



Resilient Food Systems final Workshop

Atelier final du Programme pour les Systèmes alimentaires résilients



Naivasha, Kenya

Day 1 - 7 June 2023

A person wearing a vibrant, patterned orange, blue, and white wrap and a colorful geometric skirt is holding a traditional wooden hoe. They are standing in a field of dry, brown earth with some green plants in the background. The image is used as a background for a presentation slide.

Introductions and objectives

Introductions et objectifs

Introductions



Please stand up
based on the
category

Veuillez vous
lever en
fonction de la
catégorie



- **Government Representatives from/ Représentants du gouvernement** du Burkina Faso, Burundi, Eswatini, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Uganda, Tanzania
- **Country Project Implementation from / Équipes nationales de mise en œuvre des projets** du Burkina Faso, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Uganda, Tanzania
- **National and International Research Organizations/Organisations de recherche nationales et internationales**

- **Non-Governmental Organizations/Organisations non gouvernementales**
- **Africa Union, Intergovernmental Organizations/UN, GEF Secretariat/Union Africaine, Organisations intergouvernementales/ONU, Secrétariat du FEM**
- **Private Sector Partnerships/Partenariats avec le secteur privé**
- **Others/Autres**



Objectives/Objectifs

- Consolidate **learning experiences** across all RFS projects through jointly designed Learning Labs/**Consolider les expériences d'apprentissage de tous les projets RFS grâce à des laboratoires d'apprentissage conçus conjointement.**
- Interact with **experience and evidence** around programmatic impacts and lessons learned/**Interagir avec l'expérience et les preuves concernant les impacts programmatiques et les leçons apprises.**



Objectives/Objectifs (cont.)

- Assess the **value addition of the programmatic approach** piloted by the RFS/**Évaluer la valeur ajoutée de l'approche programmatique pilotée par le RFS.**
- Facilitate **practical learning and peer exchange through field trips** hosted by the RFS Malawi project team – Enhancing the Resilience of Agro-ecological Systems Project (ERASP)/**Faciliter l'apprentissage pratique et l'échange entre collègues par le biais de visites de terrain organisées par l'équipe du projet RFS Malawi - Enhancing the Resilience of Agro-ecological Systems Project (ERASP).**
- **Celebrate RFS successes/Célébrer les succès du RFS.**

Principles of Participation

Principes de participation

Principles

Everyone is encouraged to share their views.



Register questions or comments in English or French.



This is a working workshop, be comfortable.



Please keep to time.



Learn, Teach, Share and Enjoy



Principes

Chacun est encouragé à partager son point de vue.

Faites enregistrer vos questions ou commentaires en anglais ou en français.

Il s'agit d'un atelier de travail, soyez à l'aise.

Veuillez respecter l'heure.

Apprendre, enseigner, partager et apprécier

Flow of the Event | *Déroulement de l'événement*



Day 1 | Jour 1

- **Welcome and Opening Remarks** | Bienvenue et discours d'ouverture
- **Session 1.RFS** programme achievements | Les réalisations du RFS
- Session 2. RFS final publication and reflections | *publication finale de RFS et réflexions*
- Session 3: Bridging science and policy to enhance resilience and food security| *Rapprocher la science des politiques pour renforcer la résilience et la sécurité alimentaire*
- Session 4: Catalysing green value chain development | *Catalyser la création des filières vertes*
- Session 5: Measuring resilience in a multi-country programme | *Mesurer la résilience dans un programme multi-pays*
- Session 6: Innovation in ecosystem services assessment | *Innovations dans la mesure des services écosystémiques*
- Session 7: Capitalising on best practices in SLM from the field | *Capitaliser sur les meilleures pratiques de GDT sur le terrain*
- Session 8: Knowledge management and learning across RFS
- Closing insights and briefing for the field visit | *Gestion des connaissances et apprentissage dans l'ensemble du programme RFS*
- Consultative Committee meeting | Réunion du Comité Consultatif
- Cocktail



Day 2 | Jour 2

- Field Trip | *Visite sur le terrain*
- Debrief from the site visit | Débrief de la visite du site
- Session 9: RFS legacy| *Le legs du programme RFS*
- Closing remarks | *Remarques de clôture*
- Return to Nairobi| *Retour à Nairobi*

Welcoming Remarks

Mot de bienvenue



Jean-Marc Sinnassamy

Senior Environmental Specialist, GEF

Jahan-Zeb Chowdhury

IFAD

Gitonga Mugambi

Permanent Secretary - Forestry, on behalf of
Cabinet Secretary, Ministry of Environment,
Climate Change and Forestry, Government of
Kenya.

Who is new to the
RFS programme?

*Qui découvre le
programme RFS?*






SESSION 1

Resilient Food System programme achievements


Progress Update

Jonky Tenou, RFS Task Manager, IFAD


Overall structure: RFS Programme and Regional Hub



Twelve Country Projects




The 3 pillars of the RFS approach :




#RFSimpact

RFS country projects engage over **4 million** beneficiaries.



#RFSimpact


RFS country projects engage over **4 million** beneficiaries.





Women directly benefiting from project activities
1,725,113 in total

#RFSimpact




PEOPLE



Women directly benefiting from project activities over **1,9 million**

#RFSimpact



#RFS impact



Ethiopia

89% of land under integrated landscape management **is owned by women**



Niger

564 women and youth have received literacy training (of a target of 320)



Malawi

55% of **community leadership** positions are occupied by **women**



Kenya

2387 women have been reached with **time-saving technologies** (e.g., water pans, irrigation pits)



Burkina Faso

4682 women engaging in **micro projects**



Burundi

354 beneficiaries, all of whom are women, are using **energy-efficient cookstoves**



#RFSimpact

RFS has established **multi-stakeholder platforms** at the national and sub-national level.



11

Multistakeholder platforms
at the national level



88

Multistakeholder
platforms at the
district/landscape
level




1177

Multistakeholder platforms
at the local level


#RFSimpact

RFS country projects
have restored **338,714**
hectares of previously
degraded land.



#RFSimpact

RFS country projects
have restored **338,714**
hectares of previously
degraded land.



Engaging the private sector

RFS has 22 sustainable value chains in development



Greening agricultural value chains

- **3 catalytic grants (\$ 200,000)** on green value chain development in Tanzania, Uganda, Malawi, Burkina Faso and Niger (UNDP & AGRA)
- **Training toolkit on Greening value chains** developed available online in English and French

#RFS impact

	Burkina Faso	Burundi	Eswatini	Ethiopia	Ghana	Kenya	Malawi	Niger	Nigeria	Senegal	Tanzania	Uganda
Diversity Assessment Tool for Agrobiodiversity and Resilience (DATAR)												
Earth Observation for Sustainable Development (EO4SD)												
Collect Earth (Ndivi)												
Trends Earth												
EX-Ante Carbon Balance Tool (EX-ACT)												
Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC)												
Land Degradation Assessment in Drylands Mapping Tool (WOCAT-LADA)												
Land Degradation Surveillance Framework (LDSF)												
Management Effectiveness Tool (METT)												
Multidimensional Poverty Assessment Tool (MPAT)												
Resilience, Adaptation Pathways and Transformation Assessment (RAPTA)												
RESILIENCE ATLAS												
Resilience Index Measurement and Analysis (RIMA) model												
Results and Management Impact System (RIMS)												
Self-evaluation and Holistic Assessment of climate Resilience of farmers and Pastoralists (SHARP); HH-BAT												
Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES)												
Household Dietary Score (HDDS)												
Vital Signs monitoring framework												
Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI)												
Outcome Mapping (OM)												




Knowledge management and learning

- RFS established a **strong peer-learning system** through regional workshops, learning labs, field trips, a virtual knowledge centre facilitating vibrant **communities of practice**
- **Several tools** developed to generate, capture and disseminate knowledge: RFS website (<http://www.resilientfoodsystems.co>), knowledge brief series, monthly newsletters and internal bulletins, social media campaigns, side events
- **Built on other major past and existing initiatives**
Interactions with Great Green Wall initiative, AUDA-NEPAD Terre Africa, World Overview of Conservation Approaches (WOCAT), Africa risk capacity




Projects' disbursements (USD) against GEF grant



#RFS impact


Projects' co-financing spent against secured commitments



Burkina Faso



Burundi




Eswatini



Ethiopia




Ghana



Kenya



Malawi



Niger



Nigeria



Senegal



Tanzania



Uganda



Hub Projects



Operational Changes

- Time lag between operationalization of Hub and country projects
- Complexity with different start-up contexts, capacities, needs, institutional processes and timelines per project - all pose challenges
- Lack of clarity or coherence on monitoring approaches at design
- Knowledge Management is yet to be treated as a core staffed function
- Sustainability of knowledge platforms are not adequately addressed at design
- Transition from GEBs to GEF core indicators added some challenges at regional and country levels
- COVID-19 with lockdown measures delaying hub and country project activities implementation
- **Reporting** : Different timelines negotiated by GEF IPs for submission of their PIRs delayed preparation of the programmatic report; and challenges in tracking of partners co-financing

Way forward and key milestones

Milestones to completion (31 December 2023)	Timelines
Finalise and launch RFS second publication (50 pages max)	By 30 June 2023
Complete RFS final evaluation	By 30 September 2023
Hub agencies completion reports to IFAD	15 July 2023
Prepare and submit Hub project final PIR to GEF	By 30 July 2023
Project financial closure	By 31 Dec 2023

THANK YOU



resilientfoodsystems.co



ResFoodSystems



ResilientFoodSystems

RFS final evaluation: summary of preliminary findings, lessons and next steps

Detlev Puetz, Evaluator

Terminal evaluation: Objectives and focus

Completion evaluation of the RFS program, hub and countries: for accountability and learning, along OECD DAC criteria

Summary report: an assessment that builds and expands on the 2021 RFS MTR

- Follow-up on MTR recommendations
- More inclusion of country project achievements and experiences than in the MTR

A forward-looking lessons synthesis to inform:

- Future design of GEF impact programs
- Effective and efficient management of impact programs by hub/central and country partners
- Assessment and monitoring of interventions and result



Presentation outline

- **Preliminary Findings**
 - Hub project: Overview and follow-up of MTR recommendations
 - Country Projects: Where are they?
- **Lessons**
- **What next in this Terminal Evaluation?**







Preliminaries

- RFS - a 'pilot'
 - Reminder: This was one of three pilot GEF 'impact' programs started in 2017 as the "Food Security Integrated Approach Pilot (FS-IAP)". At mid-term the RFS was performing best and most coherently among the three GEF-6 impact pilots. *(based on an IEO evaluation of IPs at the time)*
- Evaluation process
 - This Terminal Evaluation began with hub-partner interviews, desk reviews and now continues with country partner consultations
 - It is designed to summarize rather than detail findings and lessons, without field work. It should be completed by Sept. 30, 2023.

Findings



RFS Hub components

COMPONENT 1	COMPONENT 2	COMPONENT 3	COMPONENT 4
 <p>INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORKS</p> <p>Create and strengthen integrated institutional frameworks and mechanisms for scaling up proven multi-benefit approaches.</p> 	 <p>UPSCALING OF INTEGRATED APPROACHES</p> <p>Scaling up integrated approaches and practices, including resilient and sustainable food value chains.</p> 	 <p>MONITORING & ASSESSMENT</p> <p>Monitoring and assessment of global environmental benefits and agro-ecosystem resilience.</p> 	 <p>PROGRAMMATIC IMPACT, VISIBILITY AND COHERENCE</p> <p>Coordination, reporting and general management functions across RFS projects for programmatic impact, visibility and coherence.</p> 

Hub project

- **Overall the RFS Hub project performed well** after some initial delays; partners adjusted swiftly to COVID-19; further improvements after the MTR
- **RFS provided a forum for a richer dialogue** among country programs and Hub agencies than in previous GEF programs
- **Characterized by the steady program leadership of IFAD and the excellent communications work by the ICRAF**, the Hub project's lead agency
- **The aspirational GEF integrated and multi-scale RFS agenda**, the program's institutional complexity and the number of partners proved challenging
- **Progress was unequal across components and activities:**
 - Some early weaknesses on the policy and institutional side ('engage') and of effectively bringing hub partners to the countries (worsened by COVID-19)
 - Strengths included progress in scaling practices (farmer field schools) and to some extent green value chains and in assessing and measuring resilience and monitoring project progress

MTR recommendations follow-up

Recommendations	Achieved	Extent and limitations
Hub agencies to boost country interventions	Efforts were made	All hub agencies made honest efforts; some more and others less successfully; several CPs were in the process of closing down; limited resources and budgets
Hub agencies to manage workplans and budgets more adaptively , in line with emerging opportunities (especially CP work)	Low (?)	Perceived so far as low; some more work is required on analyzing agencies' 2022 and 2023 budgets
Organize regional and country events to share lessons and influence policy and practice	Some	COP-26; RFS annual workshops 2022 and 2023; few RFS-external events in SSA; low regional policy influence; more analysis required for countries
Assess CP M&E status, progress and readiness for measuring resilience and other impact for TE	Some	Focused on reporting of resilience from CPs; less on readiness and actual use of promoted tools for impact reporting
Migrate the RFS knowledge and learning platform to interested organizations (e.g. NEPAD, UN- or CG centers)	None	Limited interest by suitable candidates; costs for transition and post-completion platform management were an issue

Most RFS CPs had three principle components:

(also mirrored in the hub project)



Engage: Mostly policy and institutional activities, including different platforms and partnerships at various levels




Act: Upscaling of integrated NRM and promoting green value chains



Track: Assessments and M&E of resilience and intermediate results. Tracking of GEF global environmental benefits. Capacity development

GEF Project Costs by Component



Country projects

- **CPs reported many environmental, food security and socio-economic results and innovative activities, including**
 - Land-based GEBs
 - Proxies for intermediate environmental and food security outcomes: capacities developed, adoption of good practices, functioning platforms etc. (SmartME, PIRs and available terminal evaluations)
- **Mixed performance** of the 12 country projects
- Performance was often dependent on **co-financed baseline projects** (especially for IFAD)
- **Some aggregate results for the RFS can mask outlier projects** that for instance include GEF baselines (beneficiaries) or counted indicators differently (platforms)

Half of the RFS country projects are completed, half are still on-going

6 CPs completed

- Burkina Faso *
- Ethiopia *
- Ghana
- Kenya *
- Nigeria *
- Senegal*

* 5 CPs with terminal evaluations / PCRs

6 CPs not completed

- Burundi (planned for Sept. 2023)
- Eswatini (Sept. 2023)
- Malawi (Dec. 2023)
- Niger (June 2023)
- Tanzania (tbd)
- Uganda (tbd)

Country	Disbursement rate June 30, 2022 (per cent)	Project period	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Burkina Faso	95	04/17-12/22				X		X	
Burundi	68	01/17-09/23				X			
Eswatini	51	12/16-09/23				X			
Ethiopia	90	05/17-04/23			X		X		
Ghana	71*	05/17-11/20							
Kenya	99	01/17-08/21			X			X	
Malawi	56	04/18-12/23					X		
Niger	93	02/17-06/23			X				
Nigeria	95	12/17-12/22				X		X	
Senegal	83	07/17-02/22			X				
Tanzania	56	03/18-03/23					X		?
Uganda	51	02/18-02/23				X			?

Note: Implementation period is shown for quarters when at least 1 month of project implementation takes place in the quarter; Table shows project completion of implementation, not of financial closure.
 * project completed in 2020
 X = MTR completed; X = MTR completed; ? = Extension requested

Regular project period Project extension Project completed

Half of RFS country projects performed more or less satisfactorily, half moderately satisfactorily (agency assessments)

- **Completed CPs:** 4 satisfactory (S) and 1 moderately satisfactory (MS), 1 S/MS
 - Burkina Faso (S)
 - Ethiopia (S)
 - Kenya (S)
 - Nigeria (S)
 - Ghana (S/MS)
 - Senegal (MS)
- **Ongoing CPs:** 2 satisfactory (S) and 3 moderately satisfactory (MS), 1 MS/MU
 - Burundi (S)
 - Niger (S)
 - Eswatini (MS)
 - Malawi (MS)
 - Tanzania (MS)
 - Uganda (MS/MU)

	GEF Agency	Degree of project integration	Disbursement (June 2022)	Ratings (MTR 2020/21)	Ratings (PIR 2022)		Ratings CP Terminal Evaluation/PCR
				Implementation performance (IP)	Implementation performance	Development objectives (DO)	
Burkina Faso	IFAD	Add-on	95 %	S	HS	S	S (global assessment) S (environment/climate change)
Eswatini	IFAD	Co-design	51 %	S	MS	S	Tbd (to be done)
Kenya	IFAD	Free-standing (started as add-on)	99 %	S	HS	HS	S (Effectiveness) S (Implementation)
Malawi	IFAD	Co-design	56 %	MS	MS	MS	Tbd
Niger	IFAD	Co-design	93 %	S	HS	HS	Tbd
Senegal	IFAD / UNIDO	Add-on	83 %	MS	MS	S	TE unavailable
Tanzania	IFAD	Free-standing (started as co-design)	56 %	MU	MS	MS	Tbd
Burundi	FAO	Free-standing	68 %	MS	S	S	Tbd
Ethiopia	UNDP	Free-standing	90 %	S	S	S	S (Implementation) S (Outcomes)
Ghana	World Bank	Add-on	71 %	MS (IP) S (DO)	n/a	n/a	TE unavailable (completed in 2020)
Nigeria	UNDP	Free-standing	95 %	S	S	S	S (Implementation) S (Outcomes)
Uganda	UNDP	Free-standing	36 %	MS	MU	MU	Tbd
	FAO		66 %		S	MS	Tbd

Source: Project implementation reports and terminal evaluations (Ethiopia, Kenya, Nigeria) or PCR (Burkina Faso)

GEF principles for Programmatic Additionality

Coherence across 12 country projects (CP); through common components and activities in similar ecologies

Interactions of RFS program hub project and country projects; as coordination, knowledge and learning (K&L) platform, adding regional and global dimensions and impact

An integrated approach of multiple GEF focal areas (land degradation, biodiversity and climate change), **multiple scales** (horizontal and vertical integration across communities, landscapes, national and regional, including value chains) and **multiple partners** (GEF agencies, countries, and science, private sector partners etc.)

Integrated environmental and socio-economic approach; addressing the fundamental drivers of environmental degradation by increasing agricultural productivity, market access and broadening income opportunities

Program Additionality

Was the whole of the RFS larger than the sum of its parts?

- **Annual RFS meetings, webinars and training** and related knowledge exchanges were positive for programmatic additionality
- **RFS did not fully live up to high aspirations of programmatic value addition on :**
 - Coherence
 - Hub-CP interactions
- **Result: Many diverse and relevant activities, but not well related to those by other partners** – what are the programmatic synergies?
- **Legacy of RFS design short-comings**
 - Parallel hub and country project design: CPs were not well linked through specifically defined common activities
 - Missing budgets for Hub services in countries
 - 10 RFS agencies: Too complex and heterogenous



Hub – CP interactions

- **Moderate engagement by CPs in RFS, and by hub agencies in CPs**
- **Relatively low country demand for hub agency services**
- **Reasons:**
 - Slow CP start-up in many countries; COVID-19; wrap-up phase not conducive for late engagements
 - Hub agency service supply and demands by CP were often not matching
 - Weak and unclear CP and hub project budgeting for joint activities
 - Country staff TOR/incentives did not specify interactions
 - Slow or no budget adjustments by some hub partners
 - Hub agency incentives for cooperation in the hub were not sufficient (silo mentality)
 - Low priority and capacities for K&L in countries and projects (communication officers)
 - Some projects cared (much) more than others about engaging in the RFS and with partners (factors?)

Lessons



Lessons learnt on programmatic additionality

Lesson 1 - Plan well in advance with and across all program partners

- Early engagement by all agencies and country projects during design is critical. Aim for some common, defining activities, M&E indicators, and ways to measure. Determine ways for partners, in hub and CPs, to relate to each other, build on each other and collaborate. What's not in CP or agency design, LogFrames, budgets and workplans will not be done – or is quite unlikely to be done.

Lesson 2 - Adapt when necessary during implementation

- Adaptive and results-based management of workplans and budgets are absolutely essential to facilitate country-demand orientation and inter-agency coordination and cooperation. This needs to be embodied in grant-agreements, with clear processes, responsibilities and limits for adaptive management being laid out

Lesson 3 - Limit the number of core partners

- Fewer core hub-partners and clearly committed CPs are preferable to large numbers to ensure focus, partner agreements, accountability and ownership. Technical lead qualities and partnerships can emerge and shift during implementation among hub and country partners. Technical expertise and CPs can be added to programs over time with emerging opportunities, necessities and demands.

Lesson 4 - Measure program coherence and additionality

- Measurable process and outcome indicators in hub and CP are called for, including for programmatic collaboration and K&L. This requires a Theory of Change specifically for program K&L and programmatic additionality.

Other lessons to be explored during TE, such as on:

- 1. Linking socio-economic and environmental factors:** To what extent were fundamental socio-economic drivers for environmental degradation addressed in the RFS?
 - Including food insecurity, low agricultural productivity and poor SLM practices, and market access?
 - How did this help to decrease environmental degradation?
 - What was the role of women in all this?
- 2. Innovation and transformation:** How were innovations (and good practices) introduced, adopted and scaled-up?
 - Ways of introducing and monitoring adoption of innovations and good practices are critical; e.g. Farmer Field Schools, green value chains, policy dialogue. What ways were effective? Were behaviours changed sustainably? What favored adoption and policy progress?
 - Were innovations/good practices indeed sufficiently NRM and climate resilience focused (adaptation potential; additionality)? How compatible were they with farmers' agricultural and socio-economic preferences?
 - What are we (still not) getting right with private sector engagement?

Lessons to be explored during TE (continued)

3. **Multi-scale, multi-stakeholder platforms:** How well have they interacted, coordinated, learnt, and advocated together?
 - How have these platforms benefited from the RFS and benefited other RFS partners?
 - What results did we get out of multi-scale platforms in the RFS? When were they successful?
 - Have platforms helped to bridge the agricultural and environmental divides?
 - How sustainable were such platforms? How were potential conflicts among heterogeneous platform stakeholders resolved?
4. **M&A:** M&A – what have we learnt for better assessments of INRM and resilience related interventions?
 - To what extent were we able to establish better resilience (food security and climate resilience) baselines and monitor progress during implementation with various M&A tools? How do tools compare – which tool is best when?
 - How did the RFS maintain balance between resilience impact assessment (M&A tools) and indicators for assessing quantity and quality of intermediate (process) outputs/outcomes?

What next?





What next?

Limitations

- Hub project : Work in progress by some partners
- Few terminal evaluations and PCRs (four); some ongoing
- Limited information about final RFS year (2022/23)

Opportunities

- Much information available from:
 - RFS 2022 Annual Report
 - PIRs 2022. Info on hub-project progress of Dec. 2022
 - This Workshop and the Lessons Paper
- Latest GEB, intermediate and financial info on Smart ME

Next steps

- CP interviews: here at the workshop and beyond
- Online survey
- Collection of remaining important reports and other information, especially from hub project partners
- **Deadline:** July 30, 2023 for all reports and data to be included in first draft of TE



Thank you!

© 2014 Ulrich A. Wüstermann - All rights reserved.



global
environment
facility
INVESTING IN OUR PLANET



IFAD
Investing in rural people



CONSERVATION
INTERNATIONAL






APPENDIX




What difference did RFS and hub project make (MTR e-survey)?

Source: e-survey, n=33 (out of 89 contacted; 37%)

RFS Programme: Difference made for CP




RFS hub Project: Assessing support services for CP



What difference did RFS and hub project make (MTR e-survey)?

Source: e-survey, n=33 (out of 89 contacted; 37%)

Satisfaction on a Scale of 1-100



- Relatively high satisfaction with training and direct country project support
- Lower satisfaction with support and learning on specific subjects
- Broad satisfaction with IFAD lead and ICRAF coordination

Challenges in Hub and CP working together - voices from the field (MTR e-survey)

"The connection with the hub project was not well organized and structured"

"Country team felt bombarded"

"Hub based projects need to be more proactive"

"Continuous engagement with IAP countries. Don't get tired of"

"Strengthen the existing communication platform"

« Etre à jour au niveau de la réponse aux différentes sollicitations et aussi la disponibilité à participer à la multitude des activités prévues par visioconférence »

"Not knowing what they [Hub agencies] have to offer so that we can demand for it"

"Each CP should have a lone meeting with the RFS program and identify where support can be provided"

"Suggest targeted focus in areas that projects express deficiencies or challenges"

"Harmonizing the different packages on the ground [with central and local governments] takes time"

"COVID 19 blocked experience sharing workshops and exchange"

"Virtual meetings.... sometimes connections are difficult"

« Multiplier les séances d'échanges d'expériences »

« Créer plus des rencontres rotatives dans les pays, stabiliser les points focaux par PP »

« Partage des innovations du projet pays »

« Tout faire pour maintenir la majorité du personnel des PP afin de poursuivre avec des agents qui ont des

"If CP implementing agencies and Hub agencies are not the same there is some kind of organizational politics."

« Il y a un faible renforcement des capacités des acteurs du pays »

SESSION 2

RFS final publication and reflections on the programmatic value addition and additionality

Jonky Tenou, RFS Task Manager, IFAD



Background




OBJECTIVES AND TIMELINES

- RFS first publication highlighting the Emerging lessons learnt
- Second publication aims to capitalizing the achievements and transformations
- Next steps: finalise the publication to integrate feedback from the workshop participants and launch it by the end of June

OUTLINE

- **Chapter 1:** Programmatic value addition, additionality
- **Chapter 2:** Bridging Science and Policy to Enhance Resilience and Food Security
- **Chapter 3:** Catalysing green value chain development
- **Chapter 4:** Best practices in land restoration
- **Chapter 5:** Innovation in ecosystem services assessment
- **Chapter 6:** Measuring resilience in a multi-country programme





Programmatic Value Addition

The Resilience Food Systems Programme was conceived in response to the GEF's 2020 Vision addressing:

- drivers of environmental degradation
- broad partnerships to implement innovative programming

Through the RFS Program, the GEF tackled major drivers of environmental degradation by advancing a holistic approach.

Realized through GEF 6 GEBs and through GEF 7 core indicators.

Alignment with other regional initiatives

Regional Level


- Africa Union Commission
- Great Green wall initiative IAP commodities with UNDP
- GEF-7 Sustainable Forest Management Impact Program: Dryland Sustainable Landscapes.

Multinational Level

- UNFCCC COP27, UNCCD COP14, and UNCCD COP15

National Level

- In collaboration with WOFAN, RFS Nigeria has advanced a multi-stakeholder platform to establish the Rice Council Bill
- Pro-DAF aligns with the objectives of the 3N Initiative (Nigeriens Nourish Nigeriens)
- Eswatini attended the RFS side event UNCCD COP14 in India to share lessons and experiences





RFS programme additionality

- **Co-financing** : Strong financial leveraging **\$116 million GEF** Core grant and **\$785 million (60% secured)**
- **Programmatic coordination** : harnessing comparative advantages of several GEF agencies and other executing partners
- **Promotion of co-learning** : **Strong** South-South and **peer-learning system**
- **Promotion of co-development** : **critical role of Hub-partners** as an anchor for technical expertise and resources, in deploying tools and building country teams' capacity
- Co-Monitoring and Evaluation : Digital solution to track progress – **SMARTME** and **transition** to GEF core indicators
- **Gender mainstreaming** : M&A framework – Guidance note – good practices

Challenges



- Complexity of multi-agency approach
- Understanding and ownership of an integrated approach
- Budgeting for regional stakeholder interactions
- Limited possibility of fostering synergies between interventions, sub-components and M&A approaches among RFS partners
- Unstandardized indicators for monitoring and assessment

Programme level lessons learnt

- Simplify the project design for future integrated approaches
- Mitigate misconceptions at country level on how to benefit from the integrated approach
- Make provision for detailed country budget lines for regional activities and for regional activities in country
- Parallel design as opposed to co-design hindered the value-add of RFS
- Constraints on harmonization of monitoring indicators and tools
- Focus on high level indicators at programme level and the “packaging” of composite indicator to monitor resilience



THANK YOU



resilientfoodsystems.co




ResFoodSystems



ResilientFoodSystems

GROUP PHOTO AND TEA





SESSION 3

Bridging science and policy
to enhance resilience and
food security

Content & Presenters



Facilitated by **Lillian Goredema** (FAO)

- **Paul Emuria** (National Project coordinator, Uganda) : *Feeding the Future of SLM Through Effective Stakeholder Engagement in Uganda*
- **Moussa Ouaedraogo** (M&E officer, Burkina Faso) : *Strengthening Land Tenure Security for Greater Food Systems Resilience in Burkina Faso*
- **Rhoda Dia Johnson** (National Project Manager, Nigeria): *The Multi-Stakeholder Platform that Drove the Establishment of Nigeria's Rice Council Bill*



Background

- Science is important in addressing multiplicity of challenges limiting resilient food systems.
- Dialogue between science and policy provides decision makers with tools, guidance and information (evidence) for formulating relevant policies and their implementation.
- Multistakeholder exchange platforms, tapping into existing policy and science networks, tools for policy integration; capacity development important in creating the Science and Policy dialogue at regional and national level.
- Component 1 aimed to support science and policy dialogue



Background Cont'd

- Linking policy and Scientific platforms:
- To enhance evidence based advocacy
- To support cross sectoral policy and institutional innovations
- Country Case studies demonstrate institutional innovations (MSPs) and evidence based policy influence (LUPs, VCs)



Case study 1

Feeding the Future of SLM Through Effective Stakeholder Engagement in Uganda

- Chronic food insecurity and high poverty
- Environmental degradation and climate change
- Fragmented technical capacity on CSA, SLM and weak coordination efforts
- MSPs established to help bridge the science-policy interface for INRM, CSA and SLM uptake
- Promote a shift towards more integrated, collaborative, ecologically sustainable multi-sectoral approaches,
- Bringing together government line ministries, NGOs, Farmer institutions (APFS, watershed associations, etc)

Achievements

- Development of parish-level land use plans.
- Promotion of good SLM/CSA practices at community level.
- Training of trainers on MSPs and Value chain greening conducted by FAO, SHARED Decision Hub, ICRAF, UNDP,




Challenges



- Fragmented efforts on SLM and value chain development by multiple actors
- Insecurity exacerbated by Covid-19 pandemic in the region.

Programme level lessons learnt

- Documenting evidence on levels of land degradation using scientific tools (e.g GIS) helps raise awareness and buy-in by key state and non-state actors.
- Engaging smallholder farmer in field level hands-on validation of new technologies facilitates uptake of CSA/SLM practices.
- Better smallholder farmer access to rural finance and sustainable mechanization helps catalyze livelihood diversification.
- Capacity of local government is critical in establishing effective MSPs.






Etude de cas 2.

Renforcer la sécurité foncière pour une plus grande résilience des systèmes alimentaires au Burkina Faso

Contexte

- L'insécurité foncière est un obstacle majeur à la mise en place et au maintien des actifs productifs prévus dans le cadre du projet malgré l'existence de textes, de lois et politique;
- Récurrence de conflits liés à l'usage des terres à vocation agro sylvo pastorale dans le cadre de l'agriculture de subsistance, du pastoralisme, de la conservation, de l'exploitation minière et du logement remettent en question la sécurité foncière des petits exploitants agricoles et leur capacité à entreprendre sereinement des activités de gestion durable des terres.

BURKINA FASO: ZONE D'INTERVENTION



Contexte (cont.)

- De ce constat, le projet Neer-Tamba, en collaboration avec Direction Générale du Foncier Rural et de l'organisation du Monde Rural (DGFOMR), a initié l'élaboration de **stratégies visant à mitiger les impacts des conflits fonciers sur les actifs productifs** développés dans le cadre de la mise en œuvre du projet.
- Des stratégies participatives et inclusives ont été développées.
- Le Projet s'est doté d'un **guide de négociation des ententes foncières** et des outils pour son opérationnalisation

Renforcer la sécurité foncière pour une plus grande résilience des systèmes alimentaires au burkina faso




Elaboration d'un guide de négociation foncière inclusive

- Formation des différentes parties prenantes à l'utilisation du guide et ses outils
- Sensibilisation sur la loi foncière et la gestion des conflits
- Formalisation des ententes foncières
- Mise en place des instances foncières

Defis à relever

- Pallier la non opérationnalisation de la loi foncière (absences des services fonciers communaux)
- Réaliser des investissements sécurisés pour accroître la résilience des populations

=> Formalisation des accords fonciers avec des documents ad hoc (Protocole d'accord de cession de droit foncier, PV de remise de site) avec l'implication des différents acteurs (bénéficiaires, STD, autorités coutumières et administrative) ont permis de relever ces défis



Livrables

- Cadres multi acteurs (coutumier , STD, administration locale) pour gérer les questions liées au foncier (CORE SFR,) opérationnelles et fonctionnelles
- Chartes foncières locales en cours d'élaboration
- Instances foncière villageoises (CFV ET CCFV) opérationnelles et fonctionnelles
- Ententes foncières disponibles pour l'ensemble des infrastructures réalisées
- Système d'archivage des actes fonciers renforcés
- Bénéficiaires sensibilisés sur les modes de gestion des conflits agriculture - éleveurs
- Guide en langue locales vulgarisé

Résultats & prochaines étapes

- Sécurisation des investissements
- Réduction des conflits fonciers
- Intensification de la production
- Amélioration de l'accès des femmes aux terres aménagées et sécurisées

Reste à:

- Poursuivre le processus entamé jusqu'à l'immatriculation des terres
- Finaliser l'élaboration des chartes locales pour une gestion concertée des sites aménagés
- Poursuivre la mise en place et l'opérationnalisation des services fonciers ruraux au niveau des communes






Enseignements tirés

- Les **consensus socio-fonciers** sont un préalable à tout aménagement durable
- Au niveau politique, des **plateformes multipartites** doivent être mises en place pour mobiliser les partenaires à tous les niveaux, créer des liens et faciliter les relations entre les secteurs et les échelles.
- Les systèmes fonciers coutumiers au Burkina Faso ont une dimension socio culturelle importante. Il est donc impératif que **les projets impliquent davantage les autorités coutumières locales** qui sont également des sources importantes de connaissances sur leurs communautés et leurs contextes.
- Les approches participatives devraient adopter une perspective de genre et impliquer toutes les couches sociales dans les stratégies. *Les **approches participatives** sont essentielles à l'appropriation, à la diffusion des connaissances et à la durabilité.*
- La situation sécuritaire a davantage exacerbé la pression foncière sur les ressources naturelles d'où *la nécessité de prendre en compte la **dimension sécuritaire** dans le design des nouveaux projets*

« La participation active et concertée des autorités administratives, des autorités coutumières et des bénéficiaires est un impératif de réussite de tout processus socio foncier pour la sécurisation durable des actifs productifs réalisés dans le cadre d'un projet de développement ».



GHG emissions processes in managed ecosystems (IPCC, 2011)



Case study 2

Influencing Expansion of Agroforestry and land Use in the National Policy for Environment (AFOLU) in Nigeria



Participants during the Stakeholders workshop

Background

The Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) is a term used in the 2006 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Nigeria is not exempted from GHG emissions so there is the need to mainstream AFOLU into the National Policy on Environment


The Problem was: The narrow space/content of AFOLU in the National Policy on Environment limits its potential to shape the governments efforts towards an effective framework to address the multifaceted concerns in the sector that cuts across all major sectors of the environment.

Period : This policy influence started since April 2022 with 2 days stakeholders workshop to deliberate and come up with a comprehensive framework for expanding its space the National Policy on Environment

Responsible Parties & Target Audience: Policy formulators & Analysts, Officers of Policy Department FME , Agriculture & Forestry Experts & ETC and target audiences are Perm Sec, Minister & Federal Executive Council (Political actors)

AFOLU mitigation options:

SUPPLY SIDE



DEMAND SIDE



Dietary change
Improvement in the food chain
Use of wood products

Outputs for Successful Expansion of AFOLU in the National Policy on Environment

- It is estimated that the Agroforestry sector alone can reduce emissions by **158-712 Million tCO₂e**, However it needs to be clearly defined down to its Demand and Supply chain for concise and wholesome mitigation in Nigeria.
- Approximately **32 Million tCO₂-e** was estimated to be sequestered within 2016 from forest cover whereas forest cover loss yearly amounts to 63,359 HA annually in Nigeria.
- Land use sustainable conversion and bio-energy from Farm animals (green energy) can reduce emission by **11% & 12%** annually in the world.

Outcome & next steps

- The National Policy on Environment, is currently being reviewed to have Properly mainstreamed and captured AFOLU.
- A Comprehensive strategic framework for implementation of Environmental Policy with comprehensive component for AFOLU have been formulated
- The key players/stakeholders within the environmental sector have been Identified for synergy and resource mobilization to achieve better and greater impact
- The Policy Department is finalizing work on the policy document for submission and Approval by the Federal Executive Council





Programme-level learning

- **Take away messages**
- The project has facilitated the stakeholders engagement as its contribution to policy process that will further will build more resilience to the small holder farmers
- **Success factors**
 - Federal Govt commitment to net zero emission & Land Degradation Neutrality by 2030
 - Presidential pronouncement on planting of 100m trees by 2030
- *Projects should learn lessons from this and not be rigid in supporting initiatives that could add value to the overall results & impacts because its not part of the project design*

THANK YOU

Contributors

Rhoda Dia- Johnson

National Project Manager RFS Nigeria

rzdia4@gmail.com



resilientfoodsystems.co



ResFoodSystems



ResilientFoodSystems



Lessons to further the Integrated Approach

- Policy influence based on evidence critical for sustainable ecosystems
- Linking science and policy important for sub Saharan Africa to strengthen development and implementation of relevant policies
- Linking stakeholders through various platforms for coordinated implementation of policies



Lessons to further the Integrated Approach (Cont.)

- Science, practice and policy dialogue important for relevant support for resilience and food security
- Programmes and projects can be designed to provide good practices (including piloting innovative approaches) that influence policy shifts towards sustainability at national and global levels
- Tools, evidence gathering and interpretation, capacity support should be content specific.
- Utilising networks, platforms of implementing partners to enhance the science and policy dialogue; enhance access to tools, guidance and capacity support and amplifying advocacy
- Integrating national, regional , continental and global frameworks to influence evidence based policy decisions
- Cross sectoral approaches are relevant

THANK YOU



resilientfoodsystems.co



ResFoodSystems



ResilientFoodSystems



ACT



SESSION 4

Catalysing green value
chain development

Contents & Presenters



Mupangi Sithole

UNDP – AGRA: A framework for building sustainable food value chains

Tanzania RFS Country Project:

Linking Value Chain Greening work: with the Land Degradation and Food Security (LDFS) in Kondoa District Council, Dodoma region in Tanzania



Case study 1

Abdalla Dao: *Fostering climate-resilient Agriculture for Resilient Maize production Systems for small-scale producers in Burkina Faso.*


Case study 2

Munday Makoko: *Lessons learnt from honey value chain development in Malawi.*

Case study 3

Isaac Acquah: *Lessons learnt from greening value chains in Ghana*

Building Sustainable Value Chains in Food systems Transformation – Programme Framework



A framework for building sustainable food value chains

FVC Greening
Training Tools



Business Models
and Technologies
for
FVC chain Greening



Other
Development
Agencies



FVC Chain
Greening Action
Plans and Strategy



Execution of
synchronized FVC
Greening

- FVC greening Manual
- E-course on FVC Greening
- Knowledge Products
- Case Studies
- Showcasing Events

- Replication and scaling up of promising initiatives
- Contract farming
- Off take agreements
- Input supply modalities

- Govt Department
- Farmer Associations & groups
- Agro dealers
- Micro financial Institutions
- Commodity Traders

- Work planning
- Budgets development and financing
- Project Continuity and Upscale Vision
- incentives for VC actors

- Intervention Impact assessment
- New Value chain projects launched
- Smallholder farmer inclusive initiatives



- Number of value chain actors (farmers and farmer trainers) who received training in value chain greening concept

- % increase in number of farmers participating in commodity marketing after receiving value chain greening training

- Increment in the number of sales contracts between community/farmer-based organizations and buyers

- Number of farmers reporting <10% increment in yields or animal production as a result of green value chain development

- Number of new innovative business models adopted along the green value chains

- Number of new innovative business models adopted along the green value chains

- Number of new actors buying into the green business and value chains

MAIN ELEMENTS

INNOVATIONS

FVC GREENING PROJECTS

OUTPUTS AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Country Focused Capacity-building

USING THE VALUE CHAINS GREENING MANUAL

Regional online value chain greening training webinars

WEST AFRICA



EAST & SOUTHERN AFRICA



Catalytic Grants Implementation

Burkina Faso (Maize)

Malawi (Groundnut)

Tanzania (Sorghum)



Tanzania RFS Country Project Value Chain Greening work: **Land Degradation and Food Security (LDFS) in Kondoa District Council, Dodoma region in Tanzania**

- Key Points from Hub Team's Interactions with the RFS Country Project
- UNDP & AGRA TA to the Country Project's Value Chain Assessment Terms of Reference, Inception Report and Final Report (May 2021)
- LDFS leaders were represented at the online Regional Food Value chain greening training – Tanzania, Malawi & Eswatini (10 June 2021)
- Development and Review of the Access to Financial Services, Post-harvest crop handling training manual and Access to Markets Training Manuals (11 September 2021)
- Invitation and Participation of the Country Project Coordinator to Project Facilitation Platform with Stakeholders and Sorghum VC actors on 26 October 2021
- 22 Field Officers from the Ministry of Agriculture from Kondoa received FVC greening Training in November 2021
- Follow up training sessions for the country project staff and inclusion in catalytic grant supported projects, were scheduled and later put on hold, due to unavailability of funds



Case study 1

Fostering climate-resilient Agriculture for Resilient Maize production Systems for small-scale producers in Burkina Faso.

Within the overall objectives of Catalytic Grants Framework



We developed the resilient maize production project in Burkina Faso

GRANT FRAMEWORK



Establishing and/or strengthening of private sector linkages between lead firms and/or off-takers engaging with small-scale farmers for more predictable markets as well as provision of extension advisory services to the farmers.



Scaling up production of staples food (grain, legumes) and their contribution to soil fertility nutrition, income and carbon sequestration through strengthening seed systems using market-led approaches and the promotion of integrated soil fertility management practices



Wide-scale uptake of climate smart and environmental sustainability practices such as conservation agriculture, good agronomic practices, postharvest management, and processing practices.

Why maize ?

- The maize value chain is among the highest priorities identified by the government of Burkina Faso for food security and incomes
- Maize is grown in of the productive regions: Boucles du Mouhoun (BM), Hauts-Bassins (HB) Cascades (CD) and Centre-Ouest (CO).
- Further, maize is one of the 5 priority crops in the UEMOA region (West African Economic and Monetary Union)



Why maize ? (cont.)

- The maize value chain is among the highest priorities identified by the government of Burkina Faso for food security and incomes
- Maize is grown in of the productive regions: Boucles du Mouhoun (BM), Hauts-Bassins (HB) Cascades (CD) and Centre-Ouest (CO).
- Further, maize is one of the 5 priority crops in the UEMOA region (West African Economic and Monetary Union)
- However,
- Productivity is very low - **The yield gap is about 50% (current farmer yield is less than 2 MT/ha versus potential yields of 8-10 MT/ha and attainable yield of 5 MT/ha)**



Reach and skill at least 20,000 smallholder farmers



Connected small-scale producers to the input supply chain systems

Reached the optimum yield of the varieties,



Promoted the adoption of good agronomic practices

224 demonstration fields on integrating multipurpose trees (Cajanus cajan), in farmer field



Recruited and worked with 250 VBAs (volunteers) that were trained in sustainability approaches

Project Approach

- Proposed an innovative delivery model to fill the gaps in **basic seed production** of maize seed in Burkina Faso.
- Regenerative practices and integrated soil fertility management** were used to integrate natural resources management to address the soil and fertility degradation on smallholder farms.
- The project also deployed **Multi-stakeholders Innovative Platform (IP)** to transfer technologies/knowledge to farmers and provide space for organized engagement and to establish networks for private sector participation such as contract farming.
- The project utilized an innovative extension systems model called the Village Based Advisors (VBA) model and hub agro-dealers to help smallholder farmers to access technologies and markets in a sustainable manner

Lessons learnt

Greening and sustainability starts inputs

- strengthening seed systems
- trained farmers, via the VBA extension system

Poverty is a significant obstacle for smallholder farmers' ability to purchase improved/resilient seeds and inorganic fertilizers

Enhanced productivity and profitability while also accounting for social and environmental stewardship.

- resilient maize seed varieties production and distribution
- strip intercropping, crop rotation, and compost and fertilizers (mixing).

Seed companies participated in the establishment of demonstration farms, training farmers

- Adoption of resilient practices depends a lot on multiple benefits
- drought tolerance
- nutrition
- soil health and
- livestock fodder & income generation

Post-harvest management

Processing

Off-takers link the farmers to the market

Key conclusions

- Whilst the project generated valuable lessons and developed models of delivery that promoted market-led sustainability of resilient practices, the connection or linkage with the nationally led IAP project was inadequate to transfer lessons and technologies to the larger GEF supported programme.
- There was a mismatch in the implementation sequence of the catalytic grant and the larger IAP programme. The Catalytic grant in Burkina Faso came into operation in 2021 whilst the larger IAP programme had been in operation for a longer period of time.
- The catalytic grant requires more time to document private sector integration in value chains.
- The project is now developing knowledge products that will be shared for future programming of integrated approaches across the region.

THANK YOU

Contributors:

Abdalla Dao – Project Manager, INERA

Assan Ng'ombe – Programme Officer and Technical Lead, AGRA

Mupangi Sithole – Value Chain Specialist, UNDP

Raoul Ouedraogo, Programme Officer, AGRA





Case study 2

Beekeeping value chain in Malawi



Background

- Deforestation is widespread in Malawi, often driven by cutting down of trees for charcoal production by the rural poor
- These are the same people that are affected by land degradation, decreasing agricultural productivity and climate shocks
- Charcoal production is a major income generating activity for the rural populations
- ERASP (RFS project) introduced the honey value chain as an alternative income source to charcoal production
- The introduction of bees in landscape was expected to contribute to forest conservation



Background (Cont.)

- Enhancing the Resilience of Agro-ecological Systems Project (ERASP) was designed to complement the Programme for Rural Irrigation Programme (PRIDE) through promotion of SLM practices in upper catchments of PRIDE irrigation schemes
- Honey production was introduced as an incentive for farmers to adopt SLM practices and reverse the trend of land degradation in the catchments
- Introduced together with livestock pass-on programme and promotion of wood-saving cook stoves



Achievements

- 646 households trained in beekeeping and honey production and have been supported with equipment and other inputs required for effective honey production
- Farmer groups have been linked to markets in urban areas through producer-buyer meetings
- Household incomes have increased by 40-68% in all catchments
- 74 tree nurseries have been established and 587,000 seedlings have been planted
- 923 ha brought under climate resilient practices

Challenges



Producers unable to meet quantities demanded by the markets

=> farmers being linked to financial organizations to increase production

Programme level lessons learnt

- Beekeeping promotes restoration of ecosystems by addressing socio-economic objectives
- Beekeeping can be carried out by all genders
- Strong training and capacity building on beekeeping tools and process are essential to ensure communities continue in the long-term
- Beekeeping is a sustainable practice that ensures local communities can continue on their own even after project completion



THANK YOU

Contributors

Munday Makoko,
aisinternational@gmail.com

Victor Nyirongo, vnyirongo@gmail.com

Tsilizani Mseu, tsilizanim@gmail.com

Felix Malamula,
felixmalamula@gmail.com



resilientfoodsystems.co



ResFoodSystems



ResilientFoodSystems



Case study 3

Lessons learnt from greening value chains in Ghana

Ghana sustainable land and water management project



- Project was implemented in Northern with the objective of promoting sustainable land and water management practices within 12 districts in 76 communities for the RFS
- The project was an Additional Financing to an existing project
- The project focused on the Shea and tuber Value chain
- Implementation for the composite project started in 2011 and with the RFS IP, it extended the completion date to 2021.
- The project has ended successful and currently being upscaled to cover more areas in Ghana

Main Interventions under the RFS

- Supported farmers to practice good sustainable land management practices
- Supported with tree growing activities to prevent the cutting down of shea trees as fuel wood
- Trained community members as fire volunteer squads to prevent and manage issues of wildlife management
- Provision of processing facilities
- Provided extension service delivery to farmers



Achievements

- Supported **250** farmers to sustainably cultivate cassava
- Established **120ha** of woodlot to reduce the pressure on shea trees being cut and used as fuel wood
- Supported **3** communities with processing facilities and drying platforms to minimize post harvest losses
- Trained **50** fire volunteer squads and supported with fire suppression equipment
- Increased extension service delivery to all 76 RFS communities
- Implementation of these actions helped to create a stable environment in which small-holder farmers have the confidence to invest in their crop farms and practice intensification
- Agroforestry systems were much more beneficial for the protection of biodiversity than full-sun plantation systems; and helped in maintaining soil moisture, protecting soils from erosion, providing habitat for pollinators and other beneficial insects.

Challenges



Wildfire destroying shea trees

- Project trained and supported fire volunteer squad

Limited Government Extension Officers

- Trained farmers to provide extension to their colleague farmers and serve as a link between the community and the Government extension officers
- Trained farmers through Farmer field days –demonstrations

There project lacked the involvement of the private sector to the products (market linkages)

- The project activities are currently being upscaled to cover other areas and this market linkages has been identified

Programme level lessons learnt to advance the integrated approach

- Community – level led activities are mostly sustainable
- Every policy intervention should come with a direct benefits to the local people
- Engaging women in all aspects of project activities
- Continuous sensitisation and engagement of community to sustain their interest
- Need total political buy-in
- Need the involvement of Private sector





THANK YOU

Contributor

Isaac Charles Acquah Jnr:
icacquah@hotmail.com

Kingsley K. Amoako
kingkwaw@yahoo.com

Ivy T. Lomotey
ivynash22@yahoo.co.uk

Lessons learnt to further the integrated approach

For optimal outcome and effective engagement, **Inclusion and Participation** of all key value chain actor groups is key to have right from value chain greening intervention inception

Food value chain greening does not happen in isolation, and hence it is important to take **a holistic food system approach**, vis-à-vis crop rotation, crop complementarity, off season income generation.

While new/strong market linkages were developed during the program, there are some huge gaps/opportunities to use/tape **into broader financial services** to promote green food value chains.


Lessons learnt to further the integrated approach

Most of the commodities sold by the smallholder farmers have potential to **be locally value added (or semi-processed)** prior to selling. In some communities the need to market crop came as an afterthought when they already had crop stocked in their granaries.

Farmer groups should strive to **build relations with - one main and an alternative buyers**, as shown during the COVID 19 pandemic; relying on a single produce market erodes their negotiating power and chance of landing competitive prices for produce. Niche markets that prefer green-Good-Agricultural-Practice or organically produced crop must be explored further.

Having been a pilot program, the RFS will require a **phase 2** to scale up innovative and impactful aspects of the intervention that worked

LUNCH





TRACK



SESSION 5

Measuring resilience in a
multi-country programme

*Mesurer la résilience dans un
programme multi-pays*



Contents & Presenters



Tom Kiptenai-kemboi **(Conservation International):**

A comparative case study
on the measure of Name of
Case study resilience in
Ethiopia and Senegal

Sirine Johnson (FAO)

Monitoring agroecosystem
resilience in Burundi through
the SHARP+ tool

Co-presenters:

Birara Chekol Tarekegn
(Ethiopia)

Assane Gueye
(Senegal)


Christian Nlimubona
(Burundi)

Measuring Resilience in a Multi-County Program

What is resilience? Many definitions

Resilience of food security: Ability of food system to maintain food access, availability, and utilization in the face of chronic and acute stresses and shocks

Understand: Resilience of what to what



Component 3

1. Development of a framework for multi-scale monitoring and assessment of **ecosystem services** and **socio-economic benefits**
2. Establishment of quantitative baselines for ecosystem services and gender disaggregated **measures of food security** at multiple scales
3. A framework for measuring changes in ecosystem services and **gender disaggregated food security at multiple scales**

Monitoring framework components:

Resilience of food system, ecosystem services and socio-economic benefits

- One size doesn't fit all
- Resilient food system (Absorptive, Adaptive & transformative)
- Consider local context to collect consistent data that can be validated

Background

Components of a resilience measurement framework




Assets and capacities:

Related to unit of analysis – for example the household


Stressors and shocks

Magnitude, frequency and type of stressors and shocks that households are exposed to



Contextual factors

Institutions, natural resources, and ecosystem function, that affect resilience of a broad area



Background

Ways of acquiring data to assess indicators



Social surveys and qualitative data collection

Draws on individual and household surveys, interviews, and focus groups




Earth observation

Uses sensors on satellites or other platforms to gather information on characteristics of earth surface (land cover, productivity, etc.)




Modeling

Draws on mix of datasets, and uses statistical or computer models to assess biophysical or socioeconomic information



Tools and methods used by countries



Tool/ method used	Burkina Faso	Burundi	Eswatini	Ethiopia	Ghana	Kenya	Malawi	Niger	Nigeria	Senegal	Tanzania	Uganda	Sum
Biological Condition Gradient (BCG)													1
Calorie proxy/Food stock stability (CP)													1
Chiefdom Development Plan Monitoring Tool													1
Collect Earth													2
Computer assisted personal interviewing (CAPI) technique													1
Conservation and Nutrition Monitoring Tool													1
Dam Assessment and Identification of potential irrigation schemes Tool													1
Dimensional Resilience Score (DRS)													1
District Health Information System (DHIS)													1
Diversity Assessment Tool for Agrobiodiversity and Resilience (DATAR)													2
Eswatini Water and Agriculture Development (ESWADE) Project Management Information System													1
EX-Ante Carbon-balance Tool (EX-ACT)													8
Farm Specific Action Plan													1
Food Consumption Score (FCS)													2
Food Stability Index (FSI)													1
Geographic Information System (GIS)													5
Global Forest Watch (GFW)													1
Global Positioning System (GPS)													2
Household Baseline Assessment Tool (HH-BAT)													2
Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)													1
Household Food Security Index													1
Household Hunger Scale Accessibility Index (HHSI)													1
Household Resilience Scorecard													1
Land and Water Inventory													1
Land Degradation Assessment in Drylands (LADA) and the World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies (WOCAT) (LADA-WOCAT)													1
Land Degradation Surveillance Framework (LDSF)													4
Management Effectiveness Tracking tool (MET)													1
Multidimensional Poverty Assessment Tool (MPAT)													5
Normalised difference vegetation index (NDVI)													3
Open Data Kit (ODK)													1
Resilience, Adaptation Pathways and Transformation Approach (RAPTA)													3
Results and Impact Management System (RIMS)													5
River Gauging Stations (RGS)													1
Self-evaluation and Holistic Assessment of climate Resilience of farmers and Pastoralists (SHARP)													2
Short Message Service (SMS) Mobile platform													1
Vital Signs monitoring framework													3
Women Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI)													1
Totals per Country	5	6	10	3	6	13	4	4	9	2	4	5	71



Case study 1

Ethiopia: Integrated Landscape Management to Enhance Food Security and Ecosystem Resilience



Main Objective; The purpose of this project was to enhance long-term sustainability and resilience of the food production systems by addressing the environmental drivers of food insecurity in Ethiopia.



Priority Areas

1. **Improving** the weakening and vulnerable **natural resources base** through restoration /rehabilitation and reduction of the growing pressure on them
2. Enhancing **income security and productive use of natural resources** by farmers, pastoralists and natural resources users;
3. Developing pathways for **none natural resources-based livelihoods**





Ethiopia's achievements

Indicator	Plan	Achievement	Indicator	Plan	Achievement
Indicator 7: Extent in ha of land area and Agro-ecosystems under Integrated Land management practice	120,000ha	139,107 ha (116%)	Indicator 6: Number of functional agricultural value chains developed as an incentive mechanism for smallholder farmers to adapt climate change effects	6	8(eight) agricultural value chains selected for development.
<div> <div>  <p>March 2019</p> </div> <div>  <p>April 2020</p> </div> <div>  <p>January 2021</p> </div> </div> <p>CHANGE THRU PICTURES</p>			Indicator 8: Number of smallholder farmers (60% of whom should be women) benefiting from sustainable food value-chains	1200	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 19,502HHs (10,567M & 8,935F) benefited 4 marketplaces established for sheep market, 20-30% income of sheep VC beneficiaries increased as the result of market linkage 8,899 male 8,474 female
  			 		



BIRARA to
include a few
bullet points on
key interventions
that have led to
these results

Indicator	Target	Achievement	Increment
New partnership mechanisms	2	14	+12
Number of jobs and livelihoods created	48,000	63,254	+15,254
Direct project beneficiaries	240,000	258,971 households	+18,971
Improved land productivity		From 22% at baseline to 33% at the end of the project	+11%
Reduced Food security risks		99%	
Gender-responsive- and age-sensitive decision-support tools and participatory processes for INRM in food production practices in place	2	2	100%
Functional agricultural value chains developed for smallholder	6	8	+2
Land and <u>Agro-ecosystems</u> under Integrated Land Management (ILM)	120,000ha	139,107	+19,107ha
Financial resources invested in integrated Sustainable Land Management (SLM)	\$5M	\$3.6M	
Integrated web-based and GIS embedded information management system	12	9	-3



Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	Midterm target level	Target level at end of project	Level at Q2 2021	Cumulative progress since project start
Indicator 5: Extent of land productivity project sites (measured with the Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) increased	64% of the project sites correspond to low productivity corresponding to NDVI values ranging from 0.1 to 0.3 in the base line	5% increase in the higher NDVI values (NDVI >0.3) meaning an increase in land productivity	15% increase in the higher NDVI values (NDVI >0.3) meaning an increase in land productivity	61% of the project sites correspond to low productivity corresponding to NDVI values ranging from 0.1 to 0.30. 33% correspond to high values (NDVI from 0.3 to 1)	Since baseline, low productivity area (NDVI below 0.3) decreased (78% baseline, 67% at Q2 2021) and higher productivity (NDVI from 0.3 to 1) has increased (from 22 to 33%).

- Over the **13 project sites monitored**, an average of **30% change** in land productivity was observed, with improvements going as high as **72% in Doba District**.
- The most important changes in land cover was in **tree cover areas**, with an **average increment of 28%**. The highest tree cover increment was recorded in **Angolelana Tera** at **2,482 ha (75%)**.

Achievements Summary

Following GEF guidelines, this project falls under five of the six areas of GEF additionality:

- Specific environmental additionality
- Institutional additionality/Governance additionality
- Socio-economic additionality
- Innovation additionality

Impact on RFS program

This project contributed to the overall goals of the program in the following ways:

- It strengthened institutions
- It promoted gender equality
- It improved farmers/households' livelihoods
- It led to the implementation of activities such as the reclamation of degraded lands, improved water management, and reduced natural resources stress that can potentially lead to global environmental benefits.



Challenges and Lessons Learnt

- Limitation of fund to cover the large scale of locality of watershed neighborhoods
- The intention to compete project resources in few woredas
- Frequent woreda Steering Committee turn-over

Program Level

- No spatially explicit layers for project interventions sites
- No specific data collection for food security resilience in Ethiopia
- Challenge on harmonizing the various indicators at a regional level

Program - level lessons learnt

- Diversified livelihood approach which create synergies
- Decentralized PM system approach has improved the efficiency, ownership, empowerment, accountability
- Gender mainstreaming imbedded at all stages of a project, based on a complete gender analysis, and indicators to monitor
- Context based intervention strengthens innovativeness of the local experts
- Capacity building training should immediately be followed by practical intervention





Case study 2

Senegal Case study: Agricultural Value Chains Resilience Support Project (PARFA)



Overall Objective: Contribute to improve smallholder agriculture and food value chains through prioritising the safeguarding and maintenance of ecosystem services.



Development objective: improve the food security of smallholders as well as their resilience to environmental degradation and climate variability.

The project comprised **three components**:

- Support for multi-stakeholder platforms.
- Scaling up sustainable and resilient good practices.
- Monitoring and evaluation of the environmental impact and results of the Project.



Resilience measures



La perte de fertilité des sols est le principal problème cité par la majorité des ménages dans la zone d'intervention du projet RFS.

Les interventions du projet :

- La réhabilitation des terres dégradées et des mangroves,
- la fourniture d'un soutien technique aux chaînes de valeur
- la gestion des ressources en eau
- Systèmes de compostage au biogaz pour favoriser la santé des sols et réduire la pression sur la biomasse.



Loss of soil fertility was the main problem cited by the majority of households in the RFS project intervention zone.

Project's interventions have included:

- *Rehabilitation of degraded land and mangroves,*
- *Providing technical support for value chains*
- *Water resource management*
- *Biogas compost systems to support healthy soils and alleviate the pressure on biomass.*



Achievements | Réussites

Gestion durable de l'eau :

Aménagement de mares et de vallées:

- ❑ Travaux d'aménagement de **03** mares sur un objectif de **10 000 m3**
- ❑ Aménagement de **301 ha** de vallées
- ❑ **300 ha** de terres protégées par la Construstruction/Réhabilitation digues anti sel

Gestion durable des terres

Travaux CES/DRS:

- ❑ **650 ha** de terres exondées traitées sur **800 ha**
- ❑ **30 km** de cordons pour un objectif de **37,5 km**
- ❑ **324** diguettes en cadre pour un objectif de **404** diguettes
- ❑ **9049** plants reboisés sur un objectif de **11 000** le long des berges des vallées


Aménagement de mangrove:

- ✓ **250 ha** de mangroves reboisés et ou régénérés
- ✓ **400 ha** de mangrove conservée par l'installation de **680** ruches installées
- ✓ **100 ha** de mangrove conservée par l'installation de **35 km** de guirlande
- ✓ Pour la séquestré: **6 t /ha CO2 /an**


promotion des énergies renouvelables

- ❖ **10** bio digesteurs installés pour éviter **250,27 t CO2/an.**
- ❖ **12** systèmes de pompages solaires installés pour éviter : **43,04 t CO2/an.**
- ❖ **20** unités de transformation installés pour la réduction de : **73,53 t CO2/an.**

- Les communautés **se sont réinstallées** dans des zones autrefois très dégradées.
- La **recolonisation des terres agricoles abandonnées** en raison de l'érosion des ravines a **réduit l'exode rural** des jeunes.
- Des **centres de production de riz émergent**, en particulier à Djilass et dans les zones environnantes.
- Mise en place d'un **système de suivi et d'évaluation des terres** avec le soutien du Centre de surveillance écologique.
- Communities have **re-settled in once highly-degraded areas**
- **Re-colonisation** of abandoned farmland due to erosion in gullies **has reduced youth rural-urban migration**
- Emerging **rice production centres**, particularly in Djilass and surrounding areas.
- Establishment of **land M&E system** with the support of the Ecological Monitoring Centre



- Kaolack a enregistré une productivité positive de 0,8 %.
- Toutes les régions, à l'exception de Diourbel (-3,8 %, soit une perte d'arbres de 168 ha), ont enregistré **une augmentation positive du couvert végétal** (de 2,5 % à 37,7%).
- Toutes les régions, à l'exception de Kaffrine et de Fatick, ont enregistré un **déclin des prairies**, Laouga affichant le déclin le plus important avec 12,2 % (=43 021 ha).
- Les **terres agricoles dans les cinq sites du projet ont diminué** entre 2018 et 2022, Lounga affichant la plus forte perte de 3,3 % (=34 007 ha).



- Kaolack recorded a positive productivity of 0.8%.
- All regions except Diourbel (-3.8% translating to tree loss of 168 ha) recorded **positive tree cover increments** (2.5% to 37.7%)
- All the regions except Kaffrine and Fatick, recorded **declining grassland**, Laouga showing the highest decline at 12.2% (=43,021ha).
- **Land under agriculture in all the five project sites declined** between 2018 and 2022 with Lounga showing the highest loss of 3.3% (=34,007 ha).



Achievements Summary

Following GEF guidelines, this project falls under five of the six areas of GEF additionality:

- Specific environmental additionality
- Institutional additionality/Governance additionality
- Socio-economic additionality
- Innovation additionality

Impact on RFS program

This project contributed to the overall goals of the program in the following ways:

- It delivered important global benefits, including:
 - carbon sequestration and reduced emissions due to solar pumping bio-methanisation, and to reforested areas
 - Biodiversity conservation in the project areas
- It strengthened institutions
- It improved livelihoods



Challenges

- No details on how project quantified resilient food security in project implementation areas (not presented in end-of-project reports).
- No spatially explicit layers for project implementation sites.
- End of project data not collected.

Program - level lessons learnt

- Only practical implementation on the ground reveals the true value of an intervention.
- PARFA's success attributable to:
 - Close to 5,000 households improving livelihoods
 - Exceeding the expected targets in CO₂e emissions reduction, despite delays and project management shortcomings (complex design and complicated project implementation arrangements.).
- Consider simplifying implementation routine of GEF grants and making them more straightforward than the PARFA experience.





Case study 3

Building and strengthening resilience in Burundi



Overall Objective: Address main drivers of environmental degradation and improve agricultural productivity of smallholder farmers



Specific objectives:

1. Increase the area under sustainable land management/ integrated natural resource management
2. Increase and diversify improved and resilient production systems
3. Promote sustainable food value chains

Project interventions:

- IntegraMulti-stakeholder and multi-scale operational platforms
- Development of producers group and sustainable food value chains
- Creation of 134 FFS, including 3800 Farmers

Resilience assessment:

1. SHARP+ (FAO tool)
2. CI methodology - resilience assessment



SHARP+

SHARP+ tool used as a baseline (2016) and endline assessment (2023)

- Holistic assessment to gather information at the household level on:
 - Profiling of livelihoods
 - Resilience
- Customizable digital survey, based on a module approach
- Automatic calculation of resilience numerical score, based on 13 agro-ecosystem indicators (Cabell & Oleofse, 2013)


Approach used to:

- Measure degree of resilience of target population
- Identify key vulnerabilities to target project activities
- Monitor changes in resilience scores across time

SHARP+ results (1/3)

Identifying the main barriers to resilience (baseline):

- Livestock sector
- Trees (on farm land and surrounding forest)
- Group membership and participation
- Household's income



SHARP+ results (2/3)

Target project activities:

- Agroforestry and forestry
- New income generating activities
- Promotion of specific agricultural practices
- Water management
- Structuring FFS into cooperatives



SHARP+ results (3/3)


Monitoring resilience


Strong increase in
resilience levels for
almost all studied
aspects (17/23
modules)

→ Average increase: + 2.86


Aspects with a decrease of
resilience:

- Access to information
- Decision-making
- Main production assets





Land Productivity



- Significant changes in land productivity for Gitega and Muramvya project sites, 32% and 22% increase.
- No changes in land productivity for Mwaro
- All regions lost tree covered areas, land under agriculture as well as grassland (no change on grassland for Muramvya)

Challenges and lessons learnt

Case study level

Implementation of CI methodology: Limitation due to lack of spatial data to indicate full extent of project interventions

- Increase information flow

Difficulty in **linking project activities with increase in resilience**

- Need control population in sampling
- Discussion of results in focus groups

Program - level

Strong interest from countries in using SHARP+ but little implementation as an end-line study

- Data collection plan



Lessons learnt to further the integrated approach

AT DESIGN

1. Available tools must be well explained and presented => countries must be supported in **choosing the most appropriate tools** from the start.
2. Regional partners should take countries through their tools and identify **potential areas of synergies** with other tools and **entry points** for each tool and **when** a tool can **inform the project's orientations**.
3. Offer countries **technical backstopping** throughout their journey in implementing, monitoring, and assessing their project interventions => work with a **technical focal point at project level**, who is assigned the responsibility of managing the use of tools and knowledge updates within the country project.

Lessons learnt to further the integrated approach

4. Ensure **different levels of assessment & high linkages** between approaches and tools
5. Develop a **data collection plan**
6. Conduct **regular reviews**
7. Conduct **context-specific assessments**
8. Increase information flows between project and regional levels, with a **robust engagement system**
9. **Engage stakeholders**
10. Ensure **high quality data**
11. Use **technology for data collection and monitoring**
12. Use **statistical analysis techniques**
13. Develop a **continuous learning, regularly reviewing monitoring & assessment system**
14. Through a collective process, select a **small number of common, flagship cross-programme indicators** to which all projects are required to contribute.

Contributors

- **Sirine Johnston** (FAO), sirine.johnston@fao.org
- **Monica Noon** (CI), mnoon@conservation.org
- **Alex Zvoleff** (CI), azvoleff@conservation.org
- **Tom Kiptenai** (CI), tkiptenai-kemboi@conservation.org
- **Birara Chekol** (UNDP-Ethiopia), birara.chekol@undp.org
- **Sasha Mentz** (CIFOR-ICRAF), sasha@nicheunity.com
- **Assanne Gueye** (PARFA), gueyeass92@gmail.com



Energizer

Let's play "My superpower"



- The facilitator will throw an object at you
- When catching it – reveal what your super power is
- Throw to the person whose superpowers you want revealed



5 MINUTES

- L'animateur vous lance un objet
- En l'attrapant, révélez quel est votre superpouvoir.
- Lancez l'objet à la personne dont vous voulez révéler les superpouvoirs



TRACK



SESSION 6

Innovation in ecosystem
services assessment

*Innovations dans la mesure
des services écosystémiques*

Content & Presenters



Facilitated by **Sasha Mentz** and **Leigh Winowiecki** (CIFOR-ICRAF)

Case study 1: **Paola De Santis**, Alliance of Bioversity International and CIAT:

The Diversity Assessment Tool for Agrobiodiversity and Resilience to increase biodiversity in farming systems for enhanced resilience against shocks


Case study 2: **John Gathagu** (Upper Tana Water Fund, Kenya): Making a business case for land and water conservation in Kenya

Case study 3: **Bhekisisa Elvis Mkhonta** (Project Coordinator: Eswatini): Sustaining a land restoration monitoring framework, the experience of Eswatini with the Land Degradation Surveillance Framework.

Case study 1



www.datar-par.org



Diversity Assessment Tool for Agrobiodiversity and Resilience

- **Development and release of the DATAR**, a free open-source software platform that allows the integration of diverse crop varieties, livestock breeds, and aquatic farmed-types into decision-making plans through
- **Web Interface**
- **Web Portal**
- **Android App**





METHODOLOGY DATAR



A decision-making tool to link on farm diversity, management practices, market, and policies to plant goals, identifying constraints and provide a portfolio of interventions.

- Heuristic framework for goal setting, assessment of diversity, identification of constraints, and portfolio of interventions
- DATAR training material and guidelines available in 5 languages
- DATAR Web Portal and App Training for trainers, enumerators and data collection test conducted in 5 countries (Malawi, Burundi, Uganda, Ethiopia, and Tanzania)
- Development of an M&E component aligned with Biodiversity GEF tracking tools and indicators

Key elements of a functional production system



Selecting GOALS Project and Community levels

DATAR Database

Crop Livestock Aquaculture Genetic Providers Local Networks Policy & Institutions Countries

Crop

List Descriptors Management Market Descriptors Goals Constraint Tree Interventions

Goal






- GOAL 1 - Improve productivity under a particular environmental condition (Adaptive Traits)
- GOAL 2 - Diversity portfolios to manage risk from changing environmental/economic conditions (Diversity "per se")
- GOAL 3 - Respond to social, cultural, nutritional needs, consumer demand, market demand, demand for natural and safe products (Adaptive traits)
- GOAL 4 - Lower labour drudgery and reduce migration
- GOAL 5 - Gender and social equity, food sovereignty and cultural heritage
- GOAL 6 - Reduce pollution and environmental damage, landscape restoration and mitigate and climate change
- GOAL 7 - Conservation of globally significant biodiversity for food and agriculture

SubGoal

- Enough diversity for unpredictable precipitation (early, mid, late)
- Enough diversity for unpredictable Temperatures
- Enough diversity to reduced damage from changes in pests and pathogens (including arthropods, birds, mammals)
- Enough diversity for heterogeneous soils
- Enough diversity for diverse harvest times (meet early, mid, late markets; labor availability)
- Enough diversity for increased diet diversity


SubGoal

- Support cultural or medicinal use (rituals, ceremonies)
- Consumer demand (taste, color, ect.)
- Reduced time and inputs for food preparation
- Improved Nutrition
- Better Market Price
- Better Market access/ Transportation/ storage
- Safe Food (without chemicals)





Data Collection - surveys


1:12 PM 71%

←  **TEST: TRAINING UGANDA MAY2022 CROP**
SITE TWO - PROVINCE B - Lake Albert Crescent


Focus Group Discussion (FGD)



 DATA INPUT

 OUTPUT TABLES


House Hold Survey (HHS)





 DATA INPUT

 OUTPUT TABLES

Key Informant Survey (KIS)





 DATA INPUT

 OUTPUT TABLES

Validation & Decision Making (VDM)



 DATA INPUT

 OUTPUT TABLES

Project Database and mapping (on Web Portal)

Period in Agrobiodiversity assessment in nine d ...



1 First period of data collection [Back to Project](#)

From: 25 May 2022

To: 10 Sep 2024

[Raw Data Download](#) [Data Cleaning](#) [Cleaned Data Download](#) [Data Analysis](#) [Diversity Table](#) [Goals](#) [Constraints](#) [Interventions](#)

Available Files **65**

Filter

Management practices and Diversity choices at community level



Management practices and Diversity choices at community level

DOWNLOAD

File Name: 1TZ7M-TBI-FGD_OT3_Management_2022-05-25_2024-09-09.xlsx

Generated by: User DATAR on 12/30/22, 1:25 PM

All Output Tables All Surveys of the project



All Output Tables from all surveys (FGD, HHS and KII) of the project

DOWNLOAD

File Name: 1TZ7M-TBI-Project_OutputTables_All_Surveys_2022-05-25_2024-09-09.xlsx

Generated by: Dorothy Apiny on 11/16/22, 1:07 PM

List of participants to all the FGD of the project



Full list of participants to all FGD of the project

DOWNLOAD

File Name: 1TZ7M-TBI-FGD_Participants_2022-05-25_2024-09-09.xlsx

Generated by: Emmanuel KORIANG on 11/13/22, 4:11 PM

Goals and subgoals selected

Request new File

Filter

General **3**

Focus Group Discussion **16**

House Hold Survey **12**

Project in Uganda




Agrobiodiversity assessment in nine d ...


Site Manager | Share Project ID: 1TZ7M-TBI

Common Bean , Maize, Groundnut / Peanut, Cassava, Finger millet, Pearl millet, Banana, Sweet Potato


[Sites](#) [Project Level Surveys](#) [Users](#) [Periods of Data Collection](#) [Data Download](#) [Variety Cleaning](#) [Monitoring & Evaluation](#) [Map](#)



Project and Site Level DATA analysis



App interface



Web Portal interface

Identifying Constraints and action/intervention to better use agrobiodiversity to achieve goals

Constraints


3:17 TEST: TRAINING TANZANIA OCT 2022 CROP
NEW SITE - PROVINCE - Central Plateaux (Plains)

Local crop genetic diversity does not exist or is not in sufficient quantities within the production system

Local crop genetic diversity exists but is not accessible to farmers

Local crop genetic diversity exists, is accessible to farmers but farmers do not value and use local crop genetic resources

Local crop genetic diversity exists, is accessible to farmers but farmers do not benefit from the use local crop genetic diversity




Actions and interventions

3:18 TEST: TRAINING TANZANIA OCT 2022 CROP
NEW SITE - PROVINCE - Central Plateaux (Plains)

Improving availability of materials	Improving information and availability of information	Improving traditional variety materials and their management	Improved Processing	Alternatives and modification to seed certification systems
<input type="checkbox"/> Reintroduction of materials from ex situ collections <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reintroduction of materials from similar environments <input type="checkbox"/> Seed Cooperative for collection, distribution and multiplication of seeds <input type="checkbox"/> Community Seed Bank <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community Gene bank <input type="checkbox"/> Community managed nurseries <input type="checkbox"/> Diversity Field Fora (DFF) & Diversity Field School (DFS) <input type="checkbox"/> Diversity Kit	<input type="checkbox"/> On-farm Diversity blocks <input type="checkbox"/> Field or Laboratory trials comparing traditional and modern varieties <input type="checkbox"/> Community Biodiversity Registries <input type="checkbox"/> Literacy training, particularly for poor and vulnerable groups <input type="checkbox"/> Variety information data bases made in farmer friendly formats <input type="checkbox"/> Setting up information systems and internet connections for farmer access to information <input type="checkbox"/> Small weather stations that can be linked to	<input type="checkbox"/> Participatory crop improvement (Grassroots breeding; Participatory Plant Breeding; Participatory Varietal Selection, Evolutionary breeding) <input type="checkbox"/> Using genomics to improve in situ crop populations <input type="checkbox"/> Changing the formal breeding institutions to increase the use of farmer selection materials and traditional varieties in their programs <input type="checkbox"/> Planting of intra-specific mixtures to reduce pests and diseases <input type="checkbox"/> Improve seed storage facilities and methods	<input type="checkbox"/> Shift retailers to use different processing equipment that can use diversified materials <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Training of producers in improved processing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plant varieties common knowledge (VCK) <input type="checkbox"/> Registration and release of farmers' varieties with acceptance of enhanced bulk varieties <input type="checkbox"/> Geographic Indications <input type="checkbox"/> Quality declared seed (QDS) - that certify the vendor rather than the seed <input type="checkbox"/> Truthfully labeled seed <input type="checkbox"/> Laws that focus on seed quality rather than seed purity <input type="checkbox"/> Registries of native crops

Monitoring and Evaluation

Diversity Benefits, Development Benefits, Impact of Interventions



M&E - IMPACT of Interventions:

- Number of direct beneficiaries (gender/age)
- Number of indirect beneficiaries (gender/age)
- Area Covered (HA)

Challenges



Global tool

- Multi-country and multi-purpose tool

Interaction with multidisciplinary stakeholders

- Understanding of the agrobiodiversity context

COVID

- Delay and rethinking activities
- Online trainings
- Interactions with national Partners

Programme level lessons learnt to advance the integrated approach

- **Interactive development of the tool** allowed continuous improvement and adaptation thanks to feedbacks and testing
- Use of **local and non-scientific language** during data collection
- Setting the **context**
 - explain the key **role agrobiodiversity** can play (evolution/adaptation, ecosystem services, substitute for input, risk management, food sovereignty)
- **Women** in Decision making roles





THANK YOU

Contributor

Paola De Santis, p.desantis@cgiar.org

Devra Jarvis, d.jarvis@agrobiodiversitypar.org
d.jarvis@raffaellafoundation.org

Agnes Fonteneau,
a.fonteneau@agrobiodiversitypar.org




Case study 2

Making a business case for land and water conservation in Kenya




- First water fund in Africa – fully independent
- Science-led approaches to determine investment levels
- Demonstrated that investments in SLM can bring benefits to all, including investors
- Leveraged investments from public and private sector partners into the rehabilitation of the Tana River





Achievements

- Establishment of a fully operational MSP that brings farmers into the PPP space = 4P
- Increased water levels and decreased turbidity – (16% reduction in turbidity. 39 million liters per day more water in the NCWSC reservoir).
- 196,000 acres of land put under SLM; 318 km of riparian areasx conserved.
- Provided extension services to farmers in remote areas > 140,000 farmers.
- Improved well-being of communities – MPAT score 6%.



- 15 Water Funds established
- 70% led by partners
- 55% under implementation

Challenges



- Demonstrating the value of investing in SLM and water conservation to garner support from the private sector before results were available
- Climate change and natural phenomena - .e.g. landslides
- Data collection tools – standardization with multiple implementing partners

Programme level lessons learnt

- Engage farmers prior to implementation to streamline their needs, barriers, and objectives into project plans
- Use decision support tools and capacitate farmers, policymakers, regulators, implementing partners, and research institutions on their use
- Scale outreach through technology and partnerships including MSPs
- Include policy-specific activity planning in the project work plan
- Foster strong partnerships at multiple scales to encourage ownership and sustainability past the life of the project





THANK YOU

Contributor

John Gathagu

john.gathagu@nairobiwaterfund.org

Anthony Kariuki

anhtony.Kariuki@nairobiwaterfund.org




Case study 3

Implementing the Land Degradation Surveillance Framework (LDSF) in Eswatini



- Establish a robust biophysical baseline of soil and land health indicators
- Identify target areas for intervention to reverse land degradation that are location and context-specific.
- 13 sites located in 4 regions were sampled as LDSF sites to represent the relevant features of the country.



Achievements

- 11 of 13 sites have been analyzed
- 18/20 Different thematic maps have been produced
- Dashboard has been developed
- In service trainings with relevant stakeholders on the development of the LDSF Dashboard
 - Most recent training on data analysis was **23-26 May 2023**
- Land degradation hotspots identified
- Effective stakeholder collaboration: <https://www.worldagroforestry.org/blog/2020/11/25/people-healthy-soils-and-ecosystems-africa>



Achievements: Maps of Tree Cover and Soil Erosion Prevalence at 30-meter Resolution




Figure 8: Map of tree cover for Eswatini (2020-2021).




Figure 9: Map of soil erosion prevalence in Eswatini (2020-2021).

Challenges




- No laboratories to analyze the soil samples locally
- Shipping soil samples to Kenya become expensive both financially and with time
- Some plots were located on privately owned land => shortfall in some clusters because permission was not granted to sample those plots
- No clear financial commitment from Government to maintain the framework

Programme level lessons learnt to advance the integrated approach

- A strong political cannot be overemphasized
- Building capacity on robust, non-biased monitoring techniques is critical
- Building capacity for country based Government soil laboratories in analysing soil data is also essential
- Continuous training for stakeholders at all levels and stages
- Engaging with stakeholders to link efforts across sectors (climate change, agriculture, restoration, biodiversity) is key for sustainability:

<https://www.worldagroforestry.org/output/southern-africa-regional-stakeholder-engagement-co-design-workshop>





THANK YOU

Contributor

Bhekisisa Mkhonta

bhekisisam@eswade.co.sz

COFFEE BREAK





SESSION 7

Capitalising on best practices in SLM from the field

Capitaliser sur les meilleures pratiques de GDT sur le terrain

Content & Presenters



Facilitated by **Sasha Mentz**

Case study 1: Soumaila Abdoullaye (Coordinateur de projet, Niger) :
Stopping desert advancement through sustainable family farming in Niger |
Freiner l'avancement du désert par l'agriculture familiale durable au Niger.

Case study 2: Joseph Kihaule, Kihaule, (Project Coordinator: Tanzania):
Lessons learned from participatory land use planning in Tanzania | *Leçons
tirées de la planification participative de l'utilisation des terres en Tanzanie*



Stopper l'avancée du désert grâce à l'agriculture familiale durable au Niger

- Le RFS (Niger) fait partie intégrante du Programme de Développement de l'Agriculture Familiale ProDAF qui est financée par le FIDA et ses Partenaires (FEM, ASAP, OFID, ACEAD et la coopération Espagnole) (8 ans).
- Il s'attaque aux causes structurantes de la vulnérabilité définies dans **le Plan de Développement Economique et son social (PDES)** et la stratégie de l'Initiative 3 N "les Nigériens nourrissent les Nigériens".



Stopper l'avancée du désert grâce à l'agriculture familiale durable au Niger

- Programme mis en œuvre dans les régions de Maradi, Tahoua et Zinder, qui sont particulièrement vulnérables à la désertification et où les besoins alimentaires et nutritionnels sont extrêmement fragiles.
- Sur les 3 priorités définies par l'Etat:
 1. La gestion durables des Terres et des eaux,
 2. Les ouvrages de mobilisations des eaux pour l'irrigation
 3. La maison du paysan . Approche de faire faire , Pole de développement économique avec la prise en compte du genre et des jeunes

Forte ingénierie sociales avec
l'ensembles des acteurs pour assoir les
bases de durabilités des interventions
suivi d'ingénierie civile et la durabilités
des intervention





L'augmentation des superficies cultivables et pâturables pour booster la production et/ou la productivité agro pastorales des sites traités, en plus des multiples emplois créés au profit des jeunes ruraux, enclins à l'exode saisonnier.

Principales réalisations dans le cadre de la GDTE

349 centres d'alphabétisation bénéficiant à 8 685 apprenants sur une prévision de 352 (53 % de femmes, 51 % de jeunes) ;

188 234 ha mis sous Régénération Naturelle Assistée soit une réalisation de 96%

27 063 Ha traités soit 120% de la cibles,
5 910 122 plants plantés (Acacia, Bauhimia, Balanités, Zizuphis)

611 729 emplois temporaire créés

2,2milliaires de FCFA distribués aux ménages vulnérables

un taux de biomasse additionnel de 75,60%

été enregistré par rapport au témoin en fin 2017 (Rapport étude sur la situation de référence des indicateurs biophysiques ; CNSEE 2017).

Sub activities Sous Activités	Units Unité	Global targets Cibles Globales	Cumulated results Cumul Cibles atteintes au 20/11/2022	cumulated ratios 2022 Taux cumulé PTBA 2022
Récupération des terres dégradées en amont des bassins versants rehabilitation of land upstream	Ha	10 065	14 530	144%
Traitement des bassins versants contre l'érosion et le ruissellement rehabilitation of watersheds against erosion	Ha	6 474	5 928	92%
Fixation des dunes (mares et cuvettes) dune fixation	Ha	1 466	2 263	154%
Confection de Haies vives Living hedges	Ha	524	503	96%
Aménagements des couloirs de passage et espaces sylvopastoraux sylvapastoral corridors	Ha	3 989	3 837	96%

Observations

- On note **des variations de rendements agricoles** qui de 112kg/ha à 886 kg/ha (site de Dan Gueza)
- Site de Mainari: rendement de la biomasse herbacée est de **50kg/ha à 2140 kg/ha** de matière sèche
- Sur le plan économique, des ressources importantes injectées par le ProDAF/MTZ sous forme de **cash for asset** ont permis aux communautés bénéficiaires d'investir les montants perçus les dépenses des ménages.
 - Une étude réalisée par le projet a montré qu'au moins 80% des montants reçus ont servi aux dépenses alimentaires des ménages.
 - Les gains permettraient d'assurer une **couverture alimentaire supplémentaire de 2 mois** pour plus de 60 000 ménages selon le rapport de l'évaluation de la situation nutritionnelle INS/Niger, 2018 qui estimait le seuil de sécurité alimentaire à de 539 470 FCFA par ménage.
 - Dans le même ordre d'idée, on note la création des emplois temporaires dans les régions d'intervention du programme au niveau des villages bénéficiaires de ces activités

Défis



- Benevolat dans le gardiennages des sites traités
- Mise en place des comités de gestions des sites traités et la forte implication des communes pour la pérensation des acquis.
- Validation par les acteurs des plans de gestions des sites traités pour les maintenir

Enseignements tirés au niveau du programme pour faire progresser l'approche intégrée

- Le partage et l'échange de connaissances sur les pratiques de gestion durable des terres sont essentiels pour étendre les interventions à d'autres régions.
- Le régime foncier et ses implications doivent être pris en compte lors de la détermination des zones d'intervention.
- Les principales parties prenantes doivent être impliquées dans chaque phase du cycle de vie du projet.
- L'action coordonnée d'un large éventail de parties prenantes permet une gestion efficace des terres et de l'eau et contribue à la durabilité des résultats du projet.
- Le soutien aux activités agricoles peut réduire la vulnérabilité des ménages pendant qu'ils mettent en œuvre des interventions de gestion durable des terres et de l'eau.
- Impliquer les acteurs du secteur public dès le début du projet et intégrer les processus et les objectifs du projet

MERCI

Abdoullaye Soumaila

Coordonnateur régional
ProDAF-Maradi

Abdoullaye.soumaila@proda
f.net





Case study 2

Lessons learned from participatory land use planning in Tanzania



Provide for procedures for the administration, management and enforcement of land use plans



Objectives

- To facilitate efficient and orderly management of land use
- To empower landholders and users to make better and more productive use of their land
- To promote sustainable land use practices;
- To ensure security and equity in access to land resources; and
- To facilitate the establishment of a framework for the prevention of land use conflicts.

LAND USE PLAN FOR LYAMALAGWA VILLAGE IN SIGILI WARD, NZEGA DISTRICT, TABORA REGION (2019 -2029)

Prepared by:



National Land Use Planning Commission
P.O. Box 76550
DAR ES SALAAM
Tel : +255-022-2115573
FAX+255-022-2128057



Nzega District Council
P.O. Box 4, NZEGA.
Tel: +255 26 269 2349
Email : md@nzegadc.go.tz
Website : www.nzegadc.go.tz

Supported by United Republic of Tanzania, International Fund for Agriculture Development (IFAD) and Global Environment Facility (GEF)

Prepared by:
Lyamalagwa Village Council
P.O. Box. 4,

Achievements



- Five District Participatory Land Use Management teams established.
- A total 23 Villages/Shehias Natural Resources Management Committees established and a total of 3,870 hectares of forest restored.
- A total 8 Inter-village Natural Resources Management Committees established.
- A total of 23 Village/Shehias Land Use Planning Committees and five Joint Land Use Planning Committees (JVLUPC) in all project villages established.
- A total of 35 District Participatory Land Use Management team members trained in facilitating village/shehia land use planning.
- A total of 23 villages/shehias Land Use Plans and by- laws prepared.
- A total of 2,653 Certificate of Customary Right of Occupancy (CCRO) issued.

Challenges



- Dispute of boundaries between district and district or village/shehia and village/shehia
- Dispute of boundaries between resources users such as pastoralists and farmers
- Unregistered villages
- Identification and priorities for Community Action Plans

Programme level lessons learnt

- Village/shehia land-use plans are implemented and, since they are created by the village communities themselves, reflect their needs and are better adapted to local conditions
- Land disputes are minimized and the interests of the various stakeholders (men, women, youth, crop producers, pastoralists, etc.) are likely to be balanced and respected, since the plans have been created through dialogue;
- Land productivity will increase and benefit the various stakeholders since the plans reflect the stakeholder's interests and are really implemented.





THANK YOU

Joseph Philip Kihaule

joseph.kihaule@vpo.go,tz or
kihaulej@gmail.com



SESSION 8

Knowledge management and learning across RFS

Gestion des connaissances et
apprentissage dans l'ensemble
du programme RFS



Content & Presenter

Facilitated by Sasha Mentz

Case study: Hannah North, communication officer |
Responsable de la communication (CIFOR – ICRAF)

COMPONENT 4






PROGRAMMATIC IMPACT, VISIBILITY AND COHERENCE

Coordination,
reporting
and general
management
functions across
RFS projects for
programmatic
impact, visibility
and coherence


4. ICRAF



Background on Knowledge management and learning across RFS







Knowledge Products


RFS produces, translates and disseminates knowledge products through our communications channels

- Website
- Knowledge Centre
- Social Media (Twitter and Facebook)
- Monthly newsletter
- Events and outreach (including Workshops)
- Partner engagement


Achievements

As of 30th May 2023, RFS has generated and shared:

- 137 news stories on the main website
- 228 resources on the Knowledge Centre
- 693 Twitter posts (original, retweets and shares)
- Four annual reports (2018/19, 2020, 2021, 2022)
- 41 monthly newsletters (by programme end)



Challenges




- Engagement from national stakeholders
- Timely translations
- K&L indicators

Programme level lessons learnt



- Be consistent and proactive with translations
- Incorporate indicators for K&L as part of the programme framework
- Sensitize national stakeholders on the importance of knowledge management
- Go deeper into details of knowledge management in the programme design



Designing a Coordinated Knowledge Platform

- Key ingredients of an effective knowledge platform:
- Clear tags and categories that help users quickly find the materials they need
- Concentrated pages relating to major programmatic components
- A sustainability plan for the platform and its resources after the programme ends



Resource Library

The Resource Library contains useful reports, briefs, case studies, media, tools and guidelines generated by the 12 country projects and Regional Hub, as well as external resources relevant to the programme activities and cross-cutting themes.

Use the filters below to explore all resources related to various projects and themes, as per different document types. Use keywords to search for resources related to a specific country or topic

 Search the Resource Library for keywords, project themes, countries, outputs, etc.

Search

FILTER

Project Themes



Document Types



Projects




RFS Resources ☐ External Resources ☐

Achievements

Challenges

Lack of indicators on how knowledge products are taken up



Programme level lessons learnt



- Monitor and facilitate uptake of knowledge products
- Incorporate indicators for K&L as part of the programme framework

Facilitating South-South learning



- The structure of the annual RFS workshops has evolved from a top down to bottom up approach to learning, based on feedback from programme stakeholders and the adoption of the SHARED approach.
- Facilitating knowledge exchange through the SHARED Learning Labs have formed the basis of recent workshops and garnered positive feedback.



Resilient Food Systems

2022 Workshop Report

20-23 September 2022, Blantyre, Malawi

Achievements

- 6 programme-wide South-South learning exchanges!
- 2017 Ethiopia
- 2018 Kenya
- 2019 Ghana
- 2021 virtual format
- 2022 Malawi
- 2023 Kenya

Challenges



GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
INVESTING IN OUR PLANET



IFAD
Investing in rural people



Facilitating knowledge exchange through 'Learning Labs'



Guidance note

Produced by:



SHARED
The Decision Hub

Adopting the workshop structure based on feedback from stakeholders



Programme level lessons learnt

- Adopt a bottom-up approach to shared learning
- Be consistent and proactive with translations

Lessons learnt to further the integrated approach

- Invest time and resources into Knowledge Management!
- Be adaptive
- Prioritize translations



Questions for Country Project Teams

1. Can you share your experience working with the Hub? | *Pouvez-vous nous faire part de votre expérience de travail avec le Hub?*
2. How has the integrated Knowledge Management approach assisted you with your communications work? | *De quelle manière l'approche intégrée de la gestion des connaissances vous a-t-elle aidé dans votre travail de communication ?*
3. What would you do differently in future IAPs? | *Que feriez-vous différemment lors des prochaines approches intégrées?*



THANK YOU

Hanna North

h.north@cgiar.org

Wrap up



Briefing on field trips and sign-ups Briefing sur la visite de terrain et inscriptions



John Gathagu
Upper Tana Nairobi Water Fund

07.30 departure

Consultative Committee Meeting

Please share your views on what has worked well in the RFS, what was challenging and should be improved in future programmes / **Quelle est votre opinion de ce qui a bien fonctionné et de ce qui a été un défi et être amélioré**

Please share your recommendations for the long-term sustainability of RFS achievements / **Vos recommandations sur la durabilité à long terme des réalisations du RFS**

SEE YOU FOR COCKTAILS AT 18.00!

