Tanzania

PROLINNOVA Tanzania

PROmoting Local INNOVAtion in ecologically-oriented agriculture and natural resource management

FEASIBILITY STUDY OF LOCAL INNOVATION SUPPORT FUND PILOT IN TANZANIA: PROLINNOVA-Tanzania

By

PELUM-Tanzania

Area C-INADES Complex,

P .o. Box 54 DODOMA, Tanzania

Tel/Fax: +255 262 350744

E-Mail: info@pelumtanzania.org

September, 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS 3
1. INTRODUCTION 6
2.0 FEASIBILITY STUDY METHODOLOGY 6
2.1 Review of lessons from the LISFs experiences 6
2.2 Key informants' visits and consultations 7
2.3. *ISF design consultation and meeting* 7
2.4. Stakeholders workshop 7
3.0 FINDINGS 8
3.1 International LISFs experiences 8
3.2 The farmer-led research and development, and LISFs Experiences in Tanzania 9
3. 2. 1 The Case of the PADEP 9
2.3.2 The case of the ISWC-II programme 12
2.3.3 The case of the TARPII-SUA project 14
2. 3.4. The case of Rural Markets Development Project by the MVIWATA 16
3. 3 Analysis of institutional, policy and legal framework 18
3.3.1 Agricultural Research Services 18
3.3.2 Agricultural extension services 20
3.4 Important lessons learnt for implementing LISFs project 21
3.4.2 Level of funds decentralization 21
3.4.4 Community contributions 22
3.4.5 Enabling policy environment 22
3.4.6 Nature and diversity of the stakeholders 23
3.4.7 Level of farmer participation 23
3.4.8 Monitoring and evaluation systems 23
3.4.10 Transparency, delegation and accountability 24
3.4.11 Competitive grant process 24
3.5 Feasibility for piloting the LISFs in Tanzania 24
3.6 Challenges for LISFs piloting 25
3.7 Best LISFs set-up for Tanzania 25
3.5.1 Institutional set-up and roles 26
3.5.2 Decentralized Financial Flow Mechanisms 29
4. RECOMMENDATIONS 30
4.1 Geographic coverage 30
4.2 Partner organizations 30
4.3 Farmer involvement 31
4.4 Financial management and sustainability 31
4.5 Monitoring and evaluation 32
5. REFERENCES: 32
APPENDIX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE AND CONTRACT 33
APPENDIX II: LIST OF PEOPLE CONTACTED, POSITIONS AND THEIR INSTITUTIONS 37

ABREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

A-CBG	District Agricultural Capacity Building and Reform
ADs	Assistant Directors
AFD	Agence Francaise de Developpment
AGM	Annual General Meeting
ARD	Agricultural Research and Development
ARI-Hombolo	Agricultural Research Institute-Hombolo
ARI-Uyole	Agricultural Research Institute-Uyole
ASDP	Agricultural Sector Development Programme
ASDS	Agricultural Sector Development Strategy
ASLMs	Agricultural Sector Lead Ministries
ATIRI	Agricultural Technology and Information Response Initiatives
AZDR	Assistant Zonal Director for Research
AZDT	Assistant Zonal Director for Training
CATFs	Competitive Agricultural Technology Funds
CBD	Coffee Berry Disease
CBI	Community Based Institution
CBOs	Community Based Organisations
CCM	Cooperative College Moshi
CIAL	Local Agricultural Research Committees
CIAT	International Centre for Tropical Agriculture
CIS	Community Investments Sub-projects
CMTs	Council Management Teams
COIFs	Community Owned Innovation Funds
CORDEM	Client Oriented Research and Development Management Approach
CSOs	Civil Society Organisations
DADG	District Agricultural Development Grant
DADPs	Districts Agricultural Development Plans
DAEG	District Agricultural services Grants
DALDO	District Agriculture and Livestock Development Officer
DCD	Director of Crop Development
DDPs	District Development Plans
DED	District Executive Director
DFT	District Facilitation Team
DRT	Directorate of Research and Training
DRTE	Directorate of Research, Training and Extension
FAIR-2	Farmer Access to Innovation Resource-pilot 2
FERT/GRET	French Farmers Organisation/French NGO

FFS	Farmer Field School
FGIS	Farmer Groups Investments Sub-projects
GOT	Government of Tanzania
HH	Households
HIV/AIDS	Human Immuno-Deficiency Virus/Acquired Immunity Deficiency Syndrome
IFFI	International Foundation for Farmer Innovations (proposed)
INADES	A French Acronym for African Institute for Social and Economic Development
IRDO	Ileje Rural Development Organisation
ISWC-II	Indigenous Soil and Water Conservation-phase II
ITECO	Civil Works Consult Company
LGA	Local Government Authority
LIBRD	Local Initiatives for Biodiversity, Research and Development
LISFs	Local Innovation Support Funds
LRI-Uyole	Livestock Research Institute–Uyole
LRI-Mpwapwa	Livestock Research Institute-Mpwapwa
LVIA	Lay Volunteers International Association
MAFC	Ministry of Agriculture, Food Security and Cooperatives
MITM	Ministry of Industry, Trade and Marketing
MLD	Ministry of Livestock Development
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MVIWATA	National Network of Small-scale Farmers Groups in Tanzania
NFFIT	National Foundation for Farmer Innovations in Tanzania (proposed)
NGOs	None-Government Organisations
NIF	National Innovation Foundation
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for International Development Cooperation
NPSC	National Project Steering Committee
NRM	Natural Resources Management
NTC	National Technical Committee
PADEP	Participatory Development and Empowerment Project
PANTIL	Programme on Agriculture and NRM Transformation for Improved Livelihood
PC	Project Coordinator
PCU	Project Coordination Unit
PDO	PADEP District Officer
PEA	Project Executing Agent
PELUM	Participatory Land Use Management
PFI	Promoting Farmer Innovators
PFT	Project Facilitation Team
PID	Participatory Innovation Development

PIT	**Project Implementation Team**
PMU	**Project Monitoring Unit**
PRA	**Participatory Rural Appraisal**
PROLINNOVA	**Promoting Local Innovation Programme**
PTD	**Participatory Technology Development**
RMDP	**Rural Markets Development Project**
RPC	**Regional Project Coordinators**
SACCOS	**Savings and Credit Cooperative Society**
SF-FFSs	**Self-Financed Farmer Field Schools**
SUA	**Sokoine University of Agriculture**
TaCRI	**Tanzania Coffee Research Institute**
TARP-II	**Tanzania Agricultural Research Project Phase-II**
TARPII-SUA	**Tanzania Agricultural Research Project Phase II-Sokoine University of Agriculture**
TORs	**Terms of References**
TOT	**Training of Trainers**
UMADEP	**Uluguru Mountains Agricultural Development Project**
WDC	**Ward Development Committee**
ZARDEFs	**Zonal Agricultural Research and Development Funds**
ZDRT	**Zonal Director Research and Training**
ZRC	**Zonal Research Coordinator**
ZRELO	**Zonal Research and Extension Liaison Officer**
ZTC	**Zonal Technical Committee**
APL	**Assistant Project Leader**
PSOs	**Project Site Officers**

1. INTRODUCTION

Local Innovation Support Funds (LISFs) is a new initiative, aiming to directly access funds to innovative farmers, groups or communities in order to stimulate their innovation process. The LISFs are intended to be co-owned by local stakeholders under the Promoting Local Innovation (PROLINNOVA) programme. The PROLINNOVA programme is a global partnership in promotion of local innovations in ecologically-oriented agricultural and natural resources management. This initiative of the PROLINNOVA programme, wishes to institutionalize new mechanisms that would effectively support local agricultural and natural resources management innovation process. The PROLINNOVA focuses on Participatory Innovation Development (PID) approach in agricultural research and development (ARD) and the natural resources management for agriculture through building on and supporting local innovations. The PID key concept is to pull ideas, experiences, skills and knowledge from local people, research and development organizations working in partnership and sharing resources for sustainability of agricultural development and livelihoods of the natural resources users (Critchley *et al*., 2006).

The global PROLINNOVA programme works through the country programmes, among these is the PROLINNOVA-Tanzania programme. The Tanzanian programme is coordinated and managed by the Participatory Ecological Land Use Management (PELUM)-Tanzania. The PELUM-Tanzania is a national network of Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) operating in Tanzania, which works towards improving sustainable agriculture, food security and sustainable community development. The long-term objectives of the PELUM-Tanzania are to build the capacity of farming community groups to accumulate ecological capital and stimulate farmer learning and inspire them to experiment and innovate in empowering ways for food security as well as sustainability. Thus, the PELUM-Tanzania, through its PROLINNOVA programme, envisages piloting the LISFs initiative under the Farmer Access to Innovation Resources (FAIR2). Feasibility study is one pre-requisite for piloting these Community Owned Innovation Funds (COIFs) in all LISFs piloting countries. Before piloting, clear understanding of enabling conditions and the challenges ahead for institutionalization of the PID in an effort to stimulate local innovation process through the LISFs approach is required. Present understanding show that the ARD funds are used by the formal institutions to involve farmers as they wish. Thus, PROLINNOVA is looking for mechanisms that are co-owned and managed by farmer innovators and their organizations. The FAIR2 aims are that, farmer innovators or their groups/organizations should be able to access these funds directly so that they can hire support from research or other services provider organisations, link up with other innovators, and/or share their findings more widely. This feasibility report is one output and first step towards piloting the LISFs by the PELUM-Tanzania. The Terms of References (TORs) for this feasibility is attached in Appendix 1.

2.0 FEASIBILITY STUDY METHODOLOGY

The study approach was desk-top quick reviews of the relevant documents and visitation of the key informants for discussions as main tools, these are as detailed in the sub-sections below.

2.1 Review of lessons from the LISFs experiences

The international LISFs experiences were reviewed using internet sources and presentations of the various PROLINNOVA meetings, from the PELUM Tanzania. The available documents were reviewed and appraised

for local experiences in terms of institutional set-up, approaches to farmer involvements, types of activities funded and funding mechanisms used, participating stakeholders, Monitoring and evaluations (M&E) systems employed and sustainability aspects. The documents studies were further explored through direct consulations with key informants at National, District and farmer levels.

2.2 Key informants' visits and consultations

At national level, key informants visited for consultations were: Community Agricultural Development Officer for the Participatory Agricultural Development and Empowerment Project (PADEP) in Dar-es-salaam, and the National Network of Small-scale Farmers Groups in Tanzania (MVIWATA) in Morogoro. At the MVIWATA head office, the Agricultural Marketing Officer and farmer groups' facilitator were met for consultation. At the District level, key informants were the PADEP District Officer (PDO) and the District Agriculture and Livestock Development Officers (DALDO) in Iringa District, which was one of the 31 districts that implemented the PADEP project in the country. At farmer level, consultations were held with farmer association in Idodi village and a farmer group in Mangalali village, which were involved in the implementation of PADEP Iringa District. Apart from this PADEP intervention District, visit was also made to Mbozi and Mbinga Districts to consult the DALDOs and/or District Agricultural Extension Officers (DEOs), and at least 2 farmer groups in each District. At the Districts level, the present District Agricultural Development Plans (DADPs) and set-up and funding under Agricultural Sector Development Programme (ASDP) framework were studied. Two farmer groups were selected for consultations in Mbozi District, one in Ivwanga village [Utafiti na Hifadhi ya Mazingira Ivwanga (UTHIMI)] and another one in Itepula village [Boresha Endeleza Daima (BED)]. The selection was based on their involvements in the relevant agricultural research and development activities, which started from the local innovative ideas. In Ivwanga village, the group is currently involved in improvement and promotion of traditional ridge tillage system in partnership with research and extension, which was inspired by the Indigenous Soil and Water Conservation-II (ISWC-II) programme activities, which was conducted between 1997 and 2001. In Itepula village, the group was directly involved in the ISWC-II Programme on dry season coffee irrigation innovation. In Mbinga District, consultations were done with two farmer groups: One in Mtama village [Kilimo Mseto Mtama (KIMMTA)], and another one, in Kitanda village [JUHUDI]. Both groups were involved in improvement of traditional fallowing practices in collaboration with Agricultural Research Institute-Uyole (ARI-Uyole), Sokoine University of Agriculture (SUA) and District extension under the TARPII-SUA project (2000-2004).

2.3. *ISF design consultation and meeting*

A draft report on the preliminary data was presented to key people in the PROLINNOVA programme, who were the PELUM-Tanzania coordinator and the PROLINNOVA project officer. Two key persons from the INADES formation Tanzania were consulted and invited to review the draft copy and provide inputs to the draft. Executive Director of the IRDO was consulted for opinions. The inputs from the programme and external people were incorporated, to develop an improved draft copy for presentation in stakeholder workshop organized by the PELUM-Tanzania.

2.4. Stakeholders workshop

In the stakeholders workshop held on 27/09/08, the improved draft copy was presented to the key stakeholders identified for the LISFs piloting in the central and southern highlands zones. The presented report was discussed and additional inputs given were incorporated in the final report.

3.0 FINDINGS

3.1 International LISFs experiences

Everywhere in the world, farmers are addressing livelihood constraints and exploring new opportunities by experimenting with unique combinations of indigenous knowledge and new ideas from variety of sources (Veldhuizen, *et al*., 2006; World Bank, 2005). Furthermore, the same report notes that farmer developed innovations include both "hard" technologies, and "soft" innovations, such as new ways of communications or marketing. These socio-economic changes are generated by groups rather than individuals (World Bank, 2005). These experiences have inspired ideas of building on local farmer innovations in order to enhance sustainability and accelerate agricultural development in Africa (Reij and Waters-Bayer, 2001). According to the World Bank (2005), current mechanisms of funding agricultural research and development favours formal elite organizations, such as, international research centres, universities, government institutions, None-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) etc. These organizations favour activities that originate from them and involve farmers in their activities rather than understanding and supporting the farmer-originated and-led initiatives. The resource poor farmers in rural areas cannot access the research and development funds to pursue their own initiatives and cannot genuinely influence these organisations. Thus, it has been often difficult for farmer innovators to gain relevant information or advice from scientists in interpreting farmers' experimental results, because the farmers cannot bring scientist to see local innovations in the field. Due to these barriers, local innovations often cannot spread and stimulate ideas among other farmers.

International reviews of the LISFs cases by Veldhuizen, *et al*., (2006), which seem to have relevant lessons for LISFs-Tanzanian situation for piloting are: (1) the case of Competitive Agricultural Technology Funds (CATFs), established in Uganda. In this case, the participation of non-traditional ARD organizations, in particular farmer organisations has been very limited. No project was submitted or led by a farmer group. However, the funds are used for local-level participatory research, development of information for dissemination materials and pre-multiplication of inputs (e.g. seeds); (2) the case of the Local Agricultural Research Committees (CIAL) in Latin America championed by the International Centre for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT), which had initial goal of research, incorporated the development activities such as collective production of crops for sale for sustainability of funds for their primary goal; (3) Similarly, the self-sustaining funding mechanism was also used in the "Learning Grants" case in East Africa by the Self-Financed Farmer Field Schools (SF-FFSs). The grants are applied by the farmer FFS groups in form of a loan to be repaid to a revolving fund, with a help of qualified FFS facilitator, experienced farmer or extension; (4) the case of Agricultural Technology and Information Response Initiative (ATIRI), the initiative which was partly financed by the World Bank loan, and was aimed at empowering farmers' groups to make technology and information demands from agricultural services providers. This initiative targeted CBOs to submit grant proposals for acquisition of technological inputs (e.g. planting materials), exchange visits to other farmers who have already adopted a technology, to cover the visits of researchers from Kenya Agricultural Research Institute and other costs of seeing, learning about and adopting technologies; (5) the case of India, the

National Innovation Foundation (NIF) was developed through the efforts of the Honeybee network. The network documented innovations and traditional practices and collected outstanding examples of contemporary knowledge and formed a database of grassroots honeybee innovations. Towards institutionalizing this approach the Indian Department of Science and Technology helped to establish the NIF, with main goal of providing institutional support in scouting, spawning, sustaining and scaling up grassroots innovations. The NIF supports individual innovators in further developing their innovations, in partnership with public and private sector actors, with a view to adding value and commercializing the innovations and (6) the case of Local Initiatives for Biodiversity, Research and Development (LIBRD), coordinating PROLINNOVA program in Nepal started the LISFs pilot, which is managed from the LIBRD, but now it aims to decentralize it to the management committee, which will be made of farmers' representative, local extension, representative from the line agencies and staff from the LIBRD. Innovations supported include technical (e.g. plant breeding, conservation of soil and water) or "soft" type (e.g. new institutional arrangement). According to Fenta et al., (2008), the experience from the Community-Based institution (CBI) in Ethiopia shows that farmers can manage financial resources efficiently by themselves.

3.2 The farmer-led research and development, and LISFs Experiences in Tanzania

3. 2. 1 The Case of the PADEP

The PADEP was a large project, with total funding of 70 billion Tanzanian shillings (Equivalent of USD 70 millions). The funding of the project was done by using the World Bank loan (56 billions Tshs) and the rest was the contribution of the government and involved communities (PADEP, 2006). This project covered total of 31 districts in both Tanzania's mainland (26) and the Island (5). The project was launched in August in the financial year 2003/04 and was closed in August in the financial year 2007/08. The overall goal of the project was to increase farmers' incomes and food security through alleviation of the communities' priority constraints to increased and sustained agricultural productivity. The specific objectives of the project were: (1) to increase capacities of the village communities and farmer groups in planning and implementation of agricultural development projects; (2) to strengthen capacities of services delivery agents, focusing on the communities priority agricultural development constraints, needs and goals; (3) to increase role of the private sector in provision of agricultural inputs services to the farming communities and marketing of agricultural outputs. To achieve these objectives and in order to reach the farming communities more effectively, the project allocated 75% of the funds to the local level (Villages and Districts) investments.

The PADEP had implementation set-up arrangements from the national to village level. At the national level, there was the PCU, headed by the project coordinator. The PCU at national level coordinates and ensure that PADEP's roles in the implementation of activities are undertaken according to the plans developed at the community and farmer groups levels, submitted to the Districts and to the PCU. The PCU is formed by the secretariat of the National Technical committee (NTC) and the NPSC and the interdisciplinary National Facilitation Team (NFT). The NFT was composed of the people from the different disciplines: Agriculture, Natural Resources Management (NRM), Livestock, Cooperatives, Community Development, Water and/or irrigation, representative from an agricultural development related NGOs, health, financial management and planning. The roles of facilitation teams were to facilitate capacity building in the participatory approaches, specifically to impart the knowledge and/or skills in Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA), participatory

project preparation and appraisal, participatory monitoring and evaluation, financial management, tendering and procurement, management of public and private partnerships, environment and livelihood, and create awareness on the HIV/AIDS, its impacts to the farming community and how to control. The national facilitation team conduct Training of Trainers (TOT) for the Districts, and then District teams conducted the TOT for the Wards' teams. The District and Ward teams selected villages and conducted the PRAs to identify priority constraints for increased agricultural productivity for the preparation of proposals for the CIS and the FGIS. Additional role, of the Ward teams is to assist the community and the farmer groups to develop the project proposals and guide the village community and farmers groups on technical aspects of the implementations of the CIS and that of the FGIS.

At zone level, there were Zonal Research and Extension Liaison Officers (ZRELO), these coordinate the dissemination of the new technologies suitable for respective areas in which project is implemented and collaborate with PADEP implementing Districts in the Zone.

At regional level, the secretariats in collaboration with the National Project Steering Committee (NPSC), selected the Districts for implementation of the PADEP activities. The selection criteria used were level of poverty, potential for agricultural production, experience in using participatory development approaches, District capacity for implementation of the project activities and willingness of the District to contribute to the District capacity building costs. The secretariat also received the CIS and the FGIS as part of the respective Districts' DADPs and DDPs and provided appropriate advice and undertook the follow up of implementation as for other development projects in that Region.

At District level, the District Executive Director (DED) by the assistance of the District Agriculture and Livestock Development Officer (DALDO) using the District Facilitation Team (DFT), which is coordinated by the PADEP District Officer (PDO) supervise the implementation in the District. There were two types of village level investments: Community Investment Sub-projects (CIS) and Farmer Groups Investment Sub-projects (FGIS). In each District, 30 villages were selected for the project implementation, thus there were 870 villages covered. For each village 46m shillings was allocated, out of these 35m was for the CIS, 30m for actual investment, and 5m was for local level hire of the technical services, training, projects identification and the CIS proposal development by the village community. The communities should contribute at least 20% of the actual investment costs of the proposed CIS by the respective village community. Their contribution can be in kind in form of labour, local materials and/or cash. Allocated fund for the FGIS was 11m for each village with 4 FGIS of 10-40HH each, target of 40-160 HH per village. This means that, each group of 40HH received 2.75m. Out of these, 0.75m was for the FGIS capacity building, which included: support to local level hands on practice training and learning visits and to hire the experts' technical assistance. Thus, each HH is allocated Tshs 18,750 for capacity building support. Each household was allocated support of Tshs 25,000 for consumable inputs per year and the HH is required to contribute at least 50% i.e. the same amount towards the FGIS. If the inputs are non-consumable and/or a new technology, the household is required to contribute 20% of the amount allocated.

Each District, received 175m per year, for three years from the project and each District contributed 10% of that amount (i.e.17.5m) for strengthening the Districts' capacities required for the implementation and supervision of the project activities. These funds were for training of the farmer groups and community committees on financial management, training of project facilitation teams at ward level, to acquire transports (vehicles) and office facilities, to cover expenses for follow up, monitoring & evaluation by the ward and district facilitation teams. Before implementation starts the DEDs and the Project Coordination Unit (PCU) sign the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The CIS and the FGIS are incorporated into the Districts Agricultural Development Plans (DADPs) and Districts Development Plans (DDPs), which are submitted to the Regional Secretariat.

The funding of the PADEP activities at District, community and farmer groups levels were done when the CIS and the FGIS have been approved by the Council Management Team (CMTs), which is composed of District Heads of Departments. The CIS and the FGIS committees opened their bank accounts and deposit into them their contributions and then sign the MOUs with the DEDs. The approved proposals of the CIS and the FGIS are submitted to the PCU. The DEDs open two bank accounts, one for District capacity building funds and another for CIS and FGIS funds and sign the MOUs with the PCU. The PCU transfer the approved amounts of the funds to the DED's district capacity building account and the CIS and the FGIS account. The DEDs transfer the received amounts of the funds to each CIS and FGIS accounts.

The CIS and the FGIS committees withdraw the funds from their accounts for expenditure items specified in their approved proposal. The meetings of all members are convened, when there is need for a decision to withdraw a specified amount for the implementation of an activity. The meeting minutes is prepared, singed by the village executive secretary or chairperson. The committee submit the minutes to the PDO or DALDO, who audit, approve and officially stamp the withdrawal request. The tendering and procurements were done using the legal government procedures.

The consultations with communities and farmer groups during this study show that, the PADEP approach empowered community and farmer groups to decide and control the process. They noted that funds allocated for FGIS were too small to achieve the objectives and the pre-fixed allocated amounts for the CIS, in some cases could not meet real costs of the CIS needed, however experience gained in funds management and control is an asset to them. The communities or groups have innovations/ideas to further develop, and support for inputs, training and learning visits are the most important areas.

The PADEP project used the M and E system, which include: physical and financial progress reporting, site meetings in construction sites, annual physical visits by national level staff, mid-term review, and comprehensive project closure report and impact appraisal.

The sustainability of the project interventions were viewed in terms of the physical infrastructure established which provide the services needed by the community. The knowledge, skills and experiences gained during the project is used for livelihoods activities. Financial sustainability avenue is services fees from the completed CIS.

2.3.2 The case of the ISWC-II programme

The Indigenous Soil and Water Conservation-II (ISWC-II) programme focused on research and extension of the local people innovations on the land husbandry techniques and practices. It was conducted in three Francophone and five Anglophone African countries. The Francophone African countries were: Burkina Faso, Cameroon and Tunisia and Anglophone countries were Ethiopia, Kenya, Tanzania, Zimbabwe and Uganda. The ISWC-II programme in Tanzania started in 1997 and ended in 2001. In Tanzania, the ISWC-II programme supported the joint research between farmers, researchers, government extension workers and NGOs related to the natural resources management and agricultural services. The programme Districts of interventions were Mbeya rural, Mbozi and Ileje in Mbeya region, Mbinga in Ruvuma District, Iringa and Njombe in Iringa Region. The research partners were Agricultural Research Institute-Uyole, and the Sokoine University of Agriculture. Extension partners were government District extension offices and the NGOs in the respective Districts of operations. The objectives of the ISWC-II programme were to: (1) identify, analyze and improve the effectiveness of the ISWC practices, (2) to increase the knowledge base of the ISWC practices through documentation of the case studies and/or more in-depth studies of existing innovations, and (3) to promote dissemination of research results and lessons from the joint research and extension process.

The institutional set-up for the ISWC-II had the National Programme Coordinator (NPC) at the government institution, then the Cooperative College Moshi (CCM), reporting to the National Programme Steering Committee (NPSC). At regional level, there were CCM Regional Program Coordinators (RPC) in Iringa, Mbeya and at Sokoine University of Agriculture for Ruvuma, region, and the research contact person at ARI-Uyole. These assist the NPC in coordination for the implementation of activities at lower level. At district level, there were contact persons, either a government extension officials or from the partner NGOs. At village level, there were farmer innovator groups/individuals.

The ISWC-II programme approach was Participatory Technology Development (PTD). The CCM build the capacity of the ISWC-II partners in use of the PTD approach in all stages of the ISWC-II research and extension activities. The stages included: identification of the innovations, analyses and screening of the innovations, selection of innovations for validation, joint experimentation, monitoring and evaluation and results sharing and promotion. The ISWC programme financially supported all these stages of the PTD approach. The NPC disburse fund to the RPC, these centrally controlled the funds at their institutions, the CCM-RPC for Iringa and Mbeya and the SUA for Ruvuma region. The disbursements were based on the action plans developed in the joint reflection workshops. The funds for the respective activities were disbursed to lead implementing agency (research, extension, NGOs). The funding covered per-diems, transport, field documentation, laboratory analyses, field days/village meetings, exchange and/or cross visits by the farmer groups.

The farmer groups selected for discussion in this feasibility study in Mbozi district, one has direct and another has indirect link with the ISWC-II programme. The farmer group at Itepula directly worked with the ISWC-II programme about eight years ago. The group conducted joint experimentation on one of their members' (Ezekiel Mwasenga's) innovation, about application of 60 litres of water per coffee tree in dry season (September) to induce early flowering. This innovation increases coffee tree productivity, reduces

frequency of the spraying requirement for the Coffee Berry Disease (CBD), by the time CBD inoculums reach infectious levels in January/February the coffee berries are at advanced stage of maturity, a stage less vulnerable to the CBD. This innovation was jointly validated and jointly improved over two years and results were shared and disseminated annually in the village meetings before the ISWC-II programme ended. Discussions with some of the group members revealed that, the innovation is currently being used by about 33% of the coffee growers in the village. The main hindering factors for the slow spread are the unavailability of irrigation water and supply systems to the farm. Rainwater water harvesting micro-dams was innovated by the group as a solution to the water supply problem and this has been adopted by other 8 groups. Currently the village has 12 rainwater harvesting micro-dams for the purpose. At present, water is fetch from the dams and carried to the farms. Increasing the number of micro-dams and acquiring of the generators for pumping and the piped water supply system to the nearest farms are viewed as the solution to the water constraint problem. The original group is now registered and has bank account managed by themselves, has initiated a network with other coffee growers groups. Their current requirements for the support are: needed irrigation inputs, exposure to other innovative and affordable coffee irrigation technologies, technical assistance and advice with respect to micro-dams construction and water efficient coffee irrigation systems and the optimum coffee husbandry practices under irrigation. The Tanzania Coffee Research Institute (TaCRI) is not aware of these local initiatives. The TaCRI emphasis is on the production and distribution of the CBD and rust resistant coffee varieties in the area.

The group at Ivwanga village has been working on joint improvement of traditional ridge cultivation system, using the PTD approach. Farmers, researchers from the Agricultural Research Institute–Uyole and the District extension, undertook the work for about 10 years now (1998-2008). This local knowledge was inspired by the participation of a researcher in the ISWC activities. The initial 5 years (1998-2003) small grant was from the Tanzania Agricultural Research Project-II (TARP-II) jointly funded by the GOT and World Bank as part of scientific research on soil surface management, with the grant value of USD 2500 per year. In 2005/06, other small funds were sourced from the GOT under the scientific research for rainwater harvesting technologies, which are used to support promotion of the improved ridge-tillage system as part of *insitu* rainwater harvesting. These funds mainly supported research inputs, per-diems and transport for researchers, extension allowances and transport during field visits. As the plots sizes and numbers of participating households gradually increased, the funds could not support all the inputs costs, thus farmers contributed 60% of input costs. This work is based on the ISWC practice and was initiated by the research institute, after an observation that the ridge practices is widely used for growing beans and groundnut crops in the area, though there is no formal scientific recommendation. The analysis of reasons for using, weaknesses and the entry points for science based ideas were undertaken. The on-station validation of combinations of the farm practices and modern technologies were undertaken. The results were taken on-farm for joint verifications and adaptations of the best identified combination of the practices in small plots and gradually expanded to an acre scale. The tie idea introduced and tested was found to increase the labour, though, the effectiveness of the traditional ridge tillage in soil and water conservation increased by over 75%. Currently, farmer group has come up with the idea of using animal drawn plough, which they would like to test it and demonstrate to more farmers for increased uptake. The improved tillage system is currently used at farm scale by over 60 households in the village and other two villages. In order to test and

demonstrate the benefits of the new idea, they have developed; they indicated support for inputs (improved seeds, pesticides and fertilizers), exposure to more tillage practices and implements that improve the soil productivity, hands on practice training, monitoring and evaluation, results sharing and village field shows. This group is not currently registered, however, has a constitution and a bank account managed by them, and is the member of the SACCOS in their area.

The sustainability indicators of the ISWC-II programme were that, farmer groups that emerged during the project period exists to date, activities results are gradually being turned into development innovations by more households in the villages, the original farmer innovator group at Itepula is now registered, other groups have emerged in the village and neighboring villages, improving and/or adapting the innovations, research and extension are using PTD approach with farmer groups and knowledge and skills gained during the ISWC-II is used by farmer groups in other livelihood activities.

2.3.3 The case of the TARPII-SUA project

The TARP II-SUA project was a Government of Tanzania-NORAD funded project on "Food Security and Household Income for Smallholder Farmers Applied Research with Emphasis on Women". This was a large pilot project with total funding of Tshs 5,227m (USD 5.4m) for a period of 4 years [2000-2004] (TARP II-SUA Project, 2000/2004). The project was conducted in the Eastern and Southern Highlands Agricultural Research Zones of Tanzania. The project had specified outputs, which included: (1) to conduct client-oriented and demand driven on-farm/on-station research in production, processing and marketing, (2) to strengthen Farmer-Research-Extension Linkage, (3) to train MAFC staff for improved research performance, (4) to develop proposal for sustainable research funding mechanism, and (5) to assess and document impact of agricultural research. Each output had its budget-line for implementation of the activities.

At national policy level, the project institutional set-up had the National Project Coordinator (NPC) at SUA, who was reporting to the National Project Steering Committee (NPSC). The NPSC had members from the farming community, private sector, NGOs, MAFC, SUA, GOT, NORAD and Norwegian institutions representative. The role of the steering committee is to make decisions on the project implementation and oversee the implementation progress. The implementation at the national level was supervised by the project implementation team (PIT), which is headed by the NPC and has the output leaders at SUA as its members. The role of the PIT is to implement the day to day central activities at national level, arrange and lead the monitoring and evaluation teams for the implemented sub-projects. The members of the PIT come from SUA and the MAFC. The project had the Impact Assessment Team (IAT), which has main role of assessing and publishing the impact of the past agricultural research and monitor changes brought by the TARPII-SUA project in terms of working attitudes, social relations, agronomic, environmental, economic and institutional. At zonal level, there were 34 Project Leaders (PLs), who were directly reporting to the PIT for the sub-projects physical and financial performance in their respective institutes. At field level, implementations were undertaken in collaboration with extension and farmer groups and/or contact farmers.

The research themes for sub-projects were pre-established by the experts and call for proposals were announced twice. Researchers from Ministry of Agriculture Food Security and Cooperatives (MAFC), SUA and Norwegian Universities and Agriculture and NRM Research Institutions competed for the research grants. The grant sizes offered per annum was in the range of about Tshs 13-30m equivalent to USD 13,000-30,000 per sub-project. The research concept notes were first submitted and screened by the anonymous reviewers and the accepted concept notes were given USD 500 to be developed into full proposals. The full proposals submitted were screened at two stages, first by the project implementation team for format completeness, and then, those which met format requirements were screened for scientific quality by the anonymous reviewers. In the two calls of proposals, submitted concept notes were over 600. About 40% of the concept notes reached the full proposal stage. The selected sub-projects in total for implementation were 34, which were under the leaderships of the PLs. The success from this project activity, founded the institutionalized Programme on Agriculture and Natural Resources Transformation for Improved Livelihood (PANTIL) at SUA.

The research funds at sub-project level were centrally controlled by the PLs at their institutions. The funds were used for research inputs-including equipments, construction materials for specific structures for research work [e.g. dams, troughs etc], per-diems and transport for farmers, researchers and extension workers on project activities and for preparation of scientific publications of research findings. The flexibility existed to the use of the funds for extension-oriented activities, such as field days, results sharing village meetings, exchange or cross visits and extension materials. The project level research activities were centrally supported by the project coordination office at SUA. These included scientific conferences, capacity building trainings and annual project meetings.

The farmer-research-extension linkage output has its own central funds. These funds supported zonal farmer forums, documentation and dissemination of the forums outcomes and feedback, farmer exchange and cross visits within and outside the zone, organized field days within the zones, publication and dissemination of extension materials and also used for the prizes of the best farmers, extension and researchers in each zone.

The M and E systems used included: physical and financial reports, field follow-up by the PIT/IAT members, annual review workshops and reports, mid-term review and final physical and financial report of the project achievements measured against the stated project's outputs.

The farmer groups visited and consulted in Mbinga District had a direct link with TARPII-SUA project. They were involved in a sub-project on improvement of traditional fallowing systems using the improved fallows innovations. They view that, their involvement in this sub-project exposed them to many other soil fertility and natural resources management options, through learning from exchange visits, visiting research and other relevant organization. As indication of intervention sustainability, they still own tree seedlings nurseries for contour farming and woodlots establishments on their farms; they have initiated the coffee seedlings nurseries using the skills and knowledge learnt from the project activities. In addition, they plan to integrate number of soil fertility management options learnt into their traditional *Ngoro* cultivation

system. This indigenous technique is used to conserve soil and water, and to manage the soil productivity in steep slopes. Currently, the groups have bank accounts and they are members of the SACCOS. Both groups in Mbinga district are not registered, though they have constitutions and they have joined the Utiri farmer groups' network. The area of support they would like are inputs for nurseries, soil fertility management, improved seeds, learning visits, hands on practice training, soil analysis, joint activities planning, monitoring and evaluation, results sharing and promotion activities.

2. 3.4. The case of Rural Markets Development Project by the MVIWATA

The Rural Markets Development Project (RMDP) was large project funded by the French Government (Agence Francaise de Developpment (AFD) to the Government of Tanzania. It was a grant worth 5.7million Euro. The counterpart contribution was Tshs 1,042 million and in-kind contribution of Tshs 50million, and Tshs 992million as government tax exemptions. The RMDP started in January 2002 and officially ended in December 2004, though it received extension up to June 2005. The project locations were: Kibaigwa village in Kongwa District, Dodoma; Nyandira village in Mvomero District, Morogoro; Tandai and Tawa villages in Morogoro Rural District. The aim of the RMDP was to increase the outlets for agricultural produces in the four project areas in sustainable and replicable way. The five main activities to achieve this objective were to: (1) construct market infrastructures and their supply with clean water, (2) set-up local groups made of market users and managing the markets in a sustainable and economically viable way (market boards), (3) rehabilitate roads infrastructure to enhance the market accessibility, (4) construct two clean water schemes, and (5) support MVIWATA networks development.

Mtandao wa Vikundi vya Wakulima Tanzania (MVIWATA), which is a CSO, formed by the Networks of Small-scale Farmers Groups in Tanzania. The MVIWATA was founded in 1993 and is formally registered as CSO in 1995. It has over 60,000 members, who belong to the groups of 5-100 members organised in at least 150 local networks. The RMDP was executed by the MVIWATA of behalf of GOT. The organizational structure of the MVIWATA at time of RMDP implementation consisted of: (1) Board of Trustees, which has a main function of giving direction to overall policy orientation of the organisation; (2) Annual General Meeting (AGM), is the highest body in the organisation of MVIWATA, with the mandate to take decisions with regards to budget, plan of action, orientation. The meeting is held once a year in which representative of the networks throughout the country participate; (3) the steering committee of 9 members, all farmers, whom are elected every 3 years by the AGM. This is the decision making body on behalf of the general assembly; (4) coordination office, which is composed of the team of technical experts and administrative staff, led by the National Coordinator, currently, the Executive Director; and (5) the members, these are individual producers who are members of MVIWATA. The project had Project Monitoring Unit (PMU), headed by the Project Leader and Assistant Project Leader (APL), who was engineer; in addition, there were 4 Project Site Officers (PSOs), who were agronomists.

The MVIWATA implemented the RMDP by hiring a main technical consultant, the FERT/GRET consortium, which is an association of two French non-governmental organisations involved in rural development. The consultant was hosted in Tanzania by the permanent office of the PMU. Other contracted institutions by the MVIWATA to implement activities were: INADES formation, UMADEP, LVIA, CCM, ITECO Consult and other

service providers. The first four were for capacity building training activities and the ITECO Consult for civil works. Services provided by others include external audit, equipments, evaluation, documentation (video & cartoon) and legal advice. According to the MVIWATA (2006) RMDP final report, the overall process went through the following steps:

Step I: In 2000, the AFD signed financial grant agreement with the GOT for financing the RMDP.

Step II: In 2001, two documents were signed between MVIWATA and the Ministries and District Councils; (a) A grant agreement setting modalities of delegating the grant management to MVIWATA, on behalf of the GOT, to become the Project Executing Agency (PEA); (b) The Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), which described the modalities of implementation of the project (reporting, ownership, maintenance and management of the project infrastructure). These took place after lengthy negotiation between the MVIWATA, the Ministries and the Districts.

Step III: In 2001-02, MVIWATA entered into contracts with Tanzanian and foreign organisations for the provision of services necessary to implement the RMDP. These were main technical consultant, the FERT/GRET consortium, the capacity building training institutions (INADES, UMADEP, LVIA and CCM), the civil works companies and other service providers.

The RMDP project expected outcomes were revised and refined with stakeholders in a project launching workshop in February 2002. According to the MVIWATA (2005), documented implementation process of the RMDP, two members of the MVIWATA steering committee were elected to supervise and make monthly follow-up of the implementation. These include verification of the quality of the civil works on the ground, meeting with the contractors and reporting of the monthly follow-up to MVIWATA Steering committee. They were also authorised signatories of the RMDP funds. The funds supported hire of services for civil works, capacity building trainings, visits by the government officials and other services hired. Other capacity building activities supported under the RMDP were workshops, exchange visits, publication of the newsletter PAMBAZUKO and farmer leaders training sessions.

The M & E system used under the RMDP included: the physical and financial reports, field follow-up by the two elected members of the MVIWATA steering committee and PMU project leader, external evaluation services and the final physical and financial RMDP report.

The management and sustainability of the markets in four locations were addressed through establishment of the registered market boards as private companies. These market boards were established after lengthy studies and negotiations with the District councils over ownership and management of the markets. It was clear in the MOUs signed between MVIWATA and the District councils in 2001, that the market infrastructure to become the property of the District councils, thus MVIWATA lost the ownership to the Districts. In principle, the market board members were from the local SACCOS, MVIWATA and in one case, the District council. It was agreed that, the market boards should run as any private business as the economic efficiency of the markets was recognized to be a pillar for their sustainability. The markets generate income for maintenance of markets infrastructure and operational costs. The generated revenue is shared between the district councils and the market boards. The local SACCOS are linked to the market boards for cereal banking

for enhanced profitability. The SACCOS are owned by the small-scale farmer groups, whom are members of the MVIWATA.

The drafts of the market management contracts and MOUs had to be prepared by the PMU and discussed with the Districts. After the main points were sorted out and agreed upon the contracts and MOUs were taken to the District Council full meeting for approval. After, the approvals of the contracts and the MOUs by the Districts full councils, the DEDs and/or District council chairperson and market boards signed the contracts and the MOUs, witnessed by the MVIWATA and the legal advisor. After, the contracts and MOUs were signed the markets started to operate under the market boards.

3. 3 Analysis of institutional, policy and legal framework

A guiding policy for agricultural research and development in the country is the Agricultural Sector Development Strategy (ASDS), which was approved by the government in 2001. This strategy was geared towards addressing agricultural development constraints and agricultural sector contribution to the economic growth and poverty reduction objectives. The operational response to the ASDS is the Agricultural Sector Development Programme (ASDP). The ASDP has decentralized policy framework for governance and investment at the local level. This includes shifting from central planning to local planning of the ARD activities in the country (URT, 2006).

The ARD institutions in Tanzania include: government ministries, universities, private sector, CSOs, private consultancy firms and farmer associations, networks and formal or informal local farmer groups. These institutions are either mandated to undertake research and/or extensions services. In Tanzania, acts and/or government decrees, established the Ministries, Universities and District councils. The CSOs should be registered according to the government NGO policy under the NGO Act No. 24 of 2002. The farmers' organisations and networks are also registered by the ministry of home affairs or by the cooperatives. Formally registered and informal farmer groups are recognized and accepted to work on the common development problem. This is the case for farmer groups in the Farmer Field Schools (FFS) methodology of extension adopted in the country, which has been a major thrust of extension under the ASDP at District level.

Currently, the ARD in the country is guided by the ASDS using its operational framework, the ASDP. All the ARD actors or institutions are required by the policy to fit in the ASDP framework. The agricultural research and development under the ASDP are organized under four Agricultural Sector Lead Ministries (ASLMs), which are Ministry of Agriculture, Food Security and Cooperatives (MAFC), Ministry of Livestock Development (MLD), Ministry of Local Governments (MLGs) and Ministry of Industries, Trade and Marketing (MITM). The MLGs is responsible for extensions services at the District level with technical and advisory support from the regional secretariats and the Directorate of extension services of the MAFC, MLD & MITM at the national level. The mandate of the research services are in the Directorate of Research and Training.

3.3.1 Agricultural Research Services

The research in the Ministries of Agriculture, Food Security and Cooperatives (MAFC) and Ministry of Livestock Development (MLD) are conducted under the Directorate of Research and Training (DRT) and Directorate of Research, Training and Extension (DRTE), respectively. The DRT and DRTE are headed by the Director, who has assistant Directors for different research programs. For example, in the MAFC, the DRT has assistant Directors (ADs) for Crop Research Programme, Natural Resources Management Research Programme, Farming Systems Research and the Training Programme. Their roles are that of coordination and policy formulation and advice. The agricultural research activities are conducted in the zones, thus each zone has a Zonal Director (ZDRT), at one of the selected research institute, as the zonal headquarter. In the MLD, the research activities at zonal level are headed by the station in-charge, not the Directors as for the MAFC. Under the ZDRT, there are two assistants, the Zonal Research Coordinator (ZRC) and the Principal of the Agricultural Training Institute (ATI). In the new coming set-up, which has yet to be effected, these two assistants to the ZDRT are expected to be named Assistant Zonal Director Research (AZDR), and Assistant Zonal Director Training (AZDT), respectively. Under the two assistants and zonal in-charge for the livestock research are Heads of Research Programmes, under which there are Heads of sub-programmes. Researchers' projects are directly supervised by the Heads of sub-programs. Thus, the research project planning and budgeting starts from researchers, which is discussed at the sub-program and programme levels. The proposals are presented at the institute and/or stakeholder's annual research meeting. This meeting is a place where research plans are approved directly or accepted with amendments or rejected. Then the accepted projects are submitted to the Heads of the Programmes for compilation and submission to the ZRC, who compile them for the zone. The ZRC and Head of Programmes together with select disciplinary Zonal Technical Committee (ZTC) members, go through each accepted project to check for the advised amendments by the meeting. In case, the ZTC is not satisfied, the project is withheld and the concern researcher is informed through his/her Head of Programme. The approved projects are submitted by the ZDRT to the DRT, who compiles them for the country with assistance of the ADs. This forms the basis of budget line for research to be submitted to the Permanent Secretary of the MAFS, who compiles the whole Ministry's budget to be presented in the parliament by the Minister. The approved budget by parliament is used by the treasury to disburse funds to the Ministry. The Ministry allocates funds to the respective research and development areas using the submitted budget lines as the guideline. The received fund by the DRT or DRTE is allocated to the research institutes, using each institute's request as a guideline. The same is repeated to research programmes, sub-programmes and the research projects levels. Often, the researchers' requests are much higher than disbursed funds, and then the head of the programmes in collaboration with the ZRC decides to prioritize projects to be funded in that particular year. Some research projects originate at the ministerial level, and are adopted at the zonal level. These are determined by the government strategic targets or necessity at that particular time. The government funds are managed by the zonal sub-treasuries, thus each researcher apply the funds for the research project activity and/or items approved through the institute authority. The government financial laws, procedures and regulations are strictly observed in funds expenditure. Mostly, the funds are allocated for research inputs, fuel, per-diems, office consumables, specialised supplies (e.g. laboratory chemicals, small equipments etc). Currently, the research is financed under the Agricultural Sector Development Program (ASDP) arrangement. The ASDP research funding at the zonal level is through the competitive Zonal Agricultural Research and Development Funds (ZARDEFs). The overall ZARDEFs management apply the Client Oriented Research and Development Management Approach

(CORDEMA). Thus the ZARDEFs are managed by independent committees, in which farmers are represented at all levels. The zonal committees determine the research priority in collaboration with the Zonal Technical Committees (ZTCs). The calls for proposals for priority research areas are tendered and best proposals selected and awarded the contracts. The ZARDEFs grants are open for outsourcing to any research service provider who submitted a winning proposal to address one of the priority research areas tendered.

At the institutional level, additional research funds are accessed through local and international grants for collaborative research activities. This type of funding depends on the individual researcher's efforts and contacts he/she has developed. The project proposal for funding may originate from the researcher at the institute or a research partner outside the institute. Then the institute enters into contract with research partner or have Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The funds from these types of sources are transferred into the institute's self-hep accounts. The administrative fee equivalent to 10% of the total amount of the funds is charged for the institute's accountability for the management of funds and operational costs. The responsible researchers should apply the funds from the institute in accordance to the agreed expenditure items. The funds management and application adheres to the government financial procedures and regulations.

3.3.2 Agricultural extension services

The agricultural extensions services are offered by the government ministries, the CSOs, the private sector, the universities, the private consultancy firms and the farmer associations, farmer networks and formal or informal local farmer groups. The extension service in the MAFC and MLD are conducted under the Director of Crop Development (DCD) and Director of Research, Training and Extension (DRTE), respectively. These are assisted by the disciplinary programme's Directors. The roles of the central extension offices as those of the research directorates are coordination and policy formulation and advice. The field extension part is undertaken by the Local Government Authorities (LGAs) in collaboration with the CSOs. The LGAs, fall under the DEDs, who supervises all the development activities in the Districts. In the Agricultural Sector Development, the DEDs are assisted by the District Agriculture and Livestock Development Officers (DALDOs).

The Agricultural Sector Development Programme (ASDP) emphasises, the decentralized approach, which starts with development problems diagnosis at village level, then compiled at the Ward level and then into the District Agricultural Development Plans (DADPs), which is an integral part of the DDPs. The DADPs receive 75% of the ASDP funds. Funds are allocated to three sub-components at local level: (1) Basic District Agricultural Development Grant (DADG), meant for financing the investments in infrastructure or productive assets; (2) Local agricultural services (DAEG), meant for salaries, operation costs, financing the cost of contracting private agricultural services providers. These include grants to farmer groups to hire extension services directly through the FFS approaches or other participatory approaches. These grants to farmers will gradually increase from 0.5billion in 2006/07 to 3.5 billion in 2012/13; (3) District Agricultural Capacity Building and Reform (A-CBG). The A-CBG is for training and capacity building of Local Government Authority (LGA) and to finance LGA reform.

The ASDP uses a basket funding, whereby the government and development partners deposit the funds into holding account in Bank of Tanzania (BOT), operated by the accountant general. The funds are transferred to exchequer bank account, from where the quarterly disbursements are effected to the ASLMs: MITM, MAFC and MLD and directly to LGAs. The ASLMs transfer the funds into ZARDEFs accounts for research activities at Zonal level. The third and fourth quarters' disbursements depend on the satisfactory physical and financial management performance. The ASDP basket fund accounting policies and procedures should comply with the existing government accounting policies and procedures. The accounts were prepared in accordance with the Public Finance Act No. 6 of 2001 and its regulations, and operated in line with generally accepted public sector accounting practice.

The CSOs are recognized as important agents in community development efforts. The CSOs are generally led by the Executive Directors, who are responsible to the Board of Directors. The CSOs are well versed in participatory community development approaches, however, their coverage of intervention area are much smaller that the District councils. They mostly use the local government extensions workers in their areas of operations. Most CSOs are not for profit organisations committed to community development process. Thus, they are supported by the development partners, LGAs and beneficiaries contribute some amount of funds to their programmes. The development partners deposit the funds directly to the CSOs accounts for the agreed programme activities.

3.4 Important lessons learnt for implementing LISFs project

The lessons learnt from the case studies and analyses of the existing institutional, policy and legal framework for implementing the LISFs can be grouped into: funding volume, level of decentralization, types of activities supported, community contributions, enabling policy environment, nature and diversity of stakeholders, level of farmer participation, monitoring and evaluation (M & E) systems adopted, sustainability and accountability, openness and transparency.

3.4.1 Funding volume

All the projects had large amount of funds, which allowed having separate institutional set-up for implementation of the projects within the existing PEA. Most set-ups consisted of the PCU/PMU, the steering committees and the implementation or facilitation teams (PIT/PFT). These set-ups were administratively supported by the project funds to undertake their roles in the projects. Furthermore, due to the volume of the funds they had, these projects were able cover wide-geographical areas and/or to undertake large investments.

3.4.2 Level of funds decentralization

The case studies differed in level of decentralizing funding to farmer groups or lower levels. The PADEP and the RMDP had highest level of decentralized systems of funds control by the target groups at lower level. However, decentralization was not totally smooth under both cases, due to the traditional attitudes, social

relations over the role of resources control and decisions. These are explained by the reported experience as follows:

- The PADEP project informants revealed in some cases, the empowerments of communities were perceived as a threat to the traditional roles of professionals and/or leaders. Thus there were interference with communities' development perspectives and thus the communities' decisions were influenced. In such cases, the identified CIS were the perspectives of the local leaders or professionals, which were outwardly accepted by the village communities, but inwardly they felt is not their priority development problem, thus, the established CIS have remain the white elephants. This, show that the community empowerment through participatory approaches is a process, which requires continuous learning and induction of positive attitude and aptitude into the communities, local leaders and professionals.
- Another challenge in the PADEP was allocated amount of funds in advance to the CIS and FGIS in some cases were not adequate for communities to address fully the concerns they are facing.
- The MVIWATA faced complex negotiations with Ministries and Districts, particularly over ownership of the RMDP, or to become the PEA on behalf of the GOT.
- The MVIWATA could not use the AFD funds as they wish, on their specific activities they planned as part of the RMDP, for example the two annual workshops (2003 & 2004) were not funded by the AFD.
- The MVIWATA lost ownership of markets infrastructure to the District councils, as this was one of conditions in the MOUs they signed with District. The MVIWATA complain that, they could not understand the MOUs properly because were written in English but it did not help. Finally, they remain as key player in market boards for sustainable management of the markets.

3.4.3 Types of activities supported

In all case studied, the capacity building activities (training, learning visits, exchange of experiences) were funded. In addition, the PADEP, the RMDP and TARP-II SUA supported the hire of expert services, purchase of farm inputs and infrastructure investments. The PADEP and RMDP were development-oriented projects, while, the TARPII-SUA and the ISWC-II both incorporated both research and development in their approaches.

3.4.4 Community contributions

The contribution of the communities were both in cash and in-kind. The requirement for the cash contribution featured mostly in the PADEP case. In all projects, in-kind contribution in form of labour, farm resources (land plots & animal) were present. In less risky, development initiatives that contributes immediately to household income or food security, farmer groups are willing to contribute 50% in cash and 100% in-kind (labour and farm resources) of the costs of the activities.

3.4.5 Enabling policy environment

The GOT under its ASDP framework has adopted the decentralization policy with emphasis on the governance and investment at the local level. To this commitment, currently, there are funds for grants to FFS or other groups using the participatory approaches under the DAEG sub-component disbursed to the

District councils. The FFS groups are not necessarily legally registered, only requirement is that they have leadership and are recognized by the village authority and extension worker of the area. Most FGIS under the PADEP and the FFS groups, which received support, were not legally registered groups.

3.4.6 Nature and diversity of the stakeholders

The GOT was one of the key stakeholders in the PADEP and the RMDP, where the GOT has made direct financial and administrative contributions to the projects. In other two cases, the GOT contributions were indirect, such as salaries of the staff participating in the projects activities as part of their works and provision of the working facilities (vehicles, office space, laboratory etc). All project had the development partners, the CSOs, District extensions workers, government research institutions and private sector as part of the stakeholders. The GOT as main stakeholder of the PADEP and the RMDP is currently mainstreaming the approaches into the ASDP.

3.4.7 Level of farmer participation

The ISWC-II programme used the bottom-up approach, which built on identified local initiatives and thus harnessed the social capital (local knowledge, skills and experiences). The PADEP and the RMDP built on the priority local concerns by introducing known solutions from the professional point of view.

3.4.8 Monitoring and evaluation systems

The projects implementation progress reports were use by all the projects. Mid-term, annual and end of the project reviews and field visits by the M & E teams from the coordinating units and development partner representatives were common approaches in most of the projects. The TARP-SUA in addition, had the impact assessment team, which monitored changes brought by the project during the course of the implementation. There was regular follow-up in the RMDP, undertaken by a team of two appointed persons among the MVIWATA steering committee and the PMU.

3.4.9 *Sustainability*

The sustainability is viewed from many angles, which include: physical, social, economic, ecological and process in terms of existence, continuity and improvement over time. The key informant consulted views indicated some sustainability aspects of the projects. For example, the farmer groups that emerged during projects interventions still exist and some have joined farmer networks, some are have developed constitutions and/or registered. The knowledge and skill gained through the projects are used for livelihoods activities e.g. skills on trees seedlings nursery being applied by the groups in Mbinga District for coffee seedlings production for their use and sale. The development of irrigation intake by the PADEP in Idodi village triggered a new “soft” innovation on rice crop bank as way to increase profitability. As the irrigation intake was developed, apart from reduced irrigation water conflicts among the users, also, the rice productivity increased, but the prices offered by middlemen traders was too low at harvest time. Then the Idodi farmers’ association sought a support from “Ndunduliza”, a micro-financing institution, to support the rice bank at the Idodi SACCOS in order to sale their crop at profitable prices. In the RMDP case, the markets were linked to farmers’ owned SACCOS in each area for enhancing produce profitability. The physical infrastructure and the people’s capacity built through trainings during the projects were viewed as evident sustainability

indicators in the process of development. Revolving funds approach, such as the ones used by the CIALs in Latin America and SF-FFSs in East Africa are viewed as financial sustainability avenues. For instance, the RMDP, setting-up of commercial market boards system and for the PADEP, revolving of the grants in the FGIS and charges for the services offered from the completed CIS seem as LISFs financial sustainability avenues.

3.4.10 Transparency, delegation and accountability

The transparency, decentralization of the funds and delegation of the roles to lower levels significantly reduced costs, increased good governance of the resources and increased timeliness in the implementation of activities on one hand. On the other, the accountability of the service providers to the communities increased. This was explicitly admitted by the key informants at all levels, who were involved in the PADEP activities.

3.4.11 Competitive grant process

The competitive grant award systems, such as one used by the CATFs in Uganda and by the TARPII-SUA in Tanzania are not farmer and development agents friendly. For the LISFs piloting simple application process and budget proposal could be sufficient grants award system.

3.4.12. Targeting the grants

Experience of the TARPII-SUA project, reveal that small-holder farmers, with emphasis on women were important conditions for the sub-project. The 50% participation was emphasized in all the activities in the project. In the LISFs pilots, emphasis should be on innovations relevant to all social groups, without negative gender implications. In LISFs approach it seems important to deliberately include in the Zonal implementation teams the women researchers and extension workers.

3.5 Feasibility for piloting the LISFs in Tanzania

From the findings of this feasibility, it is evident that, there are enabling conditions for piloting LISFs towards stimulating the local innovation processes as follows:

- Existence of farmer groups to build on, which have experience in participatory development approaches, such as, joint identification of local innovations, analyses, joint experimentation, monitoring and evaluation, documentation and promotion. The two previous sister programmes, the ISWC-II and Promoting Farmer Innovators (PFI) are the cases in point.
- Recognition of the importance of the smallholder farmers' roles under the ASDP in agricultural research and development, and envisaged increased funding of the FFS or other groups under the DAEG, the LISFs pilots in Tanzania would contribute to understanding of the mechanisms towards institutionalization of the decentralized funding at local level. This provides the opportunity for the promotions of the innovations and for stimulating farmer innovations processes.
- Existence of farmer groups innovative initiatives towards solving their own development problems, as evident in the farmer groups visited during this feasibility study.

- The local partner CSOs' experience in the participatory approaches would help to facilitate the institutionalization of the PID approach for facilitating local innovation process and farmer empowerment in the research and development processes.
- Community exposure to different development committees, cooperatives, micro-finance institutions and participatory approaches, had created foundation for piloting the management of the LISFs.
- The decentralization policy of the government under the ASDP towards empowerment of the local communities in the agricultural research and development process provides an enabling environment for joint experimentation between farmers, researchers and extension workers.
- The majority of the existing farmer groups own the bank accounts and/or are members of the SACCOS or farmer networks/associations.

3.6 Challenges for LISFs piloting

Potential challenges for piloting the LISFs, which are foreseen and suggestions of ways to deal with them are as follows:

- The LISFs is a new initiative, thus it will take time to be understood and internalized by all partners in the implementation process. Thus it is important before field implementation starts, the zonal coordinators to organize training workshops for key partners and create a common understanding on the concepts, including farmer innovations and innovators.
- The less known individual innovations may be at risk due to increasing focus to the support of the farmer groups' innovative initiatives. It would be important to persuade individuals' willingness to share their innovation with others, whom may join to experiment with it.
- To handle the conflict of interest among partners in the process of the LISFs piloting, the open and transparent discussions should take place in advance at zonal level and certain principles agreed upon, the feedback should be reported to the national PROLINNOVA programme lead institute.

3.7 Best LISFs set-up for Tanzania

In all the reviewed cases, the approaches used had project coordinators, steering committees, technical committees, implementation/facilitation teams. These projects had relatively large funding support for the administrative and management costs. The PADEP was the best example of the decentralized funding and empowerment of the local communities in control of development and resources, however, its management structure did not differed from other cases, which has less decentralization in their funding mechanisms. The most conspicuous commonality in all the cases was their emphasis on the local participation in the development process, though the communities' participation levels differed. The ISWC-II has the highest, because it started with typically local ideas and practices, supported by the robust capacity building of the partners in participatory approaches. The PADEP focused on the promotion of the existing well known technologies using participatory development approaches to solve felt priority development concerns of the communities /farmer groups.

The funds available for LISFs piloting in Tanzania is small and should effectively support local innovation process, which aims to combine the research and development. Thus its institutional set-up must build on

the PROLINNOVA partner institutions and the available resources. The activities that need to be undertaken for the LISFs piloting in Tanzania include: (1) identification of the farmer groups and/or innovators and their innovations, including analyses and documentation of both "hard" and "soft types" innovations for the LISFs; (2) farmer groups training on proposal development and facilitate the development of actual proposals for the LISFs (3) farmer-led experimentation and promotion of the results through field days; (4) internal self-monitoring and evaluation undertaken by the farmer groups committees/members; and (5) joint annual evaluation workshops. It is essential to undertake the activity-1, 2 & 5 centrally, utilizing the existing expertise and experiences of the PROLINNOVA partners. The rest of the activities will be undertaken at local level by the farmer groups and/or farmer innovators with support from the relevant partner institutions. Given the above activities the ideal set-up for piloting the LISFs in Tanzania thus seem to be as follows:

3.5.1 Institutional set-up and roles

The LISFs pilots has small amount of funds, so we need to adopt the existing set-up of the PROLINNOVA programme institutional structure under the PELUM-Tanzania as follows:

National policy level: PELUM Board and PROLINNOVA-Tanzania steering committee.

This is the governing body, the roles at this level are:

- To guide and supervise the LISFs implementation.
- To review and approve work plans and required funds for the activities.
- To review and approve documents for contracts and MOUs.
- To receive and discuss the progress reports (physical and financial) from the PELUM- Tanzania coordinator and provide appropriate guidance.
- To deicide transfers of funds to lower levels based on their physical and financial performance.
- To strengthen the relationships with the development partners for continued support to local development initiatives.

National Implementation level: Implementation team

The implementation team composed of the PELUM-Tanzania coordinator, the PROLINNOVA Project Officer.

- To receive LISFs funds at national level from the development partners.
- To develop the common understanding of the terms innovations and innovators among partners.
- Prepare MOUs and contracts to be entered with the stakeholders for implementation of the LISFs activities at national and zonal levels.
- To sign MOUs and contracts with the implementing stakeholders at national and zonal levels.
- To undertake transfer or disbursement of the approved funds to the implementing stakeholders at the national and Zonal levels.
- Compile Zonal and national annual LISFs work plans and funds requests and present to the PROLINNOVA programme steering committee for approval.
- To receive LISFs progress reports from the implementing persons and/or institutions and prepare national report for presentation to the PROLINNOVA programme steering committee for the appropriate guidance.
- To prepare comprehensive national LISFs report for the supporting development partners.

- To organize and conduct planned capacity building activities at national level for the LISFs implementing partners.
- To share or pass on the guidance, supportive documents for improvement of the implementation process.
- To provide Zonal teams with the general format for LISFs proposals and criteria for their screening.
- To participate in participatory annual evaluation workshops conducted at the zonal level.
- To undertake mid- & post-LISFs reviews and evaluation for the impacts and lessons learnt.

Zonal level: Implementation team

These teams will be composed of the coordinating CSOs (INADES & IRDO), MVIWATA, research scientists from ARIs (Hombolo & Uyole) and LRIs (Mpwapwa & Uyole), DALDOs of the participating Districts and one leader from each of the piloting CBOs/farmer groups. At Zonal level, there will be some cross-cutting roles and specific role. The general cross-cutting roles of the Zonal teams are:

- To develop the common understanding of the terms innovations and innovators among partners.
- To identify the innovator CBOs/farmer groups or individuals in their respective regions.
- To identify on going local innovations process of the CBOs/farmer groups or individuals in agriculture, livestock and natural resources management areas.
- To appraise/analyze and document the innovations and innovation process.
- To adapt the general format and screening criteria for LISFs proposals to the Zonal contexts.
- To select innovator CBOs/farmer groups or individual and innovations for LISFs piloting.
- To organize CBOs and farmer groups training on the proposal development skills and/or technically facilitate the development of the LISFs proposals.
- To develop the Zonal LISFs' participatory implementation action plans
- To prepare both physical and financial reporting formats by the CBOs/farmer groups

The specific roles of the coordinating CSOs (INADES and IRDO) are:

- To receive the LISFs funds from the national implementation team
- To organize and take on overall responsibility of the Zonal planning sessions
- To prepare MOUs to enter with the CBOs/farmer groups for implementation of the LISFs
- To sign MOUs with the CBOs/farmer groups for implementation of the LISFs at farmer group level.
- To undertake transfer of the approved funds to the implementing innovator CBOs/farmer groups' accounts.
- To compile Zonal level annual LISFs work plans and funds requests and submit to the PELUM-Tanzania coordinator.
- To receive and pre-review the LISFs progress reports from the implementing CBOs or farmer groups and to prepare the Zonal comprehensive reports and submit to the national PELUM-Tanzania coordinator.
- To organize and conduct in collaboration with other stakeholders the planned capacity building activities at Zonal level for implementing partners.

- **To share or pass the guidance, supportive documents for improvement of the implementation process.**
- **To organize and facilitate in collaboration with other partners the participatory joint annual Zonal evaluation workshops.**
- **To participate in the post-LISFs pilot reviews and evaluation for impacts and lessons learnt.**

The specific roles of researchers in the LISFs piloting are:

- **To technically facilitate the participatory appraisal/analyses of innovators and innovations at Zonal level.**
- **To design the M & E protocols and facilitate their use.**
- **To facilitate the benchmarking of the innovators CBOs/farmer groups for the pilot impact evaluation.**
- **To technically facilitate the process of adapting the general format and screening criteria for the LISFs proposals to Zonal contexts.**
- **To provide methodological guidance and comparative options to the innovator CBOs/farmer group or individuals to validate their innovations systematically.**
- **To technically facilitate design and layouts of the joint formal experiments.**
- **To technically facilitate identification of data and methods of collection in each joint experiments.**
- **To prepare simple forms for data recording and to demonstrate the field data collection methods to the innovator CBOs/Farmer group members.**
- **To undertake search for up-to-date knowledge and/or the laboratory investigations where necessary about the innovations studied.**
- **To technically facilitate data organization, analysis and interpretation by the members of the innovator CBOs/ farmer groups or individuals in the joint annual Zonal evaluation workshops.**
- **To proactively link farmer-initiated innovative research to the ZARDEFs for institutionalization of the PID and sustainability of the LISFs approach.**

The roles of the innovator CBOs/farmer groups in piloting the LISFs are:

- **To have representative in the Zonal level teams to participate in performing the general roles.**
- **To follow-up each group member has farm resource (land plot or animals) for implementing the LISFs pilot.**
- **To manage and control accounts and funds for the LISFs implementation at field level.**
- **To contribute in-kind the farm resources (land and/or animals and labour) for the LISFs piloting.**
- **To apply treatments according to the agreed design and layout.**
- **To collect data and other important observations and keep them for use in the joint evaluation workshops.**
- **To undertake inbuilt self-monitoring and evaluation based on the action plans for the LISFs piloting.**
- **To prepare annual progress reports (physical and financial) and submit to the Zonal coordinating CSOs.**
- **To organize, analyze, interpret and present their data in joint Zonal annual evaluation workshops.**

The district extension workers roles in piloting the LISFs are:

- **To contribute in adapting the general format and screening criteria for the LISFs proposals to the Zonal context.**
- **To facilitate the innovator CBOs/Farmer groups or individual in field level implementation of the action plans.**
- **To provide hands on practice learning to the innovator CBOs/farmer group or individual.**
- **To link up the innovator CBOs/farmer group or individual to services providers (research, private sector agents, input suppliers etc) required to support the innovation processes.**
- **To assist in deriving the extension messages for dissemination from the joint Zonal annual evaluation workshops.**
- **To link-up the innovator CBOs/farmer group or individual to the DAEG for the sustainability of the LISFs approach.**

The role of the MVIWATA in the LISFs piloting are:

- **To contribute in adapting the general format and screening criteria for the LISFs proposals to the Zonal context.**
- **To strengthen innovator CBOs/ farmer groups capacity to lobby and advocate the LISFs approach for agricultural development.**
- **To link innovator CBOs/farmer groups to the micro-financing and banking institutions as means to access funds to pursue their innovative development innitiatives.**
- **To promote and disseminate successful innovations through linking to markets and/or commercial applications.**

Monitoring and evaluation action person

The M & E action person is required to link implementation and the impacts at the CBOs/farmer groups' level on the ground and implementation efficiency at Zonal and national levels. Thus, the roles and reporting of the M & E action person are as follows:

- **To liaise with Zonal coordinators for follow-up and strengthening of the inbuilt self-M&E of the innovator CBOs/farmer groups.**
- **To provide technical input support in the Zonal joint annual evaluation workshops.**
- **To compile the Zonal evaluation workshops reports into a national report and submit to the PELUM-Tanzania coordinator.**
- **To identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities for improvement and threats in the implementation of the LISFs pilots as whole and provide the advisory feedback to the Zonal and the national PELUM Tanzania coordinators for taking appropriate timely measures.**
- **To identify changes in the livelihoods and their implications for the institutionalization of the LISFs and PID approaches in agricultural development.**
- **To liaise with researchers in designing the field M & E protocols**

3.5.2 Decentralized Financial Flow Mechanisms

The LISFs pilots in form of small partial grants to the innovator CBOs/farmer groups seem appropriate in Tanzanian context. This is due to the research nature of the LISFs, and that the amount of funds available for this pilot is very small to finance the commercially and economically efficient innovative initiative. The financial flows that seem appropriate under Tanzanian situation are as follows: The development partners deposit the LISFs into the PELUM-Tanzania account, under which the PROLINNOVA programme administratively belongs to. The PELUM-Tanzania signs the MOUs with the coordinating Zonal CSOs. Then the allocated amounts of funds will be disbursed to the Zones for implementation of the Zonal actions plans. The funds will be deposited into the Zonal coordinating CSOs' (INADES & IRDO) accounts. These funds will support activities to be centrally undertaken at Zonal level as shown in section 3.5 above, and the innovator CBOs/farmer groups or individuals. The coordinating CSOs will sign the MOUs with CBOs/farmer groups or individuals, who their innovative initiatives have been selected for piloting of the LISFs. The MOUs will clearly spell out the in-kind contribution and other conditions of using the funds and financial reporting requirements. Then the CBOs/farmer groups or individuals accounts will receive the funds from the Zonal coordinating CBOs. The withdrawal of the funds from the account of a CBOs/farmer group or individual will follow the existing financial transaction rules and regulations between the CBOs/farmer groups or individuals and the banks. The support to the innovator CBOs/farmer groups or individuals would cover the research inputs, research risks, purchase of simple measurement tools and record keeping notebooks, hire of the research and extension services needed by the groups or individual innovators, internal monitoring and evaluation, to organize learning field days or village meetings and to finance the required learning visits to research stations or other sources of innovations or relevant practices for them to improve their innovations.

The CBOs/farmer groups piloting the LISFs will report their financial expenditures to the coordinating CSOs and the CSOs will report to the PELUM-Tanzania the expenditure of the funds transferred to them for financing farmer innovations and that spent centrally at Zonal level. This should be linked with the LISFs action plans, the LISFs proposals supported and conditions spelt out in the MOUs.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Geographic coverage

The geographical area for coverage recommended is Dodoma region, in the central zone and Mbeya region southern highlands zone. The important criteria for selection of these areas are: (1) Presence of the PID/PTD experiences and innovations to build on from the previous two sister projects, the ISWC-II and the PFI. (2) Capturing local innovations from the dry and sub-humid climates, with different farming systems and socio-cultural conditions, and (3) Presence of partner organizations participating in the PROLINNOVA programme.

4.2 Partner organizations

The current research and development partners already involved in the PROLINNOVA-Tanzania programme in each zone are ideal partners. The mandate levels of the partners for piloting the LISFs in Tanzania may be delineated into:

1. **Zonal level: Central zone: INADES-formation Tanzania, MVIWATA, Agricultural Research Institute-Hombolo, National Livestock Research Institute, Mpwapwa. Southern highlands Zone: Ileje Rural Development Organization (IRDO), MVIWATA, Agricultural Research Institute-Uyole (ARI-Uyole) and Livestock Research Centre-Uyole (LRC-Uyole).**
2. **District level: INADES, IRDO & District Agriculture & Livestock Development Officers (DALDOs).**
3. **Ward and village level: Innovator CBOs/Farmer groups (to be identified by Zonal and District partners).**

4.3 Farmer involvement

The LISFs should start from the farmers' own innovative initiatives in research and/or development activities. This will ensure that the farmers' innovative ideas on sustainable solutions to the communities concerns are taken onboard. Building on the existing innovator CBOs/farmer groups, that emerged during the ISWC-II and PFI or other well organized CBOs and the FFS groups working on local innovations should be the entry point strategy for the LISFs pilots. This will save time and other resources for effective LISFs piloting. Emphasis should be given to households and gender friendly innovations, thus, gender neutral innovations could be used as one criterion for selection. In the LISFs pilots, CBOs/farmer groups should manage and controlled the funds, hire the professionals' expertise, undertake internal M & E and generate ideas and products for their livelihoods. The roles of professional are that of facilitating and supporting the process in order to stimulate the innovation process.

4.4 Financial management and sustainability

Decentralized grant funds will be managed by the farmers using their committees. The funds will be withdrawn for the expenditure after group meetings, using the signed minutes by the village authority and district council officer from their bank account.

The revolving funds system, through the development-oriented innovation demonstrations is one option for financial sustainability by the groups. Other financial sustainability strategies and avenues include creating awareness and capacity of the farmer groups to develop proposals in collaboration with the researchers and extension workers to access funds from the ZARDEFs and the DAEGs, respectively, for continuation of their LISFs. This will also help for the long-term institutionalization of the decentralized LISFs approach to development and to sustain the local innovation process.

Long-term strategy should be documentation of farmer innovations for livelihoods to create a convincing national data base that could lead to a National Foundation for Farmer Innovations in Tanzania (NFFIT). The SCOs, especially the PELUM and the MVIWATA could take this strategy using the data base as one of the area in their lobby and advocacy activities. Similarly, at international level, the national PROLINNOVA programmes could pursue the similar strategy for International Foundation for Farmer Innovations (IFFI). If these foundations could be founded, would be a sustainable source of financing the LISFs mechanisms,

which could create a pool of interested scientists/professionals to work using the PID approach with the farmer innovator CBOs/farmer groups or individuals.

4.5 Monitoring and evaluation

The M & E action research approach, which is based on the implementation of activities, is recommended. The M & E register as monitoring tool for LISFs should be established in the zones implementing the LISFs pilots. This will be complemented by the other tools of the M & E at three levels. First level will be the farmer groups' reports & inbuilt continuous self- M & E based on the joint action plans. Second level, will be the joint partners' annual evaluations workshops at Zonal levels, whereby, the implementation process, results and outcomes are appraised/analyzed with the help of experienced facilitators and presented by the farmer groups or individual innovators. This will also lead to the next season action plans, which maintain the strengths and rectify weaknesses in the previous years' implementation. Third one will be the PELUM-Tanzania at the PROLINNOVA programme level mid-term and end of project reviews.

5. REFERENCES:

Critchley, C., Verburg, M., and Veldhuizen van L. (Eds). 2006. Facilitating Multi-stakeholder Partnership: Lessons from PROLINNOVA. A publication in the series on Promoting Local Innovation. Silang, Cavite, Philippines: IIRR/Leusden: PROLINNOVA International Secrétariat, ETC EcoCulture.

Fenta, T., Araya, H., Tesfaye, T., Haileselassie, L and Waters-Bayer, A. 2008. The Ethiopian experience in piloting Local Innovation Support Funds, April 2006- March 2008. PROLINNOVA-Ethiopia Secretariat c/o Agri-Service Ethiopia, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

PADEP. 2006. Ujue Mradi Shirikishi wa Maendeleo ya Kilimo na Uwezeshwaji [Understand the Participatory Agricultural Development and Empowerment Project], MAFC, Dar-es-salaam, Tanzania.

Reij, C. & Water-Bayer, A. 2001. Farmer innovation in Africa: a source of inspiration for agricultural development. Earthscan, London

TARP II-SUA Project. 2000/2004. Performance Report- Food Security and Household Income for Smallholder Farmers Applied Research with Emphasis on Women. TARP II-SUA Project, SUA, Morogoro, Tanzania.

United Republic of Tanzania (URT). 2006. Agricultural Sector Development Programme: support through basket fund. Government programme Document. MAFC, DSM.

Tanzania

Veldhuizen van, L. Wongtschowski and Ann Waters-Bayer. 2006. Local Innovation Support Funds: an international review of experience to derive practical guidelines. PROLINNOVA International Support Team, ETC EcoCIture, Netherlands.

World Bank. 2005. Innovation Support Funds for Farmer-Led Research and Development. IK Notes No. 85.

MVIWATA. 2006. Rural Markets Development Projects in Morogoro and Kongwa Districts-Final Report. MVIWATA, Morogoro, Tanzania

MVIWATA. 2005. Kisa Mkasa cha Bibi na Bwana Masoko. MVIWATA, Morogoro, Tanzania.

APPENDIX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE AND CONTRACT

PELUM-Tanzania Country Working Group
(Participatory Ecological Land Use Management)
Area C - INADES complex,
P.O. Box 54, DODOMA, Tanzania
Tel & Fax: +255 26-235 0744 Email info@pelumtanzania.org

TERMS OF REFERENCE AND CONTRACT

FOR

FEASIBILITY STUDY ON LOCAL INNOVATION SUPPORT FUND

PROLINNOVA Tanzania

Background

PELUM TANZANIA-Tanzania is one of the ten Country Working Groups that constitute the so called PELUM Association. It is a National network of Civil Society Organizations operating in Tanzania towards improving sustainable agriculture, food security and sustainable community development in the country. PELUM Tanzania' s long term objectives are to build the capacity of farming and rural community groups to accumulate ecological capital and stimulate farmer learning and inspire them to experiment and innovate in empowering ways for food security as well as sustainability.

To attain these objectives, PELUM Tanzania is facilitating learning and networking, participatory action learning, capacity building, lobbying and advocacy with small-scale farmers groups, civil society organizations and government institutions. It provides these services through its members and partner organizations that are involved in the implementations of its projects one of these being "Documentation and Communication for Promoting Local Innovations in Sustainable Agriculture in Tanzania, commonly known as PROLINNOVA (Promoting Local Innovation).

PROLINNOVA is an international programme aiming at promoting and institutionalizing participatory approaches to agricultural research and development that build on and support local innovation (Participatory Innovation Development, PID). Local innovation refers to efforts by farmers themselves to address livelihood constraints by experimenting on their own with alternative practices, management systems or new ways of socio-economic organisation. PROLINNOVA has shown that these efforts are a source of inspiration for sustainable agricultural development and that research and development work can become more effective if staff support local innovation through PID.

As part of its efforts to institutionalize PID, PELUM-Tanzania through PROLINNOVA Tanzania wishes to undertake pilots with mechanisms that allow financial resources to be made available directly at the level of local innovators to enable them to improve their innovations, assess these more scientifically and disseminate them. Where funds for agricultural research and development are mostly used presently by government, sometimes NGO, research and development agents, involving farmers as they wish, PROLINNOVA is looking for mechanisms that are co-owned and managed by farmer innovators and their organisations. Farmer innovators or their groups/organisations should be able to access these funds directly so that they can hire support from research or other services provider organisations, link up with other innovators, and/or share their findings more widely.

The proposed mechanism is called *Local Innovation Support Fund* (LISF). In the present understanding it can take shape at two levels: at community/farmer and at institutional level. At community level, community-owned innovation funds (COIF) can be established to strengthen local experimentation and learning. Farmers may rotate these among themselves using the results of the experimental work. The institution-based ISF operates at a higher level, supports farmer innovation in a larger geographical area. Its support to farmer groups can catalyze the emergence of local COIFs.

The ambition is to ultimately arrive at a sustainable mechanism, a LISF that continues to exist for a longer period of time. This implies a sustainable funding stream which could take various forms. This could involve, for instance, attracting funding from government, donors, private sector and farmers (and is accountable to these stakeholders), endowments, fund leveraging, or savings and loan arrangements. Prior to starting the actual LISF pilots, PROLINNOVA-Tanzania plans to undertake a feasibility study to identify best ways to achieve this and develop the best possible design for the LISF pilot. Key challenges are:

- **How best to support local innovation processes, drawing on the LISF mechanism as a key component in this support, and/ or,**
- **How best to enable mechanisms that can sustain themselves at community level without much external input.**

The work undertaken in the feasibility in Tanzania should draw on the international review of LISF experiences.

Objectives of the study
More specifically the study will have the following three objectives:

1. **To find relevant experiences in Tanzania with decentralized funding mechanisms, those for farmers and communities and their support agents, to support innovation, research and development activities, and identify lessons to be learnt for implementing LISFs project.**
2. **To review the ARD related institutional, legal and financial structures in Tanzania in order to assess the longer-term feasibility of the LISF and identify the best overall set-up that will enable regular replenishment of the fund in the future.**
3. **To develop clear recommendations on how the LISF pilots should best be implemented in terms of geographic coverage, partner organisations, farmer involvement, financial sustainability, management and, particularly, monitoring and evaluation.**

Activities
General:
The LISF pilot can only be successful if the key institutions support it. The feasibility study should therefore interact with them in an involving may, obtain and use their inputs in an effort to build-up a commitment. The National Steering Committee of PROLINNOVA Tanzania can play a role in guiding the researcher to the relevant institutions.

Farmer involvement in the study is a second general condition for the study. As this is more easily achieved at the local or district level, it may be useful to select early in the process possible geographical areas where the LISF will become active so that farmer consultation can be focused on these areas.

Study of related experiences in the country
This is a search for relevant cases through a postal mailing, Email or/and telephone; Reading of relevant documents; interview with resource persons from most interesting cases only (if at all) to identify practical lessons learnt.

Analysis of institutional, policy and legal framework:
Through a study of relevant policy and other documents and interviews with selected resource persons a clear picture of the institutional, policy and legal framework at the relevant levels will be obtained leading to indications how the proposed LISF would best fit this. Documents to be studied may relate to a/o developments in ARD, its organisation and funding, to the promotion of local knowledge and innovation, to government decentralisation in general including local government's role in ARD, to public-private partnerships and collaboration. The analysis will look at implications at local, district and national level but with an emphasis on local level.

Farmer consultation
In a few selected geographical areas interviews will be held with individual farmer (innovators) and/or farmer groups to discuss the need for an LISF at the local and institutional level and best ways to organise these. Partner organisations involved in PROLINNOVA Tanzania will guide the researcher to relevant farmers, including those who have been involved in activities of PROLINNOVA Tanzania in the past, and help to facilitate discussions[1].

[1] This activity may alternatively be resourced through in-kind capacity contributions from the local partners, so as to assist the feasibility work.

ISF design meeting
The researcher will organise with the PROLINNOVA Tanzania coordinator a one or two day meeting that will draft the overall approach and design of the LISF in the country. This meeting will be attended by core people of the programme such as in the core working group together with a few external resources persons. Insights and findings from previous steps will be an input to this meeting and its results and outputs will be captured in the report of the feasibility study.

Stakeholder workshop
The draft findings of the feasibility study, including the output of the design meeting, will be presented to relevant stakeholders during a one-day workshop. The organisation of this workshop is outside the TOR of this study. The researcher, though, is expected to present findings during this event, join the discussions and incorporate the suggestions and comments made during the workshop into the final report of the feasibility study.

Expected outputs
A report will be prepared of the study in two stages: A draft for discussion in the stakeholder workshop and a final version incorporating the results of this workshop as well as of PROLINNOVA Tanzania. The report will be in English, should not have more than 30 pages (excluding annexures) and will include findings related to all three objectives of this study.

Implementation
Researcher/consultant:
The study will be undertaken by a researcher/consultant who combines relevant expertise (participatory agricultural research and development, institutional development, fund management) with relevant skills (able to dialogue with stakeholders, effective open interaction with farmers, and consultancy skills such as report writing).

Coordination:
The researcher will report to the Country Coordinator, PELUM Tanzania, who will be responsible for final coordination of the study. The PROLINNOVA Tanzania NSC will give overall guidance.
International backstopping:
Staff from the ETC, Netherlands, and FAIR IST is available to advise the researcher by Email if required. At the start of the feasibility study ETC will make a document available that summarizes lessons learnt in ISF related activities in other countries.
Timing
The study will take place between second week of August and First week of September 2008 A detailed plans will be made with the researcher once selected. The first draft report should be available not later than the beginning of the 4th week of August 2008 in order to be able to be an input to the stakeholder workshop, which will be held at the end of the last week of August 2008. The final report will be ready not later than the end of the first week of September.
Budget
Total budget for this study amounts to 2,500,000/= including all costs and farmer consultations but excluding the workshop.

Mode of payment
(i) PELUM-Tanzania shall remunerate the consultant a total sum of Tsh. 2,500,000/= (shillings Two million five hundred thousand only) for the above assignments above.

6.0: Terms of payment
60% payment shall be made to a consultant upon signing of the contract while the
remaining 40% shall be settled after accomplishment of the assignment.
7.0: Ownership and General Terms
All data and information gathered throughout the contract period by the consultant shall remain the property of PELUM-Tanzania.
8.0: Reporting
The consultants shall submit the report of the study in English to PELUM Tanzania, both electronic and hard copy (two originals).

....

Consultant/Researcher Country Coordinator
PELUM- Tanzania (Client)

....
Date Date

APPENDIX II: LIST OF PEOPLE CONTACTED, POSITIONS AND THEIR INSTITUTIONS

Name	Position	Institution
Dr. Shekania Bisanda	Community Agric. Development Officer	MAFC, PADEP headquarter
Ms Muyovela	District Agric & Livestock Dev. Officer	Iringa District Council
Mr. Philimon Mpewe	Iringa District Agric. Extension Officer	Iringa District Council
Mr. Makundi	PADEP District Officer	Iringa District Council
Mr. Allan Ngakonda	Farmer, Secretary of the Mangalali village CIS	Mangalali village, Iringa
Mr. Onesmo Makasi	Farmer, Chairman of one of the FGIS	Mangalali village
Ms Leonora Luvinga	Farmer, Secretary of one of the FGIS	Mangalali village
Mr. Nuru Chorobi	Farmer, Mangalali Village chairman during PADEP	Mangalali village
Mr. Joel Mbwilo	Farmer, Chairman of Idodi farmers association	Idodi Village, Iringa
MS Martha Kalevela	Farmer, Secretary of the Idodi farmers association	Idodi Village
Mr. Mussa Kigelelo	Farmer, Chairman of one of the Farmer groups -Idodi	Idodi Village
Mr. Ngola Mwangosi	Farmer, Chairman of the Idodi farmers' SACCOS	Idodi Village
Ms Rehema Kindole	Farmer, member of one group in the Idodi SACCOS	Idodi Village

Ms Asante Ndimbo	Mbozi District Agric. Extension Officer	Mbozi District council
Mr. David Kibona	Farmer, Village chairman-Ivwanga	Ivwanga Village
Mr. Elia Shibanda	Farmer, Member of the UTHIMI farmer group	Ivwanga Village
Mr. Joseph Mwampashe	Farmer, Member of the UTHIMI farmer group	Ivwanga Village
Ms Elizabethi Kibona	Farmer, Chairperson of the UTHIMI farmer group	Ivwanga Village
Mr. Leaonard Msongole	Farmer, treasurer of the UTHIMI farmer group	Ivwanga Village
Mr. Amos Mwenga	Farmer, Member of the UTHIMI farmer group	Ivwanga Village
Mr. Ezekiel Mwasenga	Farmer, Chairman of the BED farmer group	Itepula village
Mr. Brison Simchimba	Farmer, Member of the BED farmer group	Itepula village
Mr. Deric Mwasenga	Farmer, Member of the BED farmer group	Itepula village
MS Helena Siwale	Farmer, Member of the BED farmer group	Itepula village
Mr. E.D. Mapunda	Ag. District Agric & Livestock Dev. Officer	Mbinga District Council
Ms. Ester Lulemi	Ward and Kitanda village Agric. Extension worker	Mbinga District Council
Mr. Phillipo Mapunda	Farmer, Village chairman- Kitanda	Kitanda village
Mr. Faustus Nchimbi	Farmer, Village Executive Secretary-Kitanda	Kitanda village
Mr. Reginald Kihuru	Farmer, Member of the JUHUDI farmer group	Kitanda village
Mr. Quenberth Hyera	Farmer, Secretary of the JUHUDI farmer group	Kitanda village
Ms Avelina Mbunda	Farmer, Chairperson of the JUHUDI farmer group	Kitanda village
Ms Alfreda Komba	Farmer, Member of the JUHUDI farmer group	Kitanda village
Ms Eda Ndunguru	Farmer, Member of the JUHUDI farmer group	Kitanda village
Mr. Gisler Mbungu	Farmer, Chairman of the KIMMTA farmer group	Mtama village
Mr. Montana Ndunguru	Farmer, Member of the KIMMTA farmer group	Mtama village
Ms Colleta Nchimbu	Farmer, Member of the KIMMTA farmer group	Mtama village
Ms Anamaria Komba	Farmer, treasurer of the KIMMTA farmer group	Mtama village
Mr. Clian Komba	Farmer, Member of the KIMMTA farmer group	Mtama village
Ms Mangaridis Ndunguru	Farmer, Member of the KIMMTA farmer group	Mtama village
Mr. Melikior Pesambili	Farmer, Member of the KIMMTA farmer group	Mtama village
Mr. Fidelis Lubinza	Agric. Marketing Officer	MVIWATA
Mr. Justice Shekilango	Project Officer /Facilitator of farmer groups	MVIWATA
Mr. Simon Mwang'onda	Executive Director	IRDO
Mr. Alphonce Katunzi	Executive Director	INADES
Mr. Patric Lameck	Project Officer	INADES
Mr. Yakob Tibamanya	Coordinator	PELUM-Tanzania
Mr. Laurent Kaburire	PROLINNOVA Project Officer	PELUM-Tanzania