

Southern Africa Drought Technology network (SADNET)

End of Pilot Phase Evaluation Report

(Community's Perspective)

January 2005

Draft 2

By Manasa Sibanda

**SAFIRE
Southern Alliance for Indigenous Resources (SAFIRE)
Box BE 398, Belvedere, Harare
10 Lawson Avenue, Milton Park
Harare, Zimbabwe
Phone: 263 4 795461/794333
Fax: 263 4 790470
Email: info@safire.co.zw
Manasa@safire.co.zw**

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	5
2.0 SADNET BACKGROUND INFORMATION	6
3.0 THE TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION.....	8
4.0 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY.....	9
5.0 KEY FINDINGS.....	10
6.0 IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT	14
7.0 HOW CAN SADNET BE DESIGNED TO IMPROVE IMPACTS ON COMMUNITIES?	17
8.0 WHAT CAN BE DONE IN 2005 AND MAKE SADNET A VIABLE NETWORK?	19
9.0 CONCLUSIONS	20
10 ANNEX A. TERMS OF REFERENCE: END OF PROJECT EVALUATION FOR THE SADNET PROJECT	21
ANNEX B: LIST OF CONSULTED PEOPLE	25
ANNEX C: SADNET EVALUATION WITH COMMUNITIES (ZIMBABWE).....	27

Executive Summary

This report presents results from an evaluation of the SADNET pilot phase. These were directly discussed with communities working with partner institutions in the project. Information was however, validated with the relevant partners including the private sector and other service providers acknowledged by communities as development agencies within their areas.

Initially, the trial phase for the SADNET project was to run from July 2002 up to the 31st of March 2004. This could have been more ideal if the Zambian component was implemented at the same rate with Zimbabwe activities. Because of a number of factors, two, 6 months extension phases were separately granted by the funding agency and donors. Drawbacks in project implementation were equally detrimental in Zimbabwe. The impacts of both the political and economic challenges in Zimbabwe during the pilot phase increased the costs of project implementation. Combined with increased coincidences of dry spells in both pilot countries brought with it challenges in the participation of key partners in the project. Services provision under drought relief programmes meant less availability of partners from actively participation in the network especially. This was adverse at project inception where their input in the planning process was more critical.

This fact notwithstanding, however, the project continued to evolve and develop over in 2003. Progress was most encouraging. It became apparent that, though perhaps flawed in some of its detail, the overall project design and implementation was sound. At programme level the original project goals were indeed achieved. More important than this, though, is the fact that, as SADNET's lessons became clear community perceptions on progress and impacts need to be taken seriously. This is so, as they are the target beneficiaries of the project. Their perceptions and recommendations will not only inform the project but future projects and policies, within SADNET partner institutions, within the pilot countries (Zambia and Zimbabwe) and, quite possibly, elsewhere within the southern African region.

The search for alternative rural production systems has gained impetus. SADNET demonstrated that the promotion of appropriate technologies (indigenous knowledge systems -IKS) particularly in dryland areas was indeed an alternative contribution towards drought mitigation. Opportunities to capitalise and build on this knowledge were increasing rapidly. The time may well come when SADNET demonstrated that it will in the long term be the forerunner to many successful networking activities on drought mitigation initiatives. Already, there were a multitude of spin-off activities arising from the pilot phase (discussed in the report). At regional level, the project became known for its innovative and adaptive approach to the challenges of promoting ICTs for drought mitigation strategies in drought prone rural areas of Southern Africa.

The impacts

On the ground, the most promising indicators of SADNET achievements (as interpreted by communities) to date, of the 10 pilot communities include the following;

- a) Have realised and utilised an expanded source of information (other communities, partner institutions, private companies, electronic sources including web based) for wide range of subject areas affecting their livelihoods.
- b) Transformed documented information to production systems and increases in incomes on agricultural products.
- c) Adopted technologies from other communities in Africa and improved food security on specific agricultural products (e.g. fresh milk preservation by use of cattle urine as preservative).

- d) Information influenced decision making on production systems especially on varieties to be grown e.g. the Matabeleland communities who shifted from a medium season millet variety to a short season variety to mature within the forecasted rainfall period for 2003/2004 season.
- e) Improved capacity of communities to lobby for better markets and marketing with the private sector. This was a result of more exposure on market trends through use of ICTs.
- f) Information needs by different gender groups were met by the network.
- g) Timeliness and relevance of information to rural communities was effective due to the active participation of members and their responsiveness to requests by communities were realised.

Recommendations

Recommendations include the following;

- i. The clientele base and outreach of the project should be expanded by offering appropriate capacity building support to its partners.
- ii. To improve on the social and economic viability of the CIRC's, the SADNET project should provide backstopping support to partners and augment their efforts to improve their capacity to generate income or recover costs at centers.
- iii. Support to existing CIRC's should continue.
- iv. Documentation of experiences at local level using different media should frame the niche of the SADNET project.
- v. The SADNET project should continue to support both traditional and more modern technologies for effective communication.
- vi. The SADNET project should continue to provide feedback, acknowledge its sources and keep promises especially at local level where interaction is limited due to accessibility factors.
- vii. SADNET should continue to offer need based support. Strengthening of community institutions directly participating in the network should be a priority.
- viii. To increase active participation and exploitation of available resources in the network, SADNET should also maximize skills from within the network. Priority should be given to members before outsourcing. This shall also facilitate circulation of resources within the network.

Conclusion

To conclude, the impacts were expected to be more elaborate in the longer term, and more substantially, it seems that SADNET's lessons and experiences will enable the development of a much more meaningful expanded phase. That will have genuine impact at the grassroots level, while simultaneously setting the standards for ICT policy and practice in Southern Africa.

1.0 Introduction

The project entitled “Southern Africa Drought Technology Network (SADNET)” is a regional network that brings together development practitioners involved in agricultural development, promoting indigenous knowledge systems (IKS) and drought mitigation activities in Southern Africa. With a total budget of CD262,026 Canadian Dollars, the 26 month pilot phase was implemented in Zimbabwe and Zambia. Financial support was provided courtesy of IFAD and CIDA.

The **overall development objective** of the project is to link sources of agricultural technical and marketing information with development practitioners, the agribusiness and rural communities in drought-prone regions, contribute towards poverty alleviation and increased food security. It seeks to enhance rural livelihoods through strengthening information exchange and networking systems among NGOs, agribusiness, government departments and communal farmers in drought prone areas of Southern Africa.

The evaluation was conducted during the month of October and November 2004. It also included an analysis of secondary information (mainly project documents) and fieldwork over three weeks in 5 CIRCAs located in 5 districts. Terms of reference with key evaluation questions, survey instruments, mainly checklists, were designed prior to the fieldwork. Testing of the survey tool was conducted in Nyamaropa one of the focal areas SADNET project was implemented. Consultations with the steering group by an independent SAFIRE staff member were conducted during the end of year meeting held on the 1st of November 2004.

Structure of this report

In **section 1**, provides an introduction that briefly describes the outline of the report and its contents. **Section 2** follows with background information of the SADNET project. It covered describes the SADNET project and expected outcomes from interventions, expected outcomes of the pilot phase, approach and implementation strategy. The preceding **section 3** is devoted towards providing the reader with the terms of reference of the evaluation exercise. These include impacts, effectiveness, efficiency, relevance and sustainability of the project as viewed by the communities. Details on the methodology applied in the evaluation are given in **section 4**. A description of the processes involved in the development of the survey tools, testing the tools and their use in the exercise is highlighted.

Section 5 analyses the community appreciation or the level of awareness of the project objectives and perceived benefits. Short, medium to long term impacts of the projects are described. Of importance to note is that these were as viewed by communities. Lastly, the section discusses community views on the SADNET implementation strategy. In **Section 6** recommendations were provided for future design of the regional project in order to improve on impacts on communities. From the recommendations, a proposed strategy of implementation for the SADNET project in Zimbabwe was derived at in **Section 7**. Lastly, in **section 8**, annexes that provide specific details or reports sighted in the main body of the report.

2.0 SADNET Background information

This section describes the SADNET project and expected outcomes from interventions, expected outcomes of the pilot phase, approach and implementation strategy.

What is SADNET

SADNET is one of SAFIRE's regional collaborative networks that bring together development practitioners involved in agricultural development, promoting indigenous knowledge systems (IKS) and drought mitigation activities in Southern Africa. These have demonstrated capacity and interest in information and communication technologies (ICTs).

Following the successful implementation of three predecessor projects that focussed on smallholder farmers in drought prone regions of Southern Africa, SADNET was initiated. These were **Community Drought Mitigation Program (CDMP)**, **Community Drought Mitigation Training Program (CDMTP)**, and **Drought Resilient Livelihood (DRL) Projects**. Other sister projects that also emerged in SAFIRE were the **Agricultural Market Linkages (MLP)** and the **Permaculture and Agroforestry Programmes**.

Expected outcome of SADNET is; To expand the range of strategies and options available to resource poor farm families to cope with drought. It will also strengthen the ability of farmers to negotiate a fair price for various products. This project targets directly women producers in these communities.

SADNET and its Approach

SADNET's approach was simple. It built on and strengthened information exchange initiatives of its partners (local institutions). This was intended partners identify and provide the information that farmers in the drought-prone areas need to improve agricultural production and marketing. Of importance, it included tapping into existing sources of information. This process include the agricultural research establishments, agribusiness or development organizations, and repackaging it into forms that is of use to communities.

SADNET project implementation strategy applied

Three main strategies were adopted. Firstly, SADNET facilitated networking and collaboration between key information sources (research institutions and/or communities) and the channels of communicating information (the extensions agents). As a network, its mandate was to cement these relationships. On the other hand, access to more advanced communication technologies (ICTs) was facilitated. This ensured better timely access as well as broadening the diversity of information. These were made available to rural communities and key institutions directly supporting information generation and delivery. Lastly but not least, relevant support and the promotion of local content was provided. Information generation and its dissemination between communities were strengthened.

Phased regional expansionary strategy

The pilot phase prepared groundwork for the establishment of an expanded network into the Southern African region. To achieve this, a phased approach was applied. Two countries were targeted to actively participate in the network after every six months. This allowed effective and efficient allocation of resources. To this effect, reconnaissance visits to identified countries were conducted. The objectives of the visits were to; (i) identify potential partner institutions, (ii) identify the demand for SADNET at national level in each country and (iii) explore funding

opportunities from relevant donors and institutions. Selected institutions then acted as focal points for the coordination of network activities. Outcomes of the visits included; (1) potential focal points identified for further discussion and development of an MOU; (2) initial demand and niche for SADNET services established as well as (3) funding opportunities explored.

3.0 The Terms of Reference for the evaluation

The Terms of Reference for the evaluation (July 2002 to September 2004) were developed through a tripartite arrangement involving the program implementation machinery, M&E system requirements and the Canadian Hunger foundation (CHF) representing the program funding donors.

The terms of reference were as follows:

- a. To evaluate SADNET's **Impact** (short, medium and long term) on rural communities. The key question to be considered is: **What impacts are already apparent as viewed by communities as a result of the project's activities?**
- b. To evaluate the project effectiveness, efficiency and extent to which results (i.e. outputs and outcomes), were achieved in the implementation of the pilot phase. A key question to be considered is; **to what extent has the SADNET project achieved the outputs as envisaged by communities at the end of the pilot phase?**
- c. To examine the **Relevance** of the SADNET project to pilot communities. Here the major question is: **Does the project's approach contributed towards the achievement of the pilot phase goal?**
- d. **Sustainability:** To what degree do communities view the project that its impacts will last beyond the conclusion of the project life span and support?
- e. To provide a summary of the recommendations of the evaluation.

Details of the TORs are presented in annexe A.

4.0 Evaluation Methodology

This section provides details of the methodology applied in the evaluation exercise. It starts by defining methodology as applied. For further details see annex B for the tools used.

Methodology is defined as the general approach or broad strategy of informing the study. **Methods** are defined as the specific tactics, tools or techniques for collecting data for analysis.

Developing survey tools and testing

Prior to the fieldwork, a concept note to conduct the evaluation, Terms of reference (TORs) and survey tools were developed. A field trip was then conducted to Nyamaropa in Nyanga for the evaluation. This community was used as a test case for the developed tools and approach. The field trip was then preceded by an Information and networks section review meeting. A review of the tools and approach used was conducted. Tools were then refined and applied to other centres. Initially a questionnaire was used (see annex Bi). Because of the nature of the evaluation and answers received, a checklist was developed and used (see annex Bii for details). Summary tables were also designed for analysis purposes by the survey team.

Project visits and observation

In the field, a SAFIRE team member was tasked with the consultations of partner institutions and communities in two provinces of Zimbabwe (Manicaland and Matabeleland). These include 5 districts host the 5 Community Information resource Centres (CIRCs) namely Nyamazura, Nyanga (Nyamaropa), Chimanimani (Mutambara), Bubi (Siganda) and Bulilima (Galaupole). Siganda and Nyamaropa were used as a control where the use of more advanced ICTs was not supported. A participatory approach involving all stakeholders was adopted. The aim of this approach was to facilitate views of stakeholders be accommodated and their definition of the project impacts captured. Direct observation was employed to capture reality on the ground. Where appropriate, visits to homesteads or crop fields were conducted to verify adoption of technologies.

Interviews

Community members were selected at random (project participants and non participants) and interviewed. Focus group discussions were made as follow up. Interviews with non participating institutions or organisations were conducted to provide information about coordination, relevance and how best the project could be improved.

Use of secondary data

Another important source of information was secondary data. This consisted of project documents and reports by the focal point, partner institutions and community institutions. Analysed information from these documents provided direction in the formulation of appropriate questions for further investigations, impacts as per perceptions by project stakeholders. Both qualitative and quantitative data was analysed.

5.0 Key Findings

Results presented in this section concentrate on views of the communities consulted. Where necessary, comments by reporting officer were explicitly stated. Given this, it was not surprising that this evaluation intended capture views on the ground and limit the opinions of experts or facilitators.

Appreciation or awareness levels of the project among communities

The level of awareness was judged by the community's knowledge of the project objectives and perceived benefits. All the interviewed communities were well versed with the project objectives and perceived benefits. This was attributed to awareness meetings conducted during project inception. Communities expressed that the project objectives were clear and in line with their vision on accessing, generation, packaging and disseminating information. It was also made clear on how these benefits were being realised. One community member at Mutambara argued that the rate at which these benefits accrue depends on the adoption rate of technologies as well as utilisation of specific information like on markets. At this point, the responsiveness of the communities to information was another dimension to be monitored by the project. Another argument was that the information needs which directly affect community livelihoods were broader than drought mitigation. It includes health, education, income generation, politics and other sectors of development. This was reflected by the community information needs that were reviewed on a quarterly basis. Except for the youths, who remained consistent on their information needs (education, job opportunities, HIV/AIDS, music), the general trend was observed to be shifting from agriculture to development in general.

Because of the synergies between SADNET and the Open Knowledge Network (OKN) project, communities at 2 CIRCs (Galaupole and Mutambara) could not separate the two project objectives. This was desirable. It reflected well on how they complimented each other. The Mutambara Commodity Association members echoed these sentiments. They regarded the two projects as one. The clear objectives of the SADNET project were building blocks towards accomplishment of community's "vision" on improved livelihoods. Not only did the project supported access to relevant information by communities but them able to document and share their own experiences in their own languages.

SADNET appropriate support and activities to partner institutions

Indeed, the sustainability of SADNET (secretariat) was one thorny issue among communities. To a large extent, however, communities identified the need for external support of the project to continue offering appropriate services. This was because they realised that continued support of the project would bring more positive impacts on their livelihoods. Communities were pleased by the resuscitation of the once "shelved" rural connectivity project" This was initiated by ORAP in Siganda and Galaupole. Because of this intervention, communities were eager to participate in the SADNET project which revived this important connectivity initiative. Communities commended this effort.

At local level, a number of sustainability options were being implemented. These include the CIRC acting as a newspaper sales agent (Nyamazura), offering computer appreciation courses, telephone, fax, e-mail and internet services to other community members at a fee. From the author's point of view, it cannot be concluded at this juncture that these improved the financial viability of the CIRCs. However, indications exist for their positive contributions towards cost recovery. The SADNET project should continue to offer support where appropriate and augment community efforts in making CIRCs viable assets.

Community views on implementation strategy and approach

It is the intention of the project to be people centred. The project conceptualisation process was then designed in such a way that it had to be consultative in nature. From this good cause, a participatory approach to project implementation was dictated as a need. As a result of this orientation, communities were impressed by the approach used by SADNET. Firstly, they applauded that relevant organisations including local level institutions were consulted. Secondly, the rest of the communities were then approached. Using a participatory approach, information and capacity needs at all levels were established. Because of this, communities felt that they were part of the planning and implementation process. It is therefore the author's conviction that a sense of belonging in the SADNET project was achieved.

One important aspect of the project implementation strategy was strengthening already existing institutions. These included those at local/community level. In particular, the Siganda Association, Galaupole Association, Nyamazura Coordinating committee and Nyamaropa Agricultural Development Association (NADA) were established through facilitation of other organisations prior to the existence of the SADNET project. Not only were they used as entry points into the larger community but their capacities strengthened. A number of trainings and study tours were facilitated by the project as mentioned by respondents (impacts on training were discussed in section 5). However, some members felt that selection of participants (by the local institutions) was rather not transparent. Neither could the author identify any off-the-peg solution to this process. Each local institution democratically selected members for training using their home grown criterion. Non project participants echoed that those with influential positions in the community were selected to attend trainings and study tours. It was then recommended that the selection process for training participants be reviewed.

Importantly, inbuilt in the SADNET approach of utilising representatives from communities was to strengthen the culture of feedback hence effective information dissemination. Evidence to reflect this culture was apparent from respondents. As a measure of feedback from selected members from the communities, it was clear that all direct participants disseminated information about training received or study tours they attended to the rest of the community. This was mostly conducted during community gatherings. In isolated cases (Nyamazura) special meetings were called where feedback was made. This was effective in information dissemination at local level.

Training facilitated by the network was need based and conducted over a reasonable time period. Facilitators (mostly network members) used local languages and illustrations for better understanding. Participants were also equipped with backup notes (reference materials). Above all, communities were satisfied with the venues as well as study tour sites. They indicated that these were gender sensitive, created appropriate and conducive learning environments. Because the above services were sourced from members, communities applauded this arrangement. SADNET shall therefore continue to mobilise skills from within the network before outsourcing from other non members.

Other major pointers to community appreciation of the project were the production of their contributions on IKS in print media (packaged into manuals in vernacular) and 2 videos translated into English. Communities felt that their knowledge was being considered worthy. Details were discussed in section 5 on impact.

Relevance of the project

The widely held view among communities was that SADNET approach and strategies applied in the implementation of the project were participatory, appropriate and effective. Responses to

information needs, capacity, information packaging and dissemination were need based. Service delivery was rated as high against the background that communities received information timely, as per their request and able to search for other relevant information using even more advanced technologies (E-mail and Internet). Notwithstanding prevailing connectivity challenges, lack of radio and TV coverage in Galaupole, communities were eager to continue to utilise the more advanced technologies. For example, the radio and TV coverage in Galaupole is Botswana. Thus they are more appraised of activities in Botswana than their own country. From rankings of appropriate media for information dissemination communities made the following recommendations in order of priority;

Table 1: ICT options ranked by communities.

Ways of disseminating information	Rank
Study tours	1
Workshops	2
Telephone	3
Demonstration plots/ field days	4
Extension agencies	4
Radio	6
Internet	6
Email	8
Newspapers	9
Television	10

The criteria used includes, timeliness, interactive ness, affordability, availability and language used in the media. Study tour and workshops were ranked the highest due to their highly interactive nature. Newspapers and television were ranked lowest because of language barrier and expense of purchasing. The other reason for television ranking lowest was the issue of electricity. Most rural areas were not electrified.

It was observed that communities had their own vision to access information that would have great impact on their livelihoods. This was further strengthened by the relevant project activities. These were incorporated into their plans as well as partner institutions working directly with them. Relevance of the project was more apparent when communities related to how they used to access information using traditional technologies. SADNET initiative provided not only a sharing of information platform but a facility that improved their rapport with the private sector and other communities especially living under marginal conditions.

The facilitatory role played by SADNET in the generation and packaging of information was effective. Communities felt that the coordination and monitoring of feedback and information validation between development practitioners and rural communities improved. Most importantly was the willingness of communities to share their Indigenous Knowledge Systems (IKS) with other communities. After they were involved in the documentation of their experiences using a variety of media (print – manuals, audio video) a sense of sharing and ownership of knowledge was cultivated. This was relevant.

Support to CIRCs by the project (or rural libraries) that lead to revival of information centres in Matabeleland was a welcome achievement of the project. Community leaders at Siganda reiterated that the revived centre improved their service delivery to communities by acting as central coordination points in the generation, packaging and dissemination of information at

community level. From the point of view of the communities, SADNET was responsive to these impediments and thus remained focused.

Information materials supplied to CIRCs were mostly sourced from within the network (partners) and non members. Due to an influx of new materials to the centres, communities requested a better record keeping system. Training on cataloguing was then conducted. Systems were developed by communities to suit their needs. These have continued to operate. As one Galaupole Association member said “we improved our filing system to accommodate more subject area materials coming in and for our monitoring purposes” The statement shows that the community in Galaupole “own” the system and the rationale to improve the “filing system” was for own “consumption” i.e. monitoring purposes.

6.0 Impacts of the project

Monitoring of impacts at community level was conducted by partner institutions and communities themselves. In this section, impacts were described as per community's perspective. Both visible and invisible impacts were discussed.

Knowledge base in technical and marketing information improved

From close to 27 different publications produced and disseminated in SADNET, 80% were technical and 5 of them contained information on marketing. Most impacts were realized with communities participating in the market linkages programme (contract farming) in Maunganidze, Nyamaropa, Mutambara and Nyamazura. This was not by intention but by nature of agricultural activities which were supported by irrigation. It translated to a high turnover in the rate of technology adoption relative to the dryland or rain fed systems. These communities received technical and marketing information on specific crops. It is therefore recommended that the SADNET project work closely with partner institutions. Furthermore, it should effectively utilize their infrastructure in the generation and dissemination of information. This proved effective and increased outreach of the project areas/communities.

The ability of communities to produce quality agricultural products was improved. Additionally, their capacity to lobby for better prices with private companies and to search for better paying contractors was enhanced. This was through better and diversified sources of marketing information. After accessing market information on prices of groundnuts, a groundnut-producing group in Nyamazura withheld its produce to the sole buyer in the area who was offering about 75% of the market price. Realizing a possible loss of market, the buyer was forced to purchase the produce at the producer market price.

Appropriate technologies adopted by communities

The world over, communities are known to experiment, invest in appropriate technologies and adopting what suits their objectives. Likewise, an improved community to community interaction and sharing of information brought about by the SADNET project yielded positive impacts. Firstly, communities translated documented technical information (produced by other communities) and improved their agricultural production systems. For example, the production systems practiced in Chimanimani were adopted in Chipinge district. After receiving documented articles on tomato growing, the Maunganidze community reviewed their production systems. They adopted relevant techniques that improved their overall yield (including quality) by over 20% and income by 40%. Their willingness and potential to share and apply appropriate technologies from other communities was principal. They managed to review their production systems based on knowledge gained from other communities to improve the quality of crops. This was yet another revelation that communities conducted regular self-assessments of their technologies.

Another impact of training identified during the evaluation was the translation of acquired skills into income. One community member in Nyamaropa who benefited from insitu training in video recording as a media for documentation offered his services for a fee. Using a different machine (from the one used during training), the community member captured a private ceremony in Nyanga. He received income equivalent to USD100. It can be concluded that the training in the use of video was of high quality. The project should continue to support communities by improving their capacity to generate income for improved livelihood.

Quality of local content improved

Generation of local content was one major focus of the SADNET pilot activities. These yielded positive results. Content was also validated with communities and packaged with the help of facilitating institutions into publishable quality booklets. Notwithstanding the fact that SADNET successfully facilitated the capacity building of communities to capture their own experiences but went a step further. The validation process with development practitioners including the private sector (vertical validation) was in itself another platform of informing partners of community's first hand knowledge. Previously, this was a gap most development practitioners overlooked in their programmes. One can conclude that SADNET excelled in this regard.

Over the years, it had been a tradition that communities were mostly contributing passively to the documentation process of IKS in their areas. Development practitioners would approach them for information which was willingly and unconditionally provided. On many occasions, reports or any documentation that followed were never accessible to them physically. Additionally, these were packaged in a form they could not utilize. Over and above the reports being made "available" many a time their input was not acknowledged. Irrespective of these two protracted scenarios, communities' willingness to provide information to "outsiders" was not deterred. Because of the evolution of participative development, this approach has become obsolete.

Many community groups participated in documenting local experiences. They alluded to the fact that SADNET has given them a rare chance of allowing them to communicate their own experience in their own language. This participatory documentation of experiences and subsequent packaging of such materials brought a different dimension altogether. The SADNET project could however, monitor possible impacts brought about this new scenario where communities displayed relatively sufficient capacity to document own experiences using a variety of media. Possible areas of impact might be a shift in the behaviors from extractive methods of documenting experiences in rural setups and or delegating communities to compile specific areas of interest and facilitate participative documentation processes among development practitioners. A total of 20 articles were developed with communities in vernacular.

Relevance and timeliness of information products improved

There were mixed feelings about timeliness of information facilitated by the network. Weather/rainfall information was rated the highest in terms of its availability at a time of need. SADNET subscribed to the Meteorological Department and FEWSNET of which materials received was electronically relayed to partners. In turn, they printed and disseminated it to communities not connected. The SADNET project should continue to support both traditional and more modern technologies for effective communication. Through this relay of information, communities were able to receive the timely seasonal bulletins. After realizing that the 2003/2004 season was characterized by dry spells, communities in Matabeleland made a decision to grow a shorter season millet variety.

Similarly, a marketing bulletin was distributed to communities participating in contract farming. Instead of growing the traditional tomato crop, they selected the more profitable green beans a horticultural crop that yielded better cash for contract farming in Manicaland. Information was also used to lobby for better prices of their produce. The Mutambara community was a good example. The Tomato association realized the prevailing market prices of their tomato. A comparison was made with the one offered by their contractor. When they realized a big gap in the pricing system of the private company, they withheld their tomatoes and negotiated for a better price. This yielded results. The Association chairperson reiterated that "gone were the days when we depended so much on information from our buyers. Now we can seek information directly with other potential markets. Information is power"

Knowledge base on ICT options by communities increased

Except for radio and TV, communities that participated in the first training workshop on ICTs, indicated little or no knowledge of computers, Internet, email and cyberspace radio. Follow up training workshops at each CIRC by the IT consultant and the production of an Introduction to ICTs booklet in local languages improved the skills and knowledge base of core members of the communities involved in managing the centers. Constant reviews of the training needs should be conducted regularly by the partners and feedback provided for possible action.

As a result of this support, communities were impressed by the efficiency of getting a wide variety of information on any subject from the internet. However, the limiting factor was connectivity. Due to the poor telephone links, accessing the internet was a challenge. Although backup was provided by supporting partner institutions, it was not compensatory or sufficient for communities to fully utilize the facility. Interested community groups like the youth were deprived of the services from the facility. Basing on the connectivity problems at CIRC level, satellite receivers could go a long way in supporting access to the internet facility. However, the websites for such were limited and do not support surfing options. SADNET should identify other potential connectivity options to improve access of information at local level.

Sense of ownership and belonging built at individual level

The evaluation exercise captured the invisible impacts at community level. The production of two videos (paprika production and drip kits) during the pilot phase had its own impacts on contributors. Preliminary reviews of shots of the videos were conducted at each point of capture. During these reviews, communities felt highly aspired to “just appear and share my knowledge”. This was one such aspiring moment that a sense of belonging over and above owning the process was further strengthened. It also reinforced willingness of communities to continue sharing using such media. Similarly, with the documents in print, communities were impressed when they observed that their names (as authors) and in some cases photographs (in illustrations) appeared in each article they contributed. They felt their efforts being appreciated. The SADNET project should continue to provide feedback, acknowledge its sources and keep promises to communities. This will in future build a better rapport and could influence approaches being employed by other development agencies at local level.

A mere presence of a computer owned by communities was inspiring. Since communities could not afford to purchase the technology, its availability made possible by the project was remarkable. Older members of the community felt that this was yet another opportunity for the younger generation to have hands on training on computer lessons for their future course. At the same time, they also wanted have a feel of what they had been missing. Resources permitting, the SADNET project shall continue to provide computers as one media for supporting access to information at community level.

Local institutional coordination improved

Consistent with local protocol, the facilitatory role of the SADNET project developed a positive reputation with stakeholders. A rapport was built by the project team. Ultimately, institutional coordination among partners in networking improved. Local leaders described how the SADNET project improved operations of local institutions. It was a culmination of appropriate approach and strategies. Other aspects included the socialization aspects of the project team members in all processes involved from consultation, documentation, training, study tours and financial support. By utilizing participatory tools in monitoring and record keeping, their operations improved significantly on progress and accountability. SADNET should therefore continue to offer need based support in its capacity building programmes at all levels. Emphasis, however, should be vested at community level.

7.0 How can SADNET be designed to improve impacts on communities?

This is a pertinent question for any initiative and SADNET is no exception. Effective coordination of a network is a challenge. In the absence of feedback and consistent monitoring, it can prove even more difficult. This evaluation actively sought feedback from communities, the core beneficiaries of the project.

This section is therefore devoted to proving recommendations emerging from communities' perspective. To this effect, the author's views on specific issues identified in the findings were also included. Resources permitting, these shall form part of the building blocks for the regional network interventions. The following were recommendations for adoption in the expanded SADNET project;

- i. The clientele base and outreach of the project should be expanded. To achieve this appropriate capacity building support to partners should be a priority. Given that resources are limited, the SADNET project should create close linkages with partner institutions and utilize their infrastructure in the generation and dissemination of information.
- ii. To improve on the social and economic viability of the CIRC's, the SADNET project should provide backstopping support to partners and augment their efforts to improve their capacity to generate income or recover costs at their centers. A facilitatory role should be employed to achieve this. Compilation of proposals, identification and linking up of communities to potential donors are alternative support strategies. The SADNET project should therefore offer support and augment community efforts in making CIRC's viable assets.
- iii. Support to existing CIRC's and new centers should continue. CIRC's acted as central coordination points in the generation, packaging and dissemination of information at community level. They are therefore invaluable to communities. However, the establishment of new centers and expand network activities was desirable.
- iv. Documentation of experiences at local level using different media should frame the niche of the SADNET project. This in itself was a threshold for sharing experiences especially among communities. To that effect, more visual, simplified and materials in vernacular should be produced and disseminated. The validation process with development practitioners including the private sector (vertical validation) should be maintained.
- v. The SADNET project should continue to support both traditional and more modern technologies for effective communication. A combination of alternative information communication technologies should be able to compliment each other. Anticipated is the efficiency and appropriateness of such technologies. This also requires that the SADNET project researches and invest in new technologies evolving with time. Basing on the connectivity problems at CIRC level, satellite receivers could go a long way in supporting access to the internet facility. Considerations should however, be made on the limitations of such facilities at community level. Therefore other potential connectivity options to improve access of information at local level should be identified and supported on a continuous basis.
- vi. Building a rapport with network partners and non members is demanding. Notwithstanding the process, once created it serves as a driving force for effective coordination hence the impacts. The SADNET project should continue to provide feedback, acknowledge sources and keep promises especially at local level where interaction was limited due to accessibility factors.

- vii. SADNET should continue to offer need based support. The nature of support should however be gender sensitive in its capacity building programmes at all levels. Focus at community level cannot be overemphasized. Strengthening of community institutions directly participating in the network should be a priority. These form an entry point into the community as well as provide monitoring functions of the project impacts. These could include technology adoption rate etc. Other aspects likely not captured at partner institutional level include the responsiveness of communities to information, technologies adopted or tried and or then rejected.
- viii. To increase active participation and exploitation of available resources in the network, SADNET should maximize skills from within the network. Priority should be given to members before outsourcing. This shall also facilitate circulation of resources within the network.

8.0 What can be done in 2005 and make SADNET a viable network?

This section outlines the strategy outputs for the Zimbabwe SADNET component. These were summarized below. These are not exhaustive but indicative of the strategic direction of major activities in the country. Considerations on supporting resources were given hence numbers (or specific targets) were not allocated per identified output.

First and foremost, the SADNET project will continue to support activities initiated in the pilot phase. These include documentation, packaging and dissemination of information, capacity building of partners including CIRC institutional structures, policy lobby and advocacy.

The following were targets set to provide the future direction of SADNET;

- i. 2 new CIRCs established every year. Not in order of priority (Chiredzi – integrate with Action Aid, Nyashanu – connections, Mhakwe – reconnaissance conducted, Kezi – Fambidzanai and FACT to actively take part, Muzarabani, Rushinga, Mudzi).
- ii. Simplified technical publications (Grasslands supplied 5 materials, MET to develop an information leaflets on weather forecast in vernacular).
- iii. Community documentation supported using different appropriate media..
- iv. Modern ICTs promoted in information generation, packaging and dissemination.
- v. Increase participation of the private sector in the network.
- vi. Network to participate in the dissemination of information on AIDS.
- vii. Support sustainability options at CIRCs
- viii. M&E system reviewed and;
- ix. Network actively participates in policy and advocacy fora.

9.0 Conclusions

The SADNET project has not only created a platform for sharing information but a facility to further exploit partnerships among its members. Institutions at local level proved capable of facilitating the documentation, packaging and dissemination of information. They have not only acted as entry points to communities but organisational models that devolve authority directly to the information deprived constituencies embracing of local interests and priorities than those that allocate control to higher levels of social organisations. It is therefore the conviction of the author that strong local institutional capacity and political capital enhance outcomes for local people by enabling them to mobilize information and experiences and negotiate for better benefits. NGOs, donors, federations and other external actors have a key role in the facilitation of this process especially the devolution of capturing local experiences on drought mitigation to locals as well as policy and practice towards local interests.

The impacts were expected to be more elaborate in the longer term, and more substantially, it seems that SADNET's lessons and experiences will enable the development of a much more meaningful, phase, that will have genuine impact at the grassroots level, while simultaneously setting the standards for ICT policy and practice in Southern Africa.

10 Annex A. Terms of Reference: End of project evaluation for the SADNET Project

By Manasa Sibanda
Draft 1: 29/09/04

Terms of reference for the end of project evaluation of the Southern Africa Drought technology Network (SADNET) Pilot Project, September, 2004

1. Introduction

The Southern African Drought Technology Network (SADNET) is in its pilot phase and implemented in Zimbabwe and Zambia. Funded by IFAD, this is a collaborative initiative involving various institutions comprising of NGOs, research institutions and government departments participating in drought mitigation and technology transfer. These have demonstrated capacity and interest in information and communication technologies (ICTs).

There were three phases to the implementation of the project. Initially, the pilot phase was planned for one year beginning July 2002. However, to draw more lessons from the pilot testing of identified ICT options, an initial six-month extension was granted up to March 31, 2004. CIDA provided extra financial support for this extension period. Furthermore, the realization of the project under expenditure during this pilot extension, another no cost extension was awarded by another 3 months up to the 30th of November 2004. A delayed start up of activities in Zambia by about 6 months contributed to this under expenditure.

1.1 SADNET Main Objective

To link sources of agricultural technical and marketing information with development practitioners, the agribusiness and rural communities in drought-prone regions, contribute towards poverty alleviation and increased food security. The project seeks to enhance rural livelihoods through strengthening information exchange and networking systems among NGOs, agribusiness, government departments and communal farmers in drought prone areas of Southern Africa.

1.2 Purpose of the pilot phase

The purpose of the pilot is to:

- Support means through which sources of information can be readily identified and accessed to strengthen agricultural production and the drought coping skills of rural communities;
- Increase the capacity of NGOs to effectively gather and interpret agricultural information for dissemination and use by rural communities; and;
- Determine how more advanced forms of ICTs can be adapted and practically applied in rural southern Africa to communicate important agricultural technical and marketing information between/amongst NGOs and research organisations, between research organizations, between NGOs and rural communities, Research organisations and rural communities and between and amongst communities themselves.

1.3 Expected outcome of SADNET is

To expand the range of strategies and options available to resource poor farm families to cope with drought. It will also strengthen the ability of farmers to negotiate a fair price for various products. This project targets directly women producers in these communities.

2. Evaluation Rationale

After 27 months of pilot implementation, the project has built sufficient lessons as rationale for the establishment of a regional network. The demand for services was not only established in the pilot countries but in two other Southern African potential countries. This expanded network therefore requires a consolidation of these lessons and recommendations to cover more countries. Therefore, the pilot phase should be evaluated before the network expands into the region. The evaluation should include a detailed review and assessment of a representative number of communities who were supported to establish information resource centers.

The review and assessment of a representative number of the communities directly supported by the project will look specifically at the effects of the network services on rural livelihoods. These include linking sources of agricultural technical and marketing information with relevant service providers. Apart from evaluating the achieved results against the logical framework, the overall evaluation of the project should look at the project strategy, its contribution to exploring new methods and avenues within ICTs. Furthermore, the evaluation should discuss the lessons and merits of a possible expansion of the project into a regional 3 year phase network. In addition, based on the findings of the evaluation, recommend any major changes to the project strategy in a possible new phase.

These terms of reference relate to the review and assessment of the community-based projects. An international evaluation team will conduct the end of pilot phase evaluation of the project.

3. Scope and Focus of the evaluation

- To review and analyze the SADNET Project's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats and from this identify the lessons learnt that would be of use for future expansion.
- To assess how far the project has achieved the original objectives.
- To assess the impact of the project on livelihoods of rural communities.
- To make recommendations on other specific areas of the project design and implementation that would ensure a smooth but phased expansion into other countries and attract donor support on ICTs.
- Produce report and present key findings and lessons in the regional network proposal for possible funding.

Within this context, elaborate on the following:

Overall, the evaluation should seek to examine the effectiveness and impact of the SADNET project in terms of its projected outputs at community and partner institutional levels. This is an end of pilot phase evaluation, and the project is expected to have achieved all its outputs as per planned activities (see pilot phase purpose). Sought are answers to four guiding questions that relate the context of its project framework. These are:

1. **Effectiveness:** To what extent has the SADNET project achieved the outputs envisaged by the end of the pilot phase?
2. **Impact:** What impacts are already apparent as a result of the project's activities?
3. **Relevance:** Does the project's approach contributed towards the achievement of the pilot phase goal?
4. **Sustainability:** To what degree has the project demonstrated that its impacts will last beyond the conclusion of the project life span and support?

At the end of the evaluation a detailed report is expected to be produced, with the **methodologies** used to gather information explicitly stated.

4. Statement of tasks

Based on the project framework, the evaluation team (comprising the SADNET coordinator and OKN Documentalists) will be expected to address a number of issues and questions, as listed below. In addition to providing tangible evidence of achievement, the team should seek to highlight areas in which SAFIRE might need to improve performance, modify approach in order to attain more positive impacts on rural livelihoods.

4.1 Effectiveness

- To what degree is SADNET on target in terms of its projected outputs, and the indicators established within the project framework for these outputs, by the end of the pilot phase? What **external** factors (i.e. factors that are beyond the project's immediate capacity to control or influence) have been important in affecting the ability of SAFIRE to achieve outputs within the planned timeframe?
- What **internal** factors (i.e. factors that are within SAFIRE's capacity to control or influence) have been important in affecting the ability of SAFIRE to achieve outputs within the planned timeframe?
- How effective has SAFIRE's management of project activities been in relation to planned and achieved activities and outputs?
- How effective were the two focal points (SAFIRE and CARE Zambia) in the implementation of the pilot phase?

4.2 Impact

- How far has the project already contributed towards improving the livelihoods of beneficiaries?
- To what extent have community institutions at CIRC's trained by SAFIRE been able to use skills imparted to them under the SADNET project?
- To what extent have communities taken ownership of SADNET supported initiatives or activities?
- How do communities involved in the SADNET project view the respective roles of SAFIRE, the private sector and other relevant partners? Is this in line with the project's objectives?
- What evidence is there that the SADNET project has contributed towards improved drought coping/mitigation strategies or the promotion of indigenous knowledge systems (IKS) within its focal areas?
- To what extent are communities able to access, document and share information?
- To what degree has the project enhanced the capacity of communities to adopt new drought mitigation technologies?
- At partner institutions and community management institutional levels, what indications are there of improved capacity in the access, generation and dissemination of drought mitigation information?
- To what degree has the project strengthen the ability of farmers to negotiate a fair price for various products through access to information using various technologies including the more advanced ICTs (satellite radio, internet and E-mail facilities)?

4.3 Relevance

- On the basis of actual project achievements, to what extent did the project activities and outputs contributed towards the attainment of the project's immediate objective?
- To what extent do the assumptions made in the project formulation held true?

4.4 Sustainability

- What indicators are there to suggest that the project's impacts will be sustained after its termination?
- To what degree does the manner in which SAFIRE is currently implementing the SADNET project suggest sustainable impacts are achieved?
- What steps should be taken to improve the likelihood of lasting benefits as a result of the SADNET project?

5. Team composition, logistics and reporting

The team (internal) will comprise no more than three people, who should between them possess specialist knowledge and experience of:

- ICTs and community development
- Rural livelihoods or agriculture
- community institutions and institutional dynamics
- participatory evaluation techniques
- gender and development

All team members will spend a minimum:

- 2 days preparation
- 13 days fieldwork between Nyamaropa, Nyamazura, Mutambara, Tongogara, Galaupole and Siganda.
- 2 days for preparation of draft report

The team leader will spend a further 2 days in preparation, submission and revision of the final report.

Total 19 working days.

All logistical arrangements will be the responsibility of the SADNET coordinator.

Annex B: List of consulted people

Name	Area
1. Mrs Supiya	Nyamazura Primary
2. Mr Mutigwa	Nyamazura Secondary
3. Turusida	Nyamazura (Animator)
4. Mrs Jasintu	Nyamazura
5. Mrs Chikatora	Nyamazura
6. Mrs Musarasunhwa	Nyamazura
7. Mrs Munyau	Nyamazura Clinic
8. Mrs Mangunya	Mutambara ward 4
9. Mrs Ndadzungira	Mutamabra
10. Mrs Ndongwe	Mutamabra
11. Mrs Mutimberi	Mutamabra
12. Mrs Mangudya	Mutamabra
13. Mrs Chitombo	Mutamabra
14. Mrs Shumba	Mutamabra
15. Mr Itayi	Mutamabra
16. Mr Masaga	Mutamabra
17. Mr Mutsa	Mutamabra
18. Mr Zviga	Mutamabra
19. Mr Mundorinodya	Mutamabra
20. Manyazhune	Mutamabra
21. Mr Gimbarimwe	Mutamabra
22. Mr Chitinha G	Mutamabra
23. Mr Chitinha F	Mutamabra
24. Mr Mutsanya	Mutamabra Primary
25. Mr Diba	Galaupole
26. Mr Gwambe	Galaupole
27. Mr Ndiweni	Galaupole
28. Mr Ngwani	Galaupole
29. Mr Tukwane	Galaupole
30. Mr Chehanga	Galaupole
31. Mr Sibombo	Galaupole
32. Mr Nkomo	Galaupole
33. Nleya	Galaupole
34. Mr Dube	Galaupole
35. Mr Ndlovu	Galaupole
36. Mduduzi Hindonga	Ndiweni
37. Lisani Nkomo	Ndiweni
38. Innocent Dube	Ndiweni
39. Admore Ndlovu	Ndiweni
40. Mhlengi Mpofu	Lupane
41. Mayibongwe Nyathi	Bubi
42. Patson Mkhwebu	Gweru
43. Nkosikhona Ndlovu	Siganda
44. Perver Tjikoba	Plumtree
45. Anyway Dewa	
46. Isiah Moyo	
47. Thamsanga Ndlovu	Plumtree
48. Mlungisi Ncube	
49. Mlungisi Ndebele	

Name	Area
50. Thabani Ncube	Gweru
51. Raphael Dube	
52. Lungisani Kheswa	Siganda
53. Kusile Mhlanga	Lupane
54. Ephraim Mpatiwa	Plumtree
55. Bright Khupe	Plumtree
56. Engelbette Nyathi	Nkosikazi
57. Vusimusi Mahlangu	Filabusi
58. Vivian Nkomo	Lupane
59. Samson Dube	Ndiweni
60. Roy Nkomo	Ndiweni
61. Temba Ngubena	Ndiweni
62. Baron Ncube	Plumtree
63. Phumuza Ndlovu	Plumtree
64. Boy Moyo	Ndiweni
65. Mangwamgwa Tshuma	Ndiweni
66. Sylvester Nkomo	Ndiweni
67. Mazibeli Bokanu	Ndiweni
68. Thiyiwe Khupe	Diba
69. Khekhe Nyathi	Diba
70. Mirriam Mabhena	Gwambe
71. Betty Ncube	Bwabe
72. Medeline Moyo	Tekwane
73. Mavis Nleya	Tekwane
74. Doli Dube	Ndiweni
75. Betty Ndlovu	Ndiweni
76. Sibongile Ndlovu	Ndiweni
77. Thembinkosi Dube	Ndiweni
78. Margaret Ndlovu	Ndiweni
79. Angeline Khupe	Ndiweni
80. Sandra Dube	Ndiweni
81. Rachel Moyo	Ndiweni
82. Thandi Moyo	Ndiweni
83. Letshani Ncube	Ndiweni
84. Soneni Ndlovu	Tshanga
85. Linah Sithole	Ndiweni

Annex C: SADNET Evaluation with Communities (Zimbabwe)

October, 2004

By Manasa Sibanda

Method for evaluating the pilot phase by output

The assessment for all outputs will be done mainly through interviews (in-depth individual interviews with the project facilitators, key informants and committee members), focus group discussions with school children. Specific tools that may be applied (depending on the situation and need) include institutional analysis, ranking of media or ICT options i.e. through selected criteria and crop timelines.

In-depth interviews will be held in 6CIRCs (Nyamaropa, Nyamazura, Mutambara, Tongogara, Galaupole and Siganda) with the individual selected farmers (drawn from different wealth categories and farmer group committee members). Interviews will also be held with resident partner institutional staff like ORAP, AREX on the project and their perceptions of the impacts. These interviews will be followed up by selected core group, ISG members and other partner institutions after the community field visits. For all the interviews checklists rather than questionnaires will be utilized. This will enable the team to probe and raise new questions as need arises.

The evaluation will be based mainly;

- (i) Visible results/changes (status of CIRCs, demand for and use of supplied information materials, adoption of technology, production of information materials at local level).
- (ii) Vision defined by participating communities and partner institutions in the absence of any visible impacts.
- (iii) Levels of awareness among partners on the project objectives and impacts.
- (iv) Clarity of the SADNET strategy and comprehension by the partners.
- (v) Assessment of the indicators as defined in the project log frame.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

With communities

1. Are the communities aware or familiar with the project objectives, impacts?
2. Vision for ICTs in the area? (schools – library etc)
3. Key issues on information access, packaging and dissemination? And how are these being addressed by the project? (Gap analysis).Where we were before the project, where we are now and where we would like to be 5years from now?
4. Institutions in place, how do they work with the wider communities?
5. Involvement of community leadership?
6. Analyze current and potential threats/challenges and opportunities for the project in relation to ICTs.
7. What has been the impact of the project so far? Was new knowledge/information channeled through the network adopted in the area?
8. The tours and exchange visits conducted.. What are the lessons learnt skills and knowledge gained, and changes in perceptions? How best can the SADNET and its members improve services for the communities to realize better impacts on their livelihoods?

9. Reasons for keeping the records, do they know why they keep the records? Do they appreciate the relevance of the records? Would they want to keep other information? What and in what form?
10. Is the community capable of PM&E? (record keeping, analyzing information and applying information to decision making)

KEY PARTNER INSTITUTIONS to be interviewed.

1. Activities of institution in the area.
2. Assess their level of involvement in the project and understanding of the project.
3. Their view on ICT issues in their project areas.
4. Their views on the project's potential impacts.
5. Comments on the strategies and how they can be reviewed to address issues in the area?
6. Are the current strategies in place the best for achieving the intended objectives?

General Information

Sex of respondent (<i>tick</i>)	Male			Female	
Age of respondent (<i>tick/optional</i>)	15-20	21-30	31-40	41-50	>51
Occupation of respondent					
Name of village					
Name of Ward					
Name of district					

Section B: details by output

Output 200: Documented sources of information and distribution channels identified for the partners of SADNET as a basis for the design of the network later in the project.

Information required and received Number of information sources to rural communities increased by 50%

Information requested	Requested to who	Information received	Received from who	Timeliness/ response or frequency	Current information requirements/ needs (gap)	Remarks (include market and technical information) and impacts on livelihoods. (state precisely; figures where incomes are mentioned i.e. % increase/decrease.

Output 300: Definition of appropriate information dissemination methods, practices and channels.

SADNET facilitated training received and impact

Training received	When	Who facilitated	Technologies , skills or information adopted or applied	How adopted or applied	Remarks (include relevance – need based, timeliness, duration, content). Specify drought mitigation strategies adopted.

Media mostly utilized

Media	Used (tick)	Preferences (rank)	Institution supporting media	Remarks (include content, timeliness, language) as well as criteria applied.
TV/ video				
E-mail				
Radio				

Print				
Internet				
Training				
Study tour				
Demonstration plots				
Extension agencies				
Telephone				
Other (define)				

New knowledge acquired (knowledge base) on technical and marketing information for communities

What new knowledge,	from where	any adoption/put to practice	Remarks

Output 400: SADNET ADVISORY GROUP and project operating structures established.

1. Area of specialization of the member
2. For how long have you been in the ISG?
3. How were you selected into the group?
4. Number of decisions made
5. Any contracts/MOUs signed or facilitated
6. Are you aware of the terms of reference of the ISG
7. Meetings attended
8. Did you participate in the regional network proposal development
9. Did you provide input to project documents supplied
10. Any M&E duties performed related to the project

Output 500: Core membership of NGOs for SADNET established.

Perform a project SWOT analysis

Strengths	Opportunities
Weaknesses	Threats

Output 600: Definition of appropriate ICT applications for SADNET.

CIRCs

Name of CIRC	Records maintained	How often/updated	Number of visitors (by gender)	Information searched/requested	Other services requested (r) or rendered (re).	Impact on livelihoods (state precisely where incomes are mentioned i.e. % increase/decrease.

Social relations between villages regarding CIRCs' control and use/access? Do they pose a threat to the project?

Information materials developed at local (community) level

What material	why the material and target audience	Was it used and by who?	any signs of adoption of knowledge	how best can this be improved

Preconceived project impacts (for the interviewer's information)

- (i) Increase in production and income
- (ii) Improved and adopted technologies on drought mitigation (include lantana camara info)
- (iii) Appropriate ICT options utilized according to needs of farmers
- (iv) Extension and training needs of the beneficiary groups are identified, trained and monitored.
- (v) Self managed community CIRC management institutions
- (vi) Secure and reliable markets for produced products by farmers established
- (vii) (Market information dissemination improved).
- (viii) Existing linkages with private business suppliers, buyers and financial institutions reviewed, established and strengthened?
- (ix) Value addition to products promoted (natural products).