

# Beneficiary Satisfaction and Impact Assessment of ISFP TCP Projects: a Global Synthesis



The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of FAO.

All rights reserved. FAO encourages the reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product. Non-commercial uses will be authorized free of charge, upon request. Reproduction for resale or other commercial purposes, including educational purposes, may incur fees. Applications for permission to reproduce or disseminate FAO copyright materials, and all queries concerning rights and licences, should be addressed by e-mail to [copyright@FAO.org](mailto:copyright@FAO.org) or to the Chief, Publishing Policy and Support Branch, Office of Knowledge Exchange, Research and Extension, FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy.

© FAO 2010

---

Cover photo: ©FAO/Danfung Dennis

## Table of contents

Acknowledgements	3
Acronyms	4
Executive Summary	5
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>2 FAO Agriculture Input Distribution TCP Projects</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1 Overview of ISFP TCP projects	9
2.2 Project description and features	9
2.3 Target beneficiaries and regions	11
2.4 Methods of distributing inputs	12
<b>3 Gauging perceptions of beneficiaries and project impacts</b>	<b>15</b>
3.1 Beneficiaries' knowledge of inputs distributed and willingness to adopt them	15
3.2 Beneficiaries' satisfaction level with the inputs received	18
3.3 Beneficiaries' perceptions of the impacts of ISFP TCP projects	20
3.4 Gender perspectives in ISFP TCP projects	21
<b>4 Lessons learned from implementation of ISFP TCP projects</b>	<b>23</b>
4.1 Project planning issues	23
4.2 Project implementation issues	25
4.2.1 Targeting issues	25
4.2.2 Logistical issues	26
4.2.3 Procurement issues	26
4.3 Structural problems of agricultural sector affecting project implementation and impact	27
4.4 Assessment issues	27
<b>5 Conclusions and recommendations</b>	<b>29</b>
References	33
<b>Appendices</b>	
<b>Appendix 1</b> General guidelines for the implementation of ISFP TCP beneficiary satisfaction and impact assessment survey	<b>34</b>
<b>Appendix 2</b> List of countries where ISFP TCP projects were implemented	<b>48</b>

## List of tables and boxes

<b>Table 1</b>	ISFP TCP project budgets and number of beneficiaries in 63 assessed countries	<b>10</b>
<b>Table 2</b>	Volumes of inputs distributed by ISFP TCP projects in 63 assessed countries	<b>11</b>
<b>Table 3</b>	Beneficiaries' knowledge of seeds distributed and willingness to adopt them	<b>17</b>
<b>Table 4</b>	Beneficiaries' knowledge of fertilizers distributed and willingness to adopt them	<b>17</b>
<b>Table 5</b>	Satisfaction of beneficiaries with receiving inputs	<b>18</b>
<b>Table 6</b>	Satisfaction of beneficiaries with the timeliness of input delivery	<b>19</b>
<b>Table 7</b>	Satisfaction of beneficiaries with the appropriateness of inputs	<b>19</b>
<b>Table 8</b>	Satisfaction of beneficiaries with the quality of inputs	<b>19</b>
<b>Table 9</b>	Perceived impacts of ISFP TCP projects on crop production and food accessibility	<b>20</b>
<b>Table 10</b>	Perceived impacts of ISFP TCP projects on ability to sell	<b>21</b>
<b>Table 11</b>	Perceived impacts of ISFP TCP projects on animal production and health	<b>21</b>
<b>Table 12</b>	Perceived impacts of ISFP TCP projects in Asia	<b>22</b>
<b>Table 13</b>	Use of income from sale of crops by gender in the SFS region	<b>22</b>
<b>Box 1</b>	Distribution methods in Belize	<b>13</b>
<b>Box 2</b>	Innovative scheme to fund community-based microprojects in Afghanistan	<b>14</b>
<b>Box 3</b>	Impact of ISFP TCP project in Chad: A testimonial from a female beneficiary in the Mandoul region	<b>22</b>
<b>Box 4</b>	ISFP TCP project in Sierra Leone: A catalyst for mobilizing USD 20 million to the National Agriculture Response Programme (NARP)	<b>23</b>
<b>Box 5</b>	Revival of rice growing in western Kenya	<b>24</b>
<b>Box 6</b>	The importance of building on country programmes	<b>25</b>

## Acknowledgements

The Initiative on Soaring Food Prices (ISFP) Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP) beneficiary satisfaction and impact assessment activity has been a large undertaking involving the implementation, technical review and analysis of assessments in 72 countries.

The ISFP Secretariat, with the support of Regional and Subregional Offices of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), has been responsible for coordinating the implementation of the assessments at the country level and developing subregional syntheses on which much of this global synthesis is based.

Special thanks go to all the FAO staff in the Regional, Subregional and Country Offices who were involved in the coordination and implementation of this activity, the national consultants recruited to carry out the national assessments and enumerators who collected the primary data. A special debt of gratitude is expressed to the beneficiary households, input suppliers and implementing agencies from around the world who spared their valuable time to answer questions and share their views on the ISFP TCP projects.

## Acronyms

AFC	Agriculture Finance Cooperation
CAADP	Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme
CERF	United Nations Central Emergency Response Fund
CFA	Comprehensive Framework for Action
EUFF	European Union Food Facility
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FSP	Fertilizer Support Programme
GAFFSP	Global Agriculture and Food Security Program
GCP	Government Cooperative Programme
HIV/AIDS	Human immunodeficiency virus/acquired immunodeficiency syndrome
IDPs	Internally displaced persons
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
ISFP	Initiative on Soaring Food Prices
ITF	Input trade fair
NARP	National Agriculture Response Programme
NGO	Nongovernmental organization
NIB	National Irrigation Board
OPEC	Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries
OSRO	Office for Sahelian Relief Operations – Office for Special Relief Operations
RAP	Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
RBM	Results-based Management
RECA	Rural Environmental Care for Africa
REU	Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia
RNE	Regional Office for the Near East and North Africa
SAP	Subregional Office for the Pacific Islands
SFC	Subregional Office for Central Africa
SFE	Subregional Office for Eastern Africa
SFS	Subregional Office for Southern Africa
SFW	Subregional Office for West Africa
SLC	Subregional Office for the Caribbean
SLM	Subregional Office for Central America
TCP	Technical Cooperation Programme
USD	United States Dollar
WFP	World Food Programme

## Executive Summary

In response to the emerging food price crisis in 2007, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) launched its Initiative on Soaring Food Prices (ISFP), which followed a twin-track approach combining the promotion of quick-response interventions with medium- and longer-term programmes for agricultural growth. As a part of the immediate response, FAO launched 74 Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP) projects in 80 countries<sup>1</sup>, distributing agricultural inputs such as seeds and fertilizers, for the most part free of cost, to vulnerable smallholder farmers to boost their production. FAO made available approximately USD 30 million for these emergency agriculture input distribution TCP projects. The funds provided for these TCP projects and knowledge gained from their implementation played an important catalytic role in mobilizing further funding for short- and medium-term food security programmes and projects. Examples of this include projects funded under the European Union Food Facility (EUFF) and the United Nations Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF).

The projects provided direct and concrete support to over 500 000 households, approximately 2.5 million people, with an average expenditure of approximately USD 59 per household. These funds were used to purchase critical agricultural inputs, provide training and support the logistics required for programme implementation. In total, the programme provided over 80 000 metric tonnes of crop and vegetable seeds, fertilizer and agrochemicals, as well as over 2.6 million seedlings and cuttings, and over 57 000 live animals.

### Key inputs provided through the FAO ISFP TCP programme

Crop seeds (tonnes)	48 735
Vegetable seeds (tonnes)	4 522
Seedlings and cuttings (pieces)	2 684 675
Fertilizer (tonnes)	27 286
Agrochemicals (tonnes)	166
Live animals	57 683
Tools and equipment (pieces)	277 984

With the view of learning lessons from such a large-scale emergency intervention, FAO carried out impact assessments for ISFP agriculture input distribution TCP projects. As the ISFP TCP projects had not been designed to include assessment components, a standardized baseline data for all projects was unavailable. The assessments were, therefore, launched to collect information, both quantitative and qualitative, regarding beneficiaries' satisfaction with the project and perceived impacts.

---

<sup>1</sup> One project in the Pacific Islands (TCP/RAS/3205) was a regional project of USD 500 000 encompassing seven countries including the Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Marshall Islands, Niue, Palau, Republic of Nauru and Tuvalu.

Survey results show that about half of the overall beneficiaries had some prior exposure to the inputs distributed and that less than half had previously received training on their use. For the most part, beneficiaries were satisfied with receiving inputs and with their quality and appropriateness, but expressed some dissatisfaction with the timeliness of their delivery. Over 65 percent of beneficiaries saw improvements in their crop production and food accessibility situation due to the provision of ISFP TCP agriculture inputs. Drought and late delivery of inputs were cited as the major reasons for those who experienced a decline in crop production and food accessibility.

Structural problems within the agricultural sector as a whole also affected ISFP TCP implementation and the projects' impacts on beneficiaries. In some regions, for example, the low availability of quality seeds in local markets affected timely procurement and distribution. The lack of irrigation affected production levels and difficult access to markets in some areas impacted on beneficiaries' ability to sell their produce. This hampered the ability of farmers to gain maximum impact from the inputs provided by the ISFP TCP project.

The following recommendations, described in greater detail in Chapter 5, are based on the findings from the ISFP TCP assessments:

- link the TCP project with other ongoing programmes or projects whenever possible;
- consider the use of revolving schemes or equity contribution systems;
- ensure that training is incorporated into the project design;
- devote greater resources to project monitoring;
- consider the geographic context of the country;
- consider flexibility in procurement rules;
- avoid distribution of live animals unless proper transportation to the beneficiary's farm can be assured;
- consider different possible distribution systems, according to the countries' reality;
- improve Results-based Management (RBM) by defining measurable project results;
- encourage stronger donor commitment with government engagement in following up short-term emergency projects with medium-term investments to address structural problems (e.g. poorly developed seed industry; poor irrigation systems; poor access to markets, post-harvest and processing technologies; need for training and strengthening of institutions, etc.) within the agriculture sector;
- use TCP funding as a catalyst for technology innovation or leveraging investment.



# 1 Introduction

As early as July 2007, FAO warned of a rising food price crisis. In December 2007, FAO launched its Initiative on Soaring Food Prices (ISFP) to help smallholder farmers grow more food and earn more money. By mid-2008, international prices for basic food commodities had reached their highest level in nearly 30 years. The food price crisis, together with the global financial crisis, pushed an additional 115 million people into poverty and hunger, bringing the total number of malnourished people to over one billion. In many developing countries, where people often spend between 60 and 80 percent of their income on food, prices continue to be high.

The ISFP followed a twin-track approach, combining the promotion of quick-response agricultural growth with medium- and longer-term programmes. FAO began implementing projects through its own Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP), financed from assessed contributions of its Members. The Programme aims to provide FAO's technical expertise to its member countries through targeted, short-term, catalytic projects. TCP projects, categorized as being either for Development Support (D) or Emergency Assistance and Support to Rehabilitation (E), should produce tangible and immediate results in a cost-effective manner. They support improved food security and poverty alleviation, and should catalyse long-term development changes (FAO, 2009).

FAO launched 74 emergency agriculture input distribution TCP projects and 45 technical assistance TCP projects. The emergency input distribution TCP projects primarily focussed on reviving agricultural production through the provision of seeds, fertilizers, pesticides and animal production inputs to vulnerable households, mostly at no cost to the producers. Other TCP projects worked on rehabilitating irrigation schemes, rainwater structures and small-scale agricultural infrastructure as well as supporting seed systems, reducing post-harvest losses and training farmers in new technologies.

The TCP projects and knowledge gained from their implementation played an important catalytic

role in mobilizing further funding for short- and medium-term food security programmes and projects. FAO's early action in approving these projects provided both immediate assistance to severely affected farming households, and sent a strong political message to donor agencies regarding the need for rapid action. Experience gained in the early implementation of the projects also provided important baseline information to direct programming choices for the deployment of much larger projects, especially the European Union Food Facility (EUFF).<sup>1</sup>

Forty-one of the 50 projects approved to date by the European Union under the Food Facility, (through a range of implementing partners), have gone to countries that already were recipients of FAO TCP funding, including 23 of the 29 country projects awarded to FAO. In all 41 of these countries, there were interagency and rapid assessments deployed for the development of country fiches used as a basis for approving the EUFF. These country fiches benefitted from knowledge obtained through the ongoing implementation of TCP projects.

With the view of learning lessons from ISFP TCP interventions, FAO carried out impact assessments for ISFP agriculture input distribution TCP projects. As the emergency national ISFP TCP projects had not been designed with assessment components, a standardized baseline data for all projects was unavailable. It was thus felt that the best way to establish projects' impacts was to survey beneficiaries' views as to how the projects affected their lives. The ISFP Secretariat developed a generic questionnaire and methodology to guide assessments and facilitate the comparison of data across countries (see Appendix 1). FAO decentralized offices

---

<sup>1</sup> The EUFF is the European Union's EUR 1 billion response to the global food crisis. It is a two-year initiative that aims to help developing countries move towards longer-term food security. Over EUR 228 million (USD 318 million) is being channelled through FAO for operations in 28 countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America and the Caribbean.

coordinated and implemented the assessments for their respective regions and countries. Given the heterogeneity in distributed inputs, questionnaires and methodology were then adjusted to country-specific contexts. The FAO subregional offices<sup>2</sup> also compiled synthesis reports for the TCP projects implemented in their region, on which a large part of this global synthesis is based.

This report highlights some of the major findings from the aforementioned beneficiary satisfaction and impact assessments. It is hoped that the lessons learned can help in the planning and implementation of future emergency input distribution projects.

---

<sup>2</sup> Synthesis reports have been compiled in the following regions: Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (RAP), Subregional Office for the Pacific Islands (SAP), Subregional Office for Central Africa (SFC), Subregional Office for Eastern Africa (SFE), Subregional Office for Southern Africa (SFS), Subregional Office for West Africa (SFW) and Subregional Office for the Caribbean (SLC).

## 2 FAO Agriculture Input Distribution TCP Projects

### 2.1 Overview of ISFP TCP projects

The goal of the ISFP TCP projects was to rapidly boost agricultural production among smallholder farmers, both for their own consumption and for the sale of surplus produce on the market. By providing quality agriculture inputs, such as quality seeds and fertilizers, the projects also aimed to enhance the awareness, knowledge and capacity of targeted beneficiaries concerning the sustainable use of improved inputs over the long run. Some projects included animal production components such as the distribution of animal feed, vaccines, live animals, etc. Such inputs could expand production of meat, eggs or other animal-related products and enable poor households to improve their purchasing power and nutritional status. The ISFP TCP projects, through their visible implementation on the ground, also aimed to mobilize additional funding and donor support for larger-scale short- and medium-term interventions.

The ISFP TCP projects targeted small farmers unable to produce enough for their own consumption and who were net buyers of food. Rising food prices hit such vulnerable households hard, often reducing their capacity for agriculture production and forcing them to sell productive assets.

One of the first activities of ISFP TCP projects was to identify the vulnerable farmers and determine the right crops and appropriate varieties of seed or animal feed requirements. Different methods were used for distributing inputs, including direct distribution to farmers, input trade fairs and voucher schemes. The ISFP Programme document outlined that safety net/food rations could also be provided to help ensure that inputs received were used for production purposes; however, the use of such an arrangement was not highlighted in any of the national assessment reports.

The ISFP TCP projects aimed to provide high quality seed of appropriate crops and varieties from local sources to ensure adaptation to local conditions and acceptance by farmers. This included support to home gardens and peri-urban

agriculture, often vital in providing the poor with fresh food of high nutritional value.

The procurement and distribution of inputs were monitored to ensure that farmers obtained inputs that met established quality standards. The use of existing practices and mechanisms for the effective supply of productive inputs to farmers and the marketing of surplus production are integral elements of any productive safety net to support sustainability. Care was taken to avoid disrupting commercial markets and, where warranted, attention was given to alternative supply systems that are more private-sector oriented (FAO, 2008).

### 2.2 Project description and features

At the global level, the ISFP launched 74 agriculture input distribution TCP projects in 80 countries. Overall, USD 30 million were used in the ISFP TCP projects, supporting over 500 000 beneficiaries worldwide (see Table 1).

The size of the ISFP TCP projects in each of the beneficiary countries ranged between USD 250 000 and USD 500 000. The overall ISFP TCP project cost per beneficiary was USD 58.86. The region with the lowest cost per beneficiary was Asia, with a minimum expenditure in Nepal (USD 13.35), while in Africa the maximum expenditure was in Kenya (USD 925.93). These countries reflect contrasting ways that ISFP TCP project interventions were designed. The project in Nepal looked to target as many beneficiaries as possible with seeds, animal feed and medicines<sup>1</sup>, while the Kenya project focused on a smaller number of beneficiaries and provided a more holistic package of rice seed, fertilizer, pesticide and technical training.

The ISFP TCP projects distributed many different types of inputs. The distribution of

---

<sup>1</sup> While the Nepal TCP project distributed animal feed and medicines, the national assessment report only examined the seed distribution component. This was justified by the fact that the livestock component was not part of the original project plan and the travel time and costs to survey the regions with livestock interventions were prohibitive.



©FAO/Alessandra Benedetti

**Table 1 ISFP TCP project budgets and number of beneficiaries in 80 countries**

Region	Sub-region <sup>b</sup>	Budget (USD)	No. of Beneficiary households	Budget/beneficiary household (USD/household)		
				Overall	Min	Max
Asia and the Pacific	RAP	4 700 000	140 512	33.45	13.35	167.79
	SAP	2 500 000	43 191	57.88	27.78	227.27
Sub-Saharan Africa	SFC	2 250 000	57 958	38.82	25.00	50.20
	SFE	2 250 000	36 953	60.89	31.25	925.93
	SFS	4 750 000	64 577	73.56	29.09	185.19
	SFW	6 490 000	86 941	74.65	37.31	179.02
Caribbean	SLC	3 250 000	20 250	169.49	46.01	865.05
Others <sup>a</sup>		3 808 000	59 269	64.25	38.31	116.28
<b>Total</b>		<b>29 998 000</b>	<b>509 651</b>	<b>58.86</b>	<b>13.35</b>	<b>925.93</b>

Note:

a - Other countries include Armenia, Haiti, Honduras, Kyrgyzstan, Mauritania, Nicaragua, Republic of Moldova and Yemen  
b - See Appendix 2 for full list of ISFP TCP beneficiary countries by subregional office

cereal seeds was more common in Asia and other regions than in sub-Saharan Africa where the focus was more on other crops, cuttings and seedlings. Many of the projects in Africa focussed on the distribution of vegetable seeds and other market garden crops due, in part, to the growing season during which the TCP projects were being implemented. The Caribbean focussed its interventions on non-cereal crops<sup>2</sup>, tools and animal production (see Table 2).

The ISFP TCP projects in some countries also had animal production components. Such projects either provided animal feed and medicines or

supplied an animal production package including live animals (e.g. chicks, piglets and rabbits), animal feed and medicines, and/or animal pen construction materials.

<sup>2</sup> The results are based on information received as of 3 September 2010 from 66 countries. Although assessments were originally planned for all 80 countries, assessments in five countries (Comoros, Eritrea, Haiti, Pakistan and Yemen) were not implemented due to circumstances beyond the control of the project. Due primarily to delays in the implementation of some projects and their consequent late closure, at the time of writing this synthesis report assessments had not been completed in three countries (Antigua and Barbuda, Guyana and Suriname) and only partially completed in six others (Guinea Bissau, Madagascar, Mauritius, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles and Sierra Leone). The survey results from these countries were thus not considered in the data tables, but described in certain parts of the report narrative.

**Table 2 Volumes of inputs distributed by ISFP TCP projects in assessed countries**

Input type	Units	Sub-Saharan Africa (26 countries)	Asia and the Pacific (23 countries)	Caribbean <sup>f</sup> (10 countries)	Other regions (6 countries)	Total
Cereals <sup>a</sup>	Tonnes	774	46 019	8.3	1 934	48 735
Other crops <sup>b</sup>	Tonnes	3 385	830	11.5	295	4 522
	Kits/packs	1 400	62 500	126	-	64 026
Cuttings and seedlings <sup>c</sup>	Number	1 991 150	180 200	513 325	-	2 684 675
Fertilizers	Tonnes	25 302	1 390	184	187	27 063
	Bags <sup>d</sup>	1 167	-	7 750	-	8 917
Pesticides, insecticides, fungicides	Kg	1 338	3 000	37	124 360	128 735
	Litres	36 862	100	283	-	37 245
Animals	Number	25 000	6 350	26 333	-	57 683
Animal feed / fodder seeds	Tonnes	1 224	-	145	-	1 369
	Bags <sup>d</sup>	-	4 100	250	-	4 350
Other animal related <sup>e</sup>	Doses or pieces	170 000	-	1 590	-	171 590
Agriculture tools and materials	Number	191 505	68 364	18 115	-	277 984

**Note:**

a - Cereals include maize, rice, wheat, millet and sorghum.

b - Other crops include vegetables, legumes, fruits, roots and tubers.

c - In addition to the above figures, the SFC region reported that 625 250 linear metres and 44 227 bottles of cassava were distributed.

d - Units expressed in bags as the size of bags was not specified in all the national reports.

e - Other animal related includes vaccines, mineral stones and medicines.

f - Data from the Caribbean is incomplete with no data for Antigua and Barbuda, Jamaica and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines. In addition to the above figures, the following inputs were distributed: seeds - 71 206 vegetable seeds, 55 bags of unspecified size (peanuts), USD 1 750 of herb and vegetable seeds; pesticides - 18 packs of unspecified size and USD 15 000 of pesticides; animal related - 165 gallons of formic acid, 11 litres and USD 150 000 of medicines; agriculture tools and materials - 40.6 kg of nails and USD 5 400 of tools and materials.

### 2.3 Target beneficiaries and regions

The methods for determining target areas and beneficiary households differed among countries and regions, but some general criteria can be identified that helped in the decision-making process.

In many countries, the projects targeted **remote and underdeveloped locations** (e.g. Bhutan, Nepal), **areas affected by conflict** (e.g. Pakistan, Sri Lanka, the Sudan) as well as areas affected by **recurrent natural disasters** like droughts, floods and hurricanes. Efforts were also made, wherever possible, to target **vulnerable households that have agricultural potential**.

Projects in western Africa, for example, broadly focussed their efforts on poor, vulnerable families, including those affected by natural disasters, those displaced by conflict, households with persons affected by chronic illness, households with limited arable land, etc. Beneficiary lists were established by local public administrators (e.g. mayor, high commissioners)

and technical authorities (e.g. Ministry of Agriculture) in collaboration with the producers themselves. Among such households some further selection criteria were identified, namely:

- ownership of farmland;
- experience in producing crops grown in the context of TCP projects, including vegetable crops and other off-season crops;
- possession of livestock for recipients of animal feed;
- existence of potential markets for the marketing of agricultural produce.

Many countries in the southern Africa subregion also tried to identify vulnerable households, which, at the same time, had good agricultural potential. It was often difficult, however, to combine vulnerability and agricultural potential characteristics, i.e. the most vulnerable groups are usually those with the least productive assets. Various TCP projects that applied this type



of selection method had difficulties in providing coherent lists of beneficiary households.

Some countries relied on the **knowledge of local leaders to identify vulnerable households** who could benefit from the ISFP TCP intervention, such as the mayors in Armenia who described their selection criteria below:

*“The inputs were given to those who were involved in farming and were poor, either living in temporary shelters/cabins, or with many children..., mainly to those who have land and are specialized in that...”, “we know who the poorest in the village are and who has arable land. We tried to give it to those in need, who have no working hands, who need that wheat...”, “we didn’t give it to the poorest, as they intended to use it as animal feed...in order for the project to be efficient we gave it to those who cultivate land.”*

A number of countries based the selection of beneficiaries primarily on their **membership to a farmer’s group** (e.g. cooperatives, associations, farmer field schools) and/or participation in ongoing government projects and programmes. The SFS region found this selection method to be one of the most efficient, as targeting was facilitated by the participation of members in groups. Nevertheless, based on the review of the beneficiary targeting experiences, in some countries (e.g. Angola and Zambia) it seems that selection of beneficiaries from groups could create internal conflict and disrupt the well-being of the group. One suggestion was that it could be more effective to target all members of selected groups even if at the expense of decreasing the number of groups selected.

On the other hand, in Burundi, while 30 percent of the beneficiaries consisted of internally displaced persons (IDPs), returnees and vulnerable farmers, the remaining 70 percent were selected from among the productive farmers. In this case, more weight was given to productive farmers because of the Government’s intention to replicate the programme on a wider scale. The project looked to incorporate farmers with capacities to pay back the seeds to enable the Government to scale up the programme by redistributing the seeds to new farmers the following seasons.

## 2.4 Methods of distributing inputs

In looking at the ways that inputs were delivered to beneficiaries in ISFP TCP projects, they can be grouped into two categories.

### Direct distribution

One of the most commonly used delivery methods by ISFP TCP projects was direct distribution. This involved the procurement of inputs from local or international sources, after which they were distributed to farmers. The distribution was conducted either through the existing government decentralized network of offices or through Nongovernmental Organizations (NGOs) and/or farmers’ groups who were then responsible for distributing inputs to individual farmers. In some cases, suppliers were responsible for delivery of inputs directly to local collection points where farmers went to pick them up.

The choice in whether to use existing government networks or to channel inputs to NGOs or farmers’ groups was influenced by the context of the country and project. For example, the TCP project in Zambia provided vegetable and legume seeds to farmers participating in the Government’s Fertilizer Support Programme (FSP). The selection of beneficiaries and methods of delivering the seeds were thus based on the processes already established by the FSP. Box 1 provides an outline of the distribution methods used in Belize and illustrates variations on the direct distribution methods.

There were projects that integrated innovative features. For example, a number of countries used revolving schemes in the design of their projects. In Saint Lucia and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, feed stocks were sold to farmers at reduced prices. The money collected was used to purchase more feed which was then distributed to a wider cross section of beneficiaries. This is a more sustainable option than the free distribution of feed seen in some countries. In Burundi, bean seeds and potato cuttings were given to beneficiaries as a loan. Farmers were asked to give back the same quantity of seeds and cuttings after harvests to be distributed to other neighbouring farmers. In the event of crop failure, however, farmers were not required to ‘refund’ the seeds and cuttings.

## Box 1 Distribution methods in Belize

In Belize, poor farming households, reeling from the devastation of Hurricane Dean in 2007 and struggling with high food and fuel prices, received assistance either in the form of seeds, fertilizers and pesticides, or chickens and pigs.

Belize used three methods of direct distribution depending on the types of inputs and availability of beneficiaries to collect them: direct delivery, collection at a central location, and personal office/supplier delivery.

Farmers were most satisfied with the direct delivery system. There were a number of drawbacks, such as limits on the amount of inputs able to be delivered at any one time and occasional transportation issues causing delays and shortages. However, beneficiaries felt that if the system could be improved, it would be ideal as it enabled them to meet implementers on a more personal basis, enhance their oversight and ensure that they received the right amount of inputs at the right time.

Beneficiaries acknowledged that with good organization the method of collecting inputs at a central location could be effective and efficient. However, the system allowed for politicians to be present at the delivery, risking government appropriation of FAO support and its use for political purposes. Furthermore, the lack of a well organized and transparent distribution can lead to confusion and little control over the flow of inputs. As a result, some beneficiaries ended up not receiving their full entitlements.

Although personal office/supplier delivery method can also enable the provision of technical advice, beneficiaries showed some dissatisfaction with this system as it required transportation and a specific delivery time, which were often difficult to arrange.

*Source:* Beneficiary Satisfaction and Impact Assessment Report of the Initiative on Soaring Food Prices Technical Cooperation Programme Project in Belize.

### Vouchers and Input Trade Fairs

The voucher and input trade fairs system involves the distribution of vouchers to beneficiary households, which could be used as money to purchase inputs at input trade fairs (ITF) organized by the government and FAO. Agricultural traders were invited to sell their wares and the farmers were free to choose the types of inputs they wished to purchase within the limitations of the value of the vouchers distributed. The use of vouchers and ITFs to deliver inputs was done in very few countries.

This system has various strengths, helping to ensure greater diversity and the free choice of inputs while decreasing logistical and administrative costs. A few positive indirect impacts of ITFs are important to note. First, indirect benefits could be seen at the procurement level, where local small-, medium- or large-scale traders could participate in ITFs. The suppliers benefited from a greater demand of goods as farmers had access to funds to purchase inputs. This provided a boost to the local economy. ITFs, furthermore, also increased the availability of inputs at the community level as

purchases could also be done with cash. The interactions among agricultural extension officers, traders and purchasers stimulated an exchange of knowledge and ideas, serving as informal training to beneficiaries and traders.

Even though ITFs have shown to be a positive approach to input distribution, they also raised some concerns, including the limited competition between traders and price fixing. It is necessary to avoid price manipulation by ensuring that an adequate critical mass of traders is present and price fixing does not occur.

The second difficulty was related to the cost-effectiveness of the sale of inputs from traders, especially when the suggested location of the ITFs was remote. In various cases in Lesotho, fairs had limited traders present with limited inputs. In Lesotho, although households seemed to be willing to purchase basal and topdressing fertilizer with their vouchers, those commodities were not available for purchase. In such cases, it might be necessary to support traders with transport so as to minimize their costs and ensure that ITFs are effectively carried out in remote areas.

## **Box 2** Innovative scheme to fund community-based microprojects in Afghanistan

Decades of conflict in Afghanistan have left much of the country's agriculture sector and rural infrastructure in tatters. Farmers have also had to contend with recurring drought, which has affected cereal production. In 2008, FAO launched a Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP) project to help assure the off-season wheat crop for some of the most vulnerable producers, providing certified wheat seed and fertilizers to families hit hard by the rise in food and fuel prices.

To discourage farmers from becoming dependent, the Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Livestock and FAO agreed to distribute the inputs against 20 percent of the actual cost of each package, excluding transportation and loading expenses. In previous years, FAO Afghanistan's input distribution scheme included a subsidy of 50 percent of the value of the input. However, with the spike in food and input prices in 2008, the figure was reduced to 20 percent. The recovered amount was then used to fund three community-based microprojects: a livestock artificial insemination centre, a veterinary clinic, and an office building for an extension department. For all three projects, the recipient organization worked closely with local community leaders to determine the needs of their communities.

*Source:* Beneficiary Satisfaction and Impact Assessment Report of the Initiative on Soaring Food Prices Technical Cooperation Programme Project in Afghanistan.

The third difficulty was related to quality control. Because various unregistered traders were part of the ITFs, issues with quality and confidence of inputs were raised by beneficiaries, implementing agencies and FAO. Lastly, problems related to the forging of vouchers were also documented. It is important to ensure that a careful fraud prevention system is included in the ITF system design.

The ISFP TCP impact assessment analysis of the benefits and limitations of voucher programmes are broadly confirmed by the findings of other more substantial reviews of input supply voucher programmes in sub-Saharan Africa.



### 3 Gauging perceptions of beneficiaries and project impacts<sup>1</sup>

FAO TCP projects under the ISFP were developed and implemented over a very short time frame in order to bring immediate assistance to affected populations and serve as a catalyst for additional funding. Because of this, it was not possible to conduct conventional baseline surveys that would have enabled more in-depth impact analysis. In the absence of such baseline data to evaluate project impact, the ISFP Secretariat developed general guidelines and generic survey questionnaires to collect some socio-economic data on beneficiaries, their satisfaction with the project and perceptions of how the project impacted them.

FAO decentralized offices and consultants recruited to carry out the assessments were given flexibility to adapt the questionnaires to better fit the context of the project and country in which the surveys were to be conducted. As the assessments were funded from residual funds of national or regional ISFP TCP projects, budgetary restrictions also played a role in determining sample sizes and methodologies. Efforts were made to collect the views of female-headed beneficiary households to see if differences existed in the perceptions of male and female beneficiaries. The views of implementing agencies and input suppliers involved in the projects were also collected.

This chapter highlights some of the major findings of the surveys including: (i) beneficiaries' knowledge of inputs distributed and willingness to adopt; (ii) satisfaction levels of beneficiaries with regards to reception, timeliness, appropriateness and quality of inputs received; (iii) perceived impacts that the project had on crop production, accessibility to food, ability to sell, animal production and animal health; and (iv) gender differences in the responses provided by sample households.

#### 3.1 Beneficiaries' knowledge of inputs distributed and willingness to adopt them

The questionnaire that was used contained four *yes* or *no* questions on the beneficiaries' knowledge on the inputs distributed and the

willingness to adopt them: (i) whether beneficiaries had used the project inputs previously; (ii) whether they were previously trained on the use of project inputs; (iii) whether they could buy project inputs locally; and (iv) whether they would be willing to buy inputs, if they were available in the market.

Table 3 presents the results regarding beneficiaries' knowledge of seeds distributed and willingness to adopt them. The main deviations to the global mean are usually caused by single countries and can be considered as exceptions. In the case of RAP, Nepal, with 36 864 beneficiaries, is mainly responsible for the low weighted average with regard to beneficiaries who have benefited from training.

In the SFS region, Zambia, with a high number of beneficiaries, had a strong influence on weighted averages. The limited access to TCP financed seeds in local markets in Zambia (25 percent) brings the weighted average down. On the other hand, Zambian beneficiaries show a high willingness to adopt (91 percent), increasing the weighted average of this indicator.

The figures show that on average only around half of the beneficiaries had previous contact with the type of seeds received<sup>2</sup> and less than a half had had training on their use. Despite the lack of access to the distributed crops, an average of 70 percent of the beneficiaries would be willing to buy the seeds if they were affordable and available.

For the SFW region, farmers of Benin, Burkina Faso and Senegal showed low levels of familiarity with the distributed improved varieties: respectively 18, 32 and 20 percent of the interviewed households had previous contact with the distributed seed varieties. Respectively,

---

1 The regional and global averages of the different indicators presented in this chapter are weighted according to the number of beneficiaries of each project; the exception being Section 3.1 in which both straight and weighted averages are presented, due to significant differences in some of the figures.

2 Depending on the countries, *type of seed* might refer to either crop or variety. In many countries where improved seed varieties of traditional crops were distributed, the question focused on the knowledge of the varieties. In countries where crops that were not the main local staple crop were distributed (e.g. vegetable seeds) the question concerned the knowledge of those crops.



©FAO/Alessandra Benedetti

77 and 61 percent of the interviewees in Benin and Burkina Faso said they would not buy the seeds as they are not available in the market.

The Dominican Republic, which targeted significantly more beneficiaries than any other country in the SLC region (5 435 in total), is mainly responsible for the increase of the weighted average of beneficiaries who received training on the distributed seeds, and for the decrease on the weighted average of beneficiaries who had access to the seeds locally.

The SAP region is a particular case. In this subregion the variance in the results of the different countries is large, making the means not very significant.

With regard to the results for training in the countries for which no (sub)regional synthesis was produced, the Republic of Moldova, whose project provided training and targeted 30 000 beneficiaries, greatly increased the weighted average.

Weighted and simple averages for fertilizers differ from each other slightly more than they do for seeds (see Table 4). This is primarily because fewer countries distributed fertilizer. In regions where only two countries with very different numbers of beneficiaries received fertilizers, the simple and the weighted averages show a wide gap. This is the case of the SFE region where only

23 percent of the Kenyan producers interviewed had used the distributed fertilizers before, while in Burundi 71 percent of the interviewed beneficiaries had experience with the input. In RAP, the difference for the same indicator is between Afghanistan (0 percent), Bangladesh (37 percent) and Cambodia (59 percent). Curiously when asked if they had received training on the use of inputs, answers showed an opposite trend: Afghanistan (100 percent), Bangladesh (58 percent), and Cambodia (10 percent). The TCP project in Afghanistan included a training component.

On the whole, as the results suggest, there was a lack of adequate knowledge concerning the application of the distributed inputs. This is mostly due to the preference given in the TCP projects to improved technologies. This is illustrated by the difference in results between Afghanistan and Chad. The seeds distributed in Chad were acquired in local markets, thus 100 percent of the producers had used them before. Conversely, in the region where the TCP project was implemented in Afghanistan, markets for agriculture inputs were almost non-existent. None of the beneficiaries interviewed in this country had ever previously used the seeds that were distributed.

Even though the introduction of new and improved varieties and types of seeds is positive,

**Table 3 Beneficiaries' knowledge of seeds distributed and willingness to adopt them**

Region	Had used the TCP seeds before		Had received training on the TCP seeds before <sup>a</sup>		Have access to TCP seeds locally		Willing to buy seeds if available	
	Weighted average (%)	Average (%)	Weighted average (%)	Average (%)	Weighted average (%)	Average (%)	Weighted average (%)	Average (%)
RAP	48	53	36	42	62	56	63	58
SAP	67	72	37	57	72	60	72	54
SFC <sup>b</sup>	53	58	80	80	69	74	87	90
SFE	57	64	46	45	55	55	80	80
SFS	46	52	38	48	46	61	79	74
SFW	38	52	49	65	42	51	44	55
SLC	65	76	37	29	48	70	68	78
Others	53	50	45	34	41	41	55	57
<b>Global</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>68</b>

Note:

a - The interpretation of this table was not the same in all countries. Some beneficiaries responded about training received only during the TCP project, while others spoke of training received before and during the TCP.

b - For the SFC region, the questions were made for all the inputs distributed and not for seeds and fertilizers separately. Only the Democratic Republic of the Congo answered the question on whether beneficiaries had received training before.

**Table 4 Beneficiaries' knowledge of fertilizers distributed and willingness to adopt them**

Region	Had used the TCP fertilizers before		Had received training on the TCP fertilizers		Have access to TCP fertilizers locally		Willing to buy fertilizers if available	
	Weighted average (%)	Average (%)	Weighted average (%)	Average (%)	Weighted average (%)	Average (%)	Weighted average (%)	Average (%)
RAP	36	49	54	67	57	48	56	48
SAP	86	88	40	54	46	50	48	38
SFE	67	47	47	26	72	72	71	71
SFS	53	58	48	53	57	63	70	65
SFW	30	39	44	61	59	57	57	52
SLC	54	68	34	28	46	66	65	73
Others	13	13	22	22	12	12	14	14
<b>Global</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>52</b>

the lack of previous utilization of seeds calls for the need for training or technical support. As the ISFP TCP projects were responding to an emergency and the instructions regarding the ISFP TCP projects required that 95 percent of the funds be used for the purchase of inputs, training components were not included in many of the projects. There were cases though, in which training was considered. In Angola, for example, the distribution of inputs was made through farmer field schools, which ensured the training of beneficiaries. In countries in which inputs were distributed through input trade fairs (e.g. Lesotho and Swaziland), beneficiaries could receive technical support while at the fair. In Nicaragua, a portion of funds from a TCP Facility (TCP/NIC/3201) provided technical assistance and capacity building support to 70 percent of ISFP TCP project beneficiaries.

ISFP TCP project beneficiaries were less familiar with fertilizers than they were with seeds, as fertilizers are expensive and sometimes not available in local markets. In the Democratic Republic of the Congo, only 9 percent of the

beneficiaries had used the fertilizers before. Also in some countries in SLC (Barbados, Saint Lucia and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines), some beneficiaries said that they would normally purchase the distributed seeds (rising prices prohibited the purchase during the year of the TCP project). This, however, did not happen with fertilizers and other agrochemicals. The beneficiaries of some countries had neither knowledge nor training (91 percent in the Bahamas) in the use of these types of inputs.

Despite the lack of training, many beneficiaries showed willingness to acquire the inputs distributed by the ISFP TCP projects. Additionally, as pointed out in the report for Southern Africa, the projects also showed a good degree of latent demand for new seeds as about 30 to 40 percent of voucher-receiving beneficiaries in Lesotho and Swaziland, for instance, chose seed varieties they had never planted before. Unfortunately, as the report for SFC states, the willingness to acquire is often greater than the purchasing capacities in the subregion.

As noted in the SFE report, the observed attitudinal change is consistent with the long held belief about farmers' willingness to embrace changes. In theory, one of the factors affecting the willingness of farmers to adopt technology is the additional income or benefits that the use of the technology generates. In this sense the results concerning the willingness to adopt the ISFP TCP inputs reflect the success they had in improving farmers' production.

### 3.2 Beneficiaries' satisfaction level with the inputs received

One of the main objectives of the ISFP TCP survey was to assess the satisfaction levels of beneficiaries with the agricultural inputs that were provided through the projects. Accordingly, the beneficiary impact assessment aimed, among other things, to gauge the satisfaction of beneficiaries regarding inputs received, the timeliness of the delivery of inputs in relation to the agricultural seasons, the appropriateness of the inputs to the farming system and the quality of the inputs. In Table 5, the responses of the beneficiaries are graded into three levels: satisfied, indifferent and dissatisfied.

This section presents the survey results on satisfaction with seeds and fertilizers as they were distributed in all regions to a significant number of countries and beneficiaries and were consistently reported separately from other inputs. Quantitative analysis of satisfaction levels with other inputs such as pesticides, tools, livestock or livestock feed has not been conducted as there are inconsistencies in the way they were analysed in the national ISFP TCP assessment reports. Some reports analysed these inputs individually, while others grouped them under a single category making it difficult to compare results between regions.

The great majority of the beneficiaries (86 percent) expressed their satisfaction with receiving seeds and fertilizers from the ISFP TCP projects. A natural question, however, is why 14 percent of the beneficiaries are indifferent or dissatisfied, even to a small extent, with receiving inputs for free. RAP found that the sources of dissatisfaction were due to a mismatch between desired and supplied materials with regard to the type, variety, quantity and timing. In the SFE region, Burundi farmers' dissatisfaction in receiving seeds was in fact an expression of the beneficiaries' opinion on the quantity and quality of the inputs, while dissatisfaction in Djibouti and Rwanda stemmed from delays in delivery in relation to the agricultural season.

Quantity seems to be an important issue for most of the beneficiaries. Although not evidenced in the figures, RAP and SFS mentioned that the quantities distributed were often too small to make an impact on production and that the distribution should include kits of complementary inputs (seeds, fertilizer, hoes, etc.). In fact, many countries attempted to provide complete kits, even running the risk of increasing the project's complexity and compromising the timeliness of delivery.

Although, as mentioned above, the global quantitative analysis of the satisfaction of beneficiaries with inputs other than seeds and fertilizers is difficult, some reports provide interesting qualitative comments on other types of inputs. The report for the SLC region mentions that feed and medicines provided to the producers of livestock were well received. Beneficiaries commented on the assistance arriving at a time when the cost of feed rose above their financial means and the assistance provided a safety net for the animals they were rearing, preventing the loss

**Table 5 Satisfaction of beneficiaries with receiving inputs**

Region	Seeds			Fertilizer		
	Satisfied (%)	Indifferent (%)	Dissatisfied (%)	Satisfied (%)	Indifferent (%)	Dissatisfied (%)
RAP	88	9	3	100	0	0
SAP	98	2	1	84	16	0
SFC	90	2	8	88	3	9
SFE	65	13	21	75	2	23
SFS*	61	4	34	47	6	47
SFW	93	2	5	90	1	9
SLC	83	9	8	80	0	20
Others	86	7	8	88	8	4
<b>Global Average</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>12</b>

\* Data for SFS relates to the satisfaction with the quantity received

of their stock (Barbados). In other instances, the livestock (chickens) supplemented the diet of the beneficiaries' families (Jamaica).

The figures in Table 6 show that respectively 65 and 86 percent of beneficiaries were satisfied with the timeliness of seed and fertilizer delivery, a figure that for seeds is lower than could be desired. The short time frame that was given for procurement and distribution made it difficult to deliver inputs before the main planting season. Some countries/regions, however, managed to work around this constraint. In West Africa, countries like Guinea (97 percent satisfaction) opted to distribute inputs for second season crops. Angola delayed input distribution for one year so it could coincide with the main planting season.

The inputs distributed were considered appropriate by most users (Table 7). The exception here is the SFE region where Rwanda (47 percent dissatisfied) had problems with the quality of the first lot of beans, which was rejected by the farmers. North Sudan's beneficiaries (23 percent dissatisfied) expressed a wish to receive a wider variety of seeds.

A third country that showed abnormal levels of dissatisfaction was Nepal. The problem here was the distribution of improved varieties of finger millet seed, while beneficiaries were accustomed to growing the local varieties.

In general, beneficiaries were satisfied with the quality of the inputs provided by the projects (Table 8).

**Table 6 Satisfaction of beneficiaries with the timeliness of inputs delivery**

Region	Seeds			Fertilizer		
	Satisfied (%)	Indifferent (%)	Dissatisfied (%)	Satisfied (%)	Indifferent (%)	Dissatisfied (%)
RAP	70	11	19	96	3	1
SAP	94	4	3	85	15	0
SFC	68	5	27	77	5	18
SFE	49	13	38	71	1	28
SFS	49	3	48	-	-	-
SFW	57	10	34	85	4	10
SLC	75	10	16	90	3	7
Others	71	10	20	88	8	4
Global Average	65	9	26	86	4	10

**Table 7 Satisfaction of beneficiaries with the appropriateness of inputs**

Region	Seeds			Fertilizer		
	Satisfied (%)	Indifferent (%)	Dissatisfied (%)	Satisfied (%)	Indifferent (%)	Dissatisfied (%)
RAP	80	11	9	99	1	0
SAP	94	5	1	84	16	0
SFC	70	7	23	-	-	-
SFE	58	14	27	91	1	8
SFS	90	3	8	92	5	3
SFW	87	6	7	80	2	18
SLC	82	11	7	90	9	0
Others	78	10	11	86	10	4
Global Average	81	8	10	84	3	13

**Table 8 Satisfaction of beneficiaries with the quality of inputs**

Region	Seeds			Fertilizer		
	Satisfied (%)	Indifferent (%)	Dissatisfied (%)	Satisfied (%)	Indifferent (%)	Dissatisfied (%)
RAP	83	12	5	100	0	0
SAP	94	6	0	82	18	0
SFC	74	5	21	91	3	6
SFE	75	2	22	94	1	5
SFS	88	5	7	95	5	0
SFW	91	7	3	99	1	0
SLC	90	5	5	74	13	13
Others	80	7	13	88	8	4
Global Average	84	8	8	97	2	1

Concerns were raised in SLC that some of the planting materials provided (cassava and sweet potatoes) did not have a regulated length and had been subject to a high percentage of water loss. The handling of delicate seeds also resulted in a number of seeds being damaged in different countries throughout the subregions, resulting in poor plant stand and low germination of seeds.

Several reports (Dominica, Grenada and Saint Lucia) referred to the need for certified providers of planting materials, more familiarity of personnel involved in the project in dealing with large quantities of inputs as well as proper drying, storage and transport.

Given the conditions in which the agents had to operate, however, it seems that the projects did the utmost to provide good quality inputs.

### 3.3 Beneficiaries' perceptions of the impacts of ISFP TCP projects

In looking at the perceived impacts that the ISFP TCP projects had on crop production and food accessibility, 65 percent of beneficiaries felt that their production had improved (see Table 9). SAP beneficiaries had the highest perception of improvement, but the results may be influenced by the small sample sizes used for the assessments in the region. About 15-20 percent of the beneficiaries felt their crop production and food accessibility had remained unchanged or had deteriorated.

A number of factors can account for the perceived deterioration of crop production and

food accessibility experienced by beneficiaries. Adverse climatic conditions, i.e. drought, had been experienced in some countries. Delays in the delivery of inputs and late planting also affected production. In some cases seeds had to be stored until the following season, which farmers felt had affected the germination rates. In a few exceptional cases, the poor quality of seeds was reported as being problematic and pushed some farmers to consume the seeds as food (e.g. Burundi). The low local availability of quality seeds was a contributing factor and the report for Rwanda, another country which faced problems of seed quality, recommended the need to develop a reliable community-based seed industry to enhance the availability of quality seeds. Constraints in the structure and functionality of local input supply markets were an overarching factor contributing to reduced ISFP TCP results.

With regard to the ability to sell, improvements felt by beneficiaries were slightly less than their perceived impact on crop production or food accessibility (see Table 10). Not all households had good access to markets to sell their surplus production, which can help to account for this difference. The inclusion of a marketing or post-harvest component in future interventions was recommended in the SLC report.

#### Animal production

In looking at the perceived impacts with regard to animal production components, about 50 percent of

**Table 9 Perceived impacts of ISFP TCP projects on crop production and food accessibility**

Perceived impact	Region	Improved (%)	Unchanged (%)	Deteriorated (%)
Crop production	RAP	62	14	24
	SAP	88	12	1
	SFC	57	12	31
	SFE	63	14	23
	SFS	50	17	33
	SFW	83	15	2
	SLC	60	34	6
	Other	42	38	20
	<b>Global Average</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>17</b>
Food accessibility	RAP	61	14	25
	SAP	87	12	1
	SFC	39	24	38
	SFE	62	20	18
	SFS	66	20	15
	SFW	83	14	2
	SLC	64	32	4
	Other	46	42	13
	<b>Global Average</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>15</b>



beneficiaries saw an improvement in animal production or health while the other 50 percent felt there was no change (see Table 11).

The figures in Table 11, however, need to be treated with some caution. In the SAP region, for example, some of the projects were still in the process of being implemented and it was not easy for beneficiaries to judge whether their animal production or health had improved or not. This accounts, in part, for the high proportion of people stating that their situation had remained unchanged.

In the SLC region, the beneficiaries in Jamaica felt that they had seen great improvements in animal production and health, while those in Grenada and Saint Lucia felt their situation remained unchanged. In the latter two countries, problems with transport of live animals had led to high mortality rates and problems in the distribution system resulted in insufficient quantities of inputs being distributed. These can be seen as reasons for the high percentage of beneficiaries stating that their situation had not changed. The SFW region had animal production components in two countries, Cape Verde and the Niger. Table 11 only shows the values for Cape Verde as the questions regarding animal production and health were not asked in the Niger.

### 3.4 Gender perspectives in ISFP TCP projects

While the majority of the ISFP TCP projects did not specifically target female-headed households, there were countries, such as Djibouti and Senegal, which made efforts to target women's cooperatives. The ISFP TCP assessments tried to consider gender perspectives by analysing differences in responses to survey questions by male- and female-headed beneficiary households. There was an inconsistency, however, in the analysis of gender differences in responses, either due to the low level of female-headed households sampled or to the fact that many assessments did not find significant differences in the answers provided. Nevertheless, there are some findings which are of interest to highlight.

In Asia, it was found that previous knowledge of the agriculture inputs received and satisfaction levels did not differ significantly between male- and female-headed households. Males, however, were more willing to buy TCP provided inputs if they were available on the market. Female beneficiaries were perhaps less likely to have the means to purchase such inputs.

The Asia report also highlights differences in the perceived impacts that the ISFP TCP had on

**Table 10 Perceived impacts of ISFP TCP projects on ability to sell**

Region	Improved (%)	Unchanged (%)	Deteriorated (%)
RAP	56	22	22
SAP	86	14	0
SFC	51	23	26
SFE	43	44	12
SFS	45	35	20
SFW	83	14	2
SLC	52	43	5
Other	38	43	19
Global Average	60	25	14

**Table 11 Perceived impacts of ISFP TCP projects on animal production and health**

Perceived impact	Region	Improved (%)	Unchanged (%)	Deteriorated (%)
Animal production	SFW	72	29	0
	SAP	28	72	0
	SLC	59	41	0
	Global Average	48	52	0
Animal health	SFW	73	27	0
	SAP	38	60	2
	SLC	54	47	0
	Global Average	53	47	1

their crop production, accessibility to food and ability to sell. While both male- and female-headed households perceived positive changes in impact in all these categories, female-headed households had lower impact perception values, reflecting either their pessimism or lower levels of production, accessibility to food and ability to sell (see Table 12).

One factor in the lower perceived impact amongst female beneficiaries could be the inadequate access of female-headed households to production services such as extension advice and the supply of credit and other inputs, including irrigation, which were generally not covered under the projects' scope. The RAP report notes that the

extension advice in particular may be deficient because the agricultural extension cadres in the countries of the region are overwhelmingly dominated by men and they prefer to cater to the male farmers.

The assessments in the SFS region looked into the use of income generated from production based on the ISFP TCP inputs received. While women beneficiaries tended to spend more income on education, male beneficiaries tended to spend more income on household improvements and agricultural and livestock inputs. The investment in social capital by female-headed households can be seen as a positive impact of the projects (see Table 13).

**Table 12 Perceived impacts of ISFP TCP projects in Asia**

	Crop production		Food accessibility		Ability to sell	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Deteriorated (%)	15	20	16	22	18	23
Unchanged (%)	10	12	10	11	18	21
Improved (%)	75	68	73	68	65	56

**Table 13 Use of income from sale of crops by gender in the SFS region**

Beneficiary Gender	Used income from sale of products on					
	Education (%)	House Improvement (%)	Agric. Inputs (%)	Livestock (%)	Hiring of casual labour (%)	Health (%)
Female (N=48)	63	13	38	27	10	7
Male (N=414)	49	26	46	22	12	0

*Note:* Table includes only beneficiaries that responded positively to at least one of the expenses. Beneficiaries that said that they did not spend income on any of the sectors were excluded from the analyses.

**Box 3 Impact of ISFP TCP project in Chad: A testimonial from a female beneficiary in the Mandoul region**

“For years we depended exclusively on rainfed agriculture, growing long-cycle crops like cereals and cassava. We had to wait at least six months before the harvest and this exposed us to food insecurity. And yet, our neighbours in the village of Koumra and the surrounding areas were eating every day because they had household gardens in addition to their rainfed crops. These last years, and especially this past year, with the support of the project, we have increased the plots of land and branched out with marketing gardening. Since then, we have been eating every day. We aren't just eating the produce from the gardens but also selling it. This allows us to meet our food and other basic needs as we wait to harvest our rainfed crops. We hope that you will continue to help us to produce more. We came around late after having suffered all these years by just relying on rainfed crops. Please, send us inputs, especially seeds. We are ready to do more but we don't know where to get good quality seeds.”

*Source:* Translated from Beneficiary Satisfaction and Impact Assessment Report of the Initiative on Soaring Food Prices Technical Cooperation Programme Project in Chad.



## 4 Lessons learned from implementation of ISFP TCP projects

### 4.1 Project planning issues

One of the issues raised in the (sub)regional syntheses of ISFP TCP project assessments was that the amounts allocated to each country project did not vary much depending on their geographic size, the size and poverty level of their population, the magnitude of losses from natural disasters, etc. More importantly, most of the funds allocated through the TCP were too small to produce an impact on production that would be capable of changing food prices in the intervened countries.

TCP interventions must be seen instead as a catalyst for change, including technical innovation and increased donor engagement. There are examples in which the ISFP TCP, though small in size, played an important catalytic role in the mobilization of larger funding by other partners. Box 4 gives the example of Sierra Leone.

Within the limitation of the ISFP TCP projects' budgets, different countries adopted different approaches in trying to make the best use of the project funds. These varied from cases in which

the projects tried to cover a high number of beneficiaries, with a small allocation to each household, to countries with a limited target population but a higher allocation per household. In Asia, for example, Afghanistan made available USD 168 for each of the 2 980 beneficiary households. The project in Nepal, on the other hand, distributed seeds, animal feed and vaccines to 37 464 households for an allocation of USD 13 per beneficiary household. Another example of very specific limited targeting in a relatively large country is Kenya, with 540 beneficiary households for a TCP of USD 500 000.

These differences in the level of funds per household obviously influence the type of input package and size of the land parcel that is cultivated. The high level of aid per household in Kenya allowed for the distribution of seeds, fertilizers and pesticides and technical assistance through the local NGO Rural Environmental Care for Africa (RECA), one of the implementing partners of the project (see Box 5). In Afghanistan beneficiaries received a complete kit of

#### **Box 4 ISFP TCP project in Sierra Leone: A catalyst for mobilizing USD 20 million to the National Agriculture Response Programme (NARP)**

When the effects of the food price crisis began to be felt, Sierra Leone's Minister of Agriculture, Forestry and Food Security worked closely with development partners, including FAO, World Food Programme (WFP), International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and the African Development Bank, as well as a coalition of NGOs, to design its National Agriculture Response Programme (NARP). The NARP mapped out short-term safety net activities, largely through WFP mechanisms, and medium-term food responses, building on "Operation Feed the Nation", the country's national programme for food security.

In 2008, FAO's ISFP provided USD 500 000 through its Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP) as the first contribution to the NARP. Other development partners, including Irish Aid, the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) Fund for International Development and the Italian Cooperation, followed suit, providing financial support to the NARP, and in mid-2009, a two-year project was launched through the European Union Food Facility (EUFF), with more than EUR 10 million in funds. Additional activities were financed under existing African Development Bank and IFAD projects and new funding through the European Commission's NGO and WFP support. Contributions to actions under the NARP now top USD 20 million.

The NARP and the EUFF project, furthermore, underpinned Sierra Leone's Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) Country Compact and resulting Country Investment Programme, which, in turn, formed the basis of a successful USD 50 million grant bid under the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP).

*Source:* Adapted from Beneficiary Satisfaction and Impact Assessment Report of the Initiative on Soaring Food Prices Technical Cooperation Programme Project in Sierra Leone.

inputs and also training on their correct use. The reports from Central and Eastern Africa and Asia were supportive of the distribution of complete kits of inputs, noting that the absence of fertilizers and pesticides from the packages delivered to households undermined the gains in yields and benefits expected from the use of improved seeds.

Although most regions reported that complete inputs kits should be distributed to farmers, the report from SFS is clear in demonstrating that when expensive inputs, such as fertilizers, are included in the kits, the number of beneficiaries declines drastically. The reports for Asia, Central and Southern Africa note, however, that as inputs are distributed for free to a limited number of people within a community, there is always a chance of informal sharing of inputs, resulting in an incorrect application of the technical input package.

Another issue that arose, which is partially linked to the available budget per household, concerned the type of inputs to distribute and how this selection was made.

Asia saw the case of *blanket approaches* being used in countries with very different

farming systems within their borders. The fact that some countries had one crop as their staple food led to only one seed variety of that crop being distributed regardless of the differences in soil and climate conditions throughout each country. On the other hand, the type of agriculture, the farming systems and the identified needs of producers in the Pacific Islands and the Caribbean usually led to the decision of adopting a complex approach involving many types of inputs (vegetable seeds, fertilizers, livestock and livestock feed, tools, machinery, building materials, etc.). These countries, however, are already constrained by their need to ship these products from long distances and, although the concept was adequate, this led to severe delays and problems in procurement and delivery.

There needs to be a good balance between blanket approaches and projects that tend to be so specific to a population's needs that they become very complex and hard to manage.

Overall, *one size cannot fit all* and countries need to have the technical capacity to weigh the

#### Box 5 Revival of rice growing in western Kenya



©FAO/Sarah Elliott

For much of the last decade, rice farmers in the Ahero Irrigation Scheme in Nyanza Province in western Kenya struggled with low yields. Despite an earlier FAO investment of two new water pumps, which helped to revive the collapsed scheme in the mid-2000s, crops continued to under-perform as farmers became increasingly hamstrung by the high cost of seeds, fertilizers and fuel. Large swathes of the scheme's 2 168 acres were even left dormant. Fall-out from post-election violence coupled with the global surge in food prices in 2007-2008 left the Ahero community – already hit hard by poverty, unemployment and HIV/AIDS – even more vulnerable.

In September 2008, FAO worked closely with Kenya's National Irrigation Board (NIB), the Agriculture Finance Cooperation (AFC) and the Rural Environmental Care for Africa (RECA), a local NGO, to provide the scheme's 540 farming families with high-yielding rice seeds, fertilizers, pesticides and technical training. The number of beneficiaries to be assisted was decided on the basis of the amount of resources available and the effective amounts of inputs required to enable the vulnerable people to restart their livelihoods. In one season alone, farmers managed to double – even triple – their yields. Thanks to a robust market for rice, many farmers earned seven to eight times what they had made in the previous year. The rice boom generated many positive spin-offs in the community of 20 000, including more jobs, especially for young people, more rice in the markets, and more money flowing through the local economy. Farmers have begun to see farming as a viable business, taking steps to become self-sufficient, including forming farmers' groups and setting up a revolving credit fund and marketing committee.

Source: Adapted from Beneficiary Satisfaction and Impact Assessment Report of the Initiative on Soaring Food Prices Technical Cooperation Programme Project in Kenya.

many factors that have an effect on the results and impacts of the projects in order to make decisions on complex issues such as objectives, targeting or inputs choice. **The choice in the level of aid per household should thus consider factors such as the country's population size, farming systems, level of poverty and type of input distribution as well as the objectives of the project**, i.e. to reach as many of the most vulnerable people as possible (provide safety nets) or to identify those small farmers with the greatest productive potential in order to significantly increase production (supply the markets).

Some reports expressed concern about the lack of detail on these issues in the ISFP TCP project documents. Flexibility, however, was seen as a major strength of the ISFP TCP projects in Southern Africa. Country project managers had to make major changes to original project designs, as many project proposals were done under extreme time pressure and without proper stakeholder consultation. Hence, consultations between FAO and stakeholders after the acceptance of proposals meant major changes but also ensured that programmes were better suited to local contexts.

## 4.2 Project implementation issues

Based on the experiences in implementing the ISFP TCP projects, this section identifies some key issues to be aware of during the implementation of such projects.

### 4.2.1 Targeting issues

As mentioned in Chapter 2, the ISFP TCP projects aimed to target vulnerable households that have some agriculture potential, particularly in areas affected by natural disasters or conflict. While it is important to have clear and specific selection criteria, various factors can affect delivery of inputs to targeted groups.

#### Political involvement

A number of the subregional synthesis reports noted that, in some instances, political interference affected the end recipients of ISFP TCP inputs. In the SFS region, the process of beneficiary selection, usually involving community chiefs, leadership councils or local government, tended to raise issues of selection bias as the selection process was politicized. The Belize report mentioned that although local extension officers had done their best to identify and list vulnerable households that were capable of producing, these lists were later modified by centralized authorities according to political preferences.

#### Demand-side pressures

In some cases, even when the selection criteria were detailed, it was found that these criteria were not always strictly applied. In Bhutan, for example, extension workers at the time of input distribution faced pressures from farmers who were not on the beneficiary lists to divide seeds equally among all

### Box 6 The importance of building on country programmes

In Southern Africa, in all instances, the deliveries of TCP inputs were done through ongoing governmental activities. This consolidation ensured that inputs were distributed in a timely manner once the project implementation started, administrative expenses were decreased and bumps and unforeseen issues were avoided. The intensive collaboration ensured that the vast majority of financial resources used in the TCPs were applied to the purchase of inputs, increasing the cost-effectiveness of projects. A significant part of the TCPs was implemented through projects on which FAO has already worked during the past and therefore FAO had good knowledge of practices, strengths and limitations of implementing agencies' activities.

Although collaboration with national governments was a major strength of the TCP projects, relying on the national government posed a few challenges. The first complexity was seen in some countries where programmes merged with ongoing governmental programmes and were directed to political goals. The successful implementation of the TCP projects was highly dependent upon the existing relationship between FAO and the Ministries of Agriculture through their focal point. Even though in most cases relationships were positive and actually facilitated the process, the lack of a constructive relationship may have posed difficulties for some activities.

Source: Adapted from FAO SFS (2010).

farmers, partly because they were provided without charge. Some workers bowed to this pressure, but such sharing reduces the amount of inputs received by households and leads to the misapplication of input packages thus reducing the impact on production levels. While the sharing of inputs with other families can never be completely avoided, as this can happen informally after target beneficiaries receive them, country reports for Bhutan and Cambodia suggested that an equity contribution by beneficiaries for the inputs they receive could improve beneficiary ownership.

#### Practical issues

The beneficiary selection criteria were not exactly followed in Nepal and hence the purpose of distributing the seeds to only vulnerable households was not met. In the absence of funds for transportation, representative farmers assigned to distribute seeds in the local areas confined themselves to their close neighbours and relatives rather than reaching out to the distant farmers who were amongst the major target groups.

In one of the Pacific Islands, a village leader who did not fit the beneficiary selection criteria received agriculture inputs, but this was justified as he played a leadership role in organizing and training villagers. Thus, while it is important to have clear and specific selection criteria to ensure transparency in the distribution process, some deviation from the established criteria may be required to better fit the country's reality.

### 4.2.2 Logistical issues

#### Timing of deliveries

As planting seasons cannot wait, the timing of delivery is of utmost importance for emergency input supply projects. Extra care needs to be taken when the project requires the delivery of a wide variety of complementary inputs. In projects that were more complex with regard to the range of inputs to be delivered, however, there were a few cases where the timing of the delivery of complementary inputs was staggered, causing inconveniences. In Grenada, for example, materials such as wire mesh and galvanized sheets were made available to some beneficiaries for building poultry pens; however, a number of households surveyed indicated that they had received the poultry before receiving those materials.

#### Transport of live animals

In the delivery of animals (particularly baby chicks) a high mortality rate was incurred in some cases. In the SLC region, for example, such deaths were attributed to accumulated heat in the farmers' transportation vehicles in cases where the input suppliers did not transport the live animals to the farms. Although livestock components result in high degrees of satisfaction and improved income and diets, the supply of live animals can only occur if proper transportation can be guaranteed down to the farm level.

#### Repackaging of inputs

When agricultural inputs have been procured in bulk, some may need to be repackaged into quantities that can be distributed to beneficiaries. Some of the pesticides supplied to the Ministries of Agriculture in the SLC region were supplied in bulk. This posed great challenges to the personnel and resources of the Ministries of Agriculture as the distribution to the beneficiaries required redistribution and decanting into smaller quantities. Such issues should be taken into consideration in the logistical planning of the project.

#### Monitoring

Many of the reports indicated the need for greater resources to be devoted to the monitoring of project activities. This is particularly important at input distribution and crop planting stages of the project as it can ensure proper targeting, and extension advice can be provided on appropriate methods to grow crops and manage livestock to ensure maximum production from inputs received.

### 4.2.3 Procurement issues

Lengthy administrative protocols and bureaucratic procedures (such as obtaining invoices, the bidding process, approval processes from FAO headquarters, actual procurement and shipping, storage, etc.) with regard to procurement was cited as a constraint in various regions. This was particularly true for countries that are relatively isolated by their geography, such as island and mountainous countries, which often have to obtain inputs from overseas or international sources. In the SLC region it was noted that these procedures resulted in inputs arriving six months later than originally expected, causing

considerable delays in project implementation. Implementing agencies and input suppliers felt that the streamlining of procedures could drastically improve the distribution system. The report for Bhutan noted that the local procurement system and procedures could have been more cost effective and timely than the direct FAO procurement.

In the reports from RAP, SAP and SLC regions, it was mentioned that local suppliers faced difficulties in procuring the quantities of inputs required for the TCP project as FAO regulations do not allow for advance payments to be made. The RAP report recommended the need for credit arrangements for private input suppliers to facilitate the purchase of the required quantities of inputs. The SAP region reported that input suppliers in seven of the fourteen countries had faced this problem, which was regarded as the main cause of delays in the procurement of inputs for the project. The SLC region noted that the lack of advance payments forced suppliers to stagger their purchases to amounts that fitted their cash flow. Such staggering not only leads to delays in the procurement of inputs, but can also cause logistical problems for projects that require a number of different types of complementary inputs to be purchased and delivered at the same time.

It should be noted that the ISFP TCP represented a new experience of procurement delegation to many FAO offices (based on the new FAO Procurement Manual). A Procurement Support unit was established and operated within TCE for a period of six months at programme inception, and helped facilitate procurement processes. However, it has been noted that there is a significant need for capacity building in procurement procedures at the FAO Representation level, an activity that is now underway.

### **4.3 Structural problems of agricultural sector affecting project implementation and impact**

Despite the overall satisfaction expressed by beneficiaries with the ISFP TCP projects, many countries reported that structural problems within the agriculture sector hindered project implementation and the achievement of better impacts.

Asia and Central Africa reported serious constraints to production due to the lack of well functioning irrigation systems or inappropriate terracing and land preparation. The ISFP TCP projects often saw machinery or materials for irrigation arrive after the growing season. In some cases, the lack of appropriate storage infrastructure jeopardized the provision of good quality seed or the possibility of keeping improved seeds for the following years.

All regions put a strong emphasis on the need to create better and more efficient markets, not only to help ensure the supply of better quality and cheaper inputs, but also to facilitate the sale of increased production. The poorly developed seed industry in some countries made it difficult to procure high quality and certified seeds in the amounts needed from local sources. Poor road infrastructure, lack of access to post-harvest and processing technologies to add value and poor access to market information hampered the ability of farmers to gain maximum impact from the inputs provided.

Structural problems need to be addressed if input distribution initiatives are to make a real difference in the livelihoods of their beneficiaries. Addressing these problems, however, should be part of the country strategies for agricultural development and not the scope of short-term emergency projects designed for rapid implementation. Additionally, the overall sustainability of these more long-term measures cannot be assured in emergency projects.

### **4.4 Assessment issues**

The ISFP TCP project assessments represents the first time that TCP projects have been evaluated on a large scale. They involved considerable effort in coordination and quality control as they were conducted simultaneously in 72 countries and an evaluation component had not been integrated in the original project design. The process was obviously not free of flaws and raised a few issues:

At the coordination level:

- the exercise should have been planned with the projects themselves. Then a baseline could have been set to facilitate the assessment process. A practical and modest approach to collect information on key indicators might have been followed;





©FAO/Sailendra Kharel

- the guidelines and generic questionnaires provided by the ISFP Secretariat were found to have been interpreted differently in different countries, perhaps because they lacked specificity;
  - the organization of orientation workshops at the regional level for the country teams carrying out impact assessment could have improved the consistency in data collection and reporting across countries. The Southern Africa office implemented both inception and validation workshops with the participation of all national consultants recruited to implement the assessments, which yielded positive results in the quality and timeliness of the reports, both at national and subregional levels. This should be regarded as best practice with respect to TCP project impact assessments, but also carries a cost that must be included in the TCP design. The Subregional Office for Southern Africa benefitted from relatively more available funding for the ISFP TCP impact assessment following the cancellation of some other planned regional activities.
- At the country level:
- in order to obtain pertinent and fresh information from the projects' stakeholders, the assessments should be divided into at least a first field mission not more than three months after the distribution of the inputs, and a second mission six months after the beginning of the first harvests.

## 5 Conclusions and recommendations

The ISFP TCP projects were launched as a productive safety net to help mitigate the impact of soaring food prices on small farmers who are unable to produce enough for their own consumption and risk having to sell productive assets to survive. The projects provided vulnerable households with quality agricultural inputs such as improved seeds, fertilizers, agricultural tools, animal feed and vaccines, mostly free of cost, and also aimed to enhance awareness and knowledge of improved agricultural inputs.

The assessments revealed that about half of the beneficiaries had previous contact with the types of seeds received and less than a half had previously received training on their use. Despite the lack of access to the distributed inputs, an average of 70 percent of the beneficiaries would be willing to buy the seeds if they were affordable and available. ISFP TCP project beneficiaries were less familiar with the fertilizers than with the seeds, as fertilizers are expensive and sometimes not available in local markets.

Overall, beneficiaries were largely satisfied with receiving inputs, their quality and appropriateness, but less satisfied with the timeliness of their delivery. Many countries faced problems in delivering inputs in a timely manner due to the short time frame available for the procurement and distribution of inputs. In some countries, this led to the late planting of seeds, which adversely affected production levels; in other countries, beneficiaries stored the seeds for the next planting season, which in some cases led to losses and poor germination rates due to insufficient storage facilities. In some cases, implementation of projects was delayed until the following growing season.

Over 65 percent of beneficiaries saw improvements in their crop production and food accessibility situation due to the provision of ISFP TCP agriculture inputs. Between 15-20 percent of beneficiaries felt that their agricultural production had remained unchanged or deteriorated. Drought

and late delivery of inputs were cited as the major reasons for deterioration in crop production and food accessibility. In a few exceptional cases, the poor quality of seeds was reported as being problematic. About 60 percent of beneficiaries saw an improvement in their ability to sell products, while 25 percent felt their situation had remained unchanged. This can be attributed in part to poor access to markets for their produce by some beneficiaries or to production not being large enough to sell.

Three out of seven subregions had animal production components in the ISFP TCP projects. Only about 50 percent of beneficiaries saw improvements in their animal production and health, while the other 50 percent felt their situation was unchanged. These figures need to be treated with caution, however, as some of the projects were still being implemented at the time of the assessment and beneficiaries could not gauge if animal production and health had improved or not. Other projects faced high mortality rates due to problems in the transport of live animals and thus beneficiaries felt there was no change in their situation.

Only a few differences could be found between the perceptions of male and female beneficiaries. Male beneficiaries were more willing to purchase inputs if they were available on the market. Female beneficiaries were often less likely to have the means to do so. Women also had lower scores with regards to perceived impacts on crop production, food accessibility and ability to sell. Less access to production services, such as extension advice, credit and irrigation, were cited as reasons for this difference. Women in southern Africa, however, were more likely to invest income generated on social capital such as education.

The experience gained in the early implementation of the projects provided important baseline information to direct programming choices for the deployment of much larger projects, especially under the EUFF.

Based on the lessons learned in the implementation of ISFP TCP projects, the following recommendations are made.

- **Link the TCP project with other ongoing programmes or projects whenever possible**

The small size of the TCP budgets means that there is a limit in the amount of inputs that can be provided. The project thus needs to find a balance between reaching a large number of beneficiaries with small amounts of inputs versus the provision of more holistic packages focussing on a fewer number of farmers. Holistic input packages can increase production, but inputs such as fertilizers are expensive and, given the limitations in TCP funds, are difficult to distribute to a large number of beneficiaries.

The integration of ISFP TCP projects into government programmes can help strengthen the level of aid given to farmers. The TCP project can supply farmers that are receiving inputs from the government with complementary inputs, improving the expected results. The existing government structure also enables the distribution of inputs in a more cost-effective manner.

- **Consider the use of revolving schemes or equity contribution systems**

Such systems can help to ensure continuity in the project investments after it has been completed. The use of revolving schemes, where beneficiaries pay back seeds they have received after the harvest or pay a subsidized amount for inputs in cash that can subsequently be used to buy more inputs or be invested in microprojects, can also help to improve ownership in the project, targeting and use of inputs received by the beneficiaries.

- **Ensure that training is incorporated into the project design**

As the rules regarding ISFP TCP projects required 95 percent of funds to be spent on purchase of inputs, several options can be considered for integrating training components:

- a) Target farmer groups, e.g. farmer field schools, which have already received training on inputs to be distributed;

- b) Link up with existing project or programme that provides training;
- c) Ensure government commitment to provide necessary extension services as a part of the project plan; or
- d) Review and revise the 95 percent input expenditure rule.

- **Devote greater resources to project monitoring**

The monitoring of projects, particularly during the input distribution and crop planting stages, is important. This can help to avoid some of the problems with targeting that were experienced and also allow for appropriate training to be provided before planting.

- **Consider the geographic context of the country**

Countries that face accessibility problems, such as island nations and mountainous countries, require more time and money for implementation. Often, the needed inputs cannot be procured locally and require purchasing from international sources which takes time to deliver. Once the inputs arrive in the country, the transportation costs and time to deliver to isolated areas must be properly considered in the project planning stages. The one-year time frame given to the projects was deemed to be too short for proper implementation in such countries.

- **Consider flexibility in procurement rules**

As advance payments are not permitted, some local suppliers faced problems in procuring the quantities of inputs required by the ISFP TCP projects. This forced some suppliers to stagger their purchases in smaller quantities, which led to delays in project implementation. This could also cause problems if a wide variety of complementary inputs needs to be purchased and delivered at the same time. The provision of credit facilities could perhaps help to alleviate this constraint. Some reports made mention of the long time needed to receive approval from FAO headquarters and efforts to streamline and expedite procedures were felt to be useful to better ensure timely delivery.



- **Avoid distribution of live animals unless proper transportation to the beneficiary's farm can be assured**  
The provision and transport of live animals needs careful consideration and planning in order to avoid high mortality rates experienced in some countries. Proper transport arrangements need to be assured all the way to the farm of the beneficiary.
- **Consider different possible distribution systems, according to the countries' reality:**
  - a) **Distribution through government institutions can be effective** due to their extended coverage, reach and possibilities of integration with existing government programmes. Attention should be paid, however to: i) political influence in the choice of beneficiaries; ii) government appropriation of support given by FAO and its use for political purposes; iii) the capacity to effectively distribute inputs and provide training on its use; and iv) the capacity of institutions to ensure that good quality inputs are delivered and that suppliers are held accountable for the quality of the products they supply. There is a need for beneficiaries to be fully informed and sensitized as to why assistance is given and who or which organization is responsible for providing the assistance. This will make political appropriation and favouritism less likely to happen and beneficiaries more aware of the objectives of the project.
  - b) **Distribution of inputs through input trade fairs has many benefits.** Farmers are able to choose the types of inputs they want, project implementers are able to reduce time and costs, and the ITFs provide a boost to the local economy and local agricultural input markets. However, such input trade fairs can only work in countries where markets are functioning. There are of course risks with regards to corruption, forgery of vouchers, price fixing and lack of quality or quantity of inputs. Measures need to be considered to mitigate such problems.
  - c) **Distribution through NGOs or farmers groups** has proven itself to be an effective way of targeting and distributing inputs to beneficiaries. If they have technical knowledge on the crops being produced this can help to ensure that farmers are properly trained on the use of inputs.
  - d) **Distribution by input suppliers** might assure that beneficiaries are better informed on the use of the inputs.
- **Improve Results-based Management (RBM) by defining measurable project results**  
The project formulation process in an emergency context is typically characterized by time constraints and pressure for rapidly achieving project approval and a quick response in delivering outputs. However, efforts to improve the measurability of initiatives to be implemented can be made at project planning phase. In particular, it is recommended to establish RBM frameworks by setting specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound project results. This can be easily done by linking the results to time-bound targets and relevant indicators. Monitoring schemes can be defined *ex post* during the project implementation phase. Implementation of RBM directly impacts the achievement of development results through accountability, results tracking and the systematization and use of lessons learned.
- **Encourage stronger donor commitment with government engagement in following up short-term emergency projects with medium-term investments to address structural problems within the agriculture sector**  
The ISFP TCP projects were launched as an emergency response to the food price crisis in 2008. Many countries reported that structural problems within the agriculture sector (e.g. poorly developed seed industry; poor irrigation systems; poor access to markets, post-harvest and processing technologies; need for training and strengthening of institutions, etc.) hindered project implementation and the achievement of better impacts. In a number of countries, the ISFP TCP projects succeeded in acting as a catalyst to mobilize further funding,

enabling the creation of linkages between short-term safety net activities and medium-term measures. Such linkages should be actively sought to catalyse development changes in the longer term.

- **Use TCP funding as a catalyst for technology innovation or leveraging investment**

As a stand-alone product, the TCP with its restricted funding can only have a limited impact

on people's livelihoods. When planning TCP projects, it is critical that they be designed to leverage additional investment or substantive technology innovation. In the case of the ISFP TCP projects, this has been achieved in several instances through their leveraging of donor funding, notably through the EUFF. Similar impacts could be sought through the use of TCPs to support the GAFSP or similar L'Aquila Food Security Initiative investment opportunities.

## References

- FAO. 2008. *Initiative on Soaring Food Prices Programme Document: Aiming to reduce food insecurity caused by soaring food prices*. Rome.
- FAO. 2009. *TCP Manual: Managing the decentralized Technical Cooperation Programme*. Rome.  
(available at [www.fao.org/tc/tcp/index\\_en.asp](http://www.fao.org/tc/tcp/index_en.asp))
- FAO RAP. 2010. *Regional Synthesis of Beneficiary Satisfaction and Impact Assessment Reports for ISFP TCP in Asian Countries*. Bangkok.
- FAO SAP. 2010. *Subregional synthesis of beneficiary satisfaction and impact assessment reports for ISFP TCP Projects in the Pacific Countries*. Apia.
- FAO SFC. 2010. *Synthèse sous régionale des évaluations du degré de satisfaction des bénéficiaires et les impacts des TCP nationaux dans le cadre l'ISFP*. Libreville.
- FAO SFE. 2010. *Beneficiary Satisfaction and Impact Assessment Survey of the Implementation of ISFP TCP Projects in the Eastern African Region*. Addis Ababa.
- FAO SFS. 2010. *Southern Africa Regional Synthesis Report: Beneficiary Satisfaction and Impact Assessment of National Input Supply TCPs*. Harare.
- FAO SFW. 2010. *Rapport de la synthèse régionale de la satisfaction des bénéficiaires et d'évaluation d'impact pour les projets ISFP TCP*. Accra.
- FAO SLC. 2010. *Synthesis of the Beneficiary Satisfaction and Impact Assessment Reports for ISFP TCP Projects in the Caribbean Region*. Bridgetown.

National ISFP TCP beneficiary satisfaction and impact assessment reports

# APPENDIX 1

## General guidelines for the implementation of ISFP TCP beneficiary satisfaction and impact assessment survey

### 1. Introduction

As an emergency response to the rising price of food in late 2007 and 2008, a large number of FAO-supported Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP) projects were initiated. In total, there were 74 agriculture input distribution TCP projects as well as 45 technical assistance TCPs that were launched. As the input supply TCPs are coming to a close, it was felt important to implement a standard beneficiary satisfaction and impact assessment for the input supply projects in order to gauge the usefulness and impacts that such TCPs have had on the farmers most affected by the food crisis.

The national TCP projects that were developed did not have a beneficiary impact assessment component integrated into the original project design. This has meant that the collection of standardized baseline data has not been conducted for all the input supply projects. While some countries have incorporated an impact assessment activity for the input supply TCPs, the methodologies used and level of information collected have differed.

In light of this situation, it was felt that the best way to gauge the impact of the TCPs is to focus on the collection of beneficiaries' views of how they feel the projects have positively or negatively impacted on their lives. The ISFP Secretariat has thus developed a generic questionnaire and methodology to help guide the assessment of input distribution TCP projects and also facilitate comparisons between countries and regions. Given the heterogeneity in the inputs that were distributed and the large number of countries, the questionnaire and methodology should be adjusted to best suit the nature and context of the project being examined.

### 2. Objectives of the assessment

The objectives of the ISFP TCP assessment are to:

- 1) Assess the level of satisfaction of beneficiaries with the FAO ISFP TCP projects and the impact that it has had on their lives;
- 2) Collect the views of project beneficiaries, implementing agencies and input suppliers on the major constraints or problems they faced with the projects and suggestions that they have for improving them;
- 3) Contribute to a lessons learning process that will be useful for optimizing future emergency responses.

### 3. Methodology

Information for the assessment will be collected through a generic questionnaire survey developed by the ISFP Secretariat in collaboration with TCP project budget holders and FAO technical departments. As the types of inputs distributed varied from project to project, the **national consultants responsible for carrying out the assessments should adjust the questions to better suit the context and nature of the TCP project they are evaluating.**

The first questionnaire (see Annex 1) aims to collect information from beneficiary households by:

- 1) examining how beneficiary farmers used the inputs they received;
- 2) gauging their satisfaction with received inputs;
- 3) getting their opinions on how they feel the TCPs have impacted on their food production and food security; and
- 4) collecting their views on problems they faced and suggestions they have for improving the TCP project.

It is expected that, on average, the first questionnaire should take about one hour to complete per household.

A second questionnaire (see Annex 2) has also been developed to gather the opinions of implementing agencies and input suppliers on what they feel are the major constraints of the TCP projects and suggestions that they have for improving them.

Once the questionnaire surveys have been completed, the data must be inserted into the computer. The ISFP Secretariat has prepared a draft data entry template to facilitate data entry and analysis of information. If the questionnaire has been adjusted to better suit the context and nature of the project and country, the data entry template should also be modified.

The results of the two questionnaires are to be analysed and compiled into a national report. The disaggregation of responses between male and female-headed households is also important in order to see what differences exist in the satisfaction and/or impacts that male and female farmers have felt.

In order to guide the compilation of the report and facilitate comparisons between countries where assessments are conducted, a report outline has been developed (see Annex 3).

## **4. Planning and implementing the survey**

This section outlines some major issues that should be considered for the planning and implementation of the surveys.

### **4.1 Sampling size and method**

As a great deal of money has been made available for the implementation of the TCPs and significant funds are also being mobilized to conduct the TCP impact assessments, every effort must be made to ensure that a meaningful sample size is selected for the survey in each country.

Based on the funding availability figures received thus far, it is estimated that approximately USD 15 000 to USD 20 000 can be spent per TCP project for the implementation of the survey and compilation of a national report. In light of these budgetary restrictions, a minimum of 100 households should be surveyed in each of the countries. However, in countries where there are a large number of beneficiary households, efforts should be made to survey a greater number. For example, the results of surveying 100 households in a country where there are 3 000 beneficiary households will have greater significance than the surveying of 100 households in a country where there are 20 000 beneficiaries.

The selection of the type and number of sample households for the survey will have to be determined by the national consultant and survey team, taking into consideration the nature and context of the project, location of the project area, gender, cost, etc.

## **4.2 Training and supervision of surveyors**

Once the survey instruments (questionnaires and data sheets) are drafted according to the specific needs of the project and country, the next steps are (i) the training of the enumerators and their supervisors; and (ii) the field testing of the survey instruments. The questionnaires and data sheets will have to be adjusted according to the results of the field tests.

Experience has shown that training is a crucial component and a significant amount of time has to be allocated for it. Surveyors should know, for example, that they should not hand the questionnaire to the farmer to fill it in, but record answers based on a discussion with the farmer. Ideally, the discussion should take place on the farm, which will allow some visual verification of the information, although this may not always be possible. Proper training will also help surveyors to better understand the information that they need to collect and better enable the formulation of appropriate and effective questions. It is also good practice to prepare a detailed implementation manual for the survey personnel. Parts of this present document can also be useful for the development of a detailed implementation manual.

In addition to the survey questionnaire, the use of group discussions can also be a useful tool to gather additional information. If such an approach is to be used, however, it is important to ensure that a good facilitator is available to properly facilitate the discussion.

Supervision of enumerators is critical during implementation of the survey. Cost may limit the study team's ability to monitor the data collection process continuously. In this case the team should do spot checks during the early stages of data collection to discover possible problems and make the necessary adjustments in time. The team will also need to scrutinize the completed questionnaires and the data files, and return visits might be necessary if major problems are seen with the information collected.

The output from the surveys is the complete data set. It is also important to prepare comprehensive documentation of the survey soon after its completion. The analysis is typically done either by the study team or by the survey consultant in collaboration with the team. The reports and analysis should be widely disseminated to encourage debate and discussion to facilitate the alleviation of the problems highlighted in the survey.

## **5. Description of survey questions**

This section provides brief descriptions of the purposes of each of the questions in the survey questionnaires. By outlining the main pieces of information that each question is trying to collect, this section aims to assist those implementing the survey to better understand the type of information they should be searching for during their interview with beneficiary farmers. The surveyors should be well trained on the purpose of each of the questions so that they thoroughly reflect beforehand on the best ways to phrase or ask questions.

## Section I: Information on household

The purpose of this section is to collect minimal information on the basic socio-economic characteristics of sample households.

### Question 1. Location

The information in this section is needed to identify the household being studied and identify the enumerator responsible for data collection. If questions arise regarding the information written in the questionnaire, the name of the data collector is important to be able to obtain clarifications.

### Question 2. Information on household head and household

The purpose of this section is to collect minimal socio-economic information regarding the household and household head. The primary purpose of collecting this information is to assist in the assessment as to whether target beneficiaries of the project have been reached. The information can also be used for any additional analyses that national consultants deem necessary or wish to conduct in order to better explain a situation that has arisen in the project.

### Question 3. Household assets

The information contained in this section will also be useful to ascertain whether target beneficiaries of the project have been reached.

#### Question 3.1 Landholding

For the purposes of agricultural censuses, FAO recommends the collection of landholding data according to seven basic land-use classifications.<sup>1</sup> However, given the limited time and resources available for conducting the survey and the fact that detailed analysis of impacts will not be conducted with this landholding information, we would only like to obtain information on the area of agriculture land and the total landholding. Land tenure issues have also been omitted as detailed analysis in this regard is not foreseen in the country assessment report.

Agriculture land includes cropland, pastures and meadows. Total landholding includes agriculture land, forest land, land used for aquaculture, homestead area, etc.

#### Question 3.2 Livestock holding

Livestock refers to all animals, birds and insects kept or reared in captivity mainly for agricultural purposes. This includes cattle, buffaloes, sheep, goats and pigs, as well as poultry, bees, silkworms, etc. Domestic animals, such as cats and dogs, are excluded unless they are being raised for food or other agricultural purposes.

## Section II: Inputs received, their use and willingness of farmers to adopt

The objective of this section is two-fold:

- 1) To collect information on the types of inputs farmers received and how they used these inputs.
- 2) To see how farmers used the crops that were produced with the support of the TCP project.

---

<sup>1</sup> The land-use classifications are: 1) land under temporary crops; 2) land under temporary meadows; 3) land temporarily fallow; 4) land under permanent crops; 5) permanent meadows and pastures; 6) forest or other wooded land; 7) other land. For more information on these land-use classifications see: <http://www.fao.org/docrep/009/a0135e/A0135E07.htm#ch11.3>.

As respondents will usually respond in local units, it is important for the surveyors to indicate the units of measurement wherever relevant. Conversions will need to be made into metric units during the entry of data into the spreadsheet.

#### **Question 4. Do you know why you were given agriculture inputs?**

The aim of this question is to judge the awareness of beneficiaries as to why they received agriculture inputs. It is also a way to lead into the more detailed questions to be asked in questions 5 to 7.

#### **Question 5. Crops grown under TCP project**

This question aims to gather basic quantitative data on how farmers used the seeds they received, the production they achieved from project support, and how they used the crops produced.

For each crop farmers planted as a result of seeds they received, the surveyor should gather the following information:

- the name of the crop grown;
- were the seeds received local or improved varieties?;
- how much seed did farmers receive? (indicate units);
- how much of the seed received was planted? (indicate units);
- what was the area of land planted with the seed that was received? What was the area of land planted the previous year for each crop? (indicate units);
- what was the total production of the crop grown during the TCP year? How much of the crop did the farmer produce the previous year? (indicate units);
- how much of the total production during the TCP year was consumed by the household (indicate units);
- how much of the total production was sold on the market and the price received per kg (indicate units);
- how much of the total production was kept as seed (indicate units).

#### **Question 6. Fertilizers and pesticides received under TCP project**

This question tries to gather quantitative data on the quantities of fertilizers and pesticides that farmers received, how farmers used them during the project period and to see how much of each fertilizer/pesticide they used the previous year.

For each fertilizer and pesticide the farmer received, the following information can be gathered:

- How much fertilizer/pesticide did the farmer receive? (indicate units);
- What was the area of land the farmer applied the fertilizer/pesticide during the project year? What area of land did the farmer apply the fertilizer/pesticide the previous year? (indicate units);
- How much of the fertilizer/pesticide received was used? How much of the fertilizer/pesticide did the farmer use the previous year? (indicate units).

#### **Question 7. Other agriculture inputs received under TCP project**

While the distribution of seeds and fertilizers was a major thrust of many TCP projects, there were also a wide variety of other inputs (e.g. agriculture tools and equipment, animal feed, veterinary medicines, etc.) that were distributed. This question aims to gather information on how much/many other inputs farmers received, whether they sold inputs and how much income they earned from selling. This question can be adapted to suit the specificities of the project being assessed, particularly if questions 5 and 6 are not very relevant.



For every other input received, the following information can be gathered:  
how much/many of the input did the farmer receive? (indicate units);

- how/much/many of the input was used? (indicate units);
- how much/many of the input was sold? How much money did the farmer earn by selling? (indicate units);
- other questions can be formulated, particularly if questions 5 and 6 are not relevant for the project being assessed.

### **Question 8. Knowledge of inputs received and willingness to adopt**

The objective of this question is to get a sense of whether the farmers are familiar with the input they received from the project and whether they had knowledge or had ever received training on the proper use of the inputs. It also looks at the availability of the inputs on the local market and whether the farmers would be willing to invest their own resources to purchase them. This last point can be an indication as to the willingness of farmers to adopt the inputs they had received.

Questions 8.1, 8.2, 8.3 and 8.3.1 should be asked for seeds, fertilizers, pesticides, and every other input the farmers received. The inputs falling under the “others” category should be specified and extra columns should be inserted if needed.

### **Section III: Satisfaction level of beneficiary farmers**

As the title suggests, the objective of this section is to gauge the satisfaction level of beneficiary farmers with the agriculture inputs they had received.

#### **Question 9.1. Please indicate your satisfaction level on the following:**

This question tries to quickly gauge the satisfaction level of beneficiaries in regards to:

- 1) the receipt of inputs;
- 2) the timeliness in which the inputs were received;
- 3) the appropriateness of the inputs that were distributed in terms of the farming system they practice and knowledge that farmers have on the utilization of the inputs;
- 4) the quality of the inputs that farmers received.

The satisfaction level of the above criteria is to be asked for seeds, fertilizers and pesticides that farmers received. The scale to be used to judge farmer satisfaction is outlined below and the surveyor simply needs to write the appropriate number in each of the boxes:

1-Highly dissatisfied; 2-Dissatisfied; 3-Indifferent; 4-Satisfied; 5-Highly satisfied.

If any other inputs were received, they should be specified in the “input type” column and rankings be given on the farmer’s satisfaction level accordingly. Any additional information that can help to explain the satisfaction scores provided by the farmers should be written in the remarks column.

#### **Question 9.2. If the inputs you received were not used for your own farm production, please explain how they were used and why**

Due to any number of reasons, farmers may not have used the inputs they received for their own farm production. This question tries to understand what

other ways farmers may have used the inputs that they received. A brief explanation as to why the farmer may have sold, stored, consumed or used the input(s) in another way should be written in the appropriate box.

#### **Section IV: Perceived impacts from receiving agriculture inputs**

The purpose of this section is to get the general views of beneficiaries on how they feel the receipt of agriculture inputs has positively or negatively impacted on their lives in terms of:

- 1) Crop production;
- 2) Food accessibility of their household;
- 3) Ability to sell more of their produce.

The following scale is used to gauge how positively or negatively the beneficiaries believe their lives have been affected according to the above three criteria. The best ways of asking these questions should be discussed during the training session. The interviewer should circle the appropriate response.

- 1-Deteriorated a lot; 2-Deteriorated a lot; 3-Unchanged; 4-Improved a little; 5-Improved a lot.

For Question 10.1, the farmer should be asked to compare the harvest for the crops for which he/she received agriculture inputs. The comparison should be made with a similar year in terms of weather, climate, etc.

#### **Questions for projects dealing with animal production related inputs**

The questions listed here are for projects that had an animal production related component. Depending on the nature of the project, other questions that use a similar scale can also be developed to gauge beneficiaries' views on how the project has positively or negatively impacted their lives

#### **Section V: Suggestions for improvement**

The purpose of this section is to get a general idea of how farmers felt about the appropriateness of the method of distributing inputs.

Question 16, through a yes/no question, aims to get a basic feel for whether the farmers felt the approach used to deliver inputs was appropriate. Questions 16.1 and 16.2 then give respondents an opportunity to share any problems they faced with the project and provide suggestions on how the project could be improved to meet their needs.

#### **Questionnaire for implementing agencies and input suppliers**

A second questionnaire has been prepared aimed at the project implementing agencies and input suppliers. Given the limited time and resources to conduct the impact assessments, the questionnaire is a short one which can be done without much extra effort or resources.

The surveyor should talk with the agriculture officer or officers responsible for distributing inputs in the districts where agriculture inputs were distributed simply and get their opinions on the major problems or constraints that they observed in the implementation of the project and also provide suggestions on how the project could be improved. The same exercise should be carried out with the input supplier(s).

---

## ANNEX 1: TCP Beneficiary Satisfaction and Impact Questionnaire

Country: \_\_\_\_\_

TCP Project Symbol: TCP/ \_\_\_\_\_

### I. Information on household

#### 1. Location

HH ID no: \_\_\_\_\_ Data collector name: \_\_\_\_\_

Village: \_\_\_\_\_ District: \_\_\_\_\_

Respondent name: \_\_\_\_\_ Relation to HH head: \_\_\_\_\_

#### 2. Information on household head and household

HH head name: \_\_\_\_\_ Gender (M/F): \_\_\_\_\_

Age: \_\_\_\_\_ Family size: \_\_\_\_\_

How many months per year have you sufficient resources (farm and non-farm) to feed your family? (months): \_\_\_\_\_ months

#### 3. Household assets

##### 3.1 Landholding

Land type	Area (local units)	Area (ha)
-----------	--------------------	-----------

Agriculture land (includes cropland, pastures and meadows)	_____	_____
--	-------	-------

Total land holding	_____	_____
--------------------	-------	-------

##### 3.2 Livestock holding<sup>a/</sup>

SN	Animal type	Total number
----	-------------	--------------

1	_____	_____
---	-------	-------

2	_____	_____
---	-------	-------

3	_____	_____
---	-------	-------

4	_____	_____
---	-------	-------

5	_____	_____
---	-------	-------

6	_____	_____
---	-------	-------

7	_____	_____
---	-------	-------

a/ Livestock refers to all animals, birds and insects kept or reared in captivity mainly for agricultural purposes. This includes cattle, buffaloes, sheep, goats and pigs, as well as poultry, bees, silkworms, etc. Domestic animals, such as cats and dogs, are excluded unless they are being raised for food or other agricultural purposes.

## II. Inputs received, their use and willingness to be adopted by farmers

4. Do you know why you were selected to receive agriculture inputs? Y  N

Explain:

---



---

### 5. Crops grown under TCP project

SN	Crop name	Seed type (local (L) or improved (I))	Quantity of seed received (kg) <sup>a/</sup>	Quantity of seed planted (kg) <sup>a/</sup>	Area of land planted (ha) <sup>a/</sup>	
					During TCP year	Previous year
1						
2						
3						
4						
Total production (kg) <sup>a/</sup>			Uses of crops grown under TCP project			
During TCP year		Previous year	Amount consumed (kg) <sup>a/</sup>	Amount sold (kg) <sup>a/</sup>	Price received (per kg) <sup>a/</sup>	Kept as seed (kg) <sup>a/</sup>

a/ Respondents can answer in local units, but calculations will later need to be made to kg, ha or kg/ha

### 6. Fertilizers and pesticides received under TCP project

SN	Fertilizer/ pesticide name	Quantity received (kg or litre) <sup>a/</sup>	Area of land covered (ha) <sup>a/</sup>		Amount used (kg or litre) <sup>a/</sup>	
			During TCP year	Previous year	During TCP year	Previous year
1						
2						
3						
4						

a/ Respondents can answer in local units, but calculations will later need to be made to kg, litre or ha

### 7. Other agriculture inputs received under TCP project

SN	Input type	Quantity received	Quantity used	Quantity sold	Income earned from sale
1					
2					
3					
4					

## 8. Knowledge of the agriculture inputs received and willingness to adopt

Question	Seeds		Fertilizers		Pesticides		Other inputs (specify)	
8.1 In the past, have you ever used the agriculture inputs that you received?	Y <input type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>	Y <input type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>	Y <input type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>	Y <input type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>
8.2 Have you ever received training on the use of the inputs you received?	Y <input type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>	Y <input type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>	Y <input type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>	Y <input type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>
8.3 Are you able to purchase the agriculture inputs you received locally?	Y <input type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>	Y <input type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>	Y <input type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>	Y <input type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>
8.3.1 If yes, would you be willing to buy these agriculture inputs on the market?	Y <input type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>	Y <input type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>	Y <input type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>	Y <input type="checkbox"/>	N <input type="checkbox"/>

## III. Satisfaction level of beneficiary farmers

### 9. Beneficiary satisfaction with inputs received

Note to surveyor:

- For Question 9.1, the following scale should be used:  
1-Highly dissatisfied; 2-Dissatisfied; 3-Indifferent; 4-Satisfied; 5-Highly satisfied.

Q. 9.1 Please indicate your satisfaction level on the following:

- On a scale of 1 to 5, what is your satisfaction level with receiving each of the inputs?
- On a scale of 1 to 5, what is your satisfaction level with the timeliness of inputs received?
- On a scale of 1 to 5, what is your satisfaction level with the appropriateness of inputs received?
- On a scale of 1 to 5, what is your satisfaction level with the quality of inputs received?

Q. 9.1 Satisfaction level<sup>a/</sup>

Input type	Receiving	Timeliness	Appropriateness	Quality	Remarks
Seeds					
Fertilizers					
Pesticides					
Others (specify)					

a/ 1-Highly dissatisfied; 2-Dissatisfied; 3-Indifferent; 4-Satisfied; 5-Highly satisfied.

Q. 9.2 If the inputs you received were not used for your own farm production, please explain how they were used and why.

Use of inputs	Explanation
Sold	
Unused/stored	
Consumed as food	
Other (specify)	

#### IV. Perceived impacts of receiving agriculture inputs

##### 10. How do you feel your crop production has improved or deteriorated as a result of the inputs you received?

1-Deteriorated a lot; 2-Deteriorated a little; 3-Unchanged; 4-Improved a little; 5-Improved a lot.

Q.10.1 By how much do you believe your yield improved or deteriorated as a result of the inputs received compared with a similar year in terms of weather, climate, etc.?

Crop	Yield improved by <sup>a/</sup> :	Yield deteriorated by <sup>a/</sup> :
	kg/ha	kg/ha
	kg/ha	kg/ha
	kg/ha	kg/ha

a/ Respondents can answer in local units, but calculations will later need to be in kg/ha

##### 11. Do you feel that the food accessibility situation of your household has improved or deteriorated?

1-Deteriorated a lot; 2-Deteriorated a little; 3-Unchanged; 4-Improved a little; 5-Improved a lot.

##### 12. Do you feel that you are able to sell more agriculture produce as a result of this season's production?

1-Deteriorated a lot; 2-Deteriorated a little; 3-Unchanged; 4-Improved a little; 5-Improved a lot.

#### Questions for projects dealing with animal production related inputs

##### 13. How do you feel that your animal production has increased or decreased as a result of inputs you received?

1-Deteriorated a lot; 2-Deteriorated a little; 3-Unchanged; 4-Improved a little; 5-Improved a lot.

##### 14. Do you feel that the health of your animals has improved or deteriorated as a result of inputs you received?

1-Deteriorated a lot; 2-Deteriorated a little; 3-Unchanged; 4-Improved a little; 5-Improved a lot.

#### V. Suggestions for improvement

##### 15. Do you feel that the approach used to deliver inputs to farmers as appropriate?

Y  N

##### 15.1 What kind of problems did you experience with the project?

1 \_\_\_\_\_  
2 \_\_\_\_\_  
3 \_\_\_\_\_  
4 \_\_\_\_\_

##### 15.2 What suggestions do you have to improve the project?

1 \_\_\_\_\_  
2 \_\_\_\_\_  
3 \_\_\_\_\_  
4 \_\_\_\_\_



---

**ANNEX 2:**  
**Questionnaire for implementing agencies and input suppliers**

Country: \_\_\_\_\_

TCP Project Symbol: TCP/ \_\_\_\_\_

Name of agriculture officer or input supplier: \_\_\_\_\_

Village: \_\_\_\_\_

District: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of data collector \_\_\_\_\_

1. What kind of constraints did you observe in the implementation of this project?

a) \_\_\_\_\_

b) \_\_\_\_\_

c) \_\_\_\_\_

d) \_\_\_\_\_

2. What suggestions would you have to improve the project

a) \_\_\_\_\_

b) \_\_\_\_\_

c) \_\_\_\_\_

d) \_\_\_\_\_

---

## ANNEX 3:

### Outline of Beneficiary Satisfaction and Impact Report for ISFP TCP Project

#### Executive summary

##### 1. Introduction

- Brief background on soaring food prices at national level
- Objective of the survey
- Methodology:
  - period of survey work and areas where work was conducted;
  - selection method of sample households;
  - organization of survey (survey coordinator, survey enumerators, training of survey staff, etc.);
  - data entry, quality checking, etc.
- Content of the report

##### 2. TCP project summary

- Brief description of project
- Main activities conducted
- Description of target area(s) and households

##### 3. Characteristics of sample beneficiary households

- General characteristics of sample households: number of households, percentage of female-headed HH, percentage of literate households, average landholding, average family size, average months of food self-sufficiency
- Asset holding of sample households: Landholding and livestock holding

##### 4. Analysis of inputs distributed

- Crops grown under TCP project:
  - Types of crops grown, amounts of seeds distributed and used per household;
  - Comparison of land area used for various crops and yields before and after the TCP project.
- Fertilizers received under TCP project:
  - Types and amounts of fertilizers distributed and used per household;
  - Comparison of land area under fertilizer use and amount of fertilizer used before and after the TCP project.
- Pesticides received under TCP project:
  - Types and amounts of pesticides distributed and used per household;
  - Comparison of land area under pesticide use and amount of pesticides used before and after the TCP project.
- Other inputs received under TCP project and their usage
- Crop production and usages of harvested crops after the TCP intervention

**5. Farmers' impressions of receiving agriculture inputs**

- Awareness of farmers as to why they received agriculture inputs
- Knowledge of the agriculture inputs received and willingness to adopt
- Average satisfaction level with inputs received
- Analysis of inputs not used for own farm production
- Perceived impacts of receiving agriculture inputs on beneficiary households
- Appropriateness of input delivery system
- Views of implementing agencies and input suppliers

**6. Conclusions and recommendations**

- Have target beneficiaries been reached
- Effectiveness of input distribution approach
- Consideration of gender dimension in TCP intervention
- Problems faced and possible solutions

**Annexes - Questionnaires**

# APPENDIX 2

## List of countries where ISFP TCP projects were implemented

---

### Africa

---

#### Subregional Office for Central Africa (SFC)

Cameroon  
Chad  
Central African Republic  
Democratic Republic of the Congo  
Sao Tome and Principe\*

#### Subregional Office for Eastern Africa (SFE)

Burundi  
Djibouti  
Kenya  
Rwanda  
Sudan

#### Subregional Office for Southern Africa (SFS)

Angola  
Comoros\*  
Eritrea\*  
Lesotho  
Madagascar\*  
Malawi  
Mauritius\*  
Seychelles\*  
Swaziland  
United Republic of Tanzania  
Zambia

#### Subregional Office for West Africa (SFW)

Benin  
Burkina Faso  
Cape Verde  
Côte d'Ivoire  
Gambia  
Ghana  
Guinea  
Guinea-Bissau\*  
Mali  
Niger  
Nigeria  
Senegal  
Sierra Leone\*  
Togo

---

### Asia and the Pacific

---

#### Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (RAP)

Afghanistan  
Bangladesh  
Bhutan  
Cambodia  
Democratic People's Republic of Korea  
Mongolia  
Nepal

Pakistan\*  
Sri Lanka  
Timor-Leste

#### Subregional Office for the Pacific Islands (SAP)

Cook Islands  
Federated States of Micronesia  
Fiji  
Kiribati  
Marshall Islands  
Nauru  
Niue  
Palau  
Papua New Guinea  
Samoa  
Solomon Islands  
Tonga  
Tuvalu  
Vanuatu

---

### Europe and Central Asia

---

#### Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia (REU)

Armenia  
Kyrgyzstan  
Republic of Moldova

---

### Latin America and the Caribbean

---

#### Subregional Office for the Caribbean (SLC)

Antigua and Barbuda\*  
Bahamas  
Barbados  
Belize  
Dominica  
Dominican Republic  
Grenada  
Guyana\*  
Haiti\*  
Jamaica  
Saint Kitts and Nevis  
Saint Lucia  
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines  
Suriname\*

#### Subregional Office for Central America (SLM)

Honduras  
Nicaragua

---

### Near East and North Africa

---

#### Regional Office for the Near East and North Africa (RNE)

Mauritania  
Yemen\*

---

\* Countries in which assessments were not completed or only partially completed at the time of writing