Sida Evaluation 2008:56

Improved Land Management for Sustainable Development (RELMA-in ICRAF)

Jan Erikson

Sida

Improved Land Management for Sustainable Development (RELMA-in ICRAF)

Jan Erikson

Sida Evaluation 2008:56

Sida

This report is part of *Sida Evaluations*, a series comprising evaluations of Swedish development assistance. Sida's other series concerned with evaluations, *Sida Studies in Evaluation,* concerns methodologically oriented studies commissioned by Sida. Both series are administered by the Department for Evaluation, an independent department reporting to Sida's Director General.

This publication can be downloaded/ordered from:
http://www.sida.se/publications

Author: Jan Erikson.

Sida Evaluation 2008:56
Commissioned by Sida, Department for Democracy and Social Development

Registration No.: 2004-000380
Date of Final Report: May 2008
Printed by Edita Communication, 2008
Art. no. Sida48046en
ISBN 978-91-586-8137-8
ISSN 1401—0402

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY
Address: SE-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Valhallavägen 199, Stockholm
Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64
E-mail: sida@sida.se. Homepage: http://www.sida.se

Table of Contents

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ACT	African Conservation Tillage Network
ACTS	African Centre for Technology Studies
CAADP	Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Programme
COMESA	Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa
CONTIL	Conservation Tillage
EAC	East African Community
EAFF	East African Farmers Federation
ECA	East and Central Africa Region of ICRAF
ECOSAN	Ecological Sanitation Network
EEPRI	Ethiopian Economic Policy Research Institute
ERHA	Ethiopian Rainwater Harvesting Association
FeMSEDA	Federal Micro and Small Enterprise Development Agency
FO	Farmers' Organisation
GWP	Global Water Partnership
ICRAF	International Centre for Research in Agroforestry (World Agroforestry Centre)
IIRR	International Institute for Rural Reconstruction
ISFM	Integrated Soil Fertility Management
KACE	Kenya Agriculture Commodity Exchange
KARI	Kenya Agricultural Research Institute
KEFRI	Kenya Forestry Research Institute
NALEP	National Agriculture and Livestock Extension Programme
NEPAD	The New Partnership of Africa's Development
RAC	Regional Advisory Committee (of RELMA)
REFON	Regional Farmers' Organisation
RELMA	Regional Land Management Unit
RRD	Resource Centre for Rural Development in Sub-Saharan Africa (Sida, Nairobi)
RSCU	Regional Soil Conservation Unit (RELMA predecessor)
SearNet	Southern and Eastern Africa Rainwater Network
SFI	Soil Fertility Initiative

SFM	Soil Fertility Management
Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
SWMNet	Soil and Water Management Network
UCA	Uganda Co-operative Alliance
UNFFE	Ugandan National Farmers Federation
WOCAT	World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies
WTO	World Trade Organisation

Summary

The purposes of this evaluation are to assess the fulfilment of project objectives and output and impact targets at the end of the support period December 2006; the degree of integration of the project's functions, approaches and methods into ICRAF's research and development activities, including the absorption of improved soil, dryland and water management practices; together with recommendations for any uncompleted activities.

In 2003, there were few host options available for RELMA other than ICRAF which obliged to a request by Sida in expectation of gaining access to effective methods for conveying research findings to smallholder farmers, subject matter knowledge on soils, water, livestock and policy development to complement its own agro-forestry research expertise; incremental funds; and a potential for cost savings from a common communication strategy.

The integration process was influenced by common outlooks as well organisational differences: ICRAF being large, matrix-structured with well programmed and budgeted activities and strong subject matter expertise in its core area but also strategically vacillating and dependent on unpredictable donor funding; while RELMA was small with a wide technical mandate, impact oriented, highly responsive to emerging needs among its institutional and farmer clients, informally managed, and allocated a generous budget for technical assistance, study tours and material support.

Their staff entertained at the outset different perceptions with some RELMA personnel anticipating an unchanged mission and encapsulated operations within the new host institution while the ICRAF management foresaw converging mandates, rapid organisational integration and uniform management procedures.

External circumstances dictated that these differences had to be bridged in a short planning period that left little time for stakeholder analyses, joint formulation of strategies or organisational streamlining and several alignment issues had to be deferred to the early part of implementation period. In spite of these constraints, implementation efficiency 2004–2006 turned out to be high: the RELMA-in-ICRAF project managed to complete almost 90% of its scheduled activities and no major task was outstanding at the time of formal project closure.

Many of the RELMA activities did generate a noticeable impact on its clients already during the implementation period, most significantly within commodity development and through policy analysis and a series of highly valued publications on land and water husbandry and other field management practices. It is anticipated that the project sub-components on soil fertility, conservation agriculture, dryland/livestock management and rainwater harvesting will continue to offer benefits to small farmers in Africa in the coming years through support by other donor organisations and through regional networks.

The modest impact of some sub-components can be linked to shortcomings in the planning process that led to overestimation of the interest of some clients while other reasons include optimistic internal perceptions of RELMA's experience and specialist knowledge. In addition, a strategic retreat by ICRAF away from dissemination of research findings down to the farmer level made the extension expertise of RELMA less relevant.

For ICRAF, the technical aspects and the aspects of disseminating knowledge on dryland/livestock husbandry management and rainwater harvesting have been particularly important together with fresh RELMA models for classifying agroforestry ecological zones and calculating the profitability of forest commodities. Institutionally, RELMA has influenced ICRAF through its teamwork approach, participatory management and sensitivity to gender issues.

Most of the fourteen project sub-components are considered to have been highly or largely relevant with limited usefulness appearing to be primarily associated with shortcomings in the planning process where standard stakeholder analyses might have revealed weak client commitments to some sub-components. Four sub-components were discontinued by the project management following the Mid-term Review of RELMA in 2005 which also brought about closer alignment with the ICRAF mandate on agroforestry, more focussed activities within commodity and market development, and firmer organisational integration.

The project management was successful in accelerating the implementation momentum after the slow initial progress in 2004, effecting productive project staff reallocations within the ICRAF structure and promoting stricter budgetary and fiscal discipline among the RELMA staff. However, it did not manage to fully compensate for weaknesses in sub-component design or client support strategies as the result of the compressed planning period or for the shortage of RELMA in-house expertise outside the core land, livestock and water management and publication competence.

Although the project was efficient in completing almost all its planned activities with the allocated staff and financial resources, cost-effectiveness was inevitably hampered by the relevance and impact limitations and can only be regarded as modest.

The project experience 2004–2006 indicates that stakeholders analyses, if required aided by external facilitators or appraisers, represents a valuable tool for identifying crucial factors for a successful integration process. A joint/synchronised planning procedure by the merging organisations is likely to assist in detecting remaining constraints as well as fresh opportunities and a formal induction period with explicit goals and activities and a mechanism for dealing with staff issues helps to speed up the integration process.

The implementation record of RELMA also implies that effective regional technical initiatives in the agricultural sector ideally should possess good examples in the form of superior practices, approaches or models to convey to their clients at the national or regional level with backstopping provided by experienced subject matter specialists. The clients should from the beginning be requested to make significant contributions to the co-operation process, thus ensuring firm ownership of their acquisitions. Sustainability prospects are likely to be enhanced by a transparent exit strategy for the provided support that in a timely manner induces clients to mobilise the resources required for consolidating the gains brought by the regional initiative.

1. Introduction

History of Regional Sida Support to Land Management. In 1982, a Regional Soil and Water Conservation Unit (RSCU) was established within the Swedish Embassy in Nairobi with the chief purpose to disseminate the positive experience of voluntary soil and water conservation among groups of farmers in Kenya to other countries in eastern and southern Africa.

In 1998, when this task was regarded as largely fulfilled, the institutional mandate of the unit was significantly widened to address also food security, processing, marketing and rural livelihood issues while the name was nominally changed to Regional Land Management Unit—RELMA—and Eritrea added as a new client country.

In 2003, an internal review found that for legal reasons it was no longer tenable to maintain a unit employing non-Sida staff within the embassy premises. After assessing different institutional options, it was decided to transform the former unit into a project—Improved Land Management for Sustainable Development or RELMA-in-ICRAF—and agreed with the World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF) in Nairobi to incorporate the RELMA activities into its research themes and regional programmes within a three-year transition period 2004–2006. It was expected that the integration into ICRAF would ensure permanence for some important RELMA initiated activities while ICRAF would be able to benefit from the former unit's experience in preparing technical publications and its methodology for building capacity among its target clients.

Terms of Reference. The main purposes of this evaluation are to assess the:

- fulfilment of project objectives and output and impact targets at the end of the support period December 2006;
- degree of integration of the project's functions, approaches and methods into ICRAF's research and development activities, including the absorption of improved soil, dryland and water management practices;
- implementation of the proposals by the Mid-Term Review mission in April 2005, which proposed a partial re-orientation of the project's functions, together with recommendations for any uncompleted activities; and
- lessons learned on the factors that determine project effectiveness and impact and their implications for future design of Sida projects, institutional integration processes and regional operations in general.

The complete Terms of Reference for the assignment are attached as Appendix 1.

Mission Work Schedule. The mission[1] began its work in Nairobi on 17 May through meetings with representatives of the Resource Centre for Rural Development (RRD) in the Swedish Embassy, ICRAF, the Kenya Agricultural Research Institute (KARI) and the National Agricultural and Livestock Extension Project (NALEP). It also had discussions with the project partners Agricultural Conservation Tillage Network (ACT), African Centre for Technology Studies (ACTS), Thuiya Enterprises and the International Institute for Rural Reconstruction (IIRR). In Kenya, a field trip was undertaken 22–23 May to Kusa in Nyanza Province where the mission met representatives of the Development Committee established with encouragement by RELMA and officials of the VI Agroforestry Project which continues to support the Kusa community.

[1] Mr. Jan Erikson, HJP International, who was assisted by Dr. Chin Ong, former Co-ordinator of the project in ICRAF, during the initial work in Kenya 17–21 May. Dr. Ong's contributions were particularly valuable as there was a change among senior management staff in ICRAF 2007–2008 and some first-hand knowledge about RELMA activities was lost.

In Ethiopia (26–27 May), the mission met representatives of the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MoARD), the Ethiopian Rainwater Harvesting Association (ERHA), the Ethiopian Economic and Policy Research Institute (EEPRI), and the Federal Micro and Small Enterprise Development Agency (FeMSEDA).

In Uganda (28–29 May), the mission held discussions with officials of the Agricultural Policy Forum, Uganda Co-operative Alliance (UCA), the Uganda National Farmers Federation (UNFFE)/the East African Farmers Federation (EAFF) and Uganda Rainwater Harvesting Association (URWA). It also visited private and institutional manufacturers and marketing agents for bamboo furniture.

In Tanzania (2 June), the mission met the former RELMA staff member responsible for livestock and drylands management, who is now the ICRAF Country Representative, together with a former member of the RELMA Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) from the Ministry of Agriculture in Dar-es-Salaam.

A list of people met is attached as Appendix 2 and a list of consulted documents is compiled in Appendix 3.

The preliminary findings were presented to ICRAF representatives in Nairobi on 5 June. A first draft report was prepared on 29 June. A second draft (31 July) offered more elaboration on the conclusions drawn from the evaluation findings and on the lessons that can be learned from the RELMA-in-ICRAF experience 2004–2007. This Final Report reflects the majority of the comments received from ICRAF and Sida on the draft versions.

2. Background

2.1 The World Agroforestry Centre ICRAF

Institutional Mandate

The mandate of ICRAF may be summarised as conducting research in seven regions on domesticated trees and their surroundings for the benefit of smallholders in co-operation with national research organisations that also assist in dissemination of the findings to public and private sector advisory services and other organisations. The ICRAF activities, which benefit more than 30 countries, are concentrated in eastern, southern and western Africa, South Asia, South-east Asia, East Asia and the northern part of South America under the direction of 14 regional offices.

Guiding Policies and Strategy

Within a Corporate Strategy that remains valid to 2011, ICRAF activities 2005–2007 were guided by a Medium Term Plan incorporating regional and national strategies across four thematic areas: Land and People, Trees and Markets, Environmental Services, and Strengthening Institutions. Regional co-operation initiatives benefited Lake Tanganyika (in conjunction with UNDP) and Green and Blue Water projects around Lake Victoria. The process of determining research topics within the themes was influenced jointly by research staff, farmers as beneficiaries of the research work, and ICRAF's financiers. However, parts of the Medium Term Plan were based on incomplete knowledge about national agricultural policies and it was also deemed to lack a clear client strategy that outlined how ICRAF should relate to Government ministries and agencies. There were expectations that RELMA might help to redress these perceived shortcomings by offering expertise on how to co-operate with agricultural ministries on policy analyses and on effective ways to manage client relationships.

From 2008, the thematic structure will be succeeded by six Global Research Projects (GRP)[2] within a strategy that is expected to better reflect future priorities for new knowledge on agroforestry. ICRAF will continue to generate information for policy analyses and formulation—initiatives 2005–2007 focussed on the charcoal, fruit, drylands and contract farming sub-sectors—but outreach activities will be limited to assistance to capacity building among organisations that disseminate research findings ("development support") rather than ICRAF engaging itself in development activities as was sometimes the case 2004–2006[3].

The transformation from themes to research projects and the associated internal and external deliberations undoubtedly absorbed considerable institutional resources and may have affected the time and attention that could be devoted to facilitate a smooth incorporation of the RELMA operations into ICRAF. There may have been limited surplus capacity available within ICRAF to offer supplementary support when the capability of RELMA did not fully agree with expectations.

Finance

Annual ICRAF expenditure typically amounts to about $30 million, of which as much as 95% may be in the form of medium or short term grants. The three-year RELMA finance (equivalent to $2.6 million annually) provided by Sida, although not constituting a major source of funds, was a welcomed contribution that offered predictability and fiscal continuity.

ICRAF Expectations on RELMA

In addition to the hopes about the value of RELMA's expertise on policy analysis and partner management, the expectation by ICRAF was to gain access to useful experience of:

- Proven field practices on land management, including water harvesting techniques and livestock management/integration, packaged into extension messages;
- Commodity chain development, including the processing and marketing functions; and
- Capacity building within co-operating organisations, including a participatory mode of collaboration and systematic information management.

The fulfilment of these expectations together with stipulated objectives and outputs and anticipated impact is reviewed in Chapter 3 (below).

2.2 Improved Land Management for Sustainable Development Project (RELMA-in-ICRAF)

History

RELMA originated from the Regional Soil Conservation Unit (RSCU) established within the Swedish Embassy in Nairobi in 1982 to disseminate the positive field and policy experiences of promoting soil and water conservation practices among voluntary groups of farmers in Kenya to national extension services in five countries in eastern and southern Africa—In addition to Kenya, also Ethiopia, Uganda, Tanzania and Zambia. Practices and methods were initially conveyed through demonstrations and staff training programmes but subsequently technical handbooks for field personnel became important instruments.

[2] The final Global Research Projects are: 1. Domestication, utilization and conservation of superior agroforestry germplasm; 2. Improving on-farm productivity of trees and agroforestry systems; 3. Improving tree product marketing for smallholders; 4. Reducing land health risks and targeting agroforestry interventions to enhance land productivity and food availability; 5. Improving the ability of farmers, ecosystems, and governments to cope with climate change; and 6. Developing policies and incentives for multi-functional landscapes with trees that provide environmental services.

[3] Since 2007, ICRAF prefers to make a distinction between "development", which signifies the whole range of activities downstream of research until the impact on the ultimate beneficiaries, and "development support" that implies assistance to capacity building at the agencies that disseminate knowledge or skills to the farmers.

In 1998, when the demand for regional backstopping of soil conservation was largely satisfied, RSCU was transformed into the Regional Land Management Unit (RELMA) with a widened mandate on geographical coverage[4], subject matters and clients. In addition to land, water and range/livestock management, RELMA was expected to promote also agricultural production, processing and marketing together with policy formulation within an ambition to enhance food security among small-scale farmers. Staff was expanded to include additional development expertise but resident specialists were not engaged on all the novel subject matters. In addition to national agricultural extension services, the range of direct clients was expanded to include NGOs, farmers organisations, local administrators, universities and research institutions. Institutional partners were increasingly engaged to conduct surveys and studies, workshops/seminars and to prepare information material.

The various activities of RELMA did not constitute elements of a coherent strategy, although a strategic aim was intended by Sida, but tended to emerge in response to perceived needs or demands among the wide set of clients.

Governance was provided by Sida and a RELMA appointed Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) with representatives from the five target countries, who also had the prerogative to propose national projects for RELMA support.

Rationale for Incorporating RELMA Functions into ICRAF

In 2002, Sida recognised that the institutional status of RELMA within the Swedish Embassy in Nairobi was, for legal reasons, untenable and ICRAF agreed in the following year to become the host 2004–2006 for continued RELMA activities within a project framework. After having scientifically verified the value of some of the field practices promoted by RELMA—most notably conservation agriculture and water harvesting techniques—ICRAF expected, apart from welcoming incremental expertise and funds as referred to above, to benefit from its perceived proficiency in transferring technologies and methods to its clients ("between research and action"), including its publishing experience. ICRAF also hoped, as noted above, to be able to influence national policies on agroforestry production and trade in agroforestry products through RELMA's involvement in activities downstream of farm production.

Expectations by Sida: Although the regional strategic aim was eventually assumed by RRD, Sida expected that the RELMA identity would be maintained after the transfer to ICRAF and that land management would remain a prominent subject matter for the benefit of national extension services. It also anticipated that the new body would continue to build on its other perceived strengths and that there might be further phases of support beyond 2006. In reality, this implied that the project should influence ICRAF to become more "development oriented" while also infusing some of its knowledge on group mobilisation/interaction into ICRAF together with its team-oriented mode of operation. Sida also hoped that RELMA's experience of "partnerships", including the arrangement with a Regional Advisory Committee, would make ICRAF more responsive to the needs of particularly disadvantaged smallholders.

RELMA Staff Expectations: The personnel of RELMA shared Sida's expectations and hoped that the project would remain as a distinct organisational unit within ICRAF, rapidly responding to external requests while also exercising "development" influence on ICRAF in the various sub-sectors but being insulated from its stricter planning, managerial, administrative and fiscal regimes. Employees also believed that the required knowledge and skills in the subject matter areas beyond land management—i.e. on commodity development and policy development—could be acquired by the existing personnel through the upcoming implementation process without the need for staff recomposition.

[4] Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda and Zambia.

The Planning and Initial Implementation Process

The expectations within ICRAF, RELMA and Sida were from the beginning tempered by three factors: the limited time that could be allocated to preparatory activities in view of the urgency to effectuate the merger; the differences in the organisational cultures of RELMA and ICRAF—one exhibiting rapid responses to external requests for support in conjunction with few restrictions on resource allocations, and the other guided by long term commitments to different set of client organisations and strict adherence to detailed budgetary guidelines; and the ambivalence displayed by ICRAF as an research organisation to external and internal demands for a more "development-oriented" approach, which affected its ability to fully absorb some of the RELMA components and activities.

A draft Project Document for continued independent operations 2002–2006 was prepared by RELMA in 2001. It was succeeded by a Plan of Operations for the period 2004–2006 prepared by ICRAF in September 2003 without any blue-print for the integration process, following the signing of a Letter of Understanding between ICRAF and RELMA in March 2003. A revised Plan of Operations was presented in November 2003. No internal or external appraisal of the revised Plan of Operations was conducted but it was mutually accepted by Sida and ICRAF as the basis for implementation start on 1 January 2004.

Due to a combination of time pressure and expectations within RELMA and Sida that its activities would continue within ICRAF within a somehow encapsulated environment, there was no stakeholder analysis or deeper institution review undertaken of the real and perceived advantages of an incorporation of RELMA into ICRAF as part of the project planning process (although a subsequent review in May 2004 of the logical framework guiding project implementation provided some valuable insights into mutual organisational strengths and weaknesses). As a result of the limited institutional analysis, the two divergent bodies faced a rather protracted alignment process.

Initial implementation progress in the first part of 2004 was particularly slow as a result of the poorly reconciled anticipations within both RELMA and ICRAF but a workshop in May under the guidance of an external facilitator produced a second and better appreciated Plan of Operations with a substantially revised logical framework to guide the implementation process (the latter, however, was not reflected throughout the Plan of Operations). This document outlined mutually agreed organisational requirements for speedier integration and project implementation gained momentum after six months delay.

It is likely that the initial implementation delay could have been avoided and that the project would have been more effectively designed if time and circumstances would have permitted stakeholder analyses and/or an appraisal in 2003. Such actions are likely to have revealed some of the weaknesses of RELMA that were subsequently exposed by the Mid-term Review in 2005 and would have contributed to enhance the cost-effectiveness ratio of several components.

Project Objective

The objective of the project formulated in the Plan of Operations of May 2004 was to increase the outreach and the quality of programmes, project and institutions that empower small scale land users to improve food security and reduce poverty. In the Annual Plan 2005, this rather broad objective was transformed into the dual purposes of attaining impact on targeted institutions and to transfer relevant experience and knowledge to ICRAF.

Clients, Partners and Networks

Clients: The beneficiaries or ultimate clients of the project's activities were defined as smallholders in both high potential and low potential areas, commonly with agroforestry activities.

The *direct clients* defined in the original Project Document fell into four categories:

- National ministries, that set policies, provide advisory services to farmers and issue regulations;
- District/local administrators, who provide support services to farmers and enforce regulations;
- NGOs and farmer organisations which exercise advocacy on policy formulation and application, provide support services and frequently form networks; and
- Universities, colleges and agricultural research institutes which undertake analyses and research, teach/train and disseminate information to scientific peers and to the public, occasionally via networks.

Unfortunately, these client categories were only partly recognised in the implementation process. As a result, few of the fourteen sub-components developed approaches for how to convey field technologies or development models to different categories of direct clients but the processes for particularly capacity building on commodity development and policy development often appear to have had an ad-hoc character.

Partners: The Plan of Operations did not clearly differentiate clients from partners, which appear to be organisations or individuals who possessed knowledge or skills complementary to those of the project. The partners were frequently paid by the project to provide services to the direct or the ultimate clients but their roles as external technical specialists, facilitators or institution builders are frequently left vague or undefined.

Networks: While networks are referred to in the Plan of Operations, there was no specific policy for the support to be provided by the project—rationale, purpose, composition, reciprocity or duration. As a result, some networks may have remained dependent on RELMA support longer than necessary as they neglected to mobilise the resources of their members.

Project Structure and Strategy

The project activities in the Plan of Operations of May 2004 fell into four Intervention Areas:

- Small-scale Farm Management (consisting of 11 sub-components);
- Capacity Building (4 sub-components);
- Information & Documentation (4 sub-components); and
- Cross-cutting Issues and Integration (this was added in May 2004).

Each Intervention Area included monitoring activities and cross-cutting issues.

The four Intervention Areas were not linked to the project objective via an implementation strategy explaining how the sub-components would interact to attain the desired impact on the direct clients and the ultimate clients or how the project activities would be phased out or absorbed into the ICRAF agenda by the end of the Sida support period on 31 December 2006. In addition, there was little consideration given to the criteria for regional interventions in preference to national initiatives which could have been a useful guide for consolidating some of the project activities.

Implementation Targets

- Impact targets were formulated at the level of Intervention Areas rather than at the sub-component level:
- Land management: "15% of key clients in each country promote best bet practices by 2006";
- Capacity building: Synergies…. championed by 3 institutions/professional associations in 3 [project] countries";
- Information/documentation: "Information on improved land management used by 15% of key clients in each country"; and
- Cross-cutting: "50% of approaches and 40% of administrative practices adopted by ICRAF".

Attainment of these impact targets has been followed by the project but, since they presented obvious difficulties to interpret and assess, monitoring has focussed more on the outputs generated by the project. Output targets were formulated at the level of the sub-components and are described and assessed in Chapter 3 Evaluation Findings (below).

While the design of the project was undoubtedly affected by the limited time and resources available for the planning process, it may also have influenced by a perception within RELMA at the time that the project period might be extended into another phase after 2006. Such a prolongation could have offered opportunity within the 2004–2006 time frame to improve on project structure, strategy and modus operandi without the pressing need to pursue fulfilment of every target within a three-year implementation period. However, it was clearly communicated to the RELMA in 2004 that Sida would not support project activities beyond the end of 2006 and staff efforts became directed at completing the scheduled activities rather than refining the implementation framework.

Organisational Resources

The RELMA staff commanded specialist knowledge on soil management, drylands/livestock management and rainwater harvesting together with capacity building and information/documentation. In-house expertise on commodity development and on policy development (part of Intervention Area 1) was of more general nature.

The leadership, administrative and accounting functions were assumed by regular ICRAF staff members. A part-time Project Co-ordinator was appointed to guide the project operations through annual plans and reviews within the framework provided by the Plan of Operations.

The Sida supervision responsibility was exercised through RRD in Nairobi.

Finance

The total project budget 2004–2006 was $7.9 million (SEK 63 million), of which 37% were for operating expenditure within the four Intervention Areas and the balance allocated to staff costs, office costs and overheads (the follow-up activities January–June 2007 were completed using funds from the 2006 budget). The project allocation in 2006 represented 4.6% of the total ICRAF expenditure that year.

3. Evaluation Findings

As the project structure displays capacity building and information/documentation activities as separate intervention areas rather than as integrated into the farm management support area, it is less useful as a framework for analysing implementation progress and results. Instead, the implicit farm management sub-structure of field practice dissemination, commodity development and policy development forms the basis for this evaluation with capacity building and information distribution activities incorporated into each component:

- Dissemination of improved field practices on the management of natural resources—farmland/soils, rangelands, water and agroforestry—to institutional clients to pass on to small-scale landowners;
- Support to processing and/or trade of agricultural and agroforestry commodities for the benefit of producers, manufacturers and traders; and
- Support to institutional clients on policy analysis and advocacy on issues rising from natural resources management or from trade constraints.

The three components or functions require different strategies to convey the field practices, the models on commodity development, and the model on policy development:

Function	1. Field practices	2. Commodity processing & trade	3. Policy analysis and advocacy
A.	Technology identification	Model identification	Model identification
B.	Awareness creation among direct and ultimate clients (demonstrations, study tours)	Awareness creation among direct clients	
C.	Preparation/distribution of information material	Preparation/distribution of information material	Preparation/distribution of information material
D.	Preparation of training material		
E.	Training of clients' trainers	Training of direct clients	Training of direct clients
F.	Training of frontline personnel		
G.	Monitoring, supervision, backstopping	Monitoring, supervision, backstopping	Monitoring, supervision, backstopping
H.	Support to networks	Support to networks	Support to networks

In analysing the individual project sub-components in the following of this chapter, the strategy requirements shown in the above matrix have been applied together with criteria for regional effectiveness. ICRAF has been viewed as one of the direct clients of the project.

In the following section, seven of the 11 sub-components that serve to disseminate field practices under Intervention Area 1 Small-scale Farm Production Management are reviewed:

- Land Rehabilitation and Soil Fertility;
- Approaches for Scaling up;
- Dryland Resources Management;
- Conservation Agriculture;
- Land Use Intensification;
- Water Management; and
- Network Support.

Two other sub-components in Intervention Area 1—Strengthening Farmers' Organisations and Service Providers, and Market Information Systems—are reviewed under 3.2 Support to Commodity Processing and Trade. The two remaining sub-components in Intervention Area 1—Policy Reforms for Improved Land Management, and Policy Analysis and Advocacy—are reviewed under 3.3. Support to Policy Analysis and Advocacy.

Most of the above sub-components were of interest to ICRAF as technical areas in their own right or as means to engage small farmers in important research fields. While several of the more successful components might have been recognised at the time of implementation start, others emerged as important due to changing perceptions within ICRAF and/or the result of particularly effective contributions by the RELMA staff. On the other hand, some promising sub-components turned out to be less useful than expected as external circumstances changed or the interest of ICRAF waned as the consequence of shifts in priorities or staff rearrangements.

3.1 Dissemination of Improved Field Practices on Natural Resources Management

Farmland/Soils

(i) Land Rehabilitation and Soil Fertility (Project sub-component 1.1.1)

Key Features: The anticipated output for this sub-component was "options for integrated soil fertility management and conservation for various land categories identified, documented and disseminated". The output was planned to be attained through six generally formulated activities.

Relevance: The sub-component is considered as largely relevant:

\+ The stated output conforms to the intervention area objective and has a regional dimension in that soil fertility management and conservation are areas of concern to most countries in Africa;

\+ This sub-component was related to the ICRAF programme for Soil Fertility Management within the Land and People theme;

– There was no clear description of whom—direct client organisations or ultimate clients—would benefit from more options for integrated soil fertility management or conservation for various land categories. It is thus difficult at this post-project stage to assess the actual demand for the offered services at the time of planning; and

– There were references in the Plan of Operations to the Soil Fertility Initiative and to the Integrated Soil Fertility Management initiative but no description/analysis was provided of what others are doing in this field and how the RELMA activities would interact with any parallel efforts.

Planned and Implemented Activities: Implementation was initially slow. The prepared accurate high-resolution soil maps proved too costly to produce with RELMA funds. It also turned out to be unexpectedly complex to prepare relevant localised fertiliser recommendations. With backing by the Mid-Term Review in 2005, ICRAF and NEPAD in 2006 jointly redefined a soil fertility research agenda together with capacity building needs. RELMA funds were used for a round-table discussion to validate the priority research areas. A synthesis of RELMA's role in influencing fertiliser policy in the region was published.

Cost-effectiveness: The budget for this sub-component was $105,000, of which $100,000 were utilised. The cost-effectiveness of this sub-component was questionable as:

– The expected output was not attained; and

– No impact on the assumed direct clients has been documented.

Outlook for 2008: NEPAD is presumably continuing to with its investment strategy to improve soil fertility management.

Conclusions: The following conclusions can be drawn:

- The stated output was not attained as the costs for producing high resolution soil maps based on remote sensing and spectral methods were not sufficiently assessed by ICRAF. Lack of assessment of client demand and results of past efforts led to a misguided attempt to generate location-specific extension recommendations on fertiliser application. Weak management of consultants precluded early curtailment of overly ambitious activities;

- However, the project facilitated the important ICRAF initiative to define a research agenda for soil fertility issues together with NEPAD and an associated capacity building plan that is expected to remain a significant element of CAADP in the coming years; and

- Although the direct impact of the sub-component on ICRAF as a learning organisation may have been limited, the project activities did contribute to make ICRAF part of larger initiative to address soil fertility issues and possibly a valued counterpart on other policy aspects of land management.

(ii) Land Use Intensification (Project sub-component 1.3)

Rationale: The justification for this sub-component was based on a perception that diminishing land parcels in Africa may eventually preclude economically viable family farming and that successful intensification approaches deserve to be disseminated to wider audiences.

Expected Output and Approach: The expected output was "a knowledge base established on sustainable and profitable market-driven farm enterprises for land use intensification for the benefit of service providers in selected watersheds of Eastern and Central Africa region". The output would be attained through a vaguely defined approach that included up-scaling of proven, successful approaches on land use intensification, sharing of the Kusa pilot project experience among stakeholders in the Lake Victoria basin, promotion of high value fruit and fodder tree species, and a sub-component that would assess and promote use of more efficient farming tools and equipment.

Relevance: This sub-component is considered as largely relevant:

\+ The expected output nominally conformed to the objective of the intervention area and the sub-component had a regional dimension;

\+ There is undoubtedly a significant demand for knowledge about successful, profitable intensification approaches among farm service institutions, not least in the low-rainfall regions of Africa, although there may be a dearth of successful examples to propagate;

\+ ICRAF was interested in both land use intensification through agroforestry and in in-depth assessments of past and ongoing initiatives in the Lake Victoria basin where it had initiated several research projects;

– The project document makes references to past successful intensification approaches although it is not clear to what extent they are already being promoted by other actors; and

– The scope of the sub-component was exceptionally wide which made it difficult to assess its relevance in advance.

Planned and Implemented Activities: Only one of the four original activities—promotion of high value fruits and fodder tree species—was pursued. Within this activity, implementation was largely limited to training farmer groups in the Kilimanjaro area on production of mangoes, avocado and apples, and a national workshop in Tanzania on processing of leucaena leaves into a fodder meal.

Generated Outputs and Achieved Impact: As a consequence, the impact of this sub-component was uneven:

- The stated output was only partly achieved;
- The ability to "empower small-scale land users to efficiently and sustainably increase fruit production" was limited to institutional clients in the Kilimanjaro region;
- ICRAF benefited from incremental funding; and
- No evidence has been produced on any effect on farmers' livestock production from the fodder workshop.

Cost-effectiveness: The budget 2004–2006 for the sub-component was $210,000 of which $209,000 were utilised. In light of the limited achievements, cost-effectiveness was poor.

Outlook for 2008 onwards: It is unclear to what extent knowledge on fruit and fodder production/processing will be spread to other geographical areas or if the other planned activities will be reignited.

Conclusions: This was probably a sub-component with too wide a scope and the lack of a clear approach made some activities fall away while others were not mutually supportive. At the end, only well known tree species in one location were promoted. ICRAF may have overestimated the interest to upscale intensification experiences to programme or policy level among institutional stakeholders and underestimated the value of the accumulated experience in this field, including the vestiges of the Kusa project. An appraisal might have been beneficial to help define a useful sub-component scope and implementation approach.

(iii) Conservation Agriculture (Project sub-component 1.2)

Rationale: The justification for this sub-component was based on four premises:

- conservation agriculture is a profitable approach that is attracting growing interest in low rainfall areas in southern and eastern Africa;
- RELMA trials in 2002 and subsequent assessments scientifically verified the value of the practices;
- ICRAF research indicated that impact can be further enhanced by incorporating selected agroforestry management practices; and
- gained practical and experimental experiences are of interest not only to other African countries but also to farmers in Latin America and South-east Asia.

Expected Output and Implementation Approach: The expected output of this component, was "extension agents and decision makers in Africa understand and take conservation agriculture into consideration and/or use". Direct clients in other regions outside Africa were not mentioned.

The output would be attained through a programmed approach that included support to the 3rd World Congress on Conservation Agriculture, preparation of a practical manual, special studies on conservation agriculture successes and failures, national workshops and assistance to existing networks that promote conservation agriculture (African Conservation Tillage network, ACT) and water harvesting (Southern and East African Rainwater Network, SearNet).

Relevance: The sub-component is considered as largely relevant:

+ The thrust of the sub-component fell within the RELMA-in-ICRAF project mandate;

– While conservation agriculture was well established in some countries in southern Africa, the interest among potential clients in East Africa was not ascertained. The Plan of Operations did not specify the direct clients—recipients of knowledge of conservation agriculture from the project—nor the ultimate clients who would acquire the skills via the direct clients;

– Interest was expressed by ICRAF in conservation agriculture as a field that could benefit from incorporation of agroforestry elements but it was unclear in what respects conservation agriculture would benefit the ICRAF themes; and

+ The project Plan of Operations made references to other actors—including GTZ, FAO, ACT and SearNet—but without a description of their activities in this field.

Planned and Implemented Activities:

1. *Supporting African Platform for World Congress on Conservation Agriculture:* The Third World Congress took place in Nairobi in October 2005. The support provided by the project—funds for establishment of a Secretariat, employment of a Project Assistant and planning support—was essential for preparing and conducting this event;

2. *Preparing African Manual on Conservation Agriculture:* The manual was prepared through project support to a two-week "write-shop" conducted by the International Institute for Rural Reconstruction (IIRR) in Nairobi in April/May 2005 with support also from FAO;

3. *Studies on conservation agriculture adoption in Africa:* The launching of five studies on conservation agriculture in Zambia, Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania and Ghana was rescheduled several times and was finally conducted in June 2007 under co-ordination by CIRAD/DMC with the project as co-financier and ACT and FAO as stakeholders;

4. *National workshops to promote conservation agriculture:* National workshops were planned in Rwanda, Lesotho and Mozambique together with follow up in Ethiopia and Malawi in conjunction with ACT but did not take place;

5. *Support to networks:* ACT was supported to establish one hub at the Harare University in Zimbabwe, co-ordinating activities with other universities and co-operating with research stations, including the Kenyan Agricultural Research Institute (KARI). ACT initiated training of extension workers in Tanzania and Eritrea. RELMA supported the network with $200,000 as core funding (workshops, secretary). The network and other conservation agriculture activities are also supported by FAO and CIRAD; and

6. *Other activities to promote conservation agriculture:* A successful awareness-raising tour on conservation agriculture to IFAD, FAO, GTZ/CIRAD and others was undertaken in September 2004. A pledge of €120,000 materialised as available funds. A national workshop was held with joint funding by JICA, generating Ethiopian interest to participate in the World Congress. Water harvesting emerged as a conservation agriculture field activity under which a training programme for farmers on building structures was designed.

Generated Outputs and Achieved Impact:

+ Part of the expected output of this sub-component was achieved as extension agents and decision makers in many countries in Africa learned about and understood conservation agriculture through the World Congress, the five case studies and the manual;

– Although most of the planned activities were completed, the sub-component activities

+ only managed to generate a new initiative to promote conservation agriculture in West Africa while most countries in East Africa are still assessing its merits and disadvantages; and

– ICRAF contributed to the sub-component by advising on incorporation of agroforestry practices—for instance fertiliser trees and improved fallows—in conservation agriculture but it is unclear to what extent conservation agriculture has influenced ICRAF's research and development activities.

Cost-effectiveness: The budget 2004–2006 for the sub-component was $345,000 which was also utilised. Since $300,000 were allocated to the World Congress deliberations, cost-effectiveness has been acceptable although the proceedings from the workshop have not yet been produced.

Outlook for 2008 onwards: It is still unclear to what extent conservation agriculture will be adopted in countries outside Zambia and Zimbabwe and but the prospects in West Africa in the coming years appear promising with the assistance by IFAD and FAO.

Conclusions: Although this sub-component completed most of the planned activities and attained a significant portion of its expected output, impact in the field was uneven as extension services in east Africa have been reluctant to embrace the recommended field practices. The tenuousness of the concept is also evidenced by the inability of ACT to complete the proceedings from the World Congress in 2005. However, it is not certain that a pre-implementation appraisal or more focussed application of funds than to the World Congress would have achieved a more positive outcome.

The interaction with ICRAF has been as expected and the recommendations by the MTR mission were partly superfluous in the absence of a wide adoption of the conservation practices.

A lesson learned is that some innovations, in the absence of inherent structures in the disseminating institution and tangible demand by the client organisations, take time to be accepted and may in the end be primarily implemented in locations where the natural resource situation, farmer preferences and institutional priorities usefully converge.

(iv) Approaches for Scaling Up

Rationale. Scaling up within ICRAF is understood as learning from past successful implementation experiences in the field in order to facilitate a wider application of the lessons at strategic or policy levels. ICRAF had in 2004 the ambition to become a leading institution on the methodology for scaling up with the aim to co-operate with NEPAD on planning of large management projects and expected RELMA to provide staff experience and funds. ICRAF and the project also intended to mainstream improved land management options into national extension and management programmes.

Expected Output. The stated expected output for this sub-component was "management problems and promising [land management] options identified and disseminated to four countries in the region".

Relevance: The sub-component was largely relevant:

+ The output conformed to the objective of the intervention area and the sub-component had a regional dimension;

+ Both ICRAF and Sida had stated interests in the sub-component;

– Potential clients among "national extension and development programmes were left undefined"; and

– "Land management options" encompass a large number of practices which were also left largely undefined.

Planned and Implemented Activities:

1. *Synthesise best practices used by ICRAF and RELMA and others for scaling up of land management options*: A workshop took place in the 1st Quarter 2005 and a report is available;
2. *Develop a toolkit for further research on scaling-up methodology:* It is unclear if this toolkit was developed;
3. Develop and publish a strategy for what works best for different technologies, clients and conditions as a basis for mainstreaming into national extension and development programmes: It is not clear if this strategy was developed; and
4. *Distribute publication and present results to beneficiaries:* It is not clear if this activity took place.

Generated Outputs and Achieved Impact: The impact of this sub-component was limited:

– The stated output "management problems and promising [land management] options identified and disseminated to four countries in the region" has not been attained and the impact on the ultimate clients small-scale farmers is thus yet to materialise; and

– It is not clear if ICRAF's command of scaling up methodology has increased.

Cost-effectiveness: The budget 2004–2006 for the sub-component was $80,000 of which $79,000 were utilised. In light of the limited achievements, the cost-effectiveness was poor.

Outlook for 2008 Onwards: It is unclear to what extent any consolidated experience on "land management methods" will be spread in the future by ICRAF to national extension and development programmes in its member countries.

Conclusions: This was an important but difficult sub-component with strong interest by both ICRAF and Sida. However, the concept of making experiences gained at the field level inform national policies or strategies is frequently tenuous in institutional settings where policies tend to flow from headquarters' in-house assessments rather than from reviews of the merits of alternative implementation approaches at the field level. Further, although RELMA had been partly successful in extending soil conservation practices to advisory services and reflecting them in national policies in eastern and southern Africa, it was not ascertained at the time of planning if the project had any conceptual approach to offer on the techniques for scaling up field practices. Inadequate appraisal and allocation of complementary implementation resources and attention by ICRAF contributed to the limited results in this respect.

Drylands/Livestock

(v) Dryland Resources Management (Project sub-component 1.1.3)

In addition to agroforestry, dryland resources management within ICRAF implies livestock husbandry and marketing, traditional practices for pasture management and even national strategies for dryland management.

Rationale: The implicit justification for this sub-component may be summarised as follows:

- Dry areas in particularly east Africa are considered to be neglected since they tend to receive less investment than higher potential areas; and
- A special sub-component on dryland resource management offered an opportunity to consolidate activities that were previously scattered among the RELMA focal areas.

Expected Output and Implementation Approach: The stated output for the sub-component was "management problems and promising [dryland resources management] options identified and disseminated to four countries in the [ECA] region".

The implementation approach or strategy was not defined nor were the direct and ultimate clients but a livestock/drylands specialist was part of the RELMA staff.

Relevance: The sub-component is considered as highly relevant:

+ The expected output would contribute to fulfil the project objectives and had a regional dimension;

+ This sub-component complemented ICRAF's ongoing work on exotic agroforestry species by widening the scope to also encompass indigenous trees and shrubs. It also helped ICRAF to broaden its zonal focus to include rangelands; and

– It is unclear what clients would benefit from the proposed activities and what their requirements were in terms of subject matter knowledge and modes of dissemination. The absence of defined clients and an implementation strategy implied risks for undertaking activities with limited impact or little regional relevance.

Activities and Outputs:

1. *Workshop on dryland intervention priorities:* The workshop, which took place in September 2004, set priorities for interventions based on project supported country reports on Ethiopia, Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda;

2. *Tree fruit production and processing:* The project funded a study tour for 10 participants from East Africa to India on dryland fruit production and processing. Training on processing of mangoes and guava for farmers in Kitui in Kenya was undertaken, following introduction of Indian cultivars. It is unclear what activities the study tour generated in the other countries;

3. *Utilisation of Prosopis Juliflora:* This fodder weed, which has spread uncontrollably in parts of north-eastern Kenya, was identified as a potential source of charcoal and ingredient in feed concentrates. Project activities appear to have been limited to production of a policy brief on its potential role in charcoal making;

4. *Survey of traditional practices on natural resource management:* A survey was undertaken in Tanzania of pasture management practices and livestock marketing strategies with the intention to scale up Tanzanian experiences in other countries in East Africa; and

5. *Preparation of country strategies:* The dryland country reports, in combination with GIS mapping, have generated strategies for dryland management in Ethiopia, Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda.

Achieved Impact: This was uneven as:

+ Training on fruit tree production and processing may have generated impact locally but little is revealed by the monitoring reports on technical issues or market prospects;

+ ICRAF has reportedly gained important insights into dryland resources management; but

– The regional effects from the project activities on tree fruits, P.Juliflora, and country strategies have so far been limited.

Cost-effectiveness: The budget for this sub-component of $150,000 was fully utilised. Cost-effectiveness is regarded as acceptable.

Outlook for 2008 onwards: Presumably the country strategies prepared in 2006 will prove useful and the Tanzanian experience on pasture management practices be valuable to other countries in East Africa.

Conclusions: Dryland resource management is a difficult area with massive investigative activities undertaken in the past, also on fruit and fodder trees. Project activities with identified clients and integrated into clear strategies have the best prospects for generating impact also outside the implementation locations.

Water

(vi) Water Management (Project sub-component 1.4)

Rationale: The justification for this sub-component may be summarised as follows:

- Demand for water for primary production is increasing, with rainwater presenting cheap and easily collected supply;
- Harvesting, storing and management technologies were available but there was a perceived need to further understand the efficiency of water use of different agricultural components and systems;
- RELMA had long promoted water harvesting and management technologies and had assisted in establishing technology and policy disseminating networks in Africa; and
- ICRAF had been working on water use efficiency in agroforestry and had assessed water management within the larger production systems of water catchment areas.

Purpose and Implementation Approach: The water management sub-component was striving to fulfil a purpose rather than to attain a single output: i.e. to promote improved water management through different means of which regional and continental networks were regarded as among the most important, being in a position also to disseminate experiences that may promote new policy initiatives on the use of rainwater.

The purpose was to be reached through four sets of activities: documentation of important local water management innovations; trials on groundwater recharge and waste water cleaning (in urban areas); promotion of policy analysis and strategy formulation; and a regional conference (through SearNet). It was not made clear in the Plan of Operations how these set of activities would interact to fulfil the purpose of the sub-component.

Relevance: The sub-component is regarded as highly relevant:

+ The purpose of the sub-component is congruent with the two project purposes to attain impact on targeted institutions and to transfer experience and knowledge to ICRAF;
+ There is considerable demand for knowledge about successful approaches on rain water management in many countries in Africa, as demonstrated by SearNet and smaller regional networks; and
+ ICRAF had placed increasing importance on rainwater harvesting technologies and policy issues and regarded this component as particularly relevant to its Institutional Strengthening theme.

Planned and Implemented Activities:

1. *Documentation of local water management innovations:* The selection of the four demonstration and learning sites in Lare in Kenya (road run-off collection into ponds) and Makanya (multiple water harvesting techniques) in Tanzania together with Kurar and Tikurso watersheds in Ethiopia was based on a combination of agro-ecological considerations, research needs and their ability to offer replicable approaches within the watersheds and in other areas. At the end, documentation work was concentrated to the Lare area in Rift Valley where the high density of ponds was found to increase water security and agricultural production. A poster and a report were prepared to support scaling up in other areas;
2. *Groundwater recharge:* While it was planned that two demonstration sites would be established in 2004, only one in Nairobi was completed. No regional course took place;

3. *Waste water management:* Three wastewater management sites were identified in Addis Ababa, Nairobi and Kampala, respectively. Trials confirmed that bamboo, like napier grass, absorbs high levels of heavy metals;

4. *Bamboo production and processing:* The water management sub-component also promoted bamboo as raw material for furniture and floorboard making. A study tour for 12 participants, mainly policy makers, from Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda and Uganda was undertaken to China and Malaysia;

5. *Policy and strategy support:* A planned inception workshop for co-operation on policy analysis and strategy formulation with the University of Uppsala did not take place as the proposed project was not approved by SAREC; and

6. *Regional SearNet conference:* The Southern and East African Rain Water Network is a registered regional implementing agency managed by its members to assist national and local organisations in converting planned water harvesting schemes into operating projects. Financial support was provided by RELMA-in-ICRAF to conferences in Gaborone in 2004, Kigali in 2005 and Mombasa in 2006 (11th conference) with participants from Botswana, Burundi, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Malawi, Rwanda, Zambia and Zimbabwe. National action plans were used to formulate a regional strategic plan for attracting donor support.

Generated Outputs and Achieved Impact:

+ ICRAF followed closely the surveying in Lare and did also take a keen interest in the use of bamboo for waste water cleansing;

– Only three of the stated sub-component outputs were attained while three demonstration and learning sites on water management went undocumented, one groundwater recharge site was not constructed, waste water management was not documented and the policy workshop did not materialise; and

– Ancillary bamboo activities on production and processing have been ineffective.

Cost-effectiveness: The budget 2004–2006 for this sub-component was $311,000, of which $276,000 (89%) were utilised. Overall cost-effectiveness has been acceptable but not impressive in spite of the successful documentation of the Lare experience.

Outlook for 2008 onwards: After the end of the Sida support period in 2006, the rain water harvesting activities promoted by project have continued via national associations in Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania and Zambia. “Green” rain water harvesting for the benefit of agroforestry has also expanded to Malawi and Rwanda with ICRAF employing the same successful approach as RSCU with programmed awareness campaigns and training of professional staff, followed by practical training of artisans in constructing tanks, dams and conveyance structures.

Conclusions: As this sub-component was largely successful in completing the planned activities and attaining the expected outputs, the rainwater harvesting methods have been energetically promoted by ICRAF in conjunction with agroforestry in two additional countries and with several other countries identified for future assistance within an expanded second support period. The experience indicates that field practices that are welcomed and affordable by smallholders, benefit from a clear implementation strategy and complement the activities of the host institution have a good chance of continuing to grow also without special donor support. The experience also shows that the rationale for subject matter networks diminishes after the build-up processes at the national level have been completed and that remaining tasks, which may have to be executed without external support, could be limited to policy issues, where the multi-country experiences are of particular value, and to capacity building where economies of scale in preparing joint training programmes are evident.

3.2 Support to Commodity Processing and Trade

(vii) Coffee quality development ("Shade coffee") (New project sub-component 1.10)
Rationale: Quality produce grown in known and respected locations tend to fetch higher prices than comparable unlabeled produce.

Purpose and Implementation Approach: The purpose of this sub-component is to prove the validity of the "appellation" concept to bulk produce in East Africa.

The planned activities and outputs encompassed analyses of suitability of growing locations, socio-economic surveys, identification of best quality enhancing practices, training and support to networking and to workshops.

Relevance: This sub-component is considered as largely relevant:

+ The purpose of the sub-component conformed to the objective of the intervention area; and

– The project did not have a tested development model to convey but promotes a pilot approach.

Planned and Implemented Activities: Pilot production sites have been selected in Uganda and Rwanda and a site in Kenya is being identified. Partners have been identified in all three countries. Socio-economic surveys have been conducted. Training in quality testing has been carried out.

Conclusions: The concept has been successful in Ethiopia and should be feasible also in suitable locations in Kenya, Rwanda and Burundi.

(viii) Strengthening Farmers' Organisations & Service Providers (Project sub-component 1.5)
Rationale: Rural institutions were regarded by the project as essential for promoting development and sustainable livelihoods and farmer organisations were deemed to need to improve their organisational skills to be able to compete with private sector agents. Since RELMA had previously initiated capacity building among farmer organisations and since ICRAF had also promoted similar groups (Land-care Associations), it was argued that the project should continue to strengthen farmers organisations for empowerment and advocacy purposes and for dissemination of new information.

Purpose and Implementation Approach: The stated purpose of the sub-component was to strengthen farmers' organisations to utilise their full potential.

The planned activities and outputs encompassed analyses of organisational profiles, identification of best practices, facilitation of "cross-fertilisation" among farmers' organisations, training, support to networking and to workshops intended to link farmers' organisations to service providers.

Relevance: This sub-component is considered as less relevant:

+ The purpose of the sub-component conformed to the objective of the intervention area;

– The project did not have a tested development model to convey but had first to analyse existing farmers' organisations to identify suitable practices for others to emulate;

– While several other bodies were supporting farmers' organisations on a regional basis, little assessment was made of their comparative advantages;

– The project did not possess expert knowledge on the pertinent subject matters.

Planned and Implemented Activities: Following the MTR in 2005[5], the activities under this sub-component were largely reduced to documenting the experiences gained 2004–2005. The following progress was made in implementing this sub-component:

1. *FO inventory/profiling:* An inventory of farmers' organisations in East Africa was concluded. The inventory found that successful organisations generally were small with members who trust each other and that few apex organisations provided useful services to the primary organisations;
2. *Regional and national advocacy:* These activities contributed to the formation of the East African Farmers' Federation (EAFF) as a voice for farmers in regional and continental contexts, including exchanges with NEPAD's Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Program;
3. *Farmers' cross-fertilisation:* Nine East African farmers toured India in December 2004; and
4. *Facilitation of regional FO meetings:* A meeting took place in Mombasa in 2004.

Achieved Impact:

+ A document on the inventory survey is available together with a Resource Book for use by farmers' organisations;
+ Important contributions to the formation and initial work of the East African Farmers' Association;
+ A workshop on farmers' organisations in conjunction with NEPAD and RRD took place in Pretoria in 2007; however

– As no model for improvement of organisational or other skills was conveyed, the impact on farmers' organisations' ability to exercise advocacy or provide better services to their members has been limited; and

– The impact of the sub-component on ICRAF's activities appears to have been marginal.

Cost-effectiveness: The budget 2004–2006 for the sub-component was $215,000 of which $199,000 were utilised. In light of the limited activities and achievements, cost-effectiveness must be regarded as poor.

Conclusions: The limited impact can be attributed to the absence of a useful model to extend, vague client focus in relation to organisational tiers as well as to commodities, and lack of a support strategy.

(ix) Market Information Systems (Project sub-component 1.6)

In contrast to land, range and water management, in which areas RELMA prior to 2004 had gathered considerable expertise on technical aspects as well as on approaches for disseminating the relevant knowledge to new users, a similar accumulation of knowledge had not taken place in relation to crop management or in relation to downstream processing and marketing activities. Further, few attempts appear to have been made by RELMA to assess the relevance and the value of the existing knowledge in these fields among other, more directly involved actors, or to have it disseminated through own information material or training programmes.

Consequently, the efforts by the project to convey new knowledge on processing and marketing of important crop and livestock commodities ran the risk of not being helped by the advantage that is provided by an accumulated body of knowledge ready for dissemination to interested clients. In the absence of "own" messages and identified clients, the project appears to have been tempted to support organisations promoting processing or marketing services without links to other sub-components.

[5] The Mid-Term Review recommended that further support be concentrated to agroforestry-based farmers' organisations.

Expected Output and Implementation Approach: The stated output for this component was "increased outreach of market information to farmers and traders".

The output was expected to be attained through collection and dissemination of market information to new beneficiaries on a wide range of commodities—crops, livestock, agroforestry and forestry produce—together with an assessment of best approaches to collect and convey market information. Achievement targets were specified as "outreach increased by 5% in current market information systems in three countries"; "survey on best approaches completed in three countries and documented"; and "best approaches disseminated to stakeholders in ECA countries".

Relevance: This sub-component is regarded as less relevant:

+ The purpose of the sub-component conformed to the objective of the intervention area;

– The project did not have tested approaches on information collection and dissemination to extend;

– The direct clients and the ultimate clients were not well defined; and

– The project did not possess expert knowledge on commodity markets or on methods for collection or dissemination of market information.

Planned and Implemented Activities: The following progress was made in implementing the sub-component activities 2004/2005:

1. *Collection and dissemination of market information in three ECA countries:* Agreements were made to collaborate with existing market information providers in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda through financial support to radio broadcasts, newspaper information, market day activities and drama performances; and

2. *Assessment and analysis of dissemination effectiveness:* This activity resulted in changes in broadcasting times, complementary text messages via SMS, and farmer feedback opportunities.

Following the MTR in April/May 2005[6], the sub-component was redefined as "Wealth Creation for Smallholders". The redefined sub-component provided information on profitable bamboo products, conducted six training workshops on bamboo processing for 100 participants from Uganda and Tanzania, and provided funds for participation by bamboo manufacturers in trade shows in Uganda and Tanzania.

Achieved Impact: This was limited as:

– It is not clear if the support served to expand information outreach as expressed by the output indicator or merely contributed to increase operating expenditure for the collaborating institutions;

– The subsequent support to bamboo production and processing did not suffice to create sustainable nursery operations or manufacturing enterprises; and

– The impact on ICRAF operations was limited.

Cost-effectiveness: The budget 2004–2006 for the sub-component was $140,000 of which $136,000 were utilised. In light of the limited activities and achievements, cost-effectiveness was poor.

Conclusions: The lack of impact may be attributed to the vague definition of the direct and ultimate clients and their requirements together with weak approaches for expanding market information and for supporting bamboo production, processing and marketing.

[6] The Mid-Term Review recommended that: further support be concentrated to market information on agroforestry commodities; the output be redefined as an established self-financing market price dissemination set-up; and that existing networks should be encouraged to handle methodology assessment and extension.

3.3 Support to Policy Analysis and Advocacy

(x) Policy Reforms for Improved Land Management (Project sub-component 1.1.4)

Expected Output and Implementation Approach: The stated output of this sub-component was "capacity of policy makers to understand and address land management problems will be enhanced". There was little illumination on its rationale or background.

The output was expected to be attained through five activities with the following qualitative targets: "synthesis of key property rights and collection issues identified"; "best bet solution developed and tested in three watersheds"; "ten policy briefs and two meetings held"; "more policy debates on land management issues"; and "policy reform processes generated by the project".

Relevance: The sub-component is regarded as largely relevant:

+ The purpose of the sub-component conformed to the objective of the intervention area;

+ An interest had been expressed by ICRAF in learning from the project how policy makers can become engaged in agroforestry as part of land management matters;

– The project did not have a model for extracting policy issues out of land management problems or a clear perception of an effective process for making policy makers understand land management problems;

– The direct clients and the ultimate clients were not adequately defined or their requirements in terms of policy analysis, legislation or strategy formulation;

– Other actors in this field—CAADP and TerrAfrica and donors such as AfDB, World Bank and UNDP—did appear to possess comparative advantages to the project; and

– The project did not have access to expert knowledge on land policy issues in Africa.

Planned and Implemented Activities: The target for 2004 was to provide a synthesis of property rights in an undefined number of geographical areas and to identify issues for collective action but neither of these activities were started.

Following internal reorientation in 2005[7], the project initiated co-operation with NEPAD/CAADP (Pillar 1), TerrAfrica and the UN Economic Commission for Africa by providing funds for meetings to develop strategies for sustainable land management and soil fertility. No explanation was offered on how such support would assist to attain the stipulated output.

Following a study visit to Sudan visit (22 participants), RELMA funded the drafting of a revised policy for the charcoal sub-sector in Kenya. The new policy is reflected in the recently approved Energy Policy and Energy Act while subsidiary legislation is being prepared. A National Project Proposal for Charcoal is under planning and RELMA has published the paper "Charcoal Trade in Kenya". KEFRI has taken up research on spacing of charcoal tree species, growth rates, wood quality, and geographical allocation of kilns.

[7] The Mid-Term Review in April/May 2005 recommended that, during its remaining lifetime, the sub-component be offering support to a regional network on policy and legal issues related to agricultural land and trees that may address charcoal production, processing and marketing among other subject matters.

Achieved Impact: This has been substantial as:

+ The policy brief on charcoal production, processing and marketing prepared with partial project support, in conjunction with the Sudan study trip, did influence policy thinking in Kenya, as clearly manifested by the new energy act, and may have enhanced the prospects for commercialising the control/extraction of P. Juliflora in northern Kenya;
+ A national project for charcoal production and trade in Kenya offers the prospects of a sustainable local bio-energy sector to which the KEFRI research may contribute valuable technical knowledge; and
+ ICRAF gained important insights in how to conduct both policy analysis and advocacy campaigns.

The total budgeted expenditure was $65,000 of which $64,000 were utilised. In light of the achievements, cost-effectiveness was acceptable.

Conclusions: The impact of the project in other countries than Kenya would have been enhanced by better definition of the direct and ultimate clients and their requirements and by access to models for reviewing land management problems and for engaging technical staff, policy makers and legislators in reform processes.

(xi) Policy Advocacy and Awareness (Project sub-component 1.7)

Rationale: The justification for this sub-component was that national policies for research and extension may be inconsistent with production and marketing policies and that the policy environment therefore may require rationalisation. Further justification was provided through a perceived need to harmonise national policies to facilitate exchange of goods and services and by the fact that the ICRAF thematic areas Land & People and Environmental Services did have strong policy focal areas that exposed gaps in relation to natural resources, rural development and the "continuum of agriculture research/extension development".

Contract law does not exists in many countries with ensuing difficulties in imposing sanctions on offending parties.

While land, water and range management, together with crop, livestock and tree production management, processing and marketing, represent the realms of small-scale farming, policy analysis and advocacy belong to the public institutions sphere together with legislation, strategy formulation and provision of support services on research, extension or credit. Outside such a context, policy analysis conceptually does constitute an odd component within the project, which further, like market information, that covers a vast range of commodities, requires considerable in-house expertise to effectively address policy issues in the sub-sectors of natural resources, rural development and research/extension.

Expected Output and Implementation Approach: The stated output for this component was to "increase the link between small-scale land users, policy makers, research/academia and other service providers in the land management issues".

The output was expected to be attained through a forum of policy and lawmakers in the East African Community area, networking with national, regional and international bodies, and tracking of evolving agricultural and related policies in the region.

Relevance: This sub-component has been largely relevant but:

– While the sub-component nominally fell within the project mandate, it lacked focus and was far removed from the realm of land, range, water and trees;

– The project did not offer a model for comparing and rationalising research/extension policies with production and marketing policies or a perception of a process for arriving at such a reconciliation;

– The key clients expected to be affiliated with this sub-component—i.e. the national custodians of policy and legal frameworks—and their requirements were left largely undefined; and

– The activities of other regional actors working on agricultural policy issues were not sufficiently taken into account.

Planned and Implemented Activities: The following progress was made:

1. *Conducting forum and preparing policy briefs:* A forum on contract farming comprising parliamentarians on agricultural committees, academic institutions, regional organisations (EAC, COMESA and NEPAD/CAADP) and others took place in Kenya in 2004. A joint workshop on contract farming for SADC, COMESA, ECOWAS and others was held in conjunction with NEPAD and RRD in 2005 to address the absence of legal frameworks and produce standards together with the existence of regional trade barriers. Preparations and conceptual work undertaken in conjunction with RRD via four regional meetings benefited a continental conference on contract farming hosted by NEPAD in Accra, Ghana in May 2005.

   Follow-up activities from a preceding forum held in 2003 included published and distributed policy briefs on contract farming and training for 18 participants from agricultural ministries and farmers' organisations Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda in Dar-es-Salaam on trade negotiation skills and proceedings in co-operation with the Africa Economic Research Consortium.

   The project supported a meeting in 2006 on contract farming between the Ministries of Agriculture in Kenya and Uganda. A draft strategy on the marketing aspects of contract farming has been prepared in Kenya with Task Force meetings financed by RELMA and an Agricultural Products Court has been proposed.

2. *Networking with national, regional and international bodies:* The project provided an account of best practices to regional organisations and helped to form a multi-stakeholder task force on contract farming.

Achieved Impact: The impact of the sub-component has been substantial although the activities have tended to gravitate towards contract farming, an arrangement that applies mainly to high value commodities outside the realm of agroforestry:

\+ The fora and policy briefs on contract farming have increased the understanding of its merits and drawbacks and may have contributed to improved legal frameworks and grading systems; and

\+ ICRAF has monitored the progress of this sub-component closely with the intention to absorb lessons on how to engage policy makers and exercise advocacy for agroforestry.

Cost-effectiveness: The budget 2004–2006 for the sub-component was $110,000 of which $105,000 were utilised. In light of the achievements, cost-effectiveness can be regarded as satisfactory.

Conclusions: The sub-component originally suffered from dubious rationale and lack of focus. Project management redirected the activities towards institutional support to contract farming which can be regarded as justified in relation to legislation, processing standards and constraints to regional trade, although national commitments to improvements in these areas are hard to gauge. However, implementation was not guided by a coherent strategy but appears to have been primarily influenced by requests from regional organisations for funds for surveys or conferences (although the Mid-term Review favoured contributions to regional exchange through information networks on policy, legal and regulatory advances in the land, range, trees and water sectors).

3.4 Cross-cutting Capacity Building, Publications and Other Issues

The remaining activities reviewed below fall under project Intervention Area 2 Capacity Building; Intervention Area 3 Information and Documentation; and Intervention Area 4 (the cross-cutting concerns related to Hiv/aids and nutrition).

The name Capacity Building for Intervention Area 2 tends to disguise the fact that no training activities were undertaken but tasks were confined to preparing books and other publications. Three of the written outputs can be classified as cross-cutting while the remaining six could advantageously have been integrated within the sub-components under Intervention Area 1 Small-scale Farm Production Management.

(xii) Capacity Building (Intervention Area 2)

Rationale: The original intention[8] of this intervention area was stated as to assess regional training needs, strengthen professional organisations, promote regional knowledge hubs benefiting small-holder farmers, and improve monitoring of service providers. In May 2005, the Mid-Term Review recommended that the objectives be made more focussed and that tasks be realigned to better support other project activities and the ICRAF theme activities in relation to agroforestry.

Expected Outputs and Implementation Approach: Although the outputs remained largely the same in 2006 after the MTR, the clients were better defined, activities were scaled down and some expenditure was cut back.

The outputs of the intervention area were expected to be attained through five sub-components: "Needs assessment for establishing benchmarks"; "Promoting/strengthening networks and associations for promoting profitable agroforestry interventions"; "Strengthening staff and institutions"; "Knowledge management"; and "Writing project proposals".

Achievements: The following tasks were completed:

Training/education:

Curriculum for In-service Training of Subject Matter Experts in Land Resources Management in Tanzania; and

Course (2 weeks) on mainstreaming market-focused development within watersheds into the extension training and school curricula.

Studies:

Profitable Agroforestry Innovations in Shared Agro-climatic Zones of East Africa and India.

[8] The objective of this intervention area was formulated as "to build capacity for creation of synergy between land management issues of production, value adding, marketing, institutions, and policy conducted".

Books and papers:
Managing Land in Ethiopia (published in 2005);

Useful Trees and Shrubs of Ethiopia: Identification, Propagation and Management (revised);

Adding Value: Improving Capacity and Linking Institutions and Professions for Promoting Synergy between Farmers' Production and Marketing;

Crafting the Missing Link: Issues, Strategies and Actions in Improving Capacity and Linking Institutions and Professions for Promoting Value-added Production in Sub-Saharan Africa.

Capacity Building for Rural People in Africa: Policy Agenda for Improved Focus in Capacity Building, Issues, Strategies and Action (an invited paper); and

Improving Approaches for Effective Teaching and Learning: Tertiary Agricultural Education.

Relevance: The sub-component is considered as largely relevant:

– The intervention area suffered from the absence of a guiding operational objective, too broad definition of client organisations, and weak ties to the ICRAF thematic areas and to the other project intervention areas;

+ ICRAF highly appreciated the assessment of the profitability of individual agroforestry enterprises, a task that had been neglected before 2006;

+ ICRAF found the classification of geographical areas into agro-ecological zones very valuable for their own work on agroforestry research;

+ The book Useful Trees and Shrubs of Ethiopia is the best reference work in its field; but

– The support to professional organisations and to special monitoring activities within the intervention area did prove less useful.

Cost-effectiveness: Budgeted and actual expenditure in $ per activity was as follows:

Activity	**Actual Expenditure 2004–2006**	**Budgeted Expenditure 2004–2006**	**Balance**
Needs assessment in promoting synergy	128 555	156 000	27 445
Promoting/strengthening networks	84 125	90 000	5 875
Strengthening staff and institutions	113 579	119 000	5 421
Knowledge management	35 451	40 000	4 549
M & E capacity building efforts	32 697	34 500	1 803
Mainstreaming cross-cutting issues	7 869	10 000	2 131
Total	**402 276**	**449 500**	**47 224**

(Publishing and distribution costs are accounted for in the sub-component Information & Documentation (xiii), below, under Intervention Area 3).

Most of the expenditure on strengthening networks and intervention specific monitoring occurred in 2004 and 2005 before the Mid-Term Review recommended reorientation and curtailment. The balance of funds on 31 December 2006 was partly used for follow-up activities during January–June 2007. However, in light of the limited achievements shown above, overall cost-effectiveness has been questionable.

Conclusions: This intervention area suffered particularly from the absence of a proper appraisal prior to implementation start which would have assisted in aligning its sub-components with the operational sub-components on field practices, commodity development and policy development, remaining only with the cross-cutting sub-components. This would have strengthened the project services by complementing the dissemination strategies with important training and education inputs. Instead, the activities under capacity building remained too dispersed also after the Mid-Term Review and their outputs came to have more in common with the Publications intervention area than with the sub- components for field practices, commodity development and policy development.

(xiii) Information and Documentation (Intervention Area 3)

Rationale: The function of this intervention area was to be supportive to the other intervention areas as well as to contribute directly to the project's two objectives. This is in contrast to the capacity building area which regrettably had few links to other project activities.

Expected Outputs and Implementation Approach: The rationale was not well reflected in the specific objective of the intervention area—"to equip key clients to more efficiently inform the beneficiaries on good land management practices and/or promoting a sound environment for increased farm production and income". However, it is partly discernible in the (modest) implementation target: "information on improved land management valued and used by at least 15% of key clients in each country".

The objective of the intervention area was to be attained through six sub-components: Publishing; Communication and Public Relations; Distribution; Capacity building in communication, publishing and distribution; Monitoring and evaluation; and Mainstreaming cross-cutting issues.

Relevance: This sub-component is considered as highly relevant:

+ The sub-components in this intervention area were potentially useful elements in the project strategy to increase outreach of institutions and programmes that assist small scale land users to improve land and water management for the purpose of increased incomes and food security;

– The criteria and the process for deciding on publishing priorities was not made clear;

– Further, the guiding documents did not define how publications and communication activities would interact with the other project elements—technologies/service/analytical models, demonstrations, ad-hoc information material and training sessions—to form effective and economical strategies for dissemination of knowledge and skills;

– The key clients expected to benefit from improved information on land management but their requirements were left largely undefined; and

+ The intervention area was valuable to ICRAF as the prepared documents included syntheses of:

  - RELMA–in–ICRAF experiences in land and water management and other areas;
  - the benefits of RELMA–in–ICRAF lessons in formulating a communication strategy; and
  - the project's skills in building capacity in communication, publishing and distribution.

Planned and Implemented Activities: Implementation efficiency was hampered by the premature departure of the head of the Publications and Communication Unit together with two other staff in September 2005 due to differences over the integration of the publication and communication functions in ICRAF. However, considerable progress was made:

1. *Publishing:* In 2004/5, the publications outstanding from 2003 and earlier were all prepared and distributed[9] (a total of 72 publications have been prepared). In addition, the project staff completed syntheses of their experiences of:

   RELMA's approaches and mode of mode of operation (2005);

   Soil conservation and fertility (2005);

   Charcoal policy in Eastern Africa (2005);

   Promoting rainwater harvesting in Eastern and Southern Africa (2005);

   Promotion of conservation agriculture in Africa (2006);

   Watershed management (2006);

   Scaling up of land innovations (2006);

   Farmers organisations (2006);

   Networking (2006); and

   Integrating animal husbandry in land management (2006).

The actual and budgeted costs for this sub-component were $232,000 and $263,000, respectively.

2. *Communication and public relations:* The following Policy Briefs were prepared:

   "Inclusive dairy policies can reduce poverty for millions";

   "Improving traditional practices yields richer rewards!"

   "Amplifying the farmers' voice in the market economy"; and

   "What is driving the charcoal industry into a dead end?"

In addition, the project website was updated and incorporated with that of ICRAF.

The actual and budgeted costs for this sub-component were $19,000 and $25,000, respectively.

3. *Distribution:* A distribution strategy was prepared together with a distribution list.

The actual and budgeted costs for this sub-component were $13,000 and $27,000, respectively.

4. *Capacity building in communication, publishing and distribution:* The actual and budgeted costs for this sub-component were $21,000 and $25,000, respectively.

5. *Monitoring and evaluation:* An evaluation of the usefulness of the RELMA publications was conducted by a consultant, yielding largely positive findings.

The actual and budgeted costs for this sub-component were $11,000 and $14,000, respectively.

[9] These included: Managing lands: a practical guidebook for development agents in Ethiopia; Conservation Agriculture Manual for Africa (with IIRR); More forage, more milk: forage production for small-scale zero grazing systems; Ponds and dams, pans and dams: a manual on planning, design, construction, and maintenance; Agroforestry practices in Eritrea; Useful Trees and Shrubs of Kenya; Fruit and nuts: Species with potential for Tanzania; and The Kusa experience: community development in western Kenya.

Achieved Impact: This has been substantial as:

+ The assessment of project activities by the consultant identified the publication series on useful trees and shrubs as the most important single source of information on natural resource management in the eastern African region; and

+ The same assessment found the extension manuals on land, water and agroforestry management almost equally useful;

+ ICRAF has absorbed experience by RELMA in preparing and printing handbooks and manuals for extension and other field staff;

– It is unclear, however, what value the policy briefs will have on their own without complementary analytical or training activities; and

– No combined communication strategy was formulated together with ICRAF.

Cost-effectiveness: The total budget 2004–2006 for the whole intervention area was $374,000 of which $311,000 were utilised. In light of the achievements, cost-effectiveness can be regarded as satisfactory.

Outlook: The digital library of ICRAF includes RELMA publications as a sub-body. Strategic storage of RELMA publications has been arranged through VI Agroforestry, NALEP (National Agricultural Extension Programme in Kenya) and KEFRI (Kenya Forestry Research Institute). Demanded reprints are likely to be charged to the recipients at cost by ICRAF.

Conclusions: It is likely that the conflict on publication strategy with ICRAF could have been avoided if a proper stakeholder analysis and/or appraisal of the project proposal had been conducted. An appraisal might also have revealed the desirability to incorporate information and documentation into a capacity building strategy and established a procedure for assessing the demand for publications (as opposed to needs).

(xiv) Mainstreaming Cross-cutting Issues (part of Intervention Area 4)

Rationale: The function of this intervention was to be complementary to cross-cutting activities already integrated into other intervention areas. No justification was provided for the selection of cross-cutting issues to be mainstreamed.

Expected Output: At least 15% of key clients in each country exposed to cross-cutting issues—gender, environment, poverty reduction, nutrition and Hiv/aids—as part of the project's activities.

Implementation Approach: Cross-cutting issues were nominally recognised as activities within the work plans of the other three intervention areas. It was not clear how the mainstreaming attempt would relate to the other cross-cut sub-components.

Relevance: This sub-component is considered as highly relevant:

+ The selected cross-cutting issues were relevant but poorly justified and thought through;

+ There are certain economies of scale to take advantage of when cross-cutting issues are mainstreamed to addressed jointly for all intervention areas; and

+ ICRAF, while being knowledgeable on particularly gender and environmental issues, has absorbed the importance of paying attention to Hiv/aids and nutrition issues.

Implemented Activities: A consultant was engaged to assist to introduce Hiv/aids and nutrition issues in western Kenya, including the Kusa area. The consultant recommended that vegetable and fruit production be promoted by the project together with labour saving rainwater harvesting. Fruit production was subsequently included in the Land Use Intensification sub-component and its nutritional importance is also reflected in the RELMA Technical Handbook on Fruits and Nuts.

Achieved Impact: This is unclear as little was reported about the impact of the activities of the Land Use Intensification component in the Mt. Kilimanjaro region or about other efforts to address cross-cutting gender and environmental issues within Intervention Areas 1, 2 and 3.

Cost-effectiveness: The total expenditure 2004–2006 for addressing cross-cutting issues was $40,000 ($7,000 in this intervention area together with $25,000 in Intervention Area 1 and $8,000 in Intervention Area 2). In light of the modest impact, the cost-effectiveness of these activities is questionable.

Outlook: It is reported that ICRAF will continue to acknowledge and address Hiv/aids and nutrition issues in their global research priorities.

Conclusions: This sub-component suffered from weaknesses in design and implementation in spite of the existence of several effective initiatives in East Africa that could have served as models. It is likely that brief inputs by specialists on cross-cutting issues during an appraisal process could have identified and rectified the planning shortcomings.

3.5 Project Management and Supervision

The Project Co-ordinator and the Sida supervisor at RRD acted ably to convene the joint RELMA–ICRAF workshop in May 2004 to revise the Plan of Operations and revive the project following the slow progress made after inception on 1 January 2004.

The project management similarly responded rapidly to the recommendations made by the Mid-term Review team in May 2005. It discontinued some of the less successful initiatives on commodity processing and trade, policy advocacy and broad capacity building and realigned the land management activities with ICRAF's agroforestry focus. It also completed the transfer of RELMA staff to the relevant ICRAF theme units.

The sustained efforts to reconcile the policy differences of the RELMA Publications Unit and the ICRAF Global Communications Unit were commendable although at the end they could not prevent staff resignation and a temporary implementation impasse.

Staff and Organisation

The decision to dissolve the former RELMA structure and assign staff under ICRAF theme and regional leaders was appropriate as was the ambition to redress imbalances in the salary structure. The staff attrition that followed the exposure to the stricter operational regime of ICRAF was, with a few exceptions, not detrimental to the effectiveness of the project. However, the organisation structure of ICRAF did not seamlessly accommodate the full range of RELMA sub-components and some had to adjust to less strong management guidance than others, possibly hampering their performance and impact.

Annual Planning and Budgeting

While the project management introduced valuable rigour into the process of budgeting for RELMA activities, it did not take the opportunity to introduce verifiable implementation targets for the project sub-components. Operational targets for outputs and impact would have helped the management to identify project weaknesses so as to instigate corrective actions at an early stage.

Formal procedures for identifying and assessing past and ongoing parallel initiatives in other organisations might have helped to avoid repetition and duplication and thus increased the cost-effectiveness of project support.

Monitoring and Evaluation

The project management initiated several evaluations of RELMA activities, including the Kusa project and the publication distribution function, as well as a final assessment in conjunction with ICRAF staff in June 2007. Project activities were also assessed regularly against stipulated implementation targets whenever applicable at the quarterly management reviews by RELMA, ICRAF and RRD. The compression of the project time table following the initial implementation delay did, however, preclude any major reorientation of sub-components that were found to be less effective than anticipated.

Administrative and Accounting Procedures

The past RELMA practices of using common pool funds before activity votes were discontinued after the incorporation of the project into ICRAF when the outstanding staff imprest obligations began to contract. Although an unaccounted balance accrued before 2004 remains, the ICRAF administrative and fiscal regimes did significantly contribute to improve the cost-efficiency of the operations of RELMA.

Termination of Project Activities

Sida had made it clear at an early stage that its support to the project would not extend beyond 2006 (activities continued up to the formal termination date 30 June 2007 to allow important follow-up tasks to be completed, including a concluding internal evaluation). Although efforts were made by the project management to forewarn early about the termination of activities, some direct and ultimate clients did not fully absorb the message and failed to prepare plans for operations without the support by RELMA.

In parallel, several RELMA staff members were engaged in efforts to raise alternative external funding for continued operations of their sub-components within the ICRAF organisational structure, although these initiatives ultimately did not meet with success.

4. Conclusions And Recommendations

The project was from the outset affected by the wide differences that existed between RELMA and ICRAF in terms of mandates, geographical coverage, client composition, length of commitments, organisational structures, and management and governance arrangements. It was also afflicted by a planning process that had to short-circuit common procedures by excluding analyses of the main stakeholders or an appraisal of the project design prior to implementation together with the brevity of the implementation period during which the many pressing tasks precluded further major efforts to enhance mutual accommodation.

In view of these circumstances, the project RELMA-in-ICRAF performed reasonably well 2004–2006. The evaluation reveals that 46 of 52 planned activities were completed and no major task was left outstanding at the time of formal project closure 30 June 2007 which points to a laudable degree of efficiency. The impact of the project on its direct and ultimate clients has been or will be particularly evident for water harvesting practices and on support to commodity development for coffee while its assistance to policy development has significantly contributed to make contract farming a better understood and more viable concept. The publications of RELMA have maintained their high standards and are, as an external evaluation disclosed, highly appreciated by both former direct project clients and other practitioners of land management. In addition, the stricter management regime of ICRAF has contributed to more cost-efficient operations during the project period than was the case prior to 2004.

For ICRAF, the project's approach to extending practices on water, dryland and livestock management has proved valuable in several programmes in Africa and its ways of working with extension clients have provided certain inspiration for ICRAF in its ambition to assist its co-operating partners on capacity building. The policy development activities have been instructive in showing fruitful modes for working with policy makers in regional bodies. Project staff have contributed valuable analyses of the profitability of agroforestry enterprises and have facilitated application of the concept of agro-ecological zones in the context of agroforestry. In addition, RELMA's procedures for preparing and disseminating information have exerted influence on ICRAF, including the participatory mode, the practice to engage external specialists, the use of concentrated poster-like summaries to distil accumulated knowledge, and its multi-channel mode for distribution of information.

Attainment of outputs: The expected outputs were largely attained for eight sub-components (iii, v, vi, vii, ix, xi, xii and xiii) and partly attained for five sub-components (I, ii, viii, v and xiv) while one anticipated output was not realised (sub-component iv). An appraisal is likely to have revealed the weaknesses in the design of some of these sub-components and might have contributed to improved formulation and more attention paid by the project management to delays and problems in the early implementation process.

Achieved impact: For the direct external clients of the project, four sub-components (vii, x, xi and xiii) had substantial impact and five uneven or unclear impact (i, ii, iii, v and xiv) while the impact of four sub-components (iv, viii, ix and xii) is deemed to have been rather limited. The reasons for the relatively modest impact record are varied. Some can be associated with shortcomings in the planning process that led to overestimation of the interest of the direct clients (for instance for land rehabilitation and soil fertility, conservation agriculture and approaches for scaling up). Other reasons include optimistic perceptions of RELMA's experience and expertise in complex matters such as capacity building (for instance for strengthening farmers' organisations and for cross-cutting capacity building), commodity processing and trade, and policy analysis and advocacy. A third reason was restrictions in ICRAF's ability to support the project by adjusting its policy and strategy frameworks (which instead became less rather than more "development oriented" during the implementation period), its organisational structure, or to allocate incremental management resources to assist RELMA in moving less dynamic sub-components. Contrary to some assumptions, RELMA had prior to 2004 not evolved specific strategies for conveying knowledge and skills on field practices, commodity value chains or policy development to its different categories of direct clients although it had a reputation for applying effective approaches in working with the ultimate client farmers.

While most sub-components had a noticeable impact on ICRAF, the change from themes to global research projects as a guiding structure for planning and operations may have adversely affected the relevance to ICRAF of the sub-components on sustainable farmland and conservation agriculture. As ICRAF decided to halt its own process for dissemination of research findings at the point of intermediary institutions, RELMA's experience in working effectively with groups of farmer clients became less relevant.

Influence of the project on other organisations than the direct clients was exerted via field practices for land management (NEPAD/CAADP), land rehabilitation (Sudan/UNEP) and conservation agriculture (Lake Victoria Basin and West Africa/IFAD) and via policy advocacy and analysis initiatives together with farmer organisations, including charcoal growers in Kenya and the East African Farmers Federation. The project also contributed significantly to the establishment of strong institutional links between ICRAF and NEPAD/CAADP, not least on policy issues.

Relevance of project activities: Four project sub-components are considered to have been highly relevant (v, vi, xiii and xiv) while eight were largely relevant (i, ii, iii, iv, vii, x, xi and xii) and two of less relevance (viii and ix). Limited usefulness appears to be associated with shortcomings in the planning process where proper stakeholder analyses should have revealed weak client commitments to some sub-components and an independent appraisal the feasibility obstacles of others. Four sub-components were discontinued by the project management following the Mid-term Review in 2005.

Cost-effectiveness: As some sub-components turned out to be less relevant or had limited impact and since expenditure matched the budget, overall cost-effectiveness has been modest. Two sub-components had satisfactory cost-effectiveness (vi and xiii), four were acceptable (iii, v, vi and x) and the cost-effectiveness of three sub-components was questionable (i, xi and xiv). The cost-effectiveness of four sub-components was poor (ii, iv, viii and ix) as the result of limited relevance or disappointing performance.

Fulfilment of Sida expectations: While the identity of RELMA gradually dissolved within the large, established organisation of ICRAF, the anticipation by Sida that land management would remain a core subject matter held true although perhaps with less regional applicability than expected. As mentioned above, the assumption that the project would influence ICRAF to become more "development oriented" was compromised by its new policy framework but the team approach and the weekly co-ordination meetings of RELMA did indeed influence the management procedures and culture of ICRAF.

Management: The project management was successful in accelerating the implementation momentum after the slow initial progress in 2004 and responded rapidly to the recommendations by the Mid-term Review in May 2005 by discontinuing some of the less successful sub-components. It also effected productive project staff reallocations within ICRAF and persistently promoted budgeting and fiscal discipline. However, it did not manage to fully compensate for all the described weaknesses in sub-component design and client support strategies or for the shortage of resident specialist expertise outside the RELMA core subject matters.

Sustainability of project results. The results or impact of the project activities are expected to remain economically, socially and environmentally sustainable. Among the ultimate farmer clients, agroforestry production is likely to continue to increase without economic, social or environmental restraints after adoption of the land management and water harvesting practices disseminated by the project and with continued benefaction from the "terroir" approach in Ethiopia and the policy liberalisation for the charcoal industry in Kenya.

Improved land management practices are also expected to be sustained without encumbrances as the result of the project's propagation of conservation agriculture practices (with measured use of herbicides) and better dryland and livestock husbandry.

Sustainability of practices and models promoted by RELMA. The field practices disseminated by the project proved to be economically, socially and environmentally sustainable will continue to be replicated—improved land management practices by ICRAF and national extension agencies, conservation agriculture by IFAD, FAO and extension services in West Africa and the Lake Victoria Basin, water harvesting in eastern and southern Africa by ICRAF, national associations and SearNet, and dryland/livestock management by ICRAF and national extension agencies.

Within ICRAF, water harvesting and dryland/livestock management practices are well established as complementary activities to encourage farmers to adopt improved management regimes centred around agroforestry interventions.

Within the field of commodity development, the "terroir" model is expected to be replicated in other parts of Ethiopia and in coffee producing countries in eastern Africa.

The approach applied by RELMA to assist farmer organisations on policy analysis and advocacy may be replicated by the East African Farmers Federation as well as by donor organisations.

The highly appreciated RELMA publications are expected to continue to spread proven knowledge about land and agroforestry management. They may in fact represent the most durable legacy of RELMA as they have been broadly distributed in eastern and southern Africa and will also remain accessible via inventories among NGOs and through the ICRAF data base.

Sustainability of RELMA modus operandi/ICRAF ownership. It is expected that the institutional practices introduced by RELMA—team-working, participatory management, extensive external linkages from farmers to policy makers, gender sensitivity, and multi-channel dissemination of information—will be sustained within ICRAF and help to maintain its reputation as a central organisation on agroforestry where research activities reflect and actively impact on farmers' problems.

Permanence of the achieved organisational integration/ICRAF ownership. In addition to the work practices, ICRAF expects to continue to embrace core RELMA subject matters such as land management, conservation agriculture, water harvesting and dryland/livestock management, together with value chain development for agroforestry commodities.

The RELMA–ICRAF integration process offers a valuable demonstration on the complexity of merging two organisations with differing mandates, size, structures and cultures that could provide beneficial lessons for similar initiatives in the future.

Recommendations: As the project was terminated with all major activities completed and ICRAF has already absorbed the preferred knowledge from RELMA, there are few issues left outstanding. However, the evaluation has disclosed that the initiatives on bamboo production, processing and marketing which did not generate the desired momentum may benefit from further attention by ICRAF or other supporters. It would also be valuable if search procedures within ICRAF were further improved to facilitate easier access to RELMA generated information (external publications and internal reports) and if the RELMA body of publications was incorporated as an element into the evolving ICRAF global communication strategy.

5. Lessons Learned

With the exception of the first and the two last points, the lessons summarised below may be of interest also to other initiatives that serve to integrate the operations of organisations with cross-border responsibilities.

Technical mandate, knowledge base and staff capabilities: While the RELMA mandate on land management was well matched by a proven body of knowledge accumulated over many years, the expansion in 1998 into the novel commodity and policy development areas would in retrospect probably have required the contributions by specialists on commodity value chain analyses, business development and policy analysis.

Regional mandate and task prioritisation: Successful interventions by a regional development project appear to demand that the following requirements are fulfilled:

1. Useful experiences—superior practices or models—for the project to convey with expert knowledge, preferably resident, to back them up;
2. Minimised duplication of other national or regional support initiatives;
3. Interested and committed direct clients in several countries who perceive that project support to adopt the promoted practices or models may make a significant positive difference to their operations; and
4. Clear strategies for providing cost-effective support to different client categories together with effective approaches for the clients to assist the ultimate beneficiaries to adopt the practices/models.

Project design features: Since a regional mandate is particularly susceptible to divergent interpretations, simple and clear objectives, principles and working procedures serve to enhance appreciation and understanding among client organisations and to facilitate co-operation and sustainability of initiatives beyond the support period.

Approaches for disseminating knowledge or skills to different categories of clients should preferably be defined through the elements of awareness campaigns, demonstrations, study tours, training sessions, information material or backstopping support.

Requirements for financial contributions by the clients are useful features for gauging the level of their commitment.

Although institution building projects are frequently complex, simple operational targets at the level of activities that are monitored on a monthly or quarterly basis help to identify implementation snags at an early stage.

Policies for support to client networks should preferably be included in the project design in order to be clear to all network members.

Planning for joint operations: Institutional/stakeholder analyses are of particular value as planning tools for organisational integration processes.

Joint or synchronised planning by client–host organisations tend to facilitate the subsequent integration process.

It is realistic to assume and accept that organisational policies and structures, management practices, staff rules and administrative routines will to a large extent be determined by the designated host organisation.

Independent formal or informal appraisal can be an important means to obtain a second opinion on project rationale, scope, structure, strategies and cost-effectiveness.

Process for achieving alignment of the operations of two organisations: A formal induction period with explicit goals, activities and mechanisms for dealing with contentious staff issues is likely to speed up the integration process.

In spite of application of careful planning and implementation procedures, the existence of two organisational bodies with different governance and principals tend to generate unpredictable developments. ICRAF was originally interested primarily in RELMA's experience of land rehabilitation/soil fertility, land use intensification, approaches for scaling up field practices to policies, and policy reforms for improved land management. Following changes in its mandate and structure, the interest was redirected towards water harvesting and dryland and livestock management practices.

Similarly, ICRAF's withdrawing from direct dissemination of research findings to farmers rendered the RELMA expertise on this process less relevant than anticipated at the time of planning.

Annex 1. Terms of Reference

Evaluation of RELMA
Improved Land management for sustainable development

1. Background Information

RELMA, the Regional Land Management Unit, used to be a unit within Sida. Its origin was the Regional Soil and Water Conservation Unit (RSCU) which was established in 1982 with the purpose to spread the positive experience of soil conservation in Kenya to other countries in East Africa. RSCU was transferred into RELMA in 1998. The operations were carried out from the ICRAF office in Nairobi, but still belonged administratively to Sida.

Sida decided in 2003 to transfer the project to ICRAF. The transfer and integration of RELMA in ICRAF would be effected through a three year project Improved Land Management for Sustainable Development. From 2004 Sida has had an agreement with ICRAF to carry out the project. The activity period ended in June 2007.

The project document states the following.

The Development Goal of the project is:

Improved livelihoods among small-scale land users and enhanced food security for all households.

The strategy to fulfil the Development Goal is:

To promote conditions that will allow small-scale land users to improve their livelihoods and to enhance food security for all people through environmentally sustainable, socially and economically viable farming, marketing and institutional systems.

The project objective is:

Increased outreach and quality of programmes, projects and institutions, which empower small-scale land users to improve food security and to reduce poverty.

The strategy to achieve the objective is:

To work systematically and closely with relevant programmes, projects and institutions and provide them with complementary, catalytic and facilitative support for them to contribute more effectively to the empowerment of small-scale land users. In this endeavour, RELMA's integration with ICRAF will result in increased effectiveness. ICRAF is strong in research for development while RELMA has vast experience in participator development.

To achieve the objective the project will aim at strengthening development programmes, projects and institutions by providing support within

Small-scale Farm Management, Capacity building and information and documentation.

2. Evaluation purpose

The activity period of the programme Improved Land Management for Sustainable Development ended in June 2007. This evaluation is a combination of an end of project evaluation and an early ex-post evaluation.

The evaluation concerns the last phase of RELMA January 2004 to June 2007. Since RELMA to a large extent builds upon the experience and initiatives from earlier phases of RELMA and other related programmes it might be necessary to take those linkages into consideration.

The purpose of the evaluation is twofold

1. to find out to what extent the project objectives have been fulfilled and to what extent RELMA has been integrated into ICRAF's work i.e. research and development activities. In that sense the evaluation serves as a control function to see if the agreement has been fulfilled,
2. for Sida and ICRAF to learn for the future when it comes to the issues handled by RELMA and design of development programmes.

The evaluation has to take into consideration the results of the mid-term review and the changes it lead to.

3. Scope of Evaluation

In relation to the objectives mentioned above and expected outcome and objectives the evaluation shall:

- Provide a brief, all-round description of the project to give general information and background to the analysis.
- Assess effectiveness by studying to what extent the project has achieved its objectives. What have the expected and unexpected results been?
- Assess impact.
- Assess relevance – Was the intervention consistent with the needs and priorities of its target group and the policies of Sida and ICRAF?
- Assess sustainability of results and ownership of ICRAF
- Assess efficiency.

Specific questions in relation to the integration of RELMA into ICRAF:

- Assess the progress of integration of RELMA's approaches and methodologies into ICRAF's research and development strategies.
- Assess the activities that have been taken on board by ICRAF and continue to be implemented after the end of RELMA to assess sustainability of the integration.
- Examine how ICRAF has benefited from specific RELMA activities.

4. Methodology

The evaluation shall be carried out through (1) analysis of available project documents and other relevant documents considered necessary by the consultant and (2) interviews with former RELMA staff, in particular the former project coordinator Chin Ong, key persons at ICRAF, representatives from the collaborating partners of RELMA, the Resource Centre for Rural Development (RRD) at the Embassy of Sweden and others the consultant assesses relevant.

Chin Ong is no longer working for ICRAF and is based in the U.K. Since the project coordinator has had an important function in the programme Sida can consider to finance his participation as a resource person in Nairobi for a maximum of 3 days (the number of days excludes his trip to Nairobi). It is up to the consultant if he or she would like to involve Chin Ong in this way, and thus it is only an option. In case the tendering company would like to use this opportunity it should be indicated in the tender and the cost for Chin Ong's participation should be included in the budget as a reimbursable cost. The ceiling amount for his participation is SEK 37 000.

The consultant may consider other methods and activities deemed essential in implementing the evaluation. Method should be spelled out in the tender documents.

The evaluation shall be carried out based on a gender perspective, i.e. analyses made and findings presented shall consider both involvement of women as well as men and the impact and consequences for women and men and their respective roles and responsibilities.

5. Workplan and schedule

The main part of the work is expected to take place in May 2008 and the field work should start in the beginning of the same month. Sida assesses the time frame for the assignment within a range of three to five weeks (40 hours per week); a majority of the time should be spent in East Africa.

ICRAF and RRD will suggest a list of people to interview. The team is free to modify the proposal as it considers fit, and to make any additional contacts as deemed essential.

The consultant shall brief ICRAF and RRD about the findings after the fieldwork has been concluded.

6. Reporting

The evaluation report shall be written in English and should not exceed 35 pages, excluding annexes. Format and outline of the report shall follow the guidelines in *Sida Evaluation Report – a Standardized Format* (see Annex 1). The draft report shall be submitted to Sida and ICRAF electronically no later than 13 June 2008. Sida and ICRAF should submit comments on the draft report no later than the 30th of June 2008. Within 2 weeks after receiving Sida's comments on the draft report, a final version shall be submitted to Sida and ICRAF electronically and in 3 hardcopies. The evaluation report must be presented in a way that enables publication without further editing. Subject to decision by Sida, the report will be published in the series Sida Evaluations.

The evaluation assignment includes the completion of *Sida Evaluations Data Work Sheet* (Annex 2), including an Evaluation Abstract (final section, G) as defined and required by DAC. The completed Data Worksheet shall be submitted to Sida along with the final version of the report. Failing a completed Data Worksheet, the report cannot be processed.

7. Evaluation team

The Evaluation shall be conducted by a senior consultant (level 1). The consultant shall not have been involved or linked with the implementation of the evaluated project.

The consultant shall have demonstrable competence in the following areas:

- Natural resource management
- Institutional and policy development
- Socio-economy
- Evaluation analysis
- Good knowledge about ICRAF

- Knowledge about and experience from East Africa in relation to agriculture and natural resource management.
- knowledge and experience of linkages between international research organisations and national extension systems.

It is a valuable merit if the consultant has good knowledge about RELMA. The consultant must however not have been involved in RELMA in a way which could question his or her objectivity.

Enclosures:

– Sida Evaluation Report – a Standardized Format

– Sida Evaluations Data Work Sheet

List of People Met

Kenya

ICRAF

Dr. Tony Simons, Director

Dr. Henning Baur, Regional Co-ordinator, Eastern Africa

Dr. Frank Place, Leader of Land and People Theme

Dr. August Temu, Director of Partnerships

Mr. Laksiri Abeysekera, Chief Financial and Operations Officer

Mr. Ernest Gatoru, Accountant

Dr. Michael Hailu, Director of Communications

Dr. Miyuki Liyama, Post-Doc Scientist

Former RELMA-in-ICRAF

Dr. Millie Abaru, Marketing and Farmers' Organisations

Mr. Maimbo M. Malesu, Regional Co-ordinator, GWP Associated Programme

Mr Alex Odour, Information Officer

Mr. George Obanyi, Publications Officer

Sida

Dr. Torsten Andersson, Resource Centre for Rural Development, Nairobi

Ms. Eidi Genfors, Resource Centre for Rural Development, Nairob

Mr. J.K. Kiara, Programme Officers

Other

Mr. Sören Damgaard-Larsen, NALEP

Mr. Isaac Bekalo, International Institute for Rural Development (IIRR)

Dr. Fridah Mugo, Director, Thuiya Enterprises Ltd

Dr. Judy Wahungu, Man. Director, ACTS

Dr. George Karanja, KARI

Mr. Bo Lager, VI Agroforestry

Mr. Philip Okech Okech, Chairman Kusa Community Development Society

Mr. Samuel Nyadida Yimbo, Secretary Kusa Community Development Society

Mr. Saidi D Mkomwa, Executive Secr., African Conservation Tillage Network

Mr. Derrick M'Mbijjewe, Man. Dir., Bamboo & Tree Company

Mr. Björn Jönsson, Senior Regional Adviser, SCC

Ethiopia

Mr. Ephraim Alamerew Bogale, Executive Director, Ethiopian Rainwater Harvesting Association (ERHA)

Mr. Mesfin Shenkut, V. Chairperson, ERHA

Dr. Berhanu Adenew Degefa, Senior Researcher, Ethiopian Economic Policy Research Institute

Mr. Yaregal Meskir, Director General Federal Micro and Small Enterprises Development

Mr. Ibrahim Mohammad, Director, Extension Dept, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (and former RAC member)

Uganda

Mr. Leonard Msemakweli, Gen. Secretary, UCA

Hon. Dr John Odit, MP, (Chair Agriculture Committee)

Mr. Chebet Maikut, President, Uganda National Farmers Federation (UNFFE)

Mr. Joseph Tanui, Land Care Co-ordinator, African Highlands Initiative

Mr. Kenneth Francis Masuki, Knowledge Management Specialist

Mr. Jackson Sinini, Bamboo furniture maker

Gen. Elly Tumwine, Creations Centre

Mr. Geoffrey Abwon, Instructor, Luziri Prison

Mr. Milton Tiyo, Officer-in-Charge, Luziri Prison

Mr. Paito Obote, Chairman, URWA

Ms. Hellen Nakato, Adm. Asst, URWA

Joseph Tanui, African Highlands Initiative

Tanzania

Dr. Aichi Kitalyi, Livestock and Farming Systems

Ms. Mary Ngema, former Dir. Of Extension and RAC member

List of Documents

An Evaluation of FARMESA and RELMA, Sida Evaluation 00/20, Jan Erikson, Eva Tobisson, Ian Walton, Gilbert Mudenda, 2000

The Regional Land Management Unit, RELMA, Phase 2, Project Document for the Period 1st January 2002–31st December 2006, December 2001

Letter of Understanding between World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF) and The Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida), 21 March 2003

Improved Land Management for Sustainable Development, Plan of Operation and Budget 2004–2006, 25 November, 2003

Improved Land Management for Sustainable Development, Plan of Operation and Budget 2004–2006, 25 November, 2003, revised draft 26 May 2004 (incl. logframe)

Regional Land Management Unit, Annual Report 2003

Terms of Reference for ICRAF's Regional Advisory Council (RAC) in East and Central Africa

Sida's Regional Land Management Unit 1998–2003, Report by Åke Barklund, March 2004

Minutes from RRD-ICRAF Meeting held on 2 June 2004

World Agroforestry Centre, Medium Term Plan 2005–2007, July 2004

Approved minutes of Sida-ICRAF meeting on RELMA-in-ICRAF project 30 Nov 2004 (amended on 16 December)

RELMA-in-ICRAF Workplan 2005 (Logframe)

World Agroforestry Centre, Programme of Work and Budget 2005

Restoring Hope, World Agroforestry Center, Annual Report 2004

Annual Report of RELMA in ICRAF for 2004 (24/02/05)

RELMA-in-ICRAF, Intervention Area 3, Information and Documentation, Monitoring and Evaluation System

ICRAF East and Central Africa Region, Annual Report 2004, 23 March 2005

Crafting the Missing Link, Farmers' Competence Initiative, Azene Bekele-Tesemma, 2005

Minutes of the meeting between Torsten Andersson and Chin Ong, 28 February, 2005

An Overview of Agricultural Extension Systems in East Africa and Networks supported by RELMA, Gathiru Kimaru, March 2005

RELMA-in-ICRAF, Follow-up of Logframe for 1st quarter of 2005

Knowledge gap assessment for linking farm-production to value addition, marketing and policy on Kenya and Ethiopia; Excerpt from Expert Critique workshops and study Consultants, undated

Policy Briefs:

No 1, 2004: Getting a better deal

No 2, 2005: Inclusive dairy policies can reduce poverty for millions

No 3, 2005: Amplifying the farmers' voice in the market economy

No 4, 2005: Improving traditional practices yields richer rewards

ICRAF

Indigenous techniques for assessing and monitoring range resources in East Africa, Occasional Paper 02

Improving Approaches for Effective Teaching and Learning, Tertiary Agricultural Education

Future Forestry Education: Responding to Expanding Societal Needs

Farming Trees, Banishing Hunger: How an agroforestry programme is helping smallholders in Malawi to grow more food and improve their livelihoods, 2008

ICRAF/RELMA

CD: RELMA Publications Archive (Manuals, Pamphlets, pdfs, RELMA Final Publications, Reports, Working Papers)

CD: Workshop on RELMA synthesis, Nairobi, 1–2 November 2006

CD: Useful Trees of Ethiopia

Progress Reports

Annual Report of RELMA in ICRAF for 2004, 24 February 2005

1st Quarter Report (RELMA-in-ICRAF), 19 May 2005

2nd Quarter Report (RELMA-in-ICRAF), August 2005

3rd Quarter Report (RELMA-in-ICRAF), 2005

Annual Report and 4th Quarter Report 2005, 2 May 2006

Notes on Meeting of Sida-ICRAF, 15 August 2006

Revised Final Technical Report on RELMA-in-ICRAF Project 2004–2006, 29 June 2007

ICRAF Annual Report 2006

Network for Greenwater Harvesting in Eastern and Southern Africa and South Asia: Progress Report 2006/2007

RELMA: 20+ years experience in supporting improved land management (pamphlet)

Transforming Lives and Landscapes: Capturing 30 years of agroforestry experience (CD)

Evaluation Reports

Evaluation of RELMA Publications in Ethiopia, Uganda, Tanzania and Kenya, Draft Report, IIRR, September 2006

Agricultural Education in Kenya & Tanzania

Agroforestry Handbook for Montane Zone of Uganda

Curriculum for In-service Training, Drip Irrigation: Options for Smallholders Farmers in East Africa

Edible Wild Plants of Tanzania

Empowering Rural Communities: Rainwater Harvesting

Enclosures to Protect and Conserve

Fruits and Nuts (Tanzania)

Impacts of Rainwater Harvesting

Low Cost Methods of Rainwater Harvesting

Management of Rangelands

Marketing of Small-holder Produce

Forage Production for Dairy

Soil and Water Conservation Manual for Eritrea

Soil Fertility and Land Productivity, Kusa Experience

Useful Trees and Shrubs for Kenya

Water from Ponds, Pans and Dams (planning manual)

Technical Documents

Lessons from Eastern Africa's Unsustainable Charcoal Business (pamphlet)

Feeding sustainability: Tree forage for enriched diets in zero-grazing systems (pamphlet)

Conservation Agriculture turning rainfall into higher crop yields (pamphlet)

Capturing Africa's potential for rainwater harvesting (pamphlet)

Linking Research to Extension for Watershed Management: The Nyando Experience (Technical Manual No.1)

The Kusa Experience: Community Development in Western Kenya, Technical Handbook No. 37)

Impacts of Rainwater Harvesting, Technical Report No. 30

Conservation Agriculture in Africa Series

Conservation agriculture as practiced in Ghana, ACT/CIRAD/FAO, 2007

Conservation agriculture as practiced in Kenya: Two case studies, ACT/CIRAD/FAO, 2007

Conservation agriculture as practiced in Tanzania: Three case studies, ACT/CIRAD/FAO, 2007

Conservation agriculture: A Uganda case study, ACT/CIRAD/FAO, 2007

Conservation agriculture in Zambia: A case study from Southern Province, ACT/CIRAD/FAO, 2007

African Highlands Initiative

African Highlands Initiative Approaches for Regenerating Livelihoods and Landscapes: Briefs on Strategies for Systems Intensification A1–6, Institutional Innovations for R&D B1–8, Integrated Watershed Management C1–3, Advancing Impact D1–4, Strengthening Local Institutions and Equity E1–5, Training Briefs T1–5.

African Highlands Initiative (CD): Briefs, Working Papers, Proceedings, Methods Guides, Methods Database (Strategies for Systems Intensification, Integrated Watershed Management, Collective Action, Local Institutions and Equity, Institutional and Policy Innovations, Scaling up and Institutional Change, Strengthening R&D Linkages).

Others

ACTS African Centre for Technology Studies

Introduction of Biotechnology and Biosafety: A Policy Analysis Training Course Designed with Reference to the High-Level African Panel on Modern Biiotechnology of the AU and NEPAD, October 2005

Science and Technology Institute, May 2008

VI Agroforestry

VI Agroforestry strategy 2008–2011 (Planting the Future)

URWA Uganda Rainwater Association

Bulletin Vol. 6, Issue 17, January–June 2008

Nairobi Arboretum—The place of trees, FONA

Rwanda

Action Plan 2007 (electronic)

Completion Report April–December 2007

Mapping Report

Workplan 2007/08

Recent Sida Evaluations

2008:44 Kampala City Council – A Project for Promoting Ecological Sanitation in Kampala, Uganda. Final Evaluation Report
John Carlsen, Jens Vad, Simon Peter Otoi
Sida

2008:45 The Strengthening Environmental Management and Land Administration Programme in Vietnam
Henny Andersen, Bach Tan Sinh, Dao Ngoc Nga, Mike Daplyn, Paul Schuttenbelt, Tommy Österberg
Sida

2008:46 Asistencia Técnica al Régimen Electoral Guatemalteco
Francesca Jessup, Elisabeth Hayek, Roger Hällhag
Sida

2008:47 Programa Acceso a Justicia Guatemala
Kimberly Inksater, Carlos Hugo Laruta, Jorge Enrique Torres
Sida

2008:48 Lessons Learnt from the Integrated Rural Development Programme (ALKA) and the Albanian Macedonia People's Empowerment Programme (AMPEP)
Cvetko Smilevski, Lars-Erik Birgergård
Sida

2008:49 Sida's Support to UNDP in Sierra Leone
Laurence Sewell, Ceinwen Giles
Sida

2008:50 Assessment of Sida Support through UNDP to Liberia Recovery and Rehabilitation
Hans Eriksson
Sida

2008:51 The Civic Education Network Trust (CIVNET) in Zimbabwe
Dren Nupen
Sida

2008:52 Lessons Learnt and the Way Forward – The Collaboration between East Africa Legislative Assembly (EALA) and the European Parliamentarians for Africa (AWEPA) March 2005–April 2008
Lisa von Trapp
Sida

2008:53 Zivikele Training – Gender Based Violence and HIV/AIDS Project in South Africa
H.G. van Dijk, T. Chelechele, LP. Malan
Sida

2008:54 The University of Zambia School of Law Book Project: Post Project Evaluation Report
Mwenda Silumesi
Sida

2008:55 The District Development Programme in Tanzania (DDP)
John Carlsen, Solar Nazal
Sida

Sida Evaluations may be ordered from:

Infocenter, Sida
SE-105 25 Stockholm
Phone: +46 (0)8 779 96 50
Fax: +46 (0)8 779 96 10
sida@sida.se

A complete backlist of earlier evaluation reports may be ordered from:

Sida, UTV, SE-105 25 Stockholm
Phone: +46 (0) 8 698 51 63
Fax: +46 (0) 8 698 56 43
Homepage: http://www.sida.se

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY
SE-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden
Tel: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Fax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64
E-mail: sida@sida.se. Homepage: http://www.sida.se