

Darwin Initiative for the Survival of Species

Annual Report

1. Darwin Project Information

Project title	<i>Options for supporting on-farm conservation in Eastern and Southern Africa</i>
Country(ies)	<i>Ethiopia, Kenya, Zambia, Zimbabwe</i>
Contractor	<i>Overseas Development Institute</i>
Project Reference No.	<i>162/11/001</i>
Grant Value	<i>£181,830</i>
Start/Finishing dates	<i>April 2002 – March 2004</i>
Reporting period	<i>1 April 2002 – 31 March 2003</i>

2. Project Background

- Briefly describe the location and circumstances of the project and the problem that the project aims to tackle.

All CBD signatories are mandated to implement on-farm conservation of agricultural biodiversity under Article 8. The Conference of the Parties recognises there is a lack of concrete information on how to do this, so has passed a number of Decisions requesting Programmes of Work to fill the gap, which are currently on-going. This project contributes to the Programmes of Work requested in Decision III/11 and V/5 on agricultural biodiversity, Decision V/15 on legal and economic incentive measures for biodiversity conservation, Decision V/17 on education and public awareness, and Decision V/16 on traditional knowledge. It does so by assessing the potential for scaling up different kinds of grass-roots projects for on-farm conservation of agricultural biodiversity in Eastern and Southern Africa, using case studies in Ethiopia, Kenya, Zambia and Zimbabwe involving a consortium of ten regional and international organisations.

3. Project Objectives

- State the purpose and objectives (or purpose and outputs) of the project. Please include the Logical Framework for this project (as an appendix) if this formed part of the original proposal or has been developed since, and report against this.

Logical framework included at Appendix 1 below.

Purpose:

Potential assessed for scaling-up different kinds of grass-roots projects for on-farm conservation of agricultural biodiversity in Eastern & Southern Africa

Outputs:

1. Project consortium trained in agricultural biodiversity assessment, economic/policy context of on-farm conservation, participatory field approaches
2. Multi-media outputs documenting potential for scaling-up different kinds of on-farm conservation projects in region.

- Have the objectives or proposed operational plan been modified over the last year and have these changes been approved by the Darwin Secretariat?

Neither the objectives nor the proposed operational plan has been significantly modified over the last year.

Minor points:

1. Regional coordination: Following staff changes it was not possible for ITDG (Zimbabwe) to take on the responsibility for regional coordination and instead this task was divided between the other consortium members (training and orientation workshop = SPGRC; data analysis in-week = EOSA; final conference = CABI).
2. Website: Following the success of the e-group (see Section 4 below) and mindful of the need to collate all outputs for burning onto the final CD-ROM, consortium members decided to make a project website. This was designed and uploaded at minimal cost using consortium skills and organisational back-up and is now operational at www.africanfarmdiversity.net.
3. Consortium members: It has not been possible for Department for Rural Development (Tanzania) to participate actively in the implementation of the project (thus meaning no sixth case study) although they have been consulted on overall project design; the Institute of Biodiversity Conservation & Research in Ethiopia has mandated Ethio-Organic Seed Action to participate in the project; and following the job change of one consortium member she now represents FAO (Zimbabwe) not DFID-Central Africa.

4. Progress

- Please provide a brief history of the project to the beginning of this reporting period. (1 para.)

(NB we assume you do mean “to the *beginning* [emphasis added] of this reporting period” ie to April 2002)

The need for this project was identified by participants at a workshop on incentive measures to enhance sustainable use and conservation of agrobiodiversity held in Lusaka in September 2001, hosted by the SADC Plant Genetic Resources Centre; interested participants formed this project consortium. The consortium consists of individuals and institutions involved in agricultural biodiversity conservation and use in the region, comprising: CABI (Kenya), FAO (Zimbabwe), Institute of Biodiversity Conservation & Research represented by Ethio-Organic Seed Action (Ethiopia), ICRISAT (Kenya), ITDG (Zimbabwe), Organic Producers and Processors Association (Zambia), Research Council of Zimbabwe (Registrar of Biosafety), and SADC Plant

Genetic Resources Centre, together with ODI and University of Reading Statistical Services Centre (SSC) from the UK. An e-group for consortium members was established to contribute to effective preparation of the project. This proved to be a very useful networking vehicle and is continuing throughout the project and beyond.

- Summarise progress over the last year against the agreed baseline timetable for the period. Explain differences including any slippage or additional outputs and activities.

In summary, progress has been as per agreed baseline timetable for 2002-03 (Section 13 of original Application for Grant). This is due to the commitment and hard work of all consortium members, which has been remarkable.

- Provide an account of the project's research, training, and/or technical work during the last year. This should include discussion on selection criteria for participants, research and training methodologies as well as results. Please **summarise** techniques and results and, if necessary, provide more detailed information in appendices (this may include cross-references to attached publications)

Training

Internal training and orientation workshop (5 days, June 2002, Lusaka)

For more on the training and orientation workshop, view www.africanfarmdiversity.net/Key_Events.html.

Selection criteria for participants: for consortium (9 people) resourced by ODI, SSC and SPGRC.

Subjects and methods: Covered agricultural biodiversity assessment, economic and policy context of on-farm conservation, participatory evaluation techniques, selection of case studies, piloting of field work method, development of project information strategy. Combination of formal PowerPoint based teaching sessions by resourcing institutions; share and discuss sessions based on Power Point presentations by consortium members; and a trial field day.

Results: consortium members equipped with the background knowledge and field tools necessary to implement successfully the participatory evaluations of the case study projects.

Research/technical work

See www.africanfarmdiversity.net for more on Case Studies, Methods, and results to date (these latter being namely Case Study summaries, draft Policy Issues and draft Best Practices)

Box 1: case studies

<i>Ethio-Organic Seed Action</i>	<i>Ethiopia</i>
<i>Integrated Pest & Production Management</i>	<i>Kenya</i>
<i>Ipongo Agricultural Development Project</i>	<i>Zambia</i>
<i>Organic Producers & Processors Association</i>	<i>Zambia</i>

<i>In-Situ Conservation Project</i>	<i>Zimbabwe</i>
<i>Southern Africa Unit for Local Resource Development</i>	<i>Zimbabwe</i>

Research methodologies

The focus of the project is on looking at the institutional conditions for success of grass roots support for on-farm conservation of agricultural biodiversity. “Success” is assessed using defined indicators that include biological as well as economic and institutional parameters.

The field research focussed on collecting the quantitative and qualitative information from all relevant stakeholders necessary to identify the institutional pre-conditions for success of the case study projects (the projects are listed in Box 1 above). This included information on:

- impact of project activities on agricultural biodiversity in project area;
- environmental, socio-cultural and policy context of project activities;
- conditions contributing to project success, and constraints, as perceived by primary stakeholders, triangulated by interviews with secondary stakeholders where possible

The field research involved different tiers. First, a number of relevant projects were selected during the training and orientation workshop as case studies, for detailed participatory field work involving all project stakeholders (farmers, staff, collaborating institutions) to learn lessons about pre-conditions for success. Cases (see Box 1 above) were chosen on the basis of key criteria relating to case study project focus, impact, length of operation, etc. Each case study project involved one week’s participatory field work. Field methods included quantitative (recorded in Debriefing Documents) and qualitative approaches (recorded in Diaries). Cameras were used to illustrate relevant experiences pictorially. The consortium members worked in pairs on each case study project, assisted by enumerators/field facilitators as necessary. There was overlap of consortium members between case study projects to provide consistency of approach to field work.

Preliminary basic sorting of the information contained in the Debriefing Documents, Diaries and distance interview files was carried out by individual project teams following a protocol agreed at the training and orientation workshop.

Relevant project team members then came together for a data analysis “in-week” to complete the analysis and draft initial outputs as a group activity, in order to capture overall lessons accurately and to incorporate illustrative detail. Coming together also enabled the consortium to be resourced by agricultural biodiversity technical advice, analytical advice, and economic and policy advice from appropriate experts.

The analysis used quantitative and qualitative techniques to identify conditions contributing to project successes and constraints and to assess the extent that these relate to underlying context, to particular types of support activity, or to internal project organization and management. The emphasis is on using a range of information sources as part of the analysis and to illustrate conclusions: quantitative, qualitative, verbal histories, photographs, etc.

Results

Basic results consist of Case Study reports, Best Practices, Policy Issues. Drafts are available under the relevant section of the project website www.africanfarmdiversity.net and will be finalised over the remaining project period.

- Discuss any significant difficulties encountered during the year.

No significant difficulties encountered during the year. On a minor point, the administration and coordination involved in implementing a project involving ten institutions in five countries took a substantial amount of staff time.

- Has the design of the project been enhanced over the last year, e.g. refining methods, indicators for measuring achievements, exit strategies?

The project was designed to allow the detailed development of project methods, including definition of indicators and field research protocols, to be undertaken as part of the initial training and orientation workshop using the experience and skills of all consortium members in a face-to-face situation. This was done in Lusaka in June 2002 and is reported on the project website.

The main unanticipated enhancement of the project has been the design and uploading of the website (see Section 3. above), which consortium members consider has significantly improved the accessibility of all types of project information to potential users internationally, regionally, and locally.

- Present a timetable (work plan) for the next reporting period.

Start	Finish	Activity	Lead responsibility
2003	2003		
April	August	Complete Information Products	All consortium members
April	August	Complete arrangements for	
		Final conference:	
		Funding	ODI
		Logistics	CABI
		Invitations	All consortium members
Sept		Final conference	All consortium members
Oct		CD-ROM distributed	ODI
		(to include conf outputs)	
Oct	Dec	Follow up with regional governments	Regional consortium members

5. Partnerships

- Describe collaboration between UK and host country partner(s) over the last year. Are there difficulties or unforeseen problems or advantages of these relationships?

Collaboration between UK and country partners has been highly successful, due to the complementary experience and skills, and high degree of commitment and hard work, of all consortium members.

Having a number of individuals involved with complementary experience and skills has been a significant advantage for the successful implementation of this project. As has their different institutional affiliations, which has generated a breadth of perspective in relation to identifying suitable information products, and also permitted considerable contribution of “in-kind” resources for eg website design and uploading, hosting the key project events, and local transport.

The minor disadvantage of a consortium involving a large number of individuals in a range of countries has been the high administrative and coordination workload. This was inadequately budgeted in the original grant application.

- Has the project been able to collaborate with similar projects in the host country or establish new links with / between local or international organisations involved in biodiversity conservation?

Yes, this was always a major planned feature of the project. It is being achieved through the range of contacts and networks of the consortium members.

6. Impact and Sustainability

- Discuss the profile of the project within the country and what efforts have been made during the year to promote the work. What evidence is there for increasing interest and capacity for biodiversity resulting from the project? Are satisfactory exit strategies for the project in place?

By involving individuals from ten different international and regional biodiversity organisations, including the regional coordinating institutions for plant genetic resources conservation (SPGRC), the project has had a head start in being able to maintain a good profile in each case study country and to a lesser extent in other countries in the region.

More formally, the project website provides easy access to all project information to any interested party internationally, regionally and locally. At each Key Event, the project has provided an opportunity for national stakeholders to meet the consortium and discuss the project (opening session of the training and orientation workshop; stakeholder feedback at the data analysis in-week). The project Information Strategy (see www.africanfarmdiversity.net section on Publications) includes plans for local newspaper articles and media interviews in each case study country as project results become available.

The main evidence for increasing interest and capacity for biodiversity resulting from the project will come after the final conference planned for September 2003. We are currently looking for funding for follow-up visits by consortium members to key government planning officials in each case study countries to discuss specifically how the points made at the final conference can be taken forward within the specific national agricultural and biodiversity conservation policy process.

These visits, couple with continued free access to project information via the website, should go a long way towards ensuring the project results are taken up as effectively as possible once the project is over.

A major objective at the present time is to identify support and resources to enable the project consortium to continue their excellent team working and networking after the end of the present Darwin project. We are in consultation with IPGRI and Sida about this, and will be approaching Equator Initiative and other relevant institutions.

7. Outputs, Outcomes and Dissemination

- Please expand and complete Table 1. **Quantify** project outputs over the last year using the coding and format from the Darwin Initiative Standard Output Measures (see website for details) and give a brief description. Please list and report on appropriate Code Nos. only. The level of detail required is specified in the Guidance notes on Output Definitions which accompanies the List of Standard Output Measures.

Table 1. Project Outputs (According to Standard Output Measures)

Code No.	Quantity	Description
4A or 4C	10 students	Participatory evaluation of case studies
4B or 4D	1 week/student	Participatory evaluation of case studies
6A	9 people	<i>Internal training and orientation workshop</i>
6B	1 week	<i>Internal training and orientation workshop</i>
7	1 method guide	Method guide
8	2 staff x 1 week	<i>Internal training and orientation workshop</i>
8	2 staff x 1 week	Data analysis in-week
17A	1 e-group and 1 website	E-group for consortium members and website for general public

- Explain differences in actual outputs against those agreed in the initial 'Project Implementation Timetable' and the 'Project Outputs Schedule', i.e. what outputs were not achieved or only partly achieved? Were additional outputs achieved?

All planned outputs achieved. Additional output 17 A = project website.

- In Table 2, provide full details of all publications and material produced over the last year that can be publicly accessed, e.g. title, name of publisher, contact details, cost. Details will be recorded on the Darwin Monitoring Website Publications Database. Mark (*) all publications and other material that you have included with this report

All publications and material produced over the last year can be publicly accessed via the project website www.africanfarmdiversity.net but have not been formally published in hard copy format yet and therefore are not recorded in Table 2 below. Please consult website for more details of specific documents. CDs containing all the documents on the website are scheduled to be produced during 2003.

Table 2: Publications

Type *	Detail	Publishers	Available from	Cost £
(e.g. journals, manual, CDs)	(title, author, year)	(name, city)	(e.g. contact address, website)	

- Provide details of dissemination activities in the host country during the year. Will these activities be continued by the host country when the project finishes, and how will this be funded and implemented?

The project has not yet reached the formal dissemination phase, which is scheduled for 2003. Informal information activities have taken place, as described in Section 6. above.

8. Project Expenditure

- Please expand and complete Table 3.

Table 3: Project expenditure during the reporting period

Item	Budget	Expenditure
------	--------	-------------

- Highlight any recently agreed changes to the budget and explain any variation in expenditure where this is +/- 10% of the budget

The variance in staff costs is the result of staff time being invoiced in 03/04 due to unavoidable delays in production / report writing. The carry-forward was agreed by Sarah Collins 14/03/03.

9. Monitoring, Evaluation and Lessons

- Discuss methods employed to monitor and evaluate the project this year. How can you demonstrate that the outputs and outcomes of the project actually contribute to the project purpose? i.e. what are the indicators of achievements (both qualitative and quantitative) and how are you measuring these?

Quantitative monitoring has been by tracking implementation according to proposed project outputs and key milestones (Section 13 of original Application for Grant).

Qualitative monitoring has been by peer review of all documentation produced by the project consortium: this has been very effective as the consortium includes individuals from all the relevant disciplines, who have therefore been able to offer useful critiques and comments.

Project evaluation will mainly occur in 2003, as outputs become available on the website for international, regional, and local use. However, a mid-term evaluation occurred at the data analysis in-week in Ethiopia in February 2003, when a morning was devoted to obtaining feedback on draft good practice guidelines and policy lessons from individuals and agencies involved in agricultural biodiversity conservation in Ethiopia (see www.africanfarmdiversity.net section on Key Events for more on this session).

The indicators of achievement at output to purpose level are set out in the Logframe at Appendix 1 below. They are on track.

- Are there lessons that you learned from this years work and can you build this learning into future plans?

The team is all: three characteristics of the individuals in the project consortium have greatly assisted with successful implementation of this project: the existing good working relations and mutual trust; the individuals' commitment and professionalism; the complementary blend of disciplines and experience.

Multi-country teams and field work involve a significant degree of administration and coordination which must be factored in at planning stage.

10. Author(s) / Date

Elizabeth Cromwell

On behalf of the project consortium

2 June 2003

Table A Logical framework

<i>Project summary</i>	<i>Measurable indicators</i>	<i>Means of verification</i>	<i>Important assumptions</i>
<p><i>Goal</i></p> <p><i>To assist countries rich in biodiversity but poor in resources with the conservation of biological diversity and implementation of the Biodiversity Convention</i></p>		<p>Plan of action prepared at final conference</p> <p>Countries national biodiversity plans and projects</p> <p>Outputs from CBD Programme of Work for agricultural biodiversity Element 3</p>	<p>Countries in Eastern and Southern Africa continue to prioritise on-farm conservation of agricultural biodiversity</p>
<p><i>Purpose</i></p> <p>Potential assessed for scaling-up different kinds of grass-roots projects for on-farm conservation of agricultural biodiversity in Eastern & Southern Africa</p>	<p>Results from Participatory Evaluation of 6 case studies of grass-roots on-farm conservation projects, by 5/03.</p>	<p>Project results report (CD-ROM).</p>	<p>Scaling up grass roots projects can make an effective contribution to conservation of agricultural biodiversity in the region.</p> <p>There are no immovable constraints to</p>
<p><i>Outputs</i></p> <p>1. Project consortium trained in agricultural biodiversity assessment, economic/policy context of on-farm conservation, participatory field approaches</p> <p>2. Multi-media outputs documenting potential for scaling-up different kinds of on-farm conservation projects in region.</p>	<p>1.1 Training delivered by 7/02</p> <p>1.2 Case study teams use training to complete participatory evaluations by 12/02 and analysis by 2/03</p> <p>2.1 CD-ROM contains results report, method doc, downloadable posters, useful ref. material by 8/03</p>	<p>1.1 Training workshop report (internal)</p> <p>1.2.1 Case study debriefing documents and field diaries (internal)</p> <p>1.2.2, 2.1 Project results report (CD-ROM)</p> <p>2.2 Conference report (internal)</p>	<p>Project not hindered by political instability.</p>
<p><i>Activities</i></p> <p>Training workshop incl. case study selection and method development</p> <p>Participatory Evaluation of case studies</p> <p>Analysis of data from participatory evaluation</p> <p>Dissemination of targeted outputs, including CD-ROM and final conference</p>	<p>£ 30,000</p> <p>£ 39,045</p> <p>£ 27,469</p> <p>£ 15,036</p> <p>£ 70,000</p>	<p>Project application</p> <p>Project progress reports</p>	<p>Project resources available - incl. complementary funding.</p> <p>Grass roots projects willing to participate as case studies.</p> <p>Project not hindered by political instability.</p>