

NATURAL RESOURCES SYSTEMS PROGRAMME
FINAL TECHNICAL REPORT

DFID Project Number

R8400

Project Title

Advancing the use of the products of NRSP's past and current research projects in Eastern Africa

Project Leader

Dr. James Kamiri Ndufa

Organisation

Kenya Forestry Research Institute (KEFRI), National Agricultural Research Organization (NARO) and African Highlands Ecoregional Programme (AHEP), Uganda

NRSP Production System

Cross Cutting, Hillside Systems, High Potential Systems

Date

September 2005

This document is an output from a project R8400 funded by the UK Department for International Development (DFID) for the benefit of developing countries. The views expressed are not necessarily those of DFID.

Contents

Abbreviations and Acronyms.....	iii
1. Executive Summary	1
2. Background.....	1
3. Project Purpose.....	3
4. Outputs.....	4
5. Research Activities.....	14
6. Environmental assessment.....	15
7. Contribution of Outputs.....	16
8. Publications and other communication materials.....	19
9. References cited in the report.....	21
10. Project logframe.....	22

This report is also supported by the following annexes:

Annex A: FTR Scientific Annex A

Annex B: NRSP Suite 2 products

B.1 Decision support system for nutrient deficiency diagnosis and corrective measures

B.2 Decision support system for striga management and control

B.3 Decision support system for better land management

B.4 A poster on types of improved fallow species suitable for soil fertility management

B.5 A poster on improved soil fertility and increase crop yield using fertilizer trees

B.6 A poster on improved soil fertility/food security and income generation

B.7 A poster on integrated striga management control strategies for increased crop yield and food security

B.8 A poster on you are losing your soils...

B.9 A guide on sustainable community based input credit scheme (SCOBICS)

B.10 The power of visioning

B.11 Bridging research and development in soil fertility management

Annex C: Monitoring and Evaluation report

Annex D: Workshops reports

D.1 Stage A workshop report for Kenya

D.2 Stage A workshop report for Uganda

Abbreviations and Acronyms

AHI- African Highlands Initiative

CBO-Community Based Organisation

CIAT- Institute for Tropical Agriculture

CIM- Conceptual Impact Model

CIMMYT- International Maize and Wheat Research Institute

COSOFAP – Consortium for Scaling Up Options for Increased Farm Productivity

DAO- District Agricultural Officers

DFID- Department for International Development

EA- East Africa

ICRAF- International Center for Research in Agroforestry

ILS- Interactive Learning Sites

IDEA- International Development Ethics Association

KARI- Kenya Agricultural Research Institute

KEFRI- Kenya Forestry Research Institute

MDG- Millennium Development Goals

NALEP – National Agricultural and Livestock Project

NARO- National Agriculture Research Organisation

NGO- Non Governmental Organisation

NRM- Natural Resource Management

NRSP- Natural Resources Support Project

SCOBICS- Sustainable Community Based Inputs Credit Scheme

SFM- Soil Fertility Management

TIs – Target Institutions

OVI- Objectively Verifiable Indicator

UP- Uptake Promotion

VECO- Vredeseilanden Coopibo

1 Executive Summary

A

The purpose of the project is to develop and promote more efficient, proactive and sustainable communication strategies for enhanced and sustained uptake of research products from four NRSP supported projects in Kenya and Uganda (Suite 2) where land management constraints and poor market access are common to farmers. Specifically, the project's communication strategy will promote uptake and wider utilisation of innovative NRM processes and methods, technology innovations and policy recommendations that have resulted from research and development work in pilot sites to a wider set of stakeholders, potential beneficiaries and key target institutions. This is justified by the fact that over the last four years, a number of NRSP projects in Kenya and Uganda have generated various research and development results for improving the management of natural resources but there has been limited uptake and utilisation of these research products. With this enhanced products uptake and increased knowledge the project will contribute to the goal of improved livelihoods of the poor people that are dependent on land and water resources.

Although the project was undertaken over one year only, there were significant achievements as regards to project outputs. Firstly, a robust communication strategy was developed, which facilitated uptake promotion and awareness of the research products. Mechanisms for scaling-out research products from farmer to farmer, community to community or within the same stakeholder group were identified. Attempts were also made to scale-up products from grassroots organizations to policy makers, donors, national and international research organization and development institutions. Secondly, new research products were developed, repackaged, pre-tested, produced and disseminated to different stakeholder groups and target TIs. Thirdly, by project end, all the institutions had started to utilise the products especially the posters. Posters provide simple and short illustrated messages that attract attention, and can be read quickly. Many of the TIs had partially read the two handbooks (The Power of Visioning, and Bridging Research and Development in Soil Fertility Management) and a guide to SCOBICS. In Kenya, COSOFAP has already started reproducing the products and distributing them to partners. Many NGOs and the private sector have also shown interest in reproducing the products and some have requested soft copies from which to produce reprints. The COSOFAP secretariat, through its network of partners, has raised awareness of the products to over 200 organizations (both members and non-members) during its training sessions, planning meetings and exhibitions. More effort however is needed in targeting policy makers, especially Members of Parliament. The national research and extension system need to be further sensitised so that they can institutionalise the use of the products. The project has contributed significantly to the NRSP purpose of delivering new knowledge that enables poor people who are largely dependent on the NR base to improve their livelihoods by enabling poor people from target and non-target areas, through the target institutions and stakeholders, to access and use the products of research projects undertaken in Kenya and Uganda.

2 Background

Majority of the rural population in the humid highlands of East Africa derives their livelihood from agriculture and utilization of natural resources. Despite the rich natural resource endowment in the area however, a large percentage fails to meet the basic needs (food, shelter and health). This is attributed to decreased agricultural production as a result of land degradation, in form of soil erosion, declining soil fertility and inadequate nutrient

replenishment.

Although extensive research on land management has been undertaken over the last decades, producing a number of technology options and innovations to combat land degradation and increase food production, uptake of research products has been limited especially by farmers policy makers and development organizations. Most of these research products are left on the shelves of research organizations. The lack of a robust communication and dissemination strategy of research results is one of the key factors limiting the adoption of NRM technologies and the impact of research efforts on the livelihood of poor people. Therefore there was need to disseminate these products widely both geographically and to a wider range of stakeholders including poor farmers and farmers' communities, rural service providers (extension, NGOs, micro-finance institutions), research organizations, local government and policy makers. The poor largely depend on access to/ use and management of natural resources to improve their livelihoods. To be able to do this, they need access to relevant and appropriate information shared in a form they can utilize. The Uptake Promotion (UP) project was thus initiated and implemented to deliver and promote the developed products to this wide range of stakeholders with a major focus on poor people. It was with this in mind that this project was conceived and implemented with the main purpose of wider promotion of these products and in a more efficient, proactive and sustainable communication strategies. The project was undertaken in Kenya and Uganda (Suite 2) where land management constraints and poor market access are common to farmers so as to enhance the geographical coverage and range of stakeholders. The activities were implemented in 2 (two) stages. Stage A was to create awareness of the products and obtain stakeholder views on the products and the best ways to communicate the products to different categories of stakeholders. Stage B seeks to incorporate the stakeholders' views (identified in A) into the products, develop and implement an effective communication strategy to promote the uptake and use of the products.

This work focused on promotion of uptake and utilisation of products from NRSP's past and current Suite 2 projects as follows:

- 1) R7056 (Nutrient sourcing and soil organic matter dynamics in mixed-species fallows of fast-growing legume trees) aimed at quantifying and recommending options for soil fertility improvements in a mixed fallows species system, increasing species diversity and products, and reducing pest pressure on single species on nutrient depleted farms.
- 2) R7856 (Strengthening social capital for improving policies and decision making in NRM) aimed at developing mechanisms and processes for linking field level findings to policy and decision-making of wider communities. The project has developed mechanisms for facilitating policy dialogue between researchers, policy makers and local communities; for formulating and implementing by-laws and local policies; and for strengthening the social capital of local communities to improve implementation and adoption of NRM policies and innovations.
- 3) R7517 (Bridging research and development in soil fertility management) aimed at the identification, development and testing of a set of tools and approaches to aid local professionals and farmers to integrate indigenous and research generated knowledge in SFM, make field level assessment of soil fertility status, identify and refine SFM options suited to specific environments and users, and assess farmers situation and

ability to invest in SFM.

- 4) R7962 (Linking soil fertility and improved cropping strategies to development interventions) aims at assisting farmers to build their livelihoods by expanding their options for resource and crop management and enhancing their capacity to make management decisions for their farming activities. The project has developed strategies for sustainable management of community-based input-credit scheme, and methods for identifying and accessing market opportunities for escaping a maize-focused poverty traps in smallholder farm by influencing institutional and policy framework

The project was developed with two key developmental objectives and one research objective. The developmental objectives were first, to influence policy and decision making that targets the removal of constraints faced by the poor in accessing, using and managing land resources sustainably and two, to promote wide adoption of better land husbandry practices that are cost effective especially for the poor. The research objective was to explore the effective Uptake Promotion approaches for land/soil management research products where land management constraints and poor markets exist for poor farmers (suite 2) in EA. The key challenges that were to be addressed by the research objectives were, first, how to develop an appropriate and friendly dissemination and information system that can be used by resource poor farmers and service providers. The second challenge was how to scale up from a small number of end users to millions, i.e. the technologies and processes need to be scaled up and out to many farmers. It was hoped that support from policy makers and active participation of all collaborating partners and institutions in research and dissemination of products would enhance adoption of better land management interventions, leading to improved NRM, agricultural production and consequently to improved livelihoods.

3 Project Purpose

The purpose of the project was to develop and promote more efficient, proactive and sustainable communication strategies for enhanced and sustained uptake of research products from four NRSP supported projects in Kenya and Uganda (Suite 2). Specifically, the project's communication strategy will promote uptake and wider utilisation of innovative NRM processes and methods, technology innovations and policy recommendations that have resulted from research and development work in pilot sites to a wider set of stakeholders, potential beneficiaries and key target institutions. This is justified by the fact that over the last four years, a number of NRSP projects in Kenya and Uganda have generated various research and development results for improving the management of natural resources but there has been limited uptake and utilisation of these research products. There is a real risk that most of these research results and products may end up on the shelves like many others past research products. This proposal brings together the strengths of research teams in Uganda and Kenya on NRM research and development and the expertise of specialists in communication, graphic design and publishing, and public relations to reach a broad range of stakeholders primarily in East Africa, and beyond.

Changes it was intended to achieve:

The uptake promotion of NRSP products was supposed to create more awareness and capacity among the beneficiaries and target institutions, which will enable them to make guided choices of the technical options and processes. The products generated from the

various Suite 2 projects will be integrated as a holistic set of options. These options range from local policy formulation, conflict resolution, credit acquisition and management as well as soil and water management technologies. This will result in greater uptake and use of the technologies. The project intended to come up with pro-poor communication strategies that will help such marginalized group participate actively in the research process and capture their views and opinions such that these can generate lessons as to what strategies should be utilized. It was also to integrate the poor in all the aspects of the livelihood improvement process through provision and access to such materials. The project also aimed at ensuring gender equity in sharing and receiving information. On environmental aspect it was expected that the use of such materials would result in more awareness about the impacts on the environment.

4 Outputs

Output 1: A more robust communication strategy developed to facilitate uptake promotion of research products

During the first Uganda project team meeting, stakeholders' concerns/issues on the products as identified during the two Stage A consultative meetings in Kenya and Uganda, were reviewed (Annex A Table 1), including appropriate communication channels (Annex A Table 2). The team members drew up strategies to incorporate these concerns into the products. The individual products were revised considering the target audience, and where possible, products that relate to each other were combined, rather than have each product on its own. A new list of possible products was developed, prioritized and target institution (TIs) identifies for Kenya. Prioritisation of products was based on criteria such as cost of production, reach, and effectiveness of communication. The UP project generated two types of products:-

- Technology-based products (these are communication materials focusing on specific technologies e.g. for soil fertility management, i.e. R7517, R7962 and R7056, products).
- Process-based products (these focus on methodologies and processes rather than specific technologies, i.e. R7856 and R7962 products).

Lessons learned in the production, dissemination, uptake and use of these different products were documented focusing on what worked, how, where, and for whom? The following guide questions were used:

- How effective are the different promotional materials and delivery processes for different target groups, e.g. resource poor farmers, development organizations, policy makers, donor organizations?
- Are there significant differences in the uptake of technology-based NRM products, and process-based research products?
- How effective are the different promotional materials and delivery processes for different target groups, e.g. resource poor farmers, development organizations, policy makers, donor organizations?
- What would be alternative communication strategies to achieve greater impact and uptake of technology and process research products
- Are there any differences in the effectiveness of different promotion mechanisms across different countries or in different situations (e.g. low and high social capital, low and high access to markets)?

- What lessons can we learn from the UP experience?

The key research issue would be to assess what methodologies and processes are appropriate for the uptake promotion of process-based products compared to technology-based products. What products are easy to disseminate and why? What strategies are needed to promote uptake of different communication materials? Can we use the same methodology for the two types of products? What are the differences?

What are the best ways for repackaging different products?

Dissemination and scaling-up strategy

Since available financial and manpower resources would not be sufficient for a comprehensive scale up, there was need to create linkages with selected local and national institutions. A list of potential institutions mainly but not exclusively in the project areas was drawn up based on whether or not their activities and resources would complement the project objectives. Strategic partnerships were thus formed with existing institutions operating in different areas of the country, working in NRM-related activities, with a geographically wide operational area, pro-poor focus and having a well-defined communication strategy. Such linkages would not only help facilitate the dissemination and up-scaling process, but also assist in the review and modification of these products, as well as their pre-testing at various stakeholder levels. In addition, the partnerships would promote up scaling and promotion of the products. Annex A Table 3 and Annex A Table 4 show the expanded list of target institutions including the nature of products to be disseminated in Kenya and Uganda.

The project team adopted the strategy of a ‘buy in’ meeting with the identified stakeholders/Target Institutions (TIs), where the various products were introduced and their use demonstrated. It was hoped that once the TIs are convinced about the usefulness of the selected priority products, they would be willing to invest in the reproduction and consequent dissemination of these products at their own expense. At a project team meeting, the stakeholder list was analysed, expanded to include not only local institutions, but also Regional Networks and re-classified further according to the NRSP Conceptual Impact Model (CIM). Suitable products for dissemination to the different TIs were assigned to each, including a strategy for scaling up. This way, the products would reach a wider geographical area. Indeed, through this process, the products were distributed to various districts in Kenya (Annex A Appendix 1) and Uganda (Annex A Appendix 2) (compared to original districts where the projects were located). In addition, more products were distributed to partner organisations in Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania, Malawi and Democratic Republic of Congo

In Kenya, the main organisation that will be used to spearhead this process is the Consortium for Scaling Up Options for Increased Farm Productivity in western Kenya (COSOFAP). COSOFAP has over 100 members in 25 districts in western Kenya and it’s some of the strategic and relevant partners that were to be involved in the scaling up process. The main purpose of COSOFAP is to improve and increase farm productivity through networking of research and development partners to avail appropriate options and information to empower poor farmers of western Kenya. The Consortium also strives to develop community self-reliance—to support communities as they identify needs, understand benefits of alternative interventions and pay for some costs associated with acquiring necessary skills or information to move forward. Therefore, when the Kenya team was scaling-up strategies, it

was very critical that we take into consideration the existing initiatives and add value to their approaches. In Uganda, individual stockholders were used in the uptake promotion process. For COSOFAP these include:

- Build upon scaling-up experiences of partners—many partners are already doing scaling up work hence COSOFAP comes strongly in coordination efforts.
- Strategic partnerships
- Scale-up technical options and participatory process
- Use interactive learning centres/sites to ensure relevance at the grassroots level
- All inclusive ownership of consortium
- Emphasis on adaptive research/farmer experimentation innovations
- Facilitate monitoring and evaluation and feedback amongst partners
- Strengthen Farmer-Extensions-Researcher-Private sector linkages
- Strengthen existing institutions especially local
- Diverse dissemination approaches

Output 2: Through repackaging, revision, and pre-testing of knowledge-sharing products with targeted institutions, a number of communication materials targeting different stakeholder groups are developed, produced and disseminated

Having sensitized the stakeholders on the NRSP products during the two Stage A workshops, suggestions were made to revise the products. Country team meetings were held supplemented with deskwork to incorporate the workshops' suggestions. After incorporating their suggestions and repackaging the products, the revised products were peer-reviewed for technical content and suitability as communication materials then pre-tested with selected target stakeholder institutions.

Pre-testing

Pre-testing was done by distributing to a carefully selected range of stakeholders (extension workers/service providers, local leaders, DAOs, NGOs, community development workers, private sector institutions, farmer-groups) and allowing them use the products with their beneficiaries during their field activities. At the time of distribution, the team members explained what each product was about, the target audience and then encouraged stakeholders to use it in the field and assess its suitability, noting any necessary improvements. The field pre-testing exercise lasted about 3 weeks following which a feedback meeting was held to obtain the outcome of the pre-testing exercise. Each product was reviewed individually and issues arising from its field pre-testing thus obtained. Most respondents felt that these field materials should be waterproof in terms of packaging; products could be made simpler and more appealing using more illustrations, translation into local dialects, and where possible, reduce the text volume. Field pre-testing of products was a necessary exercise for products describing a process (e.g. 'The Power of Visioning') and with a rather thick text volume. However, most respondents felt the time for pre-testing was rather short.

Not all the suggested 15 products from Kenya and Uganda were revised and packaged for pre-testing. Nine research products from Kenya were repackaged and distributed. In addition,

three products from Uganda were also distributed. The distribution took into consideration geographical coverage, type of stakeholder (all levels), and amount of materials available and potential outreach of the stakeholder. We differed from Uganda in the sense that they did a 1 day pre-testing workshop, whereas in Kenya due to the fact that a lot of suggestions had already been done in previous meetings, we opted to do a face to face meeting with the stakeholders who received the documents during the distribution stage. We discussed their use and how they can be utilized effectively. The capacity building was not in a workshop but at individual organizations

Distribution of the revised products

Mass production of products

Following incorporation of issues from the field pre-testing and feedback exercises into the products, the revised products were mass-produced. In total, three out of four Ugandan products were mass-produced, 500 copies each and eight products of 1000 canopies each were produced in Kenya (Annex B.1 to B.10). The somewhat fewer number of copies of products was because of the need to produce waterproof materials, which shot up the costs of production to the need to use the rather expensive glazed paper material. Similarly, the fourth product for Uganda (a pamphlet on soil erosion control) could not be mass-produced due to budgetary limitations.

Distribution

We distributed different copies of each of the products to a wide range of stakeholder institutions nationally and regionally in Kenya (Annex A Appendix 1) and Uganda (Annex A Appendix 2). Of the 500 copies of Uganda products, the colleagues in Kenya were given 150 copies of each product, the rest distributed to different stakeholders in Uganda and other countries. Similarly, Kenya colleagues supplied 500 copies of each of their eight products, which were delivered to Kawanda Agricultural Research Institute by road. The products from Kenya were distributed along with those generated in Uganda. The number of copies given to each institution was based on the number of copies of each product available versus the number that some institutions had indicated they would need during the pre-test feedback meeting. It was clear that some stakeholders preferred some products to others, and therefore whenever available, received more copies of the preferred product. For example, community development facilitators were more inclined towards “The Power of Visioning”, extension workers in NRM preferred the “Soil fertility management handbook”, while for agro-input dealers, the products dealing with “inputs access and distribution” was more relevant. These included extension workers/service providers, local leaders, DAOs, NGOs, CBOs, community development workers, private sector institutions and farmer-groups. In addition, partners from other countries in the region (Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania, Malawi and DRC) also received the products.

Feedback and issues arising from the distribution of products

Many institutions have expressed demand for more copies of products to be provided to them, following utilization of the few copies of communication products supplied to them. In Kenya, COSOFAP has already started printing more copies for its partners. Indeed some

institutions (e.g. VECO UGANDA) have already expressed in writing, interest in reproducing more products. Others such as the Uganda National Farmers Federation and East Africa seed have expressed similar interest. It is possible that with wider awareness and use of the products in the field, more institutions could have expressed interest in the same.

Strategic lessons

Partnerships and products distribution

- Many institutions expected support in form of funding, to facilitate uptake promotion of the products. However, this was not realized considering the limited funds available to the project.
- Findings from the stakeholders following distribution of products indicated that the demand for products is high, and indeed, many institutions found them useful. Within the short time following their distribution, a few (e.g. VECO UGANDA, Uganda National Farmers Federation and East Africa Seed) had already indicated willingness to invest their own resources towards production and multiplication of the communication products.
- In Kenya, COSOFAP has already started reproducing the products and distributing them to partners. Many NGOs and the private sector have also shown great interest to reproduce the products and quite a number have requested for soft copies to do the reprints.

Timing of activities

- The project team generally underestimated the time it would take to develop and revise the products to an acceptable format.
- Many institutions felt that the time between product development, distribution and monitoring and evaluation was too short to realize any impact arising from use of the products. At the time of monitoring and evaluation, many institutions had actually not used the products. In future, such a communication assignment should take a longer time than the few months that the current project had.
- The products were distributed during November (near the end of the growing season). Many users felt that it would have been better to distribute the products near the beginning of a growing season, to facilitate their immediate use in the field.

Proposal budget

- During proposal development, the cost of production of products was underestimated. Thus, a fewer number of copies of products were produced and indeed, some institutions (e.g. CIAT) had to supplement budgets for production of communication materials.

The consortium approach

- In order for the consortium approach to be effective, the project team members need more time to interact and develop a common understanding of the project assignment. This can be time-consuming due in part to busy schedules of many team members.
- Furthermore, implementation of project activities under the consortium approach

needs to be flexible in terms of time, considering that many of the team members have a number of other activities they are involved in.

Activities that were planned but could not be implemented:

- Due in part to budgetary limitations and the short duration of this project it was not possible to translate the products into local dialects. It is thought that potential institutions willing to take up further multiplication of the products could translate some of the products.
- Although it was thought that other communication channels (e.g. video, mass media) would be explored to increase the capacity of reaching a larger audience, this was not possible partly due to budgetary limitations. Similarly, time constraints hindered the development of policy briefs for policy makers.

Output 3: Outcomes and impact of NRSP products and communication strategy for the benefit of the poor farmers determined.

It was hypothesized that promotion of communication products will create more awareness, knowledge and capacity among selected target institutions, which will enable them to accelerate adoption and impacts of improved NRM technologies and innovations by small-scale farmers. To test these hypotheses, an end of project evaluation sought to investigate, monitor and evaluate the process and the effectiveness of alternative communication and uptake promotion strategies within the context of Uganda and Kenya. The study aimed to answer several research questions, including:

- What are the communication needs and expectations of the different stakeholders? What products are needed by what stakeholders, and in what format? What are the effective mechanisms for engaging with the stakeholders, building consensus and defining their interests, priorities, and participation strategies in the UP plan? How do we reach the marginalized groups, especially women and the rural poor?
- How effective are the different promotional materials and delivery processes for different target groups, e.g. resource poor farmers, development organizations, policy makers, donor organizations? Are there significant differences in the uptake of technology-based NRM products, and process-based research products?
- What would be alternative communication strategies to achieve greater impact and uptake of technology and process research products?
- What are the necessary conditions for effective use and promotion of NRM research products?
- What lessons can we learn from the UP experience? What are the constraints, challenges and opportunities for sustainability of the UP plan? What experiences do we learn from the Consortium approach?

A tracking survey of the distribution, use and potential uptake of communication products to a variety of stakeholders and target institutions, and attempts to provide answers to these questions was carried out (Annex C). Although still preliminary, the report brings out the key issues and stakeholder assessment of the usefulness of the different products, and strategies for promoting their uptake and sustainability. Table 1 below shows how the institutions have made use of the products and need for modifications in them.

Table 1: Number of institutions that have read, used and found product useful in Uganda

Product	Number of institutions read the product				
	Number of institutions Used product		Number of institutions found the product useful		
01. You are loosing your soil	24	5	24		
02. Bridging research and development in soil fertility management			14	2	14
03. The power of visioning	14	4	14		
04. A guide to Scobics	5	0	5		
05. DSS for better land management	20	3	14		
06. DSS for striga management and control		19	2	14	
07. Integrated striga control strategies for increased crop yield and soil fertility	19		14	2	
08. Improve soil fertility/food security/income generation: Plant dual purpose soybean	3	14			20
09. DSS for nutrients deficiency diagnosis and corrective measures			20	3	18
010. Type for improved fallow species suitable for soil fertility improvement			22	2	
011. Improve soil fertility and increase crop yields using fertilizer trees			22	2	17

From Table 1 it can be noted that almost all the institutions have read the posters. Posters are indeed easy to read as they are meant to provide simple and short messages with pictorial that attract attention, and can be read in a short time. However, only 15% of the institutions in Uganda and 50% have used some of the posters, particularly the private input dealers. With only few weeks after delivery towards the end of the year and the cropping season, we could not expect institutions to use these posters.

Many of the TI had partially read the two handbooks (The power of visioning and Bridging research and development in soil fertility management), and many of them used the interview time to peruse its content and to make some comments. It was observed that many TIs in Uganda did not read the “Guide to SCOBICS”, mainly because of its title “SCOBICS” which does not have recognized meanings in Uganda.

In general, most respondents found all the products informative and very useful. The products are clear and easy to understand, and have practical relevance in increasing agricultural production and improving soil fertility. The language used was straightforward that even those with low education level understand. They can be used as teaching aids support and reference materials and can enhance learning of both extension personnel and farmers. All the posters are self-explanatory and are good visual teaching aids. Thus, they

enable service providers to articulate a point easily and also ease farmers' learning. All products convey messages that farmers have been asking and are good reference material for service providers. The posters contain illustrations and messages that will be used as teaching and learning aids for both farmers and extension workers, thus aiding the communities to identify solutions to their farming problems. In addition, they will be used as reference materials and guides to decision-making. The posters are particularly good for teaching farmers on agronomic practices which if carried out will enhance productivity, and provide incentives for purchasing and using recommended inputs such as hybrid seeds, fertilizers and pesticides which will consequently increase the business turnover. In summary, many TIs felt that they use the products for:

- i. Training Farmers and Resource Persons
- ii. Guide for Trainers
- iii. Technology Dissemination
- iv. Knowledge Transfer
- v. Needs Identification and Assessment
- vi. Reference Materials for farmers and Trainers
- vii. Planning community action plans
- viii. Resource materials during demonstrations

Uptake/ Promotion and scaling-up

All organizations use a combination of methods to pass information to others within and outside the groups, CBOs still use localized channels, key being local farmer visits, chiefs barazas, merry go round sessions and during demonstrations. CBOs do not promote much the sharing of the materials outside their members, as they cannot afford to lose them, as they do not have money to replace them. They however scale-up/promote the real technologies being described. NGOs, Private sector on the other hand have facilities for promotion by photocopying and making more copies available during training or field days. Promotion is also done within the organization through in house training or seminars. Many of the CBOs belong to Umbrella organization and this will help them scale to other areas. The main results from the Monitoring and Evaluation process above are presented in Annex C.

Emerging issues/sustainability of products

Despite the fact that this tracking survey was conducted at a time when most stakeholders had no opportunities to use the different products in field situation, a number of useful lessons can be drawn for uptake promotion of communication products.

First, the timing of this tracking survey was far from the ideal situation to generate more informed feedback on the use of products in real field situation. The survey intervened only a few weeks after distribution. As a consequence, many products had not reached intended beneficiaries at the time of the survey, and most institutions have not had opportunities to use them in the field to provide constructive feedback. A monitoring and evaluation of the effectiveness of communication materials needs to be conducted at least six months after delivery of the products. However, a systematic tool for tracking use of products needs to be

developed and shared with intended users.

Second, it was clear that the active involvement of different stakeholder categories in making the products makes it easy to identify how they should be packaged, thus making them user friendly. It is also very important to have a peer-review process, pre-test the different products with the intended users and revise them before mass production. This has however cost and time implications, resulting in a limited number of copies that can be produced. Pre-testing would avoid some of the comments and needs for modification made by the users. For example, it would help to make the title clear and attractive, and avoid congestion of text into a single poster.

Thirdly, the distribution of the products needs more systematic targeting and proactive communication strategies. To ensure that the product users receive them and use them effectively there may be need for follow up on the distribution and a stakeholder workshop to explain how the products could be used. This could also serve as training of trainers that will use the products in the field.

Fourth, the distribution process of the products was not uniform. There are differences in institutional set up and arrangements for communication. In some cases, communication is centralized, whereby the Head Office or Project Manager would be the central place to deposit information which is then shared to field officers and staff according to their responsibilities and work plans. It is argued that this will ensure that the products are considered as organization property, and the line managers will ensure their proper distribution to and use by a higher number of field staff, and ensure feedback. However, we also found that in a number of cases, there was no evidence that products delivered to the Head office will eventually reach the end users or field staff. In many cases they ended up in the office shelves, some times still in the form of their delivery. The challenge is to assess organizational culture and information sharing mechanisms of different target institutions, before distribution, to determine the most effective ways of distributing products. Assessing the most effective way of distributing communication products, comparing the two approaches, remains a research challenge.

Fifth, results of Stage A recommended that to be effective, an uptake promotion project should use a combination of alternative communication methods, strategies and channels. It was considered that various TIs are heterogeneous and do not necessarily use the same approach to disseminate their products. It was therefore expected that the project would aim at developing more proactive and efficient communication strategies to reach the needs and circumstances of various stakeholders. It was anticipated that the communication strategy would include more proactive and interactive communication materials with local and national target institutions (training workshops, policy learning events, seminars, radio shows and TV programmes) as well as electronic prints (manuals, guides, decision support tools, methodology guides, policy briefs, extension materials, posters, interactive CDs), and other mass media channels. However, considering the budget allocated to the project, and the work and time involved in developing alternative communication materials, the project was only able to produce electronic prints in forms of posters (8) and handbooks (3). These provide basic materials that can be used for training, seminars, extension, radio shows, drama and

other interactive communication channels. It is interesting to note that most target institutions found these materials very useful as training, learning and reference materials that extension personnel can use to promote the adoption of natural resources management and develop community action plans. Tracking how these products are being used, and to what extent they have been translated into more interactive communication materials, is an issue that requires follow up.

Sixth, most target institutions found all the products informative and very useful. The products are clear and easy to understand, and have practical relevance in increasing agricultural production and improving soil fertility. All products convey messages that farmers have been asking and are good reference material for service providers. However, there seems to be a difference between posters and handbooks. Posters were seen as straightforward and self-explanatory that even those with low education level understand. However, they should be made simple, enlarged and subsequently packaged in A-4 paper so that it is easy to photocopy them, and give as handouts to customers and visitors. The handbooks are good reference materials. They are very useful as teaching and learning aids, and reference materials for service providers and farmers respectively. They are also applicable as reference material. However, they need to be simplified and packaged into pocket size, without losing the information contained. More importantly the handbook of “A guide to SCOBICS” may need to be repackaged in a handbook format instead of its current report format.

Seventh, a number of institutions are willing to reproduce the products as long as there are no restricted copyrights. Finding more appropriate strategies for linking up with other institutions, and creating partnerships for reproduction and distribution of the different products will remain a challenge for the institutions involved. This might involve repackaging of the products, translating them into local languages, and allowing different partners to modify some aspects as necessary. In the meantime, posting these materials to websites to allow easy access needs to be accompanied with strategies to create awareness of these products. Branding issues – Ownership issues when stakeholders want to produce more copies – This was a key issue coming up. Apart from the reproduction, some wanted to do translations and others wanted to add information. Would the added information be factual and work in many areas or would it serve just the target areas for that particular stakeholder.

Eight, sustainability of production of the materials is still a challenge. Although many institutions are interested in the products, only a few of them have indicated their willingness to commit resources towards production and supply of the materials. To date, COSOFAP have made more copies for its member and VECO UGANDA had indicated willingness to produce more copies of the communication materials for her partners. Other institutions like Uganda National Farmers Federation and East Africa Seed have indicated similar willingness. This is a good sign, and we are hopeful that with time other institutions will be willing to do the same. Funding issues for production of more copies – how do we get funding agencies interested? Only a few partners have started the production but this will be enhanced with time. Sale of information through service providers need to be explored

Reaching the poor

During the project phase of R7056, R7856, R7517 and R7963, the products were developed in consultation with farmers, pre-tested and disseminated to the poor farmers. The products

were found to be useful in natural resource management at the project areas in Kenya and Uganda. During Stage A and B phases of this project and during the buy-in meetings/workshop, further feedback was received from variety of farmers groups, CBOs and TIs working with the poor. In response to the feedback from these workshops the products were revised and further simplified for broader dissemination in Kenya and Uganda. However, further studies should be conducted on primary stakeholders to ascertain whether the products have trickled down to the poor farmers, whether they are using them and the consequences of their use in managing their natural resources.

Challenges and lessons learned from R8400 uptake promotion

The key challenges faced by R8400 uptake are enormous. Some of the challenges are highlighted below:-

- 1. Time Period:** The time period for the uptake promotion was short to allow sufficient buy-in and to use of the products by the various stakeholders. There was limited backing by the project team and inadequate technical capacity building opportunities for various stakeholders since they were not initially involved in the development of the products. The team members were involved with other activities and limited time was used in this project
- 2. Diversity of stakeholders:** Different stakeholders have different uptake promotion strategies for their products and they package their products in different way based on their agenda. There is need to harmonize these approaches in the early stages so as to ensure their synergies rather than conflicts in the approach. There is also need to categorize the stakeholders rather than treat them as homogenous entities. Some stakeholders' work directly with farmers and other are involved in training other stakeholders who work with farmers.
- 3. Products:** Majority of the research products by different projects was at different stages of development and no definite uptake promotion strategies were included during the project implementation phase. The buy-in strategies with intended stakeholders could have been undertaken from the initial stages. Targeting of products to a given stakeholder or institution should be done from initial stages. Products should be repackaged to suite their needs
- 4. Capacity Building.** Different stakeholders should be trained on the use of the products.

5 Research Activities

research Activities

The central focus of the project was to develop and implement a communication and UP strategy to enhance the uptake of research results and products to different stakeholders and target institutions giving more focus to the poor. The research phase was done simultaneously with the development outputs. To achieve both the developmental and research objectives action research was undertaken to investigate, monitor and evaluate the process and the effectiveness of alternative communication and uptake promotion strategies within the context of east Africa. To achieve this, M&E tool/framework was developed by the Uganda team and shared with the Kenya team. It took into consideration views of stakeholders consulted and who had participated in meetings. It was then modified to fit the

local conditions in Kenya. The tool comprised the use of a questionnaire, checklist and direct observation. In the field face-to-face discussions/focused group discussion were the main methods used to gather information. The checklist enabled further probing and this was more effective with CBOs and farmer groups. Questionnaires were effective with NGOs and service providers including the private sector.

Monitoring and evaluation survey looked into the following aspects:

- Use of the products for the different stakeholders
- Usefulness of the products including clarity, practicality and knowledge generation
- Uptake pathways, promotion strategies and scaling up efforts
- Impact of the products to the different stakeholders
- Sustainability including exit strategy
- Modifications to the products.

There was no major modification to the research activities only that there is need for further tracking as some of the products have not been in use for long. It is necessary to inform some of the NGOs and service providers early enough to be able to meet them unlike the farmer groups which were readily available.

6 Environmental assessment

6.1 What significant environmental impacts resulted from the research activities (both positive and negative)?

Due to time implications needed in terms of environmental impact, much of the observations were from work done during the earlier suite 2 projects and other projects done by other partners. However, the stakeholders had positive observations for the potential impacts.

Positive: Better utilisation and management of natural resource for improved farm productivity and improved livelihoods is envisaged; better planning of farms hence reducing erosion, reducing runoff from improved land management, better yields from improved fallows and striga control measures. The visioning booklet enabled farmers enhance their collective action at their plot and village level.

Negative: Different stakeholders did not envisage any negative environmental impacts at the plot or village level.

6.2 What will be the potentially significant environmental impacts (both positive and negative) of widespread dissemination and application of research findings?

Positive: In most areas, collective action is needed to arrest land degradation and food insecurity issues. Stakeholders indicated that with enhanced dissemination of the results and products more farmers will become knowledgeable and will intensify production and management of natural resource for improved farm productivity and improved livelihoods of the poor. With more farmers practicing at the landscape level, the stakeholders envisaged more positive impacts on water resources and land in general.

Negative: Stakeholders did not perceive any negative impacts even with scaling up of the research results and products.

6.3 Has there been evidence during the project's life of what is described in Section 6.2 and how were these impacts detected and monitored?

Given the time limitations there is no hard evidence from this particular project lifetime especially at the landscape level. Experiences are from localized applications especially from farmers who have been with related projects for some time.

6.4 What follow up action, if any, is recommended?

There is need for further follow up on the use of the products by different stakeholder.

7 Contribution of Outputs

7.1 NRSP Purpose and Production System Output

The three project outputs were developed to achieve the overall project purpose of developing and promoting a more efficient and proactive communication strategy that will see enhanced uptake and scaling up the use or adoption of research products and results and more so towards the poor. Output 1 was developed to ensure buy-in of stakeholders and get their views on what communication channels would be appropriate and what scaling up options can be used from their experiences especially to target the different stakeholders. Output 2 enabled the incorporation of stakeholders view into the repackaging of the products, which meant adding new knowledge and value to the products. Output 3 was the research component by which the project will generate new information and knowledge on how to target better the products and how to come up with effective and sustainable uptake /communication strategy. These contribute significantly to the NRSP purpose output whose key OVIs have been achieved in that the poor farmers in the target areas (4 districts in Kenya) are using the products and also in non-target sites (10 districts under COSOFAP and 25 districts in Uganda). The same holds true for institutions in that different institutions in target areas and non-target areas are utilizing the information in reaching out to their target groups who include the poor (see summary of institutions under section 4).

From the discussion with the different stakeholders and networking partners, the project's research products will impact positively on the lives of people within the next three to five years. This is due to the fact that some are easily achievable and some take some time. Some of these impacts are as below more in M&E report). For farmers the following was commonly realized;

- Increased yields at farm level (especially for the poor who could not afford credit or access to information and women who lack collateral and funds)
- Food security enhancement (especially women farmers who do not have access to fertiliser inputs).
- Income security enhancement (for women and poor farmers- income generating activities).
- Increased farmer networking thus strong groups and enhanced collective action)
- Improved soil fertility (all categories of farmers but more so women farmers who rank soil fertility high in their agenda).

- Instilling of the reading culture among farming communities.
- Proper land use and management and environmental conservation.
- Enhanced livelihoods

The service providers at their level felt that the introduction of communication products will have the following positive results;

- Enhanced partnerships and linkages.
- Strengthened community extension service.
- Increased reach out to farmers.
- Harmonized extension service provision
- Capacity building on new knowledge).

At policy makers' level it was envisaged that from disseminated research products/results, the following is likely to be realized;

- Revolutionized extension provision with extension service providers working together to see the farmer achieve enhanced livelihoods
- Generation of ideas from the grass roots to higher decision making levels, this is likely to bring a sense of belonging in technology development/ research thus easy up-take and sustainability of activities
- The ownership of the research processes and increased technology up-take will in the long run enhance government extension service provision.
- Enhanced livelihoods of the communities as they access services from different stakeholders

In many target areas the project has enhanced the capacity of communities to run their own credit schemes and apply the lessons to other sectors e.g. TATRO CBO in Siaya District in Kenya is now having a cereals Bank. It has enhanced equity among participating farmers and community members in terms of access to inputs and benefits. More importantly the project has built the capacity of communities in managing natural resources and inspired a sense of responsibility as shown by the repayment rates.

Use of project products and lessons by stakeholders:

As an indicator of the usefulness of the research products and potential to impact on natural resources, several partner members of COSOFAP in Kenya and other stakeholders in Uganda have started utilizing the products and lessons generated from them. Some of these are:

The COSOFAP secretariat through support from the Rockefeller Foundation has reproduced four of the posters with 2000 copies each and distributed to partners. In addition, it shared the experiences from SCOBICS during the 2004 and 2005 trade exhibitions held at Tom Mboya Labour College in Kisumu. During the exhibitions over 1000 participants attended.

The Kenya Network for Dissemination of Agricultural Technologies (KENDAT) is implementing the Sustainable Agriculture for Rural Development Project in various parts of Kenya and has used the products especially the posters in its training and field days.

The Millennium Village Project in Siaya District is a project of Columbia University implementing part of the MDGs and is utilizing the lessons from SCOBICS to implement their input distribution/credit programme and is also utilizing the other products during trainings and field days.

Butula Constituency Development Funds in western Kenya in western Kenya is utilizing the products (especially posters during training and awareness creation sessions for its women groups).

7.2 Impact of outputs

The Purpose level of the project had three OVIs to which the outputs were meant to contribute to. These are described below:

- i) By December 2005, at least two stakeholders/ institutions have adopted and are reproducing NRSP products for wider dissemination.
- ii) By December 2005, public awareness and use of NRSP products for better NRM have been created using the research products
- iii) By December 2005, at least 35 % of target institutions (policy makers, research and development organizations, rural service providers, farmers organizations) had had access to, adopt and use communication products to improve policy and decision-making in NRM

As regards the first OVI, in Kenya, COSOFAP has already started reproducing the products and distributing them to partners. Many NGOs and the private sector in Kenya and Uganda have also shown great interest to reproduce the products and quite a number have requested for soft copies to do the reprints. As regards the second OVI, COSOFAP secretariat through its network of partners has raised the awareness of the products to over 200 organizations (both members and non-members) during its training sessions, planning meetings and during the exhibitions. However, not all have started using the products, as they are not enough/available for all members. Regarding the third OVI, over 50% of the target institutions have access and are utilizing the products in Kenya and 25% in Uganda. As stated earlier, majority have not yet started producing the products. More efforts are to be put in targeting the policy makers especially Members of Parliament. The other stakeholders are strongly on board.

7.3 Uptake Promotion

Many partners have shown great interest in the promotion of the research products. In order to enhance uptake several issues should be addressed or given priority:

- Mainstreaming the products in national/public extension systems such that these are available to a wider range of target stakeholders,
- Networking with regional bodies/networks which can then promote products to many more people,
- Advocacy and lobbying for policy change especially those that will be pro-poor and enhance the acquisition of knowledge
- Addressing the issue of public-private sector linkages in enhancing research and development work and developing modalities for working together to reach wider audiences and not be too commercialized
- Formation of a framework or entities at grass root levels that can source and sell information to farmers or service providers

- Donor/funding agencies sharing of information and sharing research findings/products that have been developed
- Documentation of such products and where they could be accessed from
- Appropriate dissemination channels and communication strategy should be put in place for different stakeholders.

Promotion pathways identified

A variety of dissemination and uptake pathways need to be promoted for the different target groups. First, there is need to widen on the choice of media. In this project, only posters and books were utilized. As much as posters are good for farmers and illiterate farmers, the use of visual/electronic forms should be enhanced. Networking and networks should be encouraged as much as possible to cut costs but more so make the products reach bigger audiences in diverse geographical areas. Farmer networks at higher levels should also be encouraged, as this will have capacity to mobilize farmers countrywide. For the poor and women, field days, exchange tours, demonstrations, chiefs barazas, are good opportunities for reaching them. For NGOs and other institutions including CBOs use of websites, internet, training, workshops are ways of reaching them. One key issue is to raise more awareness on the availability of such products. Its only organizations linked to projects or COSOFAP that are aware. There are a big lot of interested stakeholders who do not know about such. Training on use of such products is also necessary. In scaling up two approaches could be explored. First is the use of community-based dissemination structures. Such structures do exist at different levels in the community and have been found to be useful in delivering information and even organizing fellow farmers. The second approach is to network with partners in different areas and pass the products to them who will in turn work with their communities (more pathways in section 4).

However there still issues to be addressed in methodologies:

How do you identify and target the poor

How do you package the information for the poor in a cost effective way

Different ethnic languages which might enhance adoption but be limited by production costs

8 Publications and other communication materials

8.1 Books and book chapters

Sanginga, P.C and Chitsike, C.A 2005 The power of visioning: A handbook for facilitating the development of community action plans. Annex B: **Advancing the use of the products of NRSP's past and current research projects in Eastern Africa**

Semalulu O, McDonagh J and Lu Y 2005 Bridging research and development in soil fertility management: Practical tools and approaches for better soil management in East Africa Annex B: **Advancing the use of the products of NRSP's past and current research projects in Eastern Africa**

8.2 Journal articles

8.2.1 Peer reviewed and published

Author or Authors, Initial. Year. Title. Publisher/Journal. XXpp. (Page numbers)

Author or Authors, Initial. Year. Title. Publisher/Journal. XXpp. (Page numbers)

Author or Authors, Initial. Year. Title. Publisher/Journal. XXpp. (Page numbers)

8.2.2 Pending publication (in press)

Author or Authors, Initial. Year. Title. Publisher/Journal submitted to. XXpp. (Page numbers)

Author or Authors, Initial. Year. Title. Publisher/Journal submitted to. XXpp. (Page numbers)

Author or Authors, Initial. Year. Title. Publisher/Journal submitted to. XXpp. (Page numbers)

8.2.3 Drafted

Author or Authors, Initial. Year. Title. Institution. XXpp. (Page numbers)

Author or Authors, Initial. Year. Title. Institution. XXpp. (Page numbers)

8.3 Institutional Report Series

Author or Authors, Initial. Year. Title. Publisher/Institution. XXpp. (Page numbers)

Author or Authors, Initial. Year. Title. Publisher/Institution. XXpp. (Page numbers)

Author or Authors, Initial. Year. Title. Publisher/Institution. XXpp. (Page numbers)

8.4 Symposium, conference and workshop papers and posters

Author or Authors, Initial. Year. Title. Details of workshop/conference. Publisher/Institution. XXpp. (Page numbers)

Author or Authors, Initial. Year. Title. Details of workshop/conference. Publisher/Institution. XXpp. (Page numbers)

Author or Authors, Initial. Year. Title. Details of workshop/conference. Publisher/Institution. XXpp. (Page numbers)

8.5 Newsletter articles

Author or Authors, Initial. Year. Title. Publisher/Institution. XXpp. (Page numbers)

Author or Authors, Initial. Year. Title. Publisher/Institution. XXpp. (Page numbers)

8.6 Academic theses

Author or Authors, Initial. Year. Title. Publisher/Institution. XXpp. (Page numbers)

Author or Authors, Initial. Year. Title. Publisher/Institution. XXpp. (Page numbers)

8.7 Extension leaflets, brochures, policy briefs and posters

KEFRI 2005 Decision support system for striga management and control. Annex B: **Advancing the use of the products of NRSP's past and current research projects in Eastern Africa**

KEFRI 2005 Decision support system for better land management. Annex B: **Advancing the use of the products of NRSP's past and current research projects in Eastern Africa**

KEFRI 2005 Decision support system for nutrient deficiency diagnosis and corrective measures Annex B: **Advancing the use of the products of NRSP's past and current research projects in Eastern Africa**

KEFRI 2005 A poster on improved soil fertility and improved crop yields using fertilizer trees Annex B: **Advancing the use of the products of NRSP's past and current research projects in Eastern Africa**

KEFRI 2005 A poster on types of improved fallow species suitable for soil fertility improvement. Annex B: **Advancing the use of the products of NRSP's past and current research projects in Eastern Africa**

KEFRI 2005 A poster on integrated string control strategies for increased crop yield and food security. Annex B: **Advancing the use of the products of NRSP's past and current research projects in Eastern Africa**

KEFRI 2005 A poster on improved soil fertility/food security and income generation. Annex B: **Advancing the use of the products of NRSP's past and current research projects in Eastern Africa**

NARO 2005 A Poster on you are losing your soil . Annex B: **Advancing the use of the products of NRSP's past and current research projects in Eastern Africa**

8.8 Manuals and guidelines

Poulton, C., Ndufa, J.K., Gitau, M and Ogolla, G 2005 A guide on sustainable community based input credit scheme (SCOBICS). Annex B: **Advancing the use of the products of NRSP's past and current research projects in Eastern Africa**

Author or Authors, Initial. Year. Title. Publisher/Institution. XXpp. (Page numbers)

Author or Authors, Initial. Year. Title. Publisher/Institution. XXpp. (Page numbers)

8.9 Media presentations (videos, web sites, TV, radio, interviews etc)

Author or Authors, Initial. Year. Title. Publisher/Institution. Format.

Author or Authors, Initial. Year. Title. Publisher/Institution. Format.

Author or Authors, Initial. Year. Title. Publisher/Institution. Format.

8.10 Reports and data records

8.10.1 Project technical reports including project internal workshop papers and proceedings

Ndufa, J.K. and Ssemalulu, O. 2005 Final Technical Report Annex A: **Advancing the use of the products of NRSP's past and current research projects in Eastern Africa**

Ndufa, J.K., Sanginga, P.C., Kayanga, S., Noordin Q 2005 Tracking the Use, Uptake and Conditions for Sustainability of Communication Products Report Annex C: **Advancing the use of the products of NRSP's past and current research projects in Eastern Africa**

Author or Authors, Initial. Year. Title. Publisher/Institution. XXpp. (Page numbers)

8.10.2 Literature reviews

Author or Authors, Initial. Year. Title. Publisher/Institution. XXpp. (Page numbers)

Author or Authors, Initial. Year. Title. Publisher/Institution. XXpp. (Page numbers)

Author or Authors, Initial. Year. Title. Publisher/Institution. XXpp. (Page numbers)

8.10.3 Scoping studies

Author or Authors, Initial. Year. Title. Publisher/Institution. XXpp. (Page numbers)

Author or Authors, Initial. Year. Title. Publisher/Institution. XXpp. (Page numbers)

8.10.4 Datasets

Author or Authors, Initial. Year. Title. Publisher/Institution. Format.

Author or Authors, Initial. Year. Title. Publisher/Institution. Format.

8.10.5 Project web site, and/or other project related web addresses

Web site address

Web site address

9 References cited in the report, sections 1-7

Enter text in this row

10 Project logframe

Narrative summary verification	Objectively verifiable indicators Important assumptions	Means of
Goal	Improved livelihoods for the poor people that are dependent on land and water resources in the densely populated, high rainfall areas in East Africa	By March 2006, new knowledge promoted by at least two of the target institution being tested by the poor in ways that will improve their livelihoods in the respective catchment areas NRSP annual project report
NRSP review report		
End of project report	Products and communication strategies have changed the attitudes and livelihoods of target stakeholders	
Enabling environment exists		
Purpose	To promote new knowledge and NRM innovations derived from the findings and results of the NRSP-funded Suite 2 projects in Eastern Africa to make it feasible for this to be scaled-up by a range of stakeholders through effective communication with relevant target institutions at a range of levels. By May 2005, at least two stakeholders/ institutions have adopted and are reproducing NRSP products for wider dissemination.	
	By May 2005, public awareness and use of NRSP products for better NRM raised.	
	By September 2005, at least 50% of target institutions (policy makers, research and development organizations, rural service providers, farmers organizations) have access to, adopt and use communication products to improve policy and decision-making in NRM.	
	Copies of communication materials	
Stakeholders' reports		
	Distribution and mailing list (including feedback from stakeholders and TIs)	
Monitoring and evaluation reports		
Quarterly and End of project report	Policy environment in Uganda and Kenya remains conducive and supportive of NRM research and development	
	Target institutions and key stakeholders remain committed to wider dissemination of NRM research results	
	Budgets and programmes of TIs allow wider dissemination and upscaling of research results	

Outputs

Use one row for each output and keep OVs, MoVs and Assumptions for each Output within the same row

1. A more robust communication strategy developed to facilitate uptake promotion of research products

By October 2004, at least 8 research products and communication materials (2 for each project) are prioritized and synthesised for repackaging,

By the end of November 2004, effective communication channels for dissemination of NRSP products to different stakeholders established

By December 2004, scaling up plans including exit strategy for sustainability of uptake promotion developed.

By December 2004, the communication needs of various stakeholders and target institutions are determined

Copies of revised products (hard and soft copies available)

Progress reports

Database and records of appropriate and prioritized communication channels for the different TIs and products available

Database of different stakeholders and communication strategies

Target institutions and key stakeholders are willing to participate in the uptake promotion

Collaborators and project staff remain committed to the project

2. Through repackaging, revision, and pre-testing of knowledge-sharing products with targeted institutions, a number of communication materials targeting different stakeholders groups are developed, produced and disseminated

By the end of August 2004, linkages with at least two priority target stakeholders/institutions and networks per country established.

By November 2004, local leaders (e.g. Councillors, MPs etc) will have been sensitized on NRSP products

By end of November, 2004, at least four products will be ready for repackaging and pretesting with stakeholders; and by March 2005, these products will be developed for wider dissemination

By the end of May 2005, appropriate alternative media products developed and disseminated to a variety of stakeholders

By the end of 2005, key stakeholders and partners are involved in the production of communication materials
Database of different research products

Workshops reports

Mass media reports

Advocacy meetings reports Target institutions and key stakeholders are willing to participate in the uptake promotion

Collaborators and project staff remain committed to the project

Budget and other resources are sufficient

3. Alternative communication strategies assessed and their outcomes and impacts monitored, evaluated and documented. By November 2004, methodology, process and tools for tracking outcomes/impacts designed.

By September 2005, potential impacts and uptake pathways of the communication materials determined

By September 2005, alternative scaling up plans including exit strategy for sustainability of uptake promotion documented and analysed

PM&E framework

Institutional reports

Project FTR

Target institutions and key stakeholders have the capacity and are willing to establish participatory monitoring and evaluation systems, as well as outcomes mapping

Activities Activity)

Milestones (and budget if calculated by

*Repeat the relevant Output narrative on a separate line before the listing of the relevant Output's activities
Use one row for each Activity and keep Milestones, budget and Assumptions for each Activity within the same row
Date and number milestones as given in the NRSP Logframe guidelines in the RD1 Information Pack.*

Output 1: A more robust communication strategy developed to facilitate uptake promotion of research products

Budget = £5,354

Funds released on time

No change of focus of collaborating institution and stakeholders

1.1. Country teams meetings/writeshops to incorporate the inputs of the two Stage A stakeholder workshops on the products MS1a Publication of the draft products

1.2. Develop strategies for dissemination and scaling up project results and products etc

MS1b Workshops report

Output 2: Through repackaging, revision, and pre-testing of knowledge-sharing products with targeted institutions, a number of communication materials targeting different stakeholders groups are developed, produced and disseminated. Budget = £20,025

Funds released on time

No change of focus of collaborating institution and stakeholders

2.1. Country teams meeting with identified stakeholders to formalise the partnerships/linkages and effective communication strategies for reproduction and dissemination of the products. MS2a Workshops report

2.2. Pre-testing of revised NRSP products with different stakeholders to provide the appropriate final products.

MS2b Meeting reports

2.3. Training workshops for TI staff and harmonise the products distribution process

MS2c Workshop report

2.4. Mass reproduction of selected NRSP products. MS2d Printing of product report

MS2e Various communication materials are provided to wide set of stakeholders

2.5. Establish effective links with higher-level policy institutions and other research and development organizations within the country and the region for promotion purposes. MS2f Report on linkages

MS2g Report on communication of products (processes and methodologies)

MS2h Meeting attendance and briefs reports

Output 3: Alternative communication strategies assessed and their outcomes and impacts monitored, evaluated and documented.

Budget = £19,622

Funds released on time

No change of focus of collaborating institution and stakeholders

3.1. Develop M&E tools for tracking changes in communication as a result of promotion of NRSP research products MS3a PM&E Framework and strategies guidelines

3.2. Monitoring and evaluation on the use of NRSP products, communication strategies and dissemination processes by the different stakeholders including poor farmers on PM&E report MS3b Training

3.3. Track the interest and potential uptake of the project approach and methodology in Kenya and Uganda quarterly reports MS3c Tracking of interest is documented in project

Add rows as needed Non output Budget = £35,447

Pre-condition

11 Keywords

Research products, Uptake promotion pathways, livelihoods, Kenya and Uganda