

The SARD Retrospective Study: Looking Back to Look Forward

A Brief Summary of Findings

By Constance L. Neely

1.0 INTRODUCTION

As part of the Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development (SARD) Initiative, a retrospective study was designed to review recognized successful and completed projects to better understand the sustainability of good practices and processes for SARD. The study was implemented as an ex-post review of existing sets of international sustainable development success stories using a set of criteria defined through a multistakeholder process. Following a desk review of several hundred cases, four cases were reviewed in the field to better understand what worked, what worked less well and to assess the sustainability (“where are they now?”) of the various successful efforts. The lessons drawn from this retrospective study can be used to inform the implementation of SARD related activities and the development of future case studies. The full summary and findings as well as country cases are also available.

2.0 METHODOLOGY

To implement the retrospective analysis, the following steps were taken:

Development of Assessment Criteria: Working with the focal points of the major groups of civil society (women, youth, NGOs, farmers, trade, science and technology, business and industry and trade unions and agricultural workers, indigenous peoples) associated with the SARD Initiative effort and professional staff from FAO, an initial set of general criteria for success were developed. These criteria (see Annex 1) reflect an emphasis on the engagement of civil society, governments and private sector actors, practices resulting and positive change in aspects of sustainability (economic, social, environmental). In addition, attention was given to those cases addressing the thematic areas of the SARD Initiative (Good Practices for SARD, Fair Employment for Agricultural Workers, and Access to Resources) and other priorities such as those related to the Millennium Development Goals.

Review of Success Story Databases: Using the general criteria described above, the consultant reviewed cases from the following sources to see how well they would meet the multi-stakeholder criteria.

- Compendium of Land and SARD Cases, (Pretty 2001)
- Cultivating our Futures (Maastricht)
- UN Success Stories (1995-2000)
- Several available IIED Cases
- Agroecology Case Studies
- Colby College Sustainable Development Reviews

The case studies and success stories reported in the above sources had varying degrees of detail and there was some overlap in some of the databases. From several hundred cases, 38 cases were identified as having the best fit in relation to the criteria. As expected, indicators for several of the criteria were not available in the short case descriptions. These 38 cases were then sieved to 15 possible candidates for in-depth review.

Design of Protocol: Using the general criteria, a survey protocol (see Annex 2) was established to guide the exploration of a limited set of country cases. Along with the protocol, a terms of reference for in-country consultants and guide for report writing were developed.

In Country Assessments: Through further screening of the pool of 15 cases (Annex 3) and success stories, four candidate cases for in-depth field site visit and review was determined. These included:

- Honduras: Desarrollo Rural basado en el Mejoramiento Agrícola Sostenible (Programa de Guaimaca), implemented by COSECHA
The objectives of this study were to increase knowledge and capacity related to conservation practices that resulted in increased income and yields, utilizing participatory methodologies
- Philippines: SARD in the Uplands of Dansolihon, Cagayan de Oro City, implemented by Asian Non Government Organization Coalition (ANGOC)
The objectives of this effort centered on access to resources, increased productivity and resource conservation, market development, policy environment reform, as well as an added health component.
- Zimbabwe: Organic Farming of Cotton with Natural Pest Management in Mashonaland Central, implemented by AfFORest and multiple partners
The objective was to put in place an organic cotton project with an aim to reduce pesticides and increase farmer health.
- Zimbabwe: Chivi Food Security Project in Masvingo, implemented by Intermediate Technology Development Group (ITDG)
The objectives of this effort were to increase household food security through agricultural production, strengthen local institutions for farmers to articulate priorities and control productive resources, influence government agricultural policies to be more responsive to the poor.

The abstracts for these four cases can be found in Annex 4. Three in-country consultants, Benjamin Erazo (Honduras), Roel Ravanera (Philippines), and Maxwell Mudhara (Zimbabwe), were identified to implement the retrospective reviews. It was anticipated that each review would be considered by multi-stakeholder panel in-country but this proved difficult to carry out with consistency. After carrying out the retrospective reviews in country and through an iterative document review process, final reports for all

four cases were submitted and are available as background information to this report. An assessment of the methodology used in this effort can be found later in this document.

3.0 LESSONS LEARNED THROUGH THE CASE STUDIES

This section addresses the lessons learned from the experiences of the four in-depth country reviews. Through a retrospective lens, the four cases demonstrate different degrees of successes as well as limitations and failures. While the full reports are available and specific lessons for each study are well articulated, the purpose of this brief discussion is to draw general rather than exhaustive lessons from across the case reviews that might be useful in informing future SARD efforts. Understandably, many of these lessons are not new to sustainable development initiatives however these cases further validate the importance of employing good principles of development in transitioning to sustainable agriculture. Lessons identified in this section reflect both successful and less than successful aspects within the four in-country cases.

All cases reported positive impacts within the time frame of the project. These included impacts such as improved yield and income, enhanced self confidence, increased skills, enhanced knowledge of conservation practices, diversification or intensification of farming systems, enhanced use of traditional knowledge, improved environmental quality, access to land, markets and other resources among others. It is also important to understand that most of the cases were successful even within the context of climatic shocks (Hurricane Mitch, El Nino, drought), economic structural adjustment, market controls, negative political influences, changes in partnerships, difficulty in titling land, outbreaks of pests, and late arriving funds from donors.

3.1 Lessons about Partnerships and Participation

Partners Involved. Each of these efforts was initiated by a national or international non-governmental organization and all projects were people centered with a focus on farmer capacity building. All efforts identified the importance of farmer priorities (realized through consultative methods) as the driving force of the effort and worked to build partnerships between farmers and other stakeholders such as government agents, other farmer networks and community based organizations, research institutions, other NGOs and in several cases business and industry. These partnerships with diverse actors were built for implementation purposes as well as to establish relationships and linkages for future endeavors that farmers or community members may wish to pursue. These could include bridging to a different sector (e.g. health) than which the project itself was designed, consolidating products for markets, building capacity for garnering future resources, or engaging in policy advocacy.

Partner Investments and Power. Generally investments of time and resources and shared expected responsibility by all partners were viewed as necessary so as not to set up a implementer-beneficiary relationship. Clarity of expected results among all partners was

important so as not to build false hopes by various actors. Disproportionate power among partners was evident in most cases. For example, in a Zimbabwe case, when one NGO pulled out there was a collapse of the project. In another case, it was recommended that farmers should be able to hire and fire the development or extension workers that were engaged in the project. In one case, numerous changes in partners were detrimental to project results. One sticking point in all cases was whether and how to remunerate local workers. For example, some projects suffered when farmer field workers pay was no longer available. In other cases, the extensionist or community workers were paid throughout the project. Lastly, a key point of power relationships was demonstrated by who appeared to be deciding the direction of development within the communities. When those decisions were viewed as coming from the community members themselves, this was viewed as success by the initiating organization.

Trust and Ownership among Partners. Building trust among partners was seen as a critical to the success of the projects. While most of the cases engaged a diverse set of actors in the initial stages of the project through participatory methods, priority setting and consultation, there were cases of resistance to the project being put in place. Resistance reported was among government actors in an NGO led initiative, however this resistance was dissipated when clear roles and responsibilities were outlined and ownership was felt among all parties. Along the same lines, government agents trained in conventional methods were not always in agreement with implementation of new practices. The case that experienced this indicated that the government workers could have undergone the same training as the farmers and other community members. Trust was built through transparency of decision making as well as a clear understanding of expectations. Ownership came about through shared responsibility as well as the importance of cascading influence of farmers taking leadership roles early in the effort.

Working with Existing Networks. All cases noted the importance of not creating new institutional structures but rather drawing on existing networks. Interestingly, it was noted in one case that by working with individual farmers rather than groups, the changes/practices were more easily adopted. Others noted the importance of working with groups of farmers that support and reinforce one another in adoption and adaptation of practices. Additionally, it was pointed out that working with farmer associations often provided important linkages with national farmer unions for scaling up knowledge.

Inclusiveness: Women and the Poorest of the Poor. The cases reflected examples of a) inclusion of women farmers and farmer groups in all stages of the project and b) as an added component that resulted in less positive impacts on women. In one example, the practice of integrating tree crops was of less interest to women farmers due to longer-term return versus immediate enhanced food security. In another case, women who chose to be involved often were relegated to land that their husbands were willing to provide and women also had more difficulty participating in training that took them away from regular day activities or took them to a distant location. While not unique to these four in-country experiences, it was rare that the poorest of the poor were able to benefit from the implementation of the projects. Alternatively, in some cases, “wealthy farmers”

chose to disassociate because they did not see adequate return or value addition over their existing efforts.

Incentives. There is still a lot to be learned about how incentives work toward or against successful implementation and long-term sustained impacts. Where in place, incentives such as short term inputs of productive resources (seeds, credit) or long-term access to land benefited the projects. Other financial incentives such as income for community workers or farmer field workers were considered helpful but when the income was not forthcoming due to problems in project management or at the end of projects (no exit strategy), related aspects suffered. Additionally, commodity subsidies could both assist or be detrimental to implementing SARD practices.

Exit strategies. This is still an unanswered question in most cases. In the case of the Philippines, the community was clearly apprised of when the project would come to a close and were in a sense prepared for the withdrawal of the program. In other cases, only last minute measures were taken to assist the community in going forward. In other cases, the strength of the institutional capacity building provided impact beyond the life of the project. Sustainability of efforts will be examined later in the document.

3.2 Lessons about Institutional Strengthening, Capacity Building and Extension

Building Individual and Institutional Capacity. An underlying mission of all cases was to increase the capacity of farmers to make decisions and choices in their practices and livelihoods. Additionally, the cases put an emphasis on assisting in the understanding of the benefits or consequences of farming practices on other sectors and stakeholders in society. Toward these ends, capacity building included farmer training in good practices for sustainable agriculture including enlivening traditional methods (formerly ridiculed), training for transformation¹, networking and negotiation skills, protocols, and training to be trainers (Farmer Field Schools). Training that focused on enhancing farmer skills, awareness, evaluation methods, confidence, dignity and behaviour changes, and creativity were sought to sustain the impact of the projects. Linked to ownership above, the studies reported that partners, particularly those who are assisting in the extension of good practices, should undergo the same training to insure an understanding of the benefits of practices. This is particularly true in cases where farmers are being asked to put innovative practices in place and extensionists and educators are steeped in specific methods that are more rigid. All cases recognized the important of training local leaders. Location of training was critical. While most training efforts took place in the district, some were outside, requiring individuals to leave home for some time. This proved to be an obstacle to the women farmers.

¹ Training for Transformation originated in Zimbabwe and is based on the Freirean approach of enabling peoples' understanding of structural causes of problems. The approach addresses links between development and education to alleviate poverty and oppression and transforming society. Skills-building begins with the individual using diagnosis and analysis and emphasizes the importance of teamwork. http://ciaris.ilo.org/english/tos/strprinc/particip/methodes/fiche_27.htm

Extending and Enhancing Knowledge. Learning was enhanced in the projects through exposure visits, field days, farmer-to-farmer visits, seed fairs, hosting of researchers by farmers and hosting of farmers at research institutions. Projects worked to maximize farmer exposure by not allowing duplicate trips by one farmer. Farmers who went on field trips provided feedback to the community upon returning. Iterative learning was enhanced through local monitoring and evaluation, particularly farmer evaluation of techniques and feedback meetings. Most cases reported that there were numerous meetings to work on problems and constraints to adoption/adaptation that farmers were experiencing. While documentation of findings and lessons learned reportedly could have been strengthened in several cases, it was seen as an important aspect for strengthening learning and promoting replicability. In one case, the trainers felt that they could no longer offer new information and that farmers became bored. Full time extension was seen as beneficial but in many cases, the farmer field workers were overburdened. Farmer Field Worker (FFW) gender mattered as women were more likely to participate in Farmer Field Schools in which the FFW was a woman.

3.3 Lessons about Process and Sequence

First things first: access, subsistence, productivity, conservation, markets. Transitioning to SARD and putting conservation efforts in place are often touted as a luxury that most farmers cannot afford. The experiences reported suggest a logical sequence in pursuing sustainable agriculture and rural development. First and foremost, reducing risks to food security and where necessary and possible ensuring access to land and productive resources. With this in place, efforts worked to enhance productivity and stability of land through good practices that support food needs of the family and conserve the resources base. A next step is then to engage markets for products over and above those required to feed the family. Greater adoption of conservation efforts was clearly demonstrated where ownership of land or stable tenure relationships was in place. Satisfying subsistence as well was always seen as first and foremost and one author noted that food insecurity is not a matter of production but rather the balance of productivity, stability and sustainability.

Choosing Communities? While not all cases explained how the project site was chosen, the Honduras case articulated the criteria applied for selecting a community to work with. The implementers had demonstrated success in one area of the country already and the case reported on in this study was, in fact, a replication. The criteria included: farmers not saturated with external support, a desire and need to learn how to provide for themselves, close to a place where sharing ideas could be shared, and easy access for visits from the capital city.

3.4 Lessons Related to Sustainability

What were the impacts and what is still in place? In some cases, there was success both in building conservation efforts and increasing production of food and other crops. In some cases, there were reports of trebled yields and doubled incomes. These were further evidenced by investments in education and housing. Many practices (IPM, minimum tillage) are still in place long after the “end of the project” and some lessons have been applied to other crops. In most cases, however, there has not been the expansion of practices that might have been anticipated. In one case, the formation of a trust to provide a mechanism for carrying on the effort was viewed as beneficial beyond the life of the project.

Human and Social Capital. Through a retrospective lens, the sustainability of the projects were realized in the building of confidence, decision making capacity, awareness, creativity, strengthened networks and the capacity to negotiate and network beyond previous realms. Decision making skills, training for transformation, and farmer trainer efforts were viewed as long lasting. Institutional capacity building for farmer groups have in some cases led to committees being formed to further spearhead development in the community.

3.5 Lessons on the Practice to Policy Continuum

While several of the projects had objectives related to informing (or reforming) policy, there was little reported in the way of change in policy due to project implementation. The Philippines case did facilitate opportunities for indigenous communities, farmers and other sectors to dialogue with government agencies at the local, provincial and national levels. During the World Food Day in 1998, the Secretary of Agriculture dialogued with 500 representatives of indigenous communities, farmers, fisherfolks, women and urban poor organizations at the end of which the Secretary expressed full support to the different organizations. The project also reported on the issues that were raised by sector and convened fora to present findings to government and civil society actors.

3.6 Lessons Garnered from the Stumbling Points

Markets. Several projects found that access to markets were an issue. Markets presented problems in most cases due low volume as well as regularity of product quality and supply. Several efforts were made to consolidate farmers to have a greater supply. In cases where a local or international market was secured, the issue again became volume of product and stability of supply. In Zimbabwe, when yields of organic cotton were not as expected (lower than conventionally produced cotton), the international private business lost interest and was no longer available to the project. This in turn made it difficult for farmers to return on the investments/loans made by the seed industry and they too chose to depart from the project.

Ambition and Time Lines. As alluded to in previous sections, well-intentioned projects often were faulted for being too ambitious. In the case of the organic cotton project in Zimbabwe, partners were in place for markets before hammering out the requirements of sustainable organic cotton production and ensuring that the number of hectares would be in production. Partners' expectations were not met and frustrations led to partners pulling out. The cases beg the questions related to how contingency plans might be built in to overcome risk or unforeseen setbacks.

4.0 METHODOLOGY DISCUSSION

This section focuses on some of the lessons that this consultant feels were learned in implementing the retrospective study review. The lessons refer specifically to ways to improve the methodology or the protocol as it was implemented.

Broaden the interviews. It would be useful to have been able to capture the insights of a wider group of those involved in the original projects including implementers, donors, partners, and those for whom the project was intended to benefit. While the consultants did a very good job of putting together the case, perhaps more information could have been garnered from different perspectives about what led to or away from success and what could have been done differently.

Build in a means to have multiple stakeholders view the results. It was the intention of the retrospective review to allow for a multi-major group review of the results. This did not seem to materialize within the in-country studies. It would have been advantageous to have assisted in the arrangement of a face-to-face meeting of local major group members to review the project report and add their own perspectives or insights to the report. Another way to implement this would have been to have a two-three person (different major group actors) to carry out the review. And perhaps a cost-effective method would be to convene a "shade tree" meeting of stakeholders in the project with multi-major group members in a participatory monitoring and evaluation (PM&E) of the project. This would not result in a case study but could have provided a rapid assessment from the different stakeholders' vantage points. This may mean that some side discussions have to take place to ensure that all voices are heard.

Place more emphasis on what was in place before and what was in place afterwards. While these aspects were integrated into the survey protocol, it may have been helpful to place more emphasis on them. In some cases, we did gain an understanding of what was involved in selecting the sites for the efforts and which organizations were present, but it would have been useful to have further elaborated the endogenous groups and perhaps existing assets that served as the starting point or impetus to the project. Understanding of "where are they now" could have been enhanced. What was in place afterwards is sometimes difficult to ascertain, perhaps a set of questions to specifically address what might still be in place would have been of great use. These could include specific or general questions concerning: which practices have been expanded, replicated, or applied to other production systems; did extension agents continue to speak to practices; how

have farmer and other stakeholder relationships changed; how has increased confidence been manifested; and how have stakeholders been innovating since the project?

Consistency across reviews. Although implementers of the in-country reviews were dedicated to carrying out the protocol, there was inconsistency of the thoroughness of responses to protocol queries. A dialogue among the consultants in which they could speak to one another and compare notes at several stages in the process would have exponentially yielded information. Reviewer dialogue would have improved consistency as well as prompted insights and further queries to be teased out.

Who carries out the review? Of the in-country reviews, two were carried out by independent consultants while one was carried out by an individual from a regional NGO who was closely related to the project being reviewed. While it is difficult to discern, one wonders how this influences the final product. Depending on their expertise and experience related to project development and implementation, any consultant can either remain objective or unknowingly introduce bias. This may be linked to inconsistencies in protocol implementation.

Understand how the money was spent. While this seems a more specific point, one project elaborated how the money had been allocated in the project. In a time of limited availability of financial resources, it is very helpful to understand in which areas successful cases chose to invest their resources. Budgetary allocation can indicate critical components and priorities as well as return on investment.

Getting at Lessons versus Cases. In a sense, there was perhaps more emphasis placed on telling a full story of the project than on specifically targeting lessons and insights to be captured before, during and after the project. Unless, a full case description is needed, perhaps a better way would be to have specific categories of insights and lessons learned each with a focused set of questions.

5.0 SUMMARY

Was it worth the investment? Looking back at projects that had been viewed as successful after several years since the end of the project was an important exercise to learn more about what constitutes ‘staying power’ for sustainable agriculture and rural development. In several cases, success was realized and maintained to a degree. In other cases, success was much less evident than anticipated. With a relatively small investment, the study learned how difficult it is to keep success in place and what elements of projects have the better chance of adding lasting value. It was also a useful testing of the protocol and will clearly inform how to go forward with reviews with SARD.

Providing Input to the SARD Initiative. The SARD Initiative promotes awareness raising and capacity building of stakeholders to implement, scale up and replicate SARD-good related practices. The lessons learned through this effort, which focused on civil society led projects in this case, can readily be used as input to the repository of

knowledge (the Resource Facility), and in criteria and priority setting for the small grants mechanism of the Initiative and as a means of reviewing various contributions by major stakeholders to the Initiative. The lessons learned from this effort can readily be applied to case-study write-up design as well as refinement of protocol methods.

The Way Forward. The study has been a useful exercise and assisted in a better understanding of “why are we doing this”. Project-based efforts, for better or for worse, are an important means for moving SARD forward. They also end. A project is only a moment in time in the life of a community and often a variety of projects are being put in place simultaneously that may or may not be coherently implemented. We are trying to learn what has to be in place for projects to have a lasting impact – what are those best practices in terms of principles of development, implementation strategies (capacity building, micro-financing, market promotion), and specific good practices that will lead to enhanced economic viability, environmental quality, and social well being of the rural poor. With this in mind, some options for improving or advancing the study to a next stage could include, among others:

- Modify the current protocol to be less extensive and more intensive with specific questions focused on aspects that lead to sustained impacts (economic, social, environmental).
- Provide in-country training and utilize periodic reviewer/consultant dialogue during protocol implementation.
- Explore the possibility of convening in-country meeting(s) of stakeholders of past successful projects and major group representatives not associated with the project(s) to attain responses to questions from different perspectives.
- Convene informal meeting with stakeholders of specific past, successful projects to rapidly attain an understanding of these
- Take the opportunity to capitalize on other best/good practice workshops around the world to interview stakeholders related to what inputs were viewed as ensuring sustained impacts as well as sharing lessons learned to date.
- Use electronic means to either capture more data from donor, major group representatives and others’ perspectives on strategies for long term impacts or to validate and augment findings of these and other retrospective analyses.

This report does not represent a full analysis of the four in-country case studies, but rather provides a brief summary of lessons and suggestions for improving the methodology. Readers are directed to the full in-country reports for greater detail and analysis of individual cases.

Acknowledgements

The consultant wishes to thank Eve Crowley (SDAR), John Dixon (AGSF), Thorsten Arnold (formerly SDAR), Ian Cherrett (SDAR), Arthur Getz-Escudero (IPSA), Paola Termine (SDAR) for their insights shared during this process; the consultants that carried out the in country efforts, Maxwell Mudhara (Zimbabwe), Benjamin Erazo (Honduras), and Roel Ravanera (ANGOC); and Sally Laird (SDAR) for assistance in subcontracting and logistics.

Annex 1. General Criteria for Review of Success Case Databases

Category	Criteria ²
Overarching Goal	1) Does the case study demonstrate one of the Millennium Development Goals and/or the Johannesburg Implementation Plan? 2) Did the case study demonstrate multiple dimensions of sustainability (social, economic, environmental)?
Thematic Areas and Activity Results/Outcomes	3) Does the case study address one of the SARD Thematic Areas? 4) Did the case study demonstrate a transition toward or enhance sustainable agriculture and rural development?
	Good Practices for SARD
	Fair Employment
	Access to Resources (land, biological resources, financial, information, technology)
Level of Stakeholder Involvement	5) Were stakeholders and their organisations engaged in activity design and implementation? 6) Did traditionally marginalized actors benefit? 7) Were multiple stakeholder groups involved in a meaningful way? (Level also of government involvement if available?)
Approach of Effort (capacity building, information exchange, monitoring)	8) Were capacity building or information exchange efforts done in a way to empower local stakeholders and/or build dialogue across stakeholder groups?
Process	9) Did the activity demonstrate an increase the lobbying, negotiating capacity or decision-making capacity of traditionally marginalized groups or other members of or networks of civil society? 10) Did the effort have a practice to policy link? At what point of entry?
Time Frame	11) Is the activity still underway? (Difficult to tell, perhaps?)
Impact	12) What was the scale of impact?
Scale	13) Did the activity take place at the local level? Did it have a mechanism for scaling horizontally or vertically?
Agroecological Zone	14) Did the activity take place in Mountain Communities?

² These criteria are being used to assess information provided in a case study. The term activity is used to describe the effort described in the case study.

Annex 2. Protocol for Retrospective Review of Successes

Protocol to Assess In-Country Case Studies (also available in Spanish)

A: Background Information

Name of Experience:

Province, Country:

Agroecological Zone:

Initiation Date:

Completion Date:

Contact Person and Institution

B. Framing the Context: Time Frames & External Influences

1. What is the time frame of the experience that is being reported on?
 - Initiation date?
 - Completion date (if applicable)?
2. If officially completed (if a time bound project), have the activity or specific aspects continued?
3. If this effort is informal (not a project), what will sustain it, who will steward it, what can be said about its future? What are the ongoing aspects that will allow it to sustain?
4. Which major external influences (triggers, causal factors, extenuating circumstances) took place before, during and after the described period (when)? And how did it affect the dynamic?

Type

Timeframe

- | | | |
|--|-------|-------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Economic changes | _____ | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Social changes | _____ | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Policy changes | _____ | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental / climatic impacts (El Niño, droughts, floods, ...) | _____ | _____ |

5. Describe the local or immediate impact of these external influences on the community / region where this case takes place.

From an internal perspective?

6. Has a specific shortcoming / development (pivotal event or inaction) been identified as main challenge that the activity or case is addressing?

7. Describe the endogenous institutional setting (social capital, institutional networks) that was in place prior to this experience, and why it is relevant in terms of advancing or slowing the progress of the experience.

8. Did any external institutional or personnel changes take place that had major impacts on the case? How and when?

C: Gauging Fit with International Commitments

9. Does the case demonstrate achievement address one of the Millennium Development Goals and/or the Johannesburg Implementation Plan? (Check all that apply)

- Aim of improving local food security, food safety, nutrition?
- Aim of reducing poverty?
- Aim of enhancing sustainable rural development?
- Aim of improving environmental sustainability?
- Aim of enhancing social equity and gender balance?
- Aim of enhancing cultural appropriateness and rights farmers, waged workers, indigenous peoples?
- Aim of improving economic development and sustainable livelihoods?
- Aim of improving fair agricultural/rural employment to ensure sustainable livelihoods

10. Does the case study/activity address multiple dimensions of sustainability (social, economic, environmental)? (order them by emphasis)

- Social
- Economic
- Environmental

D. Thematic Areas

11. Does the case study/activity address a SARD Initiative Thematic Area? (Check all that apply)

- Good Practices for SARD
- Fair Employment
- Access to Resources

12. Did the case study or activity result in positive changes in:

- Financial assets
- Social assets
- Human assets
- Physical assets
- Natural assets

13. Which group was targeted to benefit from the activity or case study?

- Farmers
 - Herdsmen
 - Fisher Folks
 - Semi-urban poor
 - Indigenous
 - Women
 - Youth
 - Local Institutions
 - Natural Resources Management
 - Institutions for Capacity building
 - Other
-

14. For case studies that address Good Practices for SARD which of the following resulted?

- Enhanced Indigenous and traditional resource management systems, practices or local knowledge enhanced or preserved
- Created or strengthened value added/niche markets/market access
- Enhanced productivity
- Intensification of existing systems
- Diversified Farming/fishery systems
- Enhanced environmental quality (a) land, (b) water, (c) biodiversity, (d) energy

15. For case studies that addressed Fair Employment, which of the following resulted?

- Created employment or self-employment opportunities
- Reduced health and safety risk to waged agricultural workers and self-employed farmers, livestock keepers/herders
- Enhanced fairer employment for waged agricultural workers
- Increased women's wage earning potential
- Reduced level of out-migration
- Addressed labour issues associated with HIV/AIDS
- Reduced use of agricultural child labour
- Addressed health and safety issues

16. For case studies that address Access to Resources, for which of the following resources did the activity increase access:

- a. land
- b. biological resources
- c. financial
- d. information
- e. technological
- f. other? _____

17. What or who inspired the experience?

18. How was support garnered for the activity?

E: Stakeholder Involvement

Stakeholders	Inspired	Initiated	Implemented	Evaluated
Indigenous People				
Women				
Youth				
Workers				
Farmers				
Pastoralists				
Fisherpersons				
NGOs/CSOs				
Local Authority				
Science and Technology				
Business and Industry				
Media				
Consumers				
National Government				
Subnational Government				
Bilateral Agencies				
Intergovernmental Organizations				

19. Building on the above steps of involvement, please show a timeline of involvement of various actors and what role they played prior to, during, and following the experience.

20. What obstacles were found during the course of the experience?

21. What were key contributions and insights during the course of the experience?

22. Which were crucial stages for stakeholder involvements, that produced major value-added?

23. If stakeholders faced diverging views, how were these resolved? Can you identify key principles that helped to find common action (Please provide lessons if such are available)?

F. Capacity building and Information Exchange

24. What kind of capacity building or information exchange took place? (Describe)

- Local learning efforts
- Training workshops
- Field Schools
- Farmer-to-Farmer
- Waged worker-to-Waged Worker
- Field visits
- School curricula
- Public service projects
- Media (radio, print, video, etc)?
- Other?

25. Please describe capacity building or information exchange efforts.

- Who organized?
- Who and in what numbers participated? (women, men)
- What was the aim of the capacity building effort?
- What (innovative) methods were employed?
- Was the effort carried out in a way to empower local stakeholders or build dialogue across stakeholder groups? How so?

26. Did the experience increase dialogue and coalescence of divergent groups? If yes, how so?

27. Did the activity increase the rights of civil society or marginalized groups?

- Yes, who? Which? How?
- No

28. Did the experience change the present day status of poor, medium, or rich individuals or the movement between these wealth classes?

29. Did the experience change behaviour or attitudes around:

- Resource use
- Collaboration
- Conflict resolution

G. Practice to Policy

30. Did the activity increase the lobbying, negotiating capacity or decision-making capacity of traditionally marginalized groups or other members of or networks of civil society? If yes, how so and at what level?

31. Did the changes in practice in natural resource management influence changes in policies? If yes, how and at what level?

- Local government policy
- National government policy

H. Impact of activities

32. What was the scale of impact? (Please describe how impact was assessed (categories, numbers, indicators))

33. Was there participation in the monitoring and evaluation within the experience?

34. What indicators of success have been identified by stakeholders?

35. Were there trade-offs identified by the stakeholders?

36. Did the experience prompt replication or expansion? How? If not, what were the barriers?

37. Were there any unexpected impacts?

I. Lessons about Lessons

38. If you had to do it over again, how would you do it differently?
(What would you not do again?)

Annex 3. Short List of 15 Case Studies Identified from Total Screened

Name	Country	MG ³	Source	Contact
Hillside Improvement	Honduras, Guatemala, Nicaragua	F,W	Compendium of Land and SARD Cases, 2001	Roland Bunch, Honduras Rolando@ cosecha.sdnhon.org.hn Juan Carlos Moreira, Guatemala centromaya@guate.net
Rodale Regenerative Ag Research Center	Senegal	F	Compendium of Land and SARD Cases, 2001	Amadou Diop, Rodale adiop@rodaleinst.org
The Society for People's Education and Economic Change, Tamil Nadu	India	F,W	Compendium of Land and SARD Cases, 2001	John Devavaram speech@md3.vsnl.net.in
Organic farming of cotton with natural pest management	Zimbabwe	F,W	Compendium of Land and SARD Cases, 2001	PAN-UK www.pan-uk.org
Indo-German Watershed Development Program, Maharashtra	India	W,Y	Compendium of Land and SARD Cases, 2001	Lobo and Korchendorfer-Lucius, 1998
Comite de Investigacion Agricola Local – CIAL	Colombia	F, S&T	Compendium of Land and SARD Cases, 2001	Ann Braun, CIAT
Federation of Senegalese NGOs, FONGS	Senegal	F	Compendium of Land and SARD Cases, 2001	
Unilever plc and SAI	Global	B&I	Compendium of Land and SARD Cases, 2001	Jan kees Vis Jan-Kees.Vis@unilever.com
National Policy for SA	Cuba		Compendium of Land and SARD Cases, 2001	Fernando Funes mgahona@ip.etecsa.cu
Microbacias and ZT programme in Santa Caterina	Brazil		Compendium of Land and SARD Cases, 2001, UN Successes	Gilmar Jacobowski EPAGRI gilmar@epagri.rct-sc.br
National IPM Programme	India		Compendium of Land and SARD	Peter Kenmore

³ F=Farmers, W=Women, B&I=Business and Industry, S&T=Science and Technology, Y=Youth, I = Indigenous Peoples

			Cases, 2001	
National IPM for Rice Programme	Indonesia		Compendium of Land and SARD Cases, 2001, UN Success Stories	Peter Kenmore
ZT in large scale farms in Parana and Grande de Sol	Brazil		Compendium of Land and SARD Cases, 2001,	John Landers John.Landers@apis.com.br
Chivi Food Security Project	Zimbabwe	F,W	Compendium of Land and SARD Cases, 2001	ITDG
Forest Women Making Their Own Decisions	India	W	ILO	Women's Environment and Sustainable Development Case Study
Employing Sustainable Community Management	Philippines	W,I,F,	UN Success	Roel R Rwanera, ANGOC angoc@angoc.ngo.ph www.un.org/esa/sustdev/mggroups/success/SARD-3.htm
Uttar Pradesh Sodic Lands Reclamation	India	W,F	UN Success	Richard Castro rcastro3@worldbank.org www.un.org/esa/sustdev/mggroups/success/SARD-15.htm
National Program for Agricultural Technology Transfer	Colombia	F, S&T	UN Success	Luis Ernesto Villegas PRONATTA@colomsat.net.co www.un.org/esa/sustdev/mggroups/success/SARD-18.htm
Tamil Nadu Women's Development Project	India	F,W	UN Success	Ms. Rarhana Haque-Rahman, IFAD www.un.org/esa/sustdev/mggroups/success/SARD-29.htm

Annex 4. Abstracts for In-Country Case Studies

1. Desarrollo Rural basado en el Mejoramiento Agrícola Sostenible - Programa de Guaimaca

Departamento de Francisco Morazán, Honduras, América Central (1992-1999), COSECHA

Este documento presenta la experiencia de la Asociación de Consejeros para una Agricultura Sostenible, Ecológica y Humana (COSECHA) en la ejecución del Programa Diseminación de la Metodología del Desarrollo Centrado en la Gente, la cual es conocida también como Metodología de Campesino a Campesino.

La experiencia ya finalizada, con una duración de 8 años (1992-1999), se ejecuto en una zona de Bosque de Pino, con altitudes que van de los 500 a 1300 metros sobre el nivel del mar, en 32 comunidades del Municipio de Guaimaca, del Departamento de Francisco Morazán en Honduras.

Este programa fue concebido como la aplicación de la metodología de desarrollo de desarrollo basado en la gente, a efecto de difundirla entre instituciones nacionales y extranjeras.

Programas como estos ya habían sido desarrollados por los integrantes de COSECHA en Guatemala y mas de 3 en Honduras. Los recursos humanos que colaboraron en su ejecución ya tenían experiencia en la aplicación de la metodología y habían venido mejorando aspectos de ella.

COSECHA plantea que el objetivo de los programas de desarrollo es el fomento de la capacidad de innovación del agricultor, a fin de permitirle adecuarse a los cambios constantes en su medio físico y económico.

La propuesta es entonces desarrollar capacidades humanas por medio de una propuesta agrícola que lleve a las personas a tener logros a corto plazo reconocibles por él y sus vecinos. De esta forma las metas que se proponen son de productividad física alcanzables por una tecnología básica de manejo de suelos adecuada a la situación ecológica.

A la fecha de este estudio el Programa tiene 5 años de haber finalizado. COSECHA desde entonces no ha tenido mas acciones de asistencia técnica a los agricultores; sin embargo continua manteniendo una relación de intercambio, ya que el área y parte de las comunidades donde se ejecuto el Programa se utiliza como demostrativa de la metodología aplicada por COSECHA. De esta suerte algunas de las comunidades reciben visitas de personas e instituciones interesadas en la metodología de campesino a campesino y los resultados de la misma. Ello permite mantener cierto interés en los campesinos para mostrar sus trabajos agrícolas, pero también les permite recibir sugerencias de los visitantes.

Los resultados mas visibles que tiene el visitante de hoy es poder comprobar que los rendimientos en granos básicos, alcanzados durante la ejecución del programa, se mantienen, que las principales practicas de conservación de suelo en ladera permanecen y que existe evolución de los campesinos hacia otros cultivos de mayor rentabilidad.

Durante la ejecución del Programa 186 campesinos lograron duplicar su ingreso monetario mediante el incremento de la productividad y dedicarse al cultivo de hortalizas en forma comercial. Como consecuencia del mejoramiento son visibles mejoras en las viviendas: techos y pisos, principalmente, que mejoran las condiciones de salud de las familias. Todas esas mejoras han sido auto financiadas y como producto del crecimiento de la auto estima de los campesinos participantes del programa. En varios de los casos observados los campesinos mantenían a sus hijos en la escuela de segunda enseñanza.

Cinco campesinos que fueron capacitados, debido al éxito personal alcanzado se han o están desempeñándose como Extensionsitas o Facilitadores Agrícolas en otros Programas, en un esquema de trabajo que les permite enseñar a otros y seguir progresando en los trabajos agrícolas de su hogar.

Para la elaboración de este documento se han tenido en cuenta las siguientes fuentes de datos:

- o Los documentos del proyecto, los cuales quedan relacionados al final del documento
- o Entrevistas, utilizando el Protocolo de investigación, con el Coordinador de COSECHA, Señor Gabino López, y con el ex Coordinador del Programa de Guamica, Señor Eduardo Tomas.
- o Entrevista con tres agricultores de Guiamaca, que en este momento prestan sus servicios como extensionistas profesionales en otro Programa de COSECHA, en el municipio de Sabana Grande, departamento de Francisco Morazán.
- o Entrevistas con agricultores / as en Guiamaca. Las comunidades a visitar fueron seleccionadas por COSECHA y son donde tuvieron los mejores resultados. En principio, la selección de los agricultores a visitar en sus casas y parcelas, fue concertada por COSECHA, pero por la proximidad de las parcelas se visitaron 5 que no estaban previstas. Las entrevistas a los agricultores fueron no estructuradas, la cual se dividió en 2 partes: por una parte, la apreciación general que el agricultor tiene del trabajo del Programa de COSECHA, y, por otra, la visita a sus cultivos en donde se converso sobre los aspectos técnicos (lo aprendido y lo que sigue aplicando)) del manejo del suelo, los cultivos, productividad, avances y limitaciones. Al final se da el listado de las entrevistas y una breve descripción de cada agricultor

Finalmente, este documento ha sido revisado y discutido con los responsables de COSECHA, quienes han hecho observaciones que han sido incorporadas.

2. SARD in the Uplands of Dansolihon

Cagayan de Oro City, Philipines, Asian Non Government Organization Coalition (ANGOC)

The Project was initiated to enhance the capacities of the upland farmers for them to participate in the development processes. It was envisioned that by doing so they would improve their productivity while conserving the fragile agricultural resource base.

It addressed first the problem of access to land. Then, it assisted in redesigning the farming system to improve productivity and prevent soil erosion. In consultation with the communities, the Project incorporated health services as one of the major interventions as a response to lack of basic services in the area. Towards the end of the Project, it attempted to link the upland farmers to the local market.

After three years, the Project was able to facilitate the awarding of stewardship contracts covering 1,650 hectares to five organizations of upland farmers under the Community Based Forestry Management Program of the government. With the improvement in the tenurial arrangement, the farmers have also adopted more sustainable farming practices leading to increased productivity and stability of the farms. Health and sanitation also improved. Underlying all these project activities was the establishment of environmentally aware and empowered community organizations.

Several lessons can be drawn from the Project experience particularly on the stages of development in the uplands, on facilitating access to land, on implementing agricultural interventions in marginal lands and in enhancing multi-stakeholder participation. It also suggests to other groups working on the uplands to take a closer look in linking upland farmers to the market as it may have substantial impact on improving their quality of life.

3. Chivi Food Security Food Project

Masvingo, Zimbabwe (1990-1996), ITDG

Intermediate Technology Development Group (ITDG) undertook a project in Chivi District, Ward 21 to enhance food security between 1990 and 1996. Chivi is an area vulnerable to drought. ITDG adopted a participatory approach for implementing the project. After establishing rapport with the people, the Project Officer identified the institutions to work with and then prioritized the problems with the community. The major area of work for the project was water conservation. The project worked with farmers' clubs and garden groups. Garden groups ensured that women were well included in the project.

Farmers and their community leaders went for the Training for Transformation course. The training empowered farmers to form groups that undertook participatory research. ITDG facilitated the interaction of farmers with the institutions working with the

technologies that offered solutions to the priority problems. On one hand, farmers visited research stations and on the other, personnel from research stations and other development institutions trained farmers on relevant technologies within the area. Farmers adopted a variety of water conservation technologies they were exposed to. Farmers also held field days, competitions and other activities spearheaded by farmers' groups.

Upon ITDG's departure from the area, farmer organizations remained intact and continued to undertake development activities. The project led to the formation of Chivi South Development Trust, which is spearheading development in the area. Nevertheless, before the trust became fully fledged, it relied on ITDG for financial support.

4. Organic Farming of Cotton with Natural Pest Management

Mashonaland Central (1997-2000), Zimbabwe, AfFORest

A program for smallholder farmer production of organic cotton was undertaken in Zambezi Valley of Zimbabwe between 1997 and 2000. Lower Guruve Development Association (LGDA) initiated the project after identifying pesticide use as being detrimental to the health of farmers and women, in particular. The profitability of pesticide use was also on the decline. Other organizations joined the program to fulfill different tasks. Export Promotion of Organic Produce from Africa (EPOPA), an organisation with experience in the promotion of the exportation of organic commodities, took over from LGDA as the overseer of the program. EPOPA, through Agro Eco, an organization with experience linking institutions involved in production and export marketing of organic cotton, and Zimbabwe Institute of Permaculture (ZIP) Research (later called AfFOResT) trained farmers in organic farming. Cargill, a private company, ginned the cotton.

Farmers trained by ZIP Research in organic farming (called Farmer Field Workers), led Farmer Field Schools (FFS) consisting of groups of farmers. In FFS, farmers working together experimented with organic cotton production. Farmers were organized into an association called Zambezi Valley Organic Producers Association (ZVOPA). At the peak in 1999, farmers increased production to 11,000 kg. The cotton was ginned and tee-shirts, produced from the cotton, were sold in Europe.

The project showed that, given the necessary know-how, farmers can produce organic cotton. It was evident that for this to be sustainable, farmers would need to be more involved in the decisions made regarding the project. In addition, farmers should not be rushed into complicated aspects such as certification as organic producers and into the exporting the cotton. They should be competent with the production process first.