



Knowledge Profiling

Promoting easy access to knowledge
and experience generated in projects
and programmes

Knowledge Profiling

Promoting easy access to knowledge
and experience generated in projects
and programmes

A Manual

Published by
IFAD, Rome, Italy
February 2009

Responsible:
Albert Engel: nrm-namibia@gtz.de
Walter Huppert: Walter.Huppert@freenet.de
Rudolph Cleveringa: r.cleveringa@ifad.org

© All photographs by IFAD

The opinions expressed in this manual are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of IFAD. The designations employed and the presentation of material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of IFAD concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The designations "developed" and "developing" countries are intended for statistical convenience and do not necessarily express a judgement about the stage reached in the development process by a particular country or area. This manual contains draft material that has not been subject to formal review. It is circulated for review and to stimulate discussion and critical comment.

Foreword

“If Siemens only knew what Siemens knows.”

This saying, often cited in knowledge management circles, points to a persistent flaw that plagues businesses and public institutions alike. It pinpoints the problems of fragmentation, dispersion and outright neglect of knowledge existing in organisations and their projects and programmes – knowledge that has often been acquired at substantial expense. This problem is also a core issue in Development Cooperation, where it is often compounded by weak management capacities in (not only) partner countries. Who reckons the knowledge lost when project documents are no longer traceable, or have been discarded or are too voluminous to allow quick and fruitful reference? The conclusion is clear: considerable amounts of local and international funding vanish into such ‘knowledge sinks’ in Development Cooperation.

Yet another difficulty keeps Development Cooperation organisations from using existing knowledge and innovations effectively. Barriers between various disciplines and sectors distract high-minded appeals to interdisciplinary problem solving. National ministries and related support organisations are structured along disciplinary lines; communication channels between them, which might allow speedy exchange of knowledge, are often meagre or non-existent. Transaction costs are sometimes considered prohibitive.

This Manual aims to help remove such impediments for effective and efficient management of knowledge and innovations in Development Cooperation. It offers simple and easily applicable methods for avoiding such knowledge management shortcomings. The *knowledge profiling (KP)* approach used in this Manual builds on ideas developed by GTZ in Namibia, where a government-supported initiative attempted to provide more rapid and easy access to knowledge generated in agricultural and water-sector projects. The method of *KP* presented here

was applied and tested in several projects, where it met with enthusiastic acceptance. It will now become a component of the GTZ package of debriefing instruments.

KP also aroused the interest of the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). Its recent Knowledge Management Strategy foresees the application of innovative tools, such as *KP*. IFAD capitalizes on its Innovation Mainstreaming Initiative (IMI) in this context, particularly on ‘Learning and Knowledge on Innovations in Water and Rural Poverty’ (*InnoWat*). One of the objectives of *InnoWat* is to make better use of local knowledge and innovations generated in IFAD-supported projects. IFAD emphasises an interdisciplinary and intersectoral approach. Hence, both the ‘knowledge scouting and mining’ and the cross-sectoral knowledge comparison potential of *KP* can benefit IFAD development effectiveness. With this in mind, IFAD has joined forces with GTZ to create this Manual and promote its use.

Both GTZ and IFAD see *KP* as a promising element of project debriefing and knowledge management. Moreover, *KP* could serve as a catalyst for cross-sectoral project interaction and exchange. We are confident that the GTZ-IFAD cooperation to develop and promote the *KP* methodology responds to increasing calls from our clients and member countries to intensify our knowledge sharing with them-since they are the main originators and final users. We invite national ministries and departments, other donors and other Development Cooperation organisations to participate and give a boost to the exchange of project-and programme-generated knowledge, experience and innovations. This would strengthen the harmonisation aims of the Paris Declaration.

Dr. Rodney Cooke, Director
Technical Advisory Division, IFAD, Rome

Jan Schwaab, Senior Technical Adviser
Knowledge Management, GTZ Eschborn

Acknowledgements

This Manual builds on ideas developed and realised by Albert Engel, GTZ Programme Manager in Namibia. His initial intention was to provide more rapid and easy access to the knowledge generated in GTZ-supported projects completed before and during his term in Namibia. With this in mind, he gained Namibian support for the creation of brief and concise 'knowledge cards' for Sustainable Animal and Range Development Programme (SARDEP), a long-standing GTZ-supported project by the Namibian Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry, and engaged in livestock management. Robert Kressirer, Rolf Mack and Walter Huppert of GTZ along with Wolfgang Werner, Consultant in Windhoek, applied the method in its initial stages in sectors as diverse as the livestock and water sectors and the field of biodiversity. At IFAD's request, Walter Huppert then brokered the institutional linkages between GTZ and IFAD and energetically initiated and supported the creation of this Manual on *knowledge profiling*. Rudolph Cleveringa, Moses Abukari and the project teams of the IFAD supported Upper East Region Land Conservation and Smallholder Rehabilitation Project (LACOSREP I and II) and Upper West Agricultural Development Project (UWADEP), were instrumental in promoting *Knowledge Profiling* application in Ghana.

Contents

Foreword	3
Acknowledgements	4
Abbreviations and Acronyms	6
1 The Concept	7
1.1 Principles	7
1.2 Applicability	7
1.3 Purpose	8
1.4 Audiences	8
2 Setting Up <i>Knowledge Profiles</i>	9
2.1 Responsibilities	9
2.2 The Sequence of Steps	9
3 Case Examples	11
3.1 Preface	11
3.2 Case Example 1	11
3.2.1 Project Brief	11
3.2.2 Module Example	12
3.3 Case Example 2	18
3.3.1 Project Brief	18
3.3.2 Module Example	18
3.4 Case Example 3	22
3.4.1 Project Brief	22
3.4.2 Module Example 1	23
3.4.3 Module Example 2	29
ANNEX	
Practical hints for the elaboration of ‘Knowledge Profiles’	35

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

BAS	Biosafety, Access and Benefit Sharing
BDTF	Biodiversity Task Force
BMC	Basin Management Committee
CAP	Catchment Area Protection
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CBO	Community-based organisation
DA	District Assembly
DEA	Directorate of Environmental Affairs
DRFN	Desert Research Foundation of Namibia
DWA	Directorate of Water Affairs
ELAK	Environmental Learning and Action in the Kuiseb
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GIDA	Ghana Irrigation Development Authority
GRN	Government of Namibia
GTZ	Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit/ German Technical Cooperation
IE	Interim Evaluation (IFAD)
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
ILWM	Integrated Land and Water Management
ILWRM	Integrated Land and Water Resources Management
ISBMC	Ishana Sub-basin Management Committee
KP	Knowledge Profiling
LACOSREP	Land Conservation and Smallholder Rehabilitation Project
LGUC	Local Government Unit Committee
MAWF	Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
MAWRD	Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Rural Development
MET	Ministry of Environment and Tourism
MoFA	Ministry of Food and Agriculture
NBP	National Biodiversity Programme
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NORPREP	Northern Region Poverty Reduction Programme
NRGP	Northern Rural Growth Programme
NWRMP	Namibia Water Resources Management Programme
NWRMR	Namibia Water Resources Management Review
RWS	Rural Water Supply
SB	Sounding Board
SBMC	Sub-Basin Management Committee
UER	Upper East Region, Ghana
UK	United Kingdom
UWADEP	Upper West Agricultural Development Project
UWR	Upper West Region, Ghana
WFP	World Food Programme
WUA	Water Users Association
WUA EC	Water User Association Executive Committee

The concept

1.1 The principles

'*Knowledge profiling*' (*KP*) in Development Cooperation means taking a look at project or programme outcomes with a new 'pair of glasses'. Traditionally, the focus has been on reaching goals, achieving results and compiling lessons learned. *KP* does this, too, but it adds a new perspective: the spotlight is on the knowledge and experience gained by the major stakeholders. Moreover, documentation of this knowledge is arranged to allow quick reference to details. Finally, *KP* facilitates comparison of knowledge acquisition between projects/programmes and even cross-sectorally.

The main principles are *easy accessibility*, *comparability* and *stakeholder perception*, which are in fact seldom observed during documentation of project- and programme-generated knowledge. To change this in future, the method emphasises the '4 Ss' of *KP*:

- Stakeholder feedback
- Shortness
- Structuring
- Standardisation

Stakeholder feedback

The major stakeholders identify the knowledge generated by the project/programme that they value most and think should be remembered and shared. This step ensures that the profiling exercise focuses not on 'expert knowledge' but on knowledge gained by the local people.

Shortness

The topics or areas of knowledge identified by the major stakeholders are termed 'modules'. For each module a brief and concise *knowledge profile* is elaborated, specifying the details of the knowledge gained and the

lessons learned in connection with the module. *Knowledge profiles* are presented in brief, 'bullet point' listings.

Structuring

The *knowledge profiles* have a special structure. While outputs, outcomes and impacts achieved by the project/programmes (or project phase) are briefly mentioned, the emphasis is on knowledge, innovations and experience gained with respect to:

- methods, tools and instruments applied
- processes employed
- furthering / hindering factors occasioned by frame conditions
- people and organisations knowledgeable about the module or some of its components
- available documents with valuable information related to the module

Standardisation

Knowledge profile structure should be standardised, so that specific information can be easily traced and compared among different projects and programmes.

1.2 Applicability

KP can best be applied during mid-term project reviews or final evaluations. It can also support 'completion reporting' by the organisation responsible. However, ad-hoc profiling exercises can be performed as needed during the project cycle. The process requires some familiarity with the project/programme and standard interviewing techniques. In-depth sector-specific professional knowledge is desirable but not necessary.

While *KP* has the greatest benefit when applied to the whole of a project, the method is flexible enough for application to project



subsections. For example, in complex agricultural development projects/programmes, KP may focus on water operations only. Also, ministerial departments, donors or NGOs may conduct a KP exercise exclusively focussed on the knowledge and experience gained through their own project/programme contributions.

1.3 Purpose

Knowledge, innovations and experience gained during projects/programmes are like hidden treasure. In later project phases or several years after project/programme completion, people know that there is valuable information out there somewhere, but it is buried within voluminous reports and documents and dispersed among lengthy descriptions, tables and graphs. Or it lives on in the minds of a handful of people whose names have often been forgotten. Another possibility is that such knowledge is applied by the target group but within a limited context, to which other possible users have no access. In the first instance, the 'treasure' is usually not considered worth the cost and effort to salvage it. In the latter case, communication barriers (e.g., between sectors) prevent the treasure's being shared.

The consequences are clear: the wheel is reinvented again and again, opportunities to replicate and upscale knowledge are lost, and inevitably money is wasted and project/programme impacts reduced.

This being the case, the purpose of KP is threefold:

1. To identify, document and enable access to knowledge.

This tool places major users in a position to gain a rapid overview of project/programme content and knowledge generation. Such a tool can also significantly enhance the usual debriefing procedures and documents.

2. To shed light on and make better use of local knowledge and innovations.

KP enables local stakeholders to articulate their own perception of project- and programme-generated knowledge. It enables better integration of existing local and indigenous knowledge into capacity-building efforts.

3. To exchange and compare knowledge and innovations.

Not all of the modules identified during a KP exercise will be sector-specific. E.g., in a water management project/programme, a health project or other projects in other sectors, there may be modules relating to institution building, training or awareness raising. Hence, such modules can enable knowledge comparison in many sectors. This aspect of KP fills an important gap in knowledge management practice in development projects and programmes. This capacity for cross comparison is of particular importance as development projects and programmes become increasingly embedded within policy frameworks, more holistic in their approach, and more multi-sectoral in nature.

1.4 Audiences

Primary audiences of KP are the organisations that planned and implemented a given project or programme.

Such organisations often cannot swiftly trace and use specific knowledge and experience gained in project interventions/programmes that date back even a few years. Moreover, they often lack the means to link up with similar efforts by others so that they miss the chance to replicate and upscale the knowledge and innovations generated.

Secondary audiences are, first, all organisations and individuals that are or were involved in the specific project/programme, and, second, 'outsiders' who wish to learn from it. KP would then help all these audiences to have quick access to the knowledge, innovations and lessons learned in the

Setting up *knowledge profiles*

2.1 Responsibilities

Responsibilities depend on how the *knowledge profile* is to be used. Normally, the project/programme implementing agency will want to replicate or upscale the knowledge and experience gained and will assume responsibility for compilation, documentation and further use of the *knowledge profile*. Whenever *knowledge profiles* are being set up by 'secondary' audiences (donors, cooperating institutions, communities-of-practice, NGOs, consultants, service providers, civil society representatives, etc), the responsibility will be theirs.

2.2 The sequence of steps

Step 1 (Awareness and motivation)

The first step of the *KP* process is to raise awareness in the organisation responsible for the project/programme, arouse interest for the process and secure a firm commitment to it. It is this organisation, after all, that stands to benefit most from the *profiling* exercise. Ideally, one unit in a ministry initiates the process, and other departments in the same or other ministries follow suit. The value added grows considerably with the number of *knowledge profiles* and with the links and comparisons between these profiles.

Step 2 (Interviewers line-up)

Depending on the size and complexity of the project/programme, one, two or more interviewers are chosen. To ensure impartiality and avoid preconceptions, these persons should not have been deeply involved in project/programme implementation. They should be familiar with the procedure and basic interviewing techniques and have a professional background in the main topics of the project/programme. In certain cases, the project appraisers or mid-term reviewers may assume this role additionally. Their task is to conduct and/or supervise the interviews, summarise the results, present them to the

Sounding Board (see below) and draft the *knowledge profiles*.

Step 3 (Sounding Board)

Next, the lead organisation gathers a small group of stakeholders (not more than four or five persons) as a 'sounding board' (SB). The SB is to identify the *modules*, reflect on the results of the interviews and provide feedback. It is essential that the people selected for the SB represent different stakeholder groups involved in project/programme design and/or implementation and that they have the capability to reflect on complex project/programme interdependencies.

Step 4 (Module search)

The *profiling* process starts with the identification of key '*knowledge modules*'. These are major clusters of themes in which, in the opinion of the sounding board members, essential knowledge and experience were accumulated in the course of the project/programme. This step is prepared by the consultants following perusal of existing project/programme documentation. In most cases, five to eight such knowledge areas are identified. This module selection is then discussed with the sounding board and a final selection made for use in interviewing and reporting.

It may well be that the selection of *modules* does not exactly correspond to the major areas of envisaged project/programme results. More often than not, stakeholders emphasize knowledge that has been gained in areas not anticipated by the planners.

Step 5 (Profiling)

Before interviewing begins, the sounding board must decide on the structuring of the *knowledge profile*. Once a certain structure is used, it should be substantially adhered to in subsequent *profiling* exercises, so that future comparability of the different exercises is

2

ensured. For example, several GTZ-supported profiling exercises in Namibia used the following structure for knowledge profiles:

- Description of the module
- Specific steps / activities implemented ('outputs')
- Use made of specific outputs ('outcomes')
- Methods, tools and instruments applied
- Specific experience, knowledge and innovations gained during implementation
 - What functioned well
 - What did not function well (opposing views of the interviewees should be mentioned as well)
- Important frame conditions relevant for the module
 - Promoting factors
 - Hindering factors
- Assessment of impact of the module
- Assessment of sustainability
- Assessment of replicability and upscaling
- Who is knowledgeable about the module or elements of it?
- In what documents can one find relevant information?

Step 6 (Interviews)

Using the module structure described before, semi-structured interviews are conducted with a number of stakeholders. All major stakeholder groups must be represented, especially the target groups and intermediaries that generated the knowledge and/or are actively using it. These groups may then act as catalysts for future upscaling and replication elsewhere. In this way, a broad spectrum of views is compiled on knowledge and innovations gathered during a given project or programme. The identity and whereabouts of the essential bearers of specific knowledge thus become a matter of record. And finally, the interviews cast new light on earlier assumptions about project- or programme-induced knowledge generation.

Step 7 (Condensing and review)

Once the interviews are completed, the consultants condense and summarise the results. Generally, the results are presented to the interviewees in a workshop, so that corrections can be made and differences discussed.

Step 8 (Presentation)

The results are presented in the final knowledge profiles. Such profiles consist of a very brief (3 to 5 sentences) description of the module followed by a bullet-point listing of the interview results as agreed. The structure of the list corresponds to the structure of the interviews (see step 5).

Step 9 (Ranking)

Subsequently, preferably during the workshop, the modules will be ranked, with the following as possible criteria:

- The amount of knowledge, innovations and experiences recorded
- The impact of the modules (or parts thereof)
- The likelihood of sustainability
- The suitability of the modules for replication elsewhere

Such ranking enables the skimming off of truly important knowledge, experience and innovations: useful information for other or future projects or programmes.

Step 10 (Saving)

The modules can now be documented and stored in different ways. One possibility is compilation within a KP Report according to the ranking (step 9). Normally, this will conclude the KP exercise. Another possibility is to save the modules in electronic files. When there are several such files, hyperlinks to similar modules in other projects may be set up for purposes of comparison and knowledge interaction.

Step 11 (Spreading)

A useful (though not absolutely essential) step will be to identify and inform potential knowledge-sharing partners other than the project/programme stakeholders. These partners may be other sector ministries, donors, NGOs, consultants and especially representatives of the civil society in the particular country, region and project/programme area. It may be helpful to discuss and define the special needs of these partners in order to tailor the knowledge documentation and - sharing accordingly.

Case Examples

3.1 Preface

In the following, we have compiled extracts from three Knowledge Profiling exercises: two from Namibia (GTZ supported) and one from Ghana (IFAD supported). Due to lack of space and for the sake of clarity we do not reproduce the complete KP Reports elaborated for these projects. We only present one selected Module for each of two GTZ supported projects and two selected Modules of an IFAD supported project. However, we reprint these Modules in full length and with the complete structure and all the details of the respective Knowledge Profile. In order to facilitate comprehension of the relevant project background, we introduce each of these Modules with a shortened description of the corresponding project background.

The project examples presented here are:

1. GTZ - Namibia Water Resources Management Programme (NWRM).
2. GTZ - Namibia's National Biodiversity Programme (NBP).
3. IFAD - Pro Poor Agricultural Water Operations in Northern Ghana.

3.2 Case Example 1: 'Namibian Water Resources Management Programme' (Second Phase)

3.2.1 Project Brief

The Namibia Water Resources Management Programme started in 1999 as a project of the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Rural Development (now: Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry, MAWF). The project can be divided into two phases. The first Phase was known as the Namibia Water Resources Management Review (NWRMR) and lasted from 1999 to 2001. The main emphasis during this Phase was the development of a

comprehensive policy framework for the Namibian water sector as well as proposals for institutional reform geared towards more equitable access to water by all Namibians. This phase of the project culminated in the adoption of the National Water Policy White Paper by the Namibian Cabinet in August 2000 and a Draft Water Resources Management Bill.

In the second phase from January 2002 to June 2006 the project supported the Government of Namibia in the implementation of the policy, legal and management recommendations of the NWRMR as approved by government. The project goal was to strengthen the capacity of Namibians to manage their water resources in an optimal way with special consideration for water related resource protection. During the second half of Phase 2 special emphasis was put on integrated land and water resources management. More specifically, it was decided to concentrate the project support in the area of integrated water basin management. Since then, the focus of the project has shifted towards integrated land and water resources management in the Cuvelai Basin in north-central Namibia.

The lessons learnt through the project in the period 1998 to 2005 were grouped around 7 main areas of experience and knowledge ('Modules'), as follows:

- Module 1:** Establishment of basin management organisations
- Module 2:** Capacity building of professionals in Integrated Land and Water Resource Management (ILWRM)
- Module 3:** ILWRM knowledge base
- Module 4:** Co-operation, networking and awareness raising
- Module 5:** Development of policy and legislation
- Module 6:** Training and education
- Module 7:** Institutional reform of the water sector

The project is concerned with water

3

resources management. However, it is worth noting that the headings of the identified areas of knowledge generation show clearly that knowledge has not been gained with respect to water resources issues only. Instead, most Modules relate to topics that are of high relevance in other Namibian sectors and projects as well where efforts have been made in similar directions.

Therefore, there is an urgent need to link and compare the lessons learnt and build on such Namibian specific experience. That is what K P helps to do.

3.2.2 Module Example

As an example, the above mentioned Module 1 is presented here:

Module 1: Establishment of Basin Management Organizations

Short description of module:

The establishment of Basin Management Committees (BMCs) is one of the corner stones of Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) as laid down in the National Water Policy White Paper and as stipulated in the new Water Act of 2004. Government of Namibia (GRN) strongly favoured the piloting of BMCs in the Cuvelai area in northern Namibia. NWRM promoted a participatory approach to demarcate sub-basins in the Cuvelai and to select a particular sub-basin as the pilot area to start with. A process of discussion, information sharing and joint decision making was supported by NWRM that led to the establishment and official launching of the Iishana BMC in October 2005 by the Minister of MAWF.

Specific steps/activities implemented ('outputs'):

- Two study tours were undertaken to Australia and the United Kingdom (UK) to look at water management agencies and stakeholder involvement. The Minister of MAWRD participated in one tour and became convinced of the basin management approach as a means for increased involvement of local people in water management.
- Based on a theme report on the participatory approach, an implementation plan was developed during Phase 1, with a sub-section on the establishment of BMCs.
- A forum of stakeholders in the water and land sectors was established in the Cuvelai Basin. It included the major stakeholders such as traditional leaders, Regional Councillors, members of Water Point Committees, Namwater and line ministries.
- The concept of Integrated Water Management was introduced in the Cuvelai Basin by way of sharing information with stakeholders.
- A concept for the demarcation of the Cuvelai Basin into sub-basins was developed with support of contracted consultants.
- Workshops were held to facilitate decisions as to the selection of a pilot sub-basin to start with
- Meetings were organized to jointly develop criteria and processes for the election of the members of the Iishana Basin Management Committee (ISBMC).
- A BMC constitution was discussed, drafted and agreed upon.
- Directorate of Water Affairs (DWA) organised well structured 'information sharing exercises' initially related to the whole Cuvelai Basin.

Use made of specific outputs ('outcome')

- Local stakeholders have taken a decision to select the Iishana Sub-Basin of the Cuvelai-Etosha Basin as the pilot area to start with.
- Stakeholders held elections and elected the members of the Iishana SBMC as well as the members of the Executive Committee of this BMC.
- The Iishana SBMC drafted and agreed upon a constitution for the IBMC.
- The Minister of MAWF officially inaugurated the Iishana BMC on October 31, 2005.

Methods, Tools, Instruments applied:

- Study trips were undertaken as a method/instrument to make key stakeholders aware of new concepts and approaches in water resource management.
- Field trips were undertaken to get a view of canals, purification plants and various sub-sector activities in water management.
- Meetings and discussions with some key stakeholders over a two year period were the main instruments of introducing ILWRM and the basin management concept.
- A number of workshops were held to share information by way of presentations on surface and ground water issues, the operations of Namwater, farming issues in freehold and non-freehold areas etc.
- A post was advertised by DWA for a person with technical and social background to support the ISBMC by staying in Oshakati.

Specific experiences made during implementation, what functioned well, what problems were encountered:

What functioned well

- Study trips abroad (to Australia and UK), while not without drawbacks in general, resulted in substantial awareness raising for high government officials with respect to the need for a perspective of 'Integrated Water Management' and the establishment of River Basin Organisations. These trips generated substantial political will to move into a new direction with water policy and with the institutional set-up.
- The fact that the Basin concept was formally adopted as policy in the National Water Policy White Paper and was included in the new Water Act, was a strong driver for the involved professionals to go in that direction.
- Cooperation with the Desert Research Foundation of Namibia (DRFN) and twinning with the Environmental Learning and Action in the Kuiseb (ELAK) project involved a non-governmental organisation (NGO) with experience in setting up a BMC. This exchange relationship with DRFN proved to be a catalyst to the whole process, in so far as the substantial knowledge and experiences made in the Kuiseb Basin could be utilised for the establishment of the BMC.
- The involvement of the Regional Councillor was useful in establishing the Basin Committee. He used his mobilising skills to create awareness about the ILWRM approach and the BMC on Oshiwambo radio.
- Staff members of DWA regarded the fact that the project largely operated without external project personnel from GTZ as a decisive strength. DWA could really take the lead and develop ownership, while GTZ support remained in the background.
- DWA strongly focussed on its role of initiating the process of BMC establishment, leaving essential initiatives and decisions to the people themselves.
- Traditional leaders proved to be the most stable / permanent stakeholders in terms of attendance.

What did not go well (what needs to be improved)

- The process of establishing BMCs is first and foremost a facilitation process. Some interviewees were of the opinion that more professional facilitation is required. The decision to charge those hydrologists of DWA who are responsible for the whole project with the additional responsibility of facilitation, risks overloading these professionals, whose main tasks fall outside the project.
- The question was raised by some interviewees, whether the members of the BMC were genuinely representative of the stakeholders in the Iishana Basin. There is a need to make sure that there is legitimate representation of the water users and that the information shared at BMC meetings is properly fed back to those people and organisations that are represented.
- Related to the previous point is a concern that government employees were overrepresented

on the BMC. This hinders a genuine and dynamic bottom-up approach and runs the risk that government staff might try to 'outsource' some of their tasks to the basin members.

- Most members of the ISBMC had full-time jobs mainly in the civil service which did not allow for much time to be spent on administrative issues. Responsibilities of elected committee members regarding the ISBMC had to compete for time with a plethora of other committees at local level. This necessitated the establishment of a Secretariat.
- So far, there was little incentive for members of the community to serve on the ISBMC.
- Long distances may have contributed to members of the community not feeling any incentives to serve on the ISBMC.
- In spite of several meetings, workshops and awareness raising initiatives, the pressing needs of the people in the Iishana Sub-Basin have not yet been identified. Also, the ISBMC has not yet put forward some priority concerns and problems that people want to be solved urgently. This, however, will be required to create incentives and build confidence in the purpose of the ISBMC and the ILWM approach.
- So far, the ISBMC and its promoters have a strong 'delivery attitude'. Information, training and awareness are seen to be 'delivered' to the people in the Basin. People do not yet take initiatives and steer information provision, training and awareness raising according to their own needs and preferences.
- The high turnover of stakeholder representatives meant that awareness creation and information sharing had to be done repeatedly.
- The land and agriculture component is not yet well represented on the ISBMC.
- There is concern that the 3-year-term, fixed in the constitution of the ISBMC, may be a cause of interruption since people who leave after 3 years go with their knowledge and experience.
- In the Cuvelai, there are substantial problems to be solved in the interest of Namibian society as a whole (resource degradation, resource allocation, pollution prevention etc.). The question remains, whether BMCs can be the appropriate vehicle to tackle such problems or what contributions they can realistically provide.
- The experiences of Rural Water Supply (RWS) in mobilising and training rural communities have not been sufficiently tapped into.

Important frame conditions relevant for the module / learning area:

Promoting factors

- It was of great importance that several highly placed professional and political protagonists identified with the process and gave it explicit backing. The project benefited of the explicit political will of the former Minister of Agriculture, Water and Rural Development. The hope is that the new Minister will continue to support the programme in a similar way.
- Initial efforts to promote a River Basin concept benefited from a general drive for decentralisation in Namibia. This promoting factor may however lose strength if the process of decentralisation meets resistance or comes to a halt.
- Formal political endorsement of the ISBMC was obtained when the Minister of Agriculture, Water and Forestry officially inaugurated the ISBMC in 2005.
- Existing ELAK experience helped the establishment of the ISBMC.

Hindering factors

- The establishment and success of the BMCs in counteracting resource degradation in the Cuvelai Basin hinges on an overall national vision and strategy to reverse resource degradation in this region. However, such a strategy has not been formulated so far.
- The basin management approach is slightly at odds with the Decentralisation Policy because basins cover several administrative regions.
- ISBMC did not have any legal status as the Water Resources Management Act, 2004 had not commenced yet (March 2006).
- One consequence of this is that the BMC is unable to open bank accounts due to the absence of any legal status, which in turn may demotivate committee members.

- The establishment of Basin Committees seems to function best in situations where there are only a small number of clearly defined problems or fields of conflict related to the resource situation and where only a few, clearly defined interest groups have to find a consensus (example: Kuiseb basin). However, in situations with resource problems that are highly complex and interrelated and where many diverse interests have to be accommodated, like in the Cuvelai Basin, it is more difficult to create the momentum needed for the establishment of BMCs.
- Proper functioning of BMCs is strongly dependent on clear mandates of the stakeholders and their capacities to fulfil these mandates. Important stakeholders are Regional Councils and their regional planners. However, capacities and competencies at this level are not yet adequately developed, which hinders a fruitful interplay with the BMC. Moreover, this state of affairs exposes the BMC the danger of being expected to perform certain tasks and functions of the regional planning unit, an expectation which cannot be fulfilled.
- The LLWM approach is not yet fully accepted in the MAWF and beyond.

Assessment of impact of module:

- So far the overall impact of the project in the area of this Module is limited, since the ISBMC has not yet identified its major areas of intervention and – in cooperation with the governmental stakeholders – the outline of a sub-basin management plan. However, with the official establishment of the BMC the preconditions for such impact achievement are created.
- However, one impact of the project in the area of this Module is that the planned intervention of Global Environment Facility (GEF) in Northern Namibia is likely to be in a neighbouring sub-basin of the Cuvelai-Etosha Basin.

Assessment of sustainability:

Sustainability of the BMC approaches in the Cuvelai and success of the ISBMC are dependent on a number of preconditions:

- People in the Sub-Basin must see the immediate benefits of having and running such a BMC, even if these benefits are not only centred around tangible results such as the provision of water.
- Political commitment and commitment of the DWA toward Basin Management must persist at a high level.
- Efforts and activities of the BMC must be embedded in and supported by an overall strategy of GRN for water and resource management in the Cuvelai-Etosha area.
- Care must be taken to prevent members of the ISBMC to be perceived as policing local communities on behalf of Namwater and the MAWF.
- The danger must be avoided that in the event of RWS continuing to chair the ISBMC continues to be held by RWS, communities will focus exclusively on water provision.
- At the same time, there is a fear that communities may lose interest in the project if they realise that it is not about water provision.

Assessment of replicability:

- Replicability seems to be high in similar environments and especially in the Cuvelai Basin. This opinion is shared by the GRN and GEF, who are discussing to set up a project with similar BMC approaches nearby Country Pilot Partnership (CPP).
- Final assessment of replicability will be possible at later stages of ISBMC and of CPP.

Who is knowledgeable about the module or elements of it?

Abraham Nehemia - RWS
Maria Amakali – DWA
Otilie Angula - DWA
Mary Seely – DRFN
André Botes – Green Scheme Authority – formerly DRFN
Anna Matros – DRFN
Albert Engel – GTZ
John Nendongo – RWS Onankali
Abraham Ashipala – NamWater, Oshakati
Loise Shixwameni – OPM
Walter Huppert – GTZ

In what documents can one find relevant information?

Amakali, M. (2004). 'Experiences with Basin Management Committees in Cuvelai'. Presentation at Planning Workshop: Integrated Land and Water Management, Nampower Convention Centre, 10-11 March 2004

Amakali, M. (2003). *Towards establishment of Cuvelai Basin Management Committee*

Botes, A. and Manning, N. (2004). 'Experience with Basin Management in the Kuiseb'. Presentation at Planning Workshop: Integrated Land and Water Management, Nampower Convention Centre, 10-11 March 2004

Clarke, N. V. (1998). *Guide to the common plants of the Cuvelai wetlands*. Southern African Botanical Diversity Network, Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Rural Development, Windhoek

Davis, A., Ward, V. (2003). *Community contact: how communities can plan and conduct exchange visits and study tours*. SADC-DRFN Desertification Interact, Windhoek

Desert Research Foundation of Namibia (DRFN). n.d. [2005] *Basin Management Approach. A Guidebook*

Desert Research Foundation of Namibia (DRFN). (2005). *Basin Management in the Cuvelai. Report on Cuvelai Basin Management Committee (BMC) Consultancy*. Windhoek

Desert Research Foundation Namibia (DRFN). n.d. [2005] *Monitoring tools for the Cuvelai Basin*. Windhoek

DRFN. (2005). *Basin Management in the Cuvelai. Proceedings. Training Workshop for: Iishana Sub-Basin Management Committee (BMC), 2-4 March 2005, Oshakati Country Lodge*

DRFN. (2005). *Basin Management in the Cuvelai. Report on Training and Capacity Building for Cuvelai Basin Management Committee (BMC) facilitators*.

Fitter, J. (compiler) (2004). *Planning Workshop Integrated Land and Water Management in Basins*. Nampower Convention Centre, 10-11 March 2004

Government Gazette of the Republic of Namibia. (2004). Water Resources Management Act, 2004 (Act No.24 of 2004)

Huppert, W. (2004). 'Issues in Integrated Land and Water Management in Basins. Presentation at Planning Workshop: Integrated Land and Water Management'. Nampower Convention Centre, 10-11 March 2004

Irving, T. (1996). *Managing water points and grazing areas in Namibia: the Cuvelai. Oshana, Oshana, Oshana and Oshikoto regions*. DRFN and MAWRD, Windhoek

Jung, C. (compiler) (2005). *Planning Workshop on Integrated Land and Water Management in Basins*. Oshakati Country Lodge, 21-21 January 2005

Marsh, A., Seely, M. (eds.) (1992). *Oshanas: sustaining people, environment and development in central Owambo*. DRFN & SIDA, Windhoek

Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Rural Development (MAWRD). (1999). *Guidelines for the implementation of community based management and cost recovery for rural water supply*

Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry (MAWF) and Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ). (2006). *Namibia Water Resource Management Project. Background Information Planning Workshop on Integrated Land and Water Management in Basins*, Namibia Water Resource Management Project Planning Workshop. Integrated Land and Water Management in Basins, 2-3 March 2006, Oshakati Country Lodge. Windhoek, Namibia

Nehemia, A. (1999). *Creating an enabling environment for institutional changes to implement appropriate community based management (CBM) in Namibia water sector*

Shixwameni, L. (2004). 'Land and water management in Namibia Basins'. Presentation at Planning Workshop: Integrated Land and Water Management, Nampower Convention Centre, 10-11 March 2004

Van Langenhove, G., Shixwameni, L., Ngurare, E., De Bruine, B. (2000). *Managing of Water Basin areas for Namibia, Conservation and Sharing water resources in a water scarce environment*. Proceedings 4th Biennial Congress of the African Division of the International Association of Hydraulic Engineering and Research, Windhoek, Namibia

3.3 Case Example 2:

‘Namibian National Biodiversity Programme’ (NBP)

3.3.1 Project Brief

The Namibian National Biodiversity Programme (NBP) was officially set up in 1996 and since then has been housed in the Directorate of Environmental Affairs (DEA) in the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET). Today, a small number of ‘secretarial’ staff coordinates the activities under the programme, overseen by the Head of the ‘International Environmental Conventions Unit’. The Head of the Unit serves as Namibian National Focal Point to each of the Rio Conventions (Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), UN Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) and UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)). The Director of the DEA is the Global Environment Facility (GEF) Focal Point. A multi-stakeholder National Biodiversity Task Force (BDTF) was set up in the late 1990’s represented by eight ministries and 15 departments within those ministries, two tertiary education institutions, parastatals and the private sector, and 10 NGOs and Unions. The 20 thematic working groups under the programme are housed in various ministries and other institutions. Currently the BDTF is no more active as in its initial set up, as little coordination support is provided by DEA. However, a number of working groups have developed their ‘own initiative’ and operate now independently. The programme has a number of on-going projects at the national level, and is partner in several regional projects.

The German Government supported the NBP from 1996 to 2005 with targeted interventions and technical and financial support. The programme was implemented in three phases.

The overall goal of the last phase (2000 – 2005) was: ‘The biological diversity and biological resources of Namibia are protected and the livelihood of the population is sustained.’ The project purpose was: ‘Biodiversity information and values are cooperatively developed and used in planning, development, management and inventory processes at national and local levels.’

The lessons learnt through the project in the period 1998 to 2005 were grouped around 7 main areas of experience and knowledge (‘Modules’), as follows:

- Module 1:** Policy and strategy development to support biodiversity use and management
- Module 2:** Monitoring and evaluation to track biodiversity status
- Module 3:** Agenda setting, awareness creation and access to biodiversity information
- Module 4:** Institution building and cooperation/ capacity development/ mainstreaming into other sectors
- Module 5:** Leverage for getting international support
- Module 6:** Protection and rehabilitation of priority biodiversity areas
- Module 7:** Promotion of sustainable use and management of natural resources

3.3.2 Module Example

As an example, the above mentioned Module 3 is presented here:

Module 3: Agenda setting, awareness creation and access to biodiversity information

Short description of module:

Making comparatively new concepts of biodiversity; biosafety, access and benefit sharing (BAS) concepts known in Namibia as a base for relevant action has been important over the past decade and since the UN Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), in Rio de Janeiro, 1992. Collecting, compiling and publishing biodiversity relevant data is an important component.

Specific steps/activities implemented ('outputs'):

- Creation of an innovative multi-disciplinary 'learning platform' comprising different government services, NGOs and science institutions. Sub-division in thematic oriented working groups but coordinated by a coordination unit comprising 3 individuals. Creation of synergies between the working groups.
- Biosafety Clearing House Mechanism (BCHM) in place.
- Online Namibia biodiversity database was created (NABID).
- Wetland's database was developed.
- Biodiversity posters distributed to all schools, government offices, embassies and border posts.
- Tree Atlas book distributed to all secondary schools and relevant government offices.

Methods, Tools, Instruments applied:

- Thematic multi-disciplinary working groups, integrated publications.
- Permanent Secretary (PS) Roundtable Meeting approach.
- Books, Posters and leaflets according to targeted group on specific subjects (Biosafety, Access and Benefit Sharing (BAS)).
- Establishment of specific units.
- Setting of priority activities on the basis of proposals using a common financing instrument Namibia Nature Foundation (NNF).
- Publications, public awareness campaigns, high level policy maker round tables, presentations at international conferences.
- Made use of media e.g. Talk on the Nation TV show as well as radio and other media (newspapers).
- Several talks on biodiversity at University of Namibia (UNAM), Polytechnic of Namibia, Namibia Wildlife Society, FIRM, Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM), NACSO gatherings.
- Workshop at local level (Grootberg) dedicated to synergies amongst the Rio conventions.
- Site events and presentations at CBD related events and other international events.
- Biosystematics needs assessment carried out.
- Biodiversity training framework developed (in-service training within MET, national level).
- UNAM Humbolt Master of Science (MSc.) programme started.
- School quizzes on World Wetlands and Water Days.

Specific experiences made during implementation, what functioned well, what problems were encountered:

What functioned well

- The learning platform was an excellent instrument to get different people on board, and to mainstream 'isolated knowledge' into a bigger frame. There are also a great number of publications derived from NBP participants; hands-on involvement of people in the work of the task force and its working groups created certain ownership and 'pride', motivating the members to carry on with their activities.

- Integration of the NBP into DEA and its core activities helped institutionalize and integrate certain functions such as the Clearing House Mechanism (CHM) (now MET webpage).
- The MET/DEA based Meta Database was initiated through the NBP and is now fully integrated into the core functions of the Directorate.
- The MET/DEA based Resource Centre was strengthened through NBP support.

What did not go well (what needs to be improved):

- There is some doubt concerning the wider use of the knowledge and information within the different institutions, mainly in the different government services attached to the NBP.
- Individuals serving on the BDTF not always reported back effectively on BDTF activities to the institutions they represented.
- A reason could be the lack of 'tailoring of information' to specific target groups.

Important frame conditions relevant for the module / learning area:

Promoting factors

- One frame condition, which is not to be neglected, is the basic interest within the Namibia society for nature. This is proven by the huge quantity of volunteer work in the collection and compiling of nature relevant data (Carnivore and tree atlas).
- Nature protection is engrained in the Namibian constitution (Art. 95); the concept of biodiversity as defined in the CBD (protection, sustainable use and access and benefit sharing) has now become more widely understood, through the interventions of the NBP; previously Namibia has mainly been concentrating on protected areas and on wildlife/ large mammals.
- To get these new concepts through quite a lot of efforts were made by the programme including on the political side. There are a number of proposals in the pipeline to translate this modern biodiversity concept into laws, rules and regulations in Namibia (Biotrade, BAS, Forest, etc.).
- A central role can be attributed to the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP), which is not yet fully accepted by the government institutions but plays an important role in defining new donors supported projects (conception).

Hindering factors

- Difficulty to reach out to diverse target groups.
- Difficulty in accessing information (particularly in electronic formats).
- Not very much into public awareness.
- Change in focus in GTZ support to Namibia (shifting the goal post) – merge with Namibia's Programme to Combat Desertification (NAPCOD).

Assessment of impact of module:

- Within the BDTF a common understanding of biodiversity and the strategic steps to maintain and use is well defined and shared.
- Accessibility of information.
- Paradigm shift in understanding the concept of wildlife in the broader biodiversity sense
- A number of decision-making tools (e.g. publications and maps) defining different hotspot areas (Wetlands, Ramsar sites, Mountain Biodiversity Hotspots, etc.) have been produced.
- Introduction to systematic conservation planning (Chris Margules, Target; Mandy Lombard, C-Plan).
- It is difficult to judge in how far this information is being used for designing development processes (i.e. social forestry, management of Ramsar sites, extension or consolidation of the protected areas (PA) network.
- There seems to be a lack in tailoring the information to the needs of potential clients/users in a very regional orientated practical way.

Assessment of sustainability:

- The roster of experts, publications, different databases are more or less available; there seems to be a common understanding about cooperation amongst NBP collaborators.
- A critical point is that knowledge is associated with individuals rather than being institutionalised (within DEA e.g. meta database).

Assessment of replicability:

- Good number of positive elements concerning agenda setting for new subjects within the political arena but also technical set-up.
- The models of open learning platforms and joint and multi-stakeholder working groups, and on innovative financing could be applied in other technical contexts than biodiversity.

Who is knowledgeable about the module or elements of it?

S. Shikongo (MET/DEA)
P. Barnard (SANBI, South Africa)
E. Noongo (meta data base) (MET/DEA)
L. Nakanuku (resource centre, CHM and meta data base) (MET/DEA)
M. Kandawa Schulz (UNAM)
J. Irish (NBRI)
J. Katjirua (MET/DEA)
K. Roberts (MAWF/DWAF)

In what documents can one find relevant information?

Anonymous. (2000). Biodiversity and development: Namibia's ten-year strategic plan of action for sustainable development through biodiversity conservation 2001-2010. Briefing notes for Permanent Secretaries. Republic of Namibia. Ministry of Environment and Tourism. (prepared by P Barnard and S Shikongo). 8 pp.

Anonymous. (1995). Ecosystem health and biological diversity. Information leaflet for Cabinet Ministers, National Biodiversity Programme, Windhoek. 2 pp.

Anonymous. (n.d.). What is this thing called biodiversity? Educational poster for schools and decision-makers (prepared by R Simmons, C Claassen, H Coetsee and others)

Burke, A. (2000). Southern Namib Restoration Fund. Brochure for corporate developers and donors. Southern Namib Restoration Ecology Project. National Biodiversity Programme. Windhoek. 2pp.

Burke, A. (2000). Southern Namib Restoration ecology – Request for additional funding. Information brief for corporate developers and donors. Southern Namib Restoration Ecology Project. National Biodiversity Programme, Windhoek. 22 pp.

Curtis, B. and Mannheimer, C. (2005). *Tree Atlas of Namibia*. National Botanical Research Institute of Namibia

Desert Research Foundation of Namibia. (1999). Conserving biodiversity: the next steps. Update: a regular briefing on aspects of sustainable development in Namibia 4(7):1-2. Information leaflet for Parliamentarians and others. Desert Research Foundation of Namibia and National Biodiversity Programme, Windhoek.

Government of the Republic of Namibia, (2001). *An overview of Biodiversity and development: Namibia's ten-year strategic plan of action through biodiversity conservation 2000-2010*. Popular booklet for parliamentarians and others (prepared by P Barnard and S Shikongo).

Sakar, S., Aggarwal, A., Garson, J., Margules, C. & Zeidler, J. (2002). Place prioritization for biodiversity content. *Journal of Bioscience*, 27 (4) Suppl. 2: 339-346

Simmons, R.E. and Allan, D.G. (2003). The Orange River avifauna: abundance, richness and comparisons. *Ostrich* 72

3.4 Case Example 3:

Pro Poor Agricultural Water Operations in Northern Ghana

3.4.1 Project Brief

The three Northern Regions in Ghana are amongst the poorest and hence have been the prominent targeted areas for IFAD's investments and interventions. The three notable water-related IFAD supported projects with considerable impact on the livelihoods of the rural poor are the Upper East Region Land Conservation & Smallholder Rehabilitation Project (LACOSREP Phase I and Phase II) and Upper West Agricultural Development Project (UWADEP).

LACOSREP I was identified by the IFAD Special Programme for Africa in 1987, prepared by FAO/Investment Centre in 1989, appraised in 1990, approved in 1991, and finally became operational in 1992 to be officially closed in late 1997 (with reservoir rehabilitation measures extending well into 1998). The overall goal of LACOSREP I was to contribute to sustainable alleviation of poverty, increased household food security and improved living conditions of rural poor, particularly women in Upper East Region (UER). The project objective was to increase the incomes of rural poor people in the region while protecting the environment and improving access to water. Core results to be achieved were the construction of 44 small dams and reservoirs, the development of small scale irrigation ('garden irrigation') downstream of the reservoirs and the establishment and strengthening of Water User Associations (WUAs) to operate and maintain these infrastructures.

LACOSREP II built on the 1998 Interim Evaluation (IE) of Phase I, in which valuable experiences gained during Phase I were to be replicated. The general orientation of goals and objectives remained unchanged. Major modifications referred to its demand-driven character and a stronger focus on grassroots capacity building and participation, gender

equity, quality issues, and cost recovery and sustainability of WUAs. This resulted in Phase II being effective in 1999, started operations in 2000 and closed officially in December 2006.

In the meantime, LACOSREP I experiences were already being transferred from the UER to the Upper West Region (UWR) in Northern Ghana. This blue-print replica called UWADEP, which was geared to achieve similar goals and objectives in a different regional context, was co-funded by IFAD and became operational in 1996 and was closed in 2004. UWADEP was to develop the small but vitally important existing potential for dry season gardening by rehabilitating some existing dams.

Upscaling lessons learnt within the Northern Ghana will be warranted by Ministry of Food and Agriculture (MoFA) and the new IFAD Northern Rural Growth Programme-NRGP (expected effectiveness April 2008). NRGP will have a pro poor value chain development focus and will address enhancing production activities (adaptive research, small scale irrigation, rural finance), rural infrastructure development (small dams, transport and capacity building of local engineering sector), and project management and M&E, including an explicit learning and knowledge management dimension.

The main areas of experience and knowledge ('Modules') generated by the projects were grouped as follows:

- Module 1:** Institutional Development of Water User Associations
- Module 2:** Inclusive Targeting and Securing Land and Water Access for the Rural Poor
- Module 3:** Innovations, Learning and Knowledge for Sustainable Farming Systems and Rural Livelihoods
- Module 4:** Multiple Use Systems and Rural Water Health Nutrition and Sanitation
- Module 5:** Capacity Building, Training and Education
- Module 6:** Participatory Design, Construction of Rural Infrastructure/Small Reservoirs

Modules 1 and 2 are presented in details below as module examples:

3.4.2 Module 1: Institutional Development of Water User Associations (WUAs)

Short description of module:

LACOSREP I, UWADEP and LACOSREP II had planned to put into operation a total of 106 small reservoirs (26 in Upper West, 80 in Upper East) for dry season irrigation, fishing and livestock drenching, bringing benefits to over 100,000 households. In these projects the establishment and institutional strengthening of WUAs was a crucial element in empowering participating groups of rural poor. The projects provided support to WUAs for dam rehabilitation or construction from District Assemblies (DAs), participate in design, construction (with 6% of total cost) and quality control. The intention was to develop these WUAs into vibrant, inclusive, equitable and functional cooperative societies, which would operate, protect and maintain the area immediately upstream of the reservoir, the dam and the downstream irrigation development.

This was to be enabled through 50-year infrastructure and land lease agreements, with built-in land allocation to women (40% of irrigable land), as well as participation of women in WUA management (40-50%). Some of the WUA key functions planned were fee based cost recovery along managing relationships with (dry season) pastoralists competing for water, and implementation of maintenance arrangements with Ghana Irrigation Development Authority (GIDA), a dependency of MoFA.

To exemplify the magnitude of project services, LACOSREP II addressed the following objectives: a total of 384 ha of land, subdivided into small plots, was planned for development under small garden irrigation (36 small dams originally planned were later re-assessed to 32) benefiting 9,400 families organised in 32 legally recognised WUAs.

Specific steps/activities implemented ('outputs'):

- By closing date of the loan (December 2006), in all three projects, a total of 90 small dams and reservoirs had been constructed and put into operation. LACOSREP II had completed 29 of its 32 dams. Total gardening ('irrigation') lands developed for dry season use under all three projects amount to about 1000 ha of which minor parts corresponds to additionally opened up gardening land (over 23 ha in UWR, 100 ha in UER).
- Processes for the formation and strengthening of WUAs have been initiated and implemented, targeting a total of 44 WUAs under LACOSREP I/II.
- Procedures for the turn-over of operation and maintenance responsibilities of dams, reservoir- and downstream areas to the WUAs under arrangements with the DA were proposed yet not formalised.
- WUA formation steps and request forms were specified in the LACOSREP II Appraisal document. The institutionalisation of such steps and eligibility criteria by means of specification and incorporation into the Project Implementation Manual has been ascertained.
- A WUA Training Manual was elaborated by the Department of Cooperatives, Ministry of Manpower, Youth and Employment.
- Capacity building trainings for the WUAs were implemented under an agreement with MoFA and LACOSREP I/II and UWADEP. They were based on the WUA Training Manual and organised together with trainers-of-trainers of the IFAD co-financed Village Infrastructure Project (VIP).
- The WUA performance, (using criteria such as accounting, bank accounts, fee collection, membership, women in management positions, serviced water/land, fluctuating sizes/ coverage of WUA, agreements with DA over land leases, tindana agreements, etc.) has been assessed for 44 WUAs in 2003. (see below under 'Specific experiences').

Use made of specific outputs ('outcome')

- Under LACOSREP I/II, a total of 44 WUAs have been constituted as pre-cooperatives and over 32 as legally recognised cooperatives, all of which run bank accounts. Some WUAs have even evolved into self-funded enterprises (e.g. Bawku Onion and Watermelon group).
- A minor fraction of WUAs remain in the Category C ('dysfunctional') and are no longer supported by MoFA or DA.
- Most WUAs have developed full grasp of land allocation issues and plot assignment mechanisms during wet and dry seasons. Plot rotation via *tindanas* is not posing major problems (anymore).
- WUA participation in managing the catchment area protection (CAP) (using WFP rations) has yielded 1040 ha of CAP managed in an environmentally sound way (IE 2006).
- WUA participation in design and construction of the dams varied from high (using local labour on initial dams in LACOSREP I to virtually nil under fully outsourced contracts to companies in LACOSREP II). Correspondingly, the sense of 'ownership' varies greatly from site to site and hence also of WUA performance and grip on dry season land allocation.
- In some WUAs, innovative mechanisms for the incorporation of new WUA members using tail water outside the original command area are being tested out (e.g. incremental fees for plots in Karni and Basyonde).
- WUA are able to develop good practices (irrespective of design intentions) for inclusive benefit sharing with vulnerable and disabled members (i.e. Karni dam site in UWR, Garu site in UER).
- Several WUAs have demonstrated their ability to innovate without project interventions (e.g. inclusion of tail-enders and blind/disabled, area expansion, piped tank irrigation, drip kits, California valves, crop/land husbandry choices).
- The empowerment dimension of WUAs is in progress and could evolve into acquiring a seat on the DA thereby enabling WUAs to have a say in decision making of the Local Government Unit (e.g. District WUA Councils in UER).

Methods, Tools, Instruments applied:

- Community mobilisation and sensitisation methods, meetings and discussions with farmers/nascent WUAs and other DA key stakeholders were undertaken.
- Study trips were undertaken by farmers and LACOSREP staff to Burkina Faso to observe alternative irrigation facilities (i.e. tubewells).
- Field trips were arranged between WUA members to observe good/alternative practices, e.g. Goo WUAs went to Bawku East to visit farmers learning how to avoid their own tomato glut and incidence of diseases. Builsa farmers want to observe modes of fencing with local raw materials.
- In 2005 14 newly trained WUAs were organised to visit Functional Literacy groups in Bongo, Bawku and Zebilla Districts (UER), interact and obtain first hand information about the Literacy Programme.
- WUA training was done in three stages: (i) training needs assessment of potential WUAs as well as trainers (to update them), (ii) delivery of general WUA formation and functions trainings, and (iii) site specific training follow up depending on local WUA performance and further detected needs. In LACOSREP II, the experienced trainers of WUAs from VIP were used to deliver WUA training (negotiation, WUA formation, bylaws, elections, women inclusion, accounting/bookkeeping, etc).
- Some WUAs (eight dam site) were trained on irrigated vegetable productions at technology demonstration sites (in LACOSREP II).
- Training events on Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) and participatory needs assessments (3 days), including gender issues were offered to project staff for the Training-of-Trainer for WUA programme.
- Self-evaluations were undertaken by LACOSREP staff of each district.

Specific experiences made during implementation, what functioned well, what problems were encountered:

What functioned well

- Positions of women in WUA Executive Committees (EC) are generally based on acceptance and performance; however women also seem to occupy 'shadow' posts. Election of women as WUA EC members went well.
- WUAs are empowering members through their recognition as pre-cooperatives (and in later development stage as cooperative societies), with by-laws and growing affiliation to the District WUA Councils (a federation of WUAs).
- Some WUAs have modified the bylaws to incorporate additional tail end/drainage/excess water users outside the original command area.
- Designs of dams were planned to accommodate transit of vehicles and improve access to other communities.
- Farmer applications for dam rehabilitation/construction were routed through DAs, thus strengthening DA legitimacy and capacities.
- The local Government Unit Committee (LGUC-lowest governmental representative level) is in close contact with WUAs (local assemblyman/women sometimes on WUA) to build consensus and define action priorities and hence devolution is a real outcome.
- DAs have entered into an empowerment process (effective decentralisation) but their understanding should be further improved on criteria for successful site selection both socially and technically.
- Water scheduling in the dry season is correctly done by WUAs, following weekly and/or 3 day irrigation intervals (resulting in better root/leaf development and less nematodes and parasites on vegetables), either by open channels (majority) or by a recent UWADEP innovation to use plastic pipes and distribution boxes (i.e. Jirapa).
- When WUAs were organised to visit Functional Literacy groups in Bongo, Bawku and Zebilla Districts, interact and obtain first hand information about the Literacy Programme, they were very impressed with performance of the learners and immediately organised their own classes.

What did not go well (what needs to be improved)

- Sensitisation campaigns detracted the project from dam (re)construction for two precious years (according to the 2006 LACOSREP II IE requests had already been filed and prioritized at DA). Delivery of upstream hardware ('dam construction') and downstream software ('training, capacity building') was not well sequenced ('WUA training without water or dam').
- Cooperation with Ministry of Health at DA levels on environmental issues to prevent and mitigate waterborne diseases and zoonosis was not successful, i.e. no specific measures were undertaken.
- Environmental impact assessments at dam (re)construction sites were only undertaken during LACOSREP II.
- Site identification for new dams does not seem to have been sufficiently participatory in all cases. In one instance, the dam was located by GIDA on top of an ancestral burial place with the consequence that the dam was never used. On some other sites the presence of totem/taboo animals such as crocodiles was not sufficiently acknowledged leading to later problems in dam wall quality and consistency as crocodiles were making nesting holes in the dam body leading to breaching and partial collapse of the wall.
- The institutional capacity and (self-assigned) degrees of freedom of projects did not fully allow for creativity and flexibility in project management to co-opt local site specific solutions. Instead, the original lay-out/blue-print of the Appraisal was often referred to.
- Land fragmentation due to social inclusion of larger than foreseen numbers of interested villagers has led to water use inefficiencies and shortened growing seasons reducing multiple cropping.
- Dovetailing and sequencing of confidence-building with Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Board before entering with dam rehabilitation/construction did not happen or was coincidental (synergies not realised).

- DAs and LGUCs were not sufficiently strengthened to address all issues pertaining to the development and delivery of project services, especially on land and water access.
- Claim and redress mechanisms to address below-standard engineering work or emergencies are still unknown to all stakeholders or judged culturally inappropriate (in spite of 1997 WUA bylaws stipulating 'sue and be sued' characteristics). This may represent a challenge area to the new WUA Council which is emerging in Bawku East District, UER (since late 2005).

Important frame conditions relevant for the module / learning area:

Promoting factors

- It was of great importance that several highly placed professional and political protagonists gave the project explicit backing.
- Role of a leading change agent with long term development vision and stamina is key to success: Adventist Development and Relief Agency (ADRA) animator and Agriculture Extension Agent (AEA) were key to consolidate changes such as inclusion of the blind and disabled, respectively improved rainfed rice husbandry techniques-dibbling for transplanting as in paddy.
- The Community Based Rural Development Project-CBRDP of the World Bank, as well as Root and Tuber and the Rural Enterprises Projects of IFAD played a support role. CIDA FARMER also complemented these enabling projects.
- The 2003 Procurement Act; and 2003 Audit Act and the recent 2007 Domestic Violence Act all focus on transparency and people's participation in governance thus supporting earlier decentralisation and CBO strengthening efforts of LACOSREP I/II and UWADEP.
- Water Resources Commission, established in 1996, is now present in Bolgatanga to govern White Volta Basin problems with representation of all interested parties. The WUA Council would be best advised to link up with this initiative.
- The 2006 draft Irrigation Policy creates a framework for further up-scaling of pertinent WUA experiences in the Northern Regions.
- Institutional and Legal framework supporting the establishment and registration of WUAs or WUA councils is enshrined in the Department of Cooperatives Decree, 1968 (National Liberation Council Decree 252).

Hindering factors

- Too pronounced civil engineering bias of GIDA and other national partners. GIDA did not incorporate farmers' specific requests to modify dam designs in spite of LACOSREP II management insistence.
- Absence of a regulatory government body to govern all the water resources surface and groundwater ('embeddedness of water'). Regulation is currently fragmented across many government line agencies.
- Lack of partnership building with NGOs and private Sector, as well as professional bodies such as Ghana Institution of Engineers.
- The Rural Roads component, meant to secure products and services to and fro dam sites and markets was successfully implemented yet some of the road rehabilitation stretches were de-linked from dam sites.

Assessment of impact of module:

- Small scale gardening: indications that young men migrate less, allowing for asset building to get a dowry.
- Theft of crops and cattle (and other assets) is reduced; the local peace process has been supported.
- Equity issues within scheme and around the catchment area protection (CAP) are well attended to (no or little elite capture of assets and benefit streams) and other villages were granted access to the dam for cattle drenching.
- Blind and disabled, who may be marginalized/ostracized (elsewhere), form part of social fabric and the vibrant WUA (i.e. the Karni case).

- Increased access for women to water and land through WUA dry season plot allocation (20-60%) and/or secured de facto inheritance.
- Mechanisms to address water shortages (prioritizing use for livestock drenching after the 1st male dry season crop) are sustainable and respected by involved parties.
- Fish stocking of reservoirs went well and delivered improvement of livelihoods.
- The LACOSREP I 1997 workshop on the 'Establishment of the legal status of WUAs: toward an effective transfer of ownership and management of dam schemes'- by the then staff member, now Hon. Minister, Dery Ambrose, led to the pertinent modifications in the draft National Irrigation Policy, Strategy and Regulatory Measures , and its corresponding rules and regulations (April 2006). Amongst others, aspects relate to strengthening institutions, clearing ownership of water and allocation arrangements, resolving land tenure, cooperative law for WUAs, and women participation and rights.
- Other villages have been attracted to form WUAs and file applications at the DA.
- DA confirms overall impact as considerable and with potential for up-scaling and replication with principally national resources.
- The overall impact of this module has, however, been modest as confirmed by IFAD Independent Office of Evaluation.

Assessment of sustainability:

Sustainability of LACOSREP and UWADEP efforts on WUA maturity:

- People, and hence WUAs, may need further support and mentoring for improved (institutional) resilience when facing (more frequent/more extreme/time shifted) droughts (and floods) related to increasing climate variability in Sub-Saharan zone.
- Overturning leasehold agreements warranted in WUA dam request by original landowners to weaker WUA members may call for judicial support services of an Ombudsman (in District Chief Assembly or DA).

Assessment of replicability:

Replicability/upscaling:

- As the project history shows, replicability of the general approach is high in Northern Ghana.
- Final assessment of replicability of various elements of the approach is recommended at later stages.
- LACOSREP I/II and UWADEP lessons learnt were partially up-scaled into NRGF and NORPREP (e.g. eligibility criteria and technical criteria of dams, WUA training for the selection of dams, dug-outs, rural water, roads and other infrastructure).

Who is knowledgeable about the module or elements of it?

Dery Ambrose, (Hon).Justice and Attorney General Ministry, Ghana
 Roy Ayariga, Director of Agriculture, Upper East Region, Ghana
 Emmanuel Eledi, Director of Agriculture, Upper West Region, Ghana
 J. Falong, AgSSIP Coordinator/Director of MoFA, Ghana
 G. Kranjac-Berisavljevic, Ass. Professor, UDS, Tamale, Ghana
 Norman Messer, Country programme manager, IFAD, Italy
 Mohamed Mansouri, Country Programme Manager, IFAD, Italy
 Rudolph Cleveringa, Senior Technical Adviser, IFAD, Italy

In what documents can one find relevant information?

Ambrose, D. P. (1997). *Establishment of the legal status of Water Users' Associations toward an effective transfer of ownership and management of dam schemes*. Workshop proceedings held on 17-19 September 1997 in Bolgatanga, LACOSREP, UER, Ghana.

Anonymous. (n.d). *Summary Proceedings of the workshop on Community-based irrigation management in Northern Ghana*, May 2002, UER (mimeo).

- Ayariga, G. A. R. (1993). Promoting Farmer-Management of Small Dams in the Upper East Region of Ghana: Guidelines for promoting the formation of WUAs, Working Paper 1 LACOSREP I, UER, Ghana.
- Ayariga, G. A. R. (1995). 'The LACOSREP WUA programme: Revised Strategies and current status.' Working paper 2, LACOSREP I, UER, Ghana.
- Ayariga, G. A. R. (1997). 'The LACOSREP WUA programme: The Vision, Performance Indicators and Issues for Sustainability,' LACOSREP I, UER, Ghana.
- Bacho, Francis Z. L. (2003). *Report on Socio-economic baseline survey of twelve dams in LACOSREP II*, UER, Ghana.
- Bacho, F. Z. L. and Bonye, S. (2006). From Public Open Access to Common Property: The Prospects and Challenges of Institutionalising Boundaries for Self-governance and Management of Community Irrigation Dams in Upper East Region, Ghana. *Ghana Journal of Development Studies* Vol.3, Number 1.
- Department of Cooperatives. (2006). *Report on District WUA councils Bank Accounts*, UER, Ghana.
- Department of Cooperatives. (2004). *Performance assessment of Phase 1 Water Users' Associations in LACOSREP II* (final report), UER, Ghana.
- Department of Cooperatives. (2003). *Report of Independent assessment of performance of Phase I WUAs*, UER, Ghana.
- Department of Cooperatives. (n.d.). Constitution/Bye-laws of Bawku West District Cooperative WUA Council Limited. UER, Ghana.
- IFAD. (2006). *Republic of Ghana: Upper East Region Land Conservation and Smallholder Rehabilitation Project Phase II Interim Evaluation*, Rome, Italy.
- IFAD. (2006). *Republic of Ghana: Upper West Region Agricultural Development Project Interim Evaluation*, Rome, Italy.
- IFAD. (2003). *Poverty, Land & Water: IFAD Experience with Water Users Associations in Ghana*, Rome, Italy.
- Kranjac-Berisavljevic, G. (2006). *Report on progress of work on 10 on-going IFAD funded dams in Upper East Region*. LACOSREP II, UDS, Tamale, Ghana.
- Messer, N. M. (2003). 'A Brief Institutional Assessment of Water User Associations in northern Ghana: early Stages of Pro-Poor Local Institutional Development in Irrigated Smallholder Agriculture,' Working Paper 2, Ghana Country Portfolio Stocktaking Exercise and Strategy Mission (draft), IFAD, Rome, Italy.
- MoFA and FAO. (2006). *National Irrigation Policy, Strategies and Regulatory Measures* (Draft report), Accra, Ghana.
- Mornah, Thomas B. (2007) *Irrigation as a driver of change in the life of rural women: A case study of Busa in the Wa municipality of the Upper West Region*, BSc. Thesis report (unpublished), Faculty of Agric, University for Development Studies, Tamale, Ghana.
- Northern Region Coordinating Council and NORPREP. (2007). Contract Agreement: Construction of Irrigation Dam at Ekumdi in the East Gonja District Assembly, Northern Region, Ghana.
- Nyari, B. S. (2003). 'Poverty and Access to Land & Water Resources in Upper East and West of Ghana,' Working Paper 3, Ghana Country Portfolio Stocktaking Exercise and Strategy Mission (draft), IFAD, Rome, Italy.
- Nyari, B. S. (2002). *Report on Diagnostic survey of the landholding system by the Water Users' Associations at the rehabilitated dam sites under LACOSREP 1*, UER, Ghana.
- Water Resources Commission. (1996). *Water Resources Commission Act 522*, Accra, Ghana.
- UWADEP. (2002). *Report on the first training workshop for AEAs and WUAs at the damsites*. Workshop held on 12th-17th August, 2002, UWR, Ghana.

3.4.3 Module 2: Inclusive Targeting and Secure Land and Water Access

Short description of module:

The targeting strategy of the three projects (LACOSREP I/II and UWADEP) was conceived as follows: Improvements in land management in the rainy season were largely targeted to rainy season men's crops, women crops on the margins of husband's fields, fishing and livestock (cattle, goats). During the dry season the focus would shift to include more women and their irrigated crops as well as household issues (e.g. domestic water, functional literacy groups, composting). The poorest of the poor, e.g. marginalized people such as the disabled and the blind or widows, were not to be targeted separately. While project designs had not acknowledged these subgroups of about 10% of village population each, the fact that villagers explicitly took care of these groups themselves turned out to be an important achievement of project implementation.

Safeguarding and improving livelihoods would be supported through secured access rights to land and water in the newly irrigated fields downstream of the dams. Land allocation would typically involve a tripartite arrangement between the District Assembly (DA), (the grantor), the original landowning families (the grantees through their representative '*tindana*') and the WUA (the custodian or steward). No differentiation for seasonal variability or plot rotation between seasons was envisaged in project designs. The land allocation system was planned to result in organising 20-50 member household groups per 10 ha of irrigated dry season gardening with 0,05-0,50 ha plots (during implementation the density of household groups on irrigated area turned out to be much higher). Seasonal allocation mechanisms were only introduced by 2003, at mid-term of LACOSREP II.

Specific steps/activities implemented ('outputs'):

- Community mobilisation and sensitisation preceded any project interventions related to infrastructure development.
- Agreements over the leasehold arrangements between the newly formed WUA, the DA and the original landowners were promoted. They were made a precondition included in the requests for reservoir reconstruction. Requests should also detail which proportion of the land ('plots') would be allocated to women (setting a design benchmark of 40%).
- LACOSREP I initially based their construction interventions fully on local community labour (WFP food-for-work on 19 of 44 dams). This was to create a sense of ownership of the catchment protection area (CAP) around the reservoir area, the dam and major infrastructure works, and of the downstream and in-field improvements.
- Context specific arrangements for the subdivision of the dry season command area have been developed on the basis of demands by the farmers.
- Innovative rules and procedures for the rotation of farm plots after their use were introduced in close interaction with the farmers and met with high adoption.
- Social arrangements have been introduced to deal with the claims of traditional owners of land concerning dry season plot allocation by WUAs.
- Inclusive targeting ('social equity', 'solidarity', 'safety net') of socially marginalized groups such as blind, disabled and widows was mostly done spontaneously by the WUA themselves, or through NGOs. Adventist Development and Relief Agency (ADRA) promoted and organized the well known but little documented case of the inclusion of the Blind Gardeners Group and the Disabled Gardeners Group into the Karni WUA (Upper West Region), where they enjoy the same rights and obligations as other WUA members.
- Resettlement of households, including ancestral grave sites around the compound, and compensation of land inundated (e.g. by the *tindana* assigning rainfed plots higher up the catchment, monetary compensation, or the WUA securing them a dry season plot downstream), has been managed largely to the satisfaction of all parties.
- Technical solutions have been introduced to prevent collapsing of wells during the rainy season.

Use made of specific outputs ('outcome')

- As mentioned in Module 1: LACOSREP I and II and UWADEP put into operation a total of over 90 small reservoirs (20 in Upper West, 70 in Upper East) for dry season irrigation, fishing and livestock drenching bringing together in WUAs some 50,000 households
- Total gardening ('irrigation') lands developed for dry season use amount to about 1,000 ha of which 10-20% amounts to additionally opened up gardening land.
- Enormous interest has been generated amongst farmers to be included in the garden irrigation development. This resulted in plot sizes well below 1/8 acre (500m² or 0,05 ha, design size LACOSREP I) and are as small as 30m² (e.g. Busa, UWR or Kamega, UER).
- (50-year) land lease or verbal agreements have created a sense of permanency and removed the need for annual renewals.
- Overall, equitable access to land was created for all community members.
- Inclusive targeting and empowerment of women has resulted in semi-permanent access of women to dry season garden plots (almost 40%) and increasing recognition in WUAs (women pay the same fees as men) and their representation in Executive Committees.
- In most cases, land conflicts were resolved in amicable manner by WUA.

Methods, Tools, Instruments applied:

- Gender sensitisation tools (e.g. activity profile, access and control profile, traditional beliefs and practices) were used in workshop series to communities, tindanas and Chiefs.
- WUA and land owner consultations led by LACOSREP II Project Management Unit to convince reticent downstream owners to free up land for original landowners in compensation for upstream land flooded by the reservoir or in the CAP area on the shores.
- The REFLECT methodology was used for community mobilization (e.g. for village level planning for development and self-assessment of impact).
- Leasehold agreements have been publicly registered in MoFA (copies are not available to WUAs or DAs, existence in MoFA could not yet be verified).
- Conflict resolution mechanisms (as offered by FAO) have been applied as disputes over rural land are not regularly brought to formal Justice tribunals (which have a record of high transaction costs).

Specific experiences made during implementation, what functioned well, what problems were encountered:

What functioned well

- Traditions of lineage-based societies (in UWR) which are based on networks of mutual support and historic power relations are not impervious to social equity issues as demonstrated by dry season plot distribution by WUAs and which are regulated by binding oral agreements.
- The point of departure for land allocation did not clearly distinguish the seasonality of allocation, i.e. design pretended that all land be allocated to the WUA irrespective of its seasonal use. As more insight was gained on roles and responsibilities of WUAs and local conditions, seasonality of plot allocation became the watershed issue: rainy season plots and lands are governed by the *tindanas*, whereas the disposition and use of dry season land would be allocated through the WUA to its members. The WUA collects a fee (regularly about US\$ 1.00) for the annual renewal of the membership which entitles the member to a plot.
- The size of the plot depends on the conditions governing the respective WUA. In some cases plot sizes are numerically equal as they result from simply dividing the dry season command area (typically 10 ha) by all (adult/adolescent) members of the community interested in dry season gardening land, typically 400 (but up to 900 or more). In other cases, plot size variations are governed by labour made available to construction, labour availability of the household, the number of wives and interest by male farmers in vegetables that require different labour and marketing intensities (e.g. daily selling leafy vegetables are a women's task requiring less land, quick-selling vegetables are adolescent youth tasks, and 'lazy' crops e.g. bean leaves are for the elderly, requiring yet another plot size). Plots can be as small as 30m²

(e.g. Busa) still attracting interest of women in search of improving diet or cash income. The quality of land (soil type, level site, position, proneness to waterlogging, etc) does not seem to interfere with plot sizes. Plot sizes for women are further limited by their capacity for labour and 'other work to do'.

- The rotatory arrangement meant that a WUA member farmer, men or women, would return the plot after its use (with up to three crops in the dry season) to the *tindana*. All semi-permanent improvements like levelling and bunding, or even mud walling and fencing, would be subject to use by a third party, while no warranty would be given by the WUA that the same plot will be used by the same member in the next year's dry season. However, social pressure resulted in such plots being returned to the same member.
- Initially, traditional landowners were reported to interfere in dry season WUA plot allocation processes and considerations were given to granting special concessions to them to avoid large claims of compensation for resettlement (especially in densely populated areas such as in Bawku District). However, by incorporating *tindana* and/or chiefs into the WUA EC and balancing out their local power, some landowners could be convinced (by community pressure rather than through negotiation by MoFA) to voluntarily give up their interests for the common good. With one exception, this now seems to be the case in all WUA dam sites.
- Land is not sold or bought; it is leased to the male head of households for a number of years and kept in permanent custody by '*tindana*'. Gardeners may compensate landowners, i.e., household heads with a token gift (kola nuts, etc) and a basket full of produce after harvest. Sharecropping does not seem to be practiced.
- Inclusion of landowners, *tindana*, chief, and/or representatives in WUA EC has led to clearer and more equitable plot allocation arrangements, especially for the dry season.
- Village participation in identification of reservoir/dam site and construction (labour, finance or providing food to labourers) also turned into cementing access rights to water, but even more importantly, to claims on downstream developed dry season gardening plots. The reduction of community labour to certain tasks (clearing reservoir area, mining and laying stones, vetiver planting, digging canals, etc) and subsequent introduction of mechanized dam reconstruction does not seem to have altered the expectations on access rights to land and water.
- Wells would be filled up after the dry season in order to avoid collapsing during the rainy season. Such re-filled wells would be easier to re-excavate for next year's dry season.

What did not go well (what needs to be improved)

- Prolonged sensitisation campaigns detracted dam construction for two years (requests already filed and prioritised at DA; lack of flexibility of project management).
- Ownership of the reservoir area, the CAP, the dam and works is not clear to involved stakeholders (MoFA, DA, WUA, Chiefs, *tindana*, community members) and although legally binding agreements are reported to have been drawn up for LACOSREP I/II and UWADep, their existence could not be verified. The lack of formal written agreements hampers the formal process of turn-over to WUAs and their claims on warranty on works (of which they are largely ignorant).
- Claims by landowners or WUA members exploiting garden plots for damages due to breaching dams or mismanagement of water resulting in erosion/siltation of their land, and/or loss of crops or livestock are not known, nor do WUA bylaws stipulate such arrangements. Damage done to third parties downstream the catchment has not been considered nor has the beneficial use of tail/excess/drainage water been subject to design or WUA training considerations. The newly created District WUA Councils does not address this issue in its bylaws yet.
- The non-distinctive use of expressions such as 'ownership', 'leasehold', 'allocation', 'land' is confusing as it entails assuming 'cadastral' arrangements or legally binding land lease/rent contracts. This does not reflect the situation on the ground where verbal agreements between individual male heads of household, the WUA EC and the *tindana* are made on a seasonal basis over the use of dry season gardening plots. The plot is the unit of agreement, not the

WUA member.

- Empowerment dimension: Although women are empowered by their presence on WUA EC and the successful allocation of dry season gardening plots, water for women fields for 2nd or 3rd dry season garden crop is often cut-off by men after harvesting the men's first dry season crop (usually in February) when remaining dam water is supposed to be used for drenching their livestock. Women are usually too feeble to dig wells (6-15 m depth, for 1 season utility before being covered up or collapsing) for gardening plots. Women do not have money to have them dug and lined. Credit is not available.
- CAPs are protected only in 25% of cases (LACOSREP 1; too rocky, too many farms, too degraded).
- Where land distribution is done by individuals (i.e. where WUA has not been able to get a grip on the issue) it may remain problematic, even for additionally reclaimed lands.
- Over-fragmentation of plots is favourable for social equity but impedes longer growing periods (and hence better prices) as well as higher water use efficiencies, thus preventing the use of water in outside downstream garden areas.
- Farmer Field Schools, extension on neglected women crops, and Rural Water Supply, Health and Sanitation were not linked to the land allocation training programmes.

Important frame conditions relevant for the module / learning area:

Promoting factors

- Determinants of success of communities include quality of its leadership, management of elite capture (social control), transparent and democratic accountability of WUAs and increasingly accountability of chiefs to their constituencies, respect for local authorities and customs.
- Where the dam is crucial to people's livelihoods (e.g. where population pressure on the land is high, or where dependency on livestock rearing is less pronounced, and/or water availability is low) it appeared to be important to allow WUAs a large measure of control over the land (LACOSREP I/II).
- Where a particular dam and downstream area had been developed in the past (1960-1980 and in the early 1990s), local communities tend to regard such lands as acquired by the State, which enables the WUA to play a more prominent role in land allocation (LACOSREP I).
- The use of predominantly local labour (LACOSREP I, start LACOSREP II) plays a decisive role tending to give the WUAs a firmer grip over the land. On the contrary, dams rehabilitated using contractors appears not to have the same element of control.
- Pro-active WUAs reduce the dependency syndrome and improve their ability to assume a firm stronghold over land resources (LACOSREP I).
- The frontline role of DA (as a 3rd party custodian or steward) in securing rights over the land before the passage of the same to the WUA has led to permanency in occupancy (LACOSREP I).
- Incorporation of land custodians (tindana) into WUA Executive Committees, tends to assist the WUA gain control over the land.
- The 1998 Interstate Succession Law is favourable to women and cemented the projects' benchmarks for women land 'ownership' of 40%.
- Madame Hawa Yakubu, Member of Parliament, and a native of Bawku District, was a notable women leader in the area who, as a role model, achieved a lot in empowerment of women in her District as well as the entire Northern Ghana.

Hindering factors

- Election induced reshuffling of MoFA and DA staff i.e. frequent staff transfers.
- Incohesion of social groups within some villages.
- Civil engineering bias of GIDA, other national partners.
- Deficiencies of scope, intensity and frequency of IFAD/UNOPS supervisions.

Assessment of impact of module:

- As mentioned in Module 1: There are indications that small irrigation garden development induces young men not to migrate/migrate less to earn income (e.g. for a dowry and asset building).
- Theft of crops and cattle (and other assets) has gone down; the local peace process has been supported due to a break up of local landowners' tight grip on lands.
- The nutritional situation, especially of children, is perceived to have improved due to incorporation of leafy vegetables into diets or by reducing the lean period/hungry season.
- Social safety network of allocating plots to blind and disabled, and to widows has improved social equity.
- Inclusive targeting of women resulted in increased functional literacy/numeracy and uptake of agronomic and livestock husbandry practices.
- The overall impact of this module has been modest as confirmed by IFAD Independent Office of Evaluation (OE).

Assessment of sustainability:

- Sustainability of LACOSREP and UWADEP is positive, however the newly proposed deed titling under the Land Administration Commission may negatively affect common pool access and usufruct.
- The inheritance situation governing land/plots is not well understood, which may endanger sustainability of access to land and water for women. Women (married or not) may inherit plots (or parts thereof) from their husbands or fathers resulting in 10-30% of women having access to a secured form of plot tenure. Young widows do not inherit late husband's land(s) as they may remarry outside the village thus affecting its patrimony. Elderly widows if capable of working the land are more eligible as their mobility is judged to be limited. In case a widow is too weak to work the land it will go to her son(s) or husband's brother(s).
- Mechanisms to address water shortages are sustainable (yet not necessarily equitable to women) and are respected by parties both within and outside the scheme (i.e. for tail enders and excess water users).

Assessment of replicability:

In general, replicability is judged to be high for Northern Ghana. More specifically,

- DA confirms overall impact and potential for up-scaling and replication with national resources.
- IFAD NORPREP and NRGPs have already incorporated lessons learnt from LACOSREP I/II and UWADEP.

Who is knowledgeable about the module or elements of it?

Roy Ayariga, Director of Agriculture, Upper East Region, Ghana

Emmanuel Eledi, Director of Agriculture, Upper West Region, Ghana

J. Falong, AgSSIP Coordinator/Director of MoFA, Ghana

G. Kranjac-Berisavljevic', Ass. Professor, UDS, Tamale, Ghana

Francis Z. L. Bacho, Lecturer, UDS, Tamale, Ghana

B. S. Nyari, consultant, Tamale, Ghana

Norman Messer, Country programme manager, IFAD, Italy

Mohamed Mansouri, Country Programme Manager, IFAD, Italy

Rudolph Cleveringa, Senior Technical Adviser, IFAD, Italy

In what documents can one find relevant information?

Ambrose, D. P. (1997). *Establishment of the legal status of Water Users' Associations toward an effective transfer of ownership and management of dam schemes*. Workshop proceedings held on 17-19 September 1997 in Bolgatanga, LACOSREP, UER, Ghana.

Anonymous. (n.d). *Summary Proceedings of the workshop on Community-based irrigation*

management in Northern Ghana, May 2002, UER, (mimeo).

Bacho, Francis Z. L. (2003). *Report on Socio-economic baseline survey of twelve dams in LACOSREP II*, UER, Ghana.

Bacho, F. Z. L. and Bonye, S. (2006). From Public Open Access to Common Property: The Prospects and Challenges of Institutionalising Boundaries for Self-governance and Management of Community Irrigation Dams in Upper East Region, Ghana. *Ghana Journal of Development Studies* Vol.3, Number 1.

IFAD. (2006). *Republic of Ghana: Upper East Region Land Conservation and Smallholder Rehabilitation Project Phase II*, Interim Evaluation, Rome, Italy.

IFAD. (2006). *Republic of Ghana: Upper West Region Agricultural Development Project*, Interim Evaluation, Rome, Italy.

IFAD. (2003). *Poverty, Land & Water: IFAD Experience with Water Users Associations in Ghana*, Rome, Italy.

Messer, N. M. (2003). 'A Brief Institutional Assessment of Water User Associations in northern Ghana: early Stages of Pro-Poor Local Institutional Development in Irrigated Smallholder Agriculture,' Working Paper 2, Ghana Country Portfolio Stocktaking Exercise and Strategy Mission (draft), IFAD, Rome, Italy.

Mornah, Thomas B. (2007). *Irrigation as a driver of change in the life of rural women: A case study of Busa in the Wa municipality of the Upper West Region*, BSc. Thesis report (unpublished), Faculty of Agric, University for Development Studies, Tamale, Ghana.

Nyari, B. S. (2003). 'Poverty and Access to Land & Water Resources in Upper East and West of Ghana,' Working Paper 3, Ghana Country Portfolio Stocktaking Exercise and Strategy Mission (draft), IFAD, Rome, Italy.

Nyari, B. S. (2002). *Report on Diagnostic survey of the landholding system by the Water Users' Associations at the rehabilitated dam sites under LACOSREP 1*, UER, Ghana.

ANNEX

Practical hints for the elaboration of knowledge profiles

General observations

The purpose of *knowledge profiling (KP)* is to document knowledge *generated by a certain project or programme*, so that it is readily available in future. *KP* is not meant to reveal existing indigenous or local knowledge or to document knowledge that the project promoters (government, donors) intended to transfer when they launched the project. Instead, *KP* focuses on project- and programme-related knowledge that stakeholders believe they have acquired during the project/programme, that is, knowledge that they consider useful for their future work and projects/programmes.

Thus, in the context of a water project/programme, for example, *KP* may not necessarily identify exclusively project-and programme-generated knowledge about water-related issues. Some stakeholders may consider other knowledge that they gained important, e.g., particular experiences and methods related to staff training, institutional strengthening, planning procedures, methods of interaction with the target group etc.

Observations on the different steps

(refer to chapter 2.2 for the elaborations).

Step 1: Awareness and motivation

It is important at the beginning of the exercise to explain the purpose of the exercise through intensive talks with the people and government units responsible for the project/programme. It may help to send a copy of this Manual to the project/programme manager beforehand, so that s/he is well informed and can support this awareness-raising exercise.

During the talks, the added value of such *KP* exercises should be stressed:

- *KP* provides quick and easy access to the project's/programme's 'lessons learned'. Thus, *KP* documentation can precede or replace reference to comprehensive project/programme documents.
- *KP* puts the accent on lessons learned *as perceived by the stakeholders*. This can be an important complement to project completion reports and evaluations which often reflect only 'expert opinion'.
- Since *KP* functions as described, the brief, summarising *KP* documents constitute valuable information that is *in the hands of stakeholders* who were involved in the project/programme.
- Stakeholder perceptions of project- and programme- generated knowledge, when brought to light through *KP during* project/programme implementation (e.g., parallel to mid-term reviews), can help improve understanding of and communication with stakeholders.
- A list of lessons learned from the stakeholder point of view provides a realistic basis for further (or future) project/programme efforts.
- *KP* documents not only sector-specific project- and programme- generated knowledge (e.g., water, health, biodiversity, etc.) but also cross-cutting factors (e.g., training, project internal communication, coordination among governmental units, etc.). Thus *KP* can bring to light similar knowledge and experience by different sectors and projects/programmes with cross-cutting issues and thus help prevent 'reinventing the wheel'.

- *KP* can serve the ministerial unit responsible for the project/programme as a quick, initial reference. It can help to unite project- and programme- generated knowledge from different departments of that ministry (and even of different ministries), thus creating synergies and improving communication.
- *KP* can be a useful support tool for the planning of new activities and projects/programmes, not only for governmental units but also for other stakeholders.

Step 2: Interviewer preparation

It is important that interviewers familiarise themselves with project/programme documents and the project/programme before starting the interviews. Field visits prior to the exercise will normally be necessary.

Step 3: Sounding Board

As mentioned in chapter 2.2, no more than four or five people should serve on the sounding board.

The persons selected should:

- be very well acquainted with the project/programme and its history
- belong to different stakeholder groups
- have a known capacity to listen to others
- have sufficient intellectual capacity to comprehend the purpose of the exercise and its procedures

Tasks of the sounding board are:

- to identify and select the *modules* to start with
- to discuss and agree upon the structure of the *knowledge profiles*
- to identify major stakeholder groups and select the persons to be interviewed (see remarks on step 6 below)
- to discuss the results of the interviews with the interviewers and reach initial consensus on the selection of 'knowledge statements' (bullet points) to be included in the report list and presented in the workshop.

Step 4: Module search

The number of *modules* identified by the members of the sounding board (areas in which many stakeholders have gained new knowledge and experience during the course of the project/programme) should be kept down to five, so that another *module* or two can be added depending of the outcome of the interviews.

Sounding board members must be made aware that:

- They should not identify only topics and areas that they personally consider important but rather areas in which they believe certain stakeholder groups have gained substantial knowledge.
- They should not focus exclusively on specific sectoral topics (e.g., water) but on cross-cutting elements as well.
- They should be prepared to modify or expand the modules to accord with the outcome of the interviews.
- The interviewers and the sounding board are responsible for screening out from the interviews answers and suggestions that are obviously irrelevant to future project/programme work. Yet they should still try to remain impartial and not favour their own 'pet topics'.

Step 5: Profiling

Apart from identifying the *modules*, the sounding board members structure the *knowledge profiles* in a manner that can remain more or less the same and thus go on being used in future as well as for purposes of comparison. It is recommended that a structure similar to the one proposed in this Manual should be considered:

- Description of the *module*
- Specific steps / activities implemented ('outputs')
- Use made of specific outputs ('outcomes')
- Methods, tools and instruments applied
- Specific experience, knowledge and innovations gained during implementation
 - What functioned well
 - What did not function well (opposing views of the interviewees should be mentioned as well)
- Important frame conditions relevant for the *module*
 - Promoting factors
 - Hindering factors
- Assessment of impact of the *module*
- Assessment of sustainability
- Assessment of replicability and upscaling
- Who is knowledgeable about the *module* or elements of it?
- In what documents can one find relevant information?

Step 6: Interviews

Normally, individual interviews will be conducted. However, depending on the time available, group interviews may be held instead, although they take much more time.

One should start by clarifying with the sounding board how many interviews can be held during the time available. (Interviews with farmer representatives may take about one hour, interviews with selected long-term project staff will take about one to two hours.) However, one must allow for enough time to arrange the interview and for the interviewers to discuss the results among themselves at the end of the interview.

Then, too, the sounding board must select the people to be interviewed. Locally prominent persons with, however, little insight into and connection with the project/programme should not be selected, although courtesy talks may be held with such persons nevertheless, and the purpose of the exercise explained to them.

The interview should be semi-structured, using the prescribed structure for profiles agreed with the sounding board as a guideline (see step 5 above).

One starts by explaining the purpose of the exercise and then goes on to ask what the larger areas of knowledge (*modules*) are in the eyes of the interviewee. Often, this question is not well understood, and interviewees start naming very detailed bits of knowledge. At this point, reference may be made to the *modules* already discussed with the sounding board and the interviewee asked whether or not these make sense to him/her as overall, generalised areas.

When one continues questioning on the further points of the profile structure, one must distinguish what to emphasise in the case of each respective interviewee group. Farmers, for example, might not be in a position to answer the project/programme related points b, c, d, h and i; whereas they may have much to say about points e, f, g and j. Project/programme staff, on the other hand, may respond at greater length to other points.

Thus interviewers will have to be flexible enough to adapt to such differences and to screen out responses that are irrelevant to the purpose of the exercise.

Step 7: Condensing and review

It is recommended that a session be held with the sounding board and initial agreement with them be reached on the condensed results of the interviews. This way, sounding board members can become co-facilitators of the workshop.

The workshop should be limited to one day. The purpose should be to verify the results of the exercise. One should invite all of the interviewees, the sounding board members and other persons with insight into the project/programme. The number of participants should not exceed 20 to 25 people. One should avoid inviting high-ranking officials who were not really involved in the project/programme to participate in the whole workshop, though they may be invited to the opening or closing or be informed in separate meetings about its outcome.

Steps 8 to 10: Presentation, Ranking, Saving, Spreading

Refer to chapter 2.2.



Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) GmbH
Dag-Hammarskjöld-Weg 1-5
65760 Eschborn, Germany
Tel.: +49 6196 79-0
Fax: +49 6196 79-1115
E-mail: info@gtz.de
www.gtz.de



Enabling poor rural people
to overcome poverty

Via Paolo di Dono, 44
00142 Rome, Italy
Tel.: +39 06 54591
Fax: +39 06 5043463
E-mail: ifad@ifad.org
www.ifad.org • www.ruralpovertyportal.org