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## Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>Agricultural Institute of Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASAM</td>
<td>Agricultural Scientists Association of Malawi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCIA</td>
<td>British Columbia Institute of Agrologists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDA</td>
<td>Canadian International Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAS</td>
<td>Canadian Society of Animal Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE</td>
<td>Canadian Society of Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSHS</td>
<td>Canadian Society of Horticultural Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSSS</td>
<td>Canadian Society of Soil Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCO</td>
<td>Developing Country Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GhIH</td>
<td>Ghana Institute of Horticulturists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSAP</td>
<td>Ghana Society of Animal Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IADP</td>
<td>International Agricultural Development Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPM</td>
<td>International Partners’ Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITPP</td>
<td>International Twinning Partnership Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATI</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture Training Institutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATI-U</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture Training Institute - Ukiriguru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBM</td>
<td>Results Based Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Strengthening Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDP</td>
<td>Social Development Priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSAEE</td>
<td>Tanzania Society for Agricultural Extension and Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

Purpose of the Report

This report provides CIDA with an assessment of the results achieved by the Agricultural Institute of Canada (AIC)’s International Twinning Partnership Program.

Development Context

Approximately 75 percent of the absolute poor in developing countries live in rural areas, and depend primarily on agriculture for their livelihoods. Thus, CIDA strongly believes that reducing poverty in rural areas, and hunger in both rural and urban areas, will depend heavily on the sustainable development of agriculture. CIDA’s overall strategy rests in part on raising food production and income of the rural poor through pro-poor economic growth, effective integrating agriculture into local and international markets, and creating productive on- and off-farm employment.

Program Overview

AIC’s international program endeavors to strengthen the organizational capacity of partners in order to maintain advances in agriculture through enduring relationships (five to nine years) between Canadian and developing country partners. These projects form the International Twinning Partnership Program (ITPP) and include technical development and experimentation, demonstration and dissemination of techniques, and efforts to reach a critical mass of potential beneficiaries. They aim to promote change at the grass roots level, e.g. adopting new technologies based on appropriate, proven production methods, to provide education on agriculture production, as well as to work for policy change in developing countries. Each project comprises two components: Strengthening Capacity and Social Development Priorities (SDP).

Methodology

The evaluation consisted of a document review, key informant interviews, participatory observation, and a field visit to Ghana, Malawi and Tanzania from December 2 to 18, 2005. The document review entailed an examination of the previous evaluation (2000), selected program and project files and other relevant
documentation. Key informant interviews included AIC’s international program officers, Canadian Partners’ coordinators, Overseas Partners’ Coordinators and members, Ministry of Agriculture Managers (overseas), as well as beneficiaries. Participatory observation involved observing interactions among project staff and participants and evidence of tangible results.

Certain factors constrained data collection, principally the brevity of the field visits that did not permit interviewing a varied group of respondents or many beneficiaries. This principally affected the amount of data collected, and, to a lesser extent, its quality. Doing group interviews and inviting community representatives to communities that were visited as part of the evaluation mitigated this but also limited.

**Highlights of Achievements**

Overall, the Program has achieved meaningful results in all outcome areas. For instance, reviving and strengthening overseas agricultural organizations that can play a more effective role in policy development; adoption of new agricultural practices resulting in increased food security and incomes for people living in extreme poverty; knowledge sharing and generation of new knowledge through applied research, among others.

Several enabling factors account for these positive results, in particular, competent and diligent management at project and Program level, responsive approaches and participatory methodologies, e.g. peer training, revolving funds, group goals setting. Other factors included strategic linkages with other actors in the agricultural/rural sector and multidisciplinary approaches.

Generally, results are relevant at all levels. They are useful to the targeted communities who are benefiting from increased food production and higher incomes. They are also relevant to the professional bodies and their members who have experienced a revival of their organizations and renewed potential to influence agricultural policy. The Program has also been rewarding to agriculture professionals, allowing them to develop new skills in RBM or participatory approaches, among others, and to work directly with communities. Program results are also relevant to CIDA and developing country governments, as poverty reduction through increased agriculture production features prominently on their agendas.
A number of the results achieved would be sustainable should CIDA’s support end in 2006. At the organisational/institutional level, there is great demand for sharing knowledge among agriculture specialists. At the community level, there is evidence that the new practices that have been taught have been adopted – with some evidence of spill over beyond the direct beneficiaries. However, the methods and approaches used to achieve these results need to be further institutionalised, both within the developing country organizations and other actors such as the Ministry of Agriculture. Developing country partners also need to strengthen their ability to mobilize resources, including members, and diversify sources of funding.

Considering the results achieved and the resources devoted to achieving them, the Program is very cost-effective and a good investment for CIDA. Much of the work is done on a volunteer basis, by Canadian and overseas partners. There was ample evidence that considerable amounts of time and efforts have been devoted to achieving results in both components of the Program.

**Challenges**

There have been few serious problems encountered to date. All partners have been achieving results at the output level and most at the outcome. All partners have adopted Results-Based Management and made progress in its application, albeit with varying degrees of success. Reporting in a timely fashion on outputs and outcomes remains a challenge, with communication problems partly to blame, e.g. no high-speed access or even e-mail connections in the DCOs’ offices, although over-extension and difficulties in mobilizing members are also likely reasons. For some of the overseas partners reaching out to rural communities has been strenuous as distances to the sites are great and transportation an issue.

Addressing and analyzing gender equality issues has been a challenge although all partners have made efforts to promote gender equality. Modest gains have been achieved, such as increasing women’s access to resources in rural communities and taking on non-traditional roles such as speaking in public and contributing to building family homes.
Recommendations

Based on our analysis, our recommendations to CIDA and AIC are as follows:

1. AIC and its partners should carefully manage the risks involved in supporting a new organization, such as the Agriculture Scientists Association of Malawi (ASAM). This would involve but not limited to:

   a. Clarifying the relationship between BCIA, MUTF and ASAM;
   b. Doing an organizational assessment (several self-assessment tools exist) to assess the needs of the Association and better target the intervention;
   c. Establishing specific targets;
   d. Ensuring and demonstrating that the project will be jointly managed by MUTF and ASAM from the beginning, although the level of responsibility may vary;
   e. Ensuring and demonstrating that the project will be jointly managed by MUTF and ASAM from the beginning, although the level of responsibility may vary;
   f. Providing on-going targeted organizational development support by the Canadian partner and/or a Malawian-based organization, to build the management capacity of ASAM and allow full transfer of coordination responsibility to ASAM by the end of an agreed upon transition period;
   g. Establishing a modest SDP component on a pilot basis while ASAM strengthens its organizational capacity. This pilot phase could be used to plan for a more elaborate intervention in the remaining years of the Program. ASAM should perform an analysis of the combined effect of HIV/AIDS and the drought on communities and agriculture in Malawi to date and the likely impact in the future.
   h. MUTF/ASAM should demonstrate that the planned SDP activities would focus directly and benefit the farming families of the Project Area, including women.

2. Continue strengthening RBM, including strengthening reporting on change rather than activities. Project and Program level reporting could also benefit by
developing indicators and targets.

3. Use the professional exchange visit as an opportunity to monitor project and Program results more formally, though the development of a monitoring template, based on the Program planned outcomes and outputs.

4. Overseas partners should carry out an organizational diagnostic (self-assessment) to better target their organizational capacity building efforts. This could serve as a baseline for future interventions and facilitate tracking of progress, particularly if clear targets are set. See Annex IX for examples of available self-assessment tools.

5. Continue strengthening partners’ capacity to address and assess gender equality. Overseas partners should explore linkages with national/local women’s organizations or gender experts in order to receive training and/or advice on gender equality (training or advisory services should be built in the project’s budget). Overseas partners should also explore the availability of funding for gender-based analysis and training on gender equality in their country, e.g. multi-donor gender fund in Malawi.

6. Offer more opportunities for South-South professional exchanges and to encourage sharing of knowledge; closer links and knowledge sharing between GSAP and GhIH should be strongly encouraged. Holding the IPMs in the South if possible is another means to facilitate South-South knowledge sharing and capacity building. Materials produced by the partners could also be shared.

7. Devise a clear exit strategy and build overseas partners capacity in mobilization / diversification of resources with the support of their Canadian partner to ensure long-term financial sustainability.
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1.0 Introduction

Approximately 75 percent of the absolute poor in developing countries live in rural areas, and depend mostly on agriculture for their livelihoods. Thus, CIDA strongly believes that reducing poverty in rural areas, and hunger in both rural and urban areas, will depend heavily on the sustainable development of agriculture. CIDA’s policy on agriculture states that through efforts in the sector, income of the rural poor must increase rapidly, and food production in the developing world must more than double over the next twenty years to match population growth. And that the sector must encourage pro-poor economic growth, raise agricultural productivity, integrate agriculture into local and international markets effectively, and create productive on- and off-farm employment.

To achieve these goals, CIDA supports numerous initiatives through its multilateral bilateral and partnership programs. CIDA has supported the International Twinning Partnership Program (ITPP) of the Agricultural Institute of Canada (AIC) as part of its overall strategy to eradicate hunger and poverty in the developing world.

This section briefly profiles the Agricultural Institute of Canada, its program and the investment it represents. This overview is followed by a brief review of the purpose and objectives of the evaluation and its methodological approach. Section 2 presents our findings and analysis; section 3 our recommendations; and, section 4 the lessons learned and best practices. The Terms of Reference, main evaluation questions and interview guides, Program Logic Model, as well as lists of people interviewed and documents reviewed, are in the Annexes.

1.1 Agricultural Institute of Canada

1.1.1 Organizational Profile

The Agricultural Institute of Canada (AIC) represents individuals, associations and organizations involved in Canadian agriculture, food, environment and health. AIC

seeks to have a positive impact on the agri-food sector in the areas of environmental sustainability, food safety and food security.  

AIC hosts conferences related to advances in agricultural research, practices and innovations that affect the agri-food sector, and publishes, in cooperation with sponsoring scientific societies, three international, peer-reviewed quarterly journals: *Canadian Journal of Plant Science*, *Canadian Journal of Soil Science* and *Canadian Journal of Animal Science*. It also offers documents of interest, as well as learning and volunteer opportunities for its members.

### 1.1.2 Program Overview

AIC’s International Agriculture Development Program (IADP), supported by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), encompasses four key goals:

- Assist partner organizations in their efforts to increase food production, alleviate poverty and improve environmental sustainability;
- Support and strengthen partner organizations so they can be more effective in increasing food production, alleviating poverty and improving the environment;
- Optimize the involvement of AIC members and provide opportunities for professional and personal development;
- Increase global visibility of AIC, its members, and projects within the international agricultural development community.

AIC’s ultimate goal is to strengthen the institutional capacity of partners to maintain advances through long-term relationships (five to nine years) between Canadian and developing country partners. These projects form the International Twinning Partnership Program (ITPP) and include technical development and experimentation, demonstration and dissemination of techniques, and activities to reach a critical mass of potential beneficiaries. All aim to promote change at the grass roots level, e.g. adopting new technologies based on appropriate, proven production methods, to provide education on agriculture production, as well as to work for policy change in developing countries. Each project comprises two components: *Strengthening Organizational Capacity* and *Social Development Priorities (SDP)*.

---

2 Source: AIC Website - http://www.aic.ca
The current phase of the Program, started in 2001 and scheduled to end in March 2006, involves four Canadian agriculture organizations and seven overseas partners. Exhibit 2.1 lists the Canadian and overseas partners involved in the current phase, as well as the main focus of each project.

The partners manage ITPP projects, supported by volunteer project coordinators appointed and sponsored by their organization or association. Project selection is guided by approved AIC criteria that measure the degree the proposed project reflects ITPP goals and objectives. Host country partner professional organizations must also demonstrate how they plan to assume responsibility for their project to ensure eventual independence from external funding. The Logic Model for ITPP, outlining expected outputs, outcomes and impacts, is at Annex VI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Exhibit 1.1</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partner Organisations and Focus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canadian Partners</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Society of Soil Science (CSSS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Society of Extension (CSE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Society for Horticultural Science (CSHS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia Institute of Agrologists (BCIA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1.3 Program Funding

In April 2001, AIC contracted with CIDA for a five-year contribution of CDN $2,447,500 with approximately one-third of the funding allocated to efforts under CIDA’s Social Development Priorities (SDP).
1.2 Purpose of the Evaluation

CIDA’s last assessment of AIC projects was undertaken in April 2000. As the current phase concludes March 31, 2006, CIDA commissioned this evaluation to:

- Assess results for the Strengthening Capacity and Social Development Priorities components of AIC’s International Twinning Partnership Program at both the program and project levels;
- Provide recommendations for the future; and,
- Identify lessons.

More specifically, the key objectives of the evaluation were to:

- Systematically re-examine conclusions and recommendations made and accepted by both parties in the 2000 Evaluation in order to identify practical measures and actions and determine whether measures taken are consistent with the recommendations made and relevant to the situation to be improved;
- Determine how well the AIC program meets and/or contributes to:

1. Achievement of Results
2. Cost-effectiveness
3. Usefulness of Results
4. Sustainability of Results
5. Partnership
6. Suitability of Design
7. Effectiveness of and Use of Resources
8. Informed and Timely Action

1.3 Methodological Approach

1.3.1 Data Gathering and Analysis Method

On the basis of the evaluation objectives identified in Section 1.2, timeframe and budget, the evaluation team opted for the following data collection method:

Developing Country Organisations
- Ghanaian Institute of Horticulturists (Ghana)
- Ghanaian Society of Animal Production (Ghana)
- Mzuzu University Trust Fund (Malawi)
- Tanzanian Society of Agriculture Education and Extension (Tanzania)
- Document Review (organizational, program and project level)
- Semi-structured key informant interviews (in person and by telephone)
- Field visits to four projects in Africa (see organizations visited in textbox)

A matrix of key questions with indicators and semi-structured key informant questionnaires were developed to guide the evaluation (Annex III), with feedback from CIDA and AIC sought at all stages.

### 1.3.2 Data Collection and Analysis

As mentioned on the previous section, data collection consisted of a document review, semi-structured interviews and participant observation. Exhibit 1.3 provides an overview of the type of data that was gathered through various sources.

#### Exhibit 1.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Data</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>The principal data collection method was semi-structured interviews. Interview guides were developed to gather data. Appendix IV identifies the groups and individuals in Canada and overseas from whom the information was gathered. By category, respondents included AIC program managers, Canadian partners coordinators, representatives and staff of overseas partners in Ghana, Malawi and Tanzania, representatives of ministries of agriculture (at the district level), as well as members of targeted communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>The consultants primarily reviewed and analysed selected background documents from CIDA, as well as program and project documents from AIC and its partners. The written and web-based documents reviewed for this evaluation, listed in Appendix V, were analysed between October 2005 and January 25th, 2006.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Observation</td>
<td>The third source of data was observing the behaviour and interactions of project staff among themselves during meetings and project activities in which the consultant participated, as well as interactions with community members. Evidence of tangible results was also sought.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Canada, one in person interview was conducted in Ottawa with AIC managers. Interviews with Canadian project coordinators were completed by telephone, and others conducted overseas during the field visits with project coordinators, volunteers and Board Members as feasible.

Using CIDA’s RBM Framework and the Program’s anticipated results per the Logic Model, the consultants conducted a qualitative analysis of the data to establish key findings presented in Section 2. While results were analysed both on a project-by-project and Program basis, they are reported at Program level. Profiles of each project reviewed and key findings are presented in Annex VIII.
1.3.3 Constraints

Certain constraints might affect the accuracy and/or validity of some of the evaluation findings, principally:

Sampling – Given the budget available, only projects in Africa were visited. While they constitute the majority of the ITPP projects, there is a possibility that the findings do not afford a complete view of the overall program.

Time – The time spent overseas with each project was limited, averaging one or two days. As a result, the main source of information was project implementers and beneficiaries. And due to time limitations, only a limited number of people from the overseas partner organizations and communities could be interviewed or interacted with. Likewise, only the coordinators of the Canadian partner organizations were interviewed, and only by telephone.

Only about one third of the communities involved in the four projects could be visited. This was mitigated by bringing representatives from the communities not visited to the sites that were.

Finally, it was not possible to interview community members at random or to speak to them individually. Time constraints meant that they could only interviewed as a group and in the presence of project staff, which most likely influenced some of the responses.

Language – As the consultant did not speak the various local languages of the communities visited, she had to rely on local resources for translation, most often project staff. This may have resulted in some key information being missed, or in omitting information that might reflect negatively on the project.

Attribution of Results – In the case of Malawi, the ITPP started with one partner organization (Mzuzu University Trust Fund - MUTF) and ended with two, as the Agriculturists Scientists Association of Malawi (ASAM) was created in the process. MUFT acted as the local facilitator and enabler of that process. Hence, the objective of the project in Malawi was not to strengthen the organizational capacity of MUTF but that of ASAM. Nonetheless, MUTF did carry out activities under the component of the
Program and expected results, while ASAM did not, it being a too recent creation to intervene at that level. Therefore, further references to Strengthening Capacity in the report apply to ASAM and Social Development Priorities results apply to MUFT.
2.0 Findings and Analysis

2.1 Introduction

This section reviews the results achieved by the AIC International Twinning Partnership Program since 2001. That the projects were near completion during the evaluation helped in assessing overall Program results achievement. Our analysis is focused at the Program level rather than project-by-project, particularly on outcomes and impacts and whether unintended consequences, positive or negative, emerged. While our findings are reported at the Program level, the underlying analysis is supported by results achieved at the project level and concrete examples drawn from projects where appropriate; see the profiles and results for the four projects reviewed at Annex VIII.

This section also examines whether results are sustainable, if the Program was cost-effective and considers other factors – the quality of partnerships, the suitability of design, the optimal use of resources – as well as if partners consistently took informed and timely action.

2.2 Results Achievement

2.2.1 Achievement of Outcomes

Finding 1: Overall, the Program has achieved meaningful results in all outcome areas. However, without a systematic organizational diagnostic at the outset of the program, the extent that capacity was strengthened is not always tangible.

Stronger Partner Organizations

The support from AIC and its Canadian partners contributed significantly to the revival or renewal of the overseas partner

Program Outcomes

- Stronger partner organizations with improved governance, more recognition nationally, increased membership with more women and youth;
- Program partners have increased capacity to plan, develop and manage sustainable programs that respond to community needs and/or national development priorities;
- Increased awareness and understanding of international development among AIC partner organizations’ members;
- Increased and improved international connections between agricultural professionals and associations;
- Partner organizations have the capacity to contribute to agricultural innovations that improve production and household food security.
organizations reviewed, and allowed for the creation of a new organisation in Malawi.

The Program appeared to play a significant role in helping their overseas partners improve their organizational capacity. By all accounts, the Developing Country Organizations (DCOs) have held AGMs annually, produced and distributed proceedings to their members and dramatically increased the number of activities for members.

DCOs increased their membership, attracted more youth and women, and can now better meet the needs of members, particularly in terms of knowledge sharing through scientific journals, lectures and/or conferences. GhIH, for instance, organizes study tours for students, and both it and GSAP engage students in applied research, in part through the SDP component, e.g. use of sheanut by-product as animal feed.

The ITPP has helped markedly increase the visibility of the DCOs, particularly in Ghana and Tanzania. GhIH, GSAP and TSAEE have boosted their visibility at the district and national levels, as well as their influence with their respective ministries of agriculture. This impact has been more noticeable at the district level, notwithstanding the significant inroads at the national level. For example, GSAP proposed a national pilot program on feedlots to the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (MoFA), and was commissioned by the Minister to write a proposal. The President of GSAP sits on the National Livestock Development Policy Committee. In Tanzania, the Director of the Ministry Agriculture and Training Institutes (MATI) is reportedly planning to assemble all 16 Principals of its training institutes to the MATI-Ukiriguru (where the project is located) to learn from TSAEE. As well, four people from these institutes are scheduled to receive training in March 2006. And, the International Partners Meeting (IPM) held in Tanzania in 2004 attracted significant interest from the Tanzanian Government. Reportedly, the Program’s overseas activities have attracted media coverage at the national level, both in Ghana and Tanzania.

In Malawi, ASAM, which was created during this phase of the Program, was able to develop its vision, mission and Constitution and was officially registered in 2005. Young professionals were recruited from the six districts in the Northern region. The field visit provided an opportunity to meet briefly with the eight-member Executive representing the six districts.
## Exhibit 2.2
### Highlights of Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Strengthening Capacity</th>
<th>Social Development Priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| GhIH         | • Organization revived – increased membership including youth and women, increased number and types of activities; increased participation at AGM.  
• Attracted students into the organization; provided opportunities including study tours and involvement in applied research.  
• Database with member profiles available.  
• Sharing knowledge among membership – three issues of scientific journal produced – newsletter. | • Adoption of new and environmentally friendly horticulture practices in four communities – evidence of some spill over effect.  
• Participation of trained community members in the training of other farmers\(^3\).  
• Increased income from farming  
• Increased access to resources and decision-making for women (at project level); women starting to take on non-traditional roles (public speaking).  
• Adoption of environmentally friendly horticulture practices – composting, natural pest control |
| GSAP         | • Increased membership and participation at AGMs; student involvement in applied research.  
• Influence on Ministry of Food and agriculture at district and national level through participation in advisory boards.  
• One issue of scientific journal and newsletter produced.  
• Increased sophistication in using RBM, e.g. planning for and reporting results. | • Adoption of innovations in animal production for women in several communities – evidence of spill over effect  
• Increased incomes and access to resources for women.  
• Increased decision-making for women and ability to manage (at project level); increased status through management of anti-snakebite serum.  
• Environmental protection – reduction in bush fires and reduction in destruction of endangered plant species through production of animal feed. |
| MUTF         | • ASAM officially registered.  
• Active Executive – development of Constitution, project planning, recruitment of members (25) in six districts, attracting young professionals, including women. | • Socio-economic and environmentally sustainable land and soil management studies completed.  
• Dialogue initiated with some people in the community. |
| TSAEE        | • Active membership, particularly at local level – seven volunteers devote significant amount of time in SDP activities; another 35 members participate on an as needed basis.  
• High level of interest from members Lake District to get involved in SDP activities.  
• MATI system sending principals to learn the approach.  
• Project’s Advisory Board includes one woman and one youth from the community. | • Significant increases in production and income from farming and other productive activities for women and youth in 11 communities – spill over effect.  
• Increased access to resources and decision-making for women (at project level).  
• Adoption of new and environmentally friendly horticulture practices – spill over effect.  
• Increased leadership of women by taking on non-traditional roles, e.g., public speaking, house building. |

\(^3\) Unless otherwise stipulated farmers include both men and women.
Capacity to Deliver Agricultural Programming in Communities

Overall, the Program is helping project beneficiaries of marginalized communities increase family income and access to food (see Exhibit 2.2 for results highlights). Anecdotally, there is evidence that increased production from the adoption of agricultural practices introduced by the overseas partners helps families more easily survive the “hunger months” and augmented women’s ability to pay for their children’s education. Community members repeated this during the field visits. There was also anecdotal evidence of a spillover effect in the communities visited. The Program’s beneficiaries indicated that their success with crops and/or animal raising had resulted in inquiries from their fellow community members, allegedly impressed by their level of success. In some of the communities visited in Ghana and Tanzania, some women came to the meeting organized for the consultant to say they also wanted to participate in the project.

While it appears that the Program has contributed to some extent to improving food security and possibly the nutritional status of participants and their families, this finding has not been systematically documented. GSAP and TSAEE have measured and recorded some of the increases in crop production, e.g., acreage or growth in number of animals vaccinated, or numbers of new houses built. And logically, increases in agricultural production should translate in improved food security and nutritional status. But perhaps as families have more access to food by eating the produce of their crop or buying foodstuffs in the dry season, rural families do not always eat the food they produce or the more nutritious food produced; or they buy food with increased income as crops are sold to meet other needs. For instance, the field visits to communities near WA provided evidence that the new types of vegetables produced were mostly sold outside the community, to city dwellers or restaurants and hotels catering to foreigners. Community members also volunteered that they sold their better-looking produce – which according to the agrologists interviewed, would also be the most nutritious.

While this may not be the case in the communities visited, in many places, women do not always control how their earnings are spent; and, the extent that the money earned by men or women in the projects was spent on food versus other items is not clear. As mentioned above, none of the overseas partners reviewed has systematically measured how the increase in income or agricultural production were rendered in food consumption or in improving the nutritional status of the rural families involved.
Finally, results in Malawi have not sublimated into the same kinds of outcomes, i.e. increased income, food security and nutritional status of community people as in the other African countries in the Program. While the MUTF was able to achieve the results it had anticipated, by producing socio-economic, as well as soil and land use studies, these seem at odds with those of other overseas partners that focus directly on agricultural production that directly benefit local communities.

These studies could be useful in the context of supporting work with the communities that populate the area and benefit the Mzuzu University at the same time, but it is still very much a “project”. Their primary purpose is to support the development of the University, and the linkages to communities remain very modest. The overseas partner seems genuinely concerned for the welfare of the communities affected by the future University Campus and is intent on contributing to improving their situation. However, the field visit could not assess the degree of trust, involvement or interest of the local communities, as only four communities members (one traditional leader and three young male farmers) were present at a meeting convened for the evaluation. There was also no opportunity to talk with local partners, e.g. the Luwinga Development Foundation Trust, to assess the level collaboration between the MUTF and local organizations.

**Increased Opportunities for Women and Youth**

In the case of Ghana and Tanzania, partner organizations were largely successful in providing opportunities for women and youth (to varying degrees). Certainly, awareness of gender has been greatly enhanced through the Program at all levels.

Concretely, through the SDP component, the majority beneficiaries of agriculture innovations have been women, e.g. increased incomes and decision-making ability and leadership skills, and enhanced business and group management skills. This has enhanced women’s ability to participate in decision-making at the project level and express their needs, as well as learning to speak publicly, which is still not common in these traditional rural communities.

In some cases, women’s participation in the Program’s activities has increased their status in the community, e.g. women in a Ghana project co-managing the anti-snakebite serum with health clinics. Village women reported that helping to save lives has earned
them increased respect in their community. In Tanzania, women undertake non-traditional roles such as building houses with income earned from increased production. And there also young women are learning to speak out publicly on issues such as HIV/AIDS through a theatre group. Through the Program, women have travelled outside their communities to meet other women’s groups and learn about production and processing. Some women were able to visit neighbouring countries, e.g. Uganda and Kenya in the case of Tanzania. GSAP has sponsored a joint venture between a youth group (management graduates) and one of the women’s groups to run a sheanut processing plant, and the two parties signed a MoU in 2005.

The Program also fostered greater involvement of women in the governance of the agricultural societies in all three countries and as members. While progress has been modest, all the DCOs have women in their Executive, in one case as President. This also reflects the relatively small numbers of women in the agricultural sciences in these countries. Some women were able to visit Canada as part of the Program’s professional exchange component.

Youth outreach has been most evident in Tanzania and Malawi, although in Ghana students were actively recruited as members of GhIH and GSAP. They also participated in study tours and other educational activities, and several students have conducted applied research.

In Tanzania, youth have been direct beneficiaries of the Program through the SDP component, which focuses almost entirely on youth, including young women. ASAM also seems to attract young professionals, and its Executive is largely composed of young people, may be due in part to the devastating effects of HIV/AIDS in Southern Africa on the adult population.

While taking steps towards gender equality, Program partners have expressed concerns as how to address and analyse issues of gender equality. There could be some benefit for them in developing linkages with women’s organizations in developing countries, or to accessing funding for gender training in the future.

**Increased and Improved International Connections**

The ITPP has fostered linkages between Canadian and developing country agricultural professionals, particularly those of partnering organizations. These contacts have
occurred mainly through the professional exchange component of the Program and the International Partners Meetings (IPMs). To date, professional exchanges are reciprocal – North to South and South to North – and overseas partners have found these exchanges useful, particularly the sharing of knowledge, and they have organized lectures for their colleagues when Canadian counterparts visit. They also appreciate support with project planning, implementation and reporting, as well as overall support with RBM. These partnerships also foster the exchange of knowledge and collaboration between African and Canadian scientists through visits to Canada. In some cases, it has facilitated links between the DCO and Canadian NGOs that have supported its project, or some commercial entities.

In addition to fostering the exchange of knowledge between the Northern and Southern partners, the Program has enhanced collaboration between Southern partners. The IPMs, which convene representatives from all participating organizations biannually, help initiate the exchange of knowledge between the Southern partners, and have, by all accounts, been very beneficial. These international gatherings usually attract government officials, which is useful for the DCOs to raise their visibility at the national level; often Ministers or other high-ranking officials are present, and boost media coverage. When held in the South, the IPM also allows a host organization to demonstrate its capacity to organize a large event and showcase its approach and results to partners. Indeed, following the IMP held in Tanzania in November 2004, Ghanaian partners adopted some of the rural development methodologies that TSAEE has used with considerable success. It also led to a mutual agreement between TSAEE and MUTF/ASAM to foster future exchanges. In a future phase, consideration should be given to allow for more South-South professional exchanges, as well as the development of and exchanged of materials by the partners. For instance, both GhIH and TSAEE have indicated that they are developing materials to be used for field training, which could be shared among partners once completed.

**Capacity to Contribute to Agricultural Innovations That Improve Production and Household Food Security**

The Program has contributed to the adoption of a number of agricultural practices. In fact, this has been the most visible result of the Program. The collective efforts of the partners in that area have resulted in increased production and food security among beneficiaries, as seen in three of the four projects visited – GSAP, GhIH and TSAEE – with evidence of spill over in the communities. While some of the innovations appear
fairly basic, most were unknown to the targeted populations. In the case of Tanzania, increases in production and income have been quite dramatic and resulted in greater demand from several groups of farmers than could be accommodated.

The two projects in Ghana also involve agricultural research, with the participation of community members. For instance, GSAP researched the use of sheanut byproduct as feed for livestock that were tested by women, and GhIH introduced new seed varieties developed by the Savannah Agriculture Research Institute (SARI), a partner organization, which were tested by the community women and men involved in the Program.

**Increased Awareness and Understanding of International Development**

As the scope of the evaluation did not permit a component to interview members of the Canadian partners beyond the project coordinators, or to survey the public, it is not possible to determine the extent that the Program contributed to increased awareness and understanding of international development issues in Canada. However, the Canadian public, and more specifically Canadian scientists, have been exposed to issues face in developing countries through the Program.

Measures to educate the public or increase awareness include websites featuring the overseas partners and their projects, presentations at Canadian partners and AIC’s AGMs, through meetings with members and at public events. A Manitoba group made a documentary on the Tanzania project, and broadcast it in that province. Canadian NGOs also raised awareness on some of the projects to generate support and raise funds for two of the projects reviewed. Both CIDA and the AIC have presented awards to some of the partners for their project, which generated media coverage in Canada, as did holding the IPM in Tanzania.

2.2.2 **Unexpected Results**

The Program has generated positive results or spin-offs at the project level, particularly for GSAP and TSAEE. This includes receiving support from Canadian NGOs met
through their partner. There also is interest from the MATI system in Tanzania to learn the methods and approach that TSAEE has developed to work with youth in rural communities and develop their entrepreneurial potential.

### Exhibit 2.4

#### Unexpected Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Strengthening Capacity</th>
<th>Social Development Priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GhIH</td>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship a Canadian NGO met through CSAS – provided mosquito nets to women; interest in providing micro-credit in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSAP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Joint commercial venture between women near Bole and youth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUTF</td>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship a Canadian NGO met through CSAS – provided mosquito nets to women; interest in providing micro-credit in the future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| TSAEE        | • Strong interest from MATI to learn from TSAEE methods and approach.  
               • Interest from UN agency to implement programming through TSAEE  
               • Groups of men and women have approached TSAEE for extension services and business development | |}

#### 2.2.3 Achievement of Impacts

The scope of the evaluation and timeframe was too limited to explore whether and how the Program had an impact at the institutional level. Most likely, it is too early to observe these kinds of results at this stage.

#### 2.2.4 Challenges

This section presents the main challenges that partners have encountered in the course of implementing their projects.

**Transportation**

While this transport logistics were more acute in Ghana, where the SDP projects are located four to five hours away on poor roads, all overseas partners experienced difficulties with transportation. Since Program resources cannot support major capital
expenditures, e.g., a four-wheel drive vehicle, so that none of the DCOs involved in the Program currently own a vehicle, overseas partners rely on other organizations for transportation, rent a vehicle, or use their own car or motorcycle to travel to communities. Arguably, not owning a vehicle encourages collaboration between organizations and reduces the overhead associated with owning and maintaining a vehicle. But if project staff and volunteers are expected to use their own vehicles or rent them, corresponding budgets have to be established. And women lack the same access to motorized transportation, a reality that has to be taken into consideration if the Program is to be inclusive of women. For instance in Tanzania, male trainers use their own motorcycle to travel to the villages; female colleagues do not, necessitating the hiring of a car.

For some of the communities involved, marketing has been a significant shortcoming, one that the DCO is intends to address in a future phase. Not being able to sell crops at a reasonable price, or losing them due to lack of transportation, has been a complaint expressed by some of the communities visited. The inability to translate increased production into increased income certainly has the potential to curtail improvements in food security and nutritional status. And both marketing and other post harvest issues, such as food preservation / transformation, have not been sufficiently addressed in the current Program phase.

**Communications**

Issues of communications have affected Program partners differently. Communication issues were more prevalent in cases where the project implementer was at great distance between both the communities and the head office of the organization, as was the case in Ghana. This has been more pronounced with regards to how the partners were able to interact with the communities than with internal communications between members, as most of the professionals in Ghana seem to possess or have access to a cell phone.

While all Program partners all had access to computers and software, their access to email varied and affected their initiative differently. In some cases, partners had access email though their workplace, either dialup or high speed access but mostly dialup. In most cases they had to go to an internet café. For one of the partner, this entailed traveling 30 kilometers to receive or send documents. Added to this are the frequent power failures. These communications problems have affected the ability of partners to
report on time. However, this is not the sole reason for reporting difficulties, which seems to occur on a regular basis for some of the partners. Other factors include the fact that the Program activities are on a volunteer basis and occur in addition to other work commitments. There might also be other factors such as over-extension at a structural level, which seems to be the case with GhIH. Despite organizational difficulties in reporting in a timely fashion, it appears that it has not impeded partners to fulfill their reporting requirements, or caused delayed program report submissions to CIDA.

**Exhibit 2.5**

**Some Challenges**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Strengthening Capacity</th>
<th>Social Development Priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| GhIH         | • Some difficulty to mobilise membership to be active – possibly too many layers and components at National level, five regional executives, five committees, six commissions – strategic thinking needed  
              • Difficulty to report in a timely fashion. Communication problems contribute to the problems, e.g. lack of email, decentralized organization, etc. | • Distance between project implementers and communities make it difficult to maintain regular contact, particularly as the organization does not own a vehicle and must rely on others for transportation |
| GSAP         | • Difficulty to mobilise membership to produce its Journal. Only one issue published as of December 2005 | • Same as above  
              • Low level of literacy of women slow down processes  
              • Linkage with communities tenuous in the absence of concrete support to offer them |
| MUTF         | • MUTF very much in the driver’s seat in terms of management and decision-making- how the transfer will occur is not clear |                                                                                               |
| TSAEE        | • Difficulty to report in a timely fashion | • Transportation is somewhat of an issue, particularly for women trainers who do not own vehicles. |

**Measuring and Reporting Outcomes**

While the issues mentioned above did not apply to all partners, certain others do. All still face challenges understanding RBM concepts, due in part to the training offered to key individuals, who then had to pass on their knowledge to others; those who received the training may not be the same people tasked with reporting. Nonetheless, progress is being made, and some partner organizations are starting to master RBM.

None of the DCOs had systematically assessed the effect of their project on food security beyond anecdotal evidence among community members, nor did the organizations measure nutritional status to this point. Admittedly, this latter indicator is
difficult to measure with the available project budgets, and would require the collaboration of other agencies, e.g. health ministry to sponsor data collection and analysis.

The issue of attribution is another challenge, given the size of the interventions and the presence of other NGOs in the regions where the SDP projects are implemented. Thus, it would be difficult to determine the projects’ contribution to increases in nutritional status, should they be found in the population. In the end, it may not have been realistic to include this outcome, given the difficulty to measure it.

### 2.3 Usefulness of Results

Usefulness of Results or Relevance was examined as to how the projects met the needs of the communities in developing countries, how well they fit with the development priorities and strategies of the government, as well as with policies and priorities of CIDA.

There is no doubt that the ITPP responds to the needs and development priorities of their government: agriculture is the economic backbone of the three countries visited and poverty reduction in rural areas is a focus for all three governments, as well as CIDA. Presently, none of the African countries visited is self-sufficient in terms of food production. Famine and HIV/AIDS are a stark reality in Malawi.

The Program is also relevant to CIDA with regards to its poverty reduction and agricultural focus, as analysed in Annex VII. The Program contributes to several of CIDA policies, such as using an RBM approach, promoting local ownership and gender equality. The Program also contributes to CIDA’s new orientation set out in the International Policy Statement, as the countries in which the projects/Program is implemented are among Canada’s countries of focus. In fact six of the seven countries in which the Program is implemented fit within that category. The Program also contributes modestly to several of the Millennium goals, as well as CIDA’s policy on Gender Equality and the Environmental Sustainability.

The results achieved in Ghana and Tanzania have a fairly high potential for replication. This would require very careful planning, as up scaling or replication of a sound
initiative can quickly go awry. A graduated approach would ensure that implementers have the skills and abilities to work in a participatory manner with rural communities (see Section 4: Lessons Learned and Best Practices).

### 2.4 Sustainability of Results

The evaluation examined whether results and benefits will likely continue after CIDA’s involvement ends, particularly as to whether there is:

- Sufficient ownership and commitment from overseas partners;
- Institutional capacity and sufficient resources;
- Conducive domestic policies and institutional environment, as well as favorable national and international environments.

**Finding:** A significant number of the results achieved through the ITPP are likely to be sustained so long as the overseas partners strengthen their ability to mobilize resources, institutionalize their methods and approaches, and diversify funding sources.

The evaluation found high degrees of ownership of results from overseas partners, and all are motivated to improve their organizational capacity and approached AIC or its Canadian partners for support. The Program, as designed, does require a high degree of commitment, which all partners have shown; much of the activities are implemented through volunteers. The Program has helped mobilize a core of dedicated individuals who have expended time to building organizational capacity and to work with marginalized communities to improve social and economic conditions; and, in some cases, achieve outstanding results.

In Ghana, both GSAP and GhIH established solid linkages with the MoFA at the district level, with MoFA collaborating by facilitating access to human resources, e.g. veterinarians, extension workers, and other staff. According to overseas partners, the increases in production obtained at the community level motivated MoFA to continue such cooperation in the future and to expand such activities by accessing available funding to train extension workers in horticulture. This positive relationship with MoFA is due to the trust built over time between organizations that intervene in the same sector and/or because of long standing personal connections between the DCO coordinator and MoFA directors at the district or national level. While these
connections are positive enablers during the implementation stage, they do not ensure sustainability in the long term. While the projects allow for training of MoFA staff, there is no systematic approach to effectively transfer and institutionalize the responsive approach, participatory methodology and scientific knowledge to MoFA, which interacts with communities on a regular basis. This needs to occur in order to allow for the expansion of programming to other communities. Understandably, resources play a role in this, as does the ability of MoFA to mobilize and retain staff and its interest to train staff.

Successful methods and approaches also need to be institutionalized within the overseas partners’ organizations beyond those currently involved, so as to widen the knowledge base. Some of the overseas partners have started to document successful practices to share them with their colleagues (e.g. GhIH’s field manual, to be completed, and TSAEE’s vegetable growing templates). However, TSAEE is going beyond dissemination of materials. In a next Program phase, it has concrete plans to offer other TSAEE members the opportunity to gain practical knowledge in the approaches and techniques it has developed. Clearly, any expansion of project activities is dependent on attracting additional resources locally or externally.

Partners also need to think of long-term sustainability, develop exit strategies, and devise plans to strengthen their ability to mobilize and diversify resources. It was noted during interviews that the Costa Rican partners might provide such guidance to others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Strengthening Capacity</th>
<th>Social Development Priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GhIH</td>
<td>• Demand for Journal and knowledge-sharing activities likely to continue. Need to strengthen ability to mobilize resources, including members. May need to streamline the number of committees and commissions for more manageable organisation.</td>
<td>• Communities need further support and encouragement to maintain results; marketing of products remains a challenge and, if not addressed, likely to discourage community members from growing crops that they cannot sell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSAP</td>
<td>• Need to institutionalize methodologies and approach. Need to strengthen ability to mobilize resources, including members.</td>
<td>• Results in communities will be sustained with follow up from GSAP and MoFA. New activities are being planned, which will require further investments. Need to strengthen linkages with NGOs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.5 Cost Effectiveness and Resource Utilization

Considering the results achieved (see Section 2.1) and that much of the activities are carried out on a volunteer basis with limited budgets for each of the projects, the Program is cost effective and has been a good investment for CIDA. There was ample evidence that a lot of time and efforts have been devoted to achieve results in both components of the Program.

By all accounts, the Canadian partners have provided valuable expertise to overseas partners. Overseas partners have valued the contribution of their counterparts and Program staff in terms of the support they offered. Most often the DCOs mentioned the help they received in terms of project, planning, implementation (e.g. solving problems) and reporting. The lectures and sharing of knowledge were also much appreciated.

Another contributing factor to the achievements of results at the project and Program level has been the paid staff and volunteers that managed and implemented the projects, competent and dedicated individuals, willing to share their knowledge and expertise.

2.6 Partnerships

The evaluation examined whether there was:
- local ownership of the processes, methods and results
- new partnerships fostered to achieve results
- shared responsibility for the achievement of results

Overseas Partners

Overall, overseas partners have developed and maintained linkages with key organizations such as research institutes, university departments, health clinics and ministries of agriculture to facilitate the implementation of their project and increase
impact. For instance, GSAP, GhIH, TSAEE established and maintain linkages with their respective Ministry of Agriculture, and GSAP and TSAE developed as international linkages. Surprisingly, there has not been closer collaboration between GhIH and GSAP given their complementary mandates; that they have intervened in the Upper West region of Ghana; and, that they both operate from Tamale for the SDP component of their project. A coordinated approach between these organizations would likely increase their impact at the community level. A coordinated approach may also be useful at the policy level.

**Canadian and Overseas Partners**

Overall, the collaboration between Canadian and overseas partners has been fruitful. The Canadian partners have contributed to the organizational development of their counterpart – e.g. through support in planning, implementation and reporting, and shared their knowledge on scientific advances in their respective fields. This has been done mainly through professional exchanges, as well as lecturing during visits to the DCO and by facilitating linkages between Canadian and developing country scientists, as well as other development actors such as NGOs.

At first glance, MUTF and ASAM are odd bedfellows: each has a different mandate. Nonetheless, it is commendable that MUTF has taken on the creation of ASAM and has demonstrated its commitment to support its development, given that it does not fit with its stated mandate. Despite the progress made to date and MUTF’s obvious commitment, challenges may arise in the future with regards to their relationship with BCIA and AIC. As ASAM capacity increases, it should take on the roles and responsibilities now handled by MUTF. How this transition will occur will have to be carefully planned and monitored (see Recommendations, Section 3).

AIC’s role as a partner in the Program has been a balancing act. On the one hand, AIC had to maintain a certain distance to not usurp the role of the Canadian partners as the primary counterparts of the DCOS; on the other, it had to be closely involved as the entity accountable to CIDA. This appears to have worked reasonably well so far.
In terms of accountability and shared responsibility for results, AIC has developed tools in addition to building a common understanding about the program through the Program Logic Framework. These tools include a three-party agreement, which outlines the roles and responsibilities of each partners and sign offs by each partner and AIC, plus an orientation manual that provides guidelines to all partners on such project management issues as planning, proposal writing, RBM, gender and reporting.

### Exhibit 2.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizations</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| GhiH         | • Has developed a solid relationship with CIHS  
               • Has developed solid relationship with Water Management Committees in four communities  
               • Has developed a collaborative relationship with MoFA  
               • Relationship with SARI is still a challenge |
| GSAP         | • Has developed a solid relationship with CSAS  
               • Has developed a collaborative relationship with MoFA  
               • Collaborates with research institutes  
               • Has developed international linkages with NGOS and private sector enterprises |
| MUTF         | • Has initiated linkage with TSAEE  
               • Relationship with BCIA and ASAM needs to be clarified |
| TSAEE        | • Despite the dissolution of the CSE, a core number of members have maintained the partnership with TSAEE though a committee. The status of this committee needs to be clarified, particularly in terms of its accountability to AIC. |

### 2.7 Appropriate Design

As noted in Section 2.1, Program activities have helped produce meaningful results in all outcome areas. It has undoubtedly contributed to the renewal and development of agricultural organizations in the South that have played a key role both in improving agricultural production in targeted communities and influencing agriculture policy in their respective countries.

The fact that there was no systematic organizational diagnostic performed at the onset of the capacity building interventions, makes it difficult for partners to assess progress over time. The Evaluation in 2000 had also noted this shortcoming and recommended that diagnostic be done by the Southern partner organizations. Unfortunately, it is one
of the few recommendations not addressed during this phase of the Program.

As AIC has observed, there is overlap between the two components of the Program. This can create some confusion in terms of reporting, particularly as the Strengthening Capacity component includes building the DCOs’ capacity in delivering agricultural programming at the community level.

In general projects correspond and link to Program goals and objectives. As noted earlier, the SDP component in Malawi appears at odds with the Program with respect to anticipated results in that area. To date, the primary beneficiary of the studies produced clearly has been Mzuzu University, rather than the communities. Expecting otherwise would have been unreasonable, given the mandate of the MUTF and the absence of an organizational entity such as ASAM to implement agricultural programming at the community level.

The socio-economic, soil and land use studies can be useful for future community programming. As mentioned, the MUFT appears ready to collaborate with ASAM on offering programming to local communities. Indeed, the focus of a future phase of the Program’s SDP component in Malawi should focus on improving the socio-economic conditions of the local communities. However, ASAM needs to further build its organizational capacity before embarking on too ambitious programming at the community level (see Section 3: Recommendations).

### 2.8 Informed and Timely Action

The evaluation examined whether the Program put in place effective monitoring and risk management systems to anticipate change and respond adequately. It also reviewed the extent to which AIC had addressed the recommendations of the 2000 Evaluation.

**Finding:** The Program has been managed diligently and transparently and most issues raised by the previous evaluation have been addressed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples of Steps Taken to Address Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Revised selection criteria and posted on website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure that projects are clearly linked with goals and strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Revised planning and reporting tools to reflect RBM approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Revised letter of agreement to clearly define RBM roles and responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sharing lessons learned at International Partners meetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Those responsible for the Program have put in place a number of systems and processes to support effective and efficient planning, management, monitoring and reporting. By the time the new phase was approved in 2001, AIC had addressed almost all the management issues raised in the previous evaluation. The only exception is implementing organizational diagnoses for overseas partners, which remains an issue. In addition AIC has offered at least three training sessions on RBM between 2001 and 2004.

Interviews and the document review suggest a high degree of transparency and good communication between CIDA headquarters and AIC program staff. They share information about threats, challenges and opportunities, identify how these might affect the Program and suggest ways for improvements.

While the outcome of the partnership between BCIA and MUTF may turn out to be very beneficial for Malawi with the creation of an entity like ASAM, there was and is a significant degree of risk remains, which should be handled with care. As noted elsewhere, the relationship between BCIA, MUTF, ASAM and AIC, and the roles and responsibilities should be clarified as soon as possible to minimize risks.
3.0 Recommendations

Based on our analysis, our recommendations to CIDA and AIC are as follows:

1. AIC and its partners should carefully manage the risks involved in supporting a new organization, such as the Agriculture Scientists Association of Malawi (ASAM). This would involve but not limited to:
   a. Clarifying the relationship between BCIA, MUTF and ASAM;
   b. Doing an organizational assessment (several self-assessment tools exist) to assess the needs of the Association and better target the intervention;
   c. Establishing specific targets;
   d. Ensuring regular monitoring by the Canadian partner and/or AIC. Consideration should be given to hiring a local consultant to monitor progress and provide technical assistance on organizational development as needed;
   e. Ensuring and demonstrating that the project will be jointly managed by MUTF and ASAM from the beginning, although the level of responsibility may vary;
   f. Providing on-going targeted organizational development support by the Canadian partner and/or a Malawian-based organization, to build the management capacity of ASAM and allow full transfer of coordination responsibility to ASAM by the end of an agreed upon transition period;
   g. Establishing a modest SDP component on a pilot basis while ASAM strengthens its organizational capacity. This pilot phase could be used to plan for a more elaborate intervention in the remaining years of the Program. ASAM should perform an analysis of the combined effect of HIV/AIDS and the drought on communities and agriculture in Malawi to date and the likely impact in the future.
   h. MUTF/ASAM should demonstrate that the planned SDP activities would focus directly and benefit the farming families of the Project Area, including women.

2. Continue strengthening RBM, including strengthening reporting on change rather than activities. Project and Program level reporting could also benefit by developing indicators and targets.
3. Use the professional exchange visit as an opportunity to monitor project and Program results more formally, through the development of a monitoring template, based on the Program planned outcomes and outputs.

4. Overseas partners should carry out an organizational diagnostic (self-assessment) to better target their organizational capacity building efforts. This could serve as a baseline for future interventions and facilitate tracking of progress, particularly if clear targets are set. See Annex IX for examples of available self-assessment tools.

5. Continue strengthening partners’ capacity to address and assess gender equality. Overseas partners should explore linkages with national/local women’s organizations or gender experts in order to receive training and/or advice on gender equality (training or advisory services should be built in the project’s budget). Overseas partners should also explore the availability of funding for gender-based analysis and training on gender equality in their country, e.g. multi-donor gender fund in Malawi.

6. Offer more opportunities for South-South professional exchanges and to encourage sharing of knowledge; closer links and knowledge sharing between GSAP and GhIH should be strongly encouraged. Holding the IPMs in the South if possible is another means to facilitate South-South knowledge sharing and capacity building. Materials produced by the partners could also be shared.

7. Devise a clear exit strategy and build overseas partners capacity in mobilization / diversification of resources with the support of their Canadian partner to ensure long-term financial sustainability.
4.0 Lessons Learned and Best Practices

This section reflects upon lessons learned and best practices that could be useful for a future phase of the Program or others who wish to implement similar initiatives.

- When working with communities, responsive approaches and participatory methodologies that recognize and respect local knowledge, are effective means to build trust and foster local ownership. Responding in a timely fashion to community needs and being humble also fosters trust.

- Multidisciplinary and inter-institutional collaboration is crucial to ensure sustainability and replication of results, as are strategic linkages with institutions that have day-to-day interactions with communities. Well-trained extension workers are particularly well placed to support and encourage farmers and spread innovative practices.

- Making use of the skills acquired by community members through a peer training approach can be an effective way to increase self-esteem, build local capacity, promote local ownership, help spread agriculture innovations and ensure long-term sustainability of results, provided that they are well supported.

- Working within existing structures with respect is more effective than trying to create new ones.

- Involving and mentoring young people in an organization is an effective way to build capacity and long-term sustainability.
Annex I – Evaluation Terms of Reference

MID-TERM EVALUATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 CONTEXT
   1.1 Evaluation process
   1.2 AIC
   1.3 Partnership with CIDA
   1.4 Reasons for evaluation
   1.5 Evaluation clients

2.0 NATURE AND SCOPE OF PROPOSED EVALUATION
   2.1 General objective
   2.2 Specific objectives and suggested approach
   2.3 Sources of information
   2.4 Information gathering techniques

3.0 MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE, ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES
   3.1 Coordinating committee
   3.11 Responsibilities of coordinating committee
   3.2 Role and responsibilities of CIDA
   3.3 Role and responsibilities of AIC
   3.4 Role and responsibilities of evaluators

4.0 QUALIFICATIONS OF EVALUATORS

5.0 DELIVERABLES
   5.1 Work plan
   5.2 Progress reports and preliminary report
   5.3 Final report

6.0 SUGGESTED TIMELINE

7.0 EVALUATION COSTS

ANNEX A Evaluation questions
ANNEX B Work plan (model)
ANNEX C Report (model)
1.0 CONTEXT

1.1 Evaluation process
This evaluation forms part of a normal performance monitoring cycle, put in place by Canadian Partnership Branch (CPB), specifically the Voluntary Sector Programs Directorate. The Directorate is responsible for ensuring that its partners execute funded programs and projects efficiently and effectively.

Evaluation is a pillar of the monitoring system. Evaluation makes it possible to obtain, from an independent source, an assessment of how partners perform and help to achieve results targeted by CPB and each of its divisions.

1.2 Agricultural Institute of Canada (AIC)
The Agricultural Institute of Canada (AIC) has historically united the professional and scientific components of Canadian agriculture in a national federation of nine provincial institutes of agrologists and eight agriculture-related scientific societies. In 2005 AIC changed to a membership organization on the basis of individual and corporate subscriptions, as well as the continued participation of the provincial institutes and scientific societies. For over eighty years, AIC has responded to the needs of its members in serving the agricultural community, playing a central role as a source of credible information and comment for the Canadian agriculture and agri-food sector. The AIC is a not for profit institution governed by a 10-member Board of Directors.

1.3 Partnership with CIDA
The AIC has been a partner of CIDA through the Canadian Partnership Branch since 1989 and currently works in six countries in Africa, Central America and Asia. The organization does not receive bilateral funding at present. The last institutional evaluation (2000) demonstrated that the organization has been successful in achieving results at the micro, meso and macro levels. The AIC has developed, or supported the development of technologies that enhance agricultural productivity and has succeeded in raising the profile of its partner organizations. At the macro level, all the AIC partners are closely linked to government bodies, and often receive direct support from them.

1.4 Purpose of evaluation
This evaluation forms part of the normal performance monitoring cycle put in place by CPB. AIC’s last institutional evaluation was undertaken in April 2000. This evaluation will first assess progress in applying the assessment’s recommendations, and then examine the development results as per the program’s Results-Based Management Framework (RBM). The evaluation will focus on evaluating the program fund and the results achieved, and not so much the organization’s institutional aspect (aside from the follow-up on the recommendations of the previous evaluation).

1.5 Evaluation clients
For the purpose of the exercise, the evaluation’s main and immediate client will be CPB’s Voluntary Sector Programs Directorate. Agricultural Institute of Canada (AIC) will be deemed an indirect client of the proposed evaluation.

2.0 NATURE AND SCOPE OF PROPOSED EVALUATION

2.1 General objective
As mentioned previously, AIC’s last institutional assessment was undertaken in April 2000 at CPB’s request. Generally speaking, the evaluator recognized the professionalism of the organization’s staff, the quality and sustainability of its activities, and its sound management practices.

One of the reasons for this evaluation is to monitor the performance and sustainability of the results achieved for both the “Strengthening Capacity” and “Social Development Priorities” components that make up AIC’s “International Twinning Partnership Program”.

2.2 Specific objectives and suggested approach
I. For the most accurate possible reading of AIC’s progress since the last institutional evaluation, the evaluators must systematically re-examine the conclusions and recommendations made and accepted by both parties in the previous exercise. The evaluators must verify the nature, substance and effectiveness of measures and solutions implemented to follow up the recommendations.

To this end, the evaluators must thus:
1. List the conclusions and recommendations made, discussed and adopted by the parties in the last institutional assessment sponsored by CPB (April 2000).
2. Identify the practical measures and action taken to follow up these conclusions and recommendations.
3. Determine whether the measures taken are consistent with the recommendations made and/or relevant to the situation to be improved.

II. As for specifically reviewing the RBM Framework, and based on the criteria defined, the evaluators must determine how well AIC meets and/or contributes to the following various types of criteria:
1. Achievement of results
2. Cost-effectiveness
3. Usefulness of results
4. Sustainability of results
5. Partnership
6. Suitable design
7. Effectiveness and use of resources
8. Informed and timely action
Annex A contains a list of evaluation questions for each type of criteria.

In reviewing the RBM framework, a field mission - ideally Africa or Asia - will allow the evaluators to gather the information needed for a field evaluation of development results generated by implementing the Results Based Framework.

2.3 Sources of information
For the purposes of the evaluation, the selected evaluators will have access to all documentation or sources of information they deem appropriate and necessary to carry out their research and analysis mandate. To this end, the partners (CIDA and AIC) will make it their duty to support the evaluators by facilitating access to their respective documentary sources. AIC must especially make available to the evaluators, at their request, all documents developed by the organization regarding corporate policies/procedures, case studies, management/diagnostic tools, etc. AIC must also ensure the availability of key staff at Headquarters and in the field. Where appropriate, AIC must help to arrange any necessary meetings or discussions with institutional partners. Similarly, the Voluntary Sector Programs Directorate agrees to provide all documents deemed useful to the progress of the work. The Directorate also agrees to contribute staff and resources (including financial resources) that the exercise requires.

2.4 Information gathering techniques
The following methods are also among the information gathering techniques that can be used in this exercise:

- Literature/statistical/financial review
- Face-to-face meetings
- Telephone interviews
- Focus groups
- Field mission

3.0 MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE, ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

3.1 Coordinating committee
To ensure better coordination of the process, greater transparency and a constructive joint approach to the proposed exercise, a select committee will supervise the evaluation. The select committee will comprise a CIDA representative and an AIC representative. Specifically, these representatives will be AIC’s Program Officers for the International Program and the CIDA Program Officer of AIC. Where necessary, with the prior consent of the committee members, the committee may include other representatives of both organizations.

3.1.1 Responsibilities of coordinating committee
The committee, or its members, will have the following main responsibilities:

- to coordinate all aspects of the evaluation process for the committee;
• to validate the evaluation mandate, especially its scope, objectives, proposed management structure, suggested timeline, and the roles and responsibilities of the various stakeholders;
• to oversee the selection of the evaluators;
• to approve the work plan submitted by consultants (especially the proposed research methodology, the information gathering techniques used and the suggested target dates);
• to identify projects to be evaluated in the field;
• to act as resource persons for the evaluators (to facilitate access to documentation, to plan travel itineraries or interviews in Canada or in the field, and so on);
• to review and comment on analyses and reports submitted by the evaluators (that is, progress reports, preliminary reports and the final report);
• to review and approve the action plan following up on the recommendations made in the final report.

It is also up to the committee to resolve, by consensus and with the selected evaluator(s), any procedural or methodological problem that may arise in the evaluation process.

3.2 Role and responsibilities of CIDA
In this exercise, CIDA (or its representative) has the following responsibilities:
• to set the evaluation process in motion;
• to draft the evaluation’s terms of reference;
• to launch and coordinate the evaluator selection and hiring process;
• to take part in meetings of the coordinating committee as required;
• to act as the main contact person for the selected evaluator(s);
• to facilitate access to CIDA documentation and staff.

3.3 Role and responsibilities of AIC
In the proposed exercise, AIC (and the organization’s staff as a whole) will play the following role:
• to help to carry out the work smoothly, by facilitating access to any documentation (or any person) deemed relevant to the exercise;
• to take part in meetings of the coordinating committee as required;
• to carry out the recommendations made in the final evaluation report, by developing and implementing an action plan. The coordinating committee will review and approve this action plan beforehand.

3.4 Role and responsibilities of the evaluator(s)
Under the coordinating committee’s supervision, the evaluator will perform these duties:
• develop a work plan and budget (inclusive of all taxes) to carry out the evaluation (see section 5.1);
• carry out the evaluation (research, analyze and outline conclusions / recommendations);
• outline preliminary findings (see section 5.2);
• submit a final report (see section 5.3).
The evaluators must maintain ongoing communication with coordinating committee members throughout the evaluation process.

4.0 QUALIFICATIONS OF EVALUATORS

- Experience in conducting and carrying out evaluations (knowledge of agriculture-related development issues and work in Africa would be preferential).
- Demonstrated analytical and methodological capabilities.
- Experience in gathering data (information) and conducting individual/group interviews.
- Practical knowledge of issues pertaining to international development and the work of organizations in this field.
- Excellent ability to speak and write English clearly and concisely.
- Knowledge of Canadian foreign policy, the general characteristics of official development assistance, the Policy Statement on Strengthening Aid Effectiveness, and Key Agency results.
- Excellent understanding of CIDA’s priorities and of the Canadian Partnership Branch funding mechanism.
- Knowledge and experience in evaluating management systems for organizations similar in nature and scope to the organization evaluated. The evaluators must also be able to adapt this ability, in specific instances, to AIC field partners to be reviewed in this exercise.

5.0 DELIVERABLES

5.1 Work plan
The selected evaluator(s) must submit a work plan to coordinating committee members for approval before evaluation work starts. This work plan must also outline the proposed evaluation methods, planned timeline and deliverables, resource allocation and timing of budgetary expenditures (inclusive of all taxes). (See paragraph 7.0, Evaluation Cost.) A sample work plan may be found in Annex B.

5.2 Progress reports and preliminary report
A preliminary report will be submitted to coordinating committee members for review and discussion before tabling the final report. This report should outline the analysis done, its general conclusions and the general recommendations to be made in the final report. To avoid last-minute “surprises”, and to help establish and maintain ongoing dialogue between committee members and the evaluator(s), the latter should consider writing brief progress reports. These reports would indicate the status of the work and the study’s key findings. These summaries could be outlined in point form, showing only key items that are essential for analytical purposes and/or critical in conducting the evaluation.

5.3 Final report
A final report must be submitted to coordinating committee members when the exercise is completed. The final report should not contain any item that is totally new or significantly
differs from the content of the preliminary report. The final report must also outline the analysis, its general and specific conclusions, and appropriate recommendations. The report should be no more than 25 pages long. Annex C contains an example of the organization of the final report.

The CIDA representative will receive a hard-copy version and an electronic version (Word and Word Pro compatible) of the final report.

### 6.0 SUGGESTED TIMELINE

The timeline below aims mainly to define the key phases in carrying out the suggested evaluation. The start and end periods for activities thus are not definitive. This allows greater flexibility in carrying out the evaluation mandate. The Coordinating Committee will then revise and finalize the timeline to reflect the priorities and availability of all stakeholders.

As stated in paragraph 5.1 of this document, the selected evaluator(s) must specify in the work plan when activities are to start and end, within the guidelines below. Once validated by the coordinating committee, the timeline (and the work plan that includes it) will constitute the reference document used for evaluation purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Develop evaluation mandate (final version)</td>
<td>July 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hire consultant</td>
<td>End of July</td>
<td>Mid-Aug. 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Carry out evaluation</td>
<td>End of August</td>
<td>Mid-Nov. 2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.0 EVALUATION COST

The evaluator(s) selected to carry out the evaluation will submit a detailed budget to CIDA. The budget will indicate the professional fees required, which must include all taxes. It will also estimate the number of days and the cost for each proposed evaluation activity.
## Annex II – Protocols and Interview Guides

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Assessment Criteria/Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Developmental Results</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **A. Effectiveness & Sustainability** | A1. To what extent have overseas partners organizations been strengthened? | i) Evidence of capacity to implement activities/projects  
ii) Evidence of ability to influence agricultural policy  
ii) Degree of organizational visibility |
| | A2. To what extent has the living conditions and the health of targeted population improved? | i) Degree of adoption of agricultural innovation  
ii) Change in income  
ii) Level of improvement in food security  
ii) Level of improvement in nutritional status |
| | A3. How sustainable are the results of the intervention in term of:  
• Capacity Strengthening?  
• Social Development Priorities? | i) # of active members  
ii) # and types of activities per year  
iii) Level of financial sustainability  
iv) # of families with increased income  
v) # of women with increased income  
vii) Change in women’s perception of own status |
| | A4. What impact has the intervention had on gender equality? | i) level of change in participation in decision-making  
ii) level of change in access to resources |
| | A5. How environmentally sustainable are the interventions? | i) # of environmentally friendly agricultural practices adopted |
| **B. Relevance** | B1. Has the Program been relevant in terms of the needs of the population and government priorities? | i) level of poverty  
ii) level of congruence between outcomes and government priorities |
| **C. Partnership** | C1. To what extent the partnership has fostered ownership of the process and results by overseas partners? | i) Evidence of decision-making at local level  
ii) Level of responsiveness of Canadian partners |
| **D. Appropriateness of Design** | D1. Is the project design of the project adequate to achieve identified outputs and outcomes? | i) Adequacy of project components  
ii) Interaction between project components  
ii) Evidence of institutional capacity / commitment to achieve expected results |
| **E. Cost-effectiveness** | F1. Could the project have achieved the same or higher quality of outputs and impacts at a lower cost? | i) Relationship between quantity of inputs and quantity and quality of outputs/outcomes |
## Key Informant Interview Guide – Canadian Partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Partnership</strong></th>
<th>1. How was your local partner selected?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. How was the project selected?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. To what extent does local partner provide leadership for the project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results – CB</strong></td>
<td>4. To what extent have the capacity building results been achieved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results – SDP</strong></td>
<td>5. To what extent has the project contributed to SDPs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengths</strong></td>
<td>6. What are the major strengths and factors?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weaknesses</strong></td>
<td>7. What are the weaknesses and factors?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong></td>
<td>8. To what extent do you think the project results will be sustainable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Best Practices</strong></td>
<td>9. To what extent has the project generated best practices?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engaging Canadians</strong></td>
<td>10. To what extent has your involvement in this project contributed to development education?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Management</strong></td>
<td>11. To what extent do you have timely and accurate information for monitoring and reporting and anticipating challenges?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Other Issues or Comments?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Informant Interview Guide – Overseas Partners

**Partnership**

1. Who initiated the partnership? (Probe for length of relationship, scope of the organization (local, regional, national), use of institutional assessments)
2. How was the project selected?
3. To what extent has your organization been involved in the project’s planning? (Please describe the involvement and any challenges to your involvement.)
4. To what extent does the project address local needs and national development priorities? How was this achieved?
5. To what extent did the project draw on lessons learned from previous projects?
6. To what extent did it allow for demonstration of new agricultural technologies?
7. Has the support from your Canadian partner been adequate? How could it be improved, if possible?
8. Have the project resources been adequate? (Challenges.)
9. To what extent do you feel ownership of the project?
10. To what extent have the project beneficiaries been actively involved in all phases of the project? Specifically, what has been the involvement of women? Youth?

**Results – CB**

11. To what extent have the capacity building results been achieved? Specifically, to what extent has the project (Please provide examples)
12. Resulted in greater, more involved and better-trained members for your organization?
13. Strengthened your organization? (Probe for clarified mandate, internal governance structure that reflects members’ interests and concerns, allowing it to better enable them to carry out its mandate, sustainability)
14. Increased the visibility and engagement of your organization and members?
15. Strengthened your ability to influence its policy and development environment?
16. What remains to be done?

**Results – SDPs**

17. To what extent has the project contributed to: (specifically for the impact on women and youth)
18. Improved household food security?
19. Agricultural Innovation?
20. Improved nutritional status for vulnerable groups?
21. Poverty reduction?
22. How have you and/or your partner been able to measure any changes?

**Gender**

23. To what extent have you been successful in promoting gender
equality? What challenges have you experienced? How have you sought to overcome them?

**Strengths**

24. What have been the project’s major successes?
25. What are the factors that contribute to the successes of the project?

**Weaknesses**

26. What have been the project’s major challenges?
27. What factors contribute to the challenges of the project? What have you done to overcome them? What, if any, are the remaining challenges/barriers to the project achieving its expected results?

**Sustainability**

28. To what extent do you think the project results will be sustainable when the project ends? What factors will contribute to, or detract from, the sustainability of the results? (Probe for exit strategies, local ownership, availability of resources)

**Best Practices**

29. To what extent has the project generated best practices? To what extent would the project be replicable? Under which conditions?

**Development**

30. Have you been involved in activities designed to increase the Canadian public’s awareness of your project and AIC’s role in contributing to development? How has this been achieved?

**Education**

31. How have you reflected CIDA’s contribution to this project?

**Project management**

32. Have there been challenges in terms of providing timely and accurate information for monitoring and reporting on the project?
33. Have experienced difficulties in anticipating challenges?
34. What has been your role and that of your Canadian partner in monitoring and reporting?
35. Are the reporting mechanisms appropriate?
36. Do you have adequate information/guidance for reporting?
37. To what extent have you and/or your Canadian partner organization adopted a results-based management approach?
38. What was required to make this happen?
39. What have been the challenges of Using RBM?
## Annex III - People Interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Category / Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Agricultural Institute of Canada</td>
<td>International Program Officer</td>
<td>Tom Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>International Program Officer</td>
<td>Brenda Millar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>International Program Officer</td>
<td>Joan Anne Nolan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canadian Society of Animal Science (CSAS)</td>
<td>Canadian Project Coordinator</td>
<td>Dr John Baah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canadian Society of Horticulture Science (CSHS)</td>
<td>Canadian Project Coordinator</td>
<td>Dinah Ceplis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>British Columbia Institute of Agrologists (BCIA)</td>
<td>Canadian Project Coordinator</td>
<td>Don Cameron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Ministry of Food and Agriculture (MoFA)</td>
<td>District Director for Bole</td>
<td>Dr Kwame Oppong-Anane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>District Director for West Mamprusi</td>
<td>Dr N. Karbo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GSAP</td>
<td>Project Coordinator, President of GSAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project Assistant Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Five Members of GSAP’s Executive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approximately 60 women from three communities in West Mamprusi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approximately 40 women from three communities near Bole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GhIH</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Dr. Gladys Timbo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Member of Project Management Team</td>
<td>Patrick Kumah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Member of Project Implementation Team</td>
<td>Gustav Mahunu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Member of Project Implementation Team</td>
<td>Halim Abdul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approximately 40 community members from Karni and Busa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two extension workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>ASAM</td>
<td>Eight Members of the Executive Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MUTF</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Ron Mkomba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project Coordinator</td>
<td>Teddy Phiri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Four community members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>MATI-U</td>
<td>Chair of TSAEE Project Advisory Board</td>
<td>Patricia Makwaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TSAEE</td>
<td>Project Coordinator</td>
<td>Beny Mwenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Approximately 15 members of TSAEE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Members of six groups totalling approximately 75 people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Annex IV - Documents Reviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td>International Policy Statement – A Role of Pride and Influence in the World: Development, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex V – Program Logic Framework

While each of the projects that make up the ITPP has its own Logic Framework, the overall Program results are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International Twinning Partnership Program</th>
<th>Expected Outputs</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
<th>Expected Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program partners demonstrate increased skills, knowledge and capacity to:</td>
<td>Plan, deliver and monitor relevant and appropriate agricultural programs</td>
<td>Stronger partner organizations with improved governance, more recognition nationally, increased membership with more women and youth</td>
<td>Stronger agricultural institutions in developing countries contribute to economic and social development at the local, regional and/or national levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manage human resources</td>
<td>Program partners have increased capacity to plan, develop and manage sustainable programs that respond to community needs and/or national development priorities</td>
<td>Improved gender equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manage financial resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expand their networks and linkages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide opportunities for women and youth to participate in, and benefit from,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agricultural programming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure environmental sustainability in programming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influence national agricultural policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expand income generating and livelihood opportunities in rural areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program participants have increased knowledge and skills related to international</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased awareness and understanding of international development among AIC partner organizations’ members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased and improved international connections among agricultural professionals and associations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partner organizations have the capacity to contribute to agricultural innovations that improve production and household food security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Annex VI - Relevance to CIDA Policies and Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIDA Policy/ Priority</th>
<th>Selected CIDA Priorities, Strategies and Approaches</th>
<th>Comments on AIC Relevance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Canada International Policy Statement - A Role and Pride and Influence in The World: Development (2005) | **Millennium Development Goals and Selected Targets**  
- Halving extreme poverty and hunger  
- Achieving universal primary education  
- Promoting gender equality  
- Reducing under-five mortality by two-thirds  
- Reducing maternal mortality by three-quarters  
- Reversing the spread of HIV/AIDS, malaria and TB  
- Ensuring Environmental sustainability  
- Developing global partnerships for development, with targets for aid | The Program is relevant as it addresses a number of issues related to the Millennium Goals. In a modest way, it contributes to reducing poverty and hunger, reducing the spread of HIV/AIDS, promoting gender equality, and ensuring environmental sustainability. Indirectly, it also may also contribute to reducing child and maternal mortality. |
| Greater Sectoral Focus  
- Promoting good governance  
- Improving health outcomes  
- Strengthening Basic Education  
- Supporting Private Sector Development  
- Advancing environmental sustainability  
- Ensuring gender equality | | The ITPP also contributes modestly to four of the five sector of focus in the new Policy Statement: good governance - by building the capacity of civil society organizations; health through increased food security; some of its projects support micro-enterprises in the agricultural sector; and gender equality is a cross-cutting theme. |
| Greater Country Concentration  
Africa: Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Niger, Rwanda, Senegal, Tanzania, Zambia  
Asia: Bangladesh, Cambodia, Indonesia, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Vietnam  
Americas: Bolivia, Guyana, Honduras, Nicaragua  
Europe: Ukraine | | Six of AIC seven overseas partners are in CIDA’s countries of focus and its projects in Africa are all in countries of focus (Ghana, Malawi, Tanzania). This supports CIDA’s efforts to have a greater impact. |
| Canada Making a Difference in the World: A Policy Statement on Strengthening Aid Effectiveness, 2002 | **Guiding Principles:**  
- Local Ownership  
- Improved donor coordination  
- Results-based approach | The projects reviewed in Ghana, Malawi and Tanzania show high degree of local ownership – programming is theirs and Canadian partners respond to their needs. The Program has contributed to increased use of results-based management among overseas and Canadian |
## CIDA Policy/ Priority | Selected CIDA Priorities, Strategies and Approaches | Comments on AIC Relevance
--- | --- | ---
CIDA’s Policy on Gender Equality (1999) | Ensure sustainable development through the achievement of equality between women and men. Objectives are to:  
- Advance women's equal participation with men as decision-makers in shaping the sustainable development of their societies  
- Support women and girls in the realization of their full human rights  
- Reduce gender inequalities in access to and control over the resources and benefits of development. | While gender equality is not a primary focus of the Program, it supports gender equality through increased access to resources and benefits of development efforts. It also seeks to support women’s equal participation in decision-making. |
CPB Mission | To support CIDA’s mandate and objectives through partnerships with civil society and the private sector in Canada and in host countries. | The Program supports the strengthening of civil society in developing countries through partnership with like-minded organizations in Canada. |
## Annex VII - Project Profiles

### Integrated Crop and Livestock Production in Northern Ghana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Project Description</th>
<th>Project Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The project aims at increasing the organizational capacity of GSAP to be an effective</td>
<td><strong>Country</strong>: Ghana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor in agriculture in Ghana and to improve food security through increasing crop</td>
<td><strong>Ghanaian Partner</strong>: Ghanaian Society of Animal Production (GSAP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(sheanut) and livestock (poultry and small ruminants) production in an integrated</td>
<td><strong>Canadian Partner</strong>: Canadian Society of Animal Science (CSAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fashion. The target population is women in several communities in Northern Ghana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Upper West Region and West Mamprusi).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Institutional Factors

GSAP has existed for several years but has not been very active. Its Executive is located in Accra in the South while the SDP Component takes place in the North. However, there is a close relationship between the Northern based scientists who are implementing the SDP component and those in the South more concerned with organizational development and activities related to the management of the Society.

### 3. Achievement of Results

#### Strengthening Capacity

GSAP has increased its management capacity as evidenced by its ability to influence on agriculture policy at national level, its capacity to hold AGMs on a regular basis and publish proceedings, meeting the needs of members though knowledge sharing of scientific advances. It has gained national recognition through media coverage of its activities and has been participating in policy making, e.g. sitting on the National Livestock Development Policy Committee. GSAP has developed international linkages within region and in Canada. Its members participate the generation of knowledge through research, and mentoring students.

#### Challenges

To date, GSAP has only been able to produce one issue of its Journal. Mobilizing volunteers to review articles has been difficult and until recently papers received have not always been of high quality.

#### Social Development Priorities

There is evidence of adoption and of agricultural innovations by targeted women and socio-economic and health benefits for the women and their families. There is also anecdotal evidence of spill over effect – i.e. actual effect in the communities has not been measured. Women feel proud of their achievements, particularly acquiring protective gear for sheanut collection and helping save lives by managing anti-snakebite serum. Project has contributed modestly to poverty reduction among participants.

The project has generated new knowledge through applied research with the collaboration of students and communities – e.g. testing new seed by product of sheanuts to feed livestock.

#### Challenges

The low literacy level of women slows down the transfer of knowledge process.
Food security increases have not been measured systematically.
Increased demand from additional women for support and from existing women’s group – e.g. for micro-credit.
The distance to travel to some of the communities combined with lack of transportation has made it strenuous for the project implementers to maintain a regular contact with the communities.

### 4. Usefulness of Results

#### Strengthening Capacity

With increased visibility and management capacity, GSAP can play a more effective role in agriculture policy and programming at local and national level. Evidence of its increased influence includes being tasked by the Minister Food and Agriculture to prepare a proposal for a national feedlot plan. A member of GSAP sits on CIDA’s FARMER project advisory committee.

#### Social Development Priorities

The project responds to the needs of the targeted women. Traditionally, women have been left out of agriculture extension, which focused on cash crops, men’s domain. Women are reporting increased incomes through adoption innovations in livestock production and sheanut collection. They also report lives saved due to the protective gear acquired through a revolving fund and anti-snake bite serum, provided by the project, the distribution of which they manage through the health clinic.
## Integrated Crop and Livestock Production in Northern Ghana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Sustainability of Results</th>
<th>Social Development Priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengthened Capacity</strong></td>
<td>While the women involved reported that they have adopted the practices that GSAP has taught them and will continue to do so, they will need some encouragement to maintain their resolve. As needs are addressed, more emerge, e.g. acquiring sheanut processing machines, micro finance for petty trade, amongst others. They still lack the confidence to get these things without outside help. At this point, GSAP is still the primary mobilizer to get things done. Illiteracy may be an important factor in their lack of self-confidence. Other organizations, such as MoFA and local NGOs, will need to play a more active role in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSAP is organizationally stronger with appropriate structures and processes in place. It has given some thought to its longer-term financial sustainability and discussed with members such measures as increasing membership fees and charging more to publish and purchase its Journal or to participate in conferences. However, it is unlikely this alone will be sufficient to sustain GSAP financially. It needs to strengthen its capacity to mobilize resources and diversify its funding source.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Partnerships</th>
<th>GSAP has maintained a fruitful partnership with CSAS in Canada. Professional exchanges have been effective for knowledge sharing – support for planning, implementation and reporting, as well as lecturing while visiting Ghana and facilitating connections between Canadian and Ghanaian scientists.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GSAP has developed strategic linkages with MoFA (at the national and local level) and other players at the local level, e.g. research institutes, health clinics to achieve results.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSAP and GhIH could benefit from collaborating more closely with one another, as their mandates are complementary and they both offer programming in the same area of Ghana.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Resource Utilization</th>
<th>The project managers have used resources wisely, and through volunteering and collaborating with the Ministry of Food and Agriculture among others, have been able to achieve greater results than would have been otherwise possible with the modest budget.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Informed and Timely Action</th>
<th>GSAP has been effective in anticipating and averting risks. To our knowledge, the project has proceeded relatively smoothly.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**Dry Season Gardening in the Upper West Region of Northern Ghana**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Project Description</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In addition to building the capacity of GhIH to be an effective actor in agriculture in Ghana, the project aims to encourage the adoption of dry season gardening methods in four communities of Northern Ghana (Upper West Region) to improve food security and nutritional status of target populations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Profile</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country</strong>: Ghana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ghanaian Partner</strong>: Ghanaian Institute of Horticulturists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canadian Partner</strong>: Canadian Society for Horticultural Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Institutional Factors</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GhIH has existed for a long time but was largely dormant prior to obtaining support from the ITPP. The original initiator for the twinning was the Savannah Agriculture Research Institute, whose staff are also members of GhIH. Historically, GhIH coordination was done through Accra but this has been moved to Kumasi in the central region.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Achievement of Results</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengthening Capacity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization has increased its management capacity, resulting it being able to publish its Journal on a regular basis, having its Executive meet regularly; it now is holding its AGMs regularly and keeping its membership informed. It has increased its ability to organize knowledge-sharing activities, e.g., conferences and lectures for its members, and has been able to recruit students who have been active in the Society – e.g. study tours, field visits to farmers. GhIH has gained national recognition through media coverage of its activities and has been participating in policy making, e.g. by sending communiqués to the government on issues and sitting on the National Horticulture Advisory Board.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenge</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication has been a challenge – e.g. only the national office has an e-mail account and it has a slow dialup connection. Reporting from the other region is often done by telephone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Usefulness of Results</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengthening Capacity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GhIH reportedly has been able to engage the government in policy dialogue. The Journal and conferences are a big draw for members, allowing for knowledge sharing among Ghanaian scientists and others interested in the development of horticulture.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Development Priorities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted communities report that the new techniques have enhanced their ability to earn an income from agriculture.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Sustainability of Results</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengthening Capacity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While the results appear sustainable, there is a need to strengthen organizational ability to mobilize resources, including membership, as some core members run the risk of burning out and disengaging.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Development Priorities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The communities have adopted the new agricultural and management techniques, as seen by their planting crops for a second year in a row using them. Men and women volunteer to train others and have developed training schedules.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6. Partnerships
The partnership between the Canadian and Ghanaian partners has been beneficial, e.g. support for planning, implementation and reporting, knowledge sharing in horticulture sciences and supervision of students’ academic work. Members of GhIH have found visits by their counterparts very useful and have organized national lectures to enable colleagues to benefit from them. GhIH also developed a solid linkage with MoFA at the district level, and there has been active collaboration between the two organizations with plans to continue in the future, e.g. MoFA has put forward proposals to CIDA’s FARMER project to train additional extension workers. Its partnership with SARI remains a challenge.

GhIH and GSAP could collaborate more closely, as their mandates are complementary and both work with communities in the Upper West region that stand to benefit from this cooperation.

### 7. Resource Utilization
The project has been managed by competent and dedicated individuals from the University of Ghana and the University for Development Studies. Throughout, GhIH has learned to manage projects to meet international donor standards. Progress is to bearing fruit, as the organization is able to deliver increased services to its members, work with farmers and contribute more effectively to policy making.

### 8. Informed and Timely Action
Reporting in a timely fashion remains a challenge for GhIH, which reports difficulties in communicating with its members, who are dispersed in five regions. The coordinator for the SDP component also appears to have been over extended for some time and has now delegated some responsibilities to more junior staff.
### Agriculture Planning and Production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Project Description</th>
<th>Project Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The project aims to create an association of agricultural scientists in Malawi and conduct a socio-economic study, as well as soil and land use studies at the location of the planned Mzuzu University campus. The objective is to generate income for the university and local communities through improved agriculture production.</td>
<td>Country: Malawi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malawian Partner: Mzuzu University Trust Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canadian Partner: British Columbia Institute of Agrologists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Institutional Factors</th>
<th>Social Development Priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The mandate of the Mzuzu University Trust Fund is to generate funds for the planned University Campus near Mzuzu. As MUTF believes that both the University and the communities could benefit from increased agriculture production, MUTF has taken upon itself to support the creation and development of a new agriculture association in Malawi, as none existed before. MUTF appears intent on continuing to collaborate with the newly formed Agriculture Scientists Association of Malawi (ASAM) and support its development. The University has demonstrated its commitment to ASAM by seconding one its staff to the project and securing an office space and drop-in centre for the new Association. Equipment acquired through the project has also been earmarked for ASAM.</td>
<td>The studies have been completed and the results are available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There have been some linkages made with the communities through the involvement of the project in HIV/AIDS charitable work at the community level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There has been limited contact with local farmers and, to date ASAM was not in a position to offer agricultural programming to the local communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Achievement of Results</th>
<th>Social Development Priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengthening Capacity</strong></td>
<td>The studies produced are of very good quality and could eventually benefit the communities if plans to support agriculture development in the surrounding communities materialize.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presumably, this will be the role of ASAM in the future. For now, the primary beneficiary is the University of Mzuzu – although the studies appear to have been disseminated locally. Until development plans are put into motion for the direct benefit of the local communities, they will be of little value to local farmers and their families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>While to our knowledge, this has not created significant problems to date, the present and future relationship between MUTF, the University and ASAM is not entirely clear. How this will affect/help the development of ASAM and relationships with the Canadian partners needs to be clarified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Usefulness of Results</th>
<th>Social Development Priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengthening Capacity</strong></td>
<td>The studies produced are of very good quality and could eventually benefit the communities if plans to support agriculture development in the surrounding communities materialize.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presumably, this will be the role of ASAM in the future. For now, the primary beneficiary is the University of Mzuzu – although the studies appear to have been disseminated locally. Until development plans are put into motion for the direct benefit of the local communities, they will be of little value to local farmers and their families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>While to our knowledge, this has not created significant problems to date, the present and future relationship between MUTF, the University and ASAM is not entirely clear. How this will affect/help the development of ASAM and relationships with the Canadian partners needs to be clarified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Sustainability of Results</th>
<th>Social Development Priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengthening Capacity</strong></td>
<td>The studies produced are of very good quality and could eventually benefit the communities if plans to support agriculture development in the surrounding communities materialize.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presumably, this will be the role of ASAM in the future. For now, the primary beneficiary is the University of Mzuzu – although the studies appear to have been disseminated locally. Until development plans are put into motion for the direct benefit of the local communities, they will be of little value to local farmers and their families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>While to our knowledge, this has not created significant problems to date, the present and future relationship between MUTF, the University and ASAM is not entirely clear. How this will affect/help the development of ASAM and relationships with the Canadian partners needs to be clarified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | Social Development Priorities |
| | See usefulness of results. ASAM was not able to implement a SDP component as it was being created. |
### Agriculture Planning and Production

| financial and institutional support, although it stands a good chance of becoming a viable organization provided it continues receiving organizational development support. The University plays a useful role in providing physical resources to ASAM via the MUTF, which plays a role of broker between the two entities. |

### 6. Partnership

Given the goals and objectives of ITPP and the mandate of MUTF, it may not have been the best choice as a partner: MUTF’s original project objectives did not match those of the Program.

The project started with one overseas partner and ended up with two by the end of the current Program phase. MUTF has been able to obtain the buy-in of the University of Mzuzu, which provides valuable support to ASAM, primarily infrastructure. The relationship between the University and ASAM can prove to be mutually beneficial for their plans to develop the land around the new Campus and the surrounding communities materialize. ASAM and its members could play a crucial role.

The nature of the partnership between BCIA, MUTF and now ASAM is not entirely transparent. Interaction between BCIA and ASAM appear to have been quite modest to date – one member of ASAM visited BC in April 2005. There needs to be much more direct interaction between ASAM and BCIA and more active participation of BCIA to support the development of ASAM for the partnership to be beneficial.

### 7. Resource Utilization

The project has been managed competently by two dedicated individuals with no experience in agriculture but with ample experience in public administration and planning. However, as the project shifted toward ASAM, there could have been more efforts to involve some of its members in partnership activities, such as the 2004 IPM meeting held in Tanzania, which could have been beneficial to ASAM’s development.

### 8. Informed and Timely Action

To our knowledge, the project has proceeded fairly smoothly. However, the overseas partner’s lack of response regarding its analysis of the HIV/AIDS crisis and famine has been worrisome for AIC.
# Youth Agricultural Training Project

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Project Description</strong></td>
<td><strong>Project Profile</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Rural youth entrepreneurship in communities in the Lake District, west of Mwanza. 90% agricultural production as well as carpentry and welding, basket making, improved cooking stoves, and tailoring | **Country:** Tanzania  
**Tanzanian Partner:** Tanzanian Society for Agriculture Education and Extension  
**Canadian Partner:** Canadian Society of Extension |
| **2. Institutional Factors** |   |
|   | **3. Achievement of Results** |
|   | TSAEE has experienced organizational growth, particularly in the Lake District area where membership went from five to 105 members and new chapters were established. The linkage between the local chapter of TSAEE and the overall body through the project is not totally clear. The project’s success has generated interest from members interested and motivated in getting involved and replicating the success of the project in other areas. The project has also attracted the interest of the government, which want to train other professionals in the approach used with great success in the Mwanza area. TSAEE has increased visibility and management capacity – certainly in terms of project management and visibility at the national level, particularly within the MATI system. Communication and transportation remain challenges, as members have to use their own vehicles to visit communities. | **Social Development Priorities**  
The project has achieved outstanding results in alleviating poverty among participants and their communities – new houses built, land and livestock acquired, crop yields increased, and incomes increased, amongst others.  
There is clear evidence of spillover effects, as several groups of farmers have come to TSAEE to receive training, which was not anticipated. Members of TSAEE have tried to meet the demand but it may soon overburden the individuals involved.  
There was evidence of empowerment of women and youth who have been taking on roles not traditionally theirs, e.g., women learning to speak in public and contributing to building houses, and youth actively participating in agriculture.  
Young men and women have acquired valuable agricultural and/or business management skills, which they use to build viable and diverse businesses. They are able to report clearly on their achievements, the challenges they face and their future plans – as evidenced by the written reports prepared by several of the groups visited.  
Not surprisingly, food security has increased as a result of the project, but it has not been measured systematically. |
| **4. Usefulness of Results** | **Social Development Priorities** |
| **Strengthening Capacity** | The results have been very rewarding to the members of TSAEE who have participated in the project. They have gained skills in participatory methodologies and have applied these skills in a very real way beyond teaching by working directly with farmers. The results are also very relevant to the organization that stands to gain from its increased visibility. | The results are very useful to the targeted population, helping alleviate poverty among participants and their communities and contributing to the retention of young people in their rural communities. The project has a high potential for replication in other parts of Tanzania |
| **Strengthening Capacity** | **Social Development Priorities** |
| While the organization has begun to consider its long-term sustainability, it needs to strengthen its ability to diversify funding sources. | The results appear entirely sustainable among the participants with the necessary skills to manage their businesses – and know that they can get training from TSAEE in growing new crops or other agricultural ventures if needed. |
| **5. Sustainability of Results** |   |
| **Strengthening Capacity** |   |
# Youth Agricultural Training Project

## 6. Partnerships
The partnership with the CSE, which has ceased to exist, does not appear to have affected the project significantly, as the individuals involved remained committed to support TSAEE and have formed a committee to continue to do so. The partnership with the communities targeted by the project is one of trust and collaboration. TSAEE has developed solid relationships with NGOs in Manitoba, which have been supportive of the communities through fundraising.

## 7. Resource Utilization
The project managers have used funds wisely and have been able to mobilise several members who have volunteered substantial amount of time supporting and training community members over the last few years. This has resulted in outstanding results for the communities and the organization – which has the attention of the Ministry of Agriculture, as mentioned above.

## 8. Informed and Timely Action
Reporting in a timely fashion remains a challenge.
Annex VIII – Organizational Self-Assessment Tools

A number of tools for organizational assessment exist. Whichever tool chosen should need to be adapted to suit the local situation or organizational development level. Also to our knowledge, none of the tools address the issue of gender or environmental sustainability, which would be relevant in this context.

One of the most recent and comprehensive resource on organizational assessment is the following tool published by International Development Research Centre (IDRC): *Enhancing Organizational Performance: A Toolbox For Self-Assessment* http://www.idrc.ca/en/ev-9370-201-1-DO_TOPIC.htm. It is available on line and in hard copy. It goes beyond organizational capacity to encompass organizational performance.

Should staff or members of AIC want to further their practical knowledge, the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) also offers a free online course on organizational assessment, based on the above resource. The online course is accessible at: http://www.iadb.org/int/rtc/ecourses/index.htm. High speed internet access is recommended to access this course.

Other free organizational self-assessment tools:

*Non-Profit Organizational Assessment Tool*
http://www.uwex.edu/li/learner/assess1.htm

*Non-profit Organizational Assessment Tool*

*MCC Organizational Self-Assessment Tool*
http://www.massculturalcouncil.org/services/org_assessment.pdf

*Generic Self-Assessment Tool*

*McKinsey & Company’s Self-Assessment Grid*