

Document:	EB 2016/117/R.11
Agenda:	8(c)
Date:	23 March 2016
Distribution:	Public
Original:	English

E



United Republic of Tanzania

Country strategic opportunities programme

Note to Executive Board representatives

Technical questions:

Francisco Pichon  
Country Director  
East and Southern Africa Division  
Tel.: +255 753 150745  
e-mail: f.pichon@ifad.org

Focal points:

Dispatch of documentation:

Alessandra Zusi Bergés  
Officer-in-Charge  
Governing Bodies Office  
Tel.: +39 06 5459 2092  
e-mail: gb\_office@ifad.org

Executive Board —117<sup>th</sup> Session  
Rome, 13-14 April 2016

---

For: Review

## Contents

Abbreviations and acronyms	ii
Map of IFAD-funded operations in the country	iii
Executive summary	iv
I. Introduction	1
II. Country diagnosis	1
A. Economic, agricultural and rural poverty context	1
B. Key challenges, policy, strategy and institutional context and IFAD's response	3
III. Previous lessons and results	4
A. Past results, impact and performance	4
B. Lessons learned	5
IV. Strategic objectives	6
A. IFAD's comparative advantage at country level	6
B. Strategic objectives	6
C. Lending and non-lending priorities	7
V. Sustainable results	8
A. Targeting and gender	8
B. Scaling up	9
C. Policy engagement	10
D. Natural resources and climate change	10
E. Nutrition-sensitive agriculture and rural development	10
VI. Successful delivery	10
A. Financing framework	10
B. Monitoring and evaluation	11
C. Knowledge management	11
D. Partnerships	12
E. Innovations	12
F. South-South and Triangular Cooperation	13

## Appendices

Appendix I:	Tanzania RB-COSOP results management framework (2016-2021)
Appendix II:	Completion report of previous RB-COSOP (2007–2014)
Appendix III:	Agreement at completion point of the last Country Programme Evaluation
Appendix IV:	RB-COSOP preparation process
Appendix V:	Key files
	Key file 1: Rural poverty and agricultural/rural sector issues
	Key file 2: Organizations matrix (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats analysis)
	Key file 3: Complementary donor initiative/partnership potential
	Key file 4: Target group identification, priority issues and potential response
Appendix VI:	Natural resources management and climate change adaptation: background, national policies and IFAD intervention strategies
Appendix VII:	Country at a glance
Appendix VIII:	Strengths and weaknesses of the National Poverty Reduction Strategy (Tanzania Mainland and Zanzibar)
Appendix IX:	Proposed concept notes

## Abbreviations and acronyms

ASDP	Agricultural Sector Development Programme (this acronym is used to refer to both a national sector-wide programme of the Government of Tanzania and an IFAD loan title)
ASDS	Agriculture Sector Development Strategy
ASSP	Agricultural Services Support Programme
AWG	agriculture working group (of the development partners in-country)
BASIC	Bagamoyo Sugar Infrastructure and Sustainable Community Development Programme
BRN	Big Results Now
CAHWs	community animal health workers
COSOP	country strategic opportunities programme
DADP	district agricultural development plan
FFS	farmer field school
HMDP	Highlands Milkshed Development Project
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IOE	Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD
KfW	KfW Development Bank
KM	knowledge management
LGA	local government authority
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MUVI	Rural Micro Small and Medium Enterprises Support Programme
4Ps	public-private-producer-partnership
PBAS	performance-based allocation system
NSGRP	National Strategy for Growth & Reduction of Poverty (also known by the Kiswahili acronyms of MKUKUTA for Mainland and MKUZA for Zanzibar)
SAGCOT	Southern Agricultural Growth Corridor of Tanzania
SO	strategic objective
ZASDP	Zanzibar Agricultural Sector Development Programme

# Map of IFAD-funded operations in the country

## United Republic of Tanzania

### IFAD-funded ongoing operations

#### COSOP



The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this map do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of IFAD concerning the delimitation of the frontiers or boundaries, or the authorities thereof.

Map compiled by IFAD | 04-01-2016

## Executive summary

1. The results-based country strategic opportunities programme (COSOP) for the United Republic of Tanzania (Mainland and Zanzibar) covers the period 2016-2021, encompassing two cycles of the performance-based allocation system (PBAS). Based on current PBAS scores, IFAD funds for the combined 2016-2021 period are estimated at US\$120 million.
2. The country strategy builds on: IFAD's self-assessment of country programme performance; the findings and recommendations of a country programme evaluation conducted in 2014-2015 by IFAD's Independent Office of Evaluation (IOE); an environmental and climate change assessment that served as the preparatory study for the COSOP in accordance with the Social, Environmental and Climate Assessment Procedures (SECAP) and other relevant evidence-based studies; and broad-based consultations with key state and non-state stakeholders, the private sector and development partners.
3. IFAD's objective in the United Republic of Tanzania is to contribute to the strategic results of the Government's agricultural development policies, strategies and investment programmes in the Mainland and Zanzibar, including: the Agricultural Sector Development Strategy and Agricultural Sector Development Programme, the Livestock Modernization Initiative for the Mainland and the emerging Agricultural Transformation Initiative for Zanzibar.
4. Accordingly, the overall COSOP objective is to contribute to transforming Tanzania's agricultural sector – including crops, livestock and fisheries – towards higher and more sustainable productivity, profitability, commercialization and increased smallholder farmer incomes for improved livelihoods, food security and nutrition, and overall resilience. The objective also contributes to relevant aspects of the global Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).
5. This multifaceted objective will be achieved by focusing on four strategic objectives (SOs) to benefit IFAD target groups and contribute to the achievement of specific sector development goals:
  - SO1: Improved institutional performance, coordination and accountability to IFAD target groups and their organizations at central and local levels;
  - SO2: More inclusive and resilient value chains of priority commodities, driven by expanded and sustainable access to markets and financial services and by a more inclusive private sector;
  - SO3: Improved climate-resilient, productivity-increasing technologies in priority crop-livestock-fishery commodities; and
  - SO4: Strengthened land governance enabling more inclusive agriculture public and private investments.
6. These interconnected SOs, to which all IFAD activities will contribute, are underpinned by a sound results chain; they promote complementarity between lending and non-lending assistance and are supported by catalytic knowledge management. They are focused squarely on IFAD's key target groups, and they reflect and build on IFAD's comparative advantage in the United Republic of Tanzania. They offer expanded support to agricultural and associated priority non-farm rural enterprises and value chains, and they mainstream and enhance governance and farmer empowerment and gender equality at various levels. Finally, they provide a vehicle for scaling up promising innovations, and for strengthening linkages to other partners and initiatives for which IFAD has already built strong constituencies through the country programme.

# United Republic of Tanzania

## Country strategic opportunities programme

### I. Introduction

1. The previous country strategy for the United Republic of Tanzania was formulated in 2006, covered the period 2007-2013, and was extended to the end of 2015. This new results-based country strategic opportunities programme (COSOP) will guide and prioritize IFAD's lending and non-lending interventions for the period 2016-2021 and cover two cycles of the performance-based allocation system (PBAS): 2016-2018 and 2019-2021.
2. The areas of engagement have been identified on the basis of IFAD's comparative advantage and clear guidance provided by the Government sector policy framework as articulated in the Agricultural Sector Development Strategy (ASDS) and Agricultural Sector Development Programme (ASDP), and the Livestock Modernization Initiative for the Mainland and the Agricultural Transformation Initiative for Zanzibar. Formulation of the strategy involved extensive consultations with key government ministries, civil society and other non-state actors such as pastoralist and hunter-gatherer groups, the private sector and relevant development partners (see appendix IV). In addition, the contents of the strategy were broadly discussed with the United Republic of Tanzania development partners' agriculture working group (AWG), which IFAD currently chairs; the Agriculture Sector Consultative Group; and the Agriculture Non-state Actors Forum (ANSAF) annual general assembly.
3. The preparation process took into account the fact that, while the United Republic of Tanzania is one united republic, both the Mainland and Zanzibar have autonomous governments. It was considered important therefore for the COSOP to recognize relevant features of the Mainland and Zanzibar to guide the priorities of the country strategy, while retaining country coherence.

### II. Country diagnosis

#### A. Economic, agricultural and rural poverty context

4. Country context. The United Republic of Tanzania has a total population of 52.3 million, growing at 3.0 per cent per annum. Of this total, about 1.3 million or 2.9 per cent of the total population inhabit the islands of Zanzibar. As of 2012, about 70 per cent of the population resided in rural areas. The United Republic of Tanzania has a long coastline and shares borders with eight countries, of which five are landlocked, so the country could become a regional commercial hub. Its land is rich in biodiversity and natural resources, including sizable deposits of natural gas. However, the United Republic of Tanzania is one of the poorest countries in the world. It is currently ranked 152<sup>nd</sup> out of 182 countries on the Human Development Index (HDI); 134<sup>th</sup> out of 185 countries on business environment; and 135<sup>th</sup> out of 212 countries on government effectiveness. For the last two indicators, the United Republic of Tanzania's ranking has deteriorated over recent years.
5. Economic context. The country has experienced high economic growth, averaging between 6 and 7 per cent per year over the past decade. The United Republic of Tanzania imports foodstuffs and livestock products because of low agricultural productivity, the lack of primary processing and weak markets. The most significant transformative factor for the economy is the discovery of large natural gas reserves that are expected to begin production within five to seven years. In the medium term, annual GDP growth is expected to rise to 7.5 per cent or higher due to an expanding mining sector and exports.

6. Poverty, human development and demographics. The recent Mainland poverty assessment by the World Bank shows that, in 2015, 28.2 per cent of the population (12 million people) were living in basic needs poverty, compared to 34.4 per cent in 2007; and that 9.7 per cent of the population (4 million people) were living in extreme poverty, compared to 11.7 per cent in 2007. Although recent economic growth is believed to have trickled down to Tanzania's poorest, the World Bank report emphasizes that approximately 70 per cent of Tanzanians continue to live on less than US\$2.00 a day.
7. Poverty is more prevalent in rural areas: over 80 per cent of the country's poor and extremely poor people live in rural areas, as do fully 84 per cent of the population in the bottom income quintile. Data on poverty prevalence for Zanzibar show that the basic needs poverty rate declined from 49 per cent in 2005 (54.6 per cent in rural areas) to 44.4 per cent in 2010 (50.7 per cent in rural areas), while food poverty declined only marginally from 13.2 per cent in 2004/2005 to 13 per cent in 2010. The incidence of rural poverty is highest among female-headed households in arid and semi-arid regions that depend exclusively on livestock and food-crop production.
8. The United Republic of Tanzania expects to meet targets for three Millennium Development Goals: reducing infant and under-five mortality, combating HIV/AIDs and malaria, and addressing gender inequality. It has lagged behind in primary school completion, maternal health, poverty eradication, malnutrition and environmental sustainability. The size of Tanzania's youth almost doubled from 4.4 million in 1990 to 8.1 million in 2010, and is expected to swell to 11 million by 2020 and 15 million by 2030, so creating jobs in rural areas is a priority (see appendix VII for additional country data).
9. Food and agriculture. The agricultural sector contributes about one quarter of GDP and provides employment to three quarters of all Tanzanian workers. The country has 95.5 million hectares (ha) of land, of which 44 million ha are classified as arable, with only 23 per cent under cultivation. About 80 per cent of production comes from subsistence farmers relying on the hand-hoe and rainfed production, with limited areas under medium and large-scale farming. Smallholder agriculture is labour-intensive with little application of modern technologies and inputs and high vulnerability to weather shocks. The country imports significant volumes of cereals and pulses, which could be produced nationally.
10. Livestock. About a quarter of the land area is used for grazing. About 90 per cent of livestock is of indigenous breeds. In 2012, about 60 per cent of rural households reported earning some income from livestock, which provides an average of 22 per cent of household income. Livestock accounts for one quarter of agricultural sales. Extensive pastoralism is recognized, and although village governments often welcome pastoralists, conflicts frequently arise with farmers. As with foodstuffs, red meat and dairy imports remain substantial.
11. Land tenure. Only 11 per cent of the land has been surveyed and only 5 per cent is registered. Of the estimated 12 million plots used for agricultural production in 2010/2011, approximately 87 per cent were owned by farming households. Farmers claim to have rights to about 12 per cent of the plots they own, but only a third of these have officially recognized titles, known as certificates of customary right of occupancy. Holding a recognized land title for farm ownership is critical for farmers to achieve land tenure security. It is also a prerequisite for undertaking improved land and water management and productivity-enhancing investments for farming as a business, as well as obtaining financing from the banking system.
12. Climate and environment. The last 40 years have seen an increase in weather variability, with extreme weather events, notably floods and droughts, occurring more frequently both within and between seasons. Temperatures seem to be increasing and are accompanied by a trend of decreasing annual rainfall, with

changes in both the start and end of the cropping seasons. Traditional agricultural technologies, low productivity and increasing population are the drivers of land degradation, together with extensive livestock raising resulting in overgrazed pastures. The application of climate-smart modern cropping and livestock could raise productivity while reducing the risks from the uncertainties of climate change (see appendix VI for further details).

## B. Key challenges, policy, strategy and institutional context and IFAD's response

### Key challenges

13. Agriculture is assigned high priority in national policies and strategies. However, growth in the sector has generally lagged behind targets (4 per cent versus over 6 per cent). The main challenges include:
  - Large crop and livestock yield gaps, due to over dependence on subsistence agriculture;
  - Constraints on achieving competitive agricultural marketing and inclusive value chain development;
  - Uncaptured opportunities for expanding exports created by regional integration and trade through the East Africa Common Market;
  - Nascent private sector role and limited level of investment;
  - Weak institutional capacities and institutional fragmentation;
  - Tenure insecurity, inequitable access and increasing conflicts arising from competition between farmers and pastoralists over resources; and
  - Lack of engagement by pastoralist and hunter-gatherer organizations in policy decisions affecting them and their livelihoods.
14. These challenges reflect, and are compounded by, the inadequate policy and regulatory environment, uneven policy implementation sometimes caused by conflicting policies, and the risk of policy reversals. In addition, the level, prioritization and quality of public investments are insufficient, with resulting inadequacies in key infrastructure (especially roads and irrigation) and other public goods and services. Appendix VIII provides an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the National Poverty Reduction Strategy.
 

National institutional context for poverty reduction
15. The political and institutional environment in the United Republic of Tanzania has been stable and committed to economic reforms. The guiding normative framework for articulating policies and strategies is Tanzania Development Vision 2025. It aims to promote the socio-economic transformation required to move the country to medium-income status by 2025, with a high level of human development. Agriculture is expected to become a key driver of the transformation process, moving from a low productivity system that is mainly dependent on rainfall and rudimentary technology, to a semi-industrialized one in which irrigation and modern technology generate production to support manufacturing activities.
16. The country has signed the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme compact and formulated its investment plan, Tanzania Agriculture Food Security Investment Plan. This is in line with aid harmonization agenda and Kilimo Kwanza (Agriculture First), the Southern Africa Growth Corridor of Tanzania (SAGCOT) and the more recent Big Results Now (BRN) initiatives. The BRN agenda aims at accelerating the country's social and economic development based on six priority sectors, including agriculture. Under this initiative, the United Republic of Tanzania envisions that by 2025 it will have commercialized the agricultural sector to ensure nationwide food security and food self-sufficiency, while increasing incomes through viable internal and international trade.



17. The new Government elected in October 2015 intends to continue on this pathway towards achieving inclusive agricultural transformation. Despite this commitment, constraints remain, such as limited institutional capacities, performance, coordination and weak governance at central and local levels. These, along with tensions between national and local priorities, result in weak delivery of agricultural support services to IFAD target groups. To address these institutional challenges, in late 2015 the new Mainland Government consolidated the two line agriculture and livestock ministries into one integrated Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries.
  18. Tanzania Agriculture Climate Resilience Plan (TACRP) 2014-2019. TACRP has five priority areas for adapting agriculture to the effects of climate change: (i) agricultural water and land management, focusing on catchment management and adoption of sustainable agriculture and water management practices; (ii) accelerating the uptake of climate-smart agriculture, including building supporting evidence for climate-smart agricultural practices and incentives at the district level, and generating awareness and capacity for these practices; (iii) reducing the impact of climate-related shocks and instituting measures to diversify livelihoods and respond to weather-related shocks; (iv) strengthening knowledge and systems to target climate action; and (v) mainstreaming gender into climate change initiatives for agriculture.
  19. Decentralization by devolution (DbyD). Since 1998 local government authorities (LGAs) have been responsible for delivering all services at the local and village level. Under DbyD, central government ministries, departments and agencies have retained four major functions: policy formulation and guidelines, capacity development of LGAs, coordination and feedback, and policy monitoring and evaluation. District governments are thus responsible for the execution of development activities in their districts, but have very limited resources and operational capacities.
- Governance and country programme risks
20. Recent governance assessments highlight the strengths and weaknesses in the country's institutional accountability, including financial management and procurement. The United Republic of Tanzania is ranked 119<sup>th</sup> out of 175 countries in the corruption perceptions index (2014). This ranking reflects weak governance, accountability and supporting systems, which (i) constrain the potential quality and impact of public service delivery of key agricultural sector services in the Mainland and Zanzibar; and (ii) pose challenges for the achievement of the proposed SOs.
  21. The current IFAD country programme is endeavouring to address these challenges and risks. Very few other development partners support the agricultural sector in both the Mainland and Zanzibar. IFAD's recent designation by the agricultural development partners to chair the AWG reflects broad-based trust in IFAD's professional and broker role. This multistakeholder trust will facilitate IFAD's role in deepening its engagement in policy dialogue and develop partnerships to address key constraints. Further details are provided in appendix V, key files 1-4, including synthesis and references to key analytical diagnostic and strategy reports and opportunities to build on, prioritize and consolidate IFAD's strategic interventions and partnerships.

### III. Previous lessons and results

- A. Past results, impact and performance
22. IFAD's past and ongoing support has included financing being channelled through the ASDP I basket fund, and individual loan-funded investment projects to support strategic thematic areas (e.g. agricultural support services and livestock, agricultural marketing, value chain development and rural financial services). Based

on the country programme evaluation and other key evidence-based evaluations, the main areas of results include:

- Expanded rural infrastructure such as small-scale irrigation and market-access roads, and agricultural support services, have generated increased areas of crop production and improved yields/productivity, employment, household food security, assets and incomes. Good progress has been made on crops in the Mainland, but livestock-related activities and pastoralism have received less attention;
- Farmer empowerment (including women) by strengthening farmer groups, water user associations, and savings and credit associations, has enhanced IFAD target groups' capacities to participate and contribute to bottom-up participatory planning and implementation of agricultural development plans at the village, ward and district levels (district agricultural development plans [DADPs]);
- In Zanzibar, the introduction and strengthening of innovative features of farmer field schools (FFSs), integrating crop and livestock technologies and support services customized to farmer conditions, have enabled increased productivity and improved mechanisms for knowledge sharing. These innovations are now being scaled up;
- Through support for ASDP I, the introduction of a programmatic, sector-wide approach to implementing agricultural policies and strategies is in itself a significant achievement. This has included alignment and harmonization of key sectoral policies, institutional arrangements and development partner investments, including support to the Government's decentralization policies and mechanisms – for example, about 75 per cent of ASDP funds were channelled through the DADPs;
- Results are below planned targets regarding enhancing smallholder access to rural markets and financial services. Projects have been hampered by wide geographical dispersion of investments and early assumptions on the role of an inclusive private sector. Improvements are however ongoing facilitated by focused implementation support and MIVARF contributing to developing the new 2015 National Microfinance Policy.

## B. Lessons learned

23. The main lessons learned from IFAD's support to Tanzania include those listed below.

- Building on the results from ASDP I, it is appropriate for IFAD to provide continued programmatic support while addressing the following key challenges and specific results-focused lessons;
  - Secure sustained political and leadership commitment by the agricultural sector lead ministries, LGAs, development partners, and private sector for a sector-wide approach to agricultural development;
  - Ensure that adequate fiscal and human resources are effectively mobilized, channelled and managed throughout the budgetary cycle;
  - Accommodate different funding modalities beyond the basket fund, while securing coherence and alignment;
  - Expand the role of and provide appropriate support to an inclusive private sector;
  - Support farmer empowerment, based on improved operational strategies and mechanisms, for instance by scaling up the FFS approach, which integrates a coordinated system of agricultural service delivery, including input-output markets; and

- Achieve effective coordination in the sector through appropriate institutional arrangements, which can be enhanced through IFAD's implementation support;
- In Zanzibar, key impacts have been achieved through the introduction of FFSs, which promote the integration of enhanced crop and livestock technologies and improved support services provided by community animal health workers (CAHWs). These interventions demonstrate cost-effectiveness and good sustainability prospects, with demonstrated spill-over effects to nearby farmers and their communities;
- The MUVI-MIVARF experience demonstrates that value chain development requires proper diagnostic assessment of key actors and their capacities to foster partnerships from the outset. Private-sector entrepreneurs such as wholesalers, processors and exporters, and other partners such as cooperative apex organizations, need to be involved during project design to better understand their interest and potential, and how they might internalize project incentives for their involvement and cooperation; and
- IFAD support to traditional stand-alone projects has presented opportunities for more refined targeting at design and implementation, but has often entailed higher project management and supervision costs. At the same time, supporting the programmatic approach has also seen limitations, including geographical dispersion of limited resources, inadequate targeting to strategic groups and less than full participation by development partners.

## IV. Strategic objectives

### A. IFAD's comparative advantage at country level

24. IFAD's country strategy reflects the findings and recommendations of the COSOP completion review and country programme evaluation and addresses priorities aligned with the Government's ASDS/ASDP II, the Livestock Modernization Initiative and Zanzibar's Agricultural Transformation Initiative and priority programmes, taking into account IFAD's comparative advantage and the lending and non-lending resources that are available for the country. It articulates IFAD's support to basket financing within ASDP II, with support to other ongoing initiatives such as agricultural value chain development, development of public-private-producer-partnership (4Ps) for inclusive commercial outgrower development; and fostering decentralization policies, modalities, and capacities, while working with districts and other local actors.

### B. Strategic objectives

25. The overall COSOP objective is to contribute to transforming the United Republic of Tanzania's agricultural sector – including crops, livestock and fisheries – towards higher and more sustainable productivity, profitability, commercialization and increased smallholder farmer incomes for improved livelihoods, food security and nutrition, and overall resilience of communities to shocks and stresses.
26. This objective will be achieved through four complementary SOs, while also addressing key cross-cutting themes: gender, nutrition and food security, partnerships, resilience and governance. These SOs, with emphasis on IFAD's target groups, include:
  - SO1: Institutional performance, coordination and accountability to IFAD target groups and their organizations at central and local levels have improved so as to enable greater effectiveness and transparency in policy formulation, greater collaboration and partnerships, and enhanced programme implementation and results;

- SO2: Value chains of priority commodities become more inclusive and resilient, driven by expanded and sustainable access to markets and financial services and by a more inclusive private sector;
  - SO3: Climate-resilient, productivity-increasing technologies in priority crop-livestock-fishery commodities are improved and their adoption scaled-up based on more effective agricultural support services reaching IFAD target groups; and
  - SO4: Land governance is strengthened to enable more inclusive agricultural public and private investments, based on more equitable access to land and effective mechanisms to address land/natural resource conflicts arising from competition between farmers and pastoralists.
27. In order to realize effectively the above SOs, IFAD will use three complementary instruments: (i) a programme-based approach to provide strategic support to ASDS/ASDP II and the Agricultural Transformation Initiative to enable scaling up innovations, enhancing capacities at various levels and promoting sustainability; (ii) project-based support as a vehicle for testing innovations and new approaches, enabling better targeting and implementing new policies; and (iii) a non-lending programme to generate evidenced-based knowledge to support policy engagement and strengthen partnerships. Additionally, these SOs will contribute to realizing SDGs 1, 2, 3, 5, 13, 14, 15 and 16.

### C. Lending and non-lending priorities

28. Ongoing lending: The ongoing IFAD portfolio is comprised of three projects: MUVI (targeting the Mainland, extended to end of 2016); MIVARF (targeting both the Mainland and Zanzibar, scheduled to close by end of 2018); and ASDP–Livestock (targeting Zanzibar, extended to mid-2017). There is also the recently approved Bagamayo Sugar Infrastructure and Sustainable Community Development Programme (BASIC), which is not yet effective. These projects address key aspects of the above SOs, and are generating experiences that offer potential for improvement and for scaling up successful results.
29. New lending: The following priorities have been selected for IFAD's new lending programme for a PBAS allocation of about US\$120 million, encompassing two PBAS cycles (see appendix IX: Concept proposals for lending priorities):
- ASDS/ASDP II (Mainland): The first programmatic lending priority is to support completion of ASDP II preparation. IFAD's support will address key aspects of the four SOs, and catalyse innovations aimed at benefitting IFAD's target groups. In addition to its positive effects on crop yields, income and food security, ASDP I had an important institutional impact on local government decentralization, which needs to be further consolidated. Programme improvements have also been introduced regarding: (a) greater geographic and subsector selectivity to avoid dispersion of investments and achieve better efficiency and outcomes; (b) greater selectivity on the type of agricultural infrastructure to be financed; (c) better implementation tracking of the DADPs; (d) greater attention to the livestock subsector, together with rangeland management and the dairy value chain; and (e) strengthening of monitoring and evaluation capacity and reporting at the local and central government levels (target approval 2017).
  - Highlands Milkshed Development Project (HMDP) (Mainland): The project will seek to raise the incomes of poor rural households that depend substantially on production and trade in dairy products by increasing the supply of raw milk to processors from smallholder dairy farmers, increasing the productivity and marketed output of smallholder dairy producers, and improving the policy environment for the dairy value chain and institutional capacity to support dairy producers (target approval 2016).

- Drylands Development Project (Mainland): Building on the past Sustainable Rangeland Management Project, the project will support integrated rangeland-based livelihoods while providing ecologically sound strategies for resolving conflicts between farmers and pastoralists (target approval 2018).
  - Zanzibar Agricultural Sector Development Programme (ZASDP): IFAD is currently providing strategic inputs to this important sector participatory process and eventual proposal. Subject to the positive outcome of this non-lending activity and demonstrated commitment by the Government, IFAD will consider providing programmatic financing for a Zanzibar-ASDP I (target approval 2019). The proposed non-lending support for development of an operational strategy for sector-wide support would then guide the preparation of the ZASDP.
30. Non-lending and policy engagement: The following non-lending activities will be programmed early in the COSOP period to deepen the policy and strategy engagement with multiple stakeholders on priority sector issues. The non-lending programme will be used to sharpen the rationale, design and implementation effectiveness of the ongoing portfolio, and to address its current challenges:
- Farmer empowerment strategy and operational plan: This activity will support a priority and pivotal IFAD cross-cutting theme, to enable further empowerment of IFAD target groups to engage more effectively in participating in, influencing and benefitting from various rural development programmes in both the Mainland and Zanzibar (target approval 2016).
  - Value chain development strategy and operational plan: IFAD will support MIVARF to enable the Government, in close collaboration with state and non-state stakeholders, to generate an updated value chain development strategy and action plan that will support strategic elements of the ASDS/ASDP II as well as the Agricultural Transformation Initiative (target approval 2016).
  - Strategy for Zanzibar Agricultural Sector Development Programme: This non-lending activity will develop a comprehensive operational strategy for a sector-wide approach to Zanzibar's agricultural development (target approval 2017).
  - Fostering good land governance for inclusive development in Tanzania: IFAD will provide grant financing to the International Land Coalition (ILC), which through its members will foster national dialogue on inclusive agricultural development in order to influence policies and guidelines on 4Ps. This initiative, combined with lending activities, will also support scaling up joint village land-use planning and the protection of rangelands in agropastoral and pastoral areas. IFAD's Executive Board approved this initiative in December 2015.

## V. Sustainable results

### A. Targeting and gender

31. The COSOP primary target group comprises about 1.2 million resource-poor smallholder households in the Mainland and Zanzibar, with a special focus on supporting women, youth and rural vulnerable groups. Women-headed households account for 50 per cent of the target group. While involving market-oriented producers for further intensification, IFAD will also concentrate its support on developing the potential for intensification and market contribution of the poorest segment of rural dwellers, mainly subsistence farmers with limited land and labour access, representing about two thirds of the smallholder farming population. This category will be supported through asset and capacity-building for integration into

other rural economic activities (see key file 4: Target group identification, priority issues and potential response).

32. Women of reproductive age represent 24.5 per cent of the population in the United Republic of Tanzania, and face challenges in economic empowerment and access to decision-making at all levels. Young people currently account for 30 per cent of the work force, mainly in agriculture. To address their needs, IFAD will support increased investment in climate-resilient productivity-enhancing technologies, including labour-saving technologies for women, rural infrastructure and capacity development, targeted incentives for priority crops and modern yield-augmenting inputs, and expanded access to microfinance services among women and youth.
33. The COSOP will also give special attention to the needs and priorities of pastoralists and hunter-gatherers, who constitute key target groups for IFAD in the United Republic of Tanzania. Support will be provided through non-lending activities to increase their visibility, voice and benefits from IFAD-supported investments and policy engagement. In collaboration with partners, IFAD will support the collection of best practices used by pastoralists and hunter-gatherers on sustainable land and water management, ecosystem-based adaptation, and biodiversity conservation as evidence-based tools for advocating supporting legal and policy frameworks. The proposed Drylands Development Project will endeavour to target pastoralists and hunter-gatherers as key beneficiaries to implement participatory land-use plans for enhancing their land tenure and food and nutrition security.

## B. Scaling up

34. To date, the most significant example of scaling up in the country programme has been the FFS approach under the ASDP, with demonstrated spillover effects to nearby farmers and communities and high technology adoption rates by smallholders. In the Zanzibar subprogramme, the FFS approach has included new features such as farmer facilitators and CAHWs who have broadened smallholder farmers' access to basic agricultural and livestock-support services, with good cost-effectiveness and sustainability prospects. The FFS approach will be also drawn on and further developed in the dairy value chain under the proposed HMDP.
35. In broad terms, the development results of the country strategy will be scaled up by linking focused project investment resources to leverage private investment and borrowing from the commercial banking system through 4Ps, and in so doing, developing commercial value chain relationships and services that are market-driven and sustainable. These efforts will be dictated by the principles of responsible investments in agriculture and food systems adopted by IFAD and others. The HMDP will strengthen the dairy value chain and, in particular, the linkages between smallholder dairy producers and their organizations on one hand, and processors or traders on the other. It will promote the development of a scalable model for integrating financial and non-financial services to dairy farmers into the commercial relationship between them and processors; and it will support efforts to reduce the cost of doing business in the dairy processing industry, thus creating incentives for further investment in the sector as a whole.
36. Promoting commercial-smallholder outgrower investments in agriculture is a government priority under the BRN and SAGCOT initiatives. Through the recently approved BASIC programme, IFAD has the potential to both leverage significant cofinancing from the African Development Bank and have a highly positive influence on how agricultural 4Ps and private-sector agricultural investment will be designed and implemented in the United Republic of Tanzania, as the programme will be a model for future public-private-producer investments in agriculture.
37. The non-lending and policy agenda under the COSOP also includes an explicit focus on scaling up. By supporting the development of strategies and operational plans on topics such as farmer empowerment, value chain development and land governance, IFAD will promote the incorporation of issues that it considers critical

for inclusive rural transformation into the strategies and programmes of the Government and other development partners.

### C. Policy engagement

38. IFAD's policy engagement agenda will contribute to the achievement of the proposed SOs, and will complement, support and draw on the experiences and lessons of its investment programmes. Areas for policy engagement will thus focus on issues of relevance for ASDP II and the future ZASDP, dairy development and sustainable rangeland management. A number of specific non-lending activities have been programmed early in the COSOP period to deepen the policy and strategy engagement with multistakeholders on priority sector issues, and to sharpen the implementation effectiveness of the ongoing portfolio and future pipeline.
39. IFAD is the current chair of the development partners AWG, which endeavours to promote coherence and consistency in development assistance to agriculture through coordination of development partner support, policy dialogue and reduced transaction costs. Specifically, the AWG supports government implementation of the ASDS/ASDP II. By concentrating efforts on ASDP II, the country office team will devote more time to providing effective support for policy dialogue and related non-lending activities, drawing on the various consultative forums involving development partners (AWG), ANSAF, and the Government (the Agricultural Sector Consultative Group).

### D. Natural resources and climate change

40. IFAD prepared an environmental and climate change assessment (ECCA) that served as a preparatory SECAP study for the COSOP. The ECCA provides strong analytical underpinnings to ensure environmental and social sustainability in the country programme. It identifies priority actions to be mainstreamed into IFAD's lending and non-lending activities to protect the environment and strengthen resilience to climate change. These include introducing climate risk assessment and supporting adoption of climate change adaptation measures and agriculture-livestock-fisheries approaches so that environmental and social considerations are integrated from the outset and quality-at-entry in project design is assured (see appendix VI for a discussion of priority actions).

### E. Nutrition-sensitive agriculture and rural development

41. Although ASDP II focuses on a number of strategic commodity value chains, nutrition outcomes remain an area of concern as little progress has been recorded on nutritional status over the past decade, especially in rural areas. The latest data revealed a 34.7 per cent rate of chronic malnutrition and there are persistent problems with food utilization despite the overall improvement in national food security. IFAD strategy will contribute to improved rural nutrition through initiatives already identified by ASDP II: support to participative advisory services such as FFSs combined with farmer education and access to information on nutrition; and food processing for improved nutritional quality in the value-addition part of the value chain.

## VI. Successful delivery

### A. Financing framework

42. The COSOP covers two PBAS cycles (2016-2018 and 2019-2021). Based on current PBAS scores, IFAD financing for the combined period is estimated at about US\$120 million (table 1). Table 2 shows the low and high case PBAS scenarios, providing an idea of the flexibility of IFAD's engagement in the country.

**Table 1**  
**PBAS calculation for COSOP year 1**

<i>Country needs</i>										
Financing terms 2016	GNI per capita 2014	Rural population 2014	IRAI 2014	RSP 2015	PAR 2015	Country performance rating	2016 annual allocation	2017 annual allocation	2018 annual allocation	Total
HC	930	35 808 913	3.76	4.17	3.7	3.92	19 600 082	19 600 082	19 600 082	58 800 245

**Table 2**  
**Relationship between performance indicators and country score**

<i>Financing scenario</i>	<i>PAR rating (+/- 1)</i>	<i>Rural sector performance score (+/- 0.3)</i>	<i>Percentage change in PBAS country score from base scenario</i>
Hypothetical low case	3	3.9	-23%
Base case	4	4.2	0%
Hypothetical high case	5	4.5	26%

## B. Monitoring and evaluation

43. The COSOP results framework includes measurable outcome indicators closely aligned with the achievement of ASDP II higher-sector goals for the Mainland and Zanzibar. All reported data will be disaggregated by gender, age and type of land users. Monitoring and evaluation arrangements will consist of conducting annual assessments of how supported lending and non-lending activities are contributing to achieve each SO and related results. In addition to annual reviews of COSOP implementation, the country team will undertake a results review in 2018 to assess progress towards results, learn lessons and make mid-course adjustments in the strategy and results framework in response to potential changes in country priorities.
44. The IFAD Country Office will play a key role in managing the country strategy by continually assessing bottlenecks and risks to successful country programme implementation and sustainability; monitoring changes in implementation circumstances that require adjustments to individual project designs; appraising the continued relevance of SOs to the country, target groups and IFAD development priorities; and proactively proposing changes to programme results frameworks when appropriate.

## C. Knowledge management

45. IFAD will use formal and informal mechanisms to collect, share and disseminate knowledge to help achieve the proposed SOs and more effectively carry out its partnership, resource mobilization, advocacy, communications and policy dialogue objectives. The approach and support for non-lending activities, customized for conditions in the Mainland and Zanzibar, will make it possible to scale up relevant results by: (i) deepening policy engagement on strategic issues; and (ii) systematizing learning and dissemination of good practices and other experiences from the portfolio. To mitigate the potential risk of negative publicity associated with the new 4P programme in Bagamoyo, IFAD will develop a communication multistakeholder dialogue strategy to address different audiences with evidence-based answers, which will be implemented by the country office and the programme teams with the help of local communication teams.



## D. Partnerships

46. IFAD will continue to strengthen its partnerships with key stakeholders in both the Mainland and Zanzibar in order to enhance the realization of its SOs and targets, involving the following key partners:

Table 3 – Country and regional-level partnerships

---

**Central line ministries** (Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries, Ministry of Industry and Trade, and the Prime Minister's Officer) **and LGAs**, consolidating IFAD as a key and reliable partner in rural development, but expanding collaboration with other ministries responsible for natural resource management and climate change, as well as the Ministry of Lands, given the Fund's expected support to improving land governance and mechanisms to address land/natural resource conflicts between farmers and pastoralists.

---

**Non-state actors**, including rural civil society organizations and umbrella organizations (ILC, Tanzania Federation of Cooperatives; MVIWATA; ANSAF; Tanzania Private Sector Foundation; SAGCOT; Zanzibar Chamber of Commerce, Industry and Agriculture; Agriculture Council of Tanzania), supporting farmer organizations on specific value chains to enable farmers to practice agriculture as a business.

---

**NGOs**, building on the innovative potential of the work undertaken by NGOs and service providers in the United Republic of Tanzania (Heifer International, SNV, Technoserve, Match Maker, Kilimo Trust, Farm Radio International).

---

**Private sector**, supporting equitable business partnerships between private enterprises and small-scale producers, in line with MIVARF, BASIC and other emerging 4Ps experiences in key commodity value chains.

---

**Development partners**, facilitated by IFAD's designation as the chair of the AWG, and engaging with the World Bank, African Development Bank, European Union and other actors such as the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation with larger complementary financial, technical and advisory services to help IFAD leverage its more limited resources to reach the desired scale of intervention.

---

**United Nations system in the United Republic of Tanzania**, especially the Rome-based agencies, exploring collaboration to improve nutrition outcomes in IFAD project areas and benefit from possible synergies and project delivery structures already in place.

---

**Research partners** (International Livestock Research Institute and the Stockholm Environmental Institute, assisting IFAD to access knowledge and design appropriate intervention in degraded ecosystems of semi-arid areas, as well as conducting external environmental monitoring of public and private investments).

---


## E. Innovations

47. The new COSOP will strategically scale up successful innovations, such as the use of farmers facilitators and CAHWs under the FFS extension approach in Zanzibar, and promote bottom-up participatory planning and implementation and tracking of DADPs in the Mainland and pilot ADPs at shehia-level (smallest administrative unit) in Zanzibar.
48. IFAD will also use loan-funded projects to test and develop innovations and more effectively target pastoralists, hunter-gatherers and other vulnerable groups within their specific geographic and resource contexts before these interventions are scaled up through more programmatic approaches. The knowledge generated and lessons learned – from implementing village land-use planning to support more equitable access to land and resources, to addressing land and resource conflicts, and fostering more inclusive decision-making processes for marginalized groups – will be used to scale up new implementation approaches, models and technologies to reach these groups.
49. BASIC is a ground-breaking 4P-modality programme delivering an innovative business model for outgrower development. Attention to the surrounding (wider) communities not directly participating in the outgrower programme, mainstreaming of climate resilience, and support for village land-use planning and land governance

are some of the programme's innovative features. BASIC's support for multistakeholder dialogue and long-term independent environmental assisted by SEI is another innovation expected to set high standards for accountability to non-state actors in future PPP in agriculture.

#### F. South-South and Triangular Cooperation

50. The country strategy will pursue integrated South-South and Triangular Cooperation in its lending and non-lending activities by incorporating knowledge platforms for possible co-investments in rural development. It will use as a basis current models being tested as shown in the figure below.



Appendix I: Tanzania RB-COSOP results management framework (2016-2021)<sup>1</sup>

Country strategy alignment <i>What is the country seeking to achieve?</i>	Key results for RB-COSOP <i>How is IFAD going to contribute?</i>			Indicative lending and non-lending activities for the next 6 years contributing to the outcome and milestone targets
	Strategic objectives <i>What will be different at the end of the RB-COSOP period?</i>	Outcome indicators <i>How will we measure the changes?</i>	Milestone indicators <i>(by end-2018)</i>  <i>How will we track progress during RB-COSOP implementation?</i>	
<p><b>Mkukuta II</b> (National-level plan, mainland)</p> <p><b>Goal:</b> To accelerate economic growth, reduce poverty; improve the standard of living and social welfare of the people of Tanzania as well as good governance and accountability. Strives to promote broad-based growth and enhancement of productivity, with greater alignment of the interventions towards wealth creation as a way out of poverty.</p> <p><b>Thematic areas:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cluster I: Growth for reduction of income poverty</li> <li>Cluster II: Improvement of quality of life and social well-being</li> <li>Cluster III: Governance and accountability</li> </ul> <p><b>Main targets:</b> <u>Overall:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Macroeconomic stability maintained</li> <li>GDP growth accelerated (from 7.0% in 2015 to 10% p.a. by 2024/2025)</li> <li>Population growth slowed down (from 3.0% p.a. to 2.7% p.a. by 2024/2025)</li> </ul> <p><u>Agricultural sector:</u> Agricultural growth increased (from 4.2 % in 2015 to 6.3 % p.a. by 2024/2025)</p> <p><b>ASDS II/ASDP II (sector level) goal:</b> Contribute to Tanzania's national economic growth, reduced rural poverty and improved food and nutrition</p>	<p><b>SO1:</b> Institutional performance, coordination, and accountability to IFAD target groups and their organizations at central and local levels have improved so as to enable greater effectiveness and transparency in policy formulation, greater collaboration and partnerships, and enhanced programme implementation and results</p>	<p>* (i) ASDP II M&amp;E system established &amp; functional with relevant indicators on institutional coordination and performance, and accountability mechanisms to non-state actors at national, regional and district level for usage by ASLMs</p> <p>- BL: Partially functional</p> <p>- Target: Fully functional</p> <p>(ii) Number of enabling policies and regulations promulgated and operational related to agriculture (crops, livestock and fisheries) and rural development benefiting IFAD target groups</p> <p>BL: 28</p> <p>Target: TBD (by ASDP II/IFAD)</p>	<p>(i) % of DADPs which have a result framework</p> <p>- BL: TBD (by ASDP II)</p> <p>- Target: 90%</p> <p>* (ii) (a) number of enabling policies promulgated and operational;</p> <p>(b) number of pro-poor policies, legislation and regulations enforced at the local or central level</p> <p>BL: 28</p> <p>Target: TBD (by ASDP II)</p>	<p><b>A) Non-Lending:</b> (to be supported by country grants)</p> <p>1) Rural Growth and Economic Empowerment Strategy and Operational Plan</p> <p>2) Value chain Development Strategy and Operational Plan</p> <p>3) Proposal for Zanzibar Agriculture Sector-Wide Programme: Approach, Rationale and Proposal</p> <p>4) Fostering good land governance for inclusive development in Tanzania (approved in Dec. 2015)</p> <p><b>B) New lending:</b></p> <p>1) Agriculture Sector Development Programme (ASDP II): target</p>
	<p><b>SO2:</b> Value chains of priority commodities become more inclusive and resilient, driven by expanded and sustainable access to markets and financial services and by a more inclusive private</p>	<p>* (i) No. of PPP partnerships/ agreements involving IFAD target groups established and operational (by priority value chain)</p> <p>- BL: TBD (by ASDP II)</p> <p>- Target: TBD (by ASD II)</p> <p>(ii) % of emerging small and medium</p>	<p>* (i) No. of PPP partnerships/ agreements involving IFAD target groups established and operational (by priority value chain):</p> <p>- BL: TBD (by ASDP II)</p> <p>- Target: TBD (by ASD II)</p>	

<sup>1</sup> Baseline and target values for some indicators used by ASDP II (and specific ones for IFAD) still need to be worked out as the new Government finalizes ASDP II results management framework. If reliable data are not available, arrangements will be made by the IFAD Tanzania country team during 2016 to collaborate with the MALF to generate the required data for common indicators based on relevant sources.


\* Asterisk refers to indicators which are also used by ASDP II, therefore, showing strong alignment with ASDP II.

<p>security in Tanzania:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inclusive and sustainable agricultural growth (6% p.a.)</li> <li>Reduced rural poverty (% of rural population below the poverty line: from 33.3% in 2011/12 to 24% by 2024/2025)</li> <li>Enhanced food and nutrition (% of rural hholds. Below food poverty line: from 11.3% in 2011/2012 to 5% by 2024/2025)</li> </ul> <p><b>Strategic objectives:</b></p> <p>1) Create enabling policy and institutional environment for enhancing modernized, commercial, competitive and value-added agriculture sector, driven by inclusive and strengthened private sector participation;</p> <p>2) Achieve sustainable increases in production, productivity, profitability and competitive value chain development in the agricultural sector (crops, livestock, fisheries), driven by smallholders; and</p> <p>3) Strengthen institutional performance and effective coordination of relevant public and private sector institutions in the agriculture sector at national and local levels, enabled by strengthened resilience</p> <p><b>ASDP II Strategic Programme Areas (SPAs):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SPA 1: Expanded and sustainable water and land-use management</li> <li>SPA 2: Improved agricultural productivity and profitability</li> <li>SPA 3: Strengthened and competitive value chain development</li> <li>SPA 4: Strengthened institutional enablers and coordination framework</li> </ul> <p>(See ASDP II components and sub-components in Attachment 1)</p>	<p>sector</p>	<p>agro-processing enterprises (e.g. climate resilient storage, nutrient-preserving storage and processing, refrigerated transport and labeling) undertaking post-harvest/value added activities with continued operations beyond 3 years of establishment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BL: small: 63; medium: 30</li> <li>Target: TBD (by ASDP II)</li> </ul> <p>* (iii) % of households/farmers with access to or benefiting from processing facilities for priority VCs (for major commodity groups) through grain/oil milling; fruits and vegetables; and roots and tubers machines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BL: 30-50 % (ref. to ASDP II)</li> <li>Target: 37-60% (ref. to ASDP II)</li> </ul> <p>* (iv) % increase in sales of smallholder producers due to additional market channel (e.g WRS, fair trade, etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BL: TBD (by ASDP II)</li> <li>Target: TBD (by ASDP II)</li> </ul> <p>* (v) % of farmers' groups with access to rural financial services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BL: 36.5 (ref. to ASDP II)</li> <li>Target: 57</li> </ul>	<p>(ii) % increase of smallholder producers partnering with private sector under inclusive ag. 4Ps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BL: TBD (by ASDP II)</li> <li>Target: TBD (by ASD II)</li> </ul> <p>(ii) No. of emerging small and medium agro-processing enterprises (e.g. climate resilient storage, nutrient-preserving storage and processing, refrigerated transport and labeling)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BL: small: 63; medium: 30</li> <li>Target: TBD (by ASDP II)</li> </ul> <p>(iii) Total volume and value of ag. production processed and marketed (using priority commodities, per above)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BL: TBD (by ASDP II)</li> <li>Target: TBD (by ASDP II)</li> </ul> <p>(iv) No. of smallholder producers participating in priority commodity VCs with income increase</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BL: TBD (by ASDP II)</li> <li>Target: TBD (by ASDP II)</li> </ul> <p>* (v) % of smallholder farmers' groups with access to rural financial services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BL: 36.5 (ref. to ASDP II)</li> <li>Target: 41</li> </ul>	<p>approval 2017</p> <p>2) Highlands Milk shed Development Project (HMDP): target approval 2016</p> <p>3) Drylands Development Project : target approval 2018</p> <p>4) Zanzibar Agricultural Sector Development Programme (ZASDP): target approval 2019</p> <p><b>C) On-going/approved lending:</b></p> <p>1) MUVI (Mainland): implementation completion end of 2016</p> <p>2) MIVARF (Mainland and Zanzibar): implementation completion end of 2018</p> <p>3) ASDL-L (Zanzibar): implementation completion end of 2017</p> <p>4) BASIC (approved in Dec., 2015)</p>
--	---------------	---	---	---

	<p><b>SO3:</b> Climate-resilient, productivity-increasing technologies in priority crop-livestock-fishery commodities are improved and their adoption scaled up based on more effective agricultural support services reaching IFAD target groups</p>	<p>* (i) Average annual yield for targeted/priority commodities            (a) Maize:            - BL: 1.6 MT/ha (ref. to ASDP II)            - Target: 2.9 MT/ha            (b) paddy:            - BL: 1.8 MT/ha (ref. to ASDP II)            - Target: 3.6 MT/ha            (c) milk:            - BL: 6-15 litre/cow/day (ref. to ASDP II)            - Target: 8-20 litre/cow/day            (d) meat:            - BL: TBD (by ASDP II)            - Target: TBD (by ASDP II)</p> <p>(ii) % of farmers satisfied with the level and quality of agric. extension services (crops/livestock)            - BL: TBD (by ASDP II)            - Target TBD (by ASDP II)</p>	<p>* (i) Enhanced adoption rates:            (a) % of smallholder farmers adopting enhanced climate resilient technologies and practices            - BL: TBD (by ASDP II)            - Target TBD (by ASDP II)            (b) No. of farmers/area (has.) practicing integrated soil fertility mgt.            BL: 1.5 M farmers (ref. to ASDP II)            Target: 3.0 M farmers (ref. to ASDP II)            BL: 0.7 M has. (ref. to ASDP II)            Target: 1.7 M has. (ref. to ASDP II)            (c) % of rural households using improved inputs (seeds, fertilizers, agro-chemicals, tools, feed supplements for dairy cattle)            - BL: 37 (ref. to ASDP II)            - Target: TBD (by ASDP II)</p> <p>(ii) % of smallholder farmers having access to extension services            - BL: TBD (by ASDP II)            - Target :TBD (by ASDP ii)</p> <p>* (iii) % average hhold. dietary score (by ASDP ii)</p>
	<p><b>SO 4:</b> Land governance is strengthened to enable more inclusive agriculture public and private investments, based on more equitable access to land and effective mechanisms to address land/natural resource conflicts arising from competition between</p>	<p>(i) No. of project beneficiaries with secure access to land and natural resources            - BL:TBD            - Target: TBD based on BASIC, SRMP and Drylands Development Project assessments</p> <p>(ii) No. of project beneficiaries with legally-recognized land and natural resource rights. This could include the</p>	<p>(i) Participation of CSOs and community groups (particularly marginalized groups) involved in decisions over land governance</p> <p>(ii) % of government, CSOs and communities showing satisfaction for village land use planning and grazing land registration</p> <p>(iii) % of village land-use plans and grazing areas registered and</p>

	<p>smallholder crop farmers, agro-pastoralists and pastoralists</p>	<p>recognition of individual, familial or group/community rights either with the issuing of CCROs, leases or titles or the designation and gazetting of land-use plans or designated grazing or forest areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- BL:TBD</li> <li>- Target: TBD based on BASIC, SRMP and Drylands Development Project assessments</li> </ul> <p>(iii) Reduced prevalence of conflicts over land and natural resources involving smallholder farmers, agro-pastoralist and pastoralist groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- BL:TBD</li> <li>- Target: TBD based on BASIC, SRMP and Drylands Development Project assessments</li> </ul>	<p>implemented</p>	
--	---	--	--------------------	--

## Attachment 1: ASDP II components and sub-components



## Completion report of previous RB-COSOP (2007–2014)

### A. Introduction

1. In late 2013/early 2014, the Tanzania country team, in close collaboration with IFAD stakeholders, designed and carried out a comprehensive assessment of IFAD's COSOPs for two periods (2003 – 2007; and 2007 – 2013). The approach followed IFAD's guidelines for COSOP Completion Reports (CCRs), which included an emphasis on a participatory self-assessment of the IFAD programme performance and IFAD's performance, and on deriving strategic lessons learned and recommendations as inputs for the design of the new COSOP. This Appendix has extracted and synthesized the relevant information from this CCR<sup>1</sup>, with a focus on the period 2007 – 2013, in order to comply with IFAD's recently updated guidelines for preparation of RB-COSOPs.

### B. Assessment of program performance

#### Main strategic objectives of the COSOP

2. The main strategic objectives, as outlined in the COSOP (2007-2013), were:
  - SO 1: Improved access to productivity enhancing technologies and services;
  - SO 2: Enhanced participation of farmer organizations in planning of ASDP;
  - SO 3: Increased access to sustainable rural financial services; and
  - SO 4: Increased access to markets and opportunities for rural enterprise.
3. These SOs were designed to address the following key sectoral issues (with further details presented in the CCR):
  - Low agricultural production and productivity caused by a number of factors.
  - Inadequate capacity of the rural poor women and men (in terms of skills and organization) to take advantage of local and national policy and programming processes;
  - Limited access to financial services by smallholder rural producers, processors and traders due to a number of factors;
  - Poor rural market infrastructure, including inadequate access to markets by SHFs/producers/ processors/traders, compounded by weak regulatory and market linkages; and
  - Weak value-chain development, including limited value-addition in agricultural produce.

#### Key instruments

4. Activities and emerging results. The COSOP adopted three main instruments to achieve its SOs: portfolio of strategic projects; non-lending (TA); and COSOP management. The main instruments and corresponding activities and outputs which have contributed to key outcomes (see section below) were supported by the variety of IFAD-supported projects. The more important outputs and emerging outcomes are summarized below with respect to each SO, and this progress is also reflected in the indicators in the updated Results Framework (Attachment 2).

---

<sup>1</sup> For further details, see: Tanzania: COSOP Completion Report and Self-Assessment (2 Volumes), April, 2014 (prepared by the IFAD country team/consultants (CCR team), in close collaboration with IFAD stakeholders).



With respect to SO1 (primarily via ASDP):

- Introduction and scaling-up of Farmer Field Schools (FFS);
- Expanded contract farming; effective use Client-Oriented-Research and Development Management Approach (CORDEMA);
- Farmer Research Groups and Farmer Extension Groups;
- Farmer Facilitators who helped scale-up to farmers relevant technology-enhancing messages;
- Adaptive research which promoted productivity increases and enterprise diversification by raising the awareness of rural producers about the production technology-environment nexus, developing rural microenterprises, promoting access to financial services and markets, and building the capacity of farmers to make reasonable choices in response to climate change (via ASDP, MUVI, MIVARF);
- Climate-proofing of new projects to strengthen the local capacity to predict and prevent the adverse impacts of climate change; and
- Implementation of the National Adaptation Programmes of Action.

With respect to SO2:

- Use of Technical Assistance Grants (TAGs) to improve the advocacy and planning capacity of FOs and women's groups (via various non-lending activities);
- Priority activities supported: Effective participation of SHFs/FOs and women groups in preparation of Village Agricultural Development Plans/ADPs and DADPs (via ASDP);
- Strengthening of farmer networks (e.g. MVIWATA) (via MUVI and MIVARF); and
- Working with and strengthening CSO/CBOs, which would strengthen farmer organizations (via RFSP and AMSDP).

With respect to SO3:

- Supporting the formation of Micro-Finance Institutions/MFI apex organizations to promote the increased bargaining power of MFIs with commercial banks and the leveraging of resources, learning and advocacy for a sustainable microfinance industry (via RFSP and MIVARF);
- Promoting the scaling-up of the successful elements of RFSP nationwide through improved capacity of existing financial institutions to work in and expand access to rural finance in the rural areas (via MUVI and MIVARF);
- Promoting partnership opportunities with donor-funded projects active in the financial sector (e.g. MEDA) (via RFSP, MUVI and MIVARF); and
- Expanding regular policy dialogue with Government, at various levels and institutions.

With respect to SO4:

- Conducting, and in some cases, facilitating policy dialogue with Government, development partners (especially through the agricultural sector working group), and other development actors (e.g. private sector, farmers) (via support to the ASDP);
- Promoting value chain development approach (via ASDP, MUVI and MIVARF); and
- Promoting and strengthening linkages with innovative AMSDP (closed) activities and the Rural Micro, Small and Medium Enterprise Support Programme (MUVI), which use a value chain approach to raise rural incomes and employment.

5. Strategic adjustments. During the COSOP period, there were various strategic and specific adjustments to enhance the responsiveness to and improved progress toward achieving the SOs. These enhancements included:

- Additional sourcing of non-lending resources, although it is noted that there is need to sharpen a sound non-lending strategy to mobilize and manage additional non-lending resources;
  - Enhanced strategic partnering with other development partners, facilitated primarily through the agricultural sector working group (AWG);
  - Shifting from output-based to a result-focused approach, with an intentional shift towards planning and managing for results, with stronger attention on impact and outcome indicators, in line with the COSOP results framework (although there was limited systematic monitoring of this results framework, as further discussed below).
6. Emerging results with respect to the SOs. Notwithstanding the limited availability of rigorous evidence on the outcomes and impacts of the COSOP, available information suggests that overall good progress was made toward meeting the four SOs, although “mixed” progress in some aspects. The CCR/assessment highlights some of the strong achievements, key gaps of analysis and shortcomings, and emerging lessons. To help focus the assessment, the IFAD CCR/assessment team, together with key Government stakeholders, reconstructed the Results Framework (See Attachment 1 for the original results framework and Attachment 2 for the updated results framework). Also, during the COSOP period, there was an observed trend of gradual improvements over time, reflecting enhanced commitment and capacities by Government, IFAD and participating stakeholders to identify/apply relevant lessons and to pursue more vigorously and systematically tangible and strategic results at the country and sectoral levels. Key aspects are highlighted in the following section.
7. Achievements/status at completion. The overall “fair” to “good” progress (or equivalent to “moderately satisfactory”) toward achieving the SOs was due to a variety of reasons discussed in the CCR. The CCR team, together with inputs from Project and Government counterparts and from other available information (e.g. CPIS, relevant evaluation reports), reconstructed the results framework (shown in Attachment 2). The data/information gaps of the results framework reflect underlying structural weaknesses in the Government’s M&E system, as well as insufficient follow-up and implementation assistance by IFAD (and other development partners)<sup>2</sup>. The updated results framework reflects available information, including proxy data. It provides a key input and reference for inferring progress toward the four SOs. It should be noted that the absence of a comprehensive and effective M&E system at the sectoral level, for ASDP, and even for the COSOP results framework has imposed some constraints in assessing in a rigorous manner the progress toward meeting the SOs. Available quantitative and qualitative information has been compiled to provide an objective basis and assessment. At the same time, there are serious attribution issues which make it very difficult to attribute the extent to which IFAD has generated or contributed to the overall increases or improvements.

With respect to SO1:

Increases in aggregate food production during the period suggest an improved access to productivity-enhanced technologies and services, and to which IFAD has provided some contributions through its various interventions. However, the absence of reliable, comprehensive and disaggregated data, coupled with variable trends (even below the baseline in some cases), suggest that the targets have not been fully achieved, or at the very least, not adequately documented/substantiated. It is not possible to infer large increases, based on limited case studies and/or anecdotal

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that JICA has been providing TA to the MAFC in strengthening the ASDP M&E system, since 2012. The efforts have focused on a “short list” of strategic indicators, and helping to link and integrate the ASDP M&E system with key surveys at the national and LGA levels.

evidence, which have often been generated by the annual sector performance reviews and/or annual Joint ASDP implementation reviews (JIRs). Official data shows that there are reported negligible aggregate increases in crop productivity for major food crops (maize and rice), and livestock productivity for meat and milk production, although not supported by available data, also appear to be somewhat flat in their productivity trends. These modest crop and livestock production and productivity trends, at best, are due to remaining structural constraints at various levels, and also due to limited funding by both public and private sectors in scaling up positive initiatives (e.g., especially FFSs which have played a strategic role in expanding access to new knowledge and technologies).

The public agricultural extension system has been strengthened under ASDP, with a 4% increase in total manpower, substantial on-the-job and formal training, and expanded coverage of smallholders with improved extension messages and resulting increased adoption rates (from 35 to about 50% of farmers). The extension impact study of ASDP (March, 2013), carried out as an input for the on-going ASDP evaluation study, highlights and documents some positive effects and impacts on enhanced production and productivity of food and export crops.<sup>3</sup> Under ASDP, extension service quality has improved, especially where FFSs have been implemented (65,000 FFS and 774,156 farmers trained).<sup>4</sup>

Another impact study carried out as part of the Completion Report for ASDP is the Irrigation Impact Study.<sup>5</sup> It highlights some notable increases in area irrigated, and resulting substantial increases in production and productivity. Some of the more important findings highlighted the following impacts and outcomes from the ASDP-supported irrigation investments:

- In the majority of the studied schemes yields performance, in particular for paddy rice, a greater part obtains relatively high yields that are close to the potential yield;
- Cases of low yield are attributed to non-use of fertilizers, inadequacy of irrigation water and development of salinity;
- ASDP investments were well-targeted to areas with severe poverty and the results show high returns from such schemes;
- Initial results suggest that ASDP could achieve its objective of simultaneously reducing poverty and ensuring food security; and
- Even though reliability of data used to estimate returns to irrigation is low, high returns to irrigation are observed even after reducing yield by 25%. Additionally, ASDP investments are lagged and will continue to benefit irrigators and add positive returns.

The assessment study recently conducted by IFAD in Zanzibar 6 (2013, with respect to SO1) shows that access to new knowledge and technologies has been a principal means of enhancing productivity in both the crop and livestock sector. For example, rice producers have increased rice production from less than a ton per hectare to 5 tons. Likewise, increase in productivity per unit area has been observed in other crop enterprises such as cassava (from 9.5 to 17.6 tons/ha), bananas (from 9.5 to 15

---

<sup>3</sup> See, Extension Impact Study (of ASDP), March 2013. It covered the following main topics, with quantitative and qualitative information: extension coverage and capacity of extension providers; innovative extension methods and success stories; assessment of the effectiveness of extension methods and techniques; impact of FFS on maize and rice productivity; impact of extension methods on income; linkages between technology adoption and increased incomes; allocation of expenditure and economic returns to extension; challenges to effective extension service delivery; and lessons for ASDP II.

<sup>4</sup> URT/MAFC, 2011a: ASDP: Progress on Agricultural Services Report.

<sup>5</sup> Assessment of Achievements of the Agricultural Sector Development Program (ASDP): Returns to Irrigation Development (draft report, August, 2013), prepared by an independent consultant team.

<sup>6</sup> IFAD 2013: Country Programme Review: Zanzibar Sub-Programme, Main Report and Appendices.

tons/ha), tomatoes (from 12.5 to 14 tons/ha), eggs (from 60 to 150 eggs/bird/year) and milk (from 1 to 10 Lts/cow/ day). The total programme outreach is 35, 078 households.<sup>7</sup> While Zanzibar also faces some data and M&E constraints, overall there does appear to be stronger evidence of steady production and productivity increases. Also, since IFAD is one of the few development partners supporting activities in Zanzibar, there is a stronger case for attributing the improvements to support by IFAD, which has played an active role in supporting Zanzibar's agricultural sector.

With respect to SO2:

Overall, there is limited available data to quantify the outcome and intermediate outcome targets regarding the extent and depth/quality of enhanced participation of farmer organizations in the planning and implementation processes of ASDP. The following section highlights some of the qualitative achievements, suggesting good progress. While it is difficult to establish with precision IFAD's contributions, stakeholder feedback and other available information suggest that IFAD has provided a strategic and effective role in supporting these achievements. In summary:

- Some 10,000 village plans (part of DADPs) have been prepared using the Opportunities and Obstacles to Development participatory approach (O&OD). This allowed for local productive agricultural investments (in 2932 villages) on a cost-sharing basis, supporting the establishment of public infrastructures and farmer group investments, with an average investment per farming household equivalent to Tshs. 10,000/year<sup>8</sup>;
- The quality of DADPs has improved over the years, and almost all LGAs follow the guidelines and fulfil the minimum conditions of the Local Capital Development Grant (LCDG) system;
- In Zanzibar (unlike in the Mainland where DADPs are being implemented), one mechanism to encourage farmer participation is the establishment of farmer forums at the district level. These have been established in nine of the ten districts in Zanzibar, actively supported by IFAD activities. The decision to open the participation of these forums not just for the members of the FFS but for all members has led to enhancing their profile and has contributed to making them a more credible body for representing farmer interests. In addition, on a pilot basis, Shehia Agriculture Development Plans (SADPs) were prepared for five Shehias namely; Kisongoni, Kombeni and Dunga-Kiembeni in Unguja; and Kinyikani and Makombeni in Pemba. This exercise had helped the Shehias develop plans for control of theft of animals and crops, introduction of grazing by-laws, improved land use and environmental conservation, enhanced self-confidence and sense of direction and an increased sense of responsibility. This has also led to recognition of the local Shehia leadership at district, regional and national levels; and hence enhancing his/her social capital.

With respect to SO3:

Similar to the other SOs, ASDP has exhibited a strong production focus and a weak M&E system, and therefore it is difficult to establish with precision the extent to which the COSOP has been able to achieve tangible results, especially at the impact and outcome levels, in increasing access to sustainable rural financial services. At the same time, this SO is inherently challenging, given the nature of the risks in providing credit to smallholders. IFAD is recognized by both Government and development partners as being the main agency which has developed a global expertise/niche in promoting expanded access to rural finance by smallholders. In summary:

<sup>7</sup> ASSP/ASDP-L (2013): Zanzibar Sub-Component Self-Assessment

<sup>8</sup> URT (2011) Evaluation of the Performance and Achievements of the Agricultural Sector Development Programme (ASDP). Final Draft.

- By 2010 a number of borrowers in the programme area with loans that have financed income generating activity was 70,619, against the target of 90,000; and
- While the number of MFIs increased from 30 in 2002 to 276 by 2010 against the planned 275; only 20% (versus the planned target of 30%) of micro - entrepreneurs with investment valued at TSh 5 million or more are women.

With respect to SO4:

While there is also limited and outdated data to quantify the extent of progress in promoting increased access to markets and opportunities for rural enterprise, and especially IFAD's contributions, available information suggests very positive progress, while still in the incipient stages of the total required infrastructure. As an input for the evaluation of ASDP, the Government arranged to carry out a Local Infrastructure Impact Study.<sup>9</sup> In summary:

- The recent study on returns to local infrastructure has examined achievements of ASDP with special focus on warehouses, community markets, dip tanks and charco dams in selected district councils. In general, planning and implementation of the projects at the community level have been executed as per ASDP guidelines. Relatively, dip tanks are performing better than the other three infrastructure types. The charco dams dry up quickly, and are partly contributed by faulty engineering designs; warehouses are too small to stimulate production; and community markets are of retail nature, with limited relevance to a rural setting. Notwithstanding these shortcomings, the beneficiary feedback has been generally favourable, especially where there are well-organized farmer groups which help maintain the infrastructure, and also reflected by their general willingness to increase their cost sharing. The study generated some relevant lessons for enhancing the efficiency, effectiveness and impacts of local infrastructure, which can play a key role in expanding market access, especially when coupled with strengthened farmer groups. This highlights a strategic contribution by IFAD, given the special attention it has devoted to supporting and promoting strengthened farmer organizations;
- Assessment of AMSDP<sup>10</sup> reveals that market training and rehabilitation of rural marketing infrastructure have enabled groups to increase volume and diversity of crops produced. For example, in Nkasi district the total production output increased to 86,273 ton for food and cash crops in 2008/09; and
- Implementation of rural marketing infrastructure, including rural roads, opened up accessibility to the farms by trucks, hence contributed to a significant reduction of transportation costs in the benefitted areas (ranging from 50 to 200%). These improvements also reduced travel time by 50%. With these improvements and better market prices, smallholder farmers have expanded their acreage for production of profitable crops, resulting in an increased proportion of marketable surplus.

#### Summary of self-assessment ratings

8. As indicated above, a major aspect of the CCR exercise involved facilitating a self-assessment of IFAD's three instruments on the part of three key actors, resulting in an overall rating of the IFAD-supported programme performance. These three stakeholder groups were: IFAD-supported Project Coordination Teams (of closed and on-going projects); key Government counterparts who are most familiar with the IFAD-supported programmes and involving "core" Ministries (in Mainland and

<sup>9</sup> Assessment of Achievements of the Agricultural Sector Development Program (ASDP): Returns to Local Infrastructure (draft report, January, 2014), prepared by an independent consultant team (from the Sokoine University of Agriculture).

<sup>10</sup> AMSDP Self-Assessment (2013).

Zanzibar); and IFAD staff (past and present) most directly engaged in the Tanzania programme. The stakeholder feedback from the three groups shows consistent feedback, based on the eight assessment criteria<sup>11</sup> (see Attachment 3 for a summary of the CCR ratings matrix, derived from the self-assessments provided by the three stakeholder groups).

9. The following points highlight the main conclusions of the self-assessment responses of the three stakeholder groups:
  - o Based on available information and analyses with respect to the eight assessment criteria, IFAD, working closely with Government, has utilized its three instruments and supporting interventions in a “relatively” efficient and effective manner in order to make “fair to good” progress toward the achievement of the COSOP SOs;
  - o Given the mixed and partial evidence with respect to the eight criteria, the assessment concludes an overall mixed rating of “moderately satisfactory” to “satisfactory” performance, for reasons discussed in the CCR (and supporting attachments). The weak M&E systems make it difficult to establish with “rigor” the extent of progress in achieving the SOs. Also, there was mixed feedback using the self-assessment feedback. Accordingly, the CCR concluded that there is an overall “moderately satisfactory” assessment of programme performance (equivalent to a weighted average rating of 4); and
  - o The SOs and their priority interventions, which have been increasingly consistent with IFAD’s emerging and recognized comparative advantage, have been very relevant to addressing complex and multifaceted agricultural sector issues in both Mainland and Zanzibar.

#### C. IFAD’s Performance

10. Approach/arrangements for COSOP design and implementation stages. The COSOP team emphasized a multi-stakeholder and participatory approach to the design and implementation of the COSOP for the 2007-2013. However, participation of Government was limited to consultations with individual ministries related to agriculture sector. A notable feature in this COSOP was good progress in achieving an envisioned shift from relying on a Cooperation Institution (CI/UNOPS) to direct supervision and implementation support by IFAD technical staff (from both Rome and Tanzania) and consultants (with increasing continuity for more effective contributions). This COSOP period also involved a deliberate decision and actions to decrease the use of separate Project Coordination Units (PCUs). With new projects designed and launched during this COSOP period (ASDP, MUVI and MIVARF), overall there was good progress in integrating project coordination arrangements into existing Government institutional structures and systems, including at the LGA level (especially since about 75% of ASDP funding is implemented through districts). At the same time, these projects have supported strategic activities to enhance the institutional capacities and country systems (e.g., M&E, financial management, procurement, district agricultural development plans, village agricultural development plans).
11. Major changes. In general, there were no major changes in the COSOP implementation arrangements by IFAD, although there were some strategic

---

<sup>11</sup> These are based on eight evaluation criteria (with a rating scale of 1-6), suggested by IFAD’s Independent Office of Evaluation (IOE): Relevance; effectiveness; efficiency; rural poverty impact; sustainability; promotion of pro-poor innovation; replication and scaling up; gender equality and women’s empowerment; and performance of partners.

enhancements to strengthen IFAD's country presence and effectiveness. This strengthening of the Tanzania office and its expanded role was part of IFAD's pilot decentralization model, in order to enhance IFAD's country presence and effectiveness. The CPM was out-posted from Rome to Dar (2006/07); there was the recruitment of a country programme assistant for handling of administrative tasks and provision of operational support; some well qualified national consultants have been hired on a part time basis (as consultants) or as volunteers, which has improved continuity of support. In addition, IFAD HQ continued to provide support for project supervision and implementation support. Also, as part of IFAD's commitment to further decentralize its operations, in 2013 IFAD management made the decision to out-post a Country Director to Tanzania. In early 2014, he assumed his role, while also covering Rwanda.

12. IFAD's office hosting arrangements in Tanzania have endeavored to follow a cost-effective approach by sharing with FAO office space in its office building, based on available and required space. Thus far, the arrangements seem to function adequately, while recognizing that current Tanzania-based staff are overloaded with a large and growing lending programme and agenda of substantive issues. Further growth in the IFAD programme in Tanzania, coupled with IFAD's commitment to continue its decentralization model in Tanzania, will require additional country-level staff, including an administrative assistant to help handle administrative and logistical arrangements.
13. Initial feedback from stakeholders on IFAD's decentralized model of operation in Tanzania has been very positive. All stakeholders interviewed expressed the clear expectation that IFAD should: (a) ensure greater continuity of key staff; and continue to be responsive to key requests and decisions by Government. In turn, this decentralization could enhance the responsiveness, implementation and impacts of IFAD's three key instruments, while ensuring an objective approach to promoting improved portfolio performance.
14. Stakeholder feedback revealed that Government and development partners have recognized IFAD's value-added and niche in contributing to Tanzania's agricultural and rural development through the following key themes and related activities: (a) IFAD was an active participant and co-financier of ASDP, which included contributing to the enhanced implementation of ASDP, using the basket fund mechanism (and the Country Programme Officer (CPO) has played a widely recognized active and constructive role in the Agricultural Working Group; (b) expanded access to rural finance; (c) strengthening farmer organizations, including their active engagement in ASDP planning at the LGA level, especially preparation of DADPs.
15. In the case of Zanzibar, IFAD has given special attention to providing project implementation support (as the main development partner in Zanzibar, also), including support for piloting the use of shehia Agricultural Development Plans (SADPs), for which the Government is currently developing a scaling-up strategy.

#### With respect to lending portfolio/projects

#### 16. Approach/arrangement/results

- IFAD supported existing projects designed during the previous COSOP (as part of their original implementation period), without making major changes in their implementation arrangements (e.g., PIDP, RFSP, and AMSDP);
- For new projects, IFAD shifted to use and strengthen existing government systems and structures, at both central and LGA levels, including the embedding

of Project Coordination Units, use of and strengthening procurement and financial management systems (MUVI and MIVARF);

- A sector wide approach in agriculture, including “basket funding”, is possible where sufficient political and donor commitment is in place, and where a well-resourced decentralization policy and operational plan exists onto which local level agricultural development planning and implementation can be attached. At the same time, it is important for the sector wide approach to include sufficient flexibility to accommodate different funding modalities, given that not all development partners are willing or able to channel funds through one basket fund, while ensuring a common framework;
- Effective M&E systems, at the sectoral and project levels, need careful and adequate attention during the design and implementation phases, to ensure SMART indicators and targets, which are operational and utilized by relevant decision-makers;
- The interventions of ASDP are completely within the framework of the districts and this will help ensure sustainability. For ASSP/ASDP-L Zanzibar, the strong farmer groups developed through FFS are showing signs of self-sustainability. District farmer fora formed by members and non-members of FFS are key tools for promoting sustainability of programme activities;
- Targeting of beneficiaries is an important feature of IFAD-supported portfolio, with varying results. Clear success of targeting can be seen in ASSP/ASDP-L Zanzibar project and MUVI where the project management has been able to closely supervise activities. Tracking for targeting has been a challenge with the ASDP, where implementation is through a decentralized process;
- One of the most common challenges for IFAD-supported projects has involved weak M&E systems, due to a combination of reasons (discussed above). As part of supporting enhanced M&E systems, IFAD introduced the use of RIMS for each IFAD-supported project, based on a common methodology, to capture project outcomes and impacts. There has been variable application and mixed reaction from project teams on the “user-friendliness” features of RIMS, hence limited/mixed commitment to its application and use; and
- IFAD continues to play a key role in identifying, testing and scaling-up successful innovations, especially in thematic areas for which it has developed a comparative advantage. For example:
  - AMSDP and RFSP generated a wealth of experience and lessons (External Evaluation Interim Report) that were useful for scaling up through the MIVARF programme (e.g., RFSP reached very remote areas in support for development of SACCOS, very poor women joining SACCOS through their informal self-help groups);
  - For AMSDP, there was the successful use of private sector partner as outreach mechanism in developing capacity of beneficiaries; the warehouse receipt scheme was an innovation which generated considerable interest, even from outside the project areas;
  - Under the ASSP/ASDP-L Zanzibar, the FFS approach has and continues to generate significant benefits (e.g. use of community animal health workers and farmer facilitators as private service providers, especially in situations where public services provision is inadequate); and
  - The successful results arising from the ASSP/ASDPL- Zanzibar could be considered for scaling-up during the next COSOP period.



17. Major changes. In 2006 the Government introduced its country-wide aid harmonization and reporting system, in line with the Joint Aid Strategy of Tanzania (JAST, 2006). It called for various adjustments and enhancements in the way development partners provided their assistance (e.g., ASDP). These enhancements were in line with IFAD's corporate strategy to implement the principles of the Paris Declaration (of 2005), of enhanced aid harmonization, alignment and effectiveness.

With respect to non-lending

18. Policy dialogue

a) During design and implementation stages:

- The majority of IFAD's policy dialogue on specific issues took place through periodic discussions (when Management visited Tanzania), and especially through the on-going dialogue conducted by the country staff. Most notably, the CPO participated actively and provided important continuity in the various dialogue fora - monthly meetings of the main development partners Group (DPG) and its Agricultural Working Group (AWG); UNCMT and some of the working groups for dialogue on UN-related issues; and the ASDP Basket Fund Steering Committee and the Consultative Group on Agriculture, which has played a key role in shaping overall policy for the sector;
- IFAD used grant resources to support targeted umbrella farmers' organizations like ACT and MVIWATA to promote farmer organization's participation in policymaking and planning at the district and national levels. There was a special focus on equitable access to land markets (US\$4.5 million was set aside for this purpose under ASDP-L) and knowledge management and partnership building.<sup>12</sup>
- There were limited grant resources to support analytical work which could help inform and deepen the policy dialogue in the above fora. Therefore, most of the policy dialogue was based on existing information and cumulative insights into sector issues; and
- Over the past two years, there have been limited non-lending initiatives, which reflects the limited efforts to mobilize grant resources, and also reflects the heavy work load of the limited country staff.

19. Major changes. Government gave policy and programmatic priority to promoting Public-Private-Partnership (PPP) approaches to accelerating agricultural development through various Presidential "flagship" programmes (e.g., including Kilimo Kwanza – Agriculture First—Southern Agriculture Growth Corridor/SAGCOT). These initiatives required expanded non-lending support on the part of IFAD, and efforts to ensure effective integration of its support to Tanzania. Until very recently, these government high-level initiatives had not resulted in major changes to IFAD's support, but required some efforts to ensure integration and complementarity.

20. Partnership building

a) During design and implementation stages:

- IFAD continued to enhance partnerships with Government agencies; the development partner group, including the United Nations family; civil society organizations and the private sector throughout COSOP implementation and

---

<sup>12</sup> IFAD TZ COSOP 2007-2013

evaluation by relying on stakeholder meetings, bilateral consultations and other initiatives;

- IFAD effectively partnered with government ministries (Agriculture, Prime Minister Office, Livestock, Marketing and Industries), development partners (World Bank, Ireland, FAO, AfDB and JICA) in the implementation of the ASDP; with Ireland in the co-financing of MUVI; and with AfDB, and Sweden in co-financing of MIVARF; and
- Partnerships with CSOs (MVIWATA, ACT, TAP, AGRA, and WVT) were also utilized effectively to build capacity and monitor IFAD projects, and to develop innovative solutions to development challenges.

21. Major changes. The above mentioned initiatives by Government to introduce and spearhead activities under two private sector-driven programs (Kilimo Kwanza and SAGCOT) have required IFAD to consider how to best integrate its three instruments, as part of strengthening its partnerships with the private sector in a manner which will be beneficial to smallholders and its other target groups.

22. Knowledge management

a) During design and implementation stages:

IFAD's knowledge management (KM) efforts have focused particularly on:

- deriving key lessons from the IMI Grant on project supervision, including: (a) concretizing the Country Programme Management Team (CPMT); (b) strengthening direct supervision, including peer review in supervision missions that allowed for cross-fertilization among projects; and (c) capacity building of CPMT members;
- building on several other grants which helped to strengthen the M&E systems of the on-going portfolio; and
- using the Zanzibar Sub-programmes (ASSP & ASDP-L) as a country/project case study through encouraging the documentation of IFAD-supported interventions and outcomes, with the aim of ensuring that relevant learning opportunities are identified, disseminated and utilized.

23. Major changes. No major changes took place.

With respect to COSOP management

24. Approach/arrangements for COSOP design and implementation stages

- IFAD's strategic framework (2007-2010) and introduction of its SWAp Policy in 2006<sup>13</sup> influenced the design approach to IFAD's support to the design of the COSOP (including the approach to supporting ASDP);
- The COSOP is seen as a starting point for defining IFAD's future operational engagement in a country, and the process of developing an in-house understanding of issues relative to an agricultural/rural SWAp;
- Participatory processes were promoted by the IFAD team, with a substantial improvement over the participatory processes followed in the previous COSOP

---

<sup>13</sup> IFAD (2006). Sector-Wide Approaches for Agriculture and Rural Development Policy. Rome

period. This enabled effective involvement of stakeholders, and their inputs in the design and implementation of the current COSOP;

- There was a focus on Result-Based COSOP, in line with IFAD guidelines, and reflected in the Results Management Framework (RMF) of the COSOP document; at the same time, the RMF had some weaknesses in that its indicators and targets did not comply adequately with the SMART criteria;
- During the COSOP design period, there was a country level focus on formulating and implementing a JAST. Also, Tanzania was used as a pilot country for the One UN programme that aimed at making the United Nations agencies pull together to achieve national poverty reduction goals. This context and mandate influenced key aspects of the COSOP design;
- During the COSOP period, the agreed Aid harmonization and Reporting system was consistent with the JAST; also, there was focus on UNDAF/UNDAP for the period 2011-2015<sup>14</sup>;
- IFAD introduced (beginning in 2008) annual COSOP implementation reviews which also involved multi-stakeholders, as part of promoting enhanced participation in all phases of the COSOP. While these reviews/workshops were viewed by stakeholders as very “informative”, the strategic agenda varied in quality and there was an absence of systematic follow-up of agreed actions prior to the convening of the next annual review. Also, there was no systematic review of the implementation status of the RMF to gauge the progress toward meeting the SOs, except in the last COSOP review (held in April, 2014). While this last review included attention on assessing progress of the RMF, thus far there had not been systematic follow up; and
- Contrary to the original COSOP plan, the IFAD team did not carry out a Mid-Term Review (MTR), partly due to there being annual COSOP reviews and the country office staff being overstretched with a heavy workload.

## 25. Major changes

- In 2011, IFAD HQ formulated a new IFAD Strategic Framework for the period 2011 to 2015. In general, this corporate strategy reinforced the strategic thrusts and SOs of the current COSOP, while giving greater attention to enabling poor rural people to improve their food security and nutrition, raise their incomes and strengthen their resilience. With this framework, IFAD’s work remains focused on poor rural people and their livelihoods and food security – and on small-scale agriculture as a crucial source of income and nutrition for many poor rural households, and a driver of rural economic growth. IFAD continues to foster the empowerment of poor rural women and men, their organizations and communities, while paying attention to issues related to:
  - Natural resources – land, water, energy and biodiversity;
  - Climate change adaptation and mitigation;
  - Improved agricultural technologies and effective production services;
  - A broad range of inclusive financial services;
  - Integration of poor rural people within value chains;
  - Rural enterprise development and non-farm employment opportunities;
  - Technical and vocational skills development; and
  - Support to rural producers’ organizations.

<sup>14</sup> United Nations Tanzania (2011) Delivering as One: United Nations Development Assistance Action Plan 2011-2015.

- In 2012, IFAD Management introduced the use of the multi-stakeholder Country Programme Management Team (CPMT). It is convened periodically to review IFAD's strategic and operational matters, and to reach a consensus on the way forward. The Tanzania CPMT is playing an active role in providing strategic guidance to the implementation of the COSOP.
- In late 2013, Government requested IFAD to co-finance (with AfDB) the proposed Bagamoyo Sugar Project, focusing on the funding of the Community and Outgrower Development Programme. In principle, IFAD is prepared to commit most of the remaining PBAS funds (US\$ 55.9 M) to support this project, which also supports the BRN agenda and can provide the basis for scaling-up the model/approach to other proposed smallholder outgrower business models; and
- Given that IFAD's IOE will be carrying out a comprehensive CPE during 2014 and into early 2015, the CPMT proposed to extend the current COSOP by an additional two years (to end of 2015). At this time, it is envisioned that the four SOs will continue to drive the focus of IFAD's interventions through its three instruments. At the same time, there is an opportunity to sharpen and enhance its on-going and new interventions to ensure stronger results at the outcome and impact levels (e.g., through improved project/portfolio performance, especially involving MUVI, MIVARF; strengthening sectoral and project M&E systems; re-energizing its non-lending activities to address strategic issues and contribute to a stronger analytical foundation for the design of the next COSOP; funding support for the smallholder outgrower programme of the proposed sugar project).

#### D. Lessons learned and recommendations

26. The CCR/assessment findings and emerging issues/challenges have provided a solid basis to identify and crystallize a number of key lessons. If such lessons are properly applied and adapted to the current and future context of Tanzania, this can enhance the prospects of better achieving the SOs of the on-going and those of the future COSOP (2016-2021). The section below highlights the more relevant lessons which have emerged from the assessment presented in the CCR. These lessons are organized according to IFAD's three main instruments (lending portfolio, non-lending, and COSOP management) to facilitate their operational relevance and application. Further details on these lessons are provided in the CCR. From this list, the CCR team identified six high priority lessons. The criteria used to select these lessons refers to those, if effectively applied, can best contribute to enhanced and sustainable strategic outcomes and impacts of the IFAD-supported and Government-led instruments (especially support to programmes/projects).
27. With respect to lending portfolio (covering all phases of the programme/project cycle)
  - ASDP investments are very thinly spread, given the national scope of the programme, and do not render themselves to achieving a critical threshold to help transform agricultural production and value added in the sector; there is a need to find the right "balance" in terms of supporting national programs (such as ASDP) and achieving transformative results of rural poverty reduction;
  - The ASDP M&E framework needs to ensure that national surveys have sufficient resources to provide necessary analysis and results on time, that service delivery surveys are financed to provide the missing annual assessments of outcome and impact performance, and that the M&E system tracks reform processes as well as measuring conventional benefits such as production and technology adoption;

- A sector-wide approach in agriculture, including “basket funding”, is possible where sufficient political and donor commitment is in place, and where a well-resourced decentralization policy and operational plan exists onto which local level agricultural development planning and implementation can be attached. At the same time, it is important for the sector-wide approach to include sufficient flexibility to accommodate different funding modalities, given that not all development partners are willing or able to channel funds through one basket fund, while ensuring a common framework; and
- There is a need to invest greater efforts and technical assistance to strengthen project and programme level M&E systems, so that they can serve as an effective tool for enhancing implementation and assurance of results at the outcome and impact levels; this will require investing resources in capacity development, among multi-stakeholder entities and actors.

28. With respect to non-lending

Policy dialogue:

- A strengthened country office and staff continuity (e.g., CPO) enables IFAD to get more effectively engaged in policy dialogue, partnership building and knowledge management. At the same time, non-lending is staff intensive, and hence, there is a need to prioritize carefully non-lending activities and its engagement in strategic policy dialogue.

29. With respect to COSOP management

- The increased trend toward IFAD’s engagement with multi-stakeholders in all phases of COSOP pillars has proven to be sound and effective in getting better results, and needs to be further strengthened (e.g., systematic follow-up to COSOP reviews; how to promote broad-based private sector role in agricultural development and rural enterprises espousing the Public-Private-Producer Partnerships).

Priority strategic recommendations

30. In the light of evidenced-based conclusions summarized in the CCR, identification of strategic issues and lessons from the design and implementation of the COSOP for Tanzania, this final section summarizes priority strategic recommendations. They are intended to further enhance the COSOP performance during its extended period (2014 and 2015, through on-going instruments/interventions), and to provide inputs for the new COSOP, guided by a results focus. This in turn, is intended to further support Government’s strategies and programmes for accelerated and inclusive agricultural growth and significantly reduced rural poverty. The proposed recommendations do not include specific ones emerging from recent IFAD supervision and implementation support missions. These agreed actions are assumed will be carried out by the relevant actors. Some of the recommendations involve enhanced processes which would facilitate the effective carrying out of these project-specific actions (e.g. MUVI and MIVARF, which had been facing some major challenges).
31. There is no “single” action which will secure “easy gains”, given that the IFAD-supported programme and IFAD performance are performing “moderately satisfactory” (with some variability). Given the complex nature of constraints at various levels, some structural in their nature, there is a need for IFAD’s Tanzania CPMT to work closely and in parallel with relevant stakeholders on various fronts,

and finding the most appropriate sequencing/phasing of actions. Accordingly, IFAD should not presume “to do” the actions, but find ways to empower strategic stakeholders to address the relevant issues identified in this report. The recommendations emerging from this CCR are organized according to IFAD’s three instruments to facilitate their operationalization. From the list of recommendations arising from the CCR/assessment, the CCR team identified seven high priority recommendations, which are outlined below. The criteria used to select these priorities refers to those actions, which if effectively implemented, could best contribute to enhanced and sustainable strategic outcomes and impacts of the IFAD-supported and Government-led instruments (especially support to on-going programmes/projects).<sup>15</sup>

32. With respect to lending portfolio (covering all phases of the programme/project cycle)

- In the event IFAD supports the forthcoming ASDP 2, which will provide a framework for support from all development partners, it is vital from the outset, with appropriate and effective technical support, to address the key challenges in the design of the SWAP and the specific modality of support, considering the cumulative experience and involvement of diverse stakeholders and the coordination effectiveness of various line ministries;
- Support to promoting agricultural productivity and sustained production by smallholder farmers is achieved through a package of well integrated strategic measures, and not by a single intervention. This approach is to be strongly supported through on-going and future projects, including adequate organisational empowerment of farmers in order to improve their ability to access services and inputs and to be able to tackle some of their constraints collectively; and
- Effective M&E systems of on-going and new projects need careful and adequate attention during the design and implementation phases, to ensure “SMART” indicators and targets are sound (and re-formulated, as needed), operational, and utilized by relevant decision-makers and implementers. It is especially important to give high priority to enhancing the M&E systems of on-going projects and for Government and IFAD project teams to use them effectively to enhance performance and results (especially with respect to MUVI and MIVARF).

33. With respect to non-lending

Policy dialogue:

- It is important that IFAD continue to strengthen its country office and staff continuity, with the aim of enabling IFAD to sustain (and re-activate, where needed) its proactive engagement in policy dialogue, partnership building and knowledge management. At the same time, non-lending is staff intensive, and hence, there is a need to prioritize carefully non-lending activities and its effective integration in strategic policy dialogue and design/enhancement of on-going and new projects.

---

<sup>15</sup> In addition, it is recognized that: each of the on-going IFAD-supported projects have agreed actions which could enhance their performance and impacts (including recent agreed actions for two on-going “struggling” projects --- MUVI and MIVARF); the forthcoming CPE will generate relevant recommendations which could also consider the ones arising from the TCPA.

34. With respect to COSOP management

- With respect to the on-going COSOP, it will be important for the IFAD CPMT, together with key Government counterparts and other stakeholders, to take a proactive approach to enhancing the effectiveness of on-going instruments and interventions, using effectively enhanced M&E systems;
- With respect to the new COSOP, it will be important for IFAD and its Government counterparts to establish a clear and strong results chain to underpin a solid and operational results management framework. This will facilitate the most effective approaches and interventions for IFAD support, especially which are linked to achieving higher level SOs and their respective impact and outcome indicators and targets; and
- With respect to the new COSOP, ensure adequate time and effort are allocated to facilitate and achieve meaningful multi-stakeholder participation in its design, implementation and M&E, including securing stronger multi-stakeholder ownership, implementation effectiveness and strategic results. At the same time, it is important to ensure systematic monitoring of the RMF and a timely and comprehensive mid-term review which can assess progress in a rigorous manner (at the outcome level, to the extent possible). This can provide a solid basis for possible adjustments/enhancements, facilitate the final assessment, and provide useful inputs to the new COSOP.



## Attachment 1: Results Framework (2007 – 2013) \*

Country Strategy Alignment	Key Results for COSOP			Institutional/Policy Objectives
	Strategic Objectives	Outcome that IFAD Expects to Influence	Milestone Indicators	Policy Dialogue Agenda
<p>1. Increased agricultural growth on Mainland from 5% (2003) to 10% (2010) and in Zanzibar from 2.4% (2005) to 6% (2010).</p> <p>2. Increased livestock sub-sector growth on Mainland from 3.5% (2003) to 9% (2010).</p> <p>3. Increased off-farm income generating activities (MSMEs)- Mainland (26% of 4.8m households in 2003 to 34% in 2010 nationwide).</p> <p>4. Secured and facilitated marketing of agricultural produce (Mainland).</p> <p>5. Improved access to microfinance services (Zanzibar).</p>	<p><b>SO 1:</b> Improved access to productivity enhancing technologies and services</p> <p><b>SO 2:</b> Enhanced participation of farmer organizations in planning of ASDP</p> <p><b>SO 3:</b> Increased access to sustainable rural financial services</p> <p><b>SO 4:</b> Increased access to markets and opportunities for rural enterprise</p>	<p>With other partners, by 2010:</p> <p>1.1. Increase food production (Baseline 2003 9mT) to 12mT.</p> <p>1.2. Increase % of farmers using modern technology (Baseline 2003: Irrigation 5%, fertilizer 12%, FYM 26%, improved seed 26%)</p> <p>1.3. Increase % use of farm mechanization (Baseline 2003: ox-plough 23%, tractor 3%)</p> <p>1.4. Proportion of smallholders participating in contract production (Baseline 2003: 0.9%) to 1.3%</p> <p>1.5. Increase % of livestock keepers using improved technology (Baseline 2003: 16% access to extension)</p> <p>2.1. 50% of ASDP DADPs clearly reflect priorities of majority of poor farmers/livestock keepers</p> <p>3.1. % of farmers who accessed formal agricultural credit (Baseline 2003 1.7%) to 10% using RFSP-assisted SACCOS.</p> <p>3.2. % of poor, especially women accessing microfinance services in Zanzibar (Baseline 2005: 12,200 members of MFIs)</p> <p>4.1. % increase in volume of produce marketed through secured warehouses (Baseline: 8 operational warehouses in 2006).</p>	<p>1.1 Zonal agricultural research institute funds operational beginning 2008 under ASDP and ASSP/ASDP-L.</p> <p>1.2 Number of districts qualifying for district agricultural grants under ASDP remains steady or increased (107 of 121 for 2007/08).</p> <p>1.3 40% of 4m. (Mainland) and 0.6m (Zanzibar) farmers/livestock keepers access extension services by 2009 under ASDP/ASSP/ASDP-L (crop 35% in 2003).</p> <p>1.4 15% increase in value of services delivered through NGOs/private sector by 2008 under ASDP/ASSP/ASDP-L.</p> <p>1.5 Financial arrangements in place for private sector acquisition/use of agricultural machinery (including animal-powered) by beginning 2009.</p> <p>2.1 Farmers forums established and recognized in 50% of districts by 2010.</p> <p>3.1 30% increase in membership of SACCOS by 2010 in RFSP regions (54,867 members 2006).</p> <p>3.2 50% increase in number of community banks supporting SACCOS in RFSP (Baseline: 3 in 2006)</p> <p>3.3 10% increase in number of functional SACCOS in Zanzibar by 2010 (through FO grant).</p> <p>3.4 From 2011, increase in number of rural financial services products (in addition to the SACCOS) nationwide.</p> <p>4.1 50% increase by 2009 in number of completed business plans for supply contracts under MUVI and AMSDP.</p> <p>4.2 50% increase in number and membership of producer/trade organizations under AMSDP and MUVI (501 groups by AMSDP in 2006).</p> <p>4.3 25% increase in number of rehabilitated warehouses (AMSDP) by 2009 (9 in 2006).</p>	<p>1.1 Security of right to land/water and equitable access for various land uses (support ACT initiative).</p> <p>1.2 Increasing the participation of the private sector in agricultural service delivery.</p> <p>1.3 Environmental safeguards for local investments.</p> <p>1.4 Mitigating impact of climate change</p> <p>2. Increasing participation of poorer farmer groups in ASDP planning at village/district level.</p> <p>3.1 Development of regulatory framework for rural finance.</p> <p>4.1 Development of strategy, rules and regulations for implementation of the Agricultural Marketing Policy (AMSDP-assisted), including produce quality certification and accreditation of inputs.</p> <p>4.3 Formulation of more efficient agricultural taxation regulations at district level.</p>

\* Except from the COSOP for the United Republic of Tanzania (September, 2007, at the time of design).



## Attachment 2: COSOP Results Framework (2007-2013): Progress \*

Strategic Objectives *	Planned Outcomes that IFAD Expects to Influence (by 2010) *	Estimated Outcomes (with IFAD Influence) (by end of 2010 and 2013) **	Planned Milestone Indicators *	Estimated Milestone Outputs (by end of 2010 and 2013) **
SO 1: Improved access to productivity enhancing technologies and services	<p>With other partners, by 2010:</p> <p>1.1. Increase food production<sup>1</sup> Baseline 2003: 9 million MT) Target 2010: to 12 million MT.</p>	<p>Working with other partners, by end of 2010 and 2013 the following estimated achievements were made:</p> <p>1.1. Increased food production Maize: 2010: 4.5 million MTs 2013: 5.2 million MTs 2014: 6.7 MTs Rice: 2010: 1.7 M MTs 2013: 1.3 M MTs 2014: 1.7 M MTs Beans: 2010: 0.87 M MTs 2013: 1.2 M MTs 2014: 1.4 M MTs Beef 2010: 0.243 M MTs 2013: 0.289 M MTs Milk 2010: 1,65 M liters 2013: 1.85 M liters</p> <p>Total "Food":<sup>2</sup> 2010: 12.3 M MTs 2013: 14,4 M MTs 2014: 16 M MTs</p>	1.1 Zonal agricultural research institute funds operational beginning 2008 under ASDP and ASSP/ASDP-L.	1.1: Zonal agricultural research institute funds operational (via ASDP and ASSP/ASDP-L): 2010: TSh 4.2 billion 2013: TSh 0.89 billion (The data are for ASDP only)

\* This Results Framework refers to the RF used for the COSOP (2007-2013), with updated progress, based on available information (and was included as an annex in the COSOP Completion Report (CCR), dated April, 2014).

<sup>1</sup> In the original RF (of 2007), there was no definition of "food crops", nor was there any disaggregation of the main food crops, thereby making it difficult to come up with an accurate comparison.

<sup>2</sup> Food crops include: Maize, Rice, Sorghum, Millets, Potatoes, Banana, Cassava and Pulses. The main data source is the MAFC Department of National Food Security

	<p>1.2. Increase % of farmers using modern technology (Baseline 2003: Irrigation 5%, fertilizer 12%, FYM 26%, improved seed 26%)</p> <p>1.3. Increase % use of farm mechanization (Baseline 2003: ox-plough 23%, tractor 3%)</p>	<p>Productivity Indicators:<sup>3</sup>  Maize: (MT/Ha)  2010: 1.55  2013: 1.24  2014: 1.6  Rice:  2010: 2.33  2013: 2.25  2014: 1.8  Beans:  2010: 0.72  2013: 0.95  2014: 1.8  Beef (use relevant productivity indicator)  2010: XX  2013: XX  Milk (Lts/cow/yr)  2010: XX  2013: XX</p> <p>1.2. % of farmers using modern technology  (a) Irrigation:  2010: 7.6 %  2013: 7.26 %  2014: 7.43 %  (b) fertilizer:  2010: 10 %  2013: XX %  (c) Farm Yard Manure (FYM):  2010: 10 %  2013: XX %  (d) Improved Seed:  2010: 24.3 %  2013: 25 %  2015: 25 %</p>	<p>1.2 Number of districts qualifying for district agricultural grants under ASDP remains steady or increased (107 of 121 for 2007/08).</p> <p>1.3 40% of 4m (Mainland) and 0.6m (Zanzibar) farmers/livestock keepers access extension</p>	<p>1.2 Number of districts qualifying for district agricultural grants under ASDP  2010: No. XXX  2013: No. XXX</p> <p>1.3 % of 4 million (Mainland) and of 0.6m (Zanzibar) farmers/livestock keepers access extension services by ASDP/ASSP/ASDP-L  2010: XXX %  2012: 45 % (mainland)<sup>4</sup>  2012: 53 (Zanzibar) (of which 61% are women)</p> <p>1.4 % increase in value of services</p>
--	--	---	--	--

<sup>3</sup> In the original RMF, there was no stated indicator and breakdown according to productivity. These figures for the main food crops have compiled from official sources.

<sup>4</sup> Source: Extension Impact Study (March, 2013).

	<p>1.4. Proportion of smallholders participating in contract production (Baseline 2003: 0.9% to 1.3% (in 2010)</p> <p>1.5. Increase % of livestock keepers using improved technology (Baseline 2003: 16% (access to extension)</p>	<p>Extension Impact study (2013) reports that S/Hs participating in the FFSs have highest % of adopting improved technologies</p> <p>1.3 Farm Mechanization:</p> <p>a) Ox-plow: 2010: 14.5 % 2013: XX %</p> <p>b) tractor 2010: 0.9 % 2013: XX %</p> <p>1.4 XX% of smallholders participating in contract production: 2010: XX % 2013: XX % Note: this is one of the ASDP shortlisted indicators</p> <p>1.5 XX% increase of livestock keepers using improved technology 2010: XX % 2013: XX % % increase in access to extension: 2010: XX % 2013: XX %</p>	<p>services by 2009 under ASDP/ASSP/ASDP-L (crop 35% in 2003).</p> <p>1.4 15% increase in value of services delivered through NGOs/private sector by 2008 (under ASDP/ASSP/ASDP-L).</p> <p>1.5 Financial arrangements in place for private sector acquisition/use of agricultural machinery (Including animal-powered) by beginning 2009.</p>	<p>delivered through NGOs/private sector under ASDP/ASSP/ASDP-L.: <sup>5</sup></p> <p>2010: XXX % 2013: XXX %</p> <p>1.5 XXX</p>
SO 2: Enhanced participation of farmer organizations in planning of ASDP	2.1. 50% of ASDP DADPs clearly reflect priorities of majority of poor farmers and/or livestock keepers	2.1 XX% of ASDP DADPs which clearly reflect priorities of majority of poor farmers/livestock keepers (or some proxy indicator):	2.1 Farmers forums established and recognized in 50% of districts by 2010.	2.1 No (X). and XX % of Districts where farmer forums have been established and recognized: 2010: XXX No. XXX % of Districts 2013: XXX No.

<sup>5</sup> This indicator was dropped as one of the key "short listed" indicators monitored under ASDP.

		<p>2010: XX % 2013: XX %</p> <p>It is estimated that about 10,000 village plans (part of DADPs) have been prepared using the O&amp;OD approach. This allowed for local productive agricultural investments funded by ASDP (covering nearly 3000 villages), on a cost-sharing basis, supporting the establishment of public infrastructures and farmer group investments, with an average investment per farming household equivalent to Tshs. 10,000/year<sup>6</sup>.</p> <p>The quality of DADPs is reported to have improved over the years. Almost all LGAs follow the guidelines and fulfil the minimum conditions of the Local Capital Development Grant (LCDG) system.</p> <p>In Zanzibar (unlike in the Mainland where DADPs are being implemented), one mechanism to encourage farmer participation is the establishment of farmer forums at the district level. These have been established in nine of the ten districts in Zanzibar, actively supported by IFAD activities. The decision to open the participation of these forums not just for</p>		<p>XXX % of Districts</p> <p>See qualitative comment, which implies good progress in establishing and operationalizing and strengthening farmers' forums and other avenues for promoting S/H engagement in the planning processes. (IFAD funds supported this work through MVIWATA and ACT)</p>
--	--	--	--	---

<sup>6</sup> URT (2011) Evaluation of the Performance and Achievements of the Agricultural Sector Development Programme (ASDP). Final Draft

		<p>the members of the FFS but for all farmers has led to enhancing their profile and has contributed to making them a more credible body for representing farmer interests. In addition, on a pilot basis, Shehia Agriculture Development Plans were prepared for Kisongoni and Kinyikani in Zanzibar. This exercise had helped the Shehias develop plans for control of theft of animals and crops, introduction of grazing by-laws, improved land use and environmental conservation, enhanced self-confidence and sense of direction and an increased sense of responsibility. This has also led to recognition of the local shehia leadership at district, regional and national levels. Other available qualitative information<sup>7</sup> reports that “significant progress has been made (in a total of 10 districts, including 2 districts in Zanzibar) in terms of support to smallholders and smallholder organizations in the areas of advocacy, planning and negotiating capacities (in both mainland and Zanzibar). In Zanzibar, there are qualitative reports of enhanced financial</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

<sup>7</sup> Extract from the Tanzania Country Programme Issues Sheet/CPIS (IFAD, January, 2013)

		empowerment, especially for women groups." At the same time, there was limited funding for these local level activities, and therefore limited the scope and depth of fully achieving this overall SO.		
SO 3: Increased access to sustainable rural financial services	<p>3.1. % of farmers who accessed formal agricultural credit (Baseline 2003: 1.7% to 10% (2010) (Using RFSP-assisted SACCOS).</p> <p>3.2. % of poor, especially women accessing microfinance services in Zanzibar (Baseline 2005: 12,200 members of MFIs)</p>	<p>3.1 % of farmers who accessed formal agricultural credit (using SACCOS): 2010: XX % 2013: XX %</p> <p>3.2. % of poor, and members of MFIs, especially women accessing microfinance services in Zanzibar 2010: XX % 2013: XX %</p> <p>Available proxy information for country-wide trends: Under the now closed RFSP, the latter had assisted 276 grass roots MFIs (by end 2009), against a design target of 275. There was growth in the number of members of MFIs which grew from 3,750 in 2002 to 117,524 by 2010.<sup>8</sup></p> <p>Under the on-going MIVARF, it is supporting grassroots financial institutions, with the aim of</p>	<p>3.1 30% increase in membership of SACCOS by 2010 in RFSP regions (54,867 members 2006).</p> <p>3.2 50% increase in number of community banks supporting SACCOS in RFSP (Baseline: 3 in 2006)</p> <p>3.3 Ten % increase in number of functional SACCOS in Zanzibar by 2010 (through FO grant).</p> <p>3.4 From 2011, increase in number of rural financial services products (in addition to the SACCOS) nationwide.</p>	<p>3.1 XX% increase in membership of SACCOS in RFSP regions 2010: XXX % 2013: XXX %</p> <p>Please note that SACCOS were indicated as a shortlisted ASDP Indicator.</p> <p>3.2 XX% increase in number of community banks supporting SACCOS 2010: XX % 2013: XX % (Info obtained from RFSP)</p> <p>3.3 XX% increase in number of functional SACCOS in Zanzibar (through FO grant). 2010: XX % 2013: XX %</p> <p>3.4 From 2011, XX increase in number of rural financial services products (in addition to the SACCOS) nationwide. 2010: XX No. 2013: XX No.</p>

<sup>8</sup> Rural Financial Services Programme and Agricultural Marketing Systems Development Programme Interim Evaluation. October 2011. Independent Office of Evaluation.

		<p>building their capacities to increase rural outreach and expanded access to microfinance services.</p> <p>Tanzania has made good progress in developing its financial sector over the last several years. However, access to and quality of rural financial services have been below desired levels, and the sector still faces some key constraints because of commercial bank sector's risk perception of small-scale operators in the agricultural and rural sectors are very high.</p> <p>Although the GoT has established the Tanzania Agricultural Development Bank (TADB), it will take time to reach a point of meeting adequately the financial targets of smallholder producers and entrepreneurs and especially those residing in rural and remote areas.</p>		
SO 4: Increased access to markets and opportunities for rural enterprise	4.1. % increase in volume of produce marketed through secured warehouses (Baseline: 8 operational warehouses in 2006).	<p>4.1. Volume and % increase in produce marketed through secured warehouses: 2006: 821 MT 2009: 8452 % Increase: 929% (note: data not available for 2013)</p>	<p>4.1 50% increase by 2009 in number of completed business plans for supply contracts under MUVI and AMSDP.</p> <p>4.2 50% increase in number and membership of producer/trade organizations under AMSDP</p>	<p>4.1 XX% increase in number of completed business plans for supply contracts under MUVI and AMSDP</p> <p>4.2 % increase in number and membership of producer/trade organizations: under AMSDP (by 2009): 140% under MUVI (by 2013): N.A.?</p>

		<p>Available information from AMSDP indicates that market training and rehabilitation of rural marketing infrastructure have enabled groups to increase volume and diversity of crops produced and marketed.</p> <p>Implementation of rural marketing infrastructure opened up accessibility to the farms by trucks, hence contributed to a reduction of transportation costs (in some cases reported to be a savings of over 100%). This also has reduced travel time by 50%, thereby contributing to expand marketing options/competition.</p>	<p>and MUVI (501 groups by AMSDP in 2006).</p> <p>4.3 25% increase in number of rehabilitated warehouses (AMSDP) (9 in 2006)</p>	<p>4.3 % increase in number of rehabilitated warehouses</p> <p>Under AMSDP, by 2009: 77%</p> <p>Under MUVI: XX%</p>
--	--	--	--	---



## Attachment 3: Ratings Matrix\*

<b>Assessment of country program</b>	<b>Rating (1-6 scale)</b>
– Rural poverty impact	4
– Relevance	5
– Effectiveness	4
– Efficiency	4
– Sustainability of benefits	4
– Gender equality	4
– Innovation and scaling up	4
– Natural resource management	4
– Adaptation to climate change	4
– Policy dialogue	4
– Knowledge management	4
– Partnership building	4
<b>Overall country program achievements</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Assessment of performance</b>	<b>Rating (1-6 scale)</b>
– IFAD performance	4
– Borrower performance	4

\* These ratings are based on the results of the self-assessment exercise carried out for preparing the CCR. The definition of each rating is based on the scale formulated by IFAD's IOE. 4 is equivalent to "moderately satisfactory". A detailed questionnaire was administered to key IFAD counterparts from three stakeholder groups: Project Coordinators of IFAD-funded projects (past and present); Government officials (central and agriculture sector ministries/agencies, in mainland and Zanzibar); and IFAD staff (most directly engaged in the design and implementation). Although there was some variability of responses amongst respondents from these 3 stakeholder groups, there was a convergence as reflected in the above ratings.

## Attachment 4: Comments/inputs from borrower

1. The CCR/assessment exercise devoted substantial efforts to taking a participatory approach, by engaging key stakeholders in providing inputs to formulate the CCR. Various approaches and instruments were used to secure this active participation, including imparting a self-assessment questionnaire which was facilitated by face-to-face interviews and discussion, to ensure clarity, meaningful discussion and substantive inputs for preparing the CCR. In addition, the CCR team organized a two day consultation workshop involving these stakeholders to share the main findings and recommendations of the draft CCR, and to generate and consolidate further inputs/feedback from the participants.\* Small discussion groups were used to seek consensus and further inputs, including responses to the following guide questions (with respect to the PowerPoint presentation):

- Do the main findings and emerging issues of the draft CCR resonate with your project design and implementation experience? Are there any other major issues involving your project?
- Are the identified high priority lessons the “right” lessons for IFAD and Project Teams to focus on? What are other relevant lessons?
- Assuming the priority strategic recommendations are the “right” ones, what support do your project teams require to implement them in the context of your on-going Project implementation? (Kindly share two examples with respect to your project)

2. Given the participatory nature of the CCR exercise and responses/inputs provided during the consultation workshop, the IFAD country/CCR team concluded that it was not necessary for the Government stakeholders to review further the draft CCR; accordingly, their comments and further inputs were captured and consolidated through the above workshop and incorporated in the final version of the CCR. The final CCR was distributed to the participating stakeholders, whom did not provide additional comments.

3. In addition, in order to capture some of the more important additional comments/inputs from the three stakeholder groups, the CCR team synthesized the self-assessment feedback according to IFAD’s three instruments, and according to the evaluation criteria used for the CCR/self-assessment exercise. The Table below synthesizes the comments/inputs from the Government stakeholders; they were subdivided in two sub-groups: Project Coordinators and Government officials, whom are key counterparts to the IFAD country team. This feedback was incorporated in the final version of the CCR, including lessons learned and recommendations.

\* Consultation Workshop: COSOP Completion report and self-assessment: Summary of Main Conclusions, Priority Lessons and Recommendations (presentation to IFAD Stakeholders, April 1, 2014, Arusha, Tanzania)

IFAD-supported instruments	Inputs/ratings according to assessment criteria  Comments/inputs by Project Coordinators (of IFAD-supported projects)	Inputs/ratings according to assessment criteria  Comments/inputs by key Government counterparts (included senior officials familiar with IFAD operations, representing key central Government Ministries (POPC, PDB, PMO, MoF, MAFC, MLFD, PMO-RALG))
A) by IFAD-supported Portfolio:	<p>a) <u>Relevance</u>: All Project teams reported that projects were generally well aligned and coherent with Government national, sectoral and LGA policies and strategies, and investment priorities. This alignment is reflected by many of the projects using similar or the same impact and outcome indicators used by the Government's policy and strategy documents. Accordingly, there was an average rating of "satisfactory" (5).</p> <p>b) <u>Effectiveness</u>: All projects generally made good progress toward meeting their project objectives, although there was some variability among projects. However, all projects suffered from weak M&amp;E systems and the absence of evidence to demonstrate the extent to which the expected impact and outcome indicators and targets were achieved. It is also worth noting that for some projects there has been limited time to observe and document impact and outcomes, especially also when projects (e.g. ASSP/ASDP-L, ASDP, MUVI and MIVARF) have experienced delays and other challenges. Accordingly, the overall rating is "moderately satisfactory" (4). There was one project (i.e. MIVARF) that had a lower self-rating for this criterion.</p>	<p>Overall, the feedback responses from this diverse group of key Government stakeholders with respect to the eight assessment criteria varied from "moderately satisfactory to satisfactory" (4-5). More specifically, with respect to:</p> <p>a) <u>Relevance</u>: Overall very favourable, with strong alignment with Government growth and poverty reduction policies and strategies. (rating: satisfactory=5)</p> <p>b) <u>Effectiveness</u>: Generally favourable but recognizing mixed performance, attribution issues, inadequate attention to strategic interventions involving the private sector and marketing; and general absence of evidence to ascertain the degree of progress to meeting SOs and related evidence on impact and outcome indicators and targets. (rating: moderately satisfactory= 4)</p> <p>c) <u>Efficiency</u>: Overall moderately satisfactory while recognizing the absence of clear unit costs targets for key project outputs, implementation delays especially at start up and mixed budget execution and some cost overruns. (Rating: 4)</p> <p>d) <u>Rural poverty impacts</u>: There were five aspects which were discussed (see questionnaire). One of the notable common observations was the country- level stagnant trends in agricultural productivity for most crops and livestock commodities due to various underling constraints, while recognizing pockets of increased productivity of selected food and</p>

	<p>c) <u>Efficiencies</u>: All project teams noted that there were variable efficiencies in their projects, due to diverse reasons outside their control (e.g., delayed and insufficient Government counterpart funds; delayed releases and weak implementation capacities especially at LGA levels). All projects had not tracked unit costs for key project outputs. Percent of budget execution was below targets and there were implementation start up delays for most projects. There was an average self-rating of “moderately satisfactory” (4).</p> <p>(d) <u>Rural poverty impacts</u>: In general, all Project Teams recognized shortcomings in generating, and especially in documenting the impacts (especially household income increases) and outcomes of their respective projects with solid quantitative evidence (as also required by RIMS). It is notable that all Project teams felt that their projects were generating positive benefits to the target beneficiaries, although delayed in some cases, due to project start up delays (e.g., ASSP/ASDP-L, MUVI, MIVARF). The main reasons were due to weak capacities at various levels; variable quality of the logical frameworks (including a lack of “SMART” indicators and targets); weak M&amp;E systems (and deficient indicators and targets), which also often resulted in an absence of or significantly delayed or flawed baseline data (e.g., ASSP/ASDP-L).</p> <p>In most projects, there was very favorable formation of social capital and empowerment of target beneficiaries, including gender</p>	<p>export crops. There was consistently positive feedback on increased social capital formation and empowerment of beneficiary farmer organizations, which has been a focus area of IFAD interventions.</p> <p>Given the scale and extent of rural poverty and the structural challenges to transform the sector, it was noted that IFAD (and other DPs) investments and other support is insignificant on its own unless harnessed with an expanded and inclusive private sector role.</p> <p>Accordingly, it was noted that the rural poverty issues are multi-factorial, multifaceted and multidimensional, hence, requiring a multi-pronged approach.</p> <p>There was a special recognition of IFAD’s valuable contributions to enhanced policies and institutions development involving agricultural marketing and rural finance. Linked to the effectiveness criterion it was rated between “moderately unsatisfactory to moderately satisfactory”. (Rating= 3-4)</p> <p>e) <u>Sustainability</u>: Overall, there was conscious optimism of sustainability aspects of the IFAD-supported projects. This reflected supporting country level programmes (e.g ASDP) and increased usage of country systems and processes of ASLMs and LGAs, and including increased integration of project teams into existing structures. At the same time it was noted that limited involvement of private sector is a shortfall that needs to be addressed in a more significant manner by all actors. (Rating=4)</p> <p>(f) <u>Pro-poor innovations, replications and scaling-up</u>: The overall perception reflects a mixed assessment. While it is noted that IFAD promotes strategic innovations and their scaling-up, achieving this in practice is a major challenge which requires the active involvement of multi-stakeholders and substantial</p>
--	---	--

	<p>aspects. All teams recognized the challenges in establishing clear attribution of results with respect to Project interventions, which is also recognized as a common weakness in the M&amp;E system (including absence of special impact studies). Recently, ASDP carried out three impact studies which provide useful analysis and more rigorous assessment of outcomes and impact indicators, thereby redressing some of the above weaknesses.</p> <p>In the case of Zanzibar, it was easier to establish attribution because the ASSP/ASDP-L was the dominant public intervention on the Island.</p> <p>There were also positive views on Project contributions to: enhanced agricultural productivity and food security (e.g., through FFSSs, although there is an acute absence of supporting data).</p> <p>There are some incipient gains in addressing climate change issues. Numerous projects have contributed to some key institutional and policy reforms (e.g., supporting ASDP planning and implementation processes at the LGA level through DADPs espousing the O&amp;OD bottom up participatory planning approach advocated under Decentralization by Devolution- D by D). In addition, some IFAD-supported projects said to have contributed to the formulation of a number of policies both in Mainland Tanzania and Zanzibar (e.g. Agricultural Marketing Policy 2008; Agricultural Policy 2013, National Irrigation Policy 2012, Zanzibar Livestock Policy; and microfinance agenda (e.g. establishment of the Dept. of Micro-Finance in the Ministry of</p>	<p>investments by both public and private investors, facilitated. Accordingly, IFAD is encouraged to promote and scale up effective innovations where there is adequate evidence. For example, it was noted that the follow up project (e.g MIVARF) to innovations introduced through RFSP and AMSDP (e.g WRS) were a practical approach to scaling-up relevant innovations. Accordingly, the overall rating hovered around "moderately satisfactory" (Rating=4).</p> <p><u>(g) Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment:</u> Overall, there was favourable feedback on this criterion, with recognition that IFAD has consistently promoted and enhanced gender equality and women's empowerment in all the IFAD-supported operations. Accordingly, there was a "satisfactory" rating by nearly all respondents. (Rating= 4)</p> <p><u>(h) Performance of Partners:</u> The feedback focused on the performance of IFAD and Government actors and conveyed a generally similar assessment for different reasons. With regards to IFAD, the following main points were noted: (i) it is a solid DP strongly committed to rural poverty reduction and being responsive to Government priorities; (ii) where there is a current challenge with one of the projects (e.g MIVARF), there was a negative feedback on IFAD's role and approach to the way forward; (iii) the increased country presence and mandate was strongly associated with positive feedback. It was noted that the country presence has been erratic during recent periods and all actors welcomed a strong country presence and mandate. There was a special appreciation conveyed on the commitment and contributions of the CPO.</p> <p>With regards to Government performance, there was a multi-dimensional response given diverse institutions actors at central and LGA levels, while noting the additional challenges at the LGA level.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>Finance; Department of Cooperative Micro-Finance, with a focus on licensed and non-licensed SACCOS; and Dept. of Cooperative Banking and Investment under the newly formed Tanzania Commission of Cooperatives ).</p> <p>Accordingly, especially due to the absence of clear and documented evidence, the average rating for the rural poverty impact indicator hovered around "moderately unsatisfactory" to "moderately satisfactory" (3-4).</p> <p>e) <u>Sustainability</u>: Overall, there was a view that each project reflected favorable sustainability features and an exit strategy. These features were the result of intentional design to ensure the projects were well integrated in existing Government systems, structures and processes (e.g., support through ASDP Basket Fund and channeling of funds to LGAs through use of DADPs and recipient inclusion of private sector actors in value chain development). This sustainability approach is unlike the previous projects' design approach, which tended to promote parallel structures, to focus on developing exit strategies towards the end of the project period.</p> <p>As some projects are nearing closure (e.g., MUVI and ASSP/ASDP-L and ASDP), there is a sense of urgency to ensure adequate processes and mechanisms are functional to help ensure scaling-up and resulting sustainability of project benefits. In these cases, there are plans for follow-up operations which would help facilitate and promote sustainability (e.g., ASDP I, which is now leading</p>	<p>There was clear recognition on the need to expand the private sector role. Accordingly, the rating for performance of key actors hovered around "moderately satisfactory" (rating=4)</p>
--	---	---

	<p>to a possible ASDP II; ASMDP and RFSP contributed to MIVARF; appropriate mechanisms for scaling-up strategic innovations (FFS-based) arising from ASSP/ASDP are now being formulated by Government (RGoZ). The overall rating hovered around "satisfactory" (5).</p> <p>(f) <u>Pro-poor innovations, replications and scaling-up:</u> Overall, each project team highlighted key innovations which have been shown to be successful, and indicated on-going efforts to scale up through appropriate mechanisms and processes (e.g., FFS-based innovations (ASDP and ASSP/ASDP-L); warehouse receipt system via AMSDP; enhanced access to finance by smallholders/"active poor" (RFSP); commodity value chain approaches for smallholders (MIVARF); introduction of Ag SWAp and use of Basket Fund monitored through Joint Implementation Reviews and Steering Committee meetings; introduction of the Ag. Reporting Data System (ARDS); introduction of participatory planning at the community level (e.g., DADPs in keeping with the O&amp;OD participatory planning tool of LGAs) (ASDP) and introduction of PPP approaches and mechanisms (e.g MIVARF, cost sharing).</p> <p>Some of the key notable limitations to scaling up of innovations were stated as: Weak M&amp;E systems and reliable evidence of readiness of innovations to be scaled up, lack of adequate and effective leadership at various levels, on a consistent basis; inadequate and erratic or lack of continuity in funding by Govt. and DPs;</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>and adverse policy changes. Accordingly, the average rating of the Pro-Poor Innovations, Replications and Scaling-Up hovered between “moderately satisfactory to satisfactory” (4-5).</p> <p>(g) <u>Gender equality and women’s empowerment:</u> According to Project Teams, overall, all projects strived to ensure various aspects of gender (e.g women representation in FFS, farmers groups, leadership; involvement of youth and the elderly) were mainstreamed in most project activities; and were monitored during implementation and supervision missions and during project reviews. While most projects have a maintained a minimum target of at least 40% of farmer group membership and leadership are women; ASSP/ASDP-L has made impressive performance as 62% of the 35,078 programmes beneficiaries are women and about 65% of the leaders in the groups are women.</p> <p>Overall, project teams report that many women farmers (including female headed households) as a result of capacity development and active involvement in FFS are now empowered with capacity to identify their problems and articulate demand for other services. The average rating for Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment criterion is “satisfactory” (5).</p> <p>(h) <u>Performance of partners:</u> Overall, project teams rate performance of partners (IFAD, Government, CI, Co-Financiers, CBOs/NGOs and private sector where applicable) moderately satisfactory given their role</p>	
--	---	--



	<p>they play in enhancing the performance of projects in terms of meeting their obligations (such as technical backstopping during supervision and implementation support missions; ensuring timely release of funds by e.g IFAD and ADB; Government waiver of taxes and provision of enabling policies and strategies; and oversight). However, some project teams, observed that the IFAD Country Office should be strengthened by out-posting the CD/CPM, who together with the existing staff, may enhance provision of timely and decisive guidance and prompt sound technical backstopping rather than relying excessively on CIs (e.g UNOPS).</p> <p>In respect to private sector/NGO/CBO involvement in project activities, most project teams (e.g ASDP and MIVARF) affirmed that they have not done well when it comes to working with the private sector. Hence, suggested that there is need to develop a clear agricultural Private Sector Strategy. The average rating for the partner criterion hovered between "moderately satisfactory to satisfactory" (4-5).</p>	
B) Non-lending activities	<p>(a) <u>Policy dialogue</u>: The project teams generally did not give high importance to the role of IFAD-supported projects in promoting and deepening policy dialogue. At the same time there was recognition that projects were addressing strategic thematic and institutional development issues and enhancements (e.g ASDP for institutional processes at the sector level, ASSP/ASDP-L for productivity – enhancing technologies/ practices and farmer</p>	<p>This feedback refers to IFAD's engagement to policy dialogue, partnership building and knowledge management. Overall, there was a favourable perception, while also recognizing a general lack of specific knowledge of the scope of the IFAD's activities in these non-lending areas. There was a specific recognition of IFAD's active role and contributions to various sector working groups, and in particular the Agriculture Working Group. There was a general perception that there is significant potential in reaping greater synergies between and amongst non-lending activities and</p>

	<p>empowerment, MIVARF for value chain development and MUVI for SME policy and institutional development). Most project teams were not comfortable in providing the rating, given their limited involvement in COSOP processes.</p> <p>(b) <u>Partnership building</u>: Generally, the projects promoted partnership building particularly among the ASLMS, LGAs, beneficiary communities and more recently private sector actors. Most project teams were not comfortable in providing the rating, given their limited involvement in COSOP processes.</p> <p>(c) <u>Knowledge management</u>: Some project teams claimed that they have been involved in a number of knowledge sharing events organized by IFAD, in addition to gaining experiences in form of written success stories from other IFAD supported projects within and even from outside the country. These contributions were appreciated as providing valuable support to effective project implementation. Most project teams were not comfortable in providing the rating, given their limited involvement in COSOP processes.</p>	<p>innovations, which could be achieved through increased systematic follow up.</p> <p>A notable area that was highlighted needing more attention was promoting a stronger role for inclusive private sector involvement.</p> <p>Accordingly, the overall rating hovered around "moderately satisfactory" and in some instances "moderately unsatisfactory" (Rating= 3-4).</p>
C) COSOP management	<p>(a) <u>Relevance</u>: A number of project teams (e.g. MUVI, ASSP/ASDP-L and MIVARF) found the COSOP to be aligned and coherent with the Government main policies and strategy documents. In many cases, recognition was given to IFAD's deliberate efforts to achieve this relevance. Most project teams were not comfortable in providing the rating, given their limited involvement in COSOP processes.</p>	<p>There was an overall perception on the design and implementation of the COSOPs for both periods, while recognizing: (a) a greater stakeholder involvement in COSOP 2007-2013; (b) the value of IFAD Country Office organizing COSOP Annual Reviews (COSOP 2007-2013) with multi-stakeholder involvement; (c) limited availability of detailed information on the COSOPs, which included the lack of sharing of any monitoring reports on COSOP implementation.</p> <p>Accordingly, the overall rating ranged</p>

	<p>(b) <u>Effectiveness</u>: Given their limited involvement in COSOP processes and available information COSOPs progress toward meeting its SOs they were unable to provide any meaningful and evidence-based assessment of COSOP effectiveness. At the same time there was a perception that each of the projects was making a positive contribution to at least one of the SOs.</p>	<p>between "moderately satisfactory to satisfactory" (Rating = 4-5), with the higher rating being associated with the "Relevance" of the COSOPs.</p>
--	--	--

## Agreement at completion point of the last Country Programme Evaluation

### TANZANIA COUNTRY PROGRAMME EVALUATION:

#### Agreement at Completion Point

##### A. Introduction

1. The Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD (IOE) carried out a Country Programme Evaluation (CPE) in 2014. This is the second CPE conducted by IOE in the United Republic of Tanzania since the Fund started its operations in the country in 1978. The first CPE was completed in 2003 and its findings served as an input to the preparation of the 2003 COSOP. The main objectives of the second CPE were to assess the overall partnership between IFAD and Tanzania in reducing rural poverty, and to generate a series of findings and recommendations that will inform the definition of future cooperation between IFAD and the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania as well as to assist in the implementation of ongoing operations and in the design of future IFAD-funded projects in the country.
2. Based on the analysis of the cooperation during the period 2004-2014, the CPE aims at providing an overarching assessment of: (i) the performance and impact of programmes and projects supported by IFAD operations; (ii) the performance and results of IFAD's non-lending activities in Tanzania: policy dialogue, knowledge management and partnership building; (iii) the relevance and effectiveness of IFAD's country strategic opportunities programmes (COSOPs) of 2003 and 2007; and overall management of the country programme. This Agreement at Completion Point (ACP) contains a summary of the main findings from the CPE (see section B below).
3. The ACP has been reached between the IFAD management (represented by the Associate Vice-President, Programme Management Department) and the Government of the United Republic Tanzania (represented by the Ministry of Agriculture, Food Security and Cooperatives on the Mainland and the Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources in Zanzibar), and reflects their understanding of the main findings from the CPE and discussions held at the CPE National Roundtable Workshop held in Dar es Salaam on 29 January 2015, as well as their commitment to adopt and implement the recommendations contained in section C of the ACP within specified timeframes.
4. This ACP will be included as an annex to the new COSOP for Tanzania. In line with the decision in 2013, the Tanzania CPE will be discussed in the IFAD Executive Board at the same time when the new Tanzania COSOP will be considered by the Board. Moreover, IOE will prepare written comments on the new COSOP for consideration at the same Board session. The written comments will focus on the extent to which the main findings and recommendations from the Tanzania CPE have been internalized in the new COSOP. The implementation of the recommendations agreed upon will be tracked through the President's Report on the Implementation Status of Evaluation Recommendations and Management Actions, which is presented to the IFAD Executive Board on an annual basis by the Fund's Management.

##### B. Main evaluation findings

5. Relevance of the portfolio was fully satisfactory for the operations supporting agricultural infrastructure and extension (ASDP). While it took a long time to the Government and the donors to agree on the ASDP content and the financing mechanisms, eventually this resulted in a programme that addressed sectoral

needs, national and donors' priorities and had realistic objectives. In line with national decentralization policies, local government authorities, particularly at district level, were the actual "implementers" of the programme. Regarding the operation that supported value chain development (MUVI and MIVARF), their designs were relevant to national policies and needs but suffered from a number of flaws, which caused subsequent implementation delays.

6. Effectiveness of the portfolio was moderately satisfactory, reflecting the dualism between operations supporting agricultural infrastructure and extension (through ASDP) and those operations supporting agricultural marketing and value chain development (through two IFAD-funded projects). On the Mainland, district-level extension services are now using the farmer field school (FFS) approach as a method that improves farmers' participation and practical learning. There are, however, important variations in the quantity and quality of delivery between districts. In Zanzibar, quality of extension services is more uniform and a few innovative practices (farmer facilitators and community animal health workers) have been introduced that can generate spillover effects on nearby farmers and their communities. These successful innovations also offer strong potential for scaling-up in both Zanzibar and mainland.
7. MUVI's achievements were heterogeneous, depending on the region of implementation. It facilitated farmers' access to extension and input distribution provided by district agricultural extension staff (which was originally not part of the design). The capacity building support for rural entrepreneurs and enterprises has been limited and of short duration. As for MIVARF, after more than three years from official entry into service, the implementation of its IFAD-funded portion lags behind.
8. Portfolio efficiency was moderately satisfactory. ASDP (both on the Mainland and in Zanzibar) showed cases of high returns to investment. For example, estimates of the internal rates of return were high on the Mainland for irrigation; in Zanzibar, estimates of returns to FFS interventions were also high for selected crops and livestock. On the other hand, MUVI and MIVARF faced problems of implementation delays and high operational cost ratios.
9. Impact was overall moderately satisfactory. The most remarkable results were for impact on agricultural productivity and food security, as well as impact on strengthening key institutions. Both ASDP and MUVI played a role in increasing crop and livestock yields in the intervention areas, mainly through extension and irrigation schemes. As for impact on institutions, the main achievement was to improve the capacity of district extension services and to establish and strengthen participatory processes to prepare District Agricultural Development Plans (DADPs). The District Agricultural Development Plans and the operational guidelines for developing, implementing and tracking the plans have provided a strategic and budgetary framework for the district Department of Agriculture, Irrigation and Cooperatives and the district staff. As the CPE notes, there are still challenges and ample room for improvement.
10. Sustainability has been assessed as moderately satisfactory. Again, the stronger case is ASDP (both on the Mainland and in Zanzibar) where the system and mechanisms for delivery of extension services and infrastructure are in place. On the Mainland, the main remaining risk is financial, if central government and development partners reduce or terminate their funding. On the other hand, MUVI faces serious sustainability threats: the management of project activities has been outsourced to external service providers and these have reduced their personnel and activities in the project area as the termination day of their contract approached. To palliate this problem, IFAD has accorded a two-year extension to this project with more selective requirements as to the geographical areas and value chains to be supported.

11. The portfolio's contribution to innovation and up scaling was assessed as moderately satisfactory. The largest merit of the portfolio has been in up-scaling the FFS and disseminating improved techniques, practices and extension approaches with funding from several donors under ASDP. In the Zanzibar sub-programme, the FFS approach was accompanied by two local incremental innovations, the Farmer Facilitators and the Community Animal Health Workers, which broadened smallholder farmers' access to basic agricultural services. However, the portfolio missed the opportunity to learn from the grant programme, consisting mainly of regional grants. Some of these grants have been innovative in piloting initiatives to improve smallholder farmers' knowledge of market prices and access to markets. However, these initiatives have not been internalized well by IFAD and are largely unknown to its main partners.
12. Finally, the portfolio has contributed to a satisfactory level enhanced gender equality and women's empowerment. Overall the portfolio has satisfactorily promoted women's participation both as members and leaders of groups, such as FFS groups and producer groups.
13. Taking into account the relatively large size of the programme, non-lending activities have received fewer resources. As for knowledge management, there has been little systematization of grassroots-level experiences. IFAD-funded interventions are rich in practical experience (e.g. on farmers' group formation, introducing post-harvest initiatives, supporting grassroots finance organizations), but this is not sufficiently documented. IFAD has also funded several regional grants with activities in Tanzania but, unfortunately, there has been limited collaboration between grant-funded and loan-funded activities, with the risk of neglecting learning from several grant-funded experiences.
14. Compared to the situation at the time of the 2003 CPE, partnerships with the Government (Mainland and Zanzibar) and the main donors in the agricultural sector are much stronger, which can be attributed to IFAD's country presence. Some gaps have been identified in the: (i) limited partnerships with the civil society and the private sector which would have been important for agricultural value chain development; (ii) weak partnerships with the UN System in Tanzania, including the Rome-based organizations; and (iii) absence of collaboration with the Ministries responsible for natural resource management and climate change, as well as with the Ministry of Lands, given that environment and land tenure issues have been underlined as areas of importance in the 2007 COSOP.
15. As for policy dialogue, there has been an imbalance between the numerous objectives set in the 2003 and the 2007 COSOPs, and they have provided limited resources (human and financial) to achieve these goals. While resources have been a constraint, the national policy environment has also been challenging, due to the high number and fragmentation of existing policies and strategies for the rural and agricultural sector. Moreover, the split responsibilities between several institutions on the Mainland, coupled with decentralization policy, make it difficult to coordinate policy dialogue and implementation.
16. Overall, progress made in non-lending activities by IFAD, the Government and their partners has been assessed as moderately unsatisfactory.
17. At the strategic level, COSOP relevance has been assessed as satisfactory, mainly because the 2003 and 2007 COSOPs have been instrumental in realigning the cooperation between IFAD and the Government of Tanzania towards supporting: (i) a sector-wide approach in agriculture, funded through basket funding; and (ii) the process of implementation of the decentralization policy whereby Local Government Authorities (LGAs) are in charge of the preparation, implementation and tracking of local agricultural development plans.
18. It was a relevant and timely decision to provide support through basket funding for agricultural infrastructure and extension in the context of ASDP. Basket funding

within an agricultural sector-wide approach was and continues to be one of the Government's preferred financing modalities and entails lower management and transaction costs.

19. On the other hand, the project-modality was the only viable option for agricultural value chain development: at the time of the 2007 COSOP formulation and up to now there was no harmonized approach comparable to ASDP. The backside of this has been the proliferation of uncoordinated value chain development interventions which may lead, inter alia, to inconsistent interventions, high transaction costs for the Government, and possibly mixed signals to the private sector. New initiatives are now emerging, under Government leadership, to enhance cooperation between donors in this area, and therefore good potential for achieving stronger alignment and harmonization in this strategic area.
20. There was no geographic prioritization in the 2003 and 2007 COSOPs because the main priority at that time for IFAD was to realign to the basket funding mechanism which purported to cover the entire territory of Tanzania. However, covering the entire territory of Tanzania has implied higher project management and supervision costs.
21. The CPE assesses COSOP effectiveness (COSOP 2003 and COSOP 2007 combined) and the overall COSOP performance as moderately satisfactory. The COSOP objectives that related to the support to ASDP, such as the enhancement of poor people's access to improved farming technology (irrigation, seeds, mechanization, fertilizers) have been achieved to a significant degree. Good progress on the Mainland has been made on crops, with less emphasis on livestock-related activities and pastoralism. Results in terms of a strengthened extension system and enhanced farming household productivity were even more "visible" in Zanzibar. Also of importance was the establishment of participatory bottom-up planning and implementation processes to prepare and implement agricultural development plans at the village, ward and district levels.
22. However, progress has been far more limited in the areas of rural finance, in enhancing farmers' expanded access to markets (especially output), and in supporting the development of value chains; these thematic areas represented an important part of the COSOP objectives. Moreover, M&E at the COSOP level did not happen to the extent envisaged by the 2007 COSOP: annual COSOP reviews were organized since 2010, but were not used to generate an assessment of progress made on achieving the objectives and to agree on priority follow-up measures.

### C. Recommendations

23. Recommendation 1. Prepare a new COSOP in collaboration with the Government of Tanzania and key national and international partners, to define a new strategy of intervention and investment priorities in the country. The new COSOP should reflect the main findings and recommendation of the current CPE and select priorities taking into account the estimated resources available for lending. In the short term, according to the Performance Based Allocation System (December 2013), US\$ 55 million are available to Tanzania in the period 2013-2015.
24. In particular, the COSOP needs to articulate IFAD's support to basket funding within ASDP, with its support to other initiatives such as agricultural value chain development, and explore opportunities for coordination with other donors on the latter. The COSOP should also specify the geographic and sub-sector selectivity for future investments, with the aim of avoiding dispersion for better efficiency and outcomes. It should also establish clear linkages between non-lending activities, grants and the lending programme and devote stronger attention to COSOP reviews (annual, mid-term, completion).

Proposed follow-up:

The new COSOP is already being prepared incorporating lessons learnt, findings and recommendations arising from the Tanzania CPE, as discussed during the National Roundtable Workshop on 29<sup>th</sup> January 2015. Based on a detailed formulation plan, the COSOP is following a participatory approach that involves key public and private sector stakeholders, both local and international. The COSOP will be submitted to IFAD's Executive Board by the end of 2015.

25. Recommendation 2. The first programmatic priority is to support the preparation and implementation of the next phase of ASDS/ASDP both on the Mainland and in Zanzibar. In addition to its positive effects on crop yields, income and food security, ASDP had an important institutional impact on local government decentralization, which needs to be further consolidated. Improvements are also needed in the programme design regarding: (i) higher selectivity on the type of agricultural infrastructure to be financed; (ii) strengthening of the M&E capacity and reporting at the local and central government levels; (iii) transferring of successful approaches tested in Zanzibar (e.g., farmer facilitators and community animal health workers) to the Mainland.
26. Within ASDS and ASDP, the livestock sub-sector, together with rangeland management and the dairy value chain, deserve specific focus. Tanzania has an important livestock potential but this has received limited attention and investment so far. In addition to opportunities, there are also risks, notably those related to conflicts between pastoralists and farmers, as well as national policy issues. Country grants could be used more effectively for better diagnosis and for piloting strategic initiatives.

Proposed follow-up:

IFAD is ensuring that the new COSOP is well aligned with the Government's agricultural development strategy and priority programmes. Preparation of ASDS II and ASDP II are in the final stages of completion for Tanzania Mainland. However, ASDS II and ASDP II do not include Zanzibar. As such, the Government of Zanzibar has prepared a draft sector-wide proposal, which it plans to submit for IFAD's technical review/enhancement (as non-lending) and subsequent financial support. In both cases, IFAD is providing strategic and timely inputs to these important sector participatory processes and eventual documents. The new COSOP also focuses on coordinated support to a strengthened sectoral M&E system. Specifically, the proposed ASDP II will be guided by an enhanced Results Framework, which will also be aligned with a strong RF for the Agricultural Sector Development Strategy II. Government, with support from consultants, have prepared a draft document (including initial draft RF) for ASDS II and ASDP II for Mainland; it is currently under discussion, and expected to be finalized by mid-July, 2015. This ASDP II document will enable the on-going preparation of the COSOP to be strongly aligned with the final version of the ASDS II and ASDP II.

The new COSOP also will consolidate and strategically scale-up successful innovations (e.g., use of farmer facilitators and community animal health workers under the FFS extension approach in Zanzibar; promotion of bottom-up participatory planning, implementation and tracking of the District Agricultural Development Plans/DADPs in mainland and pilot Shehia Agricultural Development Plans/SADPs in Zanzibar). Given that the livestock sub-sector has received limited attention, emphasis may also be placed on supporting range management and strategic livestock value chains (e.g., dairy). The new COSOP, using appropriate instruments, should also consider supporting the pastoralists/agro-pastoralists, including ecologically sound strategies for resolving conflicts between pastoralists and farmers.

27. Recommendation 3. Subject to the availability of resources, in addition to supporting ASDS/ASDP, IFAD could consider funding several priority traditional loan-funded projects, consistent with certain priorities and



conditions. In special cases, traditional projects may be needed to focus on themes and issues not addressed in general extension coverage (e.g., targeting of specific socio-economic groups, addressing problems relating to specific geographic or resource contexts, as well as testing/developing innovations before they can be scaled up through the ASDP-supported extension system).

28. For these types of projects, IFAD should consider geographical areas or commodities that are likely to have significant welfare effects on high number of poor households while controlling project management cost ratios (i.e., avoiding geographically scattered interventions). In addition, there needs to be far more focus on implementation readiness at the project design stage, with the Government playing a more active role in the design, and on learning from grant-funded pilot initiatives.

Proposed follow-up:

While the thrust of IFAD's support aims to focus on sector-wide projects/programme, support to traditional projects may continue if enough resources are available, provided such projects have potential to introduce innovative approaches and techniques for inclusive agricultural growth and rural poverty reduction; and to be replicated and scaled up (that is, potential for wider adoption after pilot testing) by government authorities, donor organizations, the private sector and other agencies. Such projects shall pay close attention to maintaining reasonable project management cost ratios (especially avoiding interventions that are geographically scattered), including transaction costs. Possible examples include, inter-alia, the "Tanzania Incentive-based Risk Sharing System for Agricultural Lending" and the "Rural Finance Innovation Fund". An additional example is in Zanzibar where the impressive performance of the FFS approach that was accompanied by two local incremental innovations, namely the Farmer Facilitators and the Community Animal Health Workers—that demonstrate cost-effectiveness and good sustainability prospects -- need to be consolidated, customized, and scaled up to other areas, including Mainland Tanzania, through appropriate mechanisms.

Consideration of IFAD support for priority traditional projects will be made during the formulation (2015) and early implementation process of the new COSOP (2016 – 2021).

29. Recommendation 4. Value chain development requires more consultation ex ante with key stakeholders, notably private entrepreneurs. In the past, private sector entrepreneurs have played a negligible role in the design of agricultural value chain development interventions. Partnerships with private sector actors need to be emphasized from the beginning. Private sector entrepreneurs and other relevant partners (e.g. cooperative apex organizations) could be more actively involved in regular COSOP review meetings as well as being strengthened through country grant-funded initiatives.
30. Coordination is needed to join efforts to develop private and public stakeholders' involvement and cooperation, to enhance public capabilities for enabling strategic policy formulation and implementation. This could be done either within the ASDP-2 framework (if found suitable) or, through other emerging multi-donor initiatives. New multi-agency initiatives are emerging (such as the Agricultural Marketing Development Trust supported by SIDA, DANIDA, Irish AID and other agencies). IFAD needs to track these initiatives with close attention and consider support if they are found of relevance for IFAD's end-clients.

Proposed follow-up:

The current CPE has noted that successful value chain development requires working closely with several private sector actors (such as wholesalers, processors and exporters); the new COSOP will accord stronger emphasis to working with

these private sector stakeholders. As concluded in the CPE, building trust among partners, both state and non-state, and improving knowledge of the fundamentals of the value chain development are essential. So is forging more coordinated approaches with relevant international organizations. The new COSOP is therefore based on inclusive consultations and on forging sound partnerships with strategic private sector actors and other relevant non-state partners -- both local and international. This would help identify relevant partners, better understand their interest and potential, and internalize incentives for their active participation. Additionally, these consultations and partnerships could be forged within the ASDP II framework and on-going and new multi-agency initiatives (e.g., SAGCOT and BRN; Agricultural Marketing Trust Fund Initiative (by DANIDA, Irish AID, SDC, SIDA).

Timeline: during the preparation of the COSOP, especially: (1) design stage -- April/July, 2015; (2) validation stage -- September, 2015); and (3) initial phase of COSOP implementation (2016 – 2018).

31. Recommendation 5. Support knowledge management, partnership development and policy dialogue activities that are closely connected to IFAD-funded operations. While IFAD has recognized knowledge management, partnership development and policy dialogue as an integrated component of its country programme in Tanzania, it has faced human and financial resources constraints. By concentrating its effort on ASDP II, the country office could devote more time to supporting effectively non-lending activities. IFAD will need to elaborate more focused objectives for non-lending activities and to mobilize the required resources. Options include: (i) embedding knowledge management and policy dialogue components in future financed operations (to document and systematize experiences, to establish practical guidelines on "what and how to do", and to contribute to deepening of policy discussions and related stock-taking events with policy makers and key counterparts); (ii) use more strategically the annual COSOP review workshops to engage key partners (e.g. non-governmental and private sector organizations); (iii) mobilize country-grant financing, both from its regular resources and from external donors, thus also improving synergy between grants and the lending portfolio; (iv) learn from relevant successful practices adopted in other IFAD-supported programmes, for example in Madagascar (see CPE 2013).
32. More specifically, IFAD could provide significant contributions to:
  - Knowledge management: (i) learn from FFS improved practices supported by ASDP in Zanzibar in order to enhance extension approaches on the Mainland; (ii) conduct a dedicated review work to systematize experience through past and ongoing grants in market access, market intelligence in view of its future use for project design and implementation support. In addition, this review should cover experiences of MUVI project in value chain development during the two-year project extension; (iii) provide support (e.g. through grants as in the case of Zanzibar) to the capacity of the Government agencies to monitor and assess development interventions and build a stronger and more functional M&E system.
  - Policy dialogue (i) support the preparation and implementation of ASDS/ASDP-II by helping prioritize the different areas of investment (e.g., extension/FFS, vs. irrigation, vs. farm equipment, vs. agro-processing equipment); (ii) supporting the Government in designing livestock and rangeland management programmes, with emphasis on conflict prevention between pastoralists and farmers, benefiting from knowledge accumulated through previous grants.
  - Establish partnerships: (i) with governmental agencies in charge of land tenure, environment and climate change in order to facilitate a stronger and more

effective dialogue on policy and regulatory issues; (ii) with non-governmental organizations and private sector organizations for agricultural value chain development; and (iii) selectively, with UN agencies that are closest to the IFAD's mandate.


Proposed follow-up:


The new COSOP will consider more focused objectives and approaches to non-lending activities, including more effective mechanisms for mobilizing resources and collaborative partnerships. The non-lending activities, namely, knowledge management, partnership development and policy dialogue are an integral part of the IFAD's country programme, but over time, they have suffered from human and financial constraints in the IFAD country office.


These issues will be addressed through relevant on-going operations, especially to the extent the findings and results can enhance portfolio performance and strategic impacts. Analyzing and systematizing field and operational experiences also are among IFAD's priorities at the corporate level, with increasing practical guidelines and approaches that can be used for project preparation and implementation, as well as for policy dialogue. The country office will explore ways to mobilize regional and country specific grants for these purposes, and to forge closer partnerships with key agencies that share IFAD's vision and smallholder focus.


Timeline: by end of July, 2015: completed draft COSOP document); by end of September/October, 2015: final COSOP document, following the COSOP validation workshop with key stakeholders.


Signatures


  
-----  
John McIntire  
Associate Vice-President  
Programme Management Department, IFAD

  
-----  
Date

  
-----  
Stephen Wassira  
Minister for Agriculture, Food Security and Cooperatives  
United Republic of Tanzania

  
-----  
Date

  
-----  
Sira Ubwa Mamboya  
Minister for Agriculture and Natural Resources  
Revolutionary Government of Zanzibar

  
-----  
Date

## RB-COSOP preparation process

The stakeholder consultation process for the new RB-COSOP has followed six major consultation steps, each one building on each other, to derive the current comprehensive COSOP for the period 2016 -2021. This participatory process is aimed to ensure that strategic state and non-state stakeholders provided substantive and prioritized inputs and engagement/feedback, at various stages of the COSOP formulation.

In summary:

Phase 1: The consultation process was launched at the time the Tanzania IFAD country office team carried out the COSOP Country Programme Assessment exercise (via a two-person team of independent consultant, initiated in December, 2013, with their final report dated April 2014). The self-assessment approach, using a questionnaire as an instrument for comparable responses, generated inputs from diverse state and non-state stakeholders regarding the initiatives support through the past COSOP, including: what worked well, what did not go as planned/expected, key lessons and initial ideas/priorities for consideration by the new COSOP. This report was shared with the key stakeholders who were interviewed, and who provided useful additional feedback, as inputs for the finalization of the Country Programme Assessment Report (CPA Report).

Phase 2: It was launched in the latter part of 2014, and carried out by IFAD's Office of Independent Evaluation (OIE). It took a systematic approach, taking into account the CPA Report, also consulting key state and non-state stakeholders. The IOE team prepared a draft report, and together with the IFAD country office, convened a stakeholder workshop (early 2015) to review/discuss the main findings and recommendations. The final CPE report served as a MAJOR reference point for the formulation plan and processes in preparing the new RB-COSOP.

Phase 3: The IFAD country office team, with the support of the same two consultant team who prepared the CPA, formulated the draft COSOP (about mid-2015), based on the following key inputs: findings and recommendations of the CPE; the draft ASDS II and ASDP II (for Mainland); other available and relevant evidenced-based studies on sector issues and strategic options for the agricultural sector; structured interviews/discussions with strategic stakeholders (state and non-state) to probe various options for IFAD support (non-lending and lending), especially where IFAD would have a comparative advantage (vis-à-vis other Development Partners).

Phase 4: The IFAD Country Director and PTA Lead Adviser held a CPMT meeting with key reviewers of COSOPs in IFAD's Headquarters (in mid-September, 2015). Very useful and constructive feedback/inputs were provided by the CPMT and other IFAD reviewers. This feedback also served as a major input to the current final draft of the COSOP.

Phase 5: The IFAD country office team convened three major consultation workshops to review/discuss the draft COSOP document (dated September 10, 2015), on the part of strategically selected state and non-state stakeholders – one workshop in Zanzibar (October 13), a second workshop in Mainland (October 15) and a third workshop in Arusha (December 4) involving indigenous peoples in collaboration with the Association for Law and Advocacy for Pastoralists and the Commission for Human Rights and Good Governance. To facilitate the workshop consultations, the draft COSOP report was distributed prior to the workshops, and during each workshop there was an updated overview of the COSOP's main elements, which also reflected the relevant feedback from IFAD-headquarter-based CPMT review in Phase 4, together with small group discussions which used a guide of key questions to elicit consensus and further inputs/priorities from the participating stakeholders. These inputs were also incorporated in the final version of the current COSOP document.

Phase 6: National elections (in both Mainland and Zanzibar) were held in late October, 2015. Therefore, it was decided to delay the finalization of the COSOP until after the new key actors/appointees took office could be consulted with the final draft document (and

updated slides) of the RB-COSOP. Notwithstanding a busy transition period by the new actors (and a reorganized and unified Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries), the IFAD country team has conducted a consultation session with the senior key actors of the MALF, including the Minister and Permanent Secretary. They have confirmed the main thrusts of the RB-COSOP document. As their operational plans are concretized during the first quarter of 2016, together with the final versions of the ASDS 2 and ASDP 2 (currently being finalized), it is anticipated that the first IFAD's annual RB-COSOP review will be used to sharpen its alignment with the finalized sectoral targets ensuring that COSOP strategic objectives and their corresponding outcomes contribute to progress toward the higher level goals.

## Key files

## Key file 1: Rural poverty and agricultural/rural sector issues

Priority thematic areas	Affected/target groups	Main issues	Priority actions needed
A) Mainland			
1) Policy and Institutional Reform and support. This involves strengthening sector enablers at national, regional and local level through effective policy formulation and implementation including ensuring policy coherence and strategic coordination across agencies/regions and LGAs; as well as existence of sound regulatory framework to facilitate harmonization and involvement of the private sector and continued support to strengthening decentralization and local level capacities and ownership	Women and men smallholder farmers (less 2 ha), livestock keepers /herders/and/ or pastoralists, fisher folks, artisans and medium sized producers (about 80% of the population <sup>1</sup> of whom 54% are women) (of the total 8,512,074 households, 5,706,329 are rural agricultural households. Of the 5,706,329 agric. households, 3,422,072 are crop households, 2,224,410 are livestock cum crop households; 55,929 depend on livestock only and 3,917 are pastoralists) <sup>2</sup> . In total there are 30,264,358 household members of whom 15,150,120 are women. (Agriculture also comprises a greater part of women's economic activity than men's: 81% of women, compared to 73% of men, are engaged in agricultural activity. In rural areas, that	<p>Inadequate policy environment and uneven policy implementation for achieving sustained and inclusive agricultural growth targets</p> <p>Proliferation of policies/ strategies/projects within the same sector without prior analysis or review; and effective coordination</p> <p>Inadequate capacity of key staff at national and local level to facilitate commercialization and work with the private sector</p> <p>Inadequate coordination among diverse stakeholders, at national and local levels, including weak agricultural statistical system<sup>4</sup></p>	<p>Promoting the effective multi-stakeholder formulation, consensus and effective implementation of key policy reforms which can enable key productivity and value chain drivers of the sector transformation process, especially expanded access to and efficient utilization of improved seeds, fertilizer (organic and inorganic), complying with sound phyto-sanitary/zoo-sanitary grades and standards for ensuring competitive exports, marketing policies and regulations, enhanced value chain development, sustainable incentive structure, consistent with Tanzania's market and competitive advantage<sup>5</sup></p> <p>Promote capacity development/building of key staff at national and local levels to enhance the transformation process of the agricultural sector from subsistence to commercial.</p> <p>Support policy analytical capacity of ASLMs for planning and policy analysis, sector performance reviews and Public Expenditure Reviews (PERs). The support will also focus on improving value chain analysis and policy support, but also addressing policy and regulatory issues that affect related value chain development.</p> <p>Support for coordination to: (i) ensure improved management and coordination of the ASDP-2 and other agricultural initiatives at various levels; (ii) facilitate planning, implementing and reporting on use of budgeted funds for ASDP-2 and related initiatives; (iii) maintain and strengthen the coordination mechanisms used under ASDP-1.</p> <p>Strengthening agricultural statistics, sector M&amp;E and analytical capacity through appropriate capacity building of key staff and operationalization of the Agricultural Statistics Strategic Plan (ASSP)<sup>6</sup></p>

<sup>1</sup>UNDP (2014), Human Development Report 2014, Sustaining Human Progress: Reducing Vulnerabilities and Building Resilience, New York:

<sup>2</sup>URT 2010. National Sample Census of Agriculture 2007/2008. NBS; URT 2014. Basic Data for Livestock and Fisheries Sectors 2013. MLFD

Priority thematic areas	Affected/target groups	Main issues	Priority actions needed
	number rises to 98% for women.) <sup>3</sup>		
2) Enhanced agricultural productivity and profitability for promoting enterprise diversification and commercialization	Women and men smallholder farmers (less 2 ha), livestock keepers and/ or pastoralists and fisher folks and medium sized producers	Low productivity levels and growth trends coupled with lack of enterprise diversification and agricultural commercialization, including inadequate and sustainable access to key inputs (especially fertilizers and seeds, animal AI, fingerlings). Increased productivity of for high potential Commodity Value Chains (CVCs) releases land for other growth sources. (see ASDS II and ASDP II)	<p>Promote growth in agricultural productivity for commercial market-oriented agriculture for priority commodities-- high potential Commodity Value Chains (CVCs) revolving around crops and livestock including fisheries by supporting the development of technologies for sustainable intensification of small-scale (climate smart) agriculture; while trying to reduce post-harvest and post-marketing losses. This will be realized through:</p> <p>(i) adoption of sustainable productivity- enhancing technologies and practices (incl. climate smart), facilitated through strengthened research-extension linkages; (ii) effective extension models using FFS and ICT; (iii) expanded and inclusive private sector role; (iv) access to rural financing; and (v) stronger and more effective farmer cooperatives and organizations' which also would support and incentivize expanded marketed production under ASDP 2<sup>7</sup> and MIVARF. Also support to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Expand irrigation and other water conservation/harvesting technology</li> <li>- Link producers with post-harvest technology and agro-processing (MUVI, MIVARF).</li> </ul>
3) Creating a coordinated system of agricultural technology development and service delivery through enhanced support for strengthening research-extension-farmer/livestock keeper/pastoralist	Women and men smallholder farmers (less 2 ha., see above), livestock keepers and/ or pastoralists and fisher folks and medium sized producers	Weak delivery of agricultural services (for crops, livestock, fisheries) mostly caused by weak research-extension-farmer linkages coupled by inadequate public and private resources	Strengthen research-extension-farmer linkages <sup>8</sup> ; and ensure extension linked to value addition and markets and related capacity building of crop/ livestock holders/pastoralists/fisherfolks and crop/livestock owners' organizations on grading and standardization of agricultural products, with specific reference to higher-value or differentiated agricultural and food products (HVAF), good agricultural practices and international food standards for those wanting to export to international markets. Assist farmers to form producer organizations to produce, process and market their produce within Tanzania and for export, including facilitating access to credit. Strengthen governance and technical capacity of FOs/cooperatives, better enforcement of the Cooperative Act, and

<sup>4</sup>URT 2015 ASDP II

<sup>5</sup>URT 2015 ASDS 11 and ASDP II

<sup>6</sup>URT/NBS Agricultural Statistical Strategic Plan 2014

<sup>3</sup>Tanzania Country Level Knowledge Network, 2013: Participation of Women in Agriculture in Tanzania: Challenges and Policy Recommendations. Policy Brief No. 8

<sup>7</sup>MAFC 2015 ASDP 2

<sup>8</sup>URT 2013 National Agriculture Policy- MAFC

Priority thematic areas	Affected/target groups	Main issues	Priority actions needed
linkages and other support services (e.g. inputs, mechanization, rural finance and markets); and promotion of district driven adaptive research and R&D liaison units			<p>public-private partnerships and investments in agricultural marketing facilities and rural infrastructure.</p> <p>Improve coordination of agricultural research system establishing linkages with producers, processors &amp; marketing and education institutions; investing in research for improving seed quality; and increasing access of farmers to credit facilities for purchase of improved inputs;</p>
4) Rural Commercialization and value addition (Building Competitive Commodity Value Chains) through strengthened PPPP	Women and men smallholder farmers (less 2 ha), livestock keepers and/ or pastoralists and fisherfolks and medium sized producers; and medium sized producers and Micro Small and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs) with marketable surplus	<p>Inadequate and lack of prioritized and quality public investments, and low private sector investments, reflecting the early stages of private sector development; this includes inadequate rural infrastructure (e.g., irrigation, rural roads and rural energy)</p> <p>High post-harvest losses due to poor harvesting, storage and transportation facilities.</p> <p>Inadequate value addition and agricultural marketing.</p>	<p>Stimulating expanded and inclusive private sector-driven value chain development and integration, facilitated by: (i) effective and viable public-private partnerships and public support services, and (ii) expanded rural infrastructure (especially small-scale irrigation, post-harvest facilities, rural energy and rural feeder roads). This would contribute to much needed expanded off-farm employment opportunities</p> <p>Promote research and development (R&amp;D) of technologies focused on post-harvest storage and handling and increasing access to credit for this purpose.</p> <p>More extension linked to value addition and markets. Capacity building of farmers/livestock keepers/pastoralists and their respective organizations on grading and standardization. This would be with specific reference to higher-value or differentiated agricultural and food products (HVAF), good agricultural practices and international food standards for those wanting to export to international markets.</p>
5) (see items 2 & 4 above)		Constraints to efficient and competitive agricultural marketing, including limited value-chain development	
6) Access to rural finance/credit	Majority of women and men producers as reflected above	Less involvement in the agriculture sector of financial institution; inadequate skills for risk assessment; lack of products to serve rural smallholders; insufficient trust among the actors across the value chain;	<p>Develop innovative financial products tailored for smallholder agriculture;</p> <p>Capacity building and strengthening of MFIs and SACCOs (through MIVARF and other initiatives);</p> <p>Policy dialogue and support to new Rural Finance strategy implementation including the National Financial Inclusion Framework 2012-2016</p> <p>Alignment with national entities such as National Economic</p>



Priority thematic areas	Affected/target groups	Main issues	Priority actions needed
		inadequate rural banking infrastructure	Empowerment Council (NEEC) and the Tanzania Agricultural Development Bank (TADB)
7) Disaster resilience management, environmental/ NRM and climate change mitigation and adaptation	Rural population, with Particular reference to population with small landholdings farming on degraded land and pastoralists in degraded rangelands	<p>Weak capacities (at national and lower levels) to respond to disaster, environmental and climate change challenges</p> <p>Inadequate capacity among communities to address environmental and natural resource management issues on a sustainable manner</p>	<p>Implementation of National Climate Change Response Strategy (NCCRS) for all sectors. Increase of the level of awareness and capacity building in Climate Change adaptation and mitigation in agricultural programmes, projects and activities, among top managers, district and lower level staff and other stakeholders.</p> <p>Encouraging practices with reduced external inputs where appropriate. Promoting drought tolerant crops and high value traditional crops- higher yields/ resilience, soil and water conservation for intensification, water harvesting for crop production, adaptation and weather based index insurance</p> <p>Promote environmental conservation through, in the case of sustainable intensification: conservation agriculture, integrated soil water and fertility management (soil health systems), integrated pest management, agroforestry and integrated farming systems with livestock management and, in the case of extensive livestock and rangelands management: improving grazing land management which has the second highest technical potential for mitigating C emissions (IPCC 2007), integrating trees (silvopastoral systems) to ramp up the potential for carbon storage (along with other co-benefits)</p> <p>Strengthening of community-based natural resource management institutions and equipped with capacity to operationalize the disaster management strategy</p>
8) See Item 1 above.		Weak institutional and human resource capacities and inadequate coordination among diverse stakeholders, at national and local levels, including weak agricultural statistical system	
9) Gender	Rural women, especially female head of households who are widowed, deserted or divorced; and other vulnerable or marginalized groups. (Over 90.4 per cent of active women in	<p>-Limited gender disaggregated data;</p> <p>-Limited access to natural and productive resources. Social practices deny many women the right to property ownership, and</p>	<p>Promoting gender equity - ensuring that women and other vulnerable groups have equitable access to resources like land<sup>10</sup> with emphasis on strengthening gender mainstreaming; and also paying attention to:</p> <p>-Development of gender disaggregated data and of indicators to monitor participation of women in economic development;</p> <p>- Increased access of women to land and strengthened land tenure</p>

Priority thematic areas	Affected/target groups	Main issues	Priority actions needed
	Tanzania are engaged in agricultural activities <sup>9</sup> ) SEE ITEM 1 ABOVE	<p>access to credit, agricultural inputs, markets, and opportunities from membership of agricultural co-operatives. Women rarely qualify for any credit that is tied to collateral requirements, which are often based on a land title deed;</p> <p>- Low exposure to agricultural services such as extension due to: (a) development and introduction of technology often without involving women, (b) multiple roles in reproduction, maintenance and production constituting heavy gender workloads and placing limitations on women's time and the extent to which they can take advantage of new agricultural knowledge and skills through extension networks or the media, (c) high rate of illiteracy among rural women, affecting their capacity for absorbing and adopting new ideas, (d) lack of deliberate and reliable mechanisms for specifically disseminating research findings to women farmers. It is often assumed that</p>	<p>security;</p> <p>- Increased access of women to research results and extension services by creating reliable channels of communication directly with women and adapting extension services to women's time constraints.</p> <p>-Development of technologies relevant to the roles of women in agricultural production and food processing.</p>

<sup>10</sup>Op. cit.

<sup>9</sup> URT 2013 National Agriculture Policy- MAFC

Priority thematic areas	Affected/target groups	Main issues	Priority actions needed
		information aimed at the general public or farmers generally will reach women.	
10) Youth	Rural youth who are under 30 years of age (according to the Integrated Labour Force Survey (2006 <sup>11</sup> ), youths in Tanzania constitute about 65 percent of the total labour force). The 2007/2008 Tanzania Sample Census of Agriculture (published in 2010) revealed that youth (below 15 yrs age) comprise of 44% of the 31,013,027 (including Zanzibar) agricultural household members. <sup>12</sup>	<p>Inadequate attention to youth involvement in agricultural activities call for a need to prepare the younger generation for the future challenges of commercial agriculture for export and environmental issues</p> <p>Limited access to natural and productive resources. Traditional and social practices deny many young people the right to property ownership, putting them at a disadvantage in seeking access to credit, agricultural inputs, marketing outlets and opportunities accruing from membership of agricultural co-operatives</p> <p>Low capacity and lack of collateral</p> <p>Low linkages with financial sectors</p>	<p>Take affirmative action in promotion of youth involvement in agriculture through provision of enabling environment like increased access of young people to surveyed land and strengthened land tenure security, including identifying community gardens for youth groups or clubs like 4H</p> <p>Development and reinforcement of national vocational training and extension services targeted to rural youth.</p> <p>Linkages with rural finance and development of tailored products for youth without collateral for credit</p>
11) Land and resource security	Lack of stakeholder involvement in decision-making processes on large scale investments and M&E of these. Poor tenure security and	Inadequate consultation processes, lack of forums for engagement of stakeholders and government. Lack of capacity, skills and	<p>Support the establishment of platforms for government-stakeholder engagement, discussion and M&amp;E on large-scale commercial investments in land.</p> <p>Build the capacity of government including livestock sector to facilitate participatory land use planning and district and village</p>

<sup>11</sup> Op cit.

<sup>12</sup> URT 2010. National Sample Census of Agriculture 2007/2008. NBS

Priority thematic areas	Affected/target groups	Main issues	Priority actions needed
	marginalisation from village level decision-making processes of particular groups including pastoralists and indigenous peoples: Only 2% (1.28 million ha) of the land deemed suitable for grazing is currently protected within village land use plans, which have been implemented in less than 10% of villages in 81 out of 150 districts.	financial resources to invest in prolonged negotiation and agreement processes over village land uses and in particular in mixed livestock-crop areas. Land use conflicts.	levels, agreement on land uses, development of formal shared resource-sharing agreements, strengthening of village institutions for management of resources, and investments in protection and development of rangeland resources. Protection of livestock routes to facilitate movement in order to share rangeland resources across villages and to access markets and livestock services.
12) Indigenous peoples	Marginalisation from decision-making processes over development, land use etc.	Viewed as backward, non-contributing, conflict-prone. Lack of awareness of rights, and knowledge how to enforce rights. Lack of platforms to engage with government and other stakeholders.	Improve participation of indigenous groups in decision-making processes on development, land etc. through inclusion in relevant platforms.  Take affirmative action to include indigenous peoples in activities and projects.
B. Zanzibar 1) (use/synthesize similar constraints, but focused on the Zanzibar context, with relevant report references)			
2) Policy and Institutional Reform and support	Women and men smallholder farmers, livestock keepers and fisherfolks (about 42 <sup>13</sup> of the population are engaged in agriculture. Of the total 137,356 rural households, 132,193 households are involved in agriculture (over 96%) <sup>14</sup> . Of the total 748,668 household	Inadequate policy environment and uneven policy implementation for achieving sustained and inclusive agricultural growth targets. Lack of cohesive institutional framework to provide for coordination and monitoring of sector-wide performance. This has	Enhance policy and institutional reforms that aim at strengthening or promoting innovative coordination mechanisms with emphasis on alignment and harmonization; as well as institutional collaboration amongst key sector ministries like MANR; MLF; Trade Industries and Marketing; Land and Water; Cooperatives, Youth, Women and children Development; Health; Finance; and Tourism and Information and the like through ICCG.  Promote capacity development/building of key staff at national and local levels to enhance the transformation process of the agricultural sector from subsistence to commercial.

<sup>13</sup> RGoZ 2010. ATI

<sup>14</sup> URT 2010. National Sample Census of Agriculture 2007/2008. NBS ;

Priority thematic areas	Affected/target groups	Main issues	Priority actions needed
	members, 375,690 are women <sup>15</sup> . Of the total agricultural households, 45,684 are livestock households <sup>16</sup> . Female headed households in Zanzibar (national average 21%) are amongst the poorest and most vulnerable households <sup>17</sup> .	made each agricultural sub-sector to implement its policies and strategic plans in isolation leading to remarkable competition and duplication of efforts, improper use of resources and imbalance of support between and within target groups <sup>18</sup>  Weak agricultural statistical system	Support policy analytical capacity of ASLMs for planning and policy analysis, sector performance reviews and Public Expenditure Reviews (PERs). The support will also focus on improving value chain analysis and policy support, but also addressing policy and regulatory issues that affect related value chain development  Strengthening agricultural statistics, sector M&E and analytical capacity through appropriate capacity building of key staff
3) Enhanced agricultural productivity and profitability for promoting enterprise diversification and commercialization	Women and men smallholder farmers, livestock keepers and fisher-folks	Low productivity levels and growth trends coupled with lack of enterprise diversification and agricultural commercialization, including inadequate and sustainable access to key inputs (especially fertilizers and seeds, animal AI, and vaccines	Promote growth in agricultural productivity for commercial market-oriented agriculture for priority commodities-- high potential Commodity Value Chains (CVCs) revolving around crops and livestock including fisheries by supporting the development of technologies for sustainable intensification of small-scale (climate smart) agriculture; while trying to reduce post-harvest and post-marketing losses. This will be realized through: (i) adoption of sustainable productivity- enhancing technologies and practices (incl. climate smart), facilitated through strengthened research-extension linkages; (ii) effective extension models using FFS and ICT; (iii) expanded and inclusive private sector role; (iv) access to rural financing; and (v) stronger and more effective farmer cooperatives and organizations' which also would support and incentivize expanded marketed production under ATP and MIVARF
4) creating a coordinated system of agricultural technology development and service delivery through enhanced support for strengthening research-extension-	Women and men smallholder farmers, livestock keepers and fisher-folks	Inadequate agricultural support services <sup>19</sup> (e.g. agricultural mechanization, input supply, research, extension and advisory services, markets, research, and financial services) coupled with low participation of the private	Provide adequate funding for demand driven/client-oriented research and development including improvements in its infrastructure, and capacity development of staff; revitalizing the extension system by adopting and up-scaling FFS (as a national extension approach vs. T&V <sup>20</sup> ) through properly trained and motivated SMSs, BEOs, Farmer Facilitators (FFs) and CAHWs;  Strengthen research-extension-farmer linkages; and ensure extension linked to value addition and markets and related capacity

<sup>15</sup> Op. cit.;

<sup>16</sup> Op.cit.

<sup>17</sup> RGoZ2008. Zanzibar Food Security and Nutrition Policy

<sup>18</sup> RGoZ (2015) Zanzibar Agricultural Sector Review 2015

<sup>19</sup> RGoZ National Sample Census Of Agriculture 2007/2008: Volume VII: Crop Sector -Zanzibar Report

<sup>20</sup> RGoZ (2015) Zanzibar Agricultural Sector Review 2015

Priority thematic areas	Affected/target groups	Main issues	Priority actions needed
farmer/livestock keeper/pastoralist linkages and other support services (e.g inputs, mechanization, rural finance and markets); and promotion of district driven adaptive research and R&D liaison units		sector in agricultural service delivery	building of crop/ livestock holders/pastoralists/fisher-folks and crop/livestock owners' organizations on grading and standardization of agricultural products, with specific reference to higher-value or differentiated agricultural and food products (HVAF), good agricultural practices and international food standards for those wanting to export to international markets. Assist farmers to form producer organizations to produce, process and market their produce within Tanzania and for export, including facilitating access to credit.
5) Rural Commercialization and value addition (Building Competitive Commodity Value Chains) through strengthened PPPP	Women and men smallholder farmers, livestock keepers and fisher-folks; and Micro Small and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs) with marketable surplus	<p>Rural commercialization and value addition is hampered by inadequate public and private investments; and lack of reliable markets, financial and credit services<sup>21</sup>.</p> <p>High post-harvest losses due to poor harvesting, storage and transportation facilities.</p> <p>Inadequate value addition and agricultural marketing.</p>	<p>Stimulating expanded and inclusive private sector-driven value chain development and integration, facilitated by: (i) effective and viable public-private partnerships and public support services, and (ii) expanded rural infrastructure (especially small-scale irrigation, post-harvest facilities, rural energy and rural feeder roads). This would contribute to much needed expanded off-farm employment opportunities</p> <p>Promote research and development (R&amp;D) of technologies focused on post-harvest storage and handling and increasing access to credit for this purpose.</p> <p>More extension linked to value addition and markets. Capacity building of farmers/livestock keepers/pastoralists and their respective organizations on grading and standardization. This would be with specific reference to higher-value or differentiated agricultural and food products (HVAF), good agricultural practices and international food standards for those wanting to export to international markets.</p>
6) Access to rural finance/credit	Majority of women and men producers as reflected above	Less involvement in the agriculture sector of financial institution; inadequate skills for risk assessment; lack of products to serve rural smallholders; insufficient trust among the actors across the value chain; inadequate rural banking infrastructure.	<p>Develop innovative financial products tailored for smallholder agriculture</p> <p>Capacity building and strengthening of MFIs and SACCOs (through MIVARF and other initiatives)</p> <p>Policy dialogue and support to new Rural Finance strategy implementation and the National Financial Inclusion Framework.</p>

<sup>21</sup> RGoZ (2015) Zanzibar Agricultural Sector Review 2015

Priority thematic areas	Affected/target groups	Main issues	Priority actions needed
7) Disaster resilience management, environmental/ NRM and climate change mitigation and adaptation	Rural population, with Particular reference to population with small landholdings farming on degraded land and livestock keepers in degraded grazing lands and fisher-folks	<p>Weak capacities (at national and lower levels) to respond to disaster, environmental and climate change challenges</p> <p>Inadequate capacity among communities to address environmental and natural resource management issues in a sustainable manner</p>	<p>Implementation of National Climate Change Response Strategy (NCCRS) for all sectors. Increase of the level of awareness and capacity building in Climate Change adaptation and mitigation in agricultural programmes, projects and activities, among top managers, district and lower level staff and other stakeholders. Encouraging practices with reduced external inputs where appropriate. Promoting drought tolerant crops and high value traditional crops- higher yields/ resilience, soil and water conservation for intensification, water harvesting for crop production, adaptation and weather based index insurance;</p> <p>Promote environmental conservation through, in the case of sustainable intensification: conservation agriculture, integrated soil water and fertility management (soil health systems), integrated pest management, agroforestry and integrated farming systems with livestock management.</p> <p>Strengthening of community-based natural resource management institutions and equipped with capacity to operationalize the disaster management strategy.</p>
8) Gender	Rural women, especially female head of households who are widowed, deserted or divorced; and other vulnerable or marginalized groups.	<p>Limited gender disaggregated data</p> <p>Limited access to natural and productive resources</p> <p>Social practices deny many women the right to property ownership, and access to credit, agricultural inputs, markets, and opportunities from membership of agricultural co-operatives.</p> <p>Women rarely qualify for any credit that is tied to collateral requirements, which are often based on a land title deed</p> <p>Low exposure to</p>	<p>Promoting gender equity - ensuring that women and other vulnerable groups have equitable access to resources like land<sup>22</sup> with emphasis on strengthening gender mainstreaming; and also paying attention to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Development of gender disaggregated data and of indicators to monitor participation of women in economic development;</li> <li>- Increased access of women to land and strengthened land tenure security;</li> <li>- Increased access of women to research results and extension services by creating reliable channels of communication directly with women and adapting extension services to women's time constraints;</li> <li>-Development of technologies relevant to the roles of women in agricultural production and food processing.</li> </ul>

<sup>22</sup> Op. cit.

Priority thematic areas	Affected/target groups	Main issues	Priority actions needed
		agricultural services such as extension due to: (a) multiple roles in reproduction, maintenance and production constituting heavy gender workloads and placing limitations on women's time and the extent to which they can take advantage of new agricultural knowledge and skills through extension networks or the media, (b) high rate of illiteracy among rural women, affecting their capacity for absorbing and adopting new ideas.	
9) Youth	Rural youth who are under 30 years of age	<p>Inadequate attention to youth involvement in agricultural activities calls for a need to prepare the younger generation for the future challenges of commercial agriculture for export and environmental issues;</p> <p>Limited access to natural and productive resources. Traditional and social practices deny many young people the right to property ownership, putting them at a disadvantage in seeking access to credit, agricultural inputs, marketing outlets and opportunities accruing from membership of agricultural co-operatives.</p> <p>Low capacity and lack of collateral.</p>	<p>Take affirmative action in promotion of youth involvement in agriculture through provision of enabling environment like increased access of young people to surveyed land and strengthened land tenure security, including identifying community gardens for youth groups or clubs like 4H;</p> <p>Development and reinforcement of national vocational training and extension services targeted to rural youth. Linkages with rural finance and development of tailored products for youth without collateral for credit.</p>



Priority thematic areas	Affected/target groups	Main issues	Priority actions needed
		Low linkages with financial sectors	
10) Land and resource security	Lack of stakeholder involvement in decision-making processes on large scale investments and M&E of these. Poor tenure security and marginalisation from village level decision-making processes of particular groups including pastoralists and indigenous peoples: Only 2% (1.28 million ha) of the land deemed suitable for grazing is currently protected within village land use plans, which have been implemented in less than 10% of villages in 81 out of 150 districts.	Inadequate consultation processes, lack of forums for engagement of stakeholders and government. Lack of capacity, skills and financial resources to invest in prolonged negotiation and agreement processes over village land uses and in particular in mixed livestock-crop areas. Land use conflicts.	Support the establishment of platforms for government-stakeholder engagement, discussion and M&E on large-scale commercial investments in land. Build the capacity of government including livestock sector to facilitate participatory land use planning and district and village levels, agreement on land uses, development of formal shared resource-sharing agreements, strengthening of village institutions for management of resources, and investments in protection and development of rangeland resources.  Protection of livestock routes to facilitate movement in order to share rangeland resources across villages and to access markets and livestock services.
11) Indigenous peoples	Marginalisation from decision-making processes over development, land use etc.	Viewed as backward, non-contributing, conflict-prone. Lack of awareness of rights, and knowledge how to enforce rights. Lack of platforms to engage with government and other stakeholders.	Improve participation of indigenous groups in decision-making processes on development, land etc. through inclusion in relevant platforms.  Take affirmative action to include indigenous peoples in activities and projects.

## Key file 2: Organizations matrix (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats analysis)

Ag. Sector and Organization	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
I) Mainland				
A) By Ag. Sector (reflecting ASDS II document)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contributes to the improvement of the livelihoods of Tanzanians and attainment of broad based economic growth and poverty alleviation. Provides about 24.1 percent of GDP, 30 per cent of export earnings and employs about 75 percent of the total labour force<sup>1</sup>.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low productivity of land, labour and production inputs;</li> <li>Weak rural infrastructure;</li> <li>Over dependency on rain-fed agriculture and low and underdeveloped irrigation potential;</li> <li>Limited capital and access to financial services for the uptake of technologies;</li> <li>Inadequate support services - agricultural training, research and extension services;</li> <li>Weak producers' organizations;</li> <li>Erosion of natural resource base and environmental degradation;</li> <li>Low level of private sector participation in service delivery and commercial activities;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Abundant natural resources (land, water) and different agro-ecological zones. E.g. 44 million hectares of land are suitable for agricultural production, only 10.8 million hectares (24 percent) are cultivated;</li> <li>Expanding domestic, regional and international market opportunities for various agricultural commodities;</li> <li>Existence of favourable policies for agricultural development;</li> <li>Existence of institutional reforms for improving efficiency and effectiveness in the provision of public services;</li> </ul>	Climate change and variability
1) Vice President's Office-Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mandated to deal with all environmental management issues in the country</li> <li>Has a Division of Environment responsible for the overall environmental policy and regulation, formulation, coordination and monitoring of environment policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most rural people are not aware and knowledgeable on the consequences of environmental degradation and climate change and variability</li> <li>Inadequate staffing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has a National Environmental Policy 1997; <u>National Action Programme (NAP) to Combat Desertification (1999)</u>; <u>National Adaptation Programme of Action – NAPA (2007)</u></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Willingness and readiness of the rural population and other farming communities to adopt and make use of sustainable environmental and natural resource</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> MAFC 2013 (National Agriculture Policy)

Ag. Sector and Organization	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>implementation in the country</li> <li>Collaborates with various institutions such as Sector Ministries, National Environment Management Council (NEMC) and Local Government Authorities.</li> <li>Focuses on a number of areas including climate change; poverty and environment mainstreaming; approval of Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA);</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>levels at national and especially at regional and district levels with personnel competent in environmental matters</li> <li>Inadequate institutional coordination coupled with weak M&amp;E systems</li> <li>Inadequate involvement of NGOs/CBOs in promotion of environmental management issues especially in rural areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implementation of a number of global and Regional Environmental Treaties, as a basis for global and regional cooperation in the pursuit for sustainable development including issues related to environment and climate change</li> <li>Introduction of environmental education in primary and secondary school curricula</li> </ul>	management measures including adaptation to climate change
2) Min. of Finance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staffed with professionals who are conversant with donor operations, economic and financial management matters.</li> <li>Borrower and there is IFAD desk Officer</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delayed release of counterpart funds</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existence of fiscal and non-fiscal policies and Micro-Finance Policy (currently under review)</li> </ul>	
3) Prime Minister's Office (PMO)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mandate to coordinate the business of all government ministries.</li> <li>Responsibility for coordination of preparation of rural development strategy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inadequate technical staff needed for coordination.</li> <li>Inadequate operational budget.</li> <li>Inadequate funds for staff training, supervision and monitoring of activities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Currently hosting IFAD Liaison Office and coordinating one IFAD – supported programme-MIVARF.</li> <li>Coordination of KILIMO KWANZA and BEST</li> <li>Division of Investment and Private Sector Development</li> <li>Hosts the National Economic Empowerment Council (NEEC)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low technical support and operation funds to carry out programme-related functions</li> </ul>
4) Prime Minister's Office, Regional Administration & Local Government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Commitment to and capacity for local government reform.</li> <li>Coordinates/implements programmes at regional/ district levels (e.g MUVI, DADPs and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Residual intervention powers at regional level.</li> <li>Limited funds to provide discretionary</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong donor support and drive for on-going decentralization and reform process.</li> </ul>	

Ag. Sector and Organization	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
(PMO-RALG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MIVARF).</li> <li>Considerable influence in policy formulation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>grants to local government.</li> <li>Limited planning and implementation capacity at the regional and district levels.</li> </ul>		
5) Min. of Agriculture, Food Security and Cooperatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Experience in implementation of Agriculture sector Wide Approach (AgSWAp)</li> <li>Coordinates ASDS2 and ASDP 2</li> <li>Some policy formulation capacity</li> <li>Experience in support of agricultural production</li> <li>Critical mass of extension and research staff</li> <li>Promotion and scaling up of Farmer Field School as a viable extension approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inadequate budgetary allocations for its programmer and projects.</li> <li>Inadequate operational budget.</li> <li>Institutional instability</li> <li>Proliferation of policies/programmer/p programmes/projects without proper coordination jeopardizing sector coherence<sup>2</sup></li> <li>Inadequate private sector involvement</li> <li>Minimal performance of the Marketing and Private Sector Development Component of ASDP</li> <li>Inadequate attention to agriculture or rural/micro-finance in ASDP</li> <li>Lack of a robust M&amp;E system with SMART indicators at output, outcome and impact levels<sup>3</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Committed to pro-poor growth strategy and willingness to support on-going reforms</li> <li>Agriculture is a priority sector for government as per MKUKUTA, BRN and Five Year Development Plan</li> <li>DPs willingness to support the agriculture sector</li> <li>Additional staff being recruited</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>considerable confusion around different approaches/initiatives to agricultural development and how they linked with each other may deter sector coherence</li> <li>ageing workforce and retirement of a number of staff at national and lower levels</li> </ul>
6) Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong technical capacity at HQ and district levels.</li> <li>Committed to sustainable agro-</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Little donor funding support and low budgetary allocations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High demand for quality livestock products in urban centers, within the region</li> </ul>	

<sup>2</sup>MAFC (2011): Evaluation of the Performance and Achievements of the Agricultural Sector Development Programme (ASDP)

<sup>3</sup>MAFC (2014) ASDP ICR

Ag. Sector and Organization	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
Development	<p>pastoral community development programmes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Targeting small-stock as a major instrument for rural poverty and food insecurity reduction, as well as gender sensitivity</li> <li>Has put in place sound livestock and fisheries policies, strategies and programmes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No clear strategy for coordination with industrial and financial sectors.</li> <li>Inadequate involvement of private sector stakeholders in policy and strategic planning</li> </ul>	<p>and the Middle East.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Emerging private service provider sub-sector with respect to inputs and veterinary services.</li> <li>Strong professional livestock/veterinary associations</li> </ul>	
7) Ministry Industries and Trade (MIT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National mandate to support private sector development.</li> <li>Responsible for SME Policy and National Steering Committee.</li> <li>Promotion and scaling up of Warehouse Receipt System (WRS) and Commodity Exchange</li> <li>Makes use of private service providers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inadequate technical staff.</li> <li>Limited operational budget for policy implementation</li> <li>Lack of experience with large donor-assisted development project investment</li> <li>Changed roles of the Trade and Marketing Division</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy and National SME Committee in place.</li> <li>High-level political support for new private sector activities.</li> <li>MITM and its parastatal SIDO, responsible for implementation of new IFAD SME programme, MUVI.</li> <li>Also has sound Agricultural Marketing Policy</li> </ul>	
8) Ministry of Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Water Point Mapping System (WPMS) as a basis for basis of better service delivery.</li> <li>Recognition of Water User Associations (WUAs)/irrigator user associations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inadequate capacity of WUAs/Irrigator User Associations</li> </ul>		
9) Ministry of Lands, Housing and Human Settlements Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promotes activities related to activities relating to land administration, land use, survey and mapping, land information management systems and adjudication<sup>4</sup></li> <li>With World Bank support, the Private Sector Competitiveness Project (PSCP) is supporting capacity building in this ministry following the Strategic Plan for Implementation of the Land Laws (SPILL).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delayed survey of land and preparation of land use plans</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support from World Bank and other DPs to streamline issues related to land survey and land use plans</li> <li>National Land Use Planning Commission (NLUPC): the NLUPC, originally established in 1984, is the executing agency for the Land Use Planning Act (2007) and has responsibilities for both policy coordination and</li> </ul>	

<sup>4</sup> SAGCOT SRESA Draft Report 2012

Ag. Sector and Organization	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developed strategies for dispute resolution mechanisms--support for functioning District Land and Housing Tribunals and support to reduce the backlog of land cases</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>physical planning</li> <li>Establishment of the "Land Bank"</li> </ul>	
10) Regional Secretariats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National Mandate to supervise, advice and provide technical backstopping to LGAs (District to village councils)</li> <li>Coordinates implementation of agricultural related activities in the region</li> <li>Mandated to build capacity of LGAs to provide agricultural related services</li> <li>Existence of the Regional Consultative Committee (RCC)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inadequate staff and capacity (including skills and facilities) to deliver the required services</li> <li>High staff turn-over due to retirements leading to lack of institutional memory and continuity of certain activities owing to lack of timely replacements</li> <li>Inadequate pay package and work incentives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proximity to LGAs in their area of jurisdiction</li> <li>Existence of ASDP Regional Coordinator</li> <li>Provision to employ more staff as per the amended Regional Administrative Act No. 19 of 1997 (Approved August 2007)</li> </ul>	
11) LGAs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Democratically elected local representatives.</li> <li>Mandate to provide a range of extension services and implement development programmes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poor resource/asset base.</li> <li>Lack of discretionary funds and poor revenue collection capacity.</li> <li>Lack of qualified professional staff in some subject areas like irrigation, agro-mechanization, project planning and management.</li> <li>Inadequate M&amp;E system and capacity</li> <li>No comprehensive inventory of Private Sector Service Providers</li> <li>Lack of long term land-use plans</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased autonomy and direct resource flow through reform process.</li> <li>Interest of DPs to build capacity at this level, e.g. support to improve taxation policies.</li> <li>Existence of policies in favor of strengthening decentralization processes including community empowerment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Possibility of district planning process to be 'hijacked' for political reasons.</li> </ul>

Ag. Sector and Organization	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
12) Cooperative Unions/Primary Cooperative Societies and apex (e.g Tanzania Federation of Cooperatives--TFC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wide presence in rural areas.</li> <li>• Good knowledge of local producers.</li> <li>• Existing physical facilities in many cases.</li> <li>• Experience in marketing of inputs and certain crops.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor capital base.</li> <li>• Failure to deliver the services to members.</li> <li>• Decline in membership.</li> <li>• Non-democratic management structure and low accountability.</li> <li>• Low level of autonomy due to political interference.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most immediately accessible base for rural producers.</li> <li>• Some are currently being restructured to enhance efficiency and improve governance (e.g. TFC)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ad hoc political interference.</li> </ul>
13) Tanzania Chamber of Commerce, Industry and Agriculture (TCCIA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extensive network, covering 20 regions and stretching wings to new ones.</li> <li>• Ability to influence Government on matters related to taxation and private sector development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Factionalized membership.</li> <li>• Large enterprises most influential.</li> <li>• Present principally in major urban centers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pilot activities underway to encourage formation of TCCIA branches in rural districts.</li> <li>• New services (market information, business advice) could increase membership and efficacy.</li> </ul>	
14) Agricultural Council of Tanzania (ACT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Competence in private sector development in the agricultural sector in its broad sense (as per FAO definition of agriculture)</li> <li>• Pioneer of KILIMO KWANZA (Agriculture First) and SAGCOT</li> <li>• Experience with credit guarantee scheme</li> <li>• Have established regional networks in key zones</li> <li>• Has expertise in value chain analysis and development, warehousing, contract farming and business development.</li> <li>• Close partnership with the national farmer groups network (MVIWATA)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inadequate staff</li> <li>• Inadequate funding</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collaborates with BEST and Development Partners (including FAO, IFAD, EU and AGRA)</li> <li>• Collaborates with financial institutions like DUNDULIZA, NMB, EXIM Bank, SCCULT and CRDB</li> <li>• Strong linkages with regional business councils</li> <li>• Has a sound strategic plan</li> </ul>	
15) National Network of Small-Scale Farmers Groups in Tanzania.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only organization representing small producers though at infant stage.</li> <li>• Network now covers more than</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low visibility at national/local level</li> <li>• Inadequate staff capacity in relation to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacity support from donors and international NGOs.</li> <li>• Increasing demand for</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could easily fail if expanded too fast.</li> <li>• May lose contact with initial</li> </ul>

Ag. Sector and Organization	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
(MVIWATA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>17 mainland regions.</li> <li>Good at lobbying and advocacy; and economic empowerment</li> <li>No historical links to government-sponsored institutions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>area of coverage.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>strong small farmer participation in planning process of ASDP.</li> <li>Affiliation with national and international networks and organisations for lobbying and advocacy such as Tanzania Land Alliance (TALA), Tanzania CSOs Trade Coalition (TCTC), Eastern and Southern African Farmers Forum (ESAFF), Eastern African Farmers Federation (EAFF) and International Peasants Movement (La Via Campesina).</li> <li>Implements programmes/ projects focusing on improvement of rural markets and finance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>objectives and purpose.</li> </ul>
16) International Private Sector Service Providers (IPSSPs) - Companies and NGOs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Considerable experience and resources, including institutional development and project implementation.</li> <li>Good at knowledge-based development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Status often unclear. Expensive</li> <li>Some have subsidies from donors. Lack of local long-term roots</li> <li>Often less well represented in regions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Able to provide training to trainers, provide management services and mobilize field teams.</li> <li>Some are eager to work in partnership with Tanzanian companies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Subterfuge by smaller local companies who may feel threatened.</li> </ul>
17) National Private Sector Service Providers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good understanding of socio-political reality in the field.</li> <li>Excellent networks of potential staff, including universities.</li> <li>Represented in regions.</li> <li>Lower costs than international companies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited experience (though growing rapidly) and skills.</li> <li>Limited resources, financial and physical.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increasingly developing capacity for a range of different services, and some already has excellent training skills.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low capacity to compete with international groups in an open-market environment.</li> </ul>
18) NGOs/CBOs (local)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local presence and knowledge.</li> <li>Principal target/partners of international NGOs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of technical and managerial skills.</li> <li>Often lack sufficient resources for</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could provide cost-effective services at grassroots level.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May be seen as competitors by cooperatives and other producer</li> </ul>



Ag. Sector and Organization	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
		<p>operations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Main sponsors may be DPs or International NGOs</li> </ul>		<p>organizations.</p>
19) Commercial Banks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Large amount of liquidity.</li> <li>Increasing interest in expanding lending options, including to agriculture</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highly risk averse and high levels of public sector borrowing provide large, low-risk.</li> <li>Limited rural network.</li> <li>Slow administration with too much paper work (some are bureaucratic).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some commercial banks like NMB and CRDB support profitable agriculture value chains and SACCOS.</li> <li>Options of telephone banking (e.g. phone credits) can be further explored.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Encouraged by Tanzania Financial Sector Deepening Trust.</li> <li>Will need further work to convince them to take new risks, but an area of important potential for MSME development.</li> </ul>
20) Microfinance Institutions (MFIs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Filling a gap left by reluctance of commercial banks to lend to small rural operators.</li> <li>Can use social collateral.</li> <li>Understand problems and work environment of the rural poor.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited number, so not available everywhere.</li> <li>Relatively high interest rates.</li> <li>Difficulty in recovery of bad debts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increasing demand for financial services.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Weak capacity to mobilize sufficient funds from commercial banks to meet credit demand.</li> </ul>
21) Savings and Credit Cooperative Societies (SACCOS) / Savings and Credit Associations (SACAs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Members linked by a common bond.</li> <li>Provide access to savings and credit facilities.</li> <li>Proper credit repayment culture through local peer pressure.</li> <li>Strong commitment by the members and management to ensure viability and sustainability.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Slow growth in membership.</li> <li>Low level of women membership in SACCOS.</li> <li>Low levels of organizational and financial management skills.</li> <li>Lack of facilities and equipment.</li> <li>Limited areas of operation and poorly diversified loan portfolios.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conducive policy framework and capacity building supported by MIVARF.</li> <li>Requirement that SACCOS be intermediary for access to Government funds.</li> <li>Strong support by Government and financial institutions like NMB, CRDB, TIB and TADB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ad hoc political interference.</li> </ul>
22) Research Agencies, Institutes and Universities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local experience and international connections.</li> <li>High caliber of staff.</li> <li>Consultancy track record in some cases.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reliance on donor/soft funding.</li> <li>Academic approach in some areas.</li> <li>Staff availability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Geographical spread for local district coverage.</li> <li>Capable of contract management.</li> <li>May require board mandate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong potential as ASPs and contractors.</li> </ul>

Ag. Sector and Organization	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Familiar with commercial practice.</li> </ul>	<p>limitations.</p>	<p>to move from single crop/ discipline focus.</p>	
23) Development Partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promotion of democratic governance</li> <li>Active Agriculture Working Group (AWG) providing strategic guidance to ASLMs through ASDP Secretariat</li> <li>Coordinated policy dialogue</li> <li>Support alignment of agricultural policies and investments with national goals and projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited coordination with other actors</li> <li>Failure to meet fully their budgetary commitments</li> <li>Lack of common agreement on the financing of the agriculture sector</li> <li>Proliferation of different approaches/initiatives/ programmes/ projects aimed to promote agricultural development and their linkage is not clear.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interested in promoting agriculture value chain development</li> <li>Promotion of climate smart agriculture</li> <li></li> </ul>	
11) Zanzibar				
A) By Ag. Sector (to recent reports from 2014 permit)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contributes to the improvement of the livelihoods of Tanzanians and attainment of broad based economic growth and poverty alleviation. Provides about 28 percent of GDP on average, 70 per cent of export earnings and employs 42 percent of active labour force in Zanzibar and indirectly to 70 percent of the population<sup>5</sup>.</li> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low productivity of land, labour and production inputs;</li> <li>Weak rural infrastructure;</li> <li>Over dependency on rain-fed agriculture and low and underdeveloped irrigation potential;</li> <li>Limited capital and access to financial services for the uptake of technologies;</li> <li>Weak producers' organizations;</li> <li>Erosion of natural resource base and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existence of favourable policies for agricultural development;</li> <li>Willingness of Government and development partners to support the sector</li> <li>Existence of agro-processing training centre<sup>6</sup></li> </ul>	Staff turn-over due to inadequate retention system

<sup>5</sup> RGoZ (2015) Zanzibar Agricultural Sector Review 2015

<sup>6</sup> RGoZ (2011).ASP 2011-2014

Ag. Sector and Organization	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
		environmental degradation; • Low level of non-state actor in service delivery and commercial activities;		
B) By Organization				
1) The First Vice President's Office- Department of Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mandated to handle all environmental matters in Zanzibar</li> <li>• Committed to implement a national environmental response framework and strategies to be implemented by all key actors in the public, private, and community entities</li> <li>• Put in place programmes for monitoring the status of the environment</li> <li>• Promotion of environmental awareness</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inadequate enforcement of environmental laws and regulations, norms, and standards</li> <li>• Inadequate awareness and knowledge on the consequences of environmental degradation</li> <li>• Inadequate qualified staff especially at district level to implement effectively the initiated environmental programmes and projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has a national Environmental Policy 2013 (an update of 1992 policy) placing emphasis on Environmental and Climate Change Governance; terrestrial and marine Resources and biodiversity; forest conservation; renewable and efficient energy; environmental pollution; waste management; integrated water resources management; development of environmental quality standards, environmental and Social Impact Assessment; environmental information systems and awareness; climate change adaptation and mitigation, sustainable tourism; gender, HIV/AIDS and public health</li> <li>• Has an Environmental Management for Sustainable Development Act of Zanzibar of 1996 and regulations such as the Environmental Impact Assessment of 2002, the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People's strong belief that natural resources are a public good to be exploited as one wishes</li> </ul>

Ag. Sector and Organization	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
			Banning of Plastic Bags of 2011 and the Sustainable Utilization of Non Renewable Natural Resources of 2011	
2) Ministry of Finance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Represents the Borrower</li> <li>Contribution to counterpart funds</li> <li>Committed to support the agriculture sector</li> <li>Aid Coordination, , provision of tax regimes and incentives for enhanced agricultural sector development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delays in release of counterpart funds</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>implementation of Micro Finance Policy</li> </ul>	
3) Min. of Agriculture and Natural Resources (source: Footnotes 4 and 5)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Experience with ASSP/ASDP-L interventions</li> <li>Adoption of FFS as a national extension approach</li> <li>Has a critical mass of key staff at national level</li> <li>Conducted a ten year agriculture sector review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inadequate budgetary allocations</li> <li>Inadequate private sector participation in the sector</li> <li>Inadequate attention to agriculture marketing issues and rural/agric. finance</li> <li>Lack of a robust M&amp;E system with SMART indicators at output, outcome and impact level</li> <li>Inadequate competent Block Extension Officers and Subject Matter Specialists at district levels</li> <li>Limited adoption of productivity enhancing technologies.</li> <li>No elaborate framework for coordination and information sharing between key sector ministries namely</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existence of enabling sector policies and strategies including Agricultural Transformation Initiative (ATI) and Research Master Plan and Extension Vision</li> <li>Existence of on-going projects/programmes like the Marketing Infrastructure, Value Addition and Rural Finance Programme (MIVARF), Food Security and Nutrition Programme, the Agricultural Sector Development Programme Livestock (ASDP-L).</li> <li>Attempting to put in place an institutional framework for the Agricultural Sector-Wide Approach (ASWAp) with an oversight being provided by the Inter Sectoral Steering Committees (ISSC)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Persistence of unfavourable weather conditions (dependence on rain-fed agriculture which is consistently becoming uncertain<sup>7</sup>)</li> <li>Lack of a cohesive institutional framework to provide for coordination and monitoring of sector-wide performance</li> </ul>

<sup>7</sup> RGoZ (2015) Zanzibar Agricultural Sector Review 2015

Ag. Sector and Organization	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
		<p>MANR and MLF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>insufficient provision of support services along the entire agricultural value chain</li> </ul>		
4) Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some experience with ASSP/ASDP-L interventions</li> <li>Adoption of FFS as a national extension approach</li> <li>Has a critical mass of key staff at national level</li> <li>Support for livestock value chain development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inadequate budgetary allocations</li> <li>Slow pace of sector growth (currently at a rate of 2%<sup>8</sup> for dairy)</li> <li>Insufficient provision of support services along the entire agricultural value chain</li> <li>Inadequate private sector participation in the sector</li> <li>Inadequate attention to agriculture marketing issues and rural/agric. finance</li> <li>Inadequate availability of good quality animal feeds and improved animal stock</li> <li>Lack of a robust M&amp;E system with SMART indicators at output, outcome and impact level</li> <li>Inadequate competent Block Extension Officers and Subject Matter Specialists at district levels</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attempting to come up with a regulatory framework for recognizing CAHWS as potential para-veterinarians</li> <li>Has put in place relevant sub-sector policies like Fisheries policy (2012); Livestock policy (2012); Forestry policy (2014) and National forest Resources Management Plan (2008-2020).</li> </ul>	Lack of a cohesive institutional framework to provide for coordination and monitoring of sector-wide performance

<sup>8</sup> RGoZ (2015) Zanzibar Agricultural Sector Review 2015

Ag. Sector and Organization	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No elaborate framework for coordination and information sharing between key sector ministries namely MANR and MLF</li> <li>Lack of fisher-folks' involvement in deep sea fishing<sup>9</sup></li> </ul>		
5) Ministry of Trade, Industry and Marketing (MTIM)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coordination and provision of operational guidance for implementation of agricultural related interventions</li> <li>Emphasis on value addition and Agro processing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited capacities in areas of trade and marketing; promotion of SMEs, planning and implementation of trade policies and provision of business information services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existence of agriculture enabling policies and legal framework such as Small and Medium Enterprise (SME) Policy; Zanzibar Bureau of Standards; Zanzibar State Trading Cooperation, Zanzibar Clove law, Clove Development Fund and Clove branding initiatives.</li> <li>Put in place Zanzibar Destination Marketing Strategy illustrating branding and marketing strategies</li> <li>Conducted a study on capacity needs assessment for mainstreaming trade in Zanzibar identifying priority areas for capacity development</li> </ul>	
6) Ministry of Cooperatives, Youth, Women and children	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promotes cooperatives development including savings and credit institutions, youth empowerment, gender mainstreaming, business skills development, establishment and management of Business Incubators,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of critical mass of competent staff to promote cooperatives development including SACCOS</li> <li>The apex organization (CUZA) and the cooperative unions in</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interest to collaborate with MANR to promote SADPs</li> </ul>	

<sup>9</sup> RGoZ (2015) Zanzibar Agricultural Sector Review 2015

Ag. Sector and Organization	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Management of Empowerment Fund.</li> </ul>	<p>Zanzibar are very weak and over the past decade little work has been done to strengthen the cooperative movement<sup>10</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of resources to promote the cooperative movement</li> </ul>		
7) Local Governments/Districts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have a District Planning Committee coordinating implementation of MKUZA interventions and agricultural related initiatives</li> <li>Promoting participatory and demand driven approach in service delivery through use of FFS</li> <li>Support for implementation and roll out of SADPs</li> <li>Committed to strengthening the DFF</li> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of adequate financial and human resources like SMSs and BEOs (in terms of numbers and capacity<sup>11</sup>)</li> <li>Lack of a shared vision on operationalization of SADPs and DFF</li> <li>Inadequate/lack of sound M&amp;E system</li> <li>Dependent on Central Government for resources to run the district affairs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Readiness of district staff and communities to practice new ideas or initiatives aimed at improving their livelihoods</li> <li>In the spirit of envisioned decentralization there is more likelihood of designing agricultural development projects/plans based on local opportunities and constraints</li> </ul>	
8) Farmers' Organizations (primary and apex organization)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Cooperative Union of Zanzibar (CUZA) and cooperative unions including primary ones have the potential to implement vision 2020 that aims modernization and empowerment of people and especially smallholder farmers</li> <li>Capable of a multiplier effect (spill-over effect) through farmer facilitators/motivators (e.g crop and livestock FFS groups)<sup>12</sup></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Primary cooperatives are weak and lack support from the cooperative unions and CUZA, both of which have very limited financial and manpower resources</li> <li>Failure of CUZA and cooperative unions to provide services to primary cooperatives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>cooperative development policy and cooperative societies Act (reviewed and updated in favor of strengthening farmer organizations<sup>13</sup>)</li> <li>MIVARF interest to strengthen /empower producer, processor and market groups and SACCOS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>

<sup>10</sup> Sam Maghimbi (2010). Cooperatives in Zanzibar: Decline and renaissance. ILO Country Office for the United Republic of Tanzania, Kenya, Rwanda, and Uganda

<sup>11</sup> RGoZ (2015) Zanzibar Agricultural Sector Review 2015

<sup>12</sup> Aide memoire (2014). Tenth IFAD Supervision and Implementation Support Mission (9-20 June 2014)

Ag. Sector and Organization	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• weak in terms of capacity and management; and/or weak collective capabilities and organization</li> <li>• accountability issues not adequately addressed</li> </ul>		
9) Private Sector entities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good understanding of socio-political reality in the field.</li> <li>• Represented in regions.</li> <li>• Lower costs than international companies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited experience (though growing rapidly) and skills.</li> <li>• Limited resources, financial and physical.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increasingly developing capacity for a range of different services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low capacity to compete with international groups in an open-market environment.</li> </ul>
10) Financial Entities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large amount of liquidity.</li> <li>• Increasing interest in expanding lending options, including to agriculture</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highly risk averse and high levels of public sector borrowing provide large, low-risk.</li> <li>• Limited rural network.</li> <li>• Slow administration with too much paper work (some are bureaucratic).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some commercial banks like NMB and CRDB support profitable agriculture value chains and SACCOS.</li> <li>• Options of telephone banking (e.g. phone credits) can be further explored.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encouraged by Tanzania Financial Sector Deepening Trust.</li> <li>• Will need further work to convince them to take new risks, but an area of important potential for MSME development.</li> </ul>
11) Non State Actors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local presence and knowledge.</li> <li>• Principal target/partners of international NGOs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of technical and managerial skills.</li> <li>• Often lack sufficient resources for operations.</li> <li>• Main sponsors may be DPs or International NGOs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could provide cost-effective services at grassroots level.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May be seen as competitors by cooperatives and other producer organizations.</li> </ul>
12) Devt. Partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promotion of democratic governance</li> <li>• Interest in setting up active Agriculture Working Group (AWG)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited coordination with other actors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interested in promoting agriculture value chain development</li> <li>• Promotion of climate smart</li> </ul>	

<sup>13</sup> MALE, CUZA and ILO COOP (2009) Conference for Cooperative Leaders and Stakeholders in Zanzibar



Ag. Sector and Organization	Strengths	Weaknesses	Opportunities	Threats
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coordinated policy dialogue</li> <li>Support alignment of agricultural policies and investments with national goals and projects</li> </ul>		agriculture	

## Key file 3: Complementary donor initiative/partnership potential

Agency (major ones)	Priority sectors and areas of focus	Period of current country strategy	Complementarity, Synergy and Partnership Potential	
A) Mainland				
1) European Union (EU)	In line with BRN- EU <sup>1</sup> aims to support sustainable agriculture with the objective of: (i) promoting general agriculture wealth through linking farmers to markets and value chains; (ii) improving food and nutrition security through improved access, availability, use of food and; (iii) enhance management of natural resources and ecosystem services for sustainable agriculture and climate change adaptation. Some projects include: i) Improve Competitiveness and Increase Postharvest Value Chain of Smallholder Farmers  ii) Food Security Thematic Programme (FSTP): Participation for Governance in Food Security  iii) also focuses on good governance and development; energy and civil society.	2014-2020	Complementarities with MIVARF and ASDP II          Complementarities with MIVARF (EU in discussion with PC MIVARF on WRS) and ASDP II	
2) USAID	The country strategy <sup>2</sup> targets increasing agricultural productivity and profitability in targeted value chains (rice, maize and horticulture) through capacity building and strengthening farmer associations, focusing on participation of women and youth – to better access improved technologies and fair market prices and strengthen the advocacy role of farmer organizations  .Staples Value Chain Project (NAFAKA) • Horticulture Projects (TAPP, TAHA) • Support for Agro-Processing and Marketing (Tuboreshe Chakula) • Sokoine University of Agriculture and Innovations in Agriculture Research (iAGRI) • Support to USDA's National Agriculture Statistical Service to assist the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) • African Women in Agriculture Research and Development (AWARD) • Institutional Support to SAGCOT Center, Catalytic Fund • Support to PDB for the BRN's Agriculture National Key Results Area	2014-2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complements ASDP and MIVARF.</li> <li>• Development of land use plans and land registration in strategic areas</li> <li>• Deepening support for expanded access to agr. Marketing and rural financial services</li> <li>• value chain development for smallholders</li> <li>• Private sector development</li> <li>• Capacity building in support of institutional frameworks for effective policy design, analysis, implementation transparency and broad stakeholder dialogue<sup>3</sup></li> </ul>	

<sup>1</sup> EU 2014: National Indicative Programme for the United Republic of Tanzania 2014-2020

<sup>2</sup> USAID-TANZANIA: Country Development Cooperation Strategy October 3, 2014 – October 3, 2019

<sup>3</sup> Notes by Carey-USAID Dar es Salaam (April-May 2015)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ASPIRE: Household Economic Strengthening for Vulnerable Populations</li> <li>• Follow-on Staples Value Chain Support Project</li> <li>• Follow-on Horticulture Support Project</li> <li>• Follow-on Agro-Processing and Marketing Project</li> </ul>		
3) World Bank	<p>Financial sector deepening through Financial Sector Support Project (FSSP<sup>4</sup>) which aims to increase household and firm access to financial services, facilitate efficient financial intermediation, and support financial stability and integrity.</p> <p>The Southern Agricultural Growth Corridor (SAGCOT) Investment Project) aims to strengthen the dialogue between the public and private sector and addresses key policy, regulatory, administrative, and infrastructure constraints along agribusiness value chains in the southern corridor. The SAGCOT Investment Project supports the operations of the SAGCOT Secretariat, grants through the Kilimo Kwanza Catalytic Fund to facilitate start-up investments by agribusinesses in the Southern corridor and develop their linkages with smallholders, and access to finance by MSMEs along agribusiness value chains through a line of credit and partial credit guarantees intermediated through the Tanzania Investment Bank and commercial banks.</p> <p>Agriculture Sector Development Project (ASDP 2006-2013): implements the national Agricultural Sector Development Strategy -focused on improving productivity and profitability of agriculture by providing better production and market infrastructure and support services to smallholders.</p> <p>National Agricultural Input Voucher Scheme (NAIVS) Through the WB-supported Accelerated Food Security Project-AFSP, targets productivity growth for staples needed to alleviate impact of rising food and input prices.</p> <p>Support for National Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan to address issues related to climate change and variability; and to sustainable management of natural resources.</p> <p>Water Sector Support Project (largest project under SWAp approach).</p> <p>3<sup>rd</sup> Tanzania Social Action Fund (TASAF III): supports the establishment of the main building blocks for a new comprehensive, nationwide safety net program. It aims at improving incomes of poor rural and urban households, while smoothing consumption. The project supports three interventions: (i) public works program, (ii) cash transfers, and (iii) community savings and investments promotion.</p>	2012-2015	<p>Complements MIVARF</p> <p>Complements MIVARF and MUVI in an endeavour to promote agribusiness value-chain development and support for MSMEs. Considerations for the Bagamoyo Eco-energy project</p> <p>Supporter of Ag-sector wide approach, contribution to ASDP Basket Fund and participation in the ASWG and Joint Implementation Review (JIR) Missions</p> <p>Complements efforts made to promote Climate-Smart Agriculture or sustainable intensification of agriculture aimed at increasing agricultural production and productivity of priority commodities under ASDP and MIVARF</p> <p>Supports irrigation water management, and soil and water conservation under ASDP II</p>

<sup>4</sup> World Bank CAS 2012-2015

			Complements MIVARF
4) AfDB	Overall: Focuses on supporting Tanzania towards greater competitiveness and more inclusive growth. Has two Pillars namely (i) Infrastructure development aimed at reducing travel time between regions, integrating the national market and connecting it to other markets in the EAC. Includes such projects as: (i) Road Sector Support Program II, (ii) MIVARF—Market Infrastructure and Rural roads, and (iii) Agriculture Sector Development Program II; and (ii) building an enabling institutional and business environment targeting fiduciary environment development and human resource development.	2011-2015 <sup>5</sup>	Complementarities with MIVARF  Joint support for ASDP II
5) JICA	ASDP support (from formulation of ASDP 1 to eventual conclusion in 2015 with focus on irrigation, rice improvement and strengthening M&E; and participation in AWG- currently the Chair). The objectives of the ASDP are (i) to enable farmers to have better access to and use of agricultural knowledge, technologies, marketing systems and infrastructure, all of which contribute to higher productivity, profitability, and farm incomes, and (ii) to promote private investment based on an improved regulatory and policy environment. Additional projects are such as:  i) Small Scale Irrigation Development Project –MAFC- May. 2013 – Mar. 2017 (District Irrigation Development fund (DIDF) which is one of the components of ASDP basket fund) aims to promote the construction of new irrigation schemes, rehabilitation of existing ones as well as procurement of necessary equipment, all of which contribute to the increase of rice production, improvement of the livelihood of small scale farmers and poverty reduction.  ii) Technical Cooperation in Supporting Service Delivery Systems of Irrigated		Joint support for ASDP II Joint support for ASDP II

<sup>5</sup> AfDB 2011. URT Country Strategy Paper 2011-2015. Regional Department East 1. OREA June 2011

	<p>Agriculture (Tanrice) project using an approach known as SRI while promoting NERICA facilitated by KATC.</p> <p>iii) Project for Supporting Rice Industry Development in Tanzania (Tanrice 2) intends to support the National Rice Development Strategy (NRDS) formulated in 2009, targeting to double its rice production of up to 1.96 million tons by 2018 (compared to the production in 2008) through intensification of irrigated paddy production.</p>		<p>Complementary with ASDP</p> <p>Complementary with ASDP</p> <p>Complementary with ASDP II</p>
6) Belgium (through BTC)	<p>Agriculture: Support for agricultural projects in Kagera and Kigoma<sup>6</sup> regions</p> <p>Water: water basket fund is non-earmarked and can thus fund any of the components of Tanzania's current Water Sector Development Programme: water resources management, rural water supply, urban water supply, sanitation and hygiene, and programme delivery support.</p>	2014-2016	<p>Complementary with ASDP</p> <p>Complements ASDP II activities related to water resources management</p>
7) FAO	<p>The FAO Country Programming Framework 2011-2016<sup>7</sup> focuses on strengthening key national institutions to develop pro-poor economic development policies and strategies that takes into account decent rural employment (incl. youth employment) and corporate responsible investment. Focuses on (i) Promoting agriculture as a business; (ii) sustainable management of natural resources including climate smart agriculture; and (iii) agricultural development planning and sector investment support.</p> <p>Also focuses on promoting good agricultural practices (GAP) and value chain addition in key sub-sectors (cassava, rice, horticulture, dairy and poultry). Furthermore, strives to promote good governance introducing improved information systems that reflect the impact of agricultural development on food and nutrition security. Provides support to ASDP and provides secretariat for the AWG. Other projects</p> <p>i) GCP/URT/132/GER - Food Systems Development: The objective of the project is to strengthen the capacities of public and private organizations and food chain actors to coordinate, plan and support food chain and business development of the rice, maize, edible oil and red meat sub sectors in the Southern Highlands of Tanzania. The project supports some component of the Agricultural Sector Development Programme which recognizes the need to promote active engagement of the private sector in dialogue to effect policy and institutional change that will promote private sector development.</p> <p>ii) GCP/URT/133/GER - Advisory Service Capacity Development in Support of Food Security in the United Republic of Tanzania The main purpose of GCP/URT/ 133 is to mainstream business and market orientation in planning and to improve enterprise development and marketing implementation capacity. The main priorities are to strengthen producer-market linkages and increase value addition through farmer and community level post-harvest operations and agro-processing enterprises.</p>	2011-2016	<p>Complements ASDP</p> <p>Complements ASDP</p>

<sup>6</sup> Tanzania and Belgium bilateral development cooperation programme for 2014-2016

<sup>7</sup> FAO 2014. Tanzania Country Programming Framework January 2014 – June 2016

	<p>iii) MTF/GLO/345/BMG - Country STAT for Sub-Saharan African Countries: FAO and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (B&amp;MGF) signed a project agreement in 2007 (Phase I) to support the development and implementation of the CountrySTAT System in 17 Sub-Saharan African (SSA) countries in order to better organize, harmonize and standardize statistical data from multiple sources and integrate them into a common platform, or (One Stop Center), to be easily accessible on-line. CountrySTAT was to be established in 17 partner countries. Tanzania is one of the beneficiary countries.</p> <p>iv) FMM/GLO/006 – Strengthening capacity of smallholder farmers for climate change adaptation through Sustainable land and water management: The project aims to strengthen the capacity of farmers in the upstream catchment, downstream rain fed and irrigation areas for climate change adaptation through improving land and water management, increasing agricultural productivity and encouraging farmers to diversity their livelihoods. It responds to Tanzania's Agricultural Sector Development Strategy (ASDS) and the United Nations Development Assistance Plan (2011-2015). These strategies identify land degradation, loss of bio-diversity and natural resources and the adverse impact of climate change as three of the most pressing problems in relation to natural resource management. The project will focus on three outputs: -            (i) Improved land and water management at farm and watershed levels by upstream and downstream farmers;            (ii) Promote climate resilient agriculture and improved agricultural productivity;            (iii) Enhanced dialogue and understanding on climate change adaptation practices.</p>		<p>Complements ASDP</p> <p>Complements ASDP</p> <p>Complements ASDP</p>
B) Zanzibar			
1) EU	Focus on promoting sustainable agriculture; energy and good governance and development; as well as support to civil society organizations. Women Empowerment in Zanzibar (WEZA): The project implemented Care Tz and Tanzania Media Women Association (TAMWA) seeks to increase income and overcome social, cultural and political barriers to rural women empowerment in four districts of northern Pemba and Southern Unguja in Zanzibar	2014-2020	Complements ASSP/ASDP-L and MIVARF
2) USAID	The country strategy <sup>8</sup> targets increasing agricultural productivity and profitability in targeted value chains (irrigated rice and horticulture) through capacity building and strengthening farmer associations, focusing on participation of women and youth – to better access improved technologies and fair market prices and strengthen the advocacy role of farmer organizations. Also Feed the Future strategies <sup>9</sup> aim at promoting agricultural production and processing; market access and natural resource management; and	2014-2019	Complements ASSP and MIVARF

<sup>8</sup> USAID-TANZANIA: Country Development Cooperation Strategy October 3, 2014 – October 3, 2019

<sup>9</sup> USAID: See FEED CHANGE FUTURE: TANZANIA FY 2011–2015 Multi-Year Strategy.

	agricultural support services and capacity building, including research and development and financial services		
3) World Bank	<p>The Marine and Coastal Environmental Management Project (MACEMP and GEF Grant) support for regulatory and policy improvements to better manage near-shore and deep-sea fisheries, the creation and management of a network of Marine Protected Areas, and conservation-compatible community investments in coastal districts.</p> <p>3<sup>rd</sup> Tanzania Social Action Fund (TASAF III) supports the establishment of the main building blocks for a new comprehensive, nationwide safety net program. It aims at improving incomes of poor rural and urban households, while smoothing consumption. The project supports three interventions: (i) public works program, (ii) cash transfers, and (iii) community savings and investments promotion</p>	2012-2015	<p>Complemented ASSP/ASDP-L</p> <p>Complements MIVARF</p>
4) AfDB	<p>MI VARF-Market Infrastructure and rural roads</p> <p>Alternative Learning Skills Development Program focuses on skills development and entrepreneurship promotion; supports activities deemed essential for promoting a thriving private sector and overall competitiveness</p>	2011-2015	<p>Complements/synergy with MIVARF</p> <p>Complements MIVARF</p>
5) FAO	Focuses on (i) Promoting agriculture as a business; (ii) sustainable management of natural resources including climate smart agriculture; and (iii) agricultural development planning and sector investment support. Also initiated dialogue on agriculture sector wide programme for Zanzibar	2014-2016	Complements ASSP/ASDP-L and MI VARF

## Key file 4: Target group identification, priority issues and potential response

Typology	Poverty Level and Causes	Coping Actions	Priority Needs	Support from other Initiatives	COSOP Response
A) Mainland					
Economically active poor <sup>1</sup> – Smallholder farmers <sup>2</sup> (crops, livestock keepers/herders and pastoralists) and artisans	<p>Poverty level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>33.3% of the rural population estimated to be below the poverty line (2011/12)</li> <li>have some land ranging between 0.9ha and 3.0 ha) and housing</li> <li>Mostly live from their own labor</li> <li>About 70 percent of Tanzania's crop area is cultivated by hand hoe. The level of farm mechanization is still low that majority of the implements are hand hoes (97.8%) and swords (93.5%). Relatively a small number of households used other farming implements such as ox-plough (14.4%), castrated bulls (13.7%), hand sprayers (11.7%) and cows (10.2 %). Other farm machinery (tractors, power-tillers) is nearly 1 %<sup>3</sup>.</li> <li>have some small livestock (indigenous</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimize risk through diversification of productive activities</li> <li>Join farmer organizations like AMCOS and SACCOS/SACAs</li> <li>Develop long term links with selected traders and processors;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase productivity through intensification, including improved access to production-enhancing technologies;</li> <li>Invest in small-scale irrigation and mechanization and enhanced overall service delivery;</li> <li>Strengthen linkages (e.g. research and extension) and enhanced access to institutions like financial and markets;</li> <li>Increase non-farm opportunities;</li> <li>Strengthen capacity for lobbying and bargaining power;</li> <li>Promote and strengthen organizational development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited support from other DPs (e.g. AfDB, WB, USAID and Irish Aid); NGOs (e.g. MUWATA, WVO, and ANSAF) and government technical departments;</li> <li>Inadequate access to agricultural development programmes or to support government technical agencies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promote sustainable agricultural intensification and use of climate smart / resilient agricultural technologies, including investment in water harvesting techniques and expansion of land under irrigated farming;</li> <li>Facilitate demand-driven support services;</li> <li>Strengthen organizational development, including strengthening of producer/market/trader/ processor groups and pastoralists' groups;</li> <li>Promote marketable production and development of market linkages;</li> <li>Strengthen rural finance/credit and development of flexible and responsive financial products;</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> URT 2012 Household Budget Survey.

<sup>2</sup> REPOA 2010, A Comparative Analysis of Poverty Incidence in Farming Systems of Tanzania. Series 10/4.

<sup>3</sup> National Sample Census of Agriculture 2007-08 (Published by NBS in 2010).



Typology	Poverty Level and Causes	Coping Actions	Priority Needs	Support from other Initiatives	COSOP Response
	<p>cattle, goats, sheep and local chicken)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• produce and have enough to eat but have no significant surplus to sell</li> <li>• Lack of or limited alternative sources of livelihood;</li> <li>• Ability to send their children to primary school</li> <li>• Often have poor access to healthcare.</li> <li>• Rural electrification is still very low as household lighting and cooking by electricity is only 20.7% and 1.7%, respectively<sup>4</sup>.</li> </ul> <p>Poverty causes<sup>5</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited marketable surplus and lack of diversification</li> <li>• Inadequate access to factors of production like labour, capital/financial services, technology (including research and extension); poor rural infrastructure including rural/market access roads, and mechanization);</li> <li>• High post-harvest losses and poor quality of produce due to inadequate</li> </ul>				

<sup>4</sup> Population and Housing Census 2012

<sup>5</sup> URT 2013 National Agriculture Policy, MAFC; URT 2014 Draft ASDP 2

Typology	Poverty Level and Causes	Coping Actions	Priority Needs	Support from other Initiatives	COSOP Response
	<p>postharvest storage and handling;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Over-dependence on rainfed agriculture;</li> <li>• Low productivity due to low application of technology, lack of business/entrepreneurial mind-set and innovation by smallholders; and other factors listed above</li> <li>• Inadequate farmer organization/ empowerment and negotiating power</li> <li>• Climate change and variability</li> </ul>				
Economically active poor –Rural micro-entrepreneurs <sup>6</sup> (non-farm)	<p>Poverty level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approximately US\$1/day</li> <li>• Have some land (0.9 - 3.0 ha) and housing</li> <li>• Live from their own labor</li> <li>• Do not have significant surplus to sell and not concerned with safety/hygiene and quality issues</li> </ul> <p>Poverty causes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited marketable surplus</li> <li>• Low productivity</li> <li>• Limited technical and business/</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Selling to relatives or neighboring communities</li> <li>• Provision of services</li> <li>• Diversification (horizontal)</li> <li>• Joining informal credit groups or SACCOS</li> <li>• </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase production and productivity</li> <li>• Profitable markets</li> <li>• Access to financial, business and technical services</li> <li>• More conducive business environment including regulations, infrastructure</li> <li>• Organizational development and empowerment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some support from Government technical departments like SIDO, VETA and NEEC</li> <li>• Some DP support like UNIDO,ILO, USAID</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote productivity of enterprises through strengthened rural business support services;</li> <li>• Promote marketable productions and development of market linkages;</li> <li>• Organizational development, including strengthening of producer/market/trader/ processor groups and SACCOS;</li> <li>• Promote strategic and/or innovative MSMEs/</li> </ul>

<sup>6</sup> UNIDO 2013. Tanzania SME Development Policy 2003 - Ten years after": Implementation Review-November 2012; URT 2014 ASDS2 and ASDP 2; URT 2008 National Employment Policy

Typology	Poverty Level and Causes	Coping Actions	Priority Needs	Support from other Initiatives	COSOP Response
	entrepreneurial skills and business mind sets <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Weak market linkages</li> <li>• Limited access to financial services</li> <li>• Poor infrastructure</li> <li>• Unfavorable business conditions</li> <li>• Lack of organization and negotiating power</li> </ul>				microenterprises and rural employment for rural youth and women; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Through MIVARF and MUVI continue policy dialogue on business environment</li> </ul>
Vulnerable groups – (women, women-headed households, youth and food insecure households)	Poverty level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• About US\$0.3/day</li> <li>• High poverty rates amongst women (60 percent of women in Tanzania live in absolute poverty<sup>7</sup>) and youths</li> <li>• Live from their own labor</li> <li>• Produce and have enough to eat although balance may be unbalanced.</li> </ul> Poverty causes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor or no access to productive assets (e.g. land and capital).</li> <li>• Discrimination in access to formal financial services</li> <li>• High rates of unemployment amongst youths</li> <li>• Lack of organization</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sell off remaining assets to meet household expenses;</li> <li>• Engage in petty trade and illicit businesses (e.g. brewing and charcoal burning) for survival.</li> <li>• Youth resort to existing opportunities or migrate to urban centers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-farm income earning opportunities/ alternative employment</li> <li>• Strategic organizational development and capacity building</li> <li>• Access to microfinance</li> <li>• Development of women's entrepreneurial activities in food processing, agro processing, horticulture and retail trade by increasing the size of these concerns and development of women's groups in agricultural and livestock activities;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have some access to agricultural programmes and support from technical agencies, but coverage is limited.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote and strengthen microenterprises and rural employment opportunities;</li> <li>• Promote demand-driven support services;</li> <li>• Expand on-farm investments (irrigation, soil and water conservation etc);</li> <li>• Promote marketable productions and development of market linkages;</li> <li>• Facilitate the creation of youth and women's groups, and capacity building for their development;</li> <li>• Facilitate expanded access to credit and development of flexible financial</li> </ul>

<sup>7</sup> Kato M.P and Kratzer J. (2013). Empowering Women through Microfinance: Evidence from Tanzania. ACRN Journal of Entrepreneurship Perspectives Vol. 2, Issue 1, p. 31-59, Feb. 2013 ISSN 2224-9729

Typology	Poverty Level and Causes	Coping Actions	Priority Needs	Support from other Initiatives	COSOP Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&amp; negotiating power</li> <li>Periodic poor health, HIV/AIDS</li> </ul>				products
B) Zanzibar					
Economically active poor <sup>8</sup> – Smallholder farmers (crops, livestock keepers and fisherfolks)	<p>Poverty level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>50.7% of the population in rural areas living below the basic needs poverty; and 13% below food poverty line</li> <li>have some land (less than 0.5ha on average) and housing</li> <li>live from their own labor</li> <li>have some small livestock</li> <li>produce and have enough to eat but have no significant surplus to sell</li> <li>Lack of or limited alternative sources of livelihood;</li> <li>Ability to send their children to primary school</li> <li>Often have poor access to healthcare.</li> </ul> <p>Poverty causes<sup>9</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited marketable surplus and lack of diversification</li> <li>Inadequate access to factors of production like labour, capital/financial services, technology</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimize risk through diversification of productive activities</li> <li>Join farmer organizations like producer groups/associations and SACCOS/SACAs</li> <li>Develop long term links with selected traders and processors;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase productivity through intensification including improved access to production-enhancing technologies</li> <li>Invest in small-scale irrigation and mechanization</li> <li>Strengthen linkages (e.g research and extension) and access to institutions like financial and markets</li> <li>Capacity for lobbying and bargaining power</li> <li>Organizational development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have some support from government technical departments and a few NGOs like UMAMWIMA supported by some DPs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promote sustainable agricultural intensification and use of climate smart agricultural technologies, including investment in water harvesting techniques and expansion of land under irrigated farming;</li> <li>Facilitate enhanced demand-driven support services;</li> <li>Strengthen organizational development, including strengthening of producer/market/trader/ processor groups and pastoralists' groups;</li> <li>Promote marketable productions and development of market linkages;</li> <li>Strengthen expanded access to enhanced rural finance/credit and development of flexible financial products</li> </ul>

<sup>8</sup> RGoZ 2010. Zanzibar Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty II (MKUZA II) 2010-2015

<sup>9</sup> RGoZ 2011. Agricultural Strategic Plan 2011-2014; Zanzibar Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty II (MKUZA II) 2010-2015

Typology	Poverty Level and Causes	Coping Actions	Priority Needs	Support from other Initiatives	COSOP Response
	<p>(including research and extension); poor rural infrastructure including rural/market access roads, and mechanization);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High post-harvest losses and poor quality of produce due to inadequate postharvest storage and handling;</li> <li>• Over-dependence on rainfed agriculture;</li> <li>• Low productivity due to low application of technology, lack of business/entrepreneurial mind-set and innovation by smallholders; and other factors listed above</li> <li>• Inadequate farmer organization/ empowerment and negotiating power</li> <li>• HIV/AIDS pandemic, malaria and other frequent diseases, drug abuse</li> <li>• Climate change and variability</li> </ul>				
Economically active poor – Rural micro-entrepreneurs (non-farm)	<p>Poverty level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have some land (less than 0.5ha) and housing</li> <li>• Live from their own labor</li> <li>• Do not have significant surplus to sell and not</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Selling to relatives or neighboring communities</li> <li>• Provision of services</li> <li>• Diversification (horizontal)</li> <li>• Joining informal credit groups or</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase production and productivity</li> <li>• Profitable markets</li> <li>• Access to financial, business and technical services</li> <li>• More conducive business environment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have some support from government technical departments and some DPs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote productivity of enterprises through strengthened rural business support services;</li> <li>• Promote marketable productions and development of</li> </ul>

Typology	Poverty Level and Causes	Coping Actions	Priority Needs	Support from other Initiatives	COSOP Response
	<p>concerned with safety/hygiene and quality issues</p> <p>Poverty causes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited marketable surplus</li> <li>Low productivity</li> <li>Limited technical and business/ entrepreneurial skills and business mind sets</li> <li>Weak market linkages</li> <li>Limited access to financial services</li> <li>Poor infrastructure</li> <li>Unfavorable business conditions</li> <li>Lack of organization and negotiating power</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SACCOS</li> </ul>	<p>including regulations, infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Organizational development and empowerment</li> </ul>		<p>market linkages;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengthen organizational development, including strengthening of producer/market/trader/ processor groups and SACCOS;</li> <li>Promote strategic and/or innovative MSMEs/ microenterprises and rural employment for rural youth and women;</li> <li>Through MIVARF and ASDP-L deepen policy dialogue and relevant actions on enhanced business environment</li> </ul>

Typology	Poverty Level and Causes	Coping Actions	Priority Needs	Support from other Initiatives	COSOP Response
Vulnerable groups – (women, women-headed households, youths and food insecure households)	<p>Poverty level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High poverty rates amongst women (70% of the agricultural labor force) and youth</li> <li>• Vulnerable groups live from their own labor</li> <li>• Produce and have enough to eat, although nutrition is unbalanced.</li> </ul> <p>Poverty causes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor or no access to productive assets (e.g land and capital).</li> <li>• Discrimination in access to formal financial services</li> <li>• High rates of unemployment amongst youths</li> <li>• Lack of organization &amp; negotiating power</li> <li>• Periodic poor health, HIV/AIDS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sell off remaining assets to meet household expenses;</li> <li>• Engage in petty trade and illicit businesses (e.g. brewing and charcoal burning) for survival.</li> <li>• Youth resort to existing opportunities or migrate to urban centers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-farm income earning opportunities/ alternative employment</li> <li>• Strategic organizational development and capacity building</li> <li>• Access to microfinance</li> <li>• Development of women's entrepreneurial activities in food processing, agro processing, horticulture and retail trade by increasing the size of these concerns and development of women's groups in agricultural and livestock activities;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have some support from government technical departments and some DPs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop microenterprises and rural employment;</li> <li>• Enhance demand-driven support services;</li> <li>• Expand on-farm investments (irrigation, soil and water conservation etc);</li> <li>• Promote marketable production and development of market linkages;</li> <li>• Facilitate the creation of youths and women's groups, capacity building for their development;</li> <li>• Facilitate credit and development of flexible financial products.</li> </ul>

## Natural resources management and climate change adaptation: background, national policies and IFAD intervention strategies

Background. As part of the RB-COSOP formulation process in Tanzania, in 2014-2015 IFAD prepared an Environmental and Climate Change Assessment (ECCA). It served as the SECAP COSOP Preparatory Study in order to provide a strong analytical underpinning to ensure environmental and social sustainability in IFAD's country programme for the country. The results of the ECCA, as summarized here, provide a framework and vital inputs into the development and decision-making for the new RB-COSOP for Tanzania (2016–2021).

The ECCA is based on (a) review of relevant Government of Tanzania (GOT) policies, plans and strategies addressing environment, natural resources management and climate change; (b) meetings with key stakeholders in GOT ministries, international institutions and non-governmental organizations active in the field; (c) field visits to IFAD project sites in the Dodoma region and in Zanzibar for viewing environmental conditions and meetings with local community stakeholders; and (d) a stakeholder consultation held on 15 December 2014 to present preliminary findings and recommendations and receive comments and feedback from relevant stakeholders.

Based on the above activities, the ECCA identified the following principal environmental and climate change issues/priorities to be mainstreamed into the new COSOP:

- Water scarcity/stress - increasing reduction in surface water resources (particularly in the semi-arid ecological zones), and resulting threats to groundwater resources.
- Land degradation - increasing degradation of rangelands and pastures (particularly in the semi-arid agro-ecological zones) for livestock grazing and degradation of critical watersheds and catchment basins linked to water supply.
- Deforestation - closely tied to the retention and storage of water within the landscape, changes in river flows and increasing degradation of forested areas, particularly around villages and in watersheds.
- Land-use planning - effectiveness of village land use plans in supporting sustainable land management and preventing pastoralist/farmer conflicts over land and water resources; sustainable distribution of natural resources for food security and development prioritized in light of increasing climatic stresses.
- Fisheries and marine/coastal degradation - reduction in marine fish catches, loss of fisheries habitat and nursery areas, seawater intrusion, and increasing coastal erosion and loss of mangroves, particularly in Zanzibar.
- Limited capacity for environmental management - limited institutional and individual capacity to support environmental management among village and district authorities.

National policies. Since independence, the GOT has developed and implemented various policies and strategies to enhance the capacities of the country's rural communities to adapt to economic shocks and environmental/climate change threats, as well as promote sound environmental protection and ensure sustainable land/natural resources management. These national policies and strategies include the following:

- National Environmental Policy (1997), which identifies challenges that adversely affect the livelihoods of communities, including land degradation that reduces the productivity of soils in many parts of the country and degradation of water resources, vegetation, etc.



- National Action Programme (NAP) to Combat Desertification (1999), which focuses on the long-term process of promoting proper management and sustainable use of the natural resources in arid and semi-arid areas to meet both local and national needs sustainably.
- National Adaptation Programme of Action – NAPA (2007), which recognizes Tanzania's vulnerability to climate change and identifies immediate and urgent climate change adaptation actions to promote long-term sustainable development in a changing climate.
- National Agricultural and Livestock Policy (1997), which defines the country's agricultural and livestock development policies and recognises that agriculture is critically dependent on sustainably maintaining environmental resources such as land, water, forests, and air.
- National Agricultural Policy (Crops policy) (2013), which brings to light key policy areas including environment and climate change issues. It states that the Government in collaboration with other stakeholders shall strive to improve adaptation measures to climate change effects and deal with all the risks involved.
- National Livestock Policy (2006), which recognises the contribution of the livestock sector to national socio-economic development and ensures sustainable livestock production, including promotion of proper land use planning for livestock development.

In addition to the national policies described above, the GOT has set the country's development priorities in a long-term development plan, Vision 2025 (Mainland) and Vision 2020 for Zanzibar. Among the plan's priorities are ensuring food self-sufficiency and security, providing universal access to safe water, alleviating abject poverty, and providing an adequate level of physical infrastructure. Both Vision 2025 and 2020 recognize the importance of mobilizing and utilizing domestic resources, including natural resources, in order to build "adaptive capacity" for promoting economic development. These aims may not be attained if environmental management and climate change adaptation concerns are not factored into the development process.

In order to achieve the objectives of Vision 2025 and Vision 2020, the GOT promulgated a National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty, MKUKUTA 2010–2015 and MKUZA 2010–2015. These strategies, among other things, focus on reducing poverty, improving the standard of living and social welfare of the people of Tanzania mainland and Zanzibar, and promoting good governance. The strategies recognize that good governance of natural resources is critical to poverty reduction because environmental degradation propagates the poverty cycle. To this end, among other things, the strategies propose scaling up the role and participation of the private sector in priority areas of growth and poverty reduction.

Proposed Priority IFAD intervention strategies. IFAD's last COSOP 2007–2015, developed eight years ago, largely focused on improving access in rural communities to productivity-enhancing technologies, sustainable financial services and agricultural markets and other opportunities for rural enterprises. The COSOP did not explicitly include language addressing environment and natural resources management or climate change considerations, but the project/programme portfolio has provided entry points for including measures to address these concerns even though the projects/programmes were not explicitly designed with such measures in project design.

The new RB-COSOP (2016–2021) should correct the relevant omissions of the last COSOP. To this end, two specific sub-objectives are proposed – one for environmental considerations and one for climate change risk assessment/adaptation – to guide the overall strategic orientation of the new COSOP.

- Specific sub-objective – environment: Ensure priority aspects of environmental sustainability and rural social equity are effectively integrated into the strategic objectives of the forthcoming COSOP.

This environmental sub-objective ensures that the COSOP does not rely solely on IFAD's traditional approach to addressing environmental and natural resources management issues, i.e. the use of environmental and social impact assessments prepared for individual projects/programmes in the IFAD portfolio, to mainstream environmental sustainability and social equity. On the contrary, the COSOP helps integrate environmental and social considerations of both lending and non-lending activities from the outset in order to promote quality at entry in project/programme design. This approach helps ensure that the project/programme portfolio developed under the new COSOP reflects IFAD's environmental and social policies, effectively contextualized for the Tanzania case.

- Specific sub-objective - climate change and variability: Effectively introduce climate risk assessment and climate-smart approaches to agriculture, livestock and fisheries into the strategic and operational objectives of the forthcoming COSOP.

This specific sub-objective for climate change risk assessment and management ensures that the COSOP addresses strengthening and reinforcing the climate resilience of stakeholder communities in IFAD's project/programme portfolio from the outset. That is, the on-going proposed project/programme portfolio developed under the new COSOP will adequately reflect IFAD's Climate Change Strategy and incorporate appropriate climate risk assessment and prioritized risk management measures to promote climate change adaptation/mitigation in its interventions.

Priority strategic actions. In addition to the specific sub-objectives proposed for the strategic orientation of the COSOP above, a number of concrete actions are proposed for the COSOP. These actions necessarily build on the sub-objectives themselves and should be viewed as initial measures for implementation of the two sub-objectives recommended.

There are basically three opportunities for proposing strategic actions, for both the lending portfolio (i.e. project/programme investments) and non-lending activities (i.e. policy dialogue, partnership building and knowledge management), to be incorporated by the new COSOP:

- First, in the transition from the old to new COSOP, a number of successful ongoing IFAD projects/programmes (e.g. ASDP II and ASDP-L), as well as non-lending activities, will continue under the new COSOP. Therefore, several strategic actions build on the existing COSOP's strategic objectives.
- Second, new strategic objectives for the new COSOP will be developed based on experience in implementation of the last COSOP, changing circumstances/needs in the agricultural sector of Tanzania (Mainland) and Zanzibar, specific prioritized requests from the GOT and IFAD's particular niche and comparative advantage in Tanzania. Thus, several actions are proposed for the COSOP in its development of new strategic objectives.
- Third, the study proposes several actions of a cross-cutting nature or from an external-financial source for the COSOP.

These three categories of strategic actions/opportunities are outlined in Table 1 below, together with the proposed priority actions to be supported by the COSOP.

## Priority strategic climate change actions for the new RB-COSOP

<p>1) Build on existing COSOP strategic objectives, to increase emphasis on and mainstream sound environmental management, climate assessment and climate change adaptation measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The farmer field school (FFS) model employed by the IFAD-financed ASSP/ASDP-L programme in Zanzibar has proved to be a successful approach to building local capacity in agro-pastoral management. Any additional investments IFAD makes under the old COSOP should include in the FFS model a new emphasis on climate-smart approaches/practices for agriculture, livestock, fisheries and forestry. These might include, for example, good agricultural/livestock practices, sustainable fisheries management, and community forestry.</li> <li>Improvement of agro-pastoral practices at the village level under the IFAD-financed ASDP-L programme in Dodoma has also proved relatively successful, but it did not attempt to address village land use planning. Any additional investments under the old COSOP should include a new emphasis on building capacity for employing a landscape approach (one that considers the broader ecosystem's resources in terms of physical planning) in village land use plans in order to support efforts to prevent conflicts between farmers and pastoralists.</li> <li>The MAFC is still in the early stages of implementing (with the assistance of a GEF grant) an effective early warning system to assist farmers and pastoralists in adapting to climate change/variability. Any additional lending or non-lending activities under the old COSOP should pursue opportunities to build awareness and capacity for the use of early warning systems.</li> </ul>	<p>Proposed priority actions to be supported by the COSOP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify and operationalize new investment opportunities (e.g. BASIC) where FFS may be used/adapted to promote climate-smart approaches/practices</li> <li>Identify and operationalize new investment opportunities where village land use planning may be used to promote integrated ENRM and prevent conflicts over natural resources</li> <li>Identify and operationalize lending or non-lending activities that might serve as the basis for building capacity for early warning systems</li> </ul>
<p>2) Operationalize new COSOP strategic objectives to initiate interventions promoting sustainable natural resources management, climate risk assessment and climate change adaptation in priority geographic areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The new COSOP targets interventions similar to those under the ASDP and ASDP-L that involve the conservation/restoration of critical catchment areas in fragile <u>semi-arid zones</u> on the mainland of Tanzania. Such interventions combine watershed restoration/management techniques, with climate-smart agricultural and livestock practices.</li> <li>The new COSOP targets interventions that promote improved livelihoods in <u>coastal zones</u> through investments in sustainable fisheries management (including marine catch and mariculture fisheries) and in climate risk management measures for coastal zone adaptation to climate change, particularly in Zanzibar.</li> </ul>	<p>Proposed priority actions to be supported by the COSOP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Formulate new projects/ programmes which target critical catchments in semi-arid zones (e.g. the Wami River in Dodoma) to promote watershed restoration tied to agro-pastoral investments.</li> <li>Formulate new projects/ programmes that improve livelihoods in coastal areas (Zanzibar and mainland Tanzania) through sustainable fisheries management and coastal adaptation.</li> </ul>
<p>3) Increase emphasis on cross-cutting activities and supplemental financing to support all IFAD interventions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The new COSOP emphasizes awareness-raising and capacity-building activities for investment project/ programme beneficiaries, rural communities and local government authorities in sustainable natural resources management, climate risk assessment/management and climate-smart approaches/measures with respect to agriculture, livestock, fisheries and forestry.</li> <li>The new COSOP seeks supplemental financing for relevant activities where appropriate from several sources: the Global Environment Facility (GEF); the Adaptation for Smallholder Agriculture Programme (ASAP); and the new Green Climate Fund (GCF). See several proposals below.</li> </ul>	<p>Proposed priority actions to be supported by the COSOP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify and formulate standard sub-component for critical ENRM and CC adaptation awareness raising and capacity building to be included in all new projects/programmes.</li> <li>Identify and operationalize appropriate activities for GEF, ASAP and GCF financing.</li> </ul>

## Proposals for activities to access GEF, ASAP and other sources of funds

The following activities are recommended for GEF, ASAP or other financing:

1) Watershed restoration, sustainable land management and forest conservation in a semi-arid region. The GEF has approved a project under the land degradation focal area for securing watershed services through sustainable land management in the Ruvu and Zigi catchments in the Eastern Arc Region of Tanzania. IFAD should investigate formulating a similar project for restoration of the Wami River watershed with the objective of strengthening natural resources management in villages along the Wami River in order to alleviate land degradation, maintain ecosystem services and improve livelihoods in the Wami River catchment.

2) Building capacity in the public and private sectors for low carbon, climate-resilient activities in coastal areas. The United Kingdom's International Climate Fund supports activities for (a) building global knowledge and evidence on climate change; (b) developing and scaling-up low carbon, climate-resilient programs; (c) building capacity in the public and private sectors supporting country-level action; and (d) mainstreaming climate change resilience. IFAD should investigate formulating appropriate activities for financing the strengthening of public and private sector capacities for building climate resilience in particularly vulnerable coastal areas.

3) Building climate resilience by managing land-use systems at the landscape level to reduce poverty, enhance biodiversity, increase yields and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. IFAD's Adaptation for Smallholder Agriculture Programme (ASAP) allows IFAD to channel climate and environmental finance to smallholder farmers. These funds promote better risk assessment and deeper understanding of interconnections between people and wider landscapes and should drive scaling up of sustainable agricultural intensification approaches that can provide multiple benefits. IFAD should investigate formulating project-related activities for ASAP financing that build climate resilience and deliver the other benefits identified above.

## Country at a glance

	1990	2000	2014
World view			
Population, total (millions)	25.46	33.99	51.82
Population growth (annual %)	3.2	2.6	3.2
Surface area (sq. km) (thousands)	947.3	947.3	947.3
Population density (people per sq. km of land area)	28.7	38.4	58.5
Poverty headcount ratio at national poverty lines (% of population)	..	..	28.2
Poverty headcount ratio at \$1.90 a day (2011 PPP) (% of population)	70.4	84.7	46.6
GNI, Atlas method (current US\$) (billions)	4.84	10.05	46.38
GNI per capita, Atlas method (current US\$)	200	300	920
GNI, PPP (current international \$) (billions)	22.53	38.50	126.31
GNI per capita, PPP (current international \$)	910	1,170	2,510
People			
Income share held by lowest 20%	7.0	6.8	7.4
Life expectancy at birth, total (years)	50	50	64
Fertility rate, total (births per woman)	6.2	5.7	5.2
Adolescent fertility rate (births per 1,000 women ages 15-19)	142	133	119
Contraceptive prevalence (% of women ages 15-49)	10	25	..
Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total)	44	36	..
Mortality rate, under-5 (per 1,000)	165	131	51
Prevalence of underweight, weight for age (% of children under 5)	25.1	25.3	13.6
Immunization, measles (% of children ages 12-23 months)	80	78	99
Primary completion rate, both sexes (%)	62	50	76
Gross enrolment ratio, primary, both sexes (%)	69.5	68.2	89.5
Gross enrolment ratio, secondary, both sexes (%)	5	6	33
Gross enrolment ratio, primary and secondary, gender parity index (GPI)	1	1	1
Prevalence of HIV, total (% of population ages 15-49)	5.1	7.9	5.3
Environment			
Forest area (sq. km) (thousands)	415.0	374.6	326.2
Terrestrial and marine protected areas (% of total territorial area)	26.4	27.8	31.7
Annual freshwater withdrawals, total (% of internal resources)	..	6.2	6.2
Improved water source (% of population with access)	54	54	56
Improved sanitation facilities (% of population with access)	7	9	15
Urban population growth (annual %)	4.9	4.2	5.5
Energy use (kg of oil equivalent per capita)	382	396	456
CO2 emissions (metric tons per capita)	0.09	0.08	0.15
Electric power consumption (kWh per capita)	51	58	99

## Economy

GDP at market prices (current US\$) (billions)	4.26	10.19	48.06
GDP growth (annual %)	7.0	4.9	7.0
Inflation, GDP deflator (annual %)	22.4	7.6	4.7
Agriculture, value added (% of GDP)	46	33	31
Industry, value added (% of GDP)	18	19	25
Services, etc., value added (% of GDP)	36	47	44
Exports of goods and services (% of GDP)	13	13	19
Imports of goods and services (% of GDP)	37	20	30
Gross capital formation (% of GDP)	26	17	31
Revenue, excluding grants (% of GDP)	..	..	12.6
Cash surplus/deficit (% of GDP)	..	..	-5.3

## States and markets

Time required to start a business (days)	..	34	26
Domestic credit provided by financial sector (% of GDP)	..	8.5	20.2
Tax revenue (% of GDP)	..	..	11.7
Military expenditure (% of GDP)	2.0	1.3	1.0
Mobile cellular subscriptions (per 100 people)	0.0	0.3	62.8
Internet users (per 100 people)	0.0	0.1	4.9
High-technology exports (% of manufactured exports)	..	1	5
Overall level of statistical capacity (scale 0 - 100)	..	..	72

## Global links

Merchandise trade (% of GDP)	32	22	35
Net barter terms of trade index (2000 = 100)	107	100	136
External debt stocks, total (DOD, current US\$) (millions)	6,426	7,183	14,436
Total debt service (% of exports of goods, services and primary income)	32.9	11.9	1.9
Net migration (thousands)	591	-296	-200
Personal remittances, received (current US\$) (millions)	..	8	389
Foreign direct investment, net inflows (BoP, current US\$) (millions)	0	463	2,045
Net official development assistance and official aid received (current US\$)			
(millions)	1,163	1,064	3,430

Source: World Development Indicators database

Figures in italics refer to periods other than those specified.

## Strengths and weaknesses of the National Poverty Reduction Strategy (Tanzania Mainland and Zanzibar)

Strategies	Strengths	Weaknesses
NSGRP (MKUKUTA I), MKUKUTA II; MKUZA I and MKUZA II (2010-2015) <sup>1</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provides an operational framework for achieving the Tanzania's Development Vision 2025, which aims to transform Tanzania into a middle income country and Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) / now Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).</li> <li>▪ The strategies seek to deepen ownership and inclusion in policy making processes, paying attention to address laws and customs that retard development and negatively affect vulnerable groups.</li> <li>▪ Make use of strategic partnerships and call for multi-stakeholders' involvement in planning, implementation and evaluation</li> <li>▪ MKUKUTA II/MKUZA II adopted a result-based approach focusing on three clusters: Cluster I: Raising economic growth for reducing income poverty; Cluster II: Improving the quality of life and social well-being; and Cluster III: Improving governance and accountability</li> <li>▪ MKUKUTA II/MKUZA II try to better prioritize strategic policies and collaborate efforts, taking lessons from the implementation of MKUKUTA I /MKUZA I. For each broad goal, the strategy sets out operational targets and outlines corresponding intervention packages supported by a Result Matrix.</li> <li>▪ MKUKUTA II/MKUZA II identify selected "growth drivers," such as agriculture, and outlines sectoral strategies to promote productivity and private sector activity in these areas. They accord high priority to transforming agriculture from subsistence to a modern, competitive, profitable and commercial sector.</li> <li>▪ Strive to boost economic growth (achieving and sustaining pro-poor broad-based growth) through prioritized interventions</li> <li>▪ Unlike MKUZA II, MKUKUTA II is implemented within the framework of the Tanzania Five</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Substantial financing gap in the Government budget. It is based on very ambitious domestic revenue projections without specifying viable alternative sources of funding</li> <li>▪ Less progress in reducing income poverty and boosting private consumption. Income poverty (basic needs and food poverty) varied across geographical areas, with the rural areas being worse off. Rural growth proxied by growth of the agricultural sector was about 4.5 percent on average<sup>2</sup>.</li> <li>▪ Progress in reducing poverty in rural areas has been particularly slow, which is supported by existing analytic work</li> <li>▪ Inadequate specification of policy interventions to ensure their effective and timely implementation<sup>3</sup></li> <li>▪ MKUKUTA II/MKUZA II do not fully clarify the linkages between operational targets and suggested intervention packages, the relationship between priority areas and intervention packages, and consistency across sectoral plans;</li> <li>▪ Inadequate prioritization of interventions during implementation</li> <li>▪ Low private sector contribution including 4Ps</li> <li>▪ inadequate structural reform to address supply constraints as a major risk for implementation of MKUZA I/ MKUKUTA II<sup>4</sup></li> <li>▪ Accountability in delivering social services remains insufficient, in particular due to (i) continuing shortages of qualified staff; (ii) still</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> MKUKUTAI/MKUZA II (2010-2015)

<sup>2</sup> MKUKUTA II

<sup>3</sup> IMF and IDA 2011. Joint Staff Advisory Note (JSAN) of the National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (NSGRP—MKUKUTA II)

<sup>4</sup> Op cit

Strategies	Strengths	Weaknesses
	<p>Year Development Plan (2011/12 to 2015/16), whose priority areas are generation of adequate electricity and water supply,; boosting agriculture and agro-processing; infrastructure improvement such as railways, roads network, ports, aviation, and marine transportation; tourism and ICT.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ It calls for greater role of the private sector involvement in economic growth. Puts emphasis on well-functioning institutions and markets for scaling up the participation of the private sector</li> <li>▪ Provides the poverty profile and socio-economic status in Tanzania, drawing mainly on recent household and sectoral surveys</li> <li>▪ Puts emphasis on investing in people and sustaining socio-economic progress, especially in view of the challenging demographic trend</li> <li>▪ Several initiatives have been undertaken to strengthen good governance and accountability under the National Framework on Good Governance and other relevant policies.</li> <li>▪ Have mainstreamed cross-cutting issues i.e. gender, environment, HIV/AIDS, disability, children, youth, elderly, employment and settlements. They place emphasis on key issues such as improving maternal, newborn, and child health; reducing fertility; and improving nutrition.</li> </ul>	<p>problematic flows of funds to service delivery units at the local levels, both in terms of timing and transparency; inequitable distribution of resources, including both funding and human resources, across districts and regions in Tanzania, resulting in significant differences in access to services and to health and education outcomes; and (iv) inadequate information on procedures to access different social services. Moreover, the current strategy provides for disjointed interventions for service delivery<sup>5</sup>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ MKUKUTA II/MKUZA II lack an effective anti-corruption program with enhanced institutional capacity and resource funding</li> </ul>

---

<sup>5</sup> Op cit.



## Proposed Concept Notes

### A) Non-lending (to be supported by country grants):

- 1) Rural Growth and Economic Empowerment Strategy and Operational Plan (early draft Concept Note is available upon request; target approval 2016)
- 2) Consolidated Value Chain Development Strategy and Operational Plan (early draft Concept Note is available upon request; target approval 2016)
- 2) Proposal for Zanzibar Agriculture Sector-Wide Programme: Approach, Rationale and Proposal (Concept Note to be prepared in 2016; target approval 2017)

### B) Lending:

- 1) Agriculture Sector Development Programme II (Mainland) (Concept Note to be prepared in 2016; target approval 2017)
- 2) Highlands Milk shed Development Project (Mainland) (Concept Note found in Attachment 1 below; target approval 2016)
- 3) Drylands Development Project (early draft Concept Note found in Attachment 2 below; target approval 2018)
- 4) Zanzibar Agricultural Sector Development Programme (Zanzibar) (Concept note to be prepared in 2016 based on the positive outcome of the proposed Zanzibar non-lending activity; target approval 2019 )

## Highlands Milkshed Development Project

### UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA CONCEPT NOTE FOR THE PROPOSED HIGHLANDS MILKSHED DEVELOPMENT PROJECT (HMDP)

#### **A. Possible geographic area of intervention and target groups**

The project will be implemented in up to 30 districts located in the milkshed areas of the Southern and Northern Highlands (Mbeya, Iringa, Njombe, Ruvuma, Arusha and Kilimanjaro). From a long list of districts, the final project area will be determined according to the following criteria: (a) productive potential – the number of smallholder dairy producers and improved dairy animals and milk collection centers in the district; (b) demand for raw milk – the number of processors and processing capacity that can provide market pull for increased production; (c) matching of productive potential and demand – the opportunity for establishing economic clusters; (d) agro-ecological conditions and anticipated climate risks; (f) opportunities for building complementarities and synergies with other initiatives in support of the project objectives (particularly the B&MGF-supported East African Dairy Development Project (EADD2) in the Southern Milkshed); and (g) demonstrated interest of individual districts to actively participate in the project.

A provisional target of 25,000 to 35,000 households (smallholder dairy farmers and dairy value chain stakeholders) have been identified as the main target groups. Smallholder dairy producers, with a particular attention to women and youth, will be the main targeted beneficiaries. The project will focus particularly on those smallholder dairy farmers supplying – or looking to supply – processors, as such an approach offers the possibility of the processors playing a role of “value chain driver”, which can facilitate sustainability and scaling-up. However, the project would also provide a more limited range of support to those other market-oriented farmers who sell (or wish to sell) their milk through other, informal channels.

The dairy value chain can be a significant driver of employment opportunities, and the project will also look to create jobs along the dairy value chain: as AI service providers, veterinary service providers, input suppliers and commercial producers of fodder/silage; as on-farm laborers; as traders and transporters; and in the processing sector. Several of these areas are particularly well suited for women and youth.

#### **B. Justification and rationale**

The recently completed Country Programme Evaluation (CPE) carried out by IFAD's Independent Office of Evaluation made a specific recommendation to support the livestock sector with focus on pastoral communities and rangeland management and dairy value chain development, since these sectors have historically received limited attention and investment. The proposed HMDP will support the development of the dairy value chain, focusing specifically on those smallholder farmers interested in dairy farming as a business, while a separate project, the Drylands Development Project - to be developed in 2017, will focus on pastoralists and other indigenous peoples as the target group.

Total milk off-take in Tanzania is about 2.1 billion litres a year, 70% of which comes from the traditional herd of indigenous animals and the remaining 30% from the improved (cross-bred, pure bred) dairy herd. Productivity is generally low, the result of the intrinsic low productivity of the traditional breed and poor management. While much of the milk off-take comes from the pastoral/agro-pastoral production systems, the most important

areas for dairy production are the Northern and Southern highlands and Tanga region in the north-east.

Of the total milk off take of 2.1 billion litres, about one-third is consumed on-farm or sold at the farm gate. Of the remaining two thirds that is marketed (some 1.4 billion litres), most is sold either as raw or sour milk. The milk passes through a variety of channels: it may be sold either individually or through cooperatives, sometimes through a cooling centre, directly or indirectly to traders ('hawkers'), who in turn sell to retailers or direct to consumers. Only about 5% of marketed milk (61 million litres p.a.) is processed.

There are some 183 milk collection centres (MCC) in the country, about 55 of which have chilling facilities, and about 80 milk processing units, the majority of which are small, processing less than 1 000 litres a day. Total installed capacity amounts to 640 000 litres per day, but utilization amounts to only 26% of this. The processors source their milk from traders, cooperatives and cooling centres, as well as directly from large-scale commercial dairy producers; and they sell their processed milk and milk products either to agents or to wholesalers. The products then go on to retailers, supermarkets and vendors; and finally either to home consumers or to hotels/restaurants and tea rooms. A total of 180 million litres p.a. reach consumers in the form of processed milk and dairy products. Of this, about 60% are imported as milk, liquid milk equivalent and other dairy products.

Overall, the challenges facing the dairy industry combine to create a vicious circle of under-performance:

- Weak support to smallholder farmers leads to low use of productivity-enhancing technologies such as AI, recommended feeding practices, diseases control measures, etc. which leads to low number of farmers adopting dairying as a commercial undertaking;
- Low numbers of progressive farmers leads to low concentration of dairy farming activities in a given area;
- Low production density leads to low levels of surplus milk, so most milk is consumed locally;
- Low surplus milk leads to low investments in milk collection and marketing;
- Low milk collection and marketing activity leads to underutilization of installed plant capacities;
- Under-utilization of plant capacities leads to high operating costs in processing, loss of price competitiveness, lack of product diversification, and weak competitiveness of local products against imports;
- Low output of local products leads to unmet consumer demand;
- Unmet consumer demand is supplied by imported products; and
- Weak local industries unable to pull demand for locally produced milk.

The policy framework for the development of the livestock sector as a whole is contained in the 2006 National Livestock Policy and the 2010 Livestock Sector Development Strategy; the Livestock Sector Development Programme designed to implement the policy and strategy; and most recently, the 2015 Tanzania Livestock Modernisation Initiative. A Livestock Sector Master Plan, currently under development, is expected to offer guidance as to how to achieve the outcomes of the Initiative.

While there are no policy documents specific to the dairy sector, the livestock policy documents emphasise the need to: (i) improve the genetic potential of the dairy herd; (ii) strengthen technical support services to producers and promote use of appropriate technologies; (iii) promote investments in production, processing and marketing; (iv) promote community-driven dairy organizations; (v) strengthen the Tanzania Dairy Board (TDB) to enforce milk quality standards; and (vi) establish a harmonized regulatory framework that lowers the cost of business and enhances milk quality and safety. The Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries (MALF), the TDB and the Tanzania Milk Processors' Association (TAMPA) have been working together to resolve the problems of

over-regulation and taxation in the sector, though to date there has been little movement to resolve the policy and institutional mandate overlaps and related costs. The recent establishment of the Dairy Development Forum (DDF) as a platform for dialogue among stakeholders in the dairy sector may offer an important opportunity for addressing these and other issues affecting the sector.

The case for IFAD support to the dairy sector in Tanzania is based on a number of factors. Across the developing world, demand for milk products is growing with rising incomes, growing urban populations, and changes in diets. In Tanzania consumption of milk is relatively low compared to other countries in the region, at 45 litres per capita p.a. though the average figure hides the fact that some areas (urban centres, highlands, pastoral areas) consume twice the national average. Not only, but as populations become more urbanised and consumer demand more segmented, so the market for processed, packaged milk and milk products of assured quality is expected to grow. Currently, only 2-3% of total consumption is based on domestically produced processed milk – again, considerably less than other countries in the region. Increased domestic supply of competitively price processed milk and milk products could therefore: (a) substitute for imported supplies within Tanzania; (b) supply a gradually growing market demand within the country; and (c) eventually exploit potential regional market opportunities, taking in parts of Malawi, Zambia and DRC.

The milk processors currently face a series of related problems, including limited, unreliable and highly seasonal supplies of raw milk; limited outreach to and collection from producers; under-utilisation of their processing capacity, much of which is in need of replacement; high costs of processing (including regulatory compliance and taxation); and low throughput of processed dairy products that, as a result, are uncompetitive relative to imports and insufficiently diversified in terms of product range. The challenge for the processors is to replace this vicious circle with a virtuous circle of increased supplies, increased capacity utilisation, lower costs, and increased production of processed milk and other dairy products, at a more competitive price to consumers.

Much of Tanzania – particularly the highlands, but also coast and central regions – has a climate that is favourable for dairy farming. However, smallholder dairy productivity is low, reflecting long calving intervals and the low use of productivity enhancing technologies such as AI, recommended feeding practices and diseases control measures. There are however substantial opportunities for improving productivity, though this depends on producers having a financial incentive to invest in improved management practices, technologies and services; and on them receiving effective supported by service providers.

This in turn requires greater availability of specialized education and training opportunities for the service providers than is currently available in Tanzania. There are extremely restricted options for building specialised institutional capacity for the dairy sector. None of the six livestock training institutes of MALF offer specialized courses in dairy science and technology or dairy production, while Sokoine University of Agriculture offers only limited training in dairy technology at undergraduate level. As a result the dairy industry is short of qualified dairy extension specialists and Tanzanian dairy technologists with competency to work in the milk production-collection-processing-marketing interfaces.

Finally, while the policy, institutional and regulatory environment for dairy development is not an enabling one, there is a new recognition of the dairy sector – reflected in the Tanzania Livestock Modernization Initiative – and a willingness to invest and support its development/upgrading; as well as a political interest to improve the policy and regulatory environment for private sector investment in Tanzania. Indeed, in his inaugural speech to Parliament in November 2015 the newly-elected President of the United Republic of Tanzania expressed his desire “to ease the burden of multiple regulators and related taxes and fees facing the coffee farmers as well as producers of other commodities such as ....milk...” The dairy industry can seize this opportunity to

pursue solutions for the policy and institutional problems that have stifled the growth of the sector to date.

### **C. Key project objectives**

The project development objective will be increased financial returns and employment opportunities from marketed oriented smallholder dairy production and services in the dairy value chain in the Northern and Southern Highlands Milk sheds in Tanzania. The achievement of this will require the following outcomes:

- Increased supplies of processed and unprocessed milk products from smallholder dairy farmers to consumers
- Increased productivity and profitability of smallholder dairy producers
- Improved policy environment for the dairy value chain and institutional capacity to support smallholder dairy producers.

Particular attention would be given to generating opportunities for women and youth; creating employment along the milk value chain, and promoting climate resilience in the dairy sector.

HMDP will contribute directly to the achievement of three of the four Strategic Objectives (SOs) of the new RB-COSOP:

- SO1: Institutional performance, coordination, and accountability to IFAD target groups and their organizations at central and local levels has improved so as to enable greater effectiveness and transparency in policy formulation, greater collaboration and partnerships, and enhanced programme implementation and results;
- SO2: Value chains of priority commodities become more inclusive and resilient, driven by expanded and sustainable access to markets and financial services and by a more inclusive private sector; and
- SO3: Climate-resilient, productivity-increasing technologies in priority crop-livestock-fishery commodities are improved and their adoption scaled up based on more effective agricultural support services reaching IFAD target groups.

The project approach is to take as its starting point the value chain for milk and milk products, and to focus particularly on supporting the production, marketing and processing of milk. In doing so, it would seek to support public and private production service deliverers – extension, input suppliers, AI and veterinary services; smallholder dairy farmers and their organizations; informal traders/transporters, and MCC operators; and milk processors. Government has a key role to play as enabler of the value chain, and the project would support Government at national and district levels both to create an enabling policy and regulatory framework for the development of the sector and to provide more effectively those public services on which it depends.

The principal (though not exclusive) focus of HMDP would be the value chain for processed milk; though it is also recognized that the processed and non-processed shares of the market are not mutually exclusive and independent, and that substantial elements of the project will provide support to those dairy farmers marketing their milk informally, rather than to processors.

Although the processed milk sub-sector currently constitutes a small share of the total milk market, it offers substantial opportunities for growth. In addition however, the milk processors have a direct and immediate interest in seeing smallholder farmers expand their production and marketed surplus of raw milk. HMDP would therefore draw on their self-interest as value chain leaders to 'pull' increased supplies, and provide them with the support that they need to achieve this. The project would strategically use public financing to leverage private investment (by the processors) in support of smallholder farmers – public-private-producer partnerships (4Ps); and in so doing, develop

commercial value chain relationships and services that are market-driven and sustainable.

At the same time, the importance of directly supporting smallholder dairy farmers is recognised. First, there is need to assist them to increase the productivity of their animals, by ensuring the effective delivery of services: input supplies, AI, veterinary and extension services. This not only is a prerequisite for entering into sustainable VC relationships with processors, but is also important for those farmers who market their produce informally. Here, climate change aspects would be given special attention, particularly with respect to geographical areas that are marginal for dairy development, given their effect on fodder availability and livestock productivity. Second, there is need to support smallholder dairy farmers to build or strengthen their organizations in order to aggregate supply, reduce production and marketing costs, increase their negotiating power in the market, and expand project outreach to large numbers of poor producers. The project will support smallholder dairy farmers in both areas, drawing on the many lessons offered by both successful and failed experiences in Tanzania.

It is clear that to have a sustained and systemic impact, the project must support the development of a policy, institutional and regulatory framework that encourages investment at all stages of the value chain, and at all levels. The project will be designed with a strong knowledge management function, to draw out policy-relevant lessons and evidence; it will look to facilitate policy dialogue between stakeholders in the sector – a process already initiated under the DDF; and it will support new policy formulation as and where necessary. Conversely, by building institutional capacity of selected Government agencies, the project will serve to enable it to operationalise and implement national policies, already existing as well as new ones. Such support will be particularly important at the district level, where capacity to support the dairy sector is weak. However, in order to achieve this the project will almost certainly have to invest in MALF's training institutes to enable them to offer the specialized training required.

There are several relevant initiatives in the dairy sector in Tanzania focused on the development of integrated 'hubs', built around groups of farmers with shared interests in accessing inputs, services and markets to achieve a critical mass of supply. These hubs have been independently developed by commercial processors in Tanga and Iringa; as well as by two projects, EADD2 and MoreMilkIT (see E. below). These experiences offer important lessons and potential opportunities for collaboration, which should be utilised in the detailed project design process.

Finally, it is recognized that individual regions, and indeed districts, are at different stages of development of the dairy sector and face different constraints and opportunities for further growth. Some districts are able to build on substantial private investment, or on ongoing or past development activities. Some regions have invested in milk collection and processing but have paid inadequate attention to production, others have invested in production but less in milk collection and processing and others still have invested in processing but less in milk production and milk collection. This means that the project will need to offer a menu of possible interventions that are tailored to the specific requirements of individual districts and that will lead to a consistent operational model of smallholder dairy development, regardless of the starting point.

#### **D. Ownership, harmonization and alignment**

HMDP will be implemented by the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries (MALF). The approach will be characterized by, on one hand, its support for strengthening the national policy framework and institutional capacity for dairy sector development; and on the other, its integration with ongoing and planned initiatives and projects related to livestock/dairy development, both supported by IFAD and/or partner institutions. In particular, lessons will be learned from, and synergies established with, the following projects:

The US\$45 million EADD2 funded by B&MGF and implemented in Iringa, Mbeya and Njombe Regions in Tanzania (as well as in Uganda and Kenya), by Heifer International (HPI) in collaboration with ILRI, Technoserve, the World Agroforestry Centre and ABS Global. HMDP will draw on the positive lessons of, and build on, the EADD “hub” model; and during detailed project design a decision will be made as to whether and how the project should work in those 15 districts in the Southern Highlands Milk shed areas which are not covered by the EADD project, or whether it should rather look to complement the EADD activities in the districts where that project is operational. Other critical issues include the potential lack of sustainability of the EADD2 model, and to what extent the lack of distributing “chillers” (present in EADD1) may impact project achievements.

MoreMilkiT is an ongoing Irish Aid-financed research-for-development initiative under a “Maziwa Zaidi” banner, managed by ILRI and implemented in Tanga and Morogoro Regions with Sokoine University of Agriculture, TDB, HPI and others. Focused on increasing the incomes of poor smallholder dairy producers, MoreMilkiT aims to develop value chains approaches with improved organization and institutions serving smallholder dairy households, generate and communicate evidence on business and organizational options for increasing participation of resource-poor households in dairy value chains, and inform policy on an appropriate role for pro-poor smallholder-based informal sector value chains in dairy sector development. More MilkiT has supported the establishment of the DDF as a forum for stakeholder dialogue within the sector: the necessity for, and value to, HMDP to provide complementary support to DDF is something to be further explored during the detailed design process.

The B&MGF-financed, World Bank-implemented Livestock-Micro Reforms for African Agribusiness (L-MIRA), currently under development, will aim to improve the policy and regulatory environment for dairy farmers and processors. L-MIRA will work towards removing constraints for farmers in the inputs and service market, by improving access to quality drugs and safe inputs, developing a regulatory framework to guide breeding service delivery, and developing government’s animal health and extension service strategy. The project will also seek to remove the regulatory compliance complexity for processors, through rationalization of laws and regulations, and implementation support for more effective regulation especially with respect to inspection activities. Public private dialogue will support and accelerate the reforms. L-MIRA is of major relevance to HMDP, and the detailed design mission will explore how it can support, and build on, the work of L-MIRA.

Two IFAD-funded grants: (a) “East Africa Livestock for Livelihoods (EA- L4L)” to HPI to support dairy development activities in selected areas in Rwanda and Tanzania (specifically Zanzibar); and (b) “Greening livestock: incentive-based climate-smart agriculture interventions for reducing the climate impact of livestock in East Africa” to ILRI, will provide insightful lessons on the implementation of the dairy “hub” development model and enhance HMDP’s capacity to ensure climate resilience of dairy development activities.

B&MGF is funding two further public-private partnership initiatives on dairy development, focused on: (a) AI delivery in East Africa as a pathway towards increasing the number of crossbred females owned by smallholders, through the project PAID, implemented by the Land O’ Lake International Development Fund and ABS Global; and (b) a National Dairy Records Processing and Dairy Farmer Education and Feedback Centre – aimed at training farmers to better manage their crossbred animals, and to encourage/support them to record performance to help them close the yield gap with their best performing neighbors.

#### **E. Components and activities.**

To achieve the objective and outcomes described above, HTDM will include activities that have been provisionally organized under three main components:

Component 1: Strengthening the linkages in the dairy value chain

The outcome of this component would be increased supplies of processed and unprocessed milk products from smallholder dairy farmers to consumers. This would be achieved through outputs realised under three sub-components.

(a) Processor outreach services: HMDP would support selected processors to establish and expand their networks of dairy advisors, who would represent the point of contact between the processor and smallholder dairy farmers. Their role would be to identify those dairy farmers that wish to supply milk to the processor, and where there is adequate concentration of interested farmers (a potential 'hub'), enable them to expand their productivity, increase their supply – and reduce the seasonal variation in supply – both individually and collectively as a group/cooperative, and assure the quality of their product. To achieve this, the advisors would provide the farmers with a range of organizational, business and technical services, both directly and indirectly, with back-up (where feasible) by District staff and private sector service providers. With a strong market focus, the intention is that the advisors' role would complement that of the District staff, and that they would be backed up by those staff; however, the reality is that, given the limited numbers of staff in some districts, they would actually fill the gaps that exist. The project could provide training to the advisors and pay their salary for a limited period of time (for example 100% for a first year, declining to 50% for a second and third).

(b) Support to processors, traders and small private dairy operators: Both processors – particularly the smaller processors that may lack business and technical skills – and traders/transporters would also be supported by the project. Particular areas of support could include: business development/management training; technical training – particularly for smaller processors/traders; and linkage to already existing financial services providers.

(c) Expanding the network of collection centres: HMDP would provide support (facilitation of business plan development and access to finance) for the establishment and operation of collection centres, with and without cooling facilities, where there is a market-driven demand for these. These could be owned by processors, traders/transporters or producers' cooperatives, and may be operated by any of these or their contracted agents.

#### Component 2: Enhancing the productivity of smallholder dairy farmers

The expected outcome of this component will be increased productivity and productivity of smallholder dairy producers. This will be achieved through outputs delivered under two sub-components.

(a) Facilitating delivery of dairy production services: the project will provide support – technical and business training – to enable rural women and youth in particular to establish themselves as AI service providers (AI technicians/lead farmers, linked to AI service providers), para-veterinary service providers (CAHW linked to private vets), input suppliers (feed, seeds, equipment, breeding stock), and commercial producers of fodder/silage.

(b) Strengthening dairy extension: District-level staff would provide training and extension advice to farmers, in particular through dairy farmer field schools (FFS), which would be aimed at enabling farmers to increase both the productivity of their animals and their marketed surplus of raw milk. Their support would be provided not only to those smallholder dairy farmers supplying processors, but also at other market-oriented farmers who sell (or wish to sell) through other, informal channels.

#### Component 3: Improving policies and institutions for dairy development

The expected outcome of this component is an improved policy environment for the dairy value chain and institutional capacity to support smallholder dairy producers. This would be achieved through outputs delivered under four sub-components, which will be further developed in close collaboration with L-MIRA.



(a) Capacity training for training facilities: In the absence of a National Dairy Action Plan that defines a national strategy for education and training for dairy development, it is not sustainable for the project to strengthen the national education/training capacity. On the other hand, in the absence of such support, it would not be possible to build the operational capacity for dairy that will be needed under the project. The project would therefore support the development of training programmes by the Department of Animal Science at Sokoine University and/or MAF, as a project-specific, short-term measure, until such time that a national strategy is developed.

(b) Capacity strengthening of key services: The project would support the training of the advisory service technicians, who would provide the processor outreach services under Component 1(a) employed; and it would offer specialized dairy training to District and village level extension staff, to enable them to train and advice farmers on practical aspects of dairy husbandry practices.

(c) Support for a National Dairy Action Plan: It is proposed that the project support the development of a National Dairy Action Plan. This would be derived from Livestock Modernization Initiative and the Livestock Sector Master Plan currently under development. Its value would be, amongst other things, to define priority areas for public and private investment and their geographical focus; offer clarity on the appropriate roles and responsibilities of the public and private sectors, and of the various public sector institutions and agencies supporting the sector; and by doing so, provide clarity as to which institutions require support, and of what sort, in order to fulfil the roles and responsibilities assigned to them, and which institutions can contribute to building the capacity required.

(d) Support for district-level policy implementation: The project would assist the districts to review their individual taxation policies so as to ensure that they do not provide a disincentive to investment in dairy production and processing. It would also assist them to rationalize and harmonize the regulatory functions of the different agencies operating within the districts: options may include a 'one stop' regulatory framework, or a 'one stop' inspectorate department charged with carrying out the multiple regulatory functions from a single mandate.

## **F. Preliminary Environmental and Social category**

The preliminary Environmental and Social category is B, considering that the project will aim to improve the productivity of dairy animals rather than to increase their numbers; and it will promote zero-grazing made possible by increased production and use of fodder, rather than extensive grazing with the risk of biophysical degradation and potential loss of biodiversity. It will also promote the use of renewable energies (e.g. solar energy and biogas technologies) wherever possible in the value chain.

## **G. Preliminary Climate Risk classification**

Tanzania has a complex existing climate, with wide variations across the country and strong seasonality. Rainfall in the highlands is already highly variable, and is growing more unpredictable. The northeast highlands will likely experience heavier, more concentrated rainfall whereas the southern highlands will likely experience rainfall decreases. While these changes are projected over the long term, the adverse impacts of climate variability have already been witnessed through extreme weather events such as the major droughts of 2005/6 and flooding in 1997/8 (linked to El Niño episodes), both of which had significant economic costs for Tanzania.

Dairy farming is perceived as both contributor to and victim of climate change; on the one hand, the sector may contribute to greenhouse gas emissions (associated with land management, dairy cows themselves, processing and transportation); while on the other hand, dairy farming is highly vulnerable to climate change and variability, mainly through increased temperatures and alterations in rainfall patterns. These factors influence feed and water availability, as well as animal health and breeding, and consequently milk

production and quality. On the basis of the SECAP Review Note the climatic risks for this project are medium to high.

For these reasons, the project will carry out further work at design stage to identify the specific climate change risks and those areas most exposed to them, in order to better tailor its operational approach. In broad terms however, HMDP will promote well-managed intensification of dairy production, based on zero-grazing made possible by increased production and use of fodder.

#### **H. Costs and financing**

HMDP will be implemented over a period of six years. The total amount of the project is estimated at up to US\$50 million, US\$20 million of which will be financed by IFAD through a highly concessional loan. A further estimated US\$20 million will be financed by co-financing institutions (e.g. B&MGF, AfDB, Bilateral agencies, etc.) and/or private/bank financing investment. The estimated Government and beneficiary's counterpart funds would be respectively US\$3 and US\$2.5 million. Further project preparation will update/firm up these costs estimates and financing plan.

#### **I. Organization and management**

The implementation of HMDP will be under the responsibility of the newly integrated Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries (MALF), which will establish a Programme Management Unit (PMU) with roles relative to administration, policy/technical, and M&E. The PMU will ensure the following tasks: (i) consolidation of the project work plan; (ii) reporting on project progress; (iii) recruitment of consultants and procurement of civil works and goods; (iv) establishment and management of a sub-account and supervision and consolidation of sub-imprest accounts in each targeted region; and (v) knowledge management (KM), monitoring and evaluation (M&E), and policy dialogue.

Each targeted region will have a Regional Implementation Unit (RIU) fully integrated within the local governing institutions. RIUs will prepare work plans, coordinate with other regional and district departments and stakeholders, and monitor and report on progress.

At district level, field project activities will be implemented with the facilitation of qualified service providers. Such service providers will be compensated through a performance-based system which has been successfully implemented under PASP in Rwanda.

The project will report to a national steering committee, involving stakeholders representing producers, processors and other private sector interest groups; and this steering committee will provide the project with policy, strategic and technical guidance. In order to strengthen both national ownership for the project and the project's policy influence, the steering committee should ideally be linked to already-existing national structures, such as the DDF or ASDP2 rather than being a stand-alone project-specific entity.

In addition, given the autonomy of the Districts under the DbyD policy, district-level steering committees should also be established to provide local-level governance, and strengthen district-level ownership.

#### **J. Monitoring and Evaluation indicators**

HMDP M&E system will be based on the log frame and will report on the RIMS indicators. All data according to IFAD standards will be disaggregated by gender, age and type of land users. Routine monitoring by the safeguard monitoring entities to be recruited under the project will focus on assessing progress and compliance with Good Dairy Production Practices (GDPP), identifying constraints and developing remedial actions to effectively address these. Monitoring results will be part of the six monthly progress reports and assessment of the GDPPs will be an essential element of all reviews. Participatory M&E and qualitative surveys will be undertaken on a regular basis.

**K. Risks**

- Policy and regulatory framework: there is wide agreement that the performance of the dairy industry in Tanzania has been long associated with a set of challenges, of which a hostile policy and regulatory environment ranks among the highest. Attention has been drawn to multiplicity, complexity and overlapping of regulations governing the industry which make both the cost of doing business, and the cost of the final product to the consumer, excessively high. Key issues include: (a) the regulatory framework, which imposes multiple, inconsistent and overlapping regulations, and results in high compliance costs; (b) multiple and fragmented institutional responsibilities for that regulation; and (c) heavy taxation of the sector, with multiple entry points for that taxation.
- Common external tariff barriers and unregulated importation of cheaper milk products from external markets (both from neighboring countries and globally) risk to suppress local initiative to increase dairy production and value addition through modern processing.
- The effect of climate change would have significant impact on natural resources, in particular pasture and forage/crop production, affecting seasonal available grazing, and thereby reduce nutrition and consequently lactation levels of traditional and improved breed cattle.
- The risk of disease outbreak, such a FMD, RVF, CBPP is constant and could decimate livestock herds and cause major loss for dairy producers and the dairy industry if contingent and prophylactic plans are not effectively and efficiently funded and implemented by national veterinary authorities.

**L. Timing**

A pre-design mission was carried out in December, 2015. Further preparation work will follow, while also taking into account the outcome of the review process of the Project Concept Note and confirmation by Government. The Quality Enhancement process would then be conducted in April 2016. The second design mission could be completed by the end of May 2016. The Project Design Report would then be submitted to the Quality Assessment review in about June 2016 and the final version of the project design could be submitted to the Executive Board by December 2016.

## M. Logical framework

During the first design mission, the team will further review and finalize the Logframe/results management framework, underpinned by a strong results chain.

Narrative Summary	Key Performance Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions (A) / Risks (R)
<b>Goal:</b>			
Increased incomes for poor rural households that depend substantially on production and trade of dairy products	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nos. of commercially-oriented smallholder dairy producers increased from x,000 to y,000</li> <li>Z jobs created in dairy value chains</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TBD</li> </ul>	
<b>Project Development Objective:</b> Increased financial returns and employment opportunities from market-oriented smallholder dairy production and services in the dairy value chain in the Northern and Southern Highlands Milk sheds in Tanzania			
<b>Outcome 1:</b> Increased domestic supplies of processed and unprocessed milk products from smallholder dairy farmers to consumers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Total milk consumption increases:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Baseline 45 litres/person p.a.</li> <li>With project x litres/person p.a.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Consumption of domestically produced, processed milk and milk products increases:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Baseline 60(?) m litres p.a.</li> <li>With project x m litres p.a.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TBD</li> </ul>	Price structure/incentives encourage smallholder farmers to sell through processors and/or MCCs
<b>Outputs:</b> 1.1 Enhanced outreach by processors to smallholder dairy producers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Av. capacity use in processing plants increased from ~26% to xx%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TBD</li> </ul>	

Narrative Summary	Key Performance Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions (A) / Risks (R)
1.2 Improved technical and business capacity of processors 1.3 Expanded network of milk collection centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ x processor-employed dairy advisors operational</li> <li>▪ y processors trained by project</li> <li>▪ Milk volumes passing through MCCs increased from 94,000 to xxx,000 litres/day</li> </ul>		
Outcome 2: Increased productivity and resilience of smallholder dairy farmers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Av. productivity / smallholder dairy cow:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Baseline ... litres p.a.</li> <li>○ With project .. litres p.a.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ TBD</li> </ul>	Price incentives and service provision enable smallholder farmers to invest in enhancing their productivity
Outputs: 2.1 Improved provision of specialised production services to smallholder dairy farmers 2.2 Improved delivery of extension and training advice to smallholder dairy farmers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Nos. AI, para-vet service providers, input suppliers, fodder producer businesses established</li> <li>▪ x. dairy FFSs established</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ TBD</li> </ul>	
Outcome 3: Improved policy environment for the dairy value chain and institutional capacity to support smallholder dairy producers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Satisfaction of processors with policy and regulatory environment               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Baseline x%; with project x+y%</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ Use by dairy farmers of AI/vet.services               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Baseline a%; with project a+b%</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ TBD</li> </ul>	Central and district government willing to resolve policy/regulatory bottlenecks constraining growth of dairy sector

Narrative Summary	Key Performance Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions (A) / Risks (R)
<p>Outputs:</p> <p>3.1 Improved capacity to deliver training to dairy service providers</p> <p>3.2 Specialised and extension service providers trained</p> <p>3.3 Preparation of National Dairy Action Plan</p> <p>3.4 Improved policy implementation at District-level</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Training programme(s) for dairy specialists developed</li> <li>▪ x dairy advisors and y village extension staff trained</li> <li>▪ National Dairy Action Plan produced</li> <li>▪ X district-level policy/regulatory reviews carried out</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ TBD</li> </ul>	

## Drylands Development Project

### UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA DRAFT CONCEPT NOTE FOR THE PROPOSED DRYLANDS DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

#### A. Possible geographic area of intervention and target groups

Approximately, 80% of the total land area in Tanzania is classified as semi-arid with highly variable rainfall in one or two seasons separated with a long dry season. There is high variation in vegetation types because of high variation in climate, soil characteristics and management conditions. Without investments in inputs such as irrigation it is difficult to provide the required ameliorating environment for crop farming, and as such, livestock production has a comparative advantage in these areas. Of 88.6 million ha of land resources in the country, 60 million ha are deemed suitable for grazing. The main sources of livelihood in semi-arid drylands are pastoralism and agro-pastoralism.

Tanzania has the third largest livestock population on the African continent comprising 25 million cattle, 98% of which are indigenous breeds, complemented by 16.7 million goats, and 8 million sheep. Despite these resources, the livestock sector is performing well below its potential. The livestock activities contribute 7.4% to the country's GDP. The annualized growth rate of the sector is low at 2.2%.

Only 2% (1.28 million ha) of the land deemed suitable for grazing is currently protected within village land-use plans, which have been implemented in less than 10% of villages in 81 out of 150 districts. With insecure access to rangelands, land users have little incentive to invest in their improvement. With new developments and the establishment of growth corridors such as SAGCOT including pastoral areas, these conflicts between land users are likely to grow unless due attention is given to land-use planning and securing of rights for rangelands users. This is a major concern of the Government of Tanzania (GoT).

Poor quality and availability of forage is common in most communal rangelands in Tanzania, characterized by seasonal variation in quantity and quality (2013). Invasive species are proliferating with 23 of the 30 invasive species found in Tanzania occurring in rangelands. Tanzania loses 412,000 ha of forests/year and 90% of the population depend on firewood or charcoal for cooking and heating.

Investment in the drylands of Tanzania is significantly behind the more temperate areas of the country. Water access for both people, livestock and crop farming is low. Local markets and abattoirs are few, meaning long treks or expensive haulage of livestock

to and between markets. There is little investment of the private sector in these, and low capacity of local livestock keepers to manage them or set them up themselves. Therefore they rely on a poorly-resourced local government<sup>83</sup>.

The livestock sector is severely constrained by low livestock reproductive rates, high mortality and high disease prevalence. With poor and irregular access to livestock production resources, production coefficients are low<sup>84</sup>.

Given the above context, the proposed Drylands Development Project will be implemented in arid and semi-arid areas of Tanzania, with exact District locations to be decided. Its starting point will be the securing of village land and rangelands achieved through the Sustainable Rangeland Management Project (SRMP) phase III. Target beneficiaries are pastoral and agro-pastoral communities in these regions, with particular attention to the inclusion of marginalised indigenous groups, women and youth. In addition other stakeholders involved in livestock production systems and value chains will also benefit.

#### B. Justification and rationale

The recently completed Country Programme Evaluation (CPE) made a specific recommendation to support the livestock sector with focus on pastoral communities, securing land rights and improving land use planning, and rangeland management, since these sectors have historically received limited attention and investment so far. A thriving livestock VC supports other agricultural VCs, as it “pulls” demand from small-scale crop producers, who grow fodder crops or supply crop residues to livestock producers. This would include ecologically-sound strategies for resolving conflicts between pastoralists and farmers. More efficient livestock production systems and improved carbon sequestration will contribute to the GoT’s climate-smart agriculture goals.

The project will contribute to all four Strategic Objectives of the RB-COSOP. IFAD has been supporting the SRMP through phases I and II. This Drylands Development Project will include and build on phase III of the SRMP. The activities undertaken will contribute to other IFAD-supported programmes including wider community development component under the Bagamoyo Sugar Infrastructure and Sustainable Community Development Programme (BASIC).

The project will also provide contributions and important lessons learned for other pastoral-focused IFAD projects in ESA and NEN Divisions.

#### C. Key project objectives

The goal is to contribute to reduced poverty, and enhanced food and livelihood security of dryland communities, while contributing to national economic growth, social stability and environmental sustainability. The project development objective will be improved pastoral and agro-pastoral livelihoods through climate-smart and resilient sustainable intensification of livestock production systems in drylands built on secure access to dryland resources and good governance. The achievement of this will require the following outcomes:

<sup>83</sup> Only 10% of farm specialized rural households are market oriented (i.e., selling more than 50% of their output), and among all rural households, just 37% of total agricultural production is marketed, 29% being crop sales and only eight percent originating from livestock.

<sup>84</sup> In indigenous cattle, the calving rate is 40–50%, the calving interval 18–24 months, pre-weaning mortality 30–40%, adult mortality 810%, mature weight 200–350 kg, offtake rate 8–10% per annum, milk yield 400 liter per lactation and carcass weight 100–175 kg. For small ruminants, the offtake rate is 25–15% per annum, lamb/kid mortality 20–40%, adult mortality 8–15% and average carcass weight of 12–15 kg.



- Joint village land-use planning facilitates conflict resolution, certification of land, shared resources and livestock routes, and improved functioning land/resource governance institutions.
- Pastoral and agro-pastoral farmers manage to restore and improve the health and productivity of drylands through supporting research, technology transfer, and capacity building.
- Livestock and agricultural production in drylands is sustainably intensified and VCD of livestock and livestock products are more resilient, as part of integrated and vibrant dryland production systems with particular benefits to women and youth.
- An enabling policy and institutional environment is created for the growth and scaling-up of drylands livestock and agriculture climate-smart and resilient integrated production systems.

The Drylands Development Project will contribute directly to the achievement of all four Strategic Objectives (SOs) of the new RB-COSOP:

- SO1: Institutional performance, coordination, and accountability to IFAD target groups and their organizations at central and local levels has improved so as to enable greater effectiveness and transparency in policy formulation, greater collaboration and partnerships, and enhanced programme implementation and results;
- SO2: Value chains of priority commodities become more inclusive and resilient, driven by expanded and sustainable access to markets and financial services and by a more inclusive private sector;
- SO3: Climate-resilient, productivity-increasing technologies in priority crop-livestock-fishery commodities are improved and their adoption scaled up based on more effective agricultural support services reaching IFAD target groups; and
- SO4: Land governance is strengthened to enable more inclusive agriculture public and private investments, based on more equitable access to land and effective mechanisms to address land/natural resource conflicts arising from competition between smallholder crop farmers, agro-pastoralists and pastoralists.

#### D. Ownership, harmonization and alignment

The Drylands Development Project will be implemented by the new Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries (MALF). It will be coordinated with ongoing and planned livestock projects, both supported by IFAD and/or partners. In particular the Project will build on and learn from:

- Fostering Good Land Governance for Inclusive Agricultural Development Project, including the establishment a platform for CSO engagement; a National Engagement Strategy through the International Land Coalition (ILC); and SRMP phase III funded by IFAD and implemented by the MALF and ILRI (together with a linked component on multi-stakeholder engagement on good governance in commercial investment). The Drylands Project will work with livestock keepers in the districts and villages where SRMP has secured rangelands as 'rangeland reserves' as part of village land use planning.
- The EU/IFAD funded Restoration of Degraded Land for Food Security and Poverty Reduction in East Africa and Sahel: Taking Successes in Land Restoration to Scale, led by ICRAF, with ILRI, ICARDA and ICRISAT (with a learning site in Shinyanga, Tanzania).

- The planned IFAD-funded Highlands Milk Shed Development Project (HMDP), currently under design focusing on climate-resilient dairy production development, dairy processing and marketing development. Though focused on dairy production and in different geographical area, important lessons learned can be made in regard to smallholder organisation, climate-resilient innovations, and livestock-based value chain development.
- The IFAD-supported Smallholder Dairy Commercialization Programme, Kenya including the experiences of such as the Keekonyokie Market Access Company and its development of a local market and slaughter house.
- Feed the Future Innovation Lab on Small-Scale Irrigation in Southern Africa (Tanzania, Ethiopia and Ghana) (ILLSA), USAID, led by IWMI working in Babati, Mvomero and Kilosa Districts.
- The GoT's Livestock Master Plan currently being developed with support from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and ILRI.
- The IFAD funded grant "Greening livestock: incentive-based CSA interventions for reducing the climate impact of livestock in East Africa" which will be implemented by ILRI. The synergy with this project will enhance HMDP's capacity to ensure climate resilience of dairy development activities.
- IIED and GoT's project on climate-smart land use planning in pastoral areas.
- The IFAD/WB-supported government Pastoralist Community Development Project in Ethiopia which has supported a participatory planning community development approach to service delivery and infrastructural development in pastoral areas.

The Drylands Development Project is aligned to the priorities set by the GoT through is Livestock Modernisation Initiative (LMI, 2015) which aims to "transform the traditional livestock sub-sector into a modern, responsible, sustainable and environmentally-friendly engine for rural development and improved national health and nutritional standards." The project contributes directly to five of the LMI's 13 key strategic areas: (i) Tanzania Rangelands Conservation and Management; (ii) Promoting Tanzanian Livestock Markets; (iii) Livestock Research & Extension through Modern Information Systems; (iv) Resilient Tanzania Pastoral Communities; and (v) Conflict to Coexistence: Livestock and Conservation.

#### E. Components and activities

To achieve the objective and outcomes described above, the Drylands Development Project will include activities that have been provisionally organized under three main components:

Component 1: Restoring and improving the health and productivity of drylands through research, technology transfer, and capacity building

This component will: (i) support the development and implementation of 'participatory rangeland management' plans of 'livestock keeper associations' as landholders of cross-village 'rangeland reserves' (as developed through SRMP phase III); and integration of livestock with agricultural production systems. This will include (ii) carrying out participatory-action-research and pilots on rangeland-dryland rehabilitation and forage/feed development including the role of irrigation; (iii) piloting of sustainable land

management activities including soil and water conservation processes and infrastructure; and (iv) planning water infrastructure and related governance development. The project will also (iv) develop regional and/or district land-use plans in order to enhance planning of land use and development at district level, including aspects of climate adaptation and resilience; and (v) consider livestock-based insurance as a risk management strategy.

#### Component 2: Intensification and value chain development of livestock and livestock-dryland products

This component will (i) carry out a preliminary assessment of livestock systems including identifying gaps and areas requiring investment in order to intensify and develop integrated livestock and livestock product value chains in rural pastoral areas, including analysis of target groups, and markets. This could include developing markets, slaughter and processing systems, traceability and assurance systems, improved care in handling of hides and skins, branding and standard labelling (e.g. free-range TeeZee beef); as well as developing livestock products such as milk or rangeland products such as vegetation-based components for beauty products; (ii) understand which value chains have the most promise for development, better analyse and develop these leading to piloting including through the facilitation of platforms for VC stakeholders to identify VC bottlenecks and opportunities for business development; (iii) map, service and secure livestock routes in the project areas to enable effective and safe movement and the development of businesses along the routes; and (iv) development of linkages to credit and savings facilities will also be considered. In this component particular attention will be given to identifying opportunities for women and youth to be engaged in these developments. The role of the private sector and local entrepreneurs will be key to the development of this component – this will use a Public-Private-Producer-Partnership approach, building on the experiences of IFAD in other countries<sup>85</sup>.

#### Component 3: Strengthening of the enabling environment for scaling-up of livestock and agricultural-based integrated production systems

This component will: (i) strengthen local capacity (communities, private sector etc.) to innovate and manage change positively in order to develop more sustainable and productive livelihood systems through knowledge generation, institution-building, secure access to resources, services and inputs, and greater role in decision-making processes; (ii) support capacity building of local and national government staff (including local extension system) on participatory rangeland management, rangeland/dryland rehabilitation, intensification and VCD of livestock and livestock products and build platforms for knowledge exchange and dissemination; (iii) support the development of policies, strategies and frameworks for improving dryland management and livestock development, better integrated with agriculture, including for example a national strategy on the management of invasive species; a framework for regional/district level spatial planning in pastoral areas; and the mainstreaming of pastoralism within Tanzania's Agricultural Sector Development Programme (ASDP). The project will build on the extensive experiences of IFAD in the scaling-up of livestock programmes through different pathways, in other countries.<sup>86</sup>

#### F. Preliminary Environmental and Social category

<sup>85</sup> See IFAD's How To Do Note on Public-Private-Producer-Partnerships (4Ps) in Agricultural Value Chains (forthcoming); and IFAD's How To Do Note on Livestock Value Chain Analysis and Project Development (forthcoming)

<sup>86</sup> See IFAD's scaling up note on Smallholder Livestock Development (2015)

Further project preparation will establish the environmental and social category and the implications for further project design and implementation.

#### G. Preliminary Climate Risk classification

Further project preparation will establish the climate risk classification, and the implications for further project design and implementation.

#### H. Costs and financing

Further project preparation will establish the project's costs and financing plan.

#### I. Organization and management

The Drylands Development Project will be implemented by the new Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries (MALF), in close collaboration with participating districts, and livestock stakeholder groups. Further project preparation will work out the most appropriate roles of each of the key actors, as well as appropriate coordination mechanisms and processes.

#### J. Monitoring and Evaluation indicators

Further project preparation will establish the project's M&E arrangements and indicators.

#### K. Risks

Further project preparation will identify the project's main risks and appropriate risk mitigation measures.

#### L. Timing

Further project preparation will establish the project's implementation period, expected to begin by about early 2018.

Document:	EB 2016/117/R.11/Add.1
Agenda:	8(c)
Date:	23 March 2016
Distribution:	Public
Original:	English

E



Investing in rural people

## Comments of the Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD on the country strategic opportunities programme for the United Republic of Tanzania

### Note to Executive Board representatives

#### Focal points:

#### Technical questions:

Oscar A. Garcia  
Director  
Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD  
Tel.: +39 06 5459 2274  
e-mail: o.garcia@ifad.org

Fabrizio Felloni  
Lead Evaluation Officer  
Tel.: +39 06 5459 2361  
e-mail: f.felloni@ifad.org

#### Dispatch of documentation:

Alessandra Zusi Bergés  
Officer-in-Charge  
Governing Bodies Office  
Tel.: +39 06 5459 2092  
e-mail: gb\_office@ifad.org

Executive Board — 117<sup>th</sup> session  
Rome, 13-14 April 2016

---

For: Review

# Comments of the Independent Office of Evaluation of IFAD on the country strategic opportunities programme for the United Republic of Tanzania

## General comments

1. The Independent Office of Evaluation (IOE) welcomes the new results-based country strategic opportunities programme (COSOP) for the United Republic of Tanzania. The document draws on the findings and recommendations of the country programme evaluation (CPE), whose agreement at completion point was signed in June 2015. IOE acknowledges the good collaboration between the national authorities on the mainland and in Zanzibar and the East and Southern Africa Division of IFAD in formulating the COSOP.
2. The strategic directions and objectives outlined in the COSOP are consistent with the lessons learned through the CPE, and are aligned with the country context and needs, including the poverty characteristics and the evolving national policy environment.
3. The attention given to non-lending activities is a positive sign. The designation of IFAD as the chair of the development partners' Agriculture Working Group is an indicator of the enhanced recognition of the Fund by other donors, and it will allow IFAD to play a stronger role in policy consultation and dialogue. An estimate of the resources required and available for non-lending activities would have been useful: in the past, progress in these areas has been constrained by the lack of earmarked financial and human resources.
4. Rural finance and value chain operations have suffered from implementation delays in the past. The COSOP could have elaborated upon the operational risks and challenges faced during portfolio implementation as these may also affect the implementation of future operations.

## Specific comments

5. Learning from the past. The COSOP takes on board the key findings of the 2015 CPE, in particular: (i) the progress made in strengthening the institutional capacity of local government authorities and in decentralizing extension systems under the Agricultural Sector Development Programme (ASDP) realized through the basket funding modality; (ii) design weaknesses in projects in support of smallholder access to rural markets and financial services; (iii) geographic dispersion of the portfolio; and (iv) limited prioritization of non-lending activities due to the absence of a clear action plan and resource constraints.
6. The strategic objectives are in line with both the country's needs and the CPE's recommendations. Strategic objective one is aimed at enhancing responsiveness and accountability of central and local public institutions to IFAD's target groups, and consolidating the results of the decentralization of agricultural extension services. Strategic objective two is aimed at supporting more inclusive and resilient value chains, with renewed efforts to engage the private sector. Strategic objective three addresses scaling up of climate-resilient technologies, based on more effective agricultural support service modalities. This corresponds to one of the specific recommendations of the CPE, based on the experience of farmer field schools in Zanzibar. Strategic objective four focuses on land governance, more inclusive agriculture, increased public and private investments and more effective mechanisms to address conflicts over land and natural resources.
7. The new lending pipeline. The two sectoral interventions supporting the Agriculture Sector Development Strategy (ASDS)/ASDP II on the mainland and the Zanzibar Agricultural Sector Development Programme respond well to the recommendations of the CPE. Regarding further support to ASDP II, more

information would be useful regarding the envisaged financing instrument – i.e. whether this will take the form of basket funding or traditional project financing – and the degree of support being provided by other donors to the programme.

8. The proposed Highland Milkshed Development Project capitalizes on the opportunity highlighted in the CPE to invest in the country's dairy sector. This project, as well as the proposed Drylands Development Project, marks a revival of interest in livestock development and in pastoral development interventions on the mainland. Such activities that have been neglected in the past.
9. The current portfolio. While COSOPs typically concentrate on future operations, more insights into experience drawn from the implementation of the Rural Micro, Small and Medium Enterprise Support Programme and the Marketing Infrastructure, Value Addition and Rural Finance Support Programme would have been valuable in this case. The achievement of the second COSOP strategic objective will rely to a large extent on these projects. Moreover, the new project in Bagamoyo (Bagamoyo Sugar Infrastructure and Sustainable Community Development Programme) will require close follow-up of potential environmental and social risks.
10. Non-lending activities and policy engagement are given prominence in the COSOP. Four main areas for attention are identified: (i) an operational plan for the farmer empowerment strategy; (ii) a value chain development strategy and operational plan; (iii) a strategy for the Zanzibar Agricultural Sector Development Programme; and (iv) fostering of good land governance for inclusive development. These areas are consistent with the priorities of the lending programme and, provided that adequate resources are assigned, would offer an opportunity to distill IFAD's practical operational experience into policy processes.
11. Overall, the COSOP results framework (appendix II, attachment 1) is well explained. Outcome and milestone indicators seem adequate for reporting on the achievement of strategic objectives. It is noted that the baseline and targets for some indicators are still to be defined, pending the finalization of the national objectives of ASDP II. It will be important to ensure the availability of reliable sources for these indicators through sectoral or project-specific monitoring systems. The document places particular emphasis on COSOP-level monitoring and evaluation (M&E); however, for M&E to function at the COSOP level, it must first be effective at the project level. This has been an area of weakness in the past and will require attention from the Government and IFAD in the future.

#### Final remarks

12. In general, IOE finds this to be a sound document and appreciates the efforts made to follow up on the recommendations of the 2015 CPE.