PD-AAP-926
ISN 36529

UNCLASSIFIED
CLASSIFICATION

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) — PART I

000209
Report Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE	2. PROJECT NUMBER	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE
Farmer Training and Production Project	621-0119.1	USAID/Tanzania

4. EVALUATION NUMBER (Enter the number maintained by the reporting unit e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No. beginning with No. 1 each FY) 84-3

☒ REGULAR EVALUATION ☐ SPECIAL EVALUATION

5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES			6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING	7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY 77	B. Final Obligation Expected FY 79	C. Final Input Delivery FY 84	A. Total $ 3,369,000 B. U.S. $ 2,528,000	From (month/yr.) 4/82 To (month/yr.) 7/84 Date of Evaluation Review 7/6/84

8. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., airgram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
1. The Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock Development (MALD) should seek other donor assistance to assure the continuation of, and addition of new wings to, the present Farmer Training Wing Network (FTW).	Ministry of Agriculture & Livestock Dev. (MALD)	ASAP but no later than 12/84
2. MALD should coordinate the efforts necessary to assure prompt delivery of needed agricultural inputs to FTW project areas.	MALD	ASAP
3. The Division of Manpower Development, MALD should establish formal working arrangments and written agreements with the Division of Research to insure proper linkages with the FTW's for the promotion of joint on-farm research activities.	Division of Manpower Dev., MALD	ASAP but no no later than 12/84
4. MALD should take the necessary action to streamline the administrative and management constraints as identified by this final evaluation.	MALD	ASAP but no later than 12/84

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS

- ☐ Project Paper
- ☐ Financial Plan
- ☐ Logical Framework
- ☐ Project Agreement
- ☐ Implementation Plan (e.g., CPI Network)
- ☐ PIO/T
- ☐ PIO/C
- ☐ PIO/P
- ☐ Other (Specify) _____
- ☐ Other (Specify) _____

10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT

- A. ☒ Continue Project Without Change
- B. ☐ Change Project Design and/or ☐ Change Implementation Plan
- C. ☐ Discontinue Project

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)

Sharon Fee, Project Officer USAID
David Acker, Chief of Party
Robert McColaugh, Agricultural Specialist, REDSO/ESA
Michael Mairay, Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock Dev.
Richard Slayo, Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock Dev.

12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval

Signature [signature]
Typed Name Frederick E. Gilbert
Date August 29, 1984

AID 1330-15 (3-78)

P.E.S. 84-3

FARMER TRAINING AND PRODUCTION PROJECT (621-0119.1)

SUMMARY - PART II

13. SUMMARY - The Evaluation Report by McColaugh and Mziray July, 1984 and opinions expressed by field personnel associated with the project were highly supportive of the project and recommended to the GOT its continuation. Specific accomplishments and major constraints are listed below:

Farmer Training Wing (FTW) Accomplishments

1. The FTW philosophy of first knowing the farmer, by understanding why and how he manages his limited resources during the cropping year, before you suggest major technological interventions, is in use and practiced throughout the FTW network.

2. The FTW's are the first attempt to do extension outreach activities outside the Ministry of Agriculture Training Institute (MATI)compounds for many of the Ministry tutors and their students.

3. The Wing provides students with a programmed opportunity to contact, work with, and learn from the farmers.

4. The outreach exercises provide the tutors with an opportunity to interact with farmers and bring their identified constraints into a classroom situation for real problem solving processes. As one principal pointed out, it allows the tutors to practice what they preach at the village level.

5. The project serves as a vehicle for technology transfer. As a result of the FTW, farmers are trying and using new innovations such as improved cultural intervention practices, small animal projects, improved livestock breeds and irrigation schemes.

6. Analysis of the various FTW surveys have helped to identify (by age, sex, crop, etc.) special interest groups. Examples are grammar school fuelwood tree plantings, women's gardening groups, small irrigation projects and others.

7. The instructional materials output from the project is an excellent methodology of how to teach students, extension agents, and farmers.

8. The project has helped to identify needed inter and intra ministerial linkages. Among these, and at various levels are: planning offices, research institutions, extension agencies and trainer networking activities.

9. Training components of the project have been quite effective in preparation of Tanzanians for FTW tasks. These successes cover both off-shore degree work and in-country inservice training for FTW and MATI staff.

10. Project management has produced a well trained and highly motivated teaching cadre at the FTW level. Although the project was late in getting started the FTW systems are developed, levels of their accomplishments are high and an exemplary relationship exists between the AID contractor and the Ministry of Agriculture.

Observations

Farmer Training Wings have been located at six widely separated MATI locations in Tanzania. The understanding of various agro-climatic conditions, local traditions, special infrastructure constraints, and many bureaucratic obstacles have been overcome. Over the life of project personnel assigned to this pilot project have proven to be a young, dynamic, highly motivated instructional mechanism for the Ministry of Agriculture. Due perhaps to the differences found between the MATIs and/or the varying stages of their maturity, the evaluation team deliniated several major constraints, which were observed during their site visits. These problems will need attention in the coming year in order to increase the efficiency of the FTW instructional programs and assure continuation. Not all constraints are found at each Wing but they were common enough denominators to bring to the attention of interested AID readers.

Major Constraints

1. Transportation and fuel shortages exist. A program as dynamic as the FTW extension outreach laboratories cannot function without a continuous and reliable transport component.

2. Allocation and timeliness of Wing operational funds is poor. The present system does not assure arrival of funds on time or in the amounts needed to carry on scheduled farmer training activities in many of the locations we visited.

3. Records systems must be established that will assure systematic FTW planning procedures and the means to measure target group or client goal achievements while also giving various measures and levels of management accountability.

4. An excellent start has been made by the project in information generation and analysis at the MATI community or village level. Additional assistance should now be sought by the project for further system refinements and improvement in data generation, national analysis and interpretation, and information retrieval. More emphasis should go into user collaboration in survey design, time series, impact evaluations, identification of analogous areas, site specific cropping calenderization, and verification of technological packages. All of these tasks will require a much more sophisticated information and data management process.

5. FTW technology levels in certain of the demonstrations we visited were not of the caliber that extension plots are expected to be. Appropriately trained FTW, MATI or research staff skilled in these crops should conduct the demonstration and at a desirable technical level.

6. Considerable frustration is being caused at all the MATIs because of a lack of needed farmer production inputs or their often tardy arrival at the village sites.

7. MATI/FTW public relations activities are lacking. No signs were posted at any of the many demonstrations plots we visited during the evalutation. These would be important in explaining to the general public what was being demonstrated, why and by whom. Only one night meeting for the 1983/84 crop season was reported where FTW staff or MATI students went together into a village and presented an informative program. Although all MATIs have project owned electric generators, motion picture projectors, slide projectors, etc., we could find no wall posters or simple hand-outs being prepared at MATI locations for farmer training or village instructional users. The team felt a number of these windows of opportunity were present that could be explored to great advantage in the coming cropping seasons.

Future Actions

The six participating MATIs are at a very critical stage in their development. Six project trainees have returned to the country and still need to be assisted in their new FTW roles. Based upon present project accomplishents the evaluation team felt the FTW philosophy should spread to other Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock Training Institutes (MATI/LITI) locations during the next few years. A number of management and administrative improvements are called for, both in the short term and for long range projections, if the continuation of this very successful and innovative program is to proceed as warranted. Without further donor support the project may be seriously hindered in its present state and fully prevented from

any meaningful growth or starting new Wings. Foreign currency support, although not high, is crucial to the continuation and spread of the FTW methodology. Both AID and the Ministry of Agriculture must seek special assistance for this program. The most ideal situation would be one donor picking up the support of all six MATIs. Lacking this possibility one might seek other alternatives such as on a MATI by MATI basis funded by different donors. This approach should only be used if the integrity of the project can be maintained under a multi donor concept, a most difficult task under any circumstances. An alternative suggested to USAID by the review team is the introduction of the Farming Systems Research (621-0156) staff into the project and use of their funding and knowledge to bring that very needed focus of agricultural production to the FTW that has been lacking up to this point. Little investigation can be accomplished during the short two years the FSR team has left in its contract. If the FSR staff were involved in this project what might be accomplished would be much good teaching at the FTW level and implementation of FSR systems and methodologies into an on-going educational system. FSR staff members suggested USAID consideration of this alternative.

14. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

A mid-term evaluation of this project was conducted in May of 1982. The results of that review changed the Project Purpose and extended the PACD date to September 30, 1984. This final evaluation was conducted within the parameters of the new purpose and the team was instructed to measure project progress and outputs since 1982 with special emphasis on remaining constraints and future actions needed for the GOT to carry forward the project.

The team, made up of the AID project officer, the contractor chief of party, FTPP Ministry Coordinator, one Tanzanian outside consultant and a REDS /ESA extension specialist, visited each of the six participating MATIs where FTWs have been established. Interviews were held with MATI directors, Wing leaders, instructional staff, research personnel, extension officers, village leaders, and farmers. The team also visited the Ministry headquarters in Dar es Salaam and interviewed a number of department and division directors associated with or serviced by the project. See Unclassified Dar es Salaam 03098 for the scope of work for the evaluation.

15. EXTERNAL FACTORS

The continuing deterioration of the Tanzanian economy and the difficulty for the project to obtain hard currency has added considerable working constraints to project operations. Spare parts, instructional materials, educational aids, and food for the farmers and students have all been almost impossible for the

GOT and, at times, the USAID contractor to obtain. The recent devaluation of the local currency is yet to be felt or measured on future project activities.

16. INPUTS

A) Technical Assistance Contract WVA/provision of five long-term consultants

B) Commodities:

Vehicles: 34 motorcycles; 7 Land Rovers; 4 buses;

Printing supplies;

Training materials; and

Audio visual equipment.

C) Training:

long term: 6 participants in U.S.;

short-term: 2 study tours abroad; and

in-country training: courses for MATI tutors.

17. OUTPUTS

To a high degree all the projected outputs have been met or will be completed by the PACD. Two exceptions are improved agricultural practices and improved production input packages, which will be completed at the levels envisioned in the project documents. Specific recommendations were made by the evaluation team to treat this critical area in the above section on future actions necessary to carry forward the project after USAID support terminates.

18. PURPOSE

The Purpose was amended as a result of the 1982 evaluation. The project was redesigned to focus more on how to teach extension agents and less on how to produce more food or improve the income of small farmers. The final evaluation team feels that the contractor met the requirements to fulfill the new purpose.

19. GOAL/SUBGOAL

The goal is to improve the social and economic well-being of the small farmers in Tanzanian villages. No measurable indicators could be provided the review team that could

substantiate the objectively verifiable indicators listed in the logframe. The evaluators' qualified answer was that the project seemed to have achieved very positive results in its attempts to improve the "social and economic well-being of the small farmers" in the project area.

20. BENEFICIARIES

Direct beneficiaries of this project are the various Tanzanian participants that were trained off-shore, FTW and MATI staff trained by the Project in extension education, change agents that have received FTPP on-the-job training, and perhaps most importantly the MATI students and tutors that participate weekly in the FTW living laboratories on extension techniques which are conducted at the village level with real farmers. Indirect beneficiaries, under the amended purpose, are the villages and the farmers that have received training, technical assistance, or direct inputs from the project.

21. UNPLANNED EFFECTS

One unplanned and positive effect has been the spread of the project to other MATIs and LITIs which have asked to be included in the FTW network. Another has been that one of the project trained staff has left the Ministry to work at the University of DSM. This has impacted negatively on the project as a whole.

22. LESSONS LEARNED

For a program of this nature to operate at the village level daily, and for the FTW staff to be able to respond to shifting educational tasks in a dynamic mode, transport seems to be a very key agent. The present transportation and logistic systems are in trouble.

The other item flagged by the review team was the lack of agronomic contractor personnel assigned to the project. The overriding bias of the University of West Virginia technician selection towards social science and extension subjects did not place equal emphasis on crop production work exercises carried on at the village level. Some recommendations in the demonstation plots for production increases are questionable and the data gathered for their verification is not sound. The review team was very impressed by the project degree trainees. They have fit in well at the FTWs, are taking their jobs seriously and show high performance in motivating other tutors and their students. One or two from each MATI should attend FSR courses given by CIMMYT. This would bring the farmer recommendations to a much more desirable level of technology.

7

FARMER TRAINING AND PRODUCTION PROJECT (621-0119.1)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY QUESTIONS

P.E.S. 84-3

Question I. What constraints does this project attempt to overcome, and whom does it constrain? Does the project attack a labor, policy or other constraints?

This project addresses the following constraints:

- limited development and flow of technology to the farmer;
- shortage of trained extension agents;
- inadequate training of extension agents, both preservice and inservice;
- very weak linkage among planners, research, training, extension and village farmers; and
- lack of participation of farmers in solving their problems.

Quesion II. What technology does the project promote to relieve the constraints?

The project centers on the establishent of Farmer Training Wings at several MATI locations which provide for:

- inclusion of research, extension, training and district office and village organization in Planning Committee membership;
- improvement of pre-service training of extension agents by emphasizing MATI students' participation in village demonstration;
- in-service short courses for extension agents;
- use of village surveys and village committees to identify and attack farmers' problems through use of low-cost or no-cost improvements in cultural practices.

Question III. What technology does the project attempt to replace?

The project addresses the following items:

- a directive and enforcing role of extension agents in increasing farm production;

- uncoordinated research, training and extension services;

- largely theoretical agricultural training; and

- traditional farming practices such as broadcasting of seeds (rather than now-planting), use of unselected seeds, less than optimal planting dates, inadequate seedbed preparation, and minimal weed control.

Question IV. Why do project planners believe that intended beneficiaries will adopt the proposed technology? (Reference Question II.)

- Coordinated planning and implementation promises to facilitate and make more meaningful the roles already set for research, extension, training, and farmers.

- Agricultural students express personal satisfaction after applying their theoretical knowledge.

- Extension agents are updated in their specialities.

- Farmers' felt-needs are the basis for village projects.

Question V. What characteristics do intended beneficiaries exhibit that have relevance to their adopting the proposed technology?

- Research staff are very well-qualified and interested in making useful contributions to agriculture.

- Teaching staff have demonstrated genuine interest in students application of classroom studies.

- Farmers, in most areas are interested in improving their own families' welfare and the project is addressing their constraints to achieving this goal.

- Extension agents feel that the project village work is easing the agents' workloads and is improving their relationship with the villagers for future efforts.

Question VI. What adoption rate has this project achieved in transferring the proposed technology? (Reference Question II.)

The technology transfer adoption rate has been

- 100% at the six MATIs but not more than 50% for active extension agents. Many of the MATI diploma students are farmer extension agents and will return to this work after graduation; and

- 100% at the six MATIs (approximately 9 villages).

- Initial farmer acceptance or recommendation responses were not using present project data.

Question VII. Will the project set in motion forces that will induce further exploration of the constraints, and improvements to the technological package proposed to overcome them?

- As long as the project is externally supported, linkage between research, extension, training and villagers will be strengthened.

- Improvement in pre-service training is and will continue to take place.

- The management of in-service training for extension workers should improve.

- Village surveys as the basis for determining needs and evaluating progress has been completed each year at all sites.

Question VIII. Do private suppliers have an incentive to examine the constraint(s) addressed by the project and come up with solutions?

Since 1967 TanGov policy has seriously discouraged if not precluded private enterprise activities. There is no evidence as yet of agri-business interest in supplying material or other inputs, although opportunities are emerging. It is fair to assume that they will become involved if and when agriculture becomes more sophisticated and demand will provide a profit motivation.

Question IX. What delivery system does the project employ to transfer the new technology to intended beneficiaries?

The project coordinates its various elements through the establishment of Farmer Training Wings at six pre-existing Ministry of Agriculture Training Institutes. The MATIs were already engaged in training future technicians in agricultural extension, land use planning, irrigation, farm mechanization, farm management and crop production. Each MATI is allied with an attached or nearby research station. Villages in the environs

serve as the "proving grounds" and living laboratories for extension instructional activities.

Question X. What training techniques does the project use to develop the delivery system?

The project has succesfully used a variety of training techniques /approaches to support its technology delivery system. These techniques/approaches include but are not limited to: field demonstrations, residential short courses (two days to two months duration), village based training, field trips to innovative farmers' fields and government agricultural installations, farmer to farmer teaching, written training booklets, slide sets, film strips, movies, research plot visits, method and result demonstration meetings, individualized project/problem oriented assistance and village cooperative training assistance. Methodologies tested and promoted by the project are components of a technical assistance cycle which include the following:

1) understanding the farmer as a rational manager of his limited resources;

2) in depth examination of specific problems confronting the farmer and their relation to the system in which he operates;

3) involvement of farmers and local leaders in extension program planning;

4) mounting project and training assistance simultaneously in a complementary manner;

5) training through dialogue, demonstration and practical "hands on" experience; and

6) formative evaluation involving trainees as well as trainers.

11

Clearances: PRM:LADean (draft)

ADO:KLyvers

PMA:SAFee

APO:JVan Den Bos