



<b>1. Project Data :</b>			
<b>OEDID:</b>	C1994		
<b>Project ID:</b>	P002772		
<b>Project Name :</b>	National Agricultural and Livestock Extension Rehabilitation Project		
<b>Country:</b>	Tanzania		
<b>Sector:</b>	Agricultural Extension		
<b>L/C Number:</b>	1994		
<b>Partners involved :</b>	ADB		
<b>Prepared by :</b>	Jacob Meerman, OEDST		
<b>Reviewed by :</b>	Jock Anderson		
<b>Group Manager :</b>	Roger Slade		
<b>Date Posted :</b>	06/22/1998		

**2. Project Objectives, Financing, Costs and Components :**

Main objective: enable the Government of Tanzania to provide farmers with extension services to increase agricultural production, productivity and rural incomes . by i) establishing an effective organization and management structure for extension services; (ii) establishing the Training and Visit methodology throughout the extension services; (iii) strengthening extension planning and implementation capacity and (iv) assisting in preparing a second phase project.

Project cost was US\$ 28.6 million distributed among IDA (19.3), African Development Fund (8.5) and domestic contribution (0.8). The components and their share of project costs are extension organization and management (76%), staff and farmer training (17%), technical assistance (7%).

**3. Achievement of Relevant Objectives :**

The project revitalized the extension service, building capacity to manage and make decisions on future directions, and giving the service a new work ethic.

**4. Significant Achievements :**

Extension services for crop and livestock -services have been integrated and have been providing worthwhile programs to many farmers and livestock-keepers. After the mid-term review (1993), cooperation between research and extension greatly improved. Farmers have adopted new technology, "pushed" by the extension service, that has increased yields and output significantly.

**5. Significant Shortcomings :**

Main shortcoming: failure to build M&E capacity, as decided during the midterm review in 1993. Consequently, measurement of benefits and weaknesses is difficult. Financial sustainability is unlikely because of frequently inadequate and uncertain government financial support for extension. The Government's completion report notes that donors/NGOs supported 75 projects during the implementation period that involved extension and frequently used extension agents in their programs. Yet most of these were not seen as integral parts of the extension program and their experience is unconsidered in the ICR.

<b>6. Ratings:</b>	<b>ICR</b>	<b>OED Review</b>	<b>Reason for Disagreement /Comments</b>
<b>Outcome:</b>	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
<b>Institutional Dev .:</b>	Substantial	Substantial	
<b>Sustainability :</b>	Likely	Likely	
<b>Bank Performance :</b>	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
<b>Borrower Perf .:</b>	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
<b>Quality of ICR :</b>		Satisfactory	

**7. Lessons of Broad Applicability :**

The involvement of farmers in designing and operating extension programs is a critical element in ensuring the continued technical relevance and usefulness of the service . The change to group-based extension was positive as ownership of the program was then transferred to the community . Transfer of responsibility for financing and organizing support for export and other specific cash crops to farmers and others involved in their production and marketing is highly desirable, but particularly when fiscal resources are highly constrained . (All of these lessons are being applied in the follow-on project.)

**8. Audit Recommended?** ☐ Yes ☒ No

**9. Comments on Quality of ICR :**

The ICR gives a detailed and internally consistent account of the project with a frank and fair discussion of strengths and weaknesses.