



**REPORT ON THE SECOND ASARECA EAST AFRICA AGRICULTURAL
PRODUCTIVITY PROGRAMME PLANNING MEETING**

**IMPERIAL RESORT BEACH HOTEL,
ENTEBBE, UGANDA - 08 - 10 NOVEMBER, 2010**

Prepared by

*Antony M. Kilewe, Violet O. Kirigua and Daniel Kilambya
Topridas Consultancy Services*

November, 2010

TABLE OF CONTENT

Executive Summary	iii
1.0 Background.....	1
1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.2 Meeting Participants and Approach.....	1
1.3 Process Management Team.....	2
1.4 Opening Remarks.....	3
1.4.1 Executive Director, ASARECA.....	3
1.4.2 World Bank Representative.....	4
1.5 Objectives of the Meeting.....	5
1.6 Recap on First ASARECA-EAAPP Planning Meeting.....	5
2.0 Regional Centres of Excellence Operational Plans.....	6
2.1 Presentations by the Regional Centres of Excellence.....	6
2.2 Plenary Discussion of the RCoE Presentations.....	6
3.0 Regional Project Implementation Plans.....	8
3.1 Wheat RCoE – Ethiopia.....	8
3.2 Dairy RCoE – Kenya.....	8
3.3 Rice RCoE – Tanzania.....	9
3.4 Cassava RCoE – Uganda.....	9
4.0 The RCoE Work Plans and Planned Activities for Year One.....	9
4.1 Wheat RCoE – Ethiopia.....	9
4.2 Dairy RCoE – Kenya.....	11
4.3 Rice RCoE – Tanzania.....	11
4.4 Cassava RCoE – Uganda.....	12
5.0 Monitoring and Evaluation.....	12
5.1 ASARECA and EAAPP logframes.....	12
5.2 Recommendation by the Subgroup on EAAPP Logframe.....	13
5.3 Baselines Surveys.....	13
5.3.1 Resolution on Baseline Surveys.....	15
6.0 Principles and Guidelines for Call for Regional Proposals.....	15
6.1 Resolution on competitive grant mechanisms.....	16
7.0 Way Forward and Closing Remarks.....	16
7.1 Way forward.....	16
7.2 Meeting Closing Remarks.....	16
7.3 Meeting Evaluation.....	17
Annex 1: List of Participants.....	19
Annex 2: Meeting Programme.....	27
Annex 3: Proposed EAAPP Logframe Harmonized With ASARECA.....	30
Annex 4: Presentation on Guidelines for Project Baseline Studies.....	32

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1** The Second ASARECA-EAAPP planning meeting was held from 8 to 10 November, 2010 at the Imperial Resort Beach Hotel, Entebbe, Uganda and was attended by a total of 68 participants drawn from the four EAAPP countries, representatives of the World Bank from Washington, Ethiopia, Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda regional offices and ASARECA Secretariat.
- 1.2** The meeting was designed to take the participants through a participatory step-by-step process of reviewing, discussing and consensus building towards the finalization of the RCOEs Operational Plans and Regional Projects Implementation Plans.
- 1.3** In order to ensure effective delivery of the expected outputs, the meeting adopted a hands-on approach with a logical combination of plenary presentations, discussion group sessions and plenary feedback and consensus building sessions. The plenary presentations were attended by all the participants in a plenary set-up. The participants then split into groups to deliberate on the assigned tasks as per the discussion group terms of reference.

2.0 Meeting Presentations

- 2.1** During the meeting, the following guiding and informative presentations were made:
 - A recap of the First ASARECA-EAAPP Meeting held on 30 August to 3 September 2010.
 - Country presentations of their respective Regional Centres of Excellence (RCoEs).
 - A guiding presentation by ASARECA's Monitoring and Evaluation Unit.
- 2.2** The meeting had two main discussion group sessions with clear terms of reference and two plenary feedback sessions. The following reports were presented and discussed during the plenary feedback sessions:
 - Plenary feedback session one presentations:
 - Dairy Regional Centre of Excellence Operational Framework.
 - Wheat Regional Centre of Excellence Operational Framework.
 - Rice Regional Centre of Excellence Operational Framework.
 - Cassava Regional Centre of Excellence Operational Framework.
 - Plenary feedback session two presentations:
 - Dairy Regional Centre of Excellence Project Implementation Plan.
 - Wheat Regional Centre of Excellence Project Implementation Plan.
 - Rice Regional Centre of Excellence Project Implementation Plan.
 - Cassava Regional Centre of Excellence Project Implementation Plan.

3.0 Summary of the Meeting Main Issues, Agreements and Recommendations

The following are the main issues, agreements and recommendations that were arrived at during the meeting:

3.1 Operational Frameworks

- When developing the performance monitoring and evaluation indicators, the RCoE teams should make reference to the credit agreement to ensure concurrence and alignment.
- Cross cutting issues (environment, gender, HIV/AIDS, drugs/substance abuse) should be incorporated into the RCoEs operational plans.
- RCoEs should make reference to the PAD when developing their environment management plans (EMP) in collaboration with relevant agencies.
- Policy issues such as IPR and MOUs are some of the aspects that ASARECA will need to follow-up through policy harmonization under its Policy Analysis and Advocacy Programme.

3.2 Regional Project Implementation Plans

- The Regional Steering Committee can be replaced by ASARECA Board of Directors who can handle the regional aspects of EAAPP.
- Value chain analysis can be undertaken because the PAD allows for this kind of analysis.
- RCoEs should have activities that are realistic and not to be too over ambitious because they will be judged on accomplishment of the indicated activities.
- The process of implementing regional activities need to be sorted out as countries seem to be doing it differently. There is need to safeguard the regionality aspects of the project.

3.3 Work plans and Activities for Year One

- RCoEs should finalize the work plans in close consultation with the other countries.
- Issues of formats was raised as each RCoE seems to have a different format and level of details and, therefore, there was a need to harmonize the formats for preparing work plans.
- There may be challenges with budgeting as country budgets are lump sum and may, therefore, need to be broken down into detailed activity budgets.

3.4 Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks

- The EAAPP Logframe in the PAD will be retained and used as it is. However, there will be a need for it to be reviewed during mid-term evaluation of the project so as to address the concerns raised regarding the indicators.
- The EAAPP Logframe should be cascaded to RCoEs level but reduced in scale and scope to the specific area of interest for each RCoE.
- A detailed glossary should be developed to elaborate on the project development objectives (PDOs) and indicators in the EAAPP Logframe. This will be done through a workshop to be held soon.
- Harmonized logframes developed by RCoEs should be submitted to ASARECAS in 2 weeks for review and advice.
- ASARECA should develop semi and annual reporting guidelines and share them with RCoEs.

3.5 Baseline surveys

- RCoEs coordinators should develop baseline survey tools and methods and share them with countries and ASARECA within 1 month. The RCoEs should meet and agree on responsibilities and timeframes for this task.
- Care should be taken to ensure that baseline surveys do not become large projects by themselves.

3.6 Competitive Grant System

- It was noted that different RCoEs are proposing different mode of competitive grant system. However, since they all have signed the agreement, it may be difficult to backtrack on this. If there are difficulties then the RCoEs should liaise with ASARECA and World Bank for possible engagement with the policy makers.
- The RCoEs should review the ASARECA Grants Manual that has been accepted by World Bank and decide whether to adopt it.
- RCOEs should revisit the PAD and engage ASARECA to give guidance on how to identify, develop and implement regional projects.
- National level activities based on infrastructure development can proceed.

3.7 Other resolutions

- RCoEs need to prepare a scoring sheet for projects and share with other countries.
- Training and dissemination concerns will be addressed during the next meeting.

1.0 BACKGROUND

1.1 Introduction

The East Africa Agricultural Productivity Programme (EAAPP) was conceived in a regional perspective in which Ethiopia, Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda will manage investment with regional objectives to foster agricultural development in the Eastern and Central Africa Sub-region. EAAPP seeks to invest in commodities that have been identified in ASARECA's Strategic Plan as being of sub-regional importance for mitigation of food insecurity. Both ASARECA and EAAPP seek to contribute to the AU/NEPAD's CAADP Pillar IV agenda which focuses on revitalizing, expanding and reforming Africa's agricultural research, technology dissemination and adoption efforts, guided by the Framework for Africa's Agricultural Productivity (FAAP).

There is, therefore, convergence even at this broad level between ASARECA's intentions and EAAPP's development objective of using Regional Centres of Excellence (RCoEs) for the purpose of increasing the productivity and competitiveness of the agricultural sector through the generation and adoption of environmentally sound technologies. EAAPP, therefore, complements ASARECA's work in the promotion of economies of scale and scope through collaboration, specialization and sharing of results.

In compliance with the assigned roles and responsibilities of ASARECA, the first meeting on the implementation of EAAPP was held in Entebbe from 30 August to 3 September, 2010. During this planning meeting, it was discussed and agreed that a follow up meeting should be held to finalize the planning process.

1.2 Meeting Participants and Approach

The second ASARECA EAAPP meeting held from 8 to 10 November, 2010 at the Imperial Resort Beach Hotel, Entebbe, Uganda was attended by a total of 68 participants drawn from the 4 EAAPP countries, and ASARECA Secretariat as shown in Annex 2. Representatives of the World Bank from Washington, Ethiopia and the East Africa regional offices also attended the meeting.

The meeting was facilitated by Dr. Antony M. Kilewe of *Topridas Consultancy Services* assisted by Ms. Violet O. Kirigua and Mr. Daniel Kilambya. The meeting was designed to take the participants through a participatory step-by-step process of reviewing, discussing and consensus building towards the finalization of the RCOEs Operational Plans and Regional Projects Implementation Plans.

In order to ensure effective delivery of the expected outputs, the meeting adopted a hands-on approach with a logical combination of plenary presentations, discussion group sessions and plenary feedback and consensus building sessions. The plenary presentations were attended by all the participants in a plenary set-up. The participants then split into groups to deliberate on the assigned tasks as per the discussion group terms of reference. Each discussion group session had clear terms of reference. The group's feedback sessions were used to present each group report and were done in a plenary set-up attended by all the participants. This set up facilitated effective consensus building and agreement on the issues under discussion by all the participants. Annex 1 show the rolling meeting programme.

1.3 Process Management Team

The Process Management Team that ensured the success of the first ASARECA EAAPP meeting, besides the participants, included the Country Team Leaders; Meeting Facilitators; Discussion Group Chair Persons, Discussion Group Rapporteurs and ASARECA Secretariat/Partnerships and Capacity Development Unit. The specific terms of reference assigned to each were as outlined below.

The ASARECA Secretariat/Partnerships and Capacity Development Unit:

- Made excellent arrangements before and during the meeting that contributed enormously to the overall success of the meeting.
- Provided overall coordination of the meeting activities to ensure that the meeting ran smoothly.
- Ensured that all sessions kept to their respective purposes and agenda by providing guiding presentations/remarks aimed at directing the participants to the relevant sections of the working documents and what is given and/or has been agreed upon in the past.
- Offered guidance, points of clarification and directions whenever needed in the plenary and working group sessions.

- The Facilitators ensured that the meeting expected outputs were delivered. Specifically, the meeting Facilitators:
 - Designed and prepared a suitable meeting conceptual framework, meeting programme, and discussion group session's terms of reference and supervised the group work sessions in close consultation with the PCD Unit of ASARECA.
 - Managed the entire meeting in the most appropriate way that ensured delivery of the expected outputs.
 - Encouraged constructive debate and true participatory dialogue during all the meeting sessions.
 - Kept the participants well informed of the materials/documents to be presented during each session and the expected session outputs.
 - Maintained continuity from one session to the next by keeping the participants well informed of the progress already made, issues already covered and consensus already attained.
 - Ensured that all the meeting sessions started and ran on time, kept to their planned agenda and delivered their respective outputs.
 - Made sure that everyone who took part felt valued and that all sessions attained cohesion, minimal conflicts and consensus.
 - Took notes of the meeting proceedings and prepared and submitted this meeting report.

- The Country Team Leaders:
 - Provided overall coordination of the review, discussion and finalization of their respective country proposal documents.
 - Facilitated the preparation and presentation of their country proposal documents whenever required.
 - Facilitated effective group discussions.
 - Provided effective guidance to the group on the issues under discussion without dominating the discussions.
 - Carried every member of the group in the discussion by ensuring that each member got adequate airtime.

- Assisted the group rapporteur in compiling and presenting the group's report.
- During each discussion group session, each group elected its Group Rapporteur who:
 - Recorded the discussions and the major areas of consensus reached by the group.
 - Compiled and presented the group's report during the group feedback sessions.
 - Prepared the final group report incorporating the comments/suggestions made during the plenary discussion of the report.

1.4 Opening Remarks

1.4.1 Executive Director, ASARECA

The meeting facilitator, Dr. Kilewe, called the meeting to order and led the participants through self introduction. He wished the participants fruitful and enjoyable meeting deliberations and invited Dr. Joseph Methu, the head of Partnerships and Capacity Building Unit of ASARECA to give his welcoming remarks. In his remarks, Dr. Methu welcomed the participants and hoped that they had a good trip and that they were comfortably settled in their hotels. He concluded his welcome remarks by introducing Dr. Seyfu Ketema, the Executive Director of ASARECA, to give his meeting opening remarks.

In his welcoming remarks, Dr. Ketema congratulated colleagues from Tanzania for the just concluded successful elections. He said this second ASARECA-EAAPP planning meeting was supposed to be held from the first week of November but was postponed to accommodate the Tanzanian colleagues who were having their national elections during that week. Dr. Ketema said that in the first ASARECA-EAAPP meeting held from 30 August-3 October, 2010, the countries worked very hard and a lot of progress was made towards the development of the RCoE project documents. He said this meeting's programme had initially been planned for 5 days, but had been reduced to 3 days to enable the team from the World Bank and the Rice RCoE to participate in an evaluation mission in Tanzania.

Dr. Ketema went on to say that this meeting has been planned to complete on the priority areas that included first, the Operational Plan which deals with the roles and responsibilities and mode of operation. This was exhaustively discussed in the last meeting and during this meeting RCoE for Wheat, Dairy, Rice and Cassava will present their reports, which will be discussed and finalized. The challenge is on how to combine responsibilities at the regional and national levels. The second priority area was the Regional Project Implementation Plans (RPIPs) in which the teams needed to revisit the issue and hoped that in the 3 days the RPIPs for all commodities will be finalized. The third priority area was the logframe in which ASARECA has one that has been aligned to CAADP. Also EAAPP has already a logframe that is aligned to ASARECA and by extension to the CAADP. There is, therefore, a need for the RCoE to develop logframes that align to the EAAPP framework. With these remarks Dr. Ketema officially declared the ASARECA-EAAPP planning meeting open and welcomed any question and comments on his opening remarks.

Question

- Kenya team has developed the competitive grants manual, will this be discussed in this meeting?

Response

- Yes this will be addressed during the discussion on the regional competitive grants.

Question

- How will the baseline data be collected so as to develop a credible baseline and how will this be harmonized among the countries?

Response

- Harmonization of data collection instruments will be addressed during the discussion on monitoring and evaluation.

Question

- How will the RCoE deal with the question of Operational Plans and the Regional Project Implementation Plans?

Response

- There is a difference between the Operational Plans (OP) and the Regional Project Implementation Plans (RPIPs). Whereas the OP focused on the roles and responsibilities of the RCOE, this was more towards governance. Each RCoE shall produce this document and ASARECA is expected to publish these. On the other hand the RPIP is more of a research plan and will include a chapter on how it will be operated.
- The Operational Plans will be extracted from the main RCoE documents, discussed, revised and then put back to the document. There will be need to agree on the roles and responsibilities to harmonize the thinking as this will help in modifying the PIP to harmonize them also. This approach will also be applied to the regional and national logframes. The challenge in the RPIPs was on how to bring the commodity country partners together to discuss and agree on the contents. The Operational plans highlights the roles and responsibilities vaguely. These need to be highlight in more detail and should be the starting point. The Operational plans will include procedures for all operations of programmes and how to address them both at regional and national levels. This includes issues of annual reports both at national and regional levels and the Regional Steering Committee members.

Question

- What lessons can be learnt from CORAF on RCoEs roles and responsibilities?

Response

- West Africa had been invited to attend but did not make it. For West Africa, it has been three years of learning and lessons learnt can be incorporated into other members programme. Experience sharing visits to West Africa can be organized.

Comment

- There is need for round table discussions for commodity teams to discuss and finalize the documents
- As the performance monitoring and evaluation framework is developed there is need to make reference to the credit agreement to ensure concurrence and alignment.

1.4.2 World Bank Representative

In his remarks, Dr. Assaye Legesse said that the World Bank team was glad to be in this meeting and apologized on behalf of the sector manager Ms. Karen Brooks who could not make it to this important meeting due unavoidable circumstances. He went on to say that this was an important meeting and apologized for the reduction of the meeting duration from five to three days, which had been necessitated by the proposed evaluation mission in Tanzania. However, he said if the meeting content was rich and detailed and if achieved within the three days, it would be a job well done.

Dr Legesse went on to say that the issue of harmonization within the RCoEs was important as it was a strategic approach on the bigger picture. He said focus should be on the four major commodities and the delivery of technologies. He asked whether there were readily available technologies ready for scaling up. He said the meeting needs to come up with a consolidated

work plan and action plan so that the RCoEs can start on the actual implementation of the programmes. Kenya, Ethiopia, and Tanzania are ready to take off but Uganda is yet to do so and hoped after this meeting they will be ready to take off. As the Executive Director had said, the logframes would not be re-invented but discussed for improvement as there is need for a framework that will track progress. He said it was a pleasure to be part of the meeting and concluded his remarks by thanking all the participants for finding time to attend this important meeting.

1.5 Objectives of the Meeting

Dr. Joseph Methu informed the participants that the purpose of this second ASARECA-EAAPP Planning Meeting was to “follow up on the progress made on the recommendations made during the first meeting and agree on the way forward in the implementation of EAAPP”. Dr. Methu went on to inform the participants that this meeting purpose was to be delivered by the following expected:

- Final Operational Frameworks that lay out the modalities of operations of the proposed RCoEs, including:
 - The roles and responsibilities of each RCoE to the sub-regional stakeholders;
 - Modus operandi of the RCoEs individually and in relation to one another.
 - Regional frameworks for cooperation amongst the RCoEs.
 - Outputs from the RCoEs and the manner by which they shall be shared amongst the beneficiary countries, as well as other stakeholders in the sub-region.
- Regional Project Implementation Plans, one each for Wheat, Dairy, Rice and Cassava commodities.
- Principles and generic guidelines and standards for call of regional proposals, review and approval of the regional project proposals.
- Monitoring and evaluation frameworks including:
 - EAAPP Logframe, (harmonised with ASARECA Logframe).
 - RCoEs Logframes (harmonised with EAAPP Logframe).
 - Performance Monitoring plans.
 - Generic reporting formats.
- Guidelines for the regional competitive grant calls.

1.6 Recap on First ASARECA-EAAPP Planning Meeting

The meeting facilitator, Dr. Antony M. Kilewe, who also facilitated the first ASARECA-EAAPP meeting, gave a recap of the last meeting with regard to process, expected outputs and the meeting resolutions. He said that the first ASARECA-EAAPP meeting held from 30 August to 03 September, 2010 at the Imperial Resort Beach Hotel, Entebbe, Uganda was attended by a total of 66 participants drawn from the four EAAPP countries and ASARECA Secretariat. The expected outputs of the meeting included:

- Decision and recommendation on the eight objectives.
- Table of contents for the four drafts RCoE operational manuals.
- Log-frame for each of the four RCoE.
- Annual work plan and budget format guidelines.
- Annual procurement plan guidelines.
- Reporting format guideline (Semi-Annual and Annual).
- Monitoring and evaluation baseline survey guidelines.
- Draft RCoE operational manual one each for Wheat, Dairy, Rice and Cassava.
- Work-plan and budget for 4th quarter of 2010 for the four RCoE and ASARECA.

- Annual work-plan for 2010/2011 for the four RCoE and ASARECA.
- Agreement on general agenda and date for a follow-up meeting.

Dr. Kilewe went on to indicate that several guiding presentations were made by ASARECA Secretariat, Country representatives of the RCoEs and the World Bank that formed the basis for the meeting expected outputs. He said that the issue of Agricultural Product Value Chain (APVC) was raised and discussed and it was indicated that for those RCoEs that have not yet identified their project areas have a golden opportunity to adopt the APVC approach. After the five days intensive deliberations and hard work, the meeting resolved that the country/RCoE teams to:

- Make further consultations on the ASARECA's roles and responsibilities in EAAP as outlined in the Annex I.
- Complete the development of regional Logical Frameworks for each of the four Centres of Excellence aligned to that of ASARECA and hence FAAP and CAADP.
- Complete the preparation of Semi-Annual and Annual reporting formats and guidelines.
- Complete the development of Monitoring and Evaluation Baseline Survey Guidelines.
- Complete the preparation of RCoE's draft Operational Manual along the presented draft table of content.
- Complete the preparation of the RCoE's Work Plans and Budgets for the 4th Quarter of 2010 and Annual Work Plans for 2011.
- Complete the RCoE's harmonization/consolidation of the regional Project Implementation Plans (RPIPs).
- Complete the development of the mechanism and procedure for identifying regional priorities along the commodity product value chain, principles and guidelines for call for proposals as well as financing and implementation of regional projects.
- Consult and make recommendations on the composition, terms of reference and mode of operation for an EAAPP Steering Committee at the regional level.
- Consult and make recommendations on the composition, terms of reference and mode of operation for the National Technical Committee for each RCoE at the country level.

2.0 REGIONAL CENTRES OF EXCELLENCE OPERATIONAL PLANS

2.1 Presentations by the Regional Centres of Excellence

During this session, the RCoEs presented their Operational Plans as developed so far except for the Cassava RCoE which has yet to complete development of its Operational Plan. In general, the RCoE Operational Plans had incorporated recommendations made during the first ASARECA-EAAPP planning meeting and the teams were putting in the final touches. Each RCoE presentation outlined how the issues of concern on roles and responsibilities, mode of operation at the national and regional levels and the expected outputs and how to share them had been incorporated. The cassava RCoE representative informed the meeting that legal opinion in Uganda had approved and ascended to facilitate project implementation. He also said the cassava RCoE is closely linked to other centres within the country and recently Uganda has just developed the RCoE training Centre of rice in Namalonge which will be an asset to the EAAPP project.

2.2 Plenary Discussion of the RCoE Presentations

The issues arising from each country/RCoE presentation were discussed in the plenary and the following comments and suggestions were raised:

- When Tanzania talks about rice activities, they have also made sure they have put their activities in the other respective countries and these have been budgeted for, but this does not seem to be the same for the other countries. The other RCoEs need to ensure that all their activities are included and budgeted for by the countries.
- The plans will not be referred to as commodity implementation plans because they also incorporate the regional aspects, as well as all the commodities being handled by the other countries. They should be referred to as project implementation plans (PIPs).
- It was indicated that what the teams have are operational plans as opposed to implementation plans. They need plans which elaborate what activities, how and when these will be implemented and what resources are required.
- The operational plans at the country level seem to be complicated, but this will be handled by the individual countries. However, there is need to take cognizance of the effects on resource flows and therefore implementation of the project. Countries need not only think about their operational plans but also how they can increase collaboration and networking.
- The impression is that countries had developed their plans and had consultation with stakeholders in country. However, countries seem to be making the same presentations again. There is need to move the process forward and focus on what has to be done and activities to be undertaken. There is pressure from all to proceed with implementation and move from concentrating on process.
- Detailed workplans showing the activities to be undertaken and accompanying budgets will be presented under the PIPs.
- Tanzania seems to have made progress with their implements plans and other countries risk being left behind.
- Cross cutting issues should be incorporated into the RCoE operational plans.
- Aspects on environment and social safeguards are missing from the plans. Management frameworks need to be developed in collaboration with the relevant national agencies. Country teams need to refer to the PAD which spells out how this should be approached.
- The dairy RCoE plan has yet to incorporate the regional aspect and the group needs to incorporate this.
- There is need for the commodity groups to agree on the research issues that need to go through the regional plans. Teams can borrow from best practice as presented for example by Tanzania.
- All the countries are referring to Steering Committees and, therefore, there is a need to discuss and harmonize them in terms of composition and roles and responsibilities.
- As part of scaling up of technologies, teams need to discuss the policy implications for information and technology sharing as countries have different policies as regards information sharing.
- Countries need to consider holding a meeting similar to the one held by Tanzania where all the country partners were present. This will assist in clarifying issues that would otherwise be an impediment to the implementation.

After exhaustive plenary discussions of RCoEs Operational plans, the teams were requested to finalize their plans based on the following recommendations:

- Review, discuss and endorse the Operational Plan.
- Revisit the composition of the Regional Steering Committees and their terms of reference for harmonization.
- Review the policy implications for technology dissemination and sharing.
- Ensure all the cross-cutting issues are incorporated into the plans.

3.0 REGIONAL PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

During this session, the RCoE teams reviewed, discussed and revised/updated their Regional Project Implementation Plans. The revised Regional Project Implementation Plans were then presented in plenary for comments and discussions. The following comments and suggestions were raised during the discussion of the RCoE presentations.

3.1 Wheat RCoE - Ethiopia

Comments

- The mechanism for sharing outputs has not been spelt out in the document.
- The outputs are too many and need to be rationalized based on the EAAPP logframe.
- With regards to the committees, in Tanzania there is the Technical Committee that approves proposals and therefore approval is at country level. However, in Kenya, there are other processes of approval. In this regard who approves the regional or national technical committee?
- The issues on the committees will be addressed under output three of this meeting that will deal with the regional competitive grant.

3.2 Dairy RCoE - Kenya

Comments

- In addition to the roles stated in the document, there is need to insert the roles agreed upon in the last meeting.
- Expected outputs are generally acceptable, but the team needs to look and generate activities for the indicated outputs.
- The team needs to align the outputs to the targets in the logframe.
- There is need to include national stakeholders in a tabular format, as national structures are important in implementation and they also influence the regional structures.
- The country teams need the ASARECA convening role activities to enable them budget for the coordination activity.
- RCoEs and ASARECA should ensure that each one of them delivers on their respective workplans.
- The operational plan has not addressed the environment management framework.
- The issue of data collection mechanisms and baseline surveys and how this shall be harmonized at regional level was raised?
- The PAD outlines how the environment and social issues will be handled and the country teams, in collaboration with the national environment management agencies, should make reference to the document to develop activities and budgets (Environment Management Plan (EMP) to address the issues.
- There is too much focus on process so far and, therefore, efforts should be made to move to the implementation phase. The PIPs is a living document that can be improved at a later date as the need arises.
- Environmental issues have not yet been addressed and will be taken up.
- There is a whole section on information and knowledge sharing mechanisms but this will be re-looked at again to ensure compliance with the guidelines.
- To address the issues of data collection, the team has developed a grants manual that indicates the data collection methods and how data will be inventoried.

3.3 Rice RCoE – Tanzania

Comments

- Each country needs to develop documents that will address environment and Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) issues.
- There is need to consult on IPR issues at the country level. These are issues ASARECA has to address in policy harmonization. MOUs will also be handled under issues of policy.

3.4 Cassava RCoE - Uganda

Comments

- Questions were raised on the relevance and need of the Regional Steering Committee (RSC). Who are the members of the RSC and what are the terms of reference?
- Having four RSC will be very demanding and expensive to accommodate. The Uganda team suggested that there should be one RSC and several national technical committees corresponding to the RCoEs.
- Countries have bought into the concept of regionality and know they have to commit some funds. It is not clear why they need the RSC and what its functions are?
- There is need for a Regional Steering Committee as this committee would look at the regional priorities and create a platform where key players are able to meet and discuss, therefore reinforcing the role of ASARECA.
- It was proposed that Regional Technical Committees replace the Regional Steering Committees.
- The PAD makes no mention or reference to the RSC. However, the document recommends the formation of country specific technical committees that will aid in the development of the manuals and project implementation plans. The ASARECA Board will handle the regional aspects of EAAPP.
- The EAAPP programme is already complex and should not be complicated further by putting in structures which cause more bureaucracy and inefficiencies. The existing mechanism can be elevated to address regionality.
- There is concern whether the regionality aspects will be captured in the absence of ASARECA.

4.0 THE RCoE WORK PLANS AND PLANNED ACTIVITIES FOR YEAR ONE

During this session, the RCoE teams reviewed, discussed and revised their respective workplans and planned activities for year one in consultation with the other country partners. The revised RCoE workplans and planned activities for year one were then presented in plenary for comments and discussions. The following comments and suggestions were raised during the discussion of the RCoE presentations.

4.1 Wheat RCoE - Ethiopia

The Wheat RCoE team leader gave the following progress on the PIP:

- They have reviewed the table of contents and were found to be sufficient.
- They have discussed and prepared annual work plans that are okay.
- Activities and partner institutions have been done and agreed by the countries.
- There is need to put budgets and work plans for 2010/2011 for each activity because they are lacking for the other countries.

- They have already started to implement some activities.

Comments

- Issues of formats was raised as each RCoE seemed to have a different format and level of detail and the therefore there was a need to harmonize the formats.

Question

- Wheat RCoE indicated that it preferred direct disbursement of funds, while the dairy RCoE is waiting for the competitive grants manual. How will ASARECA handle the regional issues in this respect? One of the conditionality of this project was the regional aspect and the PAD has clearly spelt out that these will be done through sub-projects and that in every project at least two institutions in two countries must participate.

Response

- The regional aspect of the programme has been on-going and as can be seen from the workplan tables, regional activities have been developed where countries have expressed their interest to participate in these activities.

Question

- How will regional proposals be developed? What activities are of regional nature that could be of benefit to other countries?

Response

- These programmes are of regional nature and form the basis for the baseline for the RCoEs. The research will not be undertaken on competitive basis but direct disbursement. The baselines should bring out the differences in production systems. There is an understanding of the regional challenges and are, therefore, not starting from zero.

Comments

- There may be challenges with budgeting, as budgets from the country are lump sum and may, therefore, need to be broken down into detailed budgets.
- The Wheat RCoE presentation seemed not to bring out the regionality issues clearly and may therefore need some revision.
- There is need to identify mechanisms for disbursement of funds taking cognizance of the fact that the funds are coming from different countries and, therefore, there is a need to harmonize the mechanisms for disbursement of funds, direct versus competitive grants.
- Regarding the competitive grant system there cannot be different approaches. The different RCoEs may have own mode of competitive grant system but since they have signed the agreement then it may be difficult to backtrack on this. We cannot have competitive grant system in Kenya while Uganda and Ethiopia have direct disbursement. If there are difficulties the World Bank can engage the policy makers.
- There is need to consider the whole value chain in the development of the regional priorities so as to be aligned with CAADP thinking and principles.
- Most of the countries are net importers and are trying to enhance productivity and hence the emphasis on production. We agree that value addition is important, but the focus now is on production, and when the focus changes a value chain analysis will be undertaken and if need be priorities changed.
- Value chain analysis should have been undertaken to identify issues on all the segments of the chain to avoid addressing constraints that are concentrated on only the production segment of the value chain. The PAD allows for this kind of analysis and therefore the RCoEs are encouraged to consider carrying out value chain analysis so as to identify the constraining factors.

4.2 Dairy RCoE - Kenya

The team leader on Dairy RCoE presented the progress on various aspects in the PIP. Some of the observations from the presentation were as follows:

- On research themes, the issue of value chains should be brought into the whole process to make sure that all actors and issues are captured.
- The work plans and budgets for each country are in place. However, Uganda will need to give budgets for their components.
- The work plan had been developed for Kenya for year 2011 and in quarters.
- There was a need to agree on the modalities of call for research concept notes and proposals as implementation of activities are being held back by delay in the development of the grant manual.
- Still working on component 2.2 on Training and dissemination.

Question

- Various countries have posted monies for coordination; will these monies be used by countries or the lead country?

Response

- US\$ 800,000 has been committed to ASARECA leaving US\$ 1.7 Million for activities of the RCoE.

Comment

- Given the complexity of the project the RCoEs are advised not to aim too high initially but to go slow and scale up with experience. RCoEs should have activities that are realistic and not to be too over ambitious because they will be judged on accomplishment of the planned activities.
- What is the basis for the budgets, and how realistic are they? These may cause issues at implementation. RCoEs were requested to make budgets as realistic as possible as these will be the basis of the World Bank disbursements.

4.3 Rice RCoE – Tanzania

The various components of the Rice RCoE were presented by several team members with the following observations:

- There was need to have a common process for the region in the implementation of activities.
- There was a meeting of all the four countries that identified activities that need to be done by each country using their systems.
- The guiding principle should be that at the end of the day, the deliverables should benefit the region.
- Since some countries had started implementing national priority projects, the other countries should also do so and then any identified regional projects should be submitted to ASARECA and the World Bank to sort out on the modalities of implementing them.

Question

- The first table in the presentation was not clear. Are they activities that have been approved by Tanzania or by all the countries?

Response

- In the first meeting, it was agreed that the focal leaders from the other countries will come together to harmonize the projects so to give them a regional outlook. The focal leaders were invited to Tanzania and ASARECA and other international partners also participated

in this meeting. The idea was to see what was being done by ASARECA and the international organizations to ensure that the projects are not replicated. At this meeting the activities were agreed upon and countries were therefore to go and implement the activities. Tanzania has left the approval of the proposals to the countries but believe that the proposal discussed at this regional meeting will be funded.

Comments

- There is need for an agreed process to bring out the regionality aspect and this should be led by ASARECA.
- As ASARECA member countries, we should lead the process, and through experience under ASARECA, we should be able to learn and develop a better mechanism to address the regionality aspects.
- The question is whether the regionality will work as the money is in different countries. It will be important to agree on priorities which will then be implemented in the respective countries.
- A concern was raised as to what would happen if the rice people came up with proposals agreed at the regional level but are not priority at the national level?
- Since there is no clear way forward, the national activities should be rolled out and regional activities offloaded to ASARECA.
- Financing Agreement does allow the technology generation that covers the whole chain.

4.4 Cassava RCoE - Uganda

Question

- Project focus is narrow on production

Response

- The cassava RCoE is not starting from a clean slate and priority setting has been done and, therefore, what is presented here has been informed by these priorities.
- Priorities for the Cassava projects in Tanzania are drawn from the regional priorities. We are not re-inventing the wheel and many commercialization projects are on-going and should not replicate what others are doing.

5.0 MONITORING AND EVALUATION

5.1 ASARECA and EAAPP logframes

During this session, Dr. Enock Warinda of ASARECA Secretariat presented the EAAPP logframe shown in Annex 3 and proposed suggestions on how to align the indicators to the ASARECA logframe that was already aligned to CAADP logframe. The EAAPP logframe generated a lot of discussion as participants felt that the present indicators do not measure the project development objectively. It was eventually agreed that a small group with representative from the four RCoE be formed to discuss the EAAPP logframe and come up with a way forward. The following comments and suggestions were raised during the discussion of the monitoring and evaluation and EAAPP logframe presentations.

Comments

- The current indicators do not objectively measure the project development objectives (PDO).

- Indicators of the RCoEs are not harmonized adequately with the EAAPP indicators and countries are expected to report on these during the evaluation. The EAAPP output will be measured from the sum total of the four RCoE indicators.
- The logframe is a tool to help measure progress and if the indicators do not give the information required they should be changed.
- RCoEs concerns about the indicators for the project development objectives can only be reviewed during the medium term evaluation.

Question

- Why can't the EAAPP logframe be modified now instead of waiting until after the two years?

Response

- Modifying the logframe at this point in time would mean changing the Financing Agreement and this may take a long time. Countries can still collect information on the present indicators as measures are taken to address the problem.
- There is need to refer to the Financing Agreement, additions are acceptable and no deletions can be made. However, there is need to ensure that the outputs/outcome indicators are delivered. The result frame was discussed by each of the participating countries and not imposed by the World Bank. In this regard, the indicators cannot be changed in the short term. However, there may be need to modify the baseline data to suit and inform the indicators

5.2 Recommendation by the Subgroup on EAAPP Logframe

After intense deliberation, the subgroup appointed to review the EAAPP Logframe indicators recommended as follows:

- The EAAPP Logframe in the PAD should be retained and used as it is.
- The EAAPP Log frame should be cascaded to RCoEs and further down to the projects.
- A detailed glossary should be developed to elaborate on the PDOs and indicators in the EAAPP Logframe. This should be done through a workshop that should be held soon.
- Harmonized logframes developed by RCoEs should be submitted to ASARECAS within 2 weeks.
- ASARECA should develop semi and annual reporting guidelines and share them with RCoEs.
- ASARECA M&E specialist should take note of the reservations and communicate the same to World Bank.

5.3 Baselines Surveys

Dr. Warinda gave a presentation on guidelines for undertaking the baseline surveys as shown in Annex 4. He said that a baseline study was necessary as it will enable the project determine the change that the intervention aims to bring about. Baselines, he said, can also be used to measure progress and performance. His presentation outlined the data collection tools, methods of analysis, preparations for the actual survey, importance of using tools that ensure timely and quality data, interpretation of the data and baseline report formats. This was followed by a plenary discussion detailed below.

Questions

- Is the baseline data to be collected by country or by commodity?

Response

- The baseline data will be collected by commodity.

Questions

- With regard to the methodology, will it be able to define the project areas and the control areas?

Response

- The context of the study will be based on the projects themselves.

Question

- There are four commodities; will a log frame be developed for each?

Response

- EAAPP does not take in the details of the RCoE. Therefore there is need to come up with logframes for the RCoE that are aligned EAAPP. Each of the centres has an area of strength that can be expounded on and other indicators added as necessary. The same indicator for EAAPP log frame may not be applicable across countries. The results need to be cascaded and if agree upon, the same will apply for the baselines.

Question

- Will the sample size be the same in all countries? The RCoE should have larger samples. Having one questionnaire for the commodities will make it easier to collect the data?

Response

- The sample size is depended on the strength but will not ignore the other commodities but the RCoE will also collect the information on other commodities.

Question

- Do we need the control group in this project? If yes, how will this information be collected?

Response

- In order to avoid problems on attribution on the net effect of the project during evaluation, the control is necessary. This will need to be established by looking at the geographical and social conditions of the target group to see how dynamic they are from the project areas. All these factors need to be taken into considerations when selecting a control.

Question

- The RCoEs are conducting baselines along which a result framework has already been done. How will they be harmonized?

Response

- There should be a link between the EAAPP result frame and RCoE logframe and likewise for the RCoE and projects logframes. There is, therefore, a need to make sure that these are all aligned.

Question

- How will the results from the baselines which generate a lot of data be managed and stored?

Response

- The information management collected should be stored in the databases of the RCoEs, but when this information is required it will be forwarded on the required standardized templates.

Comments

- The project objectives and indicators will be based on the result frame and if cascaded downwards then all will be well. Countries will need to agree on a regional basis and at country level what information is going to be collected. It would be important to cascade the indicators before undertaking the baselines.
- There will be redundancy in developing a logframe for a commodity when the RCoE will encompass the four commodities.

- Care should be taken to ensure baseline surveys do not become large projects by themselves. Baselines and control can be the same. The information collected from baselines can be used in the evaluation to measure the change between project inception and end. There is no need to lose time and resources undertaking these.
- On page 47 of the PAD indicates that some baseline information has already been collected. It also identifies methods, frequency of monitoring and reporting. Using this information, one can measure the yearly progress. However, this information needs to be validated for accuracy.
- In the PMP there is a column that enables one to indicate when and where the baseline information has been collected?
- Standardized questionnaires will be prepared for each of the commodities and these will be passed on to the respective countries to undertake the surveys. Sample areas will be determined by the importance of the commodity in that area.

5.3.1 Resolution on Baseline Surveys

After lively discussion, it was agreed that the RCoEs coordinators should develop appropriate baseline tools and methods and share them with all the other countries and ASARECA within one month. The RCoEs also resolved to meet and agree on responsibilities and timeframes for this activity.

6.0 PRINCIPLES AND GUIDELINES FOR CALL FOR REGIONAL PROPOSALS

The discussion in this session dealt with the aspect of the different funding mechanism, competitive versus direct funding. Dr. Ketema informed the participants that there are various ways that the competitive grant system can be applied. In ASARECA, competitive grant has been done in four ways that include the following:

- Competitive grant in which a call for concept note is issued, the received concept notes are then evaluated and winning concept notes are requested to write and submit full project proposal.
- Direct granting to regional centre of excellence that has the capacity and good reputation in a certain field is identified and they are requested for proposal and it is directly funded.
- Funding to address regional emerging issues and as a group countries can request for funding.
- Short listing of three to four projects and requesting for a proposals.

After this elaboration of the various competitive grant mechanisms, the following comments and suggestions were raised:

Question

- What is the percentage breakdown of the fund in ASARECA between the four funding mechanisms?

Response

- Roughly 70% goes into competitive grants and 30% for direct funding. An example is the Banana Bacterial Wilt Project awarded to Bioversity International. They have the international repute and capacity and were therefore requested for a proposal. However, the proposal received is critically reviewed before the award.

Comment

- In designing this project there was an important role for ASARECA in awarding grants. ASARECA was expected to manage the process as it was seen to have the comparative advantage of doing this.

6.1 Resolution on Competitive Grant Mechanisms

After presentation and discussion of the various competitive grant mechanisms, it was resolved that:

- The RCoEs should review the ASARECA Grants Manual that has been accepted by World Bank and decide whether to adopt it.
- RCoEs should revisit the PAD and engage ASARECA to give guidance on the implementation of regional projects.
- National level activities based on infrastructure development can proceed.

7.0 WAY FORWARD AND CLOSING REMARKS

7.1 Way Forward

Next meeting to review progress and address issues of information sharing at the regional level, inventorying of innovations and best practice and action plan on capacity building will be held on either the second or third week of January, 2011.

7.2 Meeting Closing Remarks

In his closing remarks, Dr. Antony M. Kilewe said that the facilitators had enjoyed very much facilitating this meeting and hoped that the meeting had delivered on the expected outputs. He hoped that the facilitators' performance had met both the ASARECA's and the participant's expectations and went on to thank:

- The ASARECA management for giving the facilitators an opportunity to facilitate this meeting.
- Dr. Methu and his team for making excellent arrangements before and during the meeting that contributed enormously to the overall success of the meeting.
- The World Bank team for their contribution and making sure the meetings' discussion take cognizance of the Project Financing Agreement.
- The meeting participants for their dedication and commitment during the meeting that enabled the meeting to achieve its purpose besides making facilitating task quite easy and enjoyable.

Dr. Kilewe concluded his closing remarks by wishing everybody safe journey to their respective destinations and looked forward to continued cooperation and collaboration in similar future activities. He then called upon Dr. Methu to give his closing remarks and to invite Dr. Ketema, the Executive Director, ASARECA to give his remarks and welcome Dr. Berhane Manna and Dr. Assaye Legesse for the final closing remarks.

On behalf of the Partnerships and Capacity Development Unit of ASARECA, Dr. Methu thanked all who participated in the meeting and for the achievement of the meeting purpose during the 3 days. He thanked the World Bank team for attending the meeting and for constantly reminding the meeting on what was in the PAD so as to keep on track on what is required of the RCoEs. He further said that there was a possibility of holding the next meeting early next year (2011).

Dr. Ketema started his closing remarks by saying that the initial plan of the meeting was to cover 7 issues. However, some were postponed to the next meeting as time was not enough to cover all of them. He noted that an inventory should be done for the already generated interventions for the commodities being handled by RCoEs. Funds could be utilized from EAAPP. The issue of capacity building for RCoEs will be dealt with during the next meeting. The tentative date for the next meeting would be the 2nd to 3rd week of January 2011. Dr. Ketema went on to thank the World Bank team and the participants for their active participation in the meeting. He expressed his satisfaction for the progress that had been achieved and congratulated everybody for the harmony, bonding and sharing of knowledge and experiences on a regional basis. At the end of the day, he said, the aim was to work for the people of Africa and the World at large. He finally thanked the facilitator Dr. Kilewe and his team for steering the meeting to achieve its objectives and wished all safe travel and hoped to meet again.

In his remarks, Dr. Manna said he will be seeing all again in the individual countries when the Mission visits Tanzania, Kenya and Ethiopia. He said the meeting has been fruitful as it had clarified important issues. Given the complexity of the project, Dr. Manna requested all to bear with the meetings as the World Bank and ASARECA shall continue to convene such meeting to iron out complexities and unclear issues of implementation. He said some of the countries have shown concern about the successive meeting, but such meetings are inevitable to plan and resolve major issues that will affect implementation of project. He said MDTF and EAAPP projects are now under one Task Team leader, an adjustment made by World Bank to facilitate coordination and complementarity and the World Bank will be closely working and keeping all informed on this. He thanked all for participating in the three day meeting and also thanked the World Bank team from Washington, Germany, Kenya, Tanzania and Ethiopia for taking part and hoped that the agreements made will be documented and the resolutions made followed up in the agreed time. He thanked the participants and wished them a safe journey home.

In his remarks Dr. Assaye Legesse, the Technical Team Leader (TTL) for EAAPP and ASARECA Multi-Donor Trust Fund said that the meeting was fruitful and EAAPP being a complex project, issues will continue to be clarified in such future meetings. The meetings are inevitable. He thanked those coordinating ASARECA-EAAPP and was also grateful to the World Bank team for their active participation in the meeting and the participants from various countries. He concluded his remarks by wishing the participants safe journey to their respective countries.

7.3 Meeting Evaluation

At the end of the workshop, the participants were requested to complete a meeting evaluation form and return it to the facilitators. The provided information would be analyzed and utilized for the planning, organization and management of future meetings. The analysis from the participants responses indicated that the meeting was quite successful with an overall rating of 32% Very Good, 63% Good and 3% Average.

- The most mentioned liked aspects of the meeting by the participants were as follows:
 - The open and free opportunity that was accorded to the participants to fully participate in all the meeting sessions leading to fruitful discussions and sharing of experiences.
 - The good organization and facilitation of the meeting that enabled the meeting to achieve its rolling programme outputs.

- The active, dedicated and committed participants during the meeting.
 - The able, clear and lively facilitators who managed a flexible agenda for the meeting.
 - The diversity in the composition of the participants which enriched the meeting discussions both in plenary and in the working groups.
- The most mentioned aspects that the participants did not like were as follows:
 - There was too much time wasted in discussing issues in a cyclical manner even after building consensus on some of them.
 - The meeting agenda was too loaded and needed more time to exhaustively handle all the issues.
 - There was lack of clarity on issues that were critical in enabling the RCoEs to move forward towards the implementation of activities.
 - The programme was not distributed to the participants before the meeting to enable them know what was expected of them.

ANNEX 1: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

ETHIOPIA

1. Fekadu Fufa Dinssa
EAAPP/WRCoE-Technical
Coordinator
Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural
Research (EIAR)
c/o P O Box 2003
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
Tel: +251 913031730
Email: fekadufd@gmail.com
2. Tesfaye Tadesse Tefera
Sweet Potato, Cassava and other Toot Crops
Research Coordinator and Focal Person for
Cassava
Ethiopian Institute for Agricultural
Research, (EIAR)
P O Box 06
Hawassa, Ethiopia
Tel: +251 911440971; +251 462209989/79
Fax: +251 452204521/0084
Email: tesfayet2@yahoo.com;
tesfaye3t@gmail.com
3. Fekade Wondmagegne
Agronomist – Wheat Focal Person
and Coordinator for All commodities
Ministry of Agriculture
P O Box 62347
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
Tel: +251 911487114
Email: woywond@yahoo.com
4. Aemiro Kehaliew Ashegrie
Dairy Focal Person (Ethiopia)
Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research
Holetta Agricultural Research Centre
P O Box 2003
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
Tel: +251 911050684
Fax: +251 2370377
Email: aemirok@yahoo.com
5. Guled Abdullahi Bahdon
Research Coordinator for EAAPP in
the PMU
Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural
Research (EIAR)
P O box 2003
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
Tel: +251 911 203869 (mobile)
Fax: +251 646 0378; +251-646-1294
Email: bahdon33@yahoo.com;
adweali@yahoo.com
6. Taye Tessema (Dr)
Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research
P O Box 2003
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
Tel: +251 911 893407 (mobile)
+251116451899 (office)
Fax: +251 11 6461899
Email: tayettessema67@gmail.com

KENYA

7. Theresia Luvuno Munga
Senior Research Officer/Cassava
Research Co-ordinator
Kenya Agricultural Research
Institute – Mtwapa
P O Box 16
Mtwapa, Mombasa
Tel: +254 0202024751
Fax: +254 0202024751
Email: tlmalamala@yahoo.com;
8. Jedida M Maina
Research Specialist, EAAPP Kenya
Ministry of Agriculture
P O Box 30028-00100
Kilimo House
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: +254 20 278870; +254 722374886
Fax: +254 20 2725774
Email: jedidahmaina@yahoo.com

karimt@kari.org

9. Elizabeth Kimenyi
Senior Assistant Director of
Agriculture
Ministry of Agriculture
P O box 30028-00100
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: +254 20 2718870
Fax: +254 20 2725774
Email: ewkimenyi@yahoo.com
10. Jane N Muriuki
National Project Coordinator EAAP Kenya
EAAPP Coordinating Unit
Ministry of Agriculture
P O Box 30028-00100
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: +254 722323202
Fax: +254 20 2725774
Email: nyagurajm@yahoo.co.uk
11. Angella Wokabi
Deputy Director – Livestock
Production (Research Liaison)
Ministry of Livestock Development
P O Box 34188
Nairobi – 00100, Kenya
Tel: +254 20 2722601/37; +254 20
724710632
Email: awokabi@jambo.co.ke;
crldivision@gmail.com
12. Titus P Lanyasunya (Dr)
Coordinator – Regional Dairy Centre of
Excellence (RDCoE)
Kenya Agricultural Research Institute
(KARI)
KARI=NAHRC
P O Box 25-20117
Naivasha, Kenya
Tel: +254 724 175266
Email: planyasunya@yahoo.com
13. David M Mwangi
Assistant Director, Animal
Production
Kenya Agricultural Research
Institute (KARI)
P O Box 57811-00200
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: +254 20 4180637
Fax: +254 20 4183443
Email: dmmwangi@kari.org
14. Munene Macharia
Principal Research Officer (Dr)
Kenya Agricultural Research Institute
(KARI)
KARI-Njoro
P O Njoro, Kenya
Tel: +254 721 297490
Fax: +254 51 61576
Email: munenwamacharia@yahoo.com
15. Winifred Kore
Principal Research Officer/National
Rice Research Coordinator
Kenya Agricultural Research
Institute
KARI-KIBOS
P O Box 1490
Kisumu, Kenya
Tel: +254 733 944897
Email: wikore2000@yahoo.co.uk

TANZANIA

16. Hussein A Mansoor
Assistant Director Crop Research &
EAAPP Focal Point
Ministry of Agriculture and
17. Bakari S Msangi (Dr)
Coordinator, Dairy Research Programme
Ministry of Livestock Development and
Fisheries

Cooperatives – Division of Research
& Development
P O Box 2066
Dar es Salaam, Tanzania
Tel: +255 784262257
Fax: +255 222865312
Email: husein.mansoor@gmail.com

P O Box 9152
Dar es Salaam, Tanzania
Tel: +255 784 416131
Email: msangibakari@yahoo.com

18. Deogratias Lwezaura
Agricultural Economist/M&E
Specialist
Department of Research and
Development
Ministry of Agriculture
P O Box 2066
Dar es Salaam, Tanzania
Tel: +255 754 273997
Email: lwezaura@hotmail.com

19. Anthony Elanga
Principal Agricultural Research Officer
Wheat Research Coordinator – Tanzania
Uyole Agricultural Research Institution
Ministry of Agriculture
P O Box 400
Mbeya, Tanzania
Tel: +255 784354064
Email: anthonyelanga@yahoo.com

20. Joyce Kuliwaki Mvuna
Acting Assistant Director, Extension
Services
Ministry of Agriculture Food
Security and Cooperatives
P O Box 9192
Dar es Salaam, Tanzania
Tel: +255 754 929022
Email: jmvuna2808@yahoo.com

21. Nkori J M Kibanda
Coordinator, Regional Rice Centre of
Excellence
Agricultural Research Institute – Katrin
Private Bag
Ifakara, Tanzania
Tel: +255 784419422
Fax: +255 232625361
Email: nkibanda2000@yahoo.com

22. Geoffrey Mkamilo (Dr)
National Coordinator, Roots and
Tuber Crops Research Programme
Directorate of Research and
Development
Agricultural Research Institute
Naliendele
P O Box 509
Mtwara, Tanzania
Tel: +255 784795389
Email:
geoffreymkamilo@yahoo.co.uk

UGANDA

23. James Oluka (Dr)
Research Officer
NaLIRRI
P O Box 96
Tororo, Uganda
Tel: +256 782 565201
Email: olukajam@yahoo.com

24. Fredrick Kabi
Dr/Research Officer
National Livestock Resources Research
Institute/National Agricultural Research
Organisation
P O Box 96
Tororo, Uganda

- Tel: +256 712 212292
Email: fredkabi@yahoo.com
25. Bua Anton (Dr)
Agricultural Economist
National Crops Resources Research
Institute (NaCRRI/NARO)
P O Box 7084
Kampala, Uganda
Tel: +256 772 461950
Fax: +256 752 726554
Email: abua@naro-ug.org;
atonbuan@yahoo.com
26. Chemayek Bosco
Research Officer – Plant Pathologist
NARO – Buginyanya Zonal Agricultural
Research and Development Institute
(BugiZARDI)
P O Box 1356
Mbale, Uganda
Tel: +256 752 986674; +256 776666
986674
Email: bosqo64@yahoo.co.uk
27. William Wamala Wagoire
Director of Research
Buginyanya ZARDI
NARO
P O Box 1356
Mbale, Uganda
Tel: +256 782892480
Email: wagoire1@yahoo.co.uk;
directorbugizardi@rocketmail.com
28. George Lukwago (Dr)
EAAPP National Coordinator, Uganda
National Agricultural Research
Organization (NARO)
P O Box 295
Entebbe, Uganda
Tel: +256 772 424891
Email: lukwagogorge@gmail.com;
lukwago_george@yahoo.com
29. Edward Ssewanyana
Director of Research
National Livestock Resources
Research Institute (NaLIRRI)
P O Box 96
Tororo, Uganda
Tel: +256 754221110
Email: edssewanyana@yahoo.com;
nalirri@gmail.com
30. Muyinza Harriet
Research Officer – Cassava Value Addition
Team, Uganda
National Agricultural Research Laboratories
(NARL-NARO)
P O box 7065
Kampala, Uganda
Tel: +256 772 475281
Email: harmuyinza@yahoo.com
31. Cedric Mutyaba
Engr. Research Officer
National Agricultural Laboratory
(NARL) of NARO
P O Box 22083
Kampala, Uganda
Tel: +256 772 592850
Email: cjmutyaba@gmail.com;
cjmutyaba@kari.go.ug
32. Dr Butungi Sheila
National Animal Genetic Resources Centre
and Data Bank (NAGRC&DB)
P O Box 183
Entebbe, Uganda
Tel: +256 712 367014
Email: butungisheila@yahoo.co.uk
33. Juliet Sentumbwe (Dr)
Assistant Commissioner/Dairy and
Meat
Ministry of Agriculture, Animal
Industry and Fisheries
P O Box 513
34. Margaret Masette
Research Officer
Head – FBRC
National Agricultural Research
Laboratories/Food Biosciences Research
Centre (FBRC)

- Entebbe, Uganda
Tel: +256 772 584598
Email: juliesenty@gmail.com
- P O box 7852
Kampala, Uganda
Tel: +256 41 4566844; Mob: +256 772 394298
Fax: +256 41 4566849
Email: margasette@utlonline.co.ug
35. Lamo Jimmy
Rice Breeder
NaCRRRI-NARO
National Crop Resources Research
Institute Namulonge
P O Box 7084
Kampala, Uganda
Tel: +256 772 342757
Email: lamojim@gmail.com
36. Michael Otim
Research Officer
National Agricultural Research
Organisation
National Crop Resources Research Institute
P O Box 7084
Kampala, Uganda
Tel: +256 41 4573016
Email: motm9405@gmail.com
37. Nakedde Divine
Senior Agricultural Inspector,
National Seed Certification Services
Ministry of Agriculture, Animal
Industries and Fisheries, Crop
Protection Department
P O Box 102
Entebbe, Uganda
Tel: Mob: +256 772 461357
Email: dinakedde@yahoo.com
38. Omongo Christopher Abu (Dr)
Coordinator Regional Cassava Centre of
Excellence
National Agricultural Research
Organization (NARO)
National Crops Resources Research
Institute, Namulonge
P O Box 7084
Kampala, Uganda
Tel: +256 772 972669
Email: chrisomongo@yahoo.com
39. Joseph Bazaale
Principal Agricultural Inspector
Ministry of Agriculture, Animal
Industry & Fisheries
P O Box 102
Entebbe, Uganda
Tel: +256 41 4320115; +256 41 4320801
Fax: +256 41 4320642
Email: jobazaale@yahoo.co.uk;
jbazaale@yahoo.co.uk
40. Stella E A Okello
Research Officer/Socio-Economist
National Crops Resources Research
Institute of National Agricultural Research
Organization
P O Box 7084
Kampala, Uganda
Tel: +256 772 375527
Email: seokello@gmail.com;
steyug@yahoo.com
41. Titus Alicai
Research Officer
NaCRRRI-Namulonge
P O Box 7084
Kampala, Uganda
Tel: +256 772 970585
Email: talicai@hotmail.com
42. Joly Kabirizi (Dr)
Senior Research Officer
National Livestock Resources Research
Institute (NaLIRRI)
P O Box 96
Tororo, Uganda
Tel: +256 777 912716
Email: jmkabirizi@gmail.com

43. Mwesigwa Magyembe Japheth
Coordinator, Competitive Grant
Scheme
National Agricultural Research
Organization (NARO)
11 – 13 Lugard Avenue
P O box 239
Entebbe, Uganda
Tel: +256 41 4322682; +256 772
980274
Fax: +256 41 432070
Email: cgs@naro.go.ug
44. Kawuki Robert
Research Officer
National Crops Resource Research Institute
(NaCrri)
P O Box 7084
Kampala, Uganda
Tel: +256 772 537715
Email: kawukisezi@yahoo.com
45. Jackson F Mubiru (Dr)
Assisted Reproductive Technologies
Expert
National Animal Genetic Resources
Centre and Data bank
(NAGRC&DB)
P O Box 16181
Kampala, Uganda
Tel: +256 772403256; +256
752403256
Email: mubiru_franco@yahoo.com

THE WORLD BANK

46. Matthew A McMahon
Consultant
World bank
1818 H St
Washington DC 20433 USA
Tel: +1 240 401 7157
Email:
matthewmcmahon@ukalumni.net
47. Berhane Manna
Sr Agricultural and EAAPP Anchor
World Bank, Washington DC
1818 H Street, NW
Washington DC 20433, USA
Tel: +1 2024589566
Fax: +1 2024770515
Email: bmanna@worldbank.org
48. Zainab Zitta Semgalawe
Senior Rural Development Specialist
World bank
P O Box 6024
Dar es Salaam, Tanzania
Tel: +255 22 2163200
Fax: +255 22 2113039
Email: zsemgalawe@worldbank.org
49. Jurgen Anthofer
Senior Agricultural Specialist
The World Bank
Reichpietschnter 10
10785 Berlin, Germany
Email: janthofer@worldbank.org
50. Assaye Legesse
Sr Agricultural Economist, TTL
World Bank
World Country Office
Addis Ababa
Ethiopia
51. Andrew M Karanja
Snr Agricultural Economist
World Bank
P O Box 30577
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: +254 02 3226410

Tel: +251 912 604315
Email: alegesse@worldbank.org

Email: akaranja@worldbank.org

ASARECA

52. Seyfu Ketema
Executive Director
ASARECA
P O box 765
Entebbe
Tel: +256 41 4320212
Email: s.ketema@asareca.org
53. Fina Opio
Programme Manager, Staple Crops
ASARECA
P O Box 765
Entebbe, Uganda
Tel: +256 41 4322227
Email: f.opio@asareca.org
54. Techalew Negash
Finance Officer
ASARECA
P O Box 765
Entebbe, Uganda
Tel: +256 41 4321314/4320556
Fax: +256 41 4322593
Email: n.techalew@asareca.org
55. Meshach Itaza Muhiirwa
Procurement and Contracting Officer
ASARECA
P O Box 765
Entebbe, Uganda
Tel: +256 41 4322325
Email: procurement@asareca.org
56. Eldad Tukahirwa
Deputy Executive Director
ASARECA
Plot 5 Mpigi Road
P O Box 765
Entebbe, Uganda
Tel: +256 41 4320348
Fax: +256 4322593
Email: e.tukahirwa@asareca.org
57. Pamela Tumwikirize
Programme Assistant
Deputy Executive Director
ASARECA
P O Box 765
Entebbe, Uganda
Tel: +256 41 4320556
Email: p.tumwikirize@asareca.org
58. Katafiire Maureen
Programme Assistant
ASARECA – High Value Non Staple
Crops Programme
P O Box 765
Entebbe, Uganda
Tel: +256 41 4320556 Ext 173
Fax: +256 41 4321777
Email: m.katafiire@asareca.org;
maureen.balinda@gmail.com
59. Ben Moses Ilakut
Publications Officer
ASARECA
P O Box 765
Entebbe, Uganda
Tel: +256 41 4320556
Fax: +256 41 4321777
Email: b.ilakut@asareca.org
60. Monica Kansiime
Programme Assistant, Monitoring &
Evaluation Unit
ASARECA
P o BOX 765
Entebbe, Uganda
Tel: +256 712 834551
Email: m.kansiime@asareca.org
61. John Kyebagadha
Internal Auditor
ASARECA
P O Box 765
Entebbe, Uganda
Tel: +256 772 495729
Email: j.kyebagadha@asareca.org;
jokye@hotmail.com

62. Abebe Demissie
Regional Project Coordinator
ASARECA
P O Box 765
Entebbe, Uganda
Tel: +256 41 4322131
Email: a.demissie@asareca.org

63. Doris Akishule Mugisha
Programme Assistant, Partnership and
Capacity Development
ASARECA
P O Box 765
Entebbe, Uganda
Tel: +256 772 455719
Email: d.akishule@asareca.org

64. Jacqueline Nyagahima
Head of Information and
Communication Unit
ASARECA
P O Box 765
Entebbe, Uganda
Tel: +256 41 4321775
Email: j.nyagahima@asareca.org

65. Fatuma Lukwago
Administrative Assistant
Deputy Executive Director's Office
P O Box 765
Entebbe, Uganda
Tel: +256 41 4320556
Email: f.lukwago@asareca.org

FACILITATORS

66. Antony M Kilewe
Meeting Facilitator
Topridas Consultancy Services
P O Box 66748,00800
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: +254 713 461188; +254
733827785
Email: kilewe@yahoo.com

67. Daniel W Kilambya
Principal Research Officer
Topridas Consultancy Services
P O Box 14733-00800
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: +254 721339549
Fax: +254 20 4443926
Email: Daniel.wambua@gmail.com

68. Violet O Kirigua
Meeting Facilitator
Topridas Consultancy Services
P O Box 66748-00800
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: +254 725 850390
Email: vokirigua@yahoo.com;
vokirigua@kari.org

ANNEX 2: MEETING PROGRAMME

This programme contained the sequential necessary and sufficient activities that were required to deliver the expected outputs and hence the meeting purpose. The programme was adjusted on a day-by-day basis in a rolling programme approach so as to accommodate emerging issues as the meeting progresses.

DAY ONE	MONDAY	08/11/2010
SESSION-TIME	ACTIVITY	RESPONSIBLE
SESSION 1	Introductions and meeting Opening Remarks	
08:00 – 08:30	Registration and review of documents	<i>Organizers and Facilitators</i>
08:30 – 08:50	Introductions	<i>Meeting Facilitators</i>
08:50 – 09:00	Welcoming remarks	<i>DED, ASARECA</i>
09:00 – 09:30	Meeting opening remarks	<i>ED, ASARECA</i>
09:30 – 10:00	Remarks from World Bank	<i>World Bank</i>
10:00 – 10:30	Meeting purpose, expected outputs and recap on First ASARECA EAAPP meeting	<i>Dr. Joseph Methu, Dr. A.M. Kilewe</i>
11:00 – 11:30	HEALTH BREAK AND GROUP PHOTOGRAPH	
SESSION 2	RCoEs Operational Frameworks – Output One	
11:00 – 11:20	Presentation of WRCoE Operational Framework	<i>Ethiopia Team Leader</i>
11:20 – 11:40	Presentation of RCoE Operational Framework	<i>Kenya Team Leader</i>
11:40 – 12:00	Presentation of Recue Operational Framework	<i>Tanzania Team Leader</i>
12:00 – 12:20	Presentation of Croce Operational Framework	<i>Uganda Team Leader</i>
12:20 – 13:00	Plenary discussion of RCoEs Operational Frameworks and recommendation on way forward	<i>Meeting Facilitators</i>
13:00 – 14:00	LUNCH BREAK	
SESSION 3	Discussion Group Session One - RCoEs Operational Frameworks	
14:00 – 14:20	Plenary discussion and agreement on discussion group terms of reference and groups formation	<i>Meeting Facilitators</i>
14:20 – 16:00	Discussion group session one as per the terms of reference	<i>Group Chair Persons and Facilitators</i>
16:00 – 16:30	HEALTH BREAK	
16:30 – 17:30	Plenary feedback and consensus building on discussion group session one as per the terms of reference	<i>Rapporteurs and Facilitators</i>
END OF DAY ONE		

DAY TWO	TUESDAY	09/11/2010
SESSION-TIME	ACTIVITY	RESPONSIBLE
SESSION 4	RCoEs Regional Project Implementation Plans (RPIPS) - Output Two	
08:30 – 08:40	Recap on day two and emerging issues	<i>Meeting Facilitators</i>

08:40 – 09:00	Presentation of WRCoE Regional Project Implementation Plan	<i>Ethiopia Team Leader</i>
09:00 – 09:20	Presentation of DRCoE Regional Project Implementation Plan	<i>Kenya Team Leader</i>
09:20 – 09:40	Presentation of RRCoE Regional Project Implementation Plan	<i>Tanzania Team Leader</i>
09:40 – 10:00	Presentation of CRCoE Regional Project Implementation Plan	<i>Uganda Team Leader</i>
10:00 – 10:30	Plenary discussion of RCoEs Regional Project Implementation Plans and recommendation on way forward	<i>Meeting Facilitators</i>
10:30 – 11:00	HEALTH BREAK	
SESSION 5	Discussion Group Session Two - RCoEs RPIPs	
11:00 – 11:20	Plenary discussion and agreement on discussion group terms of reference and groups formation	<i>Meeting Facilitators</i>
11:20 – 13:00	Discussion group session one as per the terms of reference	<i>Group Chair Persons and Facilitators</i>
13:00 – 14:00	LUNCH BREAK	
14:00 – 15:20	Plenary feedback and consensus building on discussion group session two as per the terms of reference	<i>Rapporteurs and Facilitators</i>
SESSION 6	Regional Proposals review, Approval and Priority Areas - Output Three	
15:20 – 15:30	Presentation by WRCoE	<i>Ethiopia Team Leader</i>
15:30 – 15:40	Presentation by DRCoE	<i>Kenya Team Leader</i>
15:40 – 15:50	Presentation by RRCoE	<i>Tanzania Team Leader</i>
15:50 – 16:00	Presentation by CRCoE	<i>Uganda Team Leader</i>
16:00 – 16:30	HEALTH BREAK	
16:30 – 17:30	Plenary discussion of RCoEs presentations and recommendation on way forward	<i>Meeting Facilitators</i>
END OF DAY TWO		

DAY THREE	WEDNESDAY	10/11/2010
SESSION-TIME	ACTIVITY	RESPONSIBLE
SESSION 7	Discussion Group Session Three - Regional Proposals and Priority Areas	
08:30 – 08:40	Recap on day two and emerging issues	<i>Meeting Facilitators</i>
08:40 – 08:50	Plenary discussion and agreement on discussion group terms of reference and groups formation	<i>Meeting Facilitators</i>
08:50 – 10:20	Discussion group session one as per the terms of reference	<i>Group Chair Persons and Facilitators</i>
10:20 – 11:00	Plenary feedback and consensus building on discussion group session two as per the terms of reference	<i>Rapporteurs and Facilitators</i>
11:00 – 11:30	HEALTH BREAK	

SESSION 8	Monitoring and Evaluation Frameworks - Output Four	
11:30 – 11:40	Presentation of EAAPP Logframe harmonized with ASARECA Logframe	<i>ASARECA M&E Unit</i>
11:40 – 11:50	Presentation of WRCoE Logframe harmonized with EAAPP Logframe	<i>Ethiopia Team Leader</i>
11:50 – 12:00	Presentation of DRCoE Logframe harmonized with EAAPP Logframe	<i>Kenya Team Leader</i>
12:00 – 12:10	Presentation of RRCoE Logframe harmonized with EAAPP Logframe	<i>Tanzania Team Leader</i>
12:10 – 12:20	Presentation of CRCoE Logframe harmonized with EAAPP Logframe	<i>Uganda Team Leader</i>
12:20 – 13:00	Plenary discussion of RCoEs Logframes harmonised with EAAPP Logframe and recommendation on way forward	<i>Meeting Facilitators</i>
13:00 – 14:00	LUNCH BREAK	
SESSION 9	Performance Monitoring Plans and Reporting Formats - Output Four (Continued)	
14:00 – 14:30	Presentation of performance monitoring plans, baseline survey guidelines and reporting formats	<i>ASARECA M&E Unit</i>
14:30 – 15:00	Discussion of performance monitoring plans, baseline survey guidelines and reporting formats and recommendation on way forward	<i>Meeting Facilitators</i>
14:30 – 14:40	Plenary discussion and agreement on discussion group terms of reference and groups formation	<i>Meeting Facilitators</i>
14:40 – 16:00	Discussion group session one as per the terms of reference	<i>Group Chair Persons and Facilitators</i>
16:00 – 16:30	HEALTH BREAK	
SESSION 10	Meeting Way Forward and Closing	
16:30 – 17:00	Agreement on the way forward in the implementation of EAAPP.	<i>ASARECA and Facilitators</i>
17:00 – 17:30	Meeting evaluation and closing remarks	<i>ASARECA, Participants and Facilitators</i>
END OF DAY THREE	END OF MEETING	

ANNEX 3: PROPOSED EAAPP LOGFRAME HARMONIZED WITH ASARECA

(The items shown in red are from the ASARECA Logframe)

Overall Goal	Verifiable Indicators
Enhanced sustainable productivity, value added, and competitiveness of the sub regional agricultural system.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percent increase/change in yield of selected commodities • Percent increase in labor productivity in selected products • Annual growth rate in Total Factor Productivity (TFP) • Percent change in the value of agricultural output • Rate of change in Total Factor Productivity
PDO (Purpose)	
<p>The PDO is to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Enhance regional specialization in agricultural research Enhance collaboration in agriculture training and technology dissemination; and Facilitate increased transfer of agricultural technology, information and knowledge across national boundaries <p>Enhanced utilization of agricultural research and development innovations in ECA</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rate of increase in adoption of new varieties, breeds and management practices (%) • Rate of increase in adoption of new handling and processing methods. • Rate of increase in number of improved dairy genetic materials (%) • Increase in productivity at farm level over control technology for all disseminated new technologies (%) • Rate of increase in land area with seeds of improved cultivars (%) • Percent of stakeholders adopting new technologies and management practices in selected development domains • Percent of agricultural land area under improved technologies (seeds of improved cultivars, etc) • Number of policy options implemented by stakeholders
Intermediate Outcomes	
Component 1: RCoEs	
<p>RCoEs have improved infrastructure, human, and financial resources to conduct regional research in identified priority areas.</p> <p>Strengthened Capacity for Implementing Agricultural Research for Development in ECA sub-region</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acquisition of research infrastructure and equipment according to plan (%) • Staffing of research effort on regional research projects according to plan (%) • Number of stakeholders who have acquired knowledge and skills in applying AIS as a result of ASARECA support • Number of stakeholders trained based on the identified capacity building needs (includes both short term and long term training) • Number of institutions benefiting from infrastructure development initiatives
Component 2.1: Regional Research	

Overall Goal	Verifiable Indicators
<p>Generation of agricultural knowledge and improved agricultural technologies in identified priority areas facilitated.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of regional agricultural research projects compared to plan (%) • Number of new technologies developed by RCoEs relative to plan
Component 2.2: Training and Dissemination	
<p>Availability of knowledge and improved agricultural technologies in identified priority areas in targeted countries as well as other ASARECA member countries improved.</p> <p>Enhanced Availability of information on agricultural technologies and innovations in ECA sub-region</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of existing and new technologies disseminated in more than one EAAPP country compared to plan (number per selected commodity). • Number of regional technology uptake pathways (e.g., web-based information platform, regional radio, TV program, etc.) compared to plan. • Number of appropriate information packages produced • Number of appropriate information delivery pathways used • Access to disseminated information by various stakeholder categories • Number of publications on: policies for sustainable agricultural husbandry, marketing chains, extension systems, early warning systems
Component 3: Availability and Access to Seed	
<p>Farmers access to seeds and planting materials and dairy genetic materials in identified priority areas in targeted countries as well as other ASARECA member countries improved.</p> <p>Enhanced Adoption of Policy Options by Decision-Makers to improve performance of the Agricultural sector in ECA</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of cultivars for selected commodities registered in more than one EAAPP country (number per selected commodity). • Tons of commercial seed of the selected commodities sold by seed companies, farmer organizations, etc. • Tons of breeder seed and planting materials of the selected commodities produced by research institutions and private seed companies. • Number of doses of livestock semen sold in targeted countries as well as other ASARECA member countries. • Number of demand driven technologies /innovations generated • Number of demand driven gender responsive technologies made available to uptake pathway • Number of Policy options that enhance access to and use of resources by women, men and youth recommended to policy makers • Number of Policy options presented for legislation or decree
<p>Coordination and management of regional research activities and dissemination initiatives in all EAAPP countries enhanced.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional research and training and dissemination activities implemented according to plan (%) • Harmonized M&E system for RCoEs in cooperation with ASARECA developed, adopted, and implemented

ANNEX 4: PRESENTATION ON GUIDELINES FOR PROJECT BASELINE STUDIES - Dr. Enock Warinda

Baseline Data

What is Baseline Data?

- Baseline data is basic information gathered before a program or project begins
- It is used later to provide a comparison for assessing the net effect of the programme/project.

How to conduct Baseline Studies

Consider the following steps:

- Prepare a Baseline Plan
- Conduct the Baseline Study according to the Baseline Plan
- Analyze the collected data and review the generated results
- Formulate the Baseline Report and Share the results.

Standardized Report Format for Baseline Results

Title page

- The report should have the project title, and the title page should include the names of the assessment team and the dates on which the assessment was carried out.

Acronyms

- Acronyms used in the text should be spelled out here for easy reference.

Executive summary

- The executive summary should be a brief presentation on the project focus, the context under which the baseline assessment was done, general findings and general conclusions.

Table of contents

The section headings to follow the numbering format suggested in these guidelines but this can be adapted where necessary

Introduction and background

- Include background information on:
 - The Project and its Objectives
 - Overview of the expected results
 - Extent of activities
 - Geographic scope
 - Project results and Key Performance Indicators
- Include socio-economic, physical, cultural, and political factors, etc which might have bearing on expected results

Methodology – Include:

- The general framework of the assessment
- Techniques employed in information gathering
- The participative methodology used
- Tools used to collect and analyze the information
- The composition of the assessment team
- The range of stakeholders involved
- The limitations or constraints in information gathering

Analysis of the findings:

- Include interpretation of the results within the context in which the assessment was conducted
- Elaborate Key Performance Indicators in detail, clearly indicating the data elements, data source, analytical tools used, the data and interpretation

- Identify components which may need further assessment

Conclusions

- Conclusively sum up the findings of the assessment
- Formulate general and specific recommendations for tracking the indicators, modifying and/or developing new performance indicators.

Annexes/Appendices

- Include:
 - Relevant documents
 - Data
 - Tables
 - Assessment ranking
 - Glossary and other information the assessment team deem necessary.
- Each annex/appendix should be numbered and listed by title in the table of contents.

How to Conduct Baseline Studies

Consider the following steps:

- Prepare a Baseline Plan
- Conduct the Baseline Study according to the Baseline Plan
- Analyze the collected data and review the generated results
- Formulate the Baseline Report and Share the results.

Consider Research Methods

- How representative is your Sample?
- Develop questionnaires
- Conduct focus group discussions, Direct Observations, etc
- Ensure quality control
- Use both Quantitative and Qualitative methods

Baseline Plan						
Baseline Focus	Indicators	Data Collection Method	Data Source	Location of Data Collection	Means of Analysis	Time Needed
Impacts						
Outcomes						
Outputs						
<i>Optional: Secondary changes</i>						
<i>Optional: Underpinning assumptions or Theories of Change</i>						

Getting started – Checklist for baseline study

Planning

- Focus of the study – ensure the study is going to measure the right things, define information needed to measure the activity
- Integrate the study into the activity's M&E System [PMP]
- Ensure a clear logical framework for the project/initiative, select key performance indicators to be measured
- Avail logistics and resources required for the study – for collecting, analyzing, storing and sharing data
- Availability of inherent skills for conducting the study, or possibility for out sourcing

Methodology

- Analyze strengths and weaknesses of the research methods to be used. Plan for a variety of methods to improve reliability
- Ensure the method selected clearly measures progress and results achieved against the aims of the project. The methods should also be replicable during implementation or after the activity is completed
- Ensure the methodology is explicit and recorded. Plan for data analysis, and report preparation
- Ensure that the methods selected are cost effective and represent value for money when compared with the total size of the activity
- Define the sampling techniques to be employed, and the sample should be representative of the total population
- Design data collection tools and if possible pre-test them

Adequacy of indicators

- Should be SMART
- Should cover each level of the activity's logframe
- Should help to explain the cause of observed changes, and means of verifying the indicators should be practicable

Implementation of baseline study

- Ensure adequate expertise for conducting the study, data analysis and report preparation in place
- Plan for regular analysis of data over the course of the activity
- Plan for sharing and dissemination of baseline data among implementing partners and other stakeholders

Baselines: Ways of Reconstruction

Using Secondary Data: Types of data can include:

- Census & other surveys by government agencies
- Special studies by NGOs/donors
- University research studies
- Mass media (newspapers, radio, TV)
- External trend data that might have been monitored by implementing agency

Using Internal Project Records: Types of data can include:

- Feasibility/planning studies
- Registration forms
- Monitoring Reports

- Management Information System (MIS) data
- Meeting Reports
- Partner Meeting Minutes
- Progress Reports
- Training and other implementation records, including costs
- Who collected the data and for what purpose?
- Were they collected for record-keeping or to influence policymakers or other groups?
- Do monitoring data only refer to project activities or do they also cover changes in outcomes?
- Were the data intended exclusively for internal use? For use by a restricted group? Or for public use?
- How accurate and complete are the data? Are there obvious gaps? Were these intentional or due to poor record-keeping?
- Might there have been potential biases with respect to the key indicators required for the impact evaluation?

Assessing the Reliability of Project Records

- Who collected the data and for what purpose?
- Were they collected for record-keeping or to influence policymakers or other groups?
- Do monitoring data only refer to project activities or do they also cover changes in outcomes?
- Were the data intended exclusively for internal use? For use by a restricted group? Or for public use?
- How accurate and complete are the data? Are there obvious gaps? Were these intentional or due to poor record-keeping?
- Might there have been potential biases with respect to the key indicators required for the impact evaluation?

Recall

Knowledge about Recall is greatest in:

- Areas where most research has been done on the validity of recall
 - Income and expenditure surveys
 - Demographic data
- Types of Questions
 - Yes/No; fact
 - Scaled
 - Easily related to major events

Improving the validity of Recall

- Conduct small studies to compare recall with survey or other findings
- Ensure all relevant groups interviewed
- Triangulation
- Link recall to important reference events
 - Elections
 - Drought/flood/tsunami/displacement
 - Construction of road, school, etc

Key Informant

- Not just officials and high status people

- Everyone can be a key informant on their own situation:
 - Youths and School Pupils
 - Users of technologies
 - Local Administrative Officers
- Guidelines for key-informant analysis
 - Triangulation
 - Include informants with different experiences and perspectives
 - Understand how each informant fits into the picture
 - Employ multiple rounds if necessary
 - Carefully manage ethical issues

PRA and related participatory techniques

- PRA and PLA techniques collect data at the group or community [rather than individual] level
- Can either seek to identify consensus or identify different perspectives
- Risk of bias:
 - If only certain sectors of the community participate
 - If certain people dominate the discussion

Time-related PRA techniques useful for reconstructing the past:

- Time line
- Trend analysis
- Historical transect
- Seasonal diagram
- Daily activity schedule
- Participatory genealogy
- Dream map
- Critical incidents