

NATURAL RESOURCES SYSTEMS PROGRAMME
FINAL TECHNICAL REPORT¹

DFID Project Number

R8211

Project Title

Rural Youth Livelihoods

Project Leader

Kevin Waldie

Organisation

International and Rural Development Department,
The University of Reading

NRSP Production System

High Potential

Date

October 2005

¹ This document is an output from a project 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

1	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
2	BACKGROUND	2
3	PROJECT PURPOSE	3
4	OUTPUTS	4
5	RESEARCH ACTIVITIES.....	7
6	ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT.....	11
7	CONTRIBUTION OF OUTPUTS	11
8	PUBLICATIONS AND OTHER COMMUNICATION MATERIALS	13
9	REFERENCES CITED IN THE REPORT, SECTIONS 1-7	15
10	PROJECT LOGFRAME	17
11	KEYWORDS.....	23

ANNEXES

- A. An Investigation Into The Formative Livelihoods Of Rural Youth In East Africa

- B1 The Visibility Of Youth In Rural Development Policies In Uganda And Kenya:
A Review Of Documents With Some Observations And A Discussion

- B2 The Formative Livelihoods Of Youth In Rural Kenya: A Preliminary Description
Of Data And An Indication Of Key Findings Based On An Investigative Survey
Undertaken In Kitui, Narok And Kakamega Districts.

- B3 The Questionnaire Used In The Kenya And Uganda Surveys

- B4 Draft Briefing Note: Reflecting Youth Livelihoods In Natural Resource Policy

- C Project Inventory

Abbreviations and Acronyms

DATIC	District Agricultural Training and Information Centres Programme
FTR	Final technical Report
IRDD	International and Rural Development Department (University of Reading, UK)
MYMFO	Matilong Youth Mixed Farming Organisation
NAADS	National Agricultural Advisory Services
NRM	Natural Resources Management
NRSP	Natural Resources Systems Programme
OVI	Objectively Verifiable Indicator
PI	Principle Investigator
PO	Partner Organisation
TI	Target Institutions

1 Executive Summary

This project has its immediate origins in an NRSP scoping study, “Enhancing capacity for enterprise and innovation: an investigation of the livelihood assets and strategies of rural youth in East Africa” (PD111), which was completed in October 2002. (Waldie and Mulhall 2002) This first mooted the basic hypothesis that a better understanding of youth livelihoods may be used to strengthen future rural development and natural resources management (NRM) policy and practice. The study suggested that poor understanding of the interests and needs of youth was impairing the effectiveness service delivery, and that this in turn indicated a broader problem within the policy and institutional context.

In essence, the basic concern of Project R8211 was to identify new opportunities to enhance the livelihoods of rural youth in Uganda and Kenya. Through various inter-related activities, three outputs were pursued (See section 10 below). Through these outputs the project sought to:

Gain a clearer understanding of the livelihood strategies of rural youth: how they are shaped by processes of intergenerational transmission of poverty and disadvantage, and to assess the potential of NRM to provide new opportunities for capital accumulation.

Review current policies, institutions and processes that influence the lives of young people in rural areas: explore whether current policies were supportive of the strategies of rural youth or whether, with a potentially negative impact on NR, they served to marginalize them from mainstream development activities.

Establish and disseminate models of good professional practice to support the efforts of those rural youth seeking to build their livelihoods through enterprises based upon the use of natural resources (assuming such additional support will have beneficial effect by providing further opportunities for young people to establish sustainable livelihoods in NRM.)

Investigations have affirmed that opportunities for service providers to support efforts of young people is currently hindered by both a critical lack of information and a lack of understanding of how rural youth access and make use of local natural resource endowments to shape their livelihood strategies. Project findings directly challenge entrenched assumptions held by many policy makers and service providers that marginalize rural youth by either ignoring their particular interests and needs or, worse, erroneously portraying them as inherently disinterested and/or disinclined to pursue livelihood strategies that are based upon natural resource management.

Project data shows that many youth are, in fact, proactive in engaging in NRM from an early stage in their livelihood careers, thereby affirming that youth are the major stakeholders its improvement. Further, through its field level investigations, the project has been able to strengthen the evidence base of rural policy and service delivery by gaining a better understanding of the particular characteristics of the formative livelihoods of young people. (Annex B2) On the basis of an extensive policy analysis, R8211 also explains the need to rethink the meaning of “youth” and proposes that their representation within the discourses of rural policy and practice may be enhanced through further conceptual development. (Annex B1)

In retrospect, it now seems obvious that that the setting of the Purpose Level OVIs, which concern the promotion and uptake of good examples of policy and practice, were over ambitious, and possibly too dependent upon the attainment of Output 3. The Project did not advance that far. However, the achievements of R8211 relating to Outputs 1 and 2 are such

that it can be seen to have established an appropriate evidence base upon which further steps can now be undertaken with a view to improving support and service delivery. In other words, whereas it was envisaged that R8211 could lead directly and quickly to an intervention phase, the process of investigation revealed that there was considerably more to learn and understand before this step could realistically be undertaken. The project can thus be seen to have made a direct and significant contribution to the NRSP High Potential Output Level OVI that states “*By 2002, constraints to the delivery of rural services important for the improvement of livelihoods of the poor identified*”.

Despite problems in the implementation of the collaborative research programme in Uganda, the team was able to establish and maintain very cordial relations with Partner Organisations and other key TIs during the course of the Project. Findings are to be disseminated to local and national level TIs in Uganda and Kenya (NRSP-CIM uptake domains W and X²) in the form of Research and Policy Briefs. The dedicated Youth Livelihoods website, established by the PI, will also serve to disseminate findings to a wider network of interested parties, and academic papers will be written to disseminate findings to International TIs (NRSP-CIM Y domain stakeholders).

2 Background

This project has its immediate origins in NRSP project PD111, “Enhancing capacity for enterprise and innovation: an investigation of the livelihood assets and strategies of rural youth in East Africa” which was completed in October 2002. (Waldie and Mulhall 2002). R8211, in common with PD111, was undertaken in Eastern Africa and looked to work with a range of government and non-government partner organisations which operated across various rural locations in Kenya and Uganda (For details see Section 5 below)

PD111 first mooted the hypothesis that a better understanding of youth livelihoods may be used to strengthen future rural development and natural resources management policy and practice. Whilst this basic hypothesis was not tested in any explicit manner in the scoping study, interaction with a wide range of stakeholders provided the opportunity to reflect critically upon the potential value of investigating youth livelihoods within a future programme of research.

The scoping study discovered that whilst policy makers and practitioners in Kenya and Uganda expressed a considerable interest in youth, their predominant concerns focused more specifically on “youth in crisis”. This particular view of youth was also found to be entrenched in both past and current academic scholarship, wherein young people were invariably reflected as villains of the peace, victims of war and HIV/AIDS, and sexual and labour exploitation, (e.g. Agwanda et al.2004, Collier 1996, Erulkar 2004, McGaw and Wameyo 2005, Manda et al 2003, Mondo 1996, Naker 2005, Topouzis and Hemrich 1994) By contrast, the study noted the general dearth of research, available to inform policy and practice, that portrayed the lives and livelihoods of “ordinary” rural youth in Eastern Africa. Of the few rural studies that had been carried out and were available within country, most were retrospective evaluations of various “failing” national youth development programmes (e.g. Coe 1973, Dey 1990, Kazungu 1978, Oira 1982)

PD111 also revealed that that rural development practitioners consulted were often unable to clarify the particular needs or interests that their programmes sought to meet, and the general

² NRSP 2003. *CIM Explained*. Hemel Hempstead, UK: NRSP. 12 pp

assumption appeared to be that youth would benefit simply by virtue of being part of the community. (Waldie and Mulhall 2002). The study concluded that poor understanding of the interests and needs of rural youth was impairing the effectiveness service delivery, and that this indicated underlying conceptual and methodological challenges.

However, the suggestion that a focus on youth was of particular relevance in providing a critical entry point into the analysis of the ways in which new livelihoods are established, and innovation and diversification occurs, received wide support both from the policy makers and practitioners consulted. The widespread interest within TIs in Kenya and Uganda, both within the government and NGO sectors, to seek ways to engage more fully with youth, provided a clear justification for the development of a further research project to look more closely at these issues.

3 Project Purpose

Mechanisms that better enable youth to shape and build their livelihoods, based around access to improved rural services and innovative use of natural resources, identified and promoted.

Assessment of achievement at the Purpose level using the three Logframe OVIs (Section 10) would suggest that little progress has been made with respect to the identification and promotion of “mechanisms that better enable youth to shape and build their livelihoods”. However, as accurate as this strict interpretation of the indicators may be, this does not tell the full story of progress towards the Project Purpose.

All three Purpose level OVIs look to identify changes in policy or strategy of service delivery by target institutions. In turn, these OVIs are dependent upon the high attainment of Output Three which states, “*Potential examples of good policy and practice for supporting rural youth in natural resources management developed, communicated and promoted to TIs at local, national and international level.*” Since the Project was not able, for reasons that are explained in section 5 below, to achieve Output 3 during the time-scale envisaged, an inevitable consequence was that Purpose level OVIs became unobtainable. Output 3 was, in turn, based upon the combined products of Outputs 1 and 2, which focused on research rather than development outcomes, and it is here that R8211 has been more successful. In other words, R8211 has been effective in describing current key characteristics of rural youth livelihoods, although it has not been able to move strongly towards effecting changes to them

R8211 has concluded, on the basis of its critique, that there is a prior need for the development of a sounder conceptual basis to enable more effective representation of the particular interests and needs of rural youth in policy and practice was to take place. And, as a consequence, some of the most important findings from the project relate directly to conceptual elements that will assist in providing a new framework for investigating and explaining rural youth livelihoods.

In concise terms, R8211’s contribution to “new thinking” is centred in and around the following:

- The important characteristics of youth livelihoods (based upon field level observations)
- The problem of the “invisibility of youth” in policy and reasons for this (based upon review of policy and strategy documents)

- An explanation of the relevance of life-course concepts in providing new insights and understandings of rural innovation and change (based upon interaction with sustainable livelihoods thinking)

Further explanation of the basis of relationship of these “contributions to knowledge” to the Log Frame is presented in Section 4. In Annex One these are brought together in an overview discussion, which seeks to explain the rationale of the broader critique.

As an argument, R8211 directly challenges the “dominant narrative” embedded within Kenyan and Ugandan policies and institutions that portray youth as disinterested in natural resources management and inevitably concluded that youth see little future in rural-based livelihoods. By developing a “deeper” understanding of the issues, which includes the exploration of concepts through which innovative thinking can take place, R8211 has, in fact, made an important contribution by establishing a basis upon which the future action of the kind envisaged in the original OVIs can now be achieved.

4 Outputs

1. *Livelihoods of rural youth investigated, and relevance of this new knowledge for NR policy and practice better understood*

The first OVI relating to Output One concerns the analysis of youth livelihoods in target situations in Uganda and Kenya. The second, more explicit OVI, concerns the characterisation of the practical and strategic interests of youth, and explanation of the policy implications of these. In summary, the major elements of both OVIs were achieved, although much later than anticipated and, in the event, through the implementation of research activities which were not originally anticipated. (Appendix A) During the life of the project, sharing of experience took place through a series of on-going meetings and interactions with project partners and other key stakeholders. (e.g. Walker 2003 and Walker and Okwadi 2003). However, sharing of key findings will continue to take place post-project through the development of further research products, including research and policy briefs (for an example see Annex B4) as well as academic articles.

Although the current evidence base is currently stronger for Kenya than in Uganda, the field data analysed thus far has proven sufficient to provide clarification of a number of what will likely prove to be fairly generic key characteristics of rural youth livelihoods. (The further analysis of the Ugandan survey data will confirm whether this is correct.)

The field data directly challenges “received wisdom”, embedded within local policies and institutions, that generally portrays youth as lazy and, more specifically, as disinclined to become involved in natural resources management. (Annex B2) Against this, the project data show that the large majority of youth respondents are actively involved in income generation activities. Further, not only do the majority of informants express their positive interest in farming as a future livelihood, but this “interest” is reflected in a strong reliance upon the management of renewable natural resources as an important source of income.

However, the findings also illustrate that the formative livelihoods of young people are exceptionally complex and varied. Significantly, survey data illustrate that rural youth, both male and female, will commonly “mix and match” natural resource management with additional income earning activities, such as trading, labouring and the exploitation of other natural resources that may be locally available as a form of “common property”. Very few

young people depend upon farming as a sole source of income. Strength and stamina are commonly recognised by young people as key attributes, which provide them with a comparative advantage over older people in the labour market. This is reflected in data that shows many youth, and particularly males, are associated with the undertaking of physically arduous tasks (e.g. land preparation, charcoal production, stone breaking and sand capture).

The data also indicate that it is common for the livelihood activities of youth to change quickly, with income earning rising and falling across the year. Significant discontinuity can be seen to be a key characteristic of many youth livelihoods and the survey data shows that it is common practice for many income-earning activities to be tried but once or twice, with far fewer being continued over the longer term. Furthermore, formative livelihoods often reflect an interest in seeking opportunistic and short-term engagements in the labour market; and enterprises of young people are often designed to meet specific and targeted income needs of a personal nature, thereby providing the opportunity to meet other pressing demands on their time. For example, enterprises of school going children will often start and stop, in order to accommodate the demands of school year, as well as those arising from the family farm.

Further analysis of the Uganda material will, in due course, enable comparative observations to be drawn by using data from the two national contexts.

2. Current policies and institutional processes for supporting rural youth livelihoods evaluated and potential aspects for improving service delivery identified

The OVI for Output 2 states that by the end of the project the strengths and weaknesses of current rural development policies with respect to youth livelihoods should be identified and explained. Whilst it can be stated that the OVI has been achieved, reflecting once again on the stated Output, it is true to say that less progress was made with respect to the evaluation of “institutional processes”.

A report, offering an analysis and critique of rural policy and strategy documents from both Kenya and Uganda, was the major research product relating to this output. (Annex B1, Waldie 2005b) The policy documents consulted included those that related directly to NRM, but also included key cross-sectoral strategy documents. The findings of this review centred around the phenomenon of the “invisibility” of youth within the consulted documents and the frequent subsuming of their interests and concerns within the broader category of “women and other disadvantaged groups”. Through comparing the manner in which youth and women were represented in the policy documents, it became clear that reference to gender analysis had assisted policy makers to frame the interests of women in a manner that enabled them to be regarded as appropriate focal points of policy and strategy. By contrast, even when mentioned, “youth” were invariably regarded in naturalistic terms, with emphasis placed upon their dependence on the adult world rather than as agents in their own right. It was argued that the development of a clearer conceptual framework could be achieved through the use of a “life course perspective” that, in essence, approaches age categories as social constructs. It is argued that “rethinking youth” is a prior and essential stage towards the future development of appropriate policies and services to support the livelihoods of young people.

The critique of policy statements inevitably entails an implicit critique of wider elements of the policy process, however this was not pursued in any sustained manner. Processes of policy formulation are complex at the best of times and, given the large number of policy arenas that would have had to be considered, it was decided that a full analysis of these lay

beyond the scope of the project. However, with respect to implementation processes, scoping-type enquiries (indicated as activity 2.1) were carried out in Kenya. The activity, which sought to identify “models of good practice” whereby youth may be appropriately enabled to participate in NR-focused development interventions, was based upon a series of visits to community-focused rural development organisations. However, whilst these visits were informative, they mostly reaffirmed the sense of there being a general failure to engage with young people in an effective and strategic manner. In other words, they informed the project on models of indifferent rather than good practice, and in particular on the prevalence of the service driven interventions being mounted without any consideration of, or commitment to understand, the particular interests and needs of young people. (See Mwangi 2003 and 2004b)

Whilst it is clear that the identification for improving service delivery will require a further engagement with service providers, this cannot now take place within project period. Nonetheless this has the potential to occur using the knowledge generated under Outputs 1 and 2 of the project.

3. *Potential examples of good policy and practice for supporting rural youth in natural resources management developed, communicated and promoted to TIs at local, national and international level.*

As explained above, R8211 cannot be said to have achieved Output 3, though appropriate steps towards realising this were made during the project. Reflection on the four OVIs is helpful in illustrating the reasons for the limited progress.

The first OVI concerns the maintenance of the www.youthlivelihoods.info website. Whilst this was not updated as regularly as the OVI demands, its continued presence on the web, throughout the life of the project, provided a virtual presence that was useful in creating new contacts. The second OVI also relates to communication, though here the expectation is more explicit: “*From May 2004 demand driven consultations and meetings held with key policy and practice oriented TIs, feeding into existing planning processes*”. During the project, regular meetings were held with partners and a wider range of Target Institutions. Whilst these cannot be said to have been demand driven, they certainly took place on the basis of there being a mutual interest in debating the issues underpinning the research.

However, with one notable exception (noted below), these engagements did not bring observable changes to existing planning processes as sought for in the fourth OVI. This states: “*At least one policy and one practice oriented TI indicates plans to rethink its existing approach towards rural youth by end of project.*” Failure to effect such changes can be attributed to a number of factors: to the limited engagement of the partners in field level activities, explained in Section 5, the consequent delay in production of research products (such as policy briefs) as a result of the project having to undertake further field investigations to establish an appropriate evidence base and, possibly, the presence of uncertain local planning processes.

The notable exception concerns the Project’s engagement with NAADS. The Project had a number of meetings with the NAADS chairman, following the Partner’s Workshop, which he also attended. The Chairman was clearly taken with the need to do something for the youth and subsequently requested the development of a clear NAADS strategy for the inclusion of youth into their activities. This “demand” appeared to trigger a considerable debate and discussion within the organisation and, according to sources from within NAADS itself, considerable tension with other senior officers who felt that “youth” was a non-issue. Some

youth-specific field investigations were subsequently carried out, but it transpires that these have not led to the development of the coherent strategy for which the Chairmen was looking. The lesson to be learnt here reiterates a point made earlier concerning the unexpected advocacy role that R8211 found itself playing; namely that that organisational change can sometimes be effected on the basis of power of an idea, even when the evidence base that would better explain what needs to be done and why remains limited.

In summary, whilst the Project paid exemplary attention in communicating and developing project partnerships in its early stages that would have been essential to deliver Output 3, the willingness of local organisations to debate and engage with the issues was not easily translated into the substantive changes in policy and practice envisaged. Acceptance that there is an issue to be addressed is one thing, understanding what needs to be done is something different altogether. However, R8211's focused research programme has, at the end of the day, developed a substantial evidence base so that the changes within NRSP-CIM domain W and X stakeholders as envisaged in the four OVIs can still be achieved on the basis of future research products.

5 Research Activities

This section provides a summary overview of the research activities undertaken. As the Logframe in Section 10 makes clear, the Project was committed to explore a fairly wide range of issues pertaining to the livelihoods of rural youth.

The cluster of activities under Output 1 primarily concerned the gathering information on the lives and livelihoods of rural youth, and sought to establish a firm evidence base for the project. Two distinct approaches to field-level data collection were undertaken. The first approach was to facilitate the establishment of a joint programme of collaborative fieldwork by working with "partner organisations" (PO) in Uganda. Ideas for implementing the fieldwork programme were initially explored during a Collaborator Assessment Mission to Uganda (January 2003) and firmed up during a Partners' Workshop attended by government and non-government organisations³ (April 2003). These were later moderated and agreed upon during a subsequent series of meetings and communications. The strategy for the implementation of the programme was premised on the principle of partner ownership: namely that partner institutions would take responsibility for data collection (agreed by them to be valuable to their own self-development) and would do so using existing field level resources. The rationale being that through such means, data gathered could more quickly be absorbed into local organisations and thus more effectively be used to bring about needed changes in policy and practice (as required by Output 3).

It was originally planned that data collection exercises in Uganda would take place across four of the districts in the POs were operating. These were Tororo (DATIC), Soroti (NAADS) Kasese (Save The Children) and Katakwi (MYMFO). A series of qualitative research tools were selected on the basis of their flexibility and suitability for use by PO field

³ In Uganda formal partner organisations were The department of Agricultural Extension/Education, Makerere University, Matilong Youth Mixed Farming Organisation (MYMFO), Save The Children UK, The District Agricultural training and Information Centres Programme (DATIC) and the National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS) Julius Okwadi, a research assistant on the project, worked for the National Agriculture Research Organisation (NARO). In Kenya, in addition to Professor Mwangi of Egerton University, the project primarily collaborated with World Neighbours and their partners as well as The Kenya Youth Foundation.

staff. (Walker 2003 b, 2003c, 2004a, 2004b, 2004c) The project was minded to cause minimal disruption to busy PO schedules. The tools chosen included focus group discussions with youth groups (Walker 2004e) and semi-structured interviews with key informants (Walker 2004d). In addition, the programme involved the use of reflective journals and an embedded photographic survey, which are discussed in Section 5 below. The field investigation was organised around five main themes that had emerged from the Partner's Workshop (Walker 2003a) and sought to explore the livelihood opportunities available to rural youth, the factors constraining or enhancing youth participation in the development process, the influence of poverty, issues of diversification and change, and awareness of rights.

Each new stage was instigated by a visit by project staff to introduce and test the methodology with field staff of the local PO, with the expectation that the work would cascade to the other field sites. However, as it transpired, despite reaching the formal agreement of partners to operate on this basis, their capacity to deliver reliable data on a timely basis did not, in the end, match their enthusiasm for participating. As a consequence, the investments that the project had originally made available to support data collection (for example in testing of methods, training and monitoring) were increasingly being relied upon as the mechanism for data collection itself. And, frankly, the resources were insufficient to do this properly. In due course, through lack of progress and the increasing logistical challenges arising, activities in Kasese were halted. Further, the deteriorating security situation in northern Uganda led to the subsequent withdrawal of MYMFO in Katakwi. In the end, activities were only sustained in two of the four original districts. (Walker 2005c)

The commitment to a "partnership approach" inevitably entailed a loss of direct management control. The obvious difficulty of retracting from the spirit of the partnership agreements meant that, until the MTR at least (February 2004), the fieldwork programme stumbled uncertainly forwards. One of the significant revelations of the MTR was the paradox that the continued interest exhibited by partner organisations and other policy level TIs in engaging with R8211 seemed to persist without real commitment to strengthening the evidence base. The rapid "progress" that had been made with respect the willingness of a wide range of influential TIs to enter the debate demonstrated that the project was unwittingly in danger of becoming a vehicle for advocating the interests and needs for youth, rather than explaining them. The Project and NRSP was therefore faced with the unexpected dilemma of organisations showing a desire to change their ways prior to any evidence that this was needed!

In response to the problems of establishing an appropriate evidence base, following the MTR, and with support and guidance from NRSP management, the project developed a second approach to field-level data collection. This time, the PI took direct responsibility for the planning of a formal questionnaire survey that would gather data across the key themes indicated by Output 1 activities. The Survey was designed and pre-tested between April and July 2004 and then administered to 420 respondents across three districts of Kenya and two in Uganda. The survey in Kenya, which was administered by a team led by Professor Mwangi of Egerton University, proved extremely successful in generating valid and reliable data. The Uganda survey, for reasons of having to work within the context of existing partnerships, was facilitated through field staff of partner organisations. The data gathered here proved less reliable and showed clear signs of "enumerator fatigue". Whilst subsequent review has shown that there is still much workable data here, these were not open to straightforward preliminary analysis, unlike the Kenya data that are presented and discussed in Annex B2.

The additional implementation of a formal questionnaire proved valuable in providing the evidence base for the project to establish new insights and understandings, and had the additional benefit of re-centring management around the PI. Whilst the implementation of a questionnaire survey resulted in data that could readily be “put to good use” as hard evidence in the articulation of key findings, it is important to recognise that data gathered through more participatory means, though this has proven more difficult to package, may still have considerable potential value for the development of future research products.

The use of two research activities that were brought together in an innovative effort to provide longitudinal case studies of livelihood development is worthy of note- reflective journals and a self-administered photographic survey (Walker 2005b). In Soroti and Tororo Districts, a total of 22 youth were asked to keep a weekly journal that recorded their main livelihood activities and reflections upon these over a 12-month period. Once a month these the journals were collated into summary monthly reports, which were collected by local partner organisations (POs). The POs were expected to assist the process by providing encouragement to the diarists, but also to support them by discussing issues arising and offering support where possible. After the first three months, each writer was provided with a disposable camera and given 2-3 days to conduct a photographic survey of what they regarded as their key assets and resources. Once the films were processed, the informants were brought together to explain what they had photographed and why. The informants retained one copy of the photographs, with another made for use by the project. At the end of the reporting period, semi-structured interviews were held with the journal writers to further explore particular areas of interest and to clarify key elements of their livelihood strategies.

The journals did provide useful data on “normal life”, the local resources, and the daily challenges in accessing and managing these to meet livelihood strategies. The photographic survey was particularly useful in revealing the manner in which individual personal interests shape individual livelihood strategies and hence the management of local livelihood resources. Overall, however, the longitudinal case study approach met with mixed success.

Whilst the demands of journal writing inevitably restricted the sample to people with sufficient literacy skills, it was also clear that some respondents were more interested in writing than others- so at the end there was considerable variability in the quality of the journal data from the points of view of clarity in detail and also regularity of diary entry. However, a more critical problem affecting the journal writing concerned the inability of local partners consistently to provide the agreed level of monitoring and support upon which the implementation of the study had been premised. In one district, for example, it was later discovered that the local facilitator had told the journal writers that they would have to deliver their reports since he did not have the time to collect them. The lack of sustained engagement between local partners and the journal writers was unexpected given the interest that had been expressed in these innovative techniques. The mutual learning across the service user- provider interface that had been anticipated to take place through this activity did not occur, and thus the opportunity to improve service delivery through this means was not realised.

These issues notwithstanding, project experience suggests that there is considerable potential in these techniques. Firstly, the approach provided considerable opportunity for young people to express and demonstrate their agency, as both critical informants but also as individuals making critical choices over the use of resources in pursuance of livelihood objectives. The opportunity for informants to reflect upon their own livelihoods, and to rationalise their normal day-to day experiences through self-constructed narratives, provides a valuable, critical and challenging counterpoint to “received wisdom”. With respect to the photographs,

young informants often commented with considerable pride of their efforts and achievements. So as a means of providing excluded and disadvantaged a voice, these particular techniques tested by R8211 are worthy of further consideration. Both the journals and the photographs also provided highly intimate responses, and through these came the powerful reminder that it is often personal interest (and not simply need) that shapes emerging livelihood strategies. With the benefits of a more effective implementation strategy to better support the respondents, and a clearer analytical framework to shape the analysis of the data generated, these techniques may prove very useful in future research that seeks to build a longitudinal perspective of rural livelihoods.

The cluster of activities under Output 2 focused on seeking to explore the current policies and institutional processes for supporting rural youth livelihoods.

- A series of visits to field-based organisations in Kenya (January 2003) and Uganda (September 2003 and again in January 2004) were undertaken to identify the ways and means by which the interests and needs of young people were being incorporated into rural development project and programmes. (Mwangi 2003 and 2004b)
- The identification, collection, collation and analysis of a wide range of Kenyan and Ugandan policy and strategy documents relating to the rural development as well as cross-sectoral social development strategies. (Annex B1, Waldie 2005b)

These have already been explained in Section 4.

The cluster of activities under Output 3 relate generally to the management of communication processes to enable timely sharing of information between project partners during the course of the project, and to enable uptake of future research products by TIs and other potential users. To facilitate this, an institutional survey was carried out at an early stage of the project to identify possible partners, as well as other institutional stakeholders. (See Walker and Okwadi 2003) Further understanding of the policy and institutional context was gained from a stakeholder analysis was undertaken as part of the Partner's Inception Workshop. (Walker 2003a)

Subsequently two basic strategies were followed with respect to the sharing of information during the course of the project. Firstly, as a matter of course, the project always ensured that time was allocated to round-up meetings with partners and other TIs during each and every visit to the field. In addition, a project web site was established to report on progress to TIs and to wider interested parties.

The very regular meetings were particularly helpful in maintaining cordial relations with partner organisations, even though field-support from these sources did not reach the anticipated levels, as explained above. However, it is important to note that cordiality did not always ensure the timely flow of information from POs to the Project, and it was often the case that important information (say in personnel changes, which often proved disruptive to field programmes) was only found out during face-to-face meetings. More positively, through these regular engagements, the Project was able to "*identify potential uptake contexts and the potential uses and users of project findings on policy and practice*". The PI has gathered a very extensive list of named contacts within key TIs to whom future research briefs and other research products will be sent. In summary, the face-to-face meetings, though not always productive in terms of enhancing project implementation, were certainly beneficial in strengthening the Project's social capital.

Whilst it is the case that production and dissemination of research products only after the

project has finished, the considerable networks established by the Project, and commented upon in the MTR, will greatly assist effective uptake to local partners and other TIs, within NRSP-CIM domains W and X

6 Environmental assessment

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

The project, having no technical component, is unlikely to have had any significant environmental impact.

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

No impact can be foreseen

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?

N/A

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

N/A

7 Contribution of Outputs

7.1 NRSP Purpose and Production System Output

The NRSP's purpose is: *to deliver new knowledge that enables poor people who are largely dependent on the NR base to improve their livelihoods* (Programme logframe)

The project has provided a critical examination of how existing “practice wisdom”, in Eastern Africa in the first instance, is currently shaping rural development policies and strategies, including those specifically impacting on NRM, to the likely detriment to the lives and livelihoods of young people. (Annex B1) It is anticipated that the critical evidence provided by the project can lead to greater recognition among policy makers in Kenya and Uganda of the particular interests and needs of rural youth. Thus the project's purpose is entirely consistent with the aspiration of Output 1 of the NRSP High Potential logframe: *Strategies to provide specific groups of the poor with better access to knowledge that can enhance their decisions on management of natural capital developed and promoted.*

Further, through field level investigations the project has sought to strengthen the evidence base of policy and practice by seeking a better understanding of the “nature” of formative livelihoods of young people. Findings from data gathered on the livelihoods strategies of young people directly challenges current and entrenched policy assumptions in the two target countries that commonly marginalize rural youth by portraying them as disinterested and/or disinclined to pursue a livelihood strategy based upon natural resource management. It also

indicates the need to rethink the meaning of “youth” and their representation within the discourses of East African rural development policy. (Annex B2) In this way, the project can be seen to have made a direct and significant contribution to the NRSP High Potential OVI that states “*By 2002, constraints to the delivery of rural services important for the improvement of livelihoods of the poor identified*”

7.2 Impact of outputs

R8211 included three OVIs at the purpose level. These were.

By September 2005 at least three TIs identify change in their policy and/or practice in supporting rural youth that can be attributed to project activities and findings

Two pilot mechanisms to support strategies of rural youth in natural resources management are functioning by 2005

In one context of NR management at least 100 youth can identify new opportunities for livelihood improvement attributable to pilot mechanisms

In retrospect it now seems obvious that that the setting of these OVIs were over ambitious and there is no evidence that the project has even partially achieved any of these specific “targets”. In other words, whereas it was envisaged that R8211 would itself be involved in an implementation strategy, the process of investigation revealed that there was considerably more to learn and understand before this stage could realistically be undertaken.

All three stated OVIs are, in fact, dependent upon the attainment of Output 3, which concerns the promotion and uptake of good examples of policy and practice. As explained in Section 4, the Project did not fully achieve the strategic aims of Output 3. The OVIs can therefore be recognised as “premature”. However, at the time of their formulation, there was an insufficient understanding of the complexities of undertaking research in this relatively unexplored aspect of NRM to have known that this would turn out to be the case.

On the other hand, it is also important to stress that the choice of these OVIs was valuable during the life of the project in that they served to illustrate the aspiration of the project and the heart of its concerns. Further, the achievements of R8211, particularly those relating to Outputs 1 and 2, are such that it has established a platform upon which further gains can be made and promotion of the information from the surveys can now be used to promote the fact that livelihoods of real life youth do not match up with those as represented in current policy.

7.3 Uptake Promotion

A range of further activities for uptake promotion will be carried out post-FTR.

Even though the subject of “rural youth” is not high on the development studies agenda, the unexpected conceptual and theoretical issues that have arisen from this investigation have meant that the findings from R8211 are, in view of the fundamental concerns to which they relate, important to wider academic debate. For example, as explained above, the importance of investigating the formative stages of livelihood development has led the project to the heart of debates regarding what is meant by sustainability, it has considered processes of intergenerational exchange that inform discussions of chronic poverty, and has even reflected on the notion of “youth” itself. Such issues can and will be explored further through the production of academic papers and these will be disseminated to international TIs (NRSP-

CIM domain Y).

In contrast to current levels of academic interest, project experiences have shown that there is a genuine and widespread concern among policy makers and rural development practitioners in Eastern Africa over the issue of rural youth. However, at present, opportunities to identify new ways to engage with young people and to provide effective support is being hampered by the use of inappropriate analytical constructs and frameworks in policy that serve to obfuscate critical aspects of young people's livelihood strategies. A central aspect of the future uptake promotion strategy, therefore, is to share findings with national policy shapers and makers and service providers (NRSP-CIM X and W domain stakeholders) in an informative but also challenging manner.

With a view to designing an appropriate research product to meet these needs, in the later stages of R8211 a series of consultations were held with project partners and other local target institutions. With few exceptions, key informants suggested that briefing notes, which summarised the key points, could quickly be read and readily shared with colleagues, were preferable to lengthier and more detailed reports. As a result, it was decided that a series of 4-sided A4 briefing (or "policy" or "research") notes will be used to as the primary means to inform this wider audience. (A draft note is provided as Annex B3) The notes will be distributed directly through e-mail to existing contacts, and made available in pdf format on the www.youthlivelihoods.info website. (The web-site itself will be redesigned to serve as the information centre for these, and other project products.)

Finally, in response to student requests made in previous years, from January 2006 the International and Rural Development Department of the University of Reading will be providing a masters-level module on "Life course and development". This will serve as the primary mechanism through which the PI will disseminate findings to younger international scholars and it will provide a valuable forum for the further development of ideas.

8 Publications and other communication materials

8.1 Books and book chapters

None

8.2 Journal articles

None

8.2.1 Peer reviewed and published

None

8.2.2 Pending publication (in press)

None

8.2.3 Drafted

None

8.3 Institutional Report Series

None

8.4 Symposium, conference and workshop papers and posters

None

8.5 Newsletter articles

Waldie, K.J. 2003a *Understanding and enhancing youth livelihoods in East Africa* AGREN, Overseas Development Institute 1p

Waldie, K.J. 2004b *Youth and Rural Livelihoods* LEISA, Centre for Information on Low External Input and Sustainable Agriculture 3pp

8.6 Academic theses

None

8.7 Extension leaflets, brochures, policy briefs and posters

Waldie, K.J. 2005d *Briefing paper 1 (Draft) Reflecting youth livelihoods in natural resources policy* International and Rural Development Department, The University of Reading 4pp

8.8 Manuals and guidelines

None

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

Mwangi, J.G. 2004a *Interview: Professor John Gowland Mwangi* AGFAX Radio Interview

8.10 Reports and data records**8.10.1 Project technical reports including project internal workshop papers and proceedings**

Mwangi, J.G. 2003 *Models of Good Practice Visit to Kitui District* International and Rural Development Department, The University of Reading 13pp

Mwangi, M. 2004b *Models of good practice Visit to Western Kenya* International and Rural Development Department, The University of Reading 12pp

Mwangi, J.G. 2004c *Prof. Mwangi's Pre-Testing of the RYL Questionnaire August 2004: Back to office Report* International and Rural Development Department, The University of Reading 5pp

Okwadi, J. 2003a *Activities Undertaken in Tororo in Uganda for Stage 1 of the Rural Youth Livelihoods Research Project* International and Rural Development Department, The University of Reading 22pp

Okwadi, J. 2003b *A Report on the Activities Undertaken for Themes 1 and 2 of the RYL Project in Kyere, Soroti District, Uganda* International and Rural Development Department, The University of Reading 10pp

Waldie, K.J. 2003b *Researching Rural Youth Livelihoods: A Briefing Note prepared for the Partners' Inception Meeting and Workshop in Uganda.* International and Rural Development Department, The University of Reading 9pp

Waldie, K.J. 2005a *The Formative Livelihoods of Youth in Rural Kenya: A Preliminary Description of data and an indication of key Findings Based on an Investigative Survey Undertaken in Kitui, Narok and Kakamega Districts* International and Rural Development Department, The University of Reading 95pp

Walker, M. 2003a *A report on the Partners Inception meeting and Workshop in Uganda for the Rural Youth Livelihoods Project* International and Rural Development Department, The University of Reading 23pp

- Walker, M. 2003b** *A Report on the Initial Fieldwork and Methodology Testing of Theme 1 of the RYL project in Kyere, Soroti District, Uganda* International and Rural Development Department, The University of Reading 31pp
- Walker, M. 2003c** *A Report on the Fieldwork and Methodology Testing of Theme 2 of the RYL project in Nagongera, Tororo District, Uganda* International and Rural Development Department, The University of Reading 37pp
- Walker, M. 2004a** *Paper Discussing the Research Programme, Process and Methodological Tools of the Fieldwork in Uganda for the Rural Youth Livelihoods Research Project* International and Rural Development Department, The University of Reading 12pp
- Walker, M. 2004b** *A Report on the Fieldwork and Methodology Testing of Themes 3 and 4 of the RYL Project in Nagongera, Tororo District, Uganda* International and Rural Development Department, The University of Reading 26pp
- Walker, M. 2004c** *A Report on the Fieldwork and Methodology Testing of Theme 5 of the RYL project in Nagongera, Tororo District, Uganda* International and Rural Development Department, The University of Reading 22pp
- Walker, M. 2004c** *A Report on the Final Stages of the RYL Fieldwork Conducted with Key Informants in Kyere, Soroti District* International and Rural Development Department, The University of Reading 5pp
- Walker, M. 2004e** *A Report on the Final Stages of the RYL Fieldwork Conducted with 3 Youth groups in Kyere, Soroti District* International and Rural Development Department, The University of Reading 51pp
- Walker, M. 2005a** *First Summary of Data Collected by the RYL Project in Uganda 2004-05* International and Rural Development Department, The University of Reading 29pp
- Walker, M. 2005b** *Tororo Journal Writer case Studies: December 2004- March 2005* International and Rural Development Department, The University of Reading 300pp
- Walker, M. 2005c** *Revised Field report on the Collected Findings of the Rural Youth Livelihoods Research Project in Uganda* International and Rural Development Department, The University of Reading 157pp
- Walker, M. and Okwadi, J. 2003** *A Report on a Collaborator Assessment Mission to Uganda for the Rural Youth Livelihoods project* International and Rural Development Department, The University of Reading 23pp

8.10.2 Literature reviews

Walker, M. 2004f *Youth Livelihoods and Sustainable Development* International and Rural Development Department, The University of Reading 20pp

Waldie, K.J. 2005b *The Visibility of Youth in Rural Development Policies in Uganda and Kenya: A Review of Documents with some Observations and a Discussion* International and Rural Development Department, The University of Reading 59pp

8.10.3 Scoping studies

Waldie, K.J. and Mulhall, A. 2002 *Enhancing capacity for enterprise and innovation: an investigation of the livelihood assets and strategies of rural youth in East Africa. A Report on a Scoping Mission to Uganda, Kenya and Tanzania for NRSP Programme Development III.* International and Rural Development Department, The University of Reading 15pp

8.10.4 Datasets

Waldie, K.J. 2005 *Data from an Investigative Survey Undertaken in Kitui, Narok and Kakamega as part of the Rural Youth Livelihoods Research Programme (in Excel format) 2005* International and Rural Development Department, The University of Reading. Excel

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

www.youthlivelihoods.info

9 References cited in the report, sections 1-7

Agwanda, A.O., Bocquier, P., Khasakhala, A. and Owuor, S. 2004. *The effect of economic crisis on youth precariousness in Nairobi: an analysis of itinerary to adulthood of three generations of men and women.* Développement, Institutions & Analyses de Long Terme (DIAL) http://www.dial.prd.fr/dial_publications/PDF/Doc_travail/2004-04.pdf

Coe, R. L. 1973. *The Kenya National Youth Service: a governmental response to young political activists*, Ohio University Center for International Studies. [unpublished report]

Dey, I. 1990. The failure of success and the success of failure: the Youth Polytechnic Programme in Kenya. *Public Administration and Development* 10(4): 179-198.

Collier, P. 1996. Demobilisation and Insecurity in Ethiopia and Uganda: A study in the economics of the transition from war to peace, in *Cilliers, J (Ed). Dismissed: Demobilisation and reintegration of former combatants in Africa, Halfway House: Institute for Defence*

Policy

Erulkar, A. S. 2004 *The experience of sexual coercion among young people in Kenya International Family Planning Perspectives*. Alan Guttmacher Institute. [unpublished report]

<http://www.guttmacher.org/pubs/journals/3018204.pdf>

Kazungu, D. K. 1978. *A youth program in the local community's context: the case of the Young farmers of Uganda Program*, University of Wisconsin-Madison. [unpublished report]

Manda, D.K., Kimalu, P.K., Nafula, N.N. and Kimani, D.N. 2003 *Costs and benefits of eliminating child labour in Kenya*. Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research and Analysis (KIPPRA)

<http://www.kippra.org/Download/WPNo.10.pdf>

McGaw, L. and Wameyo, A. 2005 *Violence against children affected by HIV/AIDS: a case study of Uganda World Vision International Resources on Child Rights*

[http://www.child-rights.org/PolicyAdvocacy/pahome2.5.nsf/0/88d92cf19f341a7a8825704500251541/\\$FILE/VAC%20Uganda_web.pdf](http://www.child-rights.org/PolicyAdvocacy/pahome2.5.nsf/0/88d92cf19f341a7a8825704500251541/$FILE/VAC%20Uganda_web.pdf)

Mondo, E. 1996. Uganda's experience in national management of demobilization and reintegration, in *Cilliers, J. (Ed). Dismissed: demobilization and reintegration of former combatants in Africa*, Halfway House: Institute for Defence Policy

Naker, D. 2005 *Violence against children: the voices of Ugandan children and adults Save the Children Uganda*, Raising Voices Project, Uganda [unpublished report].

http://www.crin.org/docs/resources/publications/violence/Voices_from_Uganda.pdf

Oiro, S. 1982. *Realising the potential of village polytechnics*. Nairobi, ActionAid, Kenya. [unpublished report].

Topouzis, D. and Hemrich, G. 1994 *The socio-economic impact of HIV and AIDS on rural families in Uganda: an emphasis on youth HIV and Development Programme*, UNDP

<http://www.undp.org/hiv/publications/study/english/sp2e.htm>

10 Project logframe

Narrative summary	Objectively verifiable indicators	Means of verification	Important assumptions
Goal			
<p>HP Output 1</p> <p>Strategies to provide specific groups of the poor with better access to knowledge that can enhance their decisions on management of natural capital developed and promoted</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By 2002, constraints to the delivery of rural services important for the improvement of livelihoods of the poor identified • By 2003, new strategies validated for optimising sustained returns to the management of farm land, water, inorganic and organic inputs and genetic resources • By 2005, an integrated natural resources management strategy adopted by target institutions in at least two target countries • By 2005, cost efficient delivery systems for provision of agricultural services (inter alia marketing, input supply, mechanisation, storage, financing) adopted by target institutions in at least two target countries 	<p>Reviews by programme manager</p> <p>Reports of research team and collaborating /target institutions</p> <p>Appropriate dissemination outputs</p> <p>Local, national and international statistical data</p>	<p>Adoption of strategies changes behaviour in the private sector</p> <p>Enabling environment exists</p> <p>Budgets and programmes of target institutions are sufficient and well managed</p>
Purpose			
<p>Mechanisms that better enable youth to shape and build their livelihoods, based around access to improved rural services and innovative use of natural resources, identified and promoted.</p>	<p>By September 2005 at least three TIs identify change in their policy and/or practice in supporting rural youth that can be attributed to project activities and findings</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborating institutions monitoring reports • Minutes of meetings. 	<p>Government supports youth empowerment</p>

	Two pilot mechanisms to support strategies of rural youth in natural resources management are functioning by 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government policy documents • Collaborating institutions monitoring reports 	Policy environment is supportive and promotes rural livelihood development
	In one context of NR management at least 100 youth can identify new opportunities for livelihood improvement attributable to pilot mechanisms	NRSP impact assessment report/MTR reports	
Outputs			
1. Livelihoods of rural youth investigated, and relevance of this new knowledge for NR policy and practice better understood	Analyses of youth livelihoods in target situations in Uganda and Kenya completed by Dec 2004	One case study per country on www.youthlivelihoods.info	Partner organisations commit to the research
	By March 2005 at least four characterisations of the practical and strategic interests of youth and the policy implications for livelihood building developed and shared with key stakeholders	Draft Journal paper	
2. Current policies and institutional processes for supporting rural youth livelihoods evaluated and potential aspects for improving service delivery identified	By March 2005 strengths and weaknesses of current rural development policies with respect to youth livelihoods identified and explained.	Policy analysis project report	<p>Policy environment continues to be supportive towards changing service delivery mechanisms</p> <p>Policy documents are accessible</p>

3. Potential examples of good policy and practice for supporting rural youth in natural resources management developed, communicated and promoted to TIs at local, national and international level.	www.youthlivelihoods.info website updated with news and findings from project activities every two months from May 2004 for the duration of the project.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case studies and guidelines on Web site • Web-log records • Final technical report (in multi-media format) 	Access to internet facilities continues to expand rapidly in Kenya and Uganda
	From May 2004 demand driven consultations and meetings held with key policy and practice oriented TIs, feeding into existing planning processes	Reports of meetings and statements from TIs Briefing Notes	
	Adapted briefings produced for and made available to both policy and practice oriented TIs by March 2005	Briefings Statements from key and collaborating institutions	
	At least one policy and one practice oriented TI indicates plans to rethink its existing approach towards rural youth by end of project	Statements from key and collaborating institutions Final Technical Report	

Narrative Summary	Milestones	Important assumptions
Activities		
<p>1.1 undertake literature reviews covering:</p> <p>a) Theoretical and conceptual understanding of youth livelihoods;</p> <p>b) Case studies to describe potential impacts, both positive and negative, on youth livelihoods of development programmes focused on NR management,</p> <p>c) Methodologies for analysis of role of NRM in shaping “youth transitions” and livelihood establishment in rural areas</p>		
<p>1.2 identify and characterise the livelihood opportunities available to rural youth</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interim findings reported via RYL web May 2004 (Walker/Waldie) • Photo survey of youth resources complete in Kyere June 2004 (Walker) • Findings on Photo survey identifying resource use and livelihoods reported by Sept 2004 (Walker) • Annual programme of reflective journals completed in Tororo Nov 2004 (Okasha, DATIC) • Annual programme of reflective journals completed in Kyere Jan 2005 (Okwadi) • Report on use and findings from reflective journals completed Jan 2005 (Walker) 	

1.3 identify and investigate the factors that influence youth access to and use of rural service providers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kyere field site complete June 2004 (Okwadi) • Follow-up key informant interview complete in Tororo June 2004 (Walker) • Interim findings reported via RYL web June 2004 (Walker/Waldie) 	
1.4 identify local views on rights and responsibilities of youth and investigate their influence on access to NR and other resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kyere field site complete June 2004 (Okwadi) • Follow-up key informant interview complete in Tororo June 2004 (Walker) • Interim findings reported via RYL web July 2004 (Walker/Waldie) 	
1.5 investigate how factors of poverty and inequality affect the livelihood strategies of rural youth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tororo field methodology report completed end of May 2004 (Walker) • Kyere fieldwork completed and report written July 2004 (Okwadi) <p><u>Addition</u>- wealth ranking survey</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft questionnaire completed by June 2004 • Questionnaire pre-tested July 2005 • Survey completed September 2004 	
1.6 investigate the contribution of youth to livelihood diversification and innovation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tororo field methodology tested June 2004 and report completed July 2004 (Walker) • Kyere fieldwork completed (August) and report written August 2004 (Okwadi) <p><u>Addition</u>- entrepreneur survey</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft questionnaire completed by July 2004 • Questionnaire pre-tested August 2005 • Survey completed October 2004 	

Across 1.2-1.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report of collated findings from activities 1.2-1.6 using qualitative methods completed by Nov 2004 (Walker) <p><u>Addition</u>- Kenya comparison</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report on findings from modified use of qualitative methods in Kenya by July 2004 	
2.1 review of strategies used to involve youth in selected NR programmes and projects in Kenya and Uganda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fieldtrip to visit Nakuru July 2004 (Mwangi/ Waldie) • Report collating Kenya findings August 2004 (Waldie/ Mwangi) 	
2.2 analysis of policies, institutions and processes that influence rural youth livelihoods and their access to services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collation of policy documents and development of framework to explain policy impacts on rural youth July 2004 (Waldie/ Mulhall) 	
2.3 preparation of policy-focused review material.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report on policy environment and rural youth livelihoods by August 2004 (Waldie/ Mulhall) 	
3.1 establish and maintain system for timely learning of project experiences by collaborating institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inform collaborators and associates of RYL web update every two months from May 2004 (Waldie) 	
3.2 maintain and promote of youth livelihoods information website	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RYL website to be updated every two months from May 2004 (Waldie) 	

<p>3.3 identify potential uptake contexts and the potential uses and users of project findings on policy and practice</p>	<p>Uptake contexts and potential users of findings reviewed by project management team from May 2004 on a monthly basis</p> <p>Presently monitored institutions/contexts include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uganda: NAADS (initiation of farmers forum), NARO (planning- see below), ICR, National Youth Council (policy review process), SCF, Makerere University • Kenya: World Neighbours, Ministry of Agriculture, Land Reform Policy process • International: DSA fora 	
<p>3.4 document and disseminate findings, highlighting effective and/or innovative approaches on both policy and practice that enhance rural youth livelihood.</p>	<p>Additional milestones will be set as and when opportunities are identified.</p> <p>Uganda:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present paper to NARO conference Sept 2004 (Draft to be submitted by to organisers June 2004) <p>International:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview paper on rural youth accepted by LEISA editors July 2004 • FTR draft June 2005 	

Notes:

The logframe underwent significant revisions during the course of the project. During early stages of the project, a number of changes were made to meet the needs of collaborating institutions. Further changes were made following the MTR in February 2004. The version shown here includes all the amendments but, for clarity, does not indicate elements removed or reworded.

11 Keywords

Youth, sustainable livelihoods, rural policy, livelihood diversification.