

ANNEX C

DISTRICT INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT SUB-PROJECT

BOTSWANA RURAL SECTOR GRANT PROJECT EVALUATION

(Project # 633-0077)

May 1986

Gaborone, Botswana

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. Summary
- II. Evaluation Methodology
- III. External Factors
- IV. Project Inputs
- V. Project Outputs and State of EDPS
- VI. Purpose
- VII. Goal
- VIII. Beneficiaries
- IX. Unplanned Effects
- X. Lessons Learned
- XI. Special Comments
- XII. Recommendations

I. SUMMARY

The District Institutional Development (DID) sub-project directly supports other project components which are dependent upon the effective administration of decentralized government services. The District Administration structure has major GOB responsibilities for planning and implementing development programs at the district level. Over the last few years, the GOB has significantly moved toward localizing District Officer positions, upgrading district office and logistical facilities, and providing incentives to attract qualified personnel for District Administration.

The purpose of this sub-project is to help overcome key constraints which remain to the overall improvement of management within the District Administration system. These constraints concern the need to increase the District Officers' capacity to plan and administer rural development programs, particularly those aimed at job creation and increasing rural incomes, and to provide District Officers with advanced training to improve their management, economics, and planning skills. To accomplish this purpose, the sub-project was designed to provide 37 District Officers with a total of 40 person years of training at the master's degree level.

Good progress is being made in selecting District Officers for master's level training and placing those selected in degree programs in the United States. The academic performance of participants generally has been good, and their average cumulative grade point average to date is 3.2, where 3.0 equals a "B" and 4.0 equals an "A". In 1984 and 1985, the implementation schedule for sending participants to the U.S. to begin graduate studies was followed as closely as possible. In 1986, the schedule may be accelerated due to the need to see that all students complete their studies by 1988. Participants are not returning to Botswana as scheduled since the Project underestimated the amount of time required for degree program completion. It is now expected that an individual's program duration will average 18 months rather than 12 months, so participants will return about six months later than originally expected. This change has also necessitated a change in the budget to accommodate the increased costs associated with longer training programs.

The evaluation team's recommendations deal with three aspects of this sub-project. First, in some cases greater care is necessary in identifying the specific training needs of the participants, and in turn identifying appropriate programs. Second, an attempt should be made to include all 37 eligible District Officers in the sub-project. Third, job responsibilities of returned participants should be suited to their upgraded level of skills.

10

II. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

Relevant documents and reports were reviewed to gain an understanding of the sub-project activities and progress to date. Interviews were conducted with Ministry of Local Government and Lands officials at headquarters, District Officers who have completed their master's degree programs and one who is scheduled to begin his training, other District Administration officials, and officers of the Academy for Educational Development. The content of some master's degree programs was reviewed.

Progress toward output and purpose achievement was judged on the basis of the flow of sub-project participants, their academic performance, their own impressions of the respective degree programs, and course content of those programs and their relevance to District Officer job responsibilities. Job performance of returned participants could not be evaluated since those who have returned have been at their posts for only one to four months. The final report on the District Institutional Development sub-project has been prepared in the PES format

III. EXTERNAL FACTORS

The problem of rural unemployment and under-employment which prompted the initiation of Phase I of the Project in 1980 continues today, and is expected to continue into the near future. The current National Development Plan (1985-91) projects that by 1990/91, 51.8% of the labor force will be without employment or self-employment opportunities. The GOB, through its Financial Assistance Policy and other programs, is making a concentrated effort to diversify its economy by providing technical assistance and financial incentives for the development of small industries, particularly in rural areas. The rural Sector Grant is designed to be a contribution to these efforts. Given the continuing employment problem, the idea behind the RSG is still very much valid.

IV. PROJECT INPUTS

The AID contribution to this activity was budgeted in the amount of \$820,000. This was calculated on the basis of 40 person years of long-term graduate degree training in the United States for 37 participants, and represents an average cost of \$20,400 per person year. When it was found that each participant will require on average 18 months of training rather than 12 months, this budget item was revised upward by \$332,800, to \$1,152,800. In theory this new amount would fund 37 participants for an average of 18 months each at a cost of \$20,400 per person year. However, in practice, only 29 District Officers may be participants unless there are changes to the PACD and perhaps to this sub-project budget.

149

A problem arises in that the line item for each participant is calculated on the basis of 24 months training. This is prudent budgeting procedure, but the result is that only 29 District Officers currently are expected to be included as participants because given the 24 month period used for the budget this is the maximum number which can be accommodated within the total budgeted amount. In the following section we discuss a recommendation whereby all 37 eligible District Officers would be included in this sub-project. If this recommendation is accepted, and the average training program is longer than 18 months in duration, the budget for this sub-project will require additional funds which should be available from savings elsewhere in the Project budget.

V. PROJECT OUTPUTS

The Project's original expected output was 37 District Officers trained to the master's degree level. This represented the number of District Officers who would be eligible for training over the life of the Project. According to the implementation schedule, seven participants were to be trained during 1984/85, nine during 1985/86, ten during 1986/87, and eleven during 1987/88. All participants were expected to return to Botswana by August 1988. It was thought that a total of 40 person years would be required to complete this training program.

To date, 16 participants have been sent to the U.S. to do master's level programs, and 13 are scheduled to go this year. Five of the 16 participants have returned with their degrees, and all but one continues to work in the District Administration. Current plans are to train 29 of the 37 eligible District Officers. The original schedule was based on the assumption that training would require one year only. Since it is requiring two years, implementation is slower than expected.

The estimate of 40 person years for 37 participants has been found to be inaccurate. Each participant now is expected to require on average 18 months of training. As explained in the section above, the sub-project's budget was revised upward based on 37 participants for an average training period of 18 months at a cost of \$20,400 per person year, but individual participant line items are calculated on the basis of a training period of 24 months. As a result, the projected output is 29 District Officers trained at the master's degree level. AID budget procedures permit the reallocation of funds from one participant's line item to another only after nine months have elapsed from the time of degree program completion. If the PACD remains unchanged, it is unlikely that any additional District Officers, over the 29, will be able to participate, even if funds remain in the budget, because there will be insufficient time for them to complete a degree program.

As participants return, savings may be available from individual line items and could be reallocated to help fund additional participants. Also, there may be savings available from other line items which are underspent. It is recommended that high priority be given to the training at the master's level of all 37 eligible District Officers by making use of whatever funds may be available within the Project. As a corollary to this recommendation, it is recommended that the Project Assistance Completion Date (PACD) be extended to 16 June 1990, to provide sufficient time for the completion of all degree programs, for unspent funds to become available, and for the Ministry of Local Government and Lands to locate and place temporary replacements for District Officers who are participants (see discussion under Special Comments).

The team believes that including all 37 eligible District Officers as participants is justified on at least three grounds. First, the purpose from the start has been that all 37 eligible officers would be included. Second, it appears that there will be sufficient funds in the Project to achieve this purpose. Third, overseas training of this type has proved historically to be an efficient and productive use of USAID funds, and thus deserves support in particular when it is already included as a Project component. We understand that funds may be available under the BWAST Project for District Officer training, but believe that it is logical to use the current project for this purpose since District Officer training is precisely one of the Project components.

If the number of participants is limited to 29, a PACD extension to at least 1989 is justified to enable GOB to reduce the number of officers absent from post during the coming year. One covenant in the amended Grant Agreement stipulates that GOB provide replacements for District Officers who are in the U.S. on training programs. GOB has experienced difficulty replacing District Officers on a temporary basis, and it is unreasonable to expect them to do so on a more accelerated basis.

Extension of the PACD at least will spread out the demand for replacements. However, a decision on this should be made quickly since preparations have begun to send the officers abroad later this year.

VI. Purpose

The purpose of this sub-project is to meet the training requirements of the senior cadre of District Administration staff by tailoring an intensified graduate level program for the District Officers in the three fields of Administration, Development and Lands. The sub-project is to provide District Officers with advanced training both to improve their management, economics, and planning skills, and, more

specifically, to increase the officers' capacity to plan and administer rural development programs, particularly those aimed at job creation and increasing rural incomes.

Further explanation of the scopes of work for the District Officers is provided in a report titled, "District Administration Training in Botswana," prepared by Louis A. Picard in association with the Ministry of Local Government and Lands. This report was prepared in accordance with a condition precedent requirement that prior to disbursement of AID funds for training of District Officers the GOB submit to AID a training plan and exploration of alternative training programs.

Should the sub-project include training only for the 29, then purpose achievement would be reduced accordingly. Of course, 80% of the eligible officers will have been trained, and significant improvement in planning and administration should be expected. However, job performance of the remaining 20% who will not receive training could be affected negatively.

Those who have returned have been back in Botswana only one to four months. Those four who continue to work in District Administration have been interviewed as part of this evaluation. Since they have been back only a short while, the extent to which their job performance will be improved as a result of their training can not be determined. It should be noted that the Ministry of Local Government and Lands intends to conduct an evaluation of performance after each participant has been back on the job for six months.

All participants interviewed expressed general satisfaction with their degree programs. All believe that their job performance should improve now that they have received advanced training. However, they also noted that the actual nature of their respective jobs was not expected to change. There may be some cause for concern in this regard. The nature of work expected of officers who do not hold master's degrees should be different from that expected of those who have completed their programs. The job performance of officers who have completed their degree work should be closely monitored to judge in what areas their performance has improved and in what areas there should be some revision of current responsibilities to take into account their more advanced level of skills. GOB is correct to expect that the performance of returned participants with respect to their current job responsibilities should improve, but it should also be cognizant of the potential need to adjust job responsibility along with the upgrading of skills.

A related issue is that sub-project purpose achievement will result in a cadre of highly trained District Officers being supervised by a more senior level of officers who in many cases have received much less formal training. All the participants interviewed are aware of this situation and of the potential for conflict. The Ministry should strive to maintain a favorable working relationship between the participants and

their supervisors. USAID may assist in this regard by providing funds for intensive management training courses for District Commissioners who have no university degree. This subject is discussed further under the section, "Special Comments."

Important to the achievement of the sub-project's purpose is the relevance of the subjects studied to the work of the participant District Officers. The Picard report identified the following emphases within each course of study:

- 1) District Officer (Administration) - M.A. in Public Administration/Local Administration and Development Management;
- 2) District Officer (Development) - M.A. in Development Economics and Planning, including project planning, planning appraisal and project management;
- 3) District Officer (Land) - M.S. in Land Resources/Land Use Planning/Physical Geography.

Since returned participants have been on the job only a short while, an evaluation of course relevance based on job performance is not possible. However, the following observations are relevant. First, development officers are expected to do development economics, but do not necessarily have adequate preparation to enter most of the economics courses offered at the universities being chosen. At least one participant was advised against doing the economics program due to lack of preparation, and another has had to revise his course schedule due to difficulties with a quantitative course. It may be that the respective course of study the development students do in the end is more relevant to their work, but in any case it should be understood that to expect those who do not have an economics background to do much economics at the graduate level in the universities chosen is unrealistic. If such courses are necessary, two options are available. Students could take remedial courses in economics and mathematics prior to enrollment in the graduate program, or universities could be chosen which emphasize an institutional approach, rather than a quantitative approach to economics.

A second observation relates to the "Lands" students. Some land use planning subjects relevant to Botswana's needs may not be covered in a particular university's curriculum, such as range management. It may be more appropriate for participants to attend universities which do offer these courses.

Both of the above observations indicate that closer attention should be given to the university program selection process. However, improvements to this process should involve GOB, AED and USAID, because the process includes the identification, prioritization and communication of training needs by GOB to AED, as well as the selection of university programs by AED.

VII. GOAL/SUB-GOAL

The goal of this sub-project is to strengthen the institutional framework for promoting rural employment and income generation. Interviews with the returned participants in the training program suggest that the officers have learned skills which will improve their job performance, and, in turn, improve the implementation of GOB development policy, one aspect of which is the promotion of rural employment and income generation. However, actual progress toward goal achievement can not be properly evaluated until the participants have been on the job for some time. As mentioned above, the Ministry of Local Government and Lands will conduct evaluations of individual participants' performance once sufficient time has passed to provide the necessary data.

VIII. BENEFICIARIES

The direct beneficiaries of this sub-project are the District Officers who are receiving the master's level training. It should be noted that six of the current 29 participants are women. Indirect beneficiaries are all those resident in the various districts who will benefit by the improved planning management resulting from the training received by the participants.

IX. UNPLANNED EFFECTS

The only unplanned, although probably anticipated, effect has been that one participant, soon after returning from successfully completing his master's program, left the District Administration to take a job elsewhere. His reasons for leaving apparently were both personal and professional.

X. LESSONS LEARNED

That some relevant subjects are not covered in the graduate programs selected, and that some students are not adequately prepared to do courses in which they are to enroll, indicates that with this kind of activity great care must be given to university program selection. AED is performing well in general, but there needs to be some fine-tuning with regard both to the identification of training needs, and to program selection. Both of these sub-project components are critical to achieving the overall purpose and goal.

With regard to follow-on activities, the evaluation team's scope of work requested discussion about "a mechanism and timeframe which would guide the Ministry and USAID in discussions concerning support for (District Administration training) needs beyond Phase II of the Rural Sector Grant." As

a starting point, the Ministry and USAID should jointly review the 1984 report titled, "District Administration Training in Botswana," and any revisions which have been made to this training plan since the report was first published. One revision is particularly relevant, and could form the basis of more in-depth discussions. This concerns the training needs of District Commissioners.

In a short report titled, "Training of District Administration Personnel Since 1984," distributed at the RSG Reference Group meeting held on 29 April 1986, the Ministry of Local Government and Lands discusses, among other topics, the training needs of District Commissioners who are without university degrees. This report states, "Most existing formal regional training programmes that would suit these experienced District Officers spell out that trainees should have diploma or university training in order to be admitted to the courses. This target group is also comparatively small which makes any specially designed formal training programme that would suit their needs quite expensive as the officers hold important posts and cannot be released all at the same time. It is also questionable if these officers will be prepared to subject themselves to an in-country training programme or would benefit from such a programme as they have acquired considerable skills through their practical work." The report concludes, "(This group) would benefit from intensive management courses either within the region or in the U.S."

One strong argument in favor of training District Commissioners is that it would support USAID's current activity of training District Officers. One potential problem with the District Institutional Development sub-project is that officers trained to the master's level often will be supervised by District Commissioners who do not have university degrees, nor have a good understanding of what new skills the officers have learned. Through intensive management courses, District Commissioners could be introduced to various aspects of the master's level training courses which their District Officers have completed. In this way, they would be better prepared to make use of the upgraded skills those officers have acquired.

Discussions regarding this kind of training project could start immediately. Funding could be through a separate project, or could be handled through the phase II of BWAST. Such training would be directly relevant to employment generation in rural areas since District Commissioners are in key positions in terms of the development and implementation of government policy in the individual districts.

XI. SPECIAL COMMENTS OR REMARKS

To satisfy a condition precedent (CP) GOB submitted to USAID the training report by Louis Picard, titled "District



Administration Training in Botswana," referred to in an above section. Once received and accepted by USAID as satisfying the CP, the report was the subject of no further communication between USAID and GOB. Since the report included a training schedule for the District Officer cadre being sent to the U.S., this lack of communication created some confusion. For some time GOB assumed that USAID accepted the report's training schedule, which provided that participants would be sent for training up to 1989. The Project Paper clearly states that the final group of participants would leave for training in 1987, and USAID has informed the team that they sent out notices at different intervals which dealt with the training implementation schedule. But apparently this discrepancy in dates was not discussed until almost a year after the Picard report's acceptance. In any case, there has been confusion in this regard. It should be noted that since the CP states that the report is to be "in form and substance satisfactory to AID," it is incumbent on USAID to identify areas where the report is not satisfactory. Otherwise, it is not illogical for GOB to assume that the substance of the report has been accepted.

Regarding the training of the eight eligible District Officers who are excluded from the group now slotted for training, it has been suggested by USAID that these eight can be included as participants in the BWAST project. USAID has communication from GOB in support of this position. However, others who have been interviewed in and out of GOB do not share the opinion of USAID for two reasons. First, the emphasis under BWAST is direct employment generation, not institutional development, and thus the training of District Officers would be a low priority. Second, at least six ministries, plus the private sector, will be competing for BWAST funds. A third consideration is that recommended in this report is that these same funds (from BWAST) perhaps be used for the training of District Commissioners, and it is less likely that the BWAST project would support both the remaining District Officers and the District Commissioners. In sum, dependence on BWAST for training District Officers seems to be unnecessary when a project currently exists which includes that activity as one of its components.

XII. RECOMMENDATIONS

Good progress is being made in selecting District Officers for master's level training and placing those selected in degree programs in the United States. Also, the academic performance of participants generally has been average to above average. The original Project assumptions about duration of degree programs was incorrect, and programs are lasting an average of about 18 months rather than 12 months. Thus, participants are not returning as scheduled, and there may be fewer total number of participants than expected, and costs will be higher.

A

The following recommendations are made.

1) It is recommended that greater attention be given to selecting appropriate degree programs, and that GOB be as clear and precise as possible in identifying, prioritizing and communicating the training needs of the three categories of participants (administration, development, and lands).

2) It is recommended that high priority be given to the training at the master's level of all 37 eligible District Officers by making use of whatever funds may be available within the Project.

3) It is recommended that the Project Assistance Completion Date (PACD) be extended to June 1990 to provide sufficient time for completion of all degree programs. This should allow enough time for all 37 eligible officers to complete master's programs, and allow the Ministry of Local Government and Lands to spread out the participants' departure dates so as to ease the burden of locating and placing on a temporary basis personnel to replace the absent officers.

4) It is recommended that the job performance of officers who have completed their degree work be closely monitored to judge in what areas their performance has improved and in what areas there should be some revision of current responsibilities to take into account their more advanced level of skills.

5) It is recommended that discussions between USAID and GOB about support for future District Administration training activities be based on the Picard report and revisions to that report, and in particular should consider providing District Commissioners with intensive short-term training in management so as to improve both their own work performance and their performance as supervisors of the master's level District Officers.

ANNEX D

ASSESSMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT SYSTEM FOR MONITORING AND
COORDINATING RSG PHASE II ACTIVITIES

BOTSWANA RURAL SECTOR GRANT PROJECT EVALUATION

(Project # 633-0077)

May 1986

Gaborone, Botswana

Discussion

The Rural Development Unit (RDU) of the Ministry of Finance and Development Planning has overall responsibility for monitoring and coordinating the Rural Sector Grant (RSG) Phase II activities on the part of the Government of Botswana. A committee has been established, the Rural Sector Grant Reference Group, to assist the RDU in performing this function. This committee is chaired by the Coordinator of Rural Development in the RDU, and includes as members all line ministries and other government institutions, such as the National Development Bank, which are involved in RSG activities, as well as USAID. In addition, the Communal Areas Coordinator (CAC) in the RDU is a USAID-funded position whose responsibilities include, among others, monitoring, coordinating, troubleshooting and liaising functions with respect to RSG activities. The CAC also is the Secretary to the RSG Reference Group.

The Reference Group's primary function is to monitor and coordinate RSG activities in an environment where all involved ministries and institutions can work together to assess progress of project activities and to resolve issues as they arise. The committee does not have executive powers of its own, but rather is a forum where discussion can take place and recommendations be made which are then referred to the respective ministries and institutions. The Group meets on a quarterly basis and receives reports on the various activities included in the RSG.

The evaluation team found that in general the RDU system for monitoring and coordinating Phase II activities is working well. Reports are submitted on a regular basis to the Group, and discussion centers on how issues raised in the reports can be resolved. A revised management information system has been initiated which keeps the RDU and AID informed of progress and problems with respect to the implementation of project

activities and the achievement of project objectives. This system seems to be working well, although lapses have been apparent during the evaluation team's study. The Chairwoman has noted that at times individual reports are received too late for adequate study prior to Group meetings, and we concur with her that Group members should strive to submit reports in a timely fashion so that they receive the necessary attention. The Communal Areas Coordinator is doing a good job of working with line ministries and institutions in monitoring RSG activity implementation and in dealing with project-related issues as they arise on behalf of the Rural Development Unit, the Reference Group and the line ministries and GOB institutions.

The team notes that the previous Phase I evaluation report and the 1984 audit report raised as an issue a lack of agreement between AID and the RDU on the specific responsibilities of the CAC with respect to the management of the RSG. It is our finding that within his scope of work the CAC is performing well, and that his contract should be extended, as requested by the Directorate of Personnel, for a further two years from its original expiration date of 25 January 1986. This extension is justified on the grounds that critical implementation issues will continue to arise over the following two years, and that there will be a significant change of USAID mission management within a couple of months, including the departure of the mission director and deputy director and of the RSG project manager.

Instead of entering into a discussion about interpretations of and revisions to the CAC's scope of work, the team has chosen what it feels is perhaps a more direct route to resolving this issue and had identified specific outstanding tasks which are significant to the success of the Project and which should be undertaken by the various ministries involved. It is the responsibility of the RDU, through the CAC as liaison person, to see that these tasks are fulfilled. These are listed below.

Recommendations

It is recommended that the RDU system for monitoring and coordinating Phase II activities be continued as presently organized, and that the position of CAC be extended for a further two years past the original contract expiration date of 25 January 1986.

It is also recommended that the RDU, through the CAC and his liaison with line ministries and other institutions, see that the following tasks are undertaken.

1. Horticultural Estates

a. A full analysis of the economic viability of the estates should be prepared and evaluated.

b. It should be assured that adequate and appropriate managerial and technical expertise is available to the estates' associations.

c. The issue of the residence of the association members and agricultural demonstrator at Selebi-Pikwe requires attention.

d. The issue of the Chadibe Estate development requires attention.

e. There should be a study by an irrigation specialist of all estates.

2. District Institutional Development

a. The upgrading where appropriate of job responsibilities of returned participants should be considered.

b. The specific GOB training needs should be communicated to the Academy for Educational Development (AED) to assist AED in identifying appropriate programs, and the credentials of proposed participants should be forwarded to AED promptly.

3. PEDF

a. RDU should coordinate the exploration of alternative uses for the PEDF.

4. Rural Industrial Officer Cadre

a. Greater attention is required to the development of policy regarding marketing, infrastructure and raw material supply constraints, especially in remote areas.

b. Greater leadership is also required to determine the effect the reorganization (merger of RIO, BEDU, and BAS) of the Department of Industry will have on the direction and overall goals of the RIO component.

5. AE10 Evaluation

a. This study should be completed as soon as possible so as to be considered in conjunction with the RSG Project evaluation report.

ANNEX E

SCOPE OF WORK AND SCHEDULE
BOTSWANA RURAL SECTOR GRANT PROJECT EVALUATION
(Project 633-0077)
May, 1986
Gaborone, Botswana

I. Team Leader/Project Development Officer

A. Reviews progress reports submitted by GOB ministries to Ministry of Finance and Development Planning on all sub-projects implemented under the Rural Sector Grant.

B. In conjunction with appropriate team members, Rural Development Unit (RDU) staff and planning officers in the concerned ministries, analyzes implementation bottlenecks and recommends solutions. Included in this analysis will be an assessment of the RDU system for monitoring and coordinating Phase II activities.

C. In conjunction with appropriate team members, RDU staff and planning officers in the concerned ministries, provides sub-projects status reports which include:

1. Description of activities, (completed, in progress, cancelled, etc.);
2. Achievement/shortfalls;
3. General financial status; and
4. Future monitoring requirements.

D. Provides an overview of phase II of RSG performance in relation to the stated goals, purpose, inputs and outputs of the project.

E. In conjunction with the Ministry of Local Government and Lands, district officials and returned participants, provides an assessment of district administration training. In addition to reviewing the progress of the program to date, the assessment should suggest a mechanism and timeframe which would guide the ministry and USAID in discussions concerning support for those needs beyond phase II of the Rural Sector Grant.

F. In conjunction with National Development Bank officials and Rural Industries Specialist, provides an assessment of the Productive Employment Development Fund (PEDF).

II. Horticulturalist/Agriculturalist

A. Reviews progress of Ramonaka and Selebi-Phikwe Horticultural Estates.

B. Provides a preliminary assessment of the Chadibe Estate.

C. Works with team leader, Rural Development Unit and Ministry of Agriculture for activity 1.B as described under team leader.

D. In light of on-going drought and its attendant effects on the horticultural estate, suggests technical inputs to alleviate avoidable problems and suggest alternative plans.

E. Coupled with several site visits, incorporates findings of AE10 Evaluation into conclusions on the agricultural component of the RSG Evaluation.

III. Rural Industries Specialist

A. Reviews progress of sub-projects in the Rural Industrial Officer component (CI 08).

B. Works with team leader, Rural Development Unit and Ministry of Commerce and Industry for activity 1.B as described under team leader.

C. Reviews the performance and absorptive capacity of the RIO training and general support fund and provides recommendations for improving this activity.

D. Provides a detailed sub-project status to the level of sub-activities for CI 08 and provides a preliminary review of future needs of the program and requirements for supporting these needs.

E. Reviews relationship of PEDF sub-component with RIO cadre activity.

F. Time permitting, provides helpful comments and suggestions to the team leader on the assessment of the PEDF.

IV. USAID and GOB Representatives

A. Arrange meetings and provide access to documents.

B. Available to answer project related questions.

PHASE II RURAL SECTOR GRANT EVALUATION - SCHEDULE

		MON	TUES	WED	THURS	FRI	SAT	SUN
WEEK I	RIO	28 1 TEAM ARRIVES;	29 10:30 RSG	30 SOUTHERN	1 TSHABONG	2 RIO POST VISIT	3	4
	TEAM LEADER	MEETINGS WITH USAID AND RDU	REFERENCE GROUP MEETING	GABORONE	TSHABONG	RIO POST VISIT		
	AGRIC		AFTERNOON MEETINGS	ESTATES VISIT	ESTATE VISIT	ESTATE VISIT		
	OTHER		WITH TEAM AND MINISTRIES					
WEEK II	RIO	5 MAUN	6 GOMARE	7 SEROWE FTOWN PALAPYE	8	9 KASANE	10	11
	TEAM LEADER	MAUN	GOMARE	SEROWE FTOWN PALAPYE	PUBLIC HOLIDAY	KASANE		
	AGRIC	GABORONE	CHADIBE	SELEBI-THIKWE		KASANE		
	OTHER	ELLISON MAUN	ELLISON GOMARE					
WEEK III	RIO	12 WRITE	13 WRITE	14 GROUP MEETING		15 REVISE	16 DEPART	17
	TEAM LEADER	"	"	2:00 pm RSG REFERENCE	REVISE	REVISE REVISE	REVISE	REVISE
	AGRIC	"	"	GROUP MEETING	REVISE	DEPART		
	OTHER							
WEEK IV	TEAM LEADER	19 REVISE	20 DEPART	21	22	23	24	25

ANNEX F

LIST OF MINISTRIES AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS CONTACTED

Ministry of Finance and Development Planning

Ministry of Commerce and Industry

Ministry of Local Government and Lands

Ministry of Agriculture

Ministry of Mineral Resources and Water Affairs

National Development Bank

Agricultural Technology Improvement Project personnel

Lutheran World Federation

Southern and Eastern Growers Association

Academy for Educational Development

Notes:

1. Within each Ministry, various departments were contacted.
2. Field visits were made to RIO stations, district offices, and horticultural estates throughout the country.

ANNEX G

EXPLANATION OF ABBREVIATIONS

AED	Academy for Educational Development
CAC	Communal Areas Coordinator
DID	District Institutional Development
DO	District Officer
EOPS	End of Project Status
FAP	Financial Assistance Policy
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GOB	Government of Botswana
MCI	Ministry of Commerce and Industry
MFDP	Ministry of Finance and Development Planning
MLGL	Ministry of Local Government and Lands
NDB	National Development Bank
P	Pula
PACD	Project Assistance Completion Date
PEDF	Productive Employment Development Fund
PES	Project Evaluation Summary (Standard AID project evaluation format)
RDU	Rural Development Unit
REDSO/ESA	Regional Economic Development Services Organization for East and Southern Africa
RSG	Rural Sector Grant
S/RIO	Senior Rural Industrial Officer
TGSF	Training and General Support Fund
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USAID/B	Botswana USAID Mission



Agency for International Development

*Embassy of the United States of America
Post Office Box 90
Gaborone, Botswana
Tel. 53382 and 52401 Telex BD 2336*

*(U.S. mailing address)
USAID/Botswana
Dept. of State
Washington, D.C. 20520*

January 31, 1987

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

The AE10 component of the evaluation was evaluated by a local consultant, therefore it does not follow the PES format.

However, it should be viewed as a supplement to the overall mid-term evaluation.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Beverley Reed
Executive Secretary

AE 10 AGRICULTURE SMALL PROJECTS PROGRAMME

MID TERM EVALUATION

APRIL 1986

BY M SIBANDA

CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
Acknowledgements	1
Short Background to the AE10 Programme	2
Preface	3
Evaluation method used	4
Terms of Reference	5
General Overview	6-6D
Other Projects	7-7F
Comments on Project Development	8-8A
Special Note	9-9A
Conclusions	10
Recommendations	11
AE10 PROJECTS AND FINANCIAL ANALYSIS	12

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The call for me to take up the AE10 Agriculture Small Projects Programme Mid Term Evaluation, did not come as a surprise but as a challenge for me to contribute in the rural and Agricultural development of my country.

I would like to express my deep and sincere appreciation to the following people:-

Director Agricultural Field Services,

Deputy Director Agriculture Field Services,

Mr G N Mabua, Input Officer, Ministry of Agriculture

Ken Ellison, C.A.N Ministry of Finance and Development Planning who put at my disposal all the necessary files and reading material.

My thanks also go to the Sociological Unit of the Ministry of Agriculture who prepared a comprehensive set of question guide lines for the Evaluation.

Last but not the least my thanks and appreciation go to USAID who provided the funds for the Rural Sector Grant and made the support funding available for the Evaluation exercise.

/.....

SHORT BACKGROUND TO THE AE10 AGRICULTURE

Small projects programme

The AE10 Small projects programme provides grants to community groups to improve or establish village infrastructure and productive activities related to agriculture.

These projects include small dams, woodlots, horticulture projects, poultry projects, fishing groups, the erection of drift fences to isolate crops from animal damage and construction of storage and marketing facilities for crops and agricultural inputs.

The programme began with a maximum contribution to groups of P5000.00 under NDP V. This has now been increased to P15,000.00 under NDP VI.

In this programme groups or communities have to demonstrate a commitment by making a counterpart contribution in cash or kind of at least ten percent (10%) of the total cost of the project.

The programme is implemented with the Assistance of Agricultural Demonstrators (ADs) who are responsible, with the groups, for the organisation and implementation of each project.

PREFACE

The need for a Supporting System that Really Supports

It is widely known that a farmer's ability to increase his output depends not only on natural factors; the structure of his farm and resources allocated to it; his attitudes toward himself and his techniques and quality of the instruction he receives; and the internal organisation of the rural community but depends also on a broad net work of factors - external to the farm itself = both within and beyond the rural areas, that must be organized into a system of assistance to the farmer in his efforts to increase production.

Planners and Policy makers here are of great importance in establishing principles, that can guide, direct and through their authority can organize systems adapting various elements to the needs of the farmer in a manner that will spur him to increase production.

The sytem of services that directly supports production and helps to improve the farmers living conditions is composed of a large number of varying elements - such as services of supply, marketing, credit facilities, public services - such as instruction in education, health as well as physical infrastructure, including roads and warehouses etc, etc.

In the light of this; Coordination from Ministries, their departments and or other organizations is a vital core for development.

Every Ministry, department and organisations should coordinate, comprehend, be progressive, interlinked and indeed be sychronized in spirit and effort to have development possible.

EVALUATION TRIP AND EVALUATION METHOD USED

The evaluation exercise took a wide route and covered many areas and peoples of different backgrounds, constraints, priorities and outlook in life.

The trip covered six (6) Agricultural Regions and their agricultural extension districts. ie Western region, Maun/Ngamiland region, Francistown, Central, Gaborone, and Southern regions.

Terms of Reference were used as Yard Stick and that all evaluation questions and assessment measures were taken from them. These were very wide and comprehensive and have influenced the write up of this report.

However, mention of outside forces deterrent to development or decisive to; has been noted in this report.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. Determine the economic impact of the programme on rural population; assess the extent to which the programme has created jobs or increased income for disadvantages groups of farmers and determine the degree of input from target groups in deciding on particular projects.

2. Specifically and critically examine the uses of drift fences with a view to determining how much drift fences have been effective in reducing crop damage by livestock and further examine the effects of drift fences on creating more rationale grazing and ploughing patterns.

3. Examine whether or not other projects that have been sponsored under AE10, e.g. woodlots, vegetable gardens, poultry raising, fisheries, etc have been directly related to diversifying and increasing agricultural production. Make a close examination of the existing group projects and identify aspects needing improvements. Assess the efforts made by groups or farmers to maintain and sustain these projects over medium to long term and on the basis of this suggest if AE10 projects are likely to remain operational in the future.

4. Determine whether farmers are conversant with the procedure for applying for funds and whether farmers regard this procedure as operating in their best interests and convenience. If not, what improvements can be made?

5. Determine the most successful project and/or kinds of projects and examine the factors owing to their success, i.e. good management, good AD leadership, group's determination, etc.

6. Determine reasons for the delays, if any, in applications from the extension areas through agricultural Districts up to the final approval in Ministry headquarters. Suggest ways to improve this application process.

7. Determine the Agricultural Extension support and advice to AE10 groups and projects, progress on the implementation/execution of most AE10 projects and the general problems encountered by farmers/groups and ways to solve these.

GENERAL OVERVIEW

The AE10 Agricultural Small Projects Programme is on the whole a very popular and welcome programme throughout the country.

The programme has indeed met its objectives and has served many, whose projects have been diligently and objectively planned to serve an identified problem in the group or community.

Job Creation

Projects such as Fishing, Poultry and Vegetable growing have provided a steady employment for the group participants and their families.

The success of these projects is however determined by a number of variables such as the drought and lack of water in the case of Fishermen in the Ngamiland area. Lack of fuel to run their fishing boats, shortage of salt for the drying of fish and in many instances shortage of repair materials for their boats, nets etc, etc.

The most successful part about the Fishermen is that they all understand their trade and technologies that can keep them going without the daily Nursing by the Fisheries Extension Officer.

However continued support by the Food Resources Unit is vital as it is the biggest single purchaser of their dried fish, for distribution to Clinics and Health centres in the country.

Vegetable Gardens

Group vegetable growing has not yet been a success in many projects throughout the country.

Many projects are not operational throughout the year because of lack of irrigation water. The persistent drought for the past five (5) years has indeed cut down production in most of the vegetable projects.

This natural phenomenon however is not the only one to blame all the failures to. A good number of failures arise from poor project development and appraisal, poor and unreliable group formation, lack of group constitution, lack of group work plans, plenty of group friction, lack of horticultural technology, dedication, hard work and cooperation with their Agricultural Extension personnel for advise in vegetable production.

Poultry Projects

The Serowe and Mahalapye poultry projects were the most, steadily productive, successful and most impressive units in the programme.

The Serowe - Boiteko Agricultural Management Association (AMA) group is composed of nine (9) women and one (1) man. This group of ten people is running a very successful egg laying poultry unit in conjunction with a very productive vegetable garden.

This group is very well composed, cooperated and has drawn out a very useful constitution and work plans to be followed and obeyed by members of the group.

The success of this group or project stands out of the fact that, apart from them having registered as an association with the Ministry of Agriculture, they have with them a qualified Agricultural Technician seconded to them by the Foundation for Education in Gaborone. This man's salary is paid partly by the Foundation and partly by the Boiteko group.

The Technician is hired as a coordinator of the project responsible for agricultural technical advice, recording, bookkeeping and financial management. Work organisation, sales and general administration is all entirely on the group participants.

This group meets regularly, keeps records of their meetings and Executive Committee members attend: upgrading courses arranged by CAMA of the Ministry of Agriculture.



The Cripple and Blind poultry project in Mahalapye is another occupational activity doing very well indeed. It has now fifteen (15) participants operating on daily bases.

The participants tend the birds; they feed, water, collect eggs, clean them, pack and deliver them to the market in Mahalapye village for sale.

The centre is looked after and coordinated by a Mr M Mathuba who is himself a Vice President of the Botswana Association for the Blind and Cripple who has been the spear head for this Mahalapye project.

He has volunteered in the building and construction of the Chicken house and the residential house in the centre. Participants' spirit and cooperation was very high and lots of appreciation for the programme was voiced by the participants who still looked forward for further financial help.

Drift Fences

In many instances these have changed name from place to place, depending on the land terrain and cattle pressure.

Drift fences have had to be called 'Group fences' in Shorobe, 'Land fences' in Etsha, and 'Encloser fences' in Kweneng and other Southern districts. However what ever name is used, it still simple means "Lands fences" for the protection of crops from animal damage.

This project is very popular throughout the country and carries the highest single activity over other projects and participants numbers.

The success of this activity lies in the spontaneous realization by many crop farmers that crop damage by cattle and other animals added to poor harvest in addition to that caused by low rainfall.

Farmers, their groups and communities all identified this problem and have formed themselves in working groups, collected money and drawn out working constitutions to make sure work goes on as scheduled.

Most of these successful groupings have been initiated by AMAO or GDO Extension Officers from the Ministry of Agriculture. This group of Extension workers is highly motivated and knowledgeable in group dynamics and group stimulation.

These officers have undertaken to stimulate appropriate group action in the following ways:-

1. Help in organizing people, farmers into well understanding groups with clear cut roles, objectives, intentions, identity and cooperativeness.
2. Where possible furnish special materials or organise for the relevant items needed for the project or projects.
3. Provide or organise Technical and Managerial Assistance to the people or their groups.
4. Arrange for financial assistance for farmer groups or projects through the appropriate agencies.

Examples of good Extension efficiency were found in Etsha, Shorobe, Tutume, Bobonong, Palapye, Serowe, Kweneng and the Southern districts.

Most projects here were found complete or about to be complete and participants in high spirits of enthusiasm and cooperation. All work was carried out cooperatively by all members of groups as they shared their work equally between men and women.

When erecting drift fences men are usually found cutting and loading poles to the fence site, clearing fence lines and straining fence wires. Whilst women are normally found digging holes for fence posts, planting fence posts or removing tree brush (branches and small bush) away from the fence line.

Group leaders or chairmen of groups are unanimously respected and followed by group members as per their written constitutions and guide lines.

In Shorobe, when I enquired on how they managed to have their work go on as smoothly as it did, I was told that "Constitutions" were made and drawn out in such a way that all loopholes were removed and made it impossible for members to dodge call up for work and that if anyone did dodge he/she was liable for punishment and made to pay a fee or fine which would be used to hire a person in his or her place.

Another advantage to these successful groups was that, their societies were unison in nature, background, tribe and objectivity.

These attitudes, thoughts and emotional reactions are and were not enjoyed by other groups or communities in other districts throughout the country.

OTHER PROJECTS

Projects in Ghanzi/East Hanahai, Gomare, Nokaneng, Northeast, Pilikwe and Mahalapye need a lot of help and department of agriculture's close examination and correction.

These projects have suffered from lack of project appraisal, project planning, project development and coordination of participants and or other supporting development agencies in the areas.

The drift fence and woodlot plantation in East Hanahai Basarwa settlement are all near completion.

The drift fence now stretches for fifteen (15) kilometres and will be pulled further another five (5) kilometres to twenty (20) as was originally planned for.

The objectives of this drift fence was to protect the Basarwa cattle from the commercial Trek-route cattle to BMC Lobatse. Over the years it was found that a lot of cattle were lost and taken away by the Trek-route stock to Lobatse.

The woodlot was planned and is now being planted into eucalyptus trees at the settlement for what the objectives are said to be, for the creation of employment for the Basarwa people. Both these projects in East Hanahai were initiated by the district council with little or no coordination or consultation with the Ministry of Agriculture.

Project participants too, have not been involved in project planning or consultation of any kind.

They have never been involved in any work on the projects or commitment of some kind to show their participation, save for eight (8) men who took up paid employment to clear the woodlot land before fencing it off.

The future of both these projects is certainly in doubt, because the so called participants have not been motivated towards these activities. They are foreigners to their own projects as these have been imposed on them without explanation.

Though it is hopefully anticipated that these people will settle down permanently and fore go their traditional way of life - of seasonal going to the bush for hunting and gathering.

Vegetable Projects

The Khurakhura Sewing Circle Vegetable Garden is one project whose future is in realy doubt. The Sewing Circle group of women has a long and unactive history with its projects.

Before this group took up a vegetable garden as a project it had earlier on taken up Sewing as a development project in Ghanzi.

The group had raised money from another donor to purchase eight (8) sewing machines which would help them start up a cloth production unit in Ghanzi village. Each of thse women was provided with a sewing machine, which they still keep and own as individualsnot as a group.

Working together as a group failed as they did not have guide lines or constitution to help them in cooperative business or outlook. Immediately after the failure of the Sewing exercise in 1983 the group started requesting for a vegetable garden project. The intentions and objectives of which were to raise money to subsidise the sewing project. However, again due to lack of unity and continued lack of cooperation the vegetable project has again been grounded before take off.

On close analysis it was obvious that this group was made up of unfaithful persons who needed to acquire individual wealth in the name of, and in disguise of being called a group to acquire Government funding.

The garden is never used or worked up on. Only a four foot fence was erected sometime ago and piped water reticulated into the garden. Poles and fencing materials to raise the perimetre fence to six or eight feet is lying idle and rotting away in the sun and rain.

There were also signs of broken down fertilizer bags which had already been wasted and lost.

Surprisingly, there was a beaten path to and from the water tap which was used conveniently by one of the group leaders and her family.

Nokaneng/Gomare

Division of interests, tribalism and party politics rivalry is so immense in this area that development projects are hampered and fail to achieve their targeted schedules.

Drift fence projects cited for these areas are lagging behind their scheduled time tables because lots of conflicts have arisen between cattle owners and none cattle owners. Generally, the bulk of arable farmers are not cattle ranchers and have a dire need to protect their lands and crops from cattle damage. However, the dominant powerful cattle owners think and feel the fencing of lands areas is going to curtail and restrict their cattle movements.

This conflict of interest has been made worse by the growing political rivalry ravaging the area, making it impossible for cattle farmers and arable farmers to come to a consolatory agreement. The situation is so volatile that Extension Agricultural workers are made helpless and cannot help in any way but watch. However, the situation continues dragging down, misallocation of resources.

North East

Incidencies of conflict, bickering among group members on projects and sinister vetures of tribalism coupled with Party Politic rivalry are enormous in the district, that most projects tend to be stagnant and suffer from inertia.

The Moroka Sorghum Hammer Mill is not functioning because some people feel they have been cheated on the running of it and general administration of it.

The history of the Hammer Mill has it that it was requested and purchased for the Moroka Village VDC. However when the mill arrived at the village in 1979 they were questions asked as to:-

- (1) Who was going to run it
- (2) Who was going to be responsible for its general administration.
- (3) Who was going to be responsible for its repairs, service and collection of daily takings.

The answer was simple then, though it was not unanimously agreed by everybody. The few individuals who did not agree at the time, have over the years been manipulating the situation with all vigour including tribalism and politics to win their end.

As a result of these unholy manoeuvres the committee which was chosen to run the Mill affairs does not meet any more and things are at a stand still.

Reports from Zwenshambe and Sechele state of a combination of factors similar to those prevalent in Moroka and district at large.

Pressurers on projects of this kind are indeed a hinderence to progress and lead to a waste and misallocation of resources as they are normally extremely difficult to change or persuaded to, by Extension workers who are by their employment code exonerated from such dealings.

Pilikwe Youth Development Association Sorghum Mill

The Pilikwe Sorghum Mill project faces a lot of development problems.

First it is not clear how the Association was formed and how it was registered. There is no information as to whether it was registered with the Ministry of Agriculture (CAMA) or Ministry of Education (BRIDEC) or not at all.

The Association lacks viability as a Board responsible for the development of the Sorghum Mill project.

It lacks consultation with other Agencies in the village and outside. The Association lacks Technical, Social, Economic and general know how on project development. The Association does not have a Project Memoranda or Work plan.

On further investigation during the Evaluation exercise it came to light that the Sorghum Mill idea for Pilikwe Village came from someone outside the village who cannot be available now to help the Association sort itself out. The idea was taken up haphazardly without much thought and basic planning.

Association members did not agree on many issues which led to some of them altering the Original Mill Shed building plans. The alterations led to shortages of building materials which has now lead to delays in the Mill Shed construction, completion and installation of the Sorghum Mill.

All this delay and flastration has further split the relationships among Association members.

Information received from the Village Head man and the resident Agricultural Demonstrator (DA) were that the Association members were not cooperative and did not seek for advice either with them or the local Village Development Committee.

The Committee member representative met, gave excuses on the delay as being the result of the Mill Shed alterations and the delay in the Ministry of Agriculture releasing carry-over funds for the purchase of the additional needed building materials.

He however, assured me that, now that the building materials had arrived the project would be completed and Commissioned without any more delay.

Kgetsi Ya Tsie, Rakhudu and Itekeng Vegetable Garden Groups

The three (3) Horticultural groups are situated along the Mahalapye river Southeast of Mahalapye town. They are all in Thokole Agricultural Extension area.

Their chances for the future is bright, only, if they could follow the Agricultural Extension information, guide lines and recommendations as well as the basic principles of agricultural development.

Kgetsi Ya Tsie is the oldest of all vegetable groups. All mistakes it did and continues to do are blindly followed by all other groups without consideration. Following Kgetsi Ya Tsie's operations - all groups have chosen five (5) people to form a vegetable group. Horticultural land or garden is divided up into 5 equal blocks. Block for each farmer/operator.

Each farmer/operator or block has its own reservoir to store their water for irrigation. Each block of land is re-divided up into smaller plots or beds for each farmer's convenience to grow whatever crop he may deem fit.

Sales and marketing is not arranged or coordinated, everyone does what he likes when he feels like. Each member has a day put aside for him to use the engine and pump to water his block. There is no systematic cropping or rotation in all horticultural projects. No systematic pest control measures are being followed. etc., etc.

8/1

Though the involvement of these people in agriculture is highly appreciated and encouraged it is however, fundamental that their approach to agriculture should change to a more scientific light, to assure them a more lucrative occupation.

It is recommended here that they must be encouraged to leave and forego their impulsive way to horticultural activities; Reorganize themselves as a group or groups, with proper constitutions and work plans. Have proper land layouts and big enough water reservoirs to keep enough water at all times to be available to any one member when needed. Make arrangements for engines to be serviced and have proper maintenance. To acquire from Horticultural Officer the ways of combating insect pests. Be helped to formulate a marketing system beneficial to all of them.

Encourage the groups to organize themselves to follow the procedures taken by the Serowe Boiteko A.M.A. group, Tshukudu A.M.A. in Francistown, and S.E.G.A. A.M.A. group in Gaborone. This will help improve their marketing problems, economize in the use of transport, handling, facilitate the assessment of quantities and qualities of supplies and determination of prices. Further more this cooperation and unity will improve their general administration and prepare them for the forthcoming Marketing infrastructures proposed for construction in the Central district.



COMMENTS ON PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

It is frequent that Extension workers, Communities or other rural organisations need to start up a project or projects for the improvement of local living conditions in the area.

In deciding on projects we must always remember that projects are meant for men and must meet the needs of people. Many projects have been rejected, misused or under utilized because full consideration was not given to some human, social or environmental factors.

Considerations on social, economic, political, technical and administration should be looked into earlier on at the planning stage to avoid a repulse later on in the project.

Project planning must always be guided by the following considerations:-

- (a) Is the project really in the interest of the people for whom it is proposed? Will the benefits and costs be equitably distributed?
- (b) Is the project acceptable to the people for whom it is proposed? Will they be willing to supply the necessary inputs - money, labour, materials, time etc. to achieve it?
- (c) Does the project adequately prepare the people for its consequences? Is public education or training included in its implementation?
- (d) Is the project best located in terms of physical environment conditions?
- (e) Have similar projects been tried before? If so, what success did they have or why were they not successful? How can past failures be avoided?

NOTE

Pressures on projects should be guided against and be avoided at all times. It is usual that projects are conceived and implemented with enormous waste and misallocation of resources because of very strong pressures that are extremely difficult to change. Many people tend to regard "their project" as the key to personal advancement; this is particularly true where planning is administratively separated from action.

Misguided political interests also deter projects and project development in many spheres - and result in Project Stagnation alongside an impatience for results for haste, even where projects require long periods for proper preparation and implementation.

SPECIAL NOTE

My observations in all agricultural regions and districts was that many people were interested in a number of technologies, items and the want to learn new ideas but suffered from a group constraints.

Like:

1. Lack of knowledge where to go to learn
2. Lack of information through Extension Agencies i.e. Agric. Extension GDO's AMAO, ADCO's, Adult Education, Health and Nutrition etc.
3. Lack of Coordination and Cooperation by Extension Agencies

A general lack of dialogue was apparant in all societies I met and this questions the effectiveness of Extension Agencies as vehicles of transporting and transmitting development technologies. Development as we know it, is lived by people where they are, where they live, where they learn, work, love and play. The primary community, whether geographical or organizational, is the immediate space open to most people. It is the village, the neighbourhood, the town, the factory, the office, the school, the Union, the church, sports club, the association - whatever its purpose - that personal and Societal development first and best interact. Development, even in its most subjective dimension does not happen in a vacuum. Human beings, like the societies they form, are at the same time conditioned and free. They are conditioned by history and culture, by biological rhythms and access the resources, by the level of social productivity and institutional environment. They become free in the process of learning to understand and transform nature - in an ecologically prudent way - and Society itself, a process in which personal and societal development interact. Participating in this societal process is a source of fulfilment.

Developmental problems can thus, be defined in an objective way. That the Society, its economy and Policy ought to be organized in such a manner as to maximize, for the individual and whole, the opportunities for self-fulfilment.

Developing gives an account of, and suggests the removal of husks of ignorance - that is overcoming domination, unfolding and liberating ones self. Development is the unfolding of peoples's individual and social imagination in defining goals, inventing means and ways to approach them, learning to identify and satisfy society legitimate needs. Development as defined means liberation of human beings and societies, happens, or better, is lived by people where they are. There is development when people and their Communities, whatever the space and time span to their efforts when they start to assert their autonomy, self-reliance and self-confidence. When they set out and carry out projects.

This stage can only be reached when Development Agencies all do their work objectively with a integrated approach to rural development as a binding ideal and yard stick.

The need for integration, Coordination and Cooperation arises from the fact that development problems on the ground are not the same. They have many aspects, and for reasons of what were, originally, administrative convenience and efficiency, these aspects were allocated as task areas to different Specilist planning and executive agencies. It is for this reason that as soon as there is a measure of Specialization of development agencies, there is a need for integration, coordination and cooperation of those Specialist Agencies.

CONCLUSIONS

Information and record keeping on AE10 projects was very scanty and scattered in most of the Agricultural regions and district offices. Most of the Agricultural demonstrators and their District Agricultural Officers did not even know how many projects their districts or regions had, both new and old. There was simply no effort to keep a proper file order or system to keep the AE10 records on their own, the best they did was to bundle some AE10 application duplicates with those of other projects such as AG15, LG17 etc, etc. There was no information on how much was spent on projects or how much was in balance. Everything was said to be with Agricultural Headquarters Gaborone.

Projects did not have regular visits from AD's or Extension Staff. Many Demonstrators used excuses that, they were either new in the districts from transfare, did not have time to visit because they were busy with other projects such as ALDEP, ARAP or they had just come from Quaille birds or Locusts. There seemed to be very little contact or appreciation with projects and their participants except when projects are being initiated or when people are being encouraged to form themselves into groups.

Many groups or Farmers groups still need a lot of teaching and support from the Agricultural Extension Staff in matters ranging from Group behaviour, Group responsibility, Committee responsibilities in meetings, minute keeping, as well as financial management and record keeping etc, etc.

Delays in applications were in most cases due to irregular visits by DA's to needy areas, after which delays in hearing of the farmers applications by the Village Development Committees VDCs, at their meetings which are held once every month followed by a further hearing by the District Development Committees DDC's which are held once in three months. There are at times, some applications that miss hearing by both the VDC and DDC at their first meetings which then delays the project application for a further six months before it finally reaches Ministry Headquarters or budget allocation.

In all complete projects, where the Farmers' or Group's Participants' Spirit was high and dynamic was due to, or, was a result of a good and able DA or some Extension Staff i.e. AMAO or GDO who took it up on himself to stimulate the people and give them the necessary guide lines.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- A. Cooperativeness, is a Science that needs a constant building upon and continued education on the part of farmer, is vital. Experience of Groups or Cooperatives in many countries suggests that the primary requirement for economic success is sufficient social cohesion and uniformity among members. Without it there cannot be the mutual confidence necessary for the subscription or saving of enough capital, for equal and democratic control of management, for risk-taking and for the weathering of financial and other difficulties.
- B. In economic success, the desire of individual members for the services provided by the group, cooperative, association or syndicate must be sufficiently intense, uniformly felt and continuous - for the benefit of farmers and their groups; It is recommended here that a bigger number of AMAO, GDO Cadre of Extension officers and their junior officers be trained and be posted to all Regions and Agricultural Extension districts.
- C. That AMAO and GDO's be responsible for group initiation, formulation, registration, participant - stimulation etc, etc.
- D. That AMAO and GDO officers in all regions have adequate logistic and support materials to cover the regions regularly to acquaint themselves with their junior officers' and farmers' needs when they arise.
- E. It is recommended that the work of ordinary and general AD be left to that of a Specialist Technician, certainly not that of a group initiator - for most of them lack the quality and proper experience.

- F. Botswana has up to now, created a large number of Farmers Committees, Groups or Associations which are allowed to die away or breakup in dissolutionment for lack of continued instruction on various issues, some of them pertaining their group and administration. The Extension Cadre of AMAO and GDO's be charged with activities of group stimulation based on the following principles:-
1. Help in organizing or initiation of groups
 2. Furnish special materials
 3. Provide technical and managerial assistance
 4. Provide or organize financial assistance
- G. Teaching materials be provided in the form of Projectors, appropriate films and slides to be shown to groups and associations throughout the region or regions. These films and slides will incite farmers to think more or give them desire to improve on their own projects or activities.
- H. GDO's and AMAO Officers be responsible for project recording, catalogueing and proper filing and be responsible for progress and quarterly reports to Ministry Headquarters.
- I. That proper and meaningful Project Group Constitutions, workplans and Project development plans and schedules be made available to the Ministry of Agriculture before any money or funding is released to the group. This will safe guard and eliminate the present waste and misallocation of resources.
- J. That measures be drawn and made available to RAO's and DAO's, to withdraw and move materials or tools from the unactive groups to the more active ones whose funds have not been forwarded due to financial year allocations.

AE10 DISTRICT PROJECT AND FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

DISTRICT: LOBATSE.....

AGRIC. REGION: SOUTHERN.....

PROJECT TYPE	NUMBER OF TYPE	AVERAGE SIZE	GROUP SIZE	FINANCE		BALANCE	%
				COMMITTED	SPENT		
D/FENCES	27		1450	56172.00	55966.28	205.72	46.5
VEG. GARDN	12		339	18706.00	9313.84	9392.16	20.6
POULTRY	5		98	3405.00	3405.00		8.6
WOODLOTS	1		1900	6000.00	2355.54	3644.46	1.7
FISHERIES							
CATTLE GRDS	3			6000.00	6000.00		5.1
WATER PRJS							
SS D. GRPS	8		39	3501.00	3501.00		13.7
DAM FENCES	1			640.00	640.00		1.7
STORAGES	1		26	275.00	274.00		1.7
HAMMER M. CITRUS OCHARD							
COLLECTION CENTRE							
PLANTER PROJECTS							
TOTALS	58		3852	94699	81456.66	13242.34	

AE10 DISTRICT PROJECT AND FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

DISTRICT:.. KWENENG, RAMOTSWA,..
KGATLENG & TLOKWENG

AGRIC. REGION: GABORONE.....

PROJECT TYPE	NUMBER OF TYPE	AVERAGE SIZE	GROUP SIZE	FINANCE		BALANCE	%
				COMMITTED	SPENT		
D/FENCES	36		3499	159991.00	152724.66	7266.34	62.0
VEG. GARDN	10		500	15987.00	15472.00	515.00	17.2
POULTRY	3		33	14061.00	14061.00		5.1
WOODLOTS	1		385	3500.00	3500.00		1.7
FISHERIES							
CATTLE GRDS	3		205	10360.00	10360.00		5.1
WATER PRJS							
SS D. GRPS							
DAM FENCES	4		212	4583.00	3500.63	1082.37	6.8
STORAGES	1		4709.00	4709.00	4709.00		1.7
HAMMER M. CITRUS OCHARD COLLECTION CENTRE PLANTER PROJECTS							
TOTALS	58		4834	213191.00	204327.29	8863.71	

ab

AE10 DISTRICT PROJECT AND FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

DISTRICT:.....SEROWE.....

AGRIC. REGION: ..CENTRAL.....

PROJECT TYPE	NUMBER OF TYPE	AVERAGE SIZE	GROUP SIZE	FINANCE			%
				COMMITTED	SPENT	BALANCE	
D/FENCES	40		5537	130222.00	112868.95	17353.05	67.7
VEG. GARDN	10		225	23798.00	22417.17	1380.83	16.9
POULTRY	3		91	17220.00	9780.00	7440.00	5.0
WOODLOTS	3		5010	5835.00	5343.00	492.00	5.0
FISHERIES							
CATTLE GRDS	1		200	6271.00	6271.00		1.6
WATER PRJS							
SS D. GRPS							
DAM FENCES							
STORAGES							
HAMMER M.	1		95	7000.00	6928.68	71.32	1.6
CITRUS OCHARD							
COLLECTION CENTRE							
PLANTER PROJECTS	1		50	2400.00	2400.00		1.6
TOTALS	59		11208	192746.00	166008.80	26737.20	

AE10 DISTRICT PROJECT AND FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

DISTRICT:..NORTH.EAST/TUTUME...

AGRIC. REGION: .FRANCISTOWN.

PROJECT TYPE	NUMBER OF TYPE	AVERAGE SIZE	GROUP SIZE	FINANCE		BALANCE	%
				COMMITTED	SPENT		
D/FENCES	10		1439	45514.00	38277.00	7237.00	55.5
VEG. GARDN	4			9866.00	9866.00		22.2
POULTRY							
WOODLOTS							
FISHERIES							
CATTLE GRDS							
WATER PRJS	1		147	4424.00	4268.71	155.29	5.5
SS D. GRPS	1			80.00	80.00		5.5
DAM FENCES							
STORAGES							
HAMMER M. CITRUS OCHARD	2			4100.00	4100.00		11.1
COLLECTION CENTRE PLANTER PROJECTS							
TOTALS	18			63984.00	56591.71	7392.29	

AE10 DISTRICT PROJECT AND FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

DISTRICT:.....NGAMILAND.....

AGRIC. REGION: MAUN.....

PROJECT TYPE	NUMBER OF TYPE	AVERAGE SIZE	GROUP SIZE	FINANCE			%
				COMMITTED	SPENT	BALANCE	
D/FENCES	30		1284	65552.81	64514.81	1038.00	55.5
VEG. GARDN	12		233	10636.00	10572.22	63.78	22.2
POULTRY	1		4	1738.00	1738.00		1.8
WOODLOTS							
FISHERIES	10		111	29975.97	29975.97		18.5
CATTLE GRDS							
WATER PRJS							
SS D. GRPS							
DAM FENCES							
STORAGES							
HAMMER M. CITRUS OCHARD COLLECTION CENTRE PLANTER PROJECTS	1			2280.00	2280.00		1.8
TOTALS	54		1632	110182.78	109081.00	1101.78	

98

AE10 DISTRICT PROJECT AND FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

DISTRICT:.....K GALAGADI.....

AGRIC. REGION: .WESTERN.....

PROJECT TYPE	NUMBER OF TYPE	AVERAGE SIZE	GROUP SIZE	FINANCE		BALANCE	%
				COMMITTED	SPENT		
D/FENCES	2	20KM	350	6130.00	3230.00	2900.00	22.2
VEG. GARDN	6		400	7233.00	5369.00	1864.00	66.6
POULTRY							
WOODLOTS	1		250	8623.00	3251.43	5371.57	11.1
FISHERIES							
CATTLE GRDS							
WATER PRJS							
SS D. GRPS							
DAM FENCES							
STORAGES							
HAMMER M. CITRUS OCHARD COLLECTION CENTRE PLANTER PROJECTS							
TOTALS	9	20	1000	21,986.00	11,850.43	10,135.57	

99

AE 10 PROJECT ANALYSIS SUMMARY

REGIONS

FINANCING

	SOUTHERN	GABORONE	CENTRAL	F'TOWN	MAUN	WESTERN	TOTALS
Phase I Total Committed	38851.00	114306.00	76235.00	19555.00	60581.00	5362.00	
Phase I Total Spent	38851.00	113688.00	73243.25	19555.00	60581.00	4562.00	
Phase I Balance	NIL	618.00	2991.75	NIL	NIL	800.00	
Phase II Total Committed	55848.00	98885.00	109511.00	44429.00	49602.00	18624.00	
PHASE II Total Spent	42605.66	90639.29	92686.90	37992.24	48449.00	8488.00	
Phase II Balance	13242.34	8245.71	16824.10	6436.76	1153.00	10136.00	
TOTAL COMMITTED	P 691 789.00						
TOTAL SPENT		631341.34					
BALANCE		60447.66					

PROJECT ANALYSIS

Total Projects	There are two hundred and fifty six (256) projects throughout the country.
Average Cost	Average cost per project is P2466.17 ^t
Av. Group Size	118 persons per project unit
Av. Approval Time	One year
Av. Implementatn Time	Twelve months to Eighteen months
Av. Completion Time	Three to Five years.

10-2