PROLINNOVA
PROmoting Local INNOVAtion
in ecologically-oriented agriculture and natural resource management

Funded by Rockefeller Foundation
Innovation for the Next 100 Years

Strengthening Community Resilience to Change: Combining Local Innovative Capacities with Scientific Research (CLIC–SR)

Rockefeller Foundation Project No. 2012 CSD 205

Final narrative report covering the period January–August 2016 with summary analysis of project achievements 2012–2016

PROLINNOVA International Secretariat, ETC Foundation, Netherlands
31 August 2016

Contents

List of acronyms

ABSHCBDA	Alem Birhan Self-Help Community-Based Development Association
BPA	Best Practice Association
CLIC–SR	Combining Local Innovative Capacity with Scientific Research
CP	Country Platform
CSO	civil-society organization
EA	Environmental Alert
FFS	Farmer Field School
IIRR	International Institute of Rural Reconstruction
INADES	Institut Africain pour le Développement Économique et Social
IPW	International Partners Workshop
KALRO	Kenya Agricultural and Livestock Research Organization
LISF	Local Innovation Support Fund
LSC	Local Steering Committee
M&E	monitoring and evaluation
MuZARDI	Mukono Zonal Agricultural Research and Development Institute
NARO	National Agricultural Research Organization
NGO	non-governmental organization
NRM	natural resource management
NSC	National Steering Committee
PE	PROLINNOVA–Ethiopia
PELUM	Participatory Ecological Land Use Management
PID	participatory innovation development
PROLINNOVA	Promoting Local Innovation in ecologically oriented agriculture and NRM
TALIRI	Tanzania Livestock Research Institute
UNCST	Uganda National Council for Science and Technology

Executive summary

Introduction

The CLIC–SR project started on 1 September 2012, ended on 31 August 2016, and was implemented in four countries: Ethiopia, Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda. This report covers the work done in the final project period: January–August 2016. The report adds a chapter that reviews the achievements of the project over the full project cycle. The report from an independent external evaluation was a major source of information for this final chapter.

Activities implemented in 2016

Partners concluded and analyzed the results of the ***participatory innovation development / joint experimentation activities*** where still needed. This was done either through field-based sharing and feedback meetings (2 meetings in Uganda) or review workshops and/or write-shops (3 workshops: Tanzania, Kenya, Ethiopia). Involving all relevant stakeholders, including male and female farmers, in the field meetings as well as the workshops brought different perspectives into the analysis.

A major focus of work in the reporting period was on the compilation, ***publishing and dissemination of findings and lessons learnt***. This work built on country-level dissemination strategies prepared early on in the project. Three Country Platforms (CPs), i.e. those in Ethiopia, Kenya and Uganda, published booklets/ catalogues presenting the most interesting cases of farmer innovation and innovation development in response to change. All CPs prepared case studies on joint-experimentation activities and the Tanzanian CP (five cases) and the Ugandan CP (two cases) processed these for external publishing. The CPs in Kenya and Uganda also published a (policy) brief on CLIC–SR themes, while the CPs in Tanzania and Kenya each prepared a paper on one or several joint experiments for presentation at a scientific conference. At the international level, a booklet was compiled of selected PID cases from the four countries, which in turn formed the basis for a policy brief with main project findings.

The CP in Uganda was the only one to undertake further ***policy-dialogue*** activities this year. It organized a one-day national stakeholder workshop on PID and climate change to link up with selected policymakers and to review implications of CLIC–SR findings for relevant policy debates. Among the 36 participants were representatives of the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF), the Uganda National Council for Science and Technology (UNCST), the National Agricultural Research Organization (NARO) and several district governments. The PROLINNOVA [1] international support team continued to contribute to international debates and conferences.

As far as ***project coordination and management*** are concerned, well-established mechanisms for project management allowed handling of the budget-neutral extension and the final reporting and closing of the project. Initially unplanned, all key partners managed to meet in Senegal on May, back-to-back with a PROLINNOVA workshop, to discuss tasks to finalize the project. An independent external evaluation done by a Zimbabwean researcher concluded that the project fully achieved 84% of its 19 targets, significantly achieved one (5%) and partly achieved two (11%). The main outcomes identified include enhanced farmer innovation, increased resilience in the communities to change, and farmer empowerment to deal with income-related challenges and to improve their livelihoods.

[1] PROLINNOVA: **PRO**moting **L**ocal **INNOVA**tion in ecologically oriented agriculture and natural resource management

Achievements 2012–2016

The CLIC–SR project was designed to ***strengthen the innovative capacity of smallholder farmers and their communities*** by studying, understanding and valuing local perceptions of change and farmers' own innovation responses to these changes and by implementing and documenting farmer-led joint-experimentation. Close to 30 innovations were found and documented. Over the project period, 21 joint experiments were undertaken, sometimes involving farmers and extension agents but often also including formal researchers. Findings were shared locally through workshops and case-study reports and, in the case of two CPs, through scientific papers. Around 135 farmers received some financial support from Local Innovation Support Funds (LISFs) under the project to work on their innovations. The above-mentioned work was complemented by focused capacity-building workshops for more than 1300 community members to help build their adaptive / innovation capacity.

Documentation of farmer innovations led to their dissemination and uptake, which in turn increased community adaptive capacities, but more study would be needed to quantify this. Uptake of farmer innovations will be limited to areas with similar conditions and happens often in innovation "bundles" of related, mutually supportive innovations. Working relations between researchers, extension staff and farmers improved after working together in joint experimentation, and this could facilitate future collaboration as evident, among other things, from farmers' increased experimentation capacities and confidence and experts' respect for innovation capacities of farmers.

To ***strengthen capacities of government and CSO staff in PID*** and understanding its relevance for helping farmers deal with change, including climate change, several training workshops were organized in each country, typically lasting 3–4 days, and reaching a total for the entire project of 349 people (just above 30% women). Unfortunately, there is no systematic information on the application of the learning by the participants, and the external evaluation was not in a position to cover this in detail. Several end-of-project review and documentation workshops reported how local government staff members who had been trained paid more attention to farmer innovation in their area and involved farmer innovators in their regular activities.

For increasing ***insights and awareness on relevance and effectiveness of PID***, the project continued to facilitate PROLINNOVA multistakeholder partnerships in the four countries through regular meetings. Based on country-specific dissemination strategies, a diversity of information carriers and publications were produced and distributed; these included 13 videos on farmer innovation (Kenya), four catalogues / booklets on farmer innovation (two in Ethiopia and one each in Kenya and Uganda), two policy briefs (in Kenya and Uganda) and seven case studies on joint experimentation/PID (five in Tanzania and two in Uganda). The CP partners in Kenya hosted the Eastern African Farmer Innovation Fair, a large-scale event to share the relevance of the farmer-led innovation development approach promoted by the project with a wide audience. The fair was attended by more than 1000 people and co-funded by several local and international donors.

At international level, project findings were shared through four annual PROLINNOVA International Partners Workshops and disseminated through the PROLINNOVA website, listserver and other relevant websites and listservers, as well as the publication of a booklet with selected PID cases and a policy brief on strengthening community resilience for dealing with change. In addition, the finding of the CLIC-SR project were incorporate in conference papers and articles.

The weak capacities of some of the key partners in documentation of the joint experimentation proved to be a challenge – particularly capacities to probe and look for wider sets of issues beyond the expected ones. This was less so in cases where formal researchers where actively involved. The

international team also gave substantial support to documentation activities, particularly in the final year. However, funds available were too limited to implement the full dissemination plan.

The ***policy dialogue component to mainstream the PID approach*** started with a review of relevant policy areas and possible entry points for CLIC–SR policy dialogue. Half- to one-day meetings were organized by the CPs in Ethiopia (5) and Uganda (1) to bring farmer innovators, project partners and decision-makers together to discuss central issues coming out of the CLIC–SR project. In Kenya, the Eastern Africa Farmer Innovation Fair was the main event for policy dialogue. In Tanzania, partners chose to support and send farmer innovators (13) to various agricultural shows to give evidence of their innovativeness. At the international level, members of the international support team and CP partner staff together participated in close to 30 relevant international seminars and policy meetings to share CLIC–SR experiences around building community resilience, PID, multi-stakeholder partnerships and climate-change adaptation.

There is no evidence of outcome in terms of changes to relevant policies. The external evaluation documents examples of integration of PID and joint experimentation into agricultural research work, attention to farmers' own innovation and PID in district council plans and activities, and infusion of PID into agricultural extension systems at district level. Policy-dialogue work was influenced negatively by changes in staff at the CP coordination level as well as a lack of capacities of key partners or lack of links with other specialized organizations.

The ***project's coordination and M&E*** (monitoring and evaluation) hinged on the effective systems developed within the wider PROLINNOVA network, with ETC Foundation coordinating at the international level in close collaboration with CP coordinators. The International Institute of Rural Reconstruction (IIRR) in the Philippines provided support on M&E. Generally, this worked well and allowed activities to be planned, implemented, evaluated and reported, while meeting requirements of the Rockefeller Foundation. Staff changes in project coordination in three of the four countries led to delays in implementation of the M&E. Some partners felt that the Excel-based M&E tool took too long to become available and was too complex to involve farmers in M&E. By lack of dedicated funding for visits to the countries, the technical support by the international support team was limited mostly to communication by email and Skype. In this context, the four annual partners meetings proved to be important events to review the previous year's progress, to receive advice on addressing challenges encountered and to strategize work for the following year.

Overall, the project strengthened the innovative farmers' – including many women's – confidence, self-belief and self-esteem through recognizing their work and creating platforms for them to showcase their work. It managed to enhance farmer innovation processes through investigating the essential aspects of local innovations and also, through the documentation and sharing of farmer innovations, contributed to increasing the resilience of farmers and communities involved to changes they are experiencing. There is some evidence as to how the above-mentioned processes helped farmers to address livelihood challenges and increase their asset base. Through PID, the project broadened the range of resources, knowledge and products available to farmers by mobilizing the contributions of agricultural research institutes, district- and county-level structures and agricultural extension departments. There are indications that some of the above-mentioned outcomes are spreading beyond the farmers and communities directly involved in the project, but more study would be required to substantiate this.

1 Introduction

The CLIC–SR project promotes farmer-led joint innovation that builds on the creativity of local people in ways that seek to enhance the capacities of farmers and their communities to adapt to change, including climate change. The overall vision of the CLIC–SR project and of the PROLINNOVA network in general is a world where women and men in smallholder families and communities play decisive roles in innovation systems in agriculture and natural resource management (NRM) for sustainable livelihoods.

The objectives of the CLIC–SR project were to:

- Strengthen the resilience to change of smallholders and their communities, especially the women, by enhancing their innovative capacity and thus their livelihood security through joint experimentation, also known as participatory innovation development (PID);
- Build the capacity of organizations working in agriculture and NRM so that they can effectively work with and support smallholder communities in their efforts to adapt;
- Increase insights and awareness on relevance and effectiveness of PID through sharing and learning;
- Mainstream PID as an accepted approach within targeted national and international policies and programs related to agricultural development, NRM and climate-change adaptation.

The CLIC–SR project started on 1 September 2012, initially for a period of three years, that then became four years after the project was extended by one year until the end of August 2016. CLIC–SR was being implemented in Ethiopia, Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda. In the first four months of the project (September–December 2012), inception and planning workshops were held in all four countries and field studies on local perceptions of and local innovation in response to external changes were designed. The field studies commenced in late 2012 and were completed in 2013. Preparatory consultative and planning meetings were held in all four countries in 2013 to start up farmer-led joint experimentation together with scientists from research centers and/or universities. The project partners embarked on PID training for community groups and staff from civil-society organizations (CSOs) and the local government. The Eastern Africa Farmer Innovation Fair in 2013 provided an opportunity for some farmers working with the four CPs in CLIC–SR to showcase their innovations. The event also created an excellent space for interaction between farmer innovators and other stakeholders in agricultural research and development, particularly policymakers.

In 2014 and 2015, the work focused on expanding and strengthening the joint experimentation and capacity-building activities. In Ethiopia, Kenya and Tanzania, partners made use of existing Local Innovation Support Funds (LISFs) to channel support for joint experimentation and/or established a new LISF (in one district in Kenya). In the course of 2015, partners also started to give more attention to documentation and sharing of experiences, including the organization of policy-dialogue activities.

This report summarizes the CLIC–SR activities undertaken in the final months of the project, i.e. from January to August 2016. A major focus of work has been the consolidation of documentation of experiences and lessons learnt and their publication. Partners also used this period to organize an external evaluation process to deepen their understanding of successes and failures in the project. This external evaluation is the basis for the final chapter in this report, which reviews the overall achievements of the project during the period 2012–2016.

2 Activities accomplished in 2016

This chapter summarizes the main work undertaken and its achievements from January until the end of August 2016. The discussion is organized according to four main objectives of the project.

Objective 1: Strengthen innovative capacity of smallholder farmers and their communities

Activity 1.1: Field studies and documentation of local innovation

The field studies in the four countries were completed and reported in 2013. In the case of Tanzania, additional field visits were made in the reporting period to collect information needed to fill gaps or make updates, in preparing for publishing about the innovations.

Activity 1.2: Implementation and documentation of farmer-led joint innovation development

Ethiopia: In Enebse Sar Midir *Woreda* (District), the working area of the Alem Birhan Self-Help Community-Based Development Association (ABSHCBDA), one of the implementing partners in Ethiopia, the CLIC–SR farmer-led innovation development is integrated into activities of three Farmer Field Schools (FFSs): groups of 15–30 farmers each that engage in experimentation to address main challenges in their farming. During the reporting period, representatives of all three FFSs met for two days with a larger group of farmer innovators and development and research staff (total of 50 participants) to present and review the experimentation done by farmers in the past season. A total of 11 cases were reviewed, covering a variety of topics. Among these, participants selected two innovation areas that would benefit from stronger involvement of formal researchers. This experimentation will continue beyond the CLIC–SR project period with funding from other sources.

In the Axum project area, partners concluded joint experiments on a number of topics including joint assessment of sheep and goat breeds, soil moisture management systems, chicken sex identification in eggs, and different techniques for planting *Shibaka* or *Tsekente* trees through cuttings. A last PID process concluded at the end of this period involved a group of 14 very poor farmers, who were encouraged to try out different innovations after interaction and training with farmer innovators.

Kenya: During the first months of this year, partners gave final follow-up to joint experiments in Mwingi, Machakos County, which were then concluded and documented. The experiments had been selected and planned with the Local Steering Committee (LSC), i.e. farmers handling the LISF, and were intended to further develop and improve farmers' innovative responses to change. These were:

1) *Joint development of an egg selector app*: This involved collaboration between an innovative farmer, her farmer group, a government extensionist and an ICT expert from Kenyatta University with the aim to develop a simple app that would help farmers determine the sex of eggs from external characteristics, following the system developed by the innovative farmer. However, the results of the experiment were not conclusive, as the eggs did not hatch after 21 days; most eggs bought from local farmers were unfertilized.

2) *Rejuvenation and productivity increase of old pawpaw trees through capping*: This involved an innovative farmer and the local extension officer. Notable changes could be seen between the capped and uncapped trees; the former performed much better on all key M&E criteria.

3) *Determination of watering regimes for vegetables planted in waste polythene bags*: This involved the LSC with guidance from the Mwingi agricultural extension officer and looked into the frequency of watering, quantity of water required as well as the economics of this system. However, the area experienced heavy rainfall, which hindered the experiment.

4) *Dividing/multiplying stingless-bee colonies*: This was an experiment jointly by an innovative farmer, the LSC and the Mwingi extension officer with guidance from the Apiculture Research Institute of the Kenya Agricultural and Livestock Research Organization (KARLO). The experiment was successful in the sense that it led to an effective method for dividing the bee colonies, using wooden boxes and several other specific techniques.

The four farmer innovators mentioned above and the Mwingi extension officer met with CLIC–SR partners during a one-day "write-shop". The main objective was to review the process and results of the joint experiments and to document the process. This was achieved through structured questions, whereby the farmers gave their perceptions of the process and recommendations for catalyzing locally defined experimentation.

In addition to the above-mentioned joint experiments, Kenyan partners and the LSCs in the two project areas (Machakos and Baringo) also followed up on ten farmers / farmer groups working on their own innovations, having received some financial support for this through the LISF.

Tanzania: To conclude the cycle of implementation and capacity building on farmer-led innovation development, Tanzania partners organized a 3-day workshop of people involved in the joint experimentation activities and earlier capacity-building events in order to share the outcome of completed research, review and discuss how partners have applied PID and what they learned from it, and thus prepare themselves for documentation and publishing of findings. The workshop had 36 participants (including 7 women), the majority of who were staff from government agencies and non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Participants also shared whether and how they are supporting farmer-led innovation development in their own work, either through engaging in joint experimentation directly (in the case of livestock researchers who are continuing joint experiments on cattle feeding, using their own funds) or encouraging and involving farmer innovators in own programs (in the case of several district extension staff).

Uganda: As an important step in finalizing the documentation of farmer-led joint experimentation, Ugandan partners organized one-day community assessments in each of the two project districts. Though the assessments first of all focused on the one farmer innovation and joint experiment visited, other cases and experiences were also brought in and were documented.

In Moyo District, the assessment focused on the transitional beehive. It allowed the farmer innovator to share and disseminate the results of the experiments and the community members to verify these results. Participants included beekeepers, extension staff, entomologists and a formal researcher – a total of 13 participants (9 men and 4 women).

In Nakasongola District, the community assessment focused on the innovation on economic utilization of water in a nursery bed for trees. The event involved 45 participants (35 men and 10 women). Apart from the farmer innovators and members of the farmer groups to which they belong, the event was attended by the District Chief Administrative Officer of Nakasongola and other district extension staff and staff of NARO Mukono Zonal Agricultural Research and Development Institute (MuZARDI). Generally, the assessment concluded that the innovation involving the use of polythene lining is simple and can easily be replicated. It was recommended that agriculture and forestry departments and other

development institutions would support farmers in scaling out this innovation. Information emerging from these assessments was used to enrich the two publications on PID in Uganda (see below).

Activity 1.3: Training community groups to strengthen local adaptive capacity

The formal training of community groups had been concluded in 2015. Some of the PID assessment and implementation activities mentioned above had important capacity-building dynamics.

Objective 2: Strengthen the capacity of organizations working in agriculture and NRM

Activity 2.1: Training CSO and local government staff

No further training of CSO and local government staff was undertaken in the reporting period in **Kenya, Tanzania** and **Uganda**. The CPs in Tanzania and Uganda organized important assessments or other workshop activities on farmer-led innovation development to contribute to documentation of experiences and lessons learnt (see Section 1.2 above). As always, these activities also contributed to further capacity building of those involved.

In **Ethiopia**, one final 3-day training workshop was held with about 50 participants – staff from CSOs and from government extension, training and research organizations working in the Enebse Sar Midir area. The workshop focused on gaining an understanding of PID, climate-change adaptation and Climate Resilient Green Economy (CRGE) and the linkages between these. The training in itself strengthened linkages among these key stakeholders and encouraged them to form a team that will work to create more attention to farmer innovation in response to changes in the area, also beyond the project timeframe.

Objective 3: Increase insights and awareness on relevance and effectiveness of PID

Activity 3.1: Facilitation of PROLINNOVA national multi-stakeholder partnerships

The PROLINNOVA multi-stakeholder platforms for promoting and institutionalizing local innovation and PID approaches in each of the four countries provide a means to involve several organizations concerned with agriculture and rural development in learning about the progress and findings of the CLIC–SR project. The steering committees of these platforms also play a role in overseeing and guiding the implementation of the CLIC–SR work.

Ethiopia: At the closure of the project, a one-day meeting was organized in Addis Ababa with PROLINNOVA–Ethiopia (PE) steering committee (Technical Advisory Group) members and other PE advocates to learn of the results of the CLIC–SR project and to assess its achievements. The meeting also discussed ways to revitalize the PE network.

Kenya: One meeting of the PROLINNOVA–Kenya National Steering Committee (NSC) was held towards the end of this project phase to assess the status of project implementation and to give guidance to the conclusion of activities. Bilateral working meetings with NSC members also took place to coordinate specific sub-activities.

Tanzania: During the visit of the external evaluator to Tanzania, a one-day partners meeting was held in Dodoma to review achievements over the four years of the project and to provide inputs into the external evaluation.

Uganda: During the reporting period, inputs from the core team of PROLINNOVA–Uganda stakeholders to activities and, particularly, to the work on publications were mobilized on an individual basis. All members of the NSC joined the national sharing workshop, which also mapped the way forward for the partnership in Uganda.

Activity 3.2: Countrywide dissemination of findings and lessons

Consolidating and spreading of findings and results of the CLIC–SR work as widely as possible was a major area of attention in all four CPs during this final stage of the project. Partners built on the country-specific communication / dissemination strategies prepared by all CPs with support from the international support team early on in the project. Publications realized in the reporting period were as follows:

Ethiopia: A booklet was published with successful local cases of farmer-led innovation and innovation development and distributed in the Enebse Sar Midir area. In Axum, farmer innovations were documented and published in two issues of the quarterly magazine *The Bees* (in Tigrinya). A selection of best cases of farmer innovation in response to change – cases derived from the CLIC–SR project as well as other initiatives and projects in Tigray Region – have been published by the PE partners - Best Practice Association (BPA) and the Institute for Sustainable Development (ISD) - in the booklet "Best practices of smallholder farmers in Ethiopia", co-funded by the Church of Sweden. This is the second book in the series "Stories of change at the grassroots".

Kenya: Partners decided to focus on producing a brief – a well-laid-out and accessible publication –on the LISFs and their role in strengthening community resilience, building on the CLIC–SR experiences as well as experiences with LISF elsewhere in the country. They also finalized, published and distributed an *Innovations Catalogue* to spread the message on the relevance of local innovation in dealing with change.

Tanzania: The Tanzanian partners shared experiences in PID through the publication of five technical notes in Swahili and English for each of the five joint experiments. They also produced one booklet on the PID experiences across all cases for use in future policy dialogue. The CP coordinator and a senior researcher from the Livestock Research Institute in Mpwapwa co-authored a paper on the joint experiment on cattle fattening using fishmeal that was presented at the National Research Conference on Innovations organized by the Commission for Science and Technology (COSTECH).

Uganda: A 12-page policy brief on PID and farmer innovation related to climate-change adaptation was published as a main vehicle to spread lessons from the project widely in the country. In addition, two case studies of farmer-led joint experimentation were published as well as a booklet compiling the most relevant cases of farmer innovation linked to climate-change adaptation.

Activity 3.3: PROLINNOVA International Partners Workshop

CLIC–SR partners from all four CPs involved in the project as well as international support team members based in the Netherlands attended the PROLINNOVA 2016 International Partners Workshop (IPW) hosted by PROLINNOVA–Senegal in May 2016 in Thiès, Senegal. The CLIC–SR partners contributed their project experiences in the session on strengthening resilience. They also shared with members from other countries in Africa and Asia the main findings and lessons from the CLIC–SR external

evaluation. A report on the 2016 IPW can be found on the PROLINNOVA website (http://www.prolinnova.net/content/prolinnova-international-partners-workshop-report-2016).

Though initially not planned and budgeted for, a CLIC–SR partners meeting was held ahead of the above-mentioned IPW in Senegal. Two persons each from Tanzania and Uganda and one person each from Kenya and Ethiopia took part in this meeting with representatives of the international support team (see also Activity 5.2). The half-day meeting – the final one in the project cycle – focused on reviewing and commenting on the findings of the external evaluator, who also attended the meeting, and discussing the PID cases from the four countries that had been shortlisted for detailed documentation and international publication.

Activity 3.4: International dissemination of findings and lessons

The international support team, including PID expert Brigid Letty from South Africa, collected the two cases of farmer-led joint experimentation that each of the four CPs regarded as most interesting and worked intensively with the CP partners in writing detailed case studies on each. These eight case studies have been processed into a booklet that is to be published and distributed shortly in PDF form online. The evidence from these cases as well as other experiences within the CLIC–SR project formed the basis for the international support team to write a succinct policy brief on farmer-led innovation development for strengthening community resilience in the face of change. This policy brief will also be available shortly, both online and in hard copy.

The CLIC–SR Yahoogroup has 62 members from the various partner organizations in the four countries, including some farmers. Information exchange through this e-list was limited during these final months of the project. Many more (100 plus) messages, mainly about sources of information, training opportunities and workshops related to local innovation, resilience and adaptation to change, were shared via the wider (*ca* 650-member) international PROLINNOVA Yahoogroup, which included ample information relevant for CLIC–SR partners. During the reporting period, the international support team continued to upload news items, reports and other relevant information on the PROLINNOVA website and the CLIC–SR subpage (www.prolinnova.net/clic).

Objective 4: Mainstream PID in policies and programs through policy dialogue

Activity 4.1: Country-level policy dialogue

In **Ethiopia, Kenya** and **Tanzania**, no further specific CLIC–SR policy-dialogue activities were carried out by the CPs during this reporting period. The CP coordinating partner in Kenya (World Neighbors), as member of the National Steering Committee of the International Year for Family Farming (IYFF), brought the CLIC–SR approach into the IYFF project titled *"*Promotion of public policies in favor of family farming in Uganda and Kenya". Two members of the Tanzania CLIC–SR team joined the annual national workshop of the PELUM[2]–Tanzania network.

The CP in **Uganda** organized a national-level stakeholders' sharing workshop on PID and climate change in Uganda as a way to link up with selected policymakers and to review implications of CLIC–SR findings for relevant policy debates. It was a one-day engagement held on 6 July. The purpose of the workshop was "*to share information and experiences among key stakeholders in respect to innovation development and climate-change adaptation and mitigation".* The workshop had 36 participants (28

[2] PELUM: Participatory Ecological Land Use Management

men and 8 women) including farmer innovators, researchers, NGOs and other CSOs, government extension staff from the two project districts, and staff of the MAAIF and UNCST.

National policies relevant for climate change, agricultural research and development were presented and reviewed in the light of attention paid to local resilience, farmer innovation and farmer-led innovation development. The National Climate Change policy was presented by and debated with the Climate Change Department of the Ministry of Water and Environment; policies on Intellectual Property Rights and how these relate to farmer innovation by and with the UNCST; the National Agricultural Policy provisions for advancing innovations for climate-change adaptation and mitigation by and with MAAIF; and the National Agricultural Research System and its related initiatives by and with the NARO. Farmers also shared their experiences with respect to innovation and climate-change adaptation and mitigation.

Activity 4.2: Contributing to international policy dialogue

The international support team as well as CP partners took part in several events at international level to advocate for a farmer-led joint innovation and adaptation approach in agricultural research and development for strengthening community resilience to change.

- Two representatives of the CLIC–SR international support team (Laurens van Veldhuizen and Ann Waters-Bayer) joined the third Global Conference on Agricultural Research for Development (GCARD3) held on 6–8 April 2016 in Johannesburg, organized by the Global Forum on Agricultural Research (GFAR) and hosted by the South African Government and the Agricultural Research Council of South Africa. The experiences in CLIC-SR as well as related work in the wider international PROLINNOVA in promoting farmer-led innovation development were presented in one of the five thematic working groups. Behind the scenes, CLIC–SR representatives also lobbied for this to be incorporated into the final statement from the conference.
- The day before GCARD-3, about 100 people met in the newly formed GFAR Partners Assembly, in which Laurens van Veldhuizen of the international support team was asked to share experiences of the PROLINNOVA network in multi-stakeholder collaboration and collective action, as a source of inspiration for GFAR partners.
- At the 12th European IFSA (International Farming Systems Association) symposium held on 12–15 July 2016 at Harper Adams University in the UK, Chesha Wettasinha from the international support team presented a paper "Small-scale farmers' perspectives on what enhances capacity to innovate" (http://www.prolinnova.net/content/views-farmer-innovators-capacity-innovate-presented-12th-european-ifsa-symposium) under Theme 1: Innovation, Knowledge and Learning Processes, in the workshop on Monitoring and Evaluation for Learning and Innovation, which was co-convened by Ann Waters-Bayer, also member of the international support team. This paper will be included in a special issue of an international journal.
- The coordinator of PROLINNOVA–Kenya, Eunice Karanja, took part in the Africa Symposium on Climate Change Adaptation (ASCCA), held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, on 21–23 February 2016, after the CP's paper discussing CLIC–SR experiences had been accepted for oral presentation. The title of the paper was "Supporting farmer innovation for climate-change adaptation and improvement of resilience in the farming systems of Machakos and Kitui Counties, Kenya". This symposium allowed the CP representative to raise issues on the importance of farmer innovation in dealing with climate change and other challenges to improve food security and NRM. She also promoted the concept of LISFs as a mechanism to support local adaptation in the face of climate change. The

paper from PROLINNOVA–Kenya was also accepted for publication by Springer International Publishing AG in a collection of papers from the symposium. A paper by one of the Ethiopian partners, ABSHCBDA, entitled "Farmer innovation to face climate change: the case of pest control in haricot beans", was also accepted for presentation at the symposium but the representative from this CLIC–SR partner organization could not attend for logistical reasons.

As mentioned above, the international support team wrote reports and news items on the international activities, posted them on the PROLINNOVA website (www.prolinnova.net) and circulated them to the PROLINNOVA e-network (prolinnova@yahoogroups.com), which includes decision-makers from some national and international organizations.

Objective 5: Management, coordination, M&E and technical support

Activity 5.1: Management and M&E of country-level activities

CLIC–SR is being implemented through multi-stakeholder partnerships that involve state and non-state organizations in four countries in Eastern Africa, working in two districts in each country. One member of each CP, the coordinating partner of the project, managed and monitored the CLIC–SR activities undertaken by the implementing partners in that country. The developments in these partnerships and their coordination in this final phase of the project can be summarized as follows:

Ethiopia: As reported already in 2015, the collaboration with the Ethiopian coordinating partner had to be brought to an end. For the implementation of the final stages of the project, the PROLINNOVA International Secretariat at ETC Foundation in consultation with the Technical Advisory Group (formerly called National Steering Committee) in Ethiopia decided to set up direct contracts between the Secretariat and the two main implementing partners: BPA working in Tahtai Maichew near Axum in Tigray Region and ABSHCBDA, a community-based organization working in Enebse Sar Mider in Amhara Region. This worked well, with little need for further oversight from the Technical Advisory Group during this period.

Kenya: There were no changes in the management and coordination of this CP during the final project phase, and implementation of activities and their reporting was done adequately. World Neighbors handled coordination, while the project partners included INADES[3]–Formation Kenya and the Network for Ecofarming in Africa (NECOFA) for field implementation and the Kenya Agricultural and Livestock Research Organization (KALRO, formerly known as KARI: Kenyan Agricultural Research Institute) and the Kenyan office of IIRR for providing support to documentation and publication. The PROLINNOVA–Kenya NSC also continued to guide project implementation.

Tanzania: INADES Formation–Tanzania continued its tasks in relation to project management. It collaborated with the Department of Agriculture and Livestock in Chamwino and Kondoa Districts, Makutopora Agricultural Research Station and the Tanzania Livestock Research Institute (TALIRI) Mpwapwa station. In the reporting period, most final activities were handled by INADES. A meeting of the regional coordination team, including three farmer innovators, was held to interact with the external evaluator and jointly analyze achievements and challenges in the project in Tanzania.

Uganda: The CLIC–SR activities in Uganda were coordinated by the local NGO Environmental Alert (EA), working closely with the local NGO Kulika–Uganda and also with NARO–MuZARDI and the National Agricultural Advisory Services. The overall design of the partnership has remained as before. At the

[3] INADES: Institut Africain pour le Développement Économique et Social

end of 2015, EA named a new project coordinator and the quality of the coordination by EA continued to improve significantly in 2016.

Activity 5.2: Overall project management, M&E and international support

ETC Foundation in Leusden, Netherlands, continued to handle overall management of the CLIC–SR project with the support of former ETC staff now based at the Royal Tropical Institute (KIT) in Amsterdam, as mentioned in previous reports. To allow for the budget-neutral extension into 2016, new contracts were drawn up and signed with the coordinating or (in the case of Ethiopia) implementing project partners. These guided the fund transfers for implementation of the final activities. ETC (and KIT) staff reviewed narrative and financial reports from partners and compiled the overall narrative and financial reports of the CLIC–SR project for the period January–August 2016.

The above-mentioned staff provided technical and organizational advice to the partner organizations in the four countries by email and Skype and worked with them intensively in compiling, documenting and publishing their experiences during the CLIC–SR project. The services of the PID expert Brigid Letty, based in South Africa, were obtained to assist and work with partners in documenting their PID cases. In 2016, there was no further need for IIRR to provide technical support on M&E, as all the systems were in place and being used to produce information as captured in this and previous reports.

A final CLIC –SR partners meeting took place on 25 May 2016 in Senegal, as reported in Section 3.3.

A very important activity and milestone in the project cycle has been the project's ***external evaluation***. After a careful screening of the CVs of several candidates for this assignment, the PROLINNOVA International Secretariat at ETC Foundation selected and contracted the Zimbabwe-based researcher-consultant Mutizwa Mukute for the task. He managed very well to organize, carry out and report on an inclusive and participatory evaluation process. All in all, 61 CLIC–SR stakeholders took part in the evaluation through face-to-face or Skype in-depth interviews, Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) and/or group interviews. With the available budget, the evaluator was able to make field visits to two project sites, one in Kenya and the other in Tanzania. Preliminary findings were shared during a feedback meeting with key project partners from all four CPs as well as from the international support team, organized just before the 2016 PROLINNOVA IPW held in Senegal. The report on the external evaluation is available upon request.

Generally, the external evaluation concluded that, in terms of performance, the project fully achieved 84% of its 19 targets, significantly achieved one (5%) and partly achieved two (11%). This suggests a high level of achievement. The following chapter of this report reviews and draws on the findings of the external evaluation report and on other sources to present an overall view and analysis of what the CLIC–SR project has managed to do over the entire 4-year project period.

Observations, challenges and lessons learnt

Looking back at the *experiences in joint experimentation* to encourage collaboration between farmer innovators and development and research actors, a number of lessons and conclusions have emerged or have been confirmed in the reporting period:

- Repeated trials and larger sample sizes are sometimes required during experimentation to increase the validity of findings;

- Participatory processes that ensured farmer innovators' involvement in decision-making during the joint-experimentation process did indeed lead to more focused experimental pathways by integrating indigenous and scientific knowledge;
- The joint experimentation processes need to be planned well in advance to fit the agricultural calendar. If not, first-round experiments will often be unsuccessful and experiments need to be repeated to obtain usable results and reduce experimental errors or biases.

During the CLIC–SR project, exposure of formal research and development staff to *farmers' own innovation efforts* does, in many cases, make them realize the importance and potential of farmers' own initiatives. At the same time, some innovators tend to conceal some information with a fear that their innovation will be taken over by opportunists. The issues of innovation processes, open access, public goods – especially with reference to farmer experimentation carried out with public funds (LISFs) – and especially the PROLINNOVA principle of "copy-left" (see Guideline #3 under www.prolinnova.net/content/prolinnova-guidelines) need more discussion within the network.

It remains difficult for farmer innovators to *access available financial resources for innovation*. Requirements for accessing such funds remain very competitive and prohibitive to farmers. Funds currently available through the LISFs, such as practiced during the CLIC–SR project, are more accessible to farmer but are not adequate for more complex forms of experimentation that would benefit from greater participation of formal researchers.

With regard to *project coordination and management*, some CLIC–SR partners felt that not enough resources were set aside for the international support team to visit countries in order to work with and support partners "on the job". Partners sometimes remained confused about the administrative process to be followed for accessing project funds and, when this led to delay of disbursement of funds, implementation of activities was also delayed. The project's comprehensive M&E tool could be managed by staff in the partner organizations but did not encourage involving farmers in participatory monitoring of the project.

3 Summary of achievements and lessons 2012–2016

Introduction

This report on activities in 2016 is the last narrative report of the CLIC–SR project. It is therefore opportune to add a chapter that looks back on the entire project period and reviews what has ultimately been achieved and what can be learnt from the past four years. This analysis builds very much on the external evaluation and summarizes its main findings, complemented with observations from the international support team to place the evaluation findings in a wider context. It is structured according to the main objectives of the project.

Strengthen the innovative capacity of smallholder farmers and their communities

The three main sets of project activities foreseen to realize this objective were field studies into local perceptions of change and farmers' own innovation responses to these changes, implementation and documentation of farmer-led experimentation, and training of community groups to strengthen local adaptive capacity. Table 1 summarizes data on the main activities done.

Table 1: Summary activities to strengthen community innovative capacity

Activity and target	Implementation	Remarks
Documentation of local innovative responses to change (24)	29 local innovations captured and documented	
Joint experiments done and well documented (8)	21 joint experiments initiated; 8 well documented	8 well-documented cases published for wider circulation; documentation of other joint experiments partly done, for internal learning.
Farmers supported in their innovative work through LISF grants (160)	136 (58% women) farmers benefited from LISF support	Based on project M&E data from three countries only.
Capacity building of communities to build resilience (800 farmers)	Total of 1329 farmers trained in 28 events (large differences between countries)	Training events with higher number of participants may not always have been the most effective ones.

Sources: External evaluation report and subsequent project M&E.

In terms of the outcomes of these activities and the enabling and constraining factors, the following can be noted, based on the external evaluation report and other project M&E information:

- The studies showed how farmers use their knowledge and resources to tackle challenges that they encounter as well as to take advantage of opportunities that emerge in the local contexts.
- The documentation of farmer innovations led to their dissemination and some degree of uptake – or at least providing inspiration for other farmers to experiment; this in turn, could contribute to increasing community capacities to adapt to change, including climate change, so as to deal with challenges to farmers' livelihoods, but there are no data to quantify this outcome.

- While almost all farmer innovations that emerged during the CLIC–SR project have potential for scaling, their uptake will often be limited to areas with very similar conditions; the evaluation also noted that, in many cases, there are "bundles" of related and mutually supportive local innovations, and efforts to attain wider uptake would need to consider these bundles rather than each innovation separately.
- Farmer-led joint experiments underlined the importance of combining local innovative capacities with scientific research to build on local solutions, understand why the local innovations work and use this understanding to scale the innovations – as well as the very processes of farmer innovation and PID – for wider outreach and impact;
- The cases of weaker documentation of the joint-experimentation processes made it difficult to share findings widely; the international support team had to invest considerable time in supporting the documentation.
- There is evidence that the working relationships between "experts" (researchers and extension staff) and farmers improved after working together in joint experimentation, and this should facilitate future collaboration. This refers to farmers in terms of their increased experimentation capacities and confidence to collaborate with the external experts on an equal basis and to the experts in terms of their growing respect for the innovation capacities of farmers.
- The LISF provided resources that enabled farmer innovators to work on their innovations, alone or with others; it is too early to assesses the outcome of this support for the individual innovators, for the farmer groups to which they belong, and more widely.
- Community-level training workshops increased community awareness of the broader context in which they were living and operating. They helped farmers understand the causes of some of their problems, and the opportunities to tap into in order to adapt to changing conditions.
- The joint experiments met with a number of challenges that had to be dealt with, starting with persuasion of formal researchers and other external actors to take farmer innovations seriously. Time, distance and costs comprise another set of challenging issues, given that the research stations were usually far from the sites of joint experimentation. Understanding on the part of farmers of the need for collecting detailed data and difficulties on the part of the research scientists in explaining some scientific concepts are among other challenges that emerged when people from different systems of science and innovation start working together.

Strengthen the capacity of organizations working in agriculture and NRM

The central set of activities towards this objective was the organization of capacity-building workshops for CSO and local government staff in the project's operational areas on the topics of PID and its relevance for adaptation to externally driven change, including climate change. In each of the four countries, the targeted two workshops, typically lasting 3–4 days, were held and reports on them were produced. These workshops reached a total of 349 people (just over 30% women) out of the 400 targeted. Researchers involved in the joint experiments often also joined these training events. The CPs in Ethiopia and Tanzania worked with relatively large groups of participants of 40 or more per workshop, while the CPs in Kenya and Uganda worked with groups of maximum 25 persons, and both of these CPs managed to raise additional funds from NUFFIC (Netherlands Organization for International Cooperation in Higher Education) to involve an international trainer and include additional activities such as supervised field piloting by all participants plus a refresher training of the same participants.

PROLINNOVA does not have systematic information on the outcome of these training events in terms of the application of the learning by the participants, and the external evaluation was not in the position to cover this in detail. The final review meetings on the joint experimentation and the other end-of-project meetings documented in a few cases (e.g. Tanzania) how local government staff that had been trained paid more attention to farmer innovation in their area and involved farmer innovators in their regular work. One would expect the learning and application to be stronger in the cases of Kenya and Uganda, given their capacity-building model supported with additional resources.

Increase insights and awareness on relevance and effectiveness of PID

The main activity components and their targets under this objective included, at country level, the facilitation of PROLINNOVA national multi-stakeholder partnerships through regular meetings and the preparation and implementation of a country-level dissemination strategy that would include publishing six cases of farmer innovation and two cases on PID / joint experimentation. At international level, sharing of insights was through four annual PROLINNOVA IPWs, dissemination on the PROLINNOVA website and list-server as well as other relevant websites and list-servers, and publication of a booklet with selected PID cases and a policy brief on strengthening community resilience for handling change.

The report from the external evaluation documents how most of the targeted activities have been implemented. Only in Tanzania did it prove difficult to maintain the PROLINNOVA partnership at the national level; in this case, the project worked through a multi-stakeholder partnership in the Central Region. However, in most countries, the frequency of NSC meetings was less often than targeted.

The external evaluation flags as a particularly important development the involvement of local, i.e. usually district-level, officials in the project and its activities. Allowing them to experience and see results of farmer innovation and joint experimentation directly with their own eyes is doubtless more effective in raising their awareness than would be only providing them with printed policy briefs.

Table 2 summarizes the realization of planned publication and dissemination activities across the four countries, as discussed in Section 3.2 above.

Table 2: Summary of publication and dissemination activities at country level

Activity	**Number**	**Country Platforms**
Catalogue / booklet on farmer innovation	4	Ethiopia (2), Kenya, Uganda
PID case studies	7	Tanzania, Uganda
Booklet with PID case compilation and analysis	1	Tanzania
(Policy) brief	3	Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda
Conference article	1	Tanzania
Organisation of and participation in Eastern Africa Farmer Innovation Fair	4	Ethiopia, ***Kenya***, Tanzania, Uganda
Exhibitions or mini-workshops on International Farmer Innovation Day	7	Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda
Farmer innovators participating in national or local events	18	Kenya, Tanzania
Farmer innovation videos **(**http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PL7A4E762FA96E52F7)	13	Kenya
Articles in daily newspaper	2	Kenya

The table shows the diversity of activities undertaken, influenced by different contexts and capacities in the respective countries. All CPs documented at least two detailed PID cases, but only the CPs in Uganda and Tanzania set out to publish and distribute these in the country itself. Cases from the other countries were published at the CLIC–SR international level. All in all, most documentation activities have been delayed until the very end of the project, and the findings and evidence embedded in them were thus often not yet available to feed into the CPs' policy-dialogue work. One exception is the set of 13 videos on farmer innovation prepared in Kenya for the 2013 Eastern African Farmer Innovation Fair, for which the partners mobilized co-funding support.

The Eastern African Farmer Innovation Fair was a large resource-intensive activity not foreseen in the project proposal but made possible by co-funding from a number of donors such as USAID through its Kenyan Innovation Engine program coordinated by Land o' Lakes in Kenya, the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAid), the Netherlands-based AgriProFocus (APF) and the CGIAR Research Program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS).

The evaluation report concludes that the dissemination of findings at the international level has gone well and according to plan. The PID booklet and the policy brief are about to be published for distribution electronically and, in the case of the policy brief, also in hard copy.

Challenges in realizing effective sharing and dissemination of findings included:

- The lack of involvement in the partnerships of farmer organizations with an interest in farmer-led research to add weight, e.g. to the policy work;
- Distances between stakeholders in the country, adding to travel costs for national-level partnerships;
- Limited focus and capacities of several key partners related to documentation, which led to delays; this was less so in cases where formal researchers where actively involved. The international support team also gave substantial support to the documentation activities, particularly in the final year;
- The limited awareness/capacities to probe and look for wider sets of effects and results of the project beyond the expected ones, as flagged by the external evaluation;
- Funds available were often limited to implement the full dissemination plan.

Mainstream PID in policies and programs through policy dialogue

The policy-dialogue component of the CLIC–SR has not been its strongest one. In the words of the final report from the CP in Uganda, "much more remains to be done to integrate farmer-led research in government research institutions and other agricultural institutions for support and guidance".

All CPs based their policy efforts on a review study of current relevant policy areas and possible entry points for CLIC–SR policy dialogue, but did not achieve all that they had planned in this respect, partly because they regarded the funds available for this to be insufficient.

The policy-related work accomplished included more informal one-on-one interactions with selected decision-makers as well as organizing half- or one-day meetings or workshops bringing farmer innovators, project partners and decision-makers together to discuss central issues coming out of the CLIC–SR project. Table 3 summarizes information on most important policy-dialogue efforts at the national level.

Table 3: Summary of key CLIC–SR policy-dialogue activities at national level

Activity	Number	Country
National-level workshop	1	Uganda
Local- or regional-level policy workshop	5	Ethiopia
Public lecture on farmer innovation	1	Ethiopia
Policy dialogue with key national policymakers at Eastern African Farmer Innovation Fair	1	Kenya
Farmer innovators exhibiting at National Farmers Day	13	Tanzania

At the international level, members of the international support team and CP partner staff jointly made a substantial effort in terms of policy dialogue. They took part in close to 30 relevant international seminars and policy meetings, often as a keynote speaker or facilitator of sub-workshops or panels. This provided a platform for sharing CLIC–SR experiences around building community resilience, PID, multi-stakeholder partnerships and climate-change adaptation. These experiences were valued to the extent that the event organizers often covered the costs of CLIC–SR participants. Some international events to which international support team members and/or CLIC-SR partners, including farmer innovators, contributed included a workshop convened by the German Agency for International Cooperation (GIZ) in 2014 in Kenya on "Bridging the gap between agricultural research and farmers' practice", a side event in 2014 at COP 12 in Peru for a presentation on "Farmer-centered and smallholder approaches to address food security in a changing climate", the Quaker United Nations Organization (QUNO) consultation on small-scale farmer innovation in 2015 in Switzerland, several strategic workshops of the CGIAR on fostering the capacity to innovate, and the 2016 Africa Symposium on Climate Change Adaptation held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

There is not yet any evidence of direct outcome of the above-mentioned work in terms of changes in relevant policies at various levels. There is some evidence of incorporation of the PID and farmer-innovation approach to building community resilience in programs and work of organizations that have been part of the this policy work and, probably more importantly, of project activities such as studies of farmer innovation and joint experimentation, according to the external evaluation report:

- Integration of PID/ joint experimentation approaches into the work plans and research agenda of agricultural and livestock research institutes, notably NARO-MuZARDI in Uganda, TALIRI in Tanzania and KALRO in Kenya; for example, TALIRI is conducting further experiments with fish meal as livestock feed;
- Inclusion of attention to farmers' own innovation and farmer-led PID in district/county council plans and activities where the project was implemented, such as in Machakos (Kenya), Chamwino (Tanzania) and Nakasongola (Uganda);
- Infusion of PID into agricultural extension systems at district level as above; in Ethiopia, farmer innovations have become part of the demonstration plots in some Farmer Training Centers.

The policy-dialogue work under CLIC–SR also met with several constraints. First of all, changes of staff at the CP coordination level (see below) influenced this work more than it influenced other components that were done through implementing partners. Secondly, several key CLIC–SR partners did not have policy dialogue among their main competence areas and did not link up enough with other, more capable organizations for support. Finally, it is also fair to note that policy processes in the relevant arenas are complex and that, in this light, the capacity and budget available per country for policy-related work have been relatively modest.

Management, coordination, M&E and technical support

This refers to management, coordination and M&E of country-level activities and the same at the project, i.e. international level. The latter includes the provision of technical support by the international team to the CP partners.

The external evaluation and the project's own M&E information suggests that, by and large, coordination and management has functioned well and has allowed activities to be planned, implemented, evaluated and reported, while meeting requirements of the Rockefeller Foundation. A more detailed analysis shows a more diverse picture of what worked well and what less so:

- Staff members involved in project coordination were replaced during the project period in three of the four CPs. In the case of two CPs (those in Ethiopia and Uganda), this coincided partially with restructuring or downsizing of the coordinating NGO. This led to delays in implementation and explains to some extent the need for the one-year budget-neutral extension of the project.
- The Excel-based M&E tool developed by IIRR in the Philippines took a long time to be adapted for use in the project, which delayed its application. Some project partners felt that it was too complex, making it hard to involve farmers in participatory monitoring of the project.
- Because of the lack of dedicated funding for backstopping visits, the technical support by the international team was limited mostly to communication by email and Skype. In only five cases over the project's lifespan could international team members use visits to project countries for other assignments to provide some support to CLIC–SR activities and partners.
- In this context, the annual IPW provided an important platform for coordination and sharing of learning across partners. Each year, partners from all four CPs met with 2–3 international support team members to review the past year's progress, receive advice on addressing challenges and strategize work for the following year.

Conclusion

The external evaluation concluded that, with respect to CLIC–SR's main focus on enhancing the innovative capacity of farming communities, especially women, through PID to become more resilient to change, the project did manage to strengthen the innovative farmers' confidence, self-belief and self-esteem through recognizing their work and creating platforms for them to showcase their work.

The project also enhanced farmer innovation through investigating their essential aspects using the LISFs, which were managed by farmers themselves based on local needs and priorities. The project managed to increase resilience of farming communities to change, including climate change, through the documentation and sharing of farmer innovations, with which other farmers have started to work.

In the process, farmers have been empowered to deal with market- and income-related challenges and to improve their livelihoods through diversifying income sources, increasing productivity and producing out-of-season crops. The project thus increased the asset base of the farming communities involved, including women-headed households, through enabling them to invest the income generated in buying productive resources. It also broadened the range of resources, knowledge and products available to improve local adaptive capacity by mobilizing the contributions of agricultural research institutes, district- and county-level structures and agricultural extension departments.

According to the external evaluation, there are indications that some of the above-mentioned outcomes are spreading beyond the farmers and communities directly involved in the project.

However, a longer-term timeframe would be needed to assess whether such spread is reaching significant levels.