GOODBYE TO PROJECTS?

THE INSTITUTIONAL IMPACTS OF A LIVELIHOOD APPROACH ON DEVELOPMENT INTERVENTIONS

RESEARCH PROJECT NO. R7908

DEPARTMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

WORKING PAPER SERIES

Paper No 7

A livelihoods-grounded audit of Agricultural Sector Programme Support (ASPS) - Tanzania

By Faustin Kamuzora

August 2003

ISBN:
Published by: Bradford Centre for International Development, University of Bradford,
Pemberton Building, Bradford, West Yorkshire, BD7 1DP
Tel: +44-1274 233980 Fax: +44-1274 235280
www.brad.ac.uk/acad/bcid

BACKGROUND TO PROJECT AND WORKING PAPER SERIES

This paper is one in a series of working papers prepared under a research project entitled: ***Goodbye to Projects? The Institutional Impacts of a Livelihood Approach on development interventions.***

This is a collaborative project between the Bradford Centre for International Centre for Development[1] (BCID) with the Economic and Policy Research Centre (EPRC), Uganda; Khanya – managing rural change, South Africa; and, Mzumbe University (formerly the Institute for Development Management (IDM)), Tanzania. The project is supported by the UK Department for International Development (DFID) under their Economic and Social Research Programme (ESCOR).

Approaches to projects and development have undergone considerable change in the last decade with significant policy shifts on governance, gender, poverty eradication, and environmental issues. Most recently this has led to the adoption and promotion of the sustainable livelihood (SL) approach. The adoption of the SL approach presents challenges to development interventions including: the future of projects and programmes, and sector wide approaches (SWAPs) and direct budgetary support.

This project intends to undertake an innovative review of these issues. Central to this will be to question how a livelihood approach is actually being used in a range of development interventions. This will be used to identify and clarify the challenges to the design, appraisal and implementation of development interventions and changes required from the adoption of a livelihoods approach.

The research was conducted in two phases. The first phase consisted of general and country reviews on SL and development interventions. The second phase of the research involved the compilation of ten detailed case studies of development interventions in Uganda, Tanzania and South Africa. These case studies compare and contrast the implementation of a range of sector wide approaches, programmes and projects all developed with a livelihoods-orientation.

Each case study intervention was examined through what might be termed as a 'sustainable livelihoods (SL)-grounded audit', which uses sustainable livelihoods 'principles' as the basis. The results of this analysis offer useful guidance on the opportunities and challenges faced by development practitioners in operationalizing sustainable livelihoods approaches.

This paper 'A livelihoods-grounded audit of Agricultural Sector Programme Support (ASPS) – Tanzania' is the seventh in the series of project working papers.

[1] Formerly Development and Project Planning Centre (DPPC)

This research is funded by the Department for International Development of the United Kingdom. However, the findings, interpretations and conclusions expressed in this paper are entirely those of the author(s) and should not be attributed to the Department for International Development, which does not guarantee their accuracy and can accept no responsibility for any consequences of their use.

THE AUTHORS

Faustin Kamuzora is a Lecturer and Researcher at Mzumbe University, Tanzania.

PROJECT WORKING PAPERS TO DATE

1. **Annotated bibliography on livelihood approaches and development interventions.**
2. **Appraisal of the use of livelihoods approaches in South Africa.**
3. **Review of approaches to development interventions in Tanzania: From projects to livelihoods approaches.**
4. **Review of development interventions and livelihoods approaches in Uganda**
5. **A livelihoods-grounded audit of a Participatory Planning for District Development within Capacity 21 programme (Tanzakesho) in Tanzania**
6. **A livelihoods-grounded audit of the Community-Based Planning (CBP) action research project in South Africa.**
7. **A livelihoods-grounded audit of Agricultural Sector Programme Support (ASPS) – Tanzania**
8. **A livelihoods-grounded audit of the Sustainable Management of the Usangu Wetland and its Catchment (SMUWC) project in Tanzania.**
9. **A livelihoods-grounded audit of Magu district livelihood and food security project (MDLFSP) in Tanzania**
10. **A livelihoods-grounded audit of the Sexual Health and Rights Programme (SHARP!) in Lesotho and South Africa.**
11. **A livelihoods-grounded audit of the Training and Environmental Management (TEAM) project in Lesotho.**
12. **A livelihoods-grounded audit of the Sustainable Coastal Livelihoods Programme(SCLP) in South Africa.**
13. **A livelihoods-grounded audit of the Plan for the Modernisation of Agriculture**

(PMA) in Uganda.

14. A livelihoods-grounded audit of the AIDS/STD programme in Uganda.

For more details on the project, this paper, and others in the series, please contact the UK or African co-ordinators:

Tom Franks or Anna Toner, BCID, University of Bradford, Bradford, West Yorkshire, BD1 7DP, UK Tel: +44 (0) 1274 235286; Fax: +44 (0) 1274 235280; email: t.r.franks@bradford.ac.uk or a.l.toner@bradford.ac.uk ; www.brad.ac.uk/acad/bcid

Ian Goldman or Tsiliso Tamasane, Khanya – managing rural change, 17 James Scott Street, Brandwag, Bloemfontein 9301, Free State, South Africa. Tel +27 (0)51 430 8314; Fax: 27 (0)51 430 8322; email: goldman@khanya-mrc.co.za or tsiliso@khanya-mrc.co.za www.khanya-mrc.co.za

Fred Muhumuza, EPRC, Makerere University Campus, 51 Pool Road, PO Box 7841, Kampala, Uganda. Tel: +256 (0)41 541023; Fax: +256 (0)41 541022; email: muhuma@hotmail.com

Faustin Kamuzora, Mzumbe University, P.O. Box 397, Morogoro, Tanzania. Tel: +255 (0)23 604380; Fax: +255 (0)23 4382; email: frkamuzora@yahoo.co.uk

For more details on the project and copies of recent publications please consult the project's web site:

- http://www.brad.ac.uk/acad/dppc/GTP/goodbye/html

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. An SL-grounded audit approach **7**

2. Agricultural Sector Programme Support (ASPS) - Tanzania- the case study

2.1 Description of the intervention **10**
2.2 Impact **12**

2.3 Poor people as focus **14**
2.4 Participation **14**
2.5 Partnership **15**
2.6 Holistic approach **15**
2.7 Policy and institutional links **16**
2.8 Building on strengths **16**
2.9 Dynamic and flexible **16**
2.10 Accountability/responsiveness **16**
2.11 Sustainability **17**
2.13 Critical factors **18**

Appendix 2.1 People interviewed **20**

Appendix 2.2 References and bibliography **21**

1. The SL-grounded audit of development interventions

The case studies in this research were chosen for inclusion following a first phase review of the use of livelihoods approaches in Tanzania, Uganda and Southern Africa. Data was collected using a number of methods including questionnaires, semi-structured interviews and focus group interviews, collection and review of process documentation and workshop activity.

All ten case studies have been analysed according to what we term a 'SL-grounded audit' so that emerging lessons can be compared. Each study is divided into two sections: the first a general introduction to the intervention; and the second, a structured response to a series of questions adapted from the SL-principles as defined by Carney (2002) in Box 1. SL principles are one element of sustainable livelihoods approaches. This research adopts these principles as a structuring tool and as means of pinpointing the practical implications of adopting a sustainable livelihoods approach to development.

Box 1. SLA principles defined by Carney (2002)
Sustainable livelihoods approaches: Progress and possibilities for change, p14-15, London: Department for International Development

Normative principles:
People-centred: sustainable poverty elimination requires respect for human freedom and choice. People- rather than the resources, facilities or services they use- are the priority concern. This may mean supporting resource management or good governance, for example but the underlying motivation of supporting livelihoods should determine the shape and purpose of action.
Empowering: change should result in an amplified voice opportunities and well-being for the poor.
Responsive and participatory: poor people must be key actors in identifying and addressing livelihood priorities. Outsiders need processes that enable them to listen and respond to the poor.
Sustainable: there are four key dimensions to sustainability-economic, institutional, social and environmental sustainability. All are important-a balance must be found between them.

Operational principles:
Multi-level and holistic: micro-level activity and outcomes should inform the development of policy and an effective governance environment. Macro- and meso-level structures should support people to build on their strengths.
Conducted in partnership: partnerships can be formed with poor people and their organisations, as well as with public and private sector. Partnerships should be transparent agreements based upon shared goals.
Disaggregated: it is vital to understand how assets, vulnerabilities, voice and livelihood strategies differ between disadvantaged groups as well as between men and women in these groups. Stakeholder and gender analysis are key tools.
Long-term and flexible: poverty reduction requires long-term commitment and a flexible approach to providing support.

Each case study follows the structure detailed below:

Description of the intervention: this includes a chronological description of the evolution of the particular intervention and details the main stakeholders and activities undertaken in implementation. Original logframes and planning documents have been reviewed where possible.

Impact: Assessment of the impact of interventions relates to the success or failure of an intervention to achieve the outputs or outcomes that were the main focus of the

intervention. The effect of this is that our understanding of impact is somewhat limited and partial. The methodology used in this research project did not allow for significant impact assessment with intervention beneficiaries at the micro-level (although this was done on a small-scale in most of the case studies). This section also includes some assessment of the costs of the intervention balanced against the number of people who benefit from it.

Poor People as focus
Do, or did, the objectives of the intervention include a mention of people and their livelihoods?
How central is this to the intervention's objectives?
How much were household livelihoods a focus during implementation?

Participation
What type of participation was used at each stage of design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation?
How and when did this participation occur?
What incentives were there for people to participate?

Partnerships
What was the type of partnership and collaboration between these organisations at micro-meso-macro?
Who owned the project?

Holistic approach
How holistic was the analysis used in design?
How does the plan for the intervention fit into the broader development plan?
How does the intervention coordinate with other development interventions in the area?

Policy and institutional links
How integrated was the intervention with existing institutional structures?
What evidence is there that the intervention addressed linkages between policy at micro, meso and macro levels and across sectors?

Building on strengths
Does the intervention build on existing strengths at the different levels?

Dynamic and flexible
Did the objectives and activities of the intervention change to respond to a changing environment and/or demands?
What further interventions have arisen from the intervention? How did this take place?

Accountability/ responsiveness
How were those implementing the intervention accountable to the public and intervention's beneficiaries?
Who reports to who and what about?
Do beneficiaries (micro) or partners (meso) have an influence on the intervention and how?

Sustainability

Economic

Is the system able to be sustained financially?

Are the "technologies/services" economically viable for beneficiaries?

Social

Are vulnerable groups able to access and use effectively the systems of the intervention?

Are the institutions created/used by the intervention able to sustain themselves beyond the life of the intervention?

Environmental

Are the technologies/services environmentally beneficial?

Are the systems (meso level) beneficial/neutral?

Institutionally

Are the capacities and systems established in such a way so that the system will continue (beyond the life of the intervention)?

Will they continue to generate the outcomes envisaged?

Critical factors

What were critical factors affecting the performance of this intervention?

1.2 Comparing Cases

Each case study can be read as a stand-alone document as the SL-grounded audit is in itself a useful means of understanding the strengths and weaknesses of an intervention. However, the broader aim of this research is to compare lessons across all ten case studies in order to identify more generally the challenges and opportunities faced by development practitioners in operationalising a sustainable livelihoods approach.

2.0 A SUSTAINABLE-LIVELIHOODS GROUNDED AUDIT OF THE AGRICULTURAL SECTOR PROGRAMME SUPPORT (ASPS) - TANZANIA

2.1 Description of the intervention

The Agricultural Sector Program Support (ASPS) is a multi-faceted initiative financed by the Government of Denmark through Danida. It is primarily hosted by the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MAFS), although one component, Hifadhi Ya Mazingira (HIMA) or Environmental Conservation is hosted by' the Ministry of Regional Administration and Local Government of the Office of the President (MRALG). The Livestock sub-component is hosted by the Ministry of Water and Livestock.

Phase I had six components:

1. Institutional Support
2. Smallholders irrigation
3. On-Farm Seed Production
4. Rock Phosphate Research
5. Private Agriculture Sector Support (PASS)
6. HIMA (Environmental conservation project in Iringa region)

However, the analysis of ASPS in this report dwells mainly on three components, namely, Smallholder irrigation, On-farm seed production, and HIMA. The reason for selecting these three components is that they were implemented at various levels (from micro to macro). The activities in the other three components did not extend to village level.

The program became operational in mid 1998. At that time, HIMA, which had commenced activity in early 1990s, was subsumed into ASPS. The PASS component and the sub-components, concerned with Livestock and Agricultural Statistics and Information, were added to the programme in 2000.

Phase one of the ASPS was completed at the end of 2002. Danida and the Government of Tanzania (GoT) had agreed that there would be a further phase of the program to commence without an undue hiatus.

ASPS had both development and intermediate objectives as listed below:

Development Objective:

- Increased income and improved nutrition for the poorer sections of small holders, in particular women.

Immediate Objectives:

- An environmentally sustainable increase in the productivity of natural resources and the labour applied by poor smallholders, in particular women, in their agricultural production.

- An increase in the quality and availability of public and private agricultural services through rationalisation in a financially and institutionally sustainable manner.

More specific immediate objectives for each component are provided in the component descriptions presented below:

Smallholder Irrigation
It has the overall objective of improving the ability of farmers in existing traditional irrigation schemes to achieve a sustainable increase in agricultural productivity. This objective is to be achieved through the application of improved and replicable approaches/methodologies for participatory irrigation management, and delivery of improved services by the public and private sector to smallholder irrigators.

On-Farm Seed Production
The development objective for this component is to induce increased availability and use by smallholders of superior quality seed varieties well adapted to the local agro-ecological zone. It aimed to develop sustainable methodologies and approaches for on-farm quality declared seed multiplication, provide for nationwide dissemination of the methodologies and increase the capacity of Government to implement its role in the revised National Seed Policy.

Hifadhi ya Mazingira (HIMA)
HIMA had three main components, namely Community Development (CD), Sustainable Agricultural Development and Soil and Water Conservation (SA), and Sustainable Forestry Development (SF).

The objectives of HIMA have changed over the years. However, since its incorporation into ASPS, it shared the same development objective of increased incomes and improved nutrition of poorer sections of smallholders, particularly women.

Activities
Smallholder Irrigation
1. The application of improved and replicable approaches/methodologies for participatory irrigation management.
2. The delivery of improved services by the public and private sector to smallholder irrigators.

On-Farm Seed Production
1. The development of sustainable methodologies and approaches for on-farm quality declared seed (QDS) multiplication.
2. To provide for nationwide dissemination of the methodologies increase the capacity of Government to implement its role in the revised National Seed Policy.
3. The training of farmers to produce seed.
4. Provide support through the extension and specialist staff based at district level.
5. Training, capital investment and some operational costs to the Tanzania Official Seeds Certification Agency (TOSCA), participating Agricultural Research Stations, Foundation Seed Farms and the National Plant Genetic Resource Centre. ASPS also provided some limited capital and training support to enable participating districts to provide the required extension and specialist staff support.

Hifadhi ya Mazingira (HIMA)
1. Capacity building at farmer, village and district levels to enable participation in

planning, investment and production processes being supported by other programme components.
2. Water source improvement, land and animal husbandry training and trails.
3. Marketing support (group formation and information gathering).
4. Promoting and increasing capacity for community-based natural resource management.
5. Promotion of new enterprises- seedling production, bee keeping, fish ponds.

Stakeholders
ASPS started in one stakeholder ministry (subsequently split into three: Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security, Ministry of Cooperatives and Marketing, and Ministry Water and Livestock Development) in Dodoma, Iringa and Mbeya regions. In addition, the Ministry of Regional Administration and Local Government, training institutions and private contractors are also stakeholders, as are the households involved in programme activities.

Beneficiaries
Poor farming households in selected project areas have been major beneficiaries at micro level. At a meso level, the staff that have been directly linked with the programme have benefited in terms of skills development. Capacities of irrigation engineers at district and zone levels have been improved by being fully involved in design, tendering and supervision of the irrigation schemes.

Costs
The following figures in Danish Kroners and the USD equivalent were extracted from the ASPS Programme Support Document reflecting the budget of each component.

Table 2.1: ASPS First Phase Budget (1997—2002)

Component	**Budget**	
	Danish Kroners	USD
Institutional support	71,000,000	10,508,000
On-farm seed production	38,000,000	5,624,000
Irrigation	25,000,000	3,700,000
Phosphate research	5,800,000	858,400
HIMA	90,000,000	13,320,000
Unallocated	20,200,000	2,989,600
TOTAL	**250,000,000**	**37,000,000**

2.2 Impact
No formal impact evaluation that has been conducted up to the present time[2]. However, through a review of progress reports and interviews with stakeholders, some possible impacts are indicated. For example, use of QDS by many farmers may improve the productivity of smallholders and improve nutritional status. Similarly, the completion of irrigation schemes may have some impact on the nutrition of smallholders involved in the schemes as well those not directly involved.

[2] According to an official responsible to ASPS activities in Danish Royal Embassy the final review/evaluation of the just ended phase is planned to take place in March 2003.

At the output level, the first phase of ASPS surpassed some of its targets. For example, in relation to the seed production activity, 20 villages per three regions had been planned but by February 2000, a total of 74 villages were involved due to inclusion of vegetable seed production in the programme.

Since ASPS continued implementing the HIMA activities in Iringa region the forest covers surrounding some villages have been restored and the villagers now can relate the link of indiscriminate forest clearing with subsequent environmental hazards.

Many other HIMA interventions have empowered the target beneficiaries; however some dependency on the intervention has been perpetuated for example the supply grass cuttings that are planted on steep pieces of land to control soil erosion. The interviewed farmers indicated that they were not ready to pay for the cuttings even though HIMA was using a lot of resources to deliver the cuttings to the villages.

For the three ASPS components under study (irrigation, QDS and HIMA), the reasons for achieving the outcomes/outputs include the provision of an enabling environment for work. Equipment and training were provided to stakeholders. ASPS through the institutional support component provided equipment (vehicles and computers) and rehabilitated offices. Training opportunities enabled stakeholders to undertake their functions more effectively.

However, many targets involving irrigation schemes construction had been delayed due to the process of participation of stakeholders and construction contracts tendering procedure.

ASPS activities ranged from village (micro) to district and zone (meso) as well as ministerial and international (macro) levels. Since ASPS supported the local government reform agenda, the linkages of these levels have been strengthened under ASPS. Capacities of meso level organisations—local governments (district council) and irrigation zone offices were raised, for example, through the creation of a District ASPS Tender Advisory Team (DTAT), which increased capacity for the preparation of tender documents and supervision of implementation of irrigation schemes.

At national level (macro), four ministries were involved in implementation of ASPS activities. The three 'agricultural' ministries and Ministry of Regional Administration and Local Government are responsible for ASPS activities. Communication among these ministries through the ASPS manager is an indicator of effective horizontal macro linkages.

Cost-effectiveness

The irrigation component investment budget does not meet the criteria for financial viability. However, investments in the component were carried out. The Review team in 2001 pointed out that on average the component was estimated to spend USD 1782 per hectare (the range was 1100 to 2500). This figure was considered high since the normal rate is considered to be 500-1000 USD per hectare.

Similarly, both HIMA and On-farm seed production components seem not to have been financed on financial viability basis. With budgets of USD 13,320,000 and USD

5,624,000 for HIMA and on-farm seed production respectively at the end of the first phase direct impacts on the ground are isolated to pilot areas. Much of the programme is aimed at capacity building at meso and macro level and so the direct benefits of the investments is not easily assessed at this stage.

2.3 Poor People as focus

Most of the components focused on poor people. The development objective of ASPS categorically mentions that it aimed to an increased income and improved nutrition of the poorer sections of smallholders, in particular women. According to various studies in Tanzania, income poverty is more a rural phenomenon, recognizing this fact; most of ASPS activities were directed to improve the livelihoods of people in rural areas.

2.4 Participation

During the programme formulation, experts from Denmark and Tanzania worked together to prepare the programme support document. These experts engaged various stakeholders at all levels (national, regions and districts, and villages).

At a macro level, participation of various ministries, such as the then Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives, Ministry of Finance and Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation, was considered essential. This cooperation enabled the Danish government to accept funding the programme. After this agreement, the Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives (and other ministries that were formed after breaking it into three ministries) was involved in implementation as well M&E of ASPS activities.

At a meso level, the regions and districts participated in identifying the areas in which ASPS activities would be implemented. Meso level institutions, particularly, the districts participated fully in the implementation and M&E of ASPS activities in their areas. During the implementation phase the regions did not feature so much due to the restructuring process that took place in the government system, whereby the decentralisation process made the districts centres of economic governance. The regional administration was left with a coordinating role only.

At a micro level (villages) several types of participation were employed, examples of participation typology (see appendix 10.1) that were employed under ASPS are as follows:

- *Functional participation:* ASPS used this type as a means to achieve project goals, especially reduced costs in implementing the components' activities. Similarly, in the irrigation component, irrigators participated by forming cooperatives as was required by ASPS before rehabilitating the schemes.

- *Participation for material incentives:* In this participation, people contributed resources, for example, labour in return for investments in the three components as described above.

- *Passive participation:* For example, people of Lumuma in Kilosa district participated by being told that it had been decided to rehabilitate the irrigation scheme, despite people's priority being an access road.

Participation of beneficiaries in development intervention formulation and selection has caused some problems. For example in the Namig'ongo irrigation scheme in Mbozi district, Mbeya region irrigators were involved for five years in studying how to improve this irrigation scheme, however, towards the end of first phase of ASPS experts concluded that it was not commercially viable to invest in this scheme.

However, it was alleged that the data supplied by farmers to consultants was very conservative. This could have been caused by the fact that consultants went to interview the farmers without being accompanied by district officials. This prompted the farmers to think that the consultants were gathering information on tax matters. Hence farmers had to under report the yields and hence profit levels. In Mbozi, the district leaders argued that they would not accept the financial non-viability of the scheme. They had waited for the project at Naming'ongo scheme, and felt that no other option was acceptable. If indeed farmers under reported the yields to the unaccompanied consultants, this should remind all rural development practitioners the importance of following the long established process of visiting the rural communities. It is a norm that district or other meso level officials usually accompany the visitors from outside the districts.

2.5 Partnerships

ASPS has forged good partnerships with various public and private institutions and companies. Local training institutes have been involved in training farmers. Examples of these are the Cooperative College and Agricultural Training institutions. Similarly, private construction firms have secured tenders to construct irrigation canals.

The type of partnership found under most ASPS activities is mainly funding relationship. Under this topology, ASPS is funding and implementing the activities that are its priority.

Phase one of ASPS did not provide flexibility to districts to change the activities to be funded. The districts just implemented the activities as per ASPS priority list; however, the second phase is going to rectify this situation. The funds from ASPS will be part of District Agricultural Development Plans (DADPs) and District Development Plan (DDP).

2.6 Holistic approach

ASPS focused on many agriculture sub sectors. It had six components and covered 20 districts. Three ministries (Agriculture and Food Security, Water and Livestock Development, and Regional Administration and Local Government) are involved in the implementation of different activities.

ASPS coordinates well with other development interventions since the implementing organisations are local district councils. However, this coordination is going to be strengthened in phase two. In the phase under review, the national coordinating unit had more power in terms of controlling ASPS resources. ASPS activities were implemented based on the PSD, this gave no room to integrate emerging livelihoods concerns that arose during the implementation phase.

Similarly, ASPS activities were implemented without carrying out marketing analysis; this to some extent does not guarantee the improved incomes of the farmers implementing the activities.

2.7 Policy and institutional links

Much importance was placed on supporting local government reform and also, the reduction of poverty through food security. Specifically, ASPS complimented the following policy documents: The Cooperative Development Policy (1997), Tanzania Development Vision 2025, Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (2000), and Agricultural Sector Development Strategy (2001).

As ASPS's development objective was to improve the livelihoods of the poor this fitted well with the objectives of the above policies. The three agricultural lead ministries as described above oversaw the implementation of ASPS activities. Since agricultural sector is the mainstay of the Tanzanian economy, ASPS activities were expected to have strong backward and forward linkages in the economy. Thus, ASPS objectives align well with the economic framework. Similarly, ASPS implemented its activities using the existing government frameworks. Except with the HIMA case, ASPS did not create a parallel structure at the meso levels. Initially, in each region there was an officer designated to oversee ASPS activities. When the role of regions was changed from implementation to coordinating development activities, ASPS responsible officers in the districts were given more roles to oversee the implementation of the activities.

2.8 Building on strengths

Under this principle, ASPS seems to have mixed scores at a micro level. This could be explained by the fact that, the intervention seems to have created dependency, especially, in the irrigation component and HIMA. In Kilosa district, farmers' priority of an access road was not upheld as instead ASPS chose to construct an irrigation scheme. In order to construct an irrigation scheme, farmers were required to form a cooperative. This was imposed on them and did not account for the bad experience that these farmers had with the cooperatives in the past.

However, ASPS did make use of existing assets in the irrigation component committed farmers to provide agreed contribution of labour and other materials for various projects such as building and canal construction. Equally, in the own seeds production component, participating farmers are required to provide labour and land. The same applies to HIMA component where farmers were required to provide some contribution in terms of labour and materials.

ASPS through its integration with the existing institutional structures can be seen as building on strengths and existing capacity.

2.9 Dynamic and flexible

To a good degree, ASPS has been flexible enough to accommodate the actual situation on the ground. For example, when the participatory methods were found to work more slowly than had been planned, targets were modified in terms of time of commencing of some activities.

ASPS also kept intact the funds allocated for delayed activities (other funding agencies would freeze the allocated funds if not utilised on planned time or use funds for other activities).

2.10 Accountability/ responsiveness

ASPS developed an elaborate management information system (MIS) for monitoring purposes. The staff under various components was trained in using the system. From the

field, the field officers would complete the monitoring forms and send them to the district council who compile district reports. The district reports were sent to a national coordinating unit who in turn compiled the national report. However, the case of HIMA was slightly different since in phase one of ASPS HIMA maintained the regional office. The regional office compiled district reports and sent them to the national coordinating unit.

Since reports were compiled in English, this to some extent precluded ordinary stakeholders (such as majority of councillors who do not read and understand English) from accessing the contents of reports. This being the case, beneficiaries at micro and macro levels had a slim chance of influencing the intervention.

2.11 Sustainability

Economic

According to some reports produced by consultants there has been no application of Financial Analysis and Business Principles to ascertain whether some of the innovations such as QDS or involving farmers, fish ponds, bee keeping, and stall-fed animals are economically viable. Lack of financial viability may result in farmers setting prices arbitrarily as was observed in one village in Kongwa district. Similarly, financial viability of irrigation schemes is highly doubtful.

Social

Implementation of ASPS components seems not to aggravate the social exclusion of some members of the communities. From the programme support document to the implementation stages gender concerns have been accounted for, however, it is too early to tell if the intervention has resulted in its intended objectives in all programme areas. Indications from Iringa region show that women's confidence has been uplifted by the training they have had. Similarly, on QDS production, almost fifty per cent of farmers that were selected for the activity are women.

Environmental

Environmental screening and scoping were carried out in all selected schemes and the Environmental Cell Unit within the Irrigation Section of MAFS was involved in 'decision making of irrigation infrastructure design in order to incorporate environmental issues in the final report'.

Consultants regretted that the schemes did not employ a river basin approach that would have ensured availability of water to other users in future.

However, other components such HIMA have created awareness and supported environmental conservation concerns to a good degree.

In relation to the production of QDS, one worry concerns the loss of indigenous seeds that are being replaced with the QDS. There is a danger of losing this valuable gene pool that has adapted the environment where it has been produced over a long period. There is no provision for sustaining the traditional varieties that have been replaced by the improved composite varieties (for Dodoma and Morogoro districts)[3], bred by agricultural research

[3] Iringa farmers use hybrid maize seeds

stations. Similarly, production of QDS seems to propagate the use of industrial chemicals only, efforts to supplement or replace these industrial chemicals with traditional or organic means should be considered also.

Institutional

ASPS has been praised for working with the existing government structure despite some difficulties that have been encountered in the process of implementation of programme components. As discussed earlier, the low level of capacity in the districts has been a hindrance to the smooth implementation of the programme. However, there have been some efforts to build capacity, as discussed above in the tendering process and it is planned that in the next phase of the programme human capacity development will be given a priority.

Similarly, ASPS, particularly, the irrigation component has encouraged the farmers to register in cooperatives or associations. In doing this various institutions have been involved, these include village governments, ward administration, district departments as well as other external institutions including the Cooperative College, Sokoine University, and other external consultants.

However, since ASPS has externally introduced these cooperatives/associations their sustainability can only be proved by time. The quality of leaders of one cooperative visited, gives some worries about the sustainability of these cooperatives. This is aggravated by several historical facts that befell the cooperative movement in Tanzania. In 1975 the true cooperatives were dissolved by the government decree only to be 'restored' in 1984. However, the memory of the performance of the 'restored' cooperatives concerns many farmers. Farmers/irrigators are not keen to join the established cooperatives as is evidenced in the visited cooperative, in which there was no member who had paid his/her membership fee in full. Lack of money cannot explain this because the income of most of these irrigators is relatively high as several indicators portrayed. Similarly, in the focused discussion with the cooperative leaders, it was revealed that onion farming is lucrative as one is ensured of profits albeit the poor access road to their village.

2.12 Critical factors

The critical factor that influenced the performance of ASPS is the flexibility in funding the activities that were delayed. Many of the activities under the three components analysed did not commence on planned time. One of the reasons that delayed the commencement of the activities was the participatory process. The delay of commencement of activities did not affect the commitment of funding of these activities. The funds for these delayed activities were later disbursed when activities demanded funding.

This is considered critical factor of success because DANIDA as the funding agent could have frozen the funds that was not utilised on a planned schedule. ASPS was planned to last for fifteen years under three phases of five years each' this demonstrates the importance of being realistic to the actual development realities. Short-term development interventions seem to be unrealistic as the realities on the ground calls for longer time periods.

Another critical success factor is as follows: An elaborate monitoring system was designed and implemented. Mid term evaluation (review) mission for each component under study was carried out.

Since the SL approach shifts the focus from outputs to people and demands exploration of poor people's own priorities, the short span of ASPS makes it difficult to evaluate the outcomes of the intervention (ASPS). In addition, many of ASPS activities are still in progress hence links between these activities and poverty reduction of the beneficiaries through improving the sustainability of livelihoods are yet to be ascertained.

The programme was forced to sacrifice implementing the activities on schedule to ensure that beneficiaries took part in participatory processes.
However it appears as if poor people' priorities were not always given priority as in the case of Lumuma farmers who considered an annually accessible road to their highest priority, but ASPS funded the expansion of the irrigation scheme instead.

One concern about the impact of the intervention relates to the lack of economic sustainability of some of the activities piloted through ASPS, in particular the production of QDS. This is due to insufficient economic analysis of the programme activities before funding these activities. This component also raises potential problems for environmental sustainability in terms of the increased of inorganic fertilizers and pesticides, and the loss of biodiversity in replacing local seed varieties.

Due to dynamism of ASPS some activities have been added even though they were not initially planned. For example, the on-farm seed production component added the vegetable seeds in the list of seeds to be produced after learning that this was important in some farmers' livelihood. Similarly, ASPS activities had to be rescheduled after learning that the participatory process was taking longer time than had been envisaged.

More of the learning that took place during phase one has been incorporated in phase two. For example, it was realised that even though district councils had been given more responsibility in handling ASPS resources, they lacked capacity in terms of skills. To solve this problem it has been planned that the capacities of key human resources in the accounting and logistics departments will be improved in phase two.

APPENDIX 2.1: List of Organisations and Individuals Interviewed

S/N.	Organisation	Name	Position/Title
1	Ministry of Agric. Food Security (MAFS)	Lamosai	ASPS Coordinator
2	HIMA Regional Office	Hamis	Regional Manager
3	HIMA Regional Office	Jensen	Regional Advisor
4	Iringa district council	Mnyeti	HIMA District Coordinator
5	Iringa district council	Millinga	District Irrigation Engineer
6	Iringa district council	Mrs. Maluvanda	Nutrition officer
7	Seed Certification Agency	Kato	Crops officer
8	Mbeya District Council	Msuya	District Irrigation Engineer
9	Iringa district council	Mwangailo	Extension officer
10	Iringa district council	Lugenge	Extension officer
11	Kipadula village	6 members of focused discussion group	Farmers
12	MAFS – Morogoro	Kamugisha	Irrigation Engineer
13	MAFS – Morogoro	Marealle	Irrigation Engineer
14	Lumuma Irrigation Cooperative	8 cooperative leaders	Farmers and cooperative leaders
15	MAFS – Kongwa	Makaranga	District extension office
16	Mutanana village	Edna Timoty	QDS Farmer
17	MAFS - Kongwa	Shekiondo	Extension officer
18	Pandambili	Mzee Dingi	QDS farmer
19	MAFS	Rushomesa	Environmental Impact Analyst
20	MAFS - Mahenge	Mbyallu	District Extension office
21	DANIDA	Maria	Agric./Gender Desk
22	MAFS - Kilosa	Maganga	Cooperative Officer
23	MAFS - Kilosa	Remtula	Agricultural Officer
24	MAFS - Kongwa	Dr. Kasanga	District Agric. Livestock Dev. Officer
25	MAFS	Eng. Temu	ASPS Engineer

Appendix 2.2 Bibliography

ASPS (2001). Activity Plan and Budget for ASPS. Mbeya Rural District January—December

Allen, C. and O. Sattaur (2002) "Sustainable Livelihoods Approaches: Engaging with SL or just best development practice?" Paper presented at Bradford Workshop, 29 – 30 May.

ASPS Irrigation Component (2001). Lessons Learnt and Future Directions. Mission Report (Final Draft).

ASPS (undated). Lessons Learned and Future Strategies

ASPS (2001). Iringa District Natural Resources Conservation and Land Use Management Project. Project Brochure.

ASPS (2001). Makete District Natural Resources Conservation and Land Use Management Project. Project Brochure.

ASPS (2001). Ludewa District Natural Resources Conservation and Land Use Management Project. Project Brochure

CHAULU (2001). Mashariti ya Chama cha Umwagiliaji Lumuma. ASPS Kilosa.

CHAULU (2001). Mafunzo kwa Uongozi wa CHAULU na Viongozi wa Serikali za Vijiji Lumuma Kuhusu Uongozi, Jinsia, na Usimamizi wa Fedha. ASPS Kilosa.

Chambers, R. (1992). Sustainable rural livelihoods: practical concepts for the 21st century. IDS Discussion Paper 296. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies

Conway, G. (1985). Agroecosystem analysis. Agricultural Administration, No.20

Cooperative College (2001). Kitini cha Mafunzo kwa Viongozi wa CAHULU: Misingi ya Uongozi na Uendeshaji Ushirika/Umoja wa Umwagialiaji. Dodoma

Cooperative College (2001). Training Handout for Members and Leaders of CHAULU in Leadership and Basic Management of an Irrigation Cooperative/Group. Dodoma

Danida (1997). Sector Programme Support Document: Agricultural Sector Programme Support. Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Kuzilwa, J. (2001). District Level Dairy Support in Mufind District—Assessment, Strategy and Action Plan.

Max, J.A.O. (1991). The Development of Local Government in Tanzania, Educational Publishers and Distributors Ltd. Dar es Salaam.