Investing in rural people

Grant Design Document

Grant Title and GRIPS ID

ATHAZ - SCALE

ATHAZ - Agroecological Transitions for Horticulture in Arid Zones

to increase the resilience of farmers, decent jobs, and sustainable food systems

Botswana – Zambia – Zimbabwe

Component 3 (SCALE)

GRIPS ID: **2000002827**

Grant Design Document

Part 1

Summary

Grant Sponsoring Division **Production, Market and Institutions Division (PMI)**	**Co-sponsoring Division(s)** **East and Southern Africa Division (ESA)**
Name of Technical Grant Manager: Amine Belhamissi, Senior Technical Specialist, PMI	
Project Title ATHAZ **Agroecological Transitions for Horticulture in Arid Zones to increase the resilience of farmers, decent jobs, and sustainable food systems**	**GRIPS ID**
Main Strategic Objective (*please select <u>one</u>*) ☐ SO1: Leverage better impact on the ground for IFAD's programme of work, including through improvement of in-country capacity for greater sustainability of benefits ☒ SO2: foster a more conducive policy and investment environment for smallholder agriculture and rural development, including at the regional and global level	**Main pathway supported by the grant (*please select <u>one</u>*)** ☒ Policy and investments ☐ Partnerships ☐ Knowledge
Main Priority Area (*please select <u>one</u>*) ☐ PA1: Ensuring inclusion ☐ PA 2: Enhancing focus on fragile contexts ☐ PA 3: Investing in climate resilience and biodiversity ☐ PA 4: Increasing engagement with the private sector ☐ PA 5: Promoting an integrated country programme approach ☒ PA 6: Enhancing the sustainability and scalability of investments	
Mainstreaming themes ☐ Gender ☐ Youth ☐ Nutrition X Environment & Climate ☐ N/A	
Grant scope Global/Regional ☐ Country-specific ☐	**Region(s) or country/countries** **Botswana, Zambia, Zimbabwe**
Recipient selection method: • Competitive selection ☐ • Direct selection X	
Full legal name of Recipient: Biovison Africa Trust (BvAT)	

Contact details of recipient (address, fax, email):
Fredrick Ochieng
ICIPE Nairobi
fochieng@biovisionafrica.org

Name and title of authorized person who will sign the grant agreement on behalf of the Recipient: Fredrick Ochieng/Anne Onyango

Legal Status of the Recipient:

☐ developing Member States

☐ intergovernmental organizations (including UN agencies)

☐ producers' associations/organizations

☒ civil society organizations

☐ research and academic institutions

☐ private sector

List any previous IFAD grants received by the Recipient (for each grant, report the GRIPS number, amount of grant, and date of approval):

Closed grants:

Ongoing grants:

Special Provisions (Any proposed exceptions to the General Provisions of the Grant Agreement. Include proposed wording to be included as paragraph 8 of the Agreement).

Implementation period (months)-4 years

Date of submission of the Grant Design Document for Desk Review: 17 February 2026

Part 2[1]

Project Description

Executive Summary

The ATHAZ programme, supported by the European Union through the DeSIRA+ initiative, aims to transform horticultural systems through agro-ecological practices in the arid and semi-arid regions of Botswana, Zambia, and Zimbabwe. In response to growing challenges such as climate change, water scarcity, soil fertility decline, new pests, and limited market access, the project seeks to strengthen the livelihoods of smallholder horticultural farmers by promoting an inclusive, innovative, and sustainable agroecological transition

General Objective and Specific Objectives: This programme is driven by a clear ambition: to transform the livelihoods of smallholder horticultural farmers of 3 neighboring SADC countries by strengthening their resilience to climate change. At its core, the initiative seeks to empower farmers through innovation, enabling them to boost sustainable productivity and make more efficient use of agro-ecological techniques. By fostering market-oriented horticulture and building robust value chains, the programme aims to create new income opportunities and promote decent employment in rural areas. At the same time, it works to shape policy environments and knowledge-sharing platforms that support the adoption of agroecological practices at scale, thanks to 9 agroecological innovation Hubs. Through these efforts, ATHAZ intends to amplify farmer-led innovations, ensuring they not only improve local production systems but also influence national investments and strategies in horticulture.

The ATHAZ programme is structured around four key intervention areas, each contributing to tangible impacts on production, income, policy, and knowledge systems across participating countries.

Component 1. INNOVATE – Farmer-led research and technologies. ATHAZ will establish nine agro-ecological innovation hubs and their implementing sites to co-develop solutions in irrigation efficiency, drought-tolerant seed systems, and integrated pest and pollinator management. Through these hubs, more than 60% of participating farmers (15,000 households—benefiting approximately 75,000 individuals) are expected to adopt at least one innovation, leading to productivity gains of 15–30% and reductions in water use of 20–40%. Annual technical monitoring will track these achievements, with the overall impact reaching over 100,000 rural people reporting improved production capacity.

Component 2. CONNECT – Market systems and value chains. The programme will develop and strengthen 30 value chains, promote Participatory Guarantee Systems (PGS) for quality assurance, and support circular bioeconomy models that add value to agroecological products. These efforts aim to increase household incomes by 15–30%, enable the signing of over 300 market contracts, and achieve the sale of more than 6,000 product units, as evidenced through regular market reports.

Component 3. SCALE – Policy and replication; ATHAZ will support the production of policy briefs and promote evidence-based reforms that embed agroecological practices into national investment frameworks. It will build on and align with IFAD hosting projects such as HEEP,

[1] Maximum 20 pages total for Part 2 and Part 3, excluding the Executive Summary.The suggested number of pages for each section is an indicative guide to ensure adequate balance in the information provided in each section.

FIRIP, ZEISP, and BoLCoP, influencing over 12 national or regional policies and reaching more than one million people within SADC membership, with at least 60% public awareness of agroecological practices monitored through policy and media tracking. BvAT will be in charge of implementing this component.

Component 4. FACILITATE – Knowledge and partnerships. Finally, the programme will implement a harmonized Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) system to facilitate cross-country knowledge exchange, ensure joint EU–IFAD missions, and strengthen the visibility of EU–IFAD cooperation. Knowledge products and lessons learned will be widely disseminated through MEL reporting frameworks, ensuring sustained institutional learning and coordination.

This programme has been carefully designed through participatory process (June-october 2025) as a multi-country initiative under the European Union's DeSIRA+ framework, following extensive consultations with key partners and stakeholders such as Biovision Africa Trust (BvAT), Research Institute of Organic Agriculture (FiBL), International Centre of Insect Physiology and Ecology (icipe), the EU Delegations, the IFAD country programs and teams, the Centre for Coordination of Agricultural Research and Development for Southern Africa (CCARDESA), and national governments to ensure alignment and shared ownership of the programme's goals. The formal validation and signing of the programme are anticipated by the end of 2025, paving the way for implementation to begin in early 2026.

1. Background and rationale for regular grant funding

A. Background, ownership and relevance

1.

Component 3 (SCALE) of the ATHAZ project to be implemented by BvAT intends to address several interlinked development challenges that are critical at the country, regional, and global levels. In Botswana, Zambia, and Zimbabwe, horticultural production in arid and semi‑arid zones is constrained by weak policy frameworks that do not adequately support agroecological innovations, limited institutional capacity for advocacy, and fragmented knowledge dissemination systems. Farmers, entrepreneurs, and policymakers often lack access to user‑friendly, evidence‑based knowledge products, while civil society and farmer organizations struggle to influence policy processes effectively. These challenges are compounded by climate shocks, water scarcity, and fragile rural livelihoods, which exacerbate poverty and food insecurity in arid contexts.

At the country level, SCALE responds directly to priorities identified in IFAD's COSOPs and country strategies, which emphasize sustainable rural development, climate resilience, and inclusive agribusiness models. By mapping policy enablers and barriers, and developing evidence‑based advocacy strategies, the grant aligns with national demands for stronger policy integration of agroecology. At the regional level, SCALE leverages IFAD initiatives and works closely with SADC to harmonize strategies, facilitate policy dialogues, and strengthen regional collaboration, thereby addressing gaps identified in regional stocktakes and engagement strategies. At the

global level, SCALE contributes to IFAD's corporate priorities under Priority Area 1 (Ensuring inclusion), Priority Area 3 (Investing in climate resilience and biodiversity), and Priority Area 4 (Increasing engagement with the private sector). It does so by promoting smallholder-focused horticultural models, enhancing climate resilience, and fostering partnerships that link grassroots actors to continental and global platforms such as the African Agroecology Conference.

In summary, SCALE addresses the policy, knowledge, capacity, and climate fragility challenges that hinder the adoption of agroecological innovations in arid areas. The grant is firmly aligned with corporate needs and priorities, responding to country-specific demands, regional strategies, and global frameworks to accelerate the uptake of sustainable, smallholder-focused horticultural agribusiness models.

B. Contribution and alignment to the regular grants programme

2.

The ATHAZ Project – Component 3 (SCALE) is fully aligned with the overall goal of IFAD's Regular Grants Policy, which aims to advance sustainable and inclusive rural transformation and contribute to achieving the SDGs. By addressing policy gaps, weak advocacy capacity, and limited knowledge dissemination in Botswana, Zambia, and Zimbabwe, SCALE enhances the adoption of bankable smallholder-focused horticultural agribusiness models in arid zones. The grant contributes directly to IFAD's Strategic Objectives by increasing productive capacity (SO1), strengthening market participation (SO2), and embedding climate resilience and biodiversity into rural development (SO3). It also aligns with Priority Area 1 (Ensuring inclusion) through its focus on women, youth, and marginalized groups, Priority Area 3 (Investing in climate resilience and biodiversity) by promoting agroecological innovations in fragile arid contexts, and Priority Area 4 (Increasing engagement with the private sector) through support for sustainable horticultural value chains. Regionally, SCALE leverages IFAD initiatives and works closely with SADC to harmonize strategies and foster policy dialogue, while globally it contributes to IFAD's Partnership Framework by strengthening multi-actor coalitions and knowledge exchange. In doing so, the grant supports SDG 1 (No Poverty), SDG 2 (Zero Hunger), SDG 5 (Gender Equality), SDG 13 (Climate Action), and SDG 15 (Life on Land), thereby reinforcing IFAD's broader mandate and corporate priorities.

C. Value added of regular grants financing

3.

Financing ATHAZ Component 3 (SCALE) through regular grant financing adds unique value compared to other IFAD instruments because it enables flexible, multi-actor collaboration and policy engagement that would not be feasible under traditional lending operations. Regular grants are specifically designed to support knowledge generation, advocacy, and capacity building functions that are central to SCALE's mandate of embedding agroecology into policy frameworks, strengthening institutional capacity, and disseminating evidence to farmers and entrepreneurs. Unlike loans or investment projects, grant financing allows BvAT and partners (icipe, FiBL) to convene diverse stakeholders, pilot innovative approaches such as "lighthouses," and leverage regional platforms like SADC without creating debt burdens for participating countries.

To avoid overlaps and duplication with other initiatives under the IFAD13 business model, SCALE is deliberately positioned to complement ongoing IFAD country programmes and COSOP priorities in Botswana, Zambia, and Zimbabwe. It will build on existing IFAD investments in climate resilience, horticulture, and agribusiness by filling identified gaps in policy advocacy, knowledge dissemination, and regional coalition building. Coordination with IFAD country offices and regional teams ensures that SCALE's outputs—policy briefs, advocacy strategies, farmer communication tools—are integrated into broader IFAD portfolios rather than duplicating them. At the regional level, close collaboration with SADC and alignment with IFAD's engagement strategies in Southern Africa further guarantee complementarity, while participation in continental forums like the African Agroecology Conference 2027 ensures that lessons are shared across initiatives. In this way, regular grant financing provides the most appropriate instrument to deliver SCALE's objectives, while ensuring synergy and avoiding duplication within IFAD's broader strategic framework.

D. Lessons learned

4.

Based on previous IFAD country, regional, and global grants, as well as similar projects financed by other development partners, several key lessons have informed the design of ATHAZ Component 3 (SCALE). First, past IFAD operations have shown that policy gaps and weak institutional capacity are major barriers to scaling agroecological innovations; projects that invested in evidence‑based advocacy and capacity building achieved stronger policy integration and sustainability. Second, a study by the AU EOA Initiative (BvAT) on a policy landscape on agroecological advancement in Africa showed similar gaps as well as experiences from regional initiatives, which highlight the importance of multi‑actor coalitions and knowledge exchange platforms; without them, uptake of innovations remains fragmented and localized. Third, global lessons, including from comparable initiatives such as the Andhra Pradesh Community Managed Natural Farming (APCNF) project, demonstrate that farmer‑to‑farmer learning and demonstration sites "lighthouses" are highly effective in diffusing low‑cost innovations and building trust among communities. Fourth, donor‑funded projects have emphasized the need for tailored communication strategies that adapt evidence to different audiences, policy briefs for decision‑makers, technical guides for extension agents, and user‑friendly materials for farmers. Finally, past IFAD grants have underscored the importance of regional alignment with RECs like SADC to avoid duplication and ensure complementarity with ongoing IFAD investments. These lessons directly shaped SCALE's design: embedding policy advocacy, capacity strengthening, knowledge dissemination, and regional coalition building as core activities, while ensuring that outputs are evidence‑based, inclusive, and aligned with both national COSOP priorities and regional strategies.

2. Project description

A. Goal and objectives

5.

The overall goal of Component 3 (SCALE) of the ATHAZ project is to enhance the adoption of sustainable, bankable smallholder‑focused horticultural agribusiness

models in arid and semi-arid zones by embedding agroecological innovations into supportive policy frameworks and ensuring widespread dissemination of evidence-based knowledge. The component's development objectives are: to strengthen policy environments by identifying enablers, barriers, and opportunities and developing advocacy strategies that integrate agroecology into national and local development plans; to build the capacity of local and national actors, including farmer organizations, civil society, and government institutions to effectively champion and implement these strategies; and, to facilitate knowledge exchange, awareness creation, and grassroots communication that empower farmers, entrepreneurs, and communities to adopt agroecological practices. By combining policy advocacy, institutional strengthening, and inclusive communication, SCALE seeks to accelerate agroecological transitions, improve climate resilience, and foster inclusive rural transformation in Botswana, Zambia, and Zimbabwe, while contributing to regional harmonization through SADC and global learning platforms.

B. Target country(ies) and target group

6.

The grant will be implemented in Botswana, Zambia, and Zimbabwe, countries deliberately selected because they represent arid and semi-arid zones where smallholder horticultural production faces acute challenges of climate vulnerability, fragile livelihoods, and weak policy support for agroecological innovations. These countries were prioritized based on IFAD's COSOPs and country strategies, which emphasize sustainable rural development, climate resilience, and inclusive agribusiness, as well as their alignment with regional priorities under SADC. The targeting strategy focuses on direct beneficiaries such as smallholder farmers, entrepreneurs, farmer organizations, civil society groups, and local government actors who will receive training, knowledge products, and advocacy support. Indirect beneficiaries include policymakers, extension agents, and development partners who will benefit from evidence-based advocacy strategies, policy briefs, and regional dialogue platforms.

Components, outcomes and activities

7.

The grant will finance a set of outputs and activities designed to achieve outcomes aligned with the Logframe and Theory of Change. The expected outcomes for the target group include: strengthened policy frameworks that integrate agroecological innovations into national and local development plans; enhanced institutional capacity of farmer organizations, civil society, and government actors to advocate for and implement agroecology; increased awareness and knowledge among farmers, entrepreneurs, and policymakers on the benefits of agroecological practices; and improved adoption of sustainable, smallholder-focused horticultural agribusiness models in arid zones.

The outputs will include comprehensive policy mapping and analysis, evidence-based advocacy strategies, tailored knowledge products (policy briefs, technical guides, farmer learning materials), awareness campaigns through multiple communication channels, policy dialogue forums at national, regional, and continental levels, and demonstration sites "lighthouses" for farmer-to-farmer learning. BvAT, as the lead recipient, will be responsible for policy advocacy, communication, and farmer-level

dissemination. icipe will contribute technical research and evidence generation, while FiBL will provide expertise in organic agriculture and agroecology transitions. National governments, civil society organizations, and farmer groups will act as sub‑recipients and implementing partners for capacity building and grassroots dissemination.

C. Theory of Change

8.

The Theory of Change (ToC) for the ATHAZ Component 3 (SCALE) links the development challenges faced by smallholder farmers and entrepreneurs in arid zones, such as weak policy frameworks, limited institutional capacity, fragmented knowledge dissemination, and climate fragility, with targeted interventions designed to deliver systemic change. By conducting policy mapping and analysis, developing evidence‑based advocacy strategies, and strengthening the capacity of farmer organizations, civil society, and government actors, SCALE will create enabling policy environments that integrate agroecology into national and local development plans. Through the production of tailored knowledge products, awareness campaigns, and multi‑stakeholder dialogue forums, the project will increase visibility, legitimacy, and alignment around agroecology among policymakers, extension agents, and development partners. At the grassroots level, co‑created learning materials, farmer dialogues, and demonstration "lighthouses" will empower farmers and entrepreneurs to adopt agroecological practices, thereby improving resilience, productivity, and livelihoods. The result chain flows from inputs (grant financing and technical expertise from BvAT, icipe, FiBL, and partners) to outputs (policy analyses, advocacy strategies, knowledge products, awareness campaigns, dialogue forums, demonstration sites), which generate outcomes (stronger policies, enhanced institutional capacity, informed stakeholders, empowered farmers), culminating in impacts of sustainable rural transformation, climate resilience, and inclusive horticultural agribusiness models. The ToC assumes that governments remain open to policy dialogue, farmers are willing to adopt innovations when supported by evidence and demonstration, and regional institutions like SADC provide platforms for harmonization. By connecting policy advocacy, knowledge exchange, and grassroots adoption, SCALE establishes a coherent pathway to achieve its intended impacts, consistent with the Logframe and IFAD's broader mandate.

D. Linkages and synergies with investment projects, country programmes and other initiatives funded by IFAD

9.

The grant will work in close synergy with ongoing IFAD investment projects and initiatives under the IFAD13 business model by complementing and reinforcing country programme priorities in Botswana, Zambia, and Zimbabwe. Specifically, SCALE will support IFAD‑financed operations such as climate‑resilient horticulture and agribusiness projects identified in the COSOPs and Country Strategy Notes, by filling critical gaps in policy advocacy, knowledge dissemination, and institutional capacity building. For example, where IFAD loans and investment projects focus on infrastructure, value chain development, and farmer support services, SCALE will provide the enabling environment through evidence‑based policy frameworks, advocacy strategies, and grassroots communication tools that ensure sustainability and

uptake of innovations. This catalytic effect will strengthen country-level results by embedding agroecology into national development plans, improving farmer resilience, and enhancing market participation.

During design, IFAD country and regional teams were actively engaged to ensure alignment with COSOP priorities and to identify complementarities with ongoing operations. Their involvement guarantees that SCALE's outputs policy briefs, advocacy strategies, farmer learning materials, and coalition-building platforms are integrated into broader programme delivery rather than duplicating existing efforts. Linkages and exchanges will be maintained throughout implementation via joint planning sessions, regular reporting, and participation in regional platforms such as SADC policy dialogues. Adequate resources are allocated for coordination, ensuring that IFAD country offices remain central partners in monitoring, learning, and scaling. In this way, the grant acts as a catalyst within IFAD's country programmes, reinforcing SO1 by increasing the productive capacity of poor rural people, while also contributing to climate resilience and inclusive rural transformation.

E. Partnerships and policy

10.

The grant will strengthen partnerships at the country, regional, and global levels, working in synergy with IFAD investment projects and initiatives under the IFAD13 business model while advancing IFAD's Partnership Framework objectives. At the country level, the grant will complement IFAD-financed operations in Botswana, Zambia, and Zimbabwe that focus on climate-resilient horticulture, smallholder agribusiness, and inclusive rural development, by providing catalytic support in policy advocacy, institutional capacity building, and knowledge dissemination. Regionally, the grant will engage with SADC to harmonize agroecology strategies and facilitate multi-stakeholder policy dialogues, while globally it will contribute to IFAD's partnerships with Rome-Based Agencies (FAO, WFP) by aligning agroecology evidence and advocacy with broader food systems transformation agendas.

The grant concretely contributes to the IFAD Partnership Framework by advancing objectives such as: (i) strengthening policy engagement and dialogue with governments and regional institutions; (ii) enhancing knowledge generation and dissemination for systemic change; and (iii) fostering multi-actor coalitions that include civil society, farmer organizations, and private sector actors. In line with the Private Sector Operational Strategy 2025–2030, the grant will promote smallholder-focused horticultural agribusiness models, catalyze private sector engagement in sustainable value chains, and create enabling policy environments for inclusive investment.

Operating through the Policy pathway, the grant's policy engagement strategy emphasizes evidence-based advocacy, coalition building, and alignment with COSOP/CSN priorities in each target country. It will support IFAD's increased emphasis on policy engagement by improving the policy and investment environment for smallholder agriculture, thereby enhancing the sustainability of IFAD's programme of work. At the national level, the grant aligns with the United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Frameworks and will coordinate with UN Country Teams to ensure coherence with broader development priorities. At the regional and global levels, it will contribute to higher-level policies for inclusive and sustainable rural and

food systems transformation, positioning agroecology as a key pathway to climate resilience, biodiversity conservation, and inclusive rural growth.

3. Implementation and supervision arrangements

Within BvAT, implementation and supervision arrangements for ATHAZ Component 3 (SCALE) are structured to ensure both strategic oversight and effective day-to-day management and implementation. The Executive Director (ED) will provide overall leadership, ensuring compliance with IFAD requirements, maintaining strategic partnerships, and supervising progress toward project goals. The ED will also be responsible for high-level coordination with IFAD country and regional teams, Rome-Based Agencies, and other partners to guarantee alignment with COSOP/CSN priorities and regional strategies. A designated technical project lead will oversee daily implementation, coordinating activities such as policy mapping, advocacy, knowledge dissemination, and farmer engagement. This role will be supported by the finance team, which will ensure sound financial management and reporting, and by the M&E team, which will track outputs, outcomes, and impacts against the Logframe and Theory of Change. Together, this structure ensures that strategic oversight, operational delivery, financial accountability, and monitoring are integrated, enabling BvAT to deliver the grant's objectives effectively and sustainably. The technical person is well-versed in both national and regional policy frameworks and has experience working with RECs.

A. Rationale for recipient selection and recipients' capacities

11.

The recipient, Biovision Africa Trust (BvAT), was proposed for direct selection rather than through competitive processes, based on its unique expertise and established track record in agroecology and sustainable rural development. This decision was endorsed, recognizing that BvAT's long-standing leadership in policy advocacy within the CAADP process, farmer-level dissemination, and coalition building across Africa makes it uniquely positioned to deliver the objectives of ATHAZ Component 3 (SCALE). BvAT has extensive experience implementing multi-country projects, coordinating with governments, civil society, and regional bodies such as SADC, and has demonstrated technical qualifications in agroecology transitions, knowledge management, and inclusive rural transformation.

BvAT's implementation capacity is supported by a strong technical team, financial management systems, and monitoring and evaluation expertise. Where gaps exist, such as scaling outreach to new fragile contexts or deepening private sector engagement, capacity will be strengthened through collaboration with sub-recipients and partners. These include ICIPE, which brings scientific and technical research capacity, and FiBL, which contributes global expertise in organic agriculture and agroecology transitions. Together, these partners complement BvAT's strengths, ensuring that technical, policy, and grassroots dimensions are fully covered.

The rationale for direct grant financing is that BvAT and its partners are uniquely placed to deliver systemic change through policy advocacy and knowledge dissemination, functions that cannot be achieved through IFAD's lending instruments. This arrangement ensures that the grant leverages BvAT's comparative advantage, avoids duplication with other IFAD13 initiatives, and maximizes catalytic effects by embedding agroecology into national, regional, and global frameworks.

B. Implementation procedures and project management

12.

Implementation of ATHAZ Component 3 (SCALE) will be led by Biovision Africa Trust (BvAT) as the primary recipient, with clear structures for grant management and oversight. Formal implementation agreements will define the roles and responsibilities of each partner, with BvAT coordinating overall delivery and ensuring compliance with IFAD standards. Sub-recipients (if any) will be accountable to BvAT for technical outputs, while BvAT will report directly to IFAD. Coordination will be maintained through joint planning sessions, technical working groups, and policy dialogue platforms, ensuring that strategic oversight, operational delivery, financial accountability, and monitoring are fully integrated to achieve the grant's objectives.

C. Implementation period and workplan

Implementation will be based on the following sub-components:

Sub-Comp 3.1 will focus on generating evidence, developing advocacy strategies, and engaging governments to embed agroecology into policy frameworks.

Sub-Comp 3.2 will emphasize knowledge exchange, coalition building, and strategic alliances with Rome-Based Agencies, SADC, and civil society.

Sub-Comp 3.3 will ensure communication and dissemination to farmers, entrepreneurs, and communities through dialogues, demonstration sites, and tailored materials.

Year/Quarter	Sub-Comp 3.1: Policy frameworks and advocacy	Sub-Comp 3.2: Knowledge exchange and alliances	Sub-Comp 3.3: Communication and dissemination
2026 Q1–Q2	Baseline studies, policy mapping, stakeholder consultations	Identify knowledge gaps, initiate partnerships with Rome-based agencies, SADC, and national institutions	Design a communication strategy, develop farmer-friendly materials
2026 Q3–Q4	Draft evidence-based advocacy strategies and validate with stakeholders	Launch knowledge platforms, begin coalition building	Pilot awareness campaigns, test dissemination channels
2027 Q1–Q2	Rollout advocacy strategies at the national level align with COSOP/CSN priorities	Produce knowledge products, organize regional workshops	Farmer dialogues, demonstration sites established
2027 Q3–Q4	Policy dialogues with governments, refine advocacy tools	Strengthen alliances with civil society and the private sector	Expand communication campaigns, integrate ICT tools
2028 Q1–Q2	Regional policy dialogues, harmonization with SADC	Scale farmer-to-farmer learning, cross-country exchanges	Consolidate dissemination, monitor adoption rates
2028 Q3–Q4	Midterm evaluation, adjust advocacy strategies	Document lessons learned, publish case studies	Intensify outreach to entrepreneurs and communities

Year/Quarter	Sub-Comp 3.1: Policy frameworks and advocacy	Sub-Comp 3.2: Knowledge exchange and alliances	Sub-Comp 3.3: Communication and dissemination
2029 Q1–Q2	Final policy recommendations: embed agroecology in national plans	Regional/global dissemination of knowledge products	Sustainability planning, handover of communication tools
2029 Q3–Q4	Endline evaluation, reporting to IFAD	Consolidation of alliances, long-term partnership frameworks	Final dissemination of results, closure activities

D. Planning, Monitoring and evaluation, and reporting

13.

The grant's planning, monitoring, and evaluation (M&E), learning, and reporting systems will be fully integrated to support adaptive management and evidence‑based decision‑making throughout the four‑year implementation period. Each year, an Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWPB) will be prepared by BvAT in consultation with sub‑recipients and national partners, reviewed internally by technical and finance teams, and submitted to IFAD for approval. The AWPB will serve as the operational roadmap, linking activities to outputs, outcomes, and budget allocations. M&E will be anchored in the project's Logframe and Theory of Change, with BvAT's dedicated M&E team responsible for system design, indicator tracking, and reporting. Data will be collected routinely at activity and output levels, complemented by outcome monitoring through surveys, policy tracking, and adoption assessments, and consolidated in mid‑term and end‑line evaluations. Learning will be embedded through quarterly reflection meetings, joint sector reviews, and adaptive adjustments, while knowledge products such as policy briefs and case studies will be disseminated to inform practice and policy. Reporting will follow IFAD's requirements, with semi‑annual progress reports and consolidated annual reports aligned to the AWPB and Logframe. Adequate resources are budgeted for data collection, analysis, and dissemination, ensuring that planning, M&E, learning, and reporting are harmonized to enhance programme delivery and sustainability.

E. Supervision arrangements

Grant supervision will be carried out through a structured set of activities and mechanisms designed to ensure compliance, quality delivery, and adaptive management. Supervision will include annual supervision missions led by IFAD, complemented by semi‑annual virtual reviews to track progress against the Logframe and Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWPB). Key outputs from supervision will include consolidated supervision reports and recommendations for adaptive adjustments. Timelines are aligned with the grant's four‑year cycle: inception supervision in Year 1, mid‑term supervision in Year 3, and final supervision in Year 4, with annual reviews in between. Audits will also be integrated into the supervision framework as per IFAD's guidelines.

Supervision costs will be covered primarily by IFAD's regular supervision budget, with contributions from the grant recipient (BvAT) in the form of logistical support, staff time, and facilitation of field missions.

This integrated supervision arrangement ensures that oversight is not only a compliance exercise but also a learning and adaptation mechanism, feeding directly into decision-making, reporting, and sustainability planning.

F. Risks and mitigation measures

14.

Component 3 (SCALE) faces several operational, institutional, and environmental/social/climate risks, as identified in the Integrated Risk Matrix. A primary institutional risk is the challenge of coordinating multiple actors, BvAT, icipe, FiBL, national partners, and regional bodies such as SADC, which may lead to delays or inconsistent delivery. This will be mitigated through clear implementation agreements, structured coordination mechanisms, and regular joint planning and review sessions. Operational risks include limited government uptake of agroecology policy recommendations, slow progress in policy dialogues, or low engagement from farmer groups and private sector actors. These risks will be addressed through inclusive stakeholder engagement, evidence-based advocacy, and alignment of messaging with national COSOP/CSN priorities and UN frameworks.

There is also a knowledge and communication risk, where dissemination materials may not reach or resonate with farmers, entrepreneurs, or communities. Mitigation includes co-designing materials with local partners, using multiple communication channels (radio, ICT, farmer networks), and field-testing messages before scaling. Financial and fiduciary risks, such as delays in fund flows or weak financial reporting from sub-recipients, will be mitigated through BvAT's established financial systems, close oversight, and regular audits.

Environmental, social, and climate risks for Component 3 are low to moderate, as activities focus on policy engagement, knowledge exchange, and communication rather than physical interventions. Potential risks include unintentional exclusion of vulnerable groups in policy processes or insufficient integration of climate resilience in advocacy outputs. These will be mitigated by applying IFAD's inclusion principles, ensuring gender- and youth-responsive engagement, and aligning all policy and communication products with climate-smart and agroecological principles. The SECAP Screening Checklist confirms that the component remains within the moderate risk category, and any required mitigation plans will be prepared and submitted with the GDD package, with support from ECG.

Overall, the risk profile for Component 3 is manageable, with mitigation measures embedded in planning, implementation, and supervision to safeguard the effectiveness, inclusiveness, and sustainability of SCALE outcomes.

4. Knowledge management, innovation, scaling up and sustainability

A. Innovation

15.

Component 3 (SCALE) introduces a set of mutually reinforcing innovations that strengthen agroecology policy engagement, knowledge exchange, and communication

in ways that are new to the implementation context and aligned with IFAD's corporate approach to innovation. The component will pioneer evidence-driven policy advocacy tools, including digital policy mapping, real-time evidence dashboards, and rapid-response policy briefs that translate scientific findings into actionable recommendations for governments, an approach that is largely absent in the target countries. It will also promote digital knowledge-exchange platforms and regional alliances, enabling cross-country learning among farmers, policymakers, researchers, and private sector actors through virtual learning events, online repositories, and ICT-enabled farmer-to-farmer exchanges. These digital solutions reflect IFAD's emphasis on innovation through ICT4D and digital agriculture. In addition, the component will deploy farmer-centred communication innovations, such as interactive radio, SMS/USSD services, short video explainers and social media micro-campaigns, co-designed with communities to ensure accessibility for women, youth and marginalized groups.BvAT will also link policy makers and other practitioners to its already existing platforms that build their capacity in Agroecology (e.g., the agroecology consumer website, infonet, and others)

A further innovation lies in the integration of climate resilience, nutrition, gender, youth, and biodiversity considerations into all advocacy, knowledge, and communication products, positioning agroecology as a holistic solution to multiple development challenges. This cross-cutting framing is consistent with IFAD's definition of innovation as new or improved solutions that add value, enhance development effectiveness, and can be scaled across country programmes. By combining digital tools, inclusive communication approaches, and structured multi-actor alliances, Component 3 introduces scalable models that can be replicated across IFAD's portfolio and that respond directly to IFAD's priority areas for innovation, particularly digital agriculture and integrated solutions for climate, nutrition, gender, youth, and biodiversity.

B. Knowledge management and learning

16.

The grant's Knowledge Management (KM) strategy for Component 3 is designed to systematically generate, assemble, and disseminate evidence, lessons, and innovations to strengthen decision-making, policy engagement, and partnerships throughout implementation. It will emphasize knowledge generation, knowledge use, and creating an enabling environment for evidence-based learning and collaboration. The grant will establish structured processes for capturing lessons learned from policy engagement, digital knowledge exchanges, and farmer-centred communication activities, ensuring that good practices and innovations are continuously fed back into implementation. This will include quarterly learning reviews, synthesis notes, and integration of findings into the Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWPB). Knowledge products, such as policy briefs, case studies, digital toolkits, evidence dashboards, and multimedia communication materials, will target policymakers, farmer organizations, private sector actors, regional bodies (e.g., SADC), and IFAD country teams. Through this integrated approach, the grant will ensure that knowledge is not only produced but actively used to enhance implementation quality, strengthen partnerships, and inform policy processes across the three countries.

C. Scaling up/uptake and sustainability of grant results

17.

Component 3 has strong prospects for scaling up its results beyond the life of the grant, as it focuses on policy engagement, digital knowledge systems, and communication approaches. The innovations generated, such as evidence-driven policy tools, digital knowledge platforms, and farmer-centred communication models, are designed to be institutionalized within the CAADP framework and partner ministries, farmer organizations, and regional bodies such as SADC, enabling continued uptake after project completion. Sustainability will be ensured by embedding activities within existing national structures, strengthening the capacities of government and non-state actors, and aligning all outputs with ongoing IFAD-supported investments in Botswana, Zambia, and Zimbabwe. The grant's exit strategy focuses on transferring ownership of digital platforms, knowledge products, and advocacy processes to national partners, while ensuring that alliances and coalitions established under SCALE continue to function independently. This strategy will be validated and refined during implementation through annual reviews, supervision missions, and learning events, allowing assumptions about institutional commitment, resource availability, and policy windows to be tested and adjusted. By the end of the grant, the aim is for governments, farmer organizations, and regional institutions to have the capacity, incentives, and tools to sustain and expand the approaches introduced, ensuring long-term impact on agroecology adoption, policy coherence, and rural livelihoods.

D. Communication and visibility plan

18.

Strategic communication under Component 3 will play a central role in strengthening IFAD's visibility, increasing familiarity with its mandate among target audiences, and ensuring that the results achieved through the grant are widely recognized and understood. Communication efforts will be designed to proactively highlight IFAD's leadership in promoting agroecology, digital knowledge systems, and inclusive rural transformation, while also mitigating reputational risks through clear, consistent, and evidence-based messaging. This will include integrating IFAD branding across all knowledge products, digital platforms, policy briefs, training materials, and community-level communication tools, as well as ensuring that all public-facing outputs follow IFAD's visibility guidelines. Strategic communication approaches—such as targeted media engagement, social media campaigns, interactive radio programmes, and high-profile regional events—will be used to increase awareness of IFAD's investments and achievements among policymakers, farmer organizations, private sector actors, youth and women's groups, and development partners.

To safeguard IFAD's reputation, communication will emphasize transparency, accuracy, and alignment with IFAD's corporate messages, while monitoring public narratives to identify and address potential risks early. Regular updates on progress, success stories and innovations will be shared through IFAD's country teams and regional communication channels, ensuring coherence with broader corporate communication priorities. By embedding communication within the grant's knowledge management and policy engagement processes, the project will ensure that IFAD's contributions are visible, valued, and clearly associated with positive outcomes in agroecology, climate resilience, and rural livelihoods.

Annex 1: Logical Framework

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
Goal	To contribute to more resilient, inclusive, and sustainable agrifood systems in the target countries by strengthening evidence-based policymaking, enhancing multi-actor learning, and scaling agroecological innovations through improved knowledge systems, strategic communication, and regional collaboration.	At project start, the enabling environment for scaling agroecological innovations in the target countries is weak, with limited evidence-based policymaking, fragmented knowledge systems, and insufficient multi-actor coordination. Knowledge products are not systematically generated or used to inform policy; digital platforms for sharing agroecological evidence are underdeveloped or not widely used; and communication channels between research institutions, farmer organizations and policymakers remain ad	By the end of the project, national and regional agricultural innovation systems in the target countries demonstrate significantly improved capacity to generate, share and use evidence for agroecological transformation, with strengthened multi-actor platforms, institutionalized knowledge systems, and increased uptake of agroecological innovations in	Project M&E system, including quarterly and annual progress reports Knowledge product registry (briefs, evidence data, dashboards, case studies) Digital platform analytics (user numbers, engagement metrics, downloads, interactions) Reports from national and regional learning events	Quarterly	Technical lead	Policy and Institutional Environment • Governments remain committed to agroecology, climate resilience and evidence-based policymaking. • National agricultural strategies and investment plans remain open to integrating new evidence and innovations. • Key ministries (Agriculture, Environment, Research, Planning) maintain stable leadership and engagement. 2. Stakeholder Engagement and Collaboration • Research institutions, farmer organizations and private sector actors continue to participate actively in multi-actor platforms.

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
		hoc. Regional collaboration mechanisms exist but are not effectively leveraged to harmonize approaches or accelerate scaling. As a result, agroecological innovations remain localized, with limited uptake in national policies, investment plans or extension systems.	policies, investment plans and extension practices. Evidence-based decision-making is routinely applied in policy processes, regional collaboration mechanisms are functioning effectively, and scaling pathways for key innovations are operationalized, contributing to more resilient, inclusive and sustainable agrifood systems.	(attendance lists, proceedings, outcomes) Policy engagement documentation (policy briefs, meeting minutes, policy submissions, citations of project evidence in policy documents) Supervision mission aide-mémoire and GSRs (assessing evidence use, institutional changes, scaling progress) Partner reports from ministries, research institutions, farmer			• Regional bodies (e.g., SADC, AUDA-NEPAD) remain willing to support cross-country learning and harmonization. • Partners share data, evidence and lessons in a timely and transparent manner. 3. Knowledge Systems and Digital Infrastructure • Digital platforms remain accessible, functional and adequately maintained by national or regional institutions. • Stakeholders have sufficient connectivity and digital literacy to use knowledge platforms and tools. • Data availability and quality are adequate to support evidence generation and analysis.

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
				organizations and regional bodies Outcome harvesting or contribution analysis reports documenting policy influence and scaling pathways Endline assessment of knowledge systems, policy uptake and multi-actor collaboration			4. Political and Economic Stability ● No major political instability disrupts policy processes, learning events or regional collaboration. ● Economic conditions allow governments and partners to continue investing in agroecology and innovation systems. ● External shocks (e.g., pandemics, conflict) do not severely limit mobility, collaboration or data collection. 5. Implementation Capacity ● Implementing partners retain sufficient technical capacity to generate, synthesize and communicate evidence. ● Extension systems and research institutions remain

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
							functional and able to support scaling pathways. • Adequate staffing and institutional memory are maintained throughout the project period. 6. Funding and Resource Availability • Project funds are disbursed on time to support KM, communication, and learning activities. • Co-financing or complementary investments from governments and partners remain available.
Development objective	To strengthen national and regional knowledge, innovation, and policy systems so that evidence-based agroecological	At project start, national and regional systems for generating, sharing and applying evidence on agroecological innovations are weak and fragmented. Knowledge flows between	By the end of the project, national and regional knowledge, innovation and policy systems are functioning more	Project M&E system reports (quarterly and annual), documenting progress in evidence generation, learning events, platform	Quartely	Technical lead /M&E/ KM	1. Policy and Institutional Environment Governments remain committed to agroecology, climate resilience and evidence-based decision-making. National agricultural strategies and investment plans remain open to

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
	solutions can be scaled effectively, equitably, and sustainably across the target countries	research institutions, extension systems, farmer organizations, and policymakers are limited, with no structured mechanisms for synthesizing evidence or informing policy processes. Digital knowledge platforms exist in some countries but are underutilized, poorly maintained, or not linked to decision-making. Multi-actor learning platforms operate inconsistently, with low participation and limited influence on policy or investment planning. Scaling pathways for agroecological innovations are largely undocumented, and evidence rarely informs national agricultural	effectively, with evidence on agroecological innovations routinely generated, shared and applied in decision-making. Multi-actor platforms are active and influencing policy processes; digital knowledge systems are institutionalized and widely used; and at least several agroecological innovations have clear, operational scaling pathways adopted by governments or partners. As a result, countries	functionality and policy engagement. Knowledge product registry tracking all briefs, synthesis notes, dashboards, case studies and scaling pathway documents produced under SCALE. Digital platform analytics (user statistics, downloads, engagement metrics) from national and regional knowledge platforms supported by the project. Minutes and reports from multi-actor platforms (national		Lead	integrating new evidence and innovations. Key ministries (Agriculture, Environment, Research, Planning) maintain stable leadership and remain engaged in project-supported processes. Policy windows (e.g., NAIP revisions, sector reviews) remain available during the project period. 2. Stakeholder Engagement and Collaboration Research institutions, farmer organizations, private sector actors and civil society continue to participate actively in multi-actor platforms. Regional bodies (e.g., SADC, AUDA-NEPAD) remain willing to

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
		strategies, investment plans or extension curricula. Regional coordination mechanisms (e.g., SADC, AUDA-NEPAD) are not systematically leveraged to harmonize approaches or support cross-country learning.	demonstrate stronger capacity to scale agroecological solutions in a coordinated, evidence-driven and sustainable manner.	and regional), including attendance lists, decisions taken and follow-up actions. Policy engagement documentation, such as policy briefs submitted, citations of project evidence in policy documents, and records of technical inputs to national agricultural strategies or investment plans. Supervision mission aide-mémoire and GSRs, assessing evidence use, institutional strengthening, and			support cross-country learning and harmonization. Partners share data, evidence and lessons in a timely and transparent manner. Farmer organizations and community-level actors remain willing to engage in learning and scaling processes. 3. Knowledge Systems and Digital Infrastructure Digital platforms remain accessible, functional and adequately maintained by national or regional institutions. Stakeholders have sufficient connectivity and digital literacy to use knowledge platforms and tools.

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
				progress on scaling pathways. Partner reports from ministries, research institutions, farmer organizations and regional bodies (e.g., SADC, AUDA-NEPAD) confirming use of evidence and participation in learning processes. Outcome harvesting or contribution analysis reports documenting policy influence, institutional changes and scaling outcomes.			Data availability and quality are adequate to support evidence generation, analysis and monitoring. No major disruptions affect the ability to collect, store or share knowledge. 4. Political, Economic and Environmental Stability No major political instability disrupts policy processes, learning events or regional collaboration. Economic conditions allow governments and partners to continue investing in agroecology and innovation systems. External shocks (e.g., pandemics, conflict, extreme climate events) do not severely limit mobility, collaboration or data collection.

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
				Endline assessment of knowledge systems, policy uptake, platform functionality and multi-actor collaboration.			Food system crises do not shift government priorities away from agroecology and innovation. 5. Implementation Capacity Implementing partners retain sufficient technical capacity to generate, synthesize and communicate evidence. Extension systems and research institutions remain functional and able to support scaling pathways. Adequate staffing and institutional memory are maintained throughout the project period. National and regional partners remain committed to institutionalizing knowledge systems beyond the project. 6. Funding and Resource Availability

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
							Project funds are disbursed on time to support KM, communication and learning activities. Co-financing or complementary investments from governments and partners remain available. Institutions have the resources to maintain digital platforms and learning mechanisms after project support ends.
Outcomes Component 1	Policy frameworks and evidence-based advocacy strategies	At project start, policy frameworks at national and regional levels only partially integrate agroecology, and evidence-based advocacy mechanisms are weak or inconsistently applied. National Agricultural Investment Plans (NAIPs), extension policies and climate strategies reference sustainable agriculture but	By the end of the project, agroecology and evidence-based innovation pathways are explicitly integrated into national and regional policy frameworks, including NAIPs, extension strategies	1. Policy Documents and Official Government Records Updated National Agricultural Investment Plans (NAIPs) Revised extension policies, climate strategies, or food systems plans	Annually	Technical/ M&E/KM Leads	1. Policy and Political Environment Governments remain committed to agroecology, climate resilience and evidence-based policymaking. Policy windows (e.g., NAIP revisions, extension reforms, climate strategy updates) remain open during the project period.

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
		lack operational guidance, data, or investment pathways for agroecological scaling. Evidence generated by research institutions is not systematically synthesized or communicated to policymakers, and policy processes rarely draw on structured evidence. Multi-actor platforms exist in some countries but are under-resourced, irregular, and have limited influence on policy decisions. Regional bodies such as SADC and AUDA-NEPAD have frameworks that support agroecology, but coordination with national systems is limited, and cross-country learning is ad hoc. Overall, advocacy efforts are fragmented,	and climate-resilience plans. Multi-actor platforms are active, institutionalized and influencing policy decisions, with regular participation from government, research institutions, farmer organizations and regional bodies. Evidence generated by SCALE is routinely synthesized into policy-ready formats and used in national policy dialogues, sector working groups and regional	Official policy guidelines, strategies, or regulations referencing agroecology or SCALE evidence Government gazettes or ministry circulars documenting policy changes 2. Records of Policy Engagement Minutes and reports from sector working groups, technical committees, and policy dialogue meetings Documentation of technical inputs submitted by			Political leadership in key ministries (Agriculture, Environment, Planning, Research) remains stable enough to sustain engagement. No major political shifts deprioritize agroecology or sustainable agriculture. 2. Institutional Willingness and Capacity Ministries and public agencies are willing to integrate new evidence into policy processes. Research institutions and extension systems maintain sufficient capacity to engage in evidence generation and policy dialogue. National and regional institutions are willing to adopt or institutionalize scaling pathways developed through SCALE.

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
		reactive rather than strategic, and not grounded in robust, policy-ready evidence.	coordination mechanisms. At least several policy or institutional changes reflect SCALE-supported evidence, and governments or regional bodies adopt clear, operational scaling pathways for agroecological innovations. Advocacy efforts are strategic, coordinated and grounded in robust evidence, contributing to stronger enabling environments for sustainable agrifood system transformation	SCALE to ministries or regional bodies Citations of SCALE evidence in policy drafts, strategy papers, or investment plans 3. Knowledge and Evidence Products Registry of policy briefs, evidence syntheses, scaling pathway documents, and analytical notes produced by SCALE Dissemination logs showing which institutions received which evidence products			Government partners allocate staff time to participate in multi-actor platforms and policy dialogues. 3. Stakeholder Engagement and Collaboration Farmer organizations, civil society, private sector actors and research institutions continue to participate actively in multi-actor platforms. Regional bodies (SADC, AUDA-NEPAD) remain open to using SCALE evidence and supporting harmonization efforts. Stakeholders share data, evidence and lessons transparently and in a timely manner. Advocacy coalitions remain functional and collaborative.

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
				Feedback forms from policymakers on the usefulness of evidence 4. Multi-Actor Platform Documentation Meeting minutes, attendance lists, and action points from national and regional multi-actor platforms Annual reports from platforms showing decisions taken or recommendations adopted Records of cross-country learning events and their outputs			4. Knowledge Systems and Digital Infrastructure Digital platforms remain accessible, functional and adequately maintained by national or regional institutions. Stakeholders have sufficient connectivity and digital literacy to access and use evidence products. Data availability and quality are adequate to support evidence-based policy analysis. No major disruptions affect the ability to collect, store or share knowledge. 5. Economic, Social and Environmental Stability No major economic crisis diverts government attention or resources

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
				5. Regional Body Documentation SADC, AUDA-NEPAD or other regional institutions' reports referencing SCALE evidence Regional policy frameworks or communiqués incorporating SCALE-supported recommendations Proceedings from regional dialogues or harmonization workshops 6. Project M&E and Supervision Reports Quarterly and annual progress reports			away from agroecology and innovation systems. External shocks (pandemics, conflict, extreme climate events) do not severely limit mobility, collaboration or policy processes. Food system pressures do not shift policy priorities toward short-term productivity at the expense of sustainability. 6. Funding and Resource Availability Project funds for policy engagement, evidence generation and advocacy are disbursed on time. Governments and partners maintain or increase investment in agroecology and innovation systems.

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
				Supervision mission aide-mémoire and GSRs documenting policy influence Outcome harvesting or contribution analysis reports Endline assessment of policy uptake and advocacy effectiveness 7. Digital and Communication Analytics Website and platform analytics showing access to policy-related evidence			Regional bodies have resources to participate in harmonization and learning processes.

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
				Media monitoring reports capturing references to SCALE's policy messages Social media analytics for policy-focused communication campaigns			
Outputs Component 1	Output 1: Policy-ready evidence generated, synthesized, and disseminated Output 2: Structured policy engagement mechanisms established and operational Regular policy dialogues are	At project start, there is no systematic production of policy-ready evidence on agroecological innovations in the target countries. Existing research outputs are fragmented, largely academic, and not synthesized into actionable formats for policymakers. Few or no policy briefs, evidence syntheses, or scaling pathway documents exist, and dissemination	By the end of the project, a robust and institutionalized system for generating, synthesizing and disseminating policy-ready evidence on agroecological innovations is fully operational. High-quality	Knowledge Product Registry Centralized database or tracker listing all policy briefs, synthesis notes, dashboards, case studies, and scaling pathway documents produced under SCALE. Includes metadata: date, author, theme,	Annually	Technical/ M&E/KM Leads	1. Institutional and Policy Environment Government ministries remain open to receiving and using evidence on agroecology. Policy processes (e.g., NAIP revisions, extension reforms, climate strategies) remain active and accessible during the project period.

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
	convened at national and regional levels. Output 3: Multi-actor platforms strengthened to influence policy processes Output 4: Regional alignment and harmonization on agroecology evidence strengthened Output 5: Advocacy strategies developed and institutionalized	channels are weak or ad hoc. Knowledge products are not tailored to decision-makers' needs, and there is no centralized registry or digital platform consistently used to share evidence. Engagement between research institutions and ministries is limited, resulting in minimal demand for or use of evidence in policy processes. Overall, the baseline level of structured, policy-oriented evidence generation and dissemination is low to non-existent.	evidence products—including policy briefs, synthesis notes, dashboards, case studies and scaling pathway documents—are regularly produced, widely disseminated and actively used by policymakers, research institutions and regional bodies. A centralized knowledge product registry and digital dissemination platform are functional and maintained by national partners. Evidence generated	target audience, dissemination status. 2. Digital Platform Analytics Website/platform analytics showing: Number of downloads Page views User engagement Geographic and institutional reach Analytics from national or regional knowledge platforms hosting SCALE products.			No major political changes deprioritize agroecology, innovation systems, or evidence-based policymaking. 2. Stakeholder Engagement Research institutions, universities, and technical agencies are willing to collaborate and share data. Policymakers and technical officers are available and willing to participate in evidence dissemination events. Farmer organizations and civil society actors remain engaged in co-producing and validating evidence. 3. Data Availability and Quality Relevant data on agroecological innovations, climate resilience, and farming systems is available and accessible.

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
			through SCALE is routinely referenced in national policy dialogues, sector working groups and regional coordination processes, contributing to informed decision-making and the integration of agroecology into key policy framework	3. Dissemination Logs and Distribution Lists Records of evidence products shared with ministries, research institutions, farmer organizations, regional bodies, and multi-actor platforms. Email distribution lists, workshop packets, and digital dissemination reports. 4. Policy Dialogue and Event Reports Minutes, attendance lists, and proceedings from: Policy dialogues			National partners maintain adequate data collection systems to support evidence synthesis. No major disruptions (e.g., data loss, institutional restructuring) affect access to key datasets. 4. Digital and Knowledge Infrastructure Digital platforms used for dissemination remain functional, accessible, and maintained by national or regional institutions. Stakeholders have sufficient connectivity and digital literacy to access evidence products. No major cyber or technical disruptions limit the ability to share knowledge products.

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
				Sector working groups Technical committee meetings Dissemination events Documentation showing evidence was presented or discussed. 5. Citations in Policy Documents References to SCALE evidence in: NAIPs Extension strategies Climate policies			5. Operational Capacity SCALE partners retain the technical capacity to generate high-quality evidence products. Staff turnover in ministries and research institutions does not significantly disrupt collaboration. Adequate time and resources are available for evidence synthesis, peer review, and dissemination. 6. Funding and Resource Availability Project funds for evidence generation, synthesis, and dissemination are disbursed on time. Government and partner institutions allocate staff time and logistical support for evidence-related activities.

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
				Food systems plans Regional frameworks (e.g., SADC, AUDA-NEPAD) 6. Project M&E and Supervision Reports Quarterly and annual progress reports Supervision mission aide-mémoire and GSRs Outcome harvesting or contribution analysis reports documenting evidence uptake 7. Partner Reports Reports from ministries, research			Complementary initiatives (e.g., DeSIRA+, national AIS programmes) continue to support evidence generation. 7. External Stability No major crises (pandemics, conflict, extreme climate events) disrupt data collection, research activities, or policy engagement. Economic conditions allow governments to continue prioritizing sustainable agriculture and innovation systems.

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
				institutions, and regional bodies confirming receipt and use of evidence products. Feedback forms or surveys from policymakers on the usefulness of evidence.			
Outcomes Component 2	Enhanced national and regional capacity to generate, share and apply agroecological knowledge through strengthened partnerships, active learning networks and strategic alliances that facilitate coordinated action, cross-country learning and the	At project start, knowledge exchange on agroecology across national and regional institutions is limited, fragmented and largely ad hoc. Existing partnerships between research institutions, extension systems, farmer organizations and regional bodies are weak or operate in isolation, with minimal coordination or shared learning agendas.	By the end of the project, national and regional institutions actively participate in well-functioning knowledge exchange mechanisms and strategic alliances that facilitate continuous learning, coordinated action	1. Documentation from Knowledge-Sharing Platforms Minutes, attendance lists and action points from national and regional learning platforms Reports from communities of practice (CoPs)	Quartley	Technical/ M&E/KM Leads	1. Institutional Commitment and Stability National and regional institutions remain committed to participating in knowledge-sharing processes. Leadership in key ministries, research institutions and regional bodies remains stable enough to sustain partnerships.

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
	scaling of evidence-based innovations.	Cross-country learning mechanisms are either absent or inactive, and there are no structured platforms for systematic exchange of evidence, innovations or policy lessons. Strategic alliances for scaling agroecological solutions are underdeveloped, with few formalized collaborations, limited resource sharing and minimal engagement from regional bodies such as SADC or AUDA-NEPAD. Overall, knowledge flows are slow, inconsistent and not institutionalized, reducing the ability of countries to learn from each other or coordinate scaling efforts	and the uptake of agroecological innovations. Multi-actor networks and regional platforms are institutionalized, regularly sharing evidence, tools and experiences, while strategic partnerships between governments, research institutions, farmer organizations and regional bodies drive joint initiatives and harmonized approaches to scaling agroecology.	Records of cross-country learning events, exchange visits and peer-to-peer sessions Platform workplans and annual reports showing activities and outputs 2. Partnership and Alliance Records Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs), collaboration agreements or joint workplans between institutions Reports from strategic alliances (government–research–farmer			Government priorities continue to support agroecology, innovation systems and regional collaboration. 2. Stakeholder Engagement and Collaboration Research institutions, farmer organizations, civil society and private sector actors remain willing to collaborate and share knowledge. Regional bodies (e.g., SADC, AUDA-NEPAD) continue to engage in learning platforms and joint initiatives. Stakeholders allocate time and resources to participate in learning events and alliances. 3. Functionality of Knowledge Platforms Digital and physical platforms for knowledge exchange remain

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
			Knowledge flows become timely, demand-driven and embedded in institutional processes, enabling countries to learn from each other and apply shared lessons in policy and practice.	organizations–regional bodies) Evidence of joint initiatives, co-produced knowledge products or coordinated activities 3. Digital Knowledge Platform Analytics User engagement data (logins, downloads, page views, active users) Upload and sharing statistics for knowledge products Participation metrics for online learning sessions or webinars			accessible, functional and adequately maintained. Stakeholders have sufficient digital literacy and connectivity to participate in online learning and knowledge sharing. No major technical disruptions affect the ability to host or access knowledge products. 4. Data Availability and Transparency Institutions continue to collect, store and share relevant data on agroecological innovations and scaling experiences. Partners are willing to share evidence, lessons and tools openly across countries and institutions.

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
				4. Project M&E and Supervision Reports Quarterly and annual progress reports documenting knowledge exchange and partnership activities Supervision mission aide-mémoire and GSRs assessing functionality of alliances and learning networks Outcome harvesting or contribution analysis reports capturing changes in collaboration and knowledge flows			No legal or institutional barriers emerge that restrict data sharing. 5. Regional and Cross-Country Coordination Regional bodies maintain interest in harmonizing approaches to agroecology and innovation systems. Cross-country travel and virtual collaboration remain feasible. Countries remain open to adopting or adapting lessons from peers. 6. External Stability No major crises (pandemics, conflict, extreme climate events) disrupt learning events, travel or regional coordination.

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
				5. Regional Body Documentation SADC, AUDA-NEPAD or other regional institutions' reports referencing SCALE knowledge or participation Proceedings from regional harmonization workshops or policy dialogues Regional learning agendas or frameworks developed with SCALE support 6. Feedback and Evaluation Tools			Economic conditions allow governments and institutions to continue investing in knowledge exchange and partnerships. 7. Funding and Resource Availability Project funds for learning events, partnerships and knowledge exchange are disbursed on time. National and regional partners allocate staff time and operational resources to sustain alliances. Complementary initiatives (e.g., DeSIRA+, AIS programmes) continue to support knowledge exchange.

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
				Surveys or feedback forms from participants in learning events Stakeholder assessments of partnership effectiveness Endline evaluation of knowledge exchange systems and alliances			
Outputs Component 2	Output 1: Functional national and regional knowledge-sharing platforms established and strengthened Output 2: Cross-country learning and exchange processes institutionalized	Output 1: Functional national and regional knowledge-sharing platforms established and strengthened Baseline: At project start, national and regional knowledge-sharing platforms on agroecology	Output 1: Functional national and regional knowledge-sharing platforms established and strengthened End Target: By the end of the project, national	Output 1: Functional national and regional knowledge-sharing platforms established and strengthened Sources of Verification Meeting minutes, attendance lists and action points from	Quarterly	Technical/ M&E/KM Leads	Output 1: Functional national and regional knowledge-sharing platforms established and strengthened Assumptions Key institutions (ministries, research bodies, farmer organizations) remain willing to participate in platforms.

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
	Output 3: Strategic alliances formalized and operational Output 4: Regional coordination and harmonization strengthened Output 5: Knowledge products co-created and disseminated through alliances	are either non-existent, inactive, or operating irregularly. Existing platforms lack structured agendas, clear mandates, or consistent participation from key actors such as ministries, research institutions, farmer organizations and regional bodies. Documentation of meetings, learning outputs or follow-up actions is minimal or absent. Digital spaces for knowledge exchange are fragmented and not widely used. Output 2: Cross-country learning and exchange processes institutionalized Baseline: Cross-country learning on agroecology is limited,	and regional knowledge-sharing platforms on agroecology are fully functional, meeting regularly with structured agendas, diverse participation and documented outputs. At least 3–4 national platforms and 1–2 regional platforms are institutionalized within partner institutions, producing actionable recommendations and maintaining active digital spaces for continuous	national and regional platforms Annual or quarterly platform reports documenting activities and outputs Platform workplans, TORs and institutionalization documents Records of community-of-practice (CoP) sessions Digital platform usage logs (uploads, interactions, active users) Output 2: Cross-country learning and			Regional bodies (e.g., SADC, AUDA-NEPAD) maintain interest in agroecology and innovation systems. Digital and physical meeting infrastructure remains functional and accessible. No major political or institutional disruptions affect platform participation. Stakeholders allocate staff time to attend and contribute to platform activities. Output 2: Cross-country learning and exchange processes institutionalized Assumptions Countries remain open to sharing experiences, tools and lessons.

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
		informal and largely ad hoc. There are no established mechanisms for peer-to-peer learning, exchange visits, or virtual learning sessions. Countries rarely share comparative experiences, tools or lessons, and no joint learning agendas exist. Learning events, when they occur, are project-specific and not institutionalized within national or regional systems. Output 3: Strategic alliances formalized and operational Baseline: Strategic alliances between governments, research institutions, farmer	knowledge exchange. Output 2: Cross-country learning and exchange processes institutionalized End Target: Cross-country learning is fully embedded in project and institutional practice, with at least 8–12 structured learning events (peer exchanges, virtual sessions, study tours) conducted and documented. Countries regularly share tools, lessons	exchange processes institutionalized Sources of Verification Reports from exchange visits, peer-to-peer learning events and virtual learning sessions Learning agendas and cross-country collaboration frameworks Comparative learning notes, case studies and synthesis documents Participant feedback forms and evaluation surveys			Travel and virtual collaboration remain feasible (no major crises or restrictions). Institutions maintain the capacity to document and share learning outputs. Partners are willing to align around a joint learning agenda. Funding is available for exchange visits, virtual sessions and learning events. Output 3: Strategic alliances formalized and operational Assumptions Institutions are willing to formalize partnerships through MoUs or joint workplans.

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
		organizations, private sector actors, and regional bodies are weak or absent. Collaboration is mostly informal, short-term, and project-driven, with no formal agreements, joint work plans, or coordinated initiatives. Resource-sharing arrangements are minimal, and there is no structured coordination mechanism to align actors around agroecological scaling. Output 4: Regional coordination and harmonization strengthened Baseline: Regional coordination on agroecology and innovation systems is limited and inconsistent. Engagement from regional bodies such	and innovations through established mechanisms, and at least one joint cross-country learning agenda is operational and updated annually. Output 3: Strategic alliances formalized and operational End Target: At least 3–5 strategic alliances between governments, research institutions, farmer organizations, private sector actors and regional bodies are	Event recordings, presentations and shared materials Output 3: Strategic alliances formalized and operational Sources of Verification Signed MoUs, partnership agreements or joint workplans Reports from alliance coordination meetings Documentation of joint initiatives (co-produced products, pilots, studies)			Leadership within partner institutions remains stable enough to sustain alliances. Partners are motivated to co-invest time and resources in joint initiatives. No institutional barriers emerge that limit collaboration or resource sharing. Complementary programmes (e.g., DeSIRA+, AIS initiatives) continue to support alliance activities. Output 4: Regional coordination and harmonization strengthened Assumptions Regional bodies maintain interest in harmonizing agroecology and innovation system approaches.

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
		as SADC or AUDA-NEPAD is sporadic, and there are no established regional learning agendas or harmonization processes. Countries operate largely independently, with minimal alignment of approaches, tools or policy frameworks. Regional workshops or dialogues are infrequent and not linked to national processes. Output 5: Knowledge products co-created and disseminated through alliances Baseline: Co-creation of knowledge products across institutions and countries is rare. Most knowledge products are	formalized through MoUs or joint workplans. Alliances implement joint initiatives, co-produce knowledge products and coordinate activities that directly support agroecological scaling. Resource-sharing mechanisms are in place and functioning Output 4: Regional coordination and harmonization strengthened End Target:	Resource-sharing agreements or cost-sharing arrangements Alliance progress reports submitted by partner institutions Output 4: Regional coordination and harmonization strengthened Sources of Verification SADC, AUDA-NEPAD or other regional body reports referencing SCALE activities Proceedings from regional harmonization			Countries remain committed to participating in regional coordination processes. Regional workshops and dialogues can be convened without major disruptions. Political conditions remain conducive to cross-country alignment. Regional institutions have sufficient capacity to engage with and use SCALE evidence. Output 5: Knowledge products co-created and disseminated through alliances Assumptions Institutions are willing to co-produce knowledge products and share authorship.

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
		produced in isolation by individual projects or institutions, with little collaboration or peer review. Dissemination is weak, uncoordinated and not targeted to specific audiences. There is no shared repository for storing or accessing knowledge products, and regional partners are not involved in co-production or dissemination.	Regional coordination mechanisms are active and recognized by participating countries, with SADC, AUDA-NEPAD or similar bodies regularly engaging in learning events and using SCALE evidence. At least 2 regional harmonization workshops are held, and one regional learning agenda or framework is developed and adopted to guide agroecological	workshops or policy dialogues Regional learning agendas, frameworks or guidelines developed Records of regional technical working group meetings Evidence of country participation in regional coordination processes Output 5: Knowledge products co-created and disseminated through alliances Sources of Verification			Data and evidence remain accessible for synthesis and co-creation. Digital platforms for storing and disseminating knowledge remain functional. Policymakers, researchers and farmer organizations remain engaged as target audiences. No legal or institutional barriers restrict sharing of knowledge products across countries.

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
			scaling across countries. Output 5: Knowledge products co-created and disseminated through alliances End Target: At least 10–15 co-created knowledge products (synthesis notes, case studies, toolkits, comparative analyses) are produced and disseminated through coordinated channels. A shared repository is fully functional and widely used by	Repository or registry of co-created knowledge products (toolkits, case studies, synthesis notes) Dissemination logs and distribution lists Digital analytics showing downloads, views and user engagement Co-authorship records showing multi-institutional collaboration Feedback from users (ministries, research institutions, farmer organizations)			

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
			national and regional partners. Knowledge products reach hundreds of users, and evidence is regularly referenced in learning events and alliance activities.				
Outcome Component 3:	Communication and dissemination to farmers, entrepreneurs and communities	At project start, communication systems for sharing agroecological knowledge with farmers, entrepreneurs and rural communities are weak, fragmented and largely project-specific. There is no coordinated national or regional communication strategy, and existing materials are often technical, inaccessible, and not adapted to local languages or literacy levels.	By the end of the project, farmers, entrepreneurs and rural communities across all target countries have significantly improved access to clear, actionable and locally adapted agroecological information through coordinated, multi-channel	1. Communication Reach and Engagement Data Analytics from digital platforms (SMS systems, WhatsApp groups, mobile apps, websites) Radio station broadcast logs and listener reach reports	Annually	Technical/ M&E/KM Leads	1. Institutional Commitment and Coordination Government agencies, extension services, farmer organizations and media partners remain committed to participating in coordinated communication efforts. National institutions continue to prioritize agroecology and are willing to integrate SCALE messages into their communication channels.

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
		Dissemination channels—such as radio, digital platforms, extension networks, farmer organizations and community groups—are underutilized or operate in isolation. As a result, awareness and understanding of agroecological practices, innovations and market opportunities among farmers, youth, women and agri-SMEs is low. Two-way communication mechanisms are minimal or absent, limiting the ability of communities to provide feedback or influence knowledge products. Overall, communication reach, relevance and effectiveness are limited, slowing the spread and	communication systems. At least 60–70% of target groups are regularly reached through radio, digital platforms, extension networks, farmer organizations and community-based channels. Communication products are available in local languages and accessible formats, and two-way communication mechanisms enable communities to provide feedback, share experiences and influence content. As a	Social media engagement metrics (views, shares, comments) Distribution records for printed materials (leaflets, posters, guides) 2. Community-Level Feedback and Assessment Tools Surveys and feedback forms from farmers, youth, women and SMEs Focus group discussion (FGD) reports Community scorecards or			Leadership stability allows communication strategies to be implemented consistently. 2. Stakeholder Engagement and Participation Farmers, youth, women and agri-entrepreneurs remain willing to engage with communication channels and provide feedback. Community-based organizations and cooperatives continue to support dissemination activities. Private sector actors (e.g., agri-input dealers, local media) remain open to collaboration. 3. Functionality of Communication Channels

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
		uptake of agroecological innovations.	result, awareness and understanding of agroecological practices, innovations and market opportunities increase substantially, supporting greater readiness for adoption and scaling.	participatory monitoring tools Feedback collected through digital channels (SMS polls, WhatsApp responses) 3. Extension and Farmer Organization Reports Reports from extension services documenting dissemination activities Farmer organization communication logs and meeting minutes Records of community dialogues, field days			Radio stations, digital platforms, SMS systems and community networks remain operational and accessible. Internet and mobile connectivity remain stable enough to support digital dissemination. No major disruptions affect the availability of communication infrastructure. 4. Accessibility and Relevance of Content Local languages and cultural norms remain stable enough to allow effective translation and adaptation of materials. Partners are willing to co-create content that is relevant and accessible to diverse audiences.

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
				and demonstration events Training reports showing communication integration 4. Project M&E and Supervision Documentation Quarterly and annual progress reports Supervision mission aide-mémoire and GSRs Outcome harvesting or contribution analysis reports capturing changes in awareness and understanding			Literacy levels and digital literacy do not decline in ways that would limit uptake. 5. Data Availability and Feedback Mechanisms Communities are willing and able to provide feedback through digital or in-person mechanisms. Institutions maintain systems to collect, analyze and use feedback to improve communication. No legal or institutional barriers emerge that restrict data sharing or feedback collection. 6. External Stability No major crises (conflict, pandemics, extreme climate events) disrupt communication channels or community engagement.

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
				Mid-term and endline evaluation reports 5. Communication Product Registry Repository of communication materials (audio, visual, print, digital) Records showing translation into local languages and adaptation to literacy levels Co-creation documentation with communities or farmer groups 6. Partner and Media Reports			Economic conditions allow households to maintain access to radios, phones and community networks. 7. Funding and Resource Availability Project funds for communication activities are disbursed on time. Media partners, extension services and farmer organizations have adequate resources to support dissemination. Complementary programmes (e.g., AIS, digital agriculture initiatives) continue to reinforce communication efforts.

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
				Reports from radio stations, community media, and local communication partners Documentation from NGOs, cooperatives and private sector partners involved in dissemination Evidence of cross-institutioncommunication campaigns			
Outputs Component 3:	Output 1: Communication strategies and plans developed and operationalized Output 2: Locally adapted communication	Output 1: Communication strategies and plans developed and operationalized Baseline: No national or regional communication strategies for agroecology exist.	Output 1: Communication strategies and plans developed and operationalized End Target: By project end, national and	Output 1: Communication strategies and plans developed and operationalized Sources of Verification Approved national and regional	Quarterly	Technical/ M&E/KM Leads	Output 1: Communication strategies and plans developed and operationalized Assumptions Government institutions and partners remain committed to developing and adopting communication strategies.

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
	products developed and disseminated Output 3: Multi-channel dissemination systems established and strengthened Output 4: Community feedback and two-way communication mechanisms established Output 5: Capacity of communication actors strengthened Output 6: Communication partnerships formalized and coordinated	Communication efforts are fragmented, project-specific and uncoordinated. There are no audience-segmented communication plans, and key messages are not harmonized across institutions or countries. Output 2: Locally adapted communication products developed and disseminated Baseline: Few or no communication products are available in local languages or accessible formats. Existing materials are highly technical, not adapted to literacy levels, and rarely tailored to farmers, youth, women or	regional communication strategies for agroecology are fully developed, validated and implemented in all participating countries. Audience-segmented communication plans (farmers, youth, women, SMEs) are operational, and harmonized key messages are used consistently across institutions and countries. Output 2: Locally adapted communication	communication strategies Audience-segmented communication plans (farmers, youth, women, SMEs) Records of validation workshops and stakeholder consultations Official adoption letters or institutional memos Annual communication implementation reports Output 2: Locally adapted communication			Stakeholders (ministries, extension services, farmer organizations) are willing to harmonize messages and coordinate communication efforts. Sufficient technical expertise is available to support strategy development. No major political or institutional disruptions delay validation processes. Output 2: Locally adapted communication products developed and disseminated Assumptions Local languages, cultural norms and literacy levels remain stable enough to guide adaptation. Communities and farmer organizations are willing to participate in co-creation of materials.

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
		SMEs. Dissemination of existing materials is limited and inconsistent. Output 3: Multi-channel dissemination systems established and strengthened Baseline: Radio, digital platforms, SMS systems, extension networks, and community-based channels are underutilized or operate independently. There is no coordinated multi-channel dissemination system. Digital tools (SMS, WhatsApp, mobile apps) are minimally used for agroecology communication.	products developed and disseminated End Target: At least 20–30 communication products are produced in local languages and accessible formats (audio, visual, print, digital). All products are tailored to literacy levels and cultural contexts, and disseminated widely through coordinated channels. Content includes radio scripts, infographics, practice guides, short videos, SMS	products developed and disseminated Sources of Verification Repository of communication materials (audio, visual, print, digital) Translation records and language adaptation documentation Dissemination logs showing distribution volumes and channels Samples of radio scripts, infographics, videos, SMS content, posters			Technical teams have access to accurate agroecological content for translation and adaptation. No legal or copyright barriers restrict adaptation or dissemination of content. Output 3: Multi-channel dissemination systems established and strengthened Assumptions Radio stations, digital platforms, SMS systems and extension networks remain functional and accessible. Mobile and internet connectivity remain stable enough to support digital dissemination. Media partners and ICT providers remain willing to collaborate.

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
		Output 4: Community feedback and two-way communication mechanisms established Baseline: Two-way communication mechanisms are weak or non-existent. Communities have limited opportunities to provide feedback or influence communication content. No structured tools (SMS polls, community scorecards, WhatsApp groups) are in place to capture community perspectives. Output 5: Capacity of communication actors strengthened Baseline: Extension agents, farmer organizations, youth groups, and local media	content and farmer stories. Output 3: Multi-channel dissemination systems established and strengthened End Target: A fully functional multi-channel dissemination system is operational in all target countries, integrating radio, extension networks, digital platforms, SMS/WhatsApp systems and community-based channels. At least 60–70% of target farmers, youth,	User feedback on relevance and accessibility of materials Output 3: Multi-channel dissemination systems established and strengthened Sources of Verification Radio broadcast logs and programme schedules Analytics from digital platforms (SMS systems, WhatsApp groups, mobile apps, websites) Extension service dissemination reports			Communities continue to use and trust the selected communication channels. Output 4: Community feedback and two-way communication mechanisms established Assumptions Communities are willing to provide feedback through digital or in-person mechanisms. Institutions commit to using feedback to improve communication products. Digital tools (SMS, WhatsApp) remain accessible and affordable for communities. No cultural or institutional barriers prevent open feedback from farmers or SMEs.

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
		have limited capacity in participatory communication, content creation, translation, and digital dissemination. No structured training programmes exist to strengthen communication skills related to agroecology. Output 6: Communication partnerships formalized and coordinated Baseline: Partnerships with radio stations, community media, ICT providers, farmer organizations, and private sector actors are informal or absent. There are no formal agreements or coordinated communication campaigns.	women and SMEs are reached at least twice per year through these channels. Output 4: Community feedback and two-way communication mechanisms established End Target: Structured two-way communication mechanisms (SMS polls, WhatsApp groups, community scorecards, FGDs) are established and used regularly in all participating countries. Community	Community dialogue and field-day reports Records from farmer organizations and cooperatives documenting outreach Output 4: Community feedback and two-way communication mechanisms established Sources of Verification Feedback reports from SMS polls, WhatsApp groups, and digital surveys			Output 5: Capacity of communication actors strengthened Assumptions Extension agents, farmer organizations, youth groups and media partners are available and willing to participate in training. Institutions allocate staff time for capacity-building activities. Trainers and technical experts are available to deliver high-quality training. Staff turnover does not significantly undermine capacity gains. Output 6: Communication partnerships formalized and coordinated Assumptions

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
		Regional coordination on communication is minimal.	feedback is systematically collected, analyzed and integrated into communication products and planning processes. Output 5: Capacity of communication actors strengthened End Target: At least 200–300 communication actors (extension agents, farmer organizations, youth groups, local media, communication officers) are trained in participatory communication, content creation,	Community scorecards and participatory monitoring tools Focus group discussion (FGD) reports Documentation showing how feedback was integrated into communication products Meeting minutes from community feedback sessions Output 5: Capacity of communication actors strengthened Sources of Verification			Media houses, ICT providers, farmer organizations and private sector actors remain open to partnership agreements. Regional bodies support harmonized messaging and cross-country communication efforts. Partners see value in joint campaigns and are willing to co-invest resources. No regulatory or institutional barriers emerge that restrict partnership formation.

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
			translation, digital dissemination and community engagement. National institutions demonstrate improved capacity to manage and sustain communication systems. Output 6: Communication partnerships formalized and coordinated End Target: At least 10–15 formal communication partnerships are established with	Training attendance lists and participant profiles Training curricula, manuals and materials Pre- and post-training assessments Reports from extension services and farmer organizations on improved communication practices Certificates of completion or institutional training records			

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
			radio stations, community media, ICT providers, farmer organizations and private sector actors. Joint communication campaigns are implemented across countries, and regional coordination mechanisms support harmonized messaging and shared content.	Output 6: Communication partnerships formalized and coordinated Sources of Verification Signed MoUs, partnership agreements or contracts Joint communication campaign reports Meeting minutes from coordination meetings with media, ICT providers, farmer groups Records of shared content or co-produced			

Results hyerarchy	Indicators			Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	**Baseline**	**End target**	**Source**	**Freq.**	**Respons.**	
				communication materials Regional coordination reports documenting harmonized messaging			

Annex 2: Integrated Risk Matrix

Risk Categories	Inherent	Residual
Country Context, Sector strategies and policies		
Risk(s): Shifts in political priorities or limited government commitment to agroecology may slow policy uptake and weaken engagement in regional processes.		Yes
Mitigations: Align advocacy with national COSOP/CSN priorities; maintain continuous dialogue with ministries; use evidence-based policy products to demonstrate value; leverage regional bodies (e.g., SADC) to sustain momentum.		
Environment and Climate Context		
Risk(s): Climate shocks (droughts, floods) may disrupt stakeholder engagement, farmer participation, and communication activities.		Yes
Mitigations: Use digital platforms to maintain continuity; integrate climate-resilient messaging into all knowledge products; schedule activities flexibly around seasonal calendars.		
Project Scope		
Risk(s): Wide geographic and thematic scope may stretch partner capacities and dilute focus.	Yes	
Mitigations: Prioritize high-impact policy windows; sequence activities through AWPBs; use clear roles and responsibilities across BvAT, icipe, FiBL and national partners.		
Institutional Capacity for Implementation & Sustainability		
Risk(s): Variable capacity among partners to generate evidence, manage digital tools, or sustain alliances after project closure.	Yes	
Mitigations: Provide targeted capacity strengthening; embed tools and processes within existing institutions; develop sustainability plans early; ensure national ownership of platforms and knowledge products.		
Procurement		
Risk(s): Delays in procuring services, consultants, or communication materials may affect timelines.	Yes	
Mitigations: Use BvAT's established procurement systems; plan procurement early in the AWPB cycle; maintain a roster of pre-qualified service providers.		
Financial Management		
Risk(s): Weak financial reporting or delays in fund flows from sub-recipients could affect implementation.	Yes	
Mitigations: Apply BvAT's financial controls; conduct regular financial reviews; provide training to sub-recipients; ensure timely audits.		
Environment, Social and Climate Impact		
Risk(s): Risk of excluding vulnerable groups from policy processes or communication channels; insufficient integration of climate resilience in advocacy outputs.	Yes	
Mitigations: Apply IFAD's inclusion principles; ensure gender- and youth-responsive engagement; validate messages with communities; align all outputs with climate-smart and agroecological principles.		
Target group / Stakeholders		

Risk(s): Low engagement from farmers, youth, the private sector, or policymakers may limit uptake of knowledge and innovations.	Yes	
Mitigations: Co-design communication tools with target groups; use multiple ICT channels; strengthen alliances with farmer organizations; tailor messaging to stakeholder needs.		

Annex 4: Knowledge management (KM) and communication strategy

Project objectives	Specific Objectives for KM and Communications	Activities	Target audience and dissemination plan	Indicators	Budget
Include links to the objectives of the project, to highlight how KM and Communications activities will contribute to achieving project results.	• Ensure that lessons learned, good practices and innovations emerging from all components—especially policy engagement, digital knowledge systems and farmer-centred communication—are consistently captured, synthesized and used to inform adaptive management, AWPB revisions and strategic decision-making.	Knowledge Generation and Use for Decision making Objective: Strengthen systematic generation, synthesis and use of evidence to inform adaptive management and policy engagement. Key Activities • Establish a structured learning and evidence-capture system • Conduct quarterly learning reviews and produce short synthesis notes feeding into AWPB revisions (Quarterly) • Develop evidence dashboards and internal briefs summarizing	Policymakers and Government Institutions • Ministries of Agriculture, Environment, Climate, Gender and Youth • Parliamentary committees and policy analysts • Local government extension systems 2. Farmer Organizations and Rural Communities • Smallholder farmers, women's groups and youth associations • Cooperatives and producer organizations • Community-based organizations	Indicators • Number of learning reviews conducted per year. • Number of knowledge products produced (evidence notes, synthesis briefs, dashboards). • Percentage of AWPB revisions informed by documented lessons. • Number of policy processes supported with evidence	Define a budget for the KM activities, to be also included in the project AWPB.

	• Increase awareness among policymakers, farmer organizations, regional bodies, and development partners of IFAD's investments, achievements, and leadership in agroecology, digital knowledge exchange, and inclusive rural transformation, using targeted communication products and channels. • Develop and disseminate high-quality, user-friendly knowledge products	progress, lessons and emerging innovations (Bi-annually) • Integrate lessons into supervision missions and annual planning processes (Annually) 2. Visibility, Strategic Communication and Outreach Objective: Increase awareness of IFAD's role, results and innovations while mitigating reputational risks. Key Activities • Develop a communication plan aligned with IFAD visibility guidelines (updated annually). • Produce and disseminate communication products—success stories, newsletters, social	and local leaders 3. Research and Technical Partners • icipe, FiBL, universities and national research institutes • Technical working groups and thematic networks • Regional knowledge platforms 4. Regional and Continental Bodies • SADC, AU-DA NEPAD, regional farmer federations • Regional policy forums and technical committees 5. Private Sector Actors • Agri-SMEs, digital agriculture service providers	generated by the project. • Quality rating of knowledge products (clarity, relevance, usability) based on partner feedback. • Number of internal learning sessions held with IFAD country teams and partners. Monitoring Methods • Quarterly learning review reports. • KM product registry maintained by the KM focal point. • AWPB review minutes documenting evidence use.	

	(policy briefs, case studies, digital toolkits, multimedia content) tailored to the needs of different audiences, ensuring broad uptake across the three countries and at the regional level. ● Facilitate continuous learning among government institutions, research partners, farmer organizations, and private sector actors through digital platforms, regional exchanges, and structured learning events,	media content, short videos, radio scripts (Quarterly) ● Organize high-visibility events (launches, policy dialogues, regional exchanges) showcasing IFAD's contributions (1–2 per year). ● Monitor media and stakeholder perceptions to identify and address reputational risks (Quarterly) ● Ensure consistent IFAD branding across all digital platforms, knowledge products, and events (Continuous). Timeline: Starts in Year 1 with the communication plan; outreach and visibility activities	● Input suppliers, buyers and value-chain actors 6. IFAD Internal Audiences ● Country teams and ICOs ● Regional divisions and technical specialists ● IFAD's Programme of Loans and Grants (PoLG)	● Supervision mission aide-mémoires . ● Feedback surveys from government, research partners and IFAD teams. ● Internal KM logs and analytics from dashboards. 2. Knowledge Sharing, Communication and Visibility Indicators ● Number of communicatio n products produced (stories, videos, newsletters, radio scripts, social media posts). ● Reach and engagement metrics (website visits,	

	contributing to stronger partnerships and policy influence. ● Use communication and knowledge products to promote the uptake of innovations and approaches introduced by the grant, supporting their integration into national policies, IFAD's PoLG, and regional frameworks. ● Ensure that all public-facing information is accurate, timely, and aligned with IFAD's corporate	continue throughout implementation. 3. Multi-Actor Learning, Collaboration, and Scaling Pathways Objective: Strengthen learning and collaboration among governments, research institutions, farmer organizations, and regional bodies to support scaling. Key Activities ● Establish and maintain digital knowledge-exchange platforms ● Facilitate regional learning events and cross-country exchanges (Annually) ● Produce policy briefs, case studies, and toolkits to support scaling of innovations (Biannually). ● Support national and regional alliances (e.g.,		downloads, social media impressions, radio audience estimates). ● Number of high-visibility events organized with IFAD branding. ● Percentage of communication outputs compliant with IFAD visibility guidelines. ● Number of reputational risks identified and addressed through communication actions. ● Number of media mentions referencing IFAD's role in agroecology and innovation.	

	messaging, while monitoring and addressing emerging communication risks.	SADC platforms) to institutionalize learning and policy uptake (Continuous). ● Document and share scaling pathways and success factors in end-of-year learning reports (Annually).		Monitoring Methods ● Communications output tracker. ● Analytics from digital platforms, social media and radio partners. ● Event reports and attendance lists. ● IFAD visibility compliance checklist. ● Quarterly media monitoring summaries. ● Partner feedback on clarity and accessibility of communication products. 3. Multi-Actor Learning, Collaboration, and Scaling Pathways Indicators	

				• Number of national and regional learning events conducted annually. • Number of stakeholders participating in learning exchanges (disaggregated by gender, youth, institution). • Number of policy briefs, case studies and toolkits produced and disseminated. • Number of institutions actively using digital knowledge platforms. • Number of scaling pathways documented and shared	

				with IFAD and partners. ● Number of policy or institutional changes influenced by project evidence or learning processes. Monitoring Methods ● Event reports and participant registers. ● KM dissemination logs. ● Platform usage analytics (logins, downloads, interactions). ● Annual scaling pathway review reports. ● Outcome harvesting or contribution analysis for policy influence.	

				• Stakeholder feedback surveys after learning events. Integration into the Project M&E System • Indicators will be incorporated into the Results Framework with annual targets. • KM indicators will be tracked through a KM & Communications dashboard managed by the M&E team. • Quarterly and annual progress reports will include a dedicated KM section.	

				• Supervision missions will review KM outputs, uptake and influence. • Annual GSR reviews will assess progress and adjust KM priorities as needed. • KM staff will collaborate closely with M&E to ensure data quality, consistency and timely reporting.	