letter.
1.8	Insert the geographical area in which your project is being implemented. Please make a note if this has changed during this financial year. Reasons for changes should be reported in section 3.
1.9	Insert start and end dates. The start date is the date you received your first tranche of funding.
1.10	Insert the total project budget (including funding from other sources). Please make a note if this has changed during this financial year. Reasons for changes should be reported in section 3.
1.11	Insert the total amount of funding received through the IDF for this project.
1.12	Indicate the theme that your project addresses (tick as many boxes that apply.)
1.13	Confirm that supporting documentation has been included with your report. Please tick those boxes that apply. Confirm whether any changes have been made to the logical framework, and whether the LF submitted has been approved by the Scottish Government (or is pending approval). <b>Reports that do not include all required documentation will not be considered complete.</b>
1.14	Please reference previous (actionable) feedback that you have received in your last MY and EY report, and describe any action that has been taken in response/ since then.
1.15	Insert the date that your report was produced.
1.16	Insert the names and positions of the key person(s) involved in preparing your report.
1.17	It is essential that you let us know if any of your contact details have

	changed, either in Scotland or in Malawi.
<b>Project Relevance</b>	
2.1	Provide a brief update on the context in which your project is working, and describe briefly how your project remains relevant to your project beneficiaries.
2.2	Working towards gender equity and social inclusion is considered essential to any projects funded through the IDF. Please describe briefly how your project is delivering this.
2.3	Please describe briefly how beneficiaries are engaging with the project (if at all) and what effect that is having, as well as any challenges in engaging with them.
<b>Progress and Results</b>	
3.1	If your Project has changed significantly in the focus of its delivery since your last report, please explain how and why, attaching copies of all relevant correspondence you have had with the Scottish Government about this. Please also describe and explain any changes to basic project information here.
3.2	If your Logical Framework has changed over the last Financial Year please detail and explain these here. This enables us to more quickly understand the changes and your progress, based on the most up-to-date information.
3.3	An update on any delays or challenges in monitoring will help us to understand the information presented in the report and logframe.
3.4	<b>For this question you will need to refer back to your most up-to-date APPROVED logical framework.</b> Looking again at the <i>output indicators</i> outlined, please comment on the progress made towards achieving these during the reporting period, including any challenges and how these were overcome. This should include a narrative (where relevant) as well as quantitative data – indicating clearly the milestones (including dates) and progress to date using the same measurement unit (e.g. number/percentage) provided for the baseline etc. should be outlined using a percentage or number. E.g. By end March 2016, 5 wells have been dug in the last year against a milestone target of 4.
3.5	<b>For this question you will need to refer back to your most up-to-date APPROVED logical framework.</b> Looking again at the <i>outcome indicators</i> outlined in your original application, please comment on the progress made towards achieving these during the reporting period, including any challenges and how these were overcome.
3.6	<b>For this question you will need to refer back to your most up-to-date APPROVED logical framework.</b> Please comment on the overall impact of the project to date, including any challenges and how these were overcome.
3.7	If progress towards delivering activity and outcomes has been slower than planned, please use this space to indicate the reasons why and whether any of the risks outlined in your application have impacted on the project.
<b>Sustainability</b>	
4.1	Provide a brief update on how your partnership is working and evolving.
4.2	Detail briefly your progress towards ensuring that your project will be sustainable in the longer term. We would like you to refer back to your exit strategy in your application form) as well as reflect on other elements of sustainability.
<b>Learning and Dissemination</b>	
5.1	The Scottish Government is very interested to hear of lessons you may have learnt during any aspect of the project and may use your experience in future policy consideration.

5.2	The Scottish Government is very interested to hear of any innovations or examples of best practice, and how projects are sharing good practice more widely.
5.3	The Scottish Government would like to know how the work of the project is being communicated more widely to a range of stakeholders in Scotland and beyond.
5.4	The Scottish Government would like to know if your project (whether intended or unintended) is likely to have an influence on policy.
<b>Financial Reporting</b>	
6	<b>For this question, you will also need to complete the summary page of the budget spreadsheet.</b> Please use the budget headings on the spreadsheet to provide a detailed breakdown of actual expenditure incurred during the financial year to which this report relates, against expenditure planned as well as expected expenditure for the next financial year. Please outline any reasons for any discrepancy in the budget spend. <i>N.B If the budget spend is more than 10% different from the original estimate please use the additional tabs on the budget spreadsheet to provide more detail.</i>
6.1	It is important for us to understand and learn from how projects budget, including reasons for underspend.
6.2	The Scottish Government is interested in how projects are working efficiently and effectively.
6.3	Please detail if the project has succeeded in sourcing additional funds to enable it to extend its work.
<b>IDF Programme Monitoring</b>	
7	The Scottish Government needs to understand who is being reached by the IDF and how therefore it is essential that projects contribute to programme monitoring.

**Annex 2: Budget Spreadsheet Report**