



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the United
Nations

Office of Evaluation

Addressing HIV and Gender Inequities through a Food Security and Nutrition Response in Eastern and Central Africa - OSRO/RAF/010/SWE

Mid-term evaluation report

June 2012
final

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Office of Evaluation (OED)

This report is available in electronic format at: <http://www.fao.org/evaluation>

Permission to make copy, download or print copies of part or all of this work for private study and limited classroom use is hereby granted, free of charge, provided that an accurate citation and suitable acknowledgement of FAO as the source and copyright owner is given. Where copyright holders other than FAO are indicated, please refer to the original copyright holder for terms and conditions of reuse. All requests for systematic copying and electronic distribution, including to list servers, translation rights and commercial reuse should be addressed to copyright@fao.org.

For further information, please contact:

Director, OED
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 1, 00153
Rome, Italy
Email: evaluation@fao.org

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of FAO concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

Acknowledgements

The evaluation team would like to thank the staff of the FAO Regional Emergency Office for Central and Eastern Africa (REOA) and FAO colleagues at the country offices in Burundi, CAR, DR Congo, Kenya, Rwanda and Uganda for offering their opinions and viewpoints with regard to the progress and implementation of the project “Addressing HIV and Gender Inequities through a Food Security and Nutrition Response in Eastern and Central Africa”, as well as for offering logistical and other support in the volatile humanitarian context of the Central and Eastern African Region.

We also wish to thank all of the stakeholders interviewed in the 6 countries visited that were engaged in the implementation of this project. Through our discussions and exchanges we deepened our understanding and appreciation of the local situations and the opportunities and challenges that have faced the current project as well as preceding projects.

This Final report of the Mid-Term Evaluation of the FAO project OSRO/RAF/010/SWE draws upon our interactions with key stakeholders within and outside the current project. This report presents our major findings, lessons learned, conclusions and recommendations.

We hope that this evaluation report will contribute to appreciation of the important progress made in project implementation, and will give rise to adaptations for further improvement in the remaining project period where and when appropriate. In particular, we hope that the conclusions and recommendations of this evaluation will help FAO-REOA and the various national stakeholders to develop future projects for continuation and strengthening of the regional and national capacity in Farmer Fields Schools, gender, HIV and nutrition.

Herma Majoor and Peter Ton

June 2012

Composition of the Evaluation Team

The evaluation team was composed of team leader Herma Majoor and team member Peter Ton. Herma Majoor is an independent expert in gender, food security and nutrition, and Peter Ton is a human geographer and expert in sustainable agriculture. The profiles of both members are displayed in Annex 2.

Table of Contents

Acronyms.....	iii
Executive Summary.....	v
1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Evaluation background.....	1
1.2 Structure of the report.....	1
2 Evaluation purpose and scope.....	3
2.1 Purpose.....	3
2.2 Scope.....	3
3 Evaluation methodology.....	4
3.1 Phases of evaluation.....	4
3.2 Deliverables of the evaluation.....	5
3.3 Constraints of the evaluation mission.....	5
4 Description of the project activities and the findings.....	7
4.1 Relevance.....	7
4.1.1 <i>Design and strategy of the project.....</i>	<i>8</i>
4.2 Project implementation.....	13
4.2.1 <i>Implementation status by output area.....</i>	<i>14</i>
4.2.2 <i>Project management and coordination.....</i>	<i>14</i>
4.2.3 <i>JFFLS.....</i>	<i>15</i>
4.2.4 <i>Exchange and communication.....</i>	<i>16</i>
4.2.5 <i>Allocation and use of funds.....</i>	<i>17</i>
4.3 Project support.....	18
4.3.1 <i>Technical support from FAO (HQ, regional, and country offices).....</i>	<i>18</i>
4.3.2 <i>Training.....</i>	<i>19</i>
4.3.3 <i>Monitoring.....</i>	<i>21</i>
4.4 Partnerships and linkages.....	22
4.4.1 <i>NGO implementing partners.....</i>	<i>22</i>
4.4.2 <i>Regional partners and network partners.....</i>	<i>22</i>
4.4.3 <i>Governments.....</i>	<i>23</i>
4.4.4 <i>Donors.....</i>	<i>23</i>
4.4.5 <i>Prospect partners and linkages.....</i>	<i>24</i>
4.4.6 <i>Other FF(L)S initiatives.....</i>	<i>24</i>
4.5 Impact and lessons learned.....	24
4.5.1 <i>Size and importance of impact per target group.....</i>	<i>24</i>
4.5.2 <i>Possibilities for replication and multiplication.....</i>	<i>25</i>
4.5.3 <i>Lessons learned.....</i>	<i>25</i>
4.5.4 <i>Best practices.....</i>	<i>26</i>
4.6 Sustainability.....	27
4.6.1 <i>Financial sustainability.....</i>	<i>27</i>
4.6.2 <i>Environmental sustainability.....</i>	<i>28</i>
4.6.3 <i>Sustainability at policy level.....</i>	<i>28</i>
4.6.4 <i>Institutional sustainability.....</i>	<i>29</i>
5 Conclusions and recommendations.....	31
5.1 Conclusions.....	31
5.1.1 <i>Relevance and appropriateness.....</i>	<i>31</i>
5.1.2 <i>Robustness and realism of the theory of change underpinning the project.....</i>	<i>31</i>

5.1.3	<i>Quality and realism of the project design</i>	32
5.1.4	<i>Financial resource management</i>	33
5.1.5	<i>Project management and implementation</i>	34
5.1.6	<i>Quality and timeliness of the expected outputs</i>	34
5.1.7	<i>Achievement of the expected outcome</i>	34
5.1.8	<i>Normative work</i>	35
5.1.9	<i>Gender mainstreaming</i>	35
5.1.10	<i>Sustainability</i>	36
5.1.11	<i>Overall performance of the project</i>	36
5.2	<i>Recommendations</i>	38
Annex 1:	Evaluation terms of reference	1
Annex 2:	Profile of team members	10
Annex 3:	List of documents reviewed	11
Annex 4:	List of institutions and stakeholders met during the evaluation process	14
Annex 5:	Detailed time table evaluation mission	20
Annex 6:	Table implementation details per country	23
Annex 7:	Country Report Burundi	25
Annex 8:	Country Report Central African Republic	31
Annex 9:	Country Report DR Congo	39
Annex 10:	Country Report Kenya	46
Annex 11:	Country Report Rwanda	52
Annex 12:	Country Report Uganda	59
Annex 13:	Survey Questionnaire FAO staff	66
Annex 14:	Survey Questionnaire non-government partners	68
Annex 15:	Survey Questionnaire government partners	70
Annex 16:	Survey Master Trainers (MT) and facilitators	72
Annex 17:	Survey Questionnaire Beneficiaries	74
Annex 19:	Summary of Project Logical framework and achieved results	75

Acronyms

ACDA	Agence Centrafricaine pour le Développement de l'Agriculture (CAR)
ACK	Anglican Church Kenya (Kenya)
ADRA	Adventist Development and Relief Agency (USA)
AESA	Agro-Ecological System Analysis
AGN	Nutrition and Consumer Protection Division (FAO)
AMAC	Association Mondiale des Associations Chrétiennes
ARV	Antiretroviral
AVSI	Association de Volontaires des Services Internationaux (Italy)
BAQN	Bureau des Associations des Quartiers Nord de Bujumbura (Burundi)
BTC	Belgium Technical Cooperation (Belgium)
CAFOB	Collectif des Associations et ONGs Féminines du Burundi (Burundi)
CAR	Central African Republic
CAUR	Coordination Actions d'Urgence
CEP	Champs Ecoles Paysans (CEP)
CfP	Call for Proposals
CHB	Comité Humanitaire de Base (DR Congo)
CIG	Common Interest Group
DAO	District Agricultural Office
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
DRD	Développement Rural Durable (Rwanda)
ECHO	European Commission's Directorate General for Humanitarian Aid
ECU	Emergency Coordination Unit
ESAD	Agricultural Development Economics Division (FAO)
ESW	Gender, Equity and Rural Employment Division (FAO)
EU	European Union
FAO	United Nation's Food and Agriculture Organisation
FFS	Farmer Field Schools
FFLS	Farmer Field and Life Schools
FS	Food Security
GBV	Gender Based Violence
GLIA	Great Lakes Initiative on AIDS
GSAN	Groupe Sécurité Alimentaire et Nutritionnelle
HiA	Hope in Action (Sweden/DR Congo)
HIV/AIDS	Human Immunodeficiency Virus/Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome
HQ	Head Quarters
IDP	Internally Displaced Persons
IFPRI	International Food Policy Research Institute
IGAD	Inter Governmental Authority on Development (DR Congo)
IP	Implementing Partner
IPAPEL	Inspection Provinciale d'Agriculture, de la Pêche et de l'Élevage (DR Congo)
IPC	Integrated Food Security Phase Classification
IPPM	Integrated Production and Pest Management
IYCF	Infant and Young Child Feeding
JFFLS	Junior Farmer Field and Life Schools
LWF	Lutheran World Federation
MAAIF	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (Uganda)
MINAGRIE	Ministère de l'Agriculture et de l'Élevage (Burundi)
M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation
MT	Master Trainer
NAADS	National Agricultural Advisory Development Services (Uganda)
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization

OED	Office of Evaluation (FAO)
OPE	Organisation Paysanne pour l'Élevage (Burundi)
OVC	Orphans and Vulnerable Children
PO	Producers' Organization
Prodoc	Project Document
REFED	Réseau Femme et Développement au Sud-Kivu (DR Congo)
RENEWAL	Regional Network on AIDS, Livelihoods and Food Security
REOA	Regional Emergency Office for Eastern and Central Africa (REOA) (FAO)
SAMWAKI	Sauti ya Mwanamke Kijini (DR Congo)
Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sweden)
SOFA	State of Food and Agriculture
SWAA	Society of Women against Aids in Africa (Burundi)
TCEO	Emergency Operations Service (FAO)
ToF	Training of facilitators
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNAIDS	United Nations Joint Programme on HIV/AIDS
UNFPA	United Nations Populations Fund
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
VRI	Villages Ruraux Intégrées (Burundi)
WCUK	War Child UK
WFP	World Food Programme
WHO	World Health Organisation

Executive Summary

Information about the evaluation

- ES1. The FAO, funded by Sida, started implementing gender and HIV projects in 2004; the project under consideration “Addressing HIV and Gender Inequities through a Food Security and Nutrition Response in Eastern and Central Africa” (OSRO/RAF/010/SWE), is building on the preceding projects and is implemented in Burundi, CAR, DR Congo, Kenya, Rwanda and Uganda.
- ES2. This external Mid-Term Evaluation was a requirement by donor Sida and aims to assess the progress of the project so as to inform practical and actionable corrective adjustments required for the remaining of the current phase, the formulation of a new project phase as well as further programming in the region, and to provide beneficiaries with evidence on project results to date.
- ES3. A desk review was undertaken to gain overview and understanding of the project, its objectives, achievements and constraints. The Team Leader started with a briefing in Rome with project management and other key stakeholders at HQ, including a telephone interview with Sida; subsequently the Team participated in a briefing in FAO-REOA.
- ES4. Semi-structured questionnaires were developed, on the basis of which stakeholder interviews were carried out in all beneficiary countries. The interviews have explored the status of implementation, the constraints, opportunities and contribution of and possible cooperation with other actors.

Key findings and conclusions

- ES5. The Farmer Field School approach is a global, leading approach to adult education and agricultural extension, well appreciated by all stakeholders. It is a good vehicle to incorporate gender, nutrition and HIV as well as establishing the basis for good agricultural practices for those participants willing to join producers’ organizations. FAO has been a driving force in encouraging and aligning the project partners and disposed of ample experience and knowledge.
- ES6. The integration of HIV, gender and nutrition as priority issues in the project design has proven relevant to the situation in the target countries and the priorities are highly interlinked. The project addresses the three priorities and also the linkages between them in an appropriate way.
- ES7. All IPs, except for CAR, are NGOs. Not all partners were experienced in the field of agriculture and gender, HIV and nutrition at the same time. Even though public extension agencies are involved in ToFs as much as possible, they were in most cases not yet ready to adopt this role.
- ES8. After deduction of the costs for regional support and activities including the Master Training, only \$300,000 was left per country for a two years period to implement all budgeted activities at country level. This amount was considered small, even though it consists of 72% of the total budget. The remaining 28% was spent on regional support which was a definite added value.
- ES9. Improving food security whilst addressing nutritional habits simultaneously is a valuable approach. Malnutrition was reported as mainly caused by poverty, so income generating through agriculture whilst at the same time implementing nutrition education tackles the problem from two angles.

- ES10. The project reaches very vulnerable people, and especially in the JFFLS the team has met many (semi)-orphans, very poor, malnourished and even sick children.
- ES11. Most of the participants at field level reported to be learning how to improve their agricultural techniques and production. About 85% of the time is spent on agriculture related topics. In some cases (Rwanda) the FFS groups became cooperatives.
- ES12. The project document foresees that 81,000 (indirect and direct) beneficiaries will be reached in a direct or indirect manner. During the evaluation, it was found that approximately 30,000 beneficiaries would be reached, leaving uncertainty of how the project would scale up to 81,000. There was no registration of indirect beneficiaries.
- ES13. Most of the facilitators had an agricultural background and gender, HIV and nutrition were new to them, so the provided training was necessary and useful. External subject matter specialists were almost never invited, and trained and knowledgeable experts were too expensive for the limited budget.
- ES14. Gender was a difficult concept to grasp, often mixed up with the participation rate of women and gender parity in general. Depending on country, male participants could be underrepresented. However, the committees governing the J/FFLS always generally had equal participation from both men and women. Gender related subjects were discussed in the sessions, but it was difficult for most to find a practical approach.
- ES15. Nutrition in general was always incorporated into the sessions but mostly consisted of sharing verbal information. Little practical exercise was used. More emphasis could have been put on IYCF, CF or nutrition for HIV affected as recommended by the preceding project.
- ES16. HIV is wide spread in the target countries and a sensitive issue to discuss. Still, all groups managed to incorporate HIV as a subject into the curriculum. Some groups consisted predominantly of HIV patients, which increases the risk of stigmatisation but it also meant more direct project support to improving the livelihood of HIV patients.
- ES17. Support from FAO-REOA and HQ is offered on project management, technical issues, FFS approach, gender and nutrition as well as backstopping. The quality and frequency of support were highly appreciated.
- ES18. Project management by FAO-REOA and at country level overall has been efficient and effective even though monitoring was considered weak. Even though there is a monitoring toolkit for FFS and quarterly report formats are provided to be filled out by implementing partners, there is no overall FAO monitoring framework, guidelines or formats. As a monitoring tool has now been finalized by HQ, in a future project improvement is expected. A baseline survey was implemented in all countries to assess the situation at the start of the project in order to measure impact at a later stage. The data were collected in most cases by the IPs and analysed by FAO REOA. The data of the baseline survey had not all reached regional level and had still not been analysed.
- ES19. Funds have been distributed equally between the countries, without taking specific differences into account. Disbursement of funds was mostly timely. Payment policies for IPs differed per country. The cost of regional support was considered high as compared to the amounts available at country level, but support was valuable and the included Master Training costly.
- ES20. The Evaluation Team could not assess the LoAs and budgets in all countries. In the case of WCUK in Uganda a lack of transparency was found. In general, there were no clear policies on investment grants and facilitator payments. Some countries work with investment grants, others do not. The facilitator's fees are different per country and not always according to time investment and without taking standard of living into account.

- ES21. JFFLS were conducted inside and outside schools with pupils and out-of-school children. They have two facilitators, one of whom is a teacher. The JFFLS addresses a clear gap in formal education.
- ES22. Exchange visits and Open Days were planned and budgeted for, but had not been conducted yet at this point in time except for Rwanda, where some exchange visits have already been conducted and Kenya, where inter group and inter community exchanges have taken place.
- ES23. MTs trained by the project are highly in demand for FAO projects but also by other organisations. Third parties sometimes try to size down the TOF for budget limitations. A policy with minimum criteria for the training is lacking, which makes it difficult for the MTs to take a firm standpoint.
- ES24. There was no predesigned material on nutrition, gender and HIV for the Master Trainings; one used existing FAO material, but not adapted to the specific circumstances.
- ES25. The length of the ToF is 3 weeks, based on recommendations from the preceding project. Facilitators all receive a similar training, but their quality varies with their personality and ability to use a dynamic approach. The participatory working mode often appeared problematic.
- ES26. Working with JFFLS was new to most of the MTs and facilitators. People were unsure to what extent the approach should be different and found the time dedicated to JFFLS in the training, insufficient.
- ES27. Monitoring was not participatory, systematised or regular. The project envisages an impact survey, but since the baseline survey has not been finalized yet and the size of implementation is small, a rapid qualitative assessment will be the best option.
- ES28. FAO participates in a large number of networks and clusters at national and regional level, where awareness is raised and cooperation sought on the project. WFP, UNAIDS and UN Women have shared their interest to co-fund or co-implement a longer term programme. UNJP is instrumental in co-financing in Rwanda, Uganda and Kenya.
- ES29. There was no coherent advocacy or policy influencing strategy found at country level. The RAF/010 project is successfully contributing to the objectives I2, I3 and K2 of the FAO Strategic framework 2010-2019. The project has a direct impact on the lives of 5,500 participants. Replication and upscaling are taking place through third party projects. MTs and facilitators are used in other FAO projects and by other organisations. The JFFLS groups should be guided to join already existing POs or Cooperatives.
- ES30. The integrated approach of this project appears very relevant to development settings and not only emergency settings. If a number of the current target countries would no longer be categorized as humanitarian, the existing channels of financing may not be longer available.
- ES31. The combination of Francophone and Anglophone target countries sometimes creates practical problems, especially in the communication between MTs and with the Principal MT.
- ES32. The establishment of cooperatives among the group members is one of the proposed approaches for sustainability. In Rwanda, one group was found from the preceding project, which had started up a cooperative and subsequently received additional funds from government and UNICEF.
- ES33. Financial sustainability is difficult to assess since the major part of the project focuses on capacity building, which does not lead to a rapid payback. Financial

sustainability at field level is particularly linked to the payment of facilitators, which may currently be too high in some places to be sustained by communities.

- ES34. The project was found to be relevant and valuable to the target groups. The beneficiaries had been well selected and the acquired knowledge and expertise was appreciated and valuable also to less vulnerable participants. The geographical area however is considered too large, leading to a lot of overhead costs, and it may possibly lead to a dilution of the impact. The topics of nutrition, gender and HIV were new and sometimes difficult to master for stakeholders.
- ES35. The objectives of the project, in particular those related to “mitigating the impact of HIV, conflict and gender inequities” are too ambitious. In Eldoret, Kenya, the subject of conflict is clearly incorporated but in general, the conflict theme needs further elaboration. The project does improve the lives and food security of HIV affected people. Furthermore, awareness on HIV, gender and nutrition was raised. Local food habits were considered but nutrition should be addressed in a more practical manner.
- ES36. Compared to the indicators, the project is on track. Financial spending is slightly lacking behind but not reported as a problem. The situation at country level is more ahead but this will be reflected in the overall figures with a time lapse. It will be possible to finalize the most of the field activities in a timely manner. For other activities like upscaling related actions, advocacy and continuation with other stakeholders the no cost extension will provide the extra time needed, which will enhance sustainability. The financial and progress reports contain too little information to assess the status of the financial management.
- ES37. Project management at all levels was efficient and effective even though monitoring was weak. There was no unique financial policy regarding various project related expenditures like learning/investment grants and facilitator fees.
- ES38. The essence of the J/FFLS approach was achieved overall and the groups were dynamic and active. Facilitation skills, for instance with regard to interactive teaching, didactics and participative approach needed more improvement.
- ES39. Communication took place in an interactive manner and manuals and information materials, adapted to the target group, were available at many levels. Next to verbal and written communication more use could be made of pictures and drawings.
- ES40. The expected outcome of the project was “Integrated Food Security and nutrition HIV/Gender interventions at national and community levels in areas of operations have increased by at least 40%.”, to be verified by pre-project mapping. As no mapping was available and the outcome is not easily objectively verifiable, the Team was not able to assess the likelihood of the outcome to be achieved. Overall, the project is being implemented successfully, even though it is difficult to assess the impact at this point in time and the project outcome formulation was very vague.
- ES41. The “Getting started” manual and the “J/FFLS Facilitators’ Guide”, produced for FFS in general, have been translated into French in the meantime, and are distributed among MTs and facilitators. FAO should provide clear guidelines or minimum criteria regarding the conduct of ToFs.
- ES42. FAO launched its new policies on gender equality on March 13, 2012; they can be integrated into future J/FFLS projects. Participation of men and women was mostly well-balanced throughout the project and men and women participate on an equal footing. In the field sessions, sometimes there were too little or no men participating. The way in which gender issues are addressed could be strengthened to include access to land, participation in decision-making processes and leadership skills.

ES43. The approach has shown to be a worthwhile and promising vehicle for policy linkage between emergency, rehabilitation and development in the region and the 6 target countries.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1: to FAO Senior Management on policy coherence

Establish and declare at the FAO institutional level that the Farmer Field School (FFS) concepts and methodologies are FAO's leading approach and methodology for agricultural extension, and that they should be integrated in all FAO projects world-wide, which have a component of agricultural extension to smallholders and a gender component.

Recommendation 2: to FAO Senior Management on policy coherence

The thematic and cross-cutting issues of gender, HIV/AIDS (if relevant) and nutrition should be integrated into all future FAO projects with a component on agricultural extension.

Recommendation 3: to FAO Senior Management on minimum criteria for FFS training

Establish minimum criteria for TOFs, to be imparted by FAO trained MTs, concerning the duration of trainings, the number of trainers per training, the number of participants per training, the balance between theory and practice, and the "certification" of results. This will help ascertaining a continuous quality of diffusion and upscaling of the J/FFLS approach.

Recommendation 4: to FAO REOA and country offices on environmental sustainability

Ensure that all FFS sessions are coherent with FAO's policies on Integrated Production and Pest Management (IPPM), minimize the use of pesticides and encourage alternative more environmentally friendly methods. Encourage the use of locally available and affordable resources for agronomic practices, in order to enhance the sustainability of learning and experimentation after project closure.

Recommendation 5: to FAO REOA and country offices in the target countries

Develop and implement a refreshment training for facilitators in all counties (like it was done in Rwanda). Emphasise the importance of the facilitative approach, and incorporate exercises on how to transfer the gender and nutrition messages in a more practical way.

Recommendation 6: to FAO Senior Management on policy coherence

Formulate a truly integrated longer-term joint development programme for promotion of the J/FFLS approach led by FAO with a basket fund and financial and technical support on thematic issues from other international organisations such as UNAIDS, UN Women, international NGOs and public and private donors.

Recommendation 7: to FAO REOA on monitoring and evaluation

Improve, as far as possible, the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms by developing and distributing to implementing partners appropriate formats and schedules. Speed up the data collection and analysis. Develop a rapid qualitative assessment type impact survey to enable measuring the impact of the project, as the project size per country is too small to justify large scale collection of quantitative data.

Recommendation 8: to FAO General Management and Gender Officers

Ensure an equal participation of men and women in J/FFLS project activities in order to create optimal conditions for gender-mainstreaming to take place. A quota or minimum percentage for participation may be required for both men and women. Incorporate exercises to emphasise the role of men and women as change agents with regard to gender equality in the household and the community, and to enlarge women's participation in public life and producer's organizations and support their inclusion in decision making processes and leadership roles.

Recommendation 9: to FAO Nutrition Officers and AGN

In curricula and trainings, deal with the issue of nutrition in a more practical way through participatory methods, in order to add effectiveness the learning and increase the likelihood of later use. As long as these subjects are not presented in the manuals in a sufficiently practical manner, develop temporary guiding materials and exercises. Communicate with AGN to increase specific attention to the nutrition needs of specific target groups like babies, children and HIV patients. Adapt existing manuals to reflect nutrition concerns and status quo with support from AGN for the Master Trainings and ToFs. Make additional resources available to focus on nutrition and involvement of AGN, nutrition having become an important priority in FAO's strategy.

Recommendation 10: to FAO REOA and Principal Master Trainer on J/FFLS implementation

In trainings of Master Trainers, increase the time dedicated to the junior aspects of the J/FFLS approach. Budget for at least one refresher training for Master Trainers and facilitators in all countries to additionally touch upon this subject, address emerging problems, assess and further strengthen facilitation skills, and make necessary adaptations in approaches, tools and practices being employed. Make sure that training methods are adapted to the degree of literacy of participants. Encourage more development of Master Trainer and Facilitator networks. Develop a database of Master Trainers and Facilitators for future involvement in replication and up-scaling activities and ensure regular exchange.

Recommendation 11: to FAO HQ and REOA on J/FFLS implementation

In view of sustainability of the J/FFLS interventions, develop a policy on the payment with regard to amount and payment method of learning grants and facilitator fees per country, in which payment is related to actual time investment, and in line with local salary contexts and the standard of living.

Recommendation 12: to FAO Senior Management on J/FFLS up-scaling

Increase the number of J/FFLS Master Trainers and facilitators in all countries through additional Trainings of Master Trainers and ToFs. Develop a strategy on sustainability through producer organization, replication and upscaling, including the number of Master Trainers and facilitators to be trained, in relation to demand and to expected turnover among Master Trainers.

Recommendation 13: to FAO REOA and country offices on J/FFLS up-scaling

Explore with the Ministries of Education, and with individual primary and secondary school boards, the possibilities to integrate the J/FFLS approach into the regular curricula of primary and secondary schools. Similarly, explore the possibilities to integrate the J/FFLS approach in current projects favouring school gardening.

Recommendation 14: to FAO REOA and country offices on sustainability

Ensure that a mechanism is in place to support sustainability enhancing measures like the inclusion of participants (women, men and young people) in producers' organizations or cooperatives and or the continuation of participants as facilitators. Ensure the development of a feasible and practical exit strategy in this and future projects including budget lines for necessary after project support.

Recommendation 15: to FAO REOA and country offices on sustainability

Step up efforts to offer facilitation and guidance to the J/FFLS groups to grow towards an entity and enrol themselves into registered cooperatives or producers' organizations and strengthen the gender dimension and equity of producers' organizations. Organise exchange

visits with existing cooperatives. Encourage implementing partners to facilitate the start up and formation of informal farmer networks during the start up phase.

Recommendation 16: to FAO Senior Management on future project design

If a new phase of the project were to be designed and funded after 2012, the impact may benefit from targeting a smaller amount of countries under a similar total budget and distinguishing the target countries per language (Francophone and Anglophone) and/or related to the fact whether the country is categorized as still in need of humanitarian support. Partners may be prioritized for selection when they are already active in more than one of the target countries, to facilitate upscaling and sustainability. They should be encouraged to attract and involve subject matter specialists not only on agriculture but also nutrition, gender and HIV. The regional office may be involved for technical assistance, development of lessons learned and sharing common tools.

Recommendation 17: to FAO Senior Management on partnership

Take the lead in the design of an integrated long-term development programme with FFS approach with focus on nutrition, gender and HIV and incorporate WFP, UNAIDS and UN Women with co-funding and or co-implementation, each with regard to their focus area. Set up and utilise regional networks with for instance UN organisations, EU, NGOs, donors and other interested stakeholders, including the network on Gender and Rural Livelihoods and the regional HIV and GBV working group to develop, finance and support (sub)regional approach FFS projects.

Recommendation 18: to FAO Senior Management on human resource management

More stability in contracting human resources, including in emergency setting, would ensure more commitment and loyalty of individuals to FAO as an organisation; individuals who moreover have been invested in by FAO through intensive and expensive trainings both at a regional and a national level.

Recommendation 19: To FAO Senior Management and country offices on policy coherence

Develop per country, jointly with the Ministry of Agriculture and with practitioners, a position paper to document the national history and the objectives of introduction of the Farmer Field School approach, and its transformation (into FFSL-like approaches; where applicable) and diffusion to date (in names and numbers).

Recommendation 20: To the donor on funding the integration of gender, nutrition and HIV in projects

The current project up to now has appeared successful and will have positive effects on the livelihood of poor people with a focus on the HIV affected population, which may be confirmed by means of an ex post impact evaluation. Further funding of projects in this area (subject as well as geographical) is directly needed. A holistic approach of gender, nutrition and HIV, addressing more extensively mutual relations between gender, nutrition and HIV may further enhance the impact. Also, basket funding may be considered involving multiple partners with their respective specialties.

1 Introduction

1.1 Evaluation background

1. The FAO, funded by Sida, started implementing gender and HIV projects in 2004 in Burundi, eastern DR Congo and northern Uganda and the activities were expanded to Rwanda in 2007 and Kenya in 2008 through a Regional Response Project. The project under consideration, which started in the second half of 2010, incorporated also the Central African Republic as an additional target country. Farmer Field and Life Schools (FFLS) and Junior Farmer Field and Life Schools (JFFLS) were used as a vehicle to deliver the projects.
2. Building on the previous project (OSRO/RAF/808/SWE), the present intervention is supporting government's priorities in mitigating the impact of HIV and gender inequities on the population of humanitarian concern in Eastern and Central Africa through an integrated food security and nutrition response.
3. The independent Mid-Term Evaluation was a requirement by the donor Sida. The preceding project had been closed with a Final report, yet no external end-of-project evaluation had been conducted.
4. This Mid-Term Evaluation assesses project performance in the period December 2010 to March 2012. The Project Document stipulated a starting date of 1 July 2010, yet the activities could only start 5 months later, by the end of November 2010, after Contract signature between Sida and FAO and release of funds. The Mid-Term Evaluation covered activities in all six countries plus FAO-REOA project management at regional level.
5. The period covered by the Mid-term evaluation assignment included 63 working days for Team Leader and 53 days for Team member between 16 January 2012 and 20 May 2012. The specific tasks and time table are listed in Annex 1.

1.2 Structure of the report

6. As required, the report will start with the background, purpose and scope of the Mid-Term evaluation, as well as its methodology. Section 4 then presents the main findings of the evaluation, followed by the conclusions and recommendations in section 5.
7. Section 4 is subdivided in six paragraphs. First we will discuss the relevance of the project and its activities, and the coherence with and the consistence between objectives, expected output and outcomes as to date. In this section, also the outcomes of the cross-cutting themes of gender, nutrition and HIV will be discussed.
8. The next paragraph will specify implementation-related issues, detailed per output area and country. Project management and coordination will be addressed from a regional level as well as per country, including communication and allocation and use of funds.
9. Subsequently, we will discuss support-related issues; i.e. technical support from regional office and HQ, trainings, documentation and lessons learned.
10. Paragraph 4.4 will describe our findings with regard to partners and linkages; NGO partners will be addressed as well as regional and network partners. Attention will be paid to the role and importance of government partners and donors; prospect partners and

linkages will be discussed. Finally, the presence of other projects with an FFS approach in the target countries will be discussed as well as the extent of existing attention for the gender, HIV and nutrition related subjects into the approach, or the possibility of incorporation thereof.

11. Paragraph 4.5 will focus on impacts, with a description of the size and importance per target group and the possibilities for replication and up-scaling, followed by a summary of the lessons learned.
12. The issue of sustainability is elaborated upon in paragraph 4.6, including the intervention's sustainability at a financial, institutional, policy and environmental level.
13. The report will finish by listing the most important conclusions and recommendations, in Chapter 5, based upon the findings already reflected in the preceding chapters.

2 Evaluation purpose and scope

2.1 Purpose

14. The Terms of Reference (ToR) of the Mid-Term Evaluation state that the overall objective of this Mid-Term evaluation is to assess the progress of the project so as to inform practical and actionable corrective adjustments required for the remaining of the current phase, the formulation of a new project phase as well as further programming in the region, and to provide beneficiaries with evidence on project results to date.
15. The stakeholders of this evaluation include the beneficiaries, the Government of Sweden and Sida, the governmental authorities in the beneficiary countries, the implementing partners (IPs), FAO Headquarters in Rome, the FAO Representations and ECUs in Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, CAR, DRC and Burundi, and the FAO Regional Emergency Office for Eastern and Central Africa.

2.2 Scope

16. The evaluation team has visited between 2 to 6 J/FFLS groups per country, and had meetings and interviews with a large number of FAO staff at regional and country level, with NGO partners, government representatives, Master Trainers, facilitators, beneficiaries and other organizations working in the field of food security, nutrition, gender and HIV/AIDS. The full list of resource persons is available in Annex 4.
17. The Mid-Term evaluation has assessed the project by addressing issues and questions based on the OECD/DAC criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability; both at regional level and at country level. The evaluation has focused more on relevance, effectiveness and efficiency than on impact and sustainability, since it was too early to find evidence of at this point in time. The evaluation has considered timeliness, connectedness with medium and long term objectives and targeting of beneficiaries.
18. The independent Mid-Term evaluation has assessed the overall results and the quality of the project from inception to date. The evaluation has determined the extent to which the project has delivered activities and outputs in a timely and qualitative manner, and whether adequate and appropriate technical and institutional support was provided.
19. The evaluation results provide an understanding by the team of the strengths and weaknesses and the opportunities and constraints of the project in the 6 countries under consideration, also displayed in the SWOC tables in Annexes 6-11. Good practices and differences among countries are reflected.
20. Specific recommendations have been made in order to facilitate and advice on further action by the FAO, the national governments and other stakeholders, including the need for follow-up actions after project life. The evaluation intends to contribute to the enhancement of the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the current project and future projects in the area of livelihoods, food security, gender equality, HIV/AIDS and nutrition.

3 Evaluation methodology

3.1 Phases of evaluation

21. The Mid-Term Evaluation consisted of the following phases:

- A desk review of key documents was undertaken to gain an overview and a general understanding of the project, including major objectives, achievements and constraints, and to collate project documents, strategic plans, policy documents, analytical tools and reports as well as evaluations of preceding projects, reviews and studies of relevance to this evaluation;
- The Team Leader participated in an initial internal 2-day Briefing in Rome at FAO HQ in February 2012. Meetings were scheduled with the departments OED, TCEO, ESW, AGN and ESAD and a telephone interview with donor Sida, in order to allow an open discussion on the scope and possible constraints and opportunities of the Mid-Term evaluation;
- Stakeholder interviews were carried out in the field in all of the six beneficiary countries, including with FAO staff members, with beneficiaries at grassroots level as well as with other key stakeholders in government, the donor community, UN and other international agencies, relevant networks and NGOs. The interviews have explored the status of implementation, and also the constraints, future opportunities and the contribution of and possible cooperation with other actors;
- Semi-structured questionnaires were administered to stakeholders to obtain feedback on their programme activities, results and outcomes (see Annexes 12-16). The questionnaires are quite detailed but were only used as a guidance tool to conduct interviews. The team used the questions as a check-list to touch upon all areas of interest according to the position of the stakeholder;
- In most countries (except for Uganda and Burundi, where relevant people were not present because of work abroad or other engagements), a debriefing was held to present a summary of the evaluation findings to FAO national office. In Kenya a briefing was also done with the implementing partner;
- Just after the country visits, the evaluation team was able to participate in the Mid-Term Regional Planning Workshop in Bujumbura (Burundi), where it presented a first summary of the evaluation findings, and collected suggestions, comments and feedback from FAO staff and implementing partners to incorporate into the Final report;
- Furthermore, an Aide- Mémoire was drafted in the form of a PowerPoint presentation, to synthesize the outcomes of the above components. The Aide-Mémoire was presented in two sessions (one for a group of FAO REOA staff members, one by Skype for the regional emergency coordinator, who was abroad) during a debriefing meeting at FAO-REOA in Nairobi on 23 March 2012. A somewhat abridged form of the presentation had been presented during the Mid-Term Evaluation workshop on the 21st of March for a large regional group of stakeholders, i.e. the participants of the workshop;
- The final Debriefing by Team Leader at FAO HQ in Rome was carried out on 4th of April 2012;
- A draft of Final Report was submitted by the Team by mid-April 2012 together with conclusions, recommendations and SWOC tables per country;

- Comments, remarks and observations from FAO and other stakeholders are expected to be incorporated in the final version of the Evaluation report by early-May 2012.

22. The preparatory activities for the evaluation included:

- Compilation and review of documents and reports produced by and for the project and related documents relevant for this evaluation. The list of documents reviewed may be found in annex 3;
- Identification of priority issues with assistance of FAO staff in Rome and Nairobi;
- Close review of the issues and questions outlined in the ToR and the project logical framework in order to develop the Inception report and outline for evaluation of the project's intended causal pathway, key objectives and result areas.

3.2 Deliverables of the evaluation

23. The main outputs of the Evaluation consisted of:

- An Inception Report (1 electronic version) – submitted on 20 February 2012 before the start of the field mission;
- An Aide-Mémoire in the form of a PowerPoint presentation with the preliminary findings and conclusions of the evaluation, presented during the Mid-Term Regional Workshop in Burundi, the Evaluation Team Debriefing at FAO-REOA in Nairobi, and the Team Leader Debriefing at FAO HQ in Rome;
- The Final Evaluation Report (1 electronic version) – draft submitted by Wednesday 18 April 2012, and the final report with comments incorporated ready by the beginning of May.

3.3 Constraints of the evaluation mission

24. The Evaluation Team had five (5) calendar weeks to carry out the six (6) country visits and national and international travel. Two days were dedicated to the Mid-Term Regional Workshop in Bujumbura and one day for the Evaluation Team debriefing in Nairobi. The time was short but just sufficient to meet with all stakeholders at FAO national and regional level, with Master Trainers, with most authorities, and to visit 2 to 6 J/FFLS groups per country. On the other hand, even though the schedule was very tight, the visiting of 6 countries with various background and different stages of implementation offered the team a wealth of information and opportunities for comparison.
25. However, not all implementing parties could be met in all countries (e.g. War Child UK in Uganda), and in many countries the achievements of only one of the two implementing parties could be assessed in the field (e.g. in Kenya, Uganda, DR Congo, Rwanda). Travel within countries was also time-consuming because of distance (9 hours by road in Uganda; flights in Kenya) and the poor condition of roads particularly after rain (DR Congo).
26. The tight and extensive travel schedule did often also not allow meeting with many other stakeholders such as other relevant FFS projects in the country, potential partners at NGOs and Ministries, and potential donors for up-scaling projects. Furthermore, prospected interviewees could not always be reached or did not turn out to be available to the mission. Some stakeholders were also travelling out of the country themselves.

27. The evaluation was intended to be a Mid-Term Evaluation, even when it took place well after half of the actual implementation period (December 2010-June 2012). Yet, in most countries (except for Rwanda and partly Burundi) the evaluation took place at the start of the first agricultural season of the project, and (agricultural) field level implementation had not started yet. In most cases, preparatory activities such as the training of Master Trainers and facilitators and the set up of J/FFLS groups had been executed, but still, this made it difficult if not impossible to fairly judge the results and impact of the project at field level.

4 Description of the project activities and the findings

4.1 Relevance

28. Since its start in 1990, the Farmer Field School approach has evolved and become a global and leading approach to adult education and agricultural extension-based on field observation and experimentation. The FFS approach offers good possibilities to incorporate thematic issues and concepts like HIV, gender and nutrition in an interactive manner. In post-conflict situations, the Junior Farmer Field and Life Schools (JFFLS) approach has been developed with orphaned and de-militarised youth to help them learn agricultural and life skills and to re-integrate into society.
29. FAO has been a driving force in the development and implementation of the FFS approach from its very start and has developed a large experience and knowledge on the matter. FAO staff members have abundant technical knowledge and relevant experience and expertise with FFS at a global, regional and country level. Also in this RAF/010 project, the support of FAO from all levels was highly valued and appreciated by all stakeholders.
30. The terminology appeared sometimes confusing; FFS, FFLS, JFFLS and CEP are acronyms which are used by stakeholders but not always with the same meaning. Furthermore, some stakeholders refer to life skills as the part of the sessions related to HIV, Gender and Nutrition, whilst others find that life skills are those skills, which are already integral part of the FFS next or related to agricultural skills. Apparently, there is a trend in FAO that future projects with FFS approach will incorporate gender, HIV and nutrition as a standard and therefore, the confusion may diminish considerably.
31. The integration of HIV, gender and nutrition as priority issues in the project is relevant and the issues are complementary and interlinked. For example, HIV patients, without access to proper nutrition, are unable to work in the field and thus their food security becomes further under threat. If they cannot produce an income, they run a higher risk of developing AIDS. Also, anti-retroviral drugs are not as effective with HIV/AIDS patients if their diet is limited and unbalanced.
32. The project contributes to increasing the income of HIV patients through better agriculture related income generation, but also to enhancing their access to and knowledge of good nutrition as a result of participating in the project; furthermore, the project helps reducing the stigma which may improve the integration of HIV patients within and the possible support of the larger community.
33. As to gender, women are often worse off than men with regard to food security and nutrition. However, where women get proper access to food and income for instance from agriculture, they tend to spend relatively more on their household's nutrition and on children's education than do men. Women on the other hand are more vulnerable to poverty and sexual gender-based violence (SGBV), which may translate into the adoption of coping strategies that enhance the risk of exposure to HIV. SGBV itself increases their risk to contract HIV.
34. Empowerment is a key objective of the Farmer Field School (FFS) approach, and it is even more so of the Farmer Field and Life Schools (FFLS) promoted by the project. Farmers' empowerment will facilitate them to make the best out of the human, natural and economic resources and opportunities they have at hand. Women's empowerment can specifically contribute to helping them reduce the risk of SGBV and to prevent them from

falling back into harmful coping strategies. HIV infected people may strengthen their position in society through mutual support in and through FFLS groups. Vulnerable youth which do not have access to adult support, inherited agricultural skills and regular schools may develop their human and professional skills through participation in JFFLS groups.

35. Even though the impacts of this particular RAF/010 project cannot be measured at this stage, it appears that the project contributes successfully to the integration of the issues of gender, HIV and nutrition in the FFS approach, and therewith improves the food security and nutrition situation of the target groups.
36. The project and its design appear to be very relevant to the beneficiary countries, the target regions, participants and other stakeholders. With regard to the agricultural basics of the FFLS approach, many participants reported that at least part of the agronomic methods they learned in the FFLS was new to them, that the method of working in experimenting groups opened their eyes, and that their own production benefitted from working in groups.
37. The project is building on previous activities started in 2004 and aiming at addressing HIV, gender inequities and food insecurity, on the achievements of the projects OSRO/RAF/707/SWE and OSRO/RAF/808/SWE. Most of the lessons learned in previous projects have been incorporated into the new project design and most of the Master Trainers and some facilitators are also involved in this RAF/010 project.
38. Prevalence rates of HIV are high in most target countries; the subject is often still very sensitive and stigmatisation of the infected is no exception. ARV appear to be readily available in some countries like Rwanda, yet not in the remote rural areas of the other countries. The ARV are reported not to function with people who are undernourished; the ARV do not work without a proper and balanced diet. This stresses the relevance of the links between HIV and nutrition and food security.
39. Improving food security while addressing nutritional habits is a relevant and valuable approach. Malnutrition was often observed among the target groups especially among children. Malnutrition was reported by the participants themselves but also by other stakeholders to be mainly caused by poverty. Most participants stated that they hardly ever consume meat or fish, simply because they cannot afford it. Vegetables, beans and staple crops however are available and consumed. Fruit intake was understood to be limited and periodic in many regions; there may be scope to pay more specific attention to fruit consumption within future projects.

4.1.1 Design and strategy of the project

40. The RAF/010 project intends to benefit people who are amongst the most vulnerable of society, either due to poverty, illness, violence, conflict or family situation. The Evaluation Team considers that this objective has indeed been achieved in both the FFLS and the JFFLS. Even though the Evaluation Team could not perform a quantitative assessment, it was observed and understood that many J/FFLS participants were HIV affected, victims of sexual gender-based violence, violent conflict, or generally vulnerable by illness, loss of relatives and poverty. Among the junior participants, many had lost one or both parents and/or were malnourished.
41. The demand for agricultural extension and project support was huge in all countries visited. There were always more candidates than places available in the J/FFLS groups. Even if the exact selection process and criteria could not always be assessed, the team met very few participants who did not meet the selection criteria (for example village leaders,

people having cattle or motor bikes, or showing other signs of possible wealth). Especially in the JFFLS, the selection criteria seemed to have been applied very well.

42. The total project amount is USD 2,863,000. After deduction of the amount needed for regional support and for coordinating and organising activities like the Master Training Course, per country slightly more than USD 300,000 was left for a project duration of 2 years. From this amount, field implementation, country staff as well as a contribution to the implementing partner had to be paid.
43. Slightly less than 28% of the total project budget was spent on regional support, including the (relatively costly) Master Training. Even though regional support was highly appreciated by all, and roughly 6% of the funds were spent on the Master Training, the expenditure as part of the total is still considered high.
44. In case the cooperation with partners in preceding projects had not been as successful as expected, a Call for Proposals was launched (the case of Kenya) or existing partners from other projects were invited to join (the case of DR Congo). Selection criteria then applied included the organisation's previous experience with FAO, and with the issues of food security, gender, HIV and nutrition respectively. The choice was often limited, while few partners could show to have experience in all of these fields simultaneously.
45. In the case of CAR, partners were selected through the Food Security Cluster meeting. The government partner ACDA was selected. Italian partner COOPI also met the criteria, and was interested, but finally did not follow up. FAO did not contact the organisation to inquire about their withdrawal. As a result, in CAR there is no civil society partner involved in project implementation.
46. The project implementation has covered an increasing number of countries since the start of the first similar project in 2004. The available project amount per country and per year was slightly higher (increased from 1.6 million for 5 countries over 1.5 year to 2.8 million for 6 countries over 2 years), but still, the total project amount is diluted over an ever growing geographical area.
47. Furthermore, within the countries sometimes areas are selected, which are far apart, which further aggravates the dilution of impact and decrease the practical ease of implementation.
48. Since the budget amount available per country was limited, the scale of implementation is equally small and the overall project impact therefore more limited than may have been wished for. Especially in a huge country like DR Congo, it will be hard to measure the impact of the project in consequence.
49. The project document has not been realistic about the number of beneficiaries that will be reached. The project aimed to reach 81,000 beneficiaries, directly or indirectly. In the project, only about 5,500 participants are directly involved. In project design it was assumed that the entire household would benefit, thus reaching a total of about 29,700 direct beneficiaries. In the design the assumption was made that each FFS member would reach out to a number of others. It has not become clear whether this is the case and how this mechanism works.
50. According to project design, the other approx. 50,000 beneficiaries would be reached through continuation of the support to previously established J/FFLS groups, the training of existing FFS groups on life skills, gender, HIV and nutrition; and third-party projects which benefit from implementation of the training by the J/FFLS Master Trainers, trained under the RAF/010 project. Even though some efforts were made to track the indirectly

reached beneficiaries, the Evaluation Team has to conclude that these efforts have been insufficiently structured.

51. The Evaluation Team considers that the impact of the training of Master Trainers should be measured in the number of organisations hiring them and in the number of facilitators trained by them, rather than in the number of beneficiaries reached through these third parties. This may help overcome current limitations with regard to assessing the quality of down-stream implementation of the groups by third parties.
52. The J/FFLS facilitators were trained in facilitation skills and on thematic issues during national Trainings of Facilitators. Gender, HIV and nutrition were part of the ToF and were discussed in all J/FFLS groups. The facilitators reported that on average they would spend 15% of the total time on these subjects. Many of the facilitators have an agricultural background and therefore, the thematic topics were new to them. The Evaluation Team found that in most cases facilitators dealt with the thematic issues themselves. Only in a few cases were external subject matter specialists involved to address the subjects; it was reported that subject matter specialists are often (too) expensive. In these cases, the challenge is to make sure that the external experts take on a participatory approach rather than a unilateral teaching mode.
53. Gender still appears to be a vague concept for many stakeholders and difficult to grasp and to address as a priority and cross-cutting aspect of the project. Many still feel that gender means the equal participation of women and men or even of as many women as possible. They enthusiastically report that 90% or even all participants in a group are female as a proof of achieving the objectives. However, gender objectives can best be achieved in mixed groups, since it requires changes in the attitudes of both women and men. This cannot be achieved if participation of men is not considerable or even lacking totally.
54. As the target countries are all (post)conflict countries, participation of men was also decreased by the sheer fact that more men than women had been killed during the conflicts. As households had lost their cattle, capital and other belongings and at the time had often even consumed their sowing seeds, many men left the villages to look for work that would quickly generate money: for example in mining or transport. Many of them had been gone for years and were highly unlikely to return, leaving the women responsible for supporting the families.
55. In many groups, the percentage of women was higher, or even far higher, than men. Even though this may seem to be empowering for women at first glance, in fact this may have the opposite effect. For example, if male participation in groups is small, the remaining men may leave the groups more rapidly. If groups exist of a majority of women, they may again be stigmatised as “women only” groups.
56. When men are not present in the groups the effect of gender related information is drastically reduced. In order to achieve a move towards gender equality, the participation of both men and women is necessary and cooperation between the two required. If men and women both feel equally responsible for the welfare of their household, this may contribute to an improvement of their joint livelihoods as well as the position and opportunities of women as well as men in present and future. If men understand their benefit from gender equality, it will be easier to achieve.

57. Gender equality is engrained into the FFS methodology. A recent scientific study published by one of FAO REOA's staff members¹ describes the impact of FFS on gender relations and equality. In the sessions attended, the quality and content of gender information was sufficient; yet whereas many relevant topics related to gender came up or were planned to be discussed, it appears difficult for FFS participants to see how they could change their life-styles as to favor gender equality.
58. Gender roles were discussed in the group sessions, but even though the message was understood and sometimes received with humour, it appears difficult to really create changes in these roles just by sharing information. Encouragement of women to participate in public life or public decision-making was not clearly addressed everywhere.
59. Gender inequalities also exist in HIV prevalence and incidence. Currently, the HIV prevalence in the target countries is higher among women than among men. Gender inequalities like insufficient capacity and opportunities to make decisions at household level or weak presence of women in public life and politics lead to women being at a higher risk of suffering from nutrition shortage and food insecurity. This also appears from the statistics: women both have a higher HIV prevalence and a higher rate of malnutrition.
60. The Evaluation Team acknowledges that the project made an effort to observe gender parity at all levels: within the groups, the committees were composed by men as well as women. In some cases, women would be president, in many others women were treasurer. Some groups had a minimum requirement of 3 women out of 5 board members, whereas others had 2 women as a minimum.
61. Among the FFS facilitators, 37.5 % or 99 out of 264 facilitators were women. Percentage was highest in Burundi (54% of total) and lowest in Uganda and the Central African Republic (25% each). The percentage of women among facilitators was generally higher than among extension workers at country level.
62. Nutrition was always incorporated into the sessions as a topic of interest, addressing the needs of a varied diet and the meaning of macro and micro-nutrients. The components of a varied diet were linked to the availability of the products from fields and local markets. Although nutrition was addressed, sessions were often based only on verbal information and technicalities of nutrition such as nutritional needs and habits. More practical exercises such as cooking demonstrations were employed by only a few implementing partners.
63. Nutrition was often planned to be discussed at the time of -or right after- the harvest, highlighting the possibilities of using the harvested products in different ways. Even though this timing of sharing nutritional information has its advantages, care should be taken that this planning is not interfered by and subdued to the many other priorities related to the harvest.
64. At the end of the OSRO/RAF/808/SWE project one of the recommendations was to put more emphasis on IYCF and CF. The Evaluation Team did not observe such emphasis anywhere. Even though nutrition and HIV in general were integrated into the approach, specific points of attention, including nutrition for HIV infected were not addressed,

¹ Friis-Hansen, E; Duveskog, D; Taylor, EW. Less noise in the household: the impact of Farmer Field Schools on Gender Relations. *Journal of Research in Peace, Gender and Development*, Vol. 2 (2), pp. 044-055. February 2012.

notwithstanding the fact that a significant number of beneficiaries have families with young children and/or are HIV affected.

65. In all countries targeted by the project, HIV is widespread; the percentages vary per country between 3 and 6.5% on average. HIV infected people, especially women, are frequently stigmatized and excluded and often living below the poverty line with insufficient access to food. It was reported for instance that during the year 2008 in Rwanda, 59% of the HIV infected people went without eating one day or more ².
66. The high prevalence of HIV is often attributed to cultural and economical factors. With reference to the project objectives, food insecurity may indeed also lead to coping strategies that increase the risk of HIV infection. HIV infection at its turn may lead to decrease in ability to achieve food security, giving raise to the unfortunate vicious circle.
67. HIV is still a sensitive issue in most of the countries. While start of the J/FFLS groups did not coincide with start of the agricultural season, many J/FFLS groups first started to address issues of gender, HIV and nutrition rather than agriculture. In some cases, the implementing partners explained this to be the reason why men soon left the groups. In at least one case the leave of men was explicitly related to the sensitivity of the issue HIV/AIDS and to the fact that a young woman facilitator ran sessions on the topic. Even though in most of the groups, the participants were reluctant to share their HIV status, the Evaluation Team also met with a few J/FFLS groups in which participants openly declared to be HIV patients.
68. To address sensitivity issues, HIV may be addressed as a part of general health considerations and topics positive aspects may be emphasized, like the existence of access to ARV (in many countries) and the possibility to improve the quality of life through good nutrition and support by the community. These solutions are already in part used in the J/FFLS sessions.
69. Supported by the project, Gender and HIV officers (at national and regional levels) could be recruited to support the integration of gender and HIV in the FAO programmes, which would otherwise probably not have been possible.
70. The project approach combines awareness raising on HIV prevention and living with HIV with the structural issues like food security, income generation and support from and integration into the community. If well elaborated, this combination may contribute to prevention of HIV as well as improvement of the lives of those living with HIV.
71. An issue for the project and the implementing partners to consider is the balance between HIV-affected and non-affected participants. Mixed groups contribute to the reduction of stigma of the HIV-affected. Groups with predominantly participants who were HIV-affected run the risk of stigmatisation, with the community keeping them at bay. An objective of the project is also to facilitate the integration of the HIV infected into society, as this will improve their chances for support and a better livelihood. A recommendation from the previous phase included the same observation, that mixed groups contribute more to the reduction of stigma.

² UN One programme: Improve livelihoods and promote a supportive social environment for people infected by HIV through addressing socioeconomic and gender inequalities. Rwanda, January 2012

4.2 *Project implementation*

72. Implementation of the RAF/010 project was delayed by issues of contract signature with implementing partners. In most countries having multiple agricultural seasons, this led to delays in the start of the J/FFLS groups. In other countries with a prolonged dry season, start of the J/FFLS groups was not affected, since was still waiting for the agricultural season to start.
73. In all countries except the Central African Republic there were two (2) implementing partners. Generally, per implementing partner an amount of up to only USD 50,000 was actually available. For many international and regional organisations this amount is considered small, which led to limited interest in FAO cooperation. In a number of cases, FAO selected its partners on the basis of successful collaboration in preceding project(s).
74. The establishment of J/FFLS groups followed the trainings of Master Trainers (March-June 2011) and the subsequent Training of facilitators at country level (between August 2011 and February 2012). In all countries except Rwanda (where already one cycle had taken place at the time of the Evaluation) and part of Burundi, the J/FFLS groups only really took off in January-February with plots being planted only in February-March 2012. In consequence, at the time of the visit of the Evaluation Team, the agriculture-related J/FFLS sessions had not yet started or only just started.
75. The project implementation was well underway in some of the cases, like in Rwanda. Even though selecting partners and signing contracts had taken a considerable amount of time in a number of countries, it looked as if the actual field implementation could just be finalized before the current actual end date of the project, 30 June 2012. A budget neutral extension has been agreed upon until December 2012.
76. Within the countries, the geographical spread is sometimes unjustifiably large. For instance in CAR, the target area Mambéré-Kadei is so far away, that regular monitoring, evaluation visits and support by other technical experts than the Master Trainer out-posted there is almost impossible and the implementation is left mostly to the implementing partner. In North Kivu in DR Congo, Masisi was difficult to reach. Similar problems yet at a smaller scale were found in Kenya (LWF in Turkana) and Uganda (WCUK in Karamoja).
77. For additional activities (developing networks, advocacy and linkages; proper wrap-up of the project; preparations for up-scaling institutionalization; etc.) extra time will be needed to compensate for the five (5) months' delay in project start. A request for budget neutral extension until December 2012 was requested by FAO-REOA and awarded by Sida by late-March 2012.
78. Implementing partners seemed to have applied participant selection criteria as convened at the design stage of the project, in order to target the most vulnerable and to manage the scarcity in availability of participation places in the J/FFLS groups under this project. In most cases, local and regional decision-makers were involved in geographical and participant selection from the start. In almost all countries, village leaders were consulted to select a group of prospect participants, from where a choice was made. In a specific case in Burundi, the starting point was to work with HIV patients, who then invite others to join their group. In other cases, such as in Kenya and Central African Republic, the FFLS groups were based on existing extension groups.
79. Even in the case where one of the partners had used existing extension groups to work with, in Kenya, the participants in the visited groups seemed to also answer to the

selection criteria, while belonging to the victims of post-election violence in 2007 in which many participants lost relatives as well as their homes, cattle and other belongings.

80. Some of the J/FFLS groups run a system of savings and credits (under various names). Participants put a small weekly amount of money in a box. Participants may take a loan from this amount and pay back with a small interest; others, who are in urgent problems, are helped with small amounts. At the end of the sessions the money is distributed or will be used for something profitable to all members.
81. The curriculum of the J/FFLS consists of a large number of interesting and relevant topics with regard to agriculture as well as life skills. Business management was part of the sessions in some cases but not in all. In Burundi, for instance, tomato was grown as a commercial crop on leased land in order to have rapid pay-back.
82. During the visited sessions Burundi it was reported to the Evaluation Team, that weekly calendar sprays were applied on the tomato crop with synthetic pesticides provided by FAO. Even though this concerned “approved” pesticides, the use of pesticides in general runs contrary to the agro-ecological approach proposed by FAO in Farmer Field Schools as one is supposed to focus on alternative, environment friendly methods.
83. When asked participants stated that these pesticides were “expensive”, but they could not exactly relate the cost to the income to be expected from the crop. Therefore, they could not estimate either, whether using such pesticides would be an economically-feasible option in the middle and long term.

4.2.1 Implementation status by output area

84. In all countries, the Trainings of Facilitators had been conducted. In all countries except Uganda, J/FFLS sessions were being conducted at field level. Field implementation had started between October and March, depending on the agricultural season and the time required to select and involve the implementing partner. Field implementation started earlier in countries where FAO had been able to continue with a partner from a preceding project. Rwanda was the only country to have finalised one full agricultural cycle, between September-December. In Uganda on the other hand, the sessions had started with a few activities on HIV and gender, but for agriculture-related activities, one was awaiting the start of the rainy season (March/April 2012)
85. Seeds and other agricultural input for the J/FFLS plots were provided by FAO. The procurement procedure was not always the same; especially in CAR it appeared difficult to procure inputs. In some cases, local seed was bought, in other cases seed was imported for the sake of comparison on J/FFLS plots or because local seed was believed to be of poorer quality. Imported seeds are more expensive and usually not freely available on the market, which brings up the question of sustainability of the availability and use of these inputs after project closure.

4.2.2 Project management and coordination

86. In a number of cases, the Letters of Agreement (LoA) used for implementing partners are remarkably varied in format and formulation, as are the Progress reports. Even though the most relevant information was provided, the sequence and extensiveness of information was different. More systematisation of the project through formats of documents would be advisable.
87. Project management from FAO-REOA has been effective and efficient to judgement of the Evaluation Team. Stakeholders testified of their appreciation of the continuous

availability of FAO-REOA for information and advice. Payments were disbursed to FAO national offices in a timely and correct fashion.

88. Monitoring was considered weak by the Evaluation Team. Even though there is a monitoring toolkit for FFS and quarterly report formats are provided to be filled out by implementing partners, there is no overall FAO monitoring framework, and there are no report formats or guidelines with regard to timing and responsibility. A monitoring toolkit, consisting of a table format and guidelines, has been recently finalized at HQ level, so improvement is expected in a future project. The base-line data had remained behind at different levels in the various countries.
89. Since no clear report formats are provided for the implementing partners in all countries, the quality, sequence and amount of details of information varies. Working with formats and guidelines would ease collecting and collating information for FAO, improve the quality of the data and reporting, make comparison easier and strengthen monitoring and evaluation in general.
90. Project management at country level appears to have been adequate and effective in most countries. The Evaluation Team encountered occasional complaints about delays in the signature of Letters of Agreements and subsequent disbursement of funds, which translated into delays in project implementation.
91. The Evaluation Team was able to assess in most of the signed Letters of Agreement in the target countries, the total budgeted amounts, and the break-down into cost categories and budget per category. The Evaluation Team did not find any evidence that funds were used in part for activities that fall outside the scope of this project. On the other hand, the financial information provided was insufficient to allow the team to rule out that possibility either.
92. In one case, with WCUK in Uganda, the team experienced a lack of transparency regarding project and financial management in the field, which may require further investigation by FAO.
93. In all countries it was unclear to the team what were the project's policies established, regionally and nationally, regarding facilitator payments, investment grants, and input use, procurement and provision. There was no clarity either on how these policies were being monitored.

4.2.3 JFFLS

94. Junior Farmer Field and Life Schools (JFFLS) were implemented in all countries; sometimes simultaneously with FFLS, and sometimes as the stand-alone approach (in Kenya with LWF, and in Uganda with War Child UK). Age groups differed slightly, in the range of 9 to 18 years. Some JFFLS were conducted on the site of a school; some were conducted in the community. Participants were pupils but also out-of-school children, especially in DR Congo where many children are school dropouts because of the high school fee (reportedly USD 5 per pupil per month; parents instead of the state pay for the teacher). Most of the children in the JFFLS that were visited by the evaluation team, whether in or out of school, appeared to be highly vulnerable, yet also enthusiastic about the approach.

95. Formal school education in many places is of sub-optimal quality; the approach is teacher-led and often top down³; only in CAR in an orphanage run JFFLS, it was reported that facilitative didactic methods were used. The student groups are large and often there is no time or possibility to concentrate on life skills related issues, especially in those countries where children go to school only in the morning or in the afternoon. The J/FFLS approach addresses this issue by working in a more participatory fashion and thus conveniently complements formal education.
96. The JFFLS in this project in general have two facilitators, one of which is a teacher. In some cases, the teacher-facilitators involve the caregivers into the process. They encourage the children to share their learning and invite the caregivers to regular meetings.
97. Some teacher-facilitators reported that children participating in JFFLS not only learned curriculum-related issues, but also performed better in formal school in general; their integration and acceptance by other children were believed to have improved. The children themselves often started acting as a group also outside the JFFLS, and set up cooperative savings in order to buy small animals and seeds for their households. Also, mention was made of a few cases of out-of-school children who returned to formal education because of, and encouraged by, their participation in the JFFLS group.
98. With respect to land for creating a JFFLS plot, in some schools the support staff gave up their own plots to be used by the JFFLS. In other cases, the school made land available, or land was given by someone outside the school or had to be rented.
99. Children participated in the JFFLS sessions after school hours. Sometimes they missed out on a session, when some teacher had shifted class times or because of other obligations. In some cases, children were found to be too hungry to be able to concentrate sufficiently a couple of extra hours after school time. WFP was approached in a number of cases to provide a school snack to tackle this issue.
100. ESW has been instrumental in the development of the JFFLS and has taken the lead in the evolution of the approach in this project. Their continuous support is indispensable.

4.2.4 *Exchange and communication*

101. Project RAF/010 is a sub-regional project deliberately aiming for capacity exchange between Anglophone and Francophone countries. Kenya and Uganda are considered advanced in the implementation of the J/FFLS approach, and Principal Master Trainers from Kenya were thus involved in the training of Francophone Master Trainers which took place in Musanze (Rwanda) between March and June 2012.
102. Subsequent monitoring and support was provided to the trained Master Trainers in Burundi, CAR, DR Congo and Rwanda by the Principal Master Trainer Godrick Khisa from Kenya under a contract with the sub-regional office REOA. As part of the FAO monitoring process, Khisa visited all four (4) countries for a period of about 7-10 days per country in the period January-March 2012, in order to compare the implementation in the various sites, assess J/FFLS implementation in the field, to consult and advice Master Trainers in their work, and to generate general recommendations on quality improvement.

³ McLaughlin C. et al: Old Enough to know, a summary for policy makers and practitioners, University of Cambridge, March 2012

103. Sub-regional exchange between Master Trainers was further promoted during the Mid-Term Regional Workshop which took place in March 2012 in Bujumbura (Burundi) in the presence of the Evaluation Team. On average, each of the six (6) project countries participated with a team of four (4) persons: two (2) representatives of implementing partners, one (1) from the national office of FAO, and one (1) from the Ministry of Agriculture. Experiences, constraints and successes were shared, monitoring and evaluation were addressed, networks strengthened and plans developed for future action and improvement.
104. In order to further foster the exchange of experiences and information about J/FFLS implementation in the francophone countries, one day was added to the Mid-Term Regional Workshop for FAO and implementing partners from Burundi, CAR, DR Congo and Rwanda, under guidance of the Principal Master Trainer Godrick Khisa, Burundese J/FFLS Master Trainer Philibert Yandemye and REOA FFS focal point Deborah Duveskog.
105. Except from the above events, there has been some interaction on e-mail between Master Trainers trained in Musandze on an intermittent and individual basis; MTs are sending individual reports on their accomplishments in view of obtaining full qualification. Interaction between MTs was not, however, organised on a sub-regional level and in an organised and regular manner.
106. The Prodoc foresees the organisation of exchange visits between project countries. These exchange visits are budgeted but not yet implemented. These exchange visits are budgeted and are currently being planned for execution in the second quarter of 2012.
107. All beneficiary countries and implementing partners plan to organise Open Days in order to share project information and outcomes and to generate awareness and advocacy with the authorities, international NGOs, donors and other parties interested. Open Days are usually conducted at the time of or right after harvest, reason for which thus far only Rwanda has been able to organise Open Days. Still, plans were already developed in detail by most of the implementing partners.

4.2.5 Allocation and use of funds

108. The RAF/010 project document did not originally specify the amount of funds to be used for each country individually. Before approval by donor, FAO-REOA specified that except from the budget for sub-regional activities, the remainder budget would be divided more or less equally between the six countries. The Evaluation Team considers that this was not an appropriate decision while country specific differences were insufficiently taken into account. The equal division was for instance not commensurate with the ambitions to establish new J/FFLS capacity in the Central African Republic, nor sufficient to have significant impact in such a huge country as DR Congo.
109. Contract signature has been late in most countries, sometimes leading to delays in implementation. Disbursement of funds was timely though in most cases. In CAR however, where the project was implemented for the first time, the first disbursement was reportedly not enough to cover the start-up costs.
110. The Evaluation Team found that, even though payments between FAO REOA and country offices were according to schedule, disbursement policies between national FAO offices and implementing partners differ as to their size and timing. Some implementing partners received their implementation funds too late, so that they had to pre-finance or delay part of their activities.

111. Budget lines are different per country and implementing partner, which in itself may well be justified to take account for local differences. Unclear, however, is the project's general policy regarding the payment or reimbursement of J/FFLS facilitators and the disbursement of so-called "investment / learning grants. These two issues are weak elements in project financial management.
112. With regard to the facilitators' fee, in some countries there was none at all, and the facilitators at best received a time compensation. In other countries there were varying fees sometimes as high as USD 50 (DR Congo) or USD60 (WCUK in Uganda) per person per month. In DR Congo, the fee of USD 50 was stated to be necessary as to attract good quality facilitators. Yet this was a flat rate fee, irrespective of actual time involvement, and the amount for facilitating one single J/FFLS per month (i.e. one afternoon per week) could already be equivalent to twice the regular salary of a teacher (estimated at Congo francs 30,000 i.e. USD 27). This cannot be considered sustainable.
113. In case of the facilitator being a government extensionist, such as in Eldoret (Kenya), a per diem was paid from the "investment grant" of USD 400 attributed to each J/FFLS group in Kenya. In other countries, the per diem was paid from other budget lines.
114. The Evaluation Team understands from FAO-REOA that some countries (Kenya, Uganda) do work with "investment / learning grants", which are paid directly to groups, whereas others would not. It is not clear to the team what policy or considerations are guiding this difference in policy per country. Since the direct payment is considered to support the empowerment process, it is important to streamline the approach for all countries.
115. In Kenya the "investment grant" was reportedly transferred to the J/FFLS group itself; yet here and elsewhere it was not completely clear to the team by whom these funds are managed and what they are actually used for. Making the funds available to the group itself is an empowering process, even though some time may be needed for establishment of the group before doing so. FAO/REOA, the national offices and the implementing partners are advised to report explicitly on the use of the grants where applied, as to prevent any confusion and possible misuse of funds.

4.3 Project support

4.3.1 *Technical support from FAO (HQ, regional, and country offices)*

116. The RAF/010 project was implemented at regional and country level by FAO personnel, most of whom are on a contract basis for the duration of the project. As far as emergency projects are concerned, the FAO frequently engages personnel on a temporary basis only – with a policy of 11 months of consultancy employment and 1 month of unpaid leave per year in order to prevent personnel from entering into indefinite contracts, especially in emergency and rehabilitation projects of shorter duration, since a minimum project duration of 12 months is needed to create a project post. For FAO drivers in some countries even a policy of 6 months' work and 6 months' leave without pay turns out to be common practice. The Evaluation Team, even though it understands the reason behind this practice and the difficulty to change, considers that more stability in contracts would ensure more commitment and loyalty of individuals to FAO as an organisation; individuals who moreover have been invested in by FAO through intensive and expensive trainings both at a regional and a national level.

117. Support from FAO was offered at various levels on different subjects and was generally highly appreciated by the stakeholders, with regard to technical knowledge (on agricultural issues but also on project management, HIV, nutrition and gender) and experience as well as frequency and speed of follow-up in case of need.
118. The cost of regional support was found relatively high by the Evaluation Team. The activities performed under this amount (coordination, advocacy, trainings, network related activities) are sufficient and of good quality but the total cost is relatively high as compared to the small budgets, available at country level. Even though the support is very valuable, human resource costs, administration, coordination and overhead costs weigh heavy on the budget.
119. The existing organisational structure in FAO sometimes leads to time loss within the project. A considerable part of the information, requests and reporting has to pass several layers, especially in DR Congo, where reporting may go from Bukavu to Goma through Kinshasa to Nairobi (and sometimes further to Rome). Many of the staff members at all levels have heavily loaded agenda's and as a result, the stream of information and its speed of process may be hampered.
120. FAO headquarters (HQ) contributed to implementation of the project through monitoring visits to Uganda (July 2011), Kenya (September 2011) and Rwanda (September 2011) by Senior officer Gender/HIV Carol Djeddah (ESW), who is one of the pioneers of the Junior Farmer Field and Life Schools (JFFLS), and co-author of the FAO HQ JFFLS manuals "Getting started" and "facilitator's Manual for JFFLS".
121. FAO regional office personnel involved in the RAF/010 project consists in regional project coordinator and regional emergency gender & HIV officer Karine Garnier, Community Development/FFLS advisor Deborah Duveskog and since April 2011 regional nutrition advisor Angela Kimani. As to specific events, FAO-REOA supported the organisation of the Regional Planning Workshop (December 2010), the Rwanda Training of Master Trainers (March-June 2011), the Mid-Term Regional Workshop (March 2012) and the monitoring visit to the francophone countries by Principal Master Trainer Godrick Khisa (January-March 2012) as well as other technical backstopping missions by the other team members supporting trainings and other events such as sensitization workshops on J/FFLS.
122. The FAO national offices are in charge of contract signature, payment and monitoring of the activities of the implementation partners. The FAO national offices further facilitated exchanges between country offices and master trainers, government and implementing partners. Country offices procured and provided agricultural inputs for the J/FFLS group sessions. FAO-REOA will further be instrumental in the organisation of the exchange visits between the teams of the different countries – later in 2012.
123. In the Francophone countries, some of the Master Trainers are FAO Consultants, usually 1-2 out of seven to nine. In the Central African Republic, where the programme is in its first phase, even two out of the three Master Trainers are consultants to FAO.

4.3.2 Training

124. Training of Master Trainers under this project was different for Kenya and Uganda and for the other countries. In Kenya and Uganda, Master Trainers were trained on basic FFLS skills under the preceding project and thus fully available at the time the project started. Their training consisted in participation in April 2011 in an additional one-week training on Gender, Nutrition and HIV related issues in Kisumu, Kenya.

125. The training of Master Trainers for the Francophone countries Burundi, CAR, DRC, and Rwanda was a two-tier process. All trained Francophone Master Trainers first participated in the 3 blocks (9 weeks total) Training of Master Trainers in Rwanda (March-June 2011), for which they received a participants' certificate. As a group, they subsequently organised per country one or two Trainings of Facilitators, and supervised and monitored the facilitators along the season during implementation of one or more J/FFLS groups per facilitator. FAO REOA provided additional individual support based on the outcome of the trainings. The quality of their work with the facilitators was then assessed by the Principal Master Trainer during his country visit, and in case of success a second and final Master Trainer Certificate will be issued by FAO before the end of the project.
126. The Training of Francophone Master Trainers in Rwanda was appreciated by all participants. The course was very intensive and costly to organise because of all the travel and board and lodging involved. Approximately USD 160,000 out of the regional budget was spent on the Rwanda MT training, in addition to the fees of those trained.
127. The Evaluation shows that Master Trainers are clearly in demand in the respective countries. MTs were invited by many partners implementing or willing to use the FFS or J/FFLS approach. Most of the MTs have a full program, acting either as MT for the current projects or for others, and often simultaneously. All MTs appeared highly knowledgeable, experienced and enthusiastic.
128. During the monitoring visit in the francophone countries by the Principal Master Trainer, it was observed that many third parties interested in the J/FFLS approach size down the J/FFLS trainings for reasons of budget restrictions and due to lack of sufficient understanding of the approach – to two weeks or even one week. FAO considers a minimum period of three (3) weeks essential to deliver quality, but thus far no guidance was provided to the Master Trainers on how to handle requests and negotiate sufficient budget with the third party. The Evaluation Team recommends FAO to define a clear policy on diffusion of the J/FFLS approach in order to ensure the quality of the different trainings.
129. There was no pre-designed manual for use in the Master Trainings on HIV, gender and nutrition. Use was made of the knowledge and experience of a number of key resource persons. Various existing FAO guides and booklets were used, like the Family Nutrition Guide and Living Well with HIV AIDS. The trainees were provided with a copy.
130. The material on nutrition was, even though sufficient from a technical point of view, was not entirely adapted to the circumstances. Practical exercises and examples, to be introduced by the facilitators into the session, were not sufficiently included. The facilitators were not provided with a specific manual on incorporating HIV, gender and nutrition in a practical manner, to help them to get the discussions beyond information sharing only. There is information available in the manuals but it needs adaptation for practical use for adults.
131. Facilitators are trained in the ToF by Master Trainers. Even though they all participate in the same or similar trainings, the quality of the J/FFLS sessions at field level turns out to be diverse, depending largely on personality and the ability to work in a dynamic way. Many facilitators were found to be enthusiastic and knowledgeable, but not all mastered the facilitative participatory mode of working. Too often, the information

sharing halted at a verbal level and/or written texts. Use of visuals such as drawings was limited.

132. The project design envisages that trained Master Trainers carry out at least three Trainings of Facilitators at the cost of their organisation or third-party. In practice, this has appeared to be an unrealistic assumption. Time investment and the costs of travel and per diems for training and supervision are high and have usually not yet been accounted for in the organisations' budgets.
133. Facilitators that have been trained may not always be available to the project for J/FFLS implementation. After training, facilitators may find another job and leave the project, which is understandable since facilitator work is only part time. In a number of countries, this problem was solved by having facilitators take the responsibility for more than one group; in other cases, like in South-Kivu, additional facilitators were trained to cover for trained facilitators leaving the country or not being able to facilitate the group in a qualitative manner.
134. Based on the recommendations from the OSRO/RAF/808/SWE project, the length of the ToFs has become three weeks under this project, which was appreciated by all. In Rwanda, a refresher course was even organised after the first agricultural cycle and the monitoring visit by the Principal Master Trainer, which helped the facilitators exchange successes and constraints and find solutions for problems encountered during implementation.
135. Training on conducting Junior FFLS was a new part of the curriculum in the training of MT and in the project. Stakeholders interviewed had various opinions as to whether a JFFLS session should differ considerably from those in a FFLS, and if so, in what respect and to what extent. Most participants in the Master Training agreed, in any case, that the time spent on this subject during the Training of Master Trainers (i.e. 3 days), was too short to enable them to sufficiently train the facilitators on the junior-specific elements of the approach.
136. The role and task distribution between facilitators and government extensionist with regard to facilitation of the groups varied per country. In some cases the government extensionists are involved as facilitators, in others they supervise facilitators on a less regular basis, and in the case of DRC extensionists were actually not available for participation.

4.3.3 *Monitoring*

137. Except from the technical monitoring by the Principal Master Trainer, monitoring of project implementation was in the hands of the national FAO offices in all countries. Monitoring consisted in the collection of progress reports of the implementing partners and in regular visits to assess progress in project implementation.
138. Government partners in many cases were not clearly incorporated in the monitoring of the project at regular intervals. Even though sometimes they were involved in monitoring and supervising the field level activities, they reported back only to their ministry and data were not shared with FAO. On the other hand, monitoring data of FAO were not shared with government, either.
139. Before start of the J/FFLS groups a participatory household appraisal was carried out by implementing partners together with local and school authorities to decide on whom to select as J/FFLS participants.

140. Once groups were established, a baseline survey was carried out in all countries, in the period October 2011-March 2012 depending on the country. Except for Kenya, where accidentally an old format was used, the baseline questionnaire used was elaborated by FAO-REOA with inclusion of comments and suggestions by the country offices and partners. Data gathering was mostly done by third parties, such as students or local consultants, and data were subsequently collated by the national FAO offices, and then sent to FAO-REOA for joint analysis. At the time of the Evaluation, the base-line data of none of the implementing partners had been analysed as yet (except for ACK in Kenya, who had performed the analysis themselves, but had used previous format).
141. Monitoring in general did not appear to be much systematised or regular. Progress reports from implementing partners were very diverse in nature and content and not available systematically. The Evaluation Team only received Implementing Partners' inception reports and did not receive any Country progress report, even when some countries had facts and figures available in a more orderly fashion than others.
142. The project envisages an impact survey to be undertaken towards the end of the project. In view of the late analysis of the baseline survey, a full scale impact survey will most probably not be possible within the duration of the project. Also, the size of the project per country is not sufficient to collect statistically relevant data. However, a rapid qualitative assessment of impacts per country should be possible and could take place in the last months of the project.

4.4 Partnerships and linkages

143. The RAF/010 project worked with a variety of implementation partners from different parts of society. The Evaluation Team considers this to be an advantage for learning about what works and what does not work, yet a disadvantage in terms of a diffusion strategy. The team did not encounter a strategic justification for partner choice at a regional level in terms of a future up-scaling strategy per country.

4.4.1 NGO implementing partners

144. All implementing partners but one (ACDA in the Central African Republic) are NGOs – whether international, national or local NGOs. This is logical because of the exploratory nature of implementation of the J/FFLS approach and the fact that the project is implemented in a humanitarian setting. Most public extension agencies are just not in a position to adopt or experiment such a new approach to extension at this early stage.
145. Some of the implementing partners are international NGOs with significant budgets, who could be instrumental to replicating the approach in other countries and other settings (for example LWF, AVSI). Others are national NGOs with nation-wide activities such as ACK in Kenya. Yet others are local NGOs, some of which may rely on their networks to foster the approach with sister-organisations (e.g. Caritas-Kibungo in Rwanda), or otherwise share and diffuse the experience within their area of operation and with other local and regional entities (e.g. Samwaki in DR Congo).
146. Not all partners were experienced in the field of agriculture and gender, HIV and nutrition at the same time. Since the amounts available for partner implementation were limited, the interested partners often were working in a specific field of interest.

4.4.2 Regional partners and network partners

147. The RAF/010 project is a sub-regional project aiming to provide national as well as sub-regional incentives to disseminate the J/FFLS approach and to promote the incorporation of concepts of gender, HIV prevention and nutrition in food security-related

emergency programmes. FAO-REOA actively participates in a number of regional networks among which regional Food Security and Nutrition Working Group, the Sub-Regional HIV/AIDS Cluster and chairing the IAWG on HIV and GBV as well the regional Gender and Rural Livelihood network launched by REOA in March 2011 may be mentioned.

148. Involvement of partners at a sub-regional level thus far focused on awareness-raising and advocacy. One joint regional concept note on gender in the Horn of Africa crisis was developed with IFAD WFP and FAO. As it received only limited funding by the Italian government, it was handed over to FAO Kenya to be implemented as single country project. An integrated longer-term development programme for promotion of the J/FFLS with other international organisations such as UNAIDS, UN Women, international NGOs and donors has not been set in motion yet.
149. In the meetings, which the Evaluation Team had with WFP, UNAIDS and UN Women in a number of countries, the organisations were found in principle interested in participating in a longer-term programme with J/FFLS approach on the basis of possible co-funding or co-implementation.

4.4.3 Governments

150. The objective of this RAF/010 project is to integrate the issues of gender, HIV and nutrition into the J/FFLS approach, of course with a view to replication and up-scaling the overall integrated approach. In Burundi and Car, a J/FFLS awareness workshop was implemented; this exercise is to be repeated in the other 4 countries. Still, the team did not come across the development of a coherent advocacy and policy influencing strategy at national level in any of the project countries.
151. In several of the countries visited, multiple types of FFS and FFS-like approaches are used, J/FFLS being one of them. It may be worthwhile for purposes of coordination, positioning and acquisition, to describe per country what the status of FFS implementation is, what kind of FFS-like approaches are used, how and in what way they differ from the "standard" FFS approach, and how important they are in the country (in numbers and in type of organisations using the approaches).

4.4.4 Donors

152. The Government of Sweden through Sida has been supporting the development and implementation of the J/FFLS approach in Central and East Africa under the current project RAF/010 and the previous projects and RAF/808.
153. Sweden's specific interest and attention for the issues of gender and HIV/AIDS have contributed and continue to contribute to the integration of these subjects in the organisation FAO and its activities. At the time of the Evaluation, FAO HQ issued its policy on Gender equality which comes in very well to upscale also the activities developed under the project RAF/010.
154. The J/FFLS approach is a development approach, in this case implemented in humanitarian settings. The countries DR Congo and CAR are still considered as humanitarian settings, Burundi is thus considered in many cases but the other three target countries are seen by most donors as moving toward a situation of development. The project is currently financed under the humanitarian funding of Sida, which may not be possible any further after this project's ending for all six countries under consideration.

4.4.5 Prospect partners and linkages

155. The Evaluation Team is of the opinion that the J/FFLS approach, nor the integration therein of the issues of gender, HIV and nutrition, should not be confined to emergency programmes. The J/FFLS approach appears to be of great significance to development programmes in general to which multiple multilateral and bilateral donors may be interested to contribute. FAO is advised to explore the possibilities for a basket fund to further upscale with national governments the FFS approach in Central and East Africa in its multiple forms.

4.4.6 Other FF(L)S initiatives

156. In most countries, activities are being implemented using the Farmer Field School or similar approach. In some countries there is a large programme, in others there is none yet. Still, in these cases similar terminology does not necessarily mean similar practice. There is reason to assess current practices around FFS-like approaches and their diffusion and uptake in the different countries, and to systematise efforts for up-scaling and multiplication. Fortunately FAO HQ is in the process of carrying out a global review of FFS practice with the aim of taking stock of the FFS situation and develop clearer guidelines.

4.5 Impact and lessons learned

157. Even though the circumstances in which the project is operating are difficult and the target group often faces multiple problems, the project activities are much appreciated by all stakeholders and appear to have resulted in an increase of knowledge of people in agricultural production capacities as well as life skills and often improved the livelihood and future outlook, not only of beneficiaries but also of facilitators.

4.5.1 Size and importance of impact per target group

158. The capacity and character of facilitators have an important impact on the quality of information uptake by the group: the more dynamic and open the facilitator was, and the more he/she used a participative approach, the more the group seemed to be active and knowledgeable. This highlights the important role of personal attributes among FFS facilitators, a factor often neglected in extension discussions where technical knowledge usually is emphasised.

159. The project is having a direct impact on the lives and livelihoods of approx. 5,500 J/FFLS participants. It is assumed that this has an impact, through households, on a total of maximally 30,000 persons.

160. The Prodoc assumed that around 75% of the total of 81,000 beneficiaries would be reached through the training of “existing groups”. The Evaluation Team did not encounter sufficient evidence for this to be the case. Moreover, many project stakeholders including most FAO personnel and implementing partners were unaware of this assumption in project design.

161. However, the Evaluation Team acknowledges that replication and upscaling are taking place in most countries through third-party projects for which Master Trainers trained under RAF/010 project are being solicited. The FAO and partners are recommended to monitor and assess the extent and quality of the replication and up-scaling of the J/FFLS approach per country.

4.5.2 *Possibilities for replication and multiplication*

162. The prospects for replication and multiplication of the J/FFLS approach are good in most countries. Many organisations have expressed interested or even have already started using the approach in their projects, solely or combined with other subjects. Many other organisations may also likely be convinced of the approach through lobby and advocacy.
163. The Master Trainers trained under this project, are already quite well in demand by interested third parties. The capacity to provide Trainings of Facilitators (ToF) per country shall be increased at least in the Francophone countries through the training of additional J/FFLS Master Trainers.
164. Facilitators that are currently active in the RAF/010 project may be used in other and additional projects of FAO and third parties.
165. If well-guided and supported, some talented J/FFLS group participants may also be able to set up and facilitate J/FFLS groups themselves in future, to share information, increase production and better defend their interests.
166. The schools, teachers and directors were generally very positive about the JFFLS sessions. Multiplication through other schools may well be possible as long as a JFFLS plot is available, while financial investment is limited. Once started, the group can produce its own seed and use part of its revenues for inputs required. The teachers may also share their knowledge as facilitators with other teachers at the same school.

4.5.3 *Lessons learned*

167. In all countries, the J/FFLS approach is highly appreciated by organisations and participants alike. The J/FFLS groups provide participants with a new and unique framework for learning, interacting, experimenting and developing one's own agricultural, social and facilitation skills. Lessons learnt during the J/FFLS groups are likely to be applied as well on participants' own fields, particularly when it comes to fast-growing vegetables that do not need much space and inputs.
168. This sub-regional project is instrumental to the diffusion of the J/FFLS approach from Anglophone to Francophone countries. In principle, the approach itself is appropriate for people in (post)emergency situations as well as for groups in more stable environments. The approach as such should not only be promoted and experimented with the most vulnerable groups in society, while it is also likely very valuable to others.
169. One of the assumptions of the project is that current participants of the J/FFLS will start new J/FFLS like groups on their own account after project closure. However, in most cases there is not much proof for this from the preceding projects. Only when former participants were involved in the current project as (co)facilitators, as was the case in one JFFLS in Burundi, there was such an effect. The Evaluation Team holds it for very unlikely that new groups will emerge and be facilitated by experienced facilitators or ex-participants without minimal external technical and financial support.
170. Two of the target countries are Anglophone, whereas four are Francophone. In day-to-day implementation this does not create major problems, however during strategic meetings and other regional exchanges this is a complicating, costly and time-consuming element. In the Mid Term Evaluation Meeting, for example, official translators had to be involved for simultaneous translation. The Evaluation Team witnessed that where no such translation was available, a considerable amount of time and information was lost, without people wanting to admit.

4.5.4 *Best practices*

171. In all beneficiary countries, a large majority of the J/FFLS participants appear indeed to belong to the most vulnerable groups in society. The vulnerability criteria for selection of J/FFLS participants seem to have been applied in an appropriate manner.
172. In DR Congo, the FAO successfully integrated the J/FFLS approach in a number of its own projects, and interested a number of international NGOs to conduct trainings of facilitators under guidance of one or more of the Master Trainers trained under this project RAF/010.
173. Whereas in most countries world-wide, the FFS-like approaches were first experimented within civil society before being proposed to public extension agencies as an approach to be replicated and up-scaled, in Central African Republic the project has been able to work with the public extension agency right from the start.
174. In Rwanda, FAO project management was pro-active and organised an additional, unplanned and unbudgeted Recycle Course for facilitators after the first full agricultural season in order to exchange experiences and to correct certain observed flaws in J/FFLS implementation.
175. In Burundi, the implementing partner SWAA ensured HIV affected persons to be emphasized in the selection of beneficiaries of the project, by engaging them from the very start and by encouraging them to constitute mixed J/FFLS groups of HIV-affected and non-affected persons. In Uganda, great use was made in the FFLS groups visited of drama and theatre to sketch and discuss the linkages between gender, food security, nutrition and HIV/AIDS.
176. In Burundi, participants were incorporated in cooking workshops, where they learned to prepare different dishes with the food harvested at that moment. All participants would bring in a small contribution from home (ingredients, spices, equipments) and cook and eat together. Upon request, participants enthusiastically shared oral receipts for the preparation of amaranth, which was being harvested at that moment, and reported to be using the knowledge in their households.
177. In Northern Uganda, which counts with only one rainy season, the project plans to encourage J/FFLS participants to process vegetables and leaves in order to have nutrient-rich flour for use in the dry season, in addition to the staple food cereals.
178. In Rwanda, a cooperative developed out of two groups of J/FFLS trained under the previous project RAF/808. The cooperative built its own storage facility and was in the process of adding a nursery (financed by UNICEF) and a maize drying and storage facility (financed by the government). FAO has provided support from the Telefood fund. The new J/FFLS groups established in that village may possibly enter the cooperative after project closure to strengthen their own position as well as the cooperative itself.
179. In Burundi, budget lines were added in the budget of the implementing partners to ensure the transition of participants to the future status of facilitator. These participants, 2 or 3 per group, would be provided directly after the project with agricultural inputs by FAO and technical support by the implementing partner.
180. The NGO ACK in Kenya provides a very interesting example of the use of J/FFLS groups, in Burnt Forest, to bring different ethnic communities together again in a productive, forward-looking and quiet setting after the post-election violence that stroke the area in 2007. The interactive group processes in the J/FFLS groups may contribute to conflict management.

4.6 *Sustainability*

4.6.1 *Financial sustainability*

181. The logic of the sub-regional project RAF/010 is to build capacity in the region regarding the J/FFLS approach and the integration therein of gender, HIV/AIDS and nutrition as thematic topics. Capacity-building is a costly affair and represents a one-off investment in individuals, organisations and society at large. Rapid pay-back cannot be expected. Pay-back is also difficult to assess from a practical point of view. When capacity is built by the project and used in another project or circumstance, it is very complicated to estimate but not less valuable.
182. FAO covers part of the actual costs of capacity-building under RAF/010 such as the organisation of the travel, per diem, board and lodging, and the presence of the trainers. The organisations represented contribute to the actual costs through payment of the salaries of the persons to be trained and by liberating them from other work for the duration of the training. In the case of the Training of Master Trainers time involvement was very important: three times three weeks per person. Some organisations, in particularly smaller NGOs, may well have made additional arrangements with their representatives in order to transfer part of the actual costs to the individual receiving the training. However, the team does not dispose of data on this co-financing by organisations and individuals.
183. In a number of countries, there are co-financing arrangements at programme level between the RAF/010 project and other projects - particularly UN Joint Programmes. This is certainly laudable both from a policy and a financing perspective. It is not clear to the Evaluation Team how such co-financing is monitored administratively as to prevent from making double claims about results, and also to prevent funds from being diverted. It is not clear either, whether the modalities of the project design are respected to the full extent.
184. The Evaluation Team did not assess the exact modalities of existing co-financing arrangements. In one case however (WCUK in Uganda), the Evaluation Team was left with concerns about the transparency of the contract and the co-financing arrangements. The LoA supposedly attached to WCUK's involvement in the RAF/010 project did not make any reference to the RAF/010 project, but rather to two UN Joint Programmes; and in spite of repeated requests, the team was not enabled to meet with representatives of WCUK (neither in Kampala, in the field or during Mid-Term Regional Workshop). The budget was considerably higher than for other implementing partners, in absolute sense but also relative to the number of participants.
185. At field level, with the J/FFLS groups, the actual costs of operation only consist in an indemnity for the facilitator (thus far paid for by implementing partner with funds from FAO), the cost of accessing a suitable J/FFLS plot (often for free but sometimes rented), and the costs of inputs required for experimentation (generally ordered and paid for by FAO). Where applicable, like in Burundi, the costs of accessing a suitable plot are already covered by participants. In some countries, imported seeds are used but in principle, external inputs are not required to learn the fundamentals of the J/FFLS approach and when desired participants should be able in future to arrange for these themselves. It is not sustainable to employ in J/FFLS groups inputs which are for free and can and will not

be acquired by participants themselves after project (for lack of access, funds or appropriateness). In case inputs are imported, sustainability is even less.

186. On a field level, the issue of financial sustainability is limited to the availability of the facilitator, which comes at a cost. In some cases, facilitators will feel rewarded by the status they gain from the facilitation job; an element not to be underestimated. Yet, time involvement in the preparation and conduct of the weekly J/FFLS sessions is such that a material or financial compensation will be required in order for their services to be sustained.
187. Communities may well be able to find solutions or partial solutions to the facilitator payment issue at their own level (for example through a weekly food provision to facilitator by the group or through the output of the J/FFLS plot). If the perception is that a facilitator would require compensation at the level of USD 50 per month, though, as is the case in several countries, communities will not be able to do so; it is even questionable whether they would agree to such a value.
188. FAO is recommended to explore, preferably already at this point in time, new solutions with communities for facilitator payments after project life, in order to enhance the sustainability of diffusion of the J/FFLS approach at field level. The implementing partners should be involved in this process. Farmer lead field schools may be an option, but also need a policy with regard to possible compensation of the lead farmer(s).

4.6.2 *Environmental sustainability*

189. FAO is the driving force for development and diffusion of the Farmer Field School approach and its adaptation to many different contexts and environments. The Farmer Field School approach is based on an agro-ecological system analysis (AESAs) in which the use of existing human capital is optimised and the use of costly external inputs being minimised. The Integrated Production and Pest Management (IPPM) is one of the cornerstones of FFS.
190. The J/FFLS are based on the FFS approach and therewith on the concept of Integrated Production and Pest Management. This favours environmental sustainability in terms of a rationalised and minimal use of environmentally-compromising inputs. The focus on productivity improvement will further translate in a more efficient use of land and water.
191. The environmental sustainability of the J/FFLS approach would be enhanced if the current accent on the need and the usefulness of the use of external inputs (seeds, fertilisers, pesticides) was reduced. The approach itself, which focuses on learning by experimentation, does not require the use of any external laboratory-improved seeds, synthetic fertilisers or pesticides. Where seed, soil fertility or pest management issues are at stake, many alternatives which are at hand to producers at little cost should be experimented.
192. In one case, in Burundi, environmental issues were clearly not prioritized, as weekly calendar sprays were applied on tomatoes with recommended pesticides, purchased and provided for free by FAO Burundi. The environmental consequences of using these pesticides were not always addressed and synthetic fertilizers were promoted without addressing possible financial consequences in the group.

4.6.3 *Sustainability at policy level*

193. The RAF/010 project envisages the promotion among governments and other actors in Central and Eastern Africa of the J/FFLS approach integrated with gender, HIV/AIDS

and nutrition as thematic issues. FAO-REOA is the fore-runner in this respect as the project holder. It is recommended to search recognition of the approach also at the international level within FAO for the sake of sustainability at a FAO policy level.

194. At a country level, FAO offices in a number of countries have embraced the J/FFLS approach and/or other FFS approaches and incorporate these into new projects where and when applicable. Still, the FFS is not yet always the favoured approach. In most countries it appears that the coherence in policy could be enhanced by explicitly making FFS-like approaches a prerequisite for any FAO programme or project with an extension component.
195. FAO's task is in principle to experiment, advice and facilitate governments and other actors regarding best practices and to assist in capacity-building around these practices. Multiplication and up-scaling shall be sought through the governments and associated actors in extension and rural development. The Evaluation Team is positive about the initiatives that have been undertaken thus far at a regional and national level to inform and interest governments and other stakeholders about the validity of the approach. Actors are encouraged to further strengthen information and advocacy activities in the remaining project period.
196. FAO is encouraged to strengthen sustainability of the integrated J/FFLS approach at an international level through joint programming, funding, implementation, information and advocacy with other UN agencies and international institutes, and public and private donors. UN Joint programming may provide a good opportunity to do so.
197. In all countries, the government representatives encountered were positive about the J/FFLS approach. In those countries where the Farmer Field School approach has become acknowledged and encouraged by government agricultural policy (i.e. Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda), follow-up to the RAF/010 project would logically consist in the integration of the junior aspects and the issues of gender, HIV/AIDS, nutrition in these policies. Where the FFS approach has not yet been integrated in governmental policy (i.e. Burundi, CAR, DR Congo), acknowledgement of the broader FFS approach should be sought before, or together with, the more specific integrated J/FFLS approach.
198. Even though FAO already is involved in getting the actors in the field of food security, nutrition and the FFS approach together, there is room for an enhancement of that role. FAO is the organisation with the longest experience in these subjects; furthermore, FAO is participating in numerous networks at country, regional and global networks. These factors may contribute to the feasibility of creating forms of cooperation on advocacy as well as implementation.

4.6.4 *Institutional sustainability*

199. The involvement of participants as future facilitators is a good mechanism to enhance the sustainability of the project's results. Provided that FAO and/or implementing partners are ready to support such constructions in the months shortly after the project, these groups may indeed embark upon a long-term cooperation.
200. Even though the enrolment of J/FFLS groups into registered cooperatives is often seen as a way to ensure sustainability, the Evaluation Team has only seen one example from the preceding project period; in the current project, there has been only limited effort ongoing up to now. Implementing partners have justified this, by bringing up that registration is a very lengthy and time consuming process and that it is planned for a later stage.

201. Some of the groups evolve into farmers networks or cooperatives. In Rwanda, the team met such a cooperative (3 have been initiated in total), started by the participants of one of the groups of the OSRO/RAF/808/SWE project. The cooperative seemed very successful, even more so since they had managed to attract funding from government to build a storage space and from UNICEF to build a nursery. Future participants were welcomed to enter upon payment of a fee.
202. The capacity of implementing partners is visibly enhanced by the project. The implementing partners appear capable and willing to use that capacity also after the closure of the project.

5 Conclusions and recommendations

5.1 Conclusions

5.1.1 *Relevance and appropriateness*

203. The overall goal of the project RAF/010 is to mitigate the impact of HIV, conflict and gender inequities on the population of humanitarian concern in Eastern and Central Africa. The title of the project specifies that this is done through a food security and nutrition response.
204. In general, the project was found to be very relevant in its activities and design and appeared also very valuable to the target groups. The project has managed to reach mainly highly vulnerable and resource-poor groups in all of the six countries involved. Through the JFFLS these vulnerable groups strengthen their individual agricultural knowledge and expertise and their social skills, and organise themselves into groups which may evolve into mutual support groups after project life.
205. The agricultural knowledge and expertise acquired was appreciated by the participants and found to be useful. The information about HIV, nutrition and gender also appears to address definite need and was appreciated by stakeholders.
206. The target beneficiaries in the FFLS and the JFFLS had been well selected and are indeed very poor and vulnerable. Most participants answered to the criteria of vulnerability, some were affected by HIV themselves or had an HIV affected person in their households, and a number of them were malnourished, especially in the JFFLS. In all countries (except in the region in CAR, visited by the Evaluation Team) participants' communities had suffered severely from violent conflict and displacement at some stage in the last 5 to 10 years.
207. The J/FFLS approach as such is actually a valid approach for many farmers, not only the most vulnerable. From a sustainability point of view it would be advisable to not just focus on the most vulnerable, but to rather include "less vulnerable" people in the groups to create or strengthen existing support mechanisms between groups in the mid and long run.
208. The topics of gender, HIV and nutrition were new to many of the facilitators. Therefore it was sometimes difficult for them to master and share the entire concept and to use the facilitative approaches at the same time. To overcome this problem, subject matter specialists could have been involved, from partner organisations or government institutes, but this was not done frequently.
209. The project covers a large geographical area with a relatively small budget. The costs of coordination, support and travel are therefore higher than would be necessary to build the intended J/FFLS expertise in each individual country. Also, in each country implementing partners had to be found; coordination and collaborative networks established; and inputs procured. Retrospectively, it would have been better to limit the number of target countries for economies of scale.

5.1.2 *Robustness and realism of the theory of change underpinning the project*

210. The project RAF/010 is not specific in its overall goal and title, and consequently far too ambitious in its wordings. Wordings include: "mitigating the impact of HIV, conflict

and gender inequities in Eastern and Central Africa” (goal) and “addressing HIV & gender inequities” (title). The activities of the project are actually far more specific and measurable (building training capacity, provide training, establish and run J/FFLS groups, etc.).

211. The overall project goal refers to “conflict”. This element is not sufficiently elaborated within the project activities or addressed in the curriculum, even when almost all project areas are indeed post-conflict areas and all participants are conflict-affected people. A more specific accent could have been laid on the issue of conflict management in the curriculum.
212. Most activities of the project are oriented towards the establishment of FFS-like groups working in a FFS-like fashion and incorporating in the highly agronomic curriculum the issues of gender, HIV/AIDS and nutrition. The creation of functional J/FFLS groups is assumed to mitigate the impact of HIV, conflict and gender inequities. Even though the project improves the livelihood and food security situation of a number of HIV affected people and households, the Evaluation Team considers mitigating the impact of HIV to be a too positive assumption.
213. The Evaluation Team agrees though that J/FFLS groups can be useful vehicles indeed to address issues of gender, HIV and conflict with groups of humanitarian concern. A more realistic (sub)title of the project could have been: “To strengthen the capacities of vulnerable groups in post-conflict areas through Farmer Field School groups to earn a living from agriculture, to learn about and acknowledge gender inequities, to raise awareness about HIV/AIDS and to improve nutritional diets”.
214. The integration of nutrition into the J/FFLS approach is relevant while nutrition is an important element related to food security. Nutrition was well incorporated into the curriculum and addressed during the Master Trainings, Training of Facilitators and field sessions. Local food habits and harvest were considered. Yet, the Evaluation Team believes that the topic could be dealt with in more practical ways such as cooking demonstrations and alike, in order to add effectiveness and agency to the learning. Also, the nutritional needs of special target groups like infants, children and HIV patients could be better addressed.
215. Even though the project design contains a number of promising features for sustainability, a more detailed support and approach appears to be needed in some specific cases. The establishment of cooperatives and the conversion of J/FFLS participants to become future facilitators are aimed at in most countries, but are not generally supported by concrete measures. Therefore, these intentions risk not coming beyond the planning stage.

5.1.3 Quality and realism of the project design

216. The Logical framework was not of appropriate quality according to the Evaluation Team while multiple elements were not defined in a SMART way, and multiple expected outputs were therefore not objectively verifiable.
217. The Evaluation Team considers that despite the choice to work in six countries at a time, the project design has turned out to be realistic. The execution of the project is well on track, despite the fact that the project started later than expected. In Annex 19, a schematic picture, along the lines of the logframe, is provided on the planned results as compared to the results actually achieved.

218. The project has not been realistic, however, about the number of beneficiaries that could reasonably be reached through project set-up. Instead of a total of 81,000 vulnerable household members, the Evaluation Team believes that maximally 30,000 vulnerable household members will be reached through the project interventions. In addition, the J/FFLS training capacity built with organisations and individuals in the six countries will contribute to other projects reaching out to higher numbers of vulnerable people in the medium and long term. It is difficult to estimate what numbers of people will be reached through this channel.
219. Regional exchange and collaboration are the main justification for this project being implemented through FAO-REOA. In this respect, new J/FFLS training capacity has indeed been created in Francophone countries with support from Anglophone trainers.
220. However, no linkages were established by FAO-REOA in any way with other Francophone trainers for example in West Africa where a large IPPM FFS is being implemented with development (not emergency) funds and support from FAO HQ. Part of the communication problems in trainings and monitoring could possibly have been overcome through the involvement of West African FFS IPPM trainers.
221. The Evaluation Team further considers that, apart from an Anglophone trainer running the Training of Master Trainers for Francophone countries, exchange and collaboration between the Anglophone and Francophone countries has been limited thus far both in quantity and in quality. The exchange visits planned to take place in 2012 may contribute to more such exchange.
222. The involvement in the project of the Anglophone countries Kenya and Uganda as “J/FFLS expert” countries has taken away attention from the fact that the J/FFLS approach is not yet institutionalised there, either. The information and advocacy activities planned to take place in 2012 in all countries including Kenya and Uganda may contribute to materialising such institutionalisation.
223. Training for Kenyan and Ugandan Master Trainers under this RAF/010 project was limited to one week. A refresher course in Kisumu (Kenya) on the issues of gender, HIV/AIDS and nutrition has been held. The Evaluation Team considers that it would have been better to apply the same trainings and approach in all six countries, in quality and in quantity, and to rather adjust the advocacy activities to the specific state of FFS-like development in each individual country.
224. The Evaluation shows that Master Trainers are clearly in demand in the respective countries. MTs were invited by many partners implementing or willing to use the FFS or J/FFLS approach.

5.1.4 Financial resource management

225. The Narrative and Financial Progress reports of November 2011 shared with the Evaluation Team indicate that the project was well on-track regarding the indicators as mentioned in the Logical framework. Spending was significantly delayed (only 33% spent by November 2011 but actual percentage including commitments 50%) but not reported as a problem.
226. Later financial updates by FAO-REOA coordinator leave the impression that the project will be able to implement all activities as foreseen and within convened budget. Last update showed a spending rate of 61% of total funds by March 26, 2012.
227. The Financial Progress Report as shared with donor does not provide sufficient information to assess the status and progress of the project’s financial management. The

report consisted in one single Excel-sheet with indications of the rate of spending as to late-November 2011 without any narratives, interpretation or specifications attached. No insight could be obtained on the spending pattern of the implementing partners.

5.1.5 Project management and implementation

228. The project management from FAO-REOA has been effective and efficient to judgement of the Evaluation Team. Stakeholders testified of their appreciation of the continuous availability of FAO-REOA for information and advice. Payments were disbursed to FAO national offices in a timely fashion.
229. Monitoring is considered weak. There is no monitoring framework, and there are no report formats or guidelines with regard to timing and responsibilities. The base-line data had not yet been analysed for any of the countries, and is thus not used in the project.
230. Project management at country level appears to have been adequate and effective in most countries. Note, however, that the Evaluation Team was not able to assess in all countries what Letters of Agreement had been signed, for what amounts, and how was break-down into cost categories and budget per category.
231. It was unclear to the Evaluation Team what were the project's policies established, at regional and/or national level, regarding facilitator payments, investment grants, and input use, procurement and provision; and how these policies were being monitored.

5.1.6 Quality and timeliness of the expected outputs

232. The project is expected to deliver the expected outputs within project period and in a quality that is adequate and appropriate.
233. Even though the number of beneficiaries of the project reached through direct and indirect channels is large, the process and mechanism of reaching the envisaged 81,000 participants, mentioned in the Prodoc, needs to be further elaborated.
234. The quality of the conduct of the established J/FFLS groups is the ultimate indicator for success of the project. The Evaluation Team considers that all J/FFLS groups encountered were dynamic, active, and innovative in their contexts. The facilitation skills of many facilitators could be strengthened according to judgement of the team. Still, the essence of the J/FFLS approach appears to be achieved overall. Participatory learning through experimentation about agriculture, issues of gender, HIV/AIDS and nutrition are key issues which form part and parcel of all sessions.
235. Communication and information sharing were found to be often performed in an interactive manner throughout the project and most of the involved stakeholders were skilled and experienced with regard to J/FFLS approach. There were also sufficient resources available in the form of manuals at most levels, information leaflets and videos. The information was well adapted to ultimately reach the poor population at field level. The knowledge of the participants was taken into consideration and respected.
236. The Evaluation Team found that in field sessions information and communication often was shared in a narrative or written form, notably on flip-overs. The use of visuals could be increased, especially while a significant part of the participants in the groups is illiterate.

5.1.7 Achievement of the expected outcome

237. The expected outcome of the project was formulated as "Effective regional integrated food security and nutrition response to HIV/conflict and gender inequity". The

objectively verifiable indicator for assessing the project outcome was defined as “Integrated Food Security and nutrition HIV/Gender interventions at national and community levels in areas of operations have increased by at least 40%.” The source of verification was “Mapping of the intervention before and after the project”. The Evaluation Team considers the above not defined in a SMART manner nor to be verifiable; therefore, the achievement of the above expected outcome can just not be assessed.

5.1.8 *Normative work*

238. FAO has first developed the J/FFLS approach in some countries in East and Southern Africa, and now successfully introduced the approach since a few years in four Francophone countries in Central Africa with the support of Anglophone trainers. The issues of gender, HIV/AIDS and nutrition are being integrated into the approach, which is considered both feasible and relevant.

239. Two training manuals were developed by FAO and published in 2010: the “Getting started” manual and the “J/FFLS Facilitators’ Guide”. Both documents have been translated into French in the meantime, and are currently being distributed among Master Trainers and Facilitators. Project actors had received draft versions at an earlier point in time to work with. The Evaluation Team considers the two curricula to be practical clear resource materials of good quality, suitable for the target group and written and designed in an accessible manner.

240. FAO should provide clear guidelines or minimum criteria to Master Trainers and interested third party organisations regarding the conduct of Trainings of Facilitators. The Master Trainers are experienced and knowledgeable trainers, who are in demand for conducting ToFs for third parties. As many organisations wish to limit the costs of trainings, the quality of the J/FFLS approach as envisaged may be compromised. The Master Trainers themselves are, for reasons of interest, usually not in a position to take a firm stance on this, and thus require policy support from FAO.

5.1.9 *Gender mainstreaming*

241. FAO formally launched its new policy on gender equality on March 13, 2012, i.e. during the course of the evaluation. The Evaluation Team welcomes the new policy and considers that it can be integrated with relative ease into future J/FFLS projects and designs.

242. Participation of men and women was mostly well-balanced in this RAF/010 project. Women participation was good amongst Master Trainers, Facilitators and J/FFLS participants in most cases. Women were more represented among Master Trainers and facilitators than is usually the case in the national agricultural extension agencies.

243. A key strength of the J/FFLS approach is that men and women collaborate on an equal footing, with group roles changing regularly from one person to another, while interactions between men and women members of the J/FFLS groups is enhanced both within the groups and outside in normal life. As a result, both men and women are addressed in their role as change makers.

244. Where J/FFLS groups consist in large majority, or even entirely, of women, gender mainstreaming is not possible. From a gender mainstreaming point of view it is essential to ensure that men and women interact through equal participation in groups. The Evaluation Team acknowledges that it may be difficult in specific cases (for example in DR Congo where many men go mining) to achieve such equal participation.

245. The way in which gender issues are being addressed within J/FFLS groups could be strengthened according to the Evaluation Team. Awareness about current gender roles and their sense and non-sense is likely being created, but the gender related concepts appear often to be difficult to grasp for participants and even harder to act upon in daily life. Still, the incorporation of gender subjects goes beyond SGBV and also touches upon gender roles and opportunities for women.

5.1.10 Sustainability

246. Several FAO departments and offices world-wide have spear-headed Farmer Field School-like approaches over the last decades. In terms of policy coherence, FAO is advised to formalise at an international level the recognition and acknowledgement of this work, declaring the FFS concepts to be FAO's leading approach and methodology for agricultural extension.

247. FAO's core task is to experiment, advice and facilitate governments and other actors regarding capacity-building around best practices. The Evaluation Team is positive about the initiatives that have been undertaken by the project thus far at a regional and national level to inform and interest governments and other stakeholders about the validity of the J/FFLS approach.

248. At a country level, many FAO offices have embraced the J/FFLS approach and/or other FFS approaches and incorporate these into new projects where and when applicable. However, coherence in policy could be enhanced by explicitly making FFS-like approaches a prerequisite for any FAO programme with an extension component.

249. FAO is encouraged to strengthen sustainability of the integrated J/FFLS approach at an international level through joint programming, funding, implementation, information and advocacy with other UN agencies and international institutes, and public and private donors.

250. Where the Farmer Field School approach has become acknowledged and encouraged by government agricultural policy (i.e. Kenya, Uganda and Rwanda), follow-up to the RAF/010 project would logically consist in the integration of the junior aspects and the issues of gender, HIV/AIDS, nutrition into these policies. Where the FFS approach has not yet been integrated in governmental policy (i.e. Burundi, CAR and DR Congo), acknowledgement of the broader FFS approach should be sought before, where possible together with, the more specific integrated J/FFLS approach.

251. Even though registering J/FFLS groups as cooperatives may be a lengthy and tedious process, it is a missed opportunity that this is not sufficiently pursued. Cooperatives may enable the project participants after the project's phasing out to profit from networking, profit enhancement through lower cost and better collective access to resources, thus improving their livelihood in the long run.

5.1.11 Overall performance of the project

252. Overall, the RAF/010 project is successfully being implemented. It will achieve most of its expected outputs within the time frame and budget convened.

253. Unfortunately, the expected project outcome of the RAF/010 project, as formulated in Project document, cannot be assessed while the proposed indicator is not objectively verifiable and the source of verification not well-defined.

254. The J/FFLS approach as promoted in the region and in the different countries provides a very worthwhile and promising vehicle for policy linkage between emergency,

rehabilitation and development. The approach is itself is more focused on development but still feasible for emergency settings. If upscaling and replication are properly in place, the JFFLS will not need to close down as in the case of many other approaches with a humanitarian character.

255. Individuals are trained in a participatory manner and in a group setting, which will contribute to increased interaction for learning, exchange and cooperation. Spin-off of the J/FFLS approach is expected to include: an increased consciousness of gender roles and division of labour; increased skills and expertise with facilitation, planning, organisation and conflict management with and within the group; and improved conditions for participants' cooperation in future formal or informal groups including cooperatives, saving and credit groups and other productive activities.

256. The RAF/010 project therewith is successfully contributing to the objectives I2, I3 and K2 of the FAO Strategic framework 2010-2019, which read as follows:

- * I2 - Countries' and partners respond more effectively to crises and emergencies with food and agriculture-related intervention. This is ensured by implementing this food security based project in countries with (still) humanitarian settings, and incorporating HIV, gender and nutrition on a parallel track, whilst simultaneously working towards upscaling and regional links;

- * I3 - Countries and partners have improved transition and linkages between emergency, rehabilitation and development. Government, FAO, implementing partners and stakeholders are working on implementation, replication and upscaling of the FFS approach, which may then continue to be used whilst the countries move to a development situation and beyond;

- * K2 - Governments develop enhanced capacities to incorporate gender and social equality issues in agriculture, food security and rural development programmes, projects and policies using sex-disaggregated statistics, other relevant information and resources. The project has built the capacity of government extensionists as Master Trainers and facilitators, involves various ministries in the support and execution of the project and provides capacity building in general on the FFS approach and facilitative skills as well as on gender, HIV and nutrition. FFS in many cases are now incorporated into multi-year national strategic plans.

5.2 Recommendations

Recommendation 1: to FAO Senior Management on policy coherence

Establish and declare at the FAO institutional level that the Farmer Field School (FFS) concepts and methodologies are FAO's leading approach and methodology for agricultural extension, and that they should be integrated in all FAO projects world-wide, which have a component of agricultural extension to smallholders and a gender component.

Recommendation 2: to FAO Senior Management on policy coherence

The thematic and cross-cutting issues of gender, HIV/AIDS (if relevant) and nutrition should be integrated into all future FAO projects with a component on agricultural extension.

Recommendation 3: to FAO Senior Management on minimum criteria for FFS training

Establish minimum criteria for TOFs, to be imparted by FAO trained MTs, concerning the duration of trainings, the number of trainers per training, the number of participants per training, the balance between theory and practice, and the "certification" of results. This will help ascertaining a continuous quality of diffusion and upscaling of the J/FFLS approach.

Recommendation 4: to FAO REOA and country offices on environmental sustainability

Ensure that all FFS sessions are coherent with FAO's policies on Integrated Production and Pest Management (IPPM), minimize the use of pesticides and encourage alternative more environmentally friendly methods. Encourage the use of locally available and affordable resources for agronomic practices, in order to enhance the sustainability of learning and experimentation after project closure.

Recommendation 5: to FAO REOA and country offices in the target countries

Develop and implement a refreshment training for facilitators in all counties (like it was done in Rwanda). Emphasise the importance of the facilitative approach, and incorporate exercises on how to transfer the gender and nutrition messages in a more practical way.

Recommendation 6: to FAO Senior Management on policy coherence

Formulate a truly integrated longer-term joint development programme for promotion of the J/FFLS approach led by FAO with a basket fund and financial and technical support on thematic issues from other international organisations such as UNAIDS, UN Women, international NGOs and public and private donors.

Recommendation 7: to FAO REOA on monitoring and evaluation

Improve, as far as possible, the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms by developing and distributing to implementing partners appropriate formats and schedules. Speed up the data collection and analysis. Develop a rapid qualitative assessment type impact survey to enable measuring the impact of the project, as the project size per country is too small to justify large scale collection of quantitative data.

Recommendation 8: to FAO General Management and Gender Officers

Ensure an equal participation of men and women in J/FFLS project activities in order to create optimal conditions for gender-mainstreaming to take place. A quota or minimum percentage for participation may be required for both men and women. Incorporate exercises to emphasise the role of men and women as change agents with regard to gender equality in the household and the community, and to enlarge women's participation in public life and producer's organizations and support their inclusion in decision making processes and leadership roles.

Recommendation 9: to FAO Nutrition Officers and AGN

In curricula and trainings, deal with the issue of nutrition in a more practical way through participatory methods, in order to add effectiveness the learning and increase the likelihood of later use. As long as these subjects are not presented in the manuals in a sufficiently practical manner, develop temporary guiding materials and exercises. Communicate with AGN to increase specific attention to the nutrition needs of specific target groups like babies, children and HIV patients. Adapt existing manuals to reflect nutrition concerns and status quo with support from AGN for the Master Trainings and ToFs. Make additional resources available to focus on nutrition and involvement of AGN, nutrition having become an important priority in FAO's strategy.

Recommendation 10: to FAO REOA and Principal Master Trainer on J/FFLS implementation

In trainings of Master Trainers, increase the time dedicated to the junior aspects of the J/FFLS approach. Budget for at least one refresher training for Master Trainers and facilitators in all countries to additionally touch upon this subject, address emerging problems, assess and further strengthen facilitation skills, and make necessary adaptations in approaches, tools and practices being employed. Make sure that training methods are adapted to the degree of literacy of participants. Encourage more development of Master Trainer and Facilitator networks. Develop a database of Master Trainers and Facilitators for future involvement in replication and up-scaling activities and ensure regular exchange.

Recommendation 11: to FAO HQ and REOA on J/FFLS implementation

In view of sustainability of the J/FFLS interventions, develop a policy on the payment with regard to amount and payment method of learning grants and facilitator fees per country, in which payment is related to actual time investment, and in line with local salary contexts and the standard of living.

Recommendation 12: to FAO Senior Management on J/FFLS up-scaling

Increase the number of J/FFLS Master Trainers and facilitators in all countries through additional Trainings of Master Trainers and ToFs. Develop a strategy on sustainability through producer organization, replication and upscaling, including the number of Master Trainers and facilitators to be trained, in relation to demand and to expected turnover among Master Trainers.

Recommendation 13: to FAO REOA and country offices on J/FFLS up-scaling

Explore with the Ministries of Education, and with individual primary and secondary school boards, the possibilities to integrate the J/FFLS approach into the regular curricula of primary and secondary schools. Similarly, explore the possibilities to integrate the J/FFLS approach in current projects favouring school gardening.

Recommendation 14: to FAO REOA and country offices on sustainability

Ensure that a mechanism is in place to support sustainability enhancing measures like the inclusion of participants (women, men and young people) in producers' organizations or cooperatives and or the continuation of participants as facilitators. Ensure the development of a feasible and practical exit strategy in this and future projects including budget lines for necessary after project support.

Recommendation 15: to FAO REOA and country offices on sustainability

Step up efforts to offer facilitation and guidance to the J/FFLS groups to grow towards an entity and enrol themselves into registered cooperatives or producers' organizations and strengthen the gender dimension and equity of producers' organizations. Organise exchange

visits with existing cooperatives. Encourage implementing partners to facilitate the start up and formation of informal farmer networks during the start up phase.

Recommendation 16: to FAO Senior Management on future project design

If a new phase of the project were to be designed and funded after 2012, the impact may benefit from targeting a smaller amount of countries under a similar total budget and distinguishing the target countries per language (Francophone and Anglophone) and/or related to the fact whether the country is categorized as still in need of humanitarian support. Partners may be prioritized for selection when they are already active in more than one of the target countries, to facilitate upscaling and sustainability. They should be encouraged to attract and involve subject matter specialists not only on agriculture but also nutrition, gender and HIV. The regional office may be involved for technical assistance, development of lessons learned and sharing common tools.

Recommendation 17: to FAO Senior Management on partnership

Take the lead in the design of an integrated long-term development programme with FFS approach with focus on nutrition, gender and HIV and incorporate WFP, UNAIDS and UN Women with co-funding and or co-implementation, each with regard to their focus area. Set up and utilise regional networks with for instance UN organisations, EU, NGOs, donors and other interested stakeholders, including the network on Gender and Rural Livelihoods and the regional HIV and GBV working group to develop, finance and support (sub)regional approach FFS projects.

Recommendation 18: to FAO Senior Management on human resource management

More stability in contracting human resources, including in emergency setting, would ensure more commitment and loyalty of individuals to FAO as an organisation; individuals who moreover have been invested in by FAO through intensive and expensive trainings both at a regional and a national level.

Recommendation 19: To FAO Senior Management and country offices on policy coherence

Develop per country, jointly with the Ministry of Agriculture and with practitioners, a position paper to document the national history and the objectives of introduction of the Farmer Field School approach, and its transformation (into FFSL-like approaches; where applicable) and diffusion to date (in names and numbers).

Recommendation 20: To the donor on funding the integration of gender, nutrition and HIV in projects

The current project up to now has appeared successful and will have positive effects on the livelihood of poor people with a focus on the HIV affected population, which may be confirmed by means of an ex post impact evaluation. Further funding of projects in this area (subject as well as geographical) is directly needed. A holistic approach of gender, nutrition and HIV, addressing more extensively mutual relations between gender, nutrition and HIV may further enhance the impact. Also, basket funding may be considered involving multiple partners with their respective specialties.

Annex 1: Evaluation terms of reference

Terms of Reference for Mid Term Evaluation of the project OSRO/RAF/010/SWE “Addressing HIV and Gender inequities through a food security and nutrition response in Eastern and Central Africa”

1. Background of the initiative

Building on a previous project (OSRO/RAF/808/SWE), the present intervention is supporting governments priorities in mitigating the impact of HIV, conflict and gender inequities on the population of humanitarian concern in Eastern and Central Africa through an integrated food security response. The project targets approximately 81 000 vulnerable people⁴ and involves more than 40 institutions among governments and non-government organizations (NGOs). The areas concerned are: (i) the peri-urban areas and peace villages in Burundi; (ii) eastern Rwanda [Rwandophones expelled from Tanzania]; (iii) Eastern Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC); (iv) northern Uganda; (v) Rift valley and refugee camps in Kenya; and (vi) the Bangui, Mambéré-Kadei and Lobaye prefectures in Central African Republic (CAR).

The past project already developed an innovative intervention linking HIV and Gender inequity issues to food security. FAO used the Junior Farmer Field and Life Schools (J/FFLS) as the entry point into the communities to deliver this integrated response which proved to be highly effective. Building on this and capitalizing on the lessons learnt and experiences, this project will further develop the response, build capacity of stakeholders and communities, advocate for the replication of the approach from the grassroots to the policy level, and support scaling up and rolling out across the region.

The overall goal of the project is to mitigate the impact of HIV, conflict and gender inequities on the population of humanitarian concern in eastern and central Africa. The outcome expected is an effective regional integrated food security and nutrition response to HIV, conflict, and gender inequity, which will be achieved through the delivery of the four outputs below:

- a. **Output 1:** Improved livelihoods and enhanced opportunities for income generating activities among at least 81 000 vulnerable household members affected by HIV, gender inequity and food insecurity in the region;
- b. **Output 2:** Effective coordination and lessons learning in regional Food Security, HIV and Gender related activities and initiatives;
- c. **Output 3:** Francophone and Anglophone expertise developed to implement J/FFLS for large scale roll out;
- d. **Output 4:** Regional capacity building, support and advocacy for HIV, Gender mainstreaming and development of food security and nutrition responses in FAO's and partners' field programmes (NGOs and Governments).

The Government of the Kingdom of Sweden has contributed with a total amount of USD 2 863 192 (20 000 000 SEK) in support of this project for a period of 24 months from 1 July 2010 to 30 June 2012. Whereas the expected starting date was 1/07/2010, the project started in December 2010 after signature of the agreement and receipt of the funds in November 2010.

The project is managed and supervised by the Regional Emergency officer HIV and Gender based at the Sub-Regional Emergency Office for Africa (REOA) in Nairobi. The implementation is insured through the Emergency Coordinating Units (ECUs) in Burundi,

⁴ 15 000 households x 5 persons average/household.

Uganda, CAR and DRC as well as through the FAO Representations in Rwanda and Kenya. The technical services (ESW) in FAO Headquarters (HQ) assure the technical soundness of the intervention. Operational support is guaranteed by the Emergency Operations Service (TCEO).

The main achievements to date are the following.

- a. Output 1: The Implementing Partners have been selected and the beneficiaries targeted; a total of 135 FFLS groups have been set up out of the 144 planned and a total of 73 J/FFLS groups have been set up out of the 44 planned. Out of these 208 groups set up, about 42 percent of them are at the initial stage of implementation (either under formation or at early implementation) while 58 percent of them are at the full implementation stage. In some locations, the groups already received agricultural inputs and materials for the weekly learning. A total of 26 francophone Master trainers were trained on the J/FFLS approach through a season long training in Rwanda and 261 facilitators trained through a total of 11 Training of Facilitators;
- b. Output 2: Out of the three planned coordination events, the inception/planning meeting was held on the 16-17 December 2010 in Nairobi; at the regional level, FAO has convened and chaired the regional inter-agency working group on HIV and GBV in Emergency settings leading the group as well as launched a regional network on gender and rural livelihoods/agriculture;
- c. Output 3: In some of the involved countries, FAO built additional activities within the UN Joint Programmes based on the project; the project and the approaches used by the project have been presented in the food security and nutrition forums and clusters at national and regional levels;
- d. Output 4: The institutionalisation of the J/FFLS approach and integration of the Food Security and Gender / HIV is taking place at local and national levels with adoption by inclusion into national joint programmes, policies and strategies.

2. Purpose of the evaluation

The overall objective of this mid-term evaluation is an assessment of the progress of the project so as to inform practical and actionable corrective adjustments required for the remaining of the current phase, the formulation of a new project phase as well as further programming in the region. The evaluation intends to provide beneficiaries with evidence on project results to date as well.

The stakeholders of this evaluation include the beneficiaries, the Government of Sweden and Sida, the Governments authorities in the participating countries, the implementing partners (IPs), FAO Headquarters, its Representations and ECUs in Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, CAR, DRC and Burundi, and FAO sub Regional Emergency Office for Eastern and Central Africa.

3. Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation will assess the project by addressing issues and questions based on the OECD/DAC criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability, both at regional level and at country level. Given the early stage of implementation, the evaluation will focus more on relevance, effectiveness and efficiency than on impact and sustainability, whose evidence is difficult to find so far. Considering the emergency nature of the project, the evaluation will consider timeliness, connectedness with medium and long term objectives and targeting of beneficiaries as well.

3.1 The evaluation will assess the project as follows:

- a. Relevance and appropriateness

The evaluation will provide an answer, among the others, to the following key questions:

- To what extent did the project overall objective and outcome correctly address the problems and real needs of the target groups?
- To what extent are they aligned to national and regional priorities?
- To what extent are they aligned with the Sida Strategy for humanitarian assistance 2011–2014?
- To what extent are they aligned with the FAO Strategic Framework 2010-2019 and the FAO Regional Programme Framework for Disaster Risk Management 2010-2013 for Eastern and Central Africa?
- To what extent do they reflect the priority areas defined in the FAO's NMTPF/CPFs?

b. Robustness and realism of the theory of change underpinning the project

Among the others, to the following questions will be addressed:

- How robust and realistic was the project design for the achievement of project outcome and outputs?
- Were the selected indicators valid to measure the achievement of the outcome and outputs?
- Did the assumptions stated in the logical framework hold?
- How have been the identified risks addressed?

c. Quality and realism of the project design

The evaluation will explore, among the others, the following questions:

- Was the work plan sound and realistic?
- Was the planned duration appropriate?
- Was the targeting strategy appropriate?
- To what extent the project design has been participatory?
- How the beneficiaries have been identified? Was the project successful in reaching people most in need? Have there been inclusions or exclusion errors?
- To what extent and how the project did take into account HIV/AIDS during the selection of beneficiaries?
- To what extent the institutional set-up and project management arrangements are conducive to the achievement of the project overall objective, outcome and outputs?
- To what extent the approach and the methodology adopted are appropriate?

d. Financial resources management

The evaluation will provide an answer, among the others, to the following key questions:

- Were budget allocations adequate to achieve the project outcome and outputs?
- Were budget revisions coherent and sound in matching project objectives?
- To what rate the budget has been delivered at the time of the evaluation?

e. Management and implementation

The evaluation will provide evidence, among others, on the following issues:

- Were activities managed effectively for the achievement of project overall goal, outcome and outputs?
- Were activities carried out according to the principles of the HAP Standard in Accountability and Quality Management of humanitarian action?
- Did the implementation mechanisms and the division of labour as planned between FAO and other IPs run smoothly and lead to a successful implementation of activities?
- To what extent the project staffs are suitable to achieve the project objectives?

- Were training programmes adequately designed according to real needs and capacities?
- Are there project locations where the J/FFLS approach work better?
- Were the outputs produced efficiently? Have resources been utilized in the most economical manner?
- To what extent internal monitoring and review are effective for taking remedial measures if need be?
- To what extent were the synergies with other interventions in the same targeted area exploited? Did coordination mechanisms with the existing and newly created networks on HIV and gender function well (Inter Agency Working Group on HIV and GBV for East and Central Africa, Regional Network on Gender and Rural Livelihoods, etc.)?
- To what extent were the activities of the project implemented in a participatory and empowering manner?
- Has the project involved all necessary stakeholders on HIV and gender?
- Was the actual timing of implementation appropriate?
- Has the project received appropriate and timely support from the various involved FAO offices?
- Was the administrative and technical support by the FAO appropriate?
- To what extent the project established linkages to other related projects within the FAO REOA portfolio?
- To what extent the project established linkages to other extensions programmes and in particular to the Kenya National Agriculture and Livestock Extension Programme (NALEP) supported by Sida?
- Was the support by the governments involved and by IPs appropriate in terms of time, quality and quantity?
- To what extent the project selected appropriate IPs?

f. Quality and timeliness the expected outputs

More specifically, the evaluation will focus on the following aspects:

- Were the outputs produced on time? How the project addressed eventual delays?
- To what extent the project produced quality outputs?
- Did the outputs benefit the intended beneficiaries?

g. Achievement of the expected outcome

The evaluation will provide an answer, among the others, to the following key questions:

- To what extent has the project outcome been achieved so far?
- What were the main challenges encountered during the implementation and to what extent did they affect the achievement of the outcome?
- What was the value added of the J/FFLS approach to the achievement of the outcome so far?

h. Normative work

The evaluation will focus on the following questions:

- To what extent the project took advantage of the FAO's normative products?
- To what extent the project is contributing or is likely to contribute to the normative work of FAO?

i. Gender mainstreaming

The evaluation will provide an answer, among the others, to the following key questions:

- To what extent gender issues have been integrated in the project from the beginning?
- Has the project design benefited from an inclusive stakeholders analysis and specific gender analysis?
- Has the project increased or is likely to increase equality between men and women?
- How gender issues are reflected in the project management?
- How gender issues are reflected in the identification of the beneficiaries?

j. Sustainability and connectedness

The evaluation will provide an answer, among the others, to the following questions:

- What changes triggered by the project are likely to be sustainable? Were those changes intended or not?
- Which of the project's outputs are likely to last after the end of the project? What are the institutional, technical, economic and social factors sustaining them?
- What measures have been put in place during the project's implementation to foster the sustainability of its achievements by the beneficiaries and the host institutions?
- To what extent the project is connected with and strengthens national extensions systems and policies? Does it involve national extensions workers?
- To what extent the project is connected with medium and long term development objectives?
- Looking at some of the groups who benefited from the previous project in the same areas, what are the outputs of the previous project which have been lasting until now? What are the lessons to be learned for the benefit of the current project?
- To what extent the project is known and how is it perceived by beneficiaries, partners, governments and other stakeholders?

k. Overall performance of the project and potential impact

More specifically, the evaluation will focus on the following aspects:

- Within the bigger picture of the previous project, what are the impact to date and the foreseeable impact of the project in terms of livelihoods and income of beneficiaries, entrepreneurship opportunities, food security, gender equality, knowledge of HIV/AIDS and nutrition issues among the beneficiaries?
- To what extent the project is contributing to sustaining livelihoods, according to the principles of the Sustainable Livelihoods Framework?
- To what extent the project is likely to attain its outcome and FAO Organisational Results I2, I3 and K2?
- Were intended and unintended current and foreseeable impacts produced by the project (with particular attention to the environment and to human rights) identified?
- What lessons on project implementation have already been drawn by FAO's field management and by stakeholders so far?
- To what extent the project has strengthened FAO's role in improving food security through the mitigation of the impact of HIV/AIDS, conflict and gender inequalities?
- Are there differences in terms of impact between the areas of intervention? If any, what are the lessons learnt for the remaining of the project and for future programming?

3.2 Based on the above analysis, the evaluation will draw specific conclusions and formulate recommendations for any necessary further action by Government, FAO and other parties to ensure sustainable development, including any need for

follow-up action. The evaluation will draw attention to specific good practices and lessons of interest to other similar activities.

4. Evaluation methodology

4.1 Evaluability issues

The evaluability of the project depending on the availability of clear targets and baseline and monitoring data, these will be availed to the evaluation team by the project management before the field visits. However, the evaluation team will seek to overcome any data gaps by seeking qualitative inputs in the field.

4.2 Methodology

- a. The evaluation will adhere to the UNEG Norms & Standards.
- b. The evaluation will adopt a consultative and transparent approach with internal and external stakeholders throughout the evaluation process. Triangulation of evidence and information gathered will underpin the validation of evidence collected and its analysis and will support conclusions and recommendations.
- c. The project logical framework will serve as a key reference to the evaluation team to measure achievements against planned outcome and outputs.
- d. The evaluation will make use of the following tools:
 - Review of project documents, minutes of meetings and existing reports;
 - Semi-structured interviews with key informants, stakeholders and beneficiaries at FAO HQ, in the six countries involved and at regional level;
 - Direct observation during field visits;
 - The Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) framework for assessment of project results.

In addition, the evaluation will make use of the FAO Strategic Framework 2010-2019, the FAO Regional Programme Framework for Disaster Risk Management 2010-2013 for Eastern and Central Africa, the 2010 HAP Standard in Accountability and Quality Management, and the Sustainable Livelihoods Framework.

A field mission will take place in all the six countries involved (CAR, DRC, Uganda, Rwanda, Burundi, and Kenya), in order to consult with all relevant stakeholders. Should security conditions be unfavourable in some of the six countries at the time of the field mission, surveys and questionnaires will be used so as to ensure a complete coverage and that all the relevant stakeholders have the opportunity to express their views.

5. Consultation process

- 5.1 The evaluation team will maintain close liaison with the FAO Office of Evaluation (OED), the project management, the LTU, REOA, FAO's ECUs based in Uganda, Burundi, DRC and CAR, FAO's Representations in Rwanda and Kenya, and all key stakeholders. Although the mission is free to discuss with the

authorities concerned anything relevant to its assignment, it is not authorized to make any commitment on behalf of the Government, the donor or FAO.

- 5.2 The evaluation team will present its preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations to the key stakeholders at the end of the field mission, to obtain feedback from them (at midterm review workshop) .
- 5.3 After the field mission, the Team Leader will also present the evaluation initial findings to the relevant stakeholders in FAO's Headquarters and will receive their feedback.
- 5.4 The draft evaluation report will be circulated for comment before finalisation among key stakeholders, including the project staff and IPs, REOA, relevant FAO's Representations and ECUs. Suggestions will be incorporated as deemed appropriate by the evaluation team.

6 The evaluation team

- 6.1 Team members will have no previous direct involvement in the formulation, implementation or backstopping of the project. All will sign the Declaration of Interest form of the FAO Office of Evaluation.
- 6.2 The evaluation will be carried out by a team composed of two independent experts:
 - a. Specialist in HIV/AIDS and gender issues;
 - b. Specialist in agriculture and food security with previous experience in Junior/Farmer Field and Life Schools.

Both experts will have regional experience in Eastern and Central Africa and working knowledge of both English and French.

Both experts will have good evaluation experience. Depending on the evaluation background, one of the two experts will be the Team Leader.

- 6.3 The Evaluation Team will be responsible for conducting the evaluation and applying the methodology. All team members, including the Team Leader, will participate in briefing and debriefing meetings, discussions, field visits, and will contribute to the evaluation with written inputs.
- 6.4 The Evaluation Team will be fully responsible for its independent report which may not necessarily reflect the views of the Governments or of FAO. The evaluation report will not be subject to technical clearance by FAO although OED will be responsible for ensuring conformity of the evaluation report with standards for project evaluation in FAO.

7 Reporting outputs

- 7.1 An inception report (5 pages max) will be prepared after having finalised the methodology, a detailed workplan and the tools to be used during the evaluation.
- 7.2 The evaluation report will illustrate the evidence found that responds to the evaluation issues, questions and criteria listed in the ToR. It will include an executive summary. Supporting data and analysis should be annexed to the report when considered important to complement the main report.

7.3 The recommendations will be addressed to the different stakeholders and prioritized: they will be evidence-based, relevant, focused, clearly formulated and actionable.

7.4 The evaluation team will agree on the outline of the report early in the evaluation process. The report will be prepared in English. A translation of the Executive Summary in French will be organised by OED.

7.5 Annexes to the evaluation report will include, though not limited to, the following:

- Terms of reference for the evaluation;
- Profile of team members;
- List of documents reviewed;
- List of institutions and stakeholders interviewed by the evaluation team;
- List of project outputs.

8 Evaluation timetable

The evaluation process will develop according to the following phases:

- a. **Preparatory phase:** The Team Leader will carry out internal consultations with relevant stakeholders at FAO HQ and through telephone conferences, will review relevant documents and prepare a detailed work plan along with the evaluation tools. This work will be incorporated in an inception report of 5 pages maximum, excluding annexes. This phase will cover the period 16/01/2012 to 20/02/2012, approximately.
- b. **Evaluation Mission:** The evaluation team will visit the implementation countries tentatively from 20 February to 25 March 2012, as follows:
 - 20-23 February: KENYA - Discussions at REOA in Nairobi and field visits in Kenya;
 - 24-28 February: CAR - Discussions with project team and partner meetings in Bangui, participation in the FFLS policy meeting on the 27th;
 - 29 February – 3 March: UGANDA - Field visits in Northern Uganda;
 - 4-7 March: RWANDA - Field visits in Eastern Rwanda;
 - 8-14 March: DRC – Field visits to Goma and Bukavu;
 - 15-20 March: BURUNDI - Field visits to peri-urban areas and peace villages;
 - 21-22 March: Participation in the project mid-term evaluation workshop in Bujumbura;
 - 23-25 March: KENYA - Mission wrap-up with REOA in Nairobi.
- c. **Final consultation and reporting:** The Team Leader will have a debriefing with relevant stakeholders at FAO HQ in Rome. Both team members will contribute to the report with written inputs. The Team Leader bears responsibility for submitting the final draft report to OED within three weeks from the conclusion of the mission and OED will circulate it to all FAO stakeholders. Within two additional weeks, FAO will submit to the team the comments and suggestions that the team will include as appropriate in the final report within one week. This phase will cover the period 1/4/2012 to 20/05/2012, approximately.

	Jan 12		Feb 12				March 12				Apr 12				May 12		
Weeks	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3
Internal consultations																	
Desk review																	
Preparation of evaluation tools																	
Preparation of a detailed workplan																	
Preparation of the inception report																	
Mission to Kenya																	
Mission to CAR																	
Mission to Uganda																	
Mission to Rwanda																	
Mission to DRC																	
Mission to Burundi																	
Mid-term workshop in Burundi																	
Debriefing with REOA in Kenya																	
Debriefing in Rome																	
Drafting of the report																	
Incorporation of comments																	
Finalisation of the evaluation report																	

Annex 2: Profile of team members

The evaluation team was composed of team leader Herma Majoor and team member Peter Ton.

- 1) Herma Majoor is an independent expert in gender, food security and nutrition, SGBV and HIV/AIDS and monitoring & evaluation in developing countries, incorporating a focus on gender equality where and if possible. She works with international and supranational organisations, governments, universities, international and national NGOs and civil society. She has worked as team leader in a long-term FFS/gender project. She has worked over 15 years in Central and South-Asia, the Middle East and Anglophone and Francophone Africa.
- 2) Peter Ton is a human geographer and expert in sustainable agriculture, value chains, trade for development, food security, pro-poor extension services, water & sanitation, livelihoods, learning, monitoring & evaluation. Over the years, he has been dealing with and evaluating a number of programmes and projects on J/FFLS. He has worked over 15 years in West and Central Africa, in East and Southern Africa, and in parts of Asia and Latin America.

Annex 3: List of documents reviewed

FAO General Documents

- FAO Strategic Framework 2010-2019
- FAO Office of Evaluation: Step-by-step procedures for the separate evaluation of voluntary funded initiatives – OED guidelines
- FAO Regional Programme Framework for Disaster Risk Management 2010-2013
- FAO Livelihood Assessment Toolkit
- FAO and WFP: Socio-economic and gender analysis SEAGA for Emergency and FAO Gender and Development Plan of Action 2008-2013
- FAO – Dimitra: Communication Gender for Rural Development – Integrating gender in communication for development

FAO Country documents

- FAO: Cadre National Stratégique des Priorités d'Intervention à Moyen Terme de la FAO au Burundi (2010 – 2014)
- FAO: Cadre national des priorités à moyen terme (CNPMT) 2011-2015
- FAO: Cadre National des Priorités à Moyen Terme de la FAO en République Démocratique du Congo NMTPF 2008 – 2011
- FAO : Cadre Nationale des Priorités à Moyen Terme de la FAO en République Centrafricaine NMPTF 2008 - 2011
- FAO : Cadre des priorités d'interventions à moyen terme de la FAO au Rwanda (NMTPF) 2008-2012
- FAO : Country Support Strategic Framework Uganda 2010-2014
- FAO: National Medium Term Priority Framework Kenya (NMTPF 2009-2013)
- FAO Instruction Manual: Results Based Integrated Planning and Monitoring Tool July 2011
- FAO Emergency and Rehabilitation Country Overview Central African Republic December 2011
- FAO Country Brief Burundi May 2011
- FAO Country Brief Burundi September 2011
- FAO Executive Brief Rwanda April 2011 – under revision
- FAO in emergencies Country Brief Uganda January 2012

FAO and partners' project documents OSRO/RAF/008/SWE and OSRO/RAF/010/SWE

- FAO Final Report OSRO/RAF/808/SWE “Addressing food insecurity, HIV and gender-based violence in eastern Africa”
- FAO Final Report OSRO/RAF/707/SWE “Protecting and improving food security, nutrition and livelihoods of HIV/AIDS affected households and communities in the Great Lakes Region”
- FAO Regional Stocktaking Report, OSRO/RAF/808/SWE, 24-26 February 2010, Nairobi
- FAO Regional FFS and JFFLS Status Report, February 2010, The FFS Foundation, The Netherlands
- FAO: A Rwanda Case Study, OSRO/RAF/808/SWE and OSRO/RAF/010/SWE
- FAO Project Document OSRO/RAF/707/SWE
- FAO Project Document OSRO/RAF/808/SWE
- FAO Project Document OSRO/RAF/010/SWE

- FAO Interim Report December 2010-November 2011 OSRO/RAF/010/SWE “Addressing HIV and Gender inequities through a food security and nutrition response in Eastern and Central Africa”
- FAO Planning Workshop Report, OSRO/RAF/010/SWE 17-16 December 2011, Nairobi
- FAO J/FFLS Master Trainer Training Course Report, Rwanda, July 2011, OSRO/RAF/010/SWE
- FAO : Rapport de formation : Recyclage des Formateurs 13-17 Mars 2012
- FAO : Rapport de Formation des Facilitateurs CEP 10-19 Août
- FAO : Rapport succinct individuel de ToF ; Mbaiki du 8 au 26 Août 2011
- FAO: Rapport succinct individuel de ToF ; Berbérati du 26 septembre au 15 octobre 2011
- FAO : Rapport de mission d’appui technique du bureau sous régional dans la mise en œuvre du Champ Ecole Paysan en RCA
- Terms of Agreement between FAO Kenya and ACK
- Letter of Agreement between Lutheran World Foundation and FAO Uganda
- Letter of Agreement between War Child UK and FAO Uganda
- ACK Progress Report, February 2012
- ACK: Training Report of “Training of Facilitators Workshop” 17-26 October 2011 in Eden Hotel Kapsabet
- ACK: Training Report of Training for facilitators HIV, gender and Conflict Management Workshop, 7-12 November 2011, Eldoret
- ACK: A Survey of Household Livelihood Status of Population of Humanitarian Concern in Uasin Gishu, October 2011
- Lutheran World Federation Kitgum Sub Program FAO – GBV & AIDS Farmer Field and Life School Inception Report
- War Child UK Activity Inception Report: Implementation of 27 Junior Farmer Field and Life School In Kaabong and Kotido District October-December 2011
- AVSI Rapport d’activités des J/FFS, 5 septembre-5 novembre 2011
- Protocole d’Accord entre Caritas et FAO Rwanda

FAO visibility documents

- FAO in Eastern and Central Africa Donor Brief HIV AIDS and Gender May 2011
- FAO Fact Sheet Rwanda July 2011
- FAO Donor Brief: Addressing HIV and Gender Inequities through Agriculture
- FAO at work 2010-2011 Women - Key to Food Security
- FAO The state of food and agriculture (2010-2011) Women in Agriculture: Closing the gender gap for development
- FAO The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2011
- Dimitra Article: Empowering Farmers over their Fields, Empowering Women over their Lives
- Dimitra Article: Investing in the Future of Orphans and Vulnerable Children in Northern Uganda

Various background documents and literature

- UN: Stratégie Intégrée d’appui des Nations Unies au Burundi 2010-2014

- UN : République Centrafricaine Plan Cadre des Nations Unies Pour l'Aide au Développement 2007-2011
- UN : UNDAF Kenya 2009-2013
- UN : UNDAF RD Congo 2007-2010
- UN : UNDAF Rwanda 2008-2012
- UN : UNDAF Uganda 2010-2014
- UN One programme : Improve livelihoods and promote a supportive social environment for people infected by HIV through addressing socioeconomic and gender inequalities. Rwanda, January 2012.
- UNDP. The Real Wealth of Nations: Pathways to Human Development: Human Development Report 2010
- The 2010 HAP Standard in Accountability
- IASC Guidelines for HIV/AIDS interventions in emergency settings
- Sida: Strategy for humanitarian assistance provided through the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency 2011–2014
- FSNWG Update Central Africa January 2012
- WFP: Keiths, S et al: Addressing the link between food aid and HIV/AIDS through international collaboration in Kenya and Uganda (2007)
- Road Map for Scaling up Nutrition (SUN) September 2010
- Friis-Hanssen, E. et al: Participatory Extension Processes as Catalyst for Change in Social Dynamics among Rural Poor. Innovation in Sustainable Development in Agriculture and Food, June 28-July 1, 2010, Montpellier, France
- Baaz, M.E.; Stern, M. The complexity of violence: A critical analysis of sexual violence in the Democratic Republic of Congo. Sida May 2010
- Custers, R. Het STAREC plan van de Congolese regering: een voorlopige analyse. Augustus 2009
- Dolan, C. War is not yet over: Community perceptions of sexual violence and its underpinnings in eastern DRC. November 2010
- McLaughlin C. et al: Old Enough to know, a summary for policy makers and practitioners, University of Cambridge, March 2012
- Friis-Hansen, E; Duveskog, D; Taylor, EW. Less noise in the household: the impact of Farmer Field Schools on Gender Relations. Journal of Research in Peace, Gender and Development, Vol 2 (2), pp. 044-055. February 2012.

Annex 4: List of institutions and stakeholders met during the evaluation process

Time	People met	Designation	Organisation
ROME			
Tuesday, 14 February 2012			
09:00-10:00	Marta Piccarozzi Rachel Bedouin	OED	FAO
10:00-11:00	Angela Hinrichs Tiziana Buffagni	TCEO	FAO
11.10-11.40	Holly Hufnagel Michael Pizzarri	TCEO (BDI)	FAO
11.00-12.00	Carol Djeddah	ESW	FAO
14.10-14.40	Sara Loppo	TCEO CAR desk	FAO
14.50-15.20	Tullia Aiazzi	OED Gender Focal Point	FAO
Wednesday, 15 February 2012			
09:15-9:45	Jeff Tschirley	TCER Chief	FAO
10:00-10:30	Fatouma Scheid Andrea LoBianco	TCEO (DRC)	FAO
11:00-12:00	Florence Egal Martina Park	AGN, nutrition expert AGN	FAO
12:00-12:30	Elizabeth Narrowe	Responsible FAO contacts	Sida, teleconference
13:30-14:00	Oriane Turot Siddharth Krishnaswamy	ESAD	FAO
Friday, 17 February 2012			
9:00-10:00	Eliane Najros	Coordinator Dimitra	FAO (Skype conf.)

Kenya - Nairobi		
Monday 20 February		
Karine Garnier	Regional Emergency Officer HIV/Gender	FAO-REOA
Roderick Charters	Sub Regional Emergency Coordinator	FAO-REOA
Dan Rugabira	FAO Representative in Kenya	FAO
Angela Kimani	Nutrition Officer	FAO-REOA
Samuel Atieno		Ministry of Livestock
Charles Oranga	FS and HIV Officer	FAO Kenya
Elizabeth Ssendiwala	Gender	IFAD
Margaret Akinyi Wagah	Nutrition Consultant	(Ex-)RENEWAL
Daniele de Bernardi	Regional Food Security Analyst	FAO-REOA
Tuesday 21 February		
Deborah Duveskog	Rural Community Development Officer	FAO-REOA
Queen Katembu	Gender & HIV/AIDS Support Officer	FAO Kenya
Paul Omanga	Crops Production Officer	FAO Kenya
Stanley Kimereh	Programme Assistant	FAO Kenya
Lennart Hernander	Representative	LWF
Leah Odongo-Ogesare	Programs Officer	LWF
Beatrice Muingo Mwaura	Gender Officer	Min of Agriculture
Lumumba Kokeyo	Head Mass Media Services	Min of Agriculture
Kenya - Eldoret		
Wednesday 22 February		
Jackson K. Sambu	Executive Director	ACK
Rael J. Konir	Zonal Development Coordinator Eldoret	ACK
Julius Lagat	Project Assistant	ACK
Thomas Kimathi Nyagah	Monitoring and Evaluation Officer	ACK
Josephine Tarus	Programme Coordinator	ACK
Tom Nyabundi	Master Trainer	Ministry of Agriculture
Dan Orwa	Master Trainer	Ministry of Agriculture
Thursday 23 February		
Evelyn Andieme	DAO Officer	DAO Wareng District
Grace Rohin	Extension Officer	DAO Wareng District
Jennifer Cherop	Locational Extension Officer	DAO Wareng District
Susy Kirgiren	Locational Extension Officer	DAO Wareng District
Joseph Ngetich	Chief	Farakwa Location
Benjamin Koskei	Assistant Chief	Lingwai sub-location
Benson Mwaura	Assistant Chief	Iladkeno sub-location
15 facilitators	School teachers and FFLS participants	Burnt Forest location
J/FFLS Koiwarusen	33 participants	Koiwarusen
Grace Kiptanui	Teacher and facilitator	Primary School, Koiwarusen

FFLS Kamuyu Kuona	22 participants and facilitator	Kamuyu Kuona
CAR		
Friday 24 February		
Marc Abdala	Coordonateur Principal des Urgences et de Réhabilitation	FAO CAR
Fernand Mboutou	Project manager/Master Trainer	FAO CAR
Marius S. Pounanguere	Master Trainer	ACDA
Saturday 25 February		
Peggy-Carine Dangbo	Superior Technician Agriculture/Master Trainer	ACDA
Samdou Dangaza	Chef Service Agricultural Extension	ACDA
J/FFLS Samba	15 participants & 1 facilitator	Samba (Mbaiki area)
FFLS Kokoro	22 participants & facilitator	Kokoro (Bangui area)
Monday 27 February		
Honoré Feizoure	Directeur Général	Ministère de Développement Rural et de l'Agriculture
Tuesday 28 February		
Magoumbala le Parfait	Spécialiste Projet PREVESTE	FIDA
Mathieu Ngoubou	Chargé de Mission en Agriculture	Ministère de Développement Rural et de l'Agriculture
Uganda		
Wednesday 29 February		
Elvis Obbo	National Programme Officer Gender/HIV	FAO Uganda
Francis Otim	Programme Officer	FAO Uganda
Tony Ojok	Programme Assistant FFS	FAO Uganda
Stella Sengendo	Programme Officer FS and Agricultural Livelihoods	FAO Uganda
Thursday 1 March		
William Onen	Sub Program Manager	LWF
Elda Nyero	Nutritionist	LWF
Matanza Paul Odwong	Master Trainer	LWF
Peter Abal	District Agricultural Officer	MAAIF
FFLS Ladotonen	70 participants from 8 FFLS,	Samba (Orom)
Friday 2 March		
FFLS Kokoro (Lokum)	30 participants from 4 FFLS	Kokoro (Lokum)
Saturday 3 March		
Anunciata Hakuza	Senior Agricultural Economist	MAAIF Uganda
Joseph Mukamana	In charge of project Master Trainer	FAO Rwanda
Rwanda		
Monday 5 March		
Denis Kanywabahizi	Consultant Agronome	FAO Rwanda
Laurent Gashugi	Assistant Représentative	FAO Rwanda
Christophe Mupenzi	Master Trainer	FAO EU Project FFS Cassave
Marcel Ruzibiza	Master Trainer	FAO EU Project FFS Cassave

Odile Kerekezi	Master Trainer	AVSI
Edouard Murutampunzi	Master Trainer	Caritas
Jacques Hakizimana	Master Trainer	DRL
Riccardo Bevilacqua Lazise	Représentant Légal	AVSI
Lorette Birara	Programme Coordinator	AVSI
Emanuel Rubagumya	Director	CARITAS-Kirungo
Jeanne Mukayiranga	Programme Officer	CARITAS-Kirungo
Tuesday 6 March		
Michel Sebarabirwa	Coordinateur du CDLS	Gazibo District Office
J. Bosco Ntuyahaga	Gender & Family Promotion	Gazibo District Office
Fred Murara Kazora	Deputy Secretary Rwimbogo Sector	Gazibo District Office
Eugène Rutabagaya	Programme Coordinator Gender and Democratic Governance	UNWomen
Members of Cooperative	Cooperation Duterimbere	Ndama
FFLS Tuzamurane	Participants, facilitator and coordinator	Ndama
JFFLS Munini	Head master, primary and secondary group participants and teacher/facilitator	Ndama
Wednesday 7 March		
Raphael Ruragwa	Directeur General of Planning & Programme Coordination	Min of Agriculture and Animal Resources
Lars Johansson	First Secretary	Embassy of Sweden/Sida
Marie Jusnes	First Secretary	Embassy of Sweden/Sida
Dieudonné Ruturwa	Programme officer	UNAIDS
Maxime Rwendeye	GBV Programme Coordinator	UN Women
DR Congo		
Thursday 8 March		
Laurent Ikundji	Consultant National Suivi & Evaluation	FAO Goma
Anthony Musafiri	Coordinateur Nord-Kivu	Hope in Action
Nzanzu Kasivita	Ministre	Ministère Provençal de l'Agriculture, pêche, élevage et développement rurale
Massimo Giovanola	Coordinateur Zone EST de la FAO en RDC	FAO Goma
Jonathan Muhindo	Focal Point HIV	MONUSCO
Antoine Bakangadio	Master Trainer	FAO/Projet Équateur
Aster Aristide Bashinge	Master Trainer	FAO/Dimitra
Friday 9 March		
Moïse Mohindu	Chargé des Opérations	FAO Bukavu
Adeline Nsimire	Coordinatrice	Samwaki
Tiphaine Buéké	Project Focal Point in DRC / Food Security, HIV & Nutrition officer	FAO DR Congo

Saturday 10 March		
FFLS Zuké	Participants and facilitator	Walungu
FFLS Murula	Participants and facilitator	Walungu
Monday 12 March		
Venance Mbusa Mbunga	Regional Focal point in Kivu / Master Trainer	FAO Bukavu
Guillaume Kahomboshi	Food security officer	FAO Bukavu
Elvis Basubi	Technician IPAPPEL / Master Trainer	Ministry of Agriculture Fishery and Animal Husbandry
Jean Wandjo Kibasomba	Master Trainer	FAO Bukavu
FFLS	Participants and facilitator	Moshinga
JFFLS	Participants and facilitator	Kabare
Tuesday 13 March		
Godrick Khisa	Principal Master Trainer	Consultant to FAO-REOA
Espérance Hendwaciza	Coordinator	REFED
FFLS Tinhabuguma	Participants and facilitator	Igoma
JFFLS Zadirira	Participants and facilitator	Mugogo
Wednesday 14 March		
Dalton M'undabatu Kasukolo	Agricultural Inspector Fizi	Ministry of Agriculture Fishery and Animal Husbandry
Burundi		
Thursday 15 March		
Emmanuel Nizigiyimana	Focal Point in Burundi / Consultant Horticulture	FAO Burundi
Ancilla Ndahigeze	Consultant Gender, HIV and Nutrition	FAO Burundi
Rosemeire Munhoz	Country Coordinator	UNAIDS
Liliane Bigayimpunzi	Programme Officer	WFP
Gaston Nkeshimana	Senior Programme Assistant	WFP
Soo Mee Baumann	Programme officer Health and Nutrition	WFP
Friday 16 March		
Jeanne d'Arc Kabanga	National Coordinator/ Master Trainer	SWAA
Isaac Ndayisenga	Advisor to Cabinet	Ministry of Youth, Sports and Culture
Anne-Spès Nishime	Communication and Advocacy Officer	CAFOB
Saturday 17 March		
FFLS Gisuru	Participants, facilitators	Gitega
FFLS Irumwete	Participants, facilitators	Gitega
JFFLS École Rukundo	Participants, facilitators	Gitega
Staff members	facilitators, MTs	SWAA, Gitega
Monday 19 March		
FFLS Kerebuka	Participants, facilitators	Rumonge
FFLS Chez ABUBEF	Participants, facilitators	Rumonge
JFFLS École Rumonge	Participants, facilitators	Rumonge
Tuesday 20 March		
Spéciose Naikumana	Représentent légale	OPE

FFLS	Participants and facilitator	Rumonge
FFLS	Participants and facilitator	Rumonge
JFFLS Kerebuka	Participants and 2 facilitators	Rumonge
Tuesday 20 March		
Meeting of Master Trainers preceding regional workshop		
Wednesday 21 March/Thursday 22 March		
Meeting of Master Trainers preceding regional workshop		
Friday 21 March		
Debriefing presentation regional office/Skype debriefing Rod Charters		

Annex 5: Detailed time table evaluation mission

Days/ Duty station	Activities	Team Leader	Team member
16 Jan - 18 Feb Home	Preliminary Preparations/Planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk review, literature review and preparation of survey material (questionnaire) • Brief inception report (5 pages), including country and final report format. 	7 days	1 day
14 – 15 Feb Rome	Briefing meeting at HQ	2 days	
19 Feb	Herma and Peter travel to Nairobi <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •10:35-20:40 	1 day	1 day
20 Feb Nairobi	Preliminary Preparations/Planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation with project regional manager, regional coordinator, other FAO-REOA staff, relevant network partners 	1 day	1 day
21 - 22 Feb Nairobi	Country evaluation Kenya <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Capital level 	2 days	2 days
23 Feb Eldoret	Country evaluation Kenya <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Field mission 	1 day	1 day
24 Feb	Herma and Peter travel to CAR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Meeting staff FAO Bangui 	1 day	1 day
25- 27 Feb	Country Evaluation CAR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Field visits 	3 days	3 days
28 Feb	Herma and Peter travel to Uganda <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •13:20-18:30 	1 day	1 day
29 Feb Kampala	Country Evaluation Uganda <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Meetings at Kampala level •Travel to Kitgum 	1 day	1 day
1 – 2 March Kitgum	Country Evaluation Uganda <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Field mission •Travel back to Kampala 	2 days	2 days
3 March	Country Evaluation Uganda <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Debriefing Kampala 	1 day	1 day

3 March	Herma and Peter travel to Rwanda •13:50-13:50		
4-5 March Kigali	Country Evaluation Rwanda •Meetings at Kigali level •Travel to field (Gatsibo District, Ndama site)	2 days	2 day
6 March	Country Evaluation Rwanda •Meetings at field level •Travel to Kigali	1 day	1 day
7 March Kigali	Country Evaluation Rwanda •Meetings at Kigali level	1 day	1 day
8 March	Country Evaluation DRC •Travel to Goma, DRC, by car •Meetings in Goma	1 day	1 day
9-13 March	Country Evaluation DRC •Field visits in South-Kivu	5 days	5 days
14 March	Country Evaluation DRC •Travel to Burundi via Rwanda by car	1 day	1 day
15-18 March Bujumbura	Country Evaluation Burundi •Meetings at Bujumbura level	4 days	4 days
19 March Rumonge	Country Evaluation Burundi •Meetings at field level	1 day	1 day
20 March Bujumbura	Country Evaluation Burundi •Meetings at Bujumbura level	1 day	1 day
21-22 March Bujumbura	Country Evaluation Burundi •Regional evaluation workshop	2 days	2 days
22 March	Herma and Peter travel to Nairobi •17:00-21:00		
23 March Nairobi	Debriefing at REOA	1 day	1 day
24 March	Herma and Peter travel home •8:20-15:20	1 day	1 day
Home 26 March-16 April	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data analysis • Preliminary draft report 	15 days	15 days
Rome	Debriefing at HQ level	2 days	

4-5 April			
16 - 30 April (No team time)	Circulation and comments from stakeholders		
Home	Finalization of the report/Incorporation of comments	2 days	2 days
Total days		63 days	53 days

Annex 6: Table implementation details per country

	Burundi	CAR	DR Congo	Kenya	Rwanda	Uganda
Partners	SWAA OPE	ACDA	Hope in Action Samwaki	ACK LWF	AVSI CARITAS	LWF WCUK
Selection implementing partners	SWAA continued from 707 OPE continued from 808	Through the participants of FS Cluster Meeting	Direct choice of partners in FS based on criteria for emergency partners	CfP (ACK) Continuation (LWF)	Continuation (AVSI) Direct identification (CARITAS)	CfP (WCUK) Continuation (LWF)
Contract signature	Oct/Nov 2011	Sep 2011	Dec 2011	Oct 2011	Aug 2011	Nov 2011
TOF	Sept 2011	Aug 2011 and Sep-Oct 2011	Aug/Sep 2011	Oct/Nov 2011	July/ August 2011 Refresher Feb 2012	Feb/Mar 2012
Start of field level implementation	Dec 2011/ Jan 2012	Oct 2011-Jan 2012	Partly Oct (NK) Partly Sept (SK) Not yet (Masisi)	Dec/Jan 2011	September 2011 (second round April 2012)	Agricultural act. not yet started in March 2012; preparatory field work done
# FFS	24 FFLS 8 FFLS	28 FFS 4 JFFLS	24 FFLS 8 JFFLS	15 FFLS 16 JFFLS	24 FFLS 8 JFFLS	16 FFLS 27 JFFLS
FFLS facilitators selection	By partners; SWAA has suggested a number and FAO selected	By partner	Mainly by NGO partner; in SK partly from club d'écoute ; 1 govt member in SK, one in NK	From within the group, implementation supported by extensionists	From the community, agronomists	Technical experts from community, selected by NGO partners
# facilitators	45 trained, 40 permanently active	36 (2 in each J/FFLS, 1 in FFLS)	16 (NK) 25 (SK) 8 (Masisi)	33 (15 FFLS; 16 J/FFLS)	24 facilitators educated, 20 still active	1 facilitator per 4 FFLS; 1 facilitator per 1 J/FFLS
Payment of	Only agronomists	Compensation	\$50 per month for	Government	\$33; only time	LWF: Approx

facilitators	from MDAPE: \$22 per month Others: compensation transport cost	equal to government DSA	all facilitators	extensionists: equal to government DSA	compensation for teachers according to school principle; \$33 according to FAO	50\$ allowance WCUK: 60\$ per month
Selection participants	SWAA selection of participants has focused on HIV infected OPE has selected through village leaders	By NGO partner; based on pre-existing groups	South Kivu: On individual basis but from groups that very well relate to the criteria; in North Kivu through the village leader	Based on existing extension groups	By the facilitators, on an individual basis, criteria not clearly followed; limited input from local government; awareness Tanzania returnees, voluntary participation.	On individual and voluntary basis by community leaders and NGO partners
Extensionists	Extensionists are trained and are active as supervisors on intermittent basis	Extensionists are facilitators	No extensionists; some trained facilitators are from government	Present 3-4 times per month; trained on FFLS approach	Once a month; performance contract	Target once a month, technical advise; in practice once every 3 months
Learning grant	Unclear	Unclear	There is no learning grant	Directly to groups, who pay DSA for extensionists	Paid through partner NGOs	Paid through the NGO
VSL	Pilot trails of small amounts	Not structurally used	VSL is used but still in very low amounts	5 out of 19 FFLS	In all groups	In all FFLS in Kitgum

Annex 7: Country Report Burundi

1. Introduction

Burundi is transiting from a situation of recurrent humanitarian emergencies to a more stable development but support is still direly needed. The country has a high population density and a high pressure on land as 80-90% of the people survive on agriculture. The influx since 2002 of more than 500,000 returnees (who had fled the country for Tanzania following massacres in 1972 and 1993), with the major influx in 2006, has contributed to increased land conflicts.

Climate related hazards like torrential rains, hailstorms, soil erosion, pests and diseases and price increases as well as lack of investment make life even more difficult for the farmers. On the other hand, primary school is free of charge and most of the participants interviewed had their children in school or, in the case of JFFLS, went to school themselves.

The country is very hilly, which has an effect on climate and soil (risk of erosion) and thus in agriculture and the techniques to be used. The crop production is very varied, ranging from grains to vegetables and fruits, coffee and tea, cotton and aromatic plants.

Like in Rwanda, the country is small and rather densely populated. The population grows at a fast pace (5 children per family is a normal family size) and the already small plots of land are often fragmented further after death of parents. The farmers are poor and seldom organized⁵. They are only able to use outdated techniques and lack basic quality agricultural inputs.

Even though there are three seasons offering as many possibilities for sowing and harvesting, the quality of soil is often degrading as a result of erosion and lack of fertilizers.

The HIV prevalence in Burundi in 2009 was 3.3%⁶, with higher rates among women and lower rates among youth; this rate is considerably lower than in Kenya and Uganda. With regard to malnutrition, in 2010 29% of children were moderately or severely underweight and 6% were suffering from moderate and severe wasting (acute malnutrition)⁸.

Malnutrition is cited by many stakeholders as a problem, aggravated by the limited variety of vegetables available in certain periods of the year.

The government has put in place several strategies and action plans to improve food security and nutrition; they have adopted the FFS approach in 2008⁷.

The team visited a total of six (6) J/FFLS: 2 FFLS and 1 JFFLS in both Gitega and Rumonge.

2. Status of Implementation

a. Project management

The project is implemented in 4 provinces: Bujumbura Mairie, Bururi, Ngozi and Gitega. In Rumonge (Bururi), FAO works with implementing partner OPE (7 FFLS and 4 JFFLS) who was involved as well in the preceding project. OPE has liaised with the NGO network ABUBEF and FVS to cover the life skills related subjects. The facilitators from OPE that were met by the evaluation team all had social background, and thus had to rely on technical assistance from extensionists. In Gitega, Ngozi and Bujumbura Mairie, the international NGO SWAA is implementing activities (17 FFLS and 4 JFFLS). FAO has worked with this NGO since 2004. The Society for Women against Aids in Africa (SWAA) is an US-based

⁵ Annex Cadre National Stratégique des Priorités d'Intervention A Moyen terme de la FAO au Burundi (2010-2014)

⁶ UNICEF: http://www.unicef.org/infobycountry/kenya_statistics.html

⁷ Dimitra Bulletin. Femmes Rurales, Genre et Développement

organization which works in 10 countries, mainly on the prevention of HIV/AIDS and the reduction of the impacts of HIV/AIDS.

As Burundi has three seasons with abundant rainfall, there is ample opportunity for planting and sowing of various crops. Land pressure is high, so that finding adequate plots is difficult and in some cases plots had to be rented. Village leaders have been involved in awareness-raising and the selection of participants; for the group. The implementing partners put emphasis on the most vulnerable, starting with HIV patients and child-headed households.

Finding plots appeared difficult, and the plots are sometimes small. For the selection of participants village leaders have been involved to get people together; from the group, the implementing partner has selected by finding the most vulnerable, starting with HIV patients and child headed households.

The gender balance is observed among the participants who are selected for president, treasury and secretary of each group.

At the province level, the Ministry of Agriculture provides supervisors, who have also been trained during the ToF, but they cannot be present in each session due to resource limitations. Two MTs were trained from government side.

In most of the sites visited, there was no shade or place to sit for the participants, which appeared unpleasant in case of hot sun or heavy rain, circumstances often to be found in Burundi.

b. JFFLS

In the JFFLS, two facilitators are active, usually one agronomist and one teacher. The selection of children is made with the help of schools but the location is often outside or adjacent to the schools. In the Rumonge area, one of the JFFLS is located near a hospital.

The selected children are in most of the cases either (half) orphan or suffering from HIV/AIDS. In the groups met in the field, the nutritional status of the children looked compromised and more than 75% of them belonged to the category OVC.

Even though the JFFLS targets school going as well as out-of-school children, the majority of the participants is in school, probably because primary school is for free and secondary school almost as well.

The children in the JFFLS sometimes have difficulties remaining attentive during a whole session, as a result of malnutrition and hunger. FAO in Rumonge has requested WFP to provide the children with a snack during the sessions, which has not been approved yet.

In Rumonge, some children from the preceding project had remained active and are currently involved as co-facilitators, which the Evaluation Team considers to be a very laudable initiative.

c. Description of progress up to date

The contracts with the partners were signed in October; the ToF had already been carried out in September. Field implementation started in December 2012 for most schools.

The selection of facilitators has been done by the implementing partners; the partners have made efforts to identify a mixture of facilitators with an agricultural background and with a life skills background. Agronomists with government background have been selected as well as people from the community, and people with HIV infection have also been included. In general facilitators from the community are only paid a transport allowance, yet the agronomists from government receive an allowance of 30,000 Burundi francs per month (i.e. approx. USD 25).

In Rumonge, the extensionists participate at almost every group session, which is also necessary since many facilitators are from social background. Here, all facilitators receive a fee of 8,000 Burundi francs per session, which is different again from Gitega, where only facilitators with a government background are reported to be paid.

In total 53 facilitators have been trained; 24 were for the FFLS and 16 for the JFFLS (2 per school); the remaining 13 were trained for the EU financed food security project which is carried out in the Villages Ruraux Intégrées (VRIs) (BDI/005/EC/VRI). All MTs are still active on J/FFLS: six are in Burundi, and one in Cameroon. Out the MTs in Burundi, 1 is with FAO, 2 are from the NGO partners and 2 from government. Out of the trained MTs, one is currently involved in the FAO project Horticulture Urbaine et Périurbaine (HUP); one is working on the above mentioned VRI project and one is involved with a FFLS project, implemented by LWF. The IP of HUP, CAFOB, collaborates with FAO's Dimitra Project, whose community radio approach also offer opportunities for the J/FFLS groups.

d. Integration of life skills related aspects

In the groups in Burundi, the large majority of participants are female. The reason given was that men are involved in other work and are not interested. Whilst this may look positive for women's empowerment, from a gender equality point of view it would have been better, also for the women, to have a minimum percentage of men amongst participants.

Since the focus of implementing partner SWAA is on prevention and raising awareness of HIV and support to HIV patients, they managed to transfer that focus to the implementation of the project. As a result, people living with HIV are clearly addressed as target beneficiaries and activities with regard to HIV, preventing and support from the community for those people are sufficiently addressed.

In the FFLS of SWAA, thematic topics selected by the group were HIV, family planning, conflict resolution, cooperatives, micro-credit and family law. With regard to nutrition themes, the preparation of a balanced diet came up most. SWAA seemed to be well informed on the subject and even organizes collective cooking workshops combined with health & nutrition education, in which FFLS members participate. Also, SWAA supports training on the multiple uses of soy beans, especially for HIV patients.

Implementing partner OPE does not have a specific HIV background, and relies upon selection of vulnerable people as an inclusion mechanism for HIV infected people. As a result, around 10% of the group participants are estimated to be HIV infected, which is considerably less than in the case of SWAA.

e. Monitoring

Base-line data have been collected at field level only recently. The Burundi FAO office had not yet been able to collate them and send them to the regional office for analysis.

f. Partners, networks and other FF(L)S projects

In addition to the facilitators of SWAA and OPE, the MTs also trained facilitators for other projects, notably 14 for the 22 FFLS in the project OSRO/BDI/005/EC/VRI, and 36 for the 24 FFLS of OSRO/BDI/102/SWE (Seed production).

There are also other projects ongoing in Burundi, which use the FFLS approach. One of them is a \$2,234,993 project supported by the EU, which supports the reintegration of crisis affected people, returning into Villages Ruraux Intégrées (VRIs) with capacity building related to agricultural activities to improve their food security situation, also uses the FFLS approach (BDI/005/EC/VRI); another is the \$500,000 regional project "Farmer Field Schools in support of improved cassava disease management" 2010-212 implemented also in Kenya and Uganda (GCP /INT/099/ITA). In the beginning of 2011, LWF Burundi has, in

collaboration with FAO, established Farmer Field Schools eastern Burundi in all nine villages where it works.

2. Constraints and best practices:

a. Specific constraints

The main constraint, faced by the project is land scarcity. Land is expensive and difficult to find. It has been difficult to secure plots for all J/FFLS.

More practical constraints were the absence of shades and sitting spaces at the sites visited.

b. Best practices

Participants of the FFLS, organised by are involved in cooking workshops, where they learn how to use the crop they harvested in multiple ways, combined with training on healthy food. The workshops are not actual part of the project but the participants are involved anyway.

c. Lessons learned

The children in the JFFLS are often too hungry to retain their concentration for the entire JFFLS session, which takes place on Saturday in the morning when there is no school. A budget line may be dedicated to providing snacks or a more structured cooperation should be sought with for instance WFP.

d. Unintended effects (positive or negative)

In the FFLS of SWAA, the first selection is on HIV patients; they are encouraged to invite others. This may bring about a decrease of discrimination and an increase of acceptance of the patient by the community.

3. Sustainable benefits from the project

a. Impact at grassroots and institutional level

In a country where population density and land scarcity are major problems, agriculture techniques for small farmers to increase the production are very valuable. Moreover, as singularity of crop production and availability was mentioned by beneficiaries as a constraint, the FFLS can tap into that and encourage the participants to grow and consume multiple crops. In fact, this is done among others by encouraging kitchen gardening and cooking techniques.

b. Advocacy efforts and possibilities

The activities with regard to food security and nutrition in Burundi are coordinated by the Groupe Sécurité Alimentaire et Nutrition (GSAN), which meets once a month. The group resorts under the Groupe Sectoriel Agriculture, Développement Rural et Environnement. GSAN would be a good platform for advocacy and raising technical issues.

Also the UNJP may be a good cooperation body to raise awareness on FFLS, look for additional input and funding and advocate with the government and other organizations.

One of the programs of WFP is Food Facility, under which WFP is able to finance projects for 4,000 beneficiaries per year. Even though the training part is usually only 3 months, the WFP looked willing to discuss this. WFP also runs school garden programs, which may provide an opportunity to incorporate life skills. On the other hand, WFP is unable to procure seeds, an activity where FAO may offer its support.

The Ministère de la Jeunesse targets the same beneficiaries as the project does for its JFFLS. The Ministry is aware of the project and would be interested in cooperating. Unfortunately, notwithstanding the fact that the Ministry works with various UN organizations and other donors, it has insufficient resources and would need training and MTs from FAO. The Ministry works with UNICEF on HIV with youth; a tripartite cooperation may be possible, but the Ministry does not have the capacity to develop a concrete proposal.

The Ministry also showed a UNICEF manual, which they use for addressing HIV in youth; this manual looked very practical and may be a valuable asset in the FFLS.

c. Activities likely to continue after the project's phasing out

In the budget of SWAA, money has been allocated to supported 2 participants from each group to continue as facilitators; SWAA is also prepared to support this continuation.

In the case of OPE, two to three participants are foreseen to carry on the activities; FAO will support them with input and OPE with support after the project's ending; no facilitators' fee will be paid, though.

SWAA trained 9 facilitators under the preceding project, out of which two are active again under this project, and two others are using their capacity and skills in another project.

d. Exchange and links within the region and outside

Facilitators have become part of a network and meet on a regular basis to exchange lessons learned, constraints, problems and solutions.

Links with the club d'écoute (Dimitra) will be set up with the HUP project and may be interesting to explore.

4. Recommendations

- Communicate with WFP to explore possibilities to execute a project under their Food Facility funding, or identify combination opportunities for school gardening; WFP in return is looking for support on seed provision.
- Explore possibilities for cooperation with the Ministère de la Jeunesse.
- Communicate with UNICEF on utilization of their HIV manual on HIV for youth
- Use a technique of simultaneous sowing/planting instead of sequential to increase nutritional variety

5. SWOC table

<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In a country with a high population pressure on the land, methods improving production of the land are extremely valuable. • Since partner SWAA's mission is focused on HIV, people with HIV are addressed as target beneficiaries and there is sufficient attention within the activities for prevention of HIV and support for people living with HIV and AIDS • Money is allocated in the budget of SWAA to enable 2 participants per group to continue as facilitators • It has been possible to retain seven facilitators from the preceding project and 2 others are working in other projects; support is planned for 2/3 participants from 010 	<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Civil society is strong in Burundi; the presence of women in the politics is also strong. • Work with the Ministry of Youth on developing a concrete proposal for tripartite cooperation • UNICEF works with the youth on fight against HIV, has manual – start aligning manuals, cooperation • Join forces with WFP in Food Facility, school gardens and seed provision; food provision in JFFLS • Establish linkages with Dimitra • Establish linkages with Producers Organizations
<p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sequential sowing/planting leads to nutritional variety constraints • The majority of group members is female • Payments for facilitators are different, per background and per area 	<p>Constraints</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land scarcity and population pressure leading also to difficulties in plot identification • facilitators Rumonge do not have agricultural background • No shade or sitting place in a number of schools

Annex 8: Country Report Central African Republic

1. Introduction

Central African Republic (CAR) was added as a sixth country to the list of five countries where the preceding project RAF/808 already intervened (Burundi, DR Congo, Kenya, Rwanda and Uganda). Even though CAR is a very poor country with multiple needs, the Evaluation mission considers that the inclusion of CAR in the project RAF/010 was not logical from a geographical and logistical point of view. Concentration of efforts in the five RAF/808 beneficiary countries would have made sense. The Final report of project RAF/808 stated: “Even within the current five countries of the project, there is a much larger and overwhelming need and demand for this type of integrated response.”

Inclusion of CAR was encouraged by donor Sida because of the high level of food insecurity, a high level of HIV prevalence and serious issues of gender inequities. According to the ProDoc, CAR was included in the RAF/010 project “due to its acute food and livelihood crisis caused by irregular rains and dry spell, crop and livestock diseases, rising foodstuff price in combination with rural poverty rates as high as 73% coupled with increasing violence and high levels of HIV infection rates.”. HIV prevalence in adults (15-49 years) was 6.3% in 2007; or approx. 160,000 persons. The proportion of undernourished was 41% in 2009; or approx. 1.7 million persons. CAR was ranked 179th in the Human Development Index, which is the lowest of all project countries. The Project document adds the potential risk for election related violence in CAR in 2010.

CAR is a vast country with limited governmental presence and resources and continued insecurity in more than half of the country; in particular in the East, the North, and in the Western mining area of Mambéré-Kadei. Food insecurity is high due to irregular rain and continued conflict and insecurity allegedly caused by gangs, rebels and insurgents from Chad, Sudan, Uganda (LRA) and DR Congo. Travel by road is not recommended in the East; emergency aid is provided by plane. As CAR is landlocked, inputs are often not available and import is difficult and costly. Industry, tourism and other economic sectors beyond agriculture are poorly developed. Internal conflict in the early-2000s led to the destruction of a number of the few industrial units that were around. Economic investment in infrastructure appears to be on the rise today yet quite limited even in the capital Bangui.

Otherwise, CAR is endowed in the South with a relatively humid climate which enables 2-3 harvests per year between March and December, whereas the North and East are drier savannah areas with one single rainy season. Conditions in CAR in general are good for the production of a wide variety of crops such as cereals, root crops, fruits, vegetables; and for animal husbandry of any kind. Local diets also include foods such as insects, the leaves of root crops, mushrooms and fish.

The programme prepared for the Evaluation Team was not tight time wise. As a consequence, the team could only visit two (2) J/FFLS; one JFFLS in Samba (Mbaïki district; 12 km South of Bangui) and one FFLS in Kukurú (Bangui area; 15 km North of Bangui). The area of Mambéré-Kadei could not be visited because of distance (at 450 km from Bangui) and limited infrastructure.

2. Status of Implementation

a. Project management

The project is implemented in three districts (*préfectures*): Bangui, Lobaye (just south of the capital Bangui) and Mambéré-Kadei (at 450 km West of Bangui). Project locations were already mentioned in Project document before implementation partner was identified.

The project budget in CAR is Euro 330,000 for a 2-year period. Total FAO-CAR Budget was USD 17 million until recently thanks to a USD 13 million project under the EU Food Facility. With the latter project expired today, FAO-CAR total budget is approx. USD 5 million, with another USD 3 million being expected.

Project personnel at FAO-CAR consists of the Consultants and Master Trainers Fernand Maboutou (Focal Point in Bangui), and Marius Pounanguère (in Mambéré-Kadei). The third Master Trainer, Carine Dangbo, is on the pay-roll of partner ACDA. There was no project officer for Gender & HIV and/or Nutrition at FAO-CAR under RAF/010. However, ACDA has its own HIV and Gender specialists. A Specific line was included in Project budget for purchase of motors for the starting project in CAR (USD 9,000).

FAO-CAR works with one single implementing partner the Agence Centrafricaine de Développement Agricole (ACDA). ACDA is the government extension service; it was established in 1993 as a public institute under the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development with an administrative and financial autonomy.

ACDA was selected by FAO after a Call for Expression of Interest made during a meeting of the Food Security Cluster in CAR. FAO-CAR intended to work with two implementing partners. Nine (9) potential candidates were ranked by FAO according to seven criteria: presence in project area, experience with agriculture & food security, experience with HIV and gender inequities, target group HIV/GBV, experience in working with FAO, and the person proposed to be trained as a Master Trainer. ACDA and COOPI (Italy) stood out as the best candidates for project implementation. However, for reasons still unknown to FAO-CAR, COOPI did not pursue its candidacy. Neither CAR nor REOA contacted COOPI to inquire about the background of this decision after the selection process.

The Evaluation mission strongly recommends sorting out why COOPI did not pursue its candidacy. As an Italian agency supporting projects in many countries in the region, including in other project countries such as DR Congo, COOPI could possibly become a strategic partner for future up-scaling in the region.

Because of budgetary constraints, and high travel costs from CAR, FAO-REOA decided to reduce the number of Master Trainers from CAR to participate in the Rwanda Training of Master Trainers (March-June 2011) from seven (7) to three (3); 2 men and 1 woman. The FFLS project implementation in CAR was thus compromised from day one by a factor well-known in advance (logistics). No additional training of trainers was organised in CAR to increase national training capacity in J/FFLS for future up-scaling.

The project RAF/010 envisages that trained Master Trainers carry out at least three (3) Trainings of Facilitators at the cost of their organisation or third-party, or at their own cost. In practice, this has appeared an unrealistic assumption for most persons and organisations. Time investment and the costs of travel and per diems for training and supervision are high and have usually not yet been accounted for in the organisations' budgets.

The pre-defined choice by FAO-REOA to work in remote Mambéré-Kadei was not revised after emergence of first logistical problems, or after reduction of the number of Master Trainers in CAR.

The Evaluation Team considers that there was no apparent need to select the Mambéré-Kadei region at this stage of mere JFFLS introduction in CAR. Implementation of the project has become unnecessarily expensive and logistically complicated. Monitoring and evaluation of the field activities is seriously hampered, as was exemplified by the fact that the Principal Master Trainer Godrick Khisa from Kenya (i.e. the technical supervisor of all Master Trainers trained by project) nor the Evaluation mission were able to visit and assess progress

to date in Mambéré-Kadei. Even the Master Trainer in charge of the region, Marius Pounanguère, was unable to be present on a regular basis in the region; notably he was absent between mid-February till late-March; i.e. the start of the new season and full support and supervision of the facilitators trained by the project.

Within the project RAF/010 two (2) three-week Trainings of Facilitators were organised for a total of 36 resident J/FFLS farmer facilitators; one in Mbaïki (Lobaye province; 24 persons; 18 men and 6 women) and one in Berberati (Mambéré-Kadei province; 13 persons; 10 men and 3 women). The number of facilitators trained in Berberati was thus limited for the investment made.

Farmer facilitators are proposed by their communities. The intention of the project is that the facilitators will spread the word themselves through facilitation of new J/FFLS groups.

The project RAF/010 pays implementing partner ACDA a so-called “investment grant” per group (USD 400). The budget for CAR also has a budget line (also USD 400 per group) for issues like exchange visits, graduation events and materials. The amount is spent by the group on inputs like seeds (apart from the inputs provided by FAO) and on didactic kits. Whatever money is not spent will go back into the group’s bank account.

b. J/FFLS

In CAR a total of 32 J/FFLS have been put in place thus far; 28 FFLS and 4 JFFLS. The Lobaye province south of Bangui counts 14 groups, Bangui province seven (7) groups; and Mambéré-Kadei 11 groups. All are existing groups which were already assisted by ACDA. The project in CAR counts a total of 792 J/FFLS participants in 29 villages of five (5) districts (*sous-préfectures*) in three (3) provinces (*préfectures*). Women make up 40% of participants.

The JFFLS are run by two (2) facilitators at a time; the FFLS are run by a single facilitator. The project participants are selected by ACDA.

Each J/FFLS selects a research subject to work on during one agricultural cycle. The choice was not limited to crops but could also be animal husbandry. Overall, half of the groups (16 groups) actually choose to learn about small animals: chicken, goat, sheep, pigs, ducks and fish. Ten (10) groups grow a staple food (potato, cassava, plantain, groundnuts), while six (6) groups choose a vegetable crop for FFS plot (onion, tomato, cabbage, lettuce, red beans).

By the time of the visit of the Evaluation Team, all J/FFLS groups in CAR had received didactic materials (imprint of the French J/FFLS curriculum, wooden PADEX tablet, markers, paper) and six (6) groups (2 FFLS; 4 JFFLS) also received a horticultural kit (wheelbarrow, watering can, shovel, rope, etc.). However, the distribution of inputs (seeds, fertilizers etc.) had been delayed because of administrative reasons.

The JFFLS visited in Mbaïki is associated to the orphanage of the Albert Durkhardt Foundation which counts about 235 half- and full-orphans, most of whom are just assisted during day-time. There were two facilitators – a man and a woman; both attached to the orphanage. The participants in the JFFLS were 9 to 14 years old, and had been selected according to vulnerability. Because of vacation, only half of the participants were present during the visit of the Evaluation Team. Many of these looked indeed vulnerable from a health point of view. Nutrition at the orphanage was reported to be good, sufficient and balanced.

The JFFLS meets twice a week; once for agricultural issues (Wednesday) and once for social issues (Friday). The JFFLS meeting attended by the team was preceded by singing and a prayer (Catholic), and ‘energized’ through shouting of the group and sub-group slogans, hand

clapping and the singing of songs. The JFFLS visited had put in place a palm leaf-covered seedbed for three varieties of tomato, to be transplanted within a few weeks into newly prepared and new-to-be-prepared planting beds (*planches*). The plot was next to a water point for easy irrigation. Residues from the nearby Mbaïki beer brewery were bought and used as an organic fertilizer.

The JFFLS facilitators themselves did not note much of a difference in the approaches applied at the orphanage and at the JFFLS when it comes to group dynamics (slogans, songs, etc.) and facilitation issues. The new element for them was to learn about tomato growing.

Previous sessions of the JFFLS had been used to discuss issues of HIV/AIDS and nutrition. Gender issues were planned to be discussed in upcoming weeks.

The FFLS visited (17 women, 5 men), an already existing group aiming for collective production and sales, had a lively debate about gender roles and division of tasks between men and women. Next to this thematic issue, there was a structured discussion about the state of the FFLS crop (cabbage). However, as AESA had just been launched, the team still noted a lot of text on the PADEX sheets, and no drawings of plants or methods. Visuals are required for AESA to facilitate knowledge exchange and transfer particularly with illiterate or less-literate participants. In turn, the team was happily surprised to note the explicit search of FFLS participants and facilitator for non-chemical solutions to eventual pest problems.

The team was able to participate in an entire session, which was not always possible in the other countries. The team was happily surprised to note the wooden copies of PADEX-board being used in the FFLS, and the palm-leaf covered shady site for conducting the JFFLS. These are practical, nice and effective adaptations to local context.

c. Description of progress up to date

After the Call for Expression of Interest and the subsequent selection of implementing partner ACDA, the three Master Trainers from FAO and ACDA participated in the sub-regional Training of Master Trainers in Musandze (Rwanda) between March and June 2011.

The contract between FAO-CAR and ACDA was finally signed on 25 November 2011 for a total value of USD 52,000. No explanations were provided to team for late contract signature.

The two Trainings of Facilitators in Mbaïki and Berberati took place in August-September 2011. Reports of both Trainings of Facilitators were provided. However, the Evaluation Team is surprised to see the texts being almost identical even as to successes and weaknesses, including negative comments about FAO-CAR administration support and about one of the three Master-Trainers (the person in charge of Berberati area).

The selection of J/FFLS groups was done in October-November 2011 after information meetings with village leaders and communities. First plots were installed in January and February.

Contract between FAO-CAR and ACDA stipulates that 30% of the budget will be transferred at the start of the project, 50% after Mid-Term reporting, and 20% at the end of the project. The Evaluation Team believes that more project funds for implementation need to be available to implementation partner in an earlier stage.

d. Integration of life skills related aspects

Most facilitators trained under the RAF/010 project are men. Women only make up around 25% of total. This is low compared to other countries, and certainly lower than planned by project. However, it is higher than the percentage of women working at ACDA as extension agents (12%; only 15 out of 130 nation-wide).

According to the CAR data, about 40% of J/FFLS participants are women. However, the FFLS visited by the Evaluation Team had three-quarters women. The JFFLS was balanced in composition between boys and girls.

Gender was discussed during the FFLS meeting, more specifically the division of everyday tasks between women and men. This led to nice and lively exchanges. The Evaluation Team wondered though what the practical value of such exchanges will be for peoples' lives. The project should consider to develop additional tools to make the exchanges on gender less stereotype and confrontational and to apply more indirect methods of awareness-raising around gender.

Nutrition is an issue that will be relevant in CAR in certain regions and situations. The Agreement (*Protocole d'Accord*) between FAO-CAR and ACDA does not make mention of the word "nutrition" except in the title. With regard to availability of food items, there is a lot of crop diversity around for accessing balanced diets. Participants of the FFLS planted multiple crop types. Diet at the orphanage was reported to be varied and sufficient.

Nutrition as a topic currently resorts under the Ministry of Health. ACDA acknowledged the importance of nutrition in relation to Food Security and was interested in setting up cooperation with this ministry.

e. Monitoring

The extension agents of ACDA are in charge of supervision of the J/FFLS groups, but they have not yet all been trained in the J/FFLS approach. This holds a risk of them intervening in J/FFLS group discussions and dynamics thus running counter to the participatory self-organising character of Farmer Field Schools – as could also be observed by the Evaluation Team while visiting the FFLS Kokoro (Bangui area). Also, resources are often insufficient to enable them to visit the groups on a regular basis.

FAO and ACDA agree that the extension agents attached to the project should be trained, but no planning had yet been made to that effect. Currently, in Bangui area, the ACDA extension agent visits the seven (7) J/FFLS groups three times (3) per month, whereas the Master Trainer visits two (2) times per month.

A Base-line survey was carried out at the start of the season by the *Institut Supérieur de Développement Rural* (ISDR). Data were sent to FAO-REOA in late-January for interpretation and analysis.

f. Partners, networks and other FF(L)S projects

The Farmer Field School activities under RAF/010 are integrated in the recent UN Joint Programme on HIV/AIDS (23 February 2012) as: "Knowledge transfer to Master Trainers and facilitators about FFS for awareness-raising of farming communities around HIV prevention". According to the document, UNESCO would co-finance the FFS activities at an amount of USD 500,000 of which USD 200,000 has already been secured.

FAO-CAR plans to raise further awareness about HIV and gender with about twenty (20) other organisations through the UN Joint Group in April 2012. This includes WHO, UNICEF, UNAIDS, Red Cross and Ministry of Social Affairs.

At the time of the evaluation, three additional Trainings of Facilitators were planned for 2012. One is for the FAO Cassava Project: two (2) two-week trainings with two Master Trainers for a total of 50 persons. A second is a two-week training in Bambari with all three Master Trainers for a total of 45 persons under the new project PREVES (with funds of IFAD). The third upcoming Training of Facilitators is a two-week training with one single Master Trainer for just five (5) persons under the Projet Kisito in Berberati.

Other actors in CAR that have shown interest in the J/FFLS approach are the NGOs Mercy Corps and the Danish Refugee Council.

3. Constraints and best practices:

a. Specific constraints

Mambéré-Kadei is an area remote from capital Bangui, and therefore particularly difficult and costly to monitor at this early stage of J/FFLS introduction in CAR. The budget was not sufficient to cover this and additional funds may be needed in future to solve such issues.

Inputs are difficult to obtain; many inputs need to be imported which is a slow and costly process; the infrastructure throughout the country is often of poor quality. Getting paperwork ready in time is also difficult and logistics are slow and costly.

Implementing partner ACDA is very enthusiastic about the J/FFLS approach, but despite being a public entity it does not have any funds to invest, for example in training its own agents, or in facilitating FFLS groups to take place and it lacks means of transport. With a view on sustainability, additional training of more ACDA staff members will be necessary, since the current pool of trained ACDA staff is far too small to achieve that.

b. Best practices

Participants' choice for learning has not been limited to an agricultural crop but could also entail animal husbandry.

Adaptation of FFLS tools to local context using local materials; for example copying PADEX boards (wood) and providing shade to participants (leave cover instead of plastic sheets).

Because a number of groups meet twice a week, optimum use is made of the short remainder of the project's duration.

The area of Mbaïki was selected through IPC mapping.

c. Lessons learned

Even when this project is a pilot project in CAR because of recent introduction, the government extension agency ACDA has already expressed its desire to have all its personnel trained in J/FFLS approach and methodology.

d. Unintended effects (positive or negative)

Management of the investment grants and other group donations through ACDA could not be assessed by the Evaluation mission.

4. Sustainable benefits from the project

a. Impact at grassroots and institutional level

Introduction of the J/FFLS approach at village level is likely to increase the interest for and the effectiveness of the government extension work. Participating farmers obtain tools and learn skills to self-assess the status of their crop more thoroughly, and are likely to diffuse (parts of) this expertise among fellow farmers.

b. Advocacy efforts and possibilities

FAO-CAR participates in monthly meetings of the clusters Food Security and HIV/AIDS. Regular meetings with the Ministry of Agriculture and ACDA are conducted. The Farmer Field School approach is acknowledged by ACDA and the Ministry, and is now being incorporated into the new 5-year *Plan National d'Investissements dans l'Agriculture et la Sécurité Alimentaire* (PNIASA).

According to the reports on the Trainings of Facilitators, the radio station Ndékélouka dedicated 30 minutes to the FFLS approach, of which 15 minutes in French and 15 minutes in Sango (national language). The item was re-diffused a number of times over the day.

FAO-CAR plans to raise awareness about HIV and gender with about twenty (20) other organisations through the UN Joint Group in April 2012. This includes WHO, UNICEF, UNAIDS, Red Cross, Ministry of Social Affairs, etc..

c. Activities likely to continue after the project's phasing out

Master Trainers and facilitators have been trained to diffuse the J/FFLS approach in CAR. The Evaluation Team believes that this learning and education will remain with these individuals and organisations and will have impacts over the course of years. It is too early to judge about the likeliness and degree of continuation of activities after project's phase out.

d. Exchange and links within the region and outside

The FAO-CAR programme on J/FFLS is still very young. Exchange and links within the region take place through contacts with colleague Master Trainers in the other project countries, and through the monitoring visit of Grand Master Trainer Godrick Khisa.

Field days have already been planned to a certain detail to be conducted at and after the time of harvest. All relevant partners and stakeholders will participate.

5. Recommendations

- Develop a FAO CAR J/FFLS programme that could guide future up-scaling, and describe the logic behind the required numbers of Master-Trainers, Training of Facilitators, facilitators, and their geographical distribution.
- Increase J/FFLS training capacity within CAR for future up-scaling.
- Keep track of the way in which group grants paid to ACDA are being managed and used by the J/FFLS groups.
- Engage civil society in the up-scaling of J/FFLS.
- For newly to be designed projects, take the unavoidable elevated costs into account for logistic support and monitoring in remote areas.
- Incorporate a more indirect gender awareness-raising method in the J/FFLS curriculum.
- Communicate with the Ministry of Health and involve this Ministry into the project for cooperation with regard to nutritional issues and highlighting the relationship between food security and nutrition.
- Support ACDA to submit a proposal for cascade training of its team leaders (*chefs d'équipe*) in each of the 7 regions.

6. SWOC table

<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The J/FFLS approach is new to CAR. • Implementing partner is the public extension agency. This is a unique opportunity to up-scale J/FFLS approach. • facilitators in Bangui and Lobaye provinces are farmer-facilitators, which increases opportunities for sustainability. 	<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make sure that ACDA's commitment to the approach is also expressed in budget. • Involve interested civil society groups • Elaborate on the initial interest of COOPI to be an implementing partner • Work with other UN agencies on a coordinated approach towards J/FFLS as a tool to work on HIV, gender and nutrition.
<p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women are under-represented in the government extension agency's personnel • Extension personnel involved in supervision is not all trained in J/FFLS • Situation regarding management and use of the group grants is unclear. • Nutrition is not mentioned in the contract with ACDA 	<p>Constraints</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mambéré-Kadei is so remote to Bangui that it is hard and very costly to monitor the quantity and quality of the field activities. • Inputs are difficult and costly to obtain; infrastructure is poor • Organization of visitors' programmes (Principal MT Godrick Khisa, Evaluation Team) was slow and incomplete, affecting the efficiency and effectiveness.

Annex 9: Country Report DR Congo

1. Introduction

DR Congo figures here as a country, however, the implementation of the project only takes place in two out of eleven provinces; i.e. in North and South-Kivu, in Eastern Congo. New Farmer Field School activities will soon start as well in the Equator province under a separate EU-funded project.

North and South Kivu are endowed in terms of climate and natural resources. Agriculture can benefit from 2-3 harvests per year, and humidity and temperature are such that many different crops can be grown and animals reared. Also, many minerals are found in Kivu which are of particular interest for export. Still, according to IPC, 4.5 million people live in nutritional crisis in Eastern DRC, especially women and children.

Unfortunately, North and South-Kivu have been particularly hit hard by conflicts in the Great Lakes region in Central Africa. The Kivu provinces are still confronted with violence and atrocities almost on a daily basis, including large-scale gender-based violence.

The presence in DRC of armed troops of different geographical (Uganda Rwanda, Burundi, DR Congo) and ethnic origins has led to a patch-work of interlinked conflicts and potential conflicts. Massacres in neighboring Rwanda, for example, led to an influx of refugee migrants already way back in the 1950s; many of whom have become acknowledged since 2007 as Congolese citizens. After the genocide in Rwanda in 1994, many perpetrators fled into the DRC for a safe-haven. They have not been able to return to Rwanda for fear of justice and retaliation. They are not welcomed by local Congolese and many Rwandophone communities, are living without their families, and are fought by DRC army with support from the United Nations' military force MONUSCO. In parts of Eastern DRC division along ethnic lines between native Congolese communities has also led to bloody ethnic clashes about the access to land and resources. Moreover, weapons are reportedly being traded even between adversaries through corrupt military officials. Finally, some of the mining companies involved in extractive activities are believed to finance private armies for the sake of their own security; some of which would also apply tactics of geographical cleansing in order to secure new mining territory at the expense of the original inhabitants.

The government in DR Congo is still very centralized despite recent policy to decentralize tasks and responsibilities, and corresponding budgets are yet to be released. Security absorbs a lot of public funds and investment in human resources, institutions and infrastructure suffers in consequence. Communities in DRC which until recently were victim of violence, destruction and theft of their cattle and savings are now trying to re-establish their lives and livelihoods but remain very vulnerable to any changes in security situation, climate, economy and politics. There is few cattle, so land preparation is manual and slow. Goats, sheep, chicken and guinea pigs are only found in limited numbers. Plant (banana, manioc) and animal diseases (chicken, rabbits) further contribute to vulnerability in the region.

Most agricultural and mining products from North-Kivu go reportedly through Uganda to the port of Mombasa (Kenya). Products from South-Kivu tend to rather go through Rwanda to be shipped in Dar es Salaam (Tanzania). Many exports are reportedly fraudulent. There is very little processing in Eastern Congo itself, and limited re-investment.

Prices of food are high and so are costs of transport. In search of monetary resources, many men have turned to mining activity, with some earning good money but many actually being caught up in the mining community, or establishing new families thus leaving their former wives, families and communities without any financial or labor support.

Furthermore, where governments in other countries in the region provide primary education for free, in DRC parents have to pay a schooling fee of around USD 5/child/month. In consequence, many children in the sites visited by the Evaluation Team no longer attended schools. Average HIV prevalence is not known for East-Congo. National average in DRC is reported to be 4.2%.

The Evaluation Team met with the two implementing parties in DRC: Hope in Action (HiA) in North-Kivu and Samwaki in South-Kivu. The team was unable to visit HiA J/FFLS groups in Northern Beni or Masisi for reasons of time and logistics, but in South-Kivu the team could visit five (5) groups: three (3) FFLS and two (2) JFFLS.

2. Status of Implementation

a. Project management

Project management reflects the general politico-administrative situation in DRC. Implementing partners report to the local FAO office (in Beni and Bukavu respectively), who report to the regional FAO Eastern Congo office (in Goma), which then reverts to the national FAO office (in Kinshasa) before reaching the sub-regional FAO-REOA office (in Nairobi). In DRC the project thus counts with one additional layer of administration and subsequent additional cost of management, monitoring, supervision and overhead. Part of the additional FAO time and money is covered from the organisation's general budget.

Project staff consists of national coordinator Tiphaine Buéké (FAO-Kinshasa) and the regional coordinator and Master Trainer Venance Mbusa (FAO-Goma).

The RAF/010 project is implemented in DRC through one international (Swedish) NGO in North-Kivu, and one local NGO in South-Kivu which is attached to a local radio station. Hope in Action (HiA) is in charge of project implementation in the Northern Beni region and in Masisi. Both sites are far apart, but were chosen because they already made part of the RAF/808 project with another implementing partner. Work in Masisi has become difficult for reasons of insecurity and poor access, and insecurity is such that FAO-DRC has actually been requested to pull out of the region as it can no longer ensure operations. Project implementation in South-Kivu runs according to planning.

Hope in Action and Samwaki are both new to the J/FFLS approach. They were chosen as implementing partners on the basis of pre-existing partnerships under FAO Food security programme (Hope in Action; N-Kivu) and FAO/Dimitra (Samwaki); and for their expertise in the field of HIV, gender and communication. Local NGO Samwaki has been supported by numerous organisations of which: Stem voor Afrika (NL), RFI (France), AMAC (Association Mondiale des Associations Chrétiennes), Aster International (France) and the UNDP.

In South-Kivu, Samwaki works together on some sites with Comité Humanitaire de Base (CHB), which was one of FAO's implementing partners in South-Kivu under project RAF/808. The other RAF/808 implementing partner, local NGO Centre Koko, is no longer involved. This helped to rationalise site selection while Centre Koko then intervened in distant Kaniola.

Note that some of the J/FFLS sites visited in South-Kivu had no shade or place to sit for the participants, which appears unpleasant in case of hot sun or heavy rain.

b. J/FFLS

Under the project RAF/010, FAO-DRC is implementing a total of 32 J/FFLS; 16 in North-Kivu and 16 in South-Kivu. In North-Kivu, 12 groups (9 FFLS; 3 JFFLS) are situated around Beni and 4 groups (3 FFLS and 1 JFFLS) are planned for Masisi area. However, work in Masisi is upheld by insecurity, late distribution and wrong placement of inputs, etc..

facilitators in South-Kivu are Community-facilitators, who have been proposed by their communities and village leaders.

The establishment of J/FFLS groups in South-Kivu started in August/September 2011 (10 J/FFLS), the others (6 J/FFLS) only in January/February 2012. Samwaki pre-financed the J/FFLS establishment awaiting contract. The start of J/FFLS was according to the agricultural season. Season A runs from September to December. Planting for Season B is in February/March, with Season B running till June.

Selection of beneficiaries in S-Kivu was done through community consultation (*Journées de Sensibilisation*) following vulnerability criteria.

Out of the three FFLS visited, two were largely women's groups, the third group was a 100% women's group. The number of widows is high in that area, and many men leave the villages to work in the mines, in transport or in town. Of the two JFFLS, one consisted of children attending school (in main village), whereas the other (more remotely on a hill) consisted in majority of children having abandoned school because of cost.

As the government extension services are very weak or not available, government extensionists are not involved in the implementation or supervision of the project.

g. Description of progress up to date

From DR Congo, seven (7) persons participated in the Musandze (Rwanda) Training of Master-Trainers (March-June 2011): 4 men and 3 women. The Master-Trainers met by the Mission were very content about the quality of the training, yet stated that training on the Junior-aspects of the JFFLS approach was too little to apply appropriately.

Training of Facilitators took place in September and October 2011 in two separate 3-week sessions in Beni (21 persons; 15 men and 6 women) and Bukavu (33 persons; 18 men and 15 women). For logistical reasons the Masisi facilitators participated in the South-Kivu training. The field implementation started in December 2012 for most groups.

Contracts with the implementing partners were delayed and only signed in late November 2011. HiA signed a contract for USD 18,458 and Samwaki for USD 19,393. Disbursement of funds is done in four (4) rounds: 30% at contract signature, 30% upon receipt of start-up report, 20% after interim report and 20% after receipt of final report. HiA's activities were managed from Beni until February 2012, when HiA-Goma took over responsibility.

Six (6) out of seven (7) Master-Trainers trained in Rwanda are still involved in J/FFLS activities: with FAO/Dimitra (Aster Bashinge), FAO/Projet Équateur (Antoine Bakangadio), FAO/Goma (Mbusa Mbunge), Samwaki (Adeline Nsimire), Ministry of Agriculture North-Kivu (Louise Masika Mutshiba) and the Ministry of Agriculture South-Kivu (Elvis Basubi). Number seven, Jean Wandjo was FAO's regional coordinator under this project but is now "with a break". There is no network of FFS or J/FFLS facilitators as yet.

The Master-Trainers met are familiar with the FAO Manual "Getting started" (in French version), but not with the FAO "JFFLS facilitators' Guide". They do use documentation received at the Rwanda training.

The facilitators of both implementing parties in DRC receive a payment of USD 50 per month as an "encouragement", irrespective of the number of J/FFLS facilitated (generally only one per facilitator). The following justification was provided: "The level of USD 50 was set during the Training of Master-Trainers in Rwanda. We considered a payment of USD 25,

but this would likely have compromised implementation”. Note however that the local salary of a full-time employed teacher is only around Congolese Francs 30,000 (USD 27) per month. The Evaluation recommends that facilitator payments be reduced and made dependent of labor charge and DRC general context.

None of the implementing parties in DRC reportedly works with “investment grants”.

h. Integration of life skills related aspects

Beneficiaries of the J/FFLS in DRC appear to belong in large majority to vulnerable groups: widows, women-headed households, HIV infected and victims of sexual violence, orphans. Vulnerability criteria were well applied.

For good integration of gender into the J/FFLS approach, one would wish to work with groups in which there is a balance between men and women. However, the situation in DRC is such that agriculture is largely the responsibility of women alone. Men have gone to the mines, are in transport, or left to search work in town. The FFLS groups are in majority women’s groups, so that gender issues are more difficult to address.

Nutrition does not appear to be a prime source of concern. This is to say that there is crop diversity around, and people seem to be aware of what is a balanced diet. Where nutrition is a problem this is because of poverty and a lack of access to food.

c. Monitoring

A Baseline survey has been carried out by both implementing parties. Data should be available at FAO-Kinshasa, and will be sent to FAO/REOA for analysis.

d. Partners, networks and other FF(L)S projects

Diffusion of the J/FFLS approach, knowledge and expertise is well on track in Eastern Congo, and may serve as an example to other countries.

FAO-DRC intends to integrate the J/FFLS approach in all its programmes. FAO has integrated the FFLS approach already in a new and large 3-year project in Equator province (at 2,000 km from Goma), working with four (4) implementing partners. Antoine Bakangadio is the Master Trainer involved. The FAO Équateur project (103) plans to establish approx. 200 FFLS (95 FFLS in 1st year and 95 FFLS in 2nd year, with 3rd year to consolidate). Each facilitator will be responsible for three (3) FFLS. The budget for FFLS training is USD 175,000; the overall project budget is USD 4 million. Results will be diffused through Listening Groups (*Clubs d’Écoute*).

The project RAF/010 has also been presented to the Food Security Cluster in October 2011; with approximately 20 national, international and UN organisations. Since then, in South-Kivu ADRA (USA), COOPI (Italy), ACF (France) and Hunger in Action (Sweden) have adopted the FFLS approach, and had their facilitators trained. Other organisations have also shown interest.

The NGO COOPI (Italy) implements 15 FFLS in Fizzi under project 104/UNJ, with a Master Trainer of the Ministry of Agriculture (Elvis Basubi) and FAO-Goma’s emergency project coordinator Moïse Muhindo who himself was trained in FFS under RAF/808 (then a two weeks’ course). M-T Elvis Basubi also provided a training for 30 persons of Hope in Action S-Kivu and the local NGO FESA in Kilemboué-Baraka, Fizi territory.

Another Master-Trainer (Mbusa Mbunge) trained 30 facilitators in J/FFLS with the Ministry of Agriculture and local NGO IDECHA; for ACF (France).

However, the Training of Facilitators for ADRA, COOPI and Hope in Action (for a new project) only lasted 4-5 days, whereas the full FAO JFFLS Training of Facilitators should take at least three (3) weeks. This is reason for concern about the quality and the future image

3. Constraints and best practices:

a. Specific constraints

The politico-administrative situation in DRC leads to higher operational costs than in the other RAF/010 countries. The structure of FAO offices and reporting lines also contributes to delays in the reporting and decision-making processes.

The payment of facilitators is not related to labour charge or local contexts, and therefore runs contrary to sustainability of the intervention.

b. Best practices

There is high interest from FAO and others to integrate the JFFLS approach in their projects and programmes. The Master Trainers are in demand, and are available for up-scaling.

c. Lessons learned

FAO should develop a concise and comprehensive strategy for support of JFFLS up-scaling; including a definition of minimum criteria for the length, conduct, content and quality of the Trainings of Facilitators and their subsequent monitoring in the field.

d. Unintended effects (positive or negative)

The work with school drop-outs in JFFLS may be very valuable, but should not draw away our attention from the fact that these children first and foremost need support to go to school.

4. Sustainable benefits from the project

a. Impact at grassroots and institutional level

The JFFLS approach encourages participants and their communities to engage in and to organise themselves around agriculture. Groups may evolve into mutual support groups in future. The impacts of current JFFLS project in DRC will remain with women in particular, which is appropriate in view of their dominant role in agriculture in Eastern Congo.

b. Advocacy efforts and possibilities

Advocacy & outreach are integrated in project implementation from the onset; through the active involvement of communities and local leaders in the selection of beneficiary households and persons.

FAO-Bukavu (S-Kivu) presented the project RAF/010 to partners in the Cluster Food Security in October 2011; with approximately 20 national, international and UN organisations. The same has occurred at national level in Kinshasa.

The RAF/010 project is well connected to the FAO project Dimitra. Information about the JFFLS approach is being diffused through community radios and so-called “*Clubs d’Écoute*” established by Dimitra. Samwaki was involved in Dimitra through Radio Busuba in Muschingo. Hope in Action intends to diffuse JFFLS information through four (4) community radios in Beni (2), Oicha and Masisi.

c. Activities likely to continue after the project’s phasing out

The JFFLS approach in itself is sustainable while it builds knowledge and expertise with farmers and farming communities that will remain and make sense to it in their local contexts. This will in particular be the case when working with the strong and able.

It may be more difficult to achieve substantial improvements when working with the most vulnerable. The latter are also less likely to replicate the experience with future JFFLS groups.

In the context of DRC the high payment of facilitators regardless of time investment, may undermine the sustainability of the J/FFLS approach and should be rationalised. The knowledge and expertise built through training of facilitators will not spread easily if associated with high pay.

d. Exchange and links within the region and outside

The DRC J/FFLS project is exemplary in the degree of integration of the approach in other FAO projects and in projects of third-party civil society. Other countries may learn for their up-scaling efforts from the partnership spirit and modalities that are being developed.

The potential for further up-scaling of J/FFLS in DRC is enormous. FAO-DRC should make sure that sufficient training capacity is available (Master-Trainers, Trainers and facilitators) to service organisations interested in the approach.

5. Recommendations

- Develop a FAO DRC J/FFLS programme that could guide future up-scaling in numbers, define training capacity (Master-Trainers, Trainers and facilitators) and trainings required, and their geographical distribution.
- Increase J/FFLS training capacity within DRC for future up-scaling.
- Explore the possibilities for the FFLS approach to become the regular government approach to agricultural extension.
- Rationalise the policy on payment of facilitators to adapt to labour charge and local context.
- Review how school drop-outs could be supported to pay school fees.

6. SWOC table

<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The J/FFLS is being integrated into other FAO projects. • The J/FFLS approach is being adopted by a number of international and local NGOs. • All Master Trainers trained in Rwanda, except for one, are today involved in J/FFLS up-scaling in North- and South-Kivu and beyond. 	<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The speed of integration of FFLS into new FAO and NGO projects in North- and South-Kivu and the Equator province is very promising. It would justify a further increase of the number of Master Trainers in DRC • FAO-DRC should ensure that the JFFLS approach and methodology is well understood by partners who wish to implement it in their projects. FAO-DRC shall define minimum criteria (e.g. length of trainings, no. of Master-Trainers, curriculum, set-up of monitoring, etc.) in order to ensure the quality of the approach and related trainings of facilitators. • The government of DRC and North- and South-Kivu will have to restore and renew the services they provide to citizens. The FFLS approach could possibly become the leading extension approach to smallholders.
<p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Master Trainers trained in Rwanda by FAO have been facilitating Trainings of Facilitators with international NGOs which only lasted 4-5 days instead of the required three (3) weeks. • The degree of vulnerability of those that were victims of war is such that the J/FFLS approach should not be limited to the most vulnerable, but be made available to farmer communities at large • The majority of group members is female • Payments for facilitators are very high and not related to labor charge. 	<p>Constraints</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The criterion of 50% men and 50% women is very difficult to achieve in Walungu territory (S-Kivu). Men have abandoned agriculture to a large degree; they have gone to work in mining, in transport, or town. • The absence of functional government extension services in DRC implies that alternative services through civil society are justified and needed, and may be up-scaled. • One of the project regions (Masisi) was very difficult to reach due to the security situation • Lack of decentralization leads to additional cost for project management • No shade or sitting place in some of the schools.

Annex 10: Country Report Kenya

1. Introduction

In Kenya, the approach of FFS is not new; it has been used already since 1995 and is well known as an extension approach. This project targets two regions, the region around Eldoret in the east in the Uasin Gishu District and in the Turkana District (including the Kakuma Refugee Camp) in the Rift Valley in the north east of the country. Originally, the Dabaab region was also incorporated, but has been dropped because of security considerations.

In general, Northern Kenya has suffered from recurrent drought and reduced investment in the agricultural sector. The region around Eldoret still shows traces of the 2008 post election conflict. Food security is weak and women have suffered considerably from SGBV, even though the situation is slowly improving. The area of Turkana is highly vulnerable and food insecure; there is limited access to water. Refugees from Somalia and Sudan are housed in a refugee camp.

Since the new Constitution of 2010, gender equality as well as women's property and land rights are better reflected; this does not mean that at field level implementation always takes place. The cultural traditions still tend to disfavor women and girls with regard to inheritance and property, even naming the girls "she that is only here temporarily" or "she who has no voice".

The HIV prevalence in Kenya in 2009 was 6.3%⁸. With regard to nutrition, even though the situation is slowly improving, high rates of malnutrition are still found: in 2009 16% of children were underweight and 7% were suffering from moderate and severe wasting (acute malnutrition)⁸. In Turkana, rates of malnutrition are considerably higher than on a nationwide scale.

The evaluation team has visited the FAO and partners offices in Nairobi and made a field visit to the project activities in the Uasin Gishu District: FFLS Kokoro (Kamuyu Kuona) and the JFFLS Samba (Koiwarusen), supported by ACK in Burnt Forest. The Turkana region was not visited, but an interview was conducted with the implementing partner in its Nairobi office.

The preceding project was implemented in three other locations apart from Burnt Forest. These locations are no longer supported under the current project because they were no longer characterized as places of humanitarian concern.

2. Status of Implementation

a. Project management

In the project areas, long rains begin in March and end in June/July; the harvest season of the crops planted by the J/FFLS will finish in June, just before the end of the project.

In Kakuma, the implementing partner is LWF. There are only Junior FFLS (JFFLS): 12 in total of which 3 are in the Kakuma refugee camp, and 9 in the community. The language is sometimes a constraint in the camp, as the refugees are from Somali or Sudanese background, and the facilitators are Kenyan. LWF also provides formal education in the camp schools. UNICEF sponsors the schools as well. Luckily, the schools have small plots of land where the agricultural activities of the JFFLS can be conducted. The JFFLS are established close to a water point as water is scarce. The facilitators, who are school teachers, perform the participant selection.

⁸ UNICEF: http://www.unicef.org/infobycountry/kenya_statistics.html

The project activities in Burnt Forest, Uasin Gishu District are implemented by ACK. ACK has established 15 FFLS of which 4 are mainly populated by young people; plus 4 JFFLS which are established in schools. A media consultant was hired under the project budget to document ongoing project activities. The learning grant of KSh 42,000 is directly transferred to the account of the group. From the grant, the group also pays a lunch allowance for the extensionists.

b. JFFLS

The teachers seek to involve parents and guardians on a regular basis in project activities. Many of the children are highly vulnerable and have to provide for their own and their family's food needs, which complicates their attendance after school. The children in the visited JFFLS planted their crops on a field which used to belong to support staff of the school, who had willingly given up their plot for this purpose.

Sometimes, pressure was put on the children in the JFFLS group to attend lessons that had been rescheduled to take place outside regular school hours by other teachers. Clearer incorporation of the JFFLS curriculum into the regular school curriculum could prevent such issues in future. At the same time, teachers and children in regular classes might benefit from the experiential and analysis based learning of JFFLS groups.

c. Description of progress up to date

The project has started implementation of sessions at field level, with 15 FFLS and 16 JFFLS operational since September 2011 or January 2012. Compared to the planning, the project is well on track and it looks like the implementation may be rounded up as foreseen. Four (4) ToFs have been implemented: 2 in Turkana and 2 in Eldoret (17-26 October and 7-12 November 2011), in which a total of 33 facilitators have been trained

Seven MTs were trained in Kisumu in the MT refresher workshop on gender, HIV/AIDS and nutrition (10-16 April 2011). Two MTs are covering simultaneously the two project areas. But even though seven MTs were trained by the project, three were assigned permanent jobs abroad and only two were reportedly actually sufficiently knowledgeable with regard to JFFLS. These two MTs, interviewed by the Evaluation Team in Kenya, are government extension staff and appeared to be very knowledgeable and experienced.

The facilitators were chosen from among the famer groups (FFLS Eldoret) or, in the case of JFFLS, they were school teachers. The teachers did not always have sufficient background in agriculture, which was covered by the support of an agronomist/extensionist. The FFLS facilitators have been trained to perform the teaching in a facilitative way, but with regard to technical knowledge on agriculture they sometimes face limitations. The extension officers visit the sessions between once a week and once every two weeks to share the technical training issues. The extension officers often lack facilitation skills.

In the on-going livelihood program of ACK savings and credits groups or SILC (Savings and internal Lending for Communities) are undertaken. This approach has been introduced in 5 groups out of the 19.

Two backstopping missions have been carried out in Kenya, one in September 2011 by the senior ESW officer to evaluate the progress and provided technical backstopping to the national and regional teams and one in November 2011 by the Regional Emergency Officer HIV/Gender for planning, opening and presenting the SOFA 2011 at the training of the partners on HIV and Gender. Regular backstopping missions (5 up to now) are conducted by the country team.

d. Integration of life skills related aspects

All facilitators and extensionists were trained on the life skills approach. With regard to nutrition, the extension officers and the MT were trained simultaneously. The extensionists admitted that they confine themselves mostly to technical advice on agricultural issues during the FFLS sessions and leave the life skills to the other facilitators. The MTs and facilitators did not always approach nutrition education in a practical manner, and they did not clearly address IYCF and complementary feeding or nutrition for HIV patients. They reported that subjects to be discussed should come up from the group. They planned to address nutrition issues once the crop was harvested, but did not pursue that option actively. The facilitators of the JFFLS, on the other hand, being school teachers, were found to pay more attention to nutrition.

Upon request, J/FFLS participants would list to have learned about nutritional issues like “a varied diet” and “carbohydrates, proteins” but if one would ask into more practical details referring to actual eating habits, sometimes the wrong ones were given. The training on nutrition seems to have been slightly too theoretical. Also, in a few cases the MTs, even though possessing sufficient technical knowledge, defended nutritional information that seemed to be based on cultural beliefs rather than on existing nutritional knowledge.

e. Monitoring

The baseline data were collected at the onset of the project by both implementing partners. Usually analysis is done by REOA, but in the case of ACK it was done by the implementing partner itself. LWF had almost finished the analysis and report, ACK had already handed in the report. After ACK had analyzed the results, it appeared that there was very little gender related information and ACK committed itself to conduct a gender analysis. Unfortunately, an old version of the survey format was used by ACK.

Regular monitoring is basically done by the implementing partners and FAO Kenya; the Master Trainers and government staff are hardly involved. The results and reports developed by ACK are not currently shared with the District Agricultural Office (DAO).

f. Partners, networks and other FF(L)S projects

For the Ministry of Agriculture, gender is not a new subject; the Ministry itself is actively mainstreaming gender, and it has a gender officer available who is involved in training for the project.

The DAO in the visited district shared, that they would appreciate a more formalized cooperation for instance in the form of a Letter of Agreement (LoA), which would specify mutual expectations. Also, they commented on the fact that ACK has no field staff (Eldoret staff only performs regular backstopping visits) and that input of DAO is needed to guard the quality of implementation.

As regards general agricultural extension in Kenya, the Ministry of Agriculture currently implements the programme NAAIAP (National Accelerated Agriculture Input Access Programme) which works with farmer groups but is not very participatory as an approach. The National Agriculture and Livestock Extension Programme (NALEP), however, funded by Sida, has established so-called Common Interest Groups since 2005, which are considered more or less similar to FFS groups. Gender is also incorporated into this approach and youth are included as participants. Unfortunately, the project has already ended in the meantime. There are still Common Interest Groups active though, which may offer an opportunity for collaboration with the FFLS.

3. Constraints and best practices:

a. Specific weakness

From the baseline survey of ACK, it appeared that, especially in the case of FFLS, not all participants were selected individually based on the selection criteria as outlined in the project design, but had been selected from existing extension groups. Nonetheless, many participants did look very vulnerable.

b. Best practices

The combination of a facilitator from the group and an extension officer from the government with a specific background in agriculture appeared to work well. The fact that facilitators met on a monthly basis enabled them to work in an interactive manner.

In the case of the JFFLS, the participants had been selected by the teachers (with involvement of the parents and guardians). The participants all appeared to be extremely vulnerable; they were clearly poorer than their fellow pupils, some of them were malnourished and some were sick.

5 out of 19 groups in Eldoret have integrated integration SILC (Savings and internal Lending for Communities) of livelihood program of ACK, which contributes to sustainability.

In view of the recent history of post-election violence, in 2007, special attention was paid in the composition of FFLS groups in Burnt Forest, to the inclusion of participants from various tribal backgrounds. This should contribute to improving conflict management skills, and re-establish and increase the mutual acceptance and understanding of both groups, which had been severely affected.

c. Lessons learned

The government extension officers are trained in incorporating life skills but they are not using a facilitative participatory approach. More training time may be needed to strengthen this issue.

4. Sustainable benefits from the project

a. Impact at grassroots and institutional level

Even though it was believed that community leaders were involved in the selection of the FFS participants, in practice this appeared not to be the case, apart from the start-up ceremony. The community leaders, interviewed by the team, had very little knowledge of the J/FFLS projects at all and were not a stakeholder as such.

The area around Eldoret and the Uasin Gishu District were classified by a number of people as a “high potential agricultural area” The general situation seems to have improved considerably since 2008, and the area may again become one of the “bread baskets” of Kenya in the near future.

Institutionalization of the J/FFLS approach is ongoing at least at a lower level. Most of the extension officers know the FFLS approach and employ elements of it, even though not always in a participatory manner. They specifically enjoy the group-based type of education, which saves them time and allows them to target like-minded individuals, and to benefit from positive interaction.

At a higher level, institutionalization of the J/FFLS approach may still be difficult and will likely require a considerable amount of lobby and advocacy. There is a definite need for institutionalization to occur, while it would encourage and enable the extensionists and district offices to apply and implement the J/FFLS approach to its full potential.

b. Advocacy efforts and possibilities

There is a Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Development in Kenya. All the groups were registered by this ministry and the social development workers are among the facilitators trained. FAO is recommended to engage further with this ministry particularly in view of the importance of gender within this project.

Advocacy is ongoing at a national level through the Food Security cluster meetings as well as the Food and Nutrition Security Working Group.

c. Activities likely to continue after the project's phasing out

Under the preceding project, facilitators were already trained but no specific details could be encountered about their actual involvement since in FFLS related projects. Even though the stakeholders of the current project are enthusiastic and favorable to prolongation of the project, turning current J/FFLS participants into future facilitators, more concrete activities and support may be needed to achieve this goal.

d. Exchange and links within the region and outside

Exchange visits have been carried out, or are planned, at various:

- Inter-group visits within the project area. The groups in Eldoret visit each other in preparation for the establishment of networks and to learn from each other's experiences.
- Inter-partner visit – both partners visited JFFLS sites in Bondo, where a long experience and expertise in implementing JFFLS projects was available.
- Inter-country visit at regional level – the Kenyan team plans to visit Rwanda and thereafter the Rwandan team will be visiting Kenya in April 2012 to share lessons learnt and experiences.

5. Recommendations

- Formalize the cooperation with the Ministry of Agriculture at various levels.
- Integrate the effective and efficient access of use of water into the project activities or link to other projects working in that field, since access to water was cited as the most pressing problem.
- Approach other Ministries like the Ministry of Gender for further involvement in the project

6. SWOC table

<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approach is well known. Government is committed and knowledgeable and District Steering Committees help to keep the government committed; gender is being mainstreamed. • DAO is very positive on extent and quality of cooperation • FFLS in Burnt Forest are deliberately incorporating people from various tribal backgrounds; this helps in conflict management and mutual understanding and acceptance. • The FFS sessions are conducted in a cooperative manner by the facilitators and the extension officers; cooperation between NGO and government is good and most extensionists are aware of the FFLS approach • facilitators have formed a network; they get together on a monthly basis • In the JFFLS, the most vulnerable children were selected; caregivers are involved 	<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formalize the cooperation with the Ministry of Agriculture for example by signing MoUs with DAO • Raise awareness of other possibilities such as selling seeds for securing future group activity and seeking support of the government may be more emphasized as part of the project activities. • Involve community leaders (village chiefs) on a more regular basis • Perform M&E on a more participatory basis and share the reports with all stakeholders. • Advocacy with and further involvement of Ministry of Gender • Collaboration with NALEP Common Interest Groups
<p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FFLS facilitators sometimes have insufficient technical background on agricultural techniques, whereas extension officers may lack facilitative skills • Selection of the participants was not always done on an individual basis which created the risk of not all group members being vulnerable • The target area around Eldoret is not as vulnerable as for instance certain areas in the North-East of Kenya 	<p>Constraints</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient number of MTs, particularly with regard to JFFLS • Children sometimes could not attend JFFLS sessions because regular classes were rescheduled. • Sensitivity around revealing HIV status and questions with regard to HIV/AIDS; people dropped out of the group for this reason • Institutionalization at field level is easier and has progressed further than at national level

Annex 11: Country Report Rwanda

1. Introduction

Rwanda is going through times of remarkable and steady economic growth (8.8% in 2011), and is well on track to achieve most of the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) set for 2015. Infrastructure in terms of roads etc. is very good in comparison with neighboring countries. Primary education is obligatory, and almost all children do indeed attend schools. To increase capacity schools run a double-scheme with morning and afternoon groups. Health care has improved a lot in terms of child mortality, vaccinations, access to antiretroviral (ARV) drugs, etc.

The Rwandan state is clearly present and visible also in more remote rural areas, and is reportedly efficient and effective. Corruption is understood to exist but to a much lesser degree than in neighboring countries. Performance contracts are concluded with civil servants, mayors and even individual ministers, and are monitored by third parties on a sample basis. The contracts create a strong sense of urgency of the job, as well as uncertainty and fear amongst personnel while one may easily lose one's job if objectives are not achieved in number and in time.

In Rwanda, the prevalence of HIV among people aged 15-49 is 3%⁹ with certain pockets of higher prevalence. In Kigali for instance the percentage is 7%. The women are more affected, with a percentage of 3.6% compared to 2.3% for men. Other groups at special risk are camp population, prisoners, single women and youth. The government addresses the problems with awareness campaign sand youth clubs. In general, once a month there are meetings on community works, which are obligatory for all Rwandese over 18 years of age. Rwanda also has a National Strategic Plan on HIV/AIDS 2009-2012 and a National Accelerated Plan for Women, Girls and Gender Equality and HIV 2010-2014.

The Rwandan government is considered "authoritarian" by many scholars. Some believe that authoritarian rule may be helpful to increase the efficiency of decision-making and to achieve rapid economic growth. Others point to the imposition upon society and individuals of top-down decisions which may not do justice to their particular needs and desires, thus making the basis for policy support and implementation more fragile in the mid and long-term.

Rwandan society is still very much divided by ethnic or caste-like divisions between the two main groups, the Hutu (about 85% of population) and Tutsi (about 15% of population). The genocide in 1994 was a culmination of long-term political and societal conflicts and repeated bloodshed between these groups in preceding decades. The "authoritarian" rule since 1994 has led to stability in the country, and has favored the entry from abroad (Tanzania, Uganda, etc.) of many hundreds of thousands of returnees who had fled previous conflict. Still, observers report about wide-spread hidden resentment and frustration, and are concerned that the underlying causes of previous conflicts have not been taken away. Therefore, they question whether current government policies including agricultural policy will reduce or rather enhance (hidden) social conflicts.

Population density is high and land is very scarce in Rwanda. Most families have less than one (1) hectare of land. This implies that population growth and land inheritance are major sources of concern, with plots per family becoming ever smaller. Another major issue is the allocation and registration of land titles. Access to land has been and continues to be a major

⁹ UN One programme: Improve livelihoods and promote a supportive social environment for people infected by HIV through addressing socioeconomic and gender inequalities. Rwanda, January 2012

source of conflicts. The land issue has become ever more complex after each massacre through the occupation and re-allocation of land between groups and families. Moreover, large numbers of returnees had to be re-settled over last years. The government of Rwanda is working on a system of land registration, but whereas it will solve many problems, it may actually also fuel new social conflict while there is a lot of land on which rest multiple claims.

It is in this complex context that FAO has been requested by the Government of Rwanda to intervene on the issue of food security for the benefit of returnees in Eastern Province. Notwithstanding the positive development, food insecurity still exists, especially in pockets. Many of the returnees had left Rwanda for Tanzania in the 1960s and 1970s, and were forced by Tanzanian government to return to Rwanda by around 2007. Although they are Rwandaphones, their livelihoods were in Tanzania for a long time. The returnees did not return voluntarily, nor were they particularly welcomed by the hosting communities. The Rwandan government provided them with land (1 hectare per family) in a less-fertile zone next to Akagera National Park. Most returnees were cattle herders who had lived in areas of very low population density (6 inhabitants/km²), and who now have to adapt to agriculture in a very densely-populated area (>350 inhabitants/km²).

The Evaluation Team met with implementing partners AVSI (Italy) and Caritas-Kibungo. The team could only visit one of the three intervention areas of AVSI: one (1) FFLS, one (1) Cooperative and two (2) JFFLS in Gatsibo district. Time did not allow for field visits in Kibungo area.

2. Status of Implementation

a. Project management

The choice of the RAF/010 project to explicitly work in Rwanda with returnees from Tanzania was taken by FAO/REOA before start of project. The returnees were considered very vulnerable and food insecure at the time of their return in 2007 and first years after. Still, the Project document does not specify why this target group, with its multiple initial handicaps, would be of particular interest for the integration of gender, HIV and nutrition into the J/FFLS approach.

Implementation of the RAF/010 project in Rwanda is well on track. It is the only country where the full 2011/12 Season A (September-December) had been made use of, thanks to a timely signature of contracts with implementing partners (in September 2011). Project management at FAO and AVSI is result-oriented, which shows both in planning, in reporting and in the field. Thanks to pro-active management, an un-planned and un-budgeted Recycle Course of facilitators was organised in February 2012 in order to resolve observed weaknesses in facilitators' performance.

The project RAF/010 is managed at FAO-Rwanda by the project coordinator (Josepha Mukamana) and her colleague-agronomist (Denis Kanywabahizi).

The contracts between FAO-Rwanda and the implementing partners AVSI and Caritas-Kibungo were signed in September 2011. Budgets are USD 47,930 for AVSI and USD 17,580 for Caritas-Kibungo. Field implementation started immediately afterwards to make full use of the Season A.

b. JFFLS

The FFS approach has been used in Rwanda for the past 4 years. The project is implemented by AVSI in the districts of Bugesera, Gatsibo and Nyagatare (24 J/FFLS; 6 FFLS and 2 JFFLS in each) and by Caritas-Kibungo in the district of Kirehe (8 J/FFLS; 6 FFLS and 2 JFFLS). AVSI was an implementing partner under the project RAF/808, when it worked in

Gatsibo but not the other two districts. Retrospectively, AVSI considers that it might better have concentrated its efforts in one district while current overhead is high in time and transport. Caritas-Kibungo is new to the J/FFLS approach.

The FFLS participants were selected from villages of returnees from Tanzania. In order to facilitate their integration in the community, participants from hosting communities have also been incorporated. The JFFLS participants were selected at schools where many children of returnees can be found. In most villages, multiple J/FFLS groups share a plot on the same site, with a maximum of three J/FFLS on one spot.

In line with current Rwandan agricultural policy, the J/FFLS groups visited all worked on the government's regional crop of choice for agricultural development; i.e. in Gatsibo maize in Season A and beans in Season B. The groups are technically supported by government agronomists/extensionists, and J/FFLS facilitators can and do request technical support from district specialists on thematic issues such as gender, HIV and nutrition.

c. Description of progress up to date

Nine (9) persons from Rwanda were trained during the sub-regional Training of Master Trainers that took place in Musanze in three (3) 3-week sessions between March and June 2011. Originally only seven (7) Master Trainers were planned for Rwanda, but capacity was available for more persons once the number of Master Trainers from CAR was reduced because of travel costs. Two (2) out of nine (9) Rwandan Master Trainers are women; in the other countries relatively more women were among the MT group.

The Master Trainers are attached to different organisations and projects: one (1) is with FAO under the RAF/010 project, two (2) with the FAO Cassava Project, and one (1) each with Caritas-Kibungo, Caritas-Nyundo, the NGO Développement Rural du Nord (DRN), and the producer syndicates Ingabo and Imbaraga. During the course of the Training of Master Trainers five (5) FFLS were put in place, and supported by Imbaraga and FAO-Rwanda.

The 3-weeks Training of Facilitators took place in August 2011 for a total of 60 facilitators (38 men, 22 women). Under the RAF/010 project 24 facilitators (12 men; 12 women) were trained for AVSI and Caritas-Kibungo, plus 16 with other partners (11 men, 5 women). For the FAO Cassava Project another 20 facilitators were trained (15 men, 5 women). The ToF was held simultaneously in two separate groups. In February 2012 a one-week Recycle Course for facilitators was subsequently organised in which 27 facilitators participated; the others having changed jobs or having assumed other activities in the meantime.

Through the facilitators of various projects and organisations a total of 127 J/FFLS have been put in place. The RAF/010 project supported 32 J/FFLS; at 1-3 groups per facilitator. The Cassava Project established no less than 76 J/FFLS groups, with only 2 Master Trainers and 20 trained facilitators. It is not clear to the Evaluation Team why the FAO Cassava Project and the RAF/010 project followed different policies on this matter. Other partners helped to establish another 19 J/FFLS groups.

d. Integration of life skills related aspects

Rwanda is endowed with a moderately-hot and humid climate which enables two to three harvests per year. Altitude differences create favourable conditions for the production of a wide variety of crops - for home consumption, markets and exports. Rwanda cannot be considered to be food insecure, particularly not compared to neighbouring countries. Rwanda is in essence self-sufficient in food.

Nonetheless, malnutrition is still a problem affecting approximately 20% of the children. Access to food is the key factor; awareness about the need for a balanced diet seems to be

there. Poverty is wide-spread, more pronounced in some regions, and highly related to access to land with many families owning less than one hectare of land.

The role of women in agriculture is very important. Women outnumber men in society as a consequence of past massacres. Most agricultural work is done by women, with men focussing on the physically hard work of land clearance and preparation and on marketing.

Prevalence of HIV/AIDS amongst the returnees is assumed to be higher than the national average (3%). One FFLS visited talked very openly about them all being HIV-infected persons. To our understanding there was not a mixture of HIV-infected persons and others who could provide support in case of need. Still, it was shared that mixture was aimed for in all groups.

A special accent in the Rwanda programme is put on the organisation of participants in cooperatives. Two FFLS groups under project RAF/808 afterwards constituted a cooperative named “Duterimbere” in order to increase their possibilities for marketing. The cooperative has since received financial support to build a store for inputs and harvest (through FAO and AVSI), to set up a nursery for young children (through UNICEF) and a drying place and storage for maize from around the village (through Ministry of Agriculture, as part of its Crop Intensification Programme).

e. Monitoring

At the time of the visit, the data from the Baseline survey had been collected but not yet collated and sent to FAO-REOA for analysis.

Monitoring of project implementation is carried out on a regular basis by FAO project coordinator, FAO agronomist and the coordinators of the implementing partners. Principal Master Trainer Godrick Khisa visited Rwanda in January 2012 to provide technical support and advice on facilitation of the J/FFLS groups.

f. Partners, networks and other FF(L)S projects

The Rwandan Ministry of Agriculture and the Belgium Technical Cooperation are currently implementing a 4-year large-scale Farmer Field School (FFS) programme. This provides excellent opportunities to integrate the issues of gender, HIV and nutrition. However, it should be inventoried how strong the participatory element of the already established and the proposed FFS are, while some earlier projects have reportedly been labelled FFS mistakenly.

The nine (9) Master Trainers trained in Musandze in March-June 2011 are all still involved in J/FFLS implementation. They appear to be a close group that meets from time to time for updates and exchanges.

3. Constraints and best practices:

a. Specific constraints

Rwanda is clearly facing constraints regarding the access to land. The returnees from Tanzania who are targeted by the RAF/010 project have been privileged to receive access to one (1) hectare of land and to further external support for housing etc. Their biggest constraint appears to be the need to be initiated or re-initiated into agriculture.

The target area of the project is a region with relatively little rainfall, which makes it difficult to achieve good agricultural production and results.

b. Best practices

Project management in Rwanda has been pro-active and able to solve emerging issues. The organisation of the unplanned Recycle Course for facilitators is highly appreciated by the Evaluation Team, and may serve as an example to other countries.

The Rwanda programme has been very much aligned with national, regional and local authorities, which ensures recognition of the work being done in the field and may facilitate the uptake of positive outcomes.

c. Lessons learned

Rwanda provides a clear example of a country where a lot of social and economic development can take place if government is available, functional and results-oriented. At the same time, Rwanda is an example of a country where rule is “authoritarian”, where human rights are under pressure, and where the imposition of collective action may lead to undervaluation of the real needs and interests of individuals and specific groups within society including smallholder farmers.

d. Unintended effects (positive or negative)

The J/FFLS approach as developed abroad intends to create a space for participants to develop their own understanding of agricultural and thematic issues through experimentation and exchange. It is a bottom-up approach, after which groups and individual members can relate better to their environments (geographical, social, economic and political) including their institutional environment. The fact that the agricultural part of the curriculum was completely aligned with current governmental agricultural policy from the beginning (including choice of crop for FFS plot and crop itinerary deemed required by authorities) may hamper the bottom-up approach envisaged.

Two particular factors may have a bearing on the future image of the J/FFLS approach in view of its up-scaling in Rwanda. Firstly, the J/FFLS approach is introduced jointly with the implementation of a political agricultural programme (Crop Intensification Programme) which may possibly run contrary to the individual interests of many smallholders (regarding food security and risk aversion). Secondly, the J/FFLS approach is thus far implemented only in specific programmes for returnees, who have specific characteristics and are highly sensitive from a political point of view.

4. Sustainable benefits from the project

a. Impact at grassroots and institutional level

The JFFLS programme in Rwanda should aim for the integration of the gender, HIV and nutrition elements into the new 4-year programme on Farmer Field Schools (FFS) that the Ministry of Agriculture is currently implementing with the Belgian Technical Cooperation (BTC). In case of success, the very objective of the RAF/010 project which is the integration of gender, HIV and nutrition into existing Farmer Field Schools, would be achieved entirely.

The Evaluation Team considers that Farmer Field Schools may also be a means to initiate or re-initiate predominantly herder returnees into agriculture. Whereas crop intensification may be the policy goal at a national and regional level, it will be relevant for the new farmers to dedicate specific attention to risk management (crop/marketing failure, input credits, indebtedness), and to avoid a blind focus on the use of external inputs (seeds, fertilisers, pesticides).

b. Advocacy efforts and possibilities

National, regional and local authorities have been involved in the RAF/010 project from the onset through information and awareness-raising meetings. Authorities agreed to implementation of the project after it was aligned with the current agricultural policy on crop intensification.

Open Days were organised by AVSI in January 2012 in all three districts to present the project to national, regional and local parties interested. Caritas-Kibungo also organised an Open Day with a variety of organisations.

The FAO-Rwanda project coordinator participates in the HIV/AIDS Cluster, where the RAF/010 project has been presented on various occasions.

A new UN Joint Programme is being elaborated through which FAO expects to receive an amount of USD 100,000 for the implementation of twenty (20) J/FFLS in Gatsibo and Nyagatare for a period of 1.5 years. Decision is expected by April 2012.

Possibilities were explored by the Evaluation Team with UNAIDS and UN Women to come to a cost-sharing programme for future J/FFLS up-scaling in which financial contribution would be equivalent to the percentage of thematic issues (gender, HIV) in the overall 42-week J/FFLS curriculum. Prospects look good in Rwanda to come to such an integrated UN Joint Programme in future.

c. Activities likely to continue after the project's phasing out

The nine (9) Master Trainers in Rwanda appear to be a close group that meets from time to time for update and exchanges. This human capacity in J/FFLS implementation will be around after the RAF/010 project - to be made use of by other organisations and structures.

d. Exchange and links within the region and outside

The Rwandan Master Trainers are in contact with the Master Trainers from the other RAF/010 project countries. They have expressed a clear interest to learn more about the Junior aspects of the J/FFLS approach in particular through an exchange visit to Kenya where the approach is well-established in some regions.

5. Recommendations

- Align (as far as still possible) the J/FFLS programme in Rwanda with the 4-year Farmer Field School programme being implemented by the Ministry of Agriculture with support of the Belgian Technical Cooperation (BTC).
- Develop jointly with the Ministry of Agriculture and BTC a national Rwanda J/FFLS programme that guides future up-scaling in numbers, defines training capacity (Master-Trainers, Trainers, facilitators) and trainings required, as well as their geographical distribution.
- Pay specific attention in future trainings of Master Trainers and facilitators, and in awareness-raising and advocacy activities, to the participatory nature of JFFLS and of Farmer Field Schools at large and into the prerequisites for this to be met.
- Explore all opportunities to increase land productivity with resources that are commonly available to smallholders (through farm management skills, intercropping, organic fertilisation, etc.). Avoid a focus on the use of external inputs (seeds, fertilisers, pesticides) which use is often not adapted to the realities of smallholder agriculture.

6. SWOC table

<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project management is pro-active, efficient and effective. • The government of Rwanda is present and functional in rural areas, and involved in project implementation. • The nine Master Trainers form a close group that interacts for learning. 	<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Ministry of Agriculture is very positive towards Farmer Field Schools and appears to be favorable to the inclusion of gender, HIV and nutrition. • There appear to be good opportunities for developing an integrated UN Joint Programme, with cost-sharing arrangement, between FAO, UNAIDS and UN Women.
<p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The specific nature of the target group may not facilitate appreciation and future up-scaling of the J/FFLS approach. • Most of project implementation is in the hands of one single implementing partner, which is understandable from an efficiency point of view but carries certain risks. • Actors risk being too oriented towards a directive mode of facilitation. 	<p>Constraints</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The J/FFLS appear to be too focused, at this early stage of their development, on the implementation of detailed governmental agricultural policy. • The target group is not experienced in agriculture, which represents an additional challenge to the project. • A number of trained facilitators had already identified other work opportunities, increasing the workload for their colleagues

Annex 12: Country Report Uganda

1. Introduction

Over 77% of people in Uganda depend on agriculture for a living. Sorghum and millet are popular crops, which have been used in Uganda for many centuries. Cotton is also grown, as well as many different vegetables.

The project targets the Kitgum and Lamwo districts in the Acholi sub-region and the Kaabong and Kotido Districts in the Karamoja sub-region in Northern Uganda.

Northern Uganda is home to a large group of people who were formally displaced. During the war which started in 2002, the government relocated almost the entire population of Kitgum to IDP camps. All of those internally displaced persons (IDPs) returned to their villages of origin in 2008 but they had to face the fact that their houses had been destroyed, their cattle killed and fields burnt. In the meantime, they rebuilt houses and resumed crop cultivation. The situation is still dire, though, and civil unrest is still present; reintegration is an ongoing and fragile process and more time will be needed for complete recovery.

In Kitgum, food insecurity is therefore still widespread; often, people still have had to eat their seeds for lack of food and have faced another year of food insecurity as a result. By the end of 2011, rainfall was much higher than usual, leading to loss of crops. The security situation currently is calm. Alcohol abuse was reportedly high according to the implementing partner.

The work on the land is mainly done by hand. Animal traction is not possible since the cattle have been raided during the conflict and motorized equipment is hardly available and in most cases not affordable. Even though people do not have electricity in their homes, they do use mills which run on electricity and which are provided in small commercial centers. Micro-credit is not an option in most areas, since the interest rate is around 23% and revenues from agriculture are often unstable and unpredictable. Moreover, a number of organizations including WFP, who provided the camps with emergency support and assistance, have left the area after the refugee camps were dismantled, leaving the population with needs which are too large to overcome by themselves.

In the Karamoja region, the situation may even be characterized as worse. All roads are “red routes” on which UN staff members have to travel with an escort. Armed warriors live among the population and raids and spontaneous attacks still take place on a regular basis, especially in Kotido. Water is scarce in the region, even in the wet season; the land is semi-arid and the population food insecure. Livestock in this region is still available but also at risk from raids.

The HIV prevalence in Uganda in 2009 was 6.5%¹⁰, with higher rates among women and lower rates among youth. With regard to malnutrition, in 2009 16% of children were underweight and 6% were suffering from moderate and severe wasting (acute malnutrition)⁸. Uganda has a Ministry of Gender Affairs, acting as a source of advice, advocate of gender equality and support to activities. In 2007, the second Gender Strategy was approved. The Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF) has, as a result, since a number of years worked on gender mainstreaming and the appointment of gender focal points within its various departments. A gender strategy was developed with support from DANIDA and a Gender Task Force was installed.

¹⁰ UNICEF: http://www.unicef.org/infobycountry/kenya_statistics.html

Even though the law requires equal inheritance rights, the sons are often inheriting land and property at the expense of their sisters. In the project area this problem was less pressing, since the beneficiaries often worked on land which was communal property.

The Evaluation Team visited the FFLS in Samba (Orom) and Kokoro (Lokum). At the time of the visit, the groups were still awaiting first rains to arrive, so that group activity since establishment in January/February had focused thus far on the thematic issues of gender and HIV/AIDS. No FFLS plots had been established yet.

2. Status of Implementation

a. Project management

At the onset of the project, War Child UK (WCUK) was selected as a partner for the J/FFLS implementation in Karamoja, which is a new area to the project. War child was selected because JFFLS implementation requires a child based organisation, with core activities centring around the child/youth, and has been working with young warriors. For the project activities in the Kitgum area, which was already covered under the preceding project, FAO continued cooperation with LWF since it had been considered successful.

Partner NGO LWF established a total of 16 FFLS groups: in Kitgum 8 FFLS groups with 240 participants (186 female) and in Lamwo also 8 groups with 240 participants (136 female).

Facilitators were selected by the NGO from within the community. These are persons with an adequate technical background in agriculture. Each facilitator is responsible for 4 FFLS groups. They receive a consultancy allowance for their involvement.

A system of Village Savings and Loans (VSL) will be implemented in the FFLS in Kitgum area. The participants intend to all save some money on a regular basis, which may be loaned to others at a small interest rate. A small part of the money is used for welfare, whilst the bulk is paid out at the end of the period with interest to the savers, for them to engage in a project which may increase their food security and enhance their quality of life.

The main constraint mentioned by most of the participants in Kitgum as regards their livelihoods was poor access to water. On average, a water source is available at approx. 1 kilometer from the village; yet since there is often only one water source for the village, people, especially women, have to line up and lose a lot of time, which otherwise might have been used for food production.

b. JFFLS

The partner organization WCUK has established 27 JFFLS, 12 in Kaabong (340 participants, 210 female) and 15 in Kotido (450 participants, 270 female). The prime focus in the selection was on orphans, child headed households and young women (10-18 years old).

Nine (9) out of 27 JFFLS are established outside schools and are called “community JFFLS”; the others are attached to schools. The parents as well as the teachers and the Ministry of Education are involved as stakeholders. The facilitators are school teachers.

Note that in project planning, only 8 JFFLS were foreseen to be established, yet today 27 JFFLS are reportedly in the start-up phase. The staff of the implementing partner and the running costs of the other JFFLS are financed under the UNJP OSRO/UGA/103/UNJ (Strengthening the Multi-sectoral Approach to Gender based Violence Prevention and Response in North and North-East Uganda), with support from the Norwegian government. RAF/010 met the costs of input and the training costs.

c. Description of progress up to date

In Uganda, project implementation is behind on schedule. The facilitators were trained in October/November 2011 in Kitgum and from 15-28 January 2012 in Karamoja. Another Training of Facilitators in Kitgum was planned to start two days after the visit of the Evaluation Team, but not all facilitators appeared to be aware of this fact.

Nine (9) MTs in Uganda have been trained before on J/FFLS; 6 are from the implementing partners, 1 from the MAAIF and 2 from FAO. They all attended the refresher Training of MT in Kisumu, Kenya on gender, HIV/AIDS and nutrition (10-16 April 2011) which was organized under the current project RAF/010.

Field implementation had not started yet, even though the ground work activities were going on including sensitization of the community on HIV/gender issues and some plays and drama were conducted. Post election problems had delayed the ToF and now one had to wait for the rainy season to start, to be able to implement agricultural activities. The FFLS activities in the Kitgum area had started from the 16th January with selection of participants and team building. Inception meetings were organized with community leaders, NGOs, and district personnel by the end of January. Awareness was raised among the population on the upcoming project. In a second series of meetings, target areas and suitable participants, from among those who had registered themselves as interested, were selected.

Within the groups of participants, a selection of activities and crops was made and a president, a treasurer and a secretary elected. All presidents are men, whereas all treasurers are women. One member was elected to represent the FFLS in the FFLS network, meeting once a month.

A grand majority of the project participants are women; this was reported by some participants and the implementing partner as caused by the fact that in the time of war, more men than women were killed; furthermore, men are sometimes working as and often away from home, unable to attend the meetings regularly. The FFLS will work with 3 kinds of plots: one for commercial use, one for study and one for seed reproduction.

In Karamoja region, the process was similar, but in the inception meeting District Education Officers, Community Development Officers, Head teachers, members of the School Management Committees and District Production Departments were involved, because here only JFFLS were established. Furthermore, instead of having one facilitator having to cover 4 FFLS, each FFLS has one facilitator; in the 18 cases where the JFFLS is conducted in a school the facilitator is a teacher. All facilitators have undergone training. The NGO has identified the locations for JFFLS plots.

Inputs will be procured by FAO Kampala and subsequently transported to the project areas. The first inputs will be provided by March/April 2012. A learning grant will be paid through the NGO, which distributes it subsequently to the groups.

There will be one to two FFLS sessions per week; one for theoretical training and one for collective working in the field. Extensionists from the MAAIF will visit the FFLS sessions only once every 3 months; their goal is to attend every month but for lack of time and resources, this is likely to be impossible. The extensionists had already been trained on the regular FFS approach; in this project, in April 2011 they would also be trained in on gender, HIV and nutrition aspects.

d. Integration of life skills related aspects

Implementing partner LWF has a nutritionist among its staff, who made an experienced and practical impression. She shared a number of suggestions on incorporating nutrition in a locally acceptable way into the project. Among others, she came up with ideas on integrating

attention for kitchen gardening and food processing. The nutrition activities were planned throughout the FFLS duration and not, like in some other countries, at the time of harvesting.

Furthermore, health workers are involved in the Kitgum area, which helps addressing the links with HIV/AIDS and simultaneously raise awareness on the importance of food security in relation to HIV/AIDS.

Even though the field implementation had not started yet, the participants of the FFLS visited performed dramas on gender and HIV/AIDS in a very understandable and interesting manner.

The Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries has developed a gender strategy with support from DANIDA and has a Gender task Force and Gender Focal Points; thus, even though resources may be limited, gender capacity has been built and is available.

e. Monitoring

The baseline data had been collected but not analyzed. A large part of the monitoring is done by FAO's M&E unit, located in Kampala. The data are collected by the partner NGOs and other stakeholders. The extensionists perform some shared collection of monitoring data with the NGO, but their presence may not be sufficiently regular.

f. Partners, networks and other FF(L)S projects

The DAO in Kitgum also broadcasts a radio programme on agriculture, food security and gender, and HIV/AIDS and nutrition issues. Whilst this is a laudable initiative, among the participants of the FFLS only 2 among the group of 70 persons reported to possess a radio, which raises concerns about the effectiveness of the use of radio emissions for awareness-raising.

The National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS) is a government programme for the commercialization of agriculture. NAADS works with FFS like groups. Still, they use a technical approach so more training would be needed if one wanted to expand FFLS also to these groups.

FAO has two projects which use the FFLS approach in Kenya; furthermore, there is a UN Joint Program, where also the current project is addressed.

Partner LWF implements another project on FFLS, which is funded by the EU, runs for 4 years and targets 1,900 participants in 480 groups. Also in other countries in the region, LWF is implementing projects, using FFLS approach. LWF may therefore be an interesting partner at regional level to give impetus to upscaling.

3. Constraints and best practices:

a. Specific constraints

Specific constraints, mentioned by the project participants at field level, were the scarcity of good quality seeds and the limited access to water. Not only were water points sometimes far away, due to the limited number of water points, the beneficiaries had to wait for a long time, a couple of times per day, thus also decreasing their production capacity.

At the time of visit, the progress reports of the partners had not yet been finalised (they were due around that time). Since the FFS in the Kitgum area had not started yet, the team could not attend a life session but had the opportunity to exchange with a group of participants.

Unrest after the elections in 2011 had delayed a number of project activities until after September 2011. According to FAO Uganda, delays in disbursement of the second tranche of the project budget further hampered start of the project in the field.

In some of the FFLS, a part of the plot will be used solely for seed reproduction, which will enable crop production after the closure of the project.

The nutritionist of WLF incorporates practical and locally based nutrition activities into the sessions.

Drama methods to share life skill messages seemed to be understood and appreciated by all participants.

b. Lessons learned

Even though government extension officers participated in facilitator trainings, the limited resources of the government at human, financial and equipment level hamper them to participate actively in the implementation of field level. Since they are only able to attend once every three months, it is questionable whether their enhanced capacity will benefit the quality of the project.

4. Sustainable benefits from the project

a. Impact at grassroots and institutional level

At grassroots level, people were very food insecure and may benefit from trainings which enable them to enhance their agricultural production and food supply. Since the project implementation at field level had not started yet, this could not be verified. The participants did perform drama pieces regarding gender and HIV/AIDS, which brought a message in an innovative way and were clearly enjoyed by all.

At an institutional level, due to resource scarcity within the government the chances of upscaling the approach in a sustainable manner are still limited.

b. Advocacy efforts and possibilities

Joint advocacy may be conducted at local and national government level to improve the water situation in the field. Furthermore, as a UNJP project on Gender and HIV is already at implementation stage, part of the lobbying in this regard may be used to convince the government of the importance of its presence and the value of using FFLS approach to contribute to improving the situation.

As the Ministry of Gender is quite active, it may pay off to advocate with them to undertake a role in the project and to establish cooperation with MoA, FAO and other interested organisations.

c. Activities likely to continue after the project's phasing out

A number of facilitators from the preceding projects are still working as facilitators even though not directly for this project. If an effort is made, the facilitators from the current project may also remain active for FAO and other organizations in the replication of the J/FFLS approach.

d. Exchange and links within the region and outside

The Kenyan team plans to visit Uganda and thereafter the Ugandan team intends to visit Kenya to share lessons learnt and experiences.

Among the FFLS participants, one member is selected to participate in monthly groups meetings with participants representing other groups, to discuss constraints, success, problems and solutions which have emerged from the implementation and group work

5. Recommendations

Based on the observations above, the following recommendations were derived:

- The role and frequency of presence of the government partner may be strengthened, in implementation as well as in monitoring and evaluation
- Address water shortage by joint advocacy at local and national level and by involving partner organizations, which have specialized on this issue.
- Explore the possibility to start training on FFLS approach in NAADS groups.

6. SWOC table

<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementing partner LWF has a nutritionist among their staff who is also advising the project • Health workers are involved in the project which strengthens the link between food security and HIV/AIDS activities. • Linkage with the UNJP, which has led to the start up of more JFFLS than planned • Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries developed a gender strategy 	<p>Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advertising drama performance on life skills to increase coverage area of the messages • Ask LWF nutritionist to share ideas and guide the project in Karamoja for a certain period • Use UNJP to advocate for more involvement of MoA and involvement of MoG
<p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited resources and involvement of government at all levels • Post election unrest led to late start of the ToF delaying all other activities • Communication with facilitators sometimes sub-optimal 	<p>Constraints</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long travel times and necessity to involve escorts in Karamoja region • Access to water is limited, which hampers the beneficiaries in their productive capacity • Difficult access to quality seeds

Annex 13: Survey Questionnaire FAO staff

I. Background

1. What is your role in the project?
2. How long have you been involved in the project/ in the preceding projects?
3. With which stakeholders are you working most often and on what subjects?
4. Please provide the evaluation team with any baseline data or monitoring data or data from stakeholder analyses/needs assessments you have collected up to now.

II. Status of implementation

1. What progress has been made up to now? Have there been delays?
2. Are the project activities sufficient to achieve the objectives? If not, what is missing?
3. List factors that have hindered the implementation process. What were the effects?
4. Has the implementation in all countries been equally successful? If not, list factors that have contributed to the difference in success in a positive or negative way.
5. Were budget allocations sufficient to achieve a good quality implementation of the action? Have there been budget revisions, if yes, which?
6. Is the project duration of two years feasible to achieve outcomes and objectives as listed? If not, how long would be needed? Where is the biggest time constraint?
7. Did you face constraints at financial or human resource level?
8. How do you value the support received from the regional/global level?
9. How often are data collected for monitoring? Is there a computerized system? With whom are the data shared? Have measures been taken based upon monitoring results?
10. Has there been a baseline survey? Will there be an impact survey?
11. In the preceding project, Master Trainers and facilitators were trained; are they still involved in this project? How do they use their acquired knowledge and capacity? Is there exchange with the trained beneficiaries?
12. Is the quality and commitment of MTs and facilitators sufficient?
13. What specific activities with regard to nutrition have been part of the action?

III. Project design

14. The envisaged outcome of the project is: “an effective regional integrated food security (FS) and nutrition response to HIV, conflict and gender equity”. Do you think this is feasible with regard to project duration, budget and geographical targeting?
15. What are the needs of the target group? Have they been addressed?
16. What are the national and regional priorities in the target region? Does the project address them?
17. Which part of the Sida Strategy form humanitarian assistance (2011-2014) is relevant for the project?
18. How are the objectives of the project aligned to the FAO Strategic Framework 2010-2019 and how does the project contribute to the Sustainable Livelihoods Framework?
19. How are the objectives of the project aligned to the FAO Regional Programme Framework for Disaster Risk Management 2010-2013 for Eastern and Central Africa?
20. To what extent do the objectives of the project reflect the priority areas of FAO’s NMTPF and CPFs?
21. Do you think the J/FFLS and FFLS are the right vehicles for project implementation? Please elaborate.

IV. Stakeholders, partnership and network mechanisms

22. How important is the role of government in the project? Which government authorities are stakeholders? Is their ownership sufficient?
23. Can you comment on the selection process and quality of implementing partners?
24. How important is the role of other stakeholders? Have stakeholders been left out?

25. How effective has the cooperation been between partners and in networks? Has the project benefited from this, if so how? Has the project contributed to national or regional networks, if so, how?
26. Are coordination mechanisms working in a satisfying manner?
27. Is FAO lead partner in one of the networks, if so, in which one(s)?
28. Is there exchange between countries with regard to the project and the problems under consideration? Do you see opportunities for more or more regular exchange?
29. What synergies have been exploited? Do you see future possible synergies?
30. Have you been or are you currently involved in advocacy together with other stakeholders? Please provide examples and subjects. Has it been successful?
31. What activities have you carried out or planned together with the UN Joint Programme?

V. Other projects

32. Which FAO projects are currently ongoing in the region? Do you see possibilities for linkage with this project?
33. Have linkages been established (Kenya) with Sida's National Agricultural Livestock Extension Programme?

VI. Gender mainstreaming

34. Has a specific gender analysis been carried out?
35. How and to what extent has the project contributed to decreasing gender inequity?
36. What project activities are specifically targeting gender equality and how big a part are they of the total project?
37. How are gender issues taken into account in the project management and the beneficiary selection?

VII. Sustainability

38. Which changes, brought about by the project, are likely to be sustainable? Are specific measures taken to enlarge that probability?
39. What direct impact does the project have, with regard to livelihood, income, entrepreneurship opportunities, FS, nutrition, gender equality and knowledge and behaviour with regard to HIV/AIDS?
40. Has the project had positive or negative unintentional effects/ impacts?
41. Is the project connected with national extension policies and workers?
42. Which changes, brought about by the preceding project, are still lasting?
43. What do you identify as most important lesson learned in the project?
44. What can be earmarked as best practice with regard to the project?
45. Has FAO's role in FS been strengthened by addressing HIV and gender inequity as important focus?
46. Is FAO accepted as an influential partner in the field of combating HIV and gender inequities?
47. FAO has launched a new website on gender. Do you see possibilities for the project to use the website or to contribute to it?
48. Are project lessons learned reflected in normative products?
49. Have you identified other funding opportunities? Will Sida likely fund another prolongation?
50. How do you envisage an upscaling of the project?

Annex 14: Survey Questionnaire non-government partners

I. Background

1. What is your role in your organisation? Give a brief overview of what your organisation is doing in the country (relevant to FS, HIV and gender). What is your role with regard to the project under consideration?
2. How long have you been involved in the project? Was your organisation/were you involved in the preceding projects?
3. What has been your involvement before this project in agriculture, gender and HIV?
4. With which other stakeholders are you working most often and on what subjects?

II. Status of implementation

5. Do you feel the project has been generally successful in its implementation? Have there been delays?
6. How many FFLS and J/FFLS are operating in your country? Elaborate on the stage of implementation with regard to IGA activities, receipt of inputs and materials, HIV and gender related activities. What was the attendance rate? Are the meetings evaluated with the participants?
7. Are facilitators for J/FFLS and FFLS separately trained? What are the main differences?
8. What animation activities do you use? Do you organise Field Days?
9. Describe the selection process of beneficiaries and NGO partners. Were any problems faced? Was the outcome satisfying?
10. Are the project activities sufficient to achieve the objectives? If not, what is missing?
11. List factors that have hindered the implementation. What were the effects?
12. What are the biggest risks faced by the project currently?
13. Have you had sufficient and good quality support from FAO staff?
14. Have you been able to implement activities according to the role which was planned for you? Was it clear what was expected?
15. Are you involved in project monitoring? If so, what is your role and contribution?
16. Do you get regular insight into monitoring results?
17. What specific activities with regard to nutrition have been part of the action?

III. Project design

18. The envisaged outcome of the project is: “an effective regional integrated FS and nutrition response to HIV, conflict and gender equity”. Do you think this is feasible with regard to project duration, budget and geographical targeting?
19. What are the needs of the target group relevant to the project? Have they been addressed?
20. Can you list other, possibly more urgent needs left unanswered?
21. Is the project sufficiently participatory? Which other stakeholders could have been or still be involved?
22. Does the project works better in your country than in others or worse? If so, please list negative or positive factors contributing to the difference.
23. Do you think the J/FFLS and FFLS are the right vehicles for project implementation? Please elaborate.

IV. Stakeholders, partnership and network mechanisms

24. How important is the role of government in the project? Which government authorities are stakeholders? Is their ownership sufficient?
25. How important is the role of other stakeholders? Have important stakeholders been left out?

26. How effective has the cooperation been between partners in your country? Which network partners are aware of the project activities and/or contribute to it?
27. Are coordination mechanisms working in a satisfying manner?
28. What synergies have been exploited? Do you see future possible synergies? Have you been part of those synergies?
29. Have you seen examples of duplication of activities by different implementing agencies?
30. Have you been or are you currently involved in advocacy together with other stakeholders? Please provide examples and subjects. Has it been successful?
31. (UN Partners): What activities have been undertaken or are planned as part of the UN joint programme in the field of FS, gender and HIV?

V. Gender mainstreaming

32. Has a specific gender analysis been carried out?
33. How and to what extent has the project contributed to decreasing gender inequity?
34. What project activities are specifically targeting gender equality and how big a part are they of the total project?
35. How are gender issues taken into account in the project management and the beneficiary selection?

VI. Sustainability

36. Which changes, brought about by the project, are likely to be sustainable? Are specific measures taken to enlarge that probability?
37. What direct impact does the project have, with regard to livelihood, income, entrepreneurship opportunities, FS, nutrition, gender equality and knowledge and behaviour with regard to HIV/AIDS?
38. How have FFLS, FS, gender and HIV been institutionalised through/included in national joint programmes, policies and strategies? Have there been changes lately?
39. Has the project had positive or negative unintentional effects/ impacts?
40. Is the project connected with national extension policies and workers?
41. Which changes, brought about by the preceding project, are still lasting?
42. What do you identify as most important lesson learned in the project?
43. What can be earmarked as best practice with regard to the project?
44. Do you have possibilities/are you already replicating or upscaling the FFLS approach through your own organisation?

Annex 15: Survey Questionnaire government partners

I. Background

1. What is your role in the project? How are you involved in planning and supervision?
2. In how many FFLS or J/FFLS are you involved? In what way?
3. How long have you been involved in the project? Were you involved in the preceding projects?
4. Are you collaborating with other government departments? If yes, on what subjects?
5. Give a brief overview of the other activities your Ministry implements with regard to FS, gender equality and HIV.

II. Status of implementation

6. Do you feel the project has been generally successful in its implementation? Have there been delays?
7. Are the project activities sufficient to achieve the objectives? If not, what is missing?
8. List factors that have hindered the implementation. What were the effects?
9. What are the biggest risks faced by the project currently?
10. Have you had sufficient and good quality support from FAO staff?
11. Have you been able to implement activities according to the role which was planned for you? Was it clear what was expected?
12. Are you involved in project monitoring? If so, what is your role and contribution?
13. Do you get regular insight into monitoring results?
14. What specific activities with regard to nutrition have been part of the action?

III. Project design

15. The envisaged outcome of the project is: “an effective regional integrated FS and nutrition response to HIV, conflict and gender equity”. Do you think this is feasible with regard to project duration, budget and geographical targeting?
16. What are the needs of the target group relevant to the project? Have they been addressed?
17. Can you list other, possibly more urgent needs left unanswered?
18. Is the project sufficiently participatory? Which other stakeholders could have been or still be involved?
19. Does the project perform better in your country than in others or worse? If so, please list negative or positive factors contributing to the difference.
20. Do you think the J/FFS and FFLS are the right vehicles for project implementation? Please elaborate.

IV. Stakeholders, partnership and network mechanisms

21. How important is your role in the project as government authority? Which other government authorities are stakeholders? Is your ownership sufficient?
22. How important is the role of other stakeholders? Have important stakeholders been left out?
23. How effective has the cooperation been between partners in your country? Which network partners are aware of the project activities and/or contribute to it?
24. Are coordination mechanisms working in a satisfying manner?
25. What synergies have been exploited? Do you see future possible synergies? Have you been part of those synergies?
26. Have you seen examples of duplication of activities by different implementing agencies?
27. Have you worked together with other ministries or countries to improve FS, gender equality and HIV in your country? Please provide examples and subjects. Has it been successful?

28. Is any change in legislation under consideration or has there been a change recently, which is relevant to the project?

V. Gender mainstreaming

29. How is gender mainstreaming addressed within your Ministry? Do you have a gender strategy/policy?

30. How and to what extent has the project contributed to decreasing gender inequity?

31. What project activities are specifically targeting gender equality and how big a part are they of the total project? Do you find them useful and successful?

32. How many women are working in your Ministry (percentage wise)?

33. Who controls assets and resources in the household? How gender equal are land and property rights in the law and in practice? How are these subjects addressed?

VI. Sustainability

34. Which changes, brought about by the project, are likely to be sustainable? Are specific measures taken to enlarge that probability?

35. What direct impact does the project have, with regard to livelihood, income, entrepreneurship opportunities, FS, nutrition, gender equality and knowledge and behaviour with regard to HIV/AIDS?

36. Have FFLS activities, gender equality and combating HIV been incorporated in your national plans and strategies? If so, how? Have there been any changes lately? Have budget allocations been made?

37. Has the project had positive or negative unintentional effects/ impacts?

38. Is the project connected sufficiently with national extension policies and workers? If not, how can this be improved?

39. Do you have plans to replicate or upscale a number of project activities after the project's phasing out?

40. Do staff members of your Ministry act as facilitators or Master Trainers?

41. Which changes, brought about by the preceding project, are still lasting?

42. What do you identify as most important lesson learned and best practice with regard to the project?

Annex 16: Survey Master Trainers (MT) and facilitators

I. Background

1. How long have you been MT/facilitator? Were you involved in the preceding projects? Are you MT/facilitator in FFLS, J/FFLS or both?
2. What other work do you do? How much time do you dedicate to training/facilitating?
3. What trainings have you participated in?
4. Are you a specialist in agriculture, HIV or gender or a generalist?

II. Status of implementation

5. How many trainings have you conducted under this project?
6. What is the percentage of female participators on average? What are the age limits of the J/FFLS?
7. What animation activities do you use? Do you organise Field Days?
8. Do you have sufficient knowledge? Would you like more training or information? If yes, on which subjects?
9. List factors that have hindered the implementation. What were the effects?
10. Have you had sufficient support from FAO staff?
11. Have you had sufficient support from government?
12. Do you work or exchange experience with other extensionists?
13. Do you participate in M&E? How? Do you evaluate meetings with the participants? What data do you keep from each meeting? May we see the records?
14. Do you know Master Trainers and facilitators from the preceding project? Are they still involved?
15. Are there other opportunities for you to pursue, based on the training and experience from FFLS and J/FFLS?
16. What specific activities with regard to nutrition have been part of the action?

III. Impact

17. Do the participants benefit from the training? Do they use their knowledge?
18. Give examples on how participants have used the knowledge in the field of FS, gender equality and HIV (one example each).
19. Do you think the participants have really benefited from the training?
20. Do you think the community has benefited from the training?
21. Are there needs which are still not addressed?
22. How is the link between food security/nutrition and HIV/AIDS and gender addressed by the training?
23. To what extent is the strategy of addressing HIV/AIDS and gender issues through training in food security and nutrition effective?
24. Are the project activities sufficient to achieve the objectives? If not, what is missing?
25. Do you think your country has specific characteristics which lead to bigger or smaller benefits? If so, which?

IV. Gender mainstreaming and HIV

26. Do you think the training truly contributes to improving gender equality, if so, how?
27. What else could be done to address gender equality?
28. Have you come across GBV? Is it addressed in the training? If so, how?
29. Are equal participation in employment and public life/decision making addressed in the training? If so, how?
30. Is education addressed in the training? If so, how?
31. How do you think the project contributes to combating HIV?
32. What else can be done to address HIV?

33. Do you have people in your household, family and among friends with HIV? Do you meet them often?
34. In your household, do you both (husband and wife) work? Who takes the decisions on household income spending?
35. Who controls assets and resources in general in the household? How gender equal are land and property rights in the law and in practice? How are these subjects addressed?

V. Sustainability

36. Which activities will still continue after the project's phasing out?
37. Do you think the implementing partners can have influence at policy level or legislation? Has that already happened?
38. Have you changed anything in your life triggered by what you learned in this project?
39. Do you think the livelihood of the participants has significantly improved as a result of the project? If so, how?
40. Do you think the nutrition situation of the participants has significantly improved as a result of the project? If so, how?

Annex 17: Survey Questionnaire Beneficiaries

1. Do you feel your life has improved by participating in the project? If so, how?
2. What new agricultural practices have you learned? Do you use them?
3. Can you combine the FFLS meetings easily with your daily work?
4. Do you and your family have enough to eat? Can you always eat what you want?
5. How many different food items do you eat per day? Has this changed as a result of the nutrition training?
6. Has your nutrition situation improved? Has your income improved? Has your workload diminished? Any other positive or negative changes?
7. Is somebody sick or has died from HIV in your household?
8. Do you have friends and/or family suffering from HIV? Do you meet them often?
9. Have you learned new things on HIV in the FFLS meetings? If yes, what?
10. Are you married? Please elaborate on the division of decision making in your household. Has that changed?
11. (For men and boys) do you think women are as good decision takers as men? Are they as good farmers as men?
12. Do you think certain things can only be done by men or women? If so, what?
13. What do you think is the main reason that GBV happens? Where does it happen most often?
14. Do you have children? What age? Do they go to school?
15. Do you have other urgent needs which should be addressed to really improve your life?
16. (For youth): How old are you? Do you go to school? Do you work, if yes, how many hours? Can you combine the J/FFS meetings with your daily schedule? What are your plans for the future?
17. Do you think FFLS and J/FFLS are the best way to improve livelihood, gender equality and combating HIV? Do you have other suggestions?
18. Do you think the government could play a different or bigger role? If so, how?

Annex 19: Summary of Project Logical framework and achieved results

(December 2010-March 2012)

Project goal	The overall goal of the project is to mitigate the impact of HIV, conflict and gender inequities on the population of humanitarian concern in Eastern and Central Africa.		
Expected Outcome	Effective Regional integrated food security and nutrition response to HIV / conflict and gender equity.		
Project outputs	<i>Expected results</i>	<i>Achieved results (December 2010-March 2012)</i>	<i>Observations (as per March 2012)</i>
1. Improved livelihoods and enhanced opportunities for income generating activities among at least 81,000 vulnerable household members affected by HIV, gender inequity and food insecurity in the region.	<p>1.1 At least 190 J/FFLS new groups implemented</p> <p>1.2 450 existing J/FFLS groups have integrated HIV, gender and conflict thematics</p>	<p>1.1 208 new J/FFLS groups have been established : 135 FFLS groups and 73 JFFLS groups</p> <p>1.2 450 « existing J/FFLS groups » have integrated these issues according to the progress report Dec10-Nov1</p>	<p>1.1 Entirely achieved</p> <p>1.2 Entirely achieved according to report but there is no clear registration per country of the number and type of other groups reached (former J/FFLS groups, new J/FFLS groups with third parties, etc.). Issue discussed in the Bujumbura workshop</p>
2. Effective coordination and lessons learning in regional Food Security HIV and Gender related activities and initiatives.	<p>2.1 At least 50% additional project synergies established with other partners (UN and NGOs)</p> <p>2.2 At least 20 partners per country and at regional level (UN, NGOs, Governments, Donors) sensitized to the issue of HIV and gender inequities</p>	<p>2.1 Definition of expected result is unclear</p> <p>2.2 Information and advocacy takes place through thematic working groups, organisation of Open Days, articles, radio and TV emissions, etc.</p>	<p>2.1 Unclear whether this result has been achieved; Steps have been discussed in the Bujumbura Mid-Term Workshop, March 2012</p> <p>2.2 Entirely achieved</p>

	<p>2.3 Harmonised M&E system developed</p> <p>2.4 Lessons learnt and best practices released</p> <p>2.5 At least 4 media outlets per country generate visibility material</p>	<p>2.3 M&E system is not well developed</p> <p>2.4 Lessons learnt and best practices are being documented</p> <p>2.5 Media attention was generated and/or will be generated through Open Days, articles, radio and TV emissions, etc.</p>	<p>2.3 Not entirely achieved. Baseline data collected or in process of being collected. Formats for quarterly reports distributed. M&E system is not well developed</p> <p>2.4 To be achieved in remaining project period</p> <p>2.5 To be achieved in remaining project period. The Evaluation team did not ask for exact data per country on the number of media outlets that generated visibility material</p>
<p>3. Francophone and Anglophone expertise developed to implement Junior/Farmer Field and Life Schools for large-scale roll-out</p>	<p>3.1 At least 80% of the Francophone J/FFLS Master Trainers are operational</p> <p>3.2 At least 80% of the facilitators trained operate at least 1 J/FFLS each</p> <p>3.3 At least 60% of the targeted partners have integrated the J/FFLS approach in their programmes</p>	<p>3.1 A total of 30 Francophone J/FFLS Master Trainers was trained. All MTs are operational or available</p> <p>3.2 All facilitators trained have operated at least 1 J/FFLS each</p> <p>3.3 It was not defined who are “the targeted partners”</p>	<p>3.1 Entirely achieved</p> <p>3.2 Entirely achieved</p> <p>3.3 Unclear whether achieved. There is no registration per country of the partners targeted. FAO knows who has integrated, and who plans to integrate, the J/FFLS approach in its programme</p>
<p>4. Regional capacity-building, support and advocacy for HIV, gender mainstreaming and development of food security and nutrition response in</p>	<p>4.1 At least 20 partners (NGOs and Governments) per country are able to integrate HIV and Gender in Food Security and nutrition</p>	<p>4.1 Definition of expected result is unclear. All FAO partners shall be considered able to integrate HIV and Gender in Food Security in</p>	<p>4.1 N/a. Definition of expected result is unclear</p>

<p>FAO's and partners' field programmes (NGOs and governments)</p>	<p>interventions 4.2 All thematic working groups attended by project members are sensitized on the HIV/Gender and Food security issues</p>	<p>respective of J/FFLS approach 4.2 FAO participates in thematic working groups and presents the J/FFLS approach where and when appropriate.</p>	<p>4.2 Entirely achieved</p>
--	--	---	------------------------------