



**Forum for Agricultural Advisory Services**

Plot 22A, Nakasero Road

P.O. Box 34624 Kampala, Uganda

**Tel: 256-312-313400 -Email: [secretariat@afaas-africa.org](mailto:secretariat@afaas-africa.org)**

**Evaluation of IFAD-Funded AFAAS Project on Strengthening  
Country-Level Agricultural Advisory Services**

---

Final Report

May 2015

By

Sanne Chipeta

---



**Green Development Advice**

Process, learning and change

## List of abbreviations

---

AAS	Agricultural Advisory Services
AFAAS	African Forum for Agricultural Advisory Services
AGA	Annual General Assembly
ASSP	Agricultural Sector Strategic Plan
ASWAp	Agricultural Sector Wide Approach programme
CF	Country Forum
CIKM	Communication, Information and Knowledge Management for AAS Innovation
CTA	Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation
DNEA	National Directorate for Agricultural Extension
DSIP	Development Strategy Investment Plan
EU	European Union
FAAP	Framework for African Agricultural Productivity
FUM	Farmers Union of Malawi
GFRAS	Global Forum for Rural Advisory Services
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
LUANAR	Lilongwe University of Agriculture and Natural Resources
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MaFAAS	Malawi Forum for Agricultural Advisory Services
MAIFF	Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry
MDTF	Multi Donor Trust Fund
NAADS	National Agricultural Advisory Services
NASFAM	National Small-scale Farmers Association of Malawi
OECD/DAC	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development / Development Assistance Committee
PIAIT	Platform for Agricultural Research and Innovation
PTDA	Platform for Technology Development and Adoption
SC	Steering Committee
SDC	Swiss Development Cooperation
SMS	Short Message Service
ToR	Terms of Reference
TV	Television
UFAAS	Uganda Forum for Agricultural Advisory Services
UNFEE	Uganda National Farmers Federation
USD	United States Dollars
WB	The World Bank

---

## List of content

---

List of abbreviations .....	2
List of content .....	3
1. Introduction .....	4
1.1 IFAD support for AFAAS.....	4
1.2 Evaluation .....	4
2. Evaluation framework and methodology .....	5
3. Findings .....	8
3.1 Relevance .....	8
3.2 Effectiveness .....	10
3.2.1 Country fora establishment and strengthening .....	10
3.2.2 Communication Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM) .....	15
3.2.3 Management and flow and utilisation of funds.....	19
3.3 Efficiency.....	21
3.4 Sustainability .....	22
3.4.1 Institutional.....	22
3.4.2 Human resources.....	23
3.4.3 Financial .....	23
3.4.4 Sustainability of results .....	23
3.5 Impact/outcomes .....	24
4. Lessons learned.....	24
5. Conclusion .....	26
6. Recommendations .....	27
6.1 AFAAS at the continental level.....	27
6.2 At the country level - MaFAAS and UFAAS.....	29
6.3 Development partners.....	29
Annexes.....	31
Annex 1. ToRs.....	32
Annex 2. The evaluation matrix .....	35
Annex 3. Uganda Forum for Agricultural Advisory Services (UFAAS).....	38
Annex 4. Malawi Forum for Agricultural Advisory Services (MaFAAS).....	42
Annex 5. List of people interviewed .....	47
Annex 6. List of documents .....	49
Annex 7. Attendance list for Validation Workshop .....	51

---

## Introduction

---

---

### 1.1 IFAD support for AFAAS

---

The African Forum for Agricultural Advisory Services (AFAAS) has received support from IFAD for the project “Strengthening Country-Level Agricultural Advisory Services” since 2013. The project is contributing to the AFAAS strategic plan 2011- 2015 and interlocking with the priority, in IFAD’s strategic framework 2011-2015, of improving the access for poor people to agricultural advisory services. The project is also supporting the creation of institutional and policy environments to support agricultural production and non-farm activities.

The project was planned for the period January 2013 to December 2014. It became operational after the inception meeting held in Pretoria, in March 2013 that brought together all the project stakeholders. According to the project log-frame the overall goal is: *Agricultural Advisory Services (AAS) that effectively and efficiently contribute to sustained productivity, profitability and growth of African agriculture for poverty reduction*. The project has two objectives:

1. Strengthen the capacity of country level AAS stakeholders in determining own priorities and improving AAS systems
2. Facilitate the availability and accessibility of appropriate and up-to-date knowledge on advisory services from a range of sources in Africa and worldwide

These objectives are pursued through two project components:

Component 1: Establishing Country Fora (CF) in five countries: Uganda, Malawi, Mozambique, Burkina Faso and Sierra Leone

Component 2: Communication, Information and Knowledge Management for AAS Innovation (CIKM)

The project is thus contributing to developing and strengthening the institutional network of AFAAS, by contributing towards the establishment of Country Fora for AAS stakeholders in the AFAAS member countries and also towards the use of the fora as platforms for capacity building for AAS. It should therefore be noted that the project also has an ultimate aim of creating learning from the experiences of implementation in the five countries to enable out-scaling of the concept for CF strengthening to other countries in Africa.

---

### 1.2 Evaluation

---

The present report is the result of an external evaluation of the above project. The Terms of Reference for the evaluation (ToR) is attached as annex 1. The evaluation assesses the relevance of the project and the results of the implementation in relation to the planned outputs, immediate objectives and development objective and provides recommendations on how the AAS innovations, generated through the project implementation, can be scaled up and introduced to other countries.

The evaluation is intended both for accountability towards donors, and for learning for AFAAS and the greater GFRAS community. The intended users of the findings and recommendations from the evaluation are the AFAAS Secretariat, the CFs and the donors. Donors include IFAD, which has funded the project, and the donor<sup>1</sup> contributing to the Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF) at the World Bank (EU) that funds other parts

---

<sup>1</sup> EU

of the AFAAS strategic plan. The learning part of the evaluation is complemented by an internal learning workshop conducted by AFAAS<sup>2</sup> in October 2014.

The evaluation is being used for the collection and documentation of the lessons learnt during implementation that can be used for the development of a second phase of the project. Moreover it is intended to provide information on how to consolidate the CF and replicate these in other countries and other regions such as the Asian AAS networks.

## Evaluation framework and methodology

---

The assessment of the project has been based on four of the five OECD/DAC criteria: Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency and Sustainability.

**Relevance:** The evaluation has assessed how relevant the project implementation has been to the AFAAS strategy, to IFAD's strategic framework and to the IFAD country programmes. The evaluation has furthermore assessed how the project has responded to the needs of AAS providers, partner institutions and AAS policy makers for improving the services to small scale farmers in the five countries.

**Effectiveness and efficiency:** The evaluation has assessed how effective the project has been in terms of achieving the intended results - outputs and outcomes, depending on availability of data according to the project log-frame. The evaluation has moreover assessed the efficiency in the use of funds and human resources related to the outputs and outcomes. The evaluation has identified factors for success and failures in the countries of implementation

**Sustainability:** The evaluation has included an assessment of the sustainability and replicability of the project and its approaches, interventions and results.

The evaluation matrix is included as annex 2, and contains the evaluation criteria and the related key evaluation questions and methods for answering these.

In view of the short duration of the project it has been found to be too early to assess results of the project at impact level. The overall goal of the project, according to the project document, is very ambitious for a two year project and the indicators for impact used in the log-frame are moreover difficult, and maybe impossible, to measure. The evaluation has therefore focused on identifying outcomes and trends of impact that the stakeholders find the project has contributed towards.

The evaluation has adapted an appreciative inquiry and future oriented approach, in order to facilitate the use of the results of the evaluation for the formulation of a second phase. The approach has made it possible to identify what has worked well, the successes as well as the challenges and determined potential avenues to proceed along in developing the concept.

The evaluation process consisted of five steps:

1. Inception: This included start-up skype meetings with the project management, the donor and GFRAS supervisor for the evaluation. The purpose of the inception was to focus the evaluation and develop the evaluation framework and methodology.
2. Document review.

---

<sup>2</sup> AFAAS; 2014; Analysis and Synthesis of learning from the Review of the Progress in Implementation of the AFAAS Strategy and Medium Term Operational Plan (MTO) Workshop; 14-16 October, 2014, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

3. Fieldwork: The fieldwork was carried out in Uganda and Malawi. In Uganda, face to face meetings were held with the AFAAS Secretariat and other continental stakeholders<sup>3</sup> and with the national stakeholders. In Malawi, face to face meetings and interviews were held with the national AAS stakeholders.
4. For the other three project countries - Sierra Leone, Burkina Faso and Mozambique - consultations were carried out with selected stakeholders through e-mails, Skype or phone, as feasible.
5. A workshop was conducted with key stakeholders for validation of the preliminary evaluation findings and discussions of possible recommendations (a list of participants is attached as annex 7).
6. Analysis and report drafting. This included an analysis of the data collected, through desk review, face to face meetings and interviews and consultations, and the preparation and submission of the present draft report.
7. Finalisation of the evaluation report taking into consideration the comments from AFAAS, GFRAS, and selected key stakeholders.

The stakeholders in the project were identified and an analysis with respect to their roles and interest in the project implementation was made during the inception period. Table 1 shows the stakeholder analysis. Focus group discussions and semi structured interviews were conducted with selected stakeholders at all levels. The ultimate target group, small scale farmers, was not included directly in the evaluation process as the project has not had any direct influence on this group.

The evaluation has not been able to apply a gender perspective in the assessment of results as the project design and reporting did not allow for this. Future design of interventions should consider incorporating a gender perspective in the design and results framework as disparities in the participation of men and women in AAS are well-known and counterproductive to overall aims of increased food production, food security and improved rural livelihoods.

---

<sup>3</sup> Unfortunately, it was not possible for the evaluator to meet with members of the "Project Steering Committee during the fieldwork

<b>Table 1. Stakeholders in Strengthening Country-level Agricultural Advisory Services</b>					
<b>Sphere of influence</b>	<b>Governance</b>	<b>Control</b>	<b>Influence</b>	<b>Influence</b>	<b>Interest</b>
<b>Level of implementation</b>	<b>Project governance</b>	<b>Project implementation</b>	<b>Primary target group</b>	<b>Secondary target group</b>	<b>Indirect/ultimate target group</b>
Stakeholders at continental level	<p><b>AFAAS Board</b> The Steering Committee of the project</p> <p>IFAD representative on the continental SC</p>	<p><b>AFAAS Secretariat</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AFAAS Secretariat Focal Person</li> <li>• Consultants</li> <li>• Technical Advisor – CF Institutional Development</li> <li>• Technical Advisor – communication, information and knowledge management</li> </ul>	Country fora	<p><b>Partner institutions at continental level</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research</li> <li>• Training Centres</li> <li>• Farmer Organisations</li> <li>• Private companies</li> <li>• Media</li> </ul>	
Stakeholders at Country level (Uganda, Malawi, Mozambique, Sierra Leone and Burkina Faso)	<p>Steering Committees of CFs</p> <p>National Steering Committees (if these are different from above)</p> <p>IFAD country representatives</p> <p>Funders of innovation projects other than IFAD</p>	<p><b>CFs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National Focal points and CF process facilitators</li> <li>• Consultants</li> <li>• National consultant – CF formation</li> <li>• Innovation Project Implementers</li> </ul>	<p><b>AAS providers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public</li> <li>• Private</li> <li>• Farmer organisations</li> <li>• Civil society organisations</li> </ul>	<p><b>Policy makers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ministries of Agriculture</li> </ul>	<p><b>AAS clientele</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Farmers (men and women)</li> <li>• Value chain actors</li> </ul>
				<p><b>Partner institutions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research</li> <li>• Training centres</li> <li>• Farmer Organisations</li> <li>• Private companies</li> <li>• Media</li> </ul>	

# Findings

---

## 3.1 Relevance

---

The relevance of the project has been assessed in terms of how relevant the project implementation has been to the AFAAS strategy, to IFAD's strategic framework, to the IFAD country programmes and how the implementation has contributed towards these. Furthermore the project has been assessed as to how the project has responded to the needs of AAS providers, partner institutions and AAS policy makers for improving the services in the five countries. Finally the relevance of the project has been assessed as to how the project has responded to the needs of the ultimate target group – farmers and other actors in the value chain.

### AFAAS

The project is fully aligned with the AFAAS Strategic Plan 2011 - 2015. The two objectives are directly taken as two out of the five strategic objectives in the AFAAS Strategic Plan. Establishing and strengthening the Country Fora (CF) is like building the backbone for the institutional structure of AFAAS as a multi-stakeholder platform based in the member countries. Moreover, development of the communication, information and knowledge management (CIKM) for AFAAS and, in this project, testing it in the five countries is also essential to the functionality of AFAAS for the future. This means that the project is extremely relevant for AFAAS and contributes well to its institutional development.

AFAAS has currently, apart from IFAD, a number of other sources of funding: The Multi Donor Trust Fund (MDTF) administrated by the World Bank (WB) and funded by EU, and the Swiss Development Cooperation (SDC). The sources all contribute to supporting the implementation of AFAAS strategic plan. The evaluation finds that the experiences from the IFAD project can provide general learning to AFAAS regarding how to replicate the establishment and strengthening of CFs and the CIKM among the stakeholders and partners (see chapter 4, Lessons Learned).

### IFAD

The overall strategy of IFAD is to improve livelihoods and commercialise small-scale farmers. IFAD sees the project as a contribution to its aims to improve access to AAS for the target group, which is the ultimate aim of the project. As will be described later, there are indications that this can be a long term outcome of the Country Fora and CIKM between the AAS stakeholders.

In Uganda, the IFAD country programme has a strong focus on strengthening service provision. Therefore, the project is found to be very relevant as it supports the establishment of the Uganda Forum for Agricultural Advisory Services (UFAAS) that lobby and advocate for improved AAS, and contribute to building the capacity of the service providers through the sharing of knowledge and experiences. It is particularly relevant in the current situation in Uganda where extension services are in a critical state as public support is almost non-existent. The support to the UFAAS by the IFAD country programme is regarded as extremely relevant. At the IFAD country programme, UFAAS is found to be providing an important contribution towards a lobby and advocacy platform for rectifying the situation of the extension services and bringing the development of demand driven pluralistic services back on track. It also provides a platform for technically advising the IFAD programmes in Uganda on alternative actions/measures to provide AAS to farmers.

## AAS providers, partner institutions and policy makers

In Uganda and Malawi the stakeholders view the CF as a strong contribution to their needs for a common voice and shared learning, for increasing professionalism and harmonisation among AAS providers. Partner institutions and AAS policy makers also perceive the project to be relevant and contribute to their needs. MaFAAS is very relevant for these purposes in Malawi, as the implementation structure for the policy of pluralistic and demand driven extension in Malawi includes a National Stakeholder Panel, which the MaFAAS is regarded to be.

The interviewed stakeholders in Malawi find that the implementation of the project has contributed strongly to their needs. In particular for learning about the different AAS approaches, for sharing of knowledge and information and for harmonisation of the extension delivery at grass root level. Moreover, they see the potential for a common voice into the up-coming review of the extension policy and for influencing the standard setting for extension. The public extension department finds it very relevant that there is, at this moment of time, an independent voice representing all the stakeholders with the relevant knowledge that can contribute to the coming revision of extension policy. However, the fact that representation in the forum is weak by the private sector and grass root actors is recognised as a limitation.

In Uganda the interviewed stakeholders find that the implementation of the project has contributed strongly to their need for a common voice on policy, sharing of knowledge and information. Policymakers find it very relevant that they, at this critical moment of time for extension, have a voice representing all the stakeholders with the relevant knowledge that they can draw on. It is however a limiting factor that the private sector and actors up-country are not yet well represented in the forum.

In both countries the developed virtual platform for sharing information and knowledge is perceived as very relevant, but the actual fact is that it is not used widely.

In Uganda, it was found by the Steering Committee (SC) that the initiative for dissemination and replication of innovative approaches appeared as an add-on to the original purpose of the CFs. The idea and its relevance are not very clear to the SC.

## The AAS clientele

It is clear to all stakeholders that improved access and quality of AAS is relevant for farmers and value chain actors. However, a real clientele needs assessment has not been conducted (and was not planned for). The focus of the project has been to facilitate institutional changes that would make the AAS providers, among other things, more responsive to the needs of the farmers and value chain actors.

In Malawi, the Farmers Union of Malawi (FUM) and The National Smallholder Farmers Association of Malawi (NASFAM) represent the clientele voice in the forum. In Uganda the Uganda Farmers Federation (UNFEE) represents the clientele. According to these organisations there is a clear need for increased outreach and improved quality of AAS services for small-scale farmers. Therefore it is also clear that the project partly matches the needs of the clientele for increased access to AAS.

However, so far it is not clear how the AAS will actually become more responsive to the needs of the farmers. For example, despite the intention of demand orientation in the extension policy of Malawi it is still a general weakness in the service system to ensure that the services are actually driven by demand from the farmers. The pluralistic and demand driven extension policy and the extension structure have been in existence since 2000, and the pluralistic provision of services is a reality. The policy is clearly to establish

structures and procedures for demand driven services but in reality this is not functional in most districts. A special effort to develop capacity and strengthen the voice of farmers at the local level (area and district) is needed to ensure that farmers have the ability to formulate demands for services:

- Knowing their rights to demand services,
- knowing what services are available and
- a procedure for formulating the demands and making the service providers accountable.

It would be relevant for MaFAAS to address this challenge and contribute to making the services more demand driven and ensure that the service providers become accountable and thereby responsive to the farmers through policy lobby and capacity building of the stakeholders.

---

## 3.2 Effectiveness

---

According to the Logical Framework of the project, the original expectation was that five fully functional CFs and a working CIKM system would be in place after the two year period. It appears that the log frame for the project was more or less copied from the AFAAS strategic plan, which has a longer and broader perspective: 2011-2015.

There was a significant delay in the start-up of the project. An assumption at the start of the project was that the WB MDTF which includes institutional support to AFAAS would start flowing before the beginning of the IFAD project. That would have set the ground in terms of staff capacity at the AFAAS secretariat for the implementation of the IFAD project, where the first disbursement was in February 2013. The funds from the MDTF were however delayed almost one year, so the IFAD project had a difficult start up as AFAAS was working to raise funds for staff salaries. The Inception meeting took place in March 2013 and a planning workshop in April 2013, but from here the organisational and administrative procedures related to the management and flow of funds had to be established before the activities could be initiated as individual field projects. Therefore there was a delay to the start of implementation by about 6 months, making the effective period of implementation only 18 months.

Considering the issues involved in institutional development as well as the delaying factors mentioned above, it is the assessment of the evaluator that the aims and goals in the log-frame of the IFAD project were overambitious in view of the project period of 18 months undertaken so far.

---

### 3.2.1 Country fora establishment and strengthening

---

The evaluation has assessed the effectiveness of the project from two different perspectives:

- Effectiveness of the establishment of CFs in relation to the expectation that the project would result in 5 functional<sup>4</sup> CFs in the countries
- Effectiveness of the established CF to carry out the intended functions, particularly lobby and advocacy towards investments and policies for improved AAS in line with the FAAP framework, and building capacity by facilitating sharing and learning among AAS actors to improve their services along the lines of the FAAP principles for effective AAS

---

<sup>4</sup> Functional here means carrying out the intended functions according to their strategic plans

## Effectiveness of the CF establishment

The implementation has not been as effective as expected regarding the first perspective. Of the expected five CFs, there are only two functional (MaFAAS and UFAAS). Sierra Leone was well on the way to having a functional CF and had developed a strategic plan when the Ebola outbreak stopped the meetings and networking activities that would have been necessary to claim the forum as functional. Both Mozambique and Burkina Faso have made some progress, but have still a way to go before they can be said to have functional CFs<sup>5</sup>.

Table 2 shows the development in the five countries with numbers of participants and registered members and the outputs according to the framework. It is important to note that countries at the start of the project in 2013 were at very different stages of development. Malawi, Uganda and Sierra Leone had kick-started the process of CF establishment already in 2011, through their role in developing and testing the AFAAS Guidelines for CF Establishment<sup>6</sup>. In this process the institutional country analysis of AAS and the CF proposals were developed and the CFs were launched. For these three countries the IFAD project has contributed well to strengthening the institutions and making them function through the development of strategic plans. For Sierra Leone, the Ebola outbreak unfortunately brought the activities of the CF to a stand-still, as meetings have not been possible during the last year.

Mozambique was one of the first countries to become a member of AFAAS. There was a stakeholder meeting in Maputo in 2012 where it was decided to establish a CF and a Focal Person was appointed within the Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Extension. Sensitisation meetings and a mapping of the stakeholders were conducted. When mapping the stakeholders, it was found that there is currently a Platform for Agricultural Research and Innovation (PIAIT), which is primarily serving the purpose of coordinating stakeholders in agricultural research. There are however efforts on-going to transform this into a Platform for Technology Development and Adoption (PTDA) with the aim of facilitating coordination, consultation, studies and exchange of information between Agriculture Research and Extension institutions. The Ministry of Agriculture found that this platform should also serve the purpose of the AFAAS connected Country Forum. There is a Working Group assigned for assessing the feasibility and relevance of this arrangement. A main challenge for this organisation, according to the Focal Person in Mozambique, will be to get this concept fully accepted by the AAS stakeholders.

In Burkina Faso, the work started almost from basics in 2013 with sensitisation meetings, where AFAAS staff explained the concept and facilitated the start of the process to establish the CFs. Focal Persons were appointed who undertook stakeholder mapping and arranged meetings where stakeholders discussed how to establish the CF. It has not been possible to obtain any interviews with stakeholders in Burkina Faso.

---

<sup>5</sup> It is planned to launch a CF in Mozambique in May 2015

<sup>6</sup> AFAAS. 2011. *Establishing and strengthening of AFAAS Country Forums: Guidelines*. AFAAS, Kampala, Uganda and FARA, Accra, Ghana

<b>Table 2. Performance of IFAD support in the five countries</b>					
<b>Outputs</b>	<b>Uganda</b>	<b>Malawi</b>	<b>Sierra Leone</b>	<b>Burkina Faso</b>	<b>Mozambique</b>
No. of meetings held	3	4		3	3
Institutional analysis	Yes in 2011	Yes in 2011	Yes in 2011	No	No
CF proposal developed and validated	Yes in 2011	Yes in 2011	Yes in 2011	No	Concept note partly developed
CF strategy and operational plans developed and validated	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
CF established/launched	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No <sup>7</sup>
Hosting	AFAAS	Farm Radio Trust	Ministry of Agriculture	Ministry of Agriculture	Ministry of Agriculture
Actively participating in the virtual platform	Partly	Partly	Partly	No	Only the Focal person
Capacity needs assessment	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
CIKM strategy developed	No	No	No	-	-
No. of innovations supported	Not yet	8 exhibited	2 exhibited	-	-
Learning and sharing events held	Yes	Yes	Yes	-	-
No of partnerships developed with the media and private sector actors	3 private sector actors as members	14 Private sector actors and 6 medias have participated in activities	-	-	-

<sup>7</sup> Planned to launch a CF in May 2015

## Capacity Needs Assessment

A template has been developed for the CFs to conduct Capacity Needs Assessments among AAS providers. The objectives of the assessment are to understand the existing situation and gaps in capacities of AAS actors to deliver AAS. This will provide a basis for strategic planning of the CFs and enable them to determine the added value of the CF. Two countries (Sierra Leone and Malawi) were able to conduct capacity needs assessment of organisations providing AAS.

In Sierra Leone, the assessment covered 15 organisations mainly from international and local NGOs, development projects, farmer's organization, government agencies, private financial banking and academia. In Malawi, the initial results are mainly from government, NGOs, farmer's organisations, research and academia. Both assessments show that the main AAS provision is through the government agencies. Even though there are several NGOs and project-funded initiatives, most AAS are dependent on the government extension agencies to reach out to their target farmers.

A useful assessment of capacity in the AAS institutions has potential to become a valuable tool for planning and monitoring the activities of the CF and some experiences have been achieved during the project implementation. There are however indications that the tool that has been developed is not yet completely serving the purpose. In Malawi, the capacity assessment was found to have been a disappointment as the output was not appearing credible and also didn't really respond to MaFAAS's needs for information regarding capacity. According to the report on the capacity needs assessment in Malawi<sup>8</sup> the enumerators faced the following challenges during the assessment:

- Lead contacts in the organisations were reluctant to give institutional information on human resource
- Cancellations of appointments
- Lead contacts delaying to submit electronic copies
- The tool was to some extent in-precise; this resulted in difficulties to get specific data

These challenges indicate that the member institutions did not give this adequate priority. This may be because either the managers of the institutions do not see the relevance in the type of information or there is a level of confidentiality in the information provided. The evaluation was not able to make a deeper analysis of the causes behind the challenges but finds that there is a need to go back and revise the template to ensure a better collection of information really relevant to serve the purpose and which is at the same time acceptable and useful for the CFs as well as for the individual institutions.

It is suggested to align this tool to the GFRAS concept "The New Extensionist"<sup>9</sup>, which would provide a frame for identifying the critical capacities that need to be analysed and further developed.

## Effectiveness of established CFs to increase access to improved AAS

Looking at the effectiveness of the project in relation to the second perspective – the effectiveness of the established CF to carry out the intended functions. The question is then – is it an effective platform for the intended results? – will the CF contribute effectively to outcomes of improved and increased AAS for small scale farmers? The evaluation has here assessed the results of the two CFs that have become functional, MaFAAS and UFAAS. Annex 3 and 4 present detailed descriptions of the functioning of each of these CFs and assess their results in terms of relevance, effectiveness and sustainability, as well as the key lessons learned in the process.

The overall results from the five countries confirms that the institutional development related to establishing a platform for collaboration, sharing of information and knowledge and joined policy lobby and advocacy among a multitude of stakeholders from different sectors within AAS is time consuming. It requires a

---

<sup>8</sup> MaFAAS; 2014; Report on Malawi Forum for Agricultural Advisory Services Profiling and Capacity Assessment

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.g-fras.org/en/activities/the-new-extensionist.html>

consolidated process and time, and even then may not happen at all. The results of the CFs that have succeeded, are much more promising.

### Uganda (see the detailed assessment in annex 3)

UFAAS is officially established with a constitution, membership, governance bodies and has a strategic plan agreed and approved by the Annual General Assembly (AGA). It has mobilised and registered a membership of paid up members, although they are only 36 members in all. The forum also has a strategic direction provided in the UFAAS Strategic Plan.

Despite the fact that the policy environment of AAS in Uganda is extremely difficult and politicised, UFAAS has been effective in becoming known and visible with key stakeholders and it has brought these actors together to discuss AAS issues.

UFAAS has conducted meetings and seminars for information and knowledge sharing with good results. But, perhaps as a consequence of the hostile policy environment, UFAAS has a strong focus exactly on policy lobby and advocacy and has been rather effective in this considering the limited time since project start. The forum has utilised the multi stakeholder platform well for making a joint effort. Four papers and declarations have been written, published and disseminated to Cabinet/Ministry, Parliament and Development Partners. It has moreover had a positive meeting on the extension reform with the Parliamentarian Committee on Agriculture, Animal Industries and Fisheries.

The forum is currently being consulted for developing the implementation plan for the new extension policy developed by MAIFF. The forum is to be leading the Thematic Working Group on extension in developing a new Development Strategy Investment Plan (DSIP) called the Agricultural Sector Strategy Plan (ASSP).

Time will show if it is possible to take the AAS issues out of the arena of politics and make an impact in terms of contributing to more knowledge based AAS policies.

UFAAS also has challenges, first of all it has no independent secretariat. From the start it was assumed that NAADS would be hosting UFAAS, but NAADS has since ceased to be an AAS institution. UFAAS is currently hosted by the AFAAS Secretariat in Kampala. Other challenges are the relatively limited resources and the fact that the forum has not yet managed to engage a broader group of stakeholders. The forum has so far not been effective in engaging the stakeholders at grass-root level, private sector actors and more farmer organisations other than the national based UNFEE.

### Malawi (see the detailed assessment in annex 4)

MaFAAS is the "oldest" of the CFs. Discussions regarding the establishment started already in 2008 with a consultation in Africa regarding support to institutional development of AFAAS. MaFAAS, despite not yet being legally registered, is established with an agreed constitution, governance bodies and has a strategic plan agreed and approved by the AGA. It is currently in the process of registering as a Trust. Within the extension system it is officially recognised as the National Stakeholder Forum which is a consultative forum in the pluralistic extension structure in Malawi. The forum is hosted at Farm Radio Africa, a civil society organisation. The Focal Person is seconded by the Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Extension and MaFAAS also receive support funding from the Ministry.

MaFAAS has made good use of the opportunity created by the IFAD project and has been effective in becoming functional during the project period. This is confirmed by the following findings of the evaluation:

- MaFAAS is known and visible with key stakeholders

- It has a broad group of stakeholders participating in meetings and events
- It has a strategic direction by the strategic plan
- It has brought together actors to discuss AAS issues for learning and sharing
- It is developing a common voice for policy lobby and advocacy – and is recognised as a consultation forum on these matters

MaFAAS stakeholders have, right from the start, had a focus on the opportunities for using the forum for facilitating shared learning, and it is very effective in this. The following have been achieved:

- Thematic meetings and AGAs have been conducted with a large participation of stakeholders
- A study has been conducted of the farmer to farmer extension (Lead farmer) concept – leading to agreements on harmonisation of the concept among stakeholders
- Established a College Chapter<sup>10</sup> at Lilongwe University of Agriculture and Natural Resources (LUANAR)

The evaluation also found important results in terms of joint policy lobby and advocacy:

- Panel discussion broadcasted on TV
- Meeting with Parliamentarian Working Group
- Three policy position papers

All the stakeholders interviewed view MaFAAS as a very important platform for learning, harmonisation and monitoring of extension actors and for consultation on policy matters.

MaFAAS also has challenges such as:

- Private sector engagement is weak
- Grass root level integration and mechanisms to increase responsiveness to farmer demands are weak
- Lack of formal registration
- Limited resources – secretariat
- The membership is to some extent still depending on committed individuals and not well anchored in the organisations/institutions

As the above summaries for the two countries, Malawi and Uganda, and the more detailed assessments in annex 3 and 4 show, the CFs in these two countries have utilised the financial resources and the technical support provided by AFAAS well to develop the multi stakeholder platforms to become functional country platforms for the AFAAS strategy. They are at a point now where, despite each still having their weaknesses and the UFAAS still being rather fragile as an institution, in their respective countries they are recognised as a common professional voice for AAS. They are being consulted over technical and policy matters by public authorities as well as by other stakeholders. The stakeholders also regard the platform as a crucial source and space for learning and sharing experiences and information regarding AAS issues.

---

### 3.2.2 Communication Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM)

---

#### CIKM strategy

The project was originally expected to base the second component on an AFAAS CIKM strategy that should have been developed with the use of MDTF funds in collaboration with Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation (CTA). This was however not achieved and therefore the CIKM strategy has been developed particularly for the IFAD project and both Malawi and Uganda have adopted this. The expectation is that this strategy shall later inform the ultimate development of an AFAAS CIKM strategy.

<sup>10</sup> A network of student that are interested in AAS, affiliated as a chapter of MaFAAS

The IFAD CIKM strategy was developed with the use of a consultant and it is based on the Co-Capacity and CTA “Knowledge Ecosystem” Approach”. According to the web-site of Co-Capacity<sup>11</sup>, the knowledge ecosystem approach is “*an integral or holistic approach to knowledge management*”. It is moreover explained that “*The approach is aimed at developing and fostering optimal ‘knowledge ecosystems’. These are dynamic knowledge intensive environments in which individuals, organisations and networks interact in conjunction with their surroundings - stakeholders, partners, clients, donors, etc. The entire ecosystem evolves and interacts as a system with interdependent parts. These knowledge intensive environments create value by delivering the best knowledge products and services possible*”.

An important purpose in the strategy is to strengthen country level AAS through the use of a corporate website and a virtual platform. The strategy was developed and validated at a workshop, where the focal persons from the IFAD countries participated together with the AFAAS Secretariat staff. According to the synthesis progress report from CIKM, the workshop developed a template that the countries should use to develop their own specific CIKM work plans and budgets. These were however not found in the countries during the evaluation. According to the report from the internal learning workshop<sup>12</sup> the AAS actors find the template too long and complicated to work with.

The strategy moreover provides a set of tools for assessment of CIKM needs and for different analyses of needs. However, the strategy does not provide a clear picture of the flow of information and knowledge in AFAAS or on how the strategy will be implemented. The tool for assessment of the CIKM needs consists of a long and comprehensive questionnaire. This has been tested in some of the countries. The question is whether a representative number of the stakeholders will be willing to go through the comprehensive questionnaires. This needs still to be seen. It is also not clear from the strategy how the data from this tool will be utilised.

The CIKM strategy appears to be incomplete. It provides strategic objectives and associated indicators for the CIKM work but there are not yet specific goals set for the indicators (numbers) that could be used for monitoring and evaluation.

### Websites and Virtual Networking Platform

UFAAS has developed its own Website<sup>13</sup> that has been linked to the AFAAS website. Malawi, Sierra Leone, Burkina Faso and Mozambique each have a platform on the AFAAS website. Because of language difficulties regarding Mozambique, it was decided to use the website for the National Directorate for Agricultural Extension (DNEA)<sup>14</sup> for dissemination and sharing of CF activities in the Country, and to use the page within AFAAS website for global sharing of information.

AFAAS in 2011 created a virtual platform with networking functions for sharing of news and experiences, collaborating with partners and asking questions by SMS. The Focal Persons in the five countries have been trained in managing the CF sections on the AFAAS website and also in the use of the Virtual Platform. Stakeholders have been invited to participate and many have registered on the platform and some discussions have been moderated.

The platform has the following functions:

- Problem solving: Here a person can ask a question via the internet or mobile phone and gets a response via email, internet or SMS. Others who want to know the answer to the question can request to be put on the loop. So, the interactions triggered by one question can lead to many interactions;

<sup>11</sup> <http://www.co-capacity.com/knowledge-ecosystem>

<sup>12</sup> AFAAS; 2014; Analysis and Synthesis of learning from the Review of the Progress in Implementation of the AFAAS Strategy and Medium Term Operational Plan (MTO) Workshop; 14-16 October, 2014, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

<sup>13</sup> [www.ufaas-ugandacf.org](http://www.ufaas-ugandacf.org)

<sup>14</sup> <http://www.dnea-psp.co.mz>

- People, Groups and Organisation interactions: A person/group/organisation can create a page and interact in an open or closed setting;
- Opportunities: A person can create an opportunity in a closed or open space and involve others in developing the opportunity;
- News: On the home page there is a “News” section on which news derived from scanning relevant websites are posted. People can browse the news items.

Table 3 shows the statistics on the uses that are available. It shows the total use since the start in 2011 and the use since the beginning of the project in 2013.

<b>Domain</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Total since January 2013</b>
Problems posted	94	54
People	312	136
Organisations	16	13
Groups	32	17
Opportunities	6	4
News items	361	274

As seen from the table, a fair number of people and organisations have registered and a good number of news have been posted. Unfortunately it has not been possible to obtain statistics about hits on the news. But the numbers of actual use (posts of problems and opportunities) is rather low.

These data were confirmed by the interviews with stakeholders during the evaluation. Stakeholders find it to be a good platform, but apart from the Focal Persons in the countries, none of the respondents actually use it. This is an indication of a serious dilemma for a networking institution like AFAAS, where the sharing of information and knowledge is crucial for meaningful outcomes to prevail across the countries. Most stakeholders see the virtual platform as the appropriate way of communication for the future, but at the same time admit that they for different reasons do not use it. The challenges are stated to be several such as:

- Weak internet connection and difficult access in many target areas
- Lack of a “culture” of using virtual means of communication
- Need for a facilitator at the country level

It was anticipated that there would be part time facilitators employed in the countries, but this has only happened in Uganda and only recently. In Sierra Leone there was a committed facilitator employed that started off the platform well. But unfortunately the facilitator was found abroad when the Ebola outbreak came, and could therefore not return to continue the efforts.

During the evaluation, there have been opportunities for reflection over this dilemma with both AFAAS staff and stakeholders. All agree that the virtual platform is the tool for the future, probably combined with mobile services. However, the platform may be a bit ahead of its time in the sense that it also needs a generation of people who can develop the “culture” for this kind of communication. It is interesting that in MaFAAS they see the opportunity for establishing the college chapters as the means to developing a new generation active on the platform.

What has not been pursued by the IFAD project, but has however come up as independent initiatives, is the use of social media for communication. The MaFAAS has a facebook page which has 105 subscribers as of 16 January 2015. This page is utilised to publicise MaFAAS events, report on MaFAAS events, and to

comment on broad policy issues in Malawi. UFAAS started a Facebook page, linked to its website, and this is slowly picking up as an additional communication and networking tool.

### African Extension Week

The project document envisaged support to conducting an African Extension Week and a general assembly. This was held in Botswana in August 2013. For AFAAS this is a very important activity in order to keep the continental network alive and visible. It is therefore clearly an important part of an AFAAS CIKM strategy to conduct such cross continental meetings regularly. However, without much evidence as only few of the respondents of the evaluation participated in the Extension Week, the few that did were rather critical about the arrangement and its outcomes. It is advisable to give such an activity more attention in terms of careful planning and implementation in the future.

### AAS Innovation activities

The purpose of this activity has been to try to develop a mechanism by which the CIKM can be linked to facilitation of innovation of AAS. And by which funds can be provided directly in the CFs to support joint innovation of AAS approaches in the participating countries.

Unlike the component one, where the CF establishment was supported by guidelines<sup>15</sup>, there were no guidelines to support innovation processes at the start of the project. The project therefore started with developing a framework for identification and assessment of innovative approaches during a start-up workshop for CIKM with participation from the countries. The countries after that received technical advice on how to start up the activity. The idea was that the CFs could identify interesting innovative approaches used in their countries, assess their innovativeness and possible impact and then select particularly promising approaches and develop proposals for these to be replicated and out-scaled.

The results of this have been mixed and since it depends on the functionality of the CFs the results are different between countries. In Malawi, MaFAAS was advertising for innovative AAS approaches through public media. This resulted in the collection of information regarding innovative AAS approaches used by actors in Malawi. The forum, through the consultancy of a researcher, conducted an assessment of these using the assessment tool developed by AFAAS. Out of the 13 innovations that were documented, 8 were selected for exhibition at the Annual General Assembly 2014. MaFAAS has not yet developed proposals for replication or out-scaling.

In Uganda, 14 AAS approaches were collected and assessed using the assessment tool by AFAAS. Of these 3 were selected and exhibited during the AGA. One proposal is currently being prepared.

In Sierra Leone, the process stopped because of the Ebola outbreak just before the approaches could be exhibited at the AGA. And in Burkina Faso and Mozambique, the process never took off, which was a natural result of the lack of functional CFs to carry out the activity. Nevertheless, during the AFAAS extension week 2013, the country forum in Sierra Leone exhibited the approaches that they had profiled and stakeholders from Mozambique also exhibited a few new approaches.

The results of the innovation activity are that the three countries (Malawi, Uganda and Sierra Leone) have now inventories and description of some of the AAS approaches used in the countries. The criteria for assessing the approaches in terms of innovativeness have been based on the FAAP principles<sup>16</sup>. Moreover, in connection with a workshop with participants from the countries, new criteria were added. So far, this has

---

<sup>15</sup> AFAAS. 2011. Establishing and strengthening of AFAAS Country Forums: Guidelines. AFAAS, Kampala, Uganda and FARA, Accra, Ghana

<sup>16</sup> Guiding principles for extension and research within the CAADP framework

been used for making AAS visible in the countries. The stakeholders have perceived the exercise of collecting and making the assessment of the AAS approaches as important for internal learning and for initiating discussions related to harmonisation. In Malawi the activity has led to a joint commission looking at harmonisation and quality control of the content of ICT tools.

While these results are interesting, assuming the original purpose was to promote innovation in AAS and making funds flow in the CFs for that, the evaluation must conclude that this activity has not taken off as intended. Part of this can be linked to the earlier finding that the institutional development of CFs takes more time than this project has since a functional CF obviously is a precondition for the innovation activities to take off. However, it is the assessment of the evaluator that the activity needs careful re-thinking of, first, what the stakeholders need it for and, secondly, how it should be organised. The innovation aspect understood as developing solutions to identified problems has been weak in the implementation. The innovation aspects need to be strengthened by developing a process that facilitates innovation.

Overall the main finding is that the component two has only been partly effective. The CIKM strategy needs to be revised and completed to become more effective and future efforts should strive to develop an overall CIMK strategy for AFAAS. Furthermore, the opportunities for innovation of AAS approaches that the CFs offer need to be re-considered.

---

### 3.2.3 Management and flow and utilisation of funds

---

#### Management and Monitoring & Evaluation

It has been difficult to obtain progress reports for the project. The progress reports for 2014 of component one as well as the end-of project reports for the two components were completed while the evaluation fieldwork was ongoing in March 2015. This indicates a weak monitoring and reporting system. It is not clear how quality of outputs and products such as tools, strategies and reports are quality assured, some of these appear unfinished with comments still appearing in the documents. Moreover, there is no consolidated reporting across the two components of the project, which is unusual and leaves the evaluator with an impression of lack of adequate overall leadership for effective implementation and reporting.

The technical support and facilitation from AFAAS Secretariat is assessed by all stakeholders in Malawi and Uganda to be effective and adding value to their establishment in both countries. However, the evaluation finds that UFAAS and MaFAAS are both likely to have a potential for speeding up the achievement of outcomes even more if there is more attention to the results. Looking at the reports on activities – things that have been done; meetings have been held etc. that potentially could have concluded and decided on actions to be taken. While this appears to have been the case on the ground, as seen from the good achievements in the countries, the manner of reporting from the events makes it unclear what the activities have led to – of decisions or outcomes (changed behaviour, knowledge, policy etc.). Therefore the evaluator finds that there is a high probability that stronger attention to results during the events and in the reporting would have a potential to speed up the process of achievements even more.

## Utilisation of funds

An overview of the utilisation of funds as compared to the original budget is shown in table 4.

<b>Table 4. Utilisation of funds</b>	<b>Budget 2013-2014</b>	<b>Actual Expenditure 2013 – 2014</b>	<b>Variance</b>	<b>Expenditure as % of total</b>
<b>Project activities</b>				
<b>Component 1: Establishing and Strengthening of Country Fora</b>	USD	USD		
1.1. Holding an inception workshop - facilitators, IFAD programme persons, focal persons	43.280,00	21.133,70	22.146,30	
1.2. Country sensitisation meetings	50.500,00	41.343,08	9.156,92	
1.3. AAS stakeholder and Institutional analysis	49.500,00	48.201,18	1.298,82	
1.4. Proposal development	20.000,00	19.845,15	154,85	
1.5. Validation of the Proposals in 5 countries	63.500,00	-	63.500,00	
1.6. Development of multi stakeholder Institutions	66.000,00	45.645,91	20.354,09	
1.7. Formulation of Strategic and operational plans	30.400,00	13.032,48	17.367,52	
1.8. Facilitating the CF processes	148.800,00	115.987,98	32.812,02	
1.9. Technical Support to CF	40.000,00	22.238,00	17.762,00	
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>511.980,00</b>	<b>327.427,48</b>	<b>184.552,52</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>Component 2 – Communication, Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM)</b>	-	-		
2.1. Web site and Virtual platform roll out	49.250,00	49.044,55	205,45	
2.2. CIKM needs assessment	29.400,00	-	29.400,00	
2.3. Development of CIKM strategy	59.808,00	65.183,30	(5.375,30)	
2.4. Inventory of Innovative AAS	50.700,00	-	50.700,00	
2.5. AAS Innovation Exhibition	5.000,00	-	5.000,00	
2.6. AAS Innovation Proposal Development	63.625,00	-	63.625,00	
2.7. Supporting adaptation and testing of AAS innovations	5.000,00	-	5.000,00	
2.8. National AAS Innovation Market Place	2.500,00	-	2.500,00	
2.9. CIKM Management / Consultancy	94.100,00	80.530,79	13.569,21	
2.10. AFAAS Extension and AAS Week, Botswana 2013	50.125,00	86.682,66	(36.557,66)	
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>409.508,00</b>	<b>281.441,30</b>	<b>128.066,70</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>3. Monitoring and Evaluation</b>		-	-	
3.1. Developing, establishing and implementing M&E systems	75.000,00	38.939,97	36.060,03	
<b>Sub total</b>	<b>75.000,00</b>	<b>38.939,97</b>	<b>36.060,03</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4. Program Management and Administration 10%</b>	-	-	-	
4.1. Management, Administrative and Operational Costs	73.599,00	200.899,69	(127.300,69)	
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>73.599,00</b>	<b>200.899,69</b>	<b>(127.300,69)</b>	<b>24<sup>17</sup></b>
<b>Total Requested for year 1 (2013)</b>	<b>1.069.527,00</b>	<b>848.708,44</b>		

<sup>17</sup> Planned to be 7%

The project has been operating for the two years (effectively 18 months) with a modest allocation of 1 million USD. Nevertheless, the utilisation in table 4 shows that it has been difficult for the project to absorb the funds. In particular the activities in the countries have not been able to absorb the expected funds. This is well in line with the evaluation findings that only three countries have been able to establish and absorb funds for activities to the expected degree e.g. the development of strategic plans only took place in three countries. The innovation activities have incurred much lower expenditure than expected, which is in line with the fact that the validations of proposals have not been achieved.

According to the budget, it was expected that programme management administration and operations would consume 7% of the budget. It has been considerably higher at 24%. The difference occurred particularly in the first year. As mentioned above, it was originally expected that an allocation from the MDTF would provide adequate funds for operations from the beginning of the project. This allocation however was delayed and the increased cost on this part was caused by the need to cover some of the operational costs in order to move the project forward.

The MaFAAS Executive Committee reports, concerning the flow of funds that they have received funding disbursement amounts as agreed, but payments were received at unpredictable times. For the first period, where MaFAAS had not yet a hosting arrangement, the allocation was not received until nearly the end of the spending period. This gave them a problem of absorbing the funds in a sensible manner, which for example has been another delaying factor for the progress on the innovation activities. Once the hosting arrangement with Farm Radio Africa was in place the disbursements have been regular.

For reasons beyond control of the project the expenses on the African Extension Week increased substantially.

It should be noted that despite the variances in distribution of expenditure the work plans of the project were still accomplished.

#### Donor collaboration

The current donors for AFAAS are: The MDTF administrated by WB and funded by EU, SDC and IFAD. There are indications that there is a lack of coordination between these organisations and also that there has been a breakdown in communication between WB, MDTF and EU. There was an expectation that all donors for AFAAS should join the MDTF, but there are currently no indications that this is going to happen. Donors appear more concerned with providing their own projects that can yield their own clear results. Moreover, the IFAD grants from Rome HQ have their own framework and procedure that do not allow harmonisation with the other donors.

---

### 3.3 Efficiency

---

The analysis above shows that the amounts and distribution of funds between the project activities as well as the duration of the project correspond quite well with the results found in the evaluation. It shows that the results have been delayed and less than expected achieved as per the log-frame of the project document. The analysis also shows that the expenditure basically matches with achieved results, apart from the increased costs of project management as explained above.

The Country Fora have received funds as direct transfers from the project based on their work-plans and budgets. Table 5 provides an overview of the country distribution of the funds.

<b>Country</b>	<b>USD total 2013-2014</b>
Burkina Faso	33.000
Malawi	65.000
Mozambique	25.000
Sierra Leone	86.000
Uganda	45.000
Total	255.000

The total funds made available to the countries represent 30% of the total project expenditure. Considering that the project was particularly focused on activities in the countries, stakeholders in the countries (Malawi and Uganda) find that this share could have been higher. However, as mentioned above, it was anticipated that the activities, related to the innovation initiative would have made more funds available directly to the countries. This turned out to be an overestimation of what could be achieved in the short period that the project was operational.

In Malawi it was found that the IFAD support, both in terms of finances and technical support, has leveraged good opportunities for MaFAAS to raise funds from other sources.

It should be noted that it is important to ensure that the activities and the costs associated match, in a reasonable manner with the results to be achieved as per the project log-frame. Related to this the evaluator finds it questionable to include the African extension Week under the IFAD project. It is an activity that takes a great effort in staff time, as well as significant financial resources. But it contributes only a little to the log frame objectives of the IFAD project. These are focussed on results in the five countries and only a few participants from each country can participate in the Africa Extension Week, meaning that the contribution in the countries is rather limited in the short term perspective of the project.

## 3.4 Sustainability

---

### 3.4.1 Institutional

---

In Malawi, Uganda and to a limited extent also in Sierra Leone, institutional sustainability is well on the way to be achieved. There are challenges some of which are the same as the challenges related to effectiveness. Despite the fact that MaFAAS is not yet officially registered, it does have a formally agreed constitution and ownership among a good number of committed stakeholders that assist in keeping the forum alive and active. The hosting at Farm Radio Africa appears to be a sustainable arrangement. Moreover, the ownership from the public stakeholder, the Department of Agriculture, has always been fairly strong, especially as MaFAAS plays the important role of a National Stakeholder Panel as institution in the extension policy. The way that the UFAAS is established now shows good prospects for becoming institutionally sustainable, but it is still fragile. It is formally registered but the paid up members are few and the representation is not wide enough to create a real nationwide ownership. UFAAS need to become more independent from AFAAS, and a better more independent hosting arrangement is required for that. Moreover, it is still leaning on the work of a few champions whose time and resources are limited.

Most stakeholders find it a challenge and a constraint on the further development of MaFAAS and UFAAS that they don't have sufficient funding to maintain a real secretariat.

---

<sup>18</sup> It should be noted that these funds are only the direct transfer. They do not include the funds that have been spent by the AFAAS Secretariat on activities such as CF members' participation in regional meetings or sensitisation meetings in the countries, which were managed by the AFAAS Secretariat

There is still a general tendency that the CFs consists of interested individuals, the so-called champions. When one meets other people in the organisations that they represent they are sometimes unaware of the ongoing activities indicating that the participation in the CF is not well anchored.

The CFs have substantive problems in engaging the private sector actors, even those that have extensive extension functions directly related to their activities. Private sector actors do not seem to see their interest in participating. The reason for this needs to be analysed and steps taken to frame the CFs in such a way to attract attention from and make themselves relevant to all the different actors.

---

### 3.4.2 Human resources

---

Sustainability in terms of human resources would mean that the CFs have adequate human resource capacity to remain functional. This has not yet been achieved. The CFs of Malawi, Uganda and Sierra Leone are currently still leaning heavily on champions and their limited availability in view of other commitments. However as capacity building is a strong part of the functions of the CFs this is likely to improve over time provided that the CFs are successful in the short term.

---

### 3.4.3 Financial

---

The CFs are financially sustainable when they have reliable mechanisms in place for securing financial resources for their operations. Considering the short period of the project, this is only about to be achieved in Malawi. The other four countries have yet some way to go for this to be achieved.

In Malawi, MaFAAS has received funding from the ASWAP since 2011 and will do so until 2017, as a result of playing the role of the National Stakeholder Panel. Farm Radio Trust has provided a small fund. Participants always pay their own costs when participating in meetings and events. The Executive Committee states that the IFAD funding has contributed to leveraging their own fundraising. Currently MaFAAS is negotiating with the Government of Flanders to support their activities.

UFAAS is still depending on AFAAS for fund raising. As indicated by a high level official in MAIFF, the new upcoming extension policy and restructuring of extension by MAIFF may perhaps provide an opportunity for UFAAS to become officially recognised as the multi stakeholder platform in the new structure for the national extension. This could mean that funding through the government funding for extension may become available. This is however still speculative and there would both be advantages and disadvantages in terms of being able to sustain an independent voice of the AAS actors. This should be carefully considered before agreeing to such an arrangement.

---

### 3.4.4 Sustainability of results

---

Not surprisingly, considering the short time that the project has been running, sustainability of results is at this point of time only partly recognised in the case of Malawi. As a National Stakeholder Platform, MaFAAS is a formal forum for consultation of AAS experts. Its visibility has been established among stakeholders and decision makers. It lobbied for the integration of an extension section into the current development of the National Agricultural Panel, and so it appears as a sustainable institution for influencing national strategies and policies.

### 3.5 Impact/outcomes

---

According to the project log-frame, the indicators of the intended impacts were that “AAS in the countries have sufficient human and technical capacity to effectively support value chain actors towards increasing agricultural productivity and food security” and “demand-driven AAS that are effectively supporting rural farmers and value chain actors in five countries”.

It is clearly too early to expect real measurable impact of this kind from the project. There are however good indications that in countries where the CFs are established, these are moving towards expected outcomes.

According to the log-frame, the outcomes were intended to be:

- *AAS strategies and policies influenced at national level*
- *Lessons learnt and the pools of experts developed in five countries*
- *Increased capacity of AAS actors in implementing national CAADP agendas*

In Malawi and Uganda AAS actors have started collaborating to improve and harmonise their services through shared learning and information. The activities of MaFAAS have so far focused strongly on learning and sharing between AAS actors and all the stakeholders state that they are learning from these activities. So far outcomes achieved include harmonisation of the Lead Farmer concept and the establishment of a commission to ensure the quality in the content of ICT based extension.

The forums are being recognised as consultation bodies for national strategy and policy development and actively participating in this, which is expected to result in improved policies and practises for AAS in the future.

Moreover, the initiative of creating the College Chapters in Malawi is likely to contribute well to the interest and learning on the subject of AAS by agricultural students. The descriptions of the two CFs in annex 3 and 4 elaborate more on the outcomes so far.

## 4. Lessons learned

---

Functional CFs are good platforms for improving access to quality AAS

An important lesson learned is that the functional CFs have provided professional platforms for harmonisation and improvement of AAS in the pluralistic setting of their countries. UFAAS and MaFAAS have stimulated the interest among stakeholders for learning and sharing of knowledge and for innovating on AAS approaches. They are both recognised in their countries as consultation partners regarding AAS policies and practises. Currently, both fora are participating in developing new policies. The probability is high that UFAAS and MaFAAS will stimulate improved performance among the AAS providers. Examples that this is starting to happen are that the AAS providers in Malawi are aiming at harmonising their Lead Farmer concepts and that stakeholders in Uganda used the seminar on Climate Change to integrate adaption and resilience to climate change into their strategies. MaFAAS is well on the way to resource sustainability as stakeholders use their own resources for participation and they have started their own fund-raising for projects and costs to run the country secretariat.

Establishing CFs require time, commitment and strong facilitation

The process of establishing and strengthening CFs has proved to vary considerably between the countries as they were at different stages when the project started. The three countries (Uganda, Malawi and Sierra

Leone) received substantial support in 2011 for establishment and have therefore moved much faster than the last two countries (Burkina Faso and Mozambique) which have had substantial problems in starting up. It is clear that reflections are needed on the realism of the ambitions for complicated and experimental institutional development in a two year project. The original expectations of developing 5 full functional CF in the two year period was more than overly ambitious in hindsight, when one considers the issues involved in this kind of institutional development. Developing the institutional structure of AFAAS with the CFs (multi-stakeholder platforms) as the backbone of the organisation is a model for institutional development that has not been tried or tested before, so it is still experimental and likely to require considerable time to mature. It should however, also be noted that apart from time, a stronger result oriented leadership and management is required from AFAAS Secretariat. It is understood that there is a balance to play, as the principle of activities following demand from the countries and fostering ownership in the countries is equally important. It is however the assessment of the evaluator that based on the good results in the first three countries, this balance should be more to the side of stronger and closer facilitation from the secretariat as happened in 2011. This is particularly relevant in the countries that are starting up the establishment.

### It is a challenge to engage the private sector AAS actors in CFs

The CFs have substantive problems in engaging the private sector actors, even those that have extensive extension functions connected to their activities. Private sector actors do not seem to see any interest in participating. The reason for this needs to be analysed and steps taken to frame the CFs in such a way to attract attention from all the different actors.

### More attention to results is needed

Both UFAAS and MaFAAS have potential for speeding up the outcomes if there is more attention to results. Looking, for example, at the report on activities – activities have been undertaken where conclusions could have been made and decisions taken for future action leading to outcomes such as changed behaviour, knowledge, policy etc.

### The CIKM strategy needs renewed attention

The CIKM strategy has had much focus on the utilisation of the virtual networking platform. This is for good reason since it has the potential to provide a platform for communication and knowledge management requiring low input. But despite the fact that all stakeholders view this to be an important platform for communication and knowledge management of AFAAS in the future it has been a great challenge to get the same stakeholders to use it. Currently the platform is strongly under-utilised. New ways need to be found for sustainable development and increased participation.

While the innovation activities have produced some results in three countries in the form of overview and visibility of used AAS approaches, it has not taken off as intended. The lesson is that it requires a clearer and more solid approach to innovation in order to make it succeed.

### Identified factors for success differ in the countries

The evaluation has identified, through interviews with stakeholders, the factors that are contributing to progress in the countries. An interesting lesson is that factors for success can be contradictory. In Malawi, an enabling policy environment was seen as an important factor for the success. Apart from the general favourable extension policy to the FAAP principles for AAS the extension policy and structure in Malawi included a National Stakeholder Panel (NSP) in order to facilitate and coordinate the pluralistic extension structure. MaFAAS is recognised to play the role of the NSP and has received financial support from the Ministry of Agriculture.

The contrary appears to have been the case in Uganda where the policy environment for AAS and multi stakeholder involvement has been hostile for a long period. Uganda as a country has during the project period faced immense problems in terms of AAS development. Agricultural extension is currently not functioning and the new reforms being undertaken are taking longer than expected, which is creating a situation of a vacuum, where farmers cannot access knowledge and information. However, it is notable that in this situation the need for a joint effort and unified voice has been so strong that many stakeholders have recognised the importance of UFAAS in providing a voice for AAS stakeholders.

There are also key success factors that have been common for the two countries:

- Sufficient time for establishment and institutional changes
- Both MaFAAS and UFAAS have had strong champions that have shared the AFAAS vision and have been committed to provide their time, capacity and connections to promote the agenda of establishing the CFs and making them function
- External technical support has been available in the form of direct technical and financial support from AFAAS secretariat and consultancies
- AFAAS Guidelines for establishment of CFs: The stakeholders state that the guidelines have been very helpful in the establishment of the forum. They do not dictate a particular format but provide a framework on how to establish and run the CF<sup>19</sup>.

---

## Conclusion

---

The IFAD-funded AFAAS project Strengthening Country-Level Agricultural Advisory Services has been a short duration project (two years) with an initial delay of six month. The project has been undertaken with a relatively modest allocation of funding. It is fully aligned to the AFAAS Strategic Plan and stakeholders, in the countries where the project succeeded in establishing CFs, view the project as highly relevant in creating a common voice for AAS actors and in improving AAS. However, the project has not fully succeeded in developing five functional CFs in the two year period. The original goal, in hindsight, has been more than overly ambitious, when one considers the issues involved in this kind of institutional development and also the six months delay in starting the actual implementation. The development of CFs as a forum of multi-stakeholders is still quite experimental and requires considerable time to mature, as confirmed by this project.

The project has achieved some important results despite the fact that the expectations (at least on paper) were higher than what has been achieved on the ground. CFs have been established in three countries and, despite weaknesses remaining, they are functional in two countries and the third is likely to follow soon. The functional CFs have provided professional platforms for harmonisation and improvement of AAS in the pluralistic setting of their countries, involving key stakeholders. The CFs have stimulated the interest among stakeholders for learning and sharing of knowledge and information and for innovating on AAS approaches. They are both recognised in their countries as consultation partners regarding AAS policies and practises. Currently both fora are participating in formulating new policies. The functions have more-over stimulated to improved performance among the AAS providers and one of the fora is well on the way to resource sustainability.

Component two of the project was intended to support CIKM in and between the countries, and also to initiate activities for promotion of innovative AAS approaches to be implemented and managed in the countries. This component has been partly successful in the dissemination of information and knowledge and has linked the stakeholders with the AFAAS virtual networking platform. As the virtual platform is a future

---

<sup>19</sup> It should here be noted that both the Malawi and Uganda stakeholders had a strong hand in the formulation of the guidelines as they were part of the consultation and testing of the guidelines.

oriented tool for CIKM it is still a challenge for the stakeholders to accept and adopt it. It was anticipated that component two would be based on an overall CIKM strategy for AFAAS developed through MDTF funding. This has however not happened but is highly needed to support the functions of AFAAS.

The innovation activities still need revision of the approach and tools. The promotion of the innovation concept and tools towards development of innovative AAS approaches needs more time and fine tuning.

---

## 6. Recommendations

---

---

### 6.1 AFAAS at the continental level

---

The following recommendations can be made to AFAAS on how the experiences generated through the project can be used and scaled up in relation to future interventions and new target countries.

#### Realistic goal setting

The experience gained in the IFAD funded project for AFAAS 2013 – 2014 clearly show that the institutional development involved in the establishment and development of CFs, as multi-stakeholder platforms, for strengthening AAS at country level is a process that requires time and consolidated effort. In some contexts it can happen quickly when the right and enabling policy environment is in place or there is an outstanding need for a joint effort, as was the case in Uganda. In some contexts it will take more time and in some cases it will not happen at all if the stakeholders do not find a common ground for collaboration. The experience from the establishment of the country fora also shows that the concept needs to mature, in terms of the spread of representation and being able to function, before any impact will be seen on the ground.

It is therefore recommended that future interventions be more realistic when setting goals and in ensuring that the planned activities contribute to the set goals. It should not be expected that interventions can have a success-rate of 100%. Caution should be applied when setting goals for intended impact that must both be realistic and measurable. In relation to this it is recommended that the CFs start with an institutional analysis to be used as a baseline for monitoring outcomes and impact.

#### Include a gender perspective in the design of future interventions

It is strongly recommended that future interventions incorporate a perspective to gender equality in access to AAS in the design. It is widely recognised that disparities exist between the participation of men and women in AAS and that this has a crucial impact for food production, food security and nutrition.

#### Increase the success rate for CF establishment

While the experience shows that it is not realistic to expect a 100% rate of success in establishing CFs it is still desirable that the success rate be substantially increased from what has been the case in this project, where it has been below 50%. The experience is clear in that the countries that received substantial support in 2011 with the establishment and institutional analysis carried out for the development of guidelines for establishing CFs are the ones that have moved on well. It is therefore recommended that such intensive support be provided at the start-up of the CFs.

It is recommended that the common factors for success are considered carefully and that strong and committed champions are identified in the countries to lead and govern project start up and initiate project activities. It is important that the identified and selected Focal Person is committed and has the necessary time and institutional back-up required to perform the task.

It is also recommended that the AFAAS guidelines for CF establishment are revised according to the recommendations in this evaluation. It is also recommended that tools are provided for conducting strategic planning and in particular for the institutional analysis. It is moreover recommended that the management of

the AFAAS Secretariat becomes more effective in terms of providing leadership, quality control and monitoring of the activities.

Assessment of the capacity and identification of eventual capacity gaps has potential to become a strong tool for strategic planning and monitoring of the CFs. It is therefore recommended that the existing tool for capacity assessment is carefully revised and it is suggested that this is aligned to the GFRAS concept of "The New Extensionist". This would provide a valuable frame for future capacity development of the AAS providers in the countries.

The CFs that are now established should move quickly to the next steps. It is therefore strongly recommended that their membership be broadened and deepened to include all AAS stakeholders. It is also recommended that the activities of learning and innovating AAS approaches be used with the full involvement of the members.

### Strengthen management, monitoring and quality control

It is recommended that the management, monitoring, reporting and quality control of products and reports should be strengthened within the AFAAS institution, at the AFAAS Secretariat. The institutional structure of AFAAS is complicated and highly innovative with many stakeholders collaborating in ways that are new to many. This calls for strong management and quality documentation of the experiences across the different projects as well as their components. It is highly recommended that a management system is put in place that ensures one overall project leadership that can bring together the responsible staff for the different components of the project for common planning and monitoring meetings. There is moreover a high probability that the effectiveness can be strengthened when if there is a stronger attention to results in reporting from meetings, events and projects.

### Revise and complete the CIMK strategy to become effective

Lessons learned in developing and implementing the project CIMK strategy need to be used in developing an overall CIMK strategy for AFAAS.

There is currently a need to revise the strategy to improve CIMK among stakeholders. Too little is known about the needs of the different categories of stakeholder. It is strongly recommended that the needs assessment is completed and strategies put in place that responds to different categories. The functionalities of the communication tools such as the virtual platform, social networking platform, e-mailing system and SMS as well as meetings and workshops must be adapted to serve these categories. It must be ensured that the content of all these tools is attractive to the stakeholders and that they are all adequately interactive to facilitate shared learning.

### Revise the concept of Innovation on AAS approaches

It is important that the process of innovation on AAS approaches and outreach methods take off and become effective for the CFs that are now established. This will result in development of new approaches and methods that effectively address identified problems in AAS outreach. It is therefore recommended that the procedure for innovation on AAS approaches and tools for assessment be revised. The procedure should include identification of specific problems or constraints and developing and testing innovative responses to these problems. The assessment and documentation of their innovativeness should apart from compliance with the FAAP principles also be based on how well they respond to the problems, to be addressed. Moreover a roadmap should be developed on how to support out-scaling of the innovations.

### Increase the engagement of the private sector

It is strongly recommended that ways are found to strengthen the engagement of private sector actors in the CFs and in the innovation of AAS approaches and methods. The private sector is an important stakeholder in the provision of AAS, as collaboration partners with other AAS providers and in the role of investors in the development of AAS.

In order to do so, the particular interests of private sector actors in AAS need to be identified through consultative dialogues and value chain analyses. A strategy must be developed to make the functions of the CFs more relevant to the private sector actors. This could be, for example, by developing AAS tools and approaches that can be made available to the private sector actors, or by making sure that AAS providers link to the private players in the value chains that they work with.

Ensure the relevance to the ultimate stakeholders – the farmers and other value chain actors

It is strongly recommended that ultimate stakeholder needs assessments are conducted in the CF countries and that these are used as part of the institutional assessment, as a baseline for the strategic planning and continuous monitoring and evaluation efforts.

---

## 6.2 At the country level - MaFAAS and UFAAS

---

The present evaluation presents a limited number (two) of successful country experiences. Based on this it is not possible to provide recommendations that can be generalised to suit for other countries. However for the two CFs (MaFAAS and UFAAS), the following can be recommended:

### Broaden the membership base

For UFAAS it is highly recommended that the membership of the network be broadened to embrace more stakeholders in numbers as well as specific representation of grass-root actors in the regions, AAS providers and farmer organisations as well as private sector actors.

For MaFAAS, it is recommended that the relationship with grass-root actors be strengthened and that the engagement of private sector actors be increased.

### Strengthen independent fundraising

MaFAAS is well on the way to be able to raise funds for its own operations as a network. This route is commendable and is strongly encouraged.

It is highly recommended that UFAAS develop a strategy for fundraising and strengthen its fundraising as an independent network. In this strategy it is important to consider the independence of the network. The prospects for providing a formal consultation forum/platform in the up-coming new extension system in Uganda may offer, along with the important opportunity for influencing the future extension system, a good opportunity for future part funding of the network activities.

### Strengthen innovation as a concept in the activities

Stakeholders in both CFs are expecting that the project activities will result in development of new approaches and methods that effectively address identified problems in AAS outreach. It is therefore recommended that these activities are strengthened at the country level and that the approaches that have been documented as part of the IFAD project are developed further towards out-scaling. It is recommended that technical support in form of revised tools and procedures are sought from AFAAS to strengthen this.

---

## 6.3 Development partners

---

### Development Partners increase their collaboration

To AFAAS's Development Partners it is recommended that they increase collaboration between themselves. It would increase effectiveness and efficiency (reduce transaction costs) of AFAAS programmes if the donors

could harmonise their funding support. But as this does not currently seem to be feasible it is recommended that the donors at least harmonise their supervision of the support.

## Annexes

---

### **Evaluation of IFAD-Funded Strengthening Country-Level Agricultural Advisory Services Project under AFAAS**

## **General Background**

---

The Global Forum for Rural Advisory Services (GFRAS) provides advocacy and leadership within the global development agenda for reduced hunger and poverty. It works through thematic working groups and regional networks and country fora.

As part of GFRAS, the African Forum for Agricultural Advisory Service (AFAAS) provides a mechanism for supporting and coordinating the development of agricultural extension and advisory services (AEAS) within the African Union Commission's Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) framework. AFAAS aims to improve the delivery of AEAS and the responsiveness of service providers to the needs of their clients. Enhancing the performance of advisory services is an integral element of CAADP, including the Science Agenda for Agriculture in Africa.

The AFAAS strategic plan (2011-2015) has five components: (i) participation in the implementation of CAADP; (ii) information, communication and knowledge management; (iii) supporting country fora (CF); (iv) partnerships and collaborations; and v) governance, management and funding systems.

To achieve these objectives, AFAAS received a grant from the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). The grant's aim was to strengthen the provision of AEAS at the country level. The target countries were Burkina Faso, Malawi, Mozambique, Sierra Leone, and Uganda. The project was for two years running from January 2013 to December 2014. It had two objectives:

- a) Facilitate the establishment of AEAS country fora needed for managing the information and knowledge that AEAS providers need from national, regional and international sources to respond to farmers' demands and to develop innovative ways of responding to these demands;
- b) Generate new knowledge and insights on how to enhance the capacity of AEAS providers at national, regional and international levels;"

The expected outputs and benefits are:

1. Demand-driven agricultural AEAS that are effectively supporting rural farmers and value chain actors towards increasing agricultural productivity and food security in a sustainable manner as a result of being better organised, having access to up-to-date knowledge and being networked nationally, regionally and internationally;
  2. AEAS strategies that effectively address the needs for strengthening and transforming AEAS to be more demand-driven, efficient and effective;
  3. Lessons learnt and the pools of experts developed and used for rolling out of CF formation to other AFAAS member countries; and
  4. More effective capacity of AEAS in implementing national CAADP agendas and increased levels of investments in AEAS as a result of increased confidence in AEAS by smallholder farmers, agricultural value chain actors and policy makers.
-

---

## Objectives of the Assignment

---

The objective of the assignment is to conduct an external evaluation of the IFAD-funded AFAAS project, in particular, assess the effectiveness and efficiency of its implementation against expected project outputs, immediate objective and development objective. Findings will be presented in a written report.

---

## Approaches and Methodology

---

The consultant will review the project document (the approved large design grant document of the project). He/she will develop an evaluation framework to assess the achievements and failures against the set outputs and objectives of the project. The framework will involve discussions (either face to face or online) with relevant partners engaged with AFAAS on this project.

Relevant documents (those that influence the delivery of outputs or performance of the partners engaged) will be reviewed.

The AFAAS Secretariat will facilitate contact with identified individuals or institutions and obtain appointments for face to face discussions where necessary.

---

## Scope of Work

---

The activities of the consultant will include but not be limited to the following:

- Review relevant literature or documents that can influence or affect the implementation of the project.
- Develop a minimum set of criteria for assessing the project outputs and likely of attaining immediate and development objectives.
- Assess if the project pre-conditions and assumptions held.
- Identify key project partners and individuals involved in the implementation of the project for discussion about the project components and operations.
- Identify key partners and individuals who were the targets of the project to discuss the effectiveness and efficiency in delivering the outputs and objectives as well as its relevance to the needs of the target groups.
- Travel to selected project target countries to discuss with the project partners and beneficiaries.
- Provide recommendations on how the AEAS innovations generated through country fora and communication, information and knowledge management can be scaled out and up

---

## Deliverables

---

The consultant is expected to:

1. Submit a workplan and budget to conduct the assignment within an agreed timeframe within one week of signing contract.
2. Develop an evaluation framework to assess the projects outputs and objectives against its achievements within three weeks of signing contract.
3. Provide a written report of the evaluation containing within eight weeks of signing contract.

---

## Duration of the Assignment

---

The assignment will be completed within eight weeks of signing a contract. It will involve extensive travel to project target countries.

---

## Location of the Assignment

---

The consultant shall perform his/ her duties at AFAAS Secretariat in Kampala, Uganda or as mutually determined by both parties.

---

## Eligibility Criteria

---

The consultant is expected to have:

1. At least 10 years of professional experience in institutional development, networking and partnership building preferably with focus in AEAS.
2. Profound knowledge in the institutional development and emerging paradigms in AEAS as well as knowledge management required in AEAS.
3. Extensive understanding of the AFAAS structures, Framework for African Agricultural Productivity principles and CAADP process.
4. Proven experience in conducting similar assignments in project evaluation in the areas of AEAS (experiences in IFAD projects will be an advantage).
5. Persons involved in the project in any way are not eligible.

---

## Reporting

---

The consultant will report to and be supervised by the GFRAS Secretariat. However, the contract and financial reporting will be with AFAAS secretariat.

---

## Applications

---

Applications with (a) a cover letter explaining your capacity to do the work and rates and projected number of days, (b) comprehensive curriculum vitae, and (c) names, emails, and telephone numbers of three referees should be addressed to the GFRAS secretariat at [Kristin.davis@g-fras.org](mailto:Kristin.davis@g-fras.org).

Applications shall be accepted up to 1 December 2014.

## Annex 2. The evaluation matrix

<b>Evaluation matrix</b>			
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation question</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Methods and sources</b>
Relevance	How relevant is and how does the project implementation contribute to AFAAS strategy?	Results of project implementation contribute and add value to the AFAAS Strategy	Comparing the achieved results with AFAAS strategy Interviews with AFAAS stakeholders
	How relevant is and how does the project implementation contribute to IFAD strategy?	Results of project implementation contribute and add value to the IFAD Strategy	Comparing the achieved results with IFAD strategy Interviews with IFAD stakeholders
	How relevant is and how does the project implementation contribute to IFAD country programmes?	Results of project implementation contribute and add value to the IFAD country programmes	Comparing the achieved results with IFAD Country programmes Interviews with IFAD country representatives
	How relevant is and how does the project implementation contribute to the needs of AAS providers, partner institutions and AAS policy makers for improving the services in the five countries	Project activities in the countries address documented needs of the stakeholders AAS providers, partner institutions and AAS policy makers perceive the project to be relevant and contribute to their needs	Comparing Progress Reports with Needs Assessments in the countries Interviews with stakeholders in the countries
	How relevant and appropriate are the project results to the needs of the ultimate target group	The project results match the AAS clientele needs assessment	Progress reports AAS clientele Assessments AFAAS impact Assessment Reports
Effectiveness and efficiency	How has been the overall performance of the project according to the planned activities	No. of meetings held Institutional analysis done in 5 countries CF proposals developed and validated in 5 countries CF strategy and operational plans in 5 countries developed and validated CF established in 5 countries No. of countries actively participating in the virtual platform CIKM strategy developed No. of innovations supported Learning and sharing events held No of partnerships developed with the media and private sector actors	Project and country progress reports Stakeholder interviews
	What have been the achievements of the project in terms of intended outputs	Five CF established with organisational arrangements as well as a strategic and operational plan  No. of national AAS strategies and policies influenced	Project and country progress reports  Project monitoring and evaluation reports  Review of strategic and operational plans for the countries

		Lessons learnt from establishing CF and supporting AAS innovation disseminated  Number of AAS experts engaged in the CAADP processes	Stakeholder interviews in the countries
What have been the achievements of the project in terms of outcomes?		Demand-driven AAS that are effectively supporting rural farmers and value chain actors in five countries.  AAS strategies and policies influenced at national level;  Lessons learnt and the pools of experts developed in five countries.  Increased capacity of AAS actors in implementing national CAADP agendas.	Stakeholder interviews Progress reports
What have been important factors for progress of the project implementation in the countries		Contributing factors for progress in the countries identified	Country progress reports Stakeholder interviews
What have been important factors for lack of progress of project implementation in the countries		Challenges for project implementation in the countries identified	Country progress reports Stakeholder interviews
How effective is the AFAAS (network and Secretariat in supporting the AAS at country level?		The AAS stakeholders at the country level perceive the support from the network and the secretariat to be helpful and effective in supporting the implementation and provide examples of this  The continental network is adding value to AAS at country level and examples of this are found	Country stakeholder interviews  Project and country progress reports
Are the tools and guidelines provided by AFAAS helpful and effective – what is useful and what is not?		AAS stakeholders at country level perceive the tools and guidelines as useful and identify the areas that are useful and those that are not so useful	Country progress reports  Country stakeholder interviews
How effective is the virtual network in facilitating sharing of information and knowledge?		The virtual network is used for sharing of information and knowledge by many AAS stakeholders  The information and knowledge shared through the virtual network has added value to the AAS in the countries	Web use statistics  Country stakeholder interviews
Is the project implemented in a cost efficient manner?		The distribution of use of funds and human resources correspond well with the distribution of results	Comparing expenditures with the results achieved Financial reports

			Progress reports
Sustainability	Are the results of the project sustainable institutionally, financially and in terms of human resources?	<p>The CFs are institutionally sustainable – hosts, constitution, ownership</p> <p>The CFs have reliable mechanisms in place for securing financial resources</p> <p>The CFs have adequate human resource capacity to remain functional</p> <p>National strategies and policies for AAS influenced in a sustainable manner – e.g. formal forums for consultation of AAS experts</p>	<p>Country progress reports</p> <p>National CF strategies and operational plans</p> <p>Country stakeholder interviews</p>
	Are the results of the project replicable for other countries?	Other countries are taking initiatives and demanding for replication	Progress reports and other information from the AFAAS secretariat
	Are the AAS innovations sustainable and replicable?	Examples of replication identified	Progress reports
Impact	Are there trends of impact that are perceived by the stakeholders to be results of the project?	<p>There are trends of improvements of human and technical capacity for AAS in the countries to which the project has contributed</p> <p>There are trends in increasing agricultural productivity and food security to which the project has contributed</p>	<p>National agricultural performance surveys</p> <p>National AAS impact assessment surveys</p>

## Annex 3. Uganda Forum for Agricultural Advisory Services (UFAAS)

### The establishment of the CF

UFAAS was established in 2013 and is recognised as a platform for stakeholders and actors in AAS in Uganda. UFAAS has currently 38 paid up members – 27 individual members and 9 organisations. There has been a broad participation of stakeholders in meetings and at the workshop altogether about 200 people participated.

The forum has an agreed constitution for governance and decision making. The general membership participates in Annual General Assemblies of which there have been two: One in October 2013 and one in 2014. More than 100 people participated in the last AGA, however only paid up members have a right to vote. The members for UFAAS Board are elected. The Board appoints the Executive Board. The AGA approves the work plan and budgets.

It was originally assumed that UFAAS would be hosted at NAADS. But as NAADS has now been put in control of the Ugandan Army, and re-directed from AAS to input distribution, it was decided to temporarily host UFAAS at AFAAS Secretariat. UFAAS has a Focal Person as a part time consultant and the executive board come in and assist with important parts of the work. For some tasks, professional consultants are engaged and paid as consultants.

<b>Table Membership profile of UFAAS</b>		
<b>Sector</b>	<b>No. of members</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Academia	6	
Farmer Organisations	3	1 UNFEE, 2 from District Farmer Associations
Public national	3	
Public local	4	
Private	5	3 from the same company
Civil Society	10	
Cooperatives	1	
Independent individuals	4	
Total	36	

Despite a relatively high interest from stakeholders to participate in events and meeting the number of paid up members is still not impressive. The representation of paid up members is relatively strong in terms of civil society and academia, partly from the public sector. The representation of farmer organisations is so far only by the UNFEE and two of its district associations. It has however a weaker representation from the private sector, where only two companies are represented and also of representation from outside Kampala.

### The functions

The policy environment surrounding AEAS in Uganda has in the period of the project been extremely difficult and politicised. UFAAS has however utilised the position of a multi stakeholder platform well by presenting joint position papers and declarations from the platform. Four papers and a declaration have been written, published and disseminated to cabinet/ ministry, Parliament and development partners:

- A contextual analysis of the global and regional application of agricultural extension and advisory systems and its implication for policy advocacy in Uganda

- A position paper on the proposed reforms to mainstream extension into MAAIF and restructure NAADS into the national agribusiness promotion agency
- A position paper on the involvement of the Army in agricultural service delivery
- A position paper on the immediate implications and effects of the current agricultural extension reforms.
- Declaration on the agricultural extension reforms in Uganda

The declaration from the last AGA was supported by the 126 participants representing AAS stakeholders in the country.

While the issues of AAS in Uganda have diverted from professional discussions and become heavily politicised, the UFAAS took the chance to hold a meeting with the Parliamentarian Committee for Agriculture in order to provide a professional input to the discussions on an upcoming extension reform. The forum has moreover made contributions to the Crop Variety and Health Protection bills.

The contributions have been well recognised by many stakeholders including the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAIFF) and also key development partners. The forum has now been asked to assist in developing an Ethical Standard for AAS provision and it has been stated that UFAAS will be consulted for developing the implementation plan for the new extension policy formulated by the Ministry. Moreover, as there is now on-going work on developing a new Development Strategy Investment Plan (DSIP) UFAAS will be leading the Thematic Working Group on extension as part of the Agricultural sector Strategy Planning (ASSP) under the DSIP. This means that the scene is created whereby UFAAS has important opportunities to influence the national strategies and policies as well as their implementation for the coming years.

UFAAS has furthermore undertaken capacity building events such as training of AAS providers and provided information about issues on demand, such as information about Climate Change and GMO to stakeholders during an AGA.

UFAAS has developed its own website and linked this to the AFAAS website. The stakeholders have been offered to use the Virtual sharing platform. Most stakeholders state that it is good platform but that only few of them utilise it.

So far, UFAAS has made an inventory of 14 so-called innovative AAS approaches utilised by stakeholders in Uganda and made an assessment of these using the developed AFAAS tool for this. They have now selected three approaches to be proposed for replication and one proposal is currently (March 2015) being prepared.

## The Relevance

In Uganda, the IFAD country programme has a strong strategy for strengthening service provisions and therefore the establishment of the CF, which can lobby, share experiences and develop capacity in AAS, is seen as very relevant. Particularly as it is clear that the extension provision in Uganda is currently in a critical situation and public support is almost non-existent. The support to UFAAS by the IFAD country programme is regarded as extremely relevant and an important contribution with regards to providing a lobby and advocacy platform for rectifying the situation and getting development of demand driven pluralistic services back on track. It is also important as a means of technically advising IFAD in Uganda on alternative actions/measures to provide AAS to farmers within the IFAD programmes.

There is no documentation on the needs of the stakeholders other than the discussions recorded from stakeholder meeting and workshops, which are also very brief. The intended capacity needs assessment has not been conducted,

AAS providers, partner institutions and AAS policy makers perceive the project to be relevant and contribute to their needs. The interviewed stakeholders find the implementation to have contributed strongly to their needs for a common voice on policy, sharing of knowledge and information. Policy makers find it particularly relevant that they, at this critical moment of time, have a voice representing all the stakeholders with the relevant knowledge that they can draw on. Limitations are in the representation as this is not yet fully developed (weak private sector representation and weak representation of actors up-country).

A clientele needs assessment has not been conducted. It is clear, however, to all the stakeholders interviewed, that there is at the moment a crucial gap in the provision of AAS in Uganda and it is extremely relevant and timely to have the CF established and functional.

## Outcomes

The evaluation finds that there is currently a good momentum for UFAAS to effectively produce outcomes, particularly in policy lobby and advocacy. Uganda as a country has during the project period faced immense problems in terms of AAS development. Demand-driven AAS are currently not accessible to value chain actors. But it is notable that the UFAAS as a joint effort by many stakeholders has been able, and courageous enough, to make strong statements and positions on the actions taken on AAS. This has contributed to making the forum visible as an important and qualified voice in the process of developing a new policy for extension.

UFAAS has been invited to participate in the process of developing the National Development and Investment Plan – particularly the Agricultural Strategic Plan and to lead the Task Force on agricultural extension. It is moreover being tasked by the Ministry of Agriculture to develop Ethical Standards for AAS provision. It is expected to become an important partner for the Ministry of Agriculture in developing the implementation plan for the new policy on extension aimed at re-constructing a national system for extension under the leadership of the Ministry of Agriculture. All this confirms that, despite the fact that the last two years have not seen a positive development of extension in Uganda<sup>20</sup>, it is recognised that the CF provides a voice to extension stakeholders and has the potential to play an important role in developing a national system for extension in Uganda, that draws on the knowledge of AAS actors and principles laid out in the FAAP principles.

Some of the Civil Society Organisations state that they through the sharing of other organisations experiences have adapted and fine-tuned some of their own AAS approaches.

## Sustainability

The UFAAS, as it is established now has good prospects for becoming institutionally sustainable, but it is still fragile. The numbers of paid up members are still few and the representation is not wide enough to create real sustainable ownership. In terms of human capacity, the forum is still depending on the work of a few champions, whose time and resources are limited.

UFAAS moreover needs to become more independent from AFAAS – and a more independent hosting arrangement is required.

---

<sup>20</sup> what was earlier has been dismantled and extension is currently not functioning and the whole area is extremely politicised

UFAAS does not yet have its own strategy for fundraising and is also not yet registered as a real legal entity, so it is still depending on AFAAS for fund raising.

One option could be with the new upcoming extension policy and restructuring of extension by MAIFF to become officially recognised as the multi stakeholder platform in the structure for the national extension. This could mean funding may become available through the government funding for extension. This is still speculative and it will have both advantages and disadvantages in terms of being able to sustain an independent voice. This should be carefully considered before entering into such arrangement.

## Lessons learnt

Contributing factors for progress have been:

- UFAAS started its establishment already in 2011 before the start of the project
- The AFAAS Guidelines for CF establishment
- Strong engaged champions with good capacity in AAS
- Maybe also closeness to AFAAS secretariat has contributed. Stakeholders state that the support from the AFAAS secretariat has been effective in supporting the implementation at the Uganda level. Although it is also said that the Secretariat with its limited staff has its limits as to how much it can facilitate

Factors contributing to lack of progress have been:

- Mobilisation especially up-country requires a lot of resources – more than what UFAAS has available, so the representation of stakeholder members from the local areas is still inadequate. Better representation from the field level is required
- It has been a challenge to engage the private sector
- The demands for activities are more than what can be addressed by the limited human resources
- During the project period it has been a challenge for UFAAS, as a very young institution, to become adequately visible and recognised to carry out effective advocacy
- The problematic period has had the effect that UFAAS is easily labelled as being notoriously “against government”

## Annex 4. Malawi Forum for Agricultural Advisory Services (MaFAAS)

### The establishment of the CF

MaFAAS has probably the longest history of development within the AFAAS network. The stakeholders in Malawi were consulted as part of the Neuchatel Initiative consultation in 2008 for the establishment of AFAAS. At that time the Department of Extension took a strong interest in the possibility for setting up a CF that could play the role of the National Stakeholder Panel, which had otherwise not really come to function as intended for coordination of a pluralistic extension system in Malawi. The efforts to mobilise and sensitise the stakeholders started from there and received technical support from AFAAS.

MAFAAS received support to conduct the institutional analysis from a consultancy in 2011 as part of developing the AFAAS guidelines for the establishment of CFs. MaFAAS developed a strategic plan for 2012 – 2015 based on the institutional analysis and a process of stakeholder consultation. With the support from the IFAD project for meetings and activities the development has further moved and consolidated the forum, so that MaFAAS can now be said to be a functional CF affiliated to AFAAS and in many ways playing the intended role.

MaFAAS has an executive committee of 7 members representing different stakeholders (Civil society organisations, public sector, private sector, farmer organisation and academia). MaFAAS is under registration as a Trust and has therefore elected a Board of Trustees. The forum is not yet officially registered therefore they do not have a registration of paying members.

Despite not having a formal membership MaFAAS has a list of 243 individual stakeholders that have indicated their interest by participating in events and meetings. The 243 individuals represent 109 organisations/institutions from all the stakeholder categories. While the number of participants indicates that there is substantial interest in the activities of MaFAAS it is clear that the participation in meetings does not guarantee that all these organisations will actually become paid up members. The list also includes organisations that will become partners rather than actual members. Moreover, many of the private sector stakeholders have so far only participated in order to give their own presentation, but not in the further discussions. The Focal Person estimates that approximately 70 stakeholders are committed to become actual members.

<b>Category of stakeholders</b>	<b>Numbers</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Policy makers	4	
National public institutions	8	
District public institutions	24	21 districts represented
Research and educational institutions	4	
Civil society and faith based organisations	30	
Farmer organisations	2	With national coverage through district farmers

		unions
Private sector	14	
Development partners and programmes	15	
Mass media	6	
Unknown	2	
Total	109	

MaFAAS is hosted by a Civil Society Organisation Farm Radio Trust and the Focal Person is seconded by the Department of Extension in the Ministry of Agriculture. The Focal Person is at the same time the Secretary General for the Executive Committee.

### The functions

MaFAAS has conducted a number of meetings for the stakeholders that have all focused on learning and sharing knowledge and experience. These meetings have attracted substantial interest. The forum has also conducted a study on the Farmer to Farmer approach (in Malawi called the Lead Farmer approach) in order to provide knowledge about how this could be better harmonised among the actors promoting it. They have collected information regarding innovative AAS approaches used by actors in Malawi and conducted an assessment of these using the assessment tool developed by AFAAS. Out of the 13 innovations that were documented 8 were selected to make exhibitions at the Annual General Assembly 2014.

MaFAAS has moreover been active in terms of lobby and advocacy and through a meeting with the Parliamentarian Working Group on agricultural development important issues on extension were raised. MaFAAS conducted a panel discussion with decision makers on extension issues that was broadcasted on national television. MaFAAS has also formulated position papers on the need for a review of the policy on extension services and the urgent need for frontline extension staff.

Most recently, MaFAAS has been active in establishing so-called college chapters at the educational institutions. So far a college chapter of MaFAAS is established at Lilongwe University of Agriculture and Natural Resources (LUANAR). The idea is to secure capacity among the new generation of service providers. At the same time, it is intended that these chapters can assist MaFAAS in terms of conducting relevant studies as part of their study and research thesis work.

MaFAAS does not have its own website, but has a platform at the AFAAS website. The Virtual Platform has been developed for MaFAAS and some of the stakeholders have registered, but the stakeholders interviewed admit that they are not using the platform to any effect.

A capacity assessment of stakeholders was conducted as per the template provided by AFAAS with the assistance of students from LUANAR.

Some of the weaknesses identified in the institutional analysis in 2011 are still to some extent persisting:

- MaFAAS is still not legally registered and therefore the membership and their roles are still unclear. MaFAAS is in a process of registering as a Trust, which is a demanding and requires a longer process than just registering as an association, but they are receiving legal support from a lawyer and it is assumed that the process will be completed soon.

- Grass-root representation is still weak. And as the farmers' voice will probably be represented through the grass root representation this is critical. It should however be noted that the list of stakeholders that have been involved includes stakeholders from 21 districts in Malawi which is positive.
- Private sector engagement is also still weak. It is difficult to get private sector actors to actively participate.

## The relevance

The interviewed stakeholders in Malawi find that the implementation has contributed strongly to their needs, particularly for learning about the different AAS approaches, for sharing of knowledge and information and for harmonisation of the extension delivery at grass root level. Moreover, they see the potential for a common voice in the up-coming review of the extension policy and for influencing the standard setting for extension. MaFAAS is very relevant for these purposes in Malawi, as the extension policy implementation structure includes a National Stakeholder Panel, which the MaFAAS is regarded to be.

The public extension department find it very relevant that they, at this moment of time, have an independent voice representing all the stakeholders and also with the relevant knowledge that can forward contributions into the coming revision of extension policy. Limitations are in the representation which is not yet fully representative of the AAS sector (private sector, and grass root actors).

A real clientele needs assessment has not been conducted. The national level organisations FUM and NASFAM represent the clientele voice in the forum and according to them there is a clear need by the small scale farmers for increased outreach and quality of AAS services in Malawi. Therefore it is also clear that the project partly matches the needs of the clientele for increased access to AEAS. However, so far it is not clear how to ensure that the activities precisely respond to the needs of the farmer. Securing the demand drive of the services is a general weakness in the Malawi service system. The extension policy and the District Agricultural Extension Service System (DAESS) structure has been in existence for many years (since 2000), and the pluralistic provision of services is a reality. The policy is however also clearly to establish structures and procedures for demand drive of the services, but exactly the demand drive is not functional in reality in most districts. It appears that there is need to make a special effort to build capacity and strengthen the voice of the farmer at the local level (area and district) and to strengthen their ability to formulate demands for services: Knowing their rights to demand services, knowing what services are available and having a procedure for formulating the demands and making the service providers accountable. There is need for the CF to take up this challenge and contribute to make the services more demand driven and secure that the service providers become more accountable to the farmers.

## Outcomes

In Malawi, the issues stated in the institutional analysis from 2011 concerning the situation of AAS are more or less the same as today in 2015. There is a very good policy and also implementation framework for demand driven and pluralistic services, but it is not fully functional in all districts. Several constraints such as limited funding but probably also constraints in attitude to work bottom-up by the extension system are still prevailing.

The financing of extension by Government is still extremely low – less than 4% of the agricultural budget goes to extension, most of the rest goes to finance the input subsidy programme. However, the Agricultural Sector Wide Approach programme (ASWAp) funded by a pool of donors through the Multi Donor Trust Fund (MDTF) provides most of the funding for extension.

The public extension services have more than 40% of positions vacant. The housing facilities for extension workers are in a very bad condition and many extension workers have very limited mobility as the transport

measure is bicycles and some don't even have bicycles and are supposed to visit farmers on foot. MaFAAS have been active in lobbying the government for budgeting for renovating the houses of extension workers. The Government has thus allocated 10 million USD to renovate 2800 houses.

MaFAAS has also proposed, and the government has accepted, to employ 300 interested farmers that will be mentored by existing extension workers and trained in modules relevant to the work.

MaFAAS has reviewed the Lead Farmer concept and this has been standardised into participatory selection of lead farmers, common standards for training and an agreement on not remunerating the lead farmers for the services.

The public services institutions are enthusiastic about the role that the CFs can play in setting standards and harmonisation of extension approaches. While it is good and in line with the competencies of the AAS actors it should however also be cautioned that this role may also have a downside. If not properly handled, the standardising can become a hindrance to innovation and therefore also for innovative actors to participate in the CFs. It is important that the role of harmonisation remains facilitative and advisory – providing knowledge and experiences into the processes of standard setting by Government and also leaving the role of controlling compliance with the Government authorities.

In the harmonisation and standard development it is important that all the voices of the stakeholders are heard and incorporated, particularly that the end-users of the services – the interests of the small-scale farmers are incorporated.

## Lessons learnt

There is a tendency that MaFAAS still consists of interested individuals. When you meet other people in the organisations that they represent, they are largely unaware about the activities of MaFAAS, indicating that the participation in the CF is not well anchored in the organisations, and also that the capacity developed has its limitations as well. Capacity is being developed through the learning processes in the meetings and seminars. Moreover, there are attempts to establish college chapters in the extension education institutions. MaFAAS has substantive problems in engaging the private sector actors, even those that have extensive extension functions connected to their activities. Private sector actors seem not to see their interest in participating. The reasons for this must be identified in order to frame the forum in such a way that it will be attractive to all the different actors.

MaFAAS is very likely to have a potential for speeding up the outcomes if there was more attention on results. Looking, for example, at the report on activities – things that have been done, meetings that have been held etc. where there could potentially have concluded and decided on actions to be taken, but nothing seems to be concluded– of conclusions, decisions or outcomes (changed behaviour, knowledge, policy etc.).

## Contributing factors for progress

- Time
- An enabling environment, whereby the Government recognises the role of MaFAAS as institutionalised in the extension policy
- Support from the Department of extension
- Strong champions
- Direct support from AFAAS and AFAAS consultancies, including the Guidelines for Establishment of CFs

## Constraining factors

MaFAAS has actually progressed quite well, but asked about challenges limiting the progress, the stakeholders interviewed state factors such as the long process of getting the formal registration done and the lack of resources to run a more institutionalised secretariat.

## Sustainability

MaFAAS has been in existence and under development now more or less since 2008. As a National Stakeholder Platform MaFAAS is a formal forum for consultation of AAS experts. Its visibility has been recognised among stakeholders and decision makers. MaFAAS lobbied for the integration of an extension section into the current development of the National Agricultural Panel and would appear to be a recognised forum for influencing national strategies and policies.

Despite the fact that it is not yet officially registered it does have a formally agreed constitution and ownership among a good number of committed stakeholders that assist in keeping the forum alive and active. The hosting at Farm Radio Africa appears to be a sustainable arrangement as the Executive Director of Farm Radio Africa also appears to be a committed and enthusiastic Deputy Chairman to the MaFAAS. The organisation provides facilities and financial management of value to the forum. Moreover, the ownership from the public stakeholder, the Department of Agriculture, has always been rather strong – especially as MaFAAS play the important role of a National Stakeholder Panel as institution in the extension policy.

MaFAAS has receives funding support from IFAD through AFAAS and from the ASWAp since 2011 and will continue to do so until 2017. Farm Radio Trust has also provided some funding. The Executive Committee states that the IFAD funding has contributed to leveraging their own fundraising. Currently MaFAAS is negotiating with the Government of Flandern to support their activities.

Most stakeholders find it a challenge for the further development of MaFAAS that it doesn't have enough funding to maintain a secretariat.

Despite some weaknesses still remaining, there is no doubt that MaFAAS is currently a functional CF.

Looking at the costs of this through the four years of existence:

MaFAAS has received 20 – 25.000 USD per year in the four years from the ASWAP funds: Approximately 100.000 USD. Moreover, IFAD has provided 72.000 USD over the last two years and Farm Radio Trust 500 USD. This means that the total investment of external funding for establishing MaFAAS to where it is now has been 177.000 USD. Apart from this stakeholders have contributed themselves through financing their own participation in events and meetings.

## Annex 5. List of people interviewed

---

### Global

Kristin Davis, Executive Secretary, GFRAS  
Tom Anyonge, IFAD  
Willem Janssen, World Bank

### AFAAS Continental

Dan Kisauzi, Technical Adviser, AFAAS  
Emmanuel Atenga, Technical Adviser, AFAAS  
Faith Okiror, Technical Adviser, AFAAS  
Max Oluput, Programme Officer, AFAAS  
Musa Waiswa, Technical Adviser, AFAAS  
Myra Wopereis, Former technical Adviser, AFAAS  
Samson Eshetu, Technical Adviser, AFAAS  
Silim Nahdy, Executive Director, AFAAS

### Uganda

Augustine Mwenda, Chief Executive Secretary, Uganda National Farmers Union  
Beatrice Luzobe, CF Focal Person, UFAAS  
Bogdan Stefanescu, Second Secretary Head of Rural Development, Delegation of EU to Uganda  
Charles Aben, NAADS  
Christopher Bukenya, Manager Technical Services, NAADS  
Grace Babirye, Executive Director, VEDCO  
Kayaayo Battson R. Emmanuel, Associate Director, SASAKAWA – Global 2000  
Margaret Mangeni, Chairman of National Steering Committee, UFAAS  
Mr. Okasai, Director Crop Resources, Ministry of Agriculture  
Patience Wamigisa, Technical assistant to the Minister of Agriculture, Ministry of Agriculture  
Patrich Seruyange, Operations Officer Rural Development, Delegation to EU Uganda  
Paul Kibwika, Head of Department of Extension, Makerere University, School of Agriculture and Environment Studies  
Pontian Muhwezi, Country Programme Officer, IFAD East and Southern Africa Division  
Rischarid Mira, Makerere University, School of Agriculture and Environment Studies  
Roselline Nyamutale, Country Director, SASAKAWA – Global 2000  
Rugema Semaana Hillary, Coordinator Crop Productivity Improvement, SASAKAWA – Global 2000  
Samuel Galiwango, Denior Lecturer, Bukalasa Agricultural College

### Malawi

Amos Zaindi, Country Director, Self Help Africa  
Ausward Zidana Jere, World Vision  
C. Sute Mwakasungula, Executive Director, Small Scale Livestock Livelihood Programme  
Candida Nakhumbwa, Farmers Union of Malawi, Director of Research, Policy and Partnership  
Catherine Mtinda, University of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Committee member MaFAAS  
Charity Chonde, LUANAR, Extension Department

Clodina Chowa, Deputy Director, Department of Agricultural Extension Services  
Damiano Jere, Self Help Africa, Chairperson for Lilongwe District Agriculture Extension Coordination Committee  
Heston Chiwasa, LUANAR, Extension Department  
Mike Chingamba, Natural Resources College  
Mr. Machombe, Agricultural Research and Extension Trust, Department of Extension and Specialist Services  
Mr. Nyangulu, Deputy Director, Agricultural Research and Extension Trust, Department of Extension and Specialist Services  
Paul Fatch, Department of Agricultural Extension Services, Secretary General for the Executive Committee of MaFAAS and Focal Person  
Peter Kabande, Natural Resources College, Projects Coordinator  
Rex Chapota, Executive Director, Farm Radio Trust, Vice Chairperson for MaFAAS  
Stella Kankwamba, Director, Department of Agricultural Extension Services (DAES)  
William Kabuenda, Malawi Commodity Exchange, Committee Member MaFAAS

#### Other countries

David Suale, Focal Person for SLeFAAS, Sierra Leone  
Licinia Raquel de Castanheira e Cossa, Focal Person for Mozambique

## Annex 6. List of documents

---

1. AFAAS; ?; Consultancy Report on Capacity Assessment of Members of the SLeFAAS
2. AFAAS; 2011; Establishing and strengthening of AFAAS Country Forums, Guidelines
3. AFAAS; 2013; Communication, Information and Knowledge Management Strategy; IFAD project
4. AFAAS; 2013; Report of meeting for AFAAS-IFAD Project for Strengthening Country-Level Agricultural Advisory Services
5. AFAAS; 2013; Report of the First Workshop of the CIKM component, 17 - 20 June 2013 Kampala
6. AFAAS; 2013; Strengthening Country Level Agricultural Advisory Services Project; 2013 Annual report for the CIKM Component
7. AFAAS; 2014; Analysis and Synthesis of Learning from the Review of the Progress in Implementation of the AFAAS Strategy and Medium Term Operational Plan (MTO) Workshop
8. AFAAS; 2014; IFAD-FUNDED STRENGTHENING COUNTRY-LEVEL AGRICULTURAL ADVISORY SERVICES PROJECT; COMPONENT 2: COMMUNICATION, INFORMATION AND KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT (CIKM); 2014 ANNUAL REPORT
9. AFAAS; 2014; Progress report for the period January to October 2014 on CF institutional development
10. AFAAS; 2014; Trip report from Malawi; 7-10 July 2014
11. AFAAS; 2014; Workplan and Budget, April 2014 to December 2014
12. AFAAS; 2015; AFAAS Progress Report (January – October 2014); Component 1: Country fora establishment
13. AFAAS; 2015; IFAD- Funded Strengthening Country-Level Agricultural Advisory Services; Draft Synthesis Report: Supporting Agricultural Extension and Advisory Services Innovation Processes
14. AFAAS; IFAD- FUNDED STRENGTHENING COUNTRY-LEVEL AGRICULTURAL ADVISORY SERVICES; 2015; DRAFT SYNTHESIS REPORT: SUPPORTING AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION AND ADVISORY SERVICES INNOVATION PROCESSES
15. AFAAS; IFAD- FUNDED STRENGTHENING COUNTRY-LEVEL AGRICULTURAL ADVISORY SERVICES; 2015; DRAFT SYNTHESIS REPORT: PROMOTION OF INFORMATION EXCHANGE AT NATIONAL, SUB-REGIONAL AND REGIONAL LEVELS
16. AFAAS; Strengthening Country-Level Agricultural Advisory Services, Large Grant Design Document
17. African Forum for Agricultural Advisory Services; 2011; 2011 – 2015 Strategic Plan
18. Cossa, L. R. C; ?; Summary of the status of the CF in Mozambique
19. IFAD; 2014; Pronea Support Project (PSP); Supervision report, Main report and appendices
20. MAAIF in collaboration with UFAAS; 2015; Ethics and Standards for the Agricultural Extension and Advisory Services (AEAS) in Uganda; Working document
21. MaFAAS; ?; Concept Note for Malawi Forum for Agricultural Advisory Services (MaFAAS)
22. MaFAAS; ?; The Constitution; Malawi Forum for Agricultural Advisory Services (MaFAAS)
23. MaFAAS; 2011; Institutional Assessment of AAS and AFAAS Country Forum; Malawi May 2011
24. MaFAAS; 2014; Report for November 2014 to December 2014
25. MaFAAS; 2014; Report on Malawi Forum for Agricultural Advisory Services Profiling and Capacity Assessment
26. Ministerio Da Agricultura; 2014; Plataforma De Desenvolvimento E Transferencia de Tecnologias Agrarias
27. Scenarios for the 2nd Phase of PARTI: A note for the 5th Annual Meeting, September 10-12, 2014, Maputo
28. SLeFAAS; 2013; "RAS Country Fora"; PP Presentation by David Suale and Johnson Adolphus; Side Event - 23 September 2013, Berlin Germany
29. SLeFAAS; 2013; Report on National Stakeholders interactive Event 1'st and 2'end May 2013

30. SLeFAAS; 2014; Progress Report - Sierra Leone; AFAAS/IFAD Project Report – Strengthening Country-Level Advisory Services
31. SLeFAAS; 2014; Summary of the status of the CF in Sierra Leone
32. SLeFAAS; 2014; The Strategic Plan 2014 -2018
33. UFAAS, 2014; UFAAS Regional Mobilization Report; Districts: Adjuman, Gulu, Kampala, Kitgum, Lira, Mbarara, Soroti, Tororo; September 2013 & March 2014
34. UFAAS; 2013; Exhibition of Agricultural Extension and Advisory Services (AEAS) Fora at the Jinja Agricultural Show 2013
35. UFAAS; 2013; Minutes of the UFAAS Annual General assembly held on 24th October 2013
36. UFAAS; 2013; National Annual Agricultural Extension and Advisory Services Stakeholder’s Workshop; Wednesday 29th – Thursday 30th October 2013
37. UFAAS; 2013; Report on the National Agricultural Advisory Services Stakeholders Conference 23rd - 24th October 2013
38. UFAAS; 2013; Summary of the status of UFAAS
39. UFAAS; 2013; Support to Innovative Agricultural Extension and Advisory Service approaches in Uganda; A process of documenting and up scaling national innovative approaches
40. UFAAS; 2013; The Financial Policy
41. UFAAS; 2013; UFAAS-IFAD Progress Report; January – December 2013
42. UFAAS; 2014; Position Paper of the UFAAS on the immediate Implications and Effects of the Current Agricultural extension Reforms
43. UFAAS; 2014; Position Paper of the UFAAS on the involvement of the Army in the Agricultural Service Delivery
44. UFAAS; 2014; Position Paper of the UFAAS on the Proposed Reforms to Mainstream Extension into MAAIF and Restructure NAADS into the National Agribusiness Promotion Agency (NAPA)
45. UFAAS; 2014; Training of Trainers for KOPGT Extension Workers in Farmer Institutions Development (The New Extensionist’s Role)
46. UFAAS; 2015; Progress Report of the Uganda Forum for Agricultural Advisory Services (UFAAS); PP Presentation
47. UFAAS; Uganda’s Agriculture at Crossroads: Critical Issues in the Agricultural Extension and Advisory Services; Resolutions on Uganda’s AEAS by the Uganda Forum for Agricultural Advisory Services (UFAAS)

## Annex 7. Attendance list for Validation Workshop

### VALIDATION WORKSHOP

**Dates: 31<sup>st</sup> March -1<sup>st</sup> April, 2015**  
**Venue: Speke Resort, Munyonyo, Kampala**

#### ATTENDANCE LIST

	NAME	ORGANIZATION	DESIGNATION	EMAIL	PHONE NO.
1.	Pascaline Babadankpodji	FSA/ UAC	Consultant	<a href="mailto:pasbabad@yahoo.fr">pasbabad@yahoo.fr</a>	+22995868818
2.	Paul Fatch	MaFAAS	Focal Person	<a href="mailto:paulfatch@gmail.com">paulfatch@gmail.com</a>	+265999638978
3.	Henry Manyire	SWAS/ MAK	Reviewer	<a href="mailto:hmanyire@hotmail.com">hmanyire@hotmail.com</a>	+256772430145
4.	Max Olupot	AFAAS	Technical Assistant	<a href="mailto:molupot@afaas-africa.org">molupot@afaas-africa.org</a>	0782848225
5.	Evelyn Namubiru Mwaura	AGRA	DR.	<a href="mailto:nelwanga@yahoo.com">nelwanga@yahoo.com</a>	
6.	Ann Apekey	FARA		<a href="mailto:aapekey@faraafrica.org">aapekey@faraafrica.org</a>	
7.	Gloria Gummah	AFAAS	Consultant	<a href="mailto:ggummah@afaas-africa.org">ggummah@afaas-africa.org</a>	
8.	Waiswa Musa	AFAAS	Internal Auditor	<a href="mailto:mwaiswa@afaas-africa.org">mwaiswa@afaas-africa.org</a>	
9.	Beatrice Luzobe	UFAAS	Focal Person	<a href="mailto:bnluzobe@gmail.com">bnluzobe@gmail.com</a>	0776801091
10.	Muheebwa Adeline	ASARAECA	Gender Expert	<a href="mailto:ademuheebwa@gmal.com/a.muheebwa@asareca.org">ademuheebwa@gmal.com/a.muheebwa@asareca.org</a>	0772415029
11.	Wilhemina Quaye	CSIR/ STEHRI	Gender Expert	<a href="mailto:quayewilhemina@yahoo.com">quayewilhemina@yahoo.com</a>	
12.	Aradania Paez V.	ICRAF	Social scientist	<a href="mailto:a.paez-valencia@cgjar.org">a.paez-valencia@cgjar.org</a>	+2540700299102
13.	Grace Malindi	MaFAAS	Consultant	<a href="mailto:gmalindi@gmail.com">gmalindi@gmail.com</a>	+2650888506440
14.	Caleb Gumisiriza	UNFFE	Policy & Gender off.	<a href="mailto:cgumusiriza@yahoo.com">cgumusiriza@yahoo.com</a>	0712210700
15.	Esther Michaala	AFAAS	Administrator	<a href="mailto:emichaala@afaas-africa.org">emichaala@afaas-africa.org</a>	0702936402
16.	Egesa Jerry	NAADS	Coordinator	<a href="mailto:egesajerry@yahoo.com">egesajerry@yahoo.com</a>	0782590449
17.	Kiyingi Mohammad	AFAAS	Project Support	<a href="mailto:Kiyingi07mmm@gmail.com">Kiyingi07mmm@gmail.com</a>	0772890787
18.	Faith Okiror	AFAAS	CIKM Facilitator	<a href="mailto:fokiror@afaas-africa.org">fokiror@afaas-africa.org</a>	0774898149
19.	Roselline Nyamutale	SG2000	Country Director	<a href="mailto:rnyamutale@saa-safe.org">rnyamutale@saa-safe.org</a>	0772635069
20.	Dr. Silim Nahdy	AFAAS	ED		