

CLASSIFICATION
PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

Report Symbol (U-117)

1. PROJECT TITLE Arusha Planning and Village Development Project	2. PROJECT NUMBER 621-0143	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE 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) <u>81/83</u>		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION		

5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES			6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING		7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION	
A. First PRO-AG or Equipment FY <u>78</u>	B. Final Obligation Expected FY <u>82</u>	C. Final Input Delivery FY <u>82</u>	A. Total \$ <u>23,361,300</u>	B. U.S. \$ <u>14,591,300</u>	From (month/yr.) <u>July 79</u>	To (month/yr.) <u>June 81</u>
					Date of Evaluation Review <u>June 81</u>	

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., program, SPAR, PIC, which will present detailed requests.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
<p>1. AVDVP and the Regional Planning Office should produce a single document which incorporates the Region's long term Development Plan. This should include at a minimum: a) ARUSHA TODAY; b) STRATEGIES AND PRIORITIES FOR THE YEAR 2000 and; c) INFORMATION STRATEGIES PAST AND FUTURE</p> <p>The plan should also include, as an annex, a description of projects identified by the Planning Process for which the Region will pursue additional funding resources.</p>	Regional Development Director (RDD)	Aug 81
<p>2. APVDP should assess and report on alternative sources of investment money which can be used to provide additional sources of funding to those of the project.</p>	APVDP & RDD	Aug 81

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS

<input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper	<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify)
<input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> PIC/T	
<input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework	<input type="checkbox"/> PIC/C	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify)
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/> PIC/P	

10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT

A.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change
B.	<input type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or
	<input type="checkbox"/> Change Implementation Plan
C.	<input type="checkbox"/> Discontinue Project

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS

11.1 APPROPRIATE (Name and Title)
 Thomas Luche, USAID Project Manager
 E.P. Mazalla, Regional Planning Officer,
 Arusha Region

12. Mission/AID/W Office Director

Signature: *[Signature]*
 Typed Name: Barry Riley
 Date: July 31, 1981

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Recommendations	1-4
Summary	5
Methodology	6
External Factors	7
Inputs	9
Outputs, Purposes, Goals	11
Regional & District Planning	12
Village Planning & Project Implementation	15
Agricultural Production	21
Rural Industry	24
Roads	25
Water	27
Irrigation	29
Training	28
Implementation	30
Expansion of Project Activities	32
Benefits	32
Unplanned Effects, Lessons Learned	34
Substantive	34
Procedural	38
Special Remarks	40
Implementation Issues	40
Followon Funding	43
Annexes	
A. Summary Briefing Paper	44
B. Persons Contacted/Interviewed	48
C. Comparison Between PP Financial Analysis & Actual Project	50

MISSING PAGE
NO. 1

Recommendations	Action	Date
<p>3. An additional experienced agriculturalist is needed to provide technical support to district staff in their identification and promotion of improvements in the farming of the region. If GOT is unable to assign an additional professional agriculturalist to the region, consideration might be given to use APVDP resources to hire an East African who is not presently in the government service to fill this role.</p>	<p>RDD & DAI</p>	<p>Aug 81</p>
<p>4. APVDP should present a plan to USAID/T to meet the intent of the project agreement regarding the roads component. The plan will state deployment of T.A. staff to the region, and the three districts and will conform to the "Project Approach (Page 31-38 of the P.P.). Recognizing the formidable constraints to achieving these objectives the plan should address contingencies if the region or GOT cannot meet the minimum requirements. In particular the GOT should provide counterparts as stipulated in the project agreement with assignment of the Regional Roads Inspector receiving the highest priority.</p>	<p>APVDP</p>	<p>Aug 81</p>
<p>5. USAID/T should provide to the region its updated plans to improve procurement practices over the remainder of the project.</p>	<p>USAID/T</p>	<p>Sept 81</p>
<p>6. USAID/T with REDSO/EA concurrence should specify REDSO/EA responsibility regarding project implementation; and REDSO/EA should make every effort to maximize continuity of personnel servicing the project.</p>	<p>USAID/T REDSO/EA</p>	<p>Aug 81</p>

7. Serious consideration should be given to inclusion of the Masai Districts in any follow-on project. Particularly in view of past USAID experience in pastoralist areas (such as the Masai Districts), person(s) with experience with pastoralist development projects should be included on any proposed PID design team.

USAID/T

FY 82

8. Specific plans should be made for accomplishments that can be expected during the remainder of the project:

RDD &
APVDP

Sept 81

a) If a follow-on project appears highly likely, the present project completion date should be extended to Dec. 82, resources permitting.

b) If a follow-on is not foreseen, the project completion date should be extended to June 83, resources permitting.

c) USAID/T should select a team to review project status and the plan within 9 months.

9. The APVDP water advisor should mainly concentrate his activities on helping the Water Department address rehabilitation and maintenance problems through developing a system of inventory, rehabilitation identification procedures, design and planning for procurement of replacement parts. Consultant services may be necessary to facilitate these tasks. This emphasis is not to exclude the shallow wells and training programs.

RDD and
DAI

July 81

10. Due to delays in implementation of water projects and the lead time necessary for their completion, funding

USAID/T
and RDD

Aug 81

should be authorized to end of fiscal year 83 for water projects.

- | | | |
|--|---|---------|
| 11. Prior to further obligation of funds for project activities, including those discussed in Section 23, Special Remarks, USAID/T must review and approve such project activities against criteria set forth in the project. | RDD, Contractors and USAID/T | Aug. 81 |
| 12. A record of financial costs by ProAg obligation and disbursement be completed by line category as in the ProAg (see Annex C). This record should form the basis of a full review of the project, as discussed in the Implementation Section of this Evaluation. | USAID/T | Aug 81 |
| 13. USAID/T should assign a full time Project Manager at Arusha who is familiar with project history and implementation, is highly knowledgeable of AID procedures and has perception of when to call on other AID personnel for technical or other required backup. | USAID/T | Aug 81 |
| 14. USAID/T should be more explicit in defining its implementation procedures (in particular regarding project approvals, submission of annual plans and deviations from project paper design) and the regional government and the contractors be more responsive concerning these procedures, including satisfaction of project approval criteria set out in the ProAg. | USAID/
Tanzania,
RDD and
Contractors | Aug 81 |
| 15. Assuming that the preceding recommendations can be met in substance in the time frame specified, and USAID/Tanzania continues to develop, justify and document specific procedures appropriate to the design of this project, the Evaluation Team sees no need for a revision of project authorization. | USAID/T | Aug 81 |

EVALUATION OF THE ARUSHA PLANNING
AND
VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

13. Summary

The goal of the APVDP is to improve the production, income and well-being of rural people in the three relatively better endowed agricultural districts of Arusha Region. The purpose of the project is to strengthen the capabilities of Arusha region, the three project districts and the villages in these districts to identify, implement and evaluate development activities within the framework of the policies and priorities of the Government of Tanzania (GOT). A second purpose is to provide the micro-data which will assist in the preparation of the Arusha Region Integrated Development Plan.

The project has made commendable progress since its startup in July 1979. In general it is well integrated with and has received good support from the GOT at the regional and district levels. The project approach - based on a "process" model - is innovative, ambitious, and well suited to Tanzania. It has successfully integrated the development of an improved regional planning capacity with the strengthening of Tanzania's "bottomup" style of village development, generating considerable support among regional and district leaders for significantly changed development priorities.

The APVDP staff are highly motivated and professionally competent. All have prior African experience; most speak Swahili. The staff include rural development advisors assigned to the planning office in each of the three districts, sector specialists assignment to government ministries - agriculture, water, rural industry and roads - and planning/management advisors working within the Regional Planning Office at regional headquarters. All but the roads component staff, which includes five expatriates working under separate contract, are part of an implementation team working under a U.S. Government contract.

The financial aspects of the project are summarized in Table 1, Section 16; the table indicates almost total obligation of funds, projected cost overruns in some categories, and cost variations for them. Detailed cost data and recommended breakdown by categories are included in Annex C. Project progress to date has been hindered by a number of factors. Most important of these are: delays in project startup and procurement; management difficulties between USAID offices and the contractors; insufficient recurrent funds and government staff; and an unfavorable economic environment.

It is too early to predict whether the project will be able to achieve all its objectives, particularly given the above-mentioned constraints and limited project funds. Based, however, on progress to date, the fit of the project within Tanzania, and USAID's policy priorities, the evaluation team strongly recommends that the project receive priority attention for extension of funding and project completion date, and consideration for select follow-on activities.

14. Methodology

This midterm evaluation was scheduled in the project paper. It has been preceded by one special "in-house" formative evaluation initiated and conducted by three members of the firm which assisted in the project design and has the major responsibility for project implementation. The findings of the special evaluation (which addressed some serious internal start-up problems) have been considered in this evaluation. A third evaluation is called for at project completion. The members of the evaluation team are listed below. The team included three representatives from AID, two government officials from Arusha Region, one consultant with extensive knowledge of Tanzania, plus three observer/participants: a member of the Development Alternatives, Inc. (DAI) APVDP team, a University lecturer from Dar Es Salaam, and the USAID APVDP project manager.

The scope of work for the evaluation essentially follows the project logical framework matrix, and is on file in USAID/T. The evaluation extended over a month, and included discussions and a preliminary review of materials by team members stationed in Nairobi, two weeks of intensive work in Arusha Region (including preparation of an issues-oriented discussion paper), followed by an analysis and write-up phase in Nairobi. All team members were present and assisted in the writeup in Nairobi. The final draft of this document plus a briefing paper included as Annex A were reviewed in Arusha by government officials, project implementation personnel and USAID staff from both the Arusha regional office and USAID/T based in Dar Es Salaam.

Data were collected through reviewing project-related documentation, attending briefings and village-level meetings, conducting interviews, and field investigations. Members of the team visited each of the three districts of project concentration - where extensive interviewing of government and project staff was combined with village and project site visits. A list of persons contacted is included as Annex B.

Team Members:

Ned Greeley	Behavioral Science Advisor and Team Leader, REDSO/EA, Nairobi
Alan Johnston	Rural Development Planning Advisor, Arusha Planning and Village Development Project (APVDP) (Observer)
I. Ole - Karyongi	District Development Director, Arumeru District, Arusha Region
P. K. Kitema	Planning Officer, Arusha Regional Planning Office
Elizabeth Kleemeier	Lecturer Political Science, University of Dar Es Salaam (Observer)
David Leonard	Professor Political Science, University of California, Berkeley
Dennis Light	Engineer and Planning Advisor, REDSO/EA, Nairobi
Thomas Luche	USAID Project Manager of APVDP, Arusha (Observer)
Thomas Worrick	Agricultural Economist and former member of the APVDP Project Paper Design Team, USAID/Kenya.

15. External Factors

The economic conditions in Tanzania as in other countries in the region have declined steadily since this project was designed in 1977. In particular, the war with Uganda, the continued rise in petroleum prices and drought have resulted in a severe squeeze on resources for both recurrent and development programs. In addition, the GOT has pursued some policies (pricing, input supply, marketing, taxation, etc.) which have not necessarily been conducive to the full development of the economy.

The decline in the demand for primary products by the industrial countries during the same period has added to the economic problems. The net result of these problems has been a gradual decline in regional infrastructure,

commercial agriculture and the supply of inputs to agricultural production, transport, construction and industry. Consumer goods are in short supply or unavailable in many areas.

These conditions caused by factors external to Arusha Region have had a major impact on development activities in the region, including those supported by the APVDP. The priorities of the GOT to promote rural development, for example, have not changed but the ability to finance programs has been severely limited. In addition, a number of inputs required by the region for development and maintenance purposes have not been able to be supplied.

Also significant for success of the APVDP is the changing validity of many of the assumptions underlying project design. If current trends continue, several assumptions critical to project success may prove overly optimistic; the final evaluation team should evaluate these closely. At the goal level, it is apparent, for example, that the assumption that "a decrease in the need for agricultural imports" is not going to be fulfilled. At the purpose and output levels, there are similarly several assumptions related to current economic conditions which are probably not going to be met and may influence final attainment of project objectives as discussed in the sections below. These assumptions include the following:

- adequate demand exists for the increased supply of agricultural production;
- the Tanzania Government will continue to increase and make effective use of the recurrent costs portions of its budget; and
- production activities in the project area will generate sufficient revenues to cover recurrent costs.

The assumptions concerning the likelihood of a positive response of villagers to development possibilities and the benefits accruing from their participation, appear to be well justified. The Evaluation Team is generally impressed with progress made toward the project objectives of strengthening capabilities at all levels.

Overall, external factors have caused, and are expected to continue to cause, real problems for this project. At the same time the effort made to overcome the constraints is commendable.

16. Inputs

The main project inputs are technical assistance, training, and commodities. Details of the budget are included in Table 1. This table shows total obligations, practically equalling total funding including that of technical assistance. The item "other costs" includes fuel. The obligations and expenditures relate only to technical assistance, commodities, training and other costs and do not indicate by category the purpose for which the money was used. Because of the complexity of this project, the Evaluation Team recommended that USAID/T prepare a breakdown by category in obligations and expenditures. Annex C provides additional details (including examples of cost breakdown by category).

Provision of technical assistance has slightly exceeded the amount planned in the project paper; there have been two additional persons (5 vs 3) added to the roads component of the project. Commodities have also been provided as planned, although there have been significant delays in some procurement: for example, 60 motorcycles are on order but not yet delivered and completion of an additional order of 60 motorcycles is pending review. There has been also some recategorization of funds to enable construction of warehouses and the Agricultural Implement Production Facility (an issue discussed in section 23). Because of other priorities and delays in presentation and review of plans, construction of district housing for the rural development specialists will not be undertaken.

Regarding training there has been a slight reduction in planned inputs. A maximum of eight (rather than 10) MA candidates will be sent to the U.S.; depending on budget constraints and commitment of regional personnel, this number may be reduced to seven or even five. Short-term U.S. training will be deemphasized, and greater emphasis will be placed on local training.

Other costs not foreseen in the project paper include petrol, oil and lubrication, maintenance and operation of vehicles, casual road labor, and various costs, per diem supplements, travel and other staff costs, office equipment, etc.

TABLE 1
FINANCIAL COSTS

Item	P. P. . in million \$			AID ARUSHA Projections May 1981 in million \$			Expenditures March 1981 in million \$			Obligations June 1981 in million \$		
	Total	FX	LC	Subtotal	Total	FX	LC	Total	FX	LC		
1. TECH. ASSIST.	5.4	5.1	0.3									
A. Roads				0.9	0.9	0	1.2	1.2	0	0.5	0.5	
B. DAI (non Roads)				4.6	4.3	0.3	5.3	4.9	0.4	2.3	2.3	5.1
2. COMMODITIES	8.4	3.5	4.8									
A. Roads				2.8	2.3	0.5	2.7	2.3	0.4	1.6	1.5	0.5
B. DAI (non Roads)				5.6	1.3	4.3	3.6	1.4	2.2	1.3	1.0	0.1
3. TRAINING	0.7	0.5	0.2									
A. Roads				0	0	0	0	0	0			
B. DAI (non Roads)				0.7	0.5	0.2	0.6	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.1
4. CONSTRUCTION	0	0	0									
A. DAI (non Roads)				0	0	0	0.3	0	0.3	0.04		0.04
A. DAI (non Roads)							0.3	0	0.3	0.04		0.04
5. OTHER COSTS	0.1	0.1	0									
A. Roads				0	0	0	0.8	0.8	0	0.2	0.0	0.2
B. DAI (non Roads)				0.1	0	0	1.1	0	1.1	0.5	0.0	0.5
GRAND TOTAL	14.6	9.3	5.3				15.6	10.8	4.8	6.64	5.40	1.24
A. Roads				3.7	3.2	0.5						
B. DAI (non Roads)				10.9	6.2	4.7						

17. Outputs; 18. Purposes; 19. Goals

As an integrated rural development project with a number of interrelated components and a field of activity which addresses village, district and regional level needs, APVDP has a complex series of objectives. The goal of the APVDP is to improve the production, income, and well-being of people in the rural areas of Arumeru, Mbulu and Hanang Districts of Arusha Region. The project purposes are to strengthen the capabilities of the region, the three project districts, and villages in the three districts listed in the goal; identify, implement and evaluate development activities within the framework of the policies and priorities of the GOT; and provide the micro data that will assist in the preparation of the Arusha Region Integrated Road Development Plan. There are 41 specific outputs identified in the PP Logical Framework; these are organized within four general components: planning, implementation and evaluation; agricultural production; other economic activities, and social and economic infrastructure. In the interest of clarity, we have combined our discussion of outputs, purposes and goals, and have elected to address these three sections (17, 18, 19) in relation to the APVDP major topical areas. These include: regional and district planning; village planning and project implementation, agricultural production (including natural resources); rural industry development; roads, water and irrigation; and training. Additional discussions of procedural issues related to project implementation follows evaluation of the major topical areas.

One general observation applies to all the sectors and should be made first. With the exception of the roads component of the project, APVDP is exceptionally well integrated into the regional government structure. The Technical Assistance (T.A.) staff provided by DAI not only all have local counterparts; they generally are working with large numbers of local staff and rarely will go to the field without at least one of them. It is clear that the DAI team has made a special effort in this regard. As a consequence regional and district staff must receive much of the credit for accomplishments of APVDP that are listed below. This integration and training of local counterparts has not been provided by the roads team and this is one of the primary criticisms of it made below. While praising DAI for this effort, one note of caution is necessary. Though GOT staff are ultimately responsible for and are involved in APVDP efforts, the T.A. staff are not involved in all comparable GOT work. Thus from this perspective one can distinguish between the programs of the region and those of APVDP.

If APVDP is successful in training and motivating their counterparts, the new methods should be increasingly evident beyond the boundaries of APVDP. If this is not accomplished there is a danger that the impression will be given that T.A. is necessary to achieve results. Such dependency is evident at present but somewhat more effort beyond the already commendable DAI effort at institution-building should minimize this potential problem.

Thus, although it is essential that APVDP focus its attention to achieve results, the evaluation team hopes that the distinction between APVDP and GOT work will be harder to make in the final evaluation.

REGIONAL AND DISTRICT PLANNING

This sub-section evaluates APVDP regional and district planning activities in light of the government's expectations for a regional plan and in comparison with the approaches to regional planning taken by other donors in Tanzania.

The policy of the Prime Minister's Office (PMO) to request donors to assist with the preparation of regional integrated development plans (RIDEPs) represents a GOT response to two factors. First, the 1972 decentralization reform put a tremendous strain on regional finances and manpower. Second the perception was that the lack of sufficient numbers of project proposals "in the pipeline" was the main constraint to larger foreign assistance inflows.

From the perspective of the PMO, therefore, the preparation of a regional plan represents the first phase in a long-term foreign assistance commitment by one or more donors. The purpose of a RIDEP is to provide a plan for donor development finance and technical assistance, and a methodology for planning sectorally-integrated projects.

Donor response to the PMO request has been twofold. The majority of donors have provided an expatriate team to do comprehensive surveys of a given region's resources and to write project proposals of varying scope and detail. The regions, however, have rightly perceived the resulting documents as investment plans for foreign assistance rather than decisions about the allocation of domestic resources. The plans are seen as wasted efforts when no foreign donors agree to finance them.

APVDP has taken a unique approach to RIDEP in not viewing it primarily as a tool to attract and manage foreign assistance, although it is attempting to assist the region to obtain additional donor resources. Instead the objective has been to assist government and party officials in thinking about their policies for the development of the region. The "process approach" to planning has resulted from selecting DAI as the prime design, and subsequently implementation, contractor for APVDP.

Since the national government does not itself view RIDEPs as primarily a by-product of autonomous regional policy-making, it has not established the national policies and structures supportive of APVDP efforts. The centralization of financial control, and the very large number of detailed guide-lines from the GOT has made the APVDP objective a difficult one to pursue.

The process approach to planning involves intense initial collaboration between Tanzanian officials and the technical assistance team to establish the priority areas for research, followed by extensive (and in the early phase excessive) use of expatriate consultants for data collection and analysis. (APVDP is now making effective use of local consultants from the University of Dar Es Salaam. This has institution-building benefits as well as feeding into the national policy-making process.) There have been over 150 different pieces of documentation, including 6 district long-term development strategy papers and a regional strategy paper produced to date (see Annex A for a listing).. Finally the creation of forums (workshops and planning committees) for party and government officials has been utilized to raise and discuss the policy issues identified in the research findings. The "process" has represented a methodology to increase interaction between the Tanzanians and the expatriate assistance team, in contrast to a methodology replicable in other Regional Planning offices without foreign assistance. Under APVDP, six person years of technical staff assistance were required for this effort as well as an additional 54.9 short-term consultancy months.

The remarkable achievement of APVDP has been the fact that the long-term development priorities and strategies produced through the process truly reflect Tanzanian officials' decisions and attitudes, and that the planning exercise has focused policy on issues which formerly were only vaguely articulated as problems, e.g., population growth and soil conservation. The Evaluation Team in its discussions with Tanzanians in the regions and districts has been impressed by their commitment to the planning decisions and the extent to which the priorities reflect Tanzanian

attitudes. Thus, APVDP has achieved one objective which the project paper (PP) set for it. It has been a catalyst to raise Tanzanian consciousness about regional policy issues and problems. Moreover the actual cost of APVDP planning activities, approximately US \$1 million in technical assistance and consultancies, is substantially less than that incurred by other donors to produce plan documents. (The cost figure, however, does not include training expenses, which are a part of planning and a major cost.) The Team recommends that the achievements of the planning process now be consolidated with a series of district leadership seminars which would produce a still broader consensus on its policy conclusions.

Two planning innovations are worth note. One is the use of Eco systems to do an agro-ecological aerial survey and census of the region. This proved cheaper, faster and more reliable than traditional ground surveys. Secondly, the introduction of planning committees with both government and party members into the regional and district structure increased the involvement of the Party in the earliest stages of plan formulation, a move towards greater popular participation. Nevertheless, the Final Evaluation will have to assess whether the outputs stated in the PP - district development plans; district and regional planning methods and procedures - have been satisfactorily achieved.

One question concerns the district and regional commitment to translate policies into changes in the Annual and Five-Year Budgets. The Evaluation Team has been struck by the need for the region to stress maintenance and rehabilitation of existing investments. Indeed the regional strategy calls for "the concentration of efforts on the better utilization of existing resources." Yet this is in tension with the original Tanzanian understanding of RIDEP, to attract increased levels of foreign development capital. The Final Evaluation should examine the Budgets to see whether the region has succeeded in emphasizing maintenance and rehabilitation over new development investments, as well as progress in other priority areas.

A second question concerns whether the district and regions can develop a method for placing priority on specific projects and project locations in a rational fashion, increasing the sectoral integration of project design and using project evaluations as the basis for further funding decisions -- in short whether APVDP assisted in the development of a more technical planning and budgeting methodology. Such a methodology has already been developed for APVDP's Annual Work Plan for USAID. This

year the first step was taken to integrate the preparation of the Work Plan into the region's own annual planning and budgeting exercise. This will produce some tension between Tanzanian and USAID requirements for these documents but is a step in the right direction. The planning methodologies developed by APVDP should be continued to be extended into the other submissions for the region's own Annual Plan. The final evaluation should look at technical assistance to the RPO/Planning and Evaluation Division in order to judge its effectiveness in this area.

Related to the foregoing is the character of the information systems used by APVDP in the planning exercise. Landsat photographs and an aerial survey were used to define agro-ecological zones and to generate basic data about agricultural production in the region. This was the quickest and least expensive method to generate basic reliable data for planning and will prove useful for future planning efforts as well. Field surveys were conducted of villages and civil servants which produced quite useful information. (The man-power survey in particular was widely quoted.) Finally the above-mentioned consultants (mainly expatriate) were brought in to do studies with existing data on special problems. (Those done on population trends and land use have been especially influential.) This combination of methods has been quite efficient in generating the data for integrated regional planning and for setting regional strategies. APVDP will commission studies of additional problem areas in the future but its major efforts now will turn to the government reporting systems. The studies which have been done have been good. There have been certain holes, however, in the coverage--most notably on the performance of parastatals in the region. APVDP also has not been successful in creating on-going data collection systems that would support future Tanzanian efforts at integrated regional planning, although some pilot attempts were made. This would have been difficult and expensive to do, however, and given the shortage of remaining APVDP resources, we do not recommend significant efforts in that direction now.

VILLAGE PLANNING AND PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

The largest portion of the time of the three Rural Development Specialists has been devoted to the process of planning, project development and implementation in APVDP's pilot wards. An unspecified but considerable amount of government staff time at the district and ward levels has been devoted to this process as well. Two local hire personnel also have devoted about 5 person months to the

development of a land use planning approach for the six villages in one ward. An average of perhaps a quarter of the time of three of the regionally-based project specialists has supported these activities.

The process of general village planning and small project implementation has been quite distinct from that of land use planning. The former has focused on the identification of those constraints to development which small self-help or government projects might overcome. The latter is concerned with those constraints which affect or are affected by the village's management of its land resource base.

APVDP began village land use planning in late 1980. Extensive organizational work has been done in Olkokola Ward (Arumeru) this year and similar work has just begun in Karatu Division (Mbulu) and Gallapo Ward (Hanang). Problems of population pressure, land scarcity, overstocking with livestock, and soil degradation emerged from the regional planning exercise as critical issues and these wards were chosen by their districts as needing first attention. Although the need for land use planning was first identified in the regional planning, APVDP has used extensive village dialogue to create local support for it as well. As yet there is not much concrete change as a result of the land use planning efforts. It seems clear that the people of Olkokola Ward have a clearer consciousness of their resource scarcity problems now than they did before. Village committees have requested and received visits from a family planning agency. Also, some dry season grazing has been set aside; people agree there is overgrazing and there is talk of keeping cattle from other wards out of the area. The changes in awareness are impressive. Change in behavior will be much slower in coming, however, especially as this is an area with substantial communal grazing and the "dilemma of the commons" is one of the most difficult resource management problems for a community to solve. Resource conservation is very much easier to achieve where there will be a single party responsible for the management of a piece of land over time than when there are several, potentially competing, users. The prospects for observable change appear to be much better for Karatu, where there already is concern about erosion. We believe that the subtle and difficult attitudinal changes which land use planning dialogues can create must be accompanied by some visible changes in land management if the process is to gain momentum and legitimacy in Tanzanian eyes. We recognize that fundamental social change is being attempted, that no easy results can be expected and that a remarkable degree of

official support for the program has been developed so far. That support is still fragile, however, and needs consolidation. Hence we recommend that areas in which there is a good prospect of producing some visible changes, such as Karatu, be the early targets of this program.

The other type of village planning work in which APVDP engages has been the identification of small projects. This planning began early in APVDP and will continue as a focus of the Rural Development Specialists. Both GOT policy and development theory stress the importance of popular participation for these types of projects. In order to extend Tanzania's accomplishments in this area, APVDP initially adopted the facilitator approach to the identification of small projects. This involved intensive consultation by Tanzanian facilitators with a broad range of villagers. The first object was to identify villager priorities that might be different from those expressed by their leaders. This proved unnecessary. The Tanzanian Government has stimulated a very strong desire on the part of villagers for development, a clear sense of what that would mean, and high expectations that the state will provide material assistance in its achievement. Thus Tanzanian villagers can articulate a list of priority needs quite easily. The degree of socio-economic differentiation within the villages also is sufficiently small that leaders generally express the same priorities as do other village groups. (APVDP has done separate consultations to develop women's projects. However, it has not yet tackled villages in which there are pastoralist minorities who could have different perceptions from those of their agriculturalist leaders.) APVDP therefore has concluded that when one is dealing with standard development initiatives, consultation with village leaders is an acceptable and efficient method for identifying local constraints and the actions needed to address them. When one is attempting to create a consciousness of new problems or to mobilize mass support where it has previously been absent, a more intensive consultation process is appropriate. The second object of the facilitator approach was to stimulate village efforts to solve their problems themselves where possible which is an object of GOT policy as well. It proved extremely difficult for someone associated with the Tanzanian Government and a foreign donor to do this. The government has made strong promises of assistance for village water, school and health facilities, and in the past often was generous with aid in other areas as well. Villagers expect the foreign donor to provide the help which the government has not yet delivered. Thus for many categories of projects, village self-help is held back

pending some form of matching government or donor contribution.

APVDP's use of the facilitator approach was intended as an experiment. Once its problems were identified APVDP switched to an approach of working with village leaders and identifying those projects which the villages could undertake with a small amount of outside assistance and a significant contribution of their own efforts. This approach is similar to the standard Tanzanian Government approach but involves much more extensive consultation with the village leaders and a more thorough evaluation of the project's feasibility. APVDP has developed a standard format for reporting on project feasibility to its regional review committee and this format was adopted by the region this year for use in its project budget review process on all government projects. Some of the features of the facilitator approach have been incorporated in the land use planning efforts, where a broad-based commitment to new concepts and actions is needed.

The projects developed and funded by APVDP for villages have included a variety of water, conservation and productive projects. Shallow wells, a bore hole, two small gravity flow systems, a minor dam and a small-scale irrigation system are under way or shortly to begin. In natural resources, village tree nurseries have been started in several places and the planting of trees for timber, fruit and conservation has been promoted quite successfully. Livestock work has included cattle dip construction, the development of some local beef marketing facilities, and training for veterinary staff. Agriculture activities have focused on soil conservation, grain storage, development of ox-drawn equipment and extension staff training. Small-scale industries will include maize milling and the manufacture of ox-drawn equipment, soap, brick and tile. The preceding list is not comprehensive but gives a good idea of the range of projects undertaken.

In striving to keep to the GOT commitment to popular involvement, APVDP has overcome the usual donor bias toward the technocratic identification of projects. In fact the APVDP process for the identification and development of village projects is somewhat more participatory than is the standard government one. We reviewed the history of development of most current and proposed APVDP projects and government projects budgeted for 81/82 in the areas of Agriculture, Livestock, Natural Resources and Cooperative Development. In the three APVDP districts the idea for 51% of the 76 APVDP village projects first came from villagers

themselves whereas only 18% of 114 government village projects were so initiated. (A project that affected X number of villages was counted as X village projects.) If one removes the National Maize Programme, over which the region has no control, from the counting, the government's ratio of village initiated ideas rises to 50% of 42 (although most of the village initiative comes from the historically more active district of Arumeru).

Both the government and APVDP try to consult with villagers about project ideas that have come from outside technical analysis but APVDP has been more thorough in doing so. We believe that the result has been better village understanding of and commitment to APVDP projects and that as a consequence they have a better chance of long term success. It is true that there have been failures. The negative features of the Kikwe Housing Brigade outweigh its accomplishments. The attempt to save the Dongobesh piggery also failed. Projects in the productive sectors, however, have a very high failure rate in Tanzania. (See Leonard, Hyden, Maeda, and Mushi, University of Dar Es Salaam Decentralization Paper 75.8) It seems to us that APVDP is likely to do considerably better than the average. We believe that the important thing is not so much that villagers initiate project ideas as that they approve of them, feel fully involved in their development, and committed to their success. As APVDP has been training regular government staff and involving them in their activities, we would hope that both APVDP and regular government projects would show higher levels of full village consultation and subsequent success in 1983 than they did in 1979. Such a comparison should be used as one basis for evaluating the effect of APVDP.

Some complaints have been voiced by district and regional officials about the small projects activities to the effect that APVDP time and resources should be addressed to large projects and perhaps less to village organization. These complaints seem to derive from several different causes. One is a misunderstanding on the part of many about the nature of APVDP, mistakenly believing that it was intended to make large capital investments. Another is a frustration with the slow start-up of other parts of APVDP on water systems and (in Arumeru District) road construction. A further cause is a legitimate concern that the very scarce time of the Rural Development Specialists not be frittered away on projects that can have only a very small impact. (Thus we recommend that attention be focused on small and medium projects that, if successful, can be extended to other villages with ever diminishing marginal

effort by APVDP staff, e.g., maize mills to be funded by the Tanzanian Rural Development Bank). Finally, however, we believe the complaints may derive in part from subtle, but significant, differences in perception about the constraints on village development in the region. The critics tend to view the problem as a shortage of funds and technical expertise for capital investment. APVDP staff are more concerned that villages develop the commitment and organization necessary to maintain and keep productive these capital investments. Thus to the critics, village organization can be an inefficient use of time and a constraint on the rapid movement of capital; to APVDP staff, it addresses a core problem. Neither the critics or APVDP discounts the position of the other--the regional government has identified maintenance problems as a high priority. The difference is one of emphasis. We believe that APVDP staff time should be invested as efficiently as possible and that projects with more potential for spread are sometimes appropriate. At the same time we believe that the critical problem facing the region is the maintenance and productive use of its own investments and that even more organizational work is appropriate to help villagers assume the maintenance burden that the government simply cannot handle in this time of scarce resources.

APVDP proposes to help the regional government develop a simple set of forms for reporting on the progress and success of all projects. This will assist the region in identifying implementation problems and will provide a basis for evaluating future project proposals. If the system is kept simple enough so it can be maintained easily by district functional managers, it promises to make a significant contribution to the quality of regional decision-making. We would encourage APVDP and the region to consider asking for evaluation reports on projects one year and three years after the cessation of support from government development funds, as many activities collapse or disappear when this occurs. If this reporting system is developed and if it is applied as an experience-generating exercise to projects the region undertook three years ago, the reports can be used easily and reliably to evaluate APVDP's work in the small projects area.

The other information gathering activity on which APVDP proposes to work in the next two years is the reporting of village statistics. Villages already are required to report a range of facts but this is not done particularly well. There is a need to focus village reporting on the most important statistics which it is feasible to collect reliably and to assist them in

performing the task well. This will involve paring away the demands for information that is less useful or which villages cannot collect reliably. It has been thought that a better village consciousness of population trends would result from their keeping good records of births, deaths and migration. Reporting on the operation of basic village services (e.g., number of days the clinic or water system have not functioned) also could be used to focus attention on their problems by the government. As we propose that the APVDP Rural Development Specialists devote more time to working with district staff to organize villagers to maintain their recurrent services and to sustain their collective productive investments, these reports would provide a good basis for evaluating the effectiveness of their work as well.

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION

The project paper recognizes the dominant role of agriculture in Tanzania and the regional economy. Development is dependent on increases in agricultural production and improved efficiency in the support and service sectors of research, training, input supply, marketing and (indirectly) an increase in the supply of consumer goods.

During project design it became clear that there were no major technological packages which could be used to achieve a quantum leap in agricultural output. The project was, under these circumstances, to seek incremental improvements in existing technologies through testing, training, improved extension, increasing credit and agricultural supplies and to attempt to improve the related support structures - primarily in marketing.

During the early phases of project implementation, project inputs have focused on data collection and macro analysis and interpretation. To date the agricultural specialist assigned to the regional offices of Agriculture and Livestock has concentrated on analysis and planning primarily at the macro level, while the Rural Development Specialists posted to the three target districts, assisted by district staff, have provided most of the backup for the specific agri-cultural projects. It was decided very early to focus on land use planning as the first step toward combined programs in agriculture, livestock, forestry, beekeeping, fisheries, game and natural resource use in general.

The analysis of existing production systems for agriculture and livestock (research base, input supply, manpower

and extension, economic policies, infrastructure and other constraints) is considered good. Analysis of the role of para-statal has been less thorough.

It appears that the project has accepted the conclusions of its analyst (and others) that national policies and outside constraints place unsurmountable obstacles in the path of any major program to increase general levels of production and income in the villages in the region. This conclusion has resulted in a concentration on projects which are not "directly productive" in the sense that they do not lead to immediate increases in marketed output, improved nutrition or the like. It has also reinforced the adoption of a land use planning approach to village development, which promotes integration of the full range of agriculture concerns, including crop production, livestock, forestry, soil and water, and natural resources.

The major agricultural output expected, "Increased livestock and food crop production ...", is not being pursued directly, and we do not see much that can be done under present circumstances.

We endorse the present project approach which results in activities which have longer term payoffs, stresses resource conservation and provides a base for growth should constraints be relieved in the future. Such activities include tree nursery and reforestation programs, small scale irrigation, storage unit construction and development and testing of ox drawn equipment and food processing facilities. Those few cases which result in real increased income, such as small farmer barley production, should be given highest priority.

The second major agricultural output for the project is stated as follows: "Agricultural related technologies, identified, tested and produced by village enterprises and extended through Farmers Centers."

Progress has been made in this general area but it is not as envisaged in the project paper. Major changes and partial explanations relate to changes and needs within the region's emerging development plans.

The Appropriate Technology Center was never designed and made functional apparently because it was seen as a duplication of an existing small facility. (Some team members, however, doubt the existing small facility will ever cover the range of programs originally planned for this component.) The APVDP has helped develop an alternative

program which is designed to produce ox drawn equipment (ploughs and carts) by supplying parts to the district production and assembly facilities. This change in itself is acceptable but it puts limits on the idea that the A.T. Center would provide more wide ranging support.

In many respects the original ideas for activities to be promoted under the "Farm Centers" concept are as planned, even though it was hoped they would have had more focus on production. Examples include village transport, processing equipment, training of artisans, small scale enterprises in woodcutting, etc.

It must be stressed that the major effort to date has focused on the planning activities. While this has not resulted in programs to increase production significantly, it has resulted in an awareness of constraints and resulted in a set of policy recommendations which can be used by the Regional Planning Committee in its discussions with PMO and the national government.

Within the formidable constraints already discussed the team feels more effort is needed in agriculture. How to make this effort effective is the major question. Proposals have been made for farming systems research and/or the development of a farming systems information system. Such efforts would require considerable expertise and only have benefits in the long term. They, therefore, seem inappropriate to us within the remaining life of this project. On the other hand a farming systems approach to agricultural extension is desirable and we would encourage its testing in the land use planning work. In our conception this approach would involve the selection of a limited number of farmers within each land use unit, the regular informal observation of their farming practices, and the testing out with the farmer of improvements within the context of his system as a whole. The objective would be to develop a simple method for observing farming systems and for adaptive learning from attempted innovations that could be practiced by agricultural and livestock officers themselves.

Clearly the districts also need assistance in the analysis of projects and programs and the use of existing resources. To this end we suggest more support in the form of: 1) a full time experienced agriculturalist or 2) one or more full time local experts. Although timing constraints may not permit the use of Peace Corps or other volunteers, they would be very useful in such activities as forestry and land use planning.

In summary, given national policy constraints, low producer prices, the deteriorating infrastructure, the poor marketing system and the lack of consumer goods, opportunities to increase production and incomes under the project are very limited. We recommend that: 1) the region continues to lobby GOT to relax above constraints; 2) the APVDP agriculture team be expanded so as to be able to conduct in-depth reviews of potentials at the district and ward level, 3) a simple farming systems and adaptive learning approach to agricultural extension be developed for use in the land use planning work; 4) and, if other potentials are not found, emphasis be continued and increased on:

- soil and water conservation
- reduction of storage losses
- testing and improvement of tools
- promotion of animal traction
- promotion of tree crops, especially for timber and firewood, but also for fruits, and
- further development of small-scale irrigation.

RURAL INDUSTRY

The project paper included a relatively small "other economic activities" component, which called for provision of a technical specialist, establishment of a relatively small appropriate technology center in one district, training in management and appropriate technology, and activities to support development of technology appropriate to the village setting. Following an initial period of uncertainty, the Rural Industries Specialist established himself with the Small Industrial Development Organization (SIDO) where he has been working as advisor to the regional representative. (SIDO is the government link between small industries, government agencies and banks.) After first completing a fairly comprehensive analysis of the wide range of factors which have an impact on small industries development in Arusha Region (such as credit and materials availability, GOT regulations, manpower needs and availability, training needs, incentives, coordination with other institutions involved in introducing appropriate technology, procurement, etc.), the specialist has initiated a vigorous and innovative plan of action to promote rural industry.

The main focus of the program has been on promoting agricultural production (such as by introducing improved ox drawn equipment, but also includes promotion of grain grinding mills, local manufacture of brick and tile, and

soap. Attempts have also been made to develop sources of income - loans and grants, etc. - to enable more efficient investment in this area. This has been done through the Tanzania Rural Development Bank (TRDB) which is solely funded through external sources. A major omission to date, however, has been the relatively few studies relating to the various means by which villagers and/or villages can obtain and utilize investment capital from various sources.

Commendable progress has been made in developing rural industry in Arusha region, and much of the credit from the APVDP side goes to the technical specialist. The initiative displayed, however, has led to certain developments not foreseen in the project paper. The most problematical of these has been the establishment of the Agricultural Implement Production Facility, which - as a small factory - is a considerable departure in size and concept from the small appropriate technology center envisaged in the project design. This issue is discussed in Special Remarks.

ROADS

In the case of this component, inputs have been greater than planned and outputs have been less than anticipated. Outputs consist of about 85 miles of rehabilitated district roads out of 476 targetted in the project paper. Fifty miles of road are in Mbulu District, 35 in Hanang, and 10 more are underway. There is no road construction in Arumeru District. Construction of roads was delayed over a year by late arrival of equipment, replacement and spare parts. This was compounded by early arrival of the roads team. Procurement was initially attempted by AID and then through the services of DAI, approval of which was further delayed in Washington.

Roads as constructed have minor faults, such as excessive camber in places which prevents full use of roadway, wooden bridges which were not replaced, and culverts not in place. Provision of culverts is inadequate as only concrete molds for three lengths of culvert were procured. (A culvert team is beginning construction work immediately.) The present practice of doing clearance and earthworks far in advance of pavement results in problems of existing use of the right of way during the rainy season. Additionally, the operational style of the technical assistance team approach as outlined in the project paper requires a construction superintendant in each district. Without one, no roads are constructed as in Arumeru District. (The roads superintendents were omitted in the project paper.)

The second major output in addition to the rehabilitation of district and village roads is the improved institutional capability of the region in all areas of construction, maintenance, spare parts inventory, etc. Little has been accomplished regarding this output. Relations between the Regional Engineer and the roads TA personnel are amicable, but actual interchange of ideas, work methods and systems is limited due to noncontinuous physical presence with regional counterparts. There is in addition a lack of qualified counterparts to work with the roads team especially the Regional Roads Inspector and to an extent the district engineers. There is also an independent construction oriented work style which characterizes - and to a great extent - separates the roads team from regional works personnel as well as other APVDP personnel who are concentrating on institution building. (This is less applicable to the Equipment Maintenance Specialist.) Working with the districts is, however, made difficult due to the absence of personnel below the district engineer level, lack of replacement and spare parts, vehicles, equipment, fuel, workshops and inadequate budgets which effectively reduce the district capability to labor intensive operations only.

The project paper omitted the provision of trucks for use by section maintenance camps along the newly constructed road during construction operations together with initial training. Section camps would consist of approximately 25 laborers with picks, shovels, barrows and 1 or 2 trucks per 100 miles of road; their task would be annual maintenance. This is an especially critical omission for countries like Tanzania where a large amount of roads are to be rehabilitated. Procurement of these trucks should only be considered if the project is extended or a second project initiated as there is only a short remaining time period in this project and procurement time is lengthy.

The district roads as proposed in the project paper have also been changed to reflect the need to select roads which will link district headquarters to the regional road network. This has resulted in the feeder roads component (200 miles) having to be reorganized to function as feeder/district roads. (District planners are now prioritizing these roads.) In addition these feeder roads have to be considered from the designation/maintenance viewpoint. District roads are maintained by the district; village roads are maintained by the villagers.

Recommendations are that the roads team: 1) occupy desks in the Regional Roads Office when available in July and integrate with the regional roads staff; 2) that GOT appoint a

Regional Roads Inspector; 3) that the team prepare a detailed work and cost schedule which will complete the overall road construction objectives with limited overruns; 4) that planning roads for construction be done in conjunction with the planning officers; 5) that an equipment, parts report with recommendations be completed; 6) that reports be made for a training program, regional road maintenance and repair of vehicles; 7) that the formation of an Arumeru roads brigade be immediately funded with or without an additional T.A. roads person; and, 8) that the roads contractor review and report on the best means for the districts to do road maintenance including what types of equipment, backup facilities, etc. are needed and to what extent cost savings by culverting or bridging village feeder roads is preferred rather than total rehabilitation.

WATER

APVDP is providing a Water Specialist, commodities, training and other costs for the water component of the project. The specialist is working with the Water Development Department to improve water system maintenance procedures as well as develop and construct new systems. APVDP water projects have been confined to shallow wells, deep wells with electric or diesel pumps and distribution system rehabilitation. Some nine shallow wells have been completed; development of two boreholes and rehabilitation of one system are in progress. Of the three shallow well construction teams proposed, only one is currently working, and this one has experienced delays in provision of transport and commodities (ring molds).

The overall problem at present is the fact that existing supply and/or distribution systems throughout the region are becoming inoperative at a rate faster than new ones can be added. Presently 30% of existing systems are inoperative. In addition it is GOT national policy that every village should have a water supply by 1991. Although this is an impossible task, it is taken seriously by the Water Department, hence funding and manpower has been directed to new systems instead of trying to keep existing services in operation through pre-maintenance and training. Reprioritization, therefore, is essential. (A Summary Sector Paper by the Regional Water Development Department lists a daunting series of regional tasks requiring completion to meet the 1991 deadline.)

For APVDP funded projects, prioritization should be concentrated on shallow wells and rehabilitation including inventory of village water systems. This should be done in spite of logistic problems with manpower, supplies, vehicles and fuel.

Twelve projects are planned for 81/82. In addition, prefeasibility study has been made for a hydroelectric project at Hainu, near Mbulu in Mbulu District. The funding requirement and scope of this is outside the AID project paper and it should be funded by others. An increased emphasis on training of villagers for maintenance has been proposed, however, training programs to date have been inadequate to meet the needs.

Due to the complexity of problems facing the Water Department, and its slow rate of project completion, it is anticipated the the APVDP budget for water will be considerably underutilized. In order to maximize completion of water works already underway, consideration should be given to funding water projects to the end of fiscal year 1983, including ordering of commodities for systems rehabilitation, even if other contract work is completed prior to the end of that fiscal year. Consideration should also be given to provision of short term technical assistance from, for example, the Ross Institute in London to address the subject of systems rehabilitation.

IRRIGATION

Irrigation on a small scale is the digging of a small width canal from a river intake around some 500 to 3000 acres of land and back to the river. The enclosed land can then be irrigated by lateral ditches. Project work would consist of headworks plus surveying and assistance on paper work. Excavation of canals and their maintenance would be done by the villagers. These systems exist and function effectively and are the same type as those proposed to be constructed. They are more efficient than the large-scale dam type which require greater funding cost. However, assistance should be given to water rights requests by villagers from government river authorities, such as at Maroroni, Arumeru District and Dongobesh in Mbulu District.

TRAINING

A broad range of training activities were incorporated into APVDP as an essential element on upgrading the capabilities of government officials at all levels and of village officials in planning, project development and implementation, and evaluation. Achievements to date are on target within the framework of the project paper, with only minor modifications based on manpower and training needs identified through the regional planning activities. There has been good progress toward the goal of "developing processes, systems, and capabilities in up to 75 villages, 18 wards, three districts and the region to plan, implement and evaluate development activities from the village level upwards". In addition to the formal and

in-service training programs detailed below there have been extensive activities involving village dialogue designed to familiarize village officials and leaders with the planning process and upgrade their capabilities to analyze constraints and potentials at the village level and formulate and implement village development activities.

The Rural Development Specialists were given a catalytic role in the project design to work with district staff to develop and eventually institutionalize an improved participatory approach to planning and project implementation. Development of this approach is proceeding satisfactorily. Since their role in developing and sustaining a participatory planning approach is a relatively new and demanding one, the Rural Development Specialists should now shift their efforts to building the institutional capacity among the supporting staff, particularly at the district level to sustain this approach beyond the duration of the project. This will involve not only additional work in training but the establishment of a regular training program and suitable career incentives for the appropriate civil servants especially in the planning office. In this area the GOT will need to give increased priority to filling positions in the planning and productive sectors with personnel capable of and mandated to undertake these training programs.

While the project intends to continue extensive direct investment in the training programs, no assessment has yet been made of the impact of the training activities, e.g. in terms of improved quality of performance of government or village officials. The Division of Planning and Evaluation of the Regional Planning Office should formulate a simple workable plan for this assessment, possibly based on reports from the planning activities, and the results of the assessment should be used in the design of future training programs.

Specific accomplishments in the area of training to date include:

Overseas:

Three regional officials are in their final semester of studies for Masters degrees in regional planning at Cornell University with the selection of the next group of participants to be completed within the next month. In addition six regional officials have had short term training in the U.S. and England on planning and communication.

Africa:

Eight regional and district officials have been on study tours on rural development in Africa (Botswana and Zaire).

Within Tanzania 26 regional and district officials have participated in study tours to other regions to review other regional integrated development plans or to study particular projects, while up to 20 officials from each of the project districts participated in aerial tours of their districts as part of the district planning exercise.

Arusha Region:

There have been 22 formal regional and district workshops or seminars on planning, data analysis and development planning, and communication skills. These workshops and seminars have had a total attendance of 520 officials, and an additional 30 officials have attended national workshops.

Two additional regional workshops in forestry and soil conservation have been held, each with 25 participants. There have also been 11 formal training courses involving 200 extension staff from Agriculture, Livestock, and Ujamaa and Cooperative Development. Much of the effort in training has involved on-the-job in-service training, particularly for planning officials but also for the extension staff.

All 53 villages in the 12 pilot wards have received some assistance with planning through the village dialogue process, and at least 25 villages have received more intensive support and training through the facilitator approach, land use planning and project development activities.

While the impact and effectiveness of these training activities will have to be the subject of a continuous assessment during the remaining life of the project, the Evaluation Team feels that the needs for this training were so great that the benefits can be assumed to be significant.

Implementation

This project design was one of the earlier attempts to be responsive to the "New Directions" mandate within the Africa Bureau of AID. The problem of approval and authorization are reflected in the project documents. There was an effort to be responsive to the concepts of participation and bottom up planning and implementation of development but little guidance was given in how to provide the flexibility needed given AID legislation and other formal structures. There are, because of the process involved in getting approval, numerous ambiguities in the content of the project paper. Interpretation of the intent of a number of passages in the project was made more difficult due to the almost complete turnover of involved USAID/T staff which occurred between project design and implementation.

Because of these contradictions and various interpretations of the intent of each (and the changed cast of actors most of whom were not part of the PP preparation and project authorization), there have been serious problems in implementation. Most of these have been or are being resolved over time and some remaining ones are addressed in other parts of this evaluation.

Some of these problems in particular project management and interpretation of the PP objectives require special attention so that the project can proceed smoothly and so that the problems are not repeated in future designs.

1. Communication and recording of actions by USAID, the contractor and region appear to have been inadequate. This is a problem which has been raised previously, and on which there is considerable documentation (on file in USAID/T). USAID should have spent more effort in monitoring the contractors and in documenting the controversial changes from the PP. On its part, the major contractor should have been far more forthcoming in communicating and justifying its interpretation of the project paper and for the departures from the paper (which was designed with the assistance of the major contractor) which were deemed necessary due to changes in local conditions, etc. In short, the APVDP, and regional staff should have carefully justified the program changes to ease AID approval. While we realize that time spent on this detracts from actual program implementation, it is, nonetheless, essential to getting the work done. This area requires further attention given the expected transfer from the Arusha office of the direct hire currently responsible for AID management of APVDP, and the planned abolishment of the second direct hire position in the Arusha Regional AID Office. The Evaluation Team recommends that USAID/T be certain that the sole direct hire remaining in the Arusha office be provided the adequate time, responsibility, and resources to manage what is in reality a very complicated project requiring a wide range of technical knowledge and in-depth familiarity with AID procedures.

2. Regarding interpretation of PP objectives, the Evaluation Team strongly endorses, in principle, a flexible approach to project design and implementation, and believes that such an approach as utilized in this project has resulted in impressive progress towards the completion of project purposes put forth in the PP Logical Framework. It does note, however, that certain midcourse corrections are necessary regarding certain some of the project, and recommends that USAID/T use this evaluation and previous documentation on file at USAID/T (referred to in 1 above) to hold a midpoint review of the project.

Topics to be reviewed would include those identified in the Special Remarks Section (23) of this evaluation. Of special importance are those related to: 1) changes in the levels of funding for specific line items in the budget (activities in the water component, for example, will probably not require the funding amount targeted); 2) the increased importance given to the actual funding and implementation of the project's development aspect of APVDP; and, 3) the likely need for development of a mechanism for small projects funding which may well include explicit establishment of a revolving fund or other type of general development fund not presently provided for in the PP.

Expansion of Project Activities

Given the constraints on the project budget, further expansion of activities to nonproject districts would not be appropriate at this time. During the proposed PID team stay in the region to investigate possibilities of a follow-on project, the potentials in the Masai areas need careful reevaluation. AID provided substantial resources over a ten year period to development activities in Masailand. Evaluations of that effort have generally concluded it to be a failure, hence additional USAID funding proposals will receive especially careful scrutiny.

The proposed PID team may be able to identify innovative approaches to address the development problems in these largely pastoralist areas, and these should be carefully considered.

20. Benefits

APVDP has generated a number of tangible and intangible benefits for the region. Most of these have been discussed in one way or another in the preceding pages. The tangible benefits have been in the form of roads, water and small income generating projects. With respect to roads, 32 of the 193 villages in Mbulu and Hanang Districts are now directly benefitting from reconstructed routes (that is, are on or within 5 km of one). The opening of the district road to Mbulu town has benefitted additional villagers. The roads component of APVDP is behind schedule, however, and the villages of Arumeru have not received any services from it as yet.

The achievements of APVDP with regard to agricultural production have been very small. This is largely as the result of unfavorable national economic policies and poor performance by national economic institutions. The APVDP planning process has helped to call attention to these constraints and has resulted in the regional government having forwarded

recommendations on them to the Prime Minister's Office. To date APVDP has not been successful in devising more than a few productive initiatives that escape these constraints. The evaluation team believes that the national constraints prevent any significant project results in agriculture but does hope to see more small initiatives by the end of APVDP.

Fifty-three pilot villages were designated in the PP for small project assistance and the number was to rise to 75 by the end of APVDP. (The three districts have 324 villages altogether, with an average population of just under 2000): The PP projected that 30 to 40 villages would have received small project assistance by this stage in APVDP's life. All of the 53 pilot villages have received help with planning and 34 also now have received assistance with one or more water or income-generating projects. Thus APVDP is well within its targets. Of course, ultimately, the criterion of benefit will have to be not only whether assistance was provided but also whether it resulted in a functioning water system or a satisfactory income-stream. It is too early in the life of these small projects to judge those benefits, however.

Another tangible benefit of APVDP has been the training of government staff. Three regional staff are pursuing their Masters Degrees at Cornell and the final selection for the next cohort are almost complete. Over 800 staff of various levels have received in-service courses and seminars organized by APVDP. A rough assessment will need to be made as to whether this training has resulted in improved government services. The needs for this training were so great that we are quite prepared to assume the benefits for the present.

The intangible benefits of APVDP at this point may be at least as important as the tangible ones. The GOT stresses the importance of popular participation and the pilot villages have been able to participate much more fully in development decision-making as a result of APVDP. Fifty-one percent of the ideas for APVDP-funded small projects came from villages themselves as opposed to 18% for the "government" (non-APVDP-funded) ones in the productive sectors. Furthermore, APVDP consulted more thoroughly with villagers on the remaining projects than the government did. This is remarkable, as the Tanzanian decision-making process involves a very great deal of village consultation already. For this aspect to be judged a success, however, over the life of APVDP, the improved methodologies will have to be adopted by the regular civil servants and translated into better consultation by them as well. Equally important will be the tangible demonstration that this consultation has resulted in the better commitment of villagers to the maintenance and productive use of projects.

Another set of intangibles has been the quite remarkable change in the consciousness of regional leaders on a whole range of important policy issues, which has been generated by the regional planning and village land use planning processes. The issue areas involved include: the need for migration policy and family planning; the importance of protecting the region's resource base; the necessity of devoting more attention to the maintenance and productive use of existing capital investments; and others.

Certainly one can say already that the "process approach" to planning used at the regional level has produced a much more thorough and changed awareness of critical issues by leaders than the traditional planning approaches are able to provide. Similarly the participatory approach to village land use planning gives evidence of subtle but significant changes in consciousness at this level as well. These attitudinal changes are the first step in a long process of social change and they therefore are exceedingly important in their own right. The institutionalization of the more basic of these changes would require that APVDP be extended into a follow-on project. Nonetheless, if the processes which will produce these changes are to be legitimated in the Tanzanian context it is important that they produce some tangible consequences as well in the remaining life of APVDP. Regional Development Plans should look different; increased regional resources should be devoted to the Recurrent Budget; other policy decisions should be influenced by the planning priorities, and so on. At the village level as well, at least some concrete changes in land use practices should be demonstrated in the villages in which the approach is to be pilot tested in the next two years.

In summary we believe that when the tangibles and intangibles of APVDP are added together a quite satisfactory stream of benefits has been generated. This should not divert attention, however, from the disappointments, especially with regard to the roads, water and agricultural components. Our appreciation for the intangible changes wrought so far also is accompanied by a desire to see them translated into more tangible benefits by the time of ADP's final evaluation.

21. UNPLANNED EFFECTS; 22. LESSONS LEARNED

Substantive

One of the major unplanned and positive effects of APVDP has been a significant change in the consciousness of regional, district, and local leaders on a range of important policy issues generated by the regional planning and village

land use planning processes. This change and the source of it has been discussed in the Benefits Section above. Most important among these issues are the concerns with the rapid population growth in Arusha Region, the emphasis being placed on land use planning both for increasing productivity and for conserving the land resources in order to sustain the productivity of these resources, and the necessity for placing the highest priority on maintenance and rehabilitation of existing capital investments and on developing this maintenance capacity at the district and village levels.

The extent to which awareness of the implications of population growth has been developed at all levels (regional, district, and village) is almost unique in this region. Population issues were raised in the context of limited land resources, the sustainability of agricultural productivity and medium and long term land use planning. Although population growth was presented along with a wide range of data for regional planning, the district and regional planning committees all came to identify population growth as one of the major constraints to long term development. Although population awareness and support for initiatives in such areas as migration control and family planning has been developed, priority efforts should be made in analysis, education and communication to solidify this support with programs being gradually and carefully developed based on regional support and support from a range of international donors and voluntary organizations.

Unplanned effects have derived directly from the use of the "process approach" to regional planning and village development. The process approach involves a flexible design which incorporates on-going information collection and analysis and which supports a collaborative, participatory decision-making process. Within this system, planning ideally becomes an evolutionary process of evaluating development efforts and incorporating the results of this evaluation into each ongoing phase of the planning process. The flexible nature of the process approach is supposed to handle unforeseen developments in a much more responsive manner than the more structured, "blue print" approach to regional development planning; it is also, theoretically, better able to take creative advantage of new opportunities as they arise.

As far as can be determined, the approach to date has generally proved its value by facilitating achievement of project objectives and helping to generate additional development opportunities. These have been discussed elsewhere in this evaluation. In many ways this project is a particularly interesting test of the utility of the process approach because

of the many assumptions in the original project design which have proved incorrect (see External Factors section) and because of the difficulty of operating in a context of a deteriorating economic situation and declining resources for development.

This flexible process approach has not been pursued, however, without fairly serious difficulties from the point of view of AID/contractor implementation responsibilities. These difficulties are discussed in the implementation section and are clearly a cost of undertaking such an approach. To avoid repetition of some of the problems associated with design and implementation of a flexible project approach, it is recommended that persons with direct experience with this project be included on both the PID and PP design teams of any follow-on effort.

An important task of the Final Evaluation will be to assess the extent to which AID/contractor difficulties are an inevitable outcome of a contractor implementing the process approach, or whether the difficulties which have arisen in implementation of this project are more or less situation specific and hence could be avoided, for example, in a follow-on project.

There are a number of lessons to be learned regarding the process approach to regional planning and project development as these have been introduced in Tanzania.

1) The definition of agro-ecological zones utilizing a combination of satellite imagery, aerial photos and survey with limited ground reconnaissance and with consultation with GOT officials is a reliable and cost-efficient method for data collection and analysis at the regional level.

2) A participatory mode of land use planning in which villagers, planners, district extension staff and government party members collaboratively review and define the ecological parameters, resource constraints, and development potential of their village environment provides an effective, although labor-intensive, means for generating local development plans and increasing awareness of constraints upon village development of which many villagers are only partially aware, such as the development implications of a limited land base and a steadily increasing population.

3) The process approach to planning requires careful sequencing for maximum efficiency. A preferred sequence would seem to be:

a) a definition of agro-ecological zones; b) a population study cross-cutting administrative units and agro-ecological zones; c) sector assessments; d) a set of village profiles utilizing data from a-c plus a follow-up village survey; e) a synthesis of a-d utilizing skilled analysts with a focus on information needed for decision-making; and f) discussion and write-up based on the collaborative efforts of villagers, district level government and party workers, and planners in structured situations such as workshops.

4) A process approach to planning utilizing the methods outlined above maximizes the degree to which data collection and analysis can lead to collaborative informed decision-making involving broad segments of the population.

A related set of lessons concerns the methods to be used for generating village participation in project planning and development in countries such as Tanzania.

1) APVDP initially used the very time-intensive "facilitator approach" to help villages identify their priorities and to generate self-reliant village development. It subsequently changed to a less intensive consultative process with village leaders. In countries such as Tanzania, in which rural socio-economic differentiation is modest and participation is already encouraged by the government, it is unnecessary to by-pass village leaders and go directly to the people for identification and implementation of standard development activities. Very broad and intensive participation is warranted, however, where one is trying to generate a commitment to new priorities. Such has been the case with the use of land use planning to create new awareness and action on resource scarcities. It also is desirable to avoid using village leadership as the basic channel of participation when one is generating projects for women or minority groups within the community.

2) Another lesson is that it proved difficult for the agents of a donor to stimulate pure self-reliance through participation. Villagers are too conscious of the donor's resources to undertake activities completely on their own under donor auspices.

3) Finally, it seems to the Evaluation Team that it is more important to generate projects which address critical constraints and have villager commitment than those whose characteristic is only that they have been initiated by villagers. The latter orientation may lead to resources being spent on doubtful projects solely because of their village

origin. The former permits substantial technical assistance in identifying the most important directions for village development. The important thing then is not so much that villagers initiate project ideas as that they approve of them, feel fully involved in their development, and committed to their success. Such an interactive mode permits broad participation in the pursuit of new directions but it requires considerable flexibility in village planning and implementation.

Procedural

There are also a number of lessons to be learned regarding the difficulty of designing and implementing a project which adopts a process approach to development. An unusual amount of time and resources were spent on preparing the design and securing the approval of this project. This occurred in large part because of the attempts of project designers (which included the firm currently responsible for project implementation) to design an innovative project based on the process approach to support planning and village development described above.

The considerable (and costly) effort expended in the design phase was expected to result in relatively trouble-free implementation despite the unusual demands this type of project placed on satisfaction of AID regulations and procedures (such as 611a). This effort included the development of a set of concepts and "understandings" by the project design team which enabled them to design a project which was approved in Washington following long discussions and compromises on the meanings of the project concepts. It also included development of specific procedures during implementation not clearly defined in the PP.

The major lesson learned is that implementation guidance must be clearly set forth in the PP, particularly in projects utilizing a flexible process approach in which difficulties in meeting AID's statutory and other requirements (e.g., environmental and 611(a)) are likely to occur. Such effort in the design phase must be accompanied by procedural clarity (in Project Implementation Letter, correspondence with contractors and internal mission records), careful management and continuity of personnel during the implementation phase; otherwise implementation complications can arise. Unfortunately all of these circumstances were lacking in certain respects. This has resulted in a series of misunderstandings regarding project implementation.

Understanding of the purposes and agreed-upon procedures of the project is even more difficult when a large number of actors are involved in project implementation. Three

different AID offices are involved, together with two contractors with separate implementation responsibility: the firm which helped design the project, and five road specialists with separate personal services contracts with AID to implement the roads component of the project. Unfortunately, the roads "subteam" does not share the operational style or commitment to the process approach which characterizes the overall implementation team, thus there is built in conflict between the two firms.

An additional related lesson is that day-to-day management from the USAID side requires a high degree of knowledge of AID procedures and constant communication with those responsible for implementing the project. In addition to the extra effort required given the flexible and relatively unusual nature of the process approach, there are other reasons why APVDP demands considerable USAID management input. The project is a complex integrated rural development effort with a number of interdependent components including planning and project implementation from the village through to the region level with activities in a number of different sectors. The project paper reflects this complexity; and thus requires considerable interpretative skill on the part of the USAID manager to guide project implementors. This skill is all the more critical given the style of the prime contracting firm which is characterized by strong, occasionally unyielding commitment to a specific style of flexible project design and implementation which, while innovative, has tended to require considerable extra effort on USAID's part to ensure that the interests of all parties are served and that compliance with necessary implementation procedures is observed.

In the future, every effort must be made in the design of such an innovative project to assure that the number of parties responsible for implementation are relatively few, that there be continuity in key personnel, and that they share a common understanding of the purposes of the project and the procedures necessary to implement it.

One USAID procedure deserving special mention is 611(a), which normally applies to a single project or sub items of a single project and addresses the adequacy of design, cost estimates and planning of activities to be financed by AID.

In a complex project such as APVDP where implementation depends mainly on the output of a flexible planning process and only the basic infrastructure is generally known, it is necessary to keep the cost scale of each subproject in mind and develop simplified approach procedures for: small implementation items, repetitive items, simple buildings designed by government agencies, and AID reviews of procedures

carried out by host governments on their own. Such procedures were eventually worked out in the field, but could have been developed at a much earlier point in time had the issues involved been better understood by those responsible for project management.

Procurement for road equipment, replacement and spare parts, building commodities and vehicles was critical for APVDP; thus streamlining procedures for responsive procurement action was necessary. Delays, inefficiencies and additional costs have occurred because of inefficient procurement actions in Tanzania and Washington.

23. Special Remarks

Implementation Issues

This project has generated a series of issues related to implementation which merit special comment.

1. 611(a). Africa Bureau of AID has recognized procedures in relation to projects and subprojects. These are that review and approval of subprojects must be made in terms of adequacy of design, cost and conformity to the project paper. Guidance for satisfaction of these requirements is contained in the Project Authorization and Agreement. DAI, in combining the review process between villages, districts and region, tended to ignore this process and consider that subprojects approved up through regional level were approvals to spend. To address this oversight, simplified review processes that tie into regional reviews should have been worked out early in the project to the mutual satisfaction of AID and the Region. Steps towards working out such procedures have taken place recently.

2. Implementation of Subprojects. In certain sections the project paper was ambiguous in relation to implementation, a narrow view being that apart from roads and water, little in the way of implementation of sub-projects was permitted. A broader viewpoint, which reflects the intent of the PP's emphasis on flexibility, is that implementation of small pilot subprojects is a natural outgrowth of the planning process and as such should be permitted. This would include extension of pilot subprojects elsewhere in the districts through other funding or loans. The Mission has endorsed this view and has attempted to respond accordingly, at times after the contractor had already taken action.

3. Implementation of Small Industries as Related to Agriculture. The Project Paper referred to farm centers, etc.

DAI interpreted this as subprojects related to agriculture as in 2 above and had maize mills and grain storage buildings constructed. These are essential to village agriculture.

4. Implementation of Large Industries as Related to Agriculture. The project paper included an Appropriate Technology Center. DAI quite rightly said that an A.T. center already existed in Arusha and a second one was not necessary. They proposed a steel manufacturing facility for production of agricultural plows, steel wheels and equipment for ox carts, including a steel foundry. This project was introduced to the region by DAI with the help of SIDO and TRDB and has progressed rapidly. Unfortunately the data to support such a venture appears to be inadequate although the market is there in the whole of Tanzania.

Problems that need to be answered are ownership, administration, and authority in the factory, bookkeepers, accountants, selection of craftsmen, factory assembly of dies and machinery, production integration between the subprojects, production interrelationship between craftsman, ordering of supplies, removal of wastes, delivery of assemblies or finished products, transferring of assemblies within factory. Who, for example, will address attainment of product quality, time lag for build up of efficient production, and/or production stoppages due to delays in supplies? Sales appear to be related to one fixed cost without a sensitivity analysis of what happens to demand if costs rise rapidly due to internal or external causes? There is also the question of capital costs and recurrent costs. Should AID be paying for both costs and in the event AID does not have a second overall project, would the regional budgets be sufficient to pay such recurrent costs? These are some of the practical items which should be addressed by DAI and the region. The question for AID is should they go ahead with the project. A detailed study is necessary in addition to the DAI incomplete backup data.

The wooden components of the ox carts are proposed to be manufactured in each of the three districts. This, again, should be reviewed in detail. Total cost range is \$400,000 to 500,000.

The procedure of DAI and region not providing full working details on manufacture, process, ownership and finance prior to construction and ordering of materials is not normal to USAID especially on major manufacturing facilities. Detailed submissions are required prior to approval. The direct involvement of SIDO does, however, lessen the risk of failure of the Agricultural Implement Facility.

Full working details for the Agricultural Implementation Facility on manufacture, process, ownership and finance should be submitted to USAID for approval by August 1981.

5. Other Industries Not Related to Agriculture. Other industries are a brick and tile works in Arumeru District, and a soap works; these are not shown in the project paper. The brick and tile works use Indian presses with a Scotch kiln which were provided previously by other donors. Location in the Ameru District is appropriate, that is, adjacent to a forested area, clay deposits and brick and tile housing. It should function efficiently and effectively but a detailed study is necessary, as is a detailed study of the soap factory. Cost ranges are about \$50,000 each.

6. Warehouse, Garage, Workshop. This was not shown in the project paper but is presently being constructed in Arusha. Cost range is about \$80,000.

7. Contracts. Contracts have been prepared and executed between the region and Public Works for construction of the warehouse, and between the region and a private contractor for construction of the steel manufacturing facilities building. Both contracts should have been reviewed by AID (e.g. ACO/RLA) prior to signature.

8. Low Cost Housing. A low cost housing project of 15 houses in each of five villages was proposed which included short term training on building skills followed by incorporation of trained villagers into building brigades. The building brigades were to build houses for villagers who would be given a loan funded by the project. Site investigation of six partly completed houses revealed serious problems in building skills, construction and outputs. Prices of materials also increased so rapidly as to make the loan inefficient. This subproject should be totally reevaluated including AID procedures before considering going forward on a reduced scale.

9. General Development Fund. The project paper stated that no general development fund should be established. Instead subprojects have been financed on a revolving fund basis. A review of that action should be made which will lead to revision of project documentation if the funding mechanism is to be continued.

10. Documentation. Documentation on controversial implementation issues and procedures is on file with USAID/T.

Followon Funding

Despite the difficulties in implementation, this project offers USAID and the Tanzanian Government an unusual opportunity to demonstrate the effectiveness of a bottom up strategy as well as to develop new approaches for planning for the critical needs of Tanzania over the next decade. The reasons for this are several. When combined, they provide ample justification for according this project the highest priority for followon funding.

1) The process approach closely fits the Tanzanian strategy of growth with equity. The project is located in one of the regions of high growth potential and hence stands a better than even chance of achieving sustained progress within the Tanzanian context. It is thus well placed to serve as a testing and proving ground for a number of innovative approaches to development at the regional and local levels. It also is in a region with considerable social, economic, and ecological diversity, which increases its utility as a "pilot" area. It has also been identified as a priority area of USAID concentration in the USAID Country Development Strategy Statement.

2) This project was explicitly designed to achieve "new directions basic human needs" type goals within a regional framework following a flexible mode of implementation. This design has demanded a relatively high and costly input from USAID and other sources; however, to a significant degree the promised level of achievement has been attained. The potential for a basic human needs participatory focus which takes the rural poor as a starting point has been demonstrated; with additional time and project resources - plus a relatively favorable development context - this potential should be more fully realized. The value of a flexible approach has also been demonstrated, for example, regarding the projects capacity to respond quickly and constructively to changing circumstances, such as a deteriorating economic environment.

3) The project design which integrates a "bottom-up" approach with regional planning programatically addresses a number of USAID priority concerns. These include an emphasis on growth with equity; the ability to achieve more (and wider) impact with fewer resources, the development of national and regional institutional capability, (including an emphasis on training) and collaborative donor/host country efforts leading to improved policies for socio-economic development.

In sum, it is an innovative project which could well serve to guide USAID and the Tanzanian Government in its search for more effective and appropriate development assistance in the 1980's.

ANNEX A

Arusha Planning and Village Development Project

Project Evaluation

Summary Briefing Paper

June 1981

The goal of the APVDP is to improve the production, income and well-being of rural people in three relatively better-endowed agricultural districts of Arusha Region. The purpose of the project is to strengthen the capabilities of Arusha region, the three project districts and the villages in these districts to identify, implement and evaluate development activities within the framework of the policies and priorities of the Government of Tanzania (GOT). A second purpose is to provide the micro-data which will assist in the preparation of the Arusha Region Integrated Development Plan.

The project has made commendable progress since its startup in July 1979. In general it has received good support from the GOT at the regional and district levels. The project approach -- based on a "process" model -- is innovative, ambitious, and well suited to Tanzania. It has successfully integrated the development of an improved regional planning capacity with the strengthening of Tanzania's "bottom-up" style of village development, generating considerable support among regional and district leaders for significantly changed development priorities.

The APVDP staff are highly motivated and professionally competent. All have prior African experience; most speak Swahili. The staff include rural development advisors assigned to the planning office in each of the three districts, sector specialists assigned to regional departments - agriculture, water, rural industry and roads - and planning/management advisors working within the Regional Planning Office at Regional Headquarters. All but the roads component staff, which includes five expatriates working under separate contract, are part of an implementation team working under a U.S. Government contractor.

Progress to date has been hindered by a number of factors. Most important of these are: delays in project start-up and procurement; management difficulties between USAID offices and the contractors; inadequate recurrent funds and government staff; and an unfavorable economic environment.

These factors and others have resulted in a number of concerns which were addressed by the evaluation team and are reviewed briefly below.

There is some disagreement over the appropriate geographical focus for the project. The Project Paper (PP) specified that concrete development activities were to be restricted to Arumeru, Hanang and Mbulu Districts, although the preparation of development plans was authorized for Kiteto, Monduli and Ngorongoro Districts as well. The region feels strongly that the latter districts also should receive concrete benefits from the project. Given the shortage of project funds, the Evaluation Team feels that the present project must continue to focus on the original three districts. The team does recommend that serious consideration be given to the inclusion of the entire region in any follow-on project.

A related issue is the focus of project activity within Arumeru, Hanang and Mbulu Districts. There was a consensus that project resources should be concentrated so as to maximize the likelihood of achieving a noticeable impact. This means that priority attention should be given to three sets of wards: (1) the pilot wards designated in the PP; (2) those wards that are contiguous to the pilot ones and in the same ecological zone; and (3) those wards that have been designated for intensive land use planning work. The latter two emphases follow from the Region's decisions to use ecological zones as a basic planning tool and to make resource conservation and land use planning major priorities. The team notes that land use planning will be a long-range process with few immediate returns in most areas. It is important to legitimize the process in those areas where visible accomplishments are possible in the near term. Therefore land use planning efforts should focus initially on those areas with dramatic population and/or land stresses. Attempts to deal with communal grazing systems should be deemphasized for present, as they present particularly difficult problems on which immediate, visible impact is unlikely.

Dissipation of project resources needs to be avoided in the choice of types of activities as well. In general the constraints on road construction and on village production and water projects are shortages of GOT technical support and a poorly developed capacity in the system for keeping investments maintained and/or productive. Thus the maintenance theme was given high priority by regional officials in their statement of Strategies and Priorities. Project resources must be committed in such a way as to use existing technical capacity efficiently, to build new technical competence, and to strengthen the ability of the system to keep things running.

With respect to village projects the team believes that the PP commitment to small activities is appropriate. To make APVDP investments in small projects efficient, however, a criterion for an activity's selection should be that, if it is successful, it will lead to a series of similar projects with decreasing marginal effort on the part of the districts' professional staff. Similarly APVDP should expand still more its efforts to build the capacity of district technical staff to support village projects. Finally, APVDP should give a high priority to helping district staff to assist villages in organizing the maintenance and productive use of their projects.

The Water Department is significantly behind schedule in water development. Originally its focus was to be the construction of new systems but thirty per cent of the existing water systems are not operating at present. The appropriate priority for the remaining life of APVDP, therefore, is the maintenance and rehabilitation of existing systems and the construction only of systems which are very simple to maintain, such as shallow wells.

The roads component of APVDP is over budget and behind schedule. There is a great danger that the investment in roads rehabilitation will be wasted due to the GOT's inability to maintain them. The team, therefore, recommends that the original conception for this component be adhered to, viz, that the APVDP roads personnel be integrated into the regional engineers' offices, that the GOT meet its commitment to provide adequate professional staff for these offices, that APVDP give significant attention to institutionalizing a GOT maintenance capacity, and that villages be enlisted to assist with road maintenance in their areas. At the same time the Evaluation Team believes that the promised road rehabilitation work for Arumeru should be begun immediately and that a roads brigade therefore should be developed there.

APVDP's activities in the development of small industries have been well conceived but the agricultural implements, brick and tile, and soap factories have inadequate feasibility studies. In one case this has contributed to potentially serious procedural problems with USAID. The Region should be fully briefed on USAID's requirement for the funding of construction activities.

Agricultural development was to have been a major focus of APVDP but has been seriously hindered by GOT policy, price, supply and infrastructure constraints. APVDP should continue to assist the region in pressing for actions to relieve these constraints. It also should continue with those activities that are possible despite the constraints (e.g.,

forestry and ox-drawn equipment). Finally, more APVDP resources should be devoted to the identification of local agricultural activities that are profitable despite generally unfavorable economic conditions.

In conclusion, it is too early to predict whether the project will be able to achieve all of its objectives, particularly given the above-mentioned constraints and concerns and limited project funds. Based, however, on progress to date, the fit of the project within Tanzania, and USAID's policy priorities, the Evaluation Team strongly recommends that the project receive priority attention for extension of funding and project completion date, and consideration for selected follow-on activities in a second Arusha project

ANNEX B

Persons Contacted/Interviewed

A. Regional Commissioner's Office, Arusha

Mr. E. Mwambulukutu - Regional Development Director
Mr. E. P. Mazalla - Regional Planning Officer
Mr. C. G. Hatibu - Regional Liv. Development Officer
Mr. N. M. G. Sabuni - Regional Nat. Resources Officer
Mr. J. G. Shayo - Planning Officer
Mr. P. K. Kitema - Planning Officer (Team Member)
Mr. Davis - FAO Liv. Advisor
Mr. Neema - Ag. Reg. Agric. Officer
Mr. Myovela - Regional Engineer
Mr. Hassanli - Regional Water Engineer
Mr. B. E. Njau - Executive Engineer, Water Development
Department
Mr. Finda - Technical Information & Support Unit
Mr. Charlie Sweet - Regional Planning Advisor (DAI)
Mr. Mike Sarco - Management Officer, APDVP (DAI)
Mr. Hugh Allen - Industries (DAI)
Mr. Joe Gadek - Water (DAI)
Mr. Alan Johnston - Rural Dev. Planning Advisor (DAI)
Mr. Ian Walton - Agricultural Specialist (DAI)
Mr. Alex Powers - Roads Advisor
Mr. Henry Eng - Roads Advisor
Mr. Thad Peterson - Short term (DAI)

B. Area Commissioner's Office, Arumeru

Mr. I. Ole - Karyongi - District Dev. Director
(Team Member)
Mr. Y. R. Tessua - District Planning Officer
Mrs. Joyce Stanley - Rural Dev. Specialist (DAI)
Mr. M. Sabaya - Planning Assistant
Mrs. Rhoda Madulu - Ag. District Agric. Officer
Mr. Ryoba Makaya - District Ujamaa and Cqops
Development Officer
Mrs. Massae - Ag. Dist. Liv. Officer
Mr. Kimambo - Liv. Field Officer
Mr. Nanai - Dist. Natural Resources Officer
Miss Sakina Galle - Liv. Field Assistant.
Mr. Edward Olitai - Ward Secretary, Kikwe
Mr. Elvis Mbagwa, Education Officer, Kikwe
Mr. Hussein Iddi, Village Chairman, Kikwe Village
Mr. Julius Nsukik, Village Chairman, Maweni Village

C. Area Commissioner's Office, Mbulu

Mr. A. Kisenge - Area Commissioner
Mr. Msuya - Dist. Dev. Director
Mr. Kajale - Dist. Planning Officer
Mr. Bangula - Planning Assistant
Mr. Lukumai - District Agric. Officer
Mr. Kombo - District Natural Resources Officer
Mr. Moshia - District Forest Officer
Mr. N. M. Nanyaro - Dist. Liv. Officer
Mr. P. Sulke - Divisional Secretary Dongobesh
Mr. S. Q. Sabida - District Chairman, CCM
Mr. A. Deengu - Member of Parliament
Mr. M. M. Anselmi - Ward Secretary, Murray
Mr. S. Slawe - Village Chairman, Kwermusl
Mr. P. Kondi - Village Secretary, Moringa
Mr. Lynn Schleuter - Rural Dev. Specialist (DAI)
Mr. Msengi - District Engineer

D. Area Commissioner's Office, Hanang

Mr. Mambo - Area Commissioner
Mr. W. T. Kisanji - District Dev. Director
Mr. W. A. R. Mgalula - District Planning Officer
Mr. D. Lyimo - Planning Assistant
Mr. Malisa - District Natural Resources Officer
Mr. Kiteo - District Livestock Development Officer
Mr. John Wheeler - Rural Dev. Specialist (DAI)
Mr. C. G. Bilanni - Divisional Secretary, Bashanet
Village Secretary, Ayamango Village
Mr. T. Lawe, Divisional Secretary, Mbugwe
Village Chairmen: Magugu Village, Madunga Kati
Village, Utwari Village
Mr. Gwimo - District Agriculture Officer
Mr. Lesironga - District Engineer

E. AID/Arusha

Mr. Tom Lucbe - Arusha Area Coordinator
Mr. Barry Hill - Area Agricultural Advisor
Mr. Barry Riley - Ag. Mission Director

F. Parastatals

Mr. Evarist S. Mgatta - SIDO

ANNEX C

COMPARISON BETWEEN PP FINANCIAL ANALYSIS AND ACTUAL PROJECT

The PP gives the following category line items as well as costs by T.A., Training, Commodities and Other Costs. It also shows a PP variation of 15% on each line item in order to obtain flexibility of process and development of the project. See Table 2 for comparison purposes.

Table 1 in item 16 Inputs gives items by Technical Assistance, Training, Commodities and Other Costs only for PP obligations and expenditures. While this is sufficient for most projects which are relatively simple in nature, the Arusha Village is complex in its nature and different categories of output. It is, therefore, recommended that the costs be categorized according to the Project Grant Agreement (same as PP) and that this be continued forward into obligation and major items of disbursement. Table 2 gives a recommended example.

TABLE 2
FLEXIBILITY OF P.P COSTS BY ACTIVITY

			T.A.		Training		Commodities		Other		Total
I. Planning Imp.	+15%		2.47		0.52		0.41		0.14		3.55
	0	2.15		0.45		0.36		0.12		3.09	
	-15%		1.83		0.38		0.31		0.10		2.63
II. Increased Ag.	+15%		0.99		0.16		2.44		0		3.56
	0	0.86		0.14		2.12		0		3.11	
	-15%		0.73		0.12		1.80		0		2.64
III. Other Econ. Act.	+15%		0.76		0.04		0.34		0		1.13
	0	0.66		0.03		0.29		0		0.98	
	-15%		0.56		0.02		0.24		0		0.83
IV. Social and Econ.	15%		2.01		0.07		6.44		0		8.52
	0	1.75		0.06		5.60		0		7.41	
	-15%		1.49		0.05		4.76		0		6.30
<hr/>											
A. Roads	+15%		0.99		0		3.22		0		4.22
	0	0.86		0		2.81		0		3.67	
	-15%		0.73		0		2.38		0		3.12
B. Water	15%		0.60		0.00		3.22		0		3.83
	0	0.52		0		2.80		0		3.33	
	-15%		0.44		0.00		2.38		0		2.83
C. Construction	+15%		0.41		0.06		0		0		0.47
	0	0.36		0.05		0		0		0.41	
	-15%		0.31		0.04		0		0		0.35
<hr/>											
GRAND TOTAL	+15%		6.23		0.77		9.64		0.14		
	0	5.42		0.67		8.38		0.12		14.59	
	-15%		4.61		0.57		7.08		0.10		
<hr/> <hr/>											

TABLE 3

FINANCIAL COSTS BY CATEGORY
(in \$ million)

		June 81
		<u>ProAg Obligation Disbursement</u>
I.	Planning Implementation & Eval.	
	A. Technical Assistance	2.15
	B. Training	0.45
	C. Commodities	0.36
	D. Other Costs	<u>0.12</u>
		3.09
II.	Increased Agricultural Production	
	A. Technical Assistance	0.86
	B. Training	0.14
	C. Commodities	2.12
	D. Other Costs	<u>0.</u>
		3.11
III.	Other Economic Activities	
	A. Technical Assistance	0.66
	B. Training	0.03
	C. Commodities	0.29
	D. Other Costs	<u>0.</u>
		0.98
IV.	Social and Economic Infrastructure	
	A. Technical Assistnce	1.75
	B. Training	0.06
	C. Commodities	5.60
	D. Other Costs	<u>0</u>
		7.41

In addition IV. Social and Economic Infrastructure is subdivided into:

ProAg Obligations Disbursement

A. Roads	
1. Technical Assistance	0.86
2. Training	0
3. Commodities	2.81
4. Other Costs	<u>0.</u>
	3.67
B. Water	
1. Technical Assistance	0.52
2. Training	0
3. Commodities	2.80
4. Other Costs	<u>0.</u>
	3.33
C. Construction	
1. Technical Assistance	0.36
2. Training	0.05
3. Commodities	0
4. Other Costs	<u>0.</u>
	0.41

Annex D

ARUSHA PLANNING AND VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

DOCUMENTATION

1. APVDP ANNUAL PLANS:

- a. First Annual Plan, July 1979 - June 1980
- b. Second Annual Plan, July 1980 - June 1981
- c. Third Annual Plan Submission - July 1981 - June 1982
(Supplement to the Arusha Regional 1981/82 Annual Plan Submission)

2. APVDP QUARTERLY REPORTS:

- a. Second Quarterly Report Oct. - Dec. 1979
- b. Third Quarterly Report Jan. - March 1980
- c. Fourth Quarterly Report April - June 1980
- d. Fifth Quarterly Report July - Sept. 1980
- e. Sixth Quarterly Report Oct. - Dec. 1980
- f. Seventh Quarterly Report Jan. - March 1981

3. SECTOR PAPERS:

a. AGRICULTURE AND LIVESTOCK:

1. Soil Degradation and Conservation in the Arusha Region -
Rorke Bryan; March 1980
2. Arusha Region Agricultural Review - Donald S. Humbal;
May 1980.
3. The Livestock Sector in Arusha
4. Maasai Motivation and Its Application - Henry Fosbrooke,
March 1980.
5. Maasai Motivation and Its Application, Annexure II,
The Maasai Gift Scheme - 1940 - 1944. Henry Fosbrooke,
March 1980.
6. Tsetse Clearing in Mbulu District, 1935 - 1953,
Henry Fosbrooke, March 1980.
7. Range Management in Arusha Region: Discussion Paper
Dave Peterson and Thadd Peterson, July 1980.
8. Agricultural and Livestock Production in Arusha Region:
An Agricultural Economic Perspective - Merritt Sarabeth,
Oct. 1980.
9. Regional Agricultural and Livestock Activities in Relation
to Arusha Region Development Objectives: Summary Papers -
Ian Veltor, Sept. 1980.

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

b. NATURAL RESOURCES:

1. Agro-Forestry and Its Relevance to the Arusha Region - Henry Fosbrooke, March 1980.
2. Fisheries in Arusha Region, Tanzania - Phoenix Development Services Ltd. May 1980.
3. Forestry in Arusha Region - T.J. Synott, July 1980.
4. Beekeeping in Arusha Region - Christopher Dunford, July 1980.
5. Pre-feasibility Assessment of Geothermal Resources in Northern Tanzania - Kathleen Crane, Lamont-Doherty Geological Observatory, Palisades, New York.
6. Recommendations for Soil Conservation in Karatu Division, Mbulu District, Tanzania - Rorke Bryan, February 1981.

c. SMALL INDUSTRIES (UJAMAA & COOPERATIVES):

1. APVDP Discussion Paper: A Possible APVDP Strategy for Small Industries/Appropriate Technology Activity in Arusha Region - Hugh Allen, Oct. 1979.
2. The Urban Informal Enterprise Sector in Arusha Region - M.S.D. Bagachwa and S.S.A. Nwara, Jan. 1981.
3. Formal-Private Industry in the Arusha Region: A Survey - Peter Schaefer, March 1980.

d. HEALTH:

1. A Survey of the Health Services in Arusha Region - Edith Aloor, May 1980.
2. APVDP Health Component - Stan Yoder, Sept. 1980.
3. Health Sector Assessment - Stan Yoder, Oct. 1980.

e. WATER:

1. Hainu River Study Pre-feasibility Report (TANESCO) - M. Katyese and J. Gadek, Dec. 1980.
2. Hydrogeological Investigation Report for Dikokola Borehole - K. Roy, Regional Hydrogeologist, Nov. 1980.
3. Hydrogeological Investigation Report for Kivatio Borehole - K. Roy, Regional Hydrogeologist, March 1981.
4. Preliminary Investigation Report for Donesesh Gravity Water Supply, J. Gadek, March 1981.

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

4. TRANSPORTATION/WORKS:

1. Planning Roads for the Arusha Region - Ed Holland, Jan. 1980.
2. Transportation in Arusha Region - Ed Holland, Jan. 1980.
3. Problems of Agricultural Transportation in Rural Areas (A Case Study of Seven Villages in Mbulu District) W.E. Maro, Economic Research Bureau, University of Dar es Salaam, Sept. 1980.
4. Arusha Regional Transport Planning Project (Road Transport Infrastructure) Study - Dr. Benno J. Ndulu.
5. Regional Works Issues for Discussion - John Morrison, Oct. 1980.
6. Assessment of Arusha Region Works Organization and Management - John Morrison, Oct. 1980.
7. Road Priority Determination: Arusha Region - Dr. Benno J. Ndulu, June 1981.

4. ISSUES PAPERS:

a. POPULATION:

1. Population Survey - Alan Johnston, Jan. 1980.
2. Population Final Report - Alan Johnston, Jan. 1980.

b. FINANCIAL RESOURCES:

1. Financial Resources Available for the Development of the Arusha Region: A Look into the Future - Elliott Morss.
2. Kitabu cha Mikopo na Misaada Vijijini - Arumeru District Office, July 1980. (Village Loan and Grant Paper) - in Swahili.
3. An Assessment of the Revenue Generation Capabilities of Villages, Districts and Arusha Region: Some Policy Options - Larry Schroeder, Local Revenue Administration Project, Syracuse University, June 1981.
4. The Financial Infrastructure in Tanzania, Perspectives, Problems and Policy Strategies. With Policy and Program Implications for Arusha Region. - M.S.D. Baeachwa, June 1981.

c. MANPOWER:

1. Profile and Analysis of Government Manpower in Arusha Region - [unclear], [unclear] 1982.

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

- 2. Conclusion and Recommendation of a Profile and Analysis of Government Manpower in Arusha Region - Liz Willy, Oct. 1990.

a. WILDLIFE AND TOURISM:

- 1. Sector Assessment of Tourism in the Arusha Region of Tanzania - Victoria Morss, May 1990.
- 2. The Status and Utilisation of Wildlife in Arusha Region, Tanzania, Final Report. EcoSystems Ltd., Sept. 1990.

5. ARUSHA REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

- a. Arusha Today: 1991
- b. Strategies and Priorities for the Year 2000
- c. Information Strategy: Past and Future

5. LAND USE PAPERS:

- a. Four Discussion Papers - Henry Fosbrooke
 - i. Land Tenure and Land Use
 - ii. Farming Systems
 - iii. Urban Development and the Growth of Communications
 - iv. Resource Conservation
- b. Information for Rural Land Planning in Arusha Region - Dunford, Mouat, Slaymaker, June 1990.
- c. Livestock, Wildlife and Land Use Survey: Arusha Region, Tanzania. Final Report. Volume 1: Text. Ecosystems Ltd., September 1990.
- d. Livestock, Wildlife and Land Use Survey: Arusha Region, Tanzania. Final Report. Volume 2: Figures and Tables. Ecosystems Ltd., September 1990.
- e. Land Resource Survey & Planning - Arusha Region, Tanzania; Christopher Dunford, Land Resource Surveys, 1990.
- f. Land Information Materials Available to Arusha Planning Village Development Project - Christine Dodson, Dec. 1990.
- g. Promotion of Land Use Planning in Arusha Region - Francis G. Finda, June 1991.

7. GENERAL POLICY PAPERS:

- a. ARVDP Policy Paper
- b. Village Development Activities, Arusha Planning Village Development Project, March, 1991.

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

- c. Information Activities of the APVDP: Present and Future Potentials - Elliott Morss, March 1980.
- d. A Case for Regionally Integrated Planning - Elliott Morss, March 1980.
- e. Evaluation of the Third Five Year Plan (1976-1981) Arusha Region - Institute of Development Studies, University of Dar es Salaam, April 1980.
- f. Integrating Regional Development Objectives into the Regional Planning Process - Elliott Morss.
- g. Regional Development Planning: A Critical Assessment of the Tanzania Experience and its Implications for the Arusha Planning Process - Elliott Morss, August, 1979.
- h. Center and Periphery in Arusha Region: Institutional Capacities and Development Initiatives in the Context of Existing Governmental Structures and Village Organization - Garry Thomas, November 1980.
- i. English translation of Dutch Evaluation of Visit to Arusha Planning Village Development Project, March 1981.
- j. The Village Profile Exercise: APVDP Background Information, Impressions and Perceptions - David Peterson and Thadd Peterson, June 1980.
- k. English Translation of Public Expenditure Estimates for the Year 1980/81, Vote 70: Arusha Region.
- l. English translation of The Guidelines for Preparing the Union Five-Year Plan 1981/82 - 1985/86.
- m. English translation of Guidelines for the Preparation of the Regional Estimates for the 1981/82 Financial Year.
- n. Cross-Cutting Issues emerging from the Arusha Regional Planning Exercise, Elliott Morss, November 1980.
- o. Summary Strategy Paper.
- p. Arusha Regional Planning Exercise: Decisions for the Future - January, 1981
- q. Women and Development: A Case Study of Ten Tanzanian Villages, Liz Willy, March 1981.
- r. Encouraging Village Self-Reliance in Arumeru District, Tanzania - Joyce Stanley, June 1981.

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

73.177

8. EVALUATION PAPERS:

- a. Interim Report on the Evaluation Visit to the PPVDP Graduate Training Program in Regional Planning at Cornell University, Feb. 1981.
- b. Kikwe Building Brigade Evaluation, December 1980.

9. DECISIONMAKING WORKSHOPS:

- a. Seminar on Data Analysis and Development Planning Report - Lewis, Brandford, Jones - Aug. 1980.
- b. Workshop on RIDEP/Arusha, Sept. 1979.
- c. Manyara Workshop Papers, Oct. 1979.
- d. Neoronsoro District Planning Workshop Report - Neal Cohen, Jan. 1980.
- e. Kiteto District Workshop on Planning Regional Integrated Development Plan Report - Neal Cohen, Feb. 1980.
- f. Maoni na Maelekeo yaliotokana na kukusanya Takwimu na Maarifa kutoka Vijiji vya Wilaya ya Kiteto (Kiteto District Planning Workshop Report), D. Peterson and T. Peterson, Feb. 1980. (In Swahili)
- g. Minutes of Regional Planning Committee Meeting, 9-11 Feb. 1981. (English and Swahili)

10. SECTOR AND ISSUE PAPER SUMMARIES: (all in English and Swahili)

- a. Agriculture
- b. Beekeeping
- c. Fisheries
- d. Forestry
- e. Health
- f. Livestock
- g. Population
- h. Small Industries
- i. Transport
- j. Water
- k. Wildlife/Tourism
- l. Financial Resources
- m. Implementation of Development Initiatives
- n. Land Use and Conservation
- o. Manpower

... 27

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

6

11. REGIONAL SECTOR PAPERS: (by Regional and Functional Offices)

- a. Agriculture
- b. Education
- c. Land Development
- d. Livestock
- e. Natural Resources
- f. Small Industries
- g. Stores
- h. Ujamaa and Cooperatives
- i. Water
- j. Works

12. DISTRICT STRATEGY AND PRIORITY PAPERS

- a. Arumeru District
- b. Hanang District
- c. Mbulu District
- d. Ngorongoro District
- e. Kiteto District
- f. Monduli District

13. REGIONAL AND DISTRICT PROJECT PROPOSALS:

REGION:

- a. Improvement of Veterinary Services for Arumeru, Hanang and Mbulu Districts
- b. Training Program for Ujamaa and Co-operatives Development Office
- c. Regional Brick and Tile Making Project
- d. AATP/APVDP Technical Development Project
- e. Regional Agricultural Implement Manufacture Project

ARUMERU DISTRICT:

- a. Kikwe Ward Building Brigade
- b. Grain Grinding Mill, Sakila Village
- c. Grain Grinding Mills, Nearenanyuki Ward
- d. Forestry Proposal Oikokola Ward
- e. Grain Grinding Mill, Iikurot Village

MBULU DISTRICT:

- a. Afforestation Project
- b. Mashane and Labay Crop Storage Facilities
- c. Forest and Fruit Tree Nursery, Murray/Kainam Ward
- d. Ujamaa and Co-operatives Development Office Training Program
- e. Veterinary Training Program
- f. Forest and Fruit Tree Nursery, Donsobesh Division
- g. Pigeery Project, Donsobesh Ward
- h. Nursery Tending Project
- i. Daudi Ward Beekeepers Training Project

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

HANANG DISTRICT:

- a. Provision of Ox-Plows, Katash Ward
- b. Maize Mill, Madunsa Ward
- c. Woodcutting Project, Dameyu Village, Madunsa Ward
- d. Madunsa Wood Working Project, Madunsa Ward
- e. VMT/UCDA Training Program
- f. Purchase of Maize Mill and Hulling Machine, Masusu Village
- g. Bookkeeping Training for Village Women
- h. Training in Project Planning and Management
- i. Tailoring Production Group
- j. Mat Marketing Centre
- k. Food/Beverage Production and Sales
- l. Maize Mill, Ayamango Village
- m. Women's Farmers Group

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT