

Uganda: National Agricultural Advisory Services Programme

Item	Assessment Remarks	Rating
Country & Project Name	Uganda: National Agricultural Advisory Services Programme	
Loan No.	549-UG	
Project Id.	1158	
Board Date	07 December 2000	
Effectiveness Date	27 November 2001	
Original Closing Date	30 June 2009	
Final Closing Date	European Commission (EC), Ireland Aid, Netherlands Development Assistance, Danish International Development Assistance (DANIDA) and Department for International Development (DFID) (United Kingdom): total of US\$45.00 million (including IDA financing)	
Total Project Cost US\$(M)	US\$107.93 million	
IFAD loan US\$(M)	US\$17.50 million	
Cofinanciers (if any)	European Commission (EC), Ireland Aid, Netherlands Development Assistance, Danish International Development Assistance (DANIDA) and Department for International Development (DFID) (United Kingdom): total of US\$45.00 million (including IDA financing)	
Implementing Agency	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industries and Fisheries (MAAIF)	
Principal Components	The proposed programme will have the following five components implemented over the first phase of seven years: (a) advisory and information services to farmers; (b) technology testing and market-linkage development; (c) regulation and technical auditing of service providers; (d) private sector institutional development; and (e) programme management and monitoring.	
Project Performance		
Relevance	The National Agricultural Advisory Services Programme (NAADS) was designed as a 25 years Program with an initial phase of 7 years. It was developed within the policy framework of Uganda's Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) and its design well responded to the PMA vision (Plan for Modernization of Agriculture), which was the policy framework for agriculture. Since the expiry of the PEAP in 2008, NAADS goals and objectives have been relevant to the new National Development Plan (NDP), as the national development strategy. NAADS has also been designed to be a demand-driven, client oriented local government Plan, with an approach that was responsive to community aspirations. During implementation, NAADS was seen to be flexible and responsive to the needs of its stakeholders. At the mid-term review (MTR), the original five programme's components were restructured to six, while the project objectives remained the same. The restructuring, inter alia, focused on farmer empowerment, delivery (quality and quantity) of advisory services and availed more resources for the provision of inputs. On the less positive side, the program management structure, which included national, district, sub-county and private sector level institutions, was broad and unwieldy. The lines of accountability became fuzzy and many instructions and directives took long to be received and implemented. This slowed down the project's implementation as well as it created the impression that there were authority gaps in the project management structure.	5
Effectiveness	A performance evaluation (2005) and impact analysis (2008) have provided the conclusion that NAADS has achieved its objective of increasing the capacity of farmers to demand for advisory services and adoption of improved technologies. Farmers have issued and implemented a total of over 4,600 advisory services contracts in crop, livestock, apiculture and fisheries enterprises. Although NAADS focus in the first few years was on production, the results obtained showed that NAADS was successful in increasing the capacity of farmers to demand for post-production technologies and post-harvest and marketing information. NAADS also established Public/Private/Partnerships (PPPs) as part of its value chain strategy. As at Dec. 2009, over 25 PPPs were implemented. The PPP was a new service delivery mechanism through which NAADS tapped existing potential in both the public and private sectors to: complement the delivery of improved technologies; provide agricultural advisory services; add value through agro-processing, and promote market linkages. Thus NAADS facilitated the emergence of agro-processing facilities and many agro-processing plants were established. NAADS had also a significant impact on adoption of technologies and practices, as there were promoted 41 different types of technologies to support the development of farmers' enterprises. As of 2009, farmers with the technical expertise of researchers and service providers established and managed over 45,000 Technology Demonstration Sites (TDSs) for training and expediting technology.	5
Efficiency	NAADS was declared effective in November 2001 but was eventually launched in 2002. While waiting for the formation of the National Farmers' Forum (NFF), from which the full NAADS Board would be appointed, an Interim Board was appointed to oversee the launch and implementation of the project. In 2009, after the creation of the NFF, the full Board was eventually appointed. From 2001 to 2009, the programme achieved country-wide roll-out covering 79 districts and 1066 sub-counties, as of 2010. Although initially there was a slow rate of implementation due to sub-optimal timing of program financial flows, the flow of funds	4

Item	Assessment Remarks	Rating
Country & Project Name	Uganda: National Agricultural Advisory Services Programme	
	eventually gained momentum. Together with the government contribution of approximately US\$53 million, the estimated total releases to the program amounted to approximately US\$160 million as compared to the original estimated project cost of approximately US\$108 million in the Project Appraisal Document. The programme was suspended in September 2007 for six months due to concerns, among others, about modalities for service delivery. As a result, NAADS lost valuable implementation time and the closing date of program's phase one was extended from June 2008 to December 2009. However, in March 2008 implementation was resumed with adjusted mode of service delivery to utilize public sector staff within NAADS, incorporate agro-processing more explicitly and to support the use of demonstration, model and nucleus farmers to improve technology uptake and market linkage. At program's completion, 95% of overall IFAD's funds have been disbursed. The 87% of project expenditures was incurred after the restructuring of the project (2006 to 2009) as compared to only 13% before the restructuring (2001 to 2005). The PCR highlights that the over-articulated program's management structure contributed to slow down project's implementation.	
Project Performance		
Partner Performance		
IFAD	There are no information on IFAD's performance. The PCR just mentions that the receipt of funds after submission of withdrawal applications was slower taking an average of 24 days. During the Program's suspension period between Sept. 2007 and March 2008, IFAD did not make any payments to the program.	5
Cooperating Institution	The project was supervised by the International Development Association of the World Bank (IDA). Generally there were at least two supervision missions per year. The missions fielded after the MTR undertook, in addition to implementation supervision, the preparation and development of the second phase of the Program. As a result, by the close of phase one in December 2009, the design of the second phase of the Program was almost complete. During the supervision missions, some key implementation issues were raised, the majority of which were fully resolved. During the Program's suspension period between Sept. 2007 and March 2008, IDA did not make any payments to the program.	5
Government	The Government of Uganda (GoU) was proactive in undertaking important activities needed to establish the right environment and capacity for the implementation of the project. There were some difficulties related to GoU policies in 2007/08 which slowed project's implementation. During the Program's suspension period during 2007/08 (when IFAD and IDA did not disburse funds to NAADS), in order to ensure continued implementation of Program's activities, GoU released from its own resources the full Program budget for the period. MAAIF (Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries) went through a restructuring process of its role vis a vis Local Government and the Private Sector, and therefore it faced some challenges with regard to the implementation of project activities which were assigned to it under the Program. The NAADS Board met regularly; it provided good guidance to the Secretariat and it also played a key role in monitoring project's activities directly in the field. NAADS Secretariat ably coordinated the implementation of the Programme including the programming, sourcing and accounting for the required financial resources in accordance with the Program credit and financial agreements. On the less positive side, while the PMU, the district and sub-county organisational implementation arrangements were functioning, local and country level implementation have been troubled by outside political developments and poor financial management, together with weak capacity (quantity and quality), inefficient procurement process and lack of motivation of staff. Finally, the PCR reports that NAADS suffered from too strong national interest from all levels of Government, which created a negative image of the Program.	4
NGO/Other	The programme relied on a large number of service providers and partners including the private sector (private firms, individuals and NGOs) to supply the farmer capacity building and advisory, research and development services in response to the demands of farmers, sub-counties, districts and the NAADS Executive. The PCR mentions that there was insufficient capacity in terms of quantity and the quality of service providers (SPs) at the lower levels. While some capacity building of SPs had actually taken place in the field, it was both minimal and relatively unsystematic.	4
Cofinancier(s)	See section on Cooperating Institution	NA
Combined Partner Performance	<i>There is no analysis of partners' performance. However, it seems that there were no major issues.</i>	
Rural Poverty Impact		
Household Income and Net Assets	Two separate external studies of NAADS, a performance evaluation (2005) and an impact assessment (2008), are the background for assessing project's impact. These studies have shown that farmers have seen their income increase substantially. In terms of agricultural income per capita stemming from increased productivity and better marketing, the average total effect of the Program has been estimated at UGX 20,213 which represents about 16% greater per capita agricultural income for NAADS beneficiaries over non-beneficiaries, with some differences between NAADS various regions.	5

Item	Assessment Remarks	Rating
Country & Project Name	Uganda: National Agricultural Advisory Services Programme	
Natural Resources and Environment	On this domain, the reports just mention that there was low demand for soil fertility management practices which could have been due to low capacity of service providers to provide soil fertility management and agro-forestry practices. The impact assessment study reports that NAADS did not have success in promoting improved soil fertility management.	3
Human, Social Capital and Empowerment	The Program gave a notable contribution in creating farmers' organizations, as by 2010, 55,000 Farmer groups; 648 sub-county farmer fora; 79 district farmer fora; and 1 National farmer forum had been created. The establishment of farmer institutions at all levels facilitated the empowerment of farmers and let them express their views towards technical public officers. NAADS supported farmer participation in meetings, enterprise selection, demonstrations and training. It also contributed to strengthen farmers' groups by focusing on governance systems and building farmers' skills for groups, as well as by providing training on cross-cutting issues, such as regular elections, collective savings, labor and management of TDS. In some districts, over 200 Higher Level Farm Organizations (HLFOs) have been established with the aim of developing crop-based, tree-based, or livestock-based enterprises as agribusiness ventures. They were also geared towards more resource mobilization and management, and for collective input and output marketing. On the other hand, the PCR also mentions that farmers' fora created at all levels did not have ample time to build adequate capacity, to understand the program concept and to become valuable partners in project implementation.	5
Ag. Productivity	As a result of program's intervention, there has been a widespread adoption of technologies such as improved groundnuts, rice, banana and citrus. Regarding livestock enterprises, the major ones promoted were goats, poultry, beekeeping, cattle and piggery. The NAADS Performance Evaluation (2008) showed that advisory services delivered through technology demonstrations were effective means in realizing improvements in agricultural production and productivity. The Impact Study (2008) also showed that NAADS had significant impact on crop productivity which has improved (on average by 27%) for NAADS farmers. This was irrespective on whether the particular farmer was NAADS or non-NAADS since the benefits of the program, which were largely transmitted through TDSs and demonstrations, were not restricted to only farmers that participated in the Program. The NAADS Program has generated substantial indirect or spillover effects regarding crop productivity. With regard to NAADS' impact on livestock productivity, it seems that it was limited to the promotion of adoption of improved livestock breeds.	5
Food Security	The PCR does not report on this impact domain. However, given the positive achievements on the agricultural productivity domain as well as in terms of beneficiaries' higher income, it is quite likely that there were generated positive results on beneficiaries' food security.	4
Agricultural Productivity and Food Security		5
Inst. & Policies	As a result of NAADS intervention, there were established farmers' institutions, which included the National Farmer Forum, District Farmer Forum (FF), Sub-county Farmer Forum (SFF); Parish Coordinating Committees and farmer groups. The National Farmers Forum was inaugurated only in 2007, as the continuous demands for and the creation of new districts delayed its establishment. This was the final step in establishing farmers' institutions and enabled farmers to link and participate directly, influence the national agricultural development agenda, and to voice their concerns on issues affecting the program at national level.	5
Markets	NAADS had an impact on this domain by supporting output marketing as well as by encouraging farmers to form HLFOs to link them to markets more effectively. There were also investments in infrastructure and equipment to support processing and capacity building in marketing at the district or regional level. Information Communications Technology (ICT) with HLFOs was also piloted in four districts to enable them to access market information through linkages with the Ugandan Commodity Exchange. Finally, the PPP approach provided a stepping stone for farmer groups and HLFOs to move into commercial production to reach a market and become more involved in the commodity chain. However, according to the PCR the capacity of NAADS to provide marketing services is still limited and the marketing information system providers were still few. In addition, the higher value chain activities such as marketing still deserve more attention, as it has featured low in the implementation of the program.	4
Project Impact		5
Overarching Factors		
Innovation	There is not a specific section on this criteria. The PCR just briefly mentions the introduction of innovations like the Integrated Support to Farmer Groups (ISFG) and PPPs. The Impact evaluation report (2008) mentions that NAADS has devised an innovative extension system delivery approach that targets the development and use of farmer institutions and in the process empower them to procure advisory services, manage linkage with marketing partners and conduct demand-driven monitoring and evaluation of the advisory services and their impacts.	4

Item	Assessment Remarks	Rating
Country & Project Name	Uganda: National Agricultural Advisory Services Programme	
Replicability and Scaling-up	A strong framework has been created for the implementation of the subsequent phases of the program and for the overall management of agriculture advisory in the country. A follow-up phase of NAADS, namely the Agricultural Technology and Agribusiness Advisory Services Project (ATAAS) (of a total of US\$660 million) was approved in September 2010. IFAD's contributes to this project with a loan of approximately US\$14.0 million. ATAAS development objective is to increase the agricultural productivity and incomes of participating households by improving the performance of agricultural research and advisory services, while enhancing environmental sustainability and resilience to climate risks and land degradation.	5
Innovation, Replicability and Scaling-up		5
Sustainability and Ownership	In terms of development of farmer institutions, these are still characterized by low capacity to effectively perform their roles and to demand for delivery of agricultural advisory/extension services. Some groups failed to graduate from group dynamics to the business investment level. In addition, some HLFOs did not have the capacity to undertake value adding activities such as collective marketing and members began to question their purposes. As far as the PPP is concerned, this a new model for doing business in Uganda and there is limited capacity for management of PPPs in the country and at NAADS Secretariat and with local governments. Therefore, there is a need for policy guidance and capacity building in order to promote PPPs in a sustainable manner. The demand for Agricultural Advisory Services by farmers is high. However, GoU may not be in a position to fully finance this endeavour for a while to come. Thus, during the Quality Assurance review for the follow-on project - Agriculture Technology and Agribusiness Advisory Services (ATAAS) - it was recommended to improve the sustainability of advisory services in Uganda by increasing the percentage of farmers' contribution. Finally, the impact of NAADS is expected to decline as the Program is rolled out further to the entire country. To achieve sustained Program impact, it is necessary to ensure the availability of these services in all the districts/sub-counties of roll-out.	4
Targeting	NAADS adopted an inclusive and not discriminatory approach whereby all categories of farmers participated with varying degrees of success in the Program: People with disability (PWD), People Living with HIV/AIDS (PLWA), Youth and Women. The experience on the ground is that all farmers, irrespective of economic status, sex, or physical condition, were allowed to participate in the NAADS program. Thus, project benefits were not restricted to only farmers who participated in the Program, as NAADS generated substantial indirect or spillover effects regarding adoption of technologies and practices.	4
Gender	The PCR does not say much about gender. It just mentions some gender imbalances in Farmers' Institutions leadership, with men usually being in a leadership position and women being the bulk of the members in the groups. According to the impact assessment report, although NAADS aimed at enabling gender responsive services, it has only partially achieved its objective of targeting women.	3
Overall Performance		5
Estimated number of beneficiaries		
PCR Quality		
Scope	This Project Implementation Completion Report (ICR) has been done according to the World Bank's standards, thus it does not follow IFAD's rules.	NA
Quality	This WB ICR strongly relies on the two main NAADS reports [Performance report (2005) and Impact Assessment report (2008)]. It could have provided further value added in terms of quantity of information as well as quality of the analysis.	3
Lessons	The lessons are pertinent and relevant for a second phase of the program.	5
Candour	The PCR is objective and critical on the Program main shortcomings and achievements.	5