

Inception report

Mid-term Evaluation of EU-IFAD Grant

**Restoration of degraded land for food security
and poverty reduction in East Africa and the
Sahel: taking successes in land restoration to
scale**

Dr. Urs Bloesch, Adansonia-Consulting mandated by ICARDA; Evilard

16/12/2018

Table of contents

Acronyms	3
1) Introduction	4
2) Context and background	4
3) Purpose of the mid-term evaluation.....	6
4) Mid-term evaluation approach and methodology.....	6
5) Organisation and timing of the evaluation	9
Annexe A: Evaluation matrix	10
Annexe B: Rating system	15
Annexe C: List of partners	16
Annexe D: Budget situation of EU grant on 31/10/2018	19

Acronyms

CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CRP	CGIAR Research Program
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DryDev	The Drylands Development Programme
DS	Dryland Systems
ESA	East and Southern Africa
EU	European Union
ICARDA	International Center for Agricultural Research in Dry Areas
ICRAF	International Centre for Research in Agroforestry
ICRISAT	International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
ILRI	International Livestock Research Institute
INRAN	<i>Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique du Niger</i>
MoA	Memorandum of Agreement
M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation
NARS	National Agricultural Research Systems
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
ROM	Results-Oriented Monitoring
ToR	Terms of Reference
WAS	West African Sahel

1) Introduction

Adanson-Consulting was mandated by ICARDA to conduct this external and independent mid-term evaluation. According to the Gantt Chart (IFAD's Large Grant Design Document), the mid-term evaluation should have been conducted in the middle of the second year of implementation, i.e. in the second half of 2016. However, the mid-term evaluation was postponed for several reasons amongst those:

a) The mid-term evaluation was supposed to be implemented as part of the CGIAR Research Program Dryland Systems (CRP-DS) review of WAS and ESA regions. When the CRP-DS was notified to be terminated at the end of 2016 the plan was changed and the evaluation was scheduled to be implemented in 2017.

b) A further delay took place as a result of the retirement of ICARDA M&E Project Leader, Aden Aw-Hassan under which the mid-term evaluation was supposed to take place.

A reference group of six persons composed of key stakeholders has been established for supporting and guiding the evaluation and for quality assurance. Reference group members normally comment on the ToR, the inception report, early findings as well as on the draft final report.

2) Context and background

Land degradation currently affects over 40% of the world's land resources, negatively impacting ecosystems and their ability to sustain productivity. Restoration of degraded land can be a key pathway to achieving food security and reducing poverty for some of the most vulnerable people living in Africa's drylands. In order to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals of the UN, successful restoration efforts need to be taken to scale, both reaching a larger number of farmers and covering larger areas (millions of hectares) over the coming decade. This research aims at transformative outcomes by placing farmers at the centre of land restoration efforts.

Land restoration involves restoring production from land in profitable ways for farmers and pastoralists so that their livelihoods are sustainably improved and the capacity of land to produce in the future is enhanced. Equally important are interventions to avoid further degradation, because they are generally less costly than restoration once land has been degraded – and the more degraded, the higher the cost of restoration. Any land restoration intervention has to be adapted to the specific ecological, economic, sociological and institutional context.

Core components of land restoration are recovery of vegetation and improvement and maintenance of soil health. Prior to the implementation of the project, there have been few syntheses of the broad effectiveness of land restoration projects in the developing world although there have been many accounts of individual successful efforts that have been summarized as good practice, including a set of lessons learned from the rehabilitation of degraded lands in Sub-Saharan Africa.

The goal of the project is to reduce food insecurity and improve livelihoods of poor people living in African drylands by restoring degraded land, and returning it to effective and sustainable tree, crop and livestock production, thereby increasing land profitability and landscape and livelihood resilience. The project has five interrelated objectives focussing on *lessons learned and best practice* (objective 1), *proof of application* (objective 2), *tools for scaling-up* (objective 3), *tools for scaling out* (objective 4), *knowledge management and capacity strengthening* (objective 5).

The project is implemented in two of the five regional flagships adopted by CRP-DS: West African Sahel and Dry Savannas (Mali, Niger) and East and Southern Africa (Ethiopia, Kenya, and Tanzania). The project is led by ICRAF but involve collaborating CGIAR centres (ILRI, ICRISAT and ICARDA) within the CGIAR Research Program Dryland Systems (CRP 1.1) which has been closed in 2016.

The land restoration project closely collaborates and builds on the experience of the Drylands Development Programme (DryDev) funded by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands, with a substantial contribution from World Vision Australia. This integrated program is designed to bring about change for people and landscapes in semi-arid areas of Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Kenya, Mali and Niger with contextually appropriate interventions (options by context). Partnerships among research institutions and between research institutions and development-oriented institutions are a critical characteristic of CRPs as they are the mechanisms for achieving a critical mass of research competence linked via clear impact pathways to specific development outcomes.

The land restoration project has been designed considering IFAD's large experience in dryland agriculture and is implemented in close collaboration with IFAD's country programmes. Involvement of local and national authorities and their technical services is key for the take up of the initiative and to enhance the impact in the long-term. The implementation of the project largely rely on international and national non-governmental development organisations with relevant thematic experiences (see list of partners in Annexe C).

ICRAF is leading the activity in Mali, Kenya and Tanzania; ILRI does so in Ethiopia and ICRISAT in Niger. Tanzania is primarily a learning site included in objectif 1 rather than a dissemination target. ICARDA as lead centre for the Dryland Systems CRP is leading the monitoring and evaluation including mid-term and final evaluations. Agricultural research, extension, market and policy institutions in the public and private sector will benefit through capacity strengthening.

The project implements land restoration options with around 7,000 households across social, geographic and economic contexts through on-farm planned comparisons to determine which options work where and for whom. Farming households are involved in evaluating land restoration options on their farms, including options for soil and water conservation, tree establishment, post-harvest pest and disease control, community-based rangeland management and farmer managed natural regeneration with *in-situ* grafting and micro-dosing of mineral and farmyard manure on their farms. Farmers do their own experimentation and observations and utilise their local knowledge to adapt and modify restoration options to suit their needs and context.

The research "in" development approach embraced in this project integrates the impact pathway through a "co-learning" engagement cycle with development partners in order to accelerate impact on the ground. Co-learning amongst nested communities of practice that bring farmers, community facilitators, NGOs and government extension staff, private sector actors and researchers together, allow to share knowledge and experience about what works, where and for whom on the ground.

The grant agreement was signed on 17 March 2015 by IFAD and 4 April 2015 by ICRAF for a period of three years ending end of March 2018. The total grant approved was USD 1,500,000 from IFAD. This grant was supplemented by EU funding of EURO 3,845,630 which has been signed on 24 May 2016 for project duration until end of September 2019. The total expenditure of the EU funding on 31 October 2018 amounts to EURO 2,289,480 or 59.5% of the budget spent (see financial situation in Annexe D). The programme complements investment of USD 1,500,000 from the Dryland Systems CRP and development spending of USD 33 million by

national partners also managed by the main grant recipient for this programme in addition to nationally budgeted rural development programme.

3) Purpose of the mid-term evaluation

The purpose of the mid-term evaluation is to provide accountability and learning to the project stakeholders and describe reasons behind the achieved results and consolidate lessons learnt and best practices for the remaining period of the project. While the donors (IFAD/EU) and government partners are primarily interested in accountability, project management and implementers will be interested in learning and directions that the evaluation can give for the future. Moreover, the mid-term evaluation is expected to inform future potential initiatives for dryland ecosystems in the target countries.

More specifically, the mid-term evaluation will assess the progress made of the project in view of achieving the outputs, the objectives and the goal defined in the logframe. The OECD/DAC criteria including *relevance*, *effectiveness*, *efficiency*, *impact* and *sustainability* will be assessed. It is noteworthy, that after three years and a half only, it is too early to conclusively evaluate impact and sustainability and therefore these two criteria will not be assessed in depth. Since three CGIAR Centers are leading the project, *Science quality* will also be analysed. Moreover, the cross-sectoral issues *Governance and management*, *Gender equality and women's empowerment*, *Innovation and scaling up*, *Environment and natural resources management*, *Adaptation to climate change*, and *Partnership* will be evaluated.

This evaluation will identify key information, provide lessons and make recommendations to IFAD / EU and the implementing CGIAR partners to adapt and improve the implementation and performance of the programme where necessary (adaptive management). The mid-term evaluation is a key step in the implementation of the project and lays the foundation for the terminal evaluation.

4) Mid-term evaluation approach and methodology

The mid-term evaluation will be forward looking and constructive. It follows the IFAD Evaluation Manual (2015) and the CGIAR standards for independent external evaluation (2015). It is an objective-based approach as outlined in the ToR, which analyse the impact pathway and the measuring of achievements along the results chain for generating lessons and recommendations for better performance.

In total 12 evaluation criteria will be assessed (not in-depth assessment for impact and sustainability) using the IFAD rating system (see Annexe B). The evaluation questions listed in the ToR have been amended and for each criterion a generic question has been elaborated (see evaluation matrix in Annexe A):

- 1) **Relevance** focussing on project strategy and design.
Is the project strategy and design appropriate to meet the intervention's outputs and objectives?
- 2) **Effectiveness** measures the progress made towards outputs (and objectives) using a Progress Towards Results Matrix; each indicator at objective and output level will be assessed giving an appraisal of their achievement (i.e. not started, in progress and done using the "traffic light system" with the standard colours); a critical analysis of the programme's logframe indicators and targets will be undertaken using the "SMART" criteria (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators (quantitative and qualitative) will be suggested, as necessary.

What is the project's progress toward the end-of-project targets?

- 3) **Efficiency** focusing on qualitative and quantitative outputs in relation to the inputs.
How economically has the project converted its resources/inputs into results?
- 4) **Impact** focussing on first trends of positive and negative socio-economic and environmental changes induced by the project.
Is the theory of change (impact pathway) relevant and coherent?
- 5) **Sustainability** focussing on first trends including financial risks to sustainability, socio-economic risks to sustainability, institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability and environmental risks to sustainability.
Will the beneficiaries continue to apply best restoration options after project closure?
- 6) **Science quality** focussing on the conditions that are in place for assuring high quality of science, and the conduct and outputs of research.
Do the research design, problem-setting, and choice of approaches reflect high quality in scientific thinking, state-of the-art knowledge and novelty in all areas of research?
- 7) **Governance and management** focussing on oversight and decision-making related to strategic direction, financial planning (governance) and routine decisions and administrative work related to the daily operations of the organisation (management).
Is the governance and management appropriate and efficient for project implementation?
- 8) **Gender equality and women's empowerment** focusing on the beneficiaries.
Have gender issues explicitly been considered in project design and implementation?
- 9) **Innovation and scaling up** focusing on co-learning.
What is the potential of best options by context to be scaled up?
- 10) **Environment and natural resources management** focusing on participatory approaches.
What is the project's contribution for reducing environmental vulnerability and enhancing livelihood resilience in view of poverty reduction?
- 11) **Adaptation to climate change** in view of strengthening environmental vulnerability and resilience of local communities.
Is climate change adaption an integral part of the project strategy?
- 12) **Partnership** for knowledge management and co-learning based on best practices.
Will the partnerships established (e.g. communities of practice) continue after project closure?

For each generic question in the evaluation matrix sub-questions with its indicators, sources of data and methodology have been elaborated. If necessary, evaluation questions will be further refined in the field.

A mixed method approach will be applied including document reviews (secondary data) and interviews with key informants, focus group discussions with beneficiaries and direct on-site observations (all primary data). Special attention will be devoted to the availability of gender-related data and information. The desk review will include documents prepared during the

preparation phase (IFAD's large grant design document, IFAD's president's report, theory of change, logical framework), CGIAR strategy and results framework (2016-2030), center-commissioned evaluation of the CGIAR Research Program 1.1: Dryland Agricultural Systems, baseline survey report (DryDev), annual progress reports, annual financial reports, national strategic and legal documents, data generated through the monitoring process and other materials relevant for this evidence-based evaluation. The desk review will allow the analysis of the environmental, economic and socio-cultural contexts of the project areas, the understanding of the stakeholders and the institutional set-up.

The careful selection of stakeholders and their close involvement in the MTR is key for the success of a participatory review. It is generally acknowledged that the more stakeholders have felt consulted during an evaluation, the more likely they are to use the evaluation findings and implement recommendations. The principal actors comprise: NARS, national and local governance bodies, policy makers, extension/advisory services, market actors, NGOs, smallholder farmers, agro-pastoralists and pastoralists. Particular attention is paid to ensure involvement of the beneficiaries of the local communities considering different interest groups, gender and vulnerable groups. The sites to be visited will be identified by the community facilitators considering access and available time. In addition, nearby randomly selected farms will be visited.

Key questions will be formulated in advance (open-ended questions) for each interview and semi-structured focus group discussion with the stakeholders. Whenever possible the focus group discussion method will be used for discussions with the local population (in Swahili in Kenya) while ensuring that all segments of the population participate freely. Open-ended questions will help to stimulate vivid discussions keeping in mind as guidance the pre-established evaluation questions. Particular emphasis will be placed on the active participation of women. With respect to the principles of an independent evaluation, parts of interviews and more informal discussions will be conducted without staff from the project as interviewees might not feel comfortable to speak openly in their presences. The review team should make it clear to all interviewed stakeholders that their comments and contributions will remain confidential. The final mid-term evaluation report should not mention the sources of the data presented, so as to preserve the confidentiality of the informant.

The evaluation will consider partnerships among the implementing CGIAR centres, linkages with similar thematic programmes and projects, and partnerships with research and development upon which achieving objectives depend. Cross cutting issues – gender and youth, capacity development, communications – will be assessed at various levels in the context of the project's impact pathway.

The mid-term evaluation will focus on evidence-based information that is credible, reliable, useful, ethical and of high quality. The triangulation of multiple data sources will allow verifying or cross-checking the data to ensure the validity of the findings. According to OECD/Development Assistance Committee (DAC), triangulation entails the use of three or more sources or types of information, or types of analysis to verify and substantiate an assessment. This allows evaluators to overcome the bias that comes from single informants, single methods or single observations and thus helps to ensure the robustness and reliability of evaluation findings.

The following limitations to the mid-term evaluation are to be considered:

- 1) Usually, a team is recruited for carrying out a mid-term evaluation of a complex project and not only a single consultant. The scope of the evaluation according to the ToR is very broad and impact and sustainability cannot be assessed conclusively after only three years and a half of project implementation.
- 2) The vast project area including four action countries with many testing sites and one knowledge sharing country does not allow visiting enough sites to be representative given the shortage of time for the field mission and the access to the sites. A fully representative

assessment of the overall project implementation progress and performance is therefore challenging. A more in-depth analysis will be conducted for the two action countries Kenya and Niger which will be visited. The evaluation of the project in Ethiopia and Mali will be based on a desk review supported with some remote interviews with key stakeholders.

5) Organisation and timing of the evaluation

As suggested by ICARDA the project areas in Kenya (East African country and headquarter of ICRAF) and Niger (Sahelian country) will be visited. Enrico Bonaiuti from ICARDA will accompany the field missions as observer and facilitator.

The field visit to Kenya (18 to 23 November 2018) will allow the visit of two farms per site (Kalawa, Lower Yatta, Mtito Andei, Mwala) and interviews/focus group discussions with the beneficiaries. All four sites offer unique context variations according to the data analyses from the project. The site visits will be guided by the community facilitators, including discussions with partner NGO's (ADRA, Caritas, World Vision), local authorities, technical services, and the Mutembuku farmer group.

The field visit to Niger (3 – 8 December 2018) will allow visiting farms together with partners at Djilleyni (Dosso Region) and Karabedji (Tillabéri Region) and to assist in the community of practice at both villages. Moreover, meetings with INRAN, IFAD country office, NGO-REFORM and REGIS-ER are foreseen in Niamey. Prior to each field mission interviews with key project informants will be conducted. Suggested interviews include the focal points from IFAD Kenya, ICRAF and ICRISAT.

The draft mid-term evaluation report will be submitted until 31 December 2018, while the final report is scheduled for 31 January 2019. It is important to note that the European Commission is planning in early 2019 a ROM (results-oriented monitoring) review for the project "Putting Research into Use for Nutrition, Sustainability and Resilience (PRUNSAR)" D-37401 which has also project activities in Niger and Ethiopia.

Annexe A: Evaluation matrix

Revised and amended evaluation questions of the ToR.

Evaluative questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
1) Relevance: Is the project strategy and design appropriate to meet the intervention's outputs and objectives?			
A) Is the theory of change (impact pathway) and their underlying assumptions consistent and coherent with the logframe?	Respect/coherence of the theory of change in the logframe	Logframe and theory of change	Comparison/analysis of logframe and theory of change
B) Is the project consistent with the main goals and System Level Outcomes of the CGIAR?	Coherence between project design and CGIAR strategy and results framework (2016-2030)	Logframe, theory of change, CGIAR strategy and results framework (2016-2030)	Comparison/analysis of project design and CGIAR strategy and results framework
C) Are the indicators and targets of the project logframe "SMART"?	SMART criteria	Project logframe	Analysis of the project logframe
D) Is there evidence of (continuing) demand for the project from intended beneficiaries?	Number of new beneficiaries	Field reports, community facilitator	Analysis of reports, interviews facilitator
2) Effectiveness: What is the Project's progress toward the end-of-project targets?			
A) To what extent have the outputs and objectives been attained in quantitative and in qualitative terms (progress made)?	Logframe indicators	Logframe	Assessment of indicator
3) Efficiency: How economically has the project converted its resources/inputs into results?			
A) How cost-effective is the extent to which the project has achieved its results at a lower cost compared with alternatives?	Ratio project cost activities / alternatives	Accounts from projects, costs alternatives	Cost comparison project activities - alternatives
B) What are the costs per beneficiary?	Total costs/beneficiary	Accounts, community facilitator	Calculation
4) Rural poverty impact: Is the theory of change (impact pathway) relevant and coherent?			
A) Does the initiative show first anticipated impacts on the target group?	Living standards of beneficiaries	Technical reports (impact assessments), beneficiaries, community facilitators, field mission	Analysis of project documents, interviews, focus groups discussions, field observations
B) Are the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the intended impacts?	Respect/coherence of the theory of change in the logframe	Logframe and theory of change	Comparison/analysis of logframe and theory of change

C) To what extent have beneficiary incomes changed as a result of the project (counterfactual)?	Difference in living standards project area – comparison groups baseline study DryDev	Technical reports (impact assessments), beneficiaries, NGOs, community facilitators, field mission	Comparison with-without (counterfactual)
D) What changes have taken place in household food security and nutrition and what explains such changes (contribution project)?	Difference in household food security/nutrition project area - comparison groups baseline study DryDev	Technical reports (impact assessments), beneficiaries, NGOs, community facilitators, field mission	Comparison with-without (counterfactual)
5) Sustainability: Will the beneficiaries continue to apply best restoration options after project closure?			
A) Is there any change in behaviour or management practices of beneficiaries?	Change of behaviour and management practices at beneficiary level	Technical reports, beneficiaries, NGOs, community facilitators, field mission	Analysis of documents, interviews, focus groups discussions, field observations
B) What changes in the overall context (e.g. policy framework, political situation, institutional set-up, economic shocks, civil unrest) have affected or are likely to affect project implementation and overall results?	Important changes in the context	National policies or strategies, websites, project staff and partners	Analysis of documents and websites, interviews with project staff and partners
C) Do project activities benefited from the engagement, participation and ownership of local communities, grass-roots organizations and the rural poor?	Possession of approach and techniques by the beneficiaries	NGOs, community facilitators, field mission	Interviews, focus groups discussions, field observations
D) Is there a clear indication of government commitment after the project closing date?	Statements from politicians	National policies or strategies, websites	Analysis of documents and websites, interviews with project staff and partners
6) Science quality: Do the research design, problem-setting, and choice of approaches reflect high quality in scientific thinking, state-of the-art knowledge and novelty in all areas of research?			
A) Is there evidence that the program builds on the latest scientific thinking and research results?	State-of-the-art publications	Research papers	Analysis of research papers
B) Are the actions in question truly innovative or are they well-established elsewhere but new to the country or project area?	Innovations promoted in country and elsewhere	Technical reports, stakeholders, field mission	Analysis of project documents, interviews, focus groups discussions, field observations
7) Governance and management: Is the governance and management appropriate and efficient for project implementation?			
A) Are responsibilities, reporting structure and decision making clear and transparent?	Speed, clarity and consistency of decisions	Organisation chart and operating note, data collected throughout the mid-term evaluation mission	Analysis of organisational charts and other information obtained

B) To what extent does the program have good financial management, budgeting, and reporting?	Speed, clarity and consistency of decisions and adaptive management	Organisation chart and operating note, data collected throughout the mid-term evaluation mission	Analysis of organisational charts and other information obtained
C) What are the total project management costs in relation to total project costs and how do they compare with similar projects?	Total project management costs / total project costs	Financial reports, accounts	Financial analysis
D) Did the M&E system generate information on performance and impact, which is useful for project managers, and has appropriate action been taken on the basis of this information?	M&E recommendations	M&E system	Analysis of documents, interviews with project staff and partners
E) Were successfully promoted innovations documented and shared with partners and considered in policy dialogue (internal and external communication)?	Documentation and use of innovation in policy dialogue	Factsheets, national sectorial policies	Analysis of documents and national sectorial policies
F) Did the governments and steering committees actively and timely support corrective management actions if required?	Recommended corrective management actions by the steering committees	Minutes steering committees	Analysis of steering committee minutes
8) Gender equality and women's empowerment: Have gender issues explicitly been considered in project design and implementation?			
A) What were the project's achievements in terms of promoting gender equality and women's empowerment?	Systematic consideration gender elements	Project documents, data collected throughout the MTR mission	Document analysis, interviews with stakeholders
B) To what extent did the project define and monitor sex-disaggregated results to ensure that gender equality and women's empowerment objectives were being met?	Systematic consideration gender elements	Project documents, data collected throughout the MTR mission	Document analysis, interviews with stakeholders
C) Does the project consider gender difference in knowledge and perceptions related to causes of degradation and preferences for restoration options?	Systematic consideration gender elements	Project documents, data collected throughout the MTR mission	Document analysis, interviews with stakeholders

9) Innovation and scaling up: What is the potential of best options by context to be scaled up?			
A) What are the successful restoration options under different contexts (ecological, socio-economic, cultural and institutional) and what are the enabling factors?	Benefit/cost ratio	Database (ODK project data)	Model calculation ongoing (Bayesian Belief methodology)
B) What is the scaling up mechanism for promoting best options?	Characteristics of scaling up mechanism	Technical reports, community facilitators, beneficiaries, field mission	Analysis of project documents, interviews, focus groups discussions, field observations
C) Who is taking up best options?	Profile of new farmers	Monitoring data, community facilitators, beneficiaries	Analysis of data and other sources, comparison farmer profiles (initial – new)
D) To what extent did the project develop the capacity of community groups and institutions for participatory sustainable natural resource management?	Enhanced capacity of community groups and institutions	Technical reports, NGOs, beneficiaries, field mission	Analysis of project documents, interviews, focus groups discussions, field observations
10) Environment and natural resources management: What is the project's contribution for reducing environmental vulnerability and enhancing livelihood resilience in view of poverty reduction?			
A) To what extent did the project develop an inclusive natural resource management considering gender and vulnerable groups?	Effective participatory natural resource management	Technical reports, beneficiaries, field mission	Analysis of project documents, interviews, focus groups discussions, field observations
B) To what extent did the project follow required environmental and social risk assessment procedures (considering IFAD or national environmental and social standards/norms)?	Respect of environmental and social standards/norms	IFAD or national environmental and social standards/norms, field mission	Analysis of project documents, field observations
11) Adaptation to climate change: Is climate change adaption an integral part of the project strategy?			
A) To what extent did the project demonstrate awareness of current and future climate risks?	Systematic consideration of climate change adaptation	Project documents	Document analysis
12) Partnership: Will the partnerships established (e.g. communities of practice) continue after project closure?			
A) Does the program engaged with appropriate partners, given their roles in implementation and achieving the objectives of the program?	Appropriateness of partnerships	Reports	Evaluation of partnerships

B) In what way has the Project Team facilitated the participation of NGOs and civil society, where appropriate, and what were the implications?	Frequency of exchange with NGOs and civil society	Field reports, meeting and training minutes	Analysis of documents, interviews partners
C) Is there an appropriate exit /handover strategy in partnerships? Are partners prepared and incentivized to take on any necessary responsibilities?	Existing exit/handover strategy	Exit/handover strategy	n.a.

Annexe B: Rating system

IFAD Evaluation Manual (2015)

Rating scale	Score descriptor
Highly satisfactory (6)	Under the concerned criterion, the activity (project, programme, non-lending, etc.) achieved or surpassed all main targets, objectives, expectations, results (or impacts) and could be considered as a model within its project typology.
Satisfactory (5)	Under the concerned criterion, the activity achieved almost all (indicatively, over 80-95 per cent) of the main targets, objectives, expectations, results (or impacts).
Moderately satisfactory (4)	Under the concerned criterion, the activity achieved the majority (indicatively, 60 to 80 per cent) of the targets, objectives, expectations, results or impacts. However, a significant part of these was not achieved.
Moderately unsatisfactory (3)	Under the concerned criterion, the activity did not achieve its main targets, (indicatively, less than 60 per cent) objectives, expectations, results or impacts.
Unsatisfactory (2)	Under the concerned criterion, the activity achieved only a minority of its targets, objectives, expectations, results or impacts.
Highly unsatisfactory (1)	Under the concerned criterion, the activity (project, programme, non-lending, etc.) achieved almost none of its targets, objectives, expectations, results or impacts.

Annexe C: List of partners

Country	Partner	Joint Activities	Type of Partnership
Niger	IFAD-Niger Country Programme ProDAF	Co-location of action sites in Maradi, Zinder and Tahoua	MoA
Niger	PARC-YANAYI: a development project funded by European Union on Improvement of the the resilience of rural communities risks and climate change	Co-location in Dosso and Zinder	Informal partnership with ICRISAT
Niger	University of Niamey	Joint Students with ICRISAT, collaboration on the farmer profiling	Informal partnership
Niger	INRAN	Joint Student and co-location of field activities	MoA
Niger	University of Maradi	Joint Student with ICRAF- MSc thesis	Informal partnership
Niger	OxFAM, INRAN, PGRC-DU, FAO, DGEF/MESUDD, Dan-Saga	Engaged in the Stakeholder Workshops	Informal partnership
Niger	REGIS/Project funded by USAID in Niger and Burkina	Collaboration on activities	MoA
Niger	NGO-CRS	Collaboration on activities and sites	Informal partnership
Niger	NGO-REFORM	Co-location of action sites Tahoua	MoA
Niger	AGRYMET	Joint activities	MoA
Mali, Ethiopia, Kenya	Drylands Development Programme (DryDEV)	Co-locating activities (especially the Planned Comparisons (PCs)) joint staff, collaborating on stakeholder engagement	Strong collaboration on the planned comparisons
Mali	IFAD Country Programme (PAPAM)	Co-location of activities in Sikasso, Segou and Mopti	Informal partnership
Mali	Sahel-Eco	Collaboration on the Planned Comparisons	Agreement with ICRAF through the DryDev Programme
Mali	Malian Association for Awareness Raising and Sustainable Development (AMEDD)	Collaboration on the Planned Comparisons	Agreement with ICRAF through the DryDev Programme
Mali	Malian Association for Public Education and	Collaboration on the Planned Comparisons	Agreement with ICRAF through the DryDev Programme

	Protection of the Environment (AMEPPE)		
Mali	Institut d'Economie Rurale (IER)	Joint coaching of MSc students	Agreement with ICRAF
Mali	Institut polytechnique rural de formation et de recherche appliquée (IPR/IFRA)	Joint coaching of MSc students - profiling of the famers enrolled in the PCs	Agreement with ICRAF
Mali	WASCAL (West African Science Service Center on Climate Change and Adapted Land Use)	Joint coaching of MSc students - profiling of the famers enrolled in the PCs	Informal partnership
Mali	USAID project SmAt-Scaling: "Scaling-up Climate-Smart Agroforestry Technologies for improved market access, food and nutritional security in Mali (SmAT-Scaling)"	Joint support and coaching of students and farmers	USAID has an Agreement with ICRAF for SmAt-Scaling implementation
Ethiopia	World Vision- Ethiopia	Co-coordinating Planned Comparisons in four woredas	Memorandum of Agreement for hiring of six community facilitators for monitoring
Ethiopia	Relief Society of Tigray (REST)	Coordinating DryDev activities with ICRAF, collaborating on Local Knowledge surveys in Samre woreda	Agreement with ICRAF through the DryDev Programme
Ethiopia	IFAD-Programme CBINReMP	Collaborative identification of research needs with ILRI and joint activities with ICRAF (two MSc students)	
Ethiopia	Amhara Bureau of Agriculture (BoA)	Joint activities on exclosures, both with ILRI (agreement) and ICRAF (supported MSc student)	Joint coordination agreement between ILRI and BoA)
Ethiopia	PRIME and REST-II projects	Projects requested research support in Borana and Guji Zones, Oromia Region	in 2017 ILRI signed an MoU with CARE, OSHO, and World Resources Institute (WRI)
Ethiopia	BRACED project	Afar region, programmed requested research support	Informal partnership

Ethiopia	University of Copenhagen and Imperial College	Joint MSc students stationed in Ethiopia	Agreement with ICRAF
Kenya	REGAL-IR & AVCD-LC: Burder and Wajir	Assessment of REGAL-IR's implementation of institutional option/engagement with community on technical rangeland management options	Informal partnership with ILRI - This is a new site and partner.
Kenya	SORALO Programme: Olkiramatian & Shompole Group ranches, Kajiado	Assessment of SORALO's implementation of institutional option; technical assessment to come.	in 2017 ILRI signed an MoU with SORALO and Olkiramatian and Shompole Group Ranches
Kenya	AVCD- Burder CBNRM committee in Wajir	Assessment of REGAL-IR's implementation of institutional option/engagement with community on technical rangeland management options; building community institutions for collaborative management and research	No formal partnership required
Kenya	USAID and other programmes: Il'Ngwesi Group ranch, Laikipia	Assessment of past implementation of institutional option/engagement with community on technical rangeland management options	Informal partnership with ILRI
Kenya	World Vision- Kenya	Co-location of the activities in Kenya, collaboration with field staff of ICRAF	Agreement with ICRAF through the DryDev Programme
Kenya, Ethiopia	Bangor University	Joint MSc students between ICRAF and Bangor- stationed in Ethiopia and Kenya	MoA between Bangor and ICRAF
Kenya	University of Nairobi	Joint PhD Student	Informal partnership with ICRAF
Kenya	Ministry of Agriculture, Kenya	Collaboration with ward extension officers in Machakos, Makueni, and Kitui	Informal partnership with ICRAF
Kenya	KCEP-CRAL	Collaborative discussions about alignment of workplans and activities.	MoA under review

Annexe D: Budget situation of EU grant on 31/10/2018

Category of Expenditure	Budgeted (€)	Total expenditure 31/10/2018 (€)	Remaining funds (€)
Consultancies	241,000	97,686	143,314
Equipment and Materials	200,000	32,896	167,104
Good, Service and Inputs	108,000	111,328	-3,328
Operating Costs	153,000	162,402	-9,402
Salaries and Allowances	2,450,000	1,618,202	831,798
Workshops	188,000	39,288	148,712
Training	163,000	52,591	110,409
Travel and Allowances	227,000	85,941	141,059
Administrative Costs	115,630	89,146	26,484
Total	3,845,630	2,289,480	1,556,150