

Republic of Kenya, United Republic of Tanzania, Republic of Uganda

FY2015 Ex-Post Evaluation of Technical Cooperation Project
“The Project of the African Institute for Capacity Development Phase II and Phase III”

External Evaluator: Mayumi Hamada
Foundation for Advanced Studies on International Development

0. Summary

This project aimed to establish the African Institute of Capacity Development (hereafter, AICAD) in order to conduct training and extension packages based on research that contributes to poverty alleviation and human resources development in collaboration with the member universities and to enhance self-support of AICAD in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda. Poverty alleviation was consistent with the policy and development needs of the three target countries (i.e. Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania) and Japan’s ODA policy. Therefore, relevance of the project is high. In Phase II¹ of the project, although networks with the teaching staff and other important players at the member universities were established, the development and implementation of training and extension packages based on the research results were insufficient. In Phase III, although outputs and project-purpose achievements were enhanced by focussing on extension packages as the target of JICA’s support, the relationship with the university teaching staff was weakened. Additionally, the extent of knowledge establishment and skills acquired by the participants through the project’s training and extension packages is regarded to be fair for Phase II and relatively high for Phase III. Therefore, effectiveness and impact of the project are fair. Regarding the project costs borne by the Japanese side in Phase II, it is necessary to consider that the input of human resources significantly increased compared to the planning stage, although specific figures related to the planned budget were not mentioned, while effectiveness and impact are fair. In Phase III, the project cost from the Japanese side drastically decreased compared to the planning stage because the planned figure was temporarily set and the substantial area of support from JICA was narrowed down drastically after project commencement. On the other hand, the cooperation period for Phases II and III was shorter than planned. Hence, efficiency of the project is fair. As for sustainability, some minor problems have been observed in terms of the organisational, technical and financial aspects, although no major problems have been observed in the policy background. Thus, sustainability of the project is fair.

In light of the above, this project is evaluated to be partially satisfactory.

¹ This project was implemented from Phase I to Phase III. In this evaluation study, Phase II and Phase III were evaluated integrally as one project.

1. Project Description



Project Locations
(Red star = Headquarters
Blue star = Country Office)



Knowledge and Technology Dissemination
Programme (KTDP) in Tanzania
(Food Processing)

1.1 Background

Although poverty alleviation was an important issue for African countries, it was difficult for them to plan and implement various measures to enhance productivity in agriculture, vocational training and so on by themselves. In line with the program announced by the Japanese government at the Tokyo International Conference on African Development II (TICAD II) held at Tokyo in 1998 to support African nations, AICAD was established in 2000 and aimed to develop and conduct training and extension programmes based on research which would contribute to poverty alleviation in collaboration with the member universities, and foster human resources related with them, which the Japanese government supported. AICAD conducted research, training and extension programmes which contributed to poverty alleviation in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda in collaboration with the member universities in the three countries and was acknowledged as a region-based international organisation during the project implementation period².

Japan provided its grant-aid support to construct a facility and provide equipment at the Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology campus in 2003 for AICAD. In terms of the technical cooperation project, during Phase I³ (2000–2002), the preparatory phase, it was decided to implement the project in substantial phases (Phase II and so on) in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda in conjunction with the eight universities in those countries and started to establish their basic structure and activities on a trial basis.

During Phase II (2002–2007), research support and the development and implementation of extension packages based on the research results, as well as training packages based on existing

² However, in Uganda, it is still in the process of qualification screening as a region-based international organisation at the time of the ex-post evaluation.

³ In Phase I, the substantial phases of the project cooperation period were expected to last approximately 10 years (JICA internal document).

knowledge, were conducted in collaboration with the 15 member universities in the three countries. However, since the results of the research, training and extension activities during Phase II did not reach the expected level, both sides agreed that JICA's support would be focussed on extension activities which intended to solve problems in local communities in Phase III (2007–2012), and these activities were implemented accordingly. At the completion of Phase III, there were 19 member universities (including one which suspended their membership) in the three countries, a number that had not changed at the time of this ex-post evaluation.

1.2 Project Outline⁴

		Phase II	Phase III
Overall Goal		To be the leading African institution in building human capacity for poverty reduction.	AICAD becomes an independent, region-based international organisation which plays a leading role in building human capacity for poverty reduction in Africa
Project Purpose		AICAD will establish structural and functional modality for effective linkage between knowledge/technology and application.	AICAD will be strengthened at its core functions and organisation, which embody AICAD's comparative advantages for facilitating networking and capacity building for poverty reduction and socio-economic development
Outputs	Output 1	Knowledge and technology packages for poverty reduction are identified and generated.	To ensure sustainability of the following outputs (2–3), the capacity of AICAD Secretariats enhanced, especially in planning and coordinating.
	Output 2	Partnerships for identification, generation and transfer of knowledge and technology (research, training, etc.) within the countries are strengthened.	The networking function of AICAD is strengthened.
	Output 3	Cooperation with other regions for identification, generation and transfer is enhanced (Establishment of partnership with other regions)	AICAD's activities are reinforced to focus on technology dissemination for the communities in order to contribute to poverty reduction.
	Output 4	Identified and generated knowledge and technology translated into appropriate dissemination/extension packages	/
	Output 5	Appropriate knowledge and technology are transferred to extension organisations and communities.	
	Output 6	Networks and resource sharing with institutions and communities in participating countries are established	
	Output 7	Target countries for AICAD Phase III are identified and preparations for	

⁴ Although some parts of the expression of PDM in English and Japanese versions are not exactly the same, the original expression in each version of PDM was quoted throughout this evaluation report, unless there is no specific reason, because they were already shared among the stakeholders of the project.

		joining are made	
	Output 8	Effective organisational structure is established ⁵	
Total cost (Japanese Side)		1,559 million yen	447 million yen
Project Period		August 2002–July 2007	September 2007–June 2012
Implementing Agency		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AICAD— Headquarters in Kenya and Country Office (hereinafter, CO) in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda • Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Technology (Kenya); Ministry of Communication, Science and Technology (Tanzania); Ministry of Education and Sports (Uganda) 	
Other Relevant Agencies/Organisations		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Member universities: 8 universities at the commencement of Phase 2 (5 in Kenya, 2 in Tanzania and 1 in Uganda), 19 universities at the completion of Phase 3 (7 in Kenya, 7 in Tanzania and 5 in Uganda, including 1 university in Tanzania, whose membership was suspended) 	
Supporting Agency/Organisation in Japan		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology • Ministry of Foreign Affairs • AICAD Support Committee in Japan (Kyoto University, Nagoya University and Hitotsubashi University) 	
Related Projects		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical Cooperation Project: ‘African Institute for Capacity Development’ (Kenya/Tanzania/Uganda) (2000–2002) • Grant Aid Project: ‘The Project for Construction of African Institute for African Development’ (Kenya) (2001–2003) • Technical Cooperation Project: ‘AFRICA-ai-JAPAN-Project: African Union-African innovation – JKUAT AND PAUSTI⁶ Network Project’ (Kenya) (2014–2019) 	

1.3 Outline of the Terminal Evaluation

The overview of the achievements of the project purpose and overall goal at the terminal evaluation of Phase II and Phase III, as well as recommendations, are as follows.

Table 1 Outline of the Terminal Evaluation (Phase II and Phase III)

	Phase II	Phase III
Achievement of Project Purpose	Although AICAD already have established certain modalities for research & development (R&D) and training & extension (T&E), they have not yet established a functional system of effective collaboration among the divisions.	AICAD have acquired the capacity to mobilise resources throughout the broad range of the university network as a result of conducting various activities in collaboration with the member universities.
Achievement of Overall Goal	Though AICAD are still in their early stage, as they were newly established, they steadily have been accumulating knowledge and technology and are establishing their administration system towards attaining the overall goal.	If AICAD can ensure sustainability from organisational, technical and financial aspects, and maintain their current activities both in terms of quality and quantity, it is highly probable that the overall goal will be achieved within 3 to 5 years.

⁵ In the Japanese version of the PDM, Output 8 is described as “Mechanisms for the organization, effective policy, human resources management, governance, resource management and monitoring & evaluation are established.”

⁶ PAUSTI stands for Pan-African University Science Technology Innovation. PAU is a graduate university that teaches students at master’s and doctorate courses from multiple countries throughout Africa, using the facilities, manpower and support from related organisations from the host universities, which are existing universities in Africa. It is based on the ‘PAU Plan’ formulated by the African Union Committee (AUC) in 2008.

Recommendations	<p>(1) Putting priority of Japanese support on research projects that have potential to be disseminated and promoting the 'AICAD-directed needs-oriented research' support</p> <p>(2) Enhancing follow-ups for the ex-participants of AICAD's training courses by COs</p> <p>(3) Collection and sharing information within the region for Information maintenance & Dissemination and establishing a policy and basic plan for information and communication technology (ICT)</p> <p>(4) Developing an annual operational plan through the revision of the five-year strategic plan (2005)</p> <p>(5) Dividing AICAD activities into two categories: activities funded by the three countries and those financed by external funds; JICA shall support the latter. Defining the role of COs more clearly and empowering them if need be.</p>	<p>【 Short-term 】 (By the completion of the project)</p> <p>(1) Preparing summary sheets for CEP⁷ and UOA⁸, and holding a seminar</p> <p>(2) Raising visibility within the governments of the member states</p> <p>【 Medium-term 】</p> <p>(3) Selection and concentration on core competence by further strengthening AICAD's comparative advantages</p> <p>(4) Developing strategic materials and promoting marketing/publicity</p> <p>(5) Garnering more support and cooperation from donors and other development institutions and strengthening partnerships with existing partner organisations</p> <p>(6) HQs' stronger support to COs for scaling up their activities</p>
-----------------	--	--

Source: Based on the Terminal Evaluation Report on Phase II and Phase III

2. Outline of the Evaluation Study

2.1 External Evaluator

Mayumi Hamada, Foundation for Advanced Studies on International Development

2.2 Duration of Evaluation Study

Duration of the Study: August, 2015–October, 2016

Duration of the Field Study: October 25, 2015–December 10, 2015

January 31, 2016–February 13, 2016

2.3 Method of the Evaluation Study

The project was implemented beginning Phase I through the end of Phase III. In this report, Phase II and Phase III, the target periods of this evaluation, were evaluated as one project. In terms of the evaluation criteria, the project's relevance and sustainability, which are regarded to be highly common and successive between Phase II and Phase III, were evaluated together (as for the project's sustainability, emphasis was put on Phase III in terms of information collection

⁷ CEP stands for Community Empowerment Programme. It is one of the extension programmes developed by the project and was the major area of JICA's support in Phase III. It is a programme in which various types of interference, such as technical guidance, visits to related stakeholders, provision of small equipment and so on, are made simultaneously to community groups in the model area, which was selected in advance. CEP was planned and implemented using a participatory approach with people from each community.

⁸ UOA stands for University Outreach Activity. It means outreach activities by universities to contribute to society.

and analysis).

On the other hand, priority programmes and the types of activities varied throughout both phases, and the budgetary scale for each phase significantly differs from the other. Thus, the effectiveness and efficiency of both phases were evaluated separately. Additionally, achievements of each phase were assessed respectively; the relationship between the phases, contributing/hindering factors of the achievement and complementary effects that emerged were sufficiently comprehended, followed by assessing each evaluation criterion throughout both phases.

3. Results of the Evaluation (Overall Rating: C⁹)

3.1 Relevance (Rating: ③¹⁰)

3.1.1 Relevance to the Development Plan of Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda

Poverty alleviation has been one of the major policy issues in the African region. At the time of the ex-ante evaluation of Phase II, three participating countries had established poverty reduction strategy papers (PRSP), respectively, and conducted programmes accordingly. The three nations continuously made efforts to alleviate extreme poverty and achieve millennium development goals (MDGs) of the United Nations, launching policies to enhance agricultural productivity through the extension of appropriate technology, such as the ‘Investment Programme for the Economic Recovery Strategy for Wealth and Employment Creation’ (2003–2007) in Kenya, the ‘National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty’ (NSGRP) (2005–2010) in Tanzania and ‘Poverty Eradication Action Plan’ (PEAP) (2004–2007) in Uganda. Later, these policies were taken over by policies such as ‘Vision 2030’ (2007–2030) in Kenya, ‘The Tanzania Five Year Development Plan’ (2011–2015) in Tanzania and the ‘National Development Plan’ (2010–2014) in Uganda. However, the policy direction towards poverty reduction was maintained until the project completion of Phase III. The project intended to establish a mechanism to enhance human resources development and capacity development to contribute to poverty reduction. Hence, the project had been highly consistent with the development plan of the three nations throughout Phase II and Phase III.

3.1.2 Relevance to the Development Needs of Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda

The project aimed to address social and economic development to contribute to poverty reduction. On the other hand, nominal gross national income (GNI) per capita of the three countries remained low in world ranking at the end of the cooperation period, although it increased in each country compared to 2002 (when Phase II started), 2007 (when Phase II ended) and 2012 (when Phase III ended; Table 2). Hence, tackling the poverty alleviation issue

⁹ A: Highly satisfactory, B: Satisfactory, C: Partially satisfactory, D: Unsatisfactory

¹⁰ ③: High, ②: Fair, ①: Low

had been important for the target countries from the commencement of Phase II until the completion of Phase III. Therefore, the project’s direction had been consistent with the development needs of the three countries.

Table 2: Nominal GNI

Country	Nominal GNI per person (Unit: U.S. Dollar)			Ranking		
	2002	2007	2012	2002	2007	2012
Kenya	394	718	929	179	179	180
Tanzania	310	530	682	185	188	188
Uganda	308	419	599	187	197	195

Source: GLOBAL NOTE <http://www.globalnote.jp/post-1353.html>

3.1.3 Relevance to Japan’s ODA Policy

At TICAD II and the Birmingham Summit held in 1998, the Japanese government announced its support of actualising the base network conception (‘Bases for African Human Capacity Building’ [which was renamed AICAD later] and ‘Centers for Parasitic Disease Control’) and promoting regional cooperation (South-South cooperation) in collaboration with African countries. Additionally, human resources and agricultural development were two of the five priority areas in the Country Assistance Program for Kenya, which was formulated in August 2000. In the human resources development areas especially, one of the four priority issues was ‘higher and technical education’, which indicates a desire for the establishment of network bases in human resources development. Furthermore, the Country Assistance Program for Tanzania, which was established in June 2000, indicated that ‘support for promoting agriculture and small enterprises’ was one of the five priority areas. At the time of the ex-ante evaluation of Phase III, the project matched with the Japanese aid policy, including support towards the TICAD process as well as the priority area of the JICA Country Assistance Program. Thus, the project direction was highly consistent with the Japanese aid policy in both phases.

This project was highly relevant to the three countries’ development plan and development needs, as well as Japan’s ODA policy. Therefore, its relevance is high.

3.2 Effectiveness and Impact¹¹ (Rating: ②)

3.2.1 Effectiveness

3.2.1.1 Phase II

Regarding the achievement of the eight outputs in Phase II, only one was 'high', four 'fair' and three 'low'. Thus, achievement of the outputs as a whole is medium (Table 3).

Additionally, concerning the five indicators of the project purpose, Indicators 2, 4 and 5 were redefined based on the document review and interviews with those who were concerned with the project because of the problems shown below. As a result, Indicator 2 was not used as an indicator. Among the remaining four indicators, the achievement of one indicator was 'high', one 'fair' and one 'low'. For another indicator, no data existed (Table 4). Hence, achievement of the project purpose is assessed as medium.

- Indicator 2 (criteria for expansion to be reflective of participative approaches): this indicator was not used because what it meant was not clear.
- Indicator 4 (Number of identified and generated knowledge & technology packages adopted by target communities): based on the interviews with those who were concerned with the project, this indicator was interpreted as 'the number of identified and generated knowledge and technology packages applied (committed to by the target to use them) in the project sites where the project conducted extension activities.'
- Indicator 5 (Number of adapters of the knowledge and technology identified and generated by AICAD): based on the interviews with those who were concerned with the project, this indicator was interpreted as 'the number of people who use the knowledge and technology identified and generated by AICAD outside the project sites.'

By supporting research projects implemented by teaching staff at the member universities and developing and implementing training and extension packages¹² which will contribute to poverty reduction based on the research results, this project aimed to establish an organisation which can appropriately plan, operate and manage activities, involving various related institutions. During Phase II (Phase I was a preparatory phase), the project supported formulating basic internal documents concerned with personnel management, accounting systems and the like within AICAD. It also promoted establishing basic infrastructure, such as concluding partnership agreements, and supported AICAD to be accepted as a region-based

¹¹ Sub-rating for Effectiveness is to be put with consideration of Impact.

¹² The training package here means a framework for training (objective, contents, expected targets, trainers, necessary equipment, etc.), curriculum and teaching materials. Likewise, the extension package means a set of documents, such as the framework of the extension (objective, contents, expected targets, target area, trainers, facilitators and necessary equipment, etc.), programmes, schedule and documents, related to the establishment of the structure/mechanism.

Table 3: Achievement of Outputs by the Completion of Phase II (June 2007)

Output	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Achievement	Level of Achievement
Output 1: Knowledge and technology packages for poverty reduction are identified and generated. (×)	① Number of new knowledge and technology packages identified and generated	As the result of support for 119 research projects, 25 were identified as having potential for extension.	×
	② Number of existing knowledge and technology packages identified	The number of knowledge and technology packages identified based on existing knowledge and technology was 8 for training and 0 for extension.	×
Output 2: Partnerships for identification, generation and transfer of knowledge and technology (research, training, etc.) within countries are strengthened. (○)	① Number and type of partnership agreements on knowledge and technology with institutions within the region	AICAD concluded partnership agreements on research and training with 20 institutions in the 3 countries.	○
	② Number and type of existing partnership (e.g. MOUs, records of discussion and registration, etc.) with institutions in the participating countries	AICAD concluded partnership agreements on research and training with 20 institutions in the 3 countries.	○
	③ Others (not mentioned as an indicator, but added to be reflected into the assessment of Output 2 in consideration of its content)	229 teaching staff from the member universities and 252 staff from 146 organisations, i.e., the ministries, local governments, research institutes, training institutes and non-government organisations and so on, were involved as the trainers of AICAD programmes.	○
Output 3: Cooperation with other regions for identification, generation and transfer is enhanced (Establishment of partnership with other regions). (△)	① Number and type of partnership agreements with institutions outside the region.	AICAD concluded a partnership agreement with 24 institutions (universities in Japan, Thailand and Indonesia; international organisations, such as UNCRD; bilateral donors, such as TICA of Thailand and so on) outside the region (the 3 countries).	△
	② Number and type of partnership introduced in existent partnership with institutions outside the region		
	③ Number of collaboration programmes	N/A	N/A
	④ Number of participating institutions in the collaboration programmes	N/A	N/A
Output 4: Identified and generated knowledge and technology are translated into appropriate dissemination/extension packages. (×)	① Amount of knowledge and technology translated into appropriate dissemination/extension package	3 knowledge and technology dissemination programmes (hereafter, KTDPs ¹³) were developed during Phase 2, based on the results of research projects, for which 118 research projects were funded.	×
Output 5: Appropriate knowledge and technology are transferred to extension organisations and communities. (△)	① Number of trainees (This indicator was modified from 'the number of extension organisations trained' by terminal evaluation team)	A total of 1,314 people, including extension workers, farmers and business people, were trained through AICAD training courses which were developed by Output 4 (Regional training: 221; In-country training: 644; Grassroots training ¹⁴ : 449). Among the 3 extension packages developed, 1 of them started its activities before completion of Phase II ('Improving sesame production and utilization in low to medium rainfall areas of Western Kenya' in Kenya), while other 2 started the extension activities in Phase III.	○

¹³ It means "knowledge and technology dissemination programme based on the research result." KTDP was one of the extension packages implemented by the project. AICAD developed and implemented this extension package based on the results of research supported by AICAD.

¹⁴ "The Grassroots Training" of this project is a training course for which the program is designed on request basis and implemented with participation of specific group in order to address needs of specific areas. Some of the ex-participants of the In-country Training courses were expected to become trainers for the Grassroots Training courses. It was actually observed at the time of ex-post evaluation that some ex-participants of the In-Country Training were actually received as the trainers at the Grassroots Training.

	②	Number of communities trained	N/A	N/A
	③	Other (not mentioned as an indicator but added because an indicator for extension, which should have been included to assess technical transfer, was lacking)	Regarding technology transfer through the extension package, there was only 1 KTDP package, for which extension activities started during Phase II.	×
Output 6: Networks and resource sharing with institutions and communities in participating countries are established. (△)	①	Database sharing systems with other concerned organisations set up	Among the 3 modules of the Poverty Alleviation Information and Knowledge System (hereafter, PAIKS), Module 1 (research results) and Module 2 (training resource) were completed, while Module 3 (community information) had not been completed by the project's completion nor at the time of ex-post evaluation.	×
	②	Numbers and types of shared resources with other organisations	At the time of the terminal evaluation of Phase II, the number of materials for Module 1 (research result) was 730 and for Module 2 (training resource) 1,594. The data on the materials from terminal evaluation to the project completion were not available.	○
	③	Volume of information accumulated in the database	Volume of information accumulated in the database was 2.7 GB.	△
	④	Number of access to the database from outside organisations	The number of accesses to the database from outside was 2,635 (from December 2005 to October 2006). The number of accesses to the database from outside after October 2006 was not obtained.	○
Output 7: Target countries for AICAD Phase III are identified and preparations for joining AICAD are made. (×)	①	Number and names of potential target countries meeting set criteria	The selection of the potential target countries and preparations for their entry in AICAD have not been implemented because the activities under this plan were changed to be evaluated in 2009 as a part of the AICAD strategic plan.	×
Output 8: Effective organisational structure established. (△)	①	Improvement and the existence of the documents on organisational structure, policies, human resource systems and management, governance, resource mobilisation and monitoring and evaluation	The organisation chart and the governance structure are described in the AICAD charter. The operation and management procedure of AICAD were shown in the a) administrative manual, b) terms and conditions of services and regulation and c) financial regulations manual and implemented accordingly. On the other hand, communication between HQs and COs and establishment of structure for monitoring and follow up were insufficient.	△

Source: Produced based on the document review, interview and questionnaire

Remarks: The marks in the column 'Level of Achievement' mean the following.

○ High; ○/△ Relatively high; △ Medium; × Low; — Not applicable

Table 4: Achievement of Project Purpose by the Completion of Phase II (June 2007)

Project Purpose	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Achievement	Level of Achievement	
AICAD will establish a structural and functional modality for effective linkage between knowledge/technology and application. (△)	①	Level of involvement of intermediaries and communities in identification, generation and transfer of knowledge and technology	The researchers conducted 119 research projects, and 229 teaching staff from the member universities, as well as 252 staff from 146 institutions such as ministries, local governments, research institutes and non-government organisations participated in the training as the trainers. So, the level of involvement of intermediaries is high. Also, the foundation of the structure was built (e.g. some of the ex-participants of in-country training became trainers for the grassroots training).	○
	②	Criteria for expansion to be reflective of participative approaches	This indicator was not used, because what it meant was not clear.	—
	③	Improvement of institutional capacity related to knowledge and technology	Certain approaches were established to implement research and development, and training and extension.	△

		generation, translation and transfer to community linkage	On the other hand, a functional mechanism has not been established to link each division with each other effectively for the generation, translation and transfer of knowledge and technology.	
	④	Number of identified and generated knowledge and technology packages adapted by target communities (based on the interviews with the former Experts of the project, this indicator is interpreted as 'the number of identified and generated knowledge and technology packages applied and committed to by the target to use them in the project sites where the project conducted extension activities')	There were 2 packages which were applied (or committed to by the target to use the knowledge and technology) in the project sites by the project completion of Phase II. Also, 1 ('Improving sesame production and utilization in low to medium rainfall areas of Western Kenya' in Kenya) of the 3 extension programmes (KTDP) developed based on the research results started its activities during the same phase.	×
	⑤	Number of adopters of the knowledge and technology identified and generated by AICAD (Based on the interviews with former Experts of the project, this indicator is interpreted as 'the number of people who use the knowledge and technology identified and generated by AICAD outside the project sites')	N/A	N/A

Source: Produced based on the document review, interview and questionnaire

Remarks: The marks in the column 'Level of Achievement' mean the following.

○ High; ○/△ Relatively high; △ Medium; × Low; — Not applicable

international organisation. At the same time, the project conducted a variety of activities, such as research, training and extension programmes in the three countries in collaboration with 19 member universities. On the other hand, it did not establish a functional mechanism to effectively link each division with the others for the generation, translation and transfer of knowledge and technology. As a result, the achievement of the project purpose (i.e. establishment of the mechanism of AICAD to 'effectively link knowledge/technology and application') remained medium. In Phase II, 25 research results were identified as having potential for extension, which was limited, in spite of 119 research projects supported by the project. Consequently, it did not sufficiently reach the expected result of 'practical research results which can be converted into training and extension packages to contribute to community poverty reduction.' Thus, the number of packages which were actually developed¹⁵ during Phase II was three out of 119 research projects, which was small. As a result, the activities for 'training and extension based on the research result for the sake of poverty alleviation' at the initial plan did not expand much, because of the small number of extension packages already developed, resulting in insufficient improvement of AICAD's organisational management capacity. As for the training packages, eight courses¹⁶ were developed based on the existing

¹⁵ In Phase II, 3 extension packages were developed: 'Ceramics' in Uganda, 'Semi-Prefab Concrete Construction Techniques for Urban Low Cost Housing' in Tanzania and 'Improving sesame production and utilization in low to medium rainfall areas of Western Kenya' in Kenya. In Phase III, another 3 extension packages were developed, which were 'Sustainable use of papyrus' and 'Piggery Training' in Uganda and 'Cassava Cultivation and Utilization in Rongo District' in Kenya.

¹⁶ The 8 training courses were 1) African training course, 2) rural women (training of trainers), 3) irrigation and water resource management course, 4) indigenous vegetables, 5) enterprise development course, 6) value addition

knowledge and technology, undertaken in parallel with the research support activities. The number of participants totalled 1,314, with 644 for the in-country training courses, 221 for the regional training courses and 449 for the grassroots training courses.

Therefore, the effectiveness of Phase II is fair based on the reasons stated above.

3.2.1.2 Phase III

As for the achievement of the three outputs of Phase III, two of them were ‘high’ and one was ‘medium’. Hence, achievement of the outputs as a whole is assessed to be relatively high (Refer to Table 5).

Regarding the project purpose, among five indicators, Indicator 5 (Activities for poverty alleviation are planned and implemented in collaboration with resources of member universities) overlaps with Output 2 and Output 3. Hence, Indicator 5 was not used to assess the project purpose. Since the achievement of the rest of the four indicators was medium, achievement of the project purpose is medium (Refer to Table 6).

In light of the Phase II results, JICA shifted their support policies in Phase III from training and extension based on research results to those based on existing knowledge and technology without sticking to the research results. Thus, research was excluded from major target of JICA support in Phase III, except for research that was required for the “New rice for Africa” (hereafter, NERICA) dissemination programme. Additionally, the scale of support drastically shrank compared to Phase II. Specifically, although the training courses by COs in Tanzania and Uganda were conducted mostly as planned, the KTDPs, the ‘extension programmes based on research results’ developed during Phase II, faced some problems during the implementation stage: some programmes needed to be modified significantly to customise the technology to match the local uniqueness of each target area, and the transfer of knowledge and technology tended to be one way without sufficient discussion with the communities. Consequently, the project developed the Community Empowerment Programme (hereafter, CEP)—an extension programme which combined training, extension and small-scale equipment provision targeting specific areas, although it is based on existing knowledge and technology. The activities were conducted with focusing on this programme. Although the scale of support was smaller than in Phase II, the achievement of Phase III was favourable compared to Phase II. However, the achievement of the project purpose (i.e. AICAD will be strengthened in their core functions and organisation, which embody AICAD’s comparative advantages to facilitate networking and capacity building for poverty reduction and socio-economic development) remained medium. This is because the achievement of Output 1 (i.e. enhancing AICAD’s capacity [planning and coordination]) was medium and did not contribute much to achieving the project purpose, whereas the achievements of Output 2 (i.e. the networking function of AICAD with the

course, 7) HIV/nutrition course and 8) dry-land crops.

university teaching staff who are interested in extension and training is strengthened) and Output 3 (AICAD's activities are reinforced to focus on technology dissemination for the communities) were high. Thus, the effectiveness of Phase III is fair.

Table 5: Achievement of Outputs by the Completion of Phase III (June 2012)

Output	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Achievement	Level of Achievement	
Output 1: To ensure sustainability of the following outputs (2-3), the capacity of the AICAD Secretariat is enhanced, especially in planning and coordinating. (△)	①	Introduced and established a system to secure the relevant management of AICAD	GB meetings were carried out smoothly for effective decision-making, which resulted in smooth operation of AICAD.	○
	②	Established process of formulating UP by the AICAD Secretariat	At the time of terminal evaluation, the AICAD Secretariat had improved its capacity to formulate UP without being supported. On the other hand, AICAD needs to improve the contents, as other donors' support has not been acquired.	△
	③	Implementation of activities based on the annual plan prepared by the AICAD Secretariat	The AICAD Secretariat intends to share information between HQs and COs by formulating an 'AICAD almanac'. However, there are some issues, such as insufficient examination of the feasibility of activities and insufficient discussion among those who are concerned with formulating process.	△
	④	Implementation of Country Program Review (CPR) by CO	CPR was conducted before the mid-term review in the 3 countries. Some tasks to be tackled in the remaining project period were shown, and some guidance was given for marketing-oriented approaches in the KTDPs, etc. However, CPR has not been conducted since then.	△
	⑤	Number of GB, committees and Annual Members Forum (AMF) meetings	The GB meetings, meetings of the Finance and Planning Committee, Human Resource Management and Administration Committee and AMF (where the member universities exchange views) were held almost as planned. On the other hand, the Management Committee meetings, which the management staff members of HQs and country directors of COs attend, were postponed or cancelled frequently.	△
	⑥	Strengthened supporting and coordinating function of HQs	Although HQs' support of COs improved through actions such as visits to COs by HQs staff, standardisation of email procedure, information management and monitoring of activities were still insufficient.	△
	⑦	Increase in use of AICAD facilities	Although more efforts need to be made in marketing and publicity, the use rate of the AICAD facilities gradually improved compared to 2008. However, the use rates of the assembly hall and seminar rooms are low, under 20%.	△
	⑧	Means of income generation through implementation of training courses	The "fact sheets" are created by COs and are in the finalisation process so that they can attract external funds. Although there have been some attempts to collaborate with and mobilise financial resources from other donors to organise training courses, AICAD has not clarified the means of securing revenue sufficient for their self-reliance.	△
	⑨	Training materials, manuals, guidelines made by HQs	The AICAD HQs made teaching materials for regional training, such as those for the export trade and NERICA rice cultivation manuals, as well as those developed in collaboration with World Bank Institute (WBI) and Wetlands International Africa (WIA). These materials were used for knowledge dissemination.	○
	⑩	Training materials, manuals, guidelines made by COs	COs developed 7 training materials in total for in-country training courses which were used for those courses.	○
	⑪	Tools and materials for public relations	Fact sheets were prepared, newsletters were published and a website was developed as the means of public	△

			relations. However, the low frequency and quality of publication due to the absence of a library technician are challenges. In addition, these publications were underused and not made for public purposes.	
Output 2: The networking function of AICAD is strengthened. (○)	①	Number of forums, seminars and/or workshops held at HQs	Since 2010, university outreach activity (UOA) symposiums, etc. were held 5 times in total, and 242 people participated. AICAD supported the implementation of four 6-month pilot UOAs based on proposals from universities.	○
	②	Number of HQs' activities in collaboration with member universities	Same as the above (UOA symposiums in Kenya were organised by HQs).	○
	③	Number of COs' activities in collaboration with member universities	48 COs' activities related to training, extension and awareness-raising of universities, etc. were implemented in collaboration with the member universities in the 3 countries.	○
	④	Number of HQs' activities in collaboration with relevant organisations	5 regional training courses (among them, 4 courses were organised in collaboration with the WBI and WIA) and 2 UOAs in Kenya were implemented.	△
	⑤	Number of COs' activities in collaboration with relevant organisations	There were 52 activities, which showed a drastic increase compared to the situation before the commencement.	○
Output 3: AICAD's activities are reinforced to focus on technology dissemination for the communities in order to contribute to poverty reduction. (○)	①	In-country training courses held by COs	28 in-country training courses were held by COs in the 3 countries, and 887 people attended in total.	○
	②	Grassroots training courses held by COs	13 grassroots training courses were held by COs in the 3 countries, and 537 people in total participated.	○
	③	CEP by COs	6 CEPs were implemented by COs in the 3 countries, and a total of 178 people and 114 households participated. The CEP was planned using a participatory planning approach in the target communities and were implemented accordingly.	○
	④	The KTDPs by COs	6 KTDPs were implemented by COs in the 3 countries. Direct beneficiaries of the KTDPs were 50 people and 260 households. Tanzanian communities and the building construction sector also were regarded as direct beneficiaries. Although there were a few cases in which technology was disseminated to communities effectively, AICAD came to recognise that the approach of the KDTP was not so effective as the result of the problems found during implementation.	△
	⑤	Regional training held by HQs	5 regional training courses (the names of courses are the same as in Indicator 4) were held by HQs, and a total of 146 participants attended.	○
	⑥	Dissemination of NERICA	The NERICA rice dissemination activities in Kenya and Tanzania (Zanzibar) were implemented, and 4 varieties in Kenya and 3 varieties in Zanzibar were registered. Furthermore, HQs conducted NERICA training for agricultural extension workers in Kenya. As a part of NERICA dissemination program, 16 empirical research projects were implemented.	○
	⑦	Training and/or seminars co-sponsored by other organisations	4 co-sponsored regional training courses with the WBI and WIA were held by AICAD HQs (this figure is also included in the data of Indicator 5, the number of regional training courses held by HQs).	○
	⑧	Training module	The training modules for 4 areas were being developed by each CO and were scheduled to be completed by the completion of Phase III, according to the Terminal Evaluation Report. The training modules in Uganda completed in July 2011, in Tanzania in October 2011 and in Kenya in May 2012. Hence, all of them were completed by the time of project completion.	○

Source: Produced based on the document review, interview and questionnaire
Remarks: The marks in the column 'Level of Achievement' mean the following.
○ High; ○/△ Relatively high; △ Medium; × Low; — Not applicable

Table 6: Achievement of Project Purpose by the Completion of Phase III (June 2012)

Project Purpose	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Achievement	Level of Achievement	
AICAD will be strengthened in its core functions and organisation, which embody AICAD's comparative advantages, to facilitate networking and capacity building for poverty reduction and socio-economic development. (△)	①	AICAD's organisation system (governance) is strengthened.	AICAD's organisation system was strengthened compared to Phase II because the formulation and implementation of UP and organising of GB meetings on regular basis were done in accordance with the established procedures. On the other hand, the frequency of Management Committee meetings was insufficient.	△
	②	AICAD's planning/ coordination capacity is strengthened. (This indicator is regarded to be overlapping with Indicators 1, 2, 3, 5 and for Output 1, i.e., enhancement of AICAD's capacity. As the project purpose was set based on the concept of 'in which state AICAD should be after completion of support in order to be self-supporting', this indicator is understood as 'AICAD can plan and coordinate necessary tasks alone.)	AICAD's planning/coordination capacity was strengthened through their experience with planning UPs and promoting collaboration with various institutions. On the other hand, it is necessary for AICAD HQs to further strengthen their support and coordination function for COs and take necessary actions so that COs can expand their activities in collaboration with many institutions at a national level and enhance their presence among the development community.	△
	③	Measures for economic self-reliance are formulated.	AICAD had begun recognising that strengthening marketing and being fully conscious of ordering side when conducting training and making proposals to other organisations would lead to economic self-reliance. On the other hand, it would take time for economic self-reliance to be assured (Terminal Evaluation Report).	△
	④	Coordination with member universities is strengthened, activities are strengthened and activities involved with them are enhanced. (This indicator was corrected to be 'The collaboration with the member universities is strengthened by implementing activities with their involvement' and analysed accordingly.)	UOA activities were activated in the latter half of Phase III. The teaching staff at the member universities who were interested in and willing to be involved in CEPs and the KTDPs were directly engaged with community activities as resource persons, which led to strengthening collaboration between AICAD and those teaching staff. On the other hand, looking at the whole member universities and the teaching staff, most of the teaching staff and the universities were more interested in research, thus resulting in their decreased interest in AICAD activities as the result of focussing its support on training and extension programmes.	△
	⑤	Activities for poverty alleviation are planned and implemented in collaboration with resources of member universities.	Indicator 5 was not used as an indicator of the project purpose, since it was already covered by Output 2 and Output 3.	—

Source: Produced based on the document review, interview and questionnaire

Remarks: The marks in the column 'Level of Achievement' mean the following.

○ High; ○/△ Relatively high; △ Medium; × Low; — Not applicable

Table 7: Achievement of Overall Goal Three Years after Completion of Phase II (June 2010)

Overall Goal	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Achievement	Level of Achievement
To be the leading African institution in building human capacity for poverty reduction. (△)	① Number of successful human-resource-based poverty reduction programmes compared to other institutional organisations in Africa (Since criteria to judge 'successful' and the specific meaning of 'other institutional organisations' were unclear, this indicator was judged to be hardly usable for assessment. So 'the number of successful programmers' was redefined as 'the number of established knowledge and technology 3 years after being disseminated by the project.'	Only one extension programme, a KTDP ('Improving sesame production and utilisation in low to medium rainfall areas of Western Kenya' in Kenya) started its activities in Phase II. In Phase III, its activities were continued, and 90 households of farmers cultivated sesame. Being affected by the programme, 34 households of farmers who lived outside the target area started sesame cultivation anew. As for the knowledge and technology established in communities through training, 57% of the respondents replied that they conducted surface irrigation after receiving the training, 33% conducted trickle irrigation and more than 50% answered that their agricultural income increased after the training in the monitoring survey conducted with 117 ex-participants of the irrigation and water management course, an in-country training in Uganda. Thus, certain levels of knowledge and technology were established as the effect of this course.	△

Source: Produced based on the document review, interview questionnaire

Remarks: The marks in the column 'Level of Achievement' mean the following.

○ High; ○/△ Relatively high; △ Medium; × Low; — Not applicable

Table 8: Achievement of Overall Goal of Phase III at the Time of the Ex-Post Evaluation (2016)

Overall Goal	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Achievement	Level of Achievement
AICAD becomes an independent, region-based international organisation which plays a leading role in building human capacity for poverty reduction in Africa. (○)	① AICAD activities are sustainably implemented. (This indicator implies only the continuation of activities, which is hardly usable for an indicator to assess achievement of an objective. The overall goal itself describes mere continuation of activities and is too vague for an objective. Thus, this indicator was redefined, like Phase II, as 'the number of knowledge and technology disseminated/trained, which remains to be established at the time of ex-post evaluation'.	A record of monitoring establishment of knowledge and technology in the region or the area where those extension/training activities were conducted does not exist. According to the beneficiary survey conducted with the ex-participants of 6 CEPs and 5 grassroots training courses, the establishment of knowledge and technology was reached to a certain extent. Thus, achievement of the overall goal of Phase III is assessed to be relatively high.	○/△

Source: Produced based on the document review, interview and questionnaire

Remarks: The marks in the column 'Level of Achievement' mean the following.

○ High; ○/△ Relatively high; △ Medium; × Low; — Not applicable

Although both phases aimed AICAD's strengthening of the organisation¹⁷ as the project purpose, the achievement was medium. In Phase III, however, improvement of AICAD in their planning and coordination capacity (Output 1)¹⁸ was observed in their operation of routine

¹⁷ 'Strengthening of the Organisation' means that AICAD is able to plan, implement, monitor and evaluate activities required in each phase by themselves through capacity development and establishment of their internal and external structure. 'The organisational management capacity' mentioned on the previous page means the capacity enhanced through 'organisational development'.

¹⁸ 'The planning and coordination capacity' means the capacity mentioned by the 11 indicators for Output 1 of Phase III (Refer to Table 5). In this ex-post evaluation study, this capacity was understood as a part of 'the organisational management capacity' expected to be enhanced by 'strengthening of the organisation', based on which analysis was made.

activities, such as formulating and implementing a unified programme (UP) and organising governing board (GB) meetings on a regular basis in accordance with the procedures already established. This improvement shows effects brought by the long-term support to AICAD by JICA to some extent. Although the project did not result in many research results that were convertible to training and extension packages which could contribute to poverty alleviation of communities within a short period in Phase II, it could smoothly implement and operate training and extension programmes developed based on existing knowledge and technology in Phase III. Since JICA's major support was focussed on training and extension programmes, excluding research in Phase III, the number of teaching staff who were involved in the project activities decreased compared to Phase II, although the relationship between the project and the teaching staff who were interested in training and extension programmes was deepened. Furthermore, from the viewpoint of all member universities, most of the teaching staff and the universities were more interested in research, thus resulting in their decreased interest in AICAD activities. As a result, collaborative relationship of AICAD with the teaching staff of the member universities, who have stronger interest in research, was weakened as will be explained later (Impact of Phase III, 2) Achievement of Outputs and Project Purpose).

Therefore, effectiveness throughout both phases is fair.

3.2.2 Impact

3.2.2.1 Phase II

(1) Achievement of Overall Goal

1) Achievement of the Overall Goal

The indicator (number of successful human resource-based poverty reduction programmes compared to other institutional organizations – AFRICA) for the overall goal (to be the leading African institution in building human capacity for poverty reduction) has some problems; for example, the criteria for judging being 'successful' and the specific meaning of 'other institutional organizations – AFRICA' are too vague to use as an indicator. Thus, this indicator was redefined from 'the number of successful programmes' to 'the number of established knowledge and technology three years after being disseminated' (Table 7).

With regards to the achievement of the overall goal of Phase II three years after completion, the number of extension programs that started their activities by the end of Phase II was small, i.e. only one, since the number of extension packages developed based on the research results by the end of Phase II was only three. On the other hand, the knowledge and technology transferred via some training courses were established among the participants after training, such as Irrigation and Water Management Course, an in-country training course in Uganda. The ex-participants of the course replied that the training also contributed to increasing income. Although it may not reflect the whole situation due to limited information, it is regarded that

some training courses produced effects to a certain extent.

The development of training and extension packages based on research results has been delayed because not enough research results were achieved that were convertible to those packages. On the other hand, some of the training courses based on existing knowledge and technology showed high levels of the establishment of knowledge/technology among the ex-participants even after three years, such as Irrigation and Water Management Training Course, the in-country training in Uganda. Thus, the achievement of the overall goal of Phase II is assessed to be medium.

2) Achievement of Outputs and Project Purpose (Three Years after Project Completion)

6 KTDPs (Output 5), the extension program based on research results, were conducted in Phase III in the three countries, including the one that began its activities during Phase II. The clarification of the KTDP's framework and the selection of candidates for implementation were almost completed during Phase II, which led to a smooth start for the activities in Phase III. However, situations in which the research results could not be applied at the project site occurred frequently, while there was a good practice (such as Piggery Training in Uganda). The project was emphasised to drastically change the technology so as to customise it to match the indigenous characteristics of each target area after commencement of the KTDP. Also, a defect of the program that emerged was that the one-way transfer of knowledge and technology tended to be done without having sufficient opportunities to discuss this knowledge and technology with the communities, which led to difficulty in fostering ownership of the communities. Furthermore, progress management was difficult due to the lack of structure established for monitoring. As these weaknesses of the KTDP emerged, the people concerned with the project realized that the KTDP's approach was not effective in the project. Hence, the project stopped sticking to development and implementation based on the research results, and a new extension program (CEP) was developed that intensively addressed poverty alleviation in a model area by combining multiple schemes of support, focusing its support on the CEP.

Meanwhile, monitoring and follow-up after the project's completion have not been conducted sufficiently due to a lack of funds.

(2) Other Impacts

1) Indirect Positive/Negative Impacts

① Impacts on the Natural Environment: None

② Land Acquisition and Resettlement: None

③ Other Indirect Impacts: Many of the training and extension programs conducted in Phase II were done continuously in Phase III as well. Thus, the status of the use of the knowledge and technology acquired, the change of income, the influence on the empowerment of women and

so on will be analysed together with the impact of Phase III.

No negative impact was observed.

With the reasons stated above, the impact of Phase II is fair.

3.2.2.2 Phase III

(1) Achievement of Overall Goal

1) Achievement of Overall Goal

The indicator (AICAD activities are sustainably implemented) for the overall goal (AICAD becomes an independent, region-based international organisation that plays a leading role in building human capacity for poverty reduction in Africa) means only the continuation of activities, which is hardly usable as an indicator for assessing the achievement of an objective. The overall goal itself describes merely the continuation of activities and is too vague for an objective. Thus, this indicator was redefined, like Phase II, as ‘the number of knowledge and technology disseminated/trained, which remains to be established at the time of the ex-post evaluation,’ based on which analysis was made (Table 8).

A record of monitoring the establishment of knowledge and technology in the region, or the area where extension/training activities were conducted, does not exist. To collect this information, interviews based on a questionnaire were conducted with the ex-participants of six CEPs and five grassroots training courses, as a beneficiary survey¹⁹, in this ex-post evaluation in the three countries. The result is as follows.

The replies from the respondents to the question ‘Are you still utilizing the knowledge and/or skills you acquired through the training/CEP activities now?’ were as follows. On a five-point rating scale, 104 out of the total number of respondents, i.e., 135 (77%) of six CEPs selected either ‘Yes, very much’ (5) or ‘Yes’ (4), while 37 out of 64 respondents of five grassroots training courses chose either ‘Yes, very much’ (5) or ‘Yes’ (4) (Table 9). In terms of each of the CEPs, more than half of the respondents in every CEP replied with either ‘Yes, very much’ (5) or ‘Yes’ (4). Hence, it is determined that the knowledge and technology disseminated through the six CEPs are mostly established. Among the six CEPs, ‘Improving livelihoods in Kakindu Sub-county through building capacity for soil and water conservation and agroforestry’ in Uganda showed the highest results in terms of the establishment of knowledge and technology, with 18 out of 20 respondents selecting either (5) or (4) on the five-point rating.

¹⁹ The sample size was 152 (88 participants of six CEPs and 64 participants of five grassroots training courses in the three countries). However, the total number of respondents is different from the sample size, because many of the participants of CEPs join more than one CEP in Kenya. The sample was selected according to nonrandom selection based on representatives’ introduction of the target communities or groups.

Table 9: Are You Still Utilizing the Knowledge and/or Skills You Acquired through CEP Now?

(Unit: person)

No	Country	Name of Programme	5	4	3	2	1
1	Kenya	Integrated Irrigation Farming Project	4	17	4	1	1
2	Kenya	Water Harvesting and Management Project	5	16	7	2	2
3	Kenya	Livestock Production Project	4	15	6	3	1
4	Uganda	Improving Livelihoods in Kakindu Sub-county through Building Capacity for Soil and Water Conservation and Agroforestry	14	4	2	0	0
5	Uganda	Promotion of Income Generation among Persons with Disability in Butayunja Sub-county	8	11	0	1	0
6	Tanzania	Empowering Women for Poverty Reduction (Food Processing)	2	4	1	0	0
Total			37(23)	67(38)	20(6)	7(4)	4(4)

Remarks 1 The number of each rating shows the following.

5: Yes, very much 4: Yes 3: Medium 2: Not so much 1: Not at all

Remarks 2 The number shown in parentheses indicates the number of women included in the total respondents.

Remarks 3 In Kenya, the total number of the actual respondents is different from the numbers shown above, as some residents participated in more than one CEP.

Table 10: Are You Still Utilizing the Knowledge and/or Skills You Acquired through GRT Now?

(Unit: person)

No	Country	Name of Training	5	4	3	2	1
1	Kenya	Rural Women Empowerment	0	1	3	14	0
2	Uganda	Rural Women Empowerment	10	1	0	0	2
3	Tanzania	Food Processing Training Course for Morogoro Municipal	4	0	0	0	0
4	Tanzania	Irrigation and Water Resources Management in Mlandizi	5	4	3	1	0
5	Tanzania	Export Trade of Commercial Crafts	7	5	2	2	0
Total			26(17)	11(8)	8(5)	17(17)	2(2)

Remarks 1 The number of each rating shows the following.

5: Yes, very much 4: Yes 3: Medium 2: Not so much 1: Not at all

Remarks 2 The number shown in parentheses indicates the number of women included in the total respondents.

With regards to the participants of the grassroots training, 37 out of 64 respondents selected either (5) or (4) for the same question (Table 10). Although it is difficult to generalise the answers, as the sample size is small, the extent of the establishment of knowledge and technology among the participants is regarded as relatively high. From the viewpoint of each course, more than half of the respondents of four courses, excluding the Rural Women Empowerment training course in Kenya, selected either (5) or (4). Thus, the extent of the establishment of knowledge and technology for four courses reached a certain level.

The achievement of the overall goal of Phase III is relatively high because the establishment of the knowledge and technology disseminated through the CEP is high, while that of the grassroots training is slightly lower.

2) Achievement of Outputs and Project Purpose (after Project Completion until the Ex-Post Evaluation)

After the completion of Phase III, no significant change was observed in terms of AICAD's planning and coordinating capacity, while the network functions as well as the volume of the training and extension activities have been decreasing (Table 11). Thus, there is a problem with the achievement of the outputs, which has resulted in a small contribution to the achievement of the project purpose and overall goal. Some concerned people have pointed out the lack of funds as well as the delay of the bank transfer of the budget from each government to AICAD as the reasons for the decreased number of training and extension activities. However, the total amount of the budget remains to be almost the same as that of Phase III, to be explained later in Section 3.4 ('Sustainability from Financial Aspect'). According to the interviews with those who are concerned with the project, the major reasons for the decreased volume of activities are: decrease in substantial amount of the budget due to the handling charge and foreign exchange loss of the bank transfer of the budget from the three governments to AICAD HQs and from HQs to each CO in the three countries; the transfer of the program budget from HQs to COs made only after securing the staff's salary (sometimes the first bank transfer from HQs to COs for activities was made about two months before the end of the fiscal year); and the frequent delay in sending funds from the three governments to AICAD HQs. Although AICAD maintains a network with the trainers who have expertise in and are eager to support training and extension organized by COs, it has not been effectively used due to a lack of funds and a delay in the governments' budgets. On the other hand, the formulation and implementation of strategy by HQs to acquire support from new donors have not yet progressed, so the shortage of funds has not improved.

Table 11: Transition of Extension Programs

(Unit: number of programs)

Phase Fiscal Year	Phase II						Phase III						After Phase III				
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	Total	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Total	2012	2013	2014	Total	
KTDP (New)	0	0	0	0	0	1	6						6	0	0	0	0
Kenya	0	0	0	0	1	1	2						2	0	0	0	0
Uganda	0	0	0	0	0	0	3						3	0	0	0	0
Tanzania	0	0	0	0	0	0	1						1	0	0	0	0
CEP (New)							6						6	0	0	1	1
Kenya							3						3	0	0	1	1
Uganda							2						2	0	0	0	0
Tanzania							1						1	0	0	0	0
UOA (Symposium)							0	0	0	1	4	5	0	0	0	0	
Kenya							0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	
Uganda							0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	
Tanzania							0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	
Region (Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda)							0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	
UOA (Pilot)							0	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	
Kenya							0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	
Uganda							0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	
Tanzania							0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	

Source: AICAD

Remarks 1: The above figures show the new activities in each phase.

Remarks 2: The fiscal year in the above three countries is from July until June.

Table 12: Transition of Training Programs

(Unit: number of programs)

Phase	Phase II						Phase III						After Phase III			
Fiscal Year	FY2002	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Total	FY2007	FY2008	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011	Total	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014	Total
Regional Training	1	2	2	1	2	8	2	0	0	2	2	6	1	1	1	3
In-country training	2	4	4	9	3	22	7	6	6	6	6	31	2	3	2	7
Kenya	0	2	1	3	2	8	3	2	3	3	2	13	1	1	1	3
Uganda	1	1	2	3	0	7	2	2	1	1	2	8	0	1	0	1
Tanzania	1	1	1	3	1	7	2	2	2	2	2	10	1	1	1	3
Grassroots training	0	0	2	6	4	12	2	3	3	3	3	13	4	0	0	4
Kenya	0	0	1	2	1	4	0	1	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	0
Uganda	0	0	1	2	3	6	1	2	1	1	0	5	4	0	0	4
Tanzania	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	0	0	2	2	5	0	0	0	0

Source: AICAD

Table 13: Transition of Research Project

(Unit: number of programs)

Phase	Phase II						Phase III						After Phase III			
Fiscal Year	FY2002	FY2003	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	Total	FY2007	FY2008	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011	Total	FY2012	FY2013	FY2014	Total
Research (except for NERICA dissemination)	11	23	40	28	17	119	N/A	N/A	N/A						3	3
NERICA Dissemination (including some research)							o	o	o							

Source: AICAD

Remarks: AICAD HQs managed the three research projects in fiscal year (FY) 2014, which supported the Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, the Sokoine University of Agriculture and Busitema University for three years, with a maximum budget of USD60, 000 in the three countries.

(2) Other Impacts

1) Impacts on the Natural Environment

In a CEP in Kenya, a cattle dip was constructed near a water source, which resulted in the residents' expressing concerns.

2) Land Acquisition and Resettlement

In the same CEP in Kenya above, the construction site of the cattle dip was found to be a land with disputes over property rights (although the community explained that there was no problem in terms of property rights in the planning stage).

3) Other Indirect Impacts

In response to the question 'Have the knowledge/skills acquired through the CEP activities contributed to increase your income?' in the beneficiary survey mentioned above, 80 out of the total number of the respondents, i.e., 134, of the six CEPs selected either 'Yes, very much' (5) or 'Yes' (4) (Table 14). Thus, CEP was effective to some extent. On the other hand, regarding the response to the same question about the effect of grassroots training on increasing income, 24 (38%) out of 64 respondents of the same five training chose either (5) or (4), which is lower than for CEP (Table 15). CEP, which combines multiple schemes and supports specific target area intensively, is regarded as being more effective than capacity building by means of training only.

Table 14: Have the Knowledge/Skills Acquired through the CEP Activities Contributed to Increasing Your Income?

(Unit: person)

	Country	Project Name	5	4	3	2	1
1	Kenya	Integrated Irrigation Farming Project	4	9	6	4	4
2	Kenya	Water Harvesting and Management Project	4	8	7	5	8
3	Kenya	Livestock Production Project	4	9	7	5	4
4	Uganda	Improving Livelihoods in Kakindu Sub-country through Building Capacity for Soil and Water Conservation and Agroforestry	14	5	0	1	0
5	Uganda	Promotion of Income Generation among Persons with Disability in Butayunja Sub-county	11	7	1	0	0
6	Tanzania	Empowering Women for Poverty Reduction (Food Processing)	2	3	2	0	0
Total			39(17)	41(20)	23(14)	15(11)	16(11)

Remarks 1 The number of each rating shows the following.

5: Yes, very much 4: Yes 3: Medium 2: Not so much 1: Not at all

Remarks 2 The numbers shown in parentheses indicate the number of women included in the total respondents.

Table 15: Have the Knowledge/Skills Acquired through the Grassroots Training Contributed to Increasing Your Income?

(Unit: person)

No	Country	Name of Training/Workshop	5	4	3	2	1
1	Kenya	Rural Women Empowerment	0	2	16	0	0
2	Uganda	Rural Women Empowerment	8	3	1	0	1
3	Tanzania	Food Processing Training Course for Morogoro Municipal	0	0	3	1	0
4	Tanzania	Irrigation and Water Resources Management in Mlandizi	1	5	4	3	0
5	Tanzania	Export Trade of Commercial Crafts	2	3	7	4	0
Total			11(8)	13(9)	31(25)	8(6)	1(1)

Remarks 1 The number of each rating shows the following.

5: Yes, very much 4: Yes 3: Medium 2: Not so much 1: Not at all

Remarks 2 The numbers shown in parentheses indicate the number of women included in the total respondents.

In response to the question ‘Have the knowledge/skill acquired through the activities contributed to empowerment of women?’ to the participants of CEP ‘Improving livelihoods in Kakindu Sub-county through building capacity for soil and water conservation and agroforestry’ in Uganda, 19 out of 20 respondents replied with either (5) or (4). For this reason, many respondents pointed out that women came to have their own incomes. However, in other programs or in the rest of the countries, the same tendency has not yet been observed.

Meanwhile, in a CEP in Kenya, conflict occurred among the villagers over the property right of a water tank that the project provided for the purpose of demonstration. As a result, the human relationships of the villagers deteriorated²⁰. Currently, the conflict has subsided since AICAD provided water tanks to the villagers (on an individual basis) in the same village.

For the reasons stated above, the impact of Phase III is fair.

As stated above, the achievement of the overall goal for both phases is medium. It was observed that the knowledge and technology disseminated through the CEP in Phase III have been established to some extent, although it did not much contribute to the overall goal. The project had to go through trial and error throughout both phases to establish an approach of technology dissemination. However, the establishment of knowledge and technology to some extent was brought by the CEP, which focuses on a specific target area and combines some schemes, such as training, technical guidance, small equipment provision and field visits, with using the participatory planning method.

Therefore, impact of the project throughout both phases is fair.

²⁰ Interviews at and questionnaire for Kenya CO and AICAD, as well as beneficiary survey with CEP participants

Since this project has to some extent achieved the project purpose and overall goal, effectiveness and impact of the project are fair.

3.3 Efficiency (Rating: ②)

3.3.1 Inputs

The inputs of each phase are shown in Table 16 and Table 17.

Table 16: Inputs in Phase II

Inputs	Plan	Actual
(1) Experts	8 experts (Long term: 5 experts; short term: approximately in 3 sectors as needed)	51 experts in total (Long term: 17 experts; short term: 34 experts)
(2) Trainee received	Training in Japan: as needed Third-country Training : as needed	15 trainees received in Japan 3 trainees in third-country training (Indonesia, Thailand)
(3) Equipment	Training equipment, etc., as needed	Computers; software; equipment related to computers; office equipment, such as photocopier; equipment related to GIS; facility for research and development, etc.
(4) Others	None	None
Japanese Side Total Project Cost	N.A	1,559 million yen
Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda Operational Expenses	N.A	5,186,821 U.S. dollars

Table 17: Inputs in Phase III

Inputs	Plan	Actual
(1) Experts	Approximately 8-11 experts (Long term: 5-8 experts; short term: 3 experts)	12 experts in total (Long term: 8; Short term: 4)
(2) Trainee received	Training in Japan targeting AICAD staff (or third-country training or in-country training). (No clarification of the numbers)	10 trainees received in Japan 3 trainees in third-country training
(3) Equipment	Vehicles, etc. (No description on the amount)	5 vehicles, photocopiers and other office equipment
(4) Others	Local cost support : Training cost, demonstration, dissemination, development and activity support cost, NERICA research for demonstration and registration support activity, cost for information maintenance and dissemination activity, etc. (No clarification of the amount)	Local cost support 164 million yen
Japanese Side Total Project Cost	1,360 million yen (to be reviewed at the time of mid-term evaluation)	447 million yen
Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda Operational Expenses	Fund from the three countries: 110 million yen/year AICAD (revenue from facility rent): 0.2 million yen	Approximately 650 million yen ²¹ (4,725,983 US dollars)

²¹ USD1 =Yen117.28, based on the exchange rate of August 24, 2007 (137 million yen per year on average)

3.3.1.1 Elements of Inputs

【Phase II】

As for the Japanese inputs, the number of Japanese experts drastically increased from the planned figure, i.e. 8 persons, to the actual figure, 51 persons. As for the inputs from the African side, the contribution from the three governments totalled 5,186,821 U.S. dollars. The number of counterparts allocated was 30, which is much less than the planned figure, i.e. 52²². However, the base for calculation of 52 is not clear because it was not shown in the implementation study report. Meanwhile, no specific influence caused by the decrease in the number of counterparts was observed. Hence, there is a possibility that the planned figure itself was not appropriate.

【Phase III】

As for the Japanese side, there was no significant gap between the planned and the actual inputs (although there was a wide gap between the planned and the actual project cost, which will be explained later). The inputs from the African side were almost as planned.

3.3.1.2 Project Cost

【Phase II】

It is not possible to compare the actual cost, 1,559 million yen, with the planned because there is no description of the planned figures at the time of the ex-ante evaluation.

The settlement of expenses for some research projects was delayed due to confusion caused by different views on financial settlement between both sides and the shortage of a mutual understanding²³.

【Phase III】

The contribution from the three countries totalled 4,725,983 U.S. dollars in five years, which was almost as planned. The project cost borne by the Japanese side was 447 million yen, which shows a drastic decrease by 33% compared with the planned figure, i.e. 1,360 million yen. This is because the outline of support for Phase III was not fixed after the completion of Phase II until the commencement of Phase III. Thus, Phase III started with setting a temporary figure for the planned amount of the project cost, using the actual cost of Phase II as reference, on the condition that the figure should be reviewed at the mid-term review. In fact, the actual project cost of Phase III drastically decreased from the planned figure, as the activities supported in Phase III were much more focused on extension and training compared with in Phase II. Although there was no problem in the amount of the contribution from the African side, a frequent delay of remittance from the three governments to AICAD HQs, and AICAD HQs to

²² Ex-ante evaluation summary attached to the implementation study report

²³ Interviews with those concerned with the project

its COs prevented AICAD from implementing activities in accordance with the plan.

3.3.1.3 Project Period

【Phase II】 The project period of Phase II was five years as planned (100%).

【Phase III】 The project period of Phase III was four years and ten months, which was shorter than the planned five years (97%).

As stated in relation to the project's effectiveness, the overall achievement of eight outputs of Phase II is medium. Although the number of Japanese experts increased compared to the plan, it cannot be compared to the plan, as the planned number of total inputs is not shown. No problem was seen for the inputs from the African side. The project period of Phase II was as planned (100%). Thus, the efficiency of Phase II is fair.

The overall achievement of three outputs of Phase III is relatively high. The project cost and the project period are within the plan (33% and 97%, respectively). The project cost drastically decreased compared to the plan, as Phase III started with a temporary planned figure, and the scope of work was focused during the implementation period. Thus, the efficiency of Phase III is high.

Therefore, the project's efficiency throughout both phases is fair.

3.4 Sustainability (Rating: ②)

3.4.1 Related Policy and Institutional Aspects for the Sustainability of Project Effects

After the completion of Phase III until the time of the ex-post evaluation, the policy direction toward poverty alleviation of the three governments was maintained as shown in 'The Vision 2030' (2007-2030) in Kenya, 'The Tanzanian Development Vision 2025' (2000-2025) and 'The National Development Plan' (2010-2014). Thus, the project direction is highly consistent with the policies of the three countries. It is hardly possible that this policy direction will be drastically changed in the future as well. Therefore, the policy and institutional aspects of sustainability are high.

3.4.2 Organizational Aspects of the Implementing Agency for the Sustainability of Project Effects

AICAD's internal mechanism for regular activities was established at the three divisions, i.e. research, training and extension and information dissemination. The number of staff at HQs and COs was maintaining almost the same level at the time of the ex-post evaluation (16 for HQs, 12 for COs and 28 in total), compared with at the completion of Phase II (18 for HQs, 12 for COs and 30 in total) and of Phase III (16 for HQs, 12 for COs and 28 in total). On the other

hand, the number of staff who know the situation during the project implementation period is already limited due to the high turnover of the staff at COs. In the meantime, a monitoring structure at the project sites has not been established because of the lack of funds after the project completion. After the project completion, COs could not conduct monitoring with the communities sufficiently due to a lack of funds and a low priority of the budget allocation. Consequently, it resulted in the delay of coordination with the communities by a certain CO, which led to the deterioration of human relationships arising from mistrust among the members, and to the stagnation of activities. Also, the Uganda CO was still in the process of acquiring the legal status as a region-based international organisation at the time of the ex-post evaluation, although HQs, the Kenya CO and the Tanzania CO had already acquired this.

The collaborative relationship between the member universities and AICAD has been weakened except for in some cases. Also, almost no reporting and information sharing have been done between each CO and the ministry in charge of education in the respective country, as connections between them have not been established. COs have been unable to monitor or support the implementation of those activities since information about the activities that HQs have conducted has not been relayed to COs.

On the other hand, some teaching staff who had participated as trainers of training or resource persons of extension programs in the past gave some comments such as: 'I have learned that community people are familiar with reality of the sites, and they have more knowledge than the university students' and 'Teaching community people requires trainers to devise ways of explaining such as using simple expression, etc., but many of them are highly motivated participants'. Many of the teaching staff replied that they were willing to participate again, if given another opportunity. However, for university teaching staff, spending time on training and extension will not be reflected in promotion, although publishing a research paper will be reflected. Hence, this has become a bottleneck for their participation in training and extension. Thus, sustainability from organisational aspects is determined to be relatively low.

3.4.3 Technical Aspects of the Implementing Agency for the Sustainability of Project Effects

The capacity of teaching staff at the member universities to develop training and extension packages based on the research results is determined to be sufficient, considering the achievement of the training and the KTDP. Also, teaching staff who are eager and remarkable have remained a part of the activities as trainers of training courses and resource persons of extension programs. However, the capacity of these staff has been underutilized due to the decreased scale of activities.

Meanwhile, there is no specific problem in the level of AICAD's capacity to formulate an annual plan as well as to coordinate things for training implementation. On the other hand, the capacity of AICAD to plan new programs, to use leadership for strengthening collaboration

with the organisations concerned and to acquire new research funds is not regarded as sufficient.

As stated above, there is no problem in terms of the capacity of university teaching staff concerned with training and extension, as well as AICAD's capacity to plan activities and to complete the necessary coordination for implementing training. On the other hand, AICAD's capacity to plan new programs and to acquire new research funds is insufficient, and monitoring at the project site is not sufficiently conducted. Hence, sustainability from the technical aspects of the implementing agency is determined to be fair.

3.4.4 Financial Aspects of the Implementing Agency for the Sustainability of Project Effects

The transition of the total budget amount after the completion of Phase III is shown below. Since the project completion in FY 2011, the three governments have been covering almost the same amount as the cost, which used to be covered by the Japanese side for the program activities (Table 18). It is remarkable that the amounts of the contributions from the three governments have remained almost the same amounts made after the completion of Phase III in FY2011 (except for FY 2014, which showed a 14% decrease compared with the previous year). Especially, Kenya has been covering more than half of the total contribution every year.

Table 18: Transition of Total Project Budget

(Unit: Thousand USD)

Fiscal Year	Phase III					After project completion		
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Japanese side	221	340	356	417	411			
Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda side	978	1,100	876	875	896	1,306	1,264	1,112
Total	1,199	1,440	1,232	1,292	1,307	1,306	1,264	1,112

Source: JICA terminal evaluation report and interview with AICAD

Remarks 1: The amount of the total project budget above is the one based on the Japanese fiscal year, different from that of the local fiscal year.

Remarks 2: The amount for the Japanese side was calculated with the exchange rate (TTS) from the Japanese Yen to U.S. dollars on September 1 each fiscal year (except for 2007, when the data were unavailable and were calculated with the rate on September 3).

Table 19: Revenue and Expenditure of AICAD

(Unit: Thousand USD)

Fiscal Year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Revenue	1,435	1,438	1,542	1,730	1,855	1,782
Expenditure	1,565	1,591	1,651	1,504	1,617	1,995
Balance	-131	-163	-109	227	238	-213

Source: Based on terminal evaluation report, questionnaire and interview survey with AICAD

Remarks: The balance can be different from the simple subtraction because the figures are rounded off.

At the time of the terminal evaluation of Phase III, the evaluation report indicated some concern with the deficit of AICAD. Although it went into the black in FY2012 and 2013 after the project completion, it went into the red again in FY2014 (Table 19) due to the decrease of the contribution, and its future tendency is unpredictable.

With regards to other concerns, the revenue from rental fees from the training and accommodation facility has decreased every year since FY2011, which is the last year of Phase III, while it has been fluctuating every year. Also, PAU, which was using the training facility on a regular basis at the time of the ex-post evaluation, has been constructing its own school building. Hence, its rental fee will not arise starting in 2016, which means a decrease in revenue. In addition, 115,148,716 Kenyan shillings (approximately 150,180 U.S. dollars) of the membership fees of the universities are unpaid. Concerning the funds from other donors, in addition to the training that has been jointly conducted, a training program has been conducted for local governments in collaboration with United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT) since 2014. However, information on the budget amount was not available. AICAD has not acquired research funds yet.

Table 20: Revenue from AICAD Facilities

(Unit: Thousand USD)

FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014
190	101	166	147

Source: Based on questionnaire and interview survey with AICAD

Paying attention to the expenditure, administration cost shares about 85% of it, and activity about 15%, while the ratio of the administration cost within the total expenditure has been high since Phase III up to the ex-post evaluation (Table 21). Some people concerned with the project pointed out that the lack of funds was the cause of the decreased scale of activities after the project completion. Actually, however, the program activity cost has not been decreasing. Also, other comments were heard concerning major causes of the decrease in activities, such as the frequent delay of the contributions from the three countries, as well as the decrease of the actual value of the budget caused by a remittance charge and foreign exchange loss and securing salaries before sending money for activities to COs (so the first remittance in a fiscal year from HQs to COs for activities sometimes can be received two months before the end of the fiscal year). In addition, the fact that almost the same number of staff has been maintained since Phase II is also regarded as weakening sustainability from a financial aspect. In this phase, JICA provided a large scale of support (1.6 billion yen for the project cost borne by Japanese side) as a technical cooperation project, when a certain number of staff were recruited with a region-based international organisation staff status, while the amount of JICA support (450

million yen) as well as the volume of the activities decreased in Phase III.

Also, according to AICAD’s mid-term framework budget draft (Table 22), although the total budget amount has a tendency to increase, the budget for the activity will decrease by 34% compared with the previous year in 2016, and the employment costs will be increased by 196%. The decrease of activities in volume can also lead to a decrease in a unifying force with the member universities, which has a risk of increasing unpaid membership fees.

Therefore, sustainability from a financial aspect is relatively low.

Table21: AICAD’s Total Expenditure and the Breakdown

(Unit: Thousand USD)

Fiscal Year	2011	2012	2013	2014
Program cost	207	252	241	368
(Percentage)	(13%)	(17%)	(15%)	(18%)
Administrative cost	1,444	1,252	1,376	1,627
(Percentage)	(87%)	(83%)	(85%)	(82%)
Total expenditure	1,651	1,504	1,617	1,995

Source: Based on questionnaire and interview survey with AICAD

Table22: AICAD Mid-term Framework Budget Draft

(Unit: Thousand Kenyan shilling)

Fiscal Year	2014	2015	2016	2017
Total budget	151,507	170,053	180,575	189,603
Program budget	58,000	71,921	24,100	25,305
Employment cost	48,282	46,375	91,075	95,628

Source: AICAD GB meeting document

Remarks: 1 Kenyan shilling was 1.126 Yen (JICA monthly exchange rate, December 2015, JICA web page)

Throughout both phases, all of the three countries have firmly maintained the policy to place emphasis on poverty alleviation consistently from the planning stage. Hence, sustainability from the policy and institutional aspects is high. Furthermore, the internal mechanism of AICAD’s regular activities in the three divisions of research, training and extension and information has been maintained, and almost the same number of staff was maintained at the time of the ex-post evaluation both at HQs and COs as during the project implementation period. On the other hand, the turnover of staff at COs is high. Also, the collaborative relationship between the member universities and AICAD, which AICAD had been claiming to have from the beginning, has been generally weakened. Hence, sustainability from an organisational aspect is relatively low.

The capacity of the teaching staff who develops training and extension packages or plays the

role of resource person for extension programmes and the trainer of training courses is regarded as sufficient. Although no problem has been observed in terms of AICAD's capacity of planning conventional programs and of coordinating things necessary for conducting training, the capacity to plan new programs and to acquire new research funds cannot be determined to be sufficient. In addition, insufficient monitoring at the project site caused by a lack of funds as well as the low priority of on-site monitoring and follow-up in the budget allocation led to a negative impact in Kenya. Thus, sustainability from a technical aspect is fair. In terms of sustainability from a financial aspect, the contribution from the three governments has been disbursed almost as committed, and a budget amount that is almost equivalent to the budget for during the implementation of Phase III has been secured. On the other hand, the ratio of administrative cost has been high and that of the program cost low, as the share of the administrative cost among the total expenditure has been about 85% since Phase III until the time of the ex-post evaluation, while activity cost has been about 15%. Also, the activity cost is expected to decrease, while the employment cost is expected to increase in FY2016, although the total budget is expected to be increased. A decrease in the volume of activities can not only lead to a decrease in unifying power towards the member universities but also aggravate the status of unpaid membership charges. A decrease in the volume of the activities has resulted in a lower presence of AICAD toward the member universities. Thus, sustainability from a financial aspect is relatively low.

Based on the above, some minor problems have been observed in terms of the organisational, technical and financial aspects of the implementing agency. Therefore, the sustainability of the project effects is fair.

4. Conclusion, Lessons Learned and Recommendations

4.1 Conclusion

This project aimed to establish AICAD in order to conduct training and extension packages based on research that contributes to poverty alleviation and human resources development in collaboration with the member universities and to enhance self-support of AICAD in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda. Poverty alleviation was consistent with the policy and development needs of the three target countries (i.e. Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania) and Japan's ODA policy. Therefore, relevance of the project is high. In Phase II of the project, although networks with the teaching staff and other important players at the member universities were established, the development and implementation of training and extension packages based on the research results were insufficient. In Phase III, although outputs and project-purpose achievements were enhanced by focussing on extension packages as the target of JICA's support, the relationship with the university teaching staff was weakened. Additionally, the extent of knowledge

establishment and skills acquired by the participants through the project's training and extension packages is regarded to be fair for Phase II and relatively high for Phase III. Therefore, effectiveness and impact of the project are fair. Regarding the project costs borne by the Japanese side in Phase II, it is necessary to consider that the input of human resources significantly increased compared to the planning stage, although specific figures related to the planned budget were not mentioned, while effectiveness and impact are fair. In Phase III, the project cost from the Japanese side drastically decreased compared to the planning stage because the planned figure was temporarily set and the substantial area of support from JICA was narrowed down drastically after project commencement. On the other hand, the cooperation period for Phases II and III was shorter than planned. Hence, efficiency of the project is fair. As for sustainability, some minor problems have been observed in terms of the organisational, technical and financial aspects, although no major problems have been observed in the policy background. Thus, sustainability of the project is fair.

In light of the above, this project is evaluated to be partially satisfactory.

4.2 Recommendations

4.2.1 Recommendations to the Implementing Agency

- Investigating the causes of the decrease in activities and improving the balance between the activity cost and the administrative cost

AICAD HQs should investigate the cause of the decrease in the volume of the activities in spite of the maintained amount of the activity cost, and improve the balance between the activity cost and the administrative cost. AICAD should make a countermeasure plan under the guidance of GB to make it possible to conduct the activities in an appropriate volume and promptly implement them.

- Securing research fund by acquiring external research fund

AICAD HQs should apply for research funds from international organisations or bilateral donor organisations and so on in collaboration with the member universities, and promptly acquire medium- to large-scale funds for research, which will be practical and contribute to poverty alleviation in the communities.

4.2.2 Recommendations to JICA

None

4.3 Lessons Learned

- Points of attention in practical research support

When a project plan is formulated to support universities in which practical research is

supported and its result is used within the project period, the following points should be kept in mind:

- 1) to set a sufficient research period to secure a research result high enough, to be prepared for unforeseeable circumstances
- 2) to secure a certain amount of funds per research, as there is a possibility that a research study will not conclude if the amount is too small to cover the reflection of the experimental study result
- 3) to ensure mutual understanding between the project and the researchers prior to the commencement of the research on the required research result, content and the timeframe of the research paper, specific procedure and schedule for the settlement of expenditures
- 4) to conduct monitoring during the implementation period in a timely manner to avoid deviation or deadlock.

- Duration of an organizational development project which starts with establishing a new organization across multiple-countries and/or to support regional international organization

Strengthening of organisation starting from the establishment of a new organisation requires much more labour and time compared to strengthening an existing organisation. Especially, this project had complicated aspects incorporated, such as supporting the implementation agency to become a region-based international organisation, in addition to targeting multiple countries. Hence, the project could not bring a sufficient level of sustainability of the implementation agency through strengthening of organisation in spite of 12 years of a project period, including a two-year preparation period. If lessons should be learned from this case, it is necessary to set a long project period from the beginning for a project that supports the establishment of a new organisation, targets multiple countries and supports a region-based international organisation in order to produce a certain level of effect.

- Setting specific and logical objectives and indicators and a description of calculation base

In this project, both in Phase II and Phase III, there were some problems in the logic of setting objectives and the appropriateness of indicators, which required the evaluator to reorganise them. Specifically, some problems were observed, such as: 'Overall goal is continuation of activities only and not an objective.' Also, 'Indicator cannot be used because what it means is unclear.' Also, a part of the planned amount of inputs, such as the number of counterpart staff to be allocated, was possibly excessive. However, it was difficult to judge whether the planned figure was appropriate or not because its calculation base was not described in the report at the time of planning. It is essential to set clear and logical objectives and indicators according to the basic rule of PDM, and to describe the calculation base in the detailed planning survey report, etc., to conduct an evaluation appropriately and efficiently.