

Botswana

Agricultural Services Support Project

Supervision Report

Main report and appendices

Mission Dates: 14th – 25th August 2018
Document Date: 30/10/2018
Project No. 1100001546
Report No. 4875-BW

East and Southern Africa Division
Programme Management Department

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ASC	Agricultural Service Centre
ASSP	Agricultural Service Support Project
AWPB	Annual Work Plan and Budget
BAMB	Botswana Agricultural Marketing Board
BWP	Botswana Pula
CA	Conservation Agriculture
CSA	Climate Smart Agriculture
DCP	Department of Crop Production
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EMP	Environmental Management Plan
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FFS	Farmer Field School
GABS	Government Accounting and Budgeting System
GoB	Government of Botswana
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
ISPAAD	Integrated Support Programme for Arable Agricultural Development
KM	Knowledge Management
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MoADFS	Ministry of Agriculture Development and Food Security
MoLWS	Ministry of Land, Water and Sanitation Services
MTR	Mid Term Review
NAP	National Adaptation Plan
NDC	Nationally Determined Contribution
PAPEP	Piloting Agricultural Productivity Enhancement Project
PAT	Portfolio Advisory Team
PMT	Project Management Team
PPP	Public Private Partnerships
RIMS	Results and Impact Management System
SDR	Special Drawing Rights
SMSs	Short Message Service
TA	Technical Assistance
ToT	Training of Trainers
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
USD	United States Dollar
WUA	Water User Association
WUC	Water Utilities Corporation

A. Project Overview

Region:	East and Southern Africa Division	Project at Risk Status:	Actual problem
Country:	Botswana	Environmental and Social Category:	B
Project Name:	Agricultural Services Support Project	Climate Risk Classification:	not available yet
Project Id:	1100001546	Executing Institution:	not available yet
Project Type:	Research/Extension/Training	Implementing Institutions:	not available yet
CPM:	Robson Mutandi		
Project Director:	Orman Roy		
Project Area:	not available yet		

Approval Date	05/12/2010	Last audit receipt	10/11/2017
Signing Date	21/02/2012	Date of Last SIS Mission	25/08/2018
Entry into Force Date	21/02/2012	Number of SIS Missions	19
Available for Disbursement Date	21/02/2012	Number of extensions	1
First Disbursement Date	04/05/2012	Effectiveness lag	14 months
MTR Date	12/05/2014		
Original Completion Date	31/12/2017		
Current Completion Date	31/03/2018		
Financial Closure	not available yet		

Project total financing

IFAD Financing breakdown	IFAD	\$4,039,595
	East and Southern Africa Division	\$1,610,544
Domestic Financing breakdown	Beneficiaries	\$289,219
	National Government	\$19,082,032
Co-financing breakdown,		
Project total financing		\$25,021,390

Current Mission

Mission Dates: 14th – 25th August 2018

Days in the field: 4

Mission composition: Mr Robson Mutandi, Country Director Manager (Mission Leader); Mr Shakib Mbabaali, Economist/Project Management Consultant (Alternate Mission Leader); Ms Elizabeth Ssendiwalla - Gender, Targeting, and Youth (IFAD Staff); Mr Custodio Mucavele – Country Programme Officer (IFAD Staff); Mr Richard Batamanye - Financial Management Consultant; Mr Muleya Palani - Agro-Services, Extension and Institutional Capacity Building Consultant; Mr Seymour Gimani – Irrigation and Water Consultant; Ms Grace Nakanjako – M&E and KM Consultant; Mr Alaudio Chingotuane – EFA Consultant; and Mr Ilario Rea – Climate Change, Mechanization and Conservation Agriculture Consultant.

Field sites visited: North-East District (Francistown) and Central District (Palapye and Tonota).

B. Overall Assessment

Key SIS Indicator #1	Ø	Rating	Key SIS Indicator #2	Ø	Rating
Likelihood of Achieving the Development Objective		3	Assessment of the Overall Implementation Performance		4

Effectiveness and Developmental Focus	4	Project Management	3
Effectiveness	3	Quality of Project Management	4
Targeting and Outreach	4	Knowledge Management	3
Gender equality & women's participation	4	Value for Money	3
Agricultural Productivity	3	Coherence between AWPB and Implementation	3
Nutrition		Performance of M&E System	3
Adaptation to Climate Change	4	Requirements of Social, Environmental and Climate Assessment Procedures (SECAP)	4

Sustainability and Scaling-up	4	Financial Management and Execution	4
Institutions and Policy Engagement	4	Acceptable Disbursement Rate	1
Partnership-building	4	Quality of Financial Management	4
Human and Social Capital and Empowerment	4	Quality and Timeliness of Audit	3
Quality of Beneficiary Participation	4	Counterparts Funds	6
Responsiveness of Service Providers	3	Compliance with Loan Covenants	4
Environment and Natural Resource Management	4	Procurement	3
Exit Strategy	4		
Potential for Scaling-up	4		

Relevance	5
------------------	----------

C. Mission Objectives and Key Conclusions

Background and Main Objective of the Mission

Key Mission Agreements and Conclusions

Background and Main Objective of the Mission

1. IFAD and GoB undertook a joint supervision Mission to the country during the period 14th – 25th August 2018. This was the first ASSP Mission of 2018; the previous Mission was undertaken in November/December 2017. This is the last supervision Mission before ASSP's closure which is slated for 30th September 2018. Thus, the main objective of the Mission was to review the Project's implementation progress with regard to technical and fiduciary aspects. The Mission also sought to establish whether the Project was satisfactorily undertaking the pre-closure activities. The Mission interacted variously with different stakeholders that included senior government officials, staff of the Project Management Team (PMT), selected contractors and beneficiaries. The Mission also participated in a one-day workshop organised by the PMT and held in Palapye on 21st August 2018. The workshop brought together representatives of those districts that participated in ASSP implementation and the objective was for the districts, as implementers, to give an account of ASSP implementation, achievements made, challenges experienced and lessons learned that can be used to improve the design and implementation of similar projects in the future.
2. Field visits were undertaken during the period 19th – 22nd August 2018. The sites visited included: a) Mahibitswane wastewater irrigation scheme site in Palapye to ascertain progress made and what remains to be undertaken by GoB to sustainably avail good quality water to the target beneficiaries for irrigation purpose; and b) Tonota Agriculture Service Centre to discuss with the managers of the centre the range of services provided to farmers.

Key Mission Agreements and Conclusions

1. **National Training Manual on Conservation Agriculture** – MoA needs to prepare and disseminate a comprehensive National Training Manual on Conservation Agriculture so that all issues to do with CA theories and practices are captured, documented and incorporated. This will ensure that the quality and consistency of extension messages by extension staff can be monitored, measured and evaluated and its relevance for each district can be determined.
2. **Lessons Learned from the Jwaneng Agricultural Service Centres (ASC)** – Document the pros and cons of management and operational model for Jwaneng ASC (the only ASC that has been operating for more than two years) under management by Botswana Agricultural Marketing Board. Package these lessons into appropriate knowledge products for sharing.
3. **Continued Support for ASSP Initiated Activities** – Given the slow unfolding of ASSP activities, it has not been possible to observe the progressive transformation of the target beneficiaries' livelihoods by the Project's completion date of 31st March 2018. Thus, a process needs to be put in place to continue support for the beneficiaries to ensure that the investment in ASSP translates into improved livelihood strategies and outcomes for beneficiaries.
4. **Loan and Grant Amounts to be Cancelled** – According to the Financial Controller, the equivalent of USD 538,190 has been reported as commitments in respect of the Mahibitswane wastewater irrigation scheme, desludging of ponds, consultancy in respect of project completion report, and other winding up activities. No expenditure from the loan and grant has been reported for the period 1st April 2018 to 31st July 2018. This commitment, if realised, will be charged against undisbursed funds from IFAD. That would leave the equivalent of USD 2,470,515.29 on the loan and USD 377,017.17 on the grant that will be cancelled. The last withdrawal application claiming the above amount should be submitted to IFAD prior to loan closing date, in any case not later than 30th September 2018.
5. **Final Audit** – By the time of the mission, draft financial statements in respect of the financial year had been submitted to the Auditor General for audit. It is expected that the report will be submitted on time. Since the Project is to be closed on 30th September 2018, coverage of the financial year 2017/18 to 31st March 2018 will leave six months in respect of the winding down period unaudited. In addition to the audit report for the year 2017/18, IFAD will require submission of a final audit covering the six months. This should have all the required disclosures as per IFAD audit guidelines and should be submitted no later than 31st December 2018.
6. **Settlement of Final Contract Obligations** – There have not been any new contracts entered into during the post completion phase. However, previously entered into contracts in respect of the Mahibitswane wastewater irrigation scheme, desludging of water ponds and consultancy for Project Completion Report had not been closed. Given that this is a winding down period for the Project, it is important that all contract obligations to be settled from loan and grant proceeds are completed and closed to facilitate payment of obligations and submission of withdrawal applications in relation to the same prior to Project closing date of 30th September 2018. Any obligation arising out of these contracts that will have not been paid and claimed from IFAD by 30th September 2018 will not be honoured and shall be taken over by GoB.

D. Overview and Project Progress

1. ASSP activity implementation was completed on 31st March 2018. Many of the planned activities had not been implemented and there are some activities that had been started as of the completion date but had not been completed by the time of the Mission. Overall, the pace of activity implementation was very slow and this is reflected in ASSP's cumulative disbursement rate. As of 31st July 2018, the IFAD loan was about 32.4% disbursed and the grant was 36.4% disbursed. The cumulative disbursement of the combined IFAD loan and grant, as of 31st July 2018, was about 33.5%. Following hereunder is a summary of the ASSP implementation progress.
2. **Component 1: Sustainable Agricultural Production** – This component aims at achieving a sustainable increase in smallholder agricultural productivity by bridging the gap between current and potential rain-fed crop yields as well as demonstrating a viable model for the use of urban wastewater for smallholder irrigation.
3. **Subcomponent 1.1 – Agricultural Mechanisation** – Under this subcomponent, the Project has procured and distributed the following equipment: 53 tine rippers (3 tractor drawn deep tine rippers, 30 tractor drawn shallow tine rippers, 10 furrow tine rippers and 10 animal drawn tine rippers), 10 animal drawn boom sprayers, 3 animal drawn planters and 3 animal drawn cultivators for promotion and demonstration of appropriate agricultural technologies. It is reported that some of the implements procured for the project are inappropriate in terms of power demands on the tractor models existing in some districts and also quality of manufacture. The mechanization service providers are not using these implements thus the implements are just lying idle. The Mission suggests that this issue be looked into by the Agricultural Engineering Division of the Department of Crop Production and remedial action be taken to relocate these units to locations where they are needed.
4. Training focussing on equipment/machinery maintenance, calibration of farm implements and equipment has been undertaken in all the 10 districts of the country. The training targeted farm mechanization staff from the Agricultural Engineering Division and private sector machinery operators. End of Project Evaluation report (EOP) shows that 46.4% of the beneficiaries targeted by ASSP received training in various agricultural mechanization practices. While training of tractor and agricultural machinery operators and Farm Mechanization engineers and technicians has been done there is a need for an accreditation or certification system to guarantee the competency levels of the trainees. Collaboration with tractor and farm machinery manufacturers and relevant technical engineering institutes in Botswana should be explored.
5. The previous review Mission reiterated the need to complete a comprehensive Mechanization Strategy to address the issues concerning mechanization in agricultural production in Botswana. This is particularly so when the Project is focussing on the promotion and adoption of Conservation Agriculture by smallholder farmers. However, it is noted that by the completion date of 31st March 2018 and by the time of the Mission in August 2018, a Mechanization Strategy had not been produced.
6. **Subcomponent 1.2: Improved Rain-Fed Practices** – The objective of interventions was to mitigate climate change by promoting the adoption of climate-resilient agricultural practices and introduction of appropriate technologies. The major focus of the Project was on the introduction and promotion of Conservation Agricultural (CA) practices and technologies. The Project provided training programmes, on different aspects of Conservation Agriculture, to a total of 5,017 farming households and 270 Agricultural Extension staff. Capacity building activities included the undertaking of study tours, by both selected farmers and extension staff, to countries such as Zambia, Mozambique, Rwanda and South Africa. The objective of the tours was for the target farmers and staff to acquire technical skills, knowledge and experience in CA theory and practices from smallholder practitioners and relevant institutions in these countries. To support learning, the Project has supported the establishment of 270 CA demonstration plots to allow for transfer of knowledge, skills and technological practices to other farmers. The Project has procured 10 soil test kits and 540 rain gauges to support the demonstration plots in the targeted districts. Due to inadequate capacity of the extension services to cover all the farmers, Farmer Field Schools (FFS') have been adopted by the Project to support the promotion and timely adoption of the CA messages. A total of 8 FFS' have been established under the Project.
7. Although some capacity building (through field demonstrations and study tours) for both extension staff and selected farmers was undertaken, the reported adoption rates are very low. Some of the issues highlighted as being responsible for the slow promotion and adoption of CA techniques relate to: a) limited availability of transport for extension staff; b) constrained communication means; c) limited availability, adequacy and reliability of mechanization service providers with appropriate functional equipment and implements; d) untimely delivery of agricultural inputs; and e) lack of comprehensive training material on CA. Thus, while the trainings and demonstrations on minimum tillage, soil testing and weed control represent an initial step towards a wider adoption of CA principles, further efforts will be required to secure a sounder and holistic approach and ensure coordinated efforts to increase smallholder farmers' resilience and climate change adaptation. That necessitates the need to prepare and disseminate a comprehensive National Training Manual on Conservation Agriculture so that all issues to do with CA theories and practices are captured, documented and incorporated. This will ensure that the quality and consistency of extension messages by extension staff can be monitored, measured and evaluated and its relevance for each district can be determined.
8. **Subcomponent 1.3: Pilot Scheme for Wastewater Irrigation** – The subcomponent focused on the piloting of the development (design, construction and implementation of an innovative governance model for operation and maintenance) of a 25 ha irrigation scheme at Mahibitswane in During the course of ASSP implementation, activities related to this wastewater irrigation scheme have evolved very slowly. The process was still behind schedule, by the time of the Mission, even after moving the activity completion dates twice –from February 2018 to 6 July 2018 and, subsequently, to August 2018. This, therefore, means that it will not be possible for the target beneficiaries to receive, operate, manage the scheme and generate information to be used to make recommendations for scaling up.
9. Nonetheless, some progress has been made. The following has been completed: a) pipe intake works from the Palapye Waste Water Treatment Plant, a 1,200 mm section trapezoidal stone masonry lined conveyance canal,

- 100 metres long; b) a 250 mm PVC gravity conveyance line 600 m long; c) 2 water retention ponds with a capacity of 1,480 cubic metres (m³) each; d) a 34 m³ concrete pumping sump; e) 3 submersible slurry/drainage pumps, each with a discharge/delivery capacity of 80 m³/h (22 l/s) at a total pumping head of 35 metres; f) a motor control centre/building housing the electrical motor starter boards and electrical accessories; g) a 30 m³ surge tank; h) a 250 mm PVC pressurized main 2,100 metres long; and i) a total of 27 irrigation hydrant – dual disc filter assemblies complete with control/isolation valve and water meter, and valve box/chamber, each located at the head of the proposed 1 hectare farmer plot. Other works include internal/infield unpaved and graded roads; 2 ablution blocks with a vegetable washing and grading space; provision and installation of electricity power line to ablution blocks and irrigation scheme pump station; potable domestic water supply line to pump station and ablution blocks, and irrigation perimeter fencing. Civil works, pipe work, procurement and installation of pump - sets and in-field irrigation components have been executed to a level of 98%. What remains to be undertaken relates to: a) the purchase and installation of two *ULTRAFILTRATION* units; the procurement process for the same was ongoing by the time of the Mission; and b) de-sludging operations, drying and disposal of sludge to identified landfill area, from 10 (anaerobic, facultative and maturation) ponds with a total capacity of 66,778 m³.
10. On the other hand, although the topographical surveys and mapping for plot demarcation has been concluded by the Contractor, topographical maps and detailed in-field irrigation design, drawings and cost estimates of irrigation components for the proposed 25-hectare drip irrigation scheme involving a beneficiary participatory approach is yet to be undertaken.
 11. For water quality, it is acknowledged that the contract for the provision of services for groundwater monitoring for establishment of baseline conditions of soil and water quality within and outside the irrigation scheme and compliance with BOS n°463/2011 water quality standard (BOBS) is being implemented. It is expected that the contract will be completed by the end of September 2018. However, once the baseline conditions of soil and water quality get established, it is not clear who would be responsible for the continuous quality monitoring to ensure compliance with established standards. Therefore, it is paramount that, before the scheme is handed over to the target beneficiaries, MoA puts in place a system for regular and continuous monitoring of the treated water to ensure safety of all stakeholders and the environment. Along the same line, the need to train the Water Users' Association members on handling effluent wastewater was identified by the Environment Impact Assessment as a necessary action to be taken in order to ensure safe usage. This is another important activity that should be undertaken before the irrigation scheme is handed over to the target beneficiaries.
 12. **Component 2: Enabling Environment for Smallholder Agriculture** – The component aims at: a) creating a sustainable system of incentives and local institutions to support the smallholder sub-sector; b) align the relevant institutional framework and development interventions to ensure better penetration of services to targeted beneficiaries; c) ensuring that farmers and farmer organisations have the capacity to benefit from improved service delivery, including a range of services to be provided through the ASCs and the extension system in general, which will complement and improve the effectiveness of the Integrated Support Programme for Arable Agricultural Development (ISPAAD).
 13. **Subcomponent 2.1: Improved Delivery of Extension Services** – This subcomponent focused on the provision of: a) Training of Extension Officers; b) Purchase of Equipment for District Agricultural Offices; and c) CA Strategy. As far as training of extension officers is concerned, the capacity building activities undertaken for 270 Agricultural Extension staff are highlighted under Subcomponent. In addition to skills capacity for the extension staff, the Project provided some equipment to help facilitate the staff's day-to-day undertakings. A total of 357 communication gadgets (mobile phones, tablets, etc.) were procured for frontline extension staff to assist communication and information sharing among extension staff. This is reported to have assisted the extension staff as vehicles are in short supply. For example, the staff are reported to be using the communication gadgets for collecting useful information on: a) plant protection, such as disease outbreaks and control measures; and b) cultivated area, yields, adoption rates and markets. All this information is critical for the Monitoring and Evaluation purposes. The Project purchased 7 new vehicles for selected District staff and helped recondition an additional 10 vehicles.
 14. The CA strategy, developed by the Project, continues to guide the implementation of activities and practices taught to farmers who are showing keen interest. During the field visit to Tonota, the Mission had the opportunity to interact with some of the participating farmers practising CA, following a one-week training. They seemed to understand the benefits associated with CA, in particular those related to mulching, improved soil moisture and water holding capacity and low disruption to soil structure. They also reported to receive regular visits from the Extension Officer during the rainy season and they also conducted field days to share the application of CA with other neighbouring farmers.
 15. **Subcomponent 2.2: Agricultural Service Centres (ASCs)** – This subcomponent sought to construct and equip a total of 15 ASCs and providing a full range of services farmers need to undertake farming as a business and compete effectively and profitably in a market economy. However, only four ASCs have been constructed out of which only two were operational by the time of the Mission. For the two operational ASCs, there is room for improvement with regard to the type and extent of the services being offered to the farmers, as well as improving record keeping. Implementation of this intervention is said to have been negatively affected by challenges related to construction, supervision and procurement. The ASC approach sought to maximise private sector participation in the provision of agricultural services to farmers, through the ASCs, so that they become self-sustaining. However, because of the delay in completing the construction, commissioning and operating of the ASCs means that the model of private-sector operated ASCs would not be tested, generate lessons of experience and make recommendations. It is, nonetheless, recommended that GoB continues to test out the concept, as originally conceived, with the view of establishing a sustainable private-sector provided agricultural services to smallholder farmers.
 16. **Subcomponent 2.3: Institutional Strengthening** – This is another area where activity implementation progress did not proceed as had been planned. For example, although a draft Institutional Strengthening Strategy was

prepared, it was not implemented. It was supposed to be used to systematically plan and implement institutional strengthening within the ASSP, Ministry of Agriculture and at district level. Also, although the proposal for the development of the Ministry's Management Information System was done, it was not implemented.

E. Project implementation

a. Development Effectiveness

Effectiveness and Developmental Focus

Effectiveness

Rating: 3

Previous rating: 3

Justification of rating

25. The Project has, generally, underachieved. This is largely attributed to procurement delays, inexperience in contract management and the late introduction of CA; these factors have combined to limit the Project's ability to effectively implement all key activities.

Log-Frame Analysis & Main Issues of Effectiveness

1. The development objective of ASSP is to achieve a viable and sustainable smallholder agricultural sector based on farming as a business, and not reliant on subsidies or welfare measures. This is to be assessed through three development outcomes namely Percentage increase (in real terms) of average household income from crops sold; Average value (in real terms) of subsidized inputs received by target group farmers as well as Proportion of irrigation farmers who have paid their dues/contributions.
2. Since the last supervision Mission, the project log-frame still lacks updates for indicators at outcome level. The weak M & E system coupled with delayed implementation of key deliverables greatly contributed to this status. An End of Project Evaluation, whose results were expected to inform the updates to these indicators, was still ongoing by the time of this Mission. Therefore, the Mission was unable to ascertain the actual status of attainment of Project outcomes.
3. The Project will not be able to reach the development outcome related to the waste water irrigation development, as even by the time of this Mission, the infrastructure development of the Mahibitswane waste water irrigation scheme at Palapye was still ongoing. Only 4 out of 15 (27%) Agricultural Service Centres have been completed. Even then, only 1 (Jwaneng ASC) out of the 2 which are operational is operating at nearly full capacity, providing services to farmers in mechanisation, access to production inputs and buying farmers' produce. The adoption rate of CA techniques is estimated to be low, at 20%, due to a number of factors particularly related to limited access to the appropriate machinery and implements. An annual outcome survey carried out in 2016 revealed that there was a gradual decline in the access to subsidies to the farmers, particularly for herbicides (30.6%) and machinery (40%). The area under mechanised production is increasing slowly with at least 8.1% of the targeted area covered. Results also show that the estimated current value in real terms of the amount of subsidies by an average farmer cultivating a 5-hectare piece of land with maize (60%), sorghum (20%) and millet (20%) is 14,250BWP.
4. These results are expected to improve further with increased support to more effective and sustainable production practices such as conservation agriculture and should therefore be incentivised to encourage its increased uptake by small holder farmers.
5. As the Project moves towards the closing date of IFAD funding, more emphasis should be laid on completing the End of Project Evaluation and ensuring extraction, packaging and dissemination of lessons learnt to inform future investments and up scaling of the successful practices and techniques.

Agreed Action	Responsibility	Agreed Date
Development Effectiveness		
Finalise EoP report and Extract Lessons Learnt Finalise the ongoing EoP evaluation report. Ensure adequate extraction, appropriate packaging and dissemination of lessons learnt to all stakeholders	M&E Officer and KM Officer	08/2018

Development Focus

Targeting and Outreach

Rating: 4

Previous rating: 4

Justification of rating

31. At design, it was envisioned that ASSP would benefit 20,000 households. By Project completion, 22,895 households had cumulatively received Project services. It is not possible to estimate the number of youth reached as this was not systematically tracked (except for the Palapye Irrigation Scheme). The draft End of Project (EoP) report indicates that majority of Project beneficiaries were between 36-65 years. Using comparison of beneficiary and control, the EoP report shows that persons of 36-65 years of age benefited more from ASSP, compared to those who did not with 83.7% and

69.2%, respectively, within the outcome. On the other hand, beneficiaries who are 35 years and younger, 3.7% have benefited from the Project and 2.6 % have not.

Main issues

1. The main beneficiary selection criteria for participation in the Project was self-targeting, based on personal interest, except for Palapye Irrigation scheme. For the Irrigation Scheme, a rigorous selection criteria and process was applied to identify committed farmers and avoid low-utilisation of the irrigation scheme. Through this detailed selection process, 32 beneficiaries (8 youth, 6 women, 6 couples and 4 groups) were selected. However, with the delay of completion of the infrastructure, four plot holders have officially opted out, while in one the groups, 3 out of 5 members have been inactive and are likely to be disqualified. The scheme has 25 plots and the lease for the plots are now ready for signature by the beneficiaries. The first stage of selection criteria for allocation of plots included: a) consultations through *kgotla* meetings in all Palapye wards; b) public advertisement for plot application published on notice boards of all wards, several shops and government institutions, such as hospitals, schools etc.
2. The Mission visited the Tonota Agricultural Service Centre which commenced operation in September 2017. However, data on outreach was not available as the management is not tracking such information. At Jwaneng Agricultural Service Centre, data shows that the centre served a maximum of 1,211 farmers in December 2017 and minimum number of 603 farmers in January 2017.

Main issues

- Future programmes need to make explicit efforts to engage youth in agricultural production, especially given that agriculture is not the first livelihood option for youth in Botswana. Interest was in fact indicated to be low among youth by community members interviewed during the mission given that they regard rainfed agriculture as an anchor to poverty. Interviewees also indicated however that interest is likely to rise if the use of CA results in sharp increases in agricultural productivity and income among the first lot of uptakers of CA in their communities. Explicit strategies would in that case developed and implemented systematically to remove the barriers encountered by youth to engage in agriculture, including facilitating access to sufficient quality land, tenure security, and address the lack of knowledge on agriculture through approaches that are of interest to them.
- The project collects disaggregated data but does not use it to understand the dynamics of the different groups it targets and refine project strategies accordingly.

Gender equality & women's participation

Rating: 4

Previous rating: 3

Justification of rating

34. As already indicated, about 22,895 households had cumulatively received Project services. Although the M&E data was not consistently disaggregated by sex or age, it is clear that beneficiaries included women (especially for conservation agriculture-related activities) and youth, but not as a result of deliberate Project efforts. As such, alignment of operations with the targeting quotas established by the Project occurred by default. However, targeting quotas were explicitly used as part of the selection criteria with regard to wastewater irrigation activities.

Main issues

1. By PMU's own admission, any gender and social inclusion outcomes were achieved by default and not necessarily through any deliberate effort. This is despite the fact that the PDR had detailed gender strategy and IFAD supervision Missions consistently provided guidance on mainstreaming of gender and social inclusion.
2. The Mission was availed with the End of Project draft report commissioned by ASSP. The mission observes that while data collection tools (questionnaire and interview guide) for the evaluation had targeting and gender related questions, the actual report had minimal analysis of data and information collected by gender and age. PMT is encouraged to ensure that the final report includes such analysis.
3. Capacity building and training was conducted at different levels for staff and farmers using various modalities, including study tours and learning routes. This was on different topics, such as conservation agriculture, training of tractor owners and operators on tractor maintenance, implement calibration and operation, proper use of agrochemicals. A glaring omission was awareness creation and training of gender mainstreaming/equality and social inclusion.

Main issues

- Sector strategies supported by the project need to consistently include a gender lens and be sensitive to the needs of youth.
- The implementation of activities which do not take into account the specific barriers encountered by women can hinder the improvement of their livelihoods or ability to sustain engagement in a livelihood activity initially supported by a development intervention. Women headed households in Botswana are poorer than male headed ones. Facilitating access to land, warranting tenure security, facilitating access to financing and labour, as

required, are all pre-requisites for vulnerable women to improve livelihood outcomes.

Agricultural Productivity	Rating: 3	Previous rating: 3
----------------------------------	------------------	---------------------------

Justification of rating

38. Some farmers are reporting productivity enhancement, albeit from a low starting point. However, implementation related delays meant that productivity enhancing interventions reached a small number of farmers and, as such, it is a small proportion of the target group that are reporting productivity increases. Finally, improvements can be made in terms of strengthening farmer capacity around all CA principles and ensuring that agricultural implements made available are not only suitable for tractors but also to animal draught power.

Main issues

1. Delayed activity implementation led to limiting of the extent to which many of the planned activities could be implemented. In addition, of the few target beneficiaries reached with some of the productivity enhancing technologies, such as Conservation Agriculture, the adoption rate was quite low. Some of the issues highlighted as being responsible for the slow promotion and adoption of CA techniques relate to: a) limited availability of transport for extension staff; b) constrained communication means; c) limited availability, adequacy and reliability of mechanization service providers with appropriate functional equipment and implements; d) untimely delivery of agricultural inputs; and e) lack of comprehensive training material on CA.

Nutrition	Rating:
------------------	----------------

Main issues

1. In March 2018, ASSP hosted the Regional Workshop on Nutrition Mainstreaming for Project Focal Points in IFAD East and Southern Africa (ESA) Regional Division. The workshop was aimed at developing capacity of project staff to facilitate the implementation of nutrition sensitive interventions in agriculture and rural development projects. The workshop came towards ASSP's completion. Mainstreaming of nutrition in the Ministry of Agriculture is to be spearheaded by the Department of Agricultural Research, Statistics and Policy Development (DARSPD) under the Division of Food Security. The committee comprising of different officers from different key stakeholders, like Ministry of Health, Local Government and MoA parastatals has been constituted to address nutrition issues. ASSP nutrition work plan developed during the workshop included: i) Sensitize senior management on the importance of nutrition and agriculture; ii) Role clarity for different key stakeholders in up-scaling nutrition in the agriculture sector; iii) Conduct trainings/capacity building workshop to sensitize on nutrition and agriculture; iv) Policy advocacy for inclusion of nutrition in the sector; v) Nutrition budget. As ASSP closes, these activities will be spearheaded by DARSPD.

Adaptation to Climate Change	Rating: 4	Previous rating: 4
-------------------------------------	------------------	---------------------------

Justification of rating

42. In line with several national policy and programmatic documents (i.e. NDC) indicating the use of CA practices as a key priority to adapt to harsh climate conditions, ASSP promoted the use of wastewater for crop production and CA techniques as a means to improve rain-fed agriculture production and productivity particularly through extension workers trainings, demonstrations plots and improved agricultural equipment. Yet, while the trainings and demonstrations on minimum tillage (i.e. ripping and basins), soil testing and weed control represent an initial step towards a wider adoption of CA principles, further efforts will be required to secure a sounder and holistic approach and ensure coordinated efforts to increase smallholder farmers' resilience and climate change adaptation.

Main issues

1. As identified in previous Missions, the development and implementation of an effective mechanisation strategy is a key element for a broader and effective adoption of CA. Unfortunately, this is not yet completed. Now that ASSP implementation has ended, the Department of Crop Production (DCP) relevant Division will have the responsibility to develop a road map for its finalization and adoption. This should be harmonized with farmers' existent capacities and work simultaneously with the CA trainings to timely meet farming needs, showcase the full potential of CA activities and avoid potential farmers' drop-outs. Similarly, the involvement of private machinery contractors/operators will have to be an integral part during the implementation of the mechanization strategy. Additionally, the subsidies policy is not yet aligned with the objectives of promoting the CA methods; this presents a clear contradiction. If CA is to be effectively promoted, there is a need to consider harmonising ISPAAD activities with other CA-centred programmes to avoid contradictory messages.
2. Furthermore, the quality of extension training provided has been found to be not always accurate and needs to be improved in order to demonstrate the full range of CA options on a continuous basis. For example, the comparison between the practices being promoted and other farming methods should start simultaneously to allow farmers to make observations and correctly understand the potential benefits. Also, availability of material for mulching has

been a challenge and competing off-farm activities such as the use of harvest residues as animal feed, show that holistic approaches that foresee the coexistence of different sustainable practices should be encouraged. Livestock management solutions, such as those proposed in Piloting Agricultural Productivity Enhancement Project (PAPEP) should be considered in this respect. In addition, instead of using only crop residues for mulch, branches of native shrubs growing in the surrounding areas can be used, thus allowing for sufficient soil cover. On this line, the elaboration of a CA Extension Manual with tailored approaches for each agro-ecological area should be undertaken and ideally be included within the Extension workers curricula to strengthen their capacities and ensure a harmonized approach.

3. In general, the Project increased institutional capacity for the extension staff to promote CA; some farmers were very enthusiastic from demonstrations undertaken. The DCP may build on this experience while also considering the opportunity to conduct further analysis on farmers' uptake, constraints and limitations in order to effectively assess whether farmers' have increased their resilience as a result of Project's activities being promoted. Although limited, the lessons learned from this is experience should be ideally taken into consideration by national programmes (such as ISPAAD) and use them as the basis to address specific constraints which may hamper a further uptake of climate resilient practices.
4. Finally, additional adaptation opportunities may be considered in future interventions. For instance, it may be worth to consider the ASCs as strategic infrastructures to mainstream climate smart agriculture practices. Tailored services, trainings and production inputs (i.e. drought tolerant and/or early maturing seed varieties) could be made available according to the seasonal weather forecast through a continuous and effective collaboration with relevant actors, including the Botswana Met Service, the Agriculture Research Centre and private sector suppliers.

b. Sustainability and Scaling up

Institutions and Policy Engagement	Rating: 4	Previous rating: 4
---	------------------	---------------------------

Justification of rating

47. Given Botswana's harsh environment, sustainability is being looked at from the perspective of adaptation to climate change. The key interventions include recycling of treated wastewater for irrigation and CA. Considerable work has been undertaken to understand useful approaches and different models for a sustainable small-scale irrigation system. In addition, activities related to CA and mechanization have been initiated and the Government is committed to mainstream them within ongoing government programmes, both at central and district levels. Lastly, the Project's technical implementation is embedded in the GoB system at all levels. The institutions were availed with some capacity building to strengthen their abilities for supporting implementation during and after ASSP.

Partnership-building	Rating: 4	Previous rating: 4
-----------------------------	------------------	---------------------------

Justification of rating

48. ASSP has established partnerships with a number of private sector companies, particularly during the implementation of CA-related activities. Particular mention is made of seed and machinery companies with which the Project collaborated during the demonstrations of some of the CA applications. The Project is also liaising with selected government parastatals, such as the Local Enterprise Authority and the Citizen Entrepreneurial Development Agency in the pursuit of financing for the beneficiaries of the small-scale irrigation scheme. Lastly, the Project is partnering with selected private sector stakeholders to manage some of the ASCs.

Human and Social Capital and Empowerment	Rating: 4	Previous rating: 4
---	------------------	---------------------------

Justification of rating

49. ASSP has, generally, contributed to the development of the target farmers' capacities by variously improving their skills through training, demonstrations or by participating in FFS. The Project has also linked the target beneficiaries to improved services (i.e. Agricultural Offices, Local Operators and Agricultural Service Centres) although most of the ACSs are yet to be constructed. For the irrigation scheme, the structure is in place for the selected 32 beneficiaries to be fully responsible for managing all affairs related to their irrigated scheme through their Water Users' Association.

Quality of Beneficiary Participation	Rating: 4	Previous rating: 4
---	------------------	---------------------------

Justification of rating

50. Farmers were enthusiastic in participating in Project activities. Unfortunately, the delay in completing the Mahibitswane wastewater irrigation scheme has caused withdrawal of some beneficiaries that had been selected to participate. Some studies recommended under the last mission that would have defined better quality of beneficiary participation were not carried out. These include: a) Beneficiary Satisfaction Survey of the Agricultural Service Centres;

and b) An adoption survey on the use of Conservation Agriculture techniques and mechanisation services; this was to be carried out among participating farmers in all the 27 sub-districts.

Responsiveness of Service Providers

Rating: 3

Previous rating: 4

Justification of rating

51. In general, the aspect of service provision did not proceed as desired; the process experienced a number of delays. This was particularly the case for the construction of the Mahibitswane wastewater irrigation scheme and ASCs. As a result, the irrigation scheme could not be completed by the time of ASSAP's Completion Date and will not be complete by the time of ASSAP's Closure Date. Likewise, most of the ASCs will not be completed by the time of ASSP's closure. It should, however, be mentioned that procurement process and contract management were also issues that contributed to the resultant delays.

Environment and Natural Resource Management

Rating: 4

Previous rating: 3

Justification of rating

52. Several activities promoted through ASSP aimed at ensuring a better use of the natural resource base. For example, the CA interventions contributed to improving on-farm activities. The promotion of good water management practices in the irrigation schemes (i.e. use of wastewater, sustainable land and soil management) was another activity promoted by the Project. Both ASSP beneficiaries and District Government staff have been trained on sound environmental practices. It is suggested that GoB takes advantage of the initiated practices and put in place a cross-sectoral approach to on-farm activities that also puts under consideration the impacts (negative and/or positive) from other agricultural activities (e.g. livestock).

Main issues

1. During the end of Project workshop held in Palapye on 21st August 2018, district representatives identified wild-life/human conflicts as a major issue for the promotion of CA activities, particularly in North West and Chobe areas. Thus, several farmers in those districts are demotivated because of the increasing challenges faced in the process of producing crops in their fields. The Government, through the Ministry of Environment, Tourism and Natural Resources, is exploring the possibility to use chili-based techniques as an alternative natural deterrent against animals' intrusions (e.g. elephants). By planting a few rows of chili peppers around the perimeter of their crops or mixing the chili peppers into a spray, farmers can create a buffer zone to keep animals away. DCP is therefore encouraged to link-up with this initiative while also exploring other possible solutions adopted in neighbouring countries (e.g. chili fencing) to be promoted among farmers in order to mitigate this risk.

Exit Strategy

Rating: 4

Previous rating: 4

Justification of rating

54. First of all, an exit strategy was developed by the Project and progressively implemented during the course of ASSP implementation. By design, the Project's exit/sustainability strategy was implicit. GoB already had ongoing programmes whose objectives were related to those of ASSP; the Project sought to pilot certain technologies and help improve the efficiency of some of the existing programmes. In the ASSP Financing Plan, IFAD was the junior partner; IFAD financing accounted for about 23% of the ASSP total costs at design while GoB accounted for about 76%. In addition, ASSP implementation was completely embedded within existing government institutions both at the national and district levels. Thus, GoB is committed to taking over from where the Project stopped.

Potential for Scaling-up

Rating: 4

Previous rating: 4

Justification of rating

55. There are four key potential areas for scaling up successful Project interventions namely: a) Agricultural Service Centres (ASCs); b) Conservation Agriculture; c) Use of Farmer Field School methodology in reducing the farmer extension technician ratios, and d) the use of WhatsApp socio-media platform in improving communication and sharing of knowledge and experiences among the extension technicians. Government has shown considerable interest in these areas.

Main issues

1. ASCs have the potential to improve service delivery to the smallholder farmers. Two out of 4 completed ASCs are operational under different models of operation and management frameworks. One of the four functional ASCs at Jwaneng is operated by a Government parastatal (BAMB); it has shown positive results in increasing outreach of

a range of services. While the other one at Tonota Sub-district under management of a Private Sector Firm (Agriculture) is having challenges operating at full capacity. The Project is urged to draw lessons from the existing management arrangements of the two ASCs and use them to inform future expansion and scaling up of ASCs. The construction and leasing of the ASCs is fully funded and supported by the Government of Botswana further affirming the government commitment to the undertaking.

2. The Project has registered some positive results under CA. Expansion of the initiative has, however, faced technical and financial limitations, such as inadequate equipment for mechanised operations and technical know-how by some of the extension staff/demonstrators. The Government will need to review and make considerations to operational modalities of CA to facilitate smooth scaling up of this rather important initiative.
3. The FFS methodology was implemented in 4 out of the 10 Project districts. Positive results have been registered, particularly in the reduction of farmer/extension staff ratio, peer to peer learning and increased outreach of CA techniques. Scaling up of the approach could be improved by committing more resources, particularly for facilitation of the extension staff to be able to reach out to more farmers.
4. The Project procured cell phones for some of the extension staff and created WhatsApp groups by district. Through these platforms, the staff have been able to improve communication as well as sharing of knowledge and exchange of ideas on key topical issues. Continued use of such easy and fast platforms will require investing resources in internet connectivity and relevant IT infrastructure.

c. Project Management

Quality of Project Management	Rating: 4	Previous rating: 4
--------------------------------------	------------------	---------------------------

Justification of rating

60. During the earlier part of ASSP management, frequent turnovers, particularly for the key position of Project Manager, created problems as the process suffered from lack of continuity in management and coordination processes and procedures. However, the last part of the Project saw stability in management together with staff commitment and dedication to resolving implementation bottlenecks; the team was also supported by a present and informed Project Steering Committee.

Knowledge Management	Rating: 3	Previous rating: 3
-----------------------------	------------------	---------------------------

Justification of rating

61. Since the last Mission, the Project has registered less than satisfactory progress in relation to extraction of knowledge and dissemination of lessons learnt as well as documentation of successful stories on approaches and interventions of the Project. Most of the planned actions have only been partially executed and not taken to completion. As such, various knowledge products remain in draft form with less than one month to closing of the Project.

Main issues

1. As per the last Supervision Mission, the Project was expected to concentrate efforts at extracting knowledge on both successful and unsuccessful approaches for the benefit of the design and implementation of future Projects. By the time of this Mission, a few have been prepared, including two draft video documentaries (one on Conservation Agriculture and another on other interventions) and a draft pamphlet on the lessons learnt. The Mission is concerned that the lessons learnt have not been clearly extracted and phrased as lessons but have rather been merely stated as observations of events during implementation. The Mission is also concerned that no case stories and case studies have been prepared, particularly on successful interventions such as the ASC at Jwaneng, adopters of CA techniques and benefits of FFS in reducing the extension staff/farmer ratio, among others.
2. As the Project nears its closing date, the mission urges that the following be prioritised:
 - Develop a plan of action/concept for the closing workshop, including what knowledge products have to be disseminated and in what form and start preparations immediately;
 - Clearly extract lessons learnt, and not just mere observations, on implementation and group them in broad thematic areas to facilitate readability and learning. Package them in appropriate knowledge products for sharing with the stakeholders during the closing workshop;
 - Finalize the draft video documentaries along clear defined scripts with clear messages to communicate to the stakeholders;
 - Document the pros and cons of management and operational model for Jwaneng ASC under management by BAMB. Package these into appropriate knowledge products for sharing; and
 - Prepare case studies and case stories from selected farmers under CA and FFS methodology.

Value for Money	Rating: 3	Previous rating: 3
------------------------	------------------	---------------------------

Justification of rating

64. Many of ASSP's planned activities were not implemented and there are some activities that had been started as of the completion date but had not been completed by the time of the Mission. Overall, the pace of activity implementation was very slow and this is reflected in the Project's cumulative disbursement rate that is estimated at about 37%. Accordingly, many of the expected outcomes were not realised; only a few of the outcomes were partially attained. These include some reported increases in incomes for some of the beneficiaries as well as some increased productivity for some of the participants in CA techniques. All outcomes associated with recycled wastewater irrigation scheme could not be realised because of the implementation delays.

Main issues

1. Overall, and in addition to large cost overruns for some of its activities, ASSP has suffered from delayed implementation of some of its core activities. This negatively impacted its financial execution, hence the low level of attainment of Project outcomes. It is of particular importance to note that the Project management component has disbursed/spent 82% of its allocation, whereas the two investment components have only disbursed 32% of their allocations. This points to a Project with high level of management costs compared to its outputs/outcomes, thus justifying the rating of moderately unsatisfactory.

Coherence between AWPB and Implementation

Rating: 3

Previous rating: 3

Justification of rating

66. Less than 50% of the activities that were identified up to the period ending 30th September 2018 have been implemented. The civil works for the Mahibitswane wastewater irrigation scheme have remained incomplete and therefore the scheme cannot operate; the remaining activities will have to be paid for by GoB. Provisions made for the completion of works and operationalization of two other ASCs have not been executed. Other activities such as the End of Project Evaluation report, the Project Completion Report and the various knowledge products have not been completed and preparations for the closing workshop are yet to start.

AWPB Inputs and Outputs Review and Implementation Progress

1. Several outputs/deliverables planned and budgeted for during the last six months have either been partially done or not started at all. The ASC infrastructures remain incomplete, Knowledge Management activities are yet to be delivered and the irrigation scheme is yet to be handed over by the contractor.

Performance of M&E System

Rating: 3

Previous rating: 3

Justification of rating

68. The M&E system has remained focused on activities and a few outputs. An end of project evaluation expected to assess outcomes is yet to be completed with results still at preliminary stage. The monitoring database maintained at PMT level lacks information for some years as reports from the districts are not forthcoming. The WhatsApp group created has greatly improved the flow of information. However, there is no analysis on the information shared and how this can help improve implementation. The level of commitment by the staff at the national and Field level in ensuring that there is regular information flow is low, leaving gaps in the system.

M&E System Review

1. The M&E system of the Project continues to rely on updates provided by the district and sub-district extension officers, but who often delay to send in reports related to key Project outputs and the very few outcomes achieved. Consequently, there are significant gaps in the data collection and late updates to the system maintained at the PMT level. During the Mission, a workshop was organised for the district focal persons aimed at reviewing implementation and take stock of the deliverables per district. The Mission attended the workshop and noted the low capacity in reporting accurately, and in time, on the outputs and outcomes by all the focal persons in attendance. The Mission thus provided guidance on improving reporting on results for the benefit of updating the Project logical framework but also for future measurements.
2. The Mission urges project management to follow-up on the district staff and provide regular support and guidance in data collection, processing, management and reporting. Regular face to face interactions through stakeholder review meetings should also be encouraged going forward as these are useful not only for sharing updates but to enhance cross learning for better project management. More capacity is also needed in collecting socio-economic and other performance data from the ASCs both for the respective district staff where these facilities are located and the staff of the managing institutions.

Requirements of Social, Environmental and Climate Assessment Procedures (SECAP)

Rating: 4

Previous rating: 4

Justification of rating

71. ASSP came into force in 2012, prior to SECAP becoming a mandatory requirement for all IFAD projects in 2015. Therefore, a SECAP review note was not developed for this Project. However, an Environmental and Social Review Note (ESRN) elaborated during Project design considered ASSP as a Category B project. The Project interventions are guided and implemented by the National Environmental Safeguards (Environmental Assessment Act n°10 of 2011) which required an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) study for the Mahibitswane wastewater irrigation scheme. This was elaborated in February 2016 and cleared by the DEA. The study identified potentially adverse externalities which can be mitigated and controlled through an effective monitoring of the water quality.

SECAP Review

1. Although actual field irrigation will not start before Project closure, by 30th September 2018, micro-biological monitoring of water quality at the wastewater treatment plant is carried out by the responsible authority (WUC). While WUC personnel on site ensure that this analysis is undertaken on a regular basis, chemical analysis, on the other hand, is taken only once a month. For this exercise, water samples are taken to laboratories, about 300km far from the plant site; the monthly frequency greatly reduces the reaction time for prompt remedial action in case of high levels of dangerous contaminants. In this regard, arrangements should be made to ensure compliance with national standards (BOS n°93) by WUC for chemical and micro-biological parameters. In addition, previous results from water analyses at the discharge point showed high levels of contaminants which represent a risk for both humans and the environment if not reduced to acceptable levels. On a sustainability note, the increasing population as well as the increasing number of houses and factories being built in Palapye result in higher volumes of wastewater flow to the treatment plant. In the near future, the infrastructure will need to be upgraded to ensure sufficient capacity and avoid overburdening of the system; this could lead to an eventual collapse.
2. With regard to the water quality at the irrigation scheme, the establishment of clear responsibilities and roles for the operationalization of wastewater reuse and quality control monitoring (both groundwater and surface water) before project completion was a key recommendation of the EIA in order to avoid any potential adverse environmental and public health impact after Project Closure. Similarly, in order to assess potential alteration to the water quality due to project's adverse externalities (both *in situ* and in the surrounding area), the EIA specified the need to undertake a water quality baseline. To this purpose, a national tender was launched and awarded in July 2018 for the design and development of a groundwater monitoring scheme. This also included a soil and water quality baseline as well as a hydrogeological study and the results are expected to be available and disclosed by September 2018.
3. However, once the baseline conditions of soil and water quality get established, it is not clear who would be responsible for the continuous quality monitoring to ensure compliance with established standards. Therefore, it is paramount that, before the scheme is handed over to the target beneficiaries, MoA puts in place a system for regular and continuous monitoring of the treated water to ensure safety of all stakeholders and the environment. Along the same line, the need to train the Water Users' Association members on handling effluent wastewater was identified by the Environment Impact Assessment as a necessary action to be taken in order to ensure safe usage. This is another important activity that should be undertaken before the irrigation scheme is handed over to the target beneficiaries.

d. Financial Management & Execution

Disbursement by financier

Type	Name	Current Amount	Disbursed Amount	Actual Rate
Domestic Financing breakdown	Beneficiaries	\$289,219		
	National Government	\$19,082,032		

Acceptable Disbursement Rate

Rating: 1

Previous rating: 1

Justification of rating

The project is in its 7th year of implementation and its disbursement rate is 33.5%. There has been one extension for 12 months, extending original closing date from 30 September, 2017 to 30 September, 2018. Compared to disbursement of a project with the same disbursement profile, the rate of disbursement is highly unsatisfactory.

Main issues

As at 31 July 2018, the IFAD loan was SDR 841,626.13 disbursed, representing 32.37% of SDR 2,600,000 allocated while the grant was SDR 376,607.00 disbursed, representing 36.44% of SDR 1,025,000 allocated including the initial deposit. The initial deposit of USD 393,000 on the loan and USD 215,500 on the grant that have been fully recovered. The cumulative IFAD loan and grant was 33.52% disbursed (SDR 1,215,233.13 of SDR 3,625,000 allocated) as at 31 July, 2018. This leaves undisbursed balance of SDR 1,758,373.87 (equivalents of USD 2,470,515.29) on the loan and SDR 651,393.00 (equivalents of USD 915,207.17) on the grant with a combined total of SDR 2,409,766.87 (equivalent to

USD 3,385,722.45) that remains undisbursed from IFAD.

Equivalents of USD 538,190 has been reported as commitments in respect of works for completion of Palapye irrigation scheme, dislodging of ponds, consultancy in respect of project completion report, and other winding up activities. No expenditure from the loan and grant has been reported for the period 1 April, 2018 to 31 July, 2018. This commitment, if realised will be charged against undisbursed funds from IFAD leaving equivalents of USD 2,470,515.29 on the loan and USD 377,017.17 on the grant that will be cancelled. The last withdrawal application claiming the above amount should be submitted to IFAD prior to loan closing date, in any case not later than 30 September, 2018.

Agreed Action	Responsibility	Agreed Date
Financial Management & Execution		
Withdrawal application Submit a final withdrawal application for all eligible expenditure incurred to IFAD prior to project closing date	Financial Controller	09/2018
Withdrawal application		09/2018

Fiduciary Aspects

Quality of Financial Management **Rating: 4** **Previous rating: 4**

Justification of rating

The MoA Finance Department is responsible for accounting with a specific accountant assigned but is not fully dedicated to the project. Accounting is done under the GoB's Accounting and Budgeting System (GABS), an ORACLE-based accounting software, approved budget exist and has been posted into GABS where budget monitoring and variance analysis is done.

Main issues

The financial management arrangement has been characterised by high staff turn –over, low absorption of funds, delays in reconciliations of ledger accounts in which funds are monitored within GABS, delays in reporting and submission of withdrawal applications. Budget management is done in GABS which has strong controls to guard against over commitment and variances have largely been underspends which have been attributed to slow activity implementation. The data for the period post completion date of 31 March, 2018 has not been updated. As the project nears closure, this will require urgent attention to facilitate compilation and submission of the last withdrawal application and prepare for the final audit.

Agreed Action	Responsibility	Agreed Date
Financial Management & Execution		
Financial Statements Compile draft financial statements in respect of winding up period for audit.	Financial Controller & Project Manager	10/2018
Financial Statements		10/2018

Quality and Timeliness of Audit **Rating: 3** **Previous rating: 4**

Justification of rating

Automatic rating caused by delay in the audit submission

Counterparts Funds **Rating: 6** **Previous rating: 6**

Justification of rating

GoB is providing budgeted funds on the timely basis and has since inception financed 81% of total cumulative project expenditure to date.

Main issues

The cumulative GoB contribution represents 81% of total project expenditure to date of USD 9.23 million. GoB allocation should have even been more than allocated had it not been affected by low funds absorption by the project. Construction of the Palapye irrigation scheme infrastructure has been completed but has not been handed over to the beneficiaries, as such USD 289,000 allocated to beneficiaries has not been realised. Beneficiary contribution could therefore not be measured during implementation.

Compliance with Loan Covenants	Rating: 4	Previous rating: 4
---------------------------------------	------------------	---------------------------

Justification of rating

84. The Project was generally implemented in compliance with the financing agreement covenants except for the timely submission of progress reports that has been done on an annual rather than semi-annual basis.

Main issues

1. A summary of compliance status is presented in Appendix 3.

Procurement

Procurement	Rating: 3	Previous rating: 3
--------------------	------------------	---------------------------

Justification of rating

86. Delays have been experienced in procurement in excess of one year contributing to slow activity implementation and low absorption of funds. Examples include procurement for Desludging of WUC ponds initiated in June 2016 and took longer than 12 months to be concluded. In addition, the procurement of Bio-filter feed pumps initiated at the same time (June 2016) could not be concluded.

Procurement Review

1. There have not been any new contracts entered into during the post completion phase. However, previously entered into contracts in respect of the Mahibitswane wastewater irrigation scheme, desludging of water ponds and consultancy for Project Completion Report had not been closed. Given that this is a winding down period for the Project, it is important that all contract obligations to be settled from loan and grant proceeds are completed and closed to facilitate payment of obligations and submission of withdrawal applications in relation to the same prior to Project closing date of 30th September 2018. Any obligation arising out of these contracts that will have not been paid and claimed from IFAD by 30th September 2018 will not be honoured and shall be taken over by GoB.

e. Additional Aspects

Financing of Infield Development by Farmers

1. It had been expected that the key activity of the Mahibitswane wastewater irrigation scheme would be completed and the scheme handed over to the target beneficiaries to start infield development and crop production. The October 2016 Supervision Mission had agreed with the Project on alternative ways of helping the target farmers to finance the infield development expenses. However, because of the implementation delays experienced, this has not happened. It is, therefore, recommended that the Department of Crop Production continues with the arrangements to assist the Water Users Association to prepare a business plan for the scheme as a whole, with a particular focus on identifying cash-flow requirements at scheme and individual farmer level. The plan will identify potential sources of funding, such as government run programmes (ISPAAD, Women's fund, and Youth fund), Citizen Entrepreneurial Development Agency (CEDA) or commercial banks. The potential role for government to guarantee credit financing for farmers for the infield irrigation system will also be analysed. One option is for government to put in place a credit guarantee facility to leverage as collateral for the smallholder farmers to access finance for the infield works and inputs for production during the 1st year of operation. This approach will allow for the full development of the scheme from the onset to reduce delayed production, as is common with other irrigation

F. Agreed Actions

Agreed Action	Responsibility	Agreed Date
Development Effectiveness		
Finalise EoP report and Extract Lessons Learnt Finalise the ongoing EoP evaluation report. Ensure adequate extraction, appropriate packaging and dissemination of lessons learnt to all stakeholders	M&E Officer and KM Officer	08/2018
Financial Management & Execution		
Withdrawal application Submit a final withdrawal application for all eligible expenditure incurred to IFAD prior to project closing date	Financial Controller	09/2018
Withdrawal application		09/2018
Financial Statements Compile draft financial statements in respect of winding up period for audit.	Financial Controller & Project Manager	10/2018
Financial Statements		10/2018

Agricultural Services Support Project

Logical Framework

Results Hierarchy	Indicators							Means of verification			Assumptions
	Name	Baseline	Mid-Term	End Target	Annual Result (2018)	Cumulative Result (2018)	Cumulative Result % (2018)	Source	Frequency	Responsibility	
Outreach	1.b Estimated corresponding total number of households members										
	Household members										
	1.a Corresponding number of households reached										
	Households			20 036							
	Non-women-headed households										
	Women-headed households										
	1 Persons receiving services promoted or supported by the project										
	Males										
	Total number of persons receiving services			91 364	92 996						
	Females										
	Groups receiving project services										
	Groups			50							
Goal To contribute to economic diversification, reduction of rural poverty and food insecurity, and improved livelihoods of rural communities.	Reduction in prevalence of child malnutrition							RIMS quantitative baseline survey in year 2, impact survey at completion in year 5. Complemented by qualitative analysis / household case studies.			
	Reduction in prevalence of child malnutrition			21							
	Increase in social and productive assets of rural households (household asset index)							RIMS quantitative baseline survey in year 2, impact survey at completion in year 5. Complemented by qualitative analysis / household case studies.			
	Households										

	Households for which food security has improved						RIMS quantitative baseline survey in year 2, impact survey at completion in year 5. Complemented by qualitative analysis / household case studies.				
	Households										
Objective Achieve a viable and sustainable smallholder agricultural sector based on farming as a business, and not reliant on subsidies or welfare measures.	Increase (in real terms) of average household income from crops sold.						Additional questions added to quantitative RIMS baseline and impact survey. Annual survey (smaller sample) of benefitting farmers in year 4 and possibly also in year 3. Complemented by qualitative analysis / household case studies.			Significant number of rural youth take advantage of opportunity to take up farming as a business. Government creates a conducive policy environment for agricultural development. Farmers adopting new technologies.	
	Households										
	Average value (in real terms) of subsidized inputs received by target group farmers.						Additional questions added to quantitative RIMS baseline and impact survey. Annual survey (smaller sample) of benefitting farmers in year 4 and possibly also in year 3. Complemented by qualitative analysis / household case studies.				
	Average value (in real terms) of subsidized inputs received by target group farmers			160 000							
	Proportion of irrigation farmers who have paid their dues/contributions.						Irrigation scheme records. Complemented by detailed study on pilot scheme covering crops grown, areas, production, sales, costs, health issues.				
	Proportion of irrigation farmers who have paid their dues/contributions.			100							
Outcome 1. Sustainable increase in smallholder agricultural productivity	1. Average yield for rainfed crops (maize, sorghum, millet) among target households						Additional questions added to quantitative RIMS baseline and impact survey. Annual survey (smaller sample) of benefitting farmers in year 4 and possibly also in year 3. Complemented by qualitative analysis / case studies.	Annually		Absence of prolonged (multi- year) drought periods in next 10 years.	
	Average yield for rainfed millet in kg/ha			1 000							
	Average yield for rainfed sorghum in kg/ha			1 000							
	Average yield for rainfed maize in kg/ha			1 000							

	2. Proportion of target households reporting yield increase for rainfed crops						Additional questions added to quantitative RIMS baseline and impact survey. Annual survey (smaller sample) of benefitting farmers in year 4 and possibly also in year 3. Complemented by qualitative analysis / case studies.	Annually		
	Households			20						
	3. Total area cropped and harvested in the irrigation scheme						Irrigation scheme records (note: can exceed scheme area due to double cropping).	Annually		
	Total area harvested									
	Total area cropped and harvested			29						
	Total area cropped									
Output 1.1 Efficient agricultural mechanization services available to smallholder farmers.	1. Government-owned tractors/implements sold or leased to private machinery contractors						Whoever carries out/organizes an activity (sale/lease of machinery, training, registering accredited operators, demonstration) fills a form with key data on the results, to be entered in the appropriate monitoring register.			Entrepreneurs take advantage of opportunity to be trained and invest in tractor mechanization as a business. GOB follows through with the decision to privatize agricultural mechanization services.
	Government-owned tractors/implements sold or leased			62						
	2. Private machinery contractors trained (person)						Whoever carries out/organizes an activity (sale/lease of machinery, training, registering accredited operators, demonstration) fills a form with key data on the results, to be entered in the appropriate monitoring register.			
	Private machinery contractors trained			100						
	3. Private machinery contractors provided with Business Development Services (person)						Whoever carries out/organizes an activity (sale/lease of machinery, training, registering accredited operators, demonstration) fills a form with key data on the results, to be entered in the appropriate monitoring register.			
	Private machinery contractors provided with Business Development Services			100						

4. Private machinery operators accredited (person)							Whoever carries out/organizes an activity (sale/lease of machinery, training, registering accredited operators, demonstration) fills a form with key data on the results, to be entered in the appropriate monitoring register.		
Private machinery operators accredited			100						
5. Demonstrations with improved mechanized agricultural equipment							Whoever carries out/organizes an activity (sale/lease of machinery, training, registering accredited operators, demonstration) fills a form with key data on the results, to be entered in the appropriate monitoring register.		
Demonstrations with improved mechanized agricultural equipment			540						
6. Demonstrations with improved animal-drawn agricultural implements							Whoever carries out/organizes an activity (sale/lease of machinery, training, registering accredited operators, demonstration) fills a form with key data on the results, to be entered in the appropriate monitoring register.		
Demonstrations with improved animal-drawn agricultural implements			108						
7. Mechanization officers trained on agricultural equipment and farm operations							Whoever carries out/organizes an activity (sale/lease of machinery, training, registering accredited operators, demonstration) fills a form with key data on the results, to be entered in the appropriate monitoring register.		
Mechanization officers trained on agricultural equipment and farm operations			10						
8. Private contractors trained on agricultural equipment and farm operations							Whoever carries out/organizes an activity (sale/lease of machinery, training, registering accredited operators, demonstration) fills a form with key data on the results, to be entered in the appropriate monitoring register.		
Private contractors trained on agricultural equipment and farm operations			200						
9. Financial institutions participating in project (RIMS)								Annually	
Financial institutions participating in project			10						
10. Staff or service providers trained								Annually	

	Males			50							
	Females			50							
Outcome 2: Favorable enabling environment for smallholder agricultural development.	1. Proportion of target group farmers adopting technologies recommended by the project							Additional questions added to quantitative RIMS baseline and impact survey. Annual survey (smaller sample) of benefiting farmers in year 4 and possibly also in year 3.			GOB adopts more efficient, cost-effective support system following project reform of incentive structures for smallholder agriculture.
	Proportion of target group farmers adopting technologies recommended by the project			20							
	2. Proportion of farmers using hired mechanized services							Records kept by machinery operators trained under the project.			
	Proportion of farmers using hired mechanized services			50							
	3. Cropped area covered using mechanized services.							Records kept by machinery operators trained under the project.			
	Cropped area covered using mechanized services.			60 000							
	4. Cropped area under Conservation Agriculture.							ASC management to work with ASC-based enterprises to record total numbers of clients. All complemented by qualitative analysis / case studies.			
	Cropped area under Conservation Agriculture			60 000							
	5. Farmers using ASC-based services (person).							Additional questions added to quantitative RIMS baseline and impact survey. Annual survey (smaller sample) of benefiting farmers in year 4 and possibly also in year 3.			
	Farmers using ASC-based services (person).			45 000							
	6. Proportion of rainfed farmers satisfied with available agricultural services.							Included in detailed study on pilot irrigation scheme.			
	Proportion of rainfed farmers satisfied with available agricultural services			50							
	7. Proportion of irrigation farmers satisfied with available services.							Included in detailed study on pilot irrigation scheme.			
	Proportion of irrigation farmers satisfied with available services			100							

Output 1.2 Improved rainfed agricultural practices adapted, tested and demonstrated.	1. Adaptive research trial sites established.						Whoever carries out/organizes an activity (establish trial site, conduct trial, conduct training, establish demonstration plot, carry out demonstration) fills a form with key data on the results, to be entered in the appropriate monitoring register.			GOB introduces a policy framework which provides incentives to adopt improved agricultural techniques.
	Adaptive research trial sites established			5						
	2. Adaptive research trials conducted.						Whoever carries out/organizes an activity (establish trial site, conduct trial, conduct training, establish demonstration plot, carry out demonstration) fills a form with key data on the results, to be entered in the appropriate monitoring register.			
	Adaptive research trials conducted			5						
	3. Adaptive research reports produced.						Whoever carries out/organizes an activity (establish trial site, conduct trial, conduct training, establish demonstration plot, carry out demonstration) fills a form with key data on the results, to be entered in the appropriate monitoring register.			
	Adaptive research reports produced			5						
	4. SMSs, ADs and lead farmers trained in improved crop production technologies (person).						Whoever carries out/organizes an activity (establish trial site, conduct trial, conduct training, establish demonstration plot, carry out demonstration) fills a form with key data on the results, to be entered in the appropriate monitoring register.			
	Lead farmers trained in improved crop production technologies (person).			171						
	5. Demonstration plots established in the project area						Whoever carries out/organizes an activity (establish trial site, conduct trial, conduct training, establish demonstration plot, carry out demonstration) fills a form with key data on the results, to be entered in the appropriate monitoring register.			
	Demonstration plots established in the project area			540						

6. Crop demonstrations conducted at demonstration sites							Whoever carries out/organizes an activity (establish trial site, conduct trial, conduct training, establish demonstration plot, carry out demonstration) fills a form with key data on the results, to be entered in the appropriate monitoring register.		
Crop demonstrations conducted at demonstration sites			108						
7. Farmers exposed to improved crop production methods at demonstration plots							Whoever carries out/organizes an activity (establish trial site, conduct trial, conduct training, establish demonstration plot, carry out demonstration) fills a form with key data on the results, to be entered in the appropriate monitoring register.		
Farmers exposed to improved crop production methods at demonstration plots			2 700						
8. Farmers trained in conservation agriculture							Whoever carries out/organizes an activity (establish trial site, conduct trial, conduct training, establish demonstration plot, carry out demonstration) fills a form with key data on the results, to be entered in the appropriate monitoring register.		
Farmers trained in conservation agriculture			540						
9. People accessing facilitated advisory services							Whoever carries out/organizes an activity (establish trial site, conduct trial, conduct training, establish demonstration plot, carry out demonstration) fills a form with key data on the results, to be entered in the appropriate monitoring register.		
Males									
People accessing facilitated advisory services									
Females									
1.1.4 Persons trained in production practices and/or technologies									
Men trained in crop									
Women trained in crop									

Output 1.3 Pilot scheme for smallholder wastewater irrigation established	1. Smallholder farmers to whom land in the pilot scheme has been allocated.						Key data on membership will be kept by the scheme committee, on developed area by the irrigation officer. Whoever carries out/organizes an activity (training) fills a form with key data on the results, to be entered in the appropriate monitoring register.			Smallholder farmers able to access sufficient finance to develop irrigation plots. Irrigated plots are allocated to genuine smallholder farmers.
	Smallholder farmers to whom land in the pilot scheme has been allocated			29						
	2. Developed irrigable area in the irrigation scheme.						Key data on membership will be kept by the scheme committee, on developed area by the irrigation officer. Whoever carries out/organizes an activity (training) fills a form with key data on the results, to be entered in the appropriate monitoring register.			
	Developed irrigable area in the irrigation scheme			29						
	3. People trained in irrigation scheme management.						Key data on membership will be kept by the scheme committee, on developed area by the irrigation officer. Whoever carries out/organizes an activity (training) fills a form with key data on the results, to be entered in the appropriate monitoring register.			
	People trained in irrigation scheme management			29						
	4. Farmers trained in irrigated crop production.						Key data on membership will be kept by the scheme committee, on developed area by the irrigation officer. Whoever carries out/organizes an activity (training) fills a form with key data on the results, to be entered in the appropriate monitoring register.			
	Farmers trained in irrigated crop production			29						
	5. Farmers trained post-harvest handling / marketing of irrigated crops.						Key data on membership will be kept by the scheme committee, on developed area by the irrigation officer. Whoever carries out/organizes an activity (training) fills a form with key data on the results, to be entered in the appropriate monitoring register.			
	Farmers trained post-harvest handling / marketing of irrigated crops			29						

	1.1.2 Farmland under water-related infrastructure constructed/rehabilitated						Key data on membership will be kept by the scheme committee, on developed area by the irrigation officer. Whoever carries out/organizes an activity (training) fills a form with key data on the results, to be entered in the appropriate monitoring register.		
	Hectares of land			29	32				
	7. Groups managing productive infrastructure formed/strengthened						Key data on membership will be kept by the scheme committee, on developed area by the irrigation officer. Whoever carries out/organizes an activity (training) fills a form with key data on the results, to be entered in the appropriate monitoring register.		
	Groups managing productive infrastructure formed/strengthened			15					
	8. Groups managing productive infrastructure with women in leadership positions						Key data on membership will be kept by the scheme committee, on developed area by the irrigation officer. Whoever carries out/organizes an activity (training) fills a form with key data on the results, to be entered in the appropriate monitoring register.		
	Groups managing productive infrastructure with women in leadership positions			5					
Output 2.1 Capacity to deliver extension services improved	1. SMSs and ADs trained in extension methodologies						Whoever carries out/organizes an activity (training) fills a form with key data on the results, to be entered in the appropriate monitoring register.		Sufficient qualified and committed extension workers recruited.
	SMSs and ADs trained in extension methodologies			270					
	2. Additional Agricultural Demonstrator (ADs) (Extension Agent) recruited and mobile.						Whoever carries out/organizes an activity (training) fills a form with key data on the results, to be entered in the appropriate monitoring register.		
	Additional ADs recruited and mobile.			10					
	3. Ratio of farmers per extension worker reduced (farmer/AD).						ADs submit data on clients		
	Ratio of farmers per extension worker reduced								

	4. Agro-dealers trained						Whoever carries out/organizes an activity (training) fills a form with key data on the results, to be entered in the appropriate monitoring register.			
	Agro-dealers trained			15						
	5. Village-based agents trained						Whoever carries out/organizes an activity (training) fills a form with key data on the results, to be entered in the appropriate monitoring register.			
	Village-based agents trained									
	6. People in groups managing productive infrastructure									
	People in groups managing productive infrastructure			15						
	7. Government officials and staff trained									
	Females									
	Government officials and staff trained (RIMS)			300						
	Males									
Output 2.2 Agricultural Service Centers constructed and equipped to provide stakeholder identified services	1. Agricultural Service Center (ASCs) established						ASC established means physical construction completed and management committee in place. ADs fill/update form for groups/associations/committees. M&E focal point reports on ASC-based enterprises.			GOB maintains a policy framework that provides effective incentives to entrepreneurs to invest in agricultural service provision. Farmers sufficiently participate in farmer clusters/organizations.
	ASCs established			15						
	2. Cluster management committees established/supported						ASC established means physical construction completed and management committee in place. ADs fill/update form for groups/associations/committees. M&E focal point reports on ASC-based enterprises.			
	Cluster management committees established/supported			18						
	3. Enterprises servicing smallholder farmers operating from ASCs						ASC established means physical construction completed and management committee in place. ADs fill/update form for groups/associations/committees. M&E focal point reports on ASC-based enterprises.			
	Enterprises servicing smallholder farmers operating from ASCs			15						

Outcome 2.3 Core agricultural institutional framework re-focused, and strengthened	1. Changes made to ISPAAD operations/services as a result of the ASSP-supported comprehensive review						Data from Land Boards the project works with.			Macro-economic policy framework remains receptive to concept of reducing subsidies to farmers.
	Changes made to ISPAAD operations/services as a result of the ASSP-supported comprehensive review									
	2. Farmers benefiting from new land allocations						Data from Land Boards the project works with.			
	Farmers benefiting from new land allocations			29						
Output 3.1 Effective project administration and coordination	1. Key consultative stakeholder workshops held						Project Management Team (PMT) records and project accounts.			
	Key consultative stakeholder workshops held			5						
	2. Study and survey reports produced						Project Management Team (PMT) records and project accounts.			
	Study and survey reports produced			5						
	3. Project expenditure compared to budgets						Project Management Team (PMT) records and project accounts.			
	Project expenditure compared to budgets			5						
	4. AWPBs, progress and audit reports submitted on time						Project Management Team (PMT) records and project accounts.			
	AWPBs, progress and audit reports submitted on time			10						

Botswana

Agricultural Services Support Project

Supervision Report

Appendix 1: Financial: actual financial performance; by financier by component and disbursements by category

Mission Dates: 14th – 25th August 2018

Document Date: 30/10/2018

Project No. 1100001546

Report No. 4875-BW

East and Southern Africa Division
Programme Management Department

Appendix 2: Financial: Actual financial performance by financier; by component and disbursements by category

Table 2A: Financial performance by financier

Financier	Appraisal (USD '000)	Disbursements (USD '000)	Per cent disbursed
IFAD loan	4,040	1,207	30%
IFAD grant	1,610	544	34%
Beneficiaries	290	-	0%
Government	19,080	7,482	39%
Total	25,020	9,233	37%

Table 2B: Financial performance by financier by component (USD '000)

Component	IFAD loan			IFAD grant			Government			Beneficiaries			Total		
	Appraisal	Actual	%	Appraisal	Actual	%	Appraisal	Actual	%	Appraisal	Actual	%	Appraisal	Actual	%
Sustainable agricultural production	1,620	557	34	1,098	331	30	3,056	1,060	35	290	-	-	6,064	1,948	32
Enabling environment for Smallholder Agriculture	2,013	236	12	512	106	21	14,460	5,219	36	-	-	-	16,985	5,561	32
Project Management	407	405	100	-	-	-	1,564	1,203	77	-	-	-	1,971	1,608	82
Total	4,040	1,198	30	1,610	437	27	19,080	7,482	39	290	-	-	25,020	9,117	36%

Table 2C: IFAD loan disbursements (SDR, as at 31/07/2018)

Category	Category description	Original Allocation	Revised Allocation	Disbursement	W/A pending	Balance	Per cent disbursed
I	Vehicles, equipment and materials	950,000.00	375,000.00	173,815.96	0.00	201,184.04	46.35%
II	Works	0.00	650,000.00	230,563.33	0.00	419,436.67	35.47%
III (b)	Technical support – on farm research studies for all other sub components	530,000.00	530,000.00	392,276.33	0.00	137,723.67	74.01%
IV	Improved Extension outreach	970,000.00	970,000.00	44,970.51	0.00	925,029.49	4.63%
	Un allocated	150,000.00	75,000.00	0.00	0.00	75,000.00	0%
	Initial deposit	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0%
Total		2,600,000.00	2,600,000.00	841,626.13	0.00	1,758,373.87	32.37%

Figure 1: IFAD loan/grant disbursement, comparisons between original and revised allocations and actual disbursement

Category	Category Description	Original Allocation	Revised Allocation	Disbursement	Balance	Percentage Disbursed
1	Vehicles, equipment and materials	1,095,000.00	420,000.00	205,971.14	214,028.86	49.04%
2	Civil works for irrigation pilot schemes	210,000.00	1,035,000.00	383,455.43	651,544.57	37.04%
3 (a)	Technical support – on farm research studies for pilot scheme for smallholder waste water irrigation	530,000.00	530,000.00	392,276.33	137,723.67	74.01%
3 (b)	Technical support – on farm research studies for pilot scheme for smallholder waste water irrigation	365,000.00	365,000.00	179,278.52	185,721.48	49.12%
4	Improved Extension outreach	1,200,000.00	1,200,000.00	54,251.71	1,145,748.29	4.52%
	Unallocated	225,000.00	75,000.00	0.00	75,000.00	0.00%
	Initial Deposit	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
	Start- up costs	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00%
Total		3,625,000.00	3,625,000.00	1,215,233.13	2,409,766.87	33.52%

Botswana

Agricultural Services Support Project

Supervision Report

Appendix 2: Physical progress measured against AWP&B

Mission Dates: 14th – 25th August 2018
Document Date: 30/10/2018
Project No. 1100001546
Report No. 4875-BW

East and Southern Africa Division
Programme Management Department

Appendix 1: Physical progress measured against AWP&B

		Period ending August 2018			Cummulative			Remarks/Comments
Component/Outputs / Activities	Unit	AWPB Target	Actual	% AWPB	Target	Actual	%Cumm.	
Component 1: Sustainable Agricultural Production								
Output 1.1 Efficient agricultural modernization services available to small holder farmers								
Government-owned tractors/implements sold or leased to private machinery contractors	Number				62	0	0%	A decision was taken during implementation not to lease out the ISPAAD tractors to private contractors
Private machinery contractors trained	Number of People				100	129	129%	The machinery contractors are within the community and are contracted by the farmers
Private machinery contractors provided with Business Development Services	Number of People				100	0	0%	This activity was not undertaken due to limited budget
Private machinery operators accredited	Number of People				100	0	0%	No contractors trained and accredited due to budget constraints
Demonstrations with improved mechanized agricultural equipment	Number				108	621	575%	The demonstrations were set up at each of the 20 farmers targeted per sub district including at the Lead farmers farms
Demonstrations with improved animal-drawn agricultural implements	Number				108	0	0%	Animal drawn implements but demonstration will be undertaken by the respective districts in due course

Component/Outputs / Activities	Unit	Period ending August 2018			Cumulative			Remarks/Comments
		AWPB Target	Actual	% AWPB	Target	Actual	%Cumm.	
Mechanization officers trained on agricultural equipment and farm operations (person)	Number of People				10	10	100%	The trained officers are drawn from the Agricultural Engineering Departments from the 10 districts
Private contractors trained on agricultural equipment and farm operations	Number of People				200	200	100%	Operators hired by the tractor owners were also trained by the project
Output 1.2: Improved rain fed agricultural practices adapted, tested and demonstrated								
Adaptive research trial sites established	Number				5	0	0%	Not done. These activities were deferred due to limited budget
Adaptive research trials conducted	Number				5	0	0%	Not done. These activities were deferred due to limited budget
Adaptive research reports produced	Number				5	0	0%	Not done. These activities were deferred due to limited budget
SMSs, ADs and lead farmers trained in improved crop production technologies	Person				171	171	100%	Training done for ToT for 90 ADs and 81 lead farmers from the 27 sub districts
Demonstration plots established in the project area	Number				108	621	575%	These were done at the lead farmers' fields and the targeted farmers per sub districts
Farmers exposed to improved crop production methods at demonstration plots	person				2700	15525	575%	An average of 25 farmers were exposed to improved crop production methods from each of the demonstration sites
Farmers trained in conservation agriculture	Person				540	5 017	995.4%	More farmers were reached through the extension services

		Period ending August 2018			Cummulative			Remarks/Comments
Component/Outputs / Activities	Unit	AWPB Target	Actual	% AWPB	Target	Actual	%Cumm.	
Output 1.3: Pilot scheme for smallholder wastewater irrigation established								
Smallholder farmers to whom land in the pilot scheme has been allocated	persons				29	32	110.3%	
Developed irrigable area in the irrigation scheme	ha				29	0	0%	Scheme not completed
Complete construction of Palapye Irrigation scheme		1	0	0%				Construction of the scheme is ongoing (95% completion)
De-sludging of ponds		1	0	0%				Activity is ongoing
Procurement and Installation of Ultra filtration unit for the irrigation scheme		1	0	0%				Tender for the unit cancelled
Farmers trained in irrigated crop production	person				29	32	110.3%	
Farmers trained post-harvest handling / marketing of irrigated crops	person				29	32	110.3%	
Farmland under water related infrastructure constructed/rehabilitated	ha				29	0	0%	Construction of the scheme not yet completed. So farmers are not yet doing cultivation in the irrigation scheme
Component: 2. Enabling Environment for Smallholder Agriculture								

		Period ending August 2018			Cummulative			Remarks/Comments
Component/Outputs / Activities	Unit	AWPB Target	Actual	% AWPB	Target	Actual	%Cumm.	
Output 2.1: Capacity to deliver extension services Improved								
SMSs and ADs trained in extension methodologies	persons				270	360	33.3%	270 Extension officers from 27 sub districts and 90 trained on FFS methodology. So far 5 FFS have been established
Additional ADs recruited and mobile	Persons	10	0	0%	10	0	0%	This was not done because of budgetary constraints
DSA to support extension officers on CA up scaling	Officers	270	270	100%				270 extension staff supported with DSA to monitor project activities
Agro-dealers trained.	Number of persons	0	0	0%	15	0	0%	Not done Because the ASCs were completed late
Output 2.2 Agricultural Service Centres constructed and equipped to provide stakeholder identified services								
ASCs established	Number	3	0	0%	15	4	26.7%	4 ASCs completed to date, at Jwaneng, Tonota , Parakarungu and Sefhare.
Completion of 3 ASCs (Sefhare, Mmathethe,Gumare) ²	ASCs	3	1	33%				One ASC completed at Sefhare. 1 ASC nearing completion at Mmathethe (90%) and one due for cancellation- non performing contract in Gumare (32%)

² Civil works

Component/Outputs / Activities	Unit	Period ending August 2018			Cummulative			Remarks/Comments
		AWPB Target	Actual	% AWPB	Target	Actual	%Cumm.	
Cluster management committees established/supported	Number				18	4	22%	Clusters formed around the Jwaneng ASC.
Enterprises servicing smallholder farmers operating from ASCs	Number	3	1	33%	15	3	20%	BAMB and Agric Fountain operating two of the completed ASCs. The third ASC at Sefhare is completed but operations by BAMB due to commence
Output 2.3: Core agricultural institutional framework re-focused and strengthened								
Changes made to ISPAAD operations/services as a result of the ASSP- supported comprehensive review	Number				1	0	0%	Not done, the linkages between the two, this project and programme were never done. The review is yet to be done as the recruitment of the consultant to undertake the review is still at procurement stage
Farmers benefitting from new land allocations	Person				29	32	110.3%	Farmers allocated in the irrigation scheme
Component 3. Project Management								
Output 3.1 Effective project administration and coordination								
Key consultative stakeholder workshops held	Number	0	0	0%	10	10	100%	Done prior to construction of the 3 service centers
Facilitate project review meetings	Meeting	4	1	25%				One meeting held with Project Focal Persons in August 2018
IFAD Thematic Workshops (KM, Planning, M&E, Irrigation, Nutrition)	Workshops	4	1	25%				1 workshop on mainstreaming nutrition in Agriculture was held in Maun.

Republic of Botswana
Agricultural Services Support Project (ASSP)
Supervision Report: Mission Dates: 14th – 25th August 2018

Component/Outputs / Activities	Unit	Period ending August 2018			Cumulative			Remarks/Comments
		AWPB Target	Actual	% AWPB	Target	Actual	%Cumm.	
Hold Completion Workshop	Workshop	1	0	0%				Workshop planned for Mid-September 2018
Study and survey reports produced	Number	1	1	100%	5	1	20%	1 Annual Outcome Survey done
End of project evaluation (EOP)	Number	1	0	0%				Draft report currently under review
Project Completion Report	Number	1	0	0%				First draft yet to be produced
AWPBs, progress and audit reports submitted on time	Number				10	10	100%	Done annually for the past five years

Botswana

Agricultural Services Support Project

Supervision Report

Appendix 3: Compliance with legal covenants: status of implementation

Mission Dates: 14th – 25th August 2018
Document Date: 30/10/2018
Project No. 1100001546
Report No. 4875-BW

East and Southern Africa Division
Programme Management Department

Appendix 3: Compliance with legal covenants: Status of implementation

Section	Covenant	Target/Action Due Date	Compliance Status/Date	Remarks
Section	Covenant	Target/Action Due Date	Compliance Status/Date	Remarks
Section 4.02	PCU to open and maintain a Project Account (in USD); IFAD to make an initial deposit equivalent to USD 393,000	12 February, 2012		Project account was not opened as GoB opted to use and monitor funds by ledgers in the GoB accounting system (GABS)
Section 4.02	No withdrawal to be made from loan and grant until the first AWPB has been approved by the fund and other conditions met	February, 2012	Complied	First AWPB was approved in May, 2012
Section 4.03	Procurement of goods, works and services carried out in accordance with the procedures laid down in Schedule 3	Continuous	Complied	Being monitored throughout implementation. To note is that procurements have been characterised by significant delays
Section 4.04	Insurance of vehicles, equipment and civil works financed from the loan proceeds to be consistent with sound commercial practice.	Continuous	Complied	
Section 4.05, section 11.10(b)	Audit report submitted to IFAD.	30 September, every year	Partially complied	Audit report for the year 2016/17 was submitted on 20 October, 2017; three weeks later than the due date. 2017/18 audit report submission is not yet due.
Section 4.06	Progress reports to be submitted to IFAD on a quarterly basis.		Not compliant	Reports have only been availed during missions and annually.
Schedule 4, para 7	AWPB to be submitted to the Fund, for its review and comments	31 January each year	Complied	
Schedule 4, para 8(a)	A Mid-Term Review (MTR) to be carried out jointly by the Borrower and IFAD.	30 September, 2014	Complied	