

EXTERNAL REVIEW

Of ODL Pilot Project with COL

FINAL REPORT

**Technology-mediated Open and Distance Education
and
the Global Issues of Climate Change and
Water Resources Management**

A Desk Study Report
Prepared by
Dr. Robert Fugere
NGO Management Consultant
Toronto, Canada

Reference CO8-211

September 2, 2008

INDEX

1. Executive Summary
2. Project Context
3. Monitoring & Evaluation Purposes
4. Monitoring & Evaluation Design & Implementation
5. Findings
6. Conclusions
7. Recommendations

ANNEXES

1. Contractor Terms of Reference
2. Participants' Survey

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This project was to assist COL to develop and implement an Evaluation Plan for an on-going COL activity called “ODL Pilot Project: Use of Tech-MODE for climate change and water resource management”. Specifically it was to provide an independent assessment of that project’s progress against its original plans, its activity to date and its proposed plan of action for 2008-09. Drawing upon background documents, consultants’ reports, and interviews with partners, this project was to provide COL with both a Mid-Term and a Final Report, including an assessment of the work’s effectiveness, success achieved to date and suggestions for further improvement.

The immediate purpose of this evaluation was to incorporate suggestions from this review into the ongoing planning and implementation of the Kenyan pilot project so as to strengthen the final outcome. The purpose of the ODL Pilot Project was to determine whether a specific niche exists where COL, with its Tech-MODE experience, could contribute to addressing the global challenges of climate change and water resource management.

Findings

- At each of the four stages of the ODL Project, the specific task has been spelled out carefully and accomplished quite successfully. This was especially true for the review of background literature (though the South Asian picture was less thorough than the African);
- A slight shift of emphasis was noted over the two years, from an initial preoccupation with how the project fit within COL’s mandate to a concentration on developing the Kenyan pilot project. In the process some of the original goals of replicability, of reaching the “marginalized and vulnerable groups in Africa and South Asia”, and “building local capacity” became more narrowly focused on working chiefly with tertiary educational institutions, and only in one country.
- Despite the admonitions from the background literature about the serious limitations of relying too much on scientists and academics in this field, the failure to include a survey of international and national NGOs who are most familiar with rural community work left a set of potential partners out of consideration. (This limitation has now been corrected in the Kenyan Project Proposal.)
- The reviews of current literature and of other pilot projects concluded that a clear need exists for developing (Tech-MODE) methods of linking the scientific/academic institutions concerned with CC and WRM with the livelihoods of local, marginalized rural people in Africa and South Asia (though only community radio and videos were cited as likely pathways, since computer access is still very weak for most rural communities).
- All commentators name the need to build broad partnerships involving policymakers with training colleges and with intermediary NGOs and community organizations as crucial, since no one institution can respond to the breadth of challenges in these two areas. COL’s experience in brokering networks and

partnerships between tertiary educational institutions and policy-level bodies can prove most useful.

- Discovering effective ways to establish and maintain good two-way sharing between local farmers and policy-makers is a major challenge. The Pilot Project proposed by ACTS and MMUST acknowledges this challenge and COL needs to address these challenges during implementation.
- The Kenyan Pilot Project Proposal is a solid initiative that could serve as a model for other groups and countries, particularly those with a community radio link, since ACTS has a good record of providing useful CC research to Kenyan and other African policy bodies and MMUST has worked effectively with local farmers using two radio stations.
- Shifting the focus to this one pilot project is understandable, given the limited staff and funding, but to achieve replicability, the other fourteen “finalists” in the search for a COL partner as well as two international agencies (UNFCCC’s African Regional Climate Change Workshop and UNU-INWEH) need to be kept informed of this project’s stages and findings through an update letter and occasional contacts with the Project Consultants.

Conclusions/Recommendations

- The project’s outcomes are quite appropriate to the overall goal and have provided COL with a broad knowledge base to undertake a larger commitment, both programmatic –to the level of an “Environment and Farming Initiative”- and financial –perhaps \$100,000. Such a commitment could entail: 1) an expanded institutional review of NGOs engaged with CC and WRM in both Africa and South Asia; 2) undertaking at least one other pilot project in South Asia (using e-learning if possible); 3) summarizing COL’s Tech-MODE project learnings in a brief document.
- With limited resources, it will be a challenge to maintain the balance between the global urgency of the issues of CC and WRM and the need to build the local project(s) that address those issues.
- National and international NGOs in Africa and South Asia should be surveyed to determine their experiences, learnings and needs in responding to grassroots problems with CC and WRM.
- In the future, this project needs to keep a strong emphasis on the demand-side (the local farmers) in both its planning and implementation.
- On the Kenyan Project Proposal, 1) COL should provide enabling funding and support their donor search; 2) Project partners should determine what data and stories policy-makers need from district farmers and vice versa; 3) COL consultant should visit the project 6-8 months after inception to critique project elements, record specific outputs, note if two-way sharing is occurring; observe the co-management, and prepare an update for other partners.

In summary, this is a potentially very useful project for which COL has real strengths. To gain the benefits from the investment so far and to make a significant contribution to climate change adaptation, COL does need to invest in supporting several other local multi-agency partnerships which will provide the learnings to share more broadly.

2. Project Context

The ODL Pilot Project with COL began a year and a half ago with a contract to “assist the COL to investigate and identify what niche opportunities exist to enhance the use of Tech-MODE...to address the global environmental issues of climate change and water resources management within and among Commonwealth countries”. This initial exploration led to a series of further steps which surveyed the relevant literature, noted the existing case studies, and reviewed 212 tertiary institutional websites, finally examining sixteen potential partners more deeply which led to the selection of two possible partners. Over the past six months, COL has worked more closely with a set of Kenyan partners, headed by ACTS and MMUST, to develop a pilot project that brings Open and Distance Learning together with climate change and water resources management concerns.

As an innovative step, COL decided to undertake an External Review of this project process while the project process is still underway. The hope is that suggestions drawn from this review might be incorporated into the ongoing planning and implementation of the pilot project so as to strengthen the final outcome.

Specifically, the purpose of this External Review is:

“To provide an independent assessment of the ODL Pilot Project with COL, its progress against its original plans, activities completed to date, and proposed plans of action for 2008-09.”

Working primarily with project documents, this External Review will:

- identify the project’s original goals;
- focus on key decision points to determine the rationale(s) chosen to move forward and assess their suitability in light of the original goals;
- determine through interviews the satisfaction of the participants with their part of this process;
- draw out key learnings for “proof of concept” and application to future projects;
- provide observations and suggestions to the COL ES and consultants to improve the ongoing implementation of this pilot project.

The success indicators agreed for this External Review are:

- the extent and quality of the stakeholders’ responses obtained; and
- the number and usefulness of the evaluator’s comments toward improving the project implementation.

The Activities undertaken to achieve the above outcomes included:

- reviewing the various project reports and deliverables against the plans;
- developing an Evaluation Plan for this project;
- identifying the appropriate data and data collection strategies;
- contacting stakeholders, partners and experts to gain their insights;

- determining the extent of inputs from stakeholders in developing the project concept and proposal;
- determining the extent and validity of data collected;
- reviewing the outputs of all the project activities and in particular the workshops;
- providing a Mid-Term Report on the work's effectiveness, success achieved to date and suggestions for further improvement; and
- reviewing the work done in a Final Report.

The Partners involved in this External Review included the two principal researchers, John van Mossel and Sheri Lim, and COL's Education Specialist, Dr. Krishna Alluri, whose cooperation was both comprehensive and timely. Eighteen organizational partners who had participated in the initial and intermediate stages of selection were contacted [see Record of Participant Survey Annex 2], some through a survey and others with both a survey and a telephone interview. I appreciate the cooperation which all of these partners offered to this study.

As a desk study, this review's principal limitation was its heavy reliance upon written reports. While these reports were extensive and thorough and supplemented by the telephone interviews, nonetheless they always summarize a much more extensive set of explorations and decisions made by the principal consultants over their two-year work on this project. As well, though I bring some thirty years of development experience to this task, this evaluator has limited experience with Tech-MODE methods. This study has certainly enhanced my appreciation for this relatively new methodology.

3. Monitoring and Evaluation Purposes:

As noted above, the intent of this independent assessment was to review critically the work undertaken to date on this project to ensure that it is meeting the original goals, but also to offer suggestions of how to improve its implementation and replication. Hoping to break new ground in the world-wide challenge of adapting to climate change, this project attempts to devise a local multi-party response which will also serve as a model to inspire other parties in other countries to devise their own responses. It is not easy to maintain both of these perspectives –local and international- in the same project.

The immediate beneficiaries of this review are the Project Consultants and the COL Education Specialist. On the project side, the suggestions provided should lead to improvements in the project design for the principal implementers –ACTS and MMUST in Kenya- and through them, the local farmers, NGOs, universities and government policy boards directly affected by the new interactive approach. On COL's side, the learnings from this process should inform the strategic directions envisioned in COL's next strategic plan, specifically how COL's Learning for Livelihood programs might apply Tech-MODE approaches more widely to climate change challenges world-wide.

4. Monitoring & Evaluation Design and Implementation:

The design of this External Review involved the following steps:

- clearly identify the project's original goals both for COL and for the prospective partners;
- focus on several key decision points to determine the rationale(s) chosen to move forward and to assess their suitability in light of the original goals (using primarily the written documents);
- interview up to twenty (20) participants from different stages of the winnowing process to determine their satisfaction with their part of this process and to receive their suggestions to improve the process;
- review the various reports and interview notes to draw out key learnings from this pilot process for "proof of concept" and application to future similar projects;
- provide from the foregoing analysis, observations and suggestions to the COL ES and the consultants which could improve the ongoing implementation of this pilot project.

As noted, the data for each of these steps was collected from background documents about COL, about the central issues being addressed (climate change and water management) and about the Tech-MODE methods already in use and the regular reports written by the principal consultants. These were supplemented by more than twenty survey and telephone interviews with various project stakeholders. Information or suggestions gleaned from these various sources were checked out for accuracy with the principal consultants, and occasionally, with the COL Education Specialist.

For a variety of reasons (participants on leave, incorrect contact address), not all of the surveyed participants responded. Nonetheless, the similarity of responses (with a few exceptions) to the various questions about the selection process provide a reliable basis.

The delay in receiving the London Workshop Report and the final version of the Kenya Project Proposal has somewhat limited my ability to comment on these latest steps; however, the Draft Project Proposal presumably contains the bulk of the directions envisioned and I will comment on that draft version.

5. Findings

A. The Management and Implementation of Activities

As noted in the Mid-Term Report, the work on this ODL Project has gone through four stages, each with its own activities and outputs:

1. March 2007 -Review of a) relevant background literature; b) relevant pilot projects and case studies; and c) assessment of 212 tertiary institutional websites.
2. July 2007- Analysis of 16 potential COL partners to implement Tech-MODE projects focused on Climate Change and Water Resource Management.

3. January 2008-Summary of the Pre-ICEE Workshop and Resulting Project Concept from ACTS and MMUST.
4. August 2008 -Summary of London Workshop and Draft Kenyan Project Proposal.

In each stage, the specific task has been spelled out carefully and accomplished quite successfully. In the case of the CC and WRM literature review and the categorization of the 212 tertiary institutions, the excellence of the work suggests that the results be shared with other international organizations. In each case the consultants (usually in concert with the COL ES) identified a few relevant criteria to guide their searches; this grid provided a very objective basis for comparison.

Nonetheless, when checked against the original project goals, one notes a slight shift in emphasis over these four stages. Initially the emphasis was mostly on how the project fit within COL's mandate. Later, the focus had moved to developing a pilot project which could model the application of Tech-MODE approaches to CC and WRM. In the process, the original goals of replicability, of reaching the "marginalized and vulnerable groups in Africa and South Asia", and "building local capacity" became more narrowly focused on working chiefly with tertiary educational institutions, eventually in only one country. COL is clearly most familiar with this sector, but the failure to include national and international NGOs, well versed in working with local communities in the original assessment, left one important set of potential partners out of consideration. This is to be regretted especially because one of the main recurring concerns of the background literature on CC and WRM is that most of the research/literature on these topics is produced by scientists and academicians, neither of which has a strong record of outreach to local rural populations. [The Kenyan Pilot Project Proposal has responded by including three NGOs in their planning and implementation.]

I have not carried out a thorough evaluation of the two international workshops. They have principally served as occasions for exchange and building contacts. The London workshop attracted some 20 participants, including CEE from India, the Caribbean (CCCCC), Farm Radio International, and ACTS. Elvin Nyukuri of ACTS reported, **"Initially, our understanding on ODL was that it would help create awareness among our stakeholders on issues to deal with Climate Change. As we have continued to engage ourselves more with COL activities, we realized that it is more than awareness creation and that our projects can take on these approaches for learning purposes."**

B. The Achievement of Intended Outputs/Outcomes

The original outcomes of this project [**bolded below**] may be summarized as follows; the assessment will appear after each outcome [in regular font]:

1. **To identify specific, practical activities that COL can contribute to ODL.**

The review of literature and of relevant pilot projects both concluded that there is very little of a practical nature that presently exists linking scientific and academic institutions concerned with CC and WRM to the livelihoods of local, marginalized rural people in African or South Asia. As well, the reviews found that “there are few examples across the Commonwealth where tertiary-educational institutions are engaged in ODL on the issues of CC and WRM”. Among Tech-MODE methods only the use of community radio and videos were cited as likely pathways, since for most rural communities computer-access is still very weak.

2. To identify and build partnership opportunities for COL with other institutions and agencies involved in global issues of climate change and water resources.

The broader need to build partnerships involving policymakers with training colleges and with intermediary NGOs and community based organizations is named as a crucial need by all commentators. Meeting the global challenges of CC and WRM requires a broad set of skills and capacities that are not within the scope of any one institution.

COL’s experience in brokering networks and partnerships between tertiary educational institutions and policy-level bodies can prove most useful in meeting this task. The experiences derived from the Kenyan pilot project could provide some guidance to the possibilities and difficulties of these types of multi-agency partnerships.

3. To assist communities of rural people and farmers in the Commonwealth –specifically in Africa and South Asia- to “find and exploit opportunities for improved and sustainable livelihood through the provision of access to lifelong learning on these topics”.

This outcome is perhaps the least achieved among these goals. COL’s experience with rural people and farmers has not factored into this project to any great extent for whatever reason. It remains, however, the strongest need and motivation behind the whole project.

4. To build Tech-MODE capacity among strategic agricultural education, extension, research and policymaking bodies.

This is the main focus of the Kenyan Pilot Project, drawing principally upon the use of community radio, but also on the production of manuals and course materials dealing with CC and WBM. ACTS has a good record of providing useful research to Kenyan (and other African) policy bodies.

5 & 6. To develop partnerships among communities, intermediary NGOs and universities that will build up regional-specific knowledge and provide generic skills to assess risk; and To enable two-way knowledge-sharing between institutions and rural communities and their organizations will be a prime concern and assist policy responses.

An initial partnership has been struck between MMUST University and ACTS (more policy-related) which seeks to draw in a community based group from western Kenya (SACRED) and an NGO (EcoNews-Africa). The Project Proposal includes some approaches to two-way knowledge sharing that could build region-specific climate knowledge. In its present form it does not include any provision for training in generic skills to assess risk. Both ACTS and MMUST partners have good experience in carrying out one-way knowledge-gathering or knowledge-dissemination, but neither have yet worked out any two-way sharing between local farmers and policy-makers. This is a major challenge of this project, which COL should address during implementation.

7.. To scaling up and replicate the learnings, particularly in similar environments in more than one country.

The ability to apply the learnings from both the process and the pilot project to other locations and institutions was an important element of the original plan. Both the literature review and the analysis of the 212 tertiary (mostly educational) institutions revealed that only sixteen had at least two of the requisite elements for likely success, namely experience with ODL and knowledge of climate change or water management issues. Of these sixteen, only two in Kenya and India, seemed most suitable; subsequently, finances dictated focusing only on the Kenyan grouping.

Replicating what emerges as learnings from the ACTS/MMUST project would logically occur most likely among that same group of sixteen, since they have some of the key elements already. All but one of those groups surveyed indicated their continuing interest in the Kenyan project.

Within Kenya, the project proposal indicates that at least three other community radio stations would be interested in extending the pilot project's approach in their areas.

Presumably, the two international agencies most closely linked to this COL project's mandate -namely, the African Regional Climate Change Workshop of UNFCCC and the UN University-International Network on Water, Environment and Health- would also be interested and able to link this pilot project with other groups in their respective ambits.

Some means must be devised to keep these agencies informed of the project's progress.

3. To develop with selected partners some local initiatives as models for implementation in other areas.

The Project Proposal that is emerging from ACTS and MMUST in Kenya is a solid initiative that could serve as a model for some other groups, particularly those with a community radio link. The key to this project's success, however, will lie in finding one or more simple and reliable ways to connect the quite different primary aims of most farmers and policy-makers. Most farmers in developing countries are focused on very concrete goals to survive and are not used to collecting information or measuring crops, at least in the ways that climate research institutes can readily use. Different worlds are

meeting here and some local “translators”, such as farmers’ organizations or NGOs, will need to be found, if true two-way sharing is to occur.

6. Conclusions:

A. Appropriateness of Outputs/Outcomes

The intended Outcomes –as listed in #5B above- are overall appropriate to the defined goals, although the scope in time for some of them is much longer range than others. Finding creative Tech-MODE ways of linking educational institutions with grassroots rural workers as well as with policy-makers represents a much needed means to address the growing global concerns of climate change and water resource management. Most international bodies concerned with these issues recognize that no one type of institution –be it scientific, educational, or agricultural- can successfully provide what is required. COL’s history and reputation as an honest broker, used to bringing partners from different sectors to a common task, gives it credibility in entering this field.

B. Appropriateness of Activities/ Role of Partners

1. Broaden the Partner Scoping to include NGOs

The search for appropriate partners with whom COL might promote ODL on the issue areas of CC and WRM focused mainly on tertiary educational institutions in South Asia and Africa. Given that Outcome #5 cites “develop(ing) partnerships among communities, intermediary NGOs and universities that will build up regional-specific knowledge and provides generic skills to assess risk”, the information-gathering stage should also have explored the international (and some national) NGOs that may be engaged in WRM and CC issues with local communities. Unlike universities, their mandate targets community development and working directly in the field. NGOs such as ActionAid, World Vision, World Council of Churches or SOS Sahel are all working on regional issues and often seek inputs to and from policy-makers. Certainly if COL proposes to make CC and WRM one of its central pursuits, such a NGO review would be well advised, even if COL still decides to relate primarily to educational institutes.

2. Maintain Regular Communications

One key aspect of replicability was not given sufficient emphasis in the previous activities, namely maintaining/developing regular communications with potentially interested parties. As the Kenyan project develops, it would be important to share its learnings at various stages with the fourteen other “finalists” in COL’s search for partners, as well as some of the relevant international and regional bodies concerned with CC and WRM. Both for COL’s own learning and staying up-to-date with a fast-moving field and for others’ adaptation of a Kenyan model, either an occasional newsletter or update (which might include news from other partners such as CEE, IGNOU, and CCCCC) would prove most useful.

3. Define COL's Experiences with Tech-MODE

Several among the sixteen finalists mentioned that they were unclear about exactly what COL was referring to as "Tech-MODE" [as was I]. When adding a new term to the jargon, it is most helpful to specify its meaning by providing several examples, in this case from COL's own experience with ODL methods. For partners from developing countries, it is important to demonstrate that Tech-MODE goes beyond advanced computer aided technologies and e-learning to include the use of older media technologies like community radio, video as well as print (since grassroots communities still have limited access to computers).

4. Information and Partnerships with South Asia

Although both the literature review and the institutional survey did include several South Asian references, the larger portion presented the African scene more completely. Given the number of relevant groups in both areas and the different types of climatic challenges, it is hard to capture them all in one review. For COL to move more actively into this whole set of issues across the Commonwealth, it would be advisable to contract consultants or a regional agencies active in South Asia, Caribbean and the South Pacific areas to draw up a further reference list, both of emerging research and active educational and NGO players.

5. The ACTS & MMUST Project Proposal

This proposal has helpfully incorporated both some NGO contributors in media and training and local community-based groups along with their own climate change agency and university outreach. Since the proposal keeps the project co-management between ACTS and MMUST, the addition of these other experiences and perspectives should enrich the implementation and ground project decisions in priorities closer to the local farmers' interests. It remains to be seen how these players can devise a simple and reliable two-way sharing between such different worlds as the local market and national food security policy. The community radio approach, if it uses community reporters and draws upon imaginative dramas, has excellent potential.

The project proposes to maintain links to national and international institutions concerned with climate change adaptation (such as the Kenyan Ministries of Water, Environment, Regional Planning, as IGAD-Climate Prediction and Adaptation Centre, and the UNFCCC Nairobi Work Program) and ACTS' reputation and experience should make this quite feasible.

On MMUST's side, as a first step at replication, up to three other radio stations may become involved from two different ecological regions. Farm Radio International may collaborate in developing local programs and then sharing these programs in other African countries.

In my conversations with the key drivers from both ACTS and MMUST, it seems clear that these two institutions have adopted their roles as project owners. In the case of ACTS, it is expected that this new approach of two-way sharing with local farmers may well open a rich, new avenue for ACTS' more traditional, extractive research work. The

learnings that the MMUST director gained from the London workshop discussions of ODL's varieties is strengthening its own SOLACE e-learning capacity. With COL's on-going support, they will be approaching interested donors with a solid project proposal.

C. Effectiveness of COL's Contributions

COL's direct contributions have come mainly through the work of its consultants and its Education Specialist. From the documents provided and from the interviews/surveys with participating partners, this work has been judged as very competent, thorough and timely. Two respondents felt that their suggestions had not been integrated, but I was not able to ascertain exactly what those suggestions had been.

COL and its consultants had been clear with all partners that COL could provide only a partial amount toward the overall project. Nonetheless, when in July two partners in India and in Kenya were proposed, COL only had funds to pursue one pilot project. Though two pilot projects were already minimal in terms of diversity and replicability, this decision due to the limited availability of funds reduced the overall project effectiveness. COL needs to be clear as early as possible about the amount of funding it has available.

Indirectly, COL certainly brings its own reputation to this project. This is particularly true with the tertiary educational institutions it has primarily worked with in the past. But this dominant experience with educational institutions appears also to have biased the institutional review in Stage One, leaving out (mostly) the NGO world for its survey.

More positively, inviting a number of prospective partners to the two international workshops in India and in London certainly exposed them to the broader world of Open and Distant Learning as well as the Tech-MODE experiences of other groups. This exposure was mentioned by four respondents.

D. Lessons Learned:

The lessons learned from this two-year process should best be drawn from the consultants and the Education Specialist who were most actively involved. From my perspective, the most challenging aspect of this process was –and will continue to be– maintaining the balance between the global sweep and urgency of the issues of CC and WRM and the necessity to mount and manage one (or maybe two) local pilot project that addresses many of the elements in those issues. As I noted in #5, the focus of this project shifted from that more global scope at the outset –with the literature and institutional reviews– to the exigencies of selecting and helping mount one or two specific projects. This inevitable shift led to the focus primarily on tertiary educational institutions and left the important task of maintaining communications links on the side.

To some extent, due to the observations offered in the Mid-Term Report, these short-sights were mostly caught and to some degree addressed over the subsequent three months. But the challenge to maintain that search and balance for the broader impacts will remain throughout the whole process and needs occasional reminders.

A second observation is the need to emphasize local farmer feedback and involvement. At least in the documents, the process leading to this project was COL's concern to determine if there were a "niche" in the arenas of CC and WRM where its contribution might be made. Only secondarily did the requirement that the outcome of this process should "improve the livelihoods of rural workers" get stated. I observed in the Mid-Term Report that this is not at all uncommon in the development world –and not necessarily unproductive-, but such approaches should take special care to build in some strong, grassroots feedback.

7. Recommendations:

A. On the Broader COL ODL Project

1. COL should undertake a larger program initiative to develop Tech-MODE responses to meeting the growing issues of Climate Change and Water Resources Management – to the level of an "Environment and Farming Initiative"- and financial –perhaps \$100,000. Such a commitment could entail:
 - a) The literature review on these issues confirms that there is an urgent need to devise multi-level responses that create local partnerships between rural farmers, intermediate NGOs, universities/colleges and policy agencies.
 - b) The literature review also concludes that there are very few bodies responding to this need and the case study review confirms this.
 - c) COL has a good reputation and experience in devising Tech-MODE responses to similar multi-level situations.
 - d) Initial investments have led to two COL partners in Kenya preparing a Pilot Project Proposal for an ODL response in western Kenya.
2. If a larger initiative is adopted,
 - a) an expanded institutional review of NGOs in both Africa and South Asia should be undertaken;
 - b) COL should undertake at least one other pilot project in South Asia and/or the Caribbean (using e-learning if possible);
 - c) the COL ES should compile descriptions of Tech-MODE project learnings.
3. Even if a larger program is not adopted,
 - a) links to international climate change agencies should be built and maintained (by ES or consultant), including sharing COL Project Update
 - b) a Pilot Project Update should be circulated to interested parties.

B. On the Kenya Pilot Project Proposal:

4. COL should provide enabling funding and support the donor search
5. Project Partners should determine what data/stories policy-makers need from district farmers and vice versa.
6. Eight months after project inception, Consultant should visit to provide constructive critique of project elements, to record specific outputs, to note whether information/stories are circulating in two directions, to observe how the partners are managing the three-levels and then write up an Update for circulation.

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1: Statement of Work

The Consultant shall:

assist COL in developing and implementing an Evaluation Plan for the Project
work with COL and its consultants to finalise how we would bring the overseas partners into this task in the next few days
review the project reports and deliverables against the plans;
contact stakeholders, partners and experts to gain their insights to the project;
identify appropriate data, develop data collection strategies;
implement the Evaluation Plan;
determine the extent of inputs from project stakeholders included in developing the project concept and proposal;
determine the extent and validity of data collected; and
review the outputs of all the project activities and in particular the workshops in line with project needs;
provide a Mid-term Report on the work's effectiveness, success achieved to date and suggestions for further improvement by 30th May 2008;
review the work done in all Phases of the project in a Final Report by 29th August 2008.
All correspondence with COL should include reference to the contract number listed at the top of the contract.

COL Responsibilities

COL shall: provide the consultant with the project documents and reports relevant to the project and the evaluation processes including the generic evaluation plan outline, draft terms of reference for contracted evaluators and the monitoring and evaluation report format to be used by the Consultant in reporting to COL; and

provide the Consultant the contact details of all those associated with the project (stakeholders, partners and experts) so that the Consultant could communicate with them as necessary for the fulfilling of the contract terms.

provide the Consultant with access to a calling card for the duration of the contract which will be used only for long distance calling purposes in connection with this contract.

2.2 The COL staff member with whom you should liaise on all matters related to this contract is Dr. Krishna Alluri, Education Specialist, Food Security & Environment and Team Leader: Learning for Livelihoods.

Deliverables and Timeframe

The above consultancy will be for a duration of 12 days, starting March 3, 2008, with the following deliverables and timelines:

an Initial Report by March 7, 2008: areas covered include;

- draft Performance Evaluation Framework and Timelines;
- evaluation plan outline, comments on revised project plans & reports, outputs, deliverables; and
- identification of appropriate data to be collected and in the development of data collection strategies;

A Mid-Term Evaluation Report by 30th May, 2008: Areas covered include:

- assessment of documents and reports received in view of their conformity to the original plans (deliverables and timing) for a pilot project. These documents will include: review of relevant literature; first report on opportunities for COL with list of possible institutions; second report on Exploring Institutional Participation in CC & WRM Initiatives; third report on institutional partnership-building with Kenyan partners; various workshop and conference reports;
- the appropriateness of the criteria used to select participating institutions at various junctures;
- the degree to which the workshops/meetings assisted the partners to develop the project concept, proposal, and (if reached) implementation;
- the extent and validity of data collected;
- the efficiency and client satisfaction with both the data collection and partner selection process;
- key elements emerging for replicability; and
- ability to uncover capacity gaps in these institutions and appropriate remedies (for the most likely partners);

a Draft Final Evaluation Report following COL Monitoring & Evaluation Report Format for review by COL by July 30, 2008. Areas covered include:

- executive summary of the above points as well as subsequent reports submitted by the project stakeholders;
- requirements for “proof of concept”;
- final Assessment, drawing our key lessons learned and recommendations for COL and prospective partners.

3.14. a Final Evaluation Report by August 30, 2008

Record of Participant Survey from COL Pilot Project

Person/ School	COL Aware	Live For Livelihood	Project Well described	Description Accurate?	Your Leadership Needed	Your Suggestions	Data Collection Process	Your Interest Change?	Pilot Project Interest?
Prof. Hendrick UNISA		No response							
Derica Kotze CDS/UNISA		On annual leave							
Gina Ziervogel UCT/Climate Systems Group		In Sweden							
Ailsa Holloway	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Not clear	Same	No; very busy
Faustine Bee Coop College Moshi Tanz		No response							
Prof. Kimbi Sokoine Inst. Of Cont Ed		No response							
Prof. Makhanu MMUST	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Satisfactory	Greater	Yes
Elvin Nyukuri ACTS	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Satisfactory	Greater	Yes
SOUTH ASIA									
Prof. N. Rao Annamali U	No		Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Satisfactory	same	Yes
Mr. Rehman TERI		Will return					satisfactory		

		Survey (?)							
Shivani Jain CEE	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Unaware of process	No change	yes
Pardeep Sahni IGNOU/ SOS	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Satisfactory	Yes. Needs Concerted efforts	yes
Prof. S.Malhotra, IGNOU/SOS	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Complicated	Satisfactory	Yes. Held Conference	yes
TV.Ramachandran IIS, Centre for Ecolog.Sciences	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes, Thru Discussions	Satisfactory, Somewhat	Yes, done programs	yes
Dr. B Rashid BOU		In UK school							
Dr. A. Rahman BCAS		No response							

