FOSTERING AGRICULTURE COMPETITIVENESS EMPLOYING INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES (FACET)

FINAL REPORT

OCTOBER 1, 2009 – SEPTEMBER 30, 2013

USAID Cooperative Agreement # EPP-A-00-09-00007-00

Table of Contents

I. Executive Summary 1
II. Project Overview 2
III. Results Achieved 3
A. Component 1: Knowledge Sharing, Analysis, and Toolkits 3
a. Conduct a Demand Survey 3
b. Expanded Web Presence 3
c. Development of Print and Online Materials 4
d. Knowledge sharing events, webinars and short workshops 5
e. Support of a Cross-Donor Alliance 5
f. Support Exemplary Impact Assessment(s) and Other Analysis 5
B. Component 2: Short term field support technical assistance 6
C. Summary of Results 7
IV. Learning 8

Annex 1. FACET File Public Download Count Report on Allnet page as of 9/30/13 11

September 2013

This document was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by FHI 360 on behalf of the Fostering Agriculture Competitiveness Employing Information and Communications Technologies (FACET) Project.

I. Executive Summary

The Fostering Agriculture Competitiveness Employing Information and Communications Technologies (FACET) project was a four-year initiative that ran from October 2009 through September 2013. The project focused on supporting the increased and improved use of information and communications technologies (ICTs) by USAID missions and implementing partners in sub-Saharan Africa in their work through knowledge sharing and short-term technical assistance components.

Despite being a relatively small project (total project budget of $1.3 million over four years), the FACET project was able to establish itself as a reputable and primary source of information and technical assistance at the intersection of ICT and agriculture in sub-Saharan Africa. This was accomplished through the publication of dozens of technical and practical publications, a diverse array of events, social media channels using the ICTforAg moniker, and field-based technical support to USAID missions and implementing partners.

Specifically, during its period of performance FACET:

- Published 71 briefing papers, profiles, and toolkits
- Hosted 28 events, such as webinars, short workshops, and conferences
- Provided technical assistance to USAID missions and implementing partners on 13 occasions, resulting in influencing the success of market information systems in Malawi and over 200 people from more than 10 countries in sub-Saharan Africa receiving technical training on a variety of topics related to ICT and agriculture.
- Developed an online presence that resulted in over 27,000 visits to the project website since its launch, thousands of document downloads, and an influential social media channels.

II. Project Overview

FACET was funded by USAID's Bureau for Africa, Office of Sustainable Development, Economic Growth, Environment and Agriculture Division (AFR/SD/EGEA). The project worked closely with USAID's Bureau for Economic Growth, Education and the Environment (USAID/E3) and USAID missions, as well as implementing partners, governments, and the private sector, to provide technical assistance to better enhance the competitiveness and trade in the agriculture sector across sub-Saharan Africa. Designed to be interactive and collaborative, FACET provided technical assistance to improve competitiveness and productivity across agriculture sub-sectors through the use of Information and Communications Technologies (ICTs) as tools to enhance the functioning and competitiveness of agricultural value chains and facilitate trade in agricultural products across sub-Saharan Africa.

To achieve its objectives, FACET had two components:

- Knowledge sharing across missions regarding sustainable and scalable approaches to using ICT to increase the success of Feed the Future (FTF) activities; and
- Short-term technical assistance to projects to help them improve their uses of ICT, especially in ways that may be helpful to other projects as well.

The project was implemented by FHI 360[1], and included ACDI/VOCA and Action for Enterprise as resource partners.[2]

Overall funding for this project was $1,300,000 during the four year implementation period.

[1] The project was originally awarded to the Academy for Educational Development (AED). On July 1, 2011, Family Health International (FHI) completed the process of acquiring the programs, expertise and other assets of AED, resulting in the formation of FHI 360. The FACET project was novated to FHI 360 as part of this acquisition process.

[2] The IRIS Center at the University of Maryland, College Park was also among the original resource partners until it closed down in 2012.

III. Results Achieved

A. Component 1: Knowledge Sharing, Analysis, and Toolkits

This component included six different activities. Originally these activities were not clearly demarcated in the work plan, but for the majority of the project this component has included these six activities. A summary of the results achieved under each of those activities over the project period of performance is included below.

a. Conduct a Demand Survey

- **Work plan**: FACET will conduct a demand survey of USAID/AFR missions and related agriculture development projects in sub-Saharan Africa in order to gauge a systematic sense of the ICT application demands of missions and their agriculture-related projects. This survey will capture their current and planned uses of ICT, key challenges they are facing, tools/products that would be most useful to them in their work, and areas where they would like support, to name a few. Based on the findings of this survey, and in consultation with USAID, FACET will develop print and online publications and tools in accordance with those subject areas and applications identified as most relevant to USAID/AFR missions and their projects and propose potentially useful FACET short-term technical assistance activities for specific missions or projects.
- **Results**: An ICT demand survey was sent out to FTF mission contacts in sub-Saharan Africa, along with a request for them to share the survey with their relevant agriculture development project implementing partners on May 6, 2011. The response rate was 31% (15 out of 48 invitees) and included both USAID mission and implementing project staff. The respondents expressed strong preference for briefing papers, short profiles, and short-term technical assistance. Based on the results of this survey, the project increased its focus in these three areas with a particular focus on the subject areas highlighted by respondents.

b. Expanded Web Presence

- **Work plan:** FACET will increase its web presence and the reach of materials it produces through the establishment of a FACET community at USAID ALLNET. This community site includes a dedicated online resource library that will host all FACET-produced publications, tools, presentations, and webinars, in addition to external resources and links that are related to ICT and agricultural value chains. In order to maximize exposure, FACET will continue to use E-agriculture.org, Agrilinks, and Microlinks as distribution points as well as other internet sites and distribution "channels" that appear useful to reach the intended audience.
- **Results**: FACET launched a website at https://communities.usaidallnet.gov/ictforag/home on November 22, 2010, and set up Google Analytics on the page on January 26, 2011. In May 2012, we also launched social media channels using the handle ICTforAg on Twitter and Facebook. We also established content partnerships with e-agriculture.org, Agrilinks, and Microlinks.
    - According to Google Analytics, from January 26, 2011 to September 30, 2013 the FACET managed Allnet page received 27,411 total visits (of which 18,138 were unique visitors, with the average time spent on the site 00:02:51. The top five geographical locations of visitors were: US, India, Kenya, UK, and Nigeria. In total, 7,130 visits (or 26%) were from locations in Africa, which was the project's geographic area of focus.

- Analytics for the low-cost video toolkit (http://www.ictforag.org/video), interactive radio toolkit (http://www.ictforag.org/radio) and social media handbook (http://www.ictforag.org/social) were tracked separately from the Allnet site since they are hosted on a separate domain. From its launch on May 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013, the low-cost video site had 4,147 visits. The interactive radio toolkit had 2,515 visits from its launch in December 2012 through September 30, 2013. The social media handbook had 832 visits from its launch on September 12, 2013 through September 30, 2013.Since we cannot distinguish how many of these visitors also visited the Allnet site, we have not included this total towards our indicators so as to avoid double counting.
- As part of an effort to establish technical leadership and share resources on ICT for agriculture in sub-Saharan Africa, FACET established an accessible new social brand (ICT for Ag) on Facebook and Twitter in June 2012. Using a channel-specific approach, focused initially on visual content on Facebook and rapid and multi-sectorial content curation on Twitter, has resulted in two influential and demographically distinct social channels.
    - In the first quarter after introducing social media efforts in June of 2012, the FACET team saw a five-fold leap in knowledge product downloads, as well as continuing support for other project objectives such as promotion of online webinars and offline events, technical research, soliciting user feedback, beta release of knowledge materials, and facilitating connections with target practitioners, partner organizations, and the wider agricultural development audience.
    - As of 9/30/13, ICT for Ag has attracted 1,841 followers on Twitter (skewing towards development practitioners and organizations around the world), and 2,298 fans on Facebook (77% reside in sub-Saharan Africa, the project's geographic focus).
    - Our online activities have resulted in significant online presence – achieving a peak Klout score (the leading cross-platform measure of online influence) of 61.44 in July 2013. While a proxy, it does give a comparative measure of the quality of our online engagement. FACET's peak ranks behind major online presences like CGIAR Climate (63) and CIMMYT (63) but ahead of organizations like USAID's Feed the Future (61), IFPRI (60), the FAO's e-Agriculture (60), and GSMA Mobile for Development (60).

c. Development of Print and Online Materials

- **Work plan:** FACET will develop briefing papers, application profiles, matrices, toolkits, and other print or online tools related to business and technology models for enterprise and agriculture development practitioners (USAID, NGOs and private sector) to help them think about and decide on appropriate ICT applications for agricultural value chain interventions. These materials will be developed collaboratively with USAID and implementing partners from the point of view of agricultural value chain facilitators, with a particular focus on relevance to achieving FTF objectives.
- **Results:** Over the life of the project, FACET developed numerous briefing papers, profiles, toolkits, and online presentations. As living documents, many of these

materials were updated on one or more occasions during the project period. Specifically, the project developed:[3]

- 19 briefing papers
- 49 ICT and Ag profiles
- 2 toolkits (on low-cost video and interactive radio)
- 1 handbook (on social media)

d. Knowledge sharing events, webinars and short workshops

- **Work plan:** FACET will work with USAID to develop a series of events, webinars, conferences and short workshops amounting to roughly one event per month, related to agriculture and ICT. The topics for these events will be determined with input from USAID, although when possible we will try to link events to FACET briefing papers or lessons learned from short-term technical assistance. FACET may also conduct half or full day in person workshops on specific agriculture (Ag) and ICT topics for USAID mission staff and USAID implementing partners.
- **Results:** Over the life of the project, FACET hosted a total of 28 events, webinars, and short in-person workshops, averaging slightly more than one event every two months of the project. Among the 28 were a mix of in-person events in both the US and Africa, as well as virtual events. These events were generally well received by participants, with positive evaluations of content usefulness ranging from 87% to 100% of responses across each year. While that number hovered in the high 80-low 90 percent during years two and three, it rose to 99% in the final year of the project.

e. Support of a Cross-Donor Alliance

- **Work plan:** If funding is available and it appears to be a useful contribution to the achievement of project objectives, FACET will explore various models of multi-donor alliances, analyzing the pros and cons of each model, to help USAID with the creation and facilitation of a cross-donor alliance focused on USAID/AFR FTF countries and on the use of ICT to enhance Ag project impacts. The purpose of this alliance would be to help USAID/W and USAID/AFR missions enhance their collaboration with other donors and non-governmental organizations (i.e. FARA, FAO, CRS), which would perhaps enter into joint funding arrangements on FTF- and agricultural value chain-related projects. FACET support might include facilitating and even supporting the implementation of such alliance(s).
- **Results:** It was not possible for FACET to fully support any cross-donor alliances over the project period. As a result, and in agreement with our USAID AOR, we decided that supporting a formal donor alliance was not appropriate under this award. That said, we did engage with several donors and implementing organizations on an on-going basis to facilitate their work and to support FACET's ability to fulfill its other objectives. These included the GSMA Development Fund, the G8 New Alliance ICT Challenge Fund for Agriculture, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), and USAID's Modernizing Extension and Advisory Systems (MEAS) project and Agrilinks portal.

f. Support Exemplary Impact Assessment(s) and Other Analysis

- **Work plan:** As part of FACET's scope to analyze, help develop and share tools, approaches and products to help USAID missions and their projects use ICT effectively, sustainably and scalably to increase the impact of agriculture and FTF

[3] A full list of all publications developed by the project can be found in the Annex, along with their publication date and total number of cumulative downloads since publication.

projects, FACET may support exemplary impact assessments to demonstrate to projects rigorous and practical approaches to conducting such assessments or other analyses, including, for example, market research studies or analyses of alternative technical and business models; impact evaluations of key ICT services related to agriculture; assessments of alternative approaches to providing high priority ICT services related to agriculture; and approaches to potential privatization of ICT interventions in the agriculture sector funded (at least initially) by the public sector.

- **Results:** Although FACET explored potentially supporting impact evaluations, given the level of funding available and time constraints, we were unable to do so. As a result, this activity was removed from the work plan in year 3.

B. Component 2: Short term field support technical assistance

- **Work plan:** In response to specific requests from USAID missions and operating units, the FACET team will assemble teams of experts to respond to USAID's needs and will be available to work closely with implementing partners, governments, ICT firms, and agricultural organizations to provide technical assistance, support and guidance as requested. Activities may also include targeted impact evaluations focused on specific Ag and ICT interventions or approaches, or technical workshops for mission and/or implementing partner staff lasting more than two days.
- **Results:** Over the course of the project period of performance, FACET provided short-term technical assistance to USAID missions or projects on 13 occasions. Although initially designed to provide targeted project or mission TA, the majority of assignments carried out under this component were technical workshops for a mix of USAID implementing partners, their local partners and beneficiaries, and USAID mission staff. The breakdown of assignments is as follows:
    - **Technical assistance to USAID/Market Linkages Initiative (MLI) in Malawi in 2010**: During a nine day field visit, the FACET technical team met and facilitated roundtable discussions with MLI, commodity exchange representatives, and other market information system providers. Assessments of each solution and recommendations were made against criteria established in advance by the MLI and FACET teams. These recommendations appear to have yielded results. Within a year of the FACET-led assessment, usage of the selected system topped 117,000 messages including price alerts, bids, offers, and informational messages, and 15 grain bulking centers had subscribed to the service. As of September 2013, the price enumeration network had expanded to 29 key markets in 2013, with 21,000 smallholder farmers accessing the service with over 82% of price alerts being offered on a commercial basis.
    - **Assessment on market information systems for USAID/East Africa in May 2012**: The findings from this assessment were presented to USAID/East Africa and turned into a briefing paper that was disseminated publicly through FACET's communications channels.
    - **Nine technical workshops on producing and disseminating low-cost videos for agriculture** spanning May 2012 through March 2013 in Kenya, Mozambique (in Maputo and Nampula), Ghana, Zambia, Senegal, Liberia (one on video production, one on dissemination and facilitation techniques plus follow-up technical assistance on production), Malawi: Through these workshops a total of 183 individuals from 11 countries in Africa were

trained, representing USAID implementing partners, local NGOs, government agencies, and USAID missions. In total, 83.5% of participants who completed workshop evaluations rated the content as 'Very Useful' (represented as a 5 on a five-point scale) and 15.7% rated the content a 4 out of 5. Only one participant rated it a 3 ('Moderately Useful') and none rated it below that. Follow up surveys with participants at three and nine month intervals after the workshops revealed that between 60 and 77% of participants (varying by country) were using low-cost video in their work.

- **Technical workshop on interactive radio in Malawi in April 2013**: A total of 26 individuals from two countries (Malawi and Liberia) participated at this workshop, which was led by Farm Radio International. In total, 84% of participants who completed workshop evaluations rated the content as 'Very Useful' (represented as a 5 on a five-point scale), 10.5% rated the content a 4 out of 5, and 5% rating it a 2 out of 5. It should be noted that because of how the survey administered by Farm Radio International was formatted, the circle for '5' was immediately to the right of the '4' rating, so it is possible that some of the individuals who circled '5' intended to mark '4'. Also, the one individual who rated the workshop a '2' rated each individual session a '4' or a '5', so it is unclear why they gave such a low overall rating to the workshop.
- **Technical workshop on integrating ICT into agriculture projects and social media in Kenya in September 2013**: For the first two days, there were 20 total participants (from four countries), while 17 participants (from three countries) joined the social media bootcamp on the final day. Although there was significant participant overlap between the workshop and bootcamp, as not all participants were the same we conducted participant evaluations at the end of each. For the first two days, a total of 19 participants completed the evaluation. Of those, 84% of participants rated it a 5 ('Very Useful'), 10% rated it a 4, and 5% rated it a 3 ('Moderately Useful'). For the bootcamp, a total of 15 participants completed the evaluation. Of those, 67% of participants rated it a 5 ('Very Useful'), 13% rated it a 4, and 20% rated it a 3 ('Moderately Useful').

C. Summary of Results

Over the life of the project FACET exceeded all indicator targets, with the exception of a slightly lower than expected rating of events and knowledge products during the third year. These indicators do not capture the amount of time spent providing technical assistance and guidance to practitioners informally through meetings and non-FACET sponsored events. They also do not include information such as number of multimedia presentations (such as Prezi and Projeqt), blog posts, or social media posts developed to support the wider knowledge sharing goals not captured explicitly by our measurement indicators. A table summarizing those results is below:

Measurement Indicators (Life of Project)	Target	Achieved
Total number of knowledge sharing products (including briefing papers and profiles) shared related to ICT and agriculture	70	71
Total number of knowledge sharing events (including brown bag lunches, webinars, presentations at USAID Ag Sector Council, etc.) held related to ICT and	22	28

agriculture		
Percentage of knowledge sharing events or products that were rated at least 3 or higher (on a scale of 1 to 5) for their usefulness. (An average score of 3 or higher on a scale of 1 to 5, 5 being "very useful")	100% in year 1 90% in years 2-4	100% in Yr1 91% in Yr2 87% in Yr3 99% in Yr4
Total number of visits to the FACET community website	12,800	27,411
Total number of participants (on average) at brown bag lunches, webinars, presentation, and other knowledge sharing events	N/A in year 1 7 in year 2 10 in year 3 30 in year 4	 30 in Yr2 24 in Yr3 43 in Yr4
Number of short term technical assistance activities, technical workshops or impact evaluations provided/conducted to improve the use of ICT in Ag projects	12	13

Indicator Type : 4.4.2-18	**2013 targets***	**Achieved**
Person hours of training completed in communication services supported by USG assistance	2,400 hours	3,326 hours (2012) 5,158 hours (2013)
4.4.2-18a Number of men**	38	60 (2012) 119 (2013)
4.4.2-18b Number of women**	22	42 (2012) 39 (2013)

* This indicator was only tracked for 2012 and 2013, although targets were only set in 2013.
** This information was only disaggregated for in-person events where it was possible for us to verify, and not for virtual events.

IV. Learning

The following section provides a brief overview of the key areas of learning over the life of the project, and is presented as responses to guiding questions.

- **What is the most interesting thing you have learned during this project?**

When this project first began in October 2009, the application of ICT into agriculture was still relatively nascent, particularly within development projects. The past four years have provided us with a unique perspective on this field as it has grown and developed. What the project has tried to do—and hopefully has succeeded in doing—was to synthesize what we were learning over the project period in a way that was accessible and useful to practitioners so that they could apply it to their work. The last technical workshop that we facilitated on how to integrate ICT into agriculture projects was designed on the back of all of the very thorough and diverse learning acquired during the project period.

- **What challenges have you faced and how have you needed to adapt in order to overcome them?**

Over the life of the project there were three main challenges that the project faced, discussed as follows in no particular order. The first challenge was one of location. As a relatively small

(starting at less than 25% FTE staff in the first two years, peaking at 2.5 people for a few months in year three, and then 2 full-time staff through the end of the project), DC-based project it was challenging to be completely looped into all of the work being done in our target area (sub-Saharan Africa) in ICT and agriculture. The project was not designed to allow for project staff to spend significant amounts of time in the field for the sole purpose of scoping out the state of play in target countries. For the most part, these opportunities were only available as short add-ons to technical assistance trips. This made it challenging to identify and assess effective ICT interventions and applications that were being used within agriculture, as well as more difficult to market the project's services to USAID missions and projects based in the field. Related to this, it is often difficult for implementing partners to find out contact information of relevant USAID mission and implementing partner staff by public channels, although USAID's interactive project map is a step in the right direction. Over time we were able to develop a large network of contacts across our target region and sector, which made this task easier. Our use of social media starting midway through the third year also facilitated these connections and learning. Anecdotally, at least, given the increase in requests for information and consultation from FACET staff by USAID missions, implementers, and local partners over the course of the project, it would appear that we were able to establish the project as a go-to resource eventually, perhaps just not as quickly as we would have preferred.

In the future, any project with similar objectives would be better served to explore the opportunities for occasional scoping trips to the field or the presence of a field-based staff person. Given the size of FACET's budget—particularly during the first two years—however, it is not clear if that would have been a worthwhile investment relative to the gains it would have generated in terms of additional knowledge sharing and technical assistance opportunities.

The second challenge faced by the project relates to measuring impact. Our project indicators were almost exclusively aimed at tracking outputs and short-term reactions, rather than long term changes in behavior resulting from our work. While we periodically surveyed individuals on our mailing list and through our social media channels to see how they were using and applying what they learned from our knowledge products, the results of these surveys primarily yielded anecdotal stories, rather than any clear measure of impact. The same can be said for technical workshops. Although we sent follow up surveys to participants three and nine months after workshops, the self-reported responses to those surveys give us at best anecdotes of use, rather than actual impact. Since none of the individuals or projects that we worked with were under any contractual obligation to report on anything in more detail to us, it left us without data on outcomes and impact. For similar projects in the future, USAID may want to consider making reporting on outcome data a precondition for projects that are interested in receiving any short-term technical assistance. Otherwise, it may be necessary to conduct a more extensive impact evaluation of knowledge products and technical assistance, which given the geographic range of this project would have been cost prohibitive under our project budget.

The third challenge resulted from the original size and scope of the project. Our initial budget was insufficient to achieve our two primary objectives, given the vast geographic focus of the project. As a result—along with the impact of the suspension of AED on implementation—the first two years of implementation account for much less than half of the total project's outputs. This changed significantly with the increase in FACET's obligation starting in year three, which allowed us to increase our staffing levels and funding to resource partners. As a

result, the second two years of the project accounted for 79% of the knowledge products, 82% of the events, and 92% of the short-term technical assistance assignments.

- **What would you tell someone else pursuing a similar project?**

In addition to what has already been mentioned in the above section related to challenges, our experience has reinforced the importance of relationships for any sort of regionally structured project. While the project momentum picked up significantly in the last two years, partly as a result of the benefits of additional funding, the relationships that were developed over the first two years with USAID mission staff, implementing partners, governmental agencies, local NGOs, educational institutions, and industry associations were crucial to feeding into the results that were seen during this period. The creation of knowledge products and facilitation of events is very much built around constructive relationships with relevant practitioners.

These relationships are what enabled us to access information about what has been working and not working from a diversity of practitioners. It was also through these relationships that we were able to host events that included experts whose time is often a limited commodity, particularly given that we did not pay for their participation at these events. While early on it was unclear whether the investments in these relationships would have any return, our experience has been that for the most part it would not have been possible to achieve what we did without them. Since knowledge sharing at its very core is about community building—and sharing—it is important to not overlook the value that these investments provide. Although they are not measured in terms of indicators and performance, they can pay substantial dividends in the ability of knowledge sharing and technical assistance projects to achieve their objectives.

Annex 1. FACET File Public Download Count Report on Allnet page as of 9/30/13 (cumulative)

Name	Date of upload	Number of downloads
ICT and Agriculture profiles		
Agrimanagr profile	1/4/13	411
Agro-Tech profile	12/5/12	4,117
Angaza Mkulima profile	1/23/13	306
Awaaz.De profile	11/2/11	7,195
aWhere profile	2/22/13	222
CKW profile	2/22/11	7,669
CocoaLink profile	12/5/12	3,382
Crop Nutrition profile	1/23/13	348
Digital Green profile	2/22/11	7,589
Dunavant profile	11/21/12	5,240
Esoko profile	4/18/11	8,414
FarmerConnect profile	9/25/12	8,056
FarmForce profile	8/23/13	92
Freedom Fone profile	9/21/12	7,963
FrontlineSMS profile	8/20/12	7,477
GeoTraceability profile	1/4/13	414
GLCI profile	12/9/12	2,781
iCow profile	11/18/11	7,429
iFormBuilder	11/21/12	5,796
IKSL's Green SIM Card profile	10/4/11	7,603
KenCall’s M-Kilimo profile	5/27/11	7,367
Kilimo Salama profile	12/13/11	8,200
Lima Links profile	9/17/12	8,194
Literacy Bridge - Talking Book profile	10/3/11	7,196
Magpi profile	12/12/12	3,945
Mali Shambani profile	2/22/11	7,224
Manobi profile	2/22/11	7,357
MarketMaker profile	4/18/11	7,341
MFarm profile	6/15/12	8,487
MoBiashara profile	11/2/11	8,372
Mobile Information Platform profile	10/4/11	7,851
MojaCast profile	11/21/12	4,865
MRI Agro profile	1/23/13	330
Mrittikka profile	9/6/12	7,976
Nano Ganesh profile	3/28/12	7,227
Nokia Life Tools profile	10/5/11	8,192
Nutrient Manager for Rice profile	3/6/12	7,321
Opportunity Bank Malawi profile	12/12/12	2,479
Parmalat profile	11/21/12	5,221
Plant Agrichem profile	1/24/13	274
Profile of Armajaro's Input Tracking System	1/4/13	357
Profile of Mace Foods' use of M-Pesa	2/28/12	7,489
Reuters Market Light profile	2/22/11	7,558
Shamba Shape Up profile	1/24/13	560
Smart Money profile	1/2/13	541

Name	Date of upload	Number of downloads
SourceTrace profile	8/12/13	69
Sustainable Harvest profile	7/21/11	7,376
Tanga Fresh profile	1/4/13	356
Zoona profile	12/12/12	2,754
Briefing papers		
African Agriculture and ICT: An Overview	11/19/10	9,918
An Assessment of Market Information Systems in East Africa	5/9/13	581
Call Centers for Agricultural Information	3/28/12	8,633
Crowdsourcing Applications for Agricultural Development in Africa	5/17/13	302
Gender Mainstreaming in ICT for Agriculture	11/6/12	6,961
ICT-enabled Outgrowing Operations: Highlights from Africa	1/4/13	559
ICT to Enhance Farm Extension Services in Africa	11/19/10	7,921
ICT Applications and Agricultural Input Supply Companies: Highlights from Africa	2/5/13	722
ICT Applications for Distribution and Supply Chain Management in sub-Saharan African Agriculture	1/3/11	8,985
ICT to Enhance Warehouse Receipt Systems and Commodity Exchanges in Africa	11/19/10	8,245
Key Lessons for Mobile Finance in African Agriculture: Three Case Studies	1/2/13	589
Mobile Applications for Monitoring and Evaluation in Agriculture	12/19/12	2,129
Off-the-Grid Energy Solutions for Smallholder Farmers in Africa	9/30/12	7,784
Selecting Mobile ICT Devices for Agriculture Services and Applications in sub-Saharan Africa	12/20/11	8,059
Software Platforms for Mobile Applications for Agriculture Development	10/26/11	9,037
Using ICT to Enhance Marketing for Small Agricultural Producers	5/29/13	448
Using ICT to Provide Agriculture Market Price Information in Africa	11/19/10	8,686
Using ICT to Provide Weather Information for Agriculture	9/30/12	8,323
Using Mobile Finance to Enhance Agriculture in Africa	1/3/11	9,022
Toolkits		
Integrating Low-cost Video into Agricultural Development Projects: A Toolkit for Practitioners	5/1/12	7,233
Video Toolkit: Coverpage and Introduction	5/2/12	7,597
Video Toolkit: Component 1 "How Is Low-Cost Video Currently Being Used In Agricultural Development?"	5/2/12	7,916
Video Toolkit: Component 2 "Is Low-Cost Video An Appropriate Way To Achieve Our Objectives?"	5/2/12	8,039
Video Toolkit: Component 3 "How Can We Create Our Own Agricultural Extension Videos?"	5/2/12	7,999
Video Toolkit: Component 4 "What Is The Best Way To	5/2/12	7,995

Name	Date of upload	Number of downloads
Dissemenate Our Videos?"		
Video Toolkit: Component 5 "How Can We Track The Impact That Our Videos Are Having On Farmers?"	5/2/12	8,037
Video Toolkit: Component 6 "What Are The Technical Considerations We Need To Keep In Mind?"	5/2/12	7,916
Intégrer la Vidéo à Moindre Coût dans les Projets de Développment Agricole: un Kit Destiné Aux Experts	9/19/12	8,048
Interactive Radio for Agricultural Development Projects: A Toolkit for Practitioners	12/21/12	1,227
Radio Toolkit: Coverage and Introduction	12/21/12	1,189
Radio Toolkit: Component 1	12/21/12	1,139
Radio Toolkit: Component 2	12/21/12	1,173
Radio Toolkit: Component 3	12/21/12	93
Radio Toolkit: Component 4	12/21/12	1,192
Radio Toolkit: Component 5	12/21/12	1,170
Radio Toolkit: Component 6	12/21/12	1,170
Social Media Handbook for Agricultural Practitioners	9/12/13	141