Enabel

Executive summary

Research and Innovation projects for productive, resilient and healthy agro-pastoral systems in West Africa (PRISMA)

Burkina Faso, Mali, Niger

ADE s.a.

August 2025

Agence belge de développement

enabel.be

Presentation of the evaluation

The PRISMA project, implemented between 2022 and 2025, aims to strengthen the resilience of agropastoral systems in the Sahel, mainly in Burkina Faso, Mali and Niger. In these countries, livestock farming is the main economic activity for the majority of rural households. The project is structured around four specific objectives: (SO1) Improve access to pastoral resources, (SO2) Facilitate access to quality animal feed, (SO3) Reduce health risks linked to the consumption of raw milk, (SO4) Promote public policies through evidence-based advocacy.

PRISMA operates in a particularly unstable environment, marked by increasing insecurity, tensions linked to climate change, conflicts between farmers and herders, and a deterioration of the regional cooperation framework following the withdrawal of Burkina Faso, Mali and Niger from ECOWAS in 2023. A coup d'état in Niger the same year also led to the temporary suspension of activities in certain areas.

The final evaluation of the project seeks to assess the results achieved and analyse the quality of its design and implementation. It aims to understand the extent to which the project is moving towards its objectives despite constraints, while examining the effectiveness of governance mechanisms and the ability to foster collaboration among the many actors involved. Key challenges identified include: access restrictions to rural areas that significantly limit activity implementation, the impact of political upheavals on advocacy dynamics, growing economic pressure undermining the livelihoods of herders, and gradual deterioration of natural resources in pastoral areas.

The evaluation was based on the OECD-DAC criteria (relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact) and placed particular emphasis on innovation, collective learning, inter-agency complementarity (Enabel, AECID:ARAA, LuxDev), and the integration of gender and environmental issues. Seven key questions guided the analysis, focusing in particular on the progress made, the partnership's contributions to innovation, synergies with other projects, the quality of the operational set-up, unanticipated effects, and efforts to integrate gender and environmental concerns.

The evaluation is primarily intended for the project team (coordination and management), donors (particularly the European Union), implementing agencies, as well as national institutions, ECOWAS, and pastoral organisations. It covers the period from January 2022 to June 2025, with a geographical scope limited to the capitals and a few accessible areas, as rural regions were excluded for security reasons. All thematic components of the project were examined, including those relating to animal health, food security, governance, and carbon.

Data collection followed a qualitative, participatory methodology in four phases: document review, semi-structured interviews with around 60 key stakeholders (representatives of agencies, donors, ministries, NGOs, researchers and pastoral organisations), focus groups on complex topics such as advocacy and sustainability, and systematic triangulation of sources to reduce bias.

However, the exercise faced several difficulties: Insecurity prevented access to beneficiaries in rural areas, limiting first-hand data; response desirability bias was mitigated through source triangulation; the three-week limit on the field mission required thorough documentary preparation and organisation of remote interviews.

Findings and conclusions

The PRISMA project has made significant progress towards achieving its objectives, despite an implementation environment marked by major constraints. It has notably distinguished itself through the production of technical tools, the testing of innovative pastoral practices, targeted capacity-building, and the structuring of advocacy approaches. However, the full attainment of results remains contingent on the completion of ongoing strategic deliverables (index-based insurance, online booking, carbon schemes, etc.), stronger institutional anchoring of achievements, and more systematic scaling-up of the knowledge produced. The foundations laid in the areas of agroecological innovation, political dialogue, and skills development offer significant potential for transformation, which will require, in order to materialise, increased mobilisation of national institutions and sustained support until the end of the project in 2025. (QE1)

The multi-level approach implemented by the PRISMA project allowed to mobilise diverse expertise, optimise available resources, and create an environment conducive to innovation and collective learning. Collaboration between agencies, research centres, and field actors generated knowledge transfers and enabled the co-construction of solutions adapted to the Sahelian context. However, this approach also highlighted several limitations. Inter-agency coordination, although based on a logic of specialisation, suffered from a lack of shared governance, compartmentalisation between partners, and insufficient consultation upstream of actions. These weaknesses reduced operational efficiency, hindered smooth project management, and limited the impact of activities in the field. Moreover, anticipation of the effects of research remained weak, and the involvement of local actors was uneven. (QE2)

The synergies between PRISMA and other projects led by the partner agencies (Enabel, LuxDev, AECID) enriched databases, diversified methodological approaches, and strengthened the dissemination and integration of knowledge at different levels (local, national, regional). These complementarities have made it possible to cross-fertilise experiences, improve the scientific quality of deliverables, and enhance their operational usefulness. They also facilitated the gradual embedding of innovations at various levels, through joint advocacy, training, and technical sharing activities. The use of platforms such as Task Forces or innovation laboratories supported the integration of results into local and regional dynamics. However, the impact of these synergies remains partially limited. Delays in the delivery of certain outputs, mismatches in project implementation timelines, security constraints, and a lack of formalised inter-project coordination have hindered the optimisation of complementarities. The effective integration of achievements into public policies remains unfinished, notably due to uneven institutional commitment, the absence of dedicated national funding, and a shifting political context, as illustrated by the withdrawal of some countries from regional bodies such as ECOWAS. To strengthen the reach of these interactions, a more structured strategic coordination between projects, backed by stable consultation frameworks, now appears necessary. (QE3)

The project's implementation mechanism proved generally relevant, thanks to governance aligned with regional priorities, targeted mobilisation of the partner agencies' technical expertise, and a certain capacity to adapt to local realities. Its multi-level structuring enabled to connect scientific, operational, and political dynamics, while ensuring a degree of continuity in a context marked by security instability. The project laid concrete foundations for sustainability, notably through the gradual transfer of tools, the strengthening of local capacities, and the integration of certain achievements into existing training or governance systems. However, several structural limitations

have reduced the effectiveness of the mechanism: delays in contracting, procedural disparities between agencies, the absence of a shared operational arbitration body, and silo-based functioning in certain areas (studies, data, technical coordination). The monitoring-evaluation system, although it ensured the tracking of key indicators, did not fully play a transversal strategic analysis role. The absence of an external mid-term review also limited opportunities for dynamic adjustment. (QE4)

Although no major unexpected effect was formally identified during the evaluation, several unplanned but significant effects were observed. Some revealed structural limitations of the mechanism, such as disparities in treatment between partner agencies, which created financial expectations not entirely compatible with a logic of national ownership. Others, such as the underestimation of security issues surrounding the BABs or the incomplete implementation of innovative initiatives (laboratories, Task Forces), weakened the trust of certain field actors. These elements highlight the need for better anticipation of the peripheral effects of projects, particularly those affecting motivation dynamics, security, and the continuity of actions at the local level. (QE5)

Gender integration in the PRISMA project has remained limited and poorly structured. While some isolated initiatives have emerged and some data have been disaggregated, no transformative strategy has been deployed to promote the inclusion and empowerment of women, particularly in the pastoral family economy. Female participation has remained marginal, and the structural barriers to their effective engagement have not been removed. (QE6)

The project has integrated certain environmental issues in a relevant way, including climate, pastoral resource management, and carbon. However, this approach has remained focused on carbon sequestration, to the detriment of a broader vision including biodiversity, water management, and indirect ecological risks. The absence of comprehensive environmental assessments and stronger institutional commitment has limited the ecological scope of the actions. At the same time, positive dynamics have been initiated through pastoral restoration activities, the use of technological monitoring devices, and scientific partnerships. Nevertheless, the actual impact of these actions remains difficult to assess due to a lack of longitudinal data, robust ecological monitoring mechanisms, and sufficient local anchoring. (QE7)

Coherence «	B	The PRISMA project demonstrates good internal and external coherence but suffers from operational shortcomings in its coordination with other interventions. Internally, its four specific objectives (pastoral management, livestock feed, zoonoses, advocacy) show proven technical complementarities (e.g., animal health linked to the quality of pastures and feed). Externally, it aligns with regional frameworks (ECOWAP, NDC) and builds on existing networks (RBM, APESS). Active synergies have been established with partner projects (REPO for land restoration, Mahita for zoonoses, FSRP for index-based insurance, and the Regional Food Security Reserve for operationalising the livestock feed component), avoiding duplication and pooling tools such as the Garbal/Modhem platforms. However, inter-agency coordination (Enabel, LuxDev, ARAA:AECID) remains compartmentalised, limiting potential synergies. Divergent administrative rules, the absence of real-time sharing mechanisms, and the withdrawal of the three countries from ECOWAS have disrupted regional integration. Insecurity has prevented convergence with local initiatives (e.g., the AGED and Reach Italia projects, which were suspended). The late production of key deliverables (insurance model, carbon data, online ordering and

		purchasing of livestock feed) has also hindered their integration into partner systems.
Relevance	B	PRISMA demonstrates high initial relevance with its objectives aligned with regional priorities (ECOWAS, ECOWAP), national policies (agroecology strategies, One Health plans, NDCs), and international agendas (combating climate change, food security, global health). It addresses critical challenges in the Sahel: degradation of pastoral resources, livestock food insecurity, health risks linked to zoonoses, and climate vulnerability. This relevance is reinforced by the attention paid to cross-border dynamics and the intention to coordinate the efforts of Sahelian and coastal countries. The final beneficiaries (e.g. agropastoralists) are not directly targeted by the funding but benefit from the intended effects through the actions of partners (professional organisations, NGOs, research institutes, advocacy actors). The quality of the project design allowed to build solid partnerships and to develop relevant technical and institutional innovations for these groups. However, the adaptation of the project to contextual developments (security, geopolitics) could have been strengthened from the design stage. While adjustments were made (relocation of advocacy efforts, increased mobilisation of local actors), some constraints could not be anticipated, such as the limited access to high-insecurity zones which restricted the testing of carbon credit valorisation. The lack of experimentation on this axis is also explained by the absence of dedicated funding for pilot projects and the withdrawal of technical partners from the areas concerned. Finally, although no national policy has yet been amended at this stage, several policy briefs, studies and advocacy documents have been produced. Their dissemination is ongoing, and their potential impact on public policies could become more visible in a potential Phase 2 through their appropriation by the national and regional institutions concerned.
Efficiency	B	The PRISMA project demonstrates satisfactory efficiency in a particularly complex intervention context, marked by administrative, security, and logistical challenges. On the technical side, several resources were mobilised judiciously. Relevant synergies were established, notably through the pooling of data with other initiatives such as CASSECS, and the effective use of existing platforms such as Garbal. The thematic specialisation of the implementing agencies – LuxDev on carbon in Burkina Faso, Enabel on pastoral resources and animal health in Niger and Mali, and AECID on livestock feed – contributed to a better distribution of responsibilities and a reduction in duplication. These strengths reflect a willingness to coordinate but did not fully succeed in optimising the project's strategic steering. The Project Coordination Unit (PCU), while fulfilling its day-to-day management, administrative monitoring, and reporting functions, did not have the necessary levers to ensure consolidated strategic governance between the agencies. The absence of a cross-cutting decision-making analysis mechanism limited the project's ability to generate real-time adjustments or to capitalise on inter-institutional dynamics. This fragmented governance reduced the fluidity of actions and contributed to a sequenced implementation, at times poorly synchronised, in a context where

		responsiveness would have been essential. Significant delays were also observed, particularly in contracting with certain technical partners (CIRAD, GRET), which sometimes took between six and twelve months, thereby compressing the actual implementation period. However, it should be noted that these partners subsequently delivered their outputs within the agreed deadlines. By mid-2025, around 75% of the expected results had been achieved, with remaining deliverables in the process of being finalised. This level of progress reflects a positive dynamic, but also a concentration of efforts towards the end of the project, which can affect the overall return on resources. Some budgets earmarked for strategic activities (SO1 training plans, Task Force action plans, strengthening of technical services) were under-utilised or mobilised late, despite a budget surplus being available towards the end of the project. This points more to a limitation in anticipation and planning than to a lack of resources as such. Moreover, the implementation of certain technical innovations such as AI prototypes suffered from insufficient regulatory anticipation (with authorisations not obtained in time), preventing their field testing. The prolonged suspension of activities in Niger due to insecurity (4.5 months) was not accompanied by a clear redeployment strategy, which resulted in losses of time and effort. Finally, although the project produced a significant volume of deliverables and scaling-up mechanisms were initiated, the accumulation of contextual and administrative constraints, combined with the late execution of several key components, contributed to limiting the optimisation of the ratio between resources mobilised and results achieved. In this sense, the efficiency of the project can be considered satisfactory, but it calls for major adjustments – particularly in terms of strategic steering, operational planning, and procedural simplification – in order to enhance performance in a possible second phase.
Effectiveness	B	The evaluation of the PRISMA project's effectiveness highlights a mixed dynamic. On the one hand, several technical results are positive: targets have been exceeded for the innovative mechanisms analysed (18 achieved against a target of 10), 13 risk maps have been produced (vs. 10 expected), and several technical tools (factsheets, guides) have been developed. In animal health, progress is tangible, with zoonotic prevalence studies (e.g., brucellosis at 3% compared to a target of 5%) and a significant strengthening of two reference laboratories (LABOCEL and LCV). In addition, according to progress reports and interviews, the project has contributed to agroecological transformation by building on innovative practices for the sustainable management of pastoral resources (dual-purpose forage crops, land restoration through night-time corralling of animals (HIMO), seeding of pastoral rangelands with palatable species, etc.). Despite the highly challenging security and political context, the intermediate results are on track, and a significant proportion of the final results is expected by 2025. However, some weaknesses are still limiting the full achievement of transformational outcomes and impacts: only 14% of the planned training sessions have been carried out (57/400 in SO1), scaling-up indicators (users, areas, policy) have not been met, regional political influence has been

		hampered by the withdrawal of ECOWAS member countries and the absence of adopted policies despite the production of briefs, and certain innovations (e.g., AI, carbon projects) have not yet been tested in the field.
Sustainability	B	PRISMA laid technical and institutional foundations that offer encouraging prospects for sustainability. The strengthening of scientific capacities, through national laboratories (LABOCEL, LCV) and the training of young researchers (two doctoral students, four master's degrees), constitutes a structuring investment for veterinary research, agroecology, and pastoral management. Added to this is the development of a pastoralism training module, designed for master's level and officially handed over to the AGRHYMET centre as well as to Nigerien universities, thereby reinforcing the integration of the project's achievements into higher education curricula at the regional scale. The integration of technical tools into regional policies — such as protocols on aflatoxins validated by ECOWAS, as well as synergies established with platforms such as INSAH — enhances the visibility, ownership, and sustainability of the results. The project's anchoring in active regional networks, notably RBM and APESS, contributes to the dissemination of innovations beyond pilot areas, facilitating their spread across Sahelian territories. Positive signals also lead to anticipate partial continuity of actions after the project's closure. Several initiatives supported under PRISMA are in the process of being consolidated or taken over by other actors: AECID and ARAA are working on extending mechanisms such as livestock feed banks, aflatoxin control strategies, regional training modules, and index-based insurance systems — the latter now being fully integrated into the project's Specific Objective 2. These dynamics illustrate the potential for a transition towards stronger institutional ownership by regional institutions. The prospect of a Phase 2 of the PRISMA project also offers a strategic window to consolidate achievements, finalise as-yet incomplete mechanisms (carbon, remote sensing, insurance), and strengthen multi-level governance mechanisms. This expected continuity could help stabilise the national Task Forces, whose situations remain contrasting: only Niger has finalised its action plan, while those of Mali and Burkina Faso are still awaiting funding and operationalisation. Several risk factors could hinder long-term sustainability. Regional political instability, exacerbated by the withdrawal of the countries concerned from ECOWAS, persistent insecurity in several intervention areas, and heavy dependence on external aid still make the conditions for full ownership by the States uncertain. The lack of available national funding to take over and expand the tested mechanisms remains a major obstacle to their institutionalisation. Finally, although promising, the innovation laboratories established in Koulikoro and Sikasso remain unfinished thereby limiting their capacity to anchor innovations at the community level and reduces their potential for immediate impact.
Impact	B	PRISMA has a significant impact potential, with several results already visible that suggest the possibility of structural effects in the medium term. Partner laboratories, notably LABOCEL in Niger and LCV in Mali, have significantly strengthened their diagnostic capacities, contributing to improved animal

		health management in fragile contexts. Scientific and operational tools have been produced — pastoral risk maps, validated aflatoxin protocols, technical databases — which could, in time, improve the resilience of agropastoral systems to the effects of climate change. Scientific advances, such as the carbon modelling developed with the University of Luxembourg, also constitute promising achievements. Although their concrete application remains limited at this stage, the foundations have been laid for profound changes, provided that the mechanisms are finalised and deployed in an inclusive manner. However, the actual large-scale impact remains partial. Several major innovations — such as artificial intelligence for biomass monitoring, index-based insurance systems, and the digital application for reserving and purchasing livestock feed currently under development — will only be fully operational in 2025, limiting their effect on final beneficiaries, particularly herders. The pilot projects on carbon credit, initially planned in Burkina Faso in connection with other initiatives by LuxDev and local NGOs (Rich Italia, AGED), could not be implemented in the targeted areas due to insecurity, thereby reducing opportunities for demonstration and for the ecological or economic valorisation of this innovation. Furthermore, no major national policy change has yet been observed at this stage. Although strategic documents have been developed, their actual influence on laws or public policies remains limited. The withdrawal of the countries concerned from ECOWAS has also reduced the project's regional reach, particularly regarding the harmonisation of standards and tools. That said, several recent dynamics help to nuance this situation and suggest the potential for future amplification of effects. Structural actions initiated under PRISMA are already being taken up or extended by other actors: AECID and ARAA are committed to continuing mechanisms such as information on livestock feed banks, the reservation and purchase mechanism for livestock feed, the fight against aflatoxins, and index-based insurance. Moreover, the prospect of a Phase 2 of the PRISMA project offers a strategic opportunity to consolidate achievements, finalise ongoing innovations and, above all, strengthen their dissemination and uptake at national and regional level. Thus, while the direct impacts on rural populations — particularly herders — remain, for now, limited and localised, the conditions are gradually being put in place for a scaling-up of effects. The impact analysis must therefore take into account the evolving and progressive nature of the intervention, whose deep transformations rely both on the dynamics already underway and on the realistic prospect of institutional and operational consolidation in the years ahead.

Conclusion 1: The PRISMA project addressed major issues in Sahelian pastoralism related to climate, animal health, and agroecological production systems. Its alignment with national priorities (NDCs, pastoral strategies) and regional priorities (ECOWAP, ECOWAS) gave it strong legitimacy. However, major exogenous shocks (the withdrawal of countries from ECOWAS, political instability, and the security crisis) have weakened its intervention framework. The project managed to adapt partially through decentralised approaches (task forces, use of local NGOs), but without fully compensating for the loss of the initially intended regional anchoring.

Conclusion 2: The multi-stakeholder configuration enabled the mobilisation of diverse and complementary expertise but suffered from a lack of integrated steering. The absence of a fully functional coordination unit led to fragmentation of activities and compartmentalisation between agencies. This deficit in strategic governance undermined the project's overall effectiveness by slowing implementation and limiting synergy between the project's components.

Conclusion 3: PRISMA enabled the production of numerous tools (health protocols, risk maps, insurance mechanisms, carbon factsheets, etc.) and the strengthening of key actors (laboratories, research centres, task forces). However, by mid-2025, many structuring deliverables are yet to be finalised, particularly in the areas of training, scaling up of innovations, and political advocacy. The absence of a mid-term evaluation and administrative delays have exacerbated these gaps.

Conclusion 4: While progress has been made in integrating tools into training (e.g., university modules) and in diagnostic capacities (e.g., LABOCEL, LCV), few results have been institutionalised in national policies. Dependence on external funding, the absence of domestic financing mechanisms, and a logic still marked by aid dependency (e.g., compensation schemes) hinder the sustainable appropriation of results by national actors.

Conclusion 5: Innovation laboratories and field mechanisms (livestock feed banks, support for herders, local experiments) have generated buy-in, but their support has remained partial. The sense of incompleteness expressed by several beneficiaries reflects a gap between the expectations generated by the project and its capacity to bring about lasting transformation in the territories.

Conclusion 6: The technical and scientific foundations laid by PRISMA open up real prospects for impact — on pastoral practices, veterinary public health, and resource governance. But the realisation of this potential will depend on sustained consolidation over time (Phase II), strengthened leadership by national institutions, and robust financing, monitoring, and dissemination mechanisms.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1	Conclusion	Targeted actor	Level	Priority	Type
Develop a post-ECOWAS territorialisation strategy to maintain regional anchoring	C1	Coordination Unit (Enabel - ARAA:AECID - LuxDev) in collaboration with ECOWAS (ARAA/CRSA), sectoral ministries, national NGOs	1 and 2	Short term	Strategic

Narrative: The withdrawal of Burkina Faso, Mali, and Niger from ECOWAS has profoundly weakened the originally planned regional framework for anchoring the results of the PRISMA project. In this context, it is necessary to develop a differentiated territorial strategy to maintain the achievements in the countries that have exited. This strategy involves strengthening the national Task Forces as coordination hubs, establishing bilateral collaborations with the remaining member countries, and developing sub-regional technical networks supported by research institutions, universities, or national laboratories. This approach will help sustain a regional dynamic despite political upheavals and ensure the secure dissemination of innovations.

Recommendation 2	Conclusion	Targeted actor	Level	Priority	Type
Establish consolidated steering with an inter-agency coordination unit to reinforce coherence, facilitate strategic decision-making, and optimise synergies between agencies	C2	Project Coordination Unit (Enabel – ARAA:AECID – LuxDev) in collaboration with the EU	1 and 2	Medium term	Strategic

Narrative: The multi-agency configuration of PRISMA enabled the mobilisation of diverse expertise but has also led to compartmentalisation of activities and a lack of shared steering. To improve the coherence and effectiveness of the project, it is recommended to set up an inter-agency coordination unit within the PCU, with technical focal points designated by each agency, a shared work agenda, and formalised consultation mechanisms. This unit would ensure cross-cutting monitoring of activities, facilitate strategic arbitration, and enable better anticipation of synergies and operational constraints.

Recommendation 3	Conclusion	Targeted actor	Level	Priority	Type
Finalise the key deliverables by the end of 2025 with an accelerated delivery plan to ensure the availability, transferability, and operational readiness of the products before the project closes.	C3	Project Coordination Unit (Enabel – ARAA:AECID – LuxDev) in collaboration with research centres and consultants	1	Short term	Operational

Narrative: As the project approaches its end, a significant number of essential deliverables remain unfinished. To avoid project closure with only partial results, it is urgent to establish an accelerated delivery plan. This plan should include a timetable for finalising the expected products (protocols, training modules, digital tools), monthly monitoring of progress, and streamlined validation mechanisms in coordination with national partners. The aim is to rapidly mobilise the necessary expertise, secure strategic content, and ensure that the tools produced are available, transferable, and operational before the project closes.

Recommendation 4	Conclusion	Targeted actor	Level	Priority	Type
Create a national mechanism for the transfer and institutional appropriation to ensure the sustainable integration of project tools and achievements into national policies and frameworks.	C4	Project Coordination Unit (Enabel – ARAA:AECID – LuxDev) in collaboration with sectoral ministries, ECOWAS, and the EU	1 and 2	Medium term	Strategic

Narrative: The sustainable ownership of results requires better integration into national institutional frameworks. It is therefore recommended to create a structured transfer mechanism through the signing of agreements between the project and the relevant sectoral ministries for each tool, guide, or mechanism. This mechanism should be accompanied by technical and financial support for the integration of these tools into public policies, as well as their incorporation into the training systems of technical staff (veterinary schools, agropastoral institutes, etc.). This approach aims to embed PRISMA's achievements into the routines and responsibilities of national institutions — an essential condition for their sustainability.

Recommendation 5	Conclusion	Targeted actor	Level	Priority	Type
Secure and relaunch the unfinished territorial mechanisms to sustain local dynamics and ensure the continuity of innovations beyond the PRISMA project.	C5	Project Coordination Unit (Enabel – ARAA:AECID – LuxDev) in collaboration with VSF, partner NGOs, and local authorities	1	Short term	Operational

Narrative: Several territorial mechanisms, such as innovation laboratories or community-based experiments, have not received the necessary support to reach full operational capacity. It is essential to carry out a rapid assessment of the unfinished mechanisms and implement targeted corrective actions. This involves finalising the planned training sessions, providing awareness-raising materials, and reactivating local management committees. A dedicated community revitalisation fund could be mobilised at the end of the project to safeguard these achievements and enable local structures to maintain their momentum beyond the PRISMA framework.

Recommendation 6	Conclusion	Targeted actor	Level	Priority	Type
Prepare Phase 2 around a consolidated strategic framework to transform technical achievements into structural impacts and to sustainably embed innovations into public policies and territories.	C6	Project Coordination Unit (Enabel – ARAA:AECID – LuxDev) in collaboration with partner agencies, the EU, ECOWAS, and secondary donors	1, 2 and 4	Medium term	Strategic

Narrative: To transform the technical achievements of PRISMA into structural impacts, a second phase must be based on a strengthened strategic framework. This Phase 2 should integrate two priorities: the scaling-up of innovations through national public policies, and the consolidation of the environment-climate axis with robust monitoring, financing tools (carbon funds, climate insurance), and local anchoring. It is recommended to develop a clear roadmap for this transition, with a revised logical framework, shared budgetary commitments among partners, and more integrated institutional mechanisms. This consolidation is essential to prevent the project's achievements from remaining at the demonstration stage.

Lessons learned

Lesson Learned 1: Innovation must be well anchored locally and continuously adapted in order to last and be replicable elsewhere.

The evaluation of PRISMA shows that new techniques and methods (such as remote sensing, carbon monitoring, or pastoral resource management tools) generated strong interest among stakeholders. However, these innovations were not always well adopted, as they were sometimes perceived as "products" coming from the outside rather than as solutions jointly built with local actors. Moreover, there were no established mechanisms to test, adjust, and gradually integrate these innovations into local practices and policies, which hindered their sustainability. To succeed in a project involving multiple countries and partners, there must be not only solid technical support, but also continuous learning, ongoing dialogue with users, and rapid integration into national systems.

Lesson Learned 2: Diversity of actors is a strength, but clear governance and shared responsibilities are needed to achieve concrete results.

PRISMA successfully brought together a diverse range of actors — regional institutions (ECOWAS, ARAA), research centres (CIRAD, University of Luxembourg), development cooperation agencies (LuxDev, Enabel, AECID), and NGOs — thereby creating a space rich in complementary expertise and cross-learning. This configuration fostered capacity-building among stakeholders and enriched strategic orientations. However, the evaluation reveals that this institutional plurality also resulted in compartmentalised interventions, unclear sharing of responsibilities, and coordination difficulties linked to differing organisational cultures and complex contractual frameworks. This lack of integrated steering has, at times, hindered the project's responsiveness and limited coherence between components. For this multisectoral collaboration to truly become a lever for impact, it must be supported by explicit and operational mechanisms. One of the main lessons is therefore the need to establish an inter-agency coordination unit, hosted within the Project Coordination Unit (PCU), composed of technical focal points designated by each partner agency. This unit would structure a common agenda, ensure regular consultation, facilitate strategic decision-making, and lead cross-cutting monitoring. It would thus play a central role in collective project facilitation, in bringing together expertise, and in anticipating operational constraints.

Lesson Learned 3: The absence of a dedicated budget undermines the scaling-up of results, even when synergies with other projects exist.

In the PRISMA project (2022–2025), the scaling-up of innovations (such as pastoral management tools, the index-based insurance model, or the aflatoxin mechanisms) relied mainly on activating synergies with ongoing projects of the implementing agencies (e.g. Enabel, AECID, LuxDev) and with external initiatives (PRADEL, PRAOP, FSRP, Great Green Wall, etc.). This strategy proved relevant in avoiding duplication and in mobilising existing dynamics. However, the evaluation revealed that the absence of specific budget planning for scaling-up greatly limited the project's ability to turn these synergies into reality. Partner project leaders expected operational support and funding to integrate PRISMA results into their activities, which could not be provided. As a result, several innovations (digital tools, scientific results, pastoral practices) remained at the prototype stage, due to the lack of budgetary leverage to disseminate and institutionalise them. In multi-stakeholder projects, scaling-up innovations cannot be effective without a dedicated budget line, designed from the outset, to support the operationalisation of synergies.

Lesson Learned 4: Capitalisation based on applied research makes it possible to produce robust and credible content. But if results arrive too late or are too technical, they risk staying in the drawer.

The strategic choice to base capitalisation on the results of applied research enabled the PRISMA project to produce technically robust content, drawing on local initiatives and actively involving field actors from the early stages of the project. This approach helped to showcase innovative practices driven by communities, such as pastoral early-warning systems, animal nutrition practices, and protocols on zoonoses. However, the evaluation shows that despite the technical quality of the outputs, several key deliverables were not available at the strategic moments for their dissemination. The gap between the project's operational rhythm and the timelines inherent to research (testing, validation, adjustments under real-world conditions) limited the availability of outputs at the right time. In addition, some research products — such as the index-based insurance model or the agroecological modelling reports — are still presented in a highly academic or technical form. This level of technicality can reduce uptake by end-users, particularly policymakers or field actors, who may be unfamiliar with advanced modelling tools or complex scientific language.

Finally, although national institutions were involved (e.g. CIRDES, INERA, IER, LABOCEL), their engagement in the final validation, editing, or broad dissemination processes still needs strengthening. For example, the documents on index-based insurance were shared only in a limited way with national structures, without sufficient support to facilitate their reading, adaptation, or appropriation. A better connection between scientific production, operational needs, and a dissemination strategy could therefore increase the concrete reach of the results, notably by promoting more accessible formats such as policy briefs, practical guides, or outreach videos. For future phases, this ambitious capitalisation work would benefit from a more realistic planning of validation timelines, as well as from a diversification of dissemination formats and channels, in order to encourage widespread uptake of innovations.