



**Inception Report**  
Mid-term Evaluation of IFAD Grant  
Conservation Livestock Conservation Agriculture (CLCA) Project

Dr Ross McLeod  
2/4/2021



## Contents

Acronyms.....	3
Acknowledgements.....	5
1. Introduction.....	6
1.1. Origins, objectives, and users.....	6
1.2. Structure of the report.....	7
2. Background.....	8
2.1. Conservation agriculture.....	8
2.2. Project background.....	8
2.3. Project monitoring, evaluation & learning.....	9
2.4. Evolution and structure.....	9
2.5. Funding and expenditures.....	12
2.6. Governance and management.....	13
3. Evaluation Criteria and Questions.....	15
3.1. Criteria and overarching questions.....	15
3.2. Specific evaluation questions and criteria.....	15
3.3. Evaluation tools and analysis include:.....	15
Evaluation Matrix.....	15
Interviews with CLCA project team.....	16
Semi-structured and informal interviews (SSI).....	16
Governance and Management Assessment.....	19
Organizational Timeline.....	19
Quality of Science Analysis.....	19
Beneficiary Assessment.....	19
Cost-benefit analysis.....	19
3.4. Main limitations of the evaluation:.....	19
3.5. Deliverables and timing of the evaluation.....	19
3.6. Composition of team.....	21
Annex 1: Evaluation matrix.....	22
Annex 2: Resumes of team members.....	27
Annex 3: Interview templates.....	28

## Acronyms

AWPB:	Annual Work Plan and Budget
BBN:	Bayesian Belief Network
CA:	Conservation Agriculture
CGIAR:	Consortium of International Agricultural Research Centers
CIDES-UMSA:	Postgraduate School of Development of the Universidad Mayor de San Andres
CIMMYT:	International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center
CLCA:	Crop Livestock Conservation Agriculture
COTUGRAIN:	Compagnie Grainière Tunisienne
CT:	Conventional Tillage
DZD:	Algerian Dinar
GDA:	Groupements de Développement Agricole (GDA)
HH:	Household
ICARDA:	International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas
ICT:	Information and Communications Technology
IFAD:	International Fund for Agricultural Development
INGC:	Institut National des Grandes Cultures (Tunisie)
INIFAP:	Instituto Nacional de Investigaciones Forestales Agrícolas y Pecuarias
INRAT:	Institut National de Recherche Agronomique de Tunisie
IRESA:	Institution de la Recherche et de l'Enseignement Supérieur Agricoles
ITELV:	Institut Technique des Elevages (Algérie)
ITGC:	Institut Technique des Grandes Cultures (Algérie)
KM:	Knowledge Management
LAC:	Latin America and Caribbean Countries
M&E:	Monitoring and Evaluation
NA:	North Africa
NARES:	National Agricultural Research and Extension Services
NARS:	National Agricultural Research Services
NEN:	Near East and North Africa
NGO:	Non-Governmental Organization
NT:	No Tillage
O4S:	Organization for Scaling
ODK:	Open Data Kit
OEP:	Office de l'Élevage et des Pâturages (Tunisie)
OM:	Organic Matters
PMAT:	Entreprise Nationale de Production de Matériels Agricoles Trading
PROINPA:	Fundación para la Promoción e Investigación de Productos Andinos
R&D:	Research and Development
SCT:	Simplified Cultivation Techniques
SME:	Small and Medium Enterprises
SMSA:	Mutual Association of Agricultural Services

SOLA:	Maquinaria Agrícola Solà company
SOM:	Soil Organic Matter
TND:	Tunisian Dinar
UAM-X:	Universidad Autonoma Metropolitana-Xochimilco
USD:	United States Dollar
WUE:	Water Use Efficiency
ZT:	Zero Tillage

## Acknowledgements

This Inception Report has been developed with assistance provided by ICARDA staff members and the CLCA project team. Innocent Bikara has facilitated meetings and provided project documentation. Betty Abrilian and Enrico Bonaiuti have helped with project administration. CLCA project team members Mourad Rekik (ICARDA), Zied Aidoudi (ICARDA), Boubaker Dhehibi, (ICARDA), Dina Najjar, (ICARDA) Aymen Frijja, (ICARDA); Mina Wasti, (ICARDA), Udo Rudiger, (CIM-ICARDA), Laura Becker (ICARDA) and Santiago Lopez (CIMMYT) made themselves available for an overview meeting and shared their knowledge and observations with introductory presentations about the CLCA project.

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1. Origins, objectives, and users

The Use of Conservation Agriculture in Crop-Livestock Systems (CLCA) in the drylands for enhanced water use and soil fertility in Near East and North Africa (NEN) and Latin America and Caribbean Countries (LAC) countries project is a grant project led by the International Centre for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA) and funded by the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), with subcontracts provided to International Maize and Wheat Improvement Centre (CIMMYT, Mexico) and NARES in Algeria, Tunisia, Bolivia, and Mexico.

Its overarching goal is to sustainably increase production and enhance the resilience of smallholder crop-livestock production systems to climate variability in drylands in NEN and LAC countries. The four-year project commenced in April 2018. The overall cost of the project is estimated at US\$ 3 million, of which IFAD will finance US\$ 2.5 million and US\$ 0.5 million is to be provided from NARES in the form of in-kind contributions. The project completion date is 30 June 2022.

The objectives of the midterm evaluation are to (i) appraise the activities and outputs achieved by ICARDA and partners, (ii) identify and assess outcomes of the project, (iii) identify the enablers and/or constraints to the attainment of project results and lessons learned, and (iv) make practical recommendations for corrective action required to achieve the envisioned project results within the remaining period of the project.

Countries initially selected for the implementation of the project were Bolivia and Nicaragua in LAC and Algeria and Tunisia in NEN. Due to operating constraints, Mexico was substituted for Nicaragua. The main target groups directly targeted by the project are 3,000 households of small crop-livestock producers in NEN and LAC regions whose livelihoods are dependent on crop production and livestock of which 70% are expected to adopt CLCA farming systems potentially leading to increased production. Other beneficiaries will be NARES (National Agricultural Research and Extension Services) and R&D partners and policy makers who will have access to innovative technologies.

There are several CLCA stakeholders who have a role in the midterm evaluation (**Table 1**). They include the CLCA project team, ICARDA, donors, International Maize and Wheat Improvement Centre (CIMMYT, Mexico) NARES in Algeria, Tunisia, Bolivia, and Mexico, along with farmers, academic institutions, and industry in target countries. Most stakeholders will provide input to the mid-term evaluation via informant interviews. The informants selected for these interviews and interview templates for their input are described in the report

Table 1: CLCA Project Stakeholders

Stakeholder	Role in the Mid-term evaluation	Interest in the Mid-term evaluation
Internal		

<b>Stakeholder</b>	<b>Role in the Mid-term evaluation</b>	<b>Interest in the Mid-term evaluation</b>
CLCA project coordinator and PMU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Manages CLCA project</li> <li>• Informants (selected)</li> <li>• Consider recommendations emerging from evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accountability for performance</li> <li>• Learning for improvement</li> <li>• Express opinions</li> </ul>
ICARDA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Informants (selected)</li> <li>• Evaluation logistics</li> <li>• Consider recommendations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Express opinions</li> <li>• Accountability for contribution</li> <li>• Learning for improvement</li> </ul>
CLCA project researchers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Informants (selected)</li> <li>• Consider recommendations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Express opinions</li> <li>• Accountability for contribution</li> </ul>
<b>External</b>		
Donors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Informants (selected)</li> <li>• Consider recommendations emerging from evaluation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decision making for resource allocation</li> </ul>
Research partners (e.g., International partners, NARS, universities)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Informants (selected)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Express opinions</li> <li>• Accountability for contribution</li> </ul>
Development partners (e.g., NGOs, policy makers, industry)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Informants (selected)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Express opinions</li> <li>• Accountability for contribution</li> </ul>

## 1.2. Structure of the report

The purpose of this Inception Report is to describe the approach, key evaluation questions, and work plan. Chapter 1 introduces the evaluation, Chapter 2 describes CLCA project including achievements to date and project expenditures. Chapter 3 describes the evaluation criteria and methodologies used in the evaluation. It includes the overall approach, the specific tools and methodologies and the limitations of the evaluation. There are three Annexes. The first an Evaluation Matrix (Annex 1); secondly resumes of the evaluators (Annex 2), and Annex 3 presents semi-structured interview templates for consultations.

## 2. Background

### 2.1. Conservation agriculture

Conservation agriculture (CA) involves the use of practices such as minimum tillage, crop residue cover, crop rotations and intercropping to improve long term farm productivity. Alternate uses for crop residues, such as for livestock feed, constrain smallholder adoption of CA in arid and semi-arid rainfed areas where biomass production is limited. The lack of availability of tillage equipment limits adoption among larger farms.

The proposal noted that regional projects have<sup>1</sup> investigated agronomic options for integrating CA among cropping and livestock systems in small and medium size farms across Algeria and Tunisia in North Africa (NEN) and Tajikistan in Central Asia, where site-specific CLCA packages were formulated which recognise the above-mentioned challenges. Long term trials in Latin American and Caribbean region (LAC) have also shown that conservation agriculture (zero tillage with at least partial residue retention and crop rotation) has the potential to mitigate and adapt to climate change.

There is need to build on these achievements and further refine CLCA packages using participatory research for other crop-livestock production systems in the NEN and LAC regions, involve a broader consortium of research and rural development partners (national, subregional, and international) to broaden the scope for adoption, formulate integrated pest, weed, and disease management practices and develop CA decision support frameworks for farmers.

### 2.2. Project background

ICARDA (in consortium with CIMMYT) was selected as the grant recipient for the project through a competitive process using an open call for proposals evaluated by a selection panel. The proposal submitted by ICARDA and CIMMYT has been designed to combine an adaptive research program, including integrated capacity development, for CLCA systems in both targeted regions. These activities are incorporated in the project as two components. The first, covering adaptive research involves socioeconomic and market data collection to help optimize CLCA packages for different agro-ecologies and socioeconomic contexts. The second component includes activities to develop a farmer-led extension system to accelerate adoption.

The overarching project goal is to sustainably increase production and enhance climate resilience of small farmers' communities and their crop-livestock production systems in drylands. The expected outcomes are: i) 3,000 smallholder farmers reached (at least 40% women and 20% youth below 35 years) and 2,100 have directly adopted CLCA farming systems [in four (4) target countries] with increased production and improved cost-benefits optimized by filling research and development gaps; ii) At least six (6) NARES, in addition to decision makers, NGOs and IFAD loan project partners in the four (4) target countries have

---

<sup>1</sup> "Integrated Crop-Livestock Conservation Agriculture for Sustainable Intensification of Cereal-based Systems in North Africa and Central Asia (CLCA; January 2013-January 2016; IFAD GRANT # I-R-1393-ICARDA)"



adopted tools and methodologies for reliable decision making and guide investments on contextually appropriate CLCA system; and iii) At least four (4) effective agricultural innovation systems – one (1) in each implementation area of the four (4) target countries - are coalesced in order to foster broad uptake of CA practices within integrated dryland crop-livestock production systems

### **2.3. Project monitoring, evaluation & learning**

The M&E Plan<sup>2</sup> noted the flow of activities across the project structure creates a feedback loop between Components 1 and 2. The activities and outputs in Component 1 focus on CLCA farming systems, the results of which will shape activities in Component 2. This loop governs the timing of implementation. The proposal noted M&E indicators will be developed by the selected grantee together with the national implementing partners upon project commencement. Indicators were to be harmonized with the indicators of other IFAD investment projects and the CGIAR system. The CLCA project M&E plan indicated around 37 indicators have been selected.

### **2.4. Evolution and structure**

The CLCA project commenced on 13 April 2018 and the project completion date is 30 June 2022. The 2<sup>nd</sup> Year Annual Report details implemented activities and changes over the first two years of the project. It was highlighted that due to force majeure, the target countries in LAC were changed from Nicaragua to Mexico.

Unlike Algeria and Tunisia - where the initial CLCA project was implemented - CLCA is a start-up project in the LAC region as CIMMYT had no activities in the selected country sites. There have been CA activities in wheat systems across the southern states of Bolivia, however, the CLCA project targets the Altiplano (Highlands) dryland area where cropping systems are dominated by quinoa and llama management. This area was selected to leverage the Pro-Camelidos program. These changes and new implementation areas has resulted in the project being implemented at a slower rate than planned in the LAC region.

The 2<sup>nd</sup> year progress report indicated implementation of the scaling road maps for Tunisia and Algeria have been rapid. These road maps were co-developed with national partners at the end of the first year. The 2<sup>nd</sup> Year CLCA Progress Report compared implementation achievement against planned milestones. Key elements are summarised.

#### **Component 1: Participatory adaptive research with integrated capacity development of farmers and other key partners to fully implement and evaluate CLCA systems**

Key activities of the CLCA system optimization subcomponent include stakeholder engagement and rapid appraisal. The 2<sup>nd</sup> year annual report noted the PROINPA foundation (main CLCA Partner in Bolivia) has been engaging NGOs and farmer organizations to participate in CLCA project activities. This includes the development of a collaboration with

---

<sup>2</sup> Laura Becker, Anna Aspenson, Enrico Bonaiuti, Zied Idoudi, Santiago López Ridaura, Mourad Rekik. (1/12/2020). CLCA Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning Plan: <https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.11766/12176>

the Postgraduate School of Development of the Universidad Mayor de San Andres (CIDES-UMSA). In Mexico, collaborations have been formalized with the Department of Crop and Animal Production of the Universidad Autonoma Metropolitana-Xochimilco (UAM-X).

In NENA countries, the 2nd year of CLCA project further engaged national public and private partners. In Algeria, the Technical Institute of Field Crops – ITGC (CLCA project coordinating institution) signed an agreement with the National Company of Agricultural Equipment Production & Trading – PMAT. In Tunisia, the National Institute of Agronomic Research of Tunisia – INRAT continued to collaborate with COTUGRAIN, a private seed company. Meetings, workshops, and field days were conducted in NENA to secure stakeholder engagement and identify potential new areas for scaling CA practice adoption.

Reports and protocols describing the establishment of on-farm and on-station trials, the drafting of a scientific paper in North Africa, exploring technical alternatives for CLCA systems and research gaps in Oaxaca, Mexico, and an assessment of identified alternatives in Bolivian Highlands have been conducted for Activities 1.1.2 and 1.1.3. Seeder prototypes are available, and advocacy has been developed for alternative feeding systems and livestock enterprises.

The second subcomponent is appropriate system development to support adoption and decision-making. Activities include farm-level modelling based on the farming systems approach developed as part of the ProCamelidos baseline survey and use of the FarmDESIGN model in LAC. This model includes an algorithm which is used to assess the financial outcomes of alternative farm configurations. The model was also developed to explore future possibilities of Crop-Livestock integration in sheep-cereal farms in Zaghuan (Tunisia), and Setif and Oum Bouaghi (Algeria). Reports have been prepared which outline the assessment of soil fertility, erosion and water productivity under CLCA systems in Algeria and Tunisia (monitoring on 30 farms in the three target areas in Algeria and 60 demonstration plots in 3 different sites in Tunisia).

## **Component 2: Development of a delivery system/participatory farmer-led extension system for accelerating of adoption**

This component aims to develop a road map for large-scale adoption of CA within dryland crop livestock environments. Inventory reports have been prepared for sites over the first two years of the CLCA project. The progress report noted the project will guarantee that women are included in the innovation processes in the 3<sup>rd</sup> year, regardless of land ownership.

### **2.2: Effective delivery system for machinery, agronomic and livestock services through facilitation of access to finance, private investment and public-private partnership**

The project will develop a framework for effective services delivery, including rural advisory, extension systems and service provision for machinery, agronomic and livestock services. This includes assessments of farmer perceptions. Primary data collection has involved 20 adopter farmers in Tunisia, and in Algeria, the effectiveness of various agricultural technology transfer methods for CLCA related technologies was examined by using primary data collected from 115 crop-livestock farmers.

## **Cross-cutting**

Cross-cutting outputs listed in the 2<sup>nd</sup> year progress report included:

- Databases and related narrative reports, project documents (books), survey tools and data generated including field books per site and lists of participants in courses
- Infographics to better describe what the CLCA project does and where it operates
- 4 Videos on best-bet agronomic practices under CLCA and livestock feeding management was not achieved
- 6 SMS related to best agronomic practices, CA implementation and animal feeding designed and delivered
- 15 graduate and post-graduate students enrolled in specialized course n aspects related to CLCA
- Capacity development: training activities for farmers and extension agents, demonstration events, service providers empowerment
- South-south taskforce; and
- Data analysis and report

## **Implementation challenges**

Several implementation challenges were included in the 2nd Progress Report. They included:

- PROINPA has establishment demonstration plots in Bolivia and is scaling improved fallows and wind barriers with fodder bushes. Elections have hindered the holding of field days and technical supervision by CIMMYT - who have not been able to travel to the country. COVID-19 has compounded the problem and several visits planned for March 2020 have been postponed and a Systems Analysis course organized with the Universidad Mayor de San Andres (UMSA) had to be delivered remotely.
- The project area has been defined and characterized in Mexico, with COVID-19 not substantially impacting workshops and field work. At the time of preparing the 2<sup>nd</sup> year progress report there were concerns about the sowing of maize and other crops at the beginning of the cropping season.
- Implementation in North Africa was not impacted by COVID-19 in the second year of the CLCA project, and it was noted that in some areas the project was able to achieve more than previously planned. Sub-agreements between ICARDA and the partners in Algeria and Tunisia have been established.
- The Tunisia<sup>3</sup> scaling road map indicated there are some concerns about governance. The plan noted that CLCA technology is not included within in the remit or strategies of the Ministry of Agriculture, but in the strategy of public institutions. This hinders the availability of no till seeders and quality forage seed production. These constraints, along with limited coordination at the local level by regional institutions, need to be addressed.

---

<sup>3</sup> Hatem Cheikh M'hamed. (26/4/2019). Scaling Road Map -Tunisia.

- The Algeria scaling road map indicated that there are pockets of awareness among farmers and extension staff about decreasing yields caused by poor soil fertility and inadequate soil management. The map indicated Setif farmers are well aware, however, in Msila awareness is just being developed. Farmers in OumEIBouaghi were found to have no knowledge about CA. Awareness needs to be created across a greater number of regions, along with addressing constraints such as availability of forage seeds and direct seeders. Imported seeders are expensive and lower cost local models are not extensively produced.

## 2.5. Funding and expenditures

Financial statement up to March 31st, 2020 were presented in 2<sup>nd</sup> Year Annual Report. The second-year budget of the IFAD grant was US\$ 693,900 and the balance was US\$ 225,007. It is evident that ICARDA budget utilisation over the first two years of CLCA has been highest for travel (See **Table 2**), operating and salaries, at 50-73% of budgeted direct cost category totals.

Given 50% of the total implementation time had occurred (i.e., 24 months of 48 months, 24 months - April 2018-March 2020, compared to project period of 48 months April 2018-June 2022) budget utilisation is reasonable for ICADA at 47%. CIMMYT spending is low, with an overall expenditure of 31% of allocated project budget for the first two years. Spending appears very low for workshops and equipment. The 2<sup>nd</sup> Year Progress Report indicated underspending mainly corresponds to CIMMYT engaging late in Mexico and procurement delays in purchasing equipment for North African countries and commitments to NARES partners which had not been settled.

Table 2: IFAD Project budget and expenditure, March 2020

	ICARDA				Expenditure	CIMMYT			
	Expenditure	Available	Budget	%		Available	Budget	%	
Salaries and allowances	166,911	164,089	331,000	50%	178,893	109,107	288,000	62%	
Travel and allowances	37,084	22,916	60,000	62%	31,952	107,048	139,000	23%	
Workshops	91,991	98,009	190,000	48%	11,792	168,208	180,000	7%	
Good and services	154,964	186,036	341,000	45%	95,240	181,760	277,000	34%	
Equipment	-	115,000	115,000	0%	0	120,000	120,000	0%	
Operational costs	85,829	31,171	117,000	73%	29,209	80,791	110,000	27%	
Total Direct	536,779	617,221	1,154,000	47%	347,086	766,914	1,114,000	31%	
Management fee	42,970	49,635	92,605	46%	29,528	59,867	89,395	33%	
CSP 2%	24,130	1,311	25,441	95%	0	24,559	24,559	0%	
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,140,658</b>	<b>1,285,388</b>	<b>2,426,046</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>723,700</b>	<b>1,618,254</b>	<b>2,341,954</b>	<b>31%</b>	

## **2.6. Governance and management**

The proposed duration of this initiative is 48 months (four years) starting in April 2018 and ending in June 2022. A range of governance mechanism were outlined in the proposal.

### **Steering committee**

The proposal indicated a steering committee (SC) will be formed to oversee the operational, strategic, and financial progress of the project and provide guidelines and support for improvement of project work on a yearly basis. The SC will monitor progress and meet once a year. The SC was to include ICARDA and CIMMYT (Chair and Co-chair, respectively), representatives from NARES, farmer's organizations, and other key project stakeholders from partner countries. IFAD representatives (PTA and CPMs from the participating countries) may be included as observers. The Chair and Co-chair will also serve as the focal point persons for the partners in NEN and LAC. TORs for the SC were to be drafted for the SC and its participants with the expectation of them being ratified at the first meeting. These TORs will be reviewed on a yearly basis

### **Regional inception workshop and planning**

The proposal indicated that annual regional technical coordination meetings will be held in one of the participating countries during which the scientists (including those of ICARDA), extension agents and growers will review the results of the past year and finalize the work plan for the next year. The inception workshop was held in Tunisia (Hammamet) in 7-9 May 2018. During the workshop implementing CG centres and NARES in Algeria, Nicaragua and Tunisia were present. The workshop was mainly organized around working groups to develop workplans for the various components and activities of the project.

### **Annual workplan and budget**

Annual work plans and budgets are to be developed and confirmed in the first quarter of each calendar year. The proposal also noted the SC will also lead the regional workshops (two to take place at the start of the project), to ensure cohesion across project regions. Throughout each project year, the SC will also meet virtually frequently to ensure the close following and integration of project work across the two regions.

### **Implementation arrangements**

ICARDA has lead responsibility for CLCA project activities. In-field implementation of research activities within NA will be undertaken by ICARDA, while CIMMYT will lead on activities in LAC. Coordination with CIMMYT was planned to occur within flagship 4 of CRP Wheat, where interactions between the 2 regions (NA and LAC) can occur.

Implementation is being undertaken by a consortium of local, sub-regional and international research institutions and other development partners. The proposal noted that local partners will be selected competitively using the following criteria: i) Proven expertise in CLCA or other agroecological practices relevant for small holder farmers in arid and semiarid areas in LAC and NEN; ii) proven experience in participatory research approaches with small farmers and farmers organizations; iii) Experience in working with government partners and investment project implementers; iv) good track record in financial management of grant resources and

timely reporting on project progress and results; v) provision of co-financing to the grant project activities. In the proposal it was planned that ICARDA will undertake a sub-contract with CIMMYT and will also be responsible for the sub-contracting to partners in Algeria and Tunisia, while CIMMYT will directly sub-contract partners in LAC.

### **Financial management**

The proposal noted semi-annual unaudited financial reports (SOEs) will be submitted to IFAD within 45 days of the end of the reporting period. Such financial reports shall disclose both IFAD funds and any co-financing funds, and consolidate expenditures incurred by sub-grantees, if any, which will be accountable to the Recipient for the use of sub-grant funds and be subject to normal audit oversight. A project-specific audit report will be submitted to IFAD following prior agreement to an audit TOR. A fixed assets register was to be prepared upon project approval. This will outline the distribution of equipment purchased with project funds upon project completion

### **Counterpart financing**

Counterpart financing refers to in-kind contributions from NARES. Progress reports note it is difficult for participating CG centres to have in-kind financial contributions because of the reform and establishment of CRPs in 2011.

## 3. Evaluation Criteria and Questions

The mid-term evaluation aims to formulate recommendations for the remaining implementation period of the CLCA project. Recommendations will be formulated in line with the evaluation criteria of project relevance, efficiency, quality of science, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability, as required by the ToR and OECD guidelines outlined below.

### 3.1. Criteria and overarching questions

The mid-term evaluation will follow the OECD/DAC's evaluation criteria, with the overarching objectives being to:

- (i) Appraise the activities and outputs achieved by ICARDA and partners,
- (ii) Identify and assess outcomes of the project,
- (iii) Identify the enablers and/or constraints to the attainment of project results and lessons learned, and
- (iv) Make practical recommendations for corrective action required to achieve the envisioned project results within the remaining period of the project.

### 3.2. Specific evaluation questions and criteria

Evaluation questions have been identified during inception which have been developed to address the overarching objectives of the evaluation. These questions are contained in the Evaluation Matrix (See **Annex 1**). They build on those presented in the ToR for the evaluation. Questions are presented within each component of the OECD/DAC's evaluation criteria, with relevance first, followed by effectiveness, impact, and sustainability. The Efficiency criterion includes project governance.

### 3.3. Evaluation tools and analysis include:

Some of the tools are listed and discussed here. They include:

- Evaluation Matrix (**Annex 1**)
- Semi-structured and informal interviews (**Annex 3**)
- Governance & Management Assessment
- Organizational Timeline
- Quality of science analysis
- Beneficiary Assessment
- Cost-benefit Analysis

#### Evaluation Matrix

The Evaluation Matrix (**Annex 1**) will be used to identify the most appropriate and feasible data collection methods for each of the evaluation questions. The matrix has been used to design questions for project team remote interviews (generally using Zoom), semi structured

interviews (SSI) of NARs, farmers and other stakeholders, and data extraction tools for project records. Cross-cutting themes have been included in the matrix.

#### **Interviews with CLCA project team**

Questions included in the Evaluation Matrix has been used to structure remote interviews with the project team. They are presented in **Annex 3**. The confidential interviews are largely being conducted using the Zoom platform.

#### **Semi-structured and informal interviews (SSI)**

Questionnaires have been prepared during inception for NARS partners (Questionnaire A), industry/policy makers (Questionnaire B) and farmers (Questionnaire C). They are included in **Annex 3**. Stakeholders were selected for interviews based on level of participation in the project, connectivity, and to reflect the geographic spread and scope of the project. Consultants based in LAC and NEN are undertaking the interviews. The interviews will commence first in LAC and initial results will be shared among the international and NEN consultant to ensure consistency. Responses are being coded to identify key themes and relationships. Findings will be presented as series of Excel charts in the evaluation report.

A total of 24 stakeholders, of which 22 are in Tunisia and 2 in Algeria, have been selected for NEN interviews. The list is presented in **Table 3** and includes individual farmers, farmers associations, NARES partners, private industry, academic institutions, NGOs and development agencies. All the interviews will be face-to-face meetings in Tunisia. The two interviews with the Algerian stakeholders will be online using Zoom, Google meet or the WhatsApp platform depending on availability and preferences of the interviewee.

A total of 24 people will be interviewed (22 from Bolivia and 2 from Mexico) in LAC. In Bolivia, interviewees include staff or representatives of international development agencies, NGOs that support agricultural development, entities that support agricultural research, platforms that that work in natural resource management, food processing industries, local authorities, and family producers. In the case of Mexico, a representative from an action research entity and one from an academic institution will be interviewed. Around 29% of the LAC interviews will be person-to-person, and 71% will be virtual, using Zoom, Google meet or the WhatsApp. Although the consultant lives in Bolivia, the interviews in this country will be mostly virtual, due to COVID 19.

**Table 3: Partners selected for interviews (informants)**

#### **North Africa (NEN)**

<b>Relevant Stakeholder</b>	<b>Role and Contribution</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Mode</b>
<b>Key major partners as per the project document (National Level)</b>				
<b>TUNISIA</b>				
IRESA	ICARDA Agreement Partner (Administrative)	Policy Maker Researcher	22 March	Person
INRAT	Main Implementing Institute	Partner in proposal and researcher	25 March	Person
INGC	Field Crop Institute	Partner in proposal and Role in Scale-Up	23 March	Person



OEP	Livestock Development Agency	Partner in proposal and Role in Scale-Up	22 March	Person
INAT	Researcher (Livestock)	Researcher	24 March	Person
ESA Mog	Researcher (Socio-economy)	Researcher	29 March	Person
INRGREF	Researcher (Natural Research)	Researcher	25 March	Person
<b>ALGERIA</b>				
ITELV	Livestock Development Agency	Partner in proposal and Role in Scale-Up	31 March	Online
ITGC	Main Implementing Institute	Partner in proposal and Role in Scale-Up	21 March	Online

<b>Directly/actively involved regional and proximate partners</b>				
<b>TUNISIA</b>				
INGC - Regional Focal Points Zaghuan	Field Implementation	Partner in proposal and Role in Scale-Up	29 March	Person
INGC - Regional Focal Points Beja	Field Implementation	Partner in proposal and Role in Scale-Up	26 March	Person
OEP - Regional Focal Points Zaghuan	Forage and Livestock	Partner in proposal and Role in Scale-Up	29 March	Person
OEP - Regional Focal Points Kef	Forage and Livestock	Partner in proposal and Role in Scale-Up	30 March	Person
Farmers 'Associations SMSA Chouarnia	Scaling	Beneficiaries and Local partners and role in scale up	30 March	Person
Farmers 'Associations GDA Seres	Scaling	Beneficiaries and Local partners and role in scale up	30 March	Person
Farmers 'Associations SMSA Melyen Fahs	Scaling	Beneficiaries and Local partners and role in scale up	29 March	Person
Individual Farmers Beja	Scaling	Leader farmers and Role in scale up	26 March	Person
Individual farmers Kef Sers	Scaling	Leader farmers and Role in scale up	30 March	Person
Individual farmers Zaghuan Saouf	Scaling	Leader farmers and Role in scale up	24 March	Person
<b>Tunisia partners-ready to engage as part of the innovation systems</b>				
Cotugrain (Tunis)	PPP for scaling forage mixture	Private Industry and Role in Scale-Up	22 March	Person
Seed Cleaning and treatment Unit/Local Man. (Beja)	Small machinery	Private Industry and Role in Scale-Up	26 March	Person
APAD	Knowledge dissemination	NGO / Policy maker	25 March	Person
DGFIOP	Access to OPA	policy Makers and role in scale-Up	23 March	Person
AVFA	Large scale extension and Knowledge Dissemination	policy Makers and role in scale-Up	23 March	Person

## Americas

Relevant Stakeholder	Role and Contribution	Category	Date and mode of interview
<b>BOLIVIA</b>			
Director of the National Soil Platform Bolivia (Fernando Canedo)	Partner in proposal and researcher	Researcher	12/03 - in person
FAO Programs Associate (Sergio Laguna)	Regional partner	Role in scale up	15/03 - in person
FAO AC Project Responsible (Oscar Mendoza)	Regional partner	Role in scale up	15/03 - in person
Executive Director of ADEMA (Abraham Borda)	Researcher	Role in scale up	17/03 - in person
ADEMA technician (Edilberto Layme)	Researcher	Role in scale up	19/03 - in person
Former Legal Representative of HEIFER (Edwin Marquez)	NGO	Role in scale up	17/03 - in person
IFAD Representative in Bolivia (Arnoud Hameleers)	Partner in proposal	Regional partner	16/03 - virtual
Altiplano Region Coordinator PROINPA Foundation (Wilfredo Rojas)	Participant	Role in Scale-Up	19/03 - in person
PROINPA's Southern Region Consultant (Genaro Aroni)	Participant	Role in Scale-Up	16/03 - virtual
INIAF technician – MDRyT (Hermeregildo Equize)	Participant	Role in Scale-Up	12/03 - virtual
Directory of the Bolivian Society of Soil Science (Arnulfo Borges)	Researcher	Role in Scale-Up	18/03 - virtual
Gender Responsible - PROCAMELIDOS – MDRyT (Susana Pérez)	Partner in proposal	Regional partner	18/03 - virtual
Andean Valley Industry technician (Adalid Velis)	Farmer	Role in Scale Up and Private Industry	15/03 - virtual
Local Authority Chacala community (Alfredo Colque)	Local authority	Role in Scale Up	11/03 – virtual
Local Authority Chita community (Rubén Mamani)	Local authority	Role in Scale Up	12/03 – virtual
Farmer of Sevaruyo community (Marcial Ordoñez)	Farmer	Role in Scale Up and Private Industry	13/03 - virtual
Farmer of Chita community (Juan Callizaya)	Farmer	Role in Scale Up and Private Industry	12/03 – virtual
Farmer of Chita community (Ever Villca)	Farmer	Role in Scale Up and Private Industry	12/03 – virtual
Farmer of Chita community (Nilda Paucar)	Farmer	Role in Scale Up and Private Industry	12/03 - virtual
Farmer of Chacala community (Teodocia Vásquez)	Farmer	Role in Scale Up and Private Industry	11/03 - virtual
Farmer of Chacala community (Gumerciendo Callapa)	Farmer	Role in Scale Up and Private Industry	11/03 – virtual
Farmer of Chacala community (Grover Sánchez)	Farmer	Role in Scale Up and Private Industry	11/03 - virtual

MÉXICO			
Manager of Hub Pacifico Sur-IDP CIMMYT (Abel Jaime Leal González)	Partner in proposal	Researcher	16/03 - virtual
Autonomous University of Mexico Collaborator (Cristian Reyna)	Partner in proposal	Researcher	11/03 - virtual

### **Governance and Management Assessment**

Governance and management arrangements will be assessed<sup>4</sup> in terms of extent to which they facilitate the participation and voice of stakeholders, fairness, accountability, along with being transparent, efficient, and independent.

### **Organizational Timeline**

Key events and changes in context will be assessed over the project's timeline. The analysis will help provide an overview of key events driving achievements to date, and considerations for future implementation.

### **Quality of Science Analysis**

This analysis will review the number and quality of publications using ISI of journals, where applicable. The processes for assuring high quality outputs and the extent to which papers are open access will also be examined.

### **Beneficiary Assessment**

Beneficiary Assessment will be used to assess the types of stakeholders benefiting from outputs and outcomes of the SKiM project. This includes rural poor, youth, and gender-sensitive beneficiary assessments.

### **Cost-benefit analysis**

Cost-benefit evaluation will be undertaken to quantify the impacts of any significant outputs to date, or from future implemented activities.

## **3.4. Main limitations of the evaluation:**

Due to the inability to travel, it has not been possible to hold face-to-face interviews with all CLCA project stakeholders. Interviews will be undertaken remotely in Mexico and Algeria which limits the scope for feedback. Face-to-face interview will be conducted in Tunisia and Bolivia, where possible. The evaluation will try to overcome these limitations through the selection of informants with connectivity, however this may limit the scope of informants who provide input into the evaluation.

## **3.5. Deliverables and timing of the evaluation**

The ToR has two deliverables. An additional interim report is included prior to submission of the evaluation report. They include:

<sup>4</sup> CGIAR-IEA (2014), Review of CGIAR Research Programs' Governance and Management. Rome, Italy: Independent Evaluation Arrangement (IEA) of CGIAR <http://iea.cgiar.org/>

- An **Inception Report** which expands on the TORs for the evaluation and includes interview templates, the basis for informant interviewee selection and results of a desk review of project documents. It provides a work plan and outline of the tools that will be used.
- A brief **Interim Report** outlining preliminary findings and possible recommendations for CLCA project team member's review. Comments and feedback will be included into the final evaluation report.
- The **Evaluation Report** presents all evidence and responses to evaluation criteria. It will include an executive summary, evaluation overview, description of evaluation tools, along with conclusions and recommendations. Supporting data and analysis will be annexed to the report

The timeline for outputs is as follows.

Table 4: **Evaluation timeline**

	Dates	Team Leader	MEN and LAC consulting	Activity
		Days	Days	
<b>Commence</b>	18/01/2021	0	0	Signed contract
<b>Inception Phase</b>	7-Jan	1	1	Joint meeting with ICARDA-CIMMYT for overall brainstorming and start-up of desk review. Each team to provide a small presentation on the status of the project.
	8-Jan	3	0	Preparatory Desktop Review
	8-Feb	3	0	Inception report drafting
	20-Feb	1	0	Draft Inception Report
	27-Feb	2	0	Submission of final Inception Report
<b>Data collection</b>	1/3 to 20/3	3	2	Document analysis
	1/3-16/4	2	8	Consultants visit action sites in Bolivia
	1/3-16/4	2	8	Consultants visit action sites in Tunisia
<b>Analysis-synthesis</b>	1/4-30/4	6	5	Analysis, synthesis, preparation of Final Report
	2-May	2	0	Share preliminary ideas, recommendations (Interim Report)
	7-May	1	0	Submission of draft final report
	14-May	0	0	Receipt of comments on draft final report
	14/5-29/5	2	1	Revise draft final report based on comments received
	22-May	1	0	Submit final evaluation report
<b>Dissemination</b>	1-Jun	1	1	Knowledge products from the evaluation report
<b>Total Days</b>		<b>30</b>	<b>26</b>	

### **3.6. Composition of team**

Ross McLeod will lead the evaluation. He is an economist and evaluation specialist who holds a Ph.D. in economic evaluation of research and development and is the Director of eSYS Development (economic consulting), Australia. He has 25 years of experience in designing, costing, coordinating, evaluating and reviewing development projects across 30 countries in Africa, Asia and the Pacific

Ross has demonstrated experience in results-based management, theory of change, impact pathways and evaluation of agricultural R&D which is evident across 150+ R&D project evaluations undertaken for Australian rural research corporations, the CSIRO, CGIAR Centres, Australian Cooperative Research Centres, the World Bank and the Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research. Agricultural project evaluation has included OECD criteria, cost benefit evaluation/appraisal, financial assessment, distribution effects of benefits using equilibrium trade models, reviews of lessons learned, and stakeholder consultation.

The North African consultations will be undertaken by Ahlem Massaoud. She is an agro-economist engineer in the AGER/ Agricultural Development Project. She has a bachelor's degree in Experimental Sciences from Abu Kacem Chebbi University and National Engineering Diploma specialising as an Agro economist. She has worked on numerous projects including AGER/NGO Fert, in the Governorates of: Kairouan/Kasserine/Sidi and Bouzid/Mahdia/ Monastir/Bizert, The Hive Association for Active Citizenship, Microfinanza/AGER and GIZ support for the integrated management of natural resources AGIRE II (GIZ Kairouan/Sidi BOUZID).

Informant interviews in LAC will be conducted by Dr Javier Aguilera (subject to mutual agreement), a specialist in soil and environmental management and conservation, with an emphasis on fertility of productive soils. He has extensive experience in the management, monitoring and evaluation of productive projects, with more than 20 years leading projects at the national level. He has extensive experience in participatory methodologies of research, training, and technology transfer, with a gender approach. His mother tongue is Spanish, and he speaks, writes, and reads fluent English. He holds a PhD in Soil and Environment Sciences from the School of Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources, University of Missouri, Columbia.

## Annex 1: Evaluation matrix

Questions and Proposed Evaluation Tools	Project team interviews	SSI A: NARS,	SSI B: Association	SSI C: Farmer	Governance Assessment	Organizational Timeline	Quality of Science Analysis	Beneficiary Assessment	Cost-benefit Analysis
<b>Relevance and coherence</b>									
Was the project design appropriate to meet the intervention's objectives? - -Was the project adjusted during implementation to any changes in context to retain continued relevance? Was the adjustment necessary	✓	✓			✓	✓			
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 result	✓	✓			✓	✓			
Have constraints to outcomes and impacts been considered in the project design?	✓								
Is it evident that the project builds on the latest scientific thinking and research results	✓								
To what extent is the project competing with other programs conducting similar types of research, and what efforts are being made to avoid duplication or promote synergy	✓								
Do scientists participating in the project understand research and development activities	✓								
Who are the main users of project outputs? Is there evidence of demand for project outputs? Is there evidence of real value added	✓	✓	✓	✓					
<b>Effectiveness (Goals)</b>									
What is the change in yield gaps of wheat and barley among CLCA farms in Tunisia and Algeria?	✓								
What is the change in weaned lambs among CLCA farms in Tunisia and Algeria?	✓								
What is the change in total yield of cereals and legumes among CLCA farms in Bolivia and Mexico?	✓								
What is the change in liveweight livestock among CLCA farms in Bolivia and Mexico?	✓								

<b>Effectiveness (Objectives)</b>									
How many KM models have been produced that include formative research, tools, and products?	✓								
How many evidence-based policy briefs have been produced?	✓								
How many national innovation systems have been developed which have led to uptake of CLCA technologies?	✓								
What has been the change in soil organic matter on CLCA farms?	✓								
What has been the change in water use efficiency on CLCA farms?	✓								
What has been the change in body condition score among livestock on CLCA farms in Tunisia and Algeria?	✓								
What has been the change in average daily gain among livestock on CLCA farms in Tunisia and Algeria?	✓								
What has been the change in wheat production cost on CLCA farms in Tunisia and Algeria?	✓								
What has been the change in fuel cost for wheat production on CLCA farms in Tunisia, Algeria, Bolivia, and Mexico?	✓								
<b>Effectiveness (Outcome 1)</b>									
How many farmers that have been exposed to the CLCA farmer-led extension systems?	✓								
How many farmers have adopted CLCA farming systems?	✓								
<b>Effectiveness (Output 1.1)</b>									
What are the changes in barley and wheat yields among CLCA farms in Tunisia and Algeria?	✓								
What are the changes in forage biomass among CLCA farms in Tunisia and Algeria?	✓								
How many livestock have been impacted by CLCA practices in Tunisia and Algeria?	✓								
What are the changes in fecundity rate among sheep on CLCA farms in Tunisia and Algeria?	✓								
What are the changes in the amount of dry matter (DM) fodder produced in Mexico?	✓								
How many beneficiaries have participated in knowledge sharing on CLCA practice management?	✓								
<b>Effectiveness (Output 1.2)</b>									
What areas have had soil and water conservation practices applied?	✓								
<b>Effectiveness (Outcome 2)</b>									
How many partners have adopted CLCA tools and methodologies for reliable decision-making?	✓								

<b>Effectiveness (Output 1.3)</b>									
How many analyses have generated costs, benefits, and market viability of CLCA options?	✓								
How many farm-level models developed that include multi-criteria assessment and trade off analysis for different farm types and agro-ecologies have been developed?	✓								
How many simulation tools of optimized CLCA systems have been produced?	✓								
<b>Effectiveness (Output 1.4)</b>									
How many ICT-based M&E tools have been developed that include algorithms for data storage and analysis?	✓								
How many participatory evaluations have been conducted in CLCA intervention countries?	✓								
How many surveys conducted to gather feedback from decision-makers and private market actors?	✓								
<b>Effectiveness (Outcome 3)</b>									
How many local innovation systems have been developed?	✓	✓	✓	✓					
<b>Effectiveness (Output 2.1)</b>									
How many knowledge and learning structures within which IFAD's toolkits on HHMs have been tested for proof of concept and adaptation?	✓								
<b>Effectiveness (Output 2.2)</b>									
How many CLCA intervention countries in which there is provision of efficient and effective support by extension/advisory services to beneficiaries?	✓								
How many CLCA guidelines developed for extension and advisory services developed with partner organizations?	✓								
How many private machinery service providers supported by CLCA?	✓								
How many individuals participating in CLCA courses, workshops, or field days?	✓								
How many groups using CLCA-generated methodologies and knowledge?	✓								
How many of research questions formulated that feed back to component 1?	✓								
<b>Impacts, innovation, scaling up and likely sustainability</b>									
What have been the Institutional commitment to project-related investments. Eg. Have resources been leveraged from NARES partners?	✓	✓							
How much South-South collaboration has occurred? What more can be done?	✓	✓							
Do project activities benefit from the engagement, participation and ownership of local communities, grass-roots organizations and the rural poor, and are adopted approaches technically viable?	✓	✓	✓	✓					



Is there potential for substantial outcomes and impacts (both planned & unplanned) in the next two years?	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓	✓
To what extent are positive outcomes demonstrated at pilot or small-scale level likely to be sustained and out scalable	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓	✓
<b>Efficiency and governance</b>									
How does the project expenditure compare to the budget- whole budget and per deliverable?	✓				✓	✓			
Have any re-allocations been done? What was the rationale? What are the implications of the reallocations to the budget structure and cost-effectiveness?	✓				✓	✓			
To what extent do the governance and management arrangements permit and facilitate the effective participation and voice of the different categories of stakeholders?	✓	✓			✓	✓			
How effective is contract management? Doe the PMU monitor the delivery of agreed outputs and is this delivery linked to payments? What actions can/does the PMU take in the case of non-delivery of agreed outputs?	✓				✓	✓			
To what extent are the lines of accountability within the project well-defined, accepted, and being followed? Are there any significant gaps in programmatic accountability?	✓				✓	✓			
To what extent are the program's decision-making, reporting, and evaluation processes open and available to the general public, subject to confidentiality requirements in scientific research and in human resource management?	✓				✓	✓			
How effective and efficient have been the criteria and the procedures for allocating the projects resources? How have the resource allocation processes, and timing affected the implementation of research activities?	✓				✓	✓			
Is the level of collaboration and coordination appropriate and efficient for reaching maximum synergies and enhancing partner capacity?	✓	✓			✓	✓			
Are implementation and sustainability related risks adequately identified and managed?	✓				✓	✓			
Is the management of Intellectual property used or generated by the project appropriately managed?	✓				✓	✓			
Does the quality of outputs to date reflect value for money? What can be done for the remainder of the project to enhance impact	✓				✓	✓			
Are the internal processes and conditions, including research staff and leadership quality, adequate for quality assurance	✓				✓	✓			
<b>M&amp;E Approach</b>									
Is the monitoring and evaluation system efficient for recording and enhancing processes, progress, and achievements?	✓								
Do the impact pathways logically link activities to impacts?	✓								
Are the proposed indicators to measure increased water use efficiency in rainfed and irrigated systems and reduction of erosion in soils with steep slopes appropriate?	✓								
Are the proposed indicators for measuring comprehensive trade-off models between competing uses for crop residue biomass developed and simplified for wider use? What needs to be done to deliver this output.	✓								
Has there been accurate evaluation of the social, economic, and ecological impacts of CLCA packages	✓								

<b>Cross Cutting themes</b>									
Have gender and youth issues been adequately considered in research design in terms of relevance to and effect on women/youth?	✓	✓							
Has gender been adequately considered in the impact pathway analysis, in terms of the differential roles of women and men along the impact pathways, generating equitable benefits for both women and men and enhancing the overall likelihood enhancing the livelihoods of women?	✓								
Does research on gender and youth have the potential to make a significant difference (or is it largely addressing marginal issues)?	✓								
How gender and youth research being embedded in on-going processes and scale-up and out	✓								
Have natural resource management and climate resilience and Productive agricultural technologies issues been adequately considered in research design in terms of relevance to and effect	✓								
To what extent has the project management unit developed partnerships with the entities highlighted in the proposal and other relevant entities? To what extent is the project facilitating knowledge management within these established partnerships	✓	✓	✓						

## Annex 2: Resumes of team members

### TEAM LEADER

Dr Ross McLeod is an economist and evaluation specialist with 20 years' experience designing and evaluating research and development programs across 30 countries in Africa, Asia, and the Australia-Pacific. He has been responsible for the management of, and has participated in, numerous projects. Examples include preparation of 8 development bank loans for the mobilization of \$US 300+ million in health assistance across Asia over last 10 years and evaluation of 150+ health, agriculture and food security projects for Asian Development Bank, Australian rural development corporations, United Nations agencies and the Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research. He holds a PhD in evaluation and master's degrees in public health from the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine and University of Oxford

### NORTH AFRICA

Ahlem Massaoud is an agro-economist engineer in the AGER/ Agricultural Development Project. She has a bachelor's degree in Experimental Sciences from Abu Kacem Chebbi University and National Engineering Diploma specialising as an Agro economist. She has worked on numerous projects including AGER/NGO Fert, in the Governorates of: Kairouan/Kasserine/Sidi and Bouzid/Mahdia/ Monastir/Bizert, The Hive Association for Active Citizenship, Microfinanza/AGER and GIZ support for the integrated management of natural resources AGIRE II (GIZ Kairouan/Sidi BOUZID).

### LATIN AMERICA

Dr Javier Aguilera is a specialist in soil and environmental management and conservation, with an emphasis on fertility of productive soils. He has extensive experience in the management, monitoring, and evaluation of productive projects, with more than 20 years leading projects at the national level. He has extensive experience in participatory methodologies of research, training, and technology transfer, with a gender approach. His mother tongue is Spanish, and he speaks, writes, and reads fluent English. He holds a PhD in Soil and Environment Sciences from the School of Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources, University of Missouri, Columbia

## Annex 3: Interview templates

---

### QUESTIONNAIRE A

Partner NARS Scientists and Extension Officers, Universities

#### Mid-Term Evaluation of the CLCA Project

*All information will be treated in strict confidence*

This questionnaire forms part of the mid-term evaluation of the IFAD CLCA project. A summary of results will be made available to any interested parties in the evaluation report.

---

Name:

Organisation:

Position:

Gender (M/F)

Age <25 years Y/N

Interview date:

---

A.1. What do you consider unique about the CLCA project?

---

A.2. What role have you had in project design?

---

A.3. What do you consider the best output of the CLCA project so far? Please provide at least one specific example

---

---

A.4. Who are the users of the CLCA outputs? Do you think there is demand for these outputs?

---

A.5. What is the value added of the IFAD supported program?

---

A.6. Are the benefits of the CLCA project research clear to you?

---

A.7. How do you think farmer CLCA practices will change?

---

A.8. What are you doing to support adoption of CLCA outputs?

Who is being targeted and how?

---

A.9. What do you think will be the most significant impact of CLCA in the next 2 years (if any)? How will it be achieved in your view? How will it be sustained?

---

A.10. In your opinion are there any issues or challenges facing CLCA implementation and potential impact? Do you have suggestions for solving these?

---

---

A.11. What do you see as the strengths of the CLCA approach?

---

A.12. What role do you have in work planning for the CLCA project?

Do you consider this input sufficient, or how should it change?

---

A.13. Have activities been built on lessons learned in the past? If not, what could be improved for further implementation

---

A.14. What changes, if any, would you like to see in the remaining period of the CLCA project, and why?

---

Notes:

---

---

# QUESTIONNAIRE B

Policy Maker, Development Agency, NGO

## Mid-Term Evaluation of the CLCA Project

*All information will be treated in strict confidence*

This questionnaire forms part of the mid-term evaluation of the IFAD CLCA project. A summary of results will be made available to any interested parties in the evaluation report.

---

Name:

Position:

Organisation:

Gender (M/F)

Age <25 years Y/N

Date of interview:

---

B.1. Does the project target key CLCA issues in your opinion? If so what issue(s)?

---

B.2. What contribution have you made to designing the CLCA project and implementing activities?

---

B.3. Do you think project outputs will be adopted? What will be required to achieve this?

---

---

B.4. What do you think is the most important output of the CLCA project? Please provide an example and outline why?

---

B.5. Do you anticipate that the research will result in significant impacts? If so, which people will benefit and what types of benefits will they gain. When may this happen?

---

B.6. In your view, will youth and women benefit from the CLCA project – and what kinds of benefits will they be?

---

B.7. Do you think the outcomes and impacts achieved by the CLCA project will be sustainable without support from the project? If yes, how. If not, what can be done.

---

B.8. In your view, what can be done for the remainder of the project to maximise CLCA project effectiveness and potential impact

---



---

# QUESTIONNAIRE C

Farmer, Private Industry or Association

## Mid-Term Evaluation of the CLCA Project

*All information will be treated in strict confidence*

This questionnaire forms part of the mid-term evaluation of the IFAD CLCA project. A summary of results will be made available to any interested parties in the evaluation report.

---

Name:

Position:

Organisation:

Gender (M/F)

Age <25 years Y/N

Date of interview:

---

C.1. What do you consider most useful about this project?

---

C.2. What contribution have you made to designing the project?

---

C.3. Have you attended field days or training sessions? What was good and bad about these days/sessions? What could be improved?

---

---

C.4. Have you or your community benefited from the project? If yes, please outline how? If not, please explain why/

---

C.5. Do you anticipate that the project will result in significant impacts?

If so, which people will benefit and what types of benefits will they gain. When may this happen?

---

C.6. In your view, what can be done for the remainder of the project to maximise project impact

---