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# Introduction

1. The Forest and Farm Facility (FFF) was one of the first “umbrella programmes” within the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). The FFF receives funding through a multi-donor trust fund, from donors including Sweden, Finland, United States, AgriCord (through its Farmers Fighting Poverty Programme) and Germany (under the Carlowitz project). The World Banks’ Program on Forests (PROFOR) also provided startup funds through two of the main partners: the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) and the International Union for Conservation (IUCN). Though the Programme was established with a target budget of USD 50 million for five years, only USD 12.5 million dollars were secured by FAO as of June 2016.
2. The FFF was designed under a partnership co-managed by IIED, IUCN and AgriCord, with inputs from major alliances of forest and farm producer organizations including representatives from the International Family Forest Alliance, the Global Alliance for Community Forestry and the International Alliance of Indigenous and Tribal Peoples of the Tropical Forests. The FFF was implemented through a participatory multi-stakeholder process and informed by scoping studies, resulting in a multi-year work plan that is country and context specific, and designed to improve the Country Programming Framework and to catalyze and leverage existing initiatives. The FFF was set up for a duration of five years, running from December 2012 to December 2017. However, the first significant funding was only received in August 2013, and a decision was made to launch in-country activities in six paired pilot countries during 2013: Guatemala and Nicaragua (Latin America), The Gambia and Liberia (Africa), and Nepal and Myanmar (Asia).
3. Beginning in November 2013, four more countries were selected (Bolivia, Kenya, Zambia and Vietnam) through a comprehensive selection process; work began in the second half of 2014 and the beginning of 2015. Expressions of interest were received in various forms from over 44 countries and 70 forest and farm producer organizations, indicating unmet demand.
4. The project has a monitoring and learning system (M&LS) to monitor progress on a range of indicators under each of the outputs described in the programme theory of change (ToC). An annual aggregated report on the FFF’s M&LS is presented to the Steering Committee each February, summarizing country level achievements and lessons learned.
5. FFF activities are currently underway across the 10 countries, albeit at different stages of intervention; Kenya is one of those countries. The interventions of the project include work by apex level producer organizations supported through partnership agreements, small grants to producer organizations to support enterprise and other organizational needs, multi-sectoral platforms led by government actors at national and sub-national levels, exchange visits and capacity building.
6. This MTE was conducted in accordance with the agreements signed with donors. With 1.5 years left in the current project, this evaluation provides an opportunity to improve implementation and to envisage its future after December 2017.
   1. Purpose of the evaluation
7. As mentioned above, the mid-term evaluation is programmed in the FFF project document and financing agreements. The purpose of the MTE is to inform the Project Steering Committee, the Programme Management Team, the Donor Support Group and other stakeholders about the project’s progress and performance toward attaining the expected outputs and outcomes. The intention is therefore to evaluate the programme for planning purposes as well as to inform the multi donor fund of progress to date. The mid-term evaluation is expected to bring valuable external reflections to help strengthen the programme, and to validate and complement the M&L system of the project.
8. The MTE draws specific conclusions and formulates recommendations for necessary further action by the Steering Committee, the Project Management Team and other international and in-country FFF stakeholders. It also identifies good practices and lessons learned for the formulation and execution of other similar projects that address forestry governance and/or utilizing a small grant scheme.
   1. Intended users
9. The intended users of the results of this MTE include the FFF Steering Committee, the Donor Support Group, the Project Management Team the FFF national facilitators, implementing partners, FAO country office staff, government stakeholders, and other international and in-country FFF parties.
   1. Scope and objective of the evaluation
10. **Scope:** This MTE evaluates the results achieved from the inception of FFF in December 2012 until December 2015, bearing in mind that activities did not start until mid- to late-2013. The evaluation assesses all key elements of the programme across its interventions as outlined in the ToC, with a representative set of forest and farmer producer organizations (FFPOs) and government partners in the selected five countries, and at the regional and global levels. Additionally, the management and governance structure of the project were assessed as well as the linkages between the project and other in-country and global initiatives in the context of FAO’s Strategic Objectives (in this case SO3 Output 1.1 and SO2 Output 2.2).

**Objectives and Evaluation Questions:**

1. The FFF mid-term evaluation had the following objectives:
   * Assess progress made toward achieving project results; and
   * Identify design and implementation issues that should be addressed in order to achieve the project’s intended results.
2. In order to achieve these objectives, the evaluation sought to deliver findings under the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, partnerships and coordination, normative values, sustainability, and coherence and synergies. In this regard, the evaluation was guided by the below preliminary evaluation questions respective to the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, partnership and coordination, sustainability, and FAO’s normative values. In the course of the work, the MTE added a question on the “Likelihood of Impact of the Project” to capture the project’s crucial early effects which were not recorded by its M&LS.[[1]](#footnote-1)

**Relevance**

* Evaluation question 1: How relevant is the FFF’s primary focus and logic in terms of its stated mission, in relation to the target countries’ contexts, broader sustainable development initiatives, and smallholder farmers' needs?
* Evaluation question 2: How and to what extent does the project contribute to the broader strategic FAO objectives? Sub-questions: (2.1) How coherent is FFF in terms of how it fits in with the policies, programmes and projects undertaken by the governments, FAO and other development partners? (2.2) To what extent has the FFF integrated its programme with other technical teams within the Forestry Department; with FAO’s internal priorities, building on Country Programming Frameworks and regional initiatives; and especially by linking with the Strategic Objectives (in this case SO3 Output 1.1 and SO2 Output 2.2)? (2.3) Is FFF coherent with other forestry initiatives operating within the target countries?
* Evaluation question 3: Was the project design appropriate for achieving the mission, vision and outcomes?

**Effectiveness**

* Evaluation question 4: To what extent is the FFF on track to achieving outcomes across the three pillars, and what changes are attributable to the FFF’s interventions which are directly linked to the FFF’s main objectives? Sub-questions: (4.1) To what extent were producer organizations strengthened for business development and engagement in policy dialogue? (4.2) Did FFF Catalyze multi-sectoral policy platforms? (4.3) Did FFF link local voices to global processes?

**Efficiency**

* Evaluation question 5: To what extent is the current operational modality contributing to the efficient achievement of the program outcomes?

**Likelihood of impact**

* Evaluation question 6: To what extent is FFF contributing to progress toward the expected outcomes and impact?

**Partnership and coordination**

* Evaluation question 7: Was FFF successful at engaging other partners in the FFF-supported processes?

**Sustainability**

* Evaluation question 8: How sustainable is the FFF concept of investing in the organizational capacity of forest farm producer organizations – and how might this be enhanced?

**Normative values**

* Evaluation question 9: To what extent have gender and human rights been taken into account in the design of the FFF and during the implementation?
  1. Methodology

1. The MTE adopted a consultative and transparent approach with FFF internal and external stakeholders throughout the evaluation process. The triangulation of evidence and information gathered underpins its validation and analysis, and supports the conclusions and recommendations.
2. To assess the contribution of the project toward its stated outcomes and expected impact, five participating countries were visited. In each country, national and sub-national stakeholders were interviewed and field visits were carried out to meet directly with FFF-targeted FFPOs. A sixth mission was planned for Nicaragua, but this was cancelled due to timing and logistical constraints. The five visited countries were The Gambia, Kenya, Guatemala, Myanmar and Vietnam. While these five countries were the primary focus countries for the evaluation, the MTE team also conducted desk reviews of the FFF activities carried out in the other five countries in order to corroborate the findings from the primary evaluation missions.
3. Desk reviews and consultative interviews with the FFF team at FAO headquarters constitute an important aspect of the evaluation approach, primarily in relation to questions of programme management, coherence and synergies. Interviews were also conducted with staff of IUCN and IIED, the two main FFF partners.
4. To answer the above evaluation questions, the MTE’s approach is based on mixed methods and triangulation of information. This approach was selected to ensure that the evaluation findings fully respond to the purpose of the evaluation. The methods used included the following:

* Review of existing documentation on FFF;
* Analysis of FFF self-reported information, in particular the 2014 and 2015 annual reports;
* Semi-structured interviews with key informants, stakeholders and participants, supported by the questions listed in the evaluation matrix;
* Targeted FFPOs discussion and direct observation during field visits in the focus countries;
* Validation of MTE mission observations through debriefing discussions with key stakeholders at country and FAO headquarters level.

1. In order to answer evaluation questions 1 and 3 on relevance, country visits and key informant interviews were conducted with in-country stakeholders and beneficiaries. To answer question 2 on the coherence and consistency of FFF with FAO’s strategic objectives and other FAO initiatives, the evaluation team conducted interviews with key informants at FAO headquarters and country level, as well as a desk review. For questions 4 and 9, the MTE used different analytical approaches for assessing progress and impact under each FFF pillar. In assessing progress towards Outcome 1, Pillar 1, the analysis was based on four levels for influencing forest and farm related policies (adapted from Keck and Sikkink, 1998[[2]](#footnote-2)), as follows:

* Getting issues on the political agenda;
* Encouraging discursive commitment from government;
* Securing procedural change at national level;
* Influencing behavioral change in key actors.

1. In assessing the effectiveness of activities under Outcome 2, the MTE analyzed progress made by FFF in supporting interventions aimed at improving forest and farm based value chain governance[[3]](#footnote-3) as well as the upgrading[[4]](#footnote-4) trajectories followed by FFPOs. On value chains governance, three analytical lenses were used:

* Analyzing support to policy and institutional improvements of the environment in which value chains operate;
* Analyzing support to new laws and regulations governing value chains;
* Analyzing the facilitation offered to the negotiation of trade relationships between FFPOs and downstream value chain operators.
* To analyze the upgrading strategies, three analytical lenses were used:
* Analyzing value chain upgrading strategies used by FFPOs with the support of FFF in different countries;
* Analyzing market access models practiced by FFPOs;
* Analyzing the outcomes for FFPOs and their member households.

1. The evaluation also analyzed why some FFPOs derived greater benefits from their participation in value chains. For Question 6 on the project’s expected impact on forest and farm livelihoods, the achievements under each pillar were framed in terms of the assets and capitals identified in the sustainable livelihood approach (i.e. human capital, social capital, political capital, natural assets, physical assets and financial assets).

# Background and context of the project/programme

* 1. Context of the Kenya FFF Program

1. Kenya strongly supports the development of forest and tree growing on farms. With this support, several Forest Farm Producer associations and groups have been created across the country. To further strengthen the activity of these associations, the Government submitted a competitive proposal for FFF support. The country was admitted into the FFF Programme in mid-2014, and a scoping study was commissioned in September 2014. This study highlighted a wide range of forest–farm producer organizations, including community forestry associations grouped into the National Alliance of Community Forest Associations, farmers groups represented by the Kenya National Farmers Federation, medium-sized tree-grower groups in the Kenya Forest Growers Association, and smallholder equivalents in the Farm Forestry Smallholders Association of Kenya (FF-SPAK).
2. The scoping study recommended that the FFF supports the establishment of a national multi-sectoral platform that brings together apex smallholder producer organizations with the aim of strengthening those apex organizations, promoting the delivery of effective extension service through the training of trainers and partnerships, providing support to revitalize tree improvement programmes for enhanced access to certified and affordable seed/seedlings, supporting bio-enterprises among community forestry associations, including development of business plans, providing market support, and promoting ownership rights and access for minority and marginalized Indigenous communities to their sacred and customary territories[[5]](#footnote-5).
3. FFF in Kenya was officially launched in November 2014. Two counties, Nakuru and Laikipia, were selected to pilot the implementation of FFF in the country. On 6 November 2014, a launch workshop in which more than 68 representatives from diverse stakeholder groups participated strongly was organized. The main outputs of the Workshop were a strong endorsement of the need for FFF engagement, a clear guidance on priorities for FFF support, and initial discussions on partner forest–farm producer organizations and partner government institutions.
4. On 7 November 2014, follow-on meetings led to, among other things, to determining by key stakeholders concerned that FFF’s core team in Kenya would comprise the Kenya Forest Service (secretariat); FAO Kenya (facilitator); a representative of FF–SPAK; and a representative of the Forest Action Network. It was also agreed that there should be regular advisory committee meetings comprising a broader range of institutions.
5. In 2015, scoping studies for the implementation of FFF, baseline studies in the two target counties, and stakeholder mapping were carried out. Stakeholder capacity-building assessment was undertaken in collaboration with the NGO We Effect. In the same year, there was also an effort in strengthening FF SPAK’s membership base and its capacity to organize and to provide business services to its members effectively. In December 2014, the FFF core team and the FFF global management team prepared an initial workplan as well as letters of agreement with forest–farm producer organizations such as FF- SPAK.
   1. Theory of Change
6. FFF developed a generic ToC that links development results at FFPOs level (organization capacity, access to technologies, and access to markets) with voice and participation in policy processes at national and global levels, in order to achieve the intended Impact. The strategies to achieve the Impact are arranged under three Pillars, four Outcomes and seven Outputs as presented in Figure 1. The MTE found that on this basis, the internal logic of the project is largely sound between the Outputs and Outcomes level. However, a close analysis shows that it does not express the conditions that should be in place to allow development results to reach impact. The ToC lacks important building blocks in terms of Assumptions and Impact Drivers[[6]](#footnote-6), between Outcomes level and Impacts level.

**Outcome 1:** Strengthened producer organizations engage in policy dialogue

**Outcome 2**: Local communities and producers are organized and thereby have the capacity to invest in sustainable forest and farm management and integrate into market

**Outcome 3**: Cross-sectoral coordination (...) for sustainable forest and farm management operating at national and sub-national levels

**Outcome 4:** National and global agendas and initiatives (…) are informed about the knowledge and priorities of smallholders, women, communities and IPs.

**Vision:** Smallholders, communities and indigenous peoples’ organizations have improved their livelihoods and decision-making over forest and farm landscapes

**Impact:** Smallholders, women and indigenous peoples groups have improved income and food security from sustainable forest and farm management

**Pillar1:** Strengthen smallholder, women and indigenous peoples’ produces’ producer organizations for business/livelihoods and policy engagement

**Pillar 2:** Catalyze multi-sectoral stakeholder policy platforms with governments at local and national levels

**Pillar 3**: Link local voices and learning to global processes through communication and information dissemination

**Output 4.1**: International and regional organizations representing smallholder-, women-, and IPs groups in international fora and negotiations have established communication and information channels to their respective constituencies at national and local levels (….)

**Output 4.1**: International and regional organizations representing smallholder-, women-, and IPs groups in international fora and negotiations have established communication and information channels….

**Output 1.2:** Collaboration for policy dialogue between smallholder, women, community, IPs groups, large scale private sector and government enhanced

**Output 3.1**: Establishment and coordination of government’s inter-ministerial multi-stakeholder platforms/committees (involving local organizations, CSOs, and the private sector) facilitated

**Output 3.2**: Increased information sharing and coordination between sectors results in improved understanding and implementation of different policies and programs affecting FFPOs within forest and farm landscapes

**Output 1.1:** Dispersed local forest and farm smallholders, women, and IPs are organized and strengthened to cooperate in (effective and gender inclusive) networks, alliances and federations

**Output 2.1**: Local FFPOs have knowledge about business development (…) and access to financing mechanisms

**Output 2.2**: Establishment of services such as producer hubs in support of small scale FFF- facilitated (and actively provided) services to female and male members

**Output 2.3**: Experience sharing and exchanges between FFPOs involving men and women result in increased resilience, improved practices and continued networking

Figure 1 FFF Results Framework

1. It should be recalled that it is between the levels of Outcomes and Impacts that the design should express the main changes that are expected to take place as “Intermediate States (IS)”, as the stepping-stones to Impacts in the respective pathways. It is therefore important to indicate explicitly in the ToC what are the required assumptions allowing Outcomes to lead to intermediate results (IR), and from there to planned impacts. The MTE reconstructed the ToC based on the original one in order to include the missing building blocks (Assumptions and Impact Drivers); this provides a framework that more clearly articulates the conditions that are required to reach the expected impact. The reconstructed ToC does not modify the Outputs, Outcomes, Impact and Vision. Rather it places them together with Intermediate Results (the current Pillars), Assumptions and Impact Drivers into a graphic representation of the FFF.
2. The different FFF ToC building blocks are illustrated as shown in Figure 2. The original ToC blocks are illustrated in green color and connecting black arrows, and are unchanged. Dashed black arrows are added to show the actual connectedness from the Project implementation experience to date. Other colors indicate the blocks that are missing in the original ToC: blue for the Assumptions, and dark orange for Impact Drivers.
3. During the visit in Kenya, the MTE Team discussed with National Facilitator and key FFF partners (KFS and FF-SPAK) the conditions that were necessary to reach impact. The information obtained was used to reconstruct a ToC for FFF in the context of its work in the country. The reconstructed ToC (Figure 2) shows that to reach the FFF Impact, three Intermediary States (IS) that correspond to the 3 Pillars must be achieved; these are:
4. IS-1: FFPOs capacity for doing business is enhanced and they engage in policy decision;
5. IS-2: Multi-sectoral stakeholders policy platforms are catalyzed;
6. IS-3: Local voices are linked to global processes.
7. To achieve IS-1, The MTE found that the following conditions must be met:

A/ID-1: County governments use contextualized FFF ToC in their rural development agendas”.

A/ID-2: Partnerships with micro-finance institutions (MFI) allow to extend loans to FFPOs

ID-1: FFPOs access to national & export markets improved.

ID-2: Women’s organizations entrepreneurship supported in selected value chains

1. To achieve IS-2, the MTE also found that the following conditions must be met:

A/ID-1: As above, County governments use contextualized FFF ToC in their rural development agendas”.

ID-3: Lessons and best practices from FFF allow sharing experiences.

1. To achieve IS-3, the following conditions must be met:

A/ID-3: Avenues for exchange at regional and global levels are offered

ID-3: Lessons and best practices from FFF allow sharing experiences

1. The Vision is stated as “Smallholders, communities and indigenous peoples’ organizations have improved their livelihoods and decision-making over forest and farm landscapes» is wider than the context of Kenya. This is why the MTE added a plain black arrow linking the Intermediary State “Local voices are linked to global processes” to the Vision, while the arrow link to Impact is dashed.

**Figure 2: Reconstructed FFF Theory of Change**

Smallholders, communities and indigenous peoples organizations have improved their livelihoods and decision-making over forest and farm landscapes

FFF Impact/Vision

Intermediary states (IR)/Assumptions (A)/Impact Drivers (ID)

Outcomes

Producers are organized for policy dialogue

Producers are organized for business

Cross-sectoral policy coordination for sustainable forest and farm management

National and global agendas are informed about the priorities of local producers

ID-2: Women’s organizations entrepreneurship supported in selected value chains

ID-3: Lessons and best practices from FFF allow sharing experiences

**A/ID-3:** Avenues for exchange at regional and global levels are offered

**ID-1: FFPOs access to national & export markets improved**

A/ID-1 : County governments use contextualized FFF TOC in their rural development agendas

A/ID -2: Partnerships with MFI allow to extend loans to FFPOs

IS-1: FFPOs capacity for doing business is enhanced and they engage in policy decision processes

IS-2: Multi-sectoral stakeholders policy platforms are catalyzed

IS-3: Local voices are linked to global processes

# Evaluation questions: key findings

1. This section presents the findings which are based on the desk review of the FFF documents, interviews with FFF Team, country visit (Kenya) and interviews with target FFPOs at grassroots level.

## Evaluation question 1: How relevant is FFF primary focus and logic in terms of its stated mission, in relation to the target countries’ contexts, to broader sustainable development initiatives, and to smallholder farmers' needs?

1. FFF is relevant to the strategies of the Government of Kenya Government and those of the Nakuru and Laikipia Counties Governments for the development of the rural sector. In particular, it is relevant to the Country’s Agricultural Sector Development Strategy 2010 - 2020 (ASDS) which is aimed at reducing rural poverty through commercialization of the agricultural sector. Foremost, FFF is relevant to the new Constitution 2010 and Vision 2030, which provide a target of recovering 10 percent forest cover in an effort to reduce deforestation and degradation and to create a foundation for addressing the national wood supply deficit.[[7]](#footnote-7) In the context of changes in the governance and administrative structure brought about by Kenya’s new Constitution, Farm Forestry is under the responsibility of County governments. FFF contributes to the consolidation of the devolution of rural development governance of the agricultural and forestry services to the governments of Nakuru and Laikipia Counties.

## Evaluation question 2: How and to what extent does the project contribute to the broader FAO strategic objectives?

1. The Project is particularly aligned with FAO’s Strategic Objective 3 (SO3), “Reduce rural poverty”, to which it strongly contributes. Under SO3, FAO recognizes that rural poverty is mostly concentrated among households of small-scale subsistence producers and family farmers, among others. It further recognizes that women are often amongst the most marginalized and need strengthened rights to the natural resources on which they depend. Like SO3, its focus target groups are also poor smallholders’ farmers whose livelihoods are tied to small forests and farm assets.
2. Under SO3, FAO’s focus is on a holistic approach to rural development and poverty reduction. Likewise, FFF in Kenya emphasizes integrated approaches in which forests and other farm components are considered functionally interdependent components of the same rural landscapes that must be sustainably managed and used to improve the livelihoods of their users. FFF also focuses on opportunities that strengthen linkages between forests, crops and animal production, for sustainability reasons. In this regard, FFPOs met in the country told the MTE Team that they consider trees on their farms as crops like any other crop.
3. More specifically, the FFF is aligned to FAO’s corporate outcome 3.1: The rural poor have enhanced and equitable access to productive resources, services, organizations and markets, and can manage their resources more sustainably. The output under this outcome to which FFF is contributing most is Output 3.1.1: Support to strengthen rural organizations and institutions and facilitate empowerment of rural poor. The FFF objectives under pillars 1 and 2 are closely in line with those of SO3. As such, FFF activities may certainly count towards the indicator for output 3.1.1: “Number of countries in which support was provided to create an enabling environment for rural organizations and institutions as well as the empowerment of the rural poor.”
4. At the heart of FFF consistency with FAO’s SO3 are principally FFF’s Outcomes 1 and 2. Outcome 1 is instrumental in enabling poor rural smallholder farmers to get organized and be able to engage in policy dialogue on forest and farm resource management and use related issues. Outcome 2 is instrumental in enhancing the capacity of the same target groups to invest in forest and farm management to participate in value chains and integrate into the markets.
5. The priorities for FAO in its cooperation with Kenya are laid out in the Country Program Framework 2014-2017. FFF is relevant to all the five outcomes of its focus, in particular to Outcome 2, in Kenya “Productivity of medium- and small-scale agricultural producers increased, diversified and aligned to markets”. Under this Outcome, FAO supports the country’s priorities of ensuring that there is a reduction in the country’s production costs, improved value addition and mechanization. The focus is on enhancing the productive capacity of medium- and small-scale producers, promoting diversification and inclusiveness, improving value addition while maintaining nutrition quality and ensuring that production meets market demand. A particular emphasis is put on the empowerment of women and youth and persons with special needs in all activities to improve their income and livelihoods.
   1. Evaluation question 3: Was the project design appropriate for achieving the Outcomes and the Vision?
6. The appropriateness of the Project’s design for achieving its Outcomes and Vision is unquestionable. Forest and farm smallholders of developing countries face challenges that include limited organization skills, limited access to markets and market information, to financial capital, smallholder friendly technologies, and limited or no participation in policy formation processes relating to forest and farm landscape management and use. Addressing these challenges is in the realm of FFF’s Vision and Outcomes. All key informants interviewed by the MTE Team in the country said that the FFF model is a practical and effective methodology in delivering the support to FFPOs as compared to traditional development projects. It facilitates access to smallholders through these organizations, with training and other services allowing them to do business and link to markets, and to participate in policy formation processes. The main strength of the model resides in its having a wide scope for addressing smallholder farmers’ challenges, being demand-driven, and supporting with direct grants the proposals submitted by FFPOs for funding.
7. The MTE found that although it is still early as FFF is starting the implementation of activities at grassroots level, the model has a potential to lead to expected results in terms of providing concrete grassroots to poor stallholders in the counties of Nakuru and Laikipia. In terms of methodology (concept, implementation, M&LS) the Model is replicable, in participating and other countries as well. The MTE noted that political economy assessments were missing from the initial baseline assessments in the two FFF focus counties. Such analysis, if conducted in a systematic methodical manner, might help to understand the key agents of change in the country in general, and in Nakuru and Laikipia counties in particular.
8. The appropriateness of the FFF model is further evidenced by the strong response it has received from FFPOs in response to the call for proposals. Table 1 provides a list of target FFPOs, with respective. The elaborated their proposals themselves on the basis of the FFF Model, a proof that they found it appropriate in meeting their development priorities.
9. While the FFF Model is largely appropriate, the value chain development[[8]](#footnote-8) (VCD) approach was not used to identify actions to be supported or partnerships to be mobilized along the value chain. It was noted for example that the FFF project document and the M&LS make no mention of value chains. In Kenya, the small grants agreements included a component on market access and linkages, but deeper value chain analysis is needed to fully reach the potential and identify unequal power relationships within the value chain.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 1: Characteristics of FFF’s target producer organizations | | | | | |
| Organization/group | **Registration Status** | **Number of members** | | | **Type of production** |
| Males | Females | Total |
| Nakuru County | | | | | |
| Tumaini Mwangaza Investment | Self Help Group | 7 | 8 | 15 | Timber |
| Community Food and Environment Group | Community Based Organization | 40 | 62 | 102 | Fruit tree nursery  Agroforestry |
| Menengai Crater Bee Keepers | Self Help Group | 7 | 11 | 25 | Honey /Poultry |
| Beyond 1 B Trees Mau Women CBO | Community Based Organization | 7 | 14 | 21 | Tree Nursery/Poultry |
| Lake Elementaita Group | Self Help Group | 20 | 23 | 43 | Tree Nursery/Poultry |
| Junction Bamboo Tree Nursery and Conservation Group | Community Based Organization | 17 | 11 | 28 | Bamboo/tree Nursery |
| Laikipia County | | | | | |
| Nettle World | Self Help Group | 21 | 16 | 37 | Stinging Nettle/Agroforestry |
| Marura Environment Conservation Group | Community Based Organization | 8 | 12 | 20 | Tree Nursery/Poultry |
| Yaaku Cultural Group | Community Based Organization | 9 | 11 | 20 | Honey /Agroforestry |
| Laikipia Livestock Marketing Association | Community Based Organization | 36 | 16 | 52 | Honey/Hay |
| Lariak CFA | Community Forest Association | 22 | 18 | 40 | Fruit Tree Nursery |
| Shamanek CFA | Community Forest Association | 33 | 29 | 62 | Tree Nursery |
| Membership Totals | | 225 | 231 | 456 |  |

* 1. Evaluation question 4: To what extent is the FFF on track to achieving outcomes across the three pillars and what changes can be observed that are attributable to the FFF’s interventions and are directly linked to the FFF’s main objectives?

**Pillar 1, “Strengthen smallholder, women, community and indigenous peoples’ producer organizations for business/livelihoods and policy engagement”**

1. With regarding to progress to Outcome 1, “Strengthened producer organizations engage in policy dialogue”, FFF has a good start in supporting grassroots FFPOs and their Apex structure, FF-SPAK, but it has not yet fully started the activities aiming at supporting the organization FFPOs to effectively engage in policy dialogue. Table 2 summarizes progress made so far in supporting FFPOs to influence forest and farm related policies. The MTE distinguished 4 levels for assessing policy influence (adapted from Keck and Sikkink, 1998[[9]](#footnote-9)), as follows:
2. Getting issues on political agenda
3. Encouraging discursive commitment from government
4. Securing procedural change at national level
5. Influencing behavioral change in key actors.
6. The MTE noted early encouraging progress on (i) and (ii) as follows.
7. **Getting issues on political agenda.** Under Output 1.1, “Dispersed local producers are organized into effective and gender inclusive groups”, although cross‐sectoral platforms have not yet been established, KFS organized two stakeholder workshops to develop rules for the registration of private forest owners. FF SPAK attends fora where issues relevant to farm forestry are discussed.
8. With regard to Output 1.2, “Producer groups work together with government and private sector to improve policy”, the interaction for policy improvement between FFPOs, county governments and the private sector have not yet taken place in the form of multi-stakeholders platforms. However, FFF contributed to strengthening the capacity of the apex forest and farm producer organization, FF-SPAK, so that it can help FFPOs o have voice and influence getting issues on the political agenda.
9. **Encouraging discursive commitment from government.** There is a particular influence of the work of FFF on the state policy discourses at national and sub-national levels as far as rural development strategies are concerned.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table 2: Progress made by FFF in influencing forest and farm related policies (Pillar 1 & 2) | |
| Results level | Examples of results obtained with FFF support |
| Getting issues on political agenda | Although cross‐sectoral platforms have not yet been established, KFS organized two stakeholder workshops to develop rules for the registration of private forest owners. FF SPAK attends fora where issues relevant to farm forestry are discussed. |
| Encouraging discursive commitment from state | There is a particular influence of the work of FFF on the state policy discourses at national and sub-national levels as far as rural development strategies are concerned. |

1. With regard to Outcome 2, “Local communities and producers are organized and thereby have the capacity to invest in sustainable forest and farm management and integrate into the market”, at this stage of the Programme start, the support consists in training to increase production quantity, and to strengthen managerial abilities of members of FFPOs committees, and in market analysis. Knowledge from these training activities will certainly contribute to improved productions and higher incomes. In some of the visited FFPOs that do value additions, like Nettle World in Laikipia County, there is a potential of further income increases through links to urban, regional and export markets. However, exploiting that potential requires envisaging value chain development approach from the very start of the support provided to FFPOs.
2. The MTE learnt from field visits that before FFF started training the members of FFPOs committees, the management skills were inadequate even for small-scale production. Still in most cases, building up management skills will be a long process and the organizations are demanding more training, and their members are motivated. The lack of entrepreneurship skills remains an important constraint as far as effective organization of the groups is concerned. This can be illustrated by the case of Elementaita Group, in Nakuru County. It is well placed near the main road, and it is involved in a diversity of productions including tree seedlings, fruit tree seedlings, flowers, and poultry. However, it lacks an approach of how to optimize production for each type of products. For marketing, it relies on random customers passing by, farmers in its neighborhood, and some institutional customers in the area. Its committee members recognize the lack of an approach to get information on the markets and to inform potential buyers. One of the consequence is that there are many overgrown seedlings in the Group’s nursery.
3. Under Output 2.1, it can be implicitly understood that if knowing about business for FFPOs means that they can participate in forest and farm based value chains and have access to rural finance. It is therefore important that in the support provided to FFPOs, FFF addresses the main constraints affecting smallholders participation in value chains, and training for them focuses on required knowledge to upgrading of smallholder farmers beyond local markets into urban, regional and exports.
4. At the stage of the implementation of FFF in Kenya, it is not yet possible to assess how the knowledge that FFPOs will get will help them participate in value chains for their produce and link with markets. However, the MTE notes that while support to FFPOs’ business capacity and access to markets is an important dimension of FFF, there is no mention of forest and farm based “value chains” in the Program Document or the FFF Monitoring and Learning System document.
5. As mentioned, FFF is only at the start in Kenya. However, impressions from the field visits and discussions with stakeholders is that the grants support to FFPOs’ proposals focus primarily the upstream end of forest and farm productions, particularly tree seedlings and poultry. There also some target FFPOs who add value to their production, for example in honey or herbal medicines production. In these particular cases, the value chain approach is envisaged in a fragmented way that may not allow linking smallholder farmers within FFPOs to national and export markets. The scope of the grant, not only in amount and duration (7 months) but also in aspects that are funded may not address the key constraints for access to urban and export market. The MTE visited an interesting case, the Nettle World, where there is a good potential to link to urban and export markets. However, the current funding approach that does not cover certain the key constraints such as equipment, storage infrastructure and exploration of linkages to export markets may not allow full development of such a value chain. There will therefore be a need to explore ways for access to additional finance.
6. FFF is achieving notable progress in strengthening producer organizations’ capacity to engage in business. Through Output 2.1 “Local forest and farms organizations have knowledge about business development”, Outcome 2 is the key focus of FFF as far as meeting grassroots priority support needs is concerned. It links directly to the expected project Impact and to the Vision. It can be implicitly understood from its formulation that knowing about business for FFPOs means that they can access successfully forest and farm-based value chains and rural finance. It is therefore important that in the support provided to FFPOs, FFF addresses the main constraints affecting smallholders’ access to value chains. In this regard, the trainings organized by the Project in different countries have focused on the knowledge that smallholder farmers need to add value to their productions and to link to markets.
7. Poor forests and Farms producers often struggle to gain market integration because they lack knowledge of market requirements or the skills to meet those requirements. Furthermore, weak or lack of access to information, together with other obstacles in value chains prevent FFPOs from getting the benefits that entering into national and global markets can offer. Value Chain Development (VCD) is essential for the integration of smallholder farmers into the market, and it can be applied to a broad range of other FFF impact areas such as women and indigenous groups’ empowerment, sustainable forest and farm landscapes management, food security and poverty reduction.
8. **Emerging experience in value chain upgrading.** The MTE found that FFF implicitly supports value chains upgrading through following trajectories: products upgrading[[10]](#footnote-10), process upgrading[[11]](#footnote-11), and functional upgrading[[12]](#footnote-12). Table 3 presents examples of emerging experiences in these trajectories.
9. **Product upgrading.** There are emerging experiences in nursery seedling production and medicinal product packaging. Nursery producers are producing tree seedlings from good quality seeds, and they intend to accede to quality certification with the support from KFS. The FFPO Nettle World (located in Laikipia County) is having interesting experience in packaging and labelling of nettle root and sandalwood powder.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table 3: Emerging experiences in value chain upgrading in FFF-supported FFPOs in Kenya | |
| Type of upgrading | **Example of FFPOs supported by FFF** |
| Product upgrading | * Nursery producers are producing tree seedlings from good quality seeds, and who intend to accede to quality certification from KFS. * Nettle World (located in Laikipia County): packaging and label of nettle root and sandalwood powder. |
| Process upgrading | FFPOs which manage nurseries and produce fruit tree seedlings: linking to input markets for graft material and seeds, and to output markets. |
| Functional upgrading | Nettle World is engaged in post-harvest conditioning of its nettle production before passing to processing for value addition, and to marketing. |

1. **Process upgrading.** With regard to Process upgrading FFPOs which manage nurseries and produce fruit tree seedlings are trained to link to input markets for graft material and seeds, and to output markets.
2. **Functional upgrading.** For functional upgrading the FFPO Nettle World MENTIONED ABOVE is engaged in post-harvest conditioning of its nettle production before passing to processing for value addition, and to marketing.
3. FFF experiences in helping FFPOs to know business and access markets. With the training activities targeting FFPOs’ members, FFF has been effective in the implementation of Output 2.1. The application of the acquired knowledge has further motivated the beneficiaries to orient their production systems to commercialization. In Table 4, the MTE summarizes FFF experiences to date in helping FFPOs to know business and access to markets. From the information available, two main business models are practiced by FFF-target groups: (i) Farm gate and/or roadside driven; (ii) Public institution procurement driven. The examples are given in Table 4.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Table 4: Examples of business models applied by FFF supported organizations | |
| Type of business model | **Examples of FFF targeted FFPOs** |
| Farm gate, roadside, local market place | Many FFPOs producing seedlings sell part of production at nursery sites. |
| Public institution procurement driven | Many FFPOs producing seedlings plan to sell to counties governments for their planting programs. |

1. FFF further strengthened FFPOs’ capacity to know business and access to markets through Output 2.2 and Output 2.3. Under Output 2.2, “Establishment of services in support of small forest business”, FFF has been effective in establishing services to support small forest and farm based business. The partnership between FFF, Kenya Forest Service (KFS), the Farm Forestry Smallholder Producers Association of Kenya (FF-SPAK) and county government services allows extension officers at all county administration levels to play an increased role in training and advising target FFPOs.

**Pillar 2: “Catalyze multi-sectoral stakeholder policy platforms with governments and at local and national levels”**

1. The MTE note that there are efforts by government to consult FF-Kenya on forest and farm related issues and to invite it to participate in policy discussion meetings. However, cross-sectoral platforms are not yet established. Policy dialogue takes place through ad hoc mechanisms such as stakeholders’ workshops. FFF has signed a letter of Agreement (LoA) with KFS to support cross-sectoral platforms, among others. It is also worth to mention that by virtue of the strong partnership between FFF and KFS, the Project has been effective in engaging decision-makers at national and counties governments levels on issues relating to forest and farm development. To this end, FFF is influencing dialogue between counties government and forest and farm organizations.

**Pillar 3 “Link local voices and learning to global processes through communication and information dissemination”**

1. With regard to Outcome 4, “National and global agendas and initiatives (…) are informed about knowledge and priorities of smallholders, women, communities and indigenous peoples”, FFF supported the organization of the Africa Farm/Family Forest Producers Organizations Conference that was held in Nairobi 9-11 of June 2015, to prepare African FFPOs representation in the XIV World Forestry Congress. [[13]](#footnote-13)

## Evaluation question 5: To what extent is the current operational modality contributing to the efficient achievement of the program outcomes?

1. Though FFF is at the start of its field level activities in Kenya, its operations are very in terms of inputs relative to results if account is taken of the relatively limited financial resources invested. However, the start of the operations has been as was expected because disbursements have been carried out with considerable delays. This implied a certain rush to start activities in order to abide to the duration of FFPOs’ LoAs of only 6 months. One of the consequences of the delay in the disbursements is that trainings are also shortened or rushed, leaving little time for coaching visits.
2. The Monitoring and Learning System is allowing learning by an upward flux of information that feeds into the communication effort of the three partners (FAO, IIED, IUCN). However, there is scope yet to improve feedback to stakeholders and the general public at country level and county governments level.

## Evaluation question 6: What is the likelihood that FFF will contribute to the expected impact?

1. There is a strong likelihood of reaching the Impact of the Project and contributing to its Vision in Kenya. Full project impact is normally reached some time or many years after completion of its activities. At this stage, the MTE can only assess the likelihood for reaching that Impact and for contributing to the Vision which is “Smallholders, communities and indigenous peoples organizations have improved their livelihoods and decision-making over forest and farm landscapes”. To this end, the main livelihoods “building blocks” that are analyzed for likelihood of impact relate to human, social, and political capital, and to natural, financial and physical assets.
2. Human capital. The strongest potential of impact is the domain of human capital development, in which there are considerable achievements in enhancing the stock of skills in FFPOs members (organizational, managerial, technological, MA&D). The smallholders that the MTE Team met were unanimous in their appreciation of the contribution of training to their performance in production, processing and marketing activities.
3. Social capital development at grassroots level. The most significant contribution of FFF to this domain is coming from the support to FFPOs organizational capacity. Its interventions are increasing the stock of trust that FFPOs members have in the governance of their organizations, and strengthening solidarity in communities. Smallholders are being empowered through raised awareness on the benefits of working together. The FFPOs and their governing committees are effectively contributing to a sense of local ownership of FFF’s results by their members.
4. Political capital. This is understood as the increase in the stock of power held by FFPOs and the apex organizations that can be used to achieve the development goals of their members. FFF supports the enhancement of the political capital of its target FFPOs through a diversity of trainings, as well as the support given to FF-SPAK. This Apex organization takes part in policy-making consultations with government.
5. Natural assets. FFF’s main focus at the local level has been largely to support tree seedling production. This will contribute to increase natural assets in terms of plantations to be created and fruit trees to be planted.
6. Physical assets. In general, FFF grants to FFPOs do not cover investment in physical capital. There is therefore likelihood that FFF will have limited impact on FFPOs physical assets.
7. Financial assets. Due to limited data available, it is not possible to assess the full extent to which FFF is affecting financial assets of households of FFPOs members. From the interviews with FFPOs representatives in the visited countries, the MTE Team believes that production and value addition activities supported by FFF grants are likely to positively affect household income.

## Evaluation question 7: Is FFF having success in engaging other partners in the FFF supported processes?

1. Partnerships have featured prominently in FFF interventions in Kenya. The project is working in partnership with KFS, FF-SPAK, and We Effect to strengthen the capacity and organization of forest and farm producer organizations. In 2015, FFF collaborated with We Effect for stakeholder capacity-building assessment. In addition to this, We Effect collaborates in administering small grants proposals together with FF-SPAK, KFS and county governments, and in strengthening the internal capacities of FFPOs. It should also be underlined that the partnership between FFF and We Effect offers an opportunity for resource mobilization for funding similar programs in the country. In Kenya, this has led to possibility of scaling up of FFF activities to an additional ten counties with German funding, with about USD 12 million.

## Evaluation question 8: How sustainable is the FFF concept of investing in the organizational capacity of forest farm producer organizations – and how might this be enhanced?

1. Sustainability is the likelihood of the programme benefits to be delivered for an extended period after its completion. The MTE found that the high political and social ownership of FFF model is a powerful factor of sustainability. KFS and Counties governments have integrated the FFF model in rural development discourse. The MTE also found that target FFPOs have been the main advocates of the model, and the likelihood of social and economic benefits of their members will contribute to the likelihood of sustainability of the FFF concept.
2. Another equally important factor is the success of the training activities targeting smallholders through their FFPOs. These activities have a potential of transforming farms into businesses and motivating them to move further in commercialization activities.
3. However, the MTE found that the provision of grants without defined counterpart FFPOs contribution to invest in their project may in certain situations generate an unintended effect of dependency, albeit temporary. Sustainability may therefore be enhanced if FFPOs in receipt of FFF grants contribute matching funds to their project budgets, either from their own resources, from other partners, or from bank loans.
4. The Forest Conservation and Management Bill, 201 Article 28 (1), proposes the establishment Forest Conservation and Management Trust Fund. The objects of the Trust Fund shall be to nurture, promote and inspire innovations in forest conservation and shall be used for the following purposes; promotion of commercial forest plantations; development of national community forestry programmes; establishment of nurseries and production of seeds and seedlings among others. FFF programme is supporting Kenya Forest Service (KFS) in operationalization of Forest Management Conservation Trust Fund which will focus in financing farm forestry especially for smallholders.
5. The level of ownership at the country level is quite high, and sustainability seems highly likely given that even at a starting stage there is already commitment by the government and its partners to scale up the FFF model

# Crosscutting issues

## Evaluation question 9: To what extent have gender and human rights been taken into account in the design of the FFF and during the implementation?

1. In the context of the areas of FFF action in Kenya, the main cross-cutting issue with respect to the analysis of the FFF design is Gender. FFF support to FFPOs through grants and trainings pays attention to gender equality and empowerment. In FFPOs that the MTE visited, women are well represented as members and in the governance positions. They benefit training as men members do. There is also an effort to mainstream gender issues in the design of proposals submitted by those organizations to FFF for funding, and to address women’s specific priorities at grassroots level, such as poultry production.
2. Despite the important attention it pays to gender and to addressing certain women’s priorities such as poultry production, FFF lacks a more affirmative approach in designing and implementing interventions that aim specifically at developing women’s entrepreneurship in the on- and off-farm forest and farm based value chains, for example in the nodes of processing and commercialization.
3. An important crosscutting issue which deserves special attention is youth. It is not given focus in the design of FFPOs proposals. In view of the demographic weight of the youth and their responsibility in sustainable landscape management in the future, the design and implementation of interventions should deliberately address their needs as far as access to/use of natural resources are concerned.

Conclusions and recommendations

1. The conclusions and recommendations are formulated in the overall MTE report.
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* 1. Evaluation Mission Schedule 29 February – 04 March, 2016

| **Date** | **Activity** | **Purpose, Issues to discuss** | **Participants** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **28 February** | Arrival |  |  |
| **Monday 29th February** | | | |
| 09:00  11:00  15:00 – 17:30 | * Visit Tumaini Timber Group * Visit Nakuru Tree Nursery Association   Meeting with 6 implementing producer organizations (PO) of Nakuru and Farm Forestry Smallholder Producer Association (FF SPAK) country chapter. The PO will be participating in a training on organizational analysis delivered by FF SPAK with technical support of We Effect | - To assess in-situ the implementation of the FFF at the producer organization level  - To assess the implementation of the Small Grants Agreement (SGA) with the POs | Evaluation mission  Philip Kisoyan  Oscar Simanto |
| **Tuesday 1st March** | | | |
| 08:00 – 09:30  10:00  14:00 – 17:30 | - Meeting with Nakuru County government officials  Travel to Laikipia County  - Visit to Marura Group  - Visit Nettle World | - To assess the implementation of the FFF in coordination with the county government  - To assess in-situ the implementation of the FFF at the producer organization level | Evaluation mission  Philip Kisoyan  Oscar Simanto |
| **Wednesday 2nd March** | | | |
| 08:30  10:00 – 12:30  14:30 | - Meeting with Laikipia county government officials  Meeting with 6 implementing producer organizations (PO) of Laikipia and FF SPAK country chapter. The PO will be participating in a training on Organizational Analysis delivered by FF SPAK with technical support of We Effect      - Travel to Nairobi | - To assess the implementation of the FFF in coordination with the county government  - To assess the implementation of the Small Grants Agreement (SGA) with the POs | Evaluation mission  Philip Kisoyan  Oscar Simanto |
| **Thursday 3 March** | | | |
| 08:30  10:30 – 12:30  14:00 – 17:00 | Meeting with Kenya Forestry Service (KFS)  Meeting with We Effect  Meeting with the board of FF SPAK | - To assess the implementation of the FFF in Kenya  - To assess the implementation of FFF in Kenya working together with We Effect  - To assess the implementation of the FF in Kenya and the facilitation of FF SPAK | Evaluation mission  Philip Kisoyan  Oscar Simanto |
| **Friday, 4 March** | | | |
| 08:30 -10:00  11:00 | Meeting with FAO Representative in Kenya  Wrap up meeting with the FFF Kenya core group |  | Evaluation mission  Philip Kisoyan  Oscar Simanto |

1. In order to avoid repetition in the presentation of the findings, some questions from the Evaluation Terms of Reference have been reclassified as sub-questions here in the final evaluation report where it was appropriate. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Margaret E. Keck and Kathryn Sikkink (1998). Activists beyond borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics. Cornell University Press. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Value chain governance is understood as the power to control, influence, and set the modes and rules of interaction in the value chain. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Value chain upgrading refers to the acquisition of capabilities and market linkages that enable enterprises to improve their competitiveness and move into higher-value activities. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Forest & Farm Facility (2014). Consolidating momentum : Annual Report – 2014. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Distinct from assumptions, impact drivers are factors that project/programme management can influence to a certain extent. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. The Constitution of Kenya (GoK 2010) aims to have tree cover of at least 10% of the land area of Kenya (Article 69(1) (b)).To achieve this target the government has developed policies and strategies to encourage communities and private land owners to invest in forestry. Under the new

   National Forest Policy, 2015. The Government intends to:

   (a) promote partnerships with land owners to increase on-farm tree cover and to reduce pressure on reserved forests.

   (b) promote investment in farm forestry through provision of economic and non-economic incentives.

   (c) promote on-farm species diversification.

   (d) promote development of forest based enterprises.

   (e) promote processing and marketing of farm forestry products.

   (f) promote forestry development through irrigation.

   (g) promote forestry extension and technical services. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Value chain development (VCD) is understood as a concerted effort to improve the conditions in the value chain. For FFPOs, VCD implies the improvement of their participation in value chains, enhancement of the benefits they get, and reducing the exposure to risks. Benefits and risks should be understood not only in financial terms but also in relation to the environment, livelihoods improvement and gender equity. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Margaret E. Keck and Kathryn Sikkink (1998). Activists beyond borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics. Cornell University Press. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Products upgrading: where a chain actor engages in the production of more sophisticated products in order to increase unit value. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Process upgrading: where a chain actor increases the efficiency of internal processes (production, new technologies, storages, distribution, logistics). [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Functional upgrading: where a chain actor changes the mix of functions performed by producer organizations, by working in more than one node of a value chain. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. The conference outcomes were captured in “Resolution of the Africa Farm/Family Forest Producers Organizations Conference Nairobi 9-11 of June 2015 - An initiative of the International Family Forestry Alliance (IFFA)”. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)