

Tanzania: Agricultural and Environmental Management Project

Item	Assessment Remarks	Rating
Country & Project Name	Tanzania: Agricultural and Environmental Management Project	
Loan No.:	433-TZ	
Project Id.:	1006	
Board Date	04/12/1996	
Effectiveness date	10/09/1997	
Closing date	31/12/2004	
Total Project Cost USD(M)	24.12M	
IFAD loan USD (M)	13.39M	
Cofinanciers if any	BSF (Belgian Survival Fund) grant (2.5M), OPEC parallel loan (4.1M)	
Implementing Agency	PM's Office, Regional Admin & Local Gov.	
Principal Components	1. Agriculture Dev. 2. Env. Management. 3. Infrastructure. 4. Project Facilitation & M&E.	
Project Performance		
Design	Fundamental objective to redress long run decline in agricultural. production and productivity and increased environment. The degradation was partly as a result of refugee inflow (600,000 - 40% of pop) through a conventional four component government implemented rural development project set in a devolved and devolving system of public administration. No obvious design innovations or special provision for flexibility or novel partnerships. Not clear whether refugees are part of the beneficiary population. This was a relatively large scale intervention covering five full districts. IFAD's comparative advantage at this level unclear.	5
Implementation	Was responsive to changing circumstances especially increased devolution. Changes were made inter alia in methods of service delivery and technology. There was no evidence that M&E did more than monitor inputs. But there was good staffing continuity in supervision. Financial management, procurement and compliance with loan covenants good.	5
Relevance	The project was clearly relevant to the pressing needs of the Kagera region.	5
Effectiveness	1. Agriculture Dev: Strong assertions (some with numbers from unidentified sources) that this component highly successful (IPM/ integrated pest management, production, yields, technology adoption and seed and plant material production). Credit system for inputs and equipment weak doubtful viability. 2. Environmental Management. Inadequate performance - only community forestry and wood stoves (50% achievement) worthy of note. Water hyacinth control on lake reported effective. Other dimensions: soil conservation, reduced wood fuel use largely ineffective. 3. Infrastructure. Among public health awareness, disease control (especially malaria) and health staff training only disease control effective (impregnated mosquito nets). Effective provision of drinking water supplies to about 5% of population using diverse technologies. Road rehabilitation to improve wet season access over achieved with satisfactory construction quality. Maintenance training provided.4. Project Facilitation & M&E. District implementation capacity improved, participation enhanced. M&E staff trained but subsequently many transferred. Uncertain performance.	5
Efficiency	IRR/ internal rate of return 19% at appraisal. 15% at interim evaluation. Basis of calculation not explained.	5
Partner Performance		
Partner Perf. & Quality	IFAD performance satisfactory although design did not pay enough attention to refugee issue and complexities of links to other donor actions. UNOPS played a consistent and supportive role. BSF and OPEC took a hands off but supportive, problem solving position. Overall GOT performance was satisfactory. Release of funds was tardy, but work of DA was very good.	IFAD=5, UNOPS=5, BSF=5, OPEC=5, GOT=5
Rural poverty impact		
Physical Assets	Direct impact on some assets e.g. trees and farm equipment. Indirect impact through infrastructure. Both had positive impact on wealth. Degree of change unquantified.	4
Food Security	PCR speculates on probability of positive impact, stating that many became self-sufficient in food, but cites no solid evidence.	3
Environment	Positive but small impact mainly through community forestry and water hyacinth control.	2

Item	Assessment Remarks	Rating
Country & Project Name	Tanzania: Agricultural and Environmental Management Project	
Human Assets	Technical farming skills increased and there were improvements in potable water supplies, reductions in disease and gains in public health. Impact positive but of uncertain scale.	5
Soc. Cap. & Emp.	Small but positive impact through farmer groups e.g. IPM and seed producers.	2
Ag. Productivity	PCR asserts that there were widespread crop yield increases. But no data provided.	3
Inst. & Serv.	Project had modest positive effects on district government capacity. Uncertain sustainability.	3
Financial Assets	No direct impact.	1
Markets	No identified impact.	1
Rural Poverty	In the aggregate probably a small but positive impact on poverty. Mostly, the project did not reach the poorest.	4
Overarching factors		
Targeting	Primary 30-40 % of the population are not food self-sufficient and secondary 40-50% of the population do not have a marketable surplus i.e. 70-90 per cent of population. There was no targeting of people. It needed only a simple and geographical targeting of degraded region with severe poverty and many refugees.	5
Gender	Not expressly targeted. Project provided some gender awareness training funded from an IFAD regional grant. Impact negligible.	1
Sustainability	Some evidence of partial internalisation of skills, training and participation among beneficiaries. But, sustained funding of project activities doubtful thus compromising overall project sustainability.	3
Innov, Rep & Scaling	Project did not generate innovations, but brought novel aspects of technology, organisation and implementation to the Kagera region.	4
Overall Performance	The project seemingly achieved several of its main objectives, but did not reach the poorest. It was not very novel but did lay useful foundations for future development especially by strengthening the district administration. Its sustainability is uncertain and impact in many dimensions modest or negligible. Its impact on refugees (a key part of project rationale) is unclear.	4
Contribution to IFAD Strategic Objectives	Project contributed to strategic objectives 1 and 2 but not three. Strongest contribution was probably to SO 2 by changing farming technology and practices.	SO1=3, SO2=4
Contribution to MDG's	Measurable contributions to MDG's 1, 6, and 7.	MDG1=4, MDG6=3, MDG7=4
PCR Quality		
Scope	A well drafted and comprehensive PCR. Although written in 2004 it very largely covers all requirements of 2006 guidelines. Too long and a little repetitive.	5
Quality	PCR team led by key supervising consultant supported by M&E staff. PCR has comprehensive measurement of inputs but no solid or convincing evidence on outputs. Attribution of impacts asserted not demonstrated. In general the PCR proceeds from proposition to plausible assertion omitting evidence.	2
Lessons	Apart from some small project and country specific lessons the PCR highlights the important aspect of devoting adequate time and resources to project preparation and design and to the need to build in actions to render project achievements sustainable.	5