

**GOODBYE TO PROJECTS?  
THE INSTITUTIONAL IMPACTS OF A LIVELIHOOD APPROACH ON  
DEVELOPMENT INTERVENTIONS**

**RESEARCH PROJECT NO. R7908**

**DEPARTMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

**WORKING PAPER SERIES**

Paper No 9

**A livelihoods-grounded audit of the  
Magu District Livelihood and Food  
Security Project in Tanzania**

By Faustin Kamuzora  
August 2003

---

**ISBN: 1 898828 52 0**

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

## **BACKGROUND TO PROJECT AND WORKING PAPER SERIES**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**This paper ‘A livelihoods-grounded audit of the Magu District Livelihoods and Food Security Project’ is the ninth in the series of project working papers.**

---

<sup>1</sup> Formerly Development and Project Planning Centre (DPPC)

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

## **THE AUTHOR**

**Faustin Kamuzora is a Lecturer at Mzumbe University in Tanzania.**

## **PROJECT WORKING PAPERS TO DATE**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## ***TABLE OF CONTENTS***

<b>1. An SL-grounded audit approach</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>2. Magu District Livelihood and Food Security Project (MDLFSP)</b>	
2.1 Introduction to MDLFSP	<b>10</b>
2.2 Impact of MDLFSP	<b>13</b>
2.3 Poor people as focus	<b>17</b>
2.4 Participation	<b>17</b>
2.5 Partnership	<b>18</b>
2.6 Holistic approach	<b>19</b>
2.7 Policy and institutional links	<b>19</b>
2.8 Building on strengths	<b>19</b>
2.9 Dynamic and flexible	<b>20</b>
2.10 Accountability/responsiveness	<b>20</b>
2.11 Sustainability	<b>20</b>
2.12 Critical factors	<b>21</b>
<b>Appendix 2.1 People interviewed</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Appendix 2.2 References</b>	<b>25</b>

## 1.0 THE SL-GROUNDED AUDIT OF DEVELOPMENT INTERVENTIONS

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

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

### **Box 1. SLA principles defined by Carney (2002)**

Sustainable livelihoods approaches: Progress and possibilities for change, p14-15, London: Department for International Development

Normative principles:

**People-centred:** sustainable poverty elimination requires respect for human freedom and choice. People-rather than the resources, facilities or services they use- are the priority concern. This may mean supporting resource management or good governance, for example but the underlying motivation of supporting livelihoods should determine the shape and purpose of action.

**Empowering:** change should result in an amplified voice opportunities and well-being for the poor.

**Responsive and participatory:** poor people must be key actors in identifying and addressing livelihood priorities. Outsiders need processes that enable them to listen and respond to the poor.

**Sustainable:** there are four key dimensions to sustainability-economic, institutional, social and environmental sustainability. All are important-a balance must be found between them.

Operational principles:

**Multi-level and holistic:** micro-level activity and outcomes should inform the development of policy and an effective governance environment. Macro- and meso-level structures should support people to build on their strengths.

**Conducted in partnership:** partnerships can be formed with poor people and their organisations, as well as with public and private sector. Partnerships should be transparent agreements based upon shared goals.

**Disaggregated:** it is vital to understand how assets, vulnerabilities, voice and livelihood strategies differ between disadvantaged groups as well as between men and women in these groups. Stakeholder and gender analysis are key tools.

**Long-term and flexible:** poverty reduction requires long-term commitment and a flexible approach to providing support.

Each case study follows the structure detailed below:

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

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

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

### **Poor People as focus**

Do, or did, the objectives of the intervention include a mention of people and their livelihoods?

How central is this to the intervention's objectives?

How much were household livelihoods a focus during implementation?

### **Participation**

What type of participation was used at each stage of design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation?

How and when did this participation occur?

What incentives were there for people to participate?

### **Partnerships**

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

Who owned the project?

### **Holistic approach**

How holistic was the analysis used in design?

How does the plan for the intervention fit into the broader development plan?

How does the intervention coordinate with other development interventions in the area?

### **Policy and institutional links**

How integrated was the intervention with existing institutional structures?

What evidence is there that the intervention addressed linkages between policy at micro, meso and macro levels and across sectors?

### **Building on strengths**

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

### **Dynamic and flexible**

Did the objectives and activities of the intervention change to respond to a changing environment and/or demands?

What further interventions have arisen from the intervention? How did this take place?

### **Accountability/ responsiveness**

How were those implementing the intervention accountable to the public and intervention's beneficiaries?

Who reports to who and what about?

Do beneficiaries (micro) or partners (meso) have an influence on the intervention and how?

### **Sustainability**

#### Economic



Is the system able to be sustained financially?

Are the “technologies/services” economically viable for beneficiaries?

Social

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

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

Environmental

Are the technologies/services environmentally beneficial?

Are the systems (meso level) beneficial/neutral?

Institutionally

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

Will they continue to generate the outcomes envisaged?

**Critical factors**

What were the critical factors affecting the performance of this intervention?

**Comparing Cases**

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

## **2.0 A LIVELIHOODS-GROUNDED AUDIT OF MAGU DISTRICT LIVELIHOOD AND FOOD SECURITY PROJECT (MDLSP)**

---

### **2.1 Description of the intervention**

Magu district is one of the poorest districts in Tanzania. It is located in the North-Western part of Tanzania bordering Lake Victoria. Fifty percent of area is arable land while the remaining 50 percent is pastoral land (30%) and water is 20%. The district had been experiencing persistent unfavourable weather conditions. Since the major sources of livelihood in the district are farming and animal husbandry (accounting for over 90 percent), livelihood insecurity increased due to bad weather. The annual district rainfall is about 600 to 800 millimetres. The rainfall pattern is unreliable and inadequate for crops such as maize. Another production problem in the district is declining soil fertility due to factors such as overgrazing, poor farming methods, and population growth. These problems have collectively resulted in marginalising further the livelihoods of residents through declining food and cash crop production. Poor management of Cooperatives is another problem, which aggravated problems in agricultural production, particularly in accessing appropriate agricultural inputs and marketing of agricultural produce.

Efforts to promote income generation activities and other divestment coping strategies were believed to have been undermined by inadequate access to credit, along with inadequate business entrepreneurial skills among the target population particularly the women in Magu District. It is this economic background that compelled CARE International (Tanzania) to undertake a Rapid Food and Livelihood Security Assessment (RFLSA) in 1995 to determine the extent of vulnerability in the Lake Zone (comprising of Mara, Shinyanga and Mwanza regions).

The Rapid Livelihood Security Assessment (RLSA) is a major tool for the collection and analysis of information, and also it is means of operationalizing a Household Livelihood Security (HLS) approach. The main purpose of these participatory assessments is to understand the nature of livelihood strategies of different categories of households (social differentiation), their levels of livelihood security, and the principal constraints and opportunities to address through programming. This information is also disaggregated by gender and age. Methods used often focus on visualising information, with community members involved in documenting as much as possible. Outputs from such assessments include the identification of risk factors facing households, key location specific criteria for differentiating different wealth categories of households, and identification of key leverage points and opportunities to pursue in future programming.

The RLSA confirmed the widespread of livelihood insecurity in the rural areas of the Lake Zone such as Magu. The assessment also confirmed the social, economic and physical factors that were pinpointed as the most critical constraints to improved livelihood security in the area. Furthermore, the assessment recommended interventions that were designed to improve access to agricultural technologies, improve agricultural input supply mechanisms, strengthen community-based groups and self-help capacity, and in particular, women's self-help groups in order to improve livelihood security in chosen project areas.

Hence, the MDLSP was introduced in Magu district to address the causes of livelihood insecurity identified by the RFLSA. Initially, five wards of Magu, with a total of 5,000

vulnerable family households were targeted. Special attention was to be paid to women-headed households<sup>2</sup>.

According to various project documents CARE International in Tanzania undertook implementation of the Magu District Livelihood Security in Magu District of Mwanza Region since January 1997. The MDLSP was concluded in December 2000.

The intervention according to the project document had the following objectives:

**Project Final Goal:** to increase the livelihood security of vulnerable households in Magu district, particularly those households headed by women, by providing training and assistance primarily to women to increase the output and/or income which households derive from agricultural activities managed or undertaken by women.

Poor households are defined as households not owning land or owning less than 2 acres and have no livestock.

**Intermediate Goal 1:** By December, 2000, 5000 vulnerable households in five wards of Magu district would have demonstrated increased access to and use of agricultural inputs, including seeds, fertilizers, pesticides, tools and implements.

**Intermediate Goal 2:** By December, 2000, 5000 vulnerable households would have adopted new or improved agricultural technologies, such as improved seeds, appropriate low-cost equipment, Integrated Pest Management (IPM), Integrated Plant Nutrition Management (IPNM), improved storage or processing technologies.

**Intermediate Goal 3:** By December, 2000, 2000 vulnerable households would have increased their savings investments in savings/credit societies and will have better access to sources of capital from these societies or CBO-managed revolving loan funds.

### ***Activities***

The project carried out quite a number of activities since its inception in 1996. Some of these activities include creating linkages with other organisations such as Ukirigulu Zonal Agricultural Research and Training Institute, implement manufacturers, and other research institutions such as Sokoine University of Agriculture. Similarly, the project worked with villagers in the project areas on various development activities. Other activities included conducting studies on the district and on the project, such studies are baseline, mid-term review, quantitative and qualitative final reviews, and participatory learning and action training and survey.

### ***Stakeholders***

**At the district level:** Magu district council is charged with the responsibility of coordinating development activities of the district. Under the council, two departments were mostly involved. The Department of Agriculture and Livestock was the main collaborating agency for implementation of agricultural interventions and for sharing findings from the field. Similarly, the Department of Community Development, Women and Children Affairs was used to register all the community based groups (CBOs) and was also responsible for coordinating CBOs activities.

---

<sup>2</sup> The district had a relative high number of women-headed households due polygamy. When Cooperatives were well managed, up to early 1990s, cotton crop used to provide a good income to polygamous husbands, who could manage their families. With the mismanagement of Cooperatives, income from cotton declined as the marketing problems increased. As a result many husbands abandoned some of their families hence a high number of women-headed households.

At the regional level the project collaborated with:

- ◆ Treadle pump manufacturers such as Vitanda and VETA.
- ◆ The Ukiliguru Agricultural Research and Training Institute (ARTI) with whom the project had had a close working relationship throughout the first phase in areas of agricultural research and training.
- ◆ Maswa District Rural Development Program, which was implementing various activities that complement those of the project. The project had, on various occasions, sent farmers to this program for linkage on agricultural implement usage.
- ◆ TANESA (Tanzania-Netherlands Research in AIDS project), this project had approached the MDLSP to collaborate in implementing food security and HIV/AIDS research project in Magu. TANESA used the project as an entry point into the community to minimise the effects of HIV/AIDS on community food security.

The following Table 2.1 classifies the stakeholders that were involved in the implementation of MDLSP. Depending on the role in the project implementation, some stakeholders are classified as primary, key, and secondary.

***Beneficiaries***

Various beneficiaries are given in Table2.1 below. However, major beneficiaries were farmers, notably women and CBOs that were created.

**Table 2.1 Stakeholder Analysis**

<i>Name of stakeholder</i>	<i>Type of stakeholder</i>	<i>Role in intervention</i>
CARE Norge	Primary, Key, Contributors	Funding, monitoring
CARE Tanzania	Primary, Key, Implementer, Beneficiary	Project implementation, monitoring
Magu district council	Primary, Key, Beneficiary, Implementer, Contributor	Providing ward extension worker
Ukirigulu ARTI	Secondary, Beneficiary, Implementer	
Consultants	Secondary, Beneficiaries	Carrying various studies and training
Vitanda Manufacturers	Secondary, Implementer	Manufacturing implements
New NGOs	Secondary, Beneficiaries, Partner	Complementing MDLSP activities
Farmers	Primary, Key, Implementers /Beneficiaries	Learning and implementing project activities
CBOs	Primary, Key, Beneficiaries / Implementers	Learning and implementing project activities
VETA	Secondary, Implementer	Manufacturing implements
TANESA	Secondary, Implementer, Beneficiary, Partner	Research to minimize the effect of HIV AIDS on the community food security
Maswa District Rural Development Programme	Secondary, Beneficiary, Partner	Brings farmers to Magu to learn agricultural implements usage

### **Costs**

The project was funded through CARE Norge at a cost of 10,000,000Norwegian Kronors (NOK) (equivalent to USD 1.34million) of which NOK 8,000,000 was provided by NORAD.

### **2.2 Impact**

According to project support document (PSD), the project had two types of indicators, effect indicators as well as impact indicators that would be used to monitor and evaluate project performance. These are given below.

Example indicators for Intermediate Goal 1 were as follows:

#### 1. effect indicators

- Number of project contracts with merchants and IMAs

- Total sales of inputs by these merchants
- Total stocks repurchased by the project
- Number of farmers input marketing associations formed
- Participation rate of vulnerable households in the associations
- Quantities of inputs marketed in project areas
- Value of IMA working capital
- Number of merchants switching to commercial input suppliers.

## 2. impact indicators

- Increased agricultural production due to increased use of inputs
- Total value of agricultural production per household
- Number of months food stocks will last, by household
- Types and quantities of inputs used, by household type

Consultation of the baseline survey, midterm review and final review documents, demonstrates evidence that most of the above indicators were achieved. In achieving the set goals, the project has not only coordinated programmes of assistance to the farmers, but also has linked them with local technical expertise in the area (i.e. Ukirigulu ARTI) outside the district through study tours, seminars, facilitating attendance of a number of agricultural shows such as those held in Magu district (Nane Nane's "farmers Day" in 2000) and Arusha. Most interesting has been using of project trained "innovative farmers" or 'community resource persons' to independently conduct training and demonstrations to others, a thing that has facilitated a higher rate of diffusion of technologies. For instance, about 348 contacts of innovative farmers to experts, 1,675 contacts of experts to farmers, and 2,101 contacts of farmers to farmers have been achieved in the entire project area during phase I. Drought resistant crops, new and traditional enhanced methods crop cultivation, protection and processing techniques have been imparted to the target population.

The project has also facilitated the formation of community based organisations (CBOs) under the umbrella of inputs marketing associations (IMAs) that have also facilitated savings and credit mobilisation activities through raising levels of awareness, training in accounting management techniques of small-scale revolving loan funds, and initially, the disbursement of loanable funds.

Furthermore, the final evaluation report, specifically, mentions the following as constraints and achievement of the project:

Apart from the weather related constraints in the form of persistent drought and at times, floods during the project life, which disrupted the pace of putting into practice a number of acquired intervention skills; the MDLSP has also encountered a number of other implementation problems as follows:

- The initial period evolved a strategy for purchasing and distributing agricultural inputs and implements. This strategy assumed that the private merchants would retail the inputs, however, the strategy failed because the traders did not consider the items to be sufficiently profitable;

- The initial approach of using identified indigenous community based blacksmiths to repair and manufacture affordable farm implements and tools did not succeed since the project could not guarantee the availability of raw-materials and incentive funds to the blacksmiths;
- The disbursement of loanable funds to the CBOs through IMAs encountered problems associated with loan repayments and management of revolving services;
- Financial constraints of Ukirigulu ARTI and diminished staff levels of agricultural extension officers partly affected the pace of project implementation in a number of interventions since some activities heavily rely on such extension services support.

During the project's four years of implementation, tangible achievements were recorded. A detailed review of the baseline report and final evaluation reports clearly show the achievements when compared to the baseline benchmarks. About 85 and 29 percent of household respondents in project and control areas respectively expresses satisfaction with MDLSP activities. In fact the expressed preference for project continuation stood at 97.5 percent and 59.5 percent in project and control areas respectively.

The project performance sheet shows that about 74 percent of available 8,364 households (6189 households) in the project area have to some extent been reached by the project's intervention as monitored by field officers. Furthermore, 22 IMAs have been set up, with 313 CBOs under them with the later membership levels standing at 6,531 in the entire project area.

The project was able to achieve the outcomes/outputs due to various reasons:

- The project had a dedicated management (the manager and other officials) who were highly motivated in overseeing the implementation of the project activities.
- Careful recruitment of project officers who were drawn from all over the country based on merit (since the project perks were relatively high, many of the project officers left their former jobs).
- Dealing with the problems identified by the beneficiaries themselves (before carrying activities a PRA was conducted in each project village).
- The project was flexible and responsive to the need of the day. Some of the activities such as distribution of food for the World Food Programme, and collaboration with NGOs dealing with HIV/AIDS were not envisaged when the project was designed.

At a micro-level, the project strengthened the local institutions at the village level. Utilising the *ifogong'ho*, *masalakula* and *luganda* as entry points for various intervention facilitated the implementation of project activities.

The project built the capacity of members of these traditional groups as well as other individual project beneficiaries by conducting various training activities. The list of training activities that the project conducted to various beneficiaries at the village levels is as follows:

**Box 2.1: List of Training Activities by MDLSP to Farmers**

- i. CBO management
- ii. Constitution writing
- iii. Record keeping
- iv. Usage of improved seeds
- v. Training of trainers
- vi. Safe use of agricultural chemicals
- vii. Preparation of organic agricultural chemicals
- viii. Gender issues
- ix. Cookery for cakes from cassava flour
- x. Study tours (various farmers groups toured various places such as Ukirigulu ARI, Arusha National Farmers' Show, Musoma and Mwanza)
- xi. Participation as demonstrators at CARE pavilion during Farmers' Day (the pavilion has been emerging an overall back to back winner for the past three years)

At a meso level, the Tanzanian staff, employed by the project, have gone through a thorough training process with the aim of increasing their capacity to address issues of poverty.

A list of some of the training courses the project staff undertook is as follows:

**Box 2.2: List of Training Activities to Project Field Officers and Location of Training**

1. Safe use of chemicals –TPRI Arusha
2. Savings and Credit – SEMICA Arusha
3. Computer training –Mwanza (twice)
4. Skills to conduct PRA
5. Scouting – Ukiruguru
6. Seed multiplication –ARTI Ukirigulu
7. Farm Costing –Magu by Technology Transfer officer
8. Skills to Conduct Baseline Study
9. Gender issues – Mwanza
10. Organic farming – Nairobi
11. Book keeping -- Mwanza by a Nairobi based institute
12. CBO management -- Mwanza by a Nairobi based institute
13. Business management -- Mwanza by a Nairobi based institute
14. IPO (individual operation planning) – Tarime by a consultant brought by a county office

Field officers' skills to manage their work programmes were enhanced by the requirement of each of them having a well-planned working schedule. Also, skills to manage meetings were imparted by the requirement of each of the field officers to chair the monthly district meetings. Another role each field officer was required to play in the monthly meetings was to take and prepare minutes on a roster basis.

At an international (macro) level the project facilitated the understanding of people of Norway to the real situation in developing countries such as Tanzania. Officials from NORAD, CARE Norge and the Central Party of Norway came to visit the project regularly as a monitoring requirement.



### **Cost-effectiveness**

The cost of the project was Norwegian Kronors (NOK) 10,000,000 (approximately USD 1,340,000) of which NOK 8,000,000 was provided by NORAD. A rough estimate is that USD 160 was used per household or 20 USD per individual in four years of project life.

### **2.3 Poor People as focus**

MDLFSP was Livelihoods focused. It used a Household Security Livelihood (HLS) framework in designing the project. As indicated above, the aim of MDLFSP was to increase the livelihood security of vulnerable households in Magu district, particularly those households headed by women, by providing training and assistance primarily to women to increase the output and/or income which households derive from agricultural activities managed or undertaken by women.

The project placed household livelihoods issues as a priority during the implementation phase. When it was deemed necessary some flexibility in adding extra activities to enhance household livelihoods was exercised.

### **2.4 Participation**

This intervention was developed as a result of a Rapid Food and Livelihood Security Assessment that was conducted in 1995. According to various stakeholders that were interviewed, some of their views were considered in designing the intervention. For most of activities, interactive participation took place. Using PRAs beneficiaries participated in joint analysis, development of action plans and formation or strengthening of local institutions such as IMAs, *luganda* (groups that members help each other in farming and other economic activities), *ifogong'ho* (saving and credit groups), and *masalikula* (traditional dancing and/or choir groups).

At a micro level, in conducting a Rapid Food and Livelihood Security Assessment (RFLSA), a multidisciplinary team collected views of various stakeholders from the household to district levels. Participatory methods were employed in which members of selected villages were involved in the identification and prioritisation of problems and opportunities in their societies.

The groups classified targeted for inclusion as 'marginalised' included female-headed households. From the policy's point of view of sponsors such as NORAD, CARE Norge and Centre Party of Norway, the inclusion of these groups was given paramount importance.

At a meso level, government departments at the district level were involved in designing the project by being part of the Rapid Food and Livelihood Security Assessment team that visited various villages in the district. Also, after visiting the villages, there was a round table discussion and agreement was reached on identified problems. Private sector interests were not involved until later in the implementation of the project.

However, at a macro level, the national level institutions were not involved, with the exception of the Zonal research institute, the Agricultural Research Institute (Lake Zone). The international bilateral agency that was involved in designing the project was NORAD. Similarly, CARE Tanzania was the only international NGO that was involved. These international agents facilitated the process of designing, implementing and monitoring and evaluation the intervention.

## 2.5 Partnerships

Various organisations were involved in the design, implementation and evaluation of the project. CARE expected to collaborate directly with Ukiriguru ARTI, the Magu district agricultural department, commercial farm input suppliers, commercial food processors, others organisations involved in developing and testing new agricultural technologies, small-scale manufacturers of farm implements and community-based organisations with economic mandates in their locations.

At a micro level, the project has also facilitated the formation of community based organisations (CBOs) under the umbrella of inputs marketing associations (IMAs) that have also been involved in savings and credit mobilization activities through raising levels of awareness, training in accounting management techniques of small-scale revolving loan funds, and initially, disbursement of loanable funds.

The project promoted working with traditional groups in the forms of CBOs. These traditional groups have existed in Sukumaland for many generations. These are peer groups of members who come together for the purpose of assisting each other in various occasions. For example, *luganda* is a group that members help each other in farming and other economic activities. Similarly, *ifogong'ho* is a saving and credit group, and *masalikula* is a traditional dancing and/or choir group.

Some project's activities were carried out through these groups. For example, the success of IMAs has been due to the tradition of *ifogong'ho*. Similarly, the transfer of some agricultural technologies has been possible through utilising the *luganda* groups. The traditional dancing and/or choir groups have been recently used to educate the community on issues related to HIV/AIDS.

At a meso level, partnership of the project and the Ukirigulu ARI has resulted into transfer of agricultural technologies to farmers. Among the technologies the farmers are proud to acquire from the project are the application of organic pesticides, scouting for the appropriate level of cotton pests to spray and food processing. Food processing using sweet potatoes and cassava was also demonstrated. Various types of cake and other snacks are now prepared for both home consumption and selling.

At the local government level, the project utilised the staff (extension officers) that were working in the project areas. The extension officers who were intensively utilised were from the Agriculture and Livestock department, Community Development department as well as those from Natural Resources department.

For the first phase of the project, these departments were not involved in decision-making. This was the realm of the project management.

Since the project was executed at the district level, there was no partnership with national (macro level) agencies save the regional research institute.

The project was owned by CARE (Tanzania) who designed and implemented the project. However, as described above there were numerous stakeholders. Of these stakeholders, Magu district council and its lower branches (wards and villages) to a degree had some ownership of the project.

## 2.6 Holistic approach

Various livelihood strategies were given support. The intervention was implemented in one district only (Magu). However, the intervention involved several institutions in implementation (especially training and evaluation).

Similarly, the project had range of components including extension, marketing, savings, but each village decided what they wanted to do. Therefore, the project utilised a holistic approach considering development to be broad based and cross-sectoral.

At the beginning, there were few other development interventions in the district; however, towards the end of the first phase several other development interventions were being implemented in the district. A NGOs Forum was formed in which the project was one of the founder members.

## 2.7 Policy and institutional links

In the course of implementing the project there developed a conflict of policy between the project and the district council. The policy of the district authority is to encourage the farmers to switch to cultivating and consuming sorghum instead of maize. This is due to the climatic condition prevailing in the district. The district has an erratic rainfall pattern in some areas and the quantity of rainfall is about 600 mm per annum, which does not adequately support the cultivation of maize.

However, farmers prefer maize to sorghum and the project supported the cultivation of maize. Maize is a food crop of high social status, but according to the district agricultural and livestock development officer the varieties that were supported by the project were considered unsuitable. His sentiments were “CARE advocated growth of Kilima/TMV-1 varieties. These are just unsuitable in many parts of the district. Kito and Katumani varieties would be more ideal.” In this case an effective partnership between the project and district agricultural and livestock development office was needed. This effective partnership could have benefited the targeted beneficiaries by engaging Ukirigulu ARTI to produce a maize variety that could be farmed in the Magu agro-climatic zone.

## 2.8 Building on strengths

At a micro level, the project strengthened the local institutions at the village level. Utilising the *ifogong’ho*, *masalakula* and *luganda* as entry points for various intervention facilitated the implementation of project activities.

The project built the capacity of members of these traditional groups as well as other individual project beneficiaries by conducting various training activities. The list of training activities that the project conducted to various beneficiaries at the village levels is seen in Box 2. 1 above.

At a meso level, the Tanzanian staff employed under the project have gone through a thorough training process so that their capacity to address issues of poverty has been raised (see Box 2.2 above).

At the district level, there was a general feeling of alienation from the project activities. At the inception the project created an administrative structure that was different from the existing one. The project manager was an overall decision maker of all project activities in the district. However, when the project began, the project management created a liaison

officer position from the department of Agriculture and Livestock. An officer was appointed and shifted to the project office. This officer did not stay long before returning to her former office. She complained that she was being sidelined at her 'new' office. After this incident no extra efforts were made to harmonise the situation until the end of the project in December 2000 when an NGO- Forum was created where all NGOs operating in the district meet to report to the district official on their activities.

### **2.9 Dynamic and flexible**

The objectives and activities of the intervention changed to respond to a changing environment and /or demand. Examples of the interventions that arose out of this flexibility include the provision of education on HIV/AIDS. In the original project support document this was not envisaged. However, the reality on the ground and in joining the efforts of the nation and other international development agencies, the project initiated HIV/AIDS intervention in partnership with TANESA. More flexibility was demonstrated when the project was used by World Food Programme to distributed 900 tonnes of food in 1999 in Mwanza region in order to mitigate the effects of famine that hit the region. It may also be argued that although the project demonstrated flexibility, it may perhaps have been diversifying its activities too widely.

### **2.10 Accountability/ responsiveness**

Project monitoring was quite participatory; farmers were trained in record keeping. Also, the project designed quite a number of different forms (48) that were distributed to various stakeholders. These stakeholders (farmers, IMA leaders and other CBOs) would fill in the forms and submit them to CARE field officers designated to each ward where the project was operating. Field officers would compile the reports and submit them to the district office.

In each ward, the project placed one field officer who would work in coordination with the staff of the district extension service and community development department. This team had the responsibility of implementing project activities, and their work was closely integrated with researchers at Ukiriguru ARTI and other partners. The team was also responsible for working with women to identify appropriate extension interventions that address women's needs. The project field staff had the primary responsibility of forming of community-based groups, both for input marketing and for savings and credit activities. These teams were supported technically by the coordinators of each project component at district project office.

At the district (meso) level, the project management compiled reports to be sent to CARE Dar es Salaam country office. The country office forwarded project reports to NORAD and CARE Norge in Norway.

In the first phase of the project, the district authorities (central as well as local government) did not take part in the decisions to change the direction or focus of intervention.

### **2.11 Sustainability**

#### **Economic**

Introduction of appropriate agricultural practices such as treadle irrigation machines and use of organic pesticides enhance the potential economic sustainability of agriculture. These are appropriate and profitable technologies that had been adopted by farmers. The project cost of around USD 1.34 million is very substantial and by its design and method

of implementation the intervention activities will not be economically sustainable within existing resource streams.

### **Social**

Members of community who were excluded in decision making such as female-headed households and women in general have been empowered. Also, use of community resource persons enhances social sustainability.

The project linked with existing local institutions with a view to increasing the social sustainability of the changes that it sought to bring.

### **Environmental**

The project promoted innovations which minimise negative environmental impacts. In addition, the on-going extension programme implemented by the project included messages pertaining to the proper packaging, storage, application and disposal of chemicals to further minimize negative impacts on human health and the environment. An example of which is the Integrated Pest Management (IPM) programme in cotton which was targeted at farmer groups and demonstrated on farmers' fields. The program included studies of biological agents especially predators, training of farmers in identification of important insects and pests, spraying time and methods of gaining optimum yields, and proper use of pesticides and sprayers. An innovation that is being praised by farmers is the use of organic pesticide that farmers were trained to prepare. The ingredients (pepper, tobacco leaves and soap foam) of the organic pesticide are available in the area at an affordable cost.

### **Institutional**

Despite failure in marketing of members' agricultural produce, IMAs' sustainability seem to be assured since they are providing the service which is demanded in the communities. Moreover, the sustainability emanates from the fact that IMAs are complementing the functions of traditional groups ie *ifung'ong'o*.

However, a serious doubt of sustainability hinges on the type of extension system that has operated under the project. The project had employed field officers who were mainly diploma holders in community development or agricultural sciences. These field officers would coordinate all project activities in their respective wards. The project field officers would work with other extension staff employed by local government on various project activities. Now, the question of sustainability is that once these project field officers leave (on completion of the project) what will happen to the extension system that has been organised under the project. The mostly likely thing to happen is that each department (say agriculture, forestry, community development, etc) will revert into working in isolation as in non-project areas.

Even though the project facilitated the training of community resource persons-CRPs (para extensionists) without a unifying persons of all extension staff in a ward, these CRPs will have a relatively harder job of hopping from one extension officer to another while in need of some information to take to fellow farmers.

## **2.12 Critical factors**

### ***What were critical factors affecting the performance of this intervention?***

Careful choice of project staff was one key factor of high performance of the project. All staff were selected on competitive basis. The first manager was not a national and the rest of staff had previous experience from former employment.

Another critical factor for the success of the project was selection of beneficiaries. The Sukuma people are hardworking people, and coupled with the fact that there were other rural development projects in Magu, this made the commitment to the project by the beneficiaries of high order.

Similarly, the intervention involved farmers and CBOs in the selection of new techniques. This led to a higher adoption rate of the technologies that were disseminated by the project.

However the economic and institutional unsustainability of the project has not been adequately accounted for.

The project was designed using CARE's Household Security Livelihood framework. The project took a holistic view of agricultural production and food security. The project did create a range of partnerships with local NGOs and research organisations and attempted to strengthen links with local government extension work. Local farmers were involved in training and selection of methods.

However, the project suffers from a lack of attention to both the economic and institutional sustainability of the system that it established. Insufficient integration was achieved with existing funding streams, policy and personnel.

Conducting Rapid Food and Livelihood Security Assessment (RFLSA) in 1995 before designing the project involved views of all major stakeholders in the district. This enabled the project to address real issues of Magu district's needs not as development experts would have done.

In the PSD the procedure of monitoring and evaluation is not specifically detailed, however, in the implementation phase the project produced a well-elaborated M&E system. At a village level the system was quite participatory.

As clearly explained by the project management, the first period of the project was a learning process. After conducting a mid-term review, some activities were modified to adjust to what beneficiaries felt were real needs. Secondly, the first phase of the project (1997-2000) was a learning ground that fed into the second phase of the project (2001-2005).

Before the advent of the project in the district, female-headed families did not have any voice in the Sukuma society. Through capacity building, by educating the project beneficiaries female-headed families, now have a voice. Also, the introduction of some agricultural technologies such as integrated soil management and integrated pest management, environmental sustainability has been enhanced.

The project's sustainability at the district level is questionable though. This is emanating from the fact that the management of the project decided to create a parallel structure. This resulted into alienation of the district leadership machinery. The district leadership was not happy with being kept in the dark as far as utilisation of project resources were concerned. Since the donors know that they are assisting the development of the district, the leaders think that it is proper that the government leadership be more informed on project activities.

Another disenchantment of the district government leadership to the project was premised on the type of staple food to promote. While the government leadership was promoting sorghum, the project promoted maize. Farmers prefer maize to sorghum, had there been a proper communication, a compromise could have been reached. Since the project has been cooperating with Ukirigulu ARTI, efforts to develop a variety of maize that fit the district climatic condition could be made.

**Appendix 2.1: List of Contact Persons and Organisations Interviewed**

<b>S/N.</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Sex</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Position/Title</b>
1	Gissela Banyenda	F	CARE	Field Officer
2	Dr. Mzee	M	Min. of Agriculture	District Agr. & Livest. Officer
3	Mr. Maarugu	M	District commission	District Commissioner
4	3 Mihayo	M	Magu District Council	District Planning Officer
5	Gitonga Mathenga	M	CARE Magu	First Manager of MDLSP
6	Mariam Abubakari	F	CARE Magu	Field Officer
7	Joyce Kulwa	F	CARE Magu	Field officer
8	Mr. Mkelemi	M	CARE Magu	Economic Development Officer
9	Mr. Ntarishwa Niarira	M	CARE Magu	Field Officer
10	Mama Penina	F	Tuinue Group	Farmer and Community Resource Person (CRP)
11	Haron Kumba Peleka	M	Secretary of IMA	Farmer
12	Asteria Clement	F	Tegemeo Group	Farmer and Group Treasurer
13	Soteli Katemi	M	Bugatu Village	Farmer and CRP
14	James Nyabuso	M	Lumeji	IMA Chairman
15	Inger Fadil	F	CARE Norge	Programme Officer
16	Center Party representative	M	Centre Party of Norway	Representative
17	Centre Party Representative	F	Centre Party of Norway	Representative
18	Mrs. Soteli	F	Bugatu Village	CBO member
19	Medadi Bernado	M	Mwambulenga village	Farmer
20	Ruth Benjamin	F	Igalukilo village	Farmer
21	Julius Mayunga	M	Mwamagigisi village	Farmer
22	Martha Shelembi	F	Mwambanza village	Farmer
23	Astranaout Bagile	F	Care Tz Headquarters	Programme Officer
24	Emmanuel Ndaki	M	Care Magu	Project Manager



## **2.2 References**

- Anon (1993). Evaluation of Development Assistance. Royal Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Norway.
- Bisanda, S. (2001). Final Qualitative Evaluation of Magu District Livelihood Security Project. CARE Tanzania.
- CARE INTERNATIONAL IN TANZANIA:Magu District Livelihood Security Project PHASE II. (MAGU II) Project Document, 1997
- CARE INTERNATIONAL IN TANZANIA:Magu District Livelihood Security Project PHASE II. (MAGU II) Project Document, 2001
- Howlett, D and J. Nagu (1997). Agricultural Project Planning in Tanzania.
- LZARDI (2001). Magu District Livelihood Security Project. Participatory Learning and Action and Survey Report. A Consultancy Report.
- Rutahakana, R and D. Maxwell (1997). Urban Livelihood Security Assessment: Design, Background, Strategy, Data Collection and Analysis Methodology. Care Tanzania.
- Wamara, F. M. (1998). Magu District Livelihood Security Project. Mid-term Survey Report, Phase I. CARE Tanzania.
- Wamara, F. M. (2000). Magu District Livelihood Security Project. Final Evaluation Report, Phase I. CARE Tanzania.