PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

MAIN

IFAD Grant Number

766-ASARECA

Project Title

Improved Management of Agricultural Water in Eastern and Southern Africa **(IMAWESA)**

Preparation and Start-Up Phase Project (Pre-IMAWESA)

Project Manager

Prof. Nuhu H. Hatibu

Implementing Organisations

SWMnet - Soil and Water Management Research Network *of*

ASARECA – the Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa, *in partnership with*

ICRISAT - the International Crops Research Institute for the Semi Arid Tropics

Report Authors

Mati, B.M., N. H. Hatibu and K.P.C Rao

Submitted to	Date
Director of the Eastern and Southern Africa Division of IFAD	June, 2006

ASARECA Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern and Central Africa
SWMnet Turning Knowledge into Action Soil and Water Management Research Network
ICRISAT International Crops Research Institute for Semi-Arid Tropics
IFAD International Fund for Agricultural Development

Soil and Water Management Research Network (SWMnet), Regional Coordinating Unit, P.O. Box 39063-00623 Nairobi, Kenya,
Tel: +254 20 7224550/65, Fax: +254 20 7224001, E-mail: swmnet@asareca.org; URL:www.asareca.org/swmnet

Pre-IMAWESA Completion Report

Facilitating an Effective and Efficient Establishment of the IMAWESA Project

Main Report

Hatibu, N., B.M. Mati and K.P.C. Rao

Contact us through:
The Regional Coordinator
Soil and Water Management Research Network (SWMnet),
Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in East and Central Africa (ASARECA)
C/o ICRISAT Regional Office for East and Southern Africa
Room No. F121, ILB Building, ICRAF Complex, United Nations Avenue, Gigiri,
P. O. Box 39063-00623, Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: +254 20 722 4550 or +254 20 722 4565; Fax: +254 20 722 4001
Email: b.mati@cgiar.org or swmnet@asareca.org; Website: www.asareca.org/swmnet

About SWMnet and Project Reports

The Soil and Water Management Research Network (SWMnet) is a network of the Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in East and Central Africa (ASARECA). ASARECA is a non-political organization of the national agricultural research systems (NARS) of ten countries: Burundi, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Madagascar, Rwanda, Sudan, Tanzania and Uganda. ASARECA is implementing a strategy agreed upon by its members across the 10 countries. SWMnet supports the generation of wealth by coordinating the efforts of ASARECA to contribute to effective utilization of land and water resources in profitable crop, livestock and other natural resources-based enterprises. SWMnet's vision is a situation where land and water resources of the Eastern and Central Africa (ECA) region are utilized sustainably to reduce poverty through profitable agriculture.

The SWMnet project reports are designed to report implementation and findings of research and other investigations facilitated by SWMnet in order to inform stakeholders, target groups and donors. These documents are rather detailed and are released to provide adequate feedback and basis for specific communication and knowledge sharing. To facilitate this process, readers are therefore welcome to send their comments regarding this particular report to: b.mati@cgiar.org.

The Improved Management of Agricultural Water in Eastern and Southern Africa (**IMAWESA**) project is designed to improve and strengthen the sharing of knowledge, information and best practices emanating from field experiences in implementing development programmes in agricultural water management. This is considered to be critical, both for enhanced programme design and implementation, and for providing the substantive basis upon which to engage in policy dialogue. Studies on key water management issues, training, capacity building, exchange visits and workshops for programme managers and their staff, as well as interaction through an electronic network are key elements of IMAWESA. The project will work directly in few countries but its products will cover 23 countries in the Eastern and Southern Africa Region.

Acknowledgement:
The Soil and Water Management Research Network (SWMnet) is a regional network of individuals and organizations, under ASARECA. SWMnet is currently running programmes supported by several organizations including EU, DFID, IFAD, SSA-CP and governments of participating countries. This particular publication is an output from a project funded by the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). The views expressed are not necessarily those of IFAD as the content is solely the responsibility of the authors.

Executive Summary

The purpose of the project (pre-IMAWESA) was to ensure that the ***IMAWESA project is established effectively and efficiently***. To achieve this, four outputs were planned to:

i) Establish the stakeholder partnerships necessary for effective establishment of IMAWESA as well as the setting-up of a project management unit (PMU).
ii) Implement an initial evaluation of policies, institutions and legal framework on management of water for agriculture, to set the baseline for the full-scale study and development of a policy dialogue strategy under output 1 of IMAWESA.
iii) Evaluate how IMAWESA can support the improvement of implementation of participating programmes and projects.
iv) Initiate the process of improving the capacity of programme staff to communicate experience as a way of facilitating the tapping of field experience to build a regional knowledge base.

With respect to output one, strong partnerships have been built and the IMAWESA project was smoothly commissioned in March 2006 as planned. The PMU is fully operational and has already developed a directory and contacts with over 50 stakeholders' organizations and over 200 individuals. An extensive awareness raising and advocacy that included meetings, presentations and communication through print and electronic media has been initiated to ensure that IMAWESA is well known and accepted by the target stakeholders. This has contributed immensely to the establishment of IMAWESA footprints in the different countries. Good lessons were learned from the preliminary policy study and assessment of ECAPAPA tools. The major one being that, it is very difficult to conduct such studies at regional level using consultancy. Consequently, the approach to be followed in implementing output 1 of IMAWESA has been revised and radically changed. The new plan is to form small within- country teams of two, one specialist in policy analysis and another in general aspects of agricultural water management (AWM). This will be done across 11 countries at most. The teams will be selected and supported through write-shops to undertake analysis and report writing.

Work related to output three produced a critical assessment of learning needs for the different categories of stakeholders including policy makers, managers and implementers of AWM programmes, and researchers. This will facilitate efficiency in the implementation of IMAWESA's component '***capacity strengthening for programme management and implementation'***. Furthermore, an initial scoping of status of knowledge management was implemented in Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, and Tanzania, and provided insights which will assist in better implementation support. For output four, a joint learning workshop, an expert consultation, and technical support missions were designed and implemented. The main output has been the production of a plan for communication, knowledge sharing and learning which form the basis for the improved communication and sharing of experiences and lessons. The main contribution to purpose is that the target stakeholders of IMAWESA have been identified and the means of reaching them articulated.

Several challenges to IMAWESA were observed during the implementation of pre-IMAWESA. Consequently, certain measures have been suggested to meet these challenges as summarized below:

There is a general lack of common understanding of what constitute AWM. Therefore, IMAWESA will have to put a lot of efforts on a high level of awareness raising to create the necessary common understanding before it can succeed in its objectives. It has also been noted that there is a limitation in depending on literature and secondary in the determination of a credible baseline database of the outcome-indicators at purpose level. To overcome this problem, it is intended to use the various studies planned under IMAWESA to build the baseline database. For example, the policy and institutional studies will also establish the current status of policies, strategies and institutional frameworks to be used as a basis for evaluating an indicator such as "*institutional arrangements reflect smallholder interests in agricultural water*".

The plan to use AWM development programmes and projects as "field laboratories" for IMAWESA may lead to higher expectation than can be realized because the managers are themselves very busy, struggling with meeting targets of their loan agreements. There is therefore a need for a stronger partnership building towards acceptance of IMAWESA as part and parcel of programme implementation. Strategies are required to ensure that IMAWESA gives more to managers than it demands from them, for it to be welcomed into the already busy schedules of these stakeholders. However, there is also need to ensure that IMAWESA activities are embedded with supervision missions in particular so that they form part of the *Aide Memoire* signed at the end of missions. The fact that the managers are very busy will also affect the IMAWESA ambition of using managers to support each other while building a regional pool of expertise. One solution could be the identification of managers of programmes that are already closed, who have perhaps moved into less demanding assignments and recruit them to form the pool of consultants.

The limited extent to which process documentation is taking place within programmes will be a challenge to delivering the IMAWESA target of building a regional network and community of practices based on exchange of experiences and lessons. The strategy to meet this challenge will include:

i) Creation of a positive perception that IMAWESA does not mean extra work for programmes but rather it provides opportunities and tools for enhancing effective implementation.
ii) Continued development of tools and capacity for process documentation and facilitation of its institutionalization as part of management reports, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and supervision.
iii) Validation of the IMAWESA plan for communication and knowledge sharing with stakeholders, followed by support to target programmes and government departments to develop and implement their own plans.
iv) Sensitisation of key stakeholders in concepts of knowledge management through seminars and workshops to promote commitment to investment in the acquisition, management and sharing of knowledge.

Contents

Abbreviations and Acronyms

AfDB	African Development Bank
ASAL	Arid and Semi-Arid Land
ASARECA	Association for Strengthening Agricultural Research in Eastern & Central Africa
AWM	Agricultural Water Management
CBO	Community Based Organization
CGIAR	Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research
CKDAP	Central Kenya Dry Areas Project
CKS&L	Communication, Knowledge Sharing and Learning
COMESA	Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa
COSOP	Country Strategic Opportunities Paper
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
DWA	Department of Water Affairs
ECA	Eastern and Central Africa
ECAPAPA	Eastern and Central Africa Programme for Agricultural Policy Analysis
EIAR	Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research
EPH&TFCP	Eastern Province Horticulture & Traditional Food Crops Project
ESA	Eastern and Southern Africa
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FARA	Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa
IAR4D	Integrated Agricultural Research for Development
ICRISAT	International Crops Research Institute for Semi-Arid Tropics
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IMAWESA	Improved Management of Agricultural Water in Eastern and Southern Africa
IWMI	International Water Management Institute
IWRM	Integrated Water Resource Management
KMS	Knowledge Management Systems
LDD	Land Development Division
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MKEPP	Mount Kenya East Pilot Project for Natural Resources Management
MoA	Ministry of Agriculture
MoV	Means of Verification
NALEP	National Agricultural & Livestock Extension Programme
NARES	National Agricultural Research and Extension System
NARS	National Agricultural Research System
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
NGO	Non Governmental Organization
OVI	Objectively Verifiable Indicator
PADANE	Projet de Appoo de Développement du Nord-Est de Madagascar
PIDP	Participatory Irrigation Development Programme (of Tanzania)

PM	Project Manager
PMU	Project Management Unit
PRODECA	Projet de développent de cultures alimentarités dans la région du nord
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
RDP	Rural Diversification Project
RF	Regional Facilitator
RLSP	Rural Livelihoods Support Programme
RWH	Rainwater Harvesting
SADC	Southern Africa Development Community
SARIA	Southern Africa Regional Irrigation and Drainage Association
SCP	Special Country Programme
SFPDP	Smallholder Flood Plains Development Project
SNCDP	Southern Nyanza Community Development Project
SWC	Soil and Water Conservation
S&WM	Soil and Water Management
SSA	Sub-Saharan Africa
SWMnet	Soil and Water Management Research Network of ASARECA
TAP	Technical Advisory Panel (of IMAWESA)
ToR	Terms of Reference
ToT	Training of Trainers
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services
WRC	Water Research Commission (of South Africa)
WRMA	Water Resources Management Authority
WUA	Water Users' Association

1 Introduction

1.1 Agricultural Water Management

Availability of adequate amounts of fresh water to support human and environmental needs is a major development concern in the world today. The World Water Vision[1] identifies the real problem by starting that: ***there is a water crisis today, but it is not about having too little water to satisfy our needs, but rather a crisis of managing water so badly that billions of people and the environment suffer badly.*** It is further recognized that it is in the water used for production purposes in agriculture where this problem is serious. For example, due to low productivity of water used in food production in both irrigated and rainfed systems, it is estimated that on average, humans consume about 1,300 m^3 of water per person per year in the food they eat compared to only 400 m^3 per person per year in all the other needs for water. Therefore, the battle to secure fresh water for future needs of humankind and the environment will be won or lost in the agriculture water arena. For this we need an increased understanding of what constitutes agricultural water and then design better programmes to manage it effectively and thus increase its productivity.

Agricultural Water Management (AWM) can be defined as: ***human actions taken to improve availability of water on land used for agricultural production of crops, pasture, livestock and tree-crops. These actions will include the capture and retention of natural rain, taking advantage of naturally rising or falling water levels, and diversion of water from its natural flow including pumping of water from lakes and underground systems.*** Thus, AWM would include managing of water in rainfed systems (through for example tillage and soil and water conservation), water harvesting, irrigation and drainage. Other aspects include control of water losses by evaporation and seepage, and management of watersheds to ensure adequate availability of water. By this definition it is clear that water for agriculture is broader than irrigation and drainage and that the current sectoral divide between irrigated and rainfed agriculture is not necessary (Box 1). However, what is called rainfed agriculture produces most of the world's food, and in the ESA region it accounts for over 90% of the food we produce. Therefore, there is an urgent need for a widening of the scope of policies and strategies to target the management of water in the rainfed aspect of the spectrum while focusing on effective integration of the continuum from rainfed to irrigated agriculture. IMAWESA is designed to ignite a process towards the institutionalization of this broad definition of AWM in the Eastern and Southern Africa (ESA) region.

Box 1: The rainfed to irrigated continuum
An agricultural production systems is considered "rainfed" if the predominant source of water for plant growth is the local rain falling directly on a given field. If irrigation is used it is only supplemental to the rainwater. On the other hand, "irrigated agriculture" is a situation where the water supplied from external sources is the predominant source of water for plant growth and water from rainfall (if any) is only supplemental.

[1] www.worldwatercouncil.org/fileadmin/wwc/library/WWVision

1.2 The IMAWESA Project

IMAWESA was first proposed at the regional workshop organized by IFAD in partnership with World Bank, AfDB, UNOPS, UNDP, IWMI and SWMnet in March 2004 in Mwanza, Tanzania. The workshop participants observed that:

- Water and land are the premier assets in the poverty stricken rural areas, yet robust strategies for converting these assets to wealth for the poor are not well articulated or financed.
- Although well known and proven, options for managing water in rainfed systems have received very little attention in terms of policy and investments. It has been correctly observed that "*more technology is available than we know what to do with it*" [2]
- Although participatory approaches are widely accepted, the level at which the smallholders, their support agents, national professionals and government leaders in ESA seriously engage in dialogue to influence global, regional, national and even local policies, needs to be strengthened.
- While management and performance of AWM programmes is poor, few efforts are being made to learn from good and bad experiences, and to support each other across programmes and countries.
- Field experiences of smallholder farmers themselves and their support agents are not influencing the policy, institutional and technical options for improvement of management of agricultural water in ESA.
- The information and experiences emanating from many years of practical implementation of projects have not been synthesised and scaled-up to drive innovations.

Therefore the project "Improved Management of Agricultural Water in Eastern and Southern Africa (IMAWESA)" is designed to address these issues with the purpose of strengthening the capacity of stakeholders to plan and utilize best options and enabling framework for smallholder management of agricultural water in ESA (Box 2). It is being implemented by ASARECA through SWMnet, in collaboration with ICRISAT, UNOPS and national programmes on agricultural water management in 23 countries within Eastern and Southern Africa.

The countries include Angola, Botswana, Burundi, Comoros, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya,

Box 2: IMAWESA Goal and Objectives

GOAL: To contribute to poverty reduction through improved policy, institutions, practices and performance of smallholder management of agricultural water in ESA

PURPOSE: To strengthen capacity of stakeholders to plan and utilize best options and enabling framework for smallholder management of agricultural water in ESA

Outputs

1. Enhanced policy dialogue for improved pro-poor enabling framework for smallholder management of agricultural water in ESA
2. Key issues to guide future interventions and investments for smallholder agricultural water management in ESA are understood
3. Improved effectiveness in the management and implementation of IFAD supported smallholder agricultural water management programmes in ESA
4. Enhanced sharing of knowledge and best practices in smallholder management of agricultural water, among countries, institutions and programmes

[2] *World Bank 2005a. Shaping the future of water for agriculture: a sourcebook for investment in agricultural water management. Agriculture and Rural Development* Department. Washington DC.

Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Rwanda, Seychelles, South Africa, the Sudan, Swaziland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe. However, most of the fieldwork will be conducted in those countries with recently completed and on-going programmes relevant to AWM and supported by IFAD and other organizations.

1.3 Pre-IMAWESA

Pre-IMAWESA was funded by "a small regional grant" from IFAD to maintain the momentum on knowledge management for agricultural water in ESA while IMAWESA was under development. It was intended to facilitate a quick and smooth start-up of IMAWESA and to ensure the continuity of activities which had already been initiated by IFAD including IFAD's engagement in water management policy dialogue and building the ASARECA–ICRISAT–IFAD partnership. Therefore, the purpose of pre-IMAWESA was stated as: ***to facilitate an effective and efficient establishment of the IMAWESA project.*** Its main output was to establish the stakeholder partnerships necessary for effective IMAWESA as well as the setting-up of a PMU. However, preliminary activities were also implemented with respect to three of the outputs of IMAWESA in order to learn by doing and thus refine the methodology for the main studies (see logframe in Appendix 1). This included:

i) Initial evaluation of the effect of regional and national policies, institutions and legal framework on the access of poor rural people to improved management of water for agriculture, and on performance and impact of water management programme components based on the experiences of IFAD-financed programmes. The aim was to set the baseline for the full-scale study and development of a policy dialogue strategy under output 1 of IMAWESA.

ii) Improved implementation of participating programmes and projects[3], with the aim to (i) assess training needs to guide the design and implementation of short-term courses, and (ii) evaluate the demand for short-term technical support, to assist in resolving specific issues and problems identified by stakeholders. This will assist IMAWESA (through output 3) to design support through consultancy inputs, inclusion of specific expertise into supervision teams, and technical support visits by the Regional Facilitator.

iii) Improved capacity of programme staff to communicate experience as a way of facilitating the tapping of field experience to build a regional knowledge base. This was a precursor to output 4 of IMAWESA.

[3] *The term "Programmes and Projects" is used throughout this report to refer to the IFAD-supported programmes with agricultural water management components, in Eastern and Southern Africa – which will form the case studies of IMAWESA*

1.4 Outline of the Rest of the Report

This report is design to follow the logical flow of the log-frame (Appendix 1). Therefore, the second chapter describes the achievements of the pre-IMAWESA project at purpose level and provides a synthesis of lessons from the findings and activities, and recommendations for improving the implementation of IMAWESA. The results and findings produced with respect to the outputs of the project are presented in chapter three which is divided into four sections for each of the outputs. The last chapter (4) gives a narrative summary of the activities implemented to produce the project outputs.

The report is supported by four annexes:

Annex I: Reports on output 1 of the project and presents the directory of key stakeholders, programme proposed for collaboration, and the establishment of the Technical Advisory Panel (TAP).

Annex II: Reports on output 2 of the project and presents the preliminary evaluation of policies and institutional frameworks, as well as the assessment of ECAPAPA tools for policy analysis and advocacy.

Annex III: Reports on output 3 of the project and presents the process and results of learning needs assessment, the full report of the scoping for implementation support, and proceedings of the expert consultation.

Annex IV: Reports on output 4 of the project and presents the proceedings of the joint learning workshop, the IMAWESA Plan for Communication, Knowledge Sharing and Learning, and promotional products produced for awareness raising.

2 Attaining the Purpose

As already stated in the introduction section, the purpose was to ensure that: ***IMAWESA project is established effectively and efficiently***. This has been attained in full because IMAWESA has become fully established and was operationalized by March 2006 as expected. A sub-grant agreement between ASARECA and ICRISAT has already been executed. This chapter presents a discussion of how the different outputs contributed to the attainment of the purpose and the lessons learned in the process. Assessment of the actual extent of delivery of the outputs is presented in chapter 3.

2.1 Contribution of Outputs to the Attainment of the Purpose

2.1.1 Output 1: Stakeholder partnerships established

The main contribution was through the recruitment of the Regional Facilitator who reported at the beginning of November 2005 as expected, which assisted in finalizing the establishment of the project management unit (PMU). The first meeting of the Technical Advisory Panel (TAP) was held in January 2006 and was instrumental in concretizing the IFAD-ASARECA-ICRISAT-UNOPS partnership, a major factor in attaining the effective and efficient implementation of IMAWESA. Furthermore, the IMAWESA concept has been presented to several fora in the region to raise awareness and interest of target stakeholders.

A total of ten departments and programmes working in AWM have registered specific interest to collaborate with IMAWESA. This was below the expected level of institutionalization across the region and certainly more work needs to be done. A simple analysis of the specific requests registered by the programmes shows that there is demand for nearly all the outputs of IMAWESA. Demand for support in joint learning and capacity building on technical aspects of irrigation, watershed management, and soil and water conservation and rainwater harvesting, was the highest and thus provides an avenue for the need to raise awareness on agricultural water management (AWM). The second highest demand was related to capacity building and tools for identification of knowledge gaps, and knowledge sharing and networking, which are core targets of the IMAWESA project. This high demand presents a good foundation for building strong partnerships with stakeholders.

As part of building partnerships, pre-IMAWESA was more successful in developing contacts and commitment from individuals. This has led to the development of a directory of key stakeholders working in AWM in the region, with a total of 236 individuals from 20 countries (with the exception of Comoros, Namibia and Seychelles) in the ESA, registered. This has contributed immensely to the establishment of IMAWESA footprints in the different countries. The data will form part of the second edition of SWMnet directory of experts and organizations working in soil and water management in the region, expected to be published in September 2006.

2.1.2 Output 2: Improved understanding of key policy, legal, and institutional issues affecting agricultural water management programmes

The process of policy analysis was well tested through a preliminary study which revealed as expected that no country in the ESA region has a comprehensive policy on agricultural water management. In most cases, policy and strategies are limited to irrigation and other water control infrastructure. For example, the study found that all the countries reviewed have a national policy on water and about 80% of them have national irrigation policies. There are also many other policies with bearing on key aspects of AWM but these are fragmented in both content and location, across various sectoral ministries, with some contradiction between different aspects of policy. With respect to effective and efficient implementation of IMAWESA, this indicates that there is need for a high level of awareness raising to create a common understanding of what constitutes AWM. The institutional set ups for policy formulation are also fragmented, and the policy making process not well defined in many cases, making it difficult to identify the policy makers.

Good lessons were learned in the implementation of the preliminary study, the major one being that, it is very difficult to conduct such studies at regional level using consultancy. Consequently, the approach to be followed in implementing output 1 of IMAWESA will require revision and radical changes as discussed in section 2.2.2. Policy analysis tools developed by ECAPAPA identify five major steps: (i) establishment of an agenda; (ii) data collection; (iii) analyses; (iv) dialogue; and (v) action. Furthermore, policy analysis requires the building of a "boundary organization" of experts drawn from different backgrounds and brought together to study a particular policy area or a broad range of policy issues, actively seeking to inform the policy making process.

2.1.3 Output 3: Improved implementation of IFAD supported agricultural water management programmes

The critical assessment of learning[4] needs for the different categories of stakeholders including policy makers, managers and implementers of AWM programmes, and researchers will facilitate efficiency in the implementation of IMAWESA. Furthermore, an initial scoping of status of knowledge management was implemented in Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, and Tanzania, and provided insights which will assist in better implementation support. It recommended that:

- There is need for sensitization of key stakeholders on the importance of knowledge management, with special emphasis on government officials at high levels, so as to ensure adequate budgetary support.
- Process documentation should be an in-built part of the reporting systems to ensure its acceptance and implementation.
- IFAD and other donor agencies should include knowledge management and sharing as an integral part of future loan programmes.

It was noted that the main issues that IMAWESA should deal with as a matter of urgency include:

[4] The term "Training" has been replaced by "Learning" because of the observation that, in any group of people, knowledge is inherent in all the participants and hence there is neither teacher nor student, but cross-learning from each other

- Encouraging programmes to commit certain amounts of project funds to knowledge management, sharing and exchange
- Developing appropriate incentive mechanisms to promote knowledge management efforts – such as a single window system with easily usable formats and standards for managing and sharing knowledge
- Encouraging and creating a platform for people to publish short summaries of their works and experiences
- Facilitating capacity development in the use of ICT tools.

2.1.4 Output 4: Improved capacity of managers and staff implementing agricultural water management programmes to communicate experiences and lessons

For this output of Pre-IMAWESA, managers of IFAD funded projects have attended training in knowledge management, a joint learning workshop on capacity for process documentation and communication; and several expert consultations were implemented. The main output has been the production of a plan for communication, knowledge sharing and learning which forms the basis for the improved communication and sharing of experiences and lessons. The main contribution to purpose is that the target stakeholders of IMAWESA have been identified and the means of reaching them articulated.

2.2 Synthesis of Lessons, Insights and Implications for IMAWESA

2.2.1 IMAWESA in general

Two major challenges to IMAWESA were observed during the implementation of pre-IMAWESA. The first concerns the extent to which literature and secondary data can be depended upon in the determination of a credible baseline database of the outcome-indicators at purpose level. This is because most of the target institutions and programmes do not regularly collect and maintain the relevant data. At the same time, pre-IMAWESA and even IMAWESA do not have adequate resources to embark on own comprehensive baseline studies. Furthermore, due to the heterogeneity of the target countries, a baseline data for one indicator could be different in each country while region-wise data is not available anyway. To overcome this problem, it is intended to use the various studies planned under IMAWESA to build the baseline database. For example, the policy and institutional studies will also establish the current status of policies, strategies and institutional frameworks to be used as a basis for evaluating an indicator such as "*institutional arrangements reflect smallholder interests in agricultural water*". This means that the baseline data will be completed by mid - 2007 – that is halfway through the project. This is not considered a problem since most of the issues (policies, institutions, future investment and performance) targeted by IMAWESA take time to change.

The second challenge is the plan to use AWM development programmes and projects as "field laboratories" for IMAWESA. It was realized that the managers are themselves very busy, struggling with meeting targets of their loan agreements. Therefore, even though they have given IMAWESA a lot of support, this has only happened during 'face2face' meetings and workshops. Very few if any of them have made independent follow-ups and demands with the IMAWESA PMU. Certainly, the awareness raising already mentioned earlier is a key to overcoming this challenge and this must start by building on what the

target stakeholders respond to – 'face2face' meetings. This will be implemented in four main ways:

i) Regional level expert consultation meetings to be organized in collaboration with UNOPS so that IMAWESA can be seen by the managers as part and parcel of the programme implementation;
ii) In-country consultation and seminars to be implemented as part of the technical support missions of the Regional Facilitator and IMAWESA project manager;
iii) The 2nd Regional Workshop on AWM in September 2006; and
iv) Utilization of meetings and workshops organized by other organizations to increase awareness on IMAWESA and its objectives.

Another strategy lies with making IMAWESA part and parcel of programme implementation. Therefore, while accepting the resolution by TAP that "***IMAWESA will not undertake activities covered by UNOPS' services, but utilize the knowledge generated by supervision missions and strengthen supervision missions by addressing issues and providing support external to UNOPS' responsibilities, but relevant to Agricultural Water Management***", there is strong need to ensure that IMAWESA activities are embedded with supervision missions in particular, so that they form part of the *Aide Memoire* signed at the end of missions. This will raise the status of IMAWESA among programmes and assist in achieving indicators such as "***at least three best-bet practices proven in one country have been validated in at least three other countries***".

2.2.2 For output 1 - Enhanced policy dialogue

The first lesson is that a single study implemented at regional level especially by consultants is not cost effective in capturing the full range of differences in policy and institutional frameworks across the different countries in the region. Therefore, under IMAWESA, the comprehensive policy study will be conducted through country level studies. To improve efficiency, productivity and quality, it is proposed to undertake the comprehensive policy study in three stages:

Stage I: Within Country Data Collection Studies

The plan is to form small within-country teams (2 members maximum) of specialists (policy analysis and AWM), across at most 11 countries. Stage I will include the following activities:

i) Regional workshop (one team member per country) for joint learning on the objectives and methodology of the study, to ensure that the whole exercise is standardized.
ii) In-country awareness raising of stakeholders on IMAWESA and the objectives of the policy studies to ensure adequate support and release of documents.
iii) Data collection, assessment and drafting of preliminary country report.

Stage II: Regional Write-shop to Produce Country and Preliminary Synthesis Report

One member of each country team will participate in a regional writing workshop that will include the project manager (PM) and regional facilitator (RF), to:

i) Finalize the country report in a standard format
ii) Contribute to the preparation of a regional level synthesis report;
iii) Prepare a presentation for the 2nd Regional Workshop on Agricultural Water Management.

Discussions at the 2nd Workshop will be used to prepare ToRs for follow-up studies to fill gaps at country level and production of a comprehensive regional synthesis. The follow-up will be implemented in at most five countries with the most promising preliminary case studies.

Stage III: Follow-up Gap Filling and Finalization of Regional Synthesis Report

i) Under the direction of the RF, the country (five countries) teams will fill agreed data gaps and produce revised Country Reports.
ii) Then the RF will produce a Regional Comprehensive Report to be subjected to a Regional Expert Consultation (at which policy makers, directors and other resource persons will participate).
iii) The IMAWESA PMU will design and produce briefs and other products to facilitate policy dialogue within IFAD, between IFAD and governments, and within governments.

2.2.3 For output 2 - Key issues to guide future interventions and investments

As mentioned in previous sections, the main need is for IMAWESA to invest more efforts to increase the understanding and adoption of the broader definition of AWM by stakeholders across the region. It is anticipated that the lessons and strategy described in section 2.2.2 will also apply for the planned studies on key issues to guide future interventions and investments.

2.2.4 For output 3 - Improved effectiveness in the management and implementation

The aim of output 3 of IMAWESA is to ***strengthen local capacity for programme management and implementation***. The plan is to respond to needs identified and requested by programme managers and implementers, IFAD CPMs, and UNOPS Portfolio Managers, through project-specific training, short-term technical support, and the development of communities of practices among programme staff. The main problem has been to obtain articulated demand from the different sources. The second problem is the fact mentioned earlier that managers are too busy with their programmes to find time to act as consultants providing support to other programmes through IMAWESA. One solution could be the identification of managers of programmes that are already closed, who have perhaps moved into less demanding assignments and recruit them to form the pool of consultants. To overcome the identified constraints, the plan under IMAWESA will include the following stages:

Stage I – Articulate Needs

Again we have to start with what works best – 'face2face' meetings. A comprehensive workshop will be organized to bring together managers of key programmes, UNOPS-Nairobi and IMAWESA PMU to undertake the following once and for all:

i) Finalize the joint learning and capacity building needs
ii) Agree on specific issues and problems on which programmes require consultancy inputs to assist in resolving or in developing new strategies for achieving programme objectives – followed by an agreement on the most appropriate nature of consultancy
iii) Make specific plans for the addition of specific expertise to the forthcoming supervision mission up to March 2007

iv) Plan technical support missions by the IMAWESA PM or RF especially to contribute to awareness raising on IMAWESA
v) Produce a preliminary directory of managers and other staff members of programmes (including closed ones) who can use their own experiences to provide consultancy support to other programmes.

To prepare for this meeting and using findings of Pre-IMAWESA and reports of supervision missions of UNOPS, the following will be undertaken:
i) Production of a preliminary but comprehensive list of demands for short-term technical support by different on-going projects and national institutions.
ii) Drawing up of ToRs (including contribution to knowledge exchange) for each demand, and identification of respective expertise required.
iii) Preliminary identification of existing expertise, starting with local and regional resource persons and programme staff.

Stage II - Implementation
By end of December 2006, at least five such activities in various forms to ***strengthen local capacity for programme management and implementation,*** should have been implemented to the benefit of different on-going projects and national institutions. However, the vision of IMAWESA is to act as a catalyst so that at the end we would see a department or programme in one country, using its own resources to fund a mission of experts from other countries in the region to provide advice on AWM.

2.2.5 For output 4 - Enhanced sharing of knowledge and best practices

Pre-IMAWESA made good progress on this aspect and certainly the main challenge is the limited nature to which the target stakeholders have adopted ICT in communication. Also, the limited extent to which process documentation is taking place within programmes will be a challenge to delivering this output by IMAWESA. The strategy will include:
i) The greater efforts already mentioned to popularise IMAWESA and create a positive perception that it does not mean extra work for programmes, but rather it provides opportunities and tools for enhancing effective implementation. This outreach should extend beyond IFAD-funded programmes so as to facilitate a broader clientele for sharing of knowledge, especially within countries where all programmes, despite the source of funding, fall under a single government department.
ii) Continued development of tools and capacity for Process Documentation and facilitation of its institutionalization as part of management reports, M&E and supervision.
iii) Validation of the IMAWESA plan for communication and knowledge sharing with stakeholders followed by support to target programmes and government departments to develop and implement their own plans.
iv) Sensitisation of key stakeholders in concepts of knowledge management through seminars and workshops. The main aim will be to promote commitment of stakeholders to knowledge management so as to see programmes and stakeholders actively investing in the acquisition, management and sharing of knowledge.

3 Extent of Delivery of the Project Outputs

3.1 Output 1 - Stakeholder Partnership Established

Although pre-IMAWESA was successful in building partnerships with individual stakeholders, there was limited success in institutionalized partnership with government departments and programmes. Consequently the stated indicator "***inclusion of IMAWESA activities in 2006 AWPB of participating programmes"*** was not achieved but a great deal was delivered as described in Annex I. The deliverables include: (i) development of a directory of key stakeholders of agricultural water management (AWM) in ESA; (ii) establishment of partnerships with programmes, (iii) preliminary development of M&E database; and (iii) activation of the IMAWESA Technical Advisory Panel (TAP).

3.1.1 Development of the database of key stakeholders

The stakeholders of IMAWESA have been defined as "*rural smallholders, policy makers, programme implementers, donor organizations and NARES*". Against this definition a directory that contains 236 entries has been developed. The entries cover 20 countries, but efforts are needed to reach more participating countries, particularly those in Southern Africa. A preliminary analysis (Table 1) revealed that the majority of stakeholders registered so far are policy makers, especially from government departments. Policy makers comprise 51% of the list, showing the strong role governments play in AWM across the region. The IMAWESA project works very closely with managers of IFAD-funded programmes and projects in the region and nearly all of them are included in the database. Therefore, the fact that programme and project managers comprise only 22% of the total number is of concern but may be because (i) managers of non-IFAD funded projects are still few in the list, and (ii) programme managers usually form a small proportion of staff in any country as compared to researchers, and policy makers and planners.

As already noted it is only through 'face2face' meetings that registrations have taken place, especially where managers and implementers are concerned. Therefore, the directory is dominated by those countries and programmes which were visited during the implementation of pre-IMAWESA. These are Ethiopia, Kenya, Lesotho, Tanzania and Uganda.

Table 1: Summary statistics of stakeholders included in the directory

Category of Stakeholders	Number	% of total
Policy makers	120	51
Programme/ Project Managers	53	22
Programme/ Project Implementers	14	6
Researchers, Trainers and Others	49	21
Total	**236**	100

3.1.2 Establishment of institutionalized partnerships with programmes

The following have been achieved:

i) A list of programmes, institutions and departments in the ESA that are proposed to become IMAWESA's collaborators, has been produced. It identifies 48 programmes and government departments in target countries.
ii) A compendium of partnerships created between IMAWESA and some ten programmes that have indicated more seriously their roles in the project by completing the institutional registration forms.
iii) First meeting of TAP was implemented in January 2006 and the minutes form part of Annex I. However, there was a one month's delay owing to logistical problems in availability of all the members.

3.2 Output 2 - Improved Understanding of Key Policy, Legal, and Institutional Issues

The indicator for delivery was "***Programmes have enhanced understanding of key issues affecting implementation***". The results are presented in Annex II, and they include i) a report of the preliminary study of policies, legal and institutional frameworks for agricultural water management in the ESA, and ii) assessment of tools for policy analysis as adapted from the ECAPAPA tool box. A draft of the policy study report was discussed during the joint learning workshop in November 2005. However, as expected it is difficult to ascertain if the programme managers have an enhanced understanding of key policy issues.

3.2.1 Policies and institutional arrangements

The report presents a review of policies and institutional arrangements associated with water for agriculture in 14 countries, namely Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Rwanda, Swaziland, Tanzania and Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe. Nearly all the countries in the ESA region have policies that touch on water resources management, supply and regulation, irrigation and drainage, soil and water conservation, and environmental conservation. In general policies that affect agricultural water management in the countries assessed were mentioned in a few lines within policy documents of several majors sectors, especially:

- Water and Sanitation
- Water Resources Management
- Agricultural and food security policies
- Rural Development policies
- Environmental policies
- Macro-economic policies.

In general, most of the policies address the water sector reforms more from a drinking water perspective and there is little mention of "agricultural water management" as a sub-sector in its own right. The closest link to AWM was obtained from policies on agriculture and Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSPs), and even these describe it in terms of irrigation, drainage, flood control, water harvesting, and soil and water conservation. Since most of the countries in the Eastern and Southern Africa (ESA) region are in the process of formulating and implementing various components of their PRSPs, contemporary policies

on AWM in most countries of ESA are in draft stages providing a good opportunity for IMAWESA to make a contribution. Analyses of both existing and proposed policies identified the following as the main elements that could have a bearing on agricultural water management:

i) Water is recognized as a public good in most of the policies
ii) Water regulation and allocation rights are vested with the relevant ministries, usually those of Water, Lands, Environment or Works
iii) Most policies propose decentralization, privatization, commercialization and stakeholder participation in water resources management and conservation
iv) The more tacit policies on AWM propose reviewing and implementing irrigation and drainage policies, promotion of water harvesting technologies and pollution control
v) Some policies address tackling disaster management (mostly flood control) to capture problems of preparedness, prevention, mitigation, reduction of impact, relief (emergency response) as well as rehabilitation
vi) Application of a sound water tariff for irrigation to render schemes economically viable and socially acceptable;
vii) Ensuring integrated water management for multiple purposes in agriculture and rural development.

The main finding was that there is no single policy on AWM but rather several policy statements scattered across several sectors giving rise to several overlaps and gaps. This has also led to a situation where there is a large number of those involved in making policy on AWM.

3.2.2 Key policy makers

As stated above there are several government departments in each country handling some aspects of AWM, but the most important are ministries responsible for water, lands, environment, agriculture and public works. There are also statutory organizations including National Water boards and River Basin and other authorities.

3.2.3 Policy making process

The preparation of policy documents is a lengthy process with well articulated stages and checks. Good policy papers are demand-driven and based on participation of all stakeholders. However, in reality, demand for policy reforms, such as the PRSPs has sometimes been donor-driven and the participation of stakeholders is very limited. In most cases, the process followed to develop a given policy has not been well documented. However, in general, policy making has eight major components:

i) Constituting a forum that enables all stakeholders to participate in a dialogue and analyze the proposed policy reforms
ii) A Steering Committee selected by the stakeholders and made responsible for steering the process and finalizing the policy draft
iii) A secretariat consisting of staff members of the relevant ministry who are responsible for the policy formulation
iv) Sector-based working groups constituted to investigate and collate stakeholder views
v) Reviews and exchange of information on alternative scenarios
vi) Discussion of drafts of the policy by the stakeholders
vii) Ratification by relevant authorities

viii) Publication, dissemination and adoption.

3.2.4 Policy analysis and formulation process - the ECAPAPA tools

IMAWESA will use the methodology and tools for policy advocacy that have been developed by ECAPAPA as a starting point, in implementing the policy dialogue component. ECAPAPA's toolbox[5] is a document that describes various communication strategies and policy influencing approaches. The entry point is the policy change cycle that involves five steps: (i) establishment of an agenda; (ii) data collection; (iii) analyses; (iii) dialogue; and (v) action.

3.3 Output 3 - Improved implementation of IFAD supported agricultural water management programmes

The indicator for this output, "*programme implementation improved on areas targeted by support activities*" was perhaps over-ambitious for the short duration of pre-IMAWESA. The achievements are presented in Annex III and consist of:

- An assessment of learning needs of programme managers and implementers
- A scoping study report;
- Reports of technical missions by the IMAWESA Regional Facilitator and expert consultation.

3.3.1 Assessment of learning needs

The assessment of learning needs was done through a questionnaire responded to by 136 stakeholders. Table 2 shows that 21% requested for technological combinations of various components of agricultural water management such as soil conservation, rainwater harvesting, small scale irrigation, environmental conservation, modelling and wetlands. There were those who specified irrigation (8%), watershed management (10%) and SWC/RWH (7%). Thus in total, 54% of the stakeholders requested learning needs in technological interventions. A good number (18%) of the stakeholders also requested learning needs in participatory approaches, while communication and information technologies were requested for by 18 % of the respondents.

Table 2: Learning needs of stakeholders – all categories

Learning Needs	Number	Percentage
Integrated management of agricultural water	29	21
Participatory approaches	25	18
Communication and information management	25	18
Watershed management including water for livestock	14	10
Irrigation technologies and management	11	8
Environmental conservation	9	7
Rainwater harvesting, and soil and water conservation	10	7
Research and development	9	7
Policy analysis and advocacy	4	3
Total number of respondents	136	100

[5] Start, D. and Hovland, I. 2004. Tools for Policy Impact: A Handbook for Researchers. Research and Policy Development programme, Overseas Development Institute, London

From the analysis, three priority areas of learning needs were identified:

i) Training of Trainers (ToT) on the concepts of knowledge management – to promote commitment of stakeholders to knowledge management and to enable them to incorporate it in programme plans. This will include:
   - Communication and information sharing tools
   - Process documentation and reporting for implementers and programme managers, M&E officers, and extension staff
   - Development of case studies so as to improve documentation of experiences by extension officers.

ii) Technical training on various aspects of AWM – to improve capacity of policy makers, planners, managers and project implementers.

iii) Management for impact – to improve management skills of programme managers for improved impact of AWM programmes.

3.3.2 Preliminary scoping of technical support needs

A two person mission was commissioned to undertake this scoping with the following ToRs:

- Assess level of knowledge of agricultural water management and knowledge management concepts amongst programme staff and departments.
- Assess existing capacities for knowledge management and communication, and knowledge sharing strategies of programmes that are in place.
- Concretise all technical areas of collaboration between IMAWESA and the programmes and departments, with an aim to getting signed agreements and commitment.
- Conduct initial scoping of the technical problems facing the programmes and define areas for immediate support.
- Conduct initial scoping of the technical needs of the assessed programmes and how they could be utilized to support other programmes.

The major findings were:

i) In all the five countries, there is a general weakness in documentation and communication of the experiences and lessons learned in agricultural water management. Therefore:
   - this sector should be given immediate attention to build capacity and interest, and
   - the IMAWESA Management Unit should deploy additional means for its promotion and presentation in the countries of ESA, and it should also enter into a formal agreement with each country government and target programmes in the form of a MOU.

ii) The process of decentralization of government functions and authority to local authorities will pose a major challenge to the efficient flow of experiences from the grassroots level to the Central Government ministries responsible for AWM aspects. This is true for Malawi, Tanzania, and Kenya. However, for Madagascar and Mauritius, which have not decentralised, this does not hold true.

iii) Documentation seems to have been downgraded to a low status because there are hardly any incentives for documentation, nor any punishment for the lack of it in most institutions – people have the tendency to keep documentation to the minimum

required, for example, annual reports. The main emphasis seems to be on productivity, and the connection between KM&S and productivity is clearly not being recognized as a priority.

iv) **On acceptance of IMAWESA**: It was generally noticed that the **IMAWESA programme was not well understood by various programme staff** who interacted with the mission team. This is probably due to the intangible nature of its outputs. Knowledge management projects seem to be new to many people, who are used to development projects with tangible results and outputs.

v) Mixed reactions were expressed with respect to cost sharing while participating in IMAWESA-related activities. It was generally indicated that participation could be considered if prior notification of activities is issued to enable their inclusion in the project budgets. It was pointed out that budgets allocated to programmes for training and capacity building of knowledge management are limited and heavily compressed.

vi) Generally there is good ICT at district levels, and fora for knowledge sharing exist. But this is mostly provided and orchestrated by projects. The downward flow of information is easily facilitated by projects; however the reverse flow of information is not so easily achieved unless special efforts are made.

vii) Information and data seem to be available, but it is scattered in different offices and there are no initiatives for consolidation and synthesis.

viii) Although some structures and forums exist at provincial and district levels for information sharing, much of it deals with resource tracking and progress monitoring, and not with the sharing of experiences and lessons.

ix) In all countries visited, government ministries (in particular those responsible for irrigation) expressed keen interest to be the main institution for collaboration with IMAWESA.

x) Almost all the projects visited have well-established M&E systems, with clear reporting systems. However, none of them have clearly stated communication plans.

xi) There is a general acceptance of the IMAWESA plan for communication, knowledge sharing and learning. The stakeholders met to confirm what is already in the plan.

3.3.3 Technical support missions by the Regional Facilitator

Two missions were implemented during the reporting period to Lesotho (SANReMP and SADPMA) and to Ethiopia (SCP-II). The following conclusions and recommendations for IMAWESA were made from the mission to Lesotho:

- The rainfall season usually starts late in December, instead of early August. This means that the maize crop will often be in the fields by the time the winter frosts start in March-April. Farmers therefore require alternative coping mechanisms (change crops? crop varieties? water management techniques?). IMAWESA's exchange visits could be used to search for answers.
- The issue of brain drain was raised by nearly all the stakeholder groups met, including farmers.
- The fact that in the SADC region, knowledge sharing and active interaction seems limited to basin scales, and small countries are hence disadvantaged. IMAWESA therefore offers a window of opportunity for stakeholders to interact across basins. The focus of basins may have its advantages, but polices are made along administrative unit boundaries and these kinds of concerns need to be addressed.

- Learning needs as identified by most of the stakeholders are generally on technologies (irrigation and water harvesting).
- In general, internet-based instruments for communication and knowledge sharing are available in the institutions visited in Lesotho. However, there are weak linkages across ministries and very few linkages outside the country.

From the mission to Ethiopia, the following issues were articulated:

- Potential institutions for collaboration with IMAWESA were identified as:
  - IFAD supported programmes and projects
  - Ministry of Water Resources Development
  - Ministry of Water and Rural Development (Research and Extension Department)
  - Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research (EIAR) – HQ, Melkasa and Holeta Research Centres
  - Arbamench University (Water Technology Institute)
  - IWMI sub-regional office for eastern Africa and the Nile Basin.
- The initial list of needs for technical support by programmes was identified as:
  - Knowledge on technology scale-out and mobilizing on SSI (small scale irrigation) farmers
  - At least one cross-site visit to a successful project on SSI and water management
  - Lessons on Water Users Associations, especially those with a strong link with marketing components
  - Sharing of knowledge on M & E, in particular with the PIDP project of Tanzania.
- The need for collaboration with experts, managers of present and past programmes and projects on AWM was discussed and it was agreed to write to the Director of EIAR, with a formal request for such collaboration. This will require a team putting together ministries of Water, Agriculture, EIAR and other relevant persons.

3.4 Output 4 - Improved capacity of managers and staff implementing agricultural water management programmes to communicate experiences and lessons

The indicator of delivery of this output wanted to see that "*reports submitted by target programmes and projects are well structured, well written, and covering key issues satisfactorily*". Although it is difficult to show that this was achieved, pre-IMAWESA delivered some improvement of capacity as elaborated below.

3.4.1 Promoting process documentation

A Learning workshop was organized in Nairobi, Kenya, on 8th - 11th November 2005. The outcomes of this workshop are presented as SWMnet Working Paper 4 (Annex IV-A). The participants learned by doing and participated in the production of the IMAWESA Plan for Communication, Knowledge Sharing and Learning which is being published as SWMnet Working Paper 9 (see Annex IV-B). The participants identified and recommended the following:

i) Many of the aspects of the process documentation are already taking place in the programmes but there is little analysis of insights and lessons, especially with regard to failures. Therefore, IMAWESA should:
   - support and build on whatever reporting is already going on to avoid appearing to increase the paper work demanded from the programmes,

- facilitate a strategy to encourage programme managers to share information
- facilitate the improvement of process documentation and the M&E reporting systems of programmes such that without increasing the paper work, programmes can report on experiences, lessons, failures, success and impacts of different tasks

ii) Programmes should be encouraged to put in place a recognition and rewarding system for outstanding contributors' communication products of the programme such as regional bulletins, best practices, and practical guidelines. This should include:
- support to participation in presentation of papers on experiences at national and regional conferences,
- implementation of a direct reward system for effective contributions to knowledge sharing.

3.4.2 The IMAWESA plan for communication, knowledge sharing and learning

The **aim** is to raise awareness of the stakeholders on key issues and practices affecting agricultural water management, and to convince stakeholders to change their attitudes, practices and policies. The task of implementing the plan will be based on three levels: international and regional organizations; national institutions; and programme and project level.

Eight broad categories of stakeholders will be targeted for communication, knowledge sharing and learning. These are as follows:

i) **International Institutions –** including ultimate users of knowledge, namely the donors and multilateral organizations (IFAD and others) as well as the knowledge organizations to ensure that the experiences of the poor themselves, their support agents and AWM programme managers are increasingly available in the global literature and knowledge bases, and are put to effective use during consultations.

ii) **Regional Institutions –** including political and economic organizations advancing agricultural development, such as NEPAD, COMESA, SADC, EAC, AATF and agricultural research networks such as ASARECA and FARA.

iii) **National Policy Institutions –** including the political systems such as political parties, ministries and parliament. They also include government ministers, officials (such as permanent secretaries and directors) and subject matter departments, authorities and NGOs.

iv) **National Knowledge Institutions –** such as universities, colleges and other research, training and extension organizations, which exert substantial influence on knowledge, attitudes and practices in AWM?

v) **Principal Actors at National and Local Level –** involving a deliberate targeting of those with direct responsibility for AWM within the national institutions as well as local ones. These will include heads of government (national and local) departments responsible for irrigation, rural water systems, rangeland, and agricultural extension. This will extend to equivalent officials in other public and private organizations, and NGOs.

vi) **AWM Programmes supported by IFAD, other Donors and Governments –** These constitute the main target of IMAWESA. They will provide most of the knowledge to be shared and are also targeted to put into use most of it. This target group will consist of steering committees (if in place), managers, staff, implementers, and agricultural

extension officers working with the target beneficiaries of the relevant programmes and projects.

vii) **Smallholders and their organizations** – to include smallholder farmers and agro-entrepreneurs and local communities in programme areas as well as farmer organizations (for example, water users associations, self-help groups and CBOs) and local authorities (such as village administration).

viii) **The media organizations** – especially towards changing the people's mindset and attitudes from just irrigation to holistic management of agricultural water.

Implementation of the plan will include the following **major activities**:

i) Exchange visits and technical exchange missions for direct sharing of information and experiences.
ii) Awareness raising meetings and workshops at national and programme levels within countries.
iii) Policy round-table meetings which will be designed to discuss available policy options in AWM, best practices in policy dialogue, and exchange of experiences between countries on various AWM policy and institutional frameworks.
iv) Regional workshops on agricultural water management.
v) Presentations to target stakeholders at meetings, seminars and workshops at international, regional and national levels.
vi) Joint learning workshops and expert consultations.

Three **major types of media** will be used as follows:

i) **Short, printed knowledge-sharing products** that are easy to read and thus capture the attention of target stakeholders. They will be designed with special attention to the specific needs of each particular category of stakeholders.
ii) **Technical publications,** including synthesis reports and other technical publications such as journal and conference papers, working papers, discussion papers, proceedings and manuals
iii) **Electronic media products** such as a knowledge base, power point slide presentations, a CD compilation of reference materials, awareness raising bulletins for TV and radio, and a webpage and email discussion forum.

3.4.3 Communication products produced for stakeholders

Two types of paper products have been produced to promote IMAWESA to the target stakeholders (See Annex IV-C). These are:

i) A four page leaflet to describe IMAWESA – used as a left behind after face2face meetings with stakeholders
ii) A poster presenting the challenges and aims of IMAWESA
iii) A four-page leaflet describing the planned 2nd regional workshop on AWM
iv) A poster on the planned 2nd regional workshop on AWM. The poster has been produced in English, French and Portuguese.

A Power Point slides presentation has also been produced for the 'face2face' meetings, seminars and workshops.

4 Activities Carried Out to Produce the Outputs

4.1 For Output 1 – Stakeholder Partnership Established

The log-frame specified four activities for output 1:

- *Set up IMAWESA PMU and identify and employ Regional Facilitator*
- *Establish partnership and secure stakeholder ownership*
- *Establish baseline for supporting the M&E of IMAWESA*
- *Strengthen ASARECA's capacity to engage in policy dialogue and convene policy makers and senior government officials, and to undertake M&E of its networks and projects, including IMAWESA and SWMnet.*

4.1.1 Set up IMAWESA PMU and identify and employ Regional Facilitator

Recruitment of the Regional facilitator was implemented under the ICRISAT procurement requirements for regionally recruited staff (RRS) which requires advertisement at regional level (done by 15th June 2005), followed by short listing of candidates by a panel using standardized scoring sheet (done by 30th July 2005), which was followed by interviews (conducted early in October 2005). On the recommendations of the interviewing panel, ICRISAT recruited the proposed candidate who reported on 1st November 2005. The establishment of IMAWESA project management unit (PMU) included acquiring of office space under the auspices of ICRISAT, based at ICRAF Complex in Nairobi, Kenya, as an administrative process.

4.1.2 Establish partnership and secure stakeholder ownership

This activity had three sub-activities:

- *Development of a database of key policy makers, managers and implementers of programmes with respect to smallholder management of agricultural water, in the target countries*
- *Developing partnerships with programmes, projects and departments*
- *Establishment of IMAWESA Technical Advisory Panel (TAP)*

With respect to the development of a database of the key agricultural water management (AWM) stakeholders, the first data set was compiled from reports held by the partners of IMAWESA, namely IFAD, UNOPS and SWMnet. The second set was obtained from databases maintained by international development organizations such as FAO, World Bank, and from the internet. This sub-activity yielded mostly data on institutions involved in AWM in the region, and thus does not contain details of individual contacts in the institution.

The third and largest proportion of data was obtained directly from the stakeholders themselves, who were requested to complete a registration form at various workshops and meetings as well as via e-mail. This component brought on board stakeholders from 19 countries in the region (exceptions were Angola, Comoros, Eritrea and Seychelles).

The collected data were aggregated into a simple directory and re-classified to depict the typology of stakeholders in the knowledge base. The classification into groups was identified using the following criteria:

i) Policy makers, planners and senior extension agents were defined to include all government ministries, government departments, senior government officials, planners, directors of departments, departmental heads, and chief executives of boards, and authorities (for example, Irrigation Authority, Environmental Protection Authority), heads of national associations, senior staff members of non governmental organizations (NGOs) and international organizations.

ii) Programme or project managers included managers and coordinators of IFAD-funded and other programmes and projects. It was assumed that a given programme or project can have only one manager, so all other staff were taken to be implementers.

iii) Researchers, trainers and others included researchers from national research organizations, universities and other tertiary institutions. It also includes other professionals such as suppliers of inputs and irrigation equipment, and subject matter specialists who do not fit within the description of the first three categories.

The selection of government departments, NGOs and programmes for proposed collaboration with IMAWESA was made from the database of stakeholders described above. The selection criteria included IFAD-funded projects having agricultural water management components and other programmes or projects and institutions having good potential to participate in IMAWESA activities. Some were identified at stakeholder workshops (for example, 1st Joint Learning Workshop of IMAWESA, the IFAD/UNOPS annual workshop in Kigali). This puts together institutions involved in various aspects of AWM such as policy, extension, research, project implementation and information sharing. The institutions are government departments, IFAD-funded programmes and projects, programmes and projects funded by other donors, research and training institutions, and NGOs. Whenever possible, the name and contact address of the contact person have been provided. In addition, closed projects, for which current contact addresses could not be immediately determined have been included in the list because IMAWESA intends to share knowledge even from closed projects. A total of 48 programmes , institutions and departments were identified.

In the subsequent expert consultation meeting held in Embu, Kenya in January 2006, the issue of how to ratify these partnerships was discussed and it was noted that programme managers would not be in a position to sign agreements with IMAWESA to concretize commitment because most programmes are hosted by government departments. Thus an easier way to get commitment of programmes was devised in which a simple form was sent to the programme managers, for them to complete by ticking relevant activities. The response has been slow, but about 10 programmes have indicated interest to participate.

4.1.3 Establish baseline for supporting the M&E of IMAWESA

The Pre-IMAWESA phase was charged with the responsibility to establish baseline indicators for supporting the monitoring and evaluation (M & E) of attainment of the expected outcome. A desk study was used to review reports and other relevant documents

from some 15 countries in the Eastern and Southern Africa (ESA) region. Verification of the baseline was also initiated during the Joint Learning Workshop in November 2005 in Nairobi and at the UNOPS/IFAD regional implementation workshop in Rwanda.

4.1.4 Strengthen ASARECA's capacity to engage in policy dialogue

ASARECA has been instrumental in promoting management of agricultural water issues as part of the CAADP's programme of early actions in partnership with COMESA. As a result, management of agricultural water issues was presented and endorsed as part of the CAADP of NEPAD programme of early actions in 2005.

4.2 For Output 2 – Improved Understanding of Key Policy, Legal, and Institutional Issues

The main activity planned for this output was: "*initial evaluation of effect of regional and national policies, institutions and legal framework on the access of poor rural people to improved water management, and on performance and impact of water management programme components based on the experience from IFAD financed programmes*". This was achieved through three sub-activities:

- A survey of policies in the target countries with bearing on smallholders' management of agricultural water undertaken and a matrix comparing major aspects
- Policy analysis and formulation process with bearing on smallholders' management of agricultural water undertaken in at least three target countries;
- Assessment how ECAPAPA's tools can be used to support such process, initiated. This activity was done by the PMU and involved assessment of policies and adoption of the ECAPAPA tools for policy dialogue.

4.2.1 Survey of policies in the target countries

This activity was undertaken as a short study commissioned to consultants. It formed part of a broader mandate to the consultants with the broad aim of establishing a database of key policies, policy makers and policy making process, with respect to smallholder management of agricultural water across countries in ESA, including Burundi, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Rwanda, Sudan, Swaziland, Tanzania and Uganda. The study was carried out mainly through a desk review of policy documents and programme reports, documented information gathered from the internet, published and unpublished material from reports and files obtained from libraries and offices of the World Bank, IFAD, FAO – Aquastat and other sources. The material sought included country policy papers such as PRSP and policies on agriculture, livestock, water, environment, mining and all sectors associated with water. Others included government reports as well as policy papers from IFAD, FAO and World Bank. In addition, information was gathered during stakeholder meetings.

The main constraints faced in gathering and analyzing these data included the fact that the desk study depended heavily on electronic mail while interaction with programme managers in the region was poor. This was because most of the managers in ESA were not easy to reach via email. Responses to questionnaires sent by email were erratic. In some cases, the policy documents available on the internet were out of date. Language was a

barrier particularly for Francophone countries where documents were written in French for most of the information. It was difficult to get uniform criteria for judging project success or failures.

To evaluate policy and institutional frameworks that support agricultural water management, the study evaluated two sets of documents. The first set included documents describing the prevailing policies and institutional arrangements for agricultural water in Eastern and Southern Africa. Reviewed documents fall under the category of global, regional, national (country) and sectoral policies. The dataset included:

- *Global Policies* – IFAD, WB, AfDB, FAO, IMF (7 documents reviewed)
- *Regional Policies* – AfDB, ECA, COMESA, IGAD, SADC (5 documents reviewed)
- *National (Country) Policies* – 15 documents reviewed including PRSP documents
- *Sectoral Policies* – Water, Irrigation, Agriculture, Natural Resource and Environment sectoral policies (19 documents reviewed).

Success or failure of projects was evaluated using terminal evaluation reports. Each project report was analyzed to give information based on reviewer's: (i) conclusion on the performance; (ii) observations on the policy; (iii) conclusion on institutional arrangement; (iv) observations of technical issues; (v) observation on human technical capacity and their learning needs; and (vi) comments on lessons learnt.

4.2.2 Policy analysis and formulation process

The Regional Facilitator held consultations with the ECAPAPA coordinating unit in Entebbe, to assess the ECAPAPA Toolbox for the needs of IMAWESA.

4.3 For Output 3 - Improved implementation of IFAD-supported Agricultural Water Management Programmes

This output had two activities:

- *Assessment of the training needs of programme staff and implementers and design and implement short-term courses.* This was done in three ways: (a) through a commissioned desk study; (b) from stakeholder workshops;, and (c) by the PMU alongside the registration of IMAWESA members.
- *Short-term technical support to programmes: consultancy inputs, strengthening supervision teams, visits of Regional Facilitator, staff from other programmes as consultants.* Two sub-activities were implemented:
  - A short-term technical support mission was commissioned, and undertaken by two programme managers in five countries, these being Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius and Tanzania.
  - Technical missions by the IMAWESA Regional Facilitator to Programmes in Lesotho (SADPMA and SANReMP) and Ethiopia (SCP-II).

4.3.1 Assessment of learning needs

A questionnaire survey was carried out, of people engaged in agricultural water management at middle to senior levels, including managers of IFAD-funded and other programmes and projects, government officials, university lecturers, researchers, staff from NGOs and those working in regional and international organizations. The exercise

captured respondents across 21 countries in the ESA region, which included Angola, Botswana, Burundi, D.R. Congo, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Rwanda, South Africa, the Sudan, Swaziland, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe (missing Comoros and Seychelles). Four categories have helped to identify the training needs for each group (Table 3).

Table 3: Categories of Stakeholders Assessed for Learning Needs

Category of Stakeholders	Number	Percentage
Policy makers, Planners, Heads of Departments, international organizations	44	32
Programme/Project Managers	22	16
Programme/ Project Implementers	17	13
Researchers, trainers and others	53	39
Total number requesting training	136	100
Total number of respondents surveyed	*212*	
Respondents not requesting learning	*76*	*36*

4.3.2 Short-term technical support to programmes

This was fulfilled by commissioning a technical mission undertaken by two programme managers, Mr Joseph Chisenga, who is the Programme Coordinator from Malawi and Mr Jay P Teeluck, Programme Coordinator from Mauritius. The mission visited IFAD-funded programmes and interacted with programme staff and beneficiaries in Kenya, Malawi, Tanzania, Madagascar and Mauritius. The activity was undertaken as a scoping study of preliminary assessment of experiences, weaknesses, potential and opportunities in the field of AWM with particular emphasis on knowledge management, knowledge sharing, communication plan, and strategies and tools utilized for communication.

In implementing the technical mission, the consultants participated in the Expert Consultative Meeting of IMAWESA held at Izaak Walton Inn, Embu, Kenya on 16 and 17 January 2006 that included a field trip on 16 January to the project sites of two IFAD-funded projects namely Mount Kenya East Pilot Project for Natural Resources Management (MKEPP-NRM) and Eastern Province Horticulture and Traditional Food Crops Project (EPHTFCP) at Nkubu and Meru.

The methodology and approach used was essentially a SWOT analysis conducted through brainstorming discussions focusing on level of understanding of AWM and existing capacities for knowledge management and sharing of experiences acquired from implementation of AWM programmes. In addition, the mission had extensive review meetings, and in-depth discussions with IFAD-funded programme staff, and government, parastatals and private institutions directly or indirectly involved with AWM, and conducted field visits to project sites to interact and capture beneficiaries' appreciations and observations. During the discussions, emphasis was laid on the following topics:

- Knowledge of Agricultural Water Management (AWM)
- Knowledge Management (KM), and Communication and Knowledge Sharing (KS) strategies
- Technical strengths and weaknesses of the programmes in relation to AWM and identification of areas for support as well as potential for supporting other programmes
- Presentation of the objectives of IMAWESA and identification of fields for collaboration.

Field visits to the project sites and on-spot meetings with community groups involved in AWM activities of the programmes were also implemented to capture beneficiaries' appreciations and observations with regard to water management.

4.3.3 Technical support to programmes by the IMAWESA Regional Facilitator

The IMAWESA Regional Facilitator undertook two missions to Lesotho (SANReMP and SADPMA) and to Ethiopia (SCP-II). The mission to Lesotho was combined with attending the Southern African Regional Irrigation Association (SARIA) Conference and Executive Committee meeting in Pretoria, South Africa (30th Jan-1st Feb 2006). The mission was hosted by SANReMP, who also organized the meetings with the other departments. The main objectives of the Mission were to: (i) meet with major stakeholders in AWM in Lesotho such as managers and implementers of IFAD-funded programmes, heads of key AWM departments, extension and research workers; (ii) introduce and popularize IMAWESA; and (iii) identify major requirements for general technical support by programmes, especially with regard to Learning Needs, Process Documentation, Communication, Knowledge Sharing and Management. Several organizations were visited and senior staff met at their offices in Maseru during the mission. They included the Sustainable Agriculture and Natural Resources Programme (SANReMP), Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MAFS), Department of Water Affairs (DWA) and a field visit to activities of the Sustainable Agricultural Development Programme for Mountain Areas (SADMPA) at Thaba Tseka.

The mission to Ethiopia was combined with attending the Stakeholders' Symposium and Exhibition on "Best Practices and Technologies for Small Scale Agricultural Water Management in Ethiopia", Addis Ababa, Ethiopia (7th-9th March, 2006). The main objectives of the technical mission were to:

- Attend the symposium on "Best Practices and Technologies for Small Scale Agricultural Water Management in Ethiopia",
- Meet with major stakeholders in Agricultural Water Management (AWM) in Ethiopia
- Introduce and popularize IMAWESA,
- Identify major issues for general technical support by programmes, especially with regard to the IFAD-funded Special Country Programme II.

The first three days were taken up in attending the symposium and meeting experts in AWM in Ethiopia. During the symposium, the RF presented a paper entitled "Green Water Re-capitalization: Optimizing Agricultural Productivity in Eastern and Southern Africa". In addition, the IMAWESA poster was exhibited. It was viewed by the Ethiopian State Minister for Water Resources Development, Ato Adugna Jebessa who accepted a verbal invitation to the 2nd Regional Workshop in Maputo in September, 2006. However, this will have to be followed up with a formal invitation. In general, many participants were interested in taking part in IMAWESA and 40 of them joined IMAWESA by completing the registration proforma. After the workshop, the RF held meetings with IMAWESA stakeholders in Ethiopia, and also visited the offices of the IFAD-funded Special Country Programme-II in Addis Ababa.
The meeting at the IFAD-supported Special Country Programme II was attended by the IFAD-Ethiopia Field Support Manager, Abebe Zerinem, the IFAD-SCPII Coordinator,

Ayalew Abate, the Project Sociologist, Tesfaye Fichala and the Project Agronomist, Aweke Nigafu. This meeting clarified the roles of IMAWESA and IFAD-SCPII collaboration. It was agreed that the Special Country Programme-II would work closely with IMAWESA, noting that most of the project (Special Country programme II) activities were running well. Areas needing capacity strengthening were identified as sharing of knowledge on M & E, in particular with the PIDP project of Tanzania.

Field visit to MKEPP and EPH&TFCP project activities in Eastern Kenya – in January 2006, IMAWESA held its first Expert Consultation meeting attended by participants from five countries, including officials from Kenya's Ministry of Agriculture and programme managers of IFAD-funded projects. The participants visited field activities by the Mount Kenya East Pilot Project for Natural Resources Management (MKEPP) and also by the Eastern Province Horticulture and Traditional Food Crops Project (EPH&TFCP), the Mitunguu Irrigation Scheme, and farmer field schools in the area. Since the main focus was process documentation and knowledge sharing, the field exposure visit confirmed that indeed there were experiences at project implementation level that do not filter into official documentation, hence the need for capturing these experiences at that level.

4.4 For Output 4 - Improved Capacity to Communicate Experiences and Lessons

Two sub-activities were implemented:

- Promoting process documentation by projects as a means of ensuring contribution to the knowledge base – this component involved capacity building on process documentation through the First Joint Learning Workshop (Annex IV-A)
- Develop a communication, knowledge sharing and learning plan (Annex IV-B).

4.4.1 Promoting process documentation by projects

The IMAWESA project document promises to "*promote the practice of process documentation by all programmes as a means of ensuring adequate contribution to the knowledge base*". In response to this, joint learning is expected to be the main avenue through which most of the outputs of IMAWESA will be shared. Therefore, a Learning Workshop was implemented in Nairobi, Kenya, on 8th - 11th November 2005. The workshop brought together nineteen participants from eight countries as well as UNOPS and the regional managers of IMAWESA. The specific objectives of the workshop were to:

- Provide an increased understanding of IMAWESA by its stakeholders
- Obtain stakeholders' feedback on preliminary findings of a short study on policy framework
- Obtain stakeholders' feedback on IMAWESA's plan of work for 2006
- Build capacity for preparing communication, knowledge sharing and learning plans, while preparing one for IMAWESA;
- Build capacity for process documentation.

4.4.2 Development of a learning and communication strategy

It is clear that communication and knowledge sharing is a critically central component of the IMAWESA project. Apart from this fact, it is now widely acknowledged that its only through robust communication and knowledge sharing that a knowledge project can

expect to facilitate innovations in aspects such as policies, institutions, technologies and practices. For this reason any such project, and specifically IMAWESA, requires a robust strategy for communicating and sharing information and knowledge to facilitate achievement of the purpose level objectively verifiable indicators (OVIs). Several actions are already identified in the project log-frame with respect to knowledge management and sharing.

The first opportunity was accorded by the SWMnet Professional Development Course and Training of Trainers (PDC/ToT) designed to develop and institutionalize a culture of promoting uptake, scaling-up and effective use of results from soil and water management research in East and Central Africa. The specific aim of the PDC and the ToT was to build capacity for providing training and skills development in communication planning and up-take promotion among the SWMnet stakeholders in ECA and ESA. Although designed for researchers, SWMnet Coordinating Unit invited four managers of IFAD- funded projects to attend so as to start raising capacity among the project leaders. The PDC/ToT was implemented in early July 2005 and was attended by programme managers from Burundi, Lesotho, Malawi and Mozambique among 40 participants. Other countries which sent participants were DR Congo, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Sudan, Tanzania and Uganda. This provided a very good opportunity for regional-wide cross learning. As part of the learning process, a group was formed around the four participating managers with leading researchers in AWM, to start working on the IMAWESA Communication, Knowledge Sharing and Learning (CKSL) plan.

The draft of the IMAWESA "Plan for Communication, Knowledge Sharing and Learning" (see Annex IV-B) was developed further through an extensive consultation process organized as part of: (i) the IMAWESA regional planning and learning workshop held in November 2005; (ii) IFAD workshops; and (iii) support missions. These consultations revealed that there are several weaknesses within AWM programmes in terms of institutional sharing of knowledge within and across the ESA region. Therefore, the plan was designed and will be implemented with the aim of raising awareness of the stakeholders on key issues and practices affecting AWM, and to convince stakeholders to change their attitudes, practices and policies on AWM.

4.5 General Activities

There were many other activities in which Pre-IMAWESA was involved, and meetings attended whose results fed into the project purpose and are not mentioned above. They include:

- Development of promotional materials (poster and flier produced)
- Presentation of posters and papers on IMAWESA at regional conferences,
- Securing collaboration with other networks, institutions and departments.

a. UNOPS/IFAD Regional Implementation Workshop

IMAWESA participated at the workshop in Kigali, Rwanda from 21st to 25th November 2005, at which the first promotion materials were displayed. IMAWESA hosted the parallel session on agricultural water management, at which several presentations were made. IMAWESA will commission "an IMAWESA entry organization" which would be

responsible for the in-country communication and knowledge sharing plan. The entry organization will implement some components of the plan but will also link IMAWESA to appropriate mechanisms and institutions in the country to ensure widest reach possible. This will also facilitate the institutionalization of the practice and system within national agencies (relevant government ministries, research institutions, NGOs and private organization) to use locally generated information and lessons to provide up-to-date analysis, options and knowledge to African policymakers, planners, managers and entrepreneurs so as to assist them in planning and evaluating policy and long-term development strategies. This will also enhance contribution to an international knowledge base that influences global policies and priorities. In addition, IMAWESA will source knowledge from and share with local level of programmes, as well as community organizations working with AWM programmes as main targets.

b. Joint Learning Platform and Profession Development Workshop on Integrated Management of Water Resources: the Green Water Paradigm

IMAWESA was presented to this workshop held in Kampala, Uganda in December 2005, at which IMAWESA also engaged participants in knowledge sharing and learning, as well as popularising the project and registration of stakeholders in AWM. The purpose of the workshop was to present a new framework for integrated management of land and water resources to leverage more benefits from existing water resources. The specific aim of the workshop was to enable participants to learn about the potential of green water flows and discuss the policy, institutional and technical interventions necessary to manage this resource better and thus reduce the perceived scarcity of fresh water, especially for the reduction of poverty and hunger. The joint learning programme is designed to raise awareness and create a community of practice and champions for increased investments towards the management of green water resources.

The workshop targeted scientists, resource planners and managers at director or assistant director levels, researchers and trainers (from NARS and international institutes) and NGOs and other programme managers form national, regional and international organizations working in the ten countries that are members of ASARECA. It brought together 37 participants and resources persons form 10 countries in Eastern, Central and Southern Africa as well as from the Netherlands. The African countries represented were: Burundi, DR Congo, Ethiopia, Kenya, Madagascar, Rwanda, Sudan, Tanzania and Uganda.. The organizations represented included government institutions, national research institutions, universities, and NGOs.

c. Southern Africa Regional Irrigation Association (SARIA) Workshop and Executive Committee Meeting

In January 2006, the Regional Facilitator attended the workshop and Executive Committee meeting of the Southern Africa Regional Irrigation Association (SARIA) in Pretoria, South Africa. The outcomes of this meeting included:

- Introducing IMAWESA to the Southern Africa sub-region, especially the members of the SARIA, who are mostly programme managers and researchers form all the SADC countries.

- Identification of areas for mutual cooperation between IMAWESA and the Water Research Commission (WRC) of South Africa. It was agreed that the WRC together with the Department of Water Affairs of the Ministry of Agriculture, South Africa, would make a Learning Tour of Kenya and Tanzania, to visit rainwater harvesting projects, and link up with East African researchers. This is the first of IMAWESA-WRC collaborative activities, after which further collaboration will be discussed.
- SARIA indicated tentatively that they could support IMAWESA in the forthcoming 2nd Regional Workshop in Maputo, Mozambique, once invited, and with the likelihood for SARIA to hold its own meeting at the venue alongside IMAWESA, and thus share synergies.
- Securing stakeholder participation and ownership in IMAWESA through the registration of network members from the SADC. About 20 stakeholders joined the IMAWESA "Community of Practice" at the SARIA Workshop.

d. Stakeholders' Symposium and Exhibition in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

IMAWESA was represented by the RF at the Stakeholders' Symposium and Exhibition on "Best Practices and Technologies for Small Scale Agricultural Water Management in Ethiopia", Addis Ababa, Ethiopia (7th-9th March, 2006), where she met several experts and stakeholders in AWM in Ethiopia. The IMAWESA poster was displayed and viewed by among others, the Ethiopian State Minister for Water Resources Development, Ato Adugna Jebessa. The RF presented a paper entitled "Green Water Re-capitalization for Optimizing Agricultural Productivity in Eastern and Southern Africa". The RF was also able to meet with the State Minister for Water and she verbally invited him to the 2nd Regional workshop on AWM in Maputo in September 2006. However, this will have to be followed up with a formal invitation. In general, many participants were interested in taking part in IMAWESA and 40 of them joined IMAWESA by completing the registration proforma.

***e*. Securing Collaboration with other Networks, Institutions and Departments**

The PMU has continued to seek collaboration with other networks, institutions and programmes (non-IFAD funded) in AWM in the region through visits, meetings and correspondence. In the period up to March 2006, the following institutions and programmes had indicated interest to collaborate with IMAWESA:

- Southern Africa Regional Irrigation Association (SARIA)
- National Agricultural and Livestock Extension Programme (NALEP) of the Ministry of Agriculture in Kenya
- Irrigation and Drainage Department of the Ministry of Water and Irrigation in Kenya
- Department of Crops Services, Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security, Lesotho
- Department of Water Affairs (DWA), Ministry of Natural Resources, Lesotho
- Water Research Commission of South Africa
- Waternet

Bibliography

AQUASTAT-FAO, 2003. Global Information system of water and agriculture . Land & water Dev Division of FAO. Rome.

FAO, 1995. Water Report 7. Irrigation in Africa in figures. FAO Rome.

FAO, 2000. Agriculture: Towards 2015/30. Technical Interim Report. Rome.

FDRE (Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia) 2002. Ethiopia: Sustainable Development and Poverty Reduction Program. Ministry of Finance and Economic Development. Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia. Addis Ababa.

FDRE (Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia), 2002. Ethiopia: Sustainable Development and Poverty Reduction Program. Ministry of Finance and Economic Development. Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia. Addis Ababa.

Government of Malawi, 2002. Malawi Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper. Final Draft. Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning. Lilongwe.

Hatibu, N. and Mahoo, H. F, 2000. Rainwater Harvesting for Natural Resources Management. A planning guide for Tanzania. Technical Handbook No. 26. RELMA, Nairobi.

Hunter, J.P., 1992. Promoting sustainable land management: Problems and Experiences in the SADC Region. Splash Vol..8 No.1. Maseru, Lesotho.

IFAD, 2000. Knowledge Management . A thematic Review. IFAD support for water management and irrigation in east and Southern Africa. IFAD, Rome.

IFAD, 2000. Knowledge Management. A thematic review. IFAD support for water management and irrigation in East and Southern Africa. IFAD, Rome.

IFAD, 2002. Assessment of Rural Poverty in Eastern and Southern Africa. International Fund for Agricultural Development. Rome.

IFAD, 2002. Regional Strategy Paper, Eastern and Southern Africa. International Fund for Agricultural Development. Rome.

IMAWESA, 2006. Agricultural Water Management in Eastern and Southern Africa project. Study Report.

James, 2000. Think Tanks. Towards a User Guide for Governments. Paper for the Political studies Association-UK. 50th Annual Conference 10-13 April 2000, London (from SIGMA Programme, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development).

Jayne, T. S. Mather, D. and Mghenyi, E., 2005. Smallholder farming in difficult circumstances. Policy issues for Africa. www.wye_future of small farms.com

Lundgren, L. and Taylor, G., 1993. From Soil Conservation to Land Husbandry. Guidelines Based on SIDA's Experiences. Natural Resources Management Division, SIDA. Stockholm.

Mati, B. M., 2005. Overview of water and soil nutrient management under smallholder rain-fed agriculture in East Africa. Working Paper 105. Colombo, Sri Lanka: International Water Management Institute (IWMI).

Mati, B. M. and Penning de Vries, F.W.T., 2005. Bright Spots on Technology-Driven Change in Smallholder Irrigation: Case Studies from Kenya. In: Bright Spots Demonstrate Community Successes in African Agriculture (F.W.T. Penning de Vries-editor). Working Paper 102. Colombo, Sri Lanka: International Water Management Institute (IWMI); 27-48.

McGann, J. G., 2001. Globalization and the Growth of Think Tanks. Unpublished paper.

Michanek, G.L.L. M., 1989: The legal context of conservation in Lesotho. SPLASH. Vol.5 No.1. Maseru., Lesotho.

Ministry of Agriculture, 2004. Strategy for revitalizing agriculture 2004-2014. Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries Development. Nairobi, Kenya.

NEPAD, 2003. Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP). New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) and African Union, Midrand, South Africa.

OED (Operations evaluation Department) 2003. OED Review of the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) process. Approach Paper. World Bank. Washington DC.

Republic of Kenya, 2001. Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper for the Period 2001-2002. Ministry of Finance and Planning, Nairobi.

Republic of Kenya, 2003. Ministry of Water Resources Management and Development. The first National Water Resources Management Strategy. Final draft for the period July 2003 to June 2006.

Rockstrom J. and Fallenmark, M., 2000. Semi-arid Crop Production from a Hydrological Perspective – Gap between potential and actual yields. Critical Rev. Plant Sc. 19(4):319-346.

Sally, H., Innocencio, A. and Merrey, D., 2003. Agricultural land and water management for poverty reduction and economic growth in sub-Saharan Africa: Setting the research agenda. .African Water Journal: 20-29.

Start, D. and Hovland, I., 2004. Tools for Policy Impact: A Handbook for Researchers. Research and Policy Development programme, Overseas Development Institute, London.

Stone, D., 2000. Think Tank Trans-nationalisation and Non-profit Analysis, Advice and Advocacy. Global Society, Vol 14, No.2.

URT (United Republic of Tanzania) 2001. Agricultural Sector Development Strategy.

World Bank, 2005a. Shaping the future of water for agriculture: a sourcebook for investment in agricultural water management. Agriculture and Rural Development.

World Bank, 2005b. Reengaging in agricultural Water Management. Challenges, Opportunities and Trade-offs. Water for Food Team. Agriculture and Rural Development Department (ARD). The World Bank. Washington DC.146pp.

www.dfid.gov.uklFOI/tools/chapter_D3.htm www.certi.org/publications/Manuals/rap-16-section3.htm

www.worldwatercouncil.org/fileadmin/wwc/library/WWVision.htm

Young and Lisa Quinn – Writing Effective Public Policy Papers, A Guide for Policy Advisers in Central and Eastern Europe E6.

Appendix 1: Project Log-frame

Narrative summary	Objectively verifiable indicators	Means of verification	Important assumptions
Goal			
To contribute to poverty reduction through improved policy, institutions, practices and performance of smallholder management of agricultural water in ESA Similar to IMAWESA	Evidence of increased incomes, of targeted smallholders in at least 3 of the project target countries PRS processes, sector-wide and sub-sectoral programmes, sectoral policy frameworks, public investment plans, and regional development plans reflect key issues and development options for smallholder management of agricultural water in selected ESA countries New policies established or existing policies modified to ensure improved access to and management of agricultural water by rural poor in selected ESA countries	Regional and national level statistics and surveys monitored against 2005 baseline Review of agricultural and other rural development strategies of the target countries, IFAD and other target organizations against 2005 baseline Review of government policy papers	
Purpose			
The IMAWESA project is established effectively and efficiently	IMAWESA has become fully established and operational by March 2006 IMAWESA Grant and Sub-grant Agreements signed by Feb 2006	Reports on activities Progress report	
Outputs			
Stakeholder partnership established	Inclusion of IMAWESA activities in 2006 AWPB of participating programmes[6]	Progress reports Minutes of meetings Emails and letters	IFAD Executive Board approve IMAWESA large grant
Improved understanding of key policy, legal, and institutional issues affecting water management programmes/components	Programmes have enhanced understanding of key issues affecting implementation	Communication with programme staff Programme progress reports	
Improved implementation of IFAD supported agricultural water management programmes	Programme implementation improved on areas targeted by support activities	Reports on project-specific implementation support activities Reports of supervision, monitoring, evaluation and review missions	
Improved capacity of managers and staff implementing agricultural water management programmes to communicate experiences and lessons	Reports submitted by project are well structured, well written, and covering key issues satisfactorily	Reports submitted by programmes	

[6] This refers to IFAD supported programmes with agricultural water management components, in Eastern and Southern Africa – which will form the case studies of IMAWESA

Activities	Milestones	Budget	Assumptions
For Output 1: Stakeholder partnership established			
Set up IMAWESA PMU and identify and employ Regional Facilitator	Regional Facilitator is employed December 2005		
Establish partnership and secure stakeholder ownership	1st Meeting of TAP by mid-December 2005		
Establish baseline for supporting the M&E of IMAWESA	Baseline in place by April 2006		
Strengthen ASARECA's capacity to engage in policy dialogue and convene policy makers and senior government officials, and to undertake M&E of its networks and projects, including IMAWESA and SWMnet	The IMAWESA Concept presented by ASARECA in Regional FORA by Sept 2005		
For Output 2: Improved understanding of key policy, legal, and institutional issues affecting water management programmes/components			
Initial evaluation of effect of regional and national policies, institutions and legal framework on the access of poor rural people to improved water management, and on performance and impact of water management programme components based on the experience from IFAD financed programmes	By Nov 2005, a survey of policies is complete and disseminated to programmes and TAP members		
For Output 3: Improved implementation of IFAD supported agricultural water management programmes			
3.1 Assess training needs of programme staff and implementers and design and implement short-term courses	Funds allocated for implementation support fully utilized/committed Regional Facilitator has visited 2-3 programmes		UNOPS, CPMs, programmes identify needed areas for support and request support
Short-term technical support to programmes: consultancy inputs, strengthening supervision teams , visits of Regional Facilitator, staff from other programmes as consultants			
For Output 4: Improved capacity of managers and staff implementing agricultural water management programmes to communicate experiences and lessons			
Promote process documentation by projects as a means of ensuring contribution to the knowledge base	Reports from programmes on all implementation support have been received by PMU		Programmes put adequate priority to timely submission of reports
Develop a learning and communication strategy	IMAWESA Communication Strategy in place by December 2005		