



Office of Evaluation (OED)

# Swaziland Agricultural Development Programme (SADP)

---

June 2011

# Swaziland Agricultural Development Programme

## Mid-Term Evaluation

### FINAL REPORT

#### Contents

List of appendices .....	3
Composition of the independent evaluation team .....	4
Acknowledgements.....	4
Acronyms .....	5
Executive summary .....	8
1. INTRODUCTION .....	14
2. THE SETTING: AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT IN SWAZILAND.....	17
3. THE SWAZILAND AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT .....	19
4. EVALUATION FINDINGS.....	21
5. EVALUATION SYNTHESIS .....	32
6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	41
ANNEX 1: Evaluation Terms of Reference .....	50
Annex 2: List of People Met .....	64
Annex 3: Reported achievements under the components 1, 2 and 3 .....	70
Annex 4: Swaziland National Agricultural Summit Priorities .....	72
Annex 5: Detailed Expenditure Record (EU format, expressed in €) .....	73
Annex 6: List of Documents Consulted .....	83

## **List of appendices**

- Annex 1: Evaluation Terms of Reference**
- Annex 2: List of People Met**
- Annex 3: Reported achievements under the components 1, 2 and 3**
- Annex 4: Swaziland National Agricultural Summit Priorities**
- Annex 5: Detailed Expenditure Record**
- Annex 6. List of documents consulted**

## **Composition of the independent evaluation team**

Brian Perry (Team Leader; United Kingdom, resident in Kenya)

Bernd Bultemeier (Germany; FAO Office of Evaluation)

Mick Mwala (Zambia)

Sharmala Naidoo (South Africa)

## **Acknowledgements**

The team of independent evaluators wishes to thank most sincerely the Government of Swaziland for hosting this mid-term evaluation mission. We are most grateful to the leadership and staff of the Ministry of Agriculture, and the FAO Programme staff of SADP, and indeed the staff of other Ministries and SADP partners who engaged so closely with the evaluation team, for their hospitality, patience and cooperation during the evaluation.

## Acronyms

ACAT	-	African Cooperative Action Trust
ACP	-	African, Caribbean and Pacific (countries)
ADB	-	African Development Bank
AGA	-	Animal Production and Health Division, FAO
AGP	-	Plant Production and Protection Division, FAO
AGS	-	Rural Infrastructure and Agro-Industries Division, FAO
AIDS	-	Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome
ASC	-	Agricultural Service Coordinator
BADEA	-	Arab Bank for Economic Development in Africa
CA	-	Conservation Agriculture
CARDESA	-	Centre for Agricultural Research and Development in Southern Africa
CSF	-	Finance Division (FAO)
CSO	-	Civil Society Organization
CTA	-	Chief Technical Adviser
DAC	-	Development Assistance Committee (OECD)
DBSA	-	Development Bank of Southern Africa
DCM	-	Department of Cooperative Development and Marketing
DVLS	-	Department of Livestock and Veterinary Services
EC	-	European Commission
EDF	-	European Development Fund
EPAS	-	Economic Planning and Analysis Section (MoA)
EU	-	European Union
FA	-	Financing Agreement
FAO	-	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FAOR	-	Food and Agriculture Organization Representative
FFS	-	Farmer Field Schools
FLEX	-	Facility for Fluctuations in Export Earnings (EU)
FPMIS	-	Field Programme Management Information System
FPO	-	Field Purchase Order
FSE&CC	-	Federation of Swaziland Employers and Chamber of Commerce
GAP	-	Good Agriculture Practices
GCP	-	Government Cooperative Programme (FAO)
GDP	-	Gross Domestic Product
GoS	-	Government of Swaziland
HH	-	Household(s)
HIV	-	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
HoD	-	Head of Department
HQ	-	Headquarters
HR	-	Human Resources
IBRD	-	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development
ICDF	-	International Cooperation and Development Fund (Taiwan)
IFAD	-	International Fund for Agricultural Development
JFFLS	-	Junior Farmer Field and Life Schools

LES	-	Low veld Experiment Station
LMIC	-	Lower Middle Income Country
LoA	-	Letter of Agreement
Logframe	-	Logical Framework
LPO	-	Local Purchase Order
LTO	-	Lead Technical Officer (FAO)
LTU	-	Lead Technical Unit (FAO)
LUSIP	-	Lower Usuthu Small-scale Irrigation Project (Swaziland)
M&E	-	Monitoring and Evaluation
MAU	-	Marketing Advisory Unit
MDG	-	Millennium Development Goals
MEPD	-	Ministry of Economic Planning and Development
MIF	-	Marketing and Investment Fund
MoA	-	Ministry of Agriculture
MOAC	-	Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives (until 2010)
MoU	-	Memorandum of Understanding
MTE	-	Mid-Term Evaluation
NAdS	-	National Adaptation Strategy to the EU sugar Market Reform
NADS	-	National Agricultural Diversification Strategy
NAMBOARD	-	National Agricultural Marketing Board
NAO	-	National Authorising Officer (Swaziland)
NGO	-	Non-Governmental Organization
NMTPF	-	National Medium-Term Programme Framework
NRR	-	Research and Extension Division (FAO)
ODA	-	Official Development Assistance
OECD	-	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
OED	-	Evaluation Office (FAO)
OEK	-	Office of Knowledge Exchange, Research and Extension (FAO)
PR SAP	-	Poverty Reduction Strategy and Action Programme
PS	-	Principal Secretary
PSC	-	Project Steering Committee
PTC	-	Project Technical Committee
RDA	-	Rural Development Area (Swaziland)
SACU	-	Southern African Customs Union
SADC	-	Southern African Development Community
SADP	-	Swaziland Agricultural Development Programme
SAO	-	Senior Administrative Officer
SDB	-	Swaziland Dairy Board
SIPA	-	Swaziland Investment Promotion Authority
SMART	-	Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Timely (Indicators)
SME	-	Small and Medium Enterprise
SMI	-	Swazi Meat Industries
SNAS	-	Swaziland National Agricultural Summit
SNL	-	Swazi Nation Land (communal land)
STABEX	-	STABILisation des recettes d'Exportation (EU)

SWADE	-	Swaziland Water and Agricultural Development Enterprise
SWOT	-	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats
TAT	-	Technical Assistance Team
TCI	-	FAO Investment Centre
TCP	-	Technical Cooperation Programme (of FAO)
TDL	-	Title Deed Land (Swaziland)
TOR	-	Terms Of Reference
TOT	-	Training of Trainers
UN	-	United Nations
UNDAF	-	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNISWA	-	University of Swaziland
US	-	Under-Secretary
VC	-	Value Chain
WV	-	World Vision

# Executive summary

## Introduction

The Swaziland Agricultural Development Project (SADP)<sup>1</sup> was conceived in 2007/2008 following the Swaziland National Agricultural Summit (SNAS) held in mid-2007, and in response to the availability of €14.3 million emanating from FLEX funds of the EU. The objective of the SADP programme is **to develop improved smallholder production and marketing systems which lead to sustainable food security and an improved quality of life for rural households in Swaziland**. It has three target outcomes, which are:

1. Feasible improvements to current smallholder agricultural practices are identified, tested and documented;
2. Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) capacity to effectively undertake field activities, research and service delivery is reoriented, strengthened and delivery performance is improved; and
3. Smallholder links to markets are increased.

SADP was designed in a top-down fashion, in part due to the haste required in meeting EU funding deadlines. Perhaps as a consequence, the project document<sup>2</sup> articulated an impressive vision of Swazi agricultural development possibilities, but also displayed an extremely weak understanding of the run-down state of the extension, research and marketing services, and the mechanisms necessary to resuscitate these.

This Mid-Term Evaluation was commissioned by FAO in consultation with project partners (EU, MoA, NAO) to review the achievements to date and to generate lessons learnt in order to improve SADP operations, and to provide decision makers in the GoS, the EU and FAO with an independent and objective analysis. The MTE assessed the SADP according to the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and (potential) impact.

## Evaluation findings and synthesis

Despite a slow implementation rate, SADP has had some notable successes, including the following: a series of teambuilding workshops has helped to develop a stronger team culture within SADP; a re-planning workshop has re-focused implementation; and better systems for procurement and recruitment forward planning have been set up.

In technical areas, Component 1 has developed guidelines for Good Agricultural Practices (GAP), and set up demonstration plots; engaged implementing partners through Letters of Agreement (LoAs), and organized a number of workshops with farmers. Component 2 appears to be the most advanced, and has completed the assessment of extension and research systems, started profiling of RDAs, supported Junior Farmer Field & Life Schools (JFFLS), and initiated backyard garden production of vegetables, which often benefit small-scale female-headed farm households.

---

<sup>1</sup> While SADP (Swaziland Agricultural Development Project) is called a project, it is actually a programme within the Ministry of Agriculture. The terms “project” and “programme” are used interchangeably in this report.

<sup>2</sup> The urgency of the design process even led to the existence of separate, not always consistent project documents, as the Financing Agreement between the EU and the MEPD was signed before FAO had finalized its project document.



Component 3 is lagging behind in many activities (such as work towards a Marketing and Investment Fund, and a review of NAMBOARD); a significant success story noted under this component was that of linking of farmers to markets in the marketing of marula. Component 4 carried out a comprehensive analysis of the M&E situation in MoA, developed reporting formats, and initiated M&E capacity building activities with MoA staff at HQ and in the regions.

***a. Relevance***

SADP represents a valid vision of agricultural development in Swaziland, with particular emphasis on the livelihoods and food security of lower income sectors of Swazi society. However, the overall relevance of the programme is severely compromised by the inadequate consideration in the design process of the limited size and quality of the resource base at the MoA, and of the buy-in needed by Swazi partners in order to effect institutional change of such a broad and ambitious nature.

***b. Effectiveness***

The programme has not yet been able to demonstrate efficacy. Virtually all the activities remain in the development stage, and while the extension and research assessments are now achieved, these are only the starting points on the pathway to strengthening these important institutions. Nevertheless, the thoroughness and professionalism with which they have been conducted augurs well for the processes to follow.

***c. Efficiency***

Slow and inconsistent operating procedures and processes have been SADP's greatest weakness: SADP operations have been hampered by delays in recruitment, staff unfamiliarity with (above all, FAO) procedures, unresponsiveness of FAO and MoA, late (and sometimes junior-level) nominations of MoA counterparts, staff changes within TAT, and misunderstandings about the roles to be performed by the various parties involved in SADP.

Budget utilization to date (at mid-point of SADP's implementation) is only around 25%; the most underspent budget lines in SADP are Contracts (0.51 % of available budget), Expendable Procurement (3.44 %), and Training (5.10%): an indication that SADP's presence on the ground is limited so far.

***d. Impacts***

As SADP has advanced slowly, potential impact is difficult to predict: essentially, all activities aimed at introducing significant changes, will need a longer time frame. SADP has the potential to contribute to major improvements in MoA by building capacity among staff, and also through strategic assessments that provide perspectives for the future.

Rehabilitation work supported by SADP (concerning RDA offices, Farmer Training Centres, small dams, etc.) has taken on an added significance: MoA is facing severe budget constraints and without SADP will hardly be able to invest in infrastructure. Also, should Component 3 be successful, SADP could lay the foundation for a vibrant agro-industry/business sector.

### ***e. Sustainability***

SADP was intended to develop institutional capacity within MoA, and foster commercially successful agricultural practices by rural communities. It could still achieve this, but certainly not within the time frame left for the programme. It will now require an extension if the substantial delays incurred are to be rectified, and a streamlining of the management structure to enhance the programme's efficiency.

### **Summary conclusions and recommendations**

#### **a. Conclusions**

##### *i. General*

- SADP is of critical importance to agricultural development in Swaziland; however, there is need for further streamlining of the programme itself, clearer definitions of leadership responsibilities, and greater responsiveness by FAO concerning its backstopping and support mandate. Buy-in into SADP by MoA has been inadequate, and SADP has been insufficiently incorporated into MoA work plans and routines
- At the current implementation rate, SADP will fail to achieve the three overarching outcomes of improved smallholder agricultural practices, improved research and service delivery and improved smallholder links to markets.
- The MTE concludes that given the potential impact of the programme, the progress that has been made on both the technical and team-building fronts, the MoA and the FAO should jointly seek a no-cost extension of the programme for a period of two years under the auspices of Articles 4.5 and 4.6 of the Financing Agreement between the GoS and the EU.

##### *ii. Technical*

- There is no single unifying programme document to serve as a blueprint for SADP; this inadequacy needs to be addressed urgently.
- The delay in many of the baseline studies, and particularly of the assessments of farming systems and best-bet interventions, has held back programme progress to date; a significant part of programme activities are still at the evaluation and planning stage rather than the implementation stage.
- Most TAT staff is highly qualified in technical fields but some exhibit gaps in knowledge and skills related to the institutional and inter-personal aspects of programme implementation.

##### *iii. Prioritisation and readjustment of resources*

- A commendable programme prioritisation process has been initiated by SADP, but the identified priorities often lack supporting evidence and clear criteria.

##### *iv. Leadership and management*

- **Staff Issues.** SADP started without a clear picture of the MoA human resource base; a skills audit or training needs assessment has never been performed. MoA has until recently inadequately emphasised SADP as a priority to its staff; within the FAO element of SADP there has been inadequate dialogue with, and understanding of, MoA; the extended absence of an NPD has contributed to a leadership vacuum; and issues of staff performance have not been dealt with adequately by FAO and MoA leadership.

- **Backstopping by FAO.** FAO has not provided strong, consistent and steady leadership at a strategic level, and not enough effective backstopping at a technical level. There is a need for better planned, and more strategic as well as more output-orientated programme visits from technical officers in Harare and Rome.

b. Recommendations

i. General

**1. Intensify and finalise the prioritisation and programme redesign**

The different SADP project documents need to be combined in a single unifying project document.

- A clear programme should be drawn up for the prioritisation and redesign of SADP activities currently underway and/or planned, with an emerging draft document submitted to the EU through the appropriate channels by September 30<sup>th</sup> 2011.
- This programme should explicitly state the roles and responsibilities of each partner, including overall leadership responsibilities, and lines of communication. The original budgetary allocation will need to be revised in the light of identified needs.

**2. Institutionalise and publicly document the buy-in and commitment of the MoA and its partner GoS institutions**

The SADP must be reconfirmed as a strategic and operational priority by the Ministry of Agriculture.

**3. Seek a no-cost extension of the SADP from the EU**

MoA and the FAO should jointly seek a no-cost extension of the programme for a period of two years under the auspices of Articles 4.5 and 4.6 of the Financing Agreement between the GoS and the EU.

ii. Technical

**4. Component 1. Fast track the delayed evaluation of “best-bet” interventions**

The “best-bet” inventory has not yet been completed. This activity must be fast-tracked, and additional resources allocated if required, to ensure that this rudimentary pillar of the SADP concept does not delay further.

**5. Component 2. Develop a clearer vision of target and accessible beneficiary groups in the extension service**

SADP should give high priority to identifying and updating key target groups for extension services, considering both the impact on the target beneficiaries, as well as the field capability to effectively deliver the desired services.

**6. Component 2. Resuscitating Swaziland’s capacity in agricultural research**

SADP’s draft strategy and investment framework for agricultural research is ambitious, and the investment implications in terms of rational resource allocations and opportunity costs may be overwhelming; as an alternative, an exploration of regional cooperation possibilities with institutions such as the Centre for Agricultural Research and Development in Southern Africa (CARDESA), may provide an alternative scenario.

**7. Component 3. Fast tracking of support to key smallholder value chain enterprises**

A better understanding of where public sector can support and enhance market engagement is central to the aspirations of SADP: the pending assessment must be initiated with urgency, and greater engagement of local NGOs and small private enterprises should be sought.

#### **8. Develop Standard Operating Procedures**

Many routine activities (such as development and clearance of TOR, procurement of standard items) have often taken an inordinate amount of time. FAO, MoA and SADP need to agree on standard procedures for routine activities, and in particular define the periods within which action must be completed.

#### **9. Develop a revised and mutually agreeable work plan, including recruitment, procurement and backstopping requirements**

In order to increase mutual understanding among the SADP team and also to alert SADP stakeholders concerning their expected inputs, SADP should develop a revised work plan that includes backstopping requirements, pending procurement and recruitment issues, and other operational issues with a clear indication to all parties as to which inputs are expected, and when.

#### **10. Provide additional operations training, and increase operational support capacity**

FAO operational procedures may be complex, but SADP seems to have suffered from excessively lengthy delays at several levels. Further training of SADP staff would be beneficial (especially of the newly recruited Accountant/Procurement Officer), as well as strengthening the operational support.

iii. Prioritisation and readjustment of resources

#### **11. Develop a redesigned SADP based on agreed priorities, initial successes, documented GoS and delivery partner commitment and the presence of champions**

Further to Recommendation 1, the MTE recommends that a structured and facilitated process is initiated by the end of July 2011 which picks up on the recent SADP Programme Review dialogue and prioritisation exercise. Central to this will be the development of a clear set of criteria on which priority activities will be selected.

iv. Leadership and management

#### **12. The urgent need to give priority to SADP activities within the MoA**

As part of the renewed priority assigned to SADP within MoA, human resource and time allocations to SADP activities by MoA staff should be recorded in workplans, performance agreements, etc. As a beginning, the MTE recommends that an appraisal of MoA staff resources and a training needs assessment be conducted so as to gain a clearer picture of existing strengths and bottlenecks.

#### **13. The need to strengthen SADP leadership at the CTA level**

There is an urgent need to strengthen the leadership in SADP with emphasis on partnership, dialogue, understanding and trust in the relationship between MoA, FAO staff and other partners. The MTE recommends that the TOR of the SADP CTA position be revised to reflect these principles. Furthermore, FAO should take all necessary measures to ensure that the leadership issue is addressed as a matter of priority.

#### **14. The need to better manage staff performance and intra-institutional relationships**

The MTE team strongly recommends that efforts continue to build a strong working relationship within the SADP team, and to foster a culture of teamwork, accountability, service orientation and effective communication. Improved leadership and management is required from both the TAT and the MoA. The MTE team proposes four mechanisms be considered to achieve this.

- Undertake an assessment of the MoA human resource base, including training needs assessment so as to define better the collaboration potential.
- Utilise operations management tools and approaches.
- The TAT adopt a “coaching” approach to capacity building.
- Consideration of External Organizational Development Support to MoA.
- Creating the position of Operations Officer (OO).

#### **15. The urgent need for strong leadership in, and streamlining of, Component 3.**

The MTE was struck by the poor performance of Component 3, as well as the absence of an effective working relationship between project personnel working in this area. This situation is not viable, and the MTE recommends that FAO takes measures to address this situation as a matter of urgency.

#### **16. Revitalising the technical backstopping by FAO**

There is a need to introduce more structure, urgency and feedback mechanisms into the backstopping support from Rome (and where appropriate from Harare). Such support needs to be both demand driven (from Rome and Swaziland), of a dynamic and iterative nature, and raised to a peer review level rather than undertaken in a supervisory mode. The MTE recommends that the LTU re-evaluates its role and its leadership in the light of these conclusions.

# 1. INTRODUCTION

## a. Background to the evaluation

The Swaziland Agricultural Development Project (SADP) was conceived in late 2007 and early 2008 as a response to the development challenges identified at the Swaziland National Agricultural Summit (SNAS) held in mid-2007, and to the opportunistic availability of €14.3 million emanating from FLEX funds of the EU.<sup>3</sup> The objective of the SADP programme is **to develop improved smallholder production and marketing systems which lead to sustainable food security and an improved quality of life for rural households in Swaziland**. It has three target outcomes, which are:

1. Feasible improvements to current smallholder agricultural practices are identified, tested and documented;
2. Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) capacity to effectively undertake field activities, research and service delivery is reoriented, strengthened and delivery performance is improved; and
3. Smallholder links to markets are increased.

The design process of SADP was not straightforward, and this arguably complicated the viability of the emerging infant project. The initial conceptualisation was undertaken by the FAO Investment Centre (TCI), who with TCP<sup>4</sup> funding rapidly designed a broad-based MoA resuscitation programme which they presented to the EU. The proposal was quickly approved to meet EU funding deadlines, and a Financing Agreement (FA) was signed between the EU (December 2007) and the Ministry of Economic Planning and Development (MEPD)<sup>5</sup> of the Government of Swaziland (GoS) in August 2008.

In the programme formulation process, the FAO's Investment Centre had named the technical divisions of FAO as potential implementing partners; a division of FAO was selected to lead the technical side (and designated Lead Technical Unit – LTU), and a team of FAO staff was fielded in September 2008 to develop a project document using the FAO format. While keen to put their mark on the new programme, and to update the position of the MoA, they soon learned that making revisions to the design presented in the already signed Financing Agreement was difficult. Eventually a separate Contribution Agreement was signed between the Swazi National Authorising Officer (in December 2008) and FAO (in January 2009), and the first funds were transferred to FAO in March 2009.

---

<sup>3</sup>The EU funds were known as Stabex, the abbreviation for the fund for the stabilisation of export revenue from agricultural products, introduced as part of the Lomé I convention. It compensated for losses in revenue from exports of products to the EU by ACP countries as a result of fluctuations in prices on the global market, on the condition that the losses represented a significant portion of their trade balance. The major beneficiaries of Stabex have been the large-scale producers of cocoa, cotton, coffee, groundnuts and tea. Recently this compensation mechanism has been replaced by another called Flex, which stands for the compensation fund for the short-term fluctuations of export revenues, triggered by both losses of these revenues and the subsequent deterioration of the public deficit..

<sup>4</sup> Technical Cooperation Programme: development (and also emergency) activities funded from FAO's own Regular Budget.

<sup>5</sup> The Ministry of Economic Planning and Development (MEPD) is the signatory on behalf of the GoS of all internationally funded technical cooperation initiatives.

The SADP programme is wide ranging and very ambitious. However, due in part to the haste required in meeting EU funding deadlines, the manner of its development was very much “top down”, which appears to have negatively affected universal buy-in by MoA and other stakeholders. Furthermore, while the conceptualisation and programme formulation articulated an impressive if somewhat idealistic vision of where public sector support to Swazi agricultural development needed to go from a technical standpoint, it was extremely weak in its understanding of the run-down state of the extension, research and marketing services of the MoA at the programme onset, and the larger organizational challenges within the MoA that affect these services. This meant that the organisational and institutional elements required to achieve the vision were substantially underestimated. As the project got underway, this stark gap in understanding was compounded by significant delays in project implementation, due in part to the weak administrative support from the FAO Representation in Maputo (at the time, also accredited to Swaziland), in part to the inexperience of newly engaged international staff in FAO procedures, in part to human resource constraints within MoA, in part to some major inadequacies of the team building processes between the MoA and FAO staff, and in part to weak programme leadership from both FAO and MoA. These factors have negatively affected the effective implementation of the programme.

Despite these inadequacies, SADP has made some important achievements. But the programme is well behind schedule and grossly underspent and so key changes need to be made if it is to deliver the outcomes expected by all parties by the project termination date.

#### b. Purpose and scope of the evaluation

##### **Purpose**

The Mid-Term Evaluation was commissioned by FAO in consultation with project partners (EU, MoA, NAO) to review the achievement to date and to generate lessons learnt in order to improve SADP operations, and to provide decision makers in the GoS, the EU and FAO with an independent and objective analysis which can be used to make informed decisions on the project’s future direction. This analysis has assessed the project’s relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and potential impact, and in this report makes recommendations on possible changes which the project might need to consider.

Specifically, the evaluation has:

- reviewed the progress of the project to date, based on the above criteria, and identify its key strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and threats;
- generated conclusions and recommendations which will guide all parties, including programme management, on the mode of operation, programme priorities and focus, and implementation strategy, in an effort to improve the likelihood of achieving agreed programme deliverables.
- revisited the programme design in view of the time frame remaining for implementation, and advanced proposals for adaptation or revision as considered necessary and appropriate.

##### **Key issues/key evaluation questions**

The evaluation was undertaken according to the five OECD/DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and (actual and potential) impact. Due to the particular

features of this project (especially its slow implementation rate), particular attention was given to efficiency aspects, and possible scenarios to achieve lasting and substantial impact.

### **Evaluation methodology and organization**

The evaluation was set up by FAO's Independent Office of Evaluation in consultation with project partners, as an independent and external exercise. FAO staff in Swaziland took responsibility for liaising with the GoS (represented by NAO and the PS MoA), EU, Project Steering Committees and relevant stakeholders for all aspects related to the evaluation. The evaluation team was facilitated by the project and the FAO office in Swaziland for administrative and logistical issues but conducted its work independently.

The evaluation methodology was consultative and drew upon the views and perspectives of government (in particular NAO and MoA), FAO and EU, beneficiaries within Swaziland and backstopping units at FAO HQ and decentralized offices. The evaluation tools included data and documentation reviews, and interviews with key decision makers and partner stakeholders in Swaziland, Harare and Rome.

The methodology included the following principles:

- a. The MTE adopted a participatory learning review approach
- b. Triangulation was a key method for validation of information and evidence
- c. The MTE followed a consultative, iterative and transparent approach with internal and external stakeholders throughout the whole process
- d. A range of tools and methods were used: desk review of existing programme documents like plans and reports, semi-structured interviews with key informants, beneficiaries and stakeholders, focus group discussions supported by check lists and/or protocols, direct observation during field visits, etc.
- e. Key informants at country level were drawn from TAT staff, PSC and PTC, MoA staff, MEPD/NAO, the EU Delegation, HODs, RDA staff, the Marketing Boards (NAMBOARD, Dairy Board, etc.), the University of Swaziland, Technoserve, NGOs, consultants and/or SWADE regarding dams. A full programme of the meetings and interviews undertaken by the MTE is given in Annex 2



## 2. THE SETTING: AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT IN SWAZILAND

### b. Historical context of agricultural development in Swaziland

Swaziland has a population of about 1.1 million people with a land area of about 17, 360 km<sup>2</sup>. Agriculture constitutes a major part of the economy, second to manufacturing; the agricultural activities are carried out in a two-tier land tenure system, the Title Deed Land (TDL) and the Swazi National Land (SNL). The TDL is a freehold/concession form of ownership and comprises commercial plantations, estates, ranches and farms, which are generally highly productive. Sugarcane is the most common crop on TDL, but also citrus, pineapple and timber are produced, mostly for export.

The SNL is crown territory held in trust for the nation by the King and allocated to individual families as communal tracts by the Chiefs: the SNL comprises some 86 per cent of all agricultural land or approximately 100,000 farm households. Farm size averaged about 1.3 ha, but has reportedly decreased in recent years as a result of demographic changes<sup>6</sup>. The productivity of SNL farms is very low and the quality of the produce is generally poor; the contribution by farmers from SNL to overall earnings from agriculture has remained very limited.

### c. The roles of public and private sectors

Swaziland has a mixed economy which tends to be dominated by the public sector; the private sector has not distinguished itself as a driver of growth. Swaziland competes for private sector investment with other Southern African Customs Union (SACU) member states, especially vis-à-vis the favourable investment environment in South Africa.

Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) constitute an important component of the private sector in Swaziland, implementing a wide range of developmental projects in a number of fields. Around 100 NGOs in Swaziland cover a diversity of needs and services, including education, training, youth, women's issues, income generation, and agricultural development.

### d. The contributions by donor agencies

The Kingdom of Swaziland is one of the few recipients of loans from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), based on its Lower Middle Income Country (LMIC) status; however, because of its poor track record in governance, donor interest has been weak and programme financing of agriculture has been in the hands of one agency at a time; this responsibility seems to have passed from USAID to IFAD and now the EU. The African Development Bank, United Nations (UN) agencies, the United States, and the European Commission are the major donors of general development activities.

---

<sup>6</sup> Swaziland Review of Commerce and Industry: An overview of the Kingdom of Swaziland, 2011

#### e. The Swaziland National Agricultural Summit

The SNAS of mid 2007 was organized in response to the declining contribution of the agricultural sector to the national economy. The major thrust of the SNAS was to plan the reorientation of agricultural production systems to enable farmers to create wealth for themselves, thereby making a significant and positive contribution to food security, rural development, employment creation and poverty reduction in Swaziland. Participation in the SNAS included a wide range of stakeholders from both the public and private sectors, including farmers.

The SNAS identified eleven key constraints:

- a. The absence of a functional National Farmers Organisation (institutional)
- b. Difficulties in accessing loans (marketing)
- c. The absence of the Land Policy (policy)
- d. Absence of comprehensive water resources development programme (policy)
- e. Low levels of knowledge and skills in agriculture: general lack of basic skills in agri-business (capacity building)
- f. MoA's structure not responsive to the country's needs for technical support (institutional)
- g. Agricultural research is not demand driven, too centralized, characterised by lack of appropriate policy, inadequate capacity, and very ineffective delivery systems (institutional/capacity building)
- h. Inefficient extension service of the MoA (institutional/capacity building)
- i. Poor marketing structure: high costs of imported inputs and low prices of produce (marketing)
- j. Inadequate supply of breeding and feeder stock: piggery, dairy, beef, goats, poultry and fish (production)
- k. Effects of the HIV/AIDS pandemic, resulting in reduced productivity due to a weakened and sick workforce (health)

#### **Priorities**

The SNAS identified 15 projects which could constitute a 'recovery' programme in the areas of policy, marketing, capacity building, infrastructure, production and environment, and in addition also identified 14 other important areas. While the priorities undoubtedly reflected the many constraints encountered in the sector, this long list of projects and important areas lacked a coherent framework and perhaps set the scene for an overload of the SADP agenda.

Following the SNAS, an implementation framework was worked out that included an Inter-Ministerial Steering Committee, a National Agriculture Summit Co-ordination Unit, and a National Agriculture Summit Technical Committee. It is unclear as to what links existed between these committees and SADP.

### 3. THE SWAZILAND AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

#### a. The conceptualisation and design process

Following the SNAS, a FAO mission (co-financed by FAO's Investment Centre), travelled to Swaziland from 1 to 9 December 2007 to participate in an identification mission. At the time, the proposed programme was to be funded from the EC FLEX (formerly STABEX) mechanism, a compensation for revenue losses the country had suffered due to fluctuations in earnings from exports (amounting to €14.3 million to be allocated over a five year period). The identification mission was followed up by a Project Preparation Mission from 14 January – 1 February 2008 (funded through an FAO TCP project: TCP/SWA/3102).

The Preparation Mission proposed a project comprising three technical components addressing each of the three main elements of the production and marketing chain, with a fourth component providing for project management and supervision. The proposed project implementation period was 5 years; however, the Preparation Mission's Aide-Memoire cautioned that "... much of the first year of implementation [would be] focusing on preparatory activities including policy definition and formulation of an agreed service delivery mechanism."

The preparation of the draft document, including various fiches and supporting papers required by the EC, as well as working papers on each of the three technical components, was completed in spring of 2008; after some initial critical response by the EC, the draft document was accepted and the Financing Agreement was signed by the Ministry of Economic Planning and Development (MEPD) in August 2008.

#### b. Project development and assignment of roles

The development of the initial draft programme document was followed up by a further FAO formulation mission<sup>7</sup> in 2008 (14 to 27 September), which comprised one member of the original preparation team from FAO's Investment Centre, and representatives of FAO technical units who were to make up the project's Technical Task Force. This team was expected to prepare the final draft of a standard FAO Government Cooperative Programme (GCP) document, which in turn was to become the Annex I of the Contribution Agreement (CA) between the Government of Swaziland (GoS) and FAO, in which the GoS entrusted FAO to provide the technical and administrative inputs needed for the SADP<sup>8</sup>. However, due to the limitations posed by the design process, the Contribution Agreement was finally signed with a short version of the project document attached as

---

<sup>7</sup> Financed by FAO TCP funds.

<sup>8</sup> The envisaged financial arrangement was for the EC to release funds to the National Authorising Office (in the MEPD) which in turn would allocate resources to MoA as executing agency. FAO would act as an implementing partner in the execution of the project on the basis of the Contribution Agreement between MEPD and FAO. The formulation team worked under some limitations: contrary to expectations, major adjustments to the draft project document prepared earlier were not possible as any changes made had to respect the framework of the FA (which meant, among others, that the project logframe for example had to remain the same as in the FA).

Annex 1; the FAO GCP document became a Working Document but was not officially accepted by all parties as the basis for project implementation.

c. Project structure

The SADP design (as expressed in the FAO GCP project document) envisaged the main technical work to be performed under three Components:

*Component 1: Improved and Sustainable Agricultural Production*

Main expected outputs<sup>9</sup>: baseline studies on farming systems; identification of technologies for replication and up-scaling; increased access to water resources including development of small-scale irrigation systems; and enhancement of livestock production (including Conservation Agriculture, and mixed crop/livestock systems).

*Component 2: Agricultural Research and Service Delivery*

Main expected outputs: assessment of extension system and proposals for reform; assessment of research system and proposals for reform; and establishment of monitoring and evaluation system for extension system (leading to better decision-making)

*Component 3: Marketing and Agribusiness Development*

Main expected outputs: improved GOS capacity to undertake value chain analysis and develop appropriate interventions; enhanced knowledge of extension staff of market oriented production; improved smallholder marketing and business skills; strengthened farmer linkages to input and output markets (including establishment of Marketing and Investment Fund); more efficient marketing operations of GoS agencies; increased knowledge of rural women of community-based food processing.

d. The roles assigned to FAO

The Contribution Agreement gave the bulk of the funding to FAO, and stipulated that all technical assistance, project-related travel and contracts, including Letters of Agreements, procurement of equipment, vehicle and supplies, would be made by FAO in consultation with the PS of MoA.

Apart from the TAT, the budget included funding for unallocated short-term expertise (TOR to be endorsed by the PTC ), local support staff (secretarial support, clerks, drivers) and miscellaneous general operating expenses for a total amount of € 14,220,000, including costs of communications, electricity, maintenance of equipments, stationary, etc.

FAO financial and administrative backstopping was to be provided from the FAO Representation in Mozambique (also accredited to Swaziland); technical support and supervision was to come from the appropriate technical divisions in FAO, at both headquarters and the regional and sub-regional offices in Accra and Harare, respectively.

In addition, FAO committed to funding one Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP) project in relation to livestock traceability (€ 341,000) to complement EC funds.

---

<sup>9</sup> Adapted from the FAO project document.

## 4. EVALUATION FINDINGS

### a. Emerging success stories

The section below presents some emerging successes in the SADP, and elements which form a base for further programme development.

#### i. General

Within the challenging agricultural and fiscal environment Swaziland is facing, and given the teething administrative and other problems it has experienced, SADP has had some notable successes, including the following:

- **Building partnerships.** A set of workshops was held in acknowledgement of the need to build relationships within the FAO team and between the FAO and MoA teams within the programme, as well as to facilitate programme implementation. These workshops included an “ownership” workshop in December 2009, a “Strategic Leadership and Team Management” workshop in March 2010, a “Team Building” workshop which included implementing agencies such as the Swaziland Dairy Board in June 2010, a set of regional workshops leading up to a re-planning workshop in August 2010 and an “Internal Programme Review” in April 2011. Some of these workshops had external service providers as facilitators, in acknowledgement that independent facilitation was required. The workshops were reportedly honest about the internal and external challenges, including the need for a stronger team culture and drive within SADP.
- **Programme planning.** The re-planning workshop was held in recognition of the slow progress, the danger of not meeting the programme objectives and deadlines, and the need to work collaboratively to re-align the project to its objectives. Subsequently, SADP staff interviewed by the evaluation team reported that there has been more focussed implementation. Some other positive developments in terms of the re-planning include:
  - The process of the re-planning was more engaging in that it tried to bring the partners as well as the MoA more centrally into planning and implementation;
  - The re-planning workshop was also used as an opportunity to explain the procurement regulations, and some significant progress was subsequently made - for example in the procurement for backyard gardens and the pig quarantine project;
  - It was agreed that an internal programme review would be held every six months and this commitment was honoured amongst the team with a review held in April 2011. This was a second opportunity to take stock, restart on a more vigorous new page and with a shared understanding of issues. Interviewees reported that the review was able to discuss contentious issues, which points to a level of honesty and openness within the team.
- **Developing task teams.** Specific groups (task teams) were established with various stakeholders, including NGOs, to develop agricultural extension services policy as well as to activate the agroforestry component. In both these teams SADP members took the initiative, identified and proposed key people to be part of a task team. This approach seems to have had notable success since faster progress is being made in these areas than in some others.
- **Facilitating procurement.** A Procurement Committee (which considers bids and does procurement forward planning) and a Roster of Experts (a panel of preferred service providers) is being established to fast-track procurement. Although procurement is still slow despite this,

according to team reports, this is more because of the slow approval processes involving a number of FAO steps at different levels. Whatever the reasons for the slow procurement processes, both of the above-mentioned steps show positive movement with regard to unblocking procurement constraints.

## ii. Component 1

Component 1 activities are grouped as a) identification, testing and documentation of sustainable and appropriate production technologies, b) design and provision of sustainable water utilization infrastructure and c) improving cost-effectiveness and sustainable livestock management. Performance on these activities show varied levels of success to date. Below are some candidate success stories.

- **GAP guideline development.** In order to enhance field activities, implementation guidelines for Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) were developed and these included agroforestry and conservation agriculture technologies. Design and management of demonstration plots for these technologies were also developed (Dlamini and Ginindza, 2010) and adopted (April 2011) in some of the field activities. To ensure adoption of these technologies training materials and methods on GAP were developed and were being finalised for use in training by extension staff.
- **Engagement with partners.** Implementation of the programme activities required collaboration with partners such as NGOs who were on location. In this regard the programme engaged partners on site (NGOs and others) through Letters of Agreement (LoAs). Procurement and distribution of inputs for implementation of field activities had started and are at advanced stage with suppliers have been identified and orders made.
- **Demonstration site registration.** Registration of the demonstration sites is almost completed in readiness for the next cropping season; to date 31 demonstrations on Conservation Agriculture, liming and maize varieties have been established with the participation of 278 farmers.
- **Engagement with farmers.** Further engagement of farmers has been through consultative workshops at national (one with 9 females and 15 males) and regional (in the four regions with a total of 30 females and 82 males) levels covering aspects of planning, monitoring and reporting, data collection tools and review of demonstrations and participant selection criteria. This links in with component 4. Platforms for engagement with farmers extended to field days (16) in all regions and RDAs (872 farmers participated; 64% were female).

## iii. Component 2

This component appears to be the most advanced programmatically. Although the component is a long way from achieving its target outcome, the following elements have been achieved.

- **Assessment of extension and research systems.** In response to the identified concerns from the National Agricultural Summit regarding ineffective extension and 'out-dated' research systems, the Programme has completed the analysis and assessment of the national extension system

including both the supply and demand sides<sup>10</sup> and drawn up a draft of the strategy and investment framework for the national research system<sup>11</sup>.

- **The profiling of RDAs.** To establish a functional network of extension nodes across the country an exercise of profiling RDAs (two completed) has been initiated for prioritisation of those to be upgraded.
- **Targeting the youth.** The programme has the youth as one of its target beneficiaries and these have received attention via facilitator and planning workshops for JFFLS (Junior Farmer Field & Life Schools).
- **Back-yard garden production of vegetables.** Attention to food security in a broad sense has been addressed through backyard gardens; this has targeted the vulnerable group in rural populations. It is the only intervention that has clearly targeted this group among the programme activities. While being piloted at a very small scale the concept is well conceived; it might benefit from developing model gardens with 'champion' farmers, which would be the nucleus for out-scaling of the concept.

iv. Component 3

- **Marketing of marula.** The only significant success story noted under this component was that of linking of farmers to markets in the marketing of marula. This is an important outcome of the programme and the promising initial results on marula marketing, in a partnership with private enterprise, was reported by farmers in Tikhuba RDA.
- Under "emerging issues" documented in the report of the SADP Programme Review carried out in April 2011, the following appears: a "scary" (*sic*) rate of implementation, estimated at less than 15% of planned activities; weak supervision of staff; lack of guidelines on the collection and screening of existing studies; failure to adhere to plans, lack of cohesion amongst team members; inconsistency in coordination of meetings.

v. Component 4

- **M & E status evaluation.** The programme carried out an M&E consultancy in September 2010 which provided a sound analysis of the existing situation in the MoA as well as in the programme itself. This served as a guide to interventions in the area of M&E: the SADP inputs on development of reporting formats and routines in backyard gardening programme serve as an example of the potential roll-out of the M&E interventions to address the identified gaps.
- **M & E training.** Based on the findings of the above exercise, M&E capacity building activities with MoA staff at HQ and in the regions were initiated, and a training module on basic M&E concepts and processes developed for the purpose.

b. The process of catching up: the substantial pending tray

---

<sup>10</sup> Assessment of the National Agricultural Extension System Report, Franz Schorosch, Edward Chuma, KJB Keregero, Alma Andrade, undated.

<sup>11</sup> The National Agricultural Research System, Swaziland: Strategy and Investment Framework, G.W. Otim-Nape, M. Blackie, J. Pali Shikhulu, Draft 15 May 2011

Many SADP areas are delayed significantly and will influence the ability of the programme to meet its objectives on time. There are a number of external and internal reasons for the delays. The FAO-recruited advisers did not take up their posts until late 2009. Then a period of familiarisation followed, exploring SADP programme responsibilities, as well as GoS and FAO operating procedures. This meant that the background studies on extension, research and farmers' organisations systems, etc., intended to set the baseline for subsequent interventions, did not even have their terms of reference ready before mid to late 2010, and in some cases early 2011. A summary analysis of the causes of these delays appears below in section 5.

It is also surprising to note that a programme that was expressly aimed at institutional capacity building, and lamented "insufficient institutional and human capacity building and lack of adaptation to changing challenges and environments", did not address capacity strengthening at the different levels of the system that would allow sustainability of capacity building initiatives. In fact, the FAO project document, despite indicating the MoA as the implementing agency, does not consider capacity within the MoA as a whole, but only identifies capacity constraints within Research and Extension, and to some extent farmer organizations – hence the capacity building activities are focussed on Research and Extension. The project document indicates "The second component (Strengthened Agricultural Research and Service Delivery) will assist MoA to develop coherent and relevant policies, institutional structures and field programmes that will result in more effective, demand-driven research and agricultural services to small producers and will support the expansion of a range of successful previous initiatives in sustainable agriculture ....." The evaluation team is of the view that addressing these issues is vital in terms of programme success, and that unless tackled strategically at the broader MoA level, has little chance of sustainability.

Furthermore, the programme operates under two different programme documents, due to the hurried design process. This has further complicated the planning and decision making.

Below is a listing of key areas in each of the four components which are pending. As a general comment, it is noted that there needs to be a more active drive to "prioritize partnerships and alliance building in all component interventions, in order to create synergies and common efforts, and mobilize linkages and networks", as indicated in the project document (page 29).

i. Component 1

- **Best-bet assessment.** Component one has still to undertake the assessment and synthesis of "best bets", an activity to provide the basis for intervention selection. This was deemed essential, and envisaged as being completed at the end of year one. The evaluation team agrees with the strong emphasis placed on the best-bet selection, and believes that along with this exercise is the need for baseline studies on farming systems and production practices to guide and objectively gauge the level of progress of the programme. Twenty months into the project life these remain undone.

Other pending areas are:

- Completion of mobilization and registration of demonstration sites and host farmers.
- Operationalization of the guidelines on GAP for priority technologies.



- Development of a conceptual framework or hypotheses and associated data collection and analytical methods for surveys; the ‘what’ and ‘how’ to measure progress.
- Re-planning the earth dams activities and allocate adequate resources for both the rehabilitation/construction of the dams and the downstream irrigation development
- Inclusion of livestock in the portfolio of farming is strategic; SADP needs to contribute to the MoA prioritisation between dairy, village chickens, pigs and perhaps goats.
- Evaluation of the potential rehabilitation of Gege Dairy farm as a source of breeding dairy heifers and consideration of the various business models possible, given the previous history with the dairy farm and the severe budget constraints within the Swazi government generally and the MoA specifically.
- The coordination and possible clustering of discrete projects within the larger programme in order to maximise gains. For example, dams that could service school and/or backyard and community gardens.

## ii. Component 2

- **The pathway from assessment studies to policies and strategies.** In order to establish an institutional framework for the effective and efficient functioning of extension and research systems, the completed extension assessment study and the drafted research assessment study must be owned by the MoA and other stakeholders in order to translate them into extension and research policies and strategies. A push for the formulation of strategies must take priority given the due process in policy formulation that is long and may not be realized during the life of the programme. These strategies should guide institutional change in extension and research.
- **Extension and research performance indicators.** For an effective and efficient extension and research system the infusion of an M&E system will be required, and this calls for a development of extension and research service performance and cost-effectiveness systems; such systems should feedback to policy.
- **Develop clarity of target areas for extension services.** The original project document identified target ecosystems and beneficiaries who will need to have tailor-made interventions and these included:
  - Rain-fed crops & livestock; irrigation-based systems; household/community-based agricultural enterprises; vulnerable groups; women; youth
- **Strengthening of farmers’ organisations.** There is need for a defined farmers’ input into the agricultural development of Swaziland and this will be through farmers’ organisations analysis and assessment to define their roles and responsibility. This will ensure that farmers’ voice is heard. This is critical to establishing a strong partnership between the MoA and the farmers’ organizations that could result in greater success of projects, assistance with monitoring and evaluation and, over the longer term, less dependence on SADP and the MoA in terms of sustainability.
- **Institutional reform in the MoA.** Implementation of institutional reform in MoA, including the use of M&E in feedback to policy and strategy.

The evaluation team questions as to whether component 2 has diverted too much from some of the original targeting concepts developed. There were originally three elements under the overriding aim to strengthen agricultural service delivery, viz. institutional reform for decentralised service

delivery (which, as noted above, would necessitate inclusion at MoA level generally, not only as related to extension), improved service delivery performance, and tailoring of field activities to support core clients. The four core clients were rain fed crop and livestock farmers, irrigation-based producers, household-based clients and vulnerable groups. It is understood that there are now three core categories for farmer support and development across SADP: (1) Smallholder Vulnerable Groups; (2) Rain-fed smallholder crop and livestock farmers capable of attaining household food security; and (3) smallholders with the potential to commercialise as individuals or groups, including producers on irrigation plots/schemes. The evaluation team believes that SADP needs to address the questions: ‘Does this framework and the different candidate target categories still represent the diverse activities of component 2?’, and “what is possible/what are the best bets given the time and resource constraints?’

### iii. Component 3

Component 3 is crucial to the sustainability of the first two components, particularly in view of the present fiscal constraints within the Swazi government. It is therefore imperative that much energy is invested in getting this component off the ground as soon as possible in a way which is fully coordinated with the other work streams and working closely with other government partners, the private sector and the relevant associations and NGOs. As very little had been achieved under this component, the ‘pending tray’ would require careful prioritization of the originally planned activities. Such activities would have to be those with the highest opportunity of being completed during the remaining project time and should have an impact.

- **Market opportunities in key value chains.** Identify challenges and opportunities in key value chains appropriate for smallholder producer participation. This should also seek to learn lessons from preceding initiatives, both government and donor-funded, and in consideration of both successful and unsuccessful examples. The activities below within component 3 should be informed by the findings of this initiative.
- **Market orientation opportunities.** Development of market orientation opportunities for smallholder producers
- Establishment of the **Marketing and Investment Fund**<sup>12</sup>: this will require very careful consideration by the consultants and SADP team, particularly with respect to the sustainability issues.
- **Agri-business unit establishment.** Establishment of an agri-business unit in MoA: a serious prerequisite to this is the institutional reforms along with a human resource audit.
- **Review of regulatory and development functions of NAMBOARD and the Swaziland Dairy Board.** This is considered a second phase activity after the above has been prioritised and is underway. The institutional changes that may be necessitated after such a review would be long and difficult, and the quick wins should get priority in this component as in others.
- **Swiftly address the leadership and inter-personal issues** which have been mentioned to the MTE team by almost all interviewees and noted in internal documents reviewed by the team.

---

<sup>12</sup> A fund envisaged in the FAO project document with the purpose of linking producers to existing marketing outlets; loans (or grants – the prodoc is contradictory about this) are intended for a wide range of items: equipment, quality improvement, technical assistance, payment compulsory industry liability insurance, design costs, and legal counselling.

#### iv. Component 4

Component 4 has had a dual role in the project set-up: on the one hand, it was to ensure management of SADP; on the other hand, it was to establish and/or improve key reporting (and ultimately planning functions) within MoA. Concerning the latter function, the FAO project document emphasized in particular the establishment of an “M&E system for the national service delivery system based on key extension indicators providing information on the technical profiles, expenditures, training, etc.”, and envisaged a close liaison with the MoA Monitoring and Evaluation Unit.

Against this backdrop, a roadmap document was developed by the MoA’s Economic Planning and Analysis Section (EPAS) with guidance from the M&E Adviser, which foresees a shift from a centralized M&E approach to decentralization of M&E functions to all levels and positions. There is general agreement that the MoA M&E system is characterized by low data quality, limited intra and inter-departmental sharing of information, underutilization of M&E information, and limited use of technology (e.g. databases, website) for systematic information management (documentation, storage and sharing).

The assessment of the existing M&E system carried out by an external consultant in 2010, as well as two M&E training sessions organized by SADP have laid some of the foundations for a future functioning MoA M&E system. But while the SADP M&E system is estimated to be 60% complete (missing: benchmarking of indicators, development of electronic database, development of an M&E plan, and development of field level data collection tools), the MoA system is still at an early stage. Also, the M&E assessment still needs to be formally approved before work on the development of an M&E strategy can start.

The pending list concerning M&E institutionalization in the MoA is therefore as follows:

- An overall MoA M&E strategy still needs to be developed, including a definition of “a mixture of participatory approaches, inclusive of both quantitative and qualitative information collected from the multiple layers and actors ...” as stipulated in the FAO project document
- An electronic database (including a central server) still has to be set up in the MoA, and M&E training of MoA staff still needs to be mainstreamed
- Finally, the functioning of an M&E system ultimately depends on the generation of quality data from field offices: this has started on a very limited scale as a pilot activity, but will require substantial investment in training, logistical support and hardware

#### v. SADP<sup>13</sup> Leadership and Management

---

<sup>13</sup> SADP refers to both the FAO and MoA components, as does SADP Management. Where the evaluation team refers to the donor advisory and technical side of SADP, the term ‘FAO SADP’ is used and where the reference is to the government implementing side the term ‘MoA SADP’ is used.

The SADP appears to be in a near-crisis situation where outcomes and expenditure are slow and the programme is in grave danger of not achieving its objectives. It is evident that leadership of the programme is weak, with inadequate coordination, communication and management. There is an absence of programme champions at senior level which is particularly necessary given the constrained environment and delays in programme start and implementation. There is a need for a greater sense of urgency from all sides (FAO Swaziland, TAT, MoA and FAO Harare and Rome) with more frequent PSC and PTC meetings to discuss strategic issues. However, on a more positive note, the programme seems to have a few individual champions on both the FAO and MoA sides that are making a difference in their selected areas, enabling some of the successes mentioned at the start of this section. A concerted focus on improved communications and operations management in the core SADP team could result in significant short term improvements in key areas.

The SADP centres on the MoA, where both MoA and FAO staff are co-hosted. This model of having the advisory team embedded in the host government is lauded by the evaluation team. However, successful and harmonious working relationships require more than close juxtaposition. They require mutual ownership and commitment, sound and decisive leadership, clear channels of reporting, enthusiasm around a shared vision and excellent communications. Many of these elements have been lacking in SADP and there is a clear 'them and us' attitude which is affecting mutual ownership.

A key challenge with SADP is that it is very complex and involves engagements at many different levels of the MoA. It is acknowledged by MoA staff and officials that there are a number of challenges within the MoA environment. These include severe resource constraints within the MoA, insufficient levels of time committed to SADP, uneven management and technical capacity, as well as the absence of certain basic systems and procedures, such as a strategic planning framework and a performance management system.

There is a thread of acknowledgement throughout both project documents that the challenging environment in Swaziland includes capacity constraints within the MoA. However, capacity building within the MoA isn't an objective indicated in the project documents, except within Extension and Research Services. Had this been more specifically identified and pursued, the necessary interventions may have been identified and followed up earlier. For example, at institutional level, assistance could have been directed at identifying and drafting the necessary Human Resource and other policies. At organizational level, this could have included the development of systems and procedures in terms of HR management and information, including succession planning, organizational culture and financial management<sup>14</sup>. This approach would have located the Extension and Research services capacity building within a more receptive organization. However, SADP seems to be focussed at the individual level, with one of the indicators being the number of agricultural services capacity building programmes implemented by 2013. But even at the individual level, a glaring omission in SADP is that a skills audit or training needs assessment was not envisaged as a necessary precondition for capacity building.

To date, there is no clear overview of the HR capacity among the MoA despite interviewees and official records indicating an unusually high number of MoA staff reaching retirement age. Capacity building and succession planning is an issue that isn't receiving the necessary attention. SADP could

---

<sup>14</sup> Training programmes undertaken in isolation do not necessarily translate into sustainable capacity building.

contribute to developing a more strategic focus in order to make a long-lasting difference to the MoA as an organization.

Within the SADP FAO team there are also challenges. The CTA has taken up the NPD position (vacant since December 2010) in an acting capacity, but this was not enough to fill the leadership and coordination role defined for the NPD. There is an absence of leadership and no central driver at the top seeking to find creative ways around the challenges within the MoA, dealing decisively and early with performance matters within the FAO team, demanding more frequent and better backstopping, and building a team culture (both within the FAO team and at broader SADP level between the FAO and MoA).

The TAT is meant to advise on and assist in the implementation of the programme, including the provision of technical expertise tasks, and administrative, preparatory and ancillary tasks relating to planning, monitoring, reporting on project components, procurement, and financial management. As such, it should operate as an example of best practice that the MOA would want to emulate. Yet staff have indicated that there is a proliferation of committees at the lower levels, poor coordination, monitoring, evaluation and reporting within the team, and issues of poor performance and difficult relationships which have not been dealt with adequately and decisively. It has been reported that the programme has a number staff meetings, staff operations meetings, etc. at varying intervals and with changing participation. This affects continuity, programme coherence and momentum.

Indeed, the strategy/methodology for project implementation is based on a twin-track approach with the second track being: "institutional reorientation and strengthening to promote long-term sustainable support to the agricultural sector" (Project document, Annex I page 34). The FAO team needs to be able to drive, initiate and catalyse projects in order for the programme to meet its objectives in such a way that it promotes transformation within the MOA. However, it is difficult for a programme or a department to do this kind of organizational culture turnaround without sustained external assistance, simply because managers are too busy with day-to-day work and are often in crisis management mode. In addition, technical specialists are not necessarily familiar with the types of operations management practices that are required to shift the organization/team into a higher performing one.

A Project Steering Committee (PSC) was set up, led by the NAO of the MEPD and this is meant to meet at least once a year to provide strategic guidance to the project. The PSC has met three times (last in February 2011), but did not convene for most of 2010, when critical delays in the project were becoming evident. A Project Technical Committee (PTC) chaired by the PS of the MoA is expected to meet quarterly to ensure that the approved work plans are carried out. The PTC met slightly less frequently than stipulated, but above all did not have the participation as foreseen in the project document, a factor which may have delayed agreement on planned activities.

In summary, it is evident that roles are not all clarified, there is an absence of trust between the FAO and MOA teams as well as within the FAO team, levels of frustrations are high and visible, the value of each team member is not recognised nor is the inter-dependence amongst them recognised and there isn't a culture of self-reflection and accountability built within the programme as a whole. It is

a combination of these issues which has led to the call for 'senior leadership to lead strategic and change management' and 'improve coordination and facilitation' (SADP six monthly review report).

vi. The need for prioritisation: defining the criteria

The SADP programme was highly ambitious at its outset, but given the considerable delays in getting many activities off the ground, there is now a need for some fundamental prioritisation within the broad portfolio to ensure that the key outcomes are achieved. As part of this, there is a need for more effective targeting of selected stakeholders based on their receptivity to development interventions, the presence of an enabling environment, and the relative strengths and comparative advantage of participating MoA or partner stakeholders. As an initiation of this process, the SADP team has recently held two workshops to draft a set of priorities. However, the initial tabulations emerging are still overly long shopping lists of activities in each component, and have not yet become the few, well justified and well documented priorities that are now necessary. The prioritisation process now requires intensifying and fast-tracking, using a set of agreed criteria on which decisions can be made. Candidate criteria on project and activity selection should include:

- The activity is core to the achievement of one or more of the three target outcomes
- The activity is achievable with deliverables within the next three years
- The activity has the documented full commitment of the MoA and other implementing partners
- The activity is led in the MoA (or relevant Ministry) by an active, engaged and committed champion
- The activity is categorised as a quick win
- The activity focuses on target high priority beneficiaries
- The activity has high likelihood to be integrated fully into the MoA or other relevant institution, thereby being sustainable beyond the life of SADP
- The activity has readily available and capacitated non-governmental partners to assist in the implementation (e.g. private sector, NGOs, farmer forums)
- The activity has a high cost of capital investment which will contribute to long-term infrastructure enhancement

It is proposed that a prioritisation process is initiated in which each activity within each of the four components is subject to evaluation under these and other relevant criteria. Each activity could then be scored, receiving a score of 1 – 10 for each of the criteria.

Importantly, it will then be necessary to evaluate the complementarity and cross-fertilisation between activities, which may enhance or reduce their scores accordingly.

The next element in the process would of course be the cost of each activity. The programme is grossly underspent, so certain high cost capital intensive activities may be attractive, as long as they make a fundamental contribution to relevant infrastructure development which will enhance the sustainability of programme outcomes.

This prioritisation process should have the following attributes:

- Involve FAO and MoA SADP senior staff
- Involve EU staff to ensure buy-in by the major donor
- Be facilitated externally
- Be well prepared in advance, in terms of documented clear evidence of the status of each programme activity in each component
- The outcome would be binding

## 5. EVALUATION SYNTHESIS

### *a. Relevance*

Based on the evaluation undertaken in the SNAS, the SADP represents a valid vision of the needs of agricultural development in Swaziland, with particular emphasis on the livelihoods and food security of lower income sectors of Swazi society, including small-scale farmers. In this context the programme is relevant. Indeed, the package including an immediate activation of well-documented “best-bet” interventions at the farm and community level, combined with market access enhancement and supported by institutional strengthening and service delivery devolution presented a dream package for agricultural development in Swaziland. However, the overall relevance of the programme is severely compromised by the inadequate consideration of the size, quality and incentives of the human and institutional resource base at the MoA, and the institutional change needed to implement such a broad and ambitious resuscitation of agriculture through public sector engagement. This brings into question the modality of setting up such huge initiatives on the basis of two short visits by external investment centre teams, distant from the understanding of Swazi public service structures, without the benefit of institutional planners in the team, and with inadequate consideration given to buy-in by Swazi partners.

As far as the relevance of the specific components is concerned, they are all fundamental ingredients to sound small-scale agricultural development. The relevance is brought into question by the weakness in ascertaining how the four components would be linked, and of course how the entire package would be led and managed effectively.

The evaluation team has been privy to the emerging draft plans for a strategy and investment framework for agricultural research in Swaziland. We commend the expertise and commitment put into this assessment, but we query the relevance and scale of the draft recommendations. Given the challenges in translating visions into practical programmes being experienced by SADP, the question of what scale of research will be implementable must be answered. In developing a research strategy, it will be important to take into account not only the research gaps and opportunities, but also the broader socioeconomic context of expanding research capacity and institutions, and the investment implications in terms of rational resource allocation and opportunity cost. This perhaps requires an in-depth exploration of scenarios which seek to expand regional cooperation with networking institutions, such as the Centre for Agricultural Research and Development in Southern Africa (CARDESA).

### *b. Effectiveness*

The programme has not yet been able to demonstrate efficacy. Virtually all the activities remain in the development stage, and while the extension and research assessments are now achieved, these are only the starting points on the pathway to strengthening these important institutions. Nevertheless, the thoroughness and professionalism with which they have been conducted augurs well for the processes to follow.



### *c. Efficiency*

FAO, as described in the 'Action' appended to the Contribution Agreement, is to provide the following services:

- Technical assistance services,
- Administrative and Operational Services, and
- Accounting and financial services

These services have been performed with varying degrees of efficiency.

Disregarding the delays in initial recruitment of the SADP team (FAO HQ was apparently not in a position to pre-position candidates for the TAT<sup>15</sup>) SADP started well enough: the office of the Assistant FAOR in Mbabane was instrumental in obtaining premises for the programme within the MoA and proceeded with timely procurement of two vehicles. The premises were subsequently refurbished and equipped during 2010 and internet connectivity was improved<sup>16</sup>.

The timeline below illustrates some of the key processes; it is apparent that the work plan as documented in the FAO project document (the "Working Document") was unrealistic from the beginning, and that also the Plan of Operations formulated in December 2009 (when the SADP team was nearly complete) did not always predict project progress correctly.

It should be mentioned that efficiency as discussed in this chapter relates to all project parties; however, the focus is on the FAO SADP team and their handling of the implementation process. Reference to other project parties is made in the appropriate context.

---

<sup>15</sup> FAO HQ could have used the time after the signing of the Contribution Agreement (as a firm indication of donor financing) for pre-selection of TAT candidates. (Waivers of Vacancy Announcements are often obtained in the case of field projects, but usually not for CTAs.)

<sup>16</sup> However, FAO intranet access has only been available since April 2011; before that date, FAOR Mozambique had to provide information on procedures, FAO Data Warehouse, etc.

**Table 1**

**Brief Timeline**

**Key Activities/Milestones as planned in Project Document (prodoc) and revised in 2009 Plan of Operations (PoO)**

Activity/Milestone	Expected	Actual	Comments
<b>Section A - Project Formulation and Funds Disbursements</b>			
National Agricultural Summit		18-20 July 2007	Preceded by series of workshops in the 4 regions
Formulation of Draft Proposal		1-9 December 2007 14 January-1 February 2008	FAO Investment Centre Mission
Detailed Formulation Mission		14-27 September 2008	Led by FAO Technical Units from HQ and SFS; one member from previous Investment Centre mission
Financing Agreement Signature		21 December 2007 by EU 21 August 2008 by MEPD	
Contribution Agreement		19 December 2008 by NAO 16 January 2009 by FAOR	
First Tranche Received by FAO		February/March 2009	
Designation of Budget Holder		25 February 2009	Ms Maria Zimmermann, FAO Representative Mozambique (retired 30 April 2010)
<b>Section B - Project Staffing and Oversight</b>			
Project Task Force	1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter 2009	10 March 2009	Call for constituent meeting of Project Task Force - no minutes
National Programme Director appointed	1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter 2009	September 2009	NPD reportedly recruited without EU formal agreement (incumbent passed away December 2010)
Programme Coordinator appointed	1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter 2009	September 2009	
Appointment of TAT	1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter 2009	September 2009-Jan 2010	Most staff present by end-2009; Marketing Adviser arrived in Jan 2010
Appointment of new FAO Rep		September 2010	New FAOR – no visit to Swaziland
Appointment of New FAO Rep		April 2011	SFS Regional Coordinator/FAOR Zimbabwe: Double Accreditation for Swaziland
<b>Section C – Major Activities</b>			
Extension Assessment	4 <sup>th</sup> quarter 2009 (prodoc) 3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter 2010 (PoO)	Consultants in country Aug-Sep 2010	Proposals for improved extension system were to be developed by 4 <sup>th</sup> quarter 2009 (prodoc) or 3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter 2010 (PoO); now scheduled for June 2011
Research Assessment	4 <sup>th</sup> quarter 2009 (prodoc) 3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter 2010 (PoO)	Consultants in country April-May 2011	Proposals for capacity building programme and adaptation of research programmes were planned for 4 <sup>th</sup> quarter 2009 (prodoc); in PoO treated as continuous activity
MoA M&E Assessment	4 <sup>th</sup> quarter 2009 (prodoc)	Consultant in country Sept 2010	PoO blank on consultancy; MoA M&E strategy planned but as yet no proposals formulated
Farming Systems Assessment	4 <sup>th</sup> quarter 2009 (prodoc) 3/2010 (PoO)	May 2011	Ongoing consultancy
NAMBOARD Assessment	4 <sup>th</sup> quarter 2009 (prodoc)	Tender out in May 2011	Treated as continuous activity in PoO; backstopping mission in May 2010 proposed implementation schedule, but reportedly long lead times for meetings with MOA and NAMBOARD caused delays
RDA Profiling	throughout 2010 (PoO)	September 2010	Two RDA profiles developed; assessment not specifically mentioned in prodoc (PoO implies assessments of all 17 RDAs)
Earth Dams Feasibility Study and Construction	4 <sup>th</sup> quarter 2009 (prodoc)	Pre-feasibility study Oct 2010; community needs assessment Feb 2011	Prodoc envisaged construction of dams by 4 <sup>th</sup> quarter 2009; in PoO treated as continuous activity (with construction/rehabilitation of 8 dams finished by 2013)

The above timeline demonstrates that many of the main SADP technical activities are still at an initial stage: in some crucial areas (research, extension, M&E system, earth dams) the technical assessments have been completed, but the development of plans, strategies, capacity building curricula and implementation schedules still has to happen. Some other activities have been partially completed (RDA assessments), and some assessments (Farming Systems, NAMBOARD) still have to start.

The reasons for delays are not always apparent: in some cases, the development and subsequent clearance of TOR for various assignments seems to have taken an inordinately long period of time; in other cases, there seem to have been differences of opinion as to who should drive the process: SADP and/or the MoA, or FAO.

The slow pace of implementation is reflected in the Budget Utilization table below: it shows that while SADP has roughly reached the mid-point of its implementation period, it is underspent in most areas: the overall budget utilization is around 25%. The only budget lines corresponding more or less to the envisaged utilization relate to personnel (staff and consultants), and non-expendable procurement. These are expenditures largely related to management and technical expertise.

Table 2: Budget Utilization

	Total US\$ as per Budget Revision "A" (May 2009)	Commitments and Actuals May 2011	Commitments and Actuals as % of Total Budget	Commitments and Actuals as % of Budget Line	Available Budget
5011 Salaries Professional (Parent account)	3,550,986	1,973,740	10.95	55.58	1,843,123
5012 Salaries General Service (Parent account)	443,037				
5013 Consultants (Parent account)	1,250,648	688,730	3.82	55.07	739,075
5014 Contracts (Parent account)	3,420,407	17,456	0.1	0.51	3,402,949
5020 Locally Contracted Labour (Parent account)					
5021 Travel (Parent account)	863,593	207,246	1.15	24	656,347
5023 Training (Parent account)	2,773,978	141,597	0.79	5.1	2,632,379
5024 Expendable Procurement (Parent account)	2,235,601	76,828	0.43	3.44	2,158,773
5025 Non Expendable Procurement (Parent account)	1,292,974	832,407	4.62	64.38	460,567
5027 Technical Support Services (Parent account)	363,949	48,319	0.27	13.28	315,630
5028 General Operating Expenses (Parent account)	655,703	174,062	0.97	26.55	481,641
5029 Support Costs (Parent account)	1,179,561	222,272	1.23	18.84	957,289
5040 General Operating Expenses - external common services (Parent account)		6			<6>
5050 General Operating Expenses - internal common services (Parent account)		650			<650>
Grand Total	18,030,437	4,383,312	24.31	24.31	13,647,116

The most underspent budget lines in SADP are Contracts (0.51 % of available budget), Expendable Procurement (3.44 %), and Training (5.10%). While it would be correct to point out that expenditure under these budget lines has to be carefully prepared and planned, and would therefore have to be preceded by technical analysis, these very low expenditure figures indicate that SADP's presence on the ground (and the accompanying material benefits) has been limited so far.

The substantial difference between the allocated and actually spent amounts would indicate that there was a need for a budget revision following the initial Budget Revision “A”, in order to account for delays, and re-schedule the future years. Considering particularly the above three budget lines, the low delivery rates make the preparation of an expenditure plan a necessity in order to inform a budget revision.

SADP did not – at least initially – succeed in establishing transparent operating procedures for operational and administrative processes. Despite various team building and re-planning exercises, there has not been sufficient adherence to agreed work plans, nor has reporting been comprehensive and timely enough to flag delays in implementation. (This would also point to deficiencies in SADP’s oversight structure, as the bodies in charge of providing guidance did not formally respond to the obvious slippages for an extended period.)

The likely reasons can be put down to staff unfamiliarity with rules and regulations of the various institutions involved in SADP, frequent changes (and sometimes insufficient availability) of counterparts, staff changes within SADP, and misunderstandings about the respective roles of the various parties in the SADP institutional arrangements.

The project has also suffered from an absence of “champions”: persons in crucial positions who could provide enthusiasm, commitment and guidance, and when necessary are prepared to push for action. In addition, some of the provisions of the FAO project document were vague, and led to differences of opinions about the right approaches. For example, the position of SADP counterparts was insufficiently explained in the project document, and SADP initially had regular counterparts (Focal Persons – their precise TOR were developed only in 2011) mostly among less senior staff in MoA with little decision-making authority; buy-in by Heads of Departments was limited.

The MoA’s constrained human resources were already highlighted in a 2010 EU monitoring report, which identified the (limited) government contribution of human resources as “a serious constraint for implementation of SADP”. The report estimated that Focal Points on average committed only about 10% of their time to SDAP work, instead of the stipulated 50%. SADP started issuing “Advisory Notes” in August 2010 to increase the urgency of some actions.

A recommendation indicated in the project document to strengthen sustainability of interventions is “... sustaining sufficient and high quality project backstopping in both technical and organizational areas of support”. Yet SADP’s Backstopping Task Force (originally located in the FAO offices in Maputo, Harare and Rome) met infrequently (two meetings on record, no minutes available), and there have been surprisingly few technical backstopping missions (five since project inception). Some of these backstopping missions proposed detailed action plans, but the follow-up taken based on these proposals is not well recorded.

Operational support was provided by the FAO representation in Maputo until late March 2011 (the FAO Representation in Zimbabwe took over in April 2011); however, with the departure of the long-serving Maputo FAOR in early 2010, SADP faced a hiatus until September 2010 until a successor was appointed<sup>17</sup>. During that period, a number of crucial administrative activities were delayed or

---

<sup>17</sup> But even then, the newly appointed FAOR did not visit Swaziland; only when the Accreditation went to the FAOR in Zimbabwe, the Budget Holder function was effectively re-established.

complicated by the FAO offices involved (in Maputo, Accra, Rome and Budapest), and this situation was exacerbated by SADP's unfamiliarity with FAO procedures<sup>18</sup>. This fairly complex system of operations adds to the length of time taken to complete an action, and if institutional memory is removed with the departure of key collaborators (as happened with the departure of the FAOR), lengthy delays can occur.

Examples of administrative delays are illustrated by the procurement process for pick-up trucks (the second batch of vehicles ordered for SADP): the order was initiated in November 2009, delivery took place in May 2011. Delays were caused by requests for clarification on specifications, changes to tenders, re-tendering, and clearance processes. In the process, SADP saved approximately US\$ 10,000 per vehicle over the initial bid, but the programme was severely hampered in its capacity to deliver and lost valuable time. However, there are also a few examples of relatively quick procurement actions: motorcycles were procured locally, and within the planned timeframe.

Recruitment of some consultants has also taken an inordinately long time. The action has to be initiated by SADP before technical clearance by FAO backstopping units, and there are several instances of technical clearance being delayed by the Lead Technical Unit or Technical Support Officers. The same can be said for MoA clearance of candidates, which apparently requires concurrence on the TOR and final approval by the PS (including for short-term consultants). For example, the fielding of the Research Assessment Team took from August 2010 (development of TOR, proposal of shortlisted consultants) until March 2011 (first visit) and May 2011 (presentation of draft report). Also recruitment of local consultants (or local consulting firms and NGOs) has taken long: due to the clearances required (for TOR, as well as for the actual consultants<sup>19</sup>) and the hiring process through tenders, the actual completion of the process has often taken more than six months. The time between invitations of expressions of interest, and then the invitations to selected organisations to submit a proposal, sometimes has taken three months and thus compressed the time available for carrying out the actual assignment.

On recruitment and procurement procedures, it appears that SADP did not initially create a list of approved contractors (be it by FAO or other UN agencies) for consultants and consultant firms. This would have accelerated the issuance of LoAs and/or contracts, and – together with prior well documented and justified reasoning – would have allowed FAO to grant waivers and apply special considerations. A procurement committee is now in place at SADP<sup>20</sup>. No use was made of Local Purchase Orders (LPOs) that can now be used in adjacent countries, nor of Field Purchase Orders (FPOs). An inventory of equipment procured is in place but it does not reflect users and locations.

The major constraints in the field of administration thus seem to be the underestimation by SADP of the time required at GoS level, the time required for obtaining technical clearance; and the time required for procurement/recruitment itself.

---

<sup>18</sup> Administrative actions pass through several stages in FAO: SADP as originator, then the FAO Representation as Budget Holder, followed by (depending on the specific action undertaken) the FAO Regional Office for Africa in Accra, FAO HQ, and (for recruitment) the FAO Shared Services Centre in Budapest.

<sup>19</sup> Concerning, for example, the consultancy on the commercialization of Gege Farm, it took two months from submission of draft TOR from ASA/CTA to MoA (DVLS) in January 2011 to get a (positive) response from MoA. The FAO technical backstopping officer then approved within a week.

<sup>20</sup> Procurement above the delegated authorization of US\$ 10,000 is submitted to the procurement committee at FAOR Maputo – now FAO Harare

SADP has tried to tackle the issues by sending staff for specific training (Procurement Training course, Budget Holder training course) and then in turn offering briefings to SADP staff and MoA officials. However, these sessions were slow to be initiated given widespread understanding of the problems, and turnout in some cases was disappointing. In addition, forms were developed, a SADP Procurement Committee set up, and advance planning procedures explained. Finally, FAO recently sent a dedicated operations consultant on a six-week mission to analyse, advise and train staff in SADP operations. It is too early to judge the success of these measures but the review team sees them as positive steps taken as attempts to gain lost ground.

Some other important processes have been less than optimal. This includes the preparation of individual six-monthly reports as well as of the FAO six-monthly reports; the reporting frequency has not been adhered to. Workshops reports were prepared and distributed, but were not made available on FAO's FPMIS (Field Programme Management Information System)<sup>21</sup>. Furthermore, backstopping reports by HQ staff were not distributed to government, despite repeated requests by MoA. However, there has been no dedicated reporting on crucial activities completed under SADP's four components (e.g., the selection of pilot sites for crop production, the extension assessment, and the feasibility studies for dams) and their implications for the future work.

Concerning financial reporting and planning, due to project expenditure in Emalangi, FAO has had to maintain an accurate monitoring of the FAO records vis-à-vis the EU and the Oracle US\$ approved budgets – a demanding task requiring manual maintenance of a complex shadow tracking system. Except for the initial SADP Budget Revision, no other budget revision has been raised to realistically reflect anticipated work plan inputs. The 2010 year-end mandatory budget revision and rephrasing into subsequent years have also not yet been produced. The call for funds (2nd tranche) took place unilaterally through Government request to the EU Swaziland delegation, and was not certified by FAO HQ (CSF) as required by FAO rules. (HQ certification makes sense, as certain expenditures are recorded at HQ level and may show up only later in the project accounts.)

The low delivery (meaning low rate of budget utilization) by SADP was clearly recorded in FAO's FPMIS throughout 2010 – but there is no evidence of remedial action initiated or demanded by the FAO HQ, BH, SFS or RAF.

Work plans and progress reports have not fully met their intended purpose. Component 4 has produced an impressive amount of planning and reporting templates, but these are not (yet) used for effective forward planning, nor are reporting systematically work done against the elements in the work plan. Changes in the work plan away from the original project document (deleting and/or shifting activities and outputs) have not been formally recorded in a revision.

#### ***d. Impacts***

As SADP has advanced so slowly, it is still difficult to predict what its impacts might be at the scheduled termination date. Activities which require significant institutional transformations or

---

<sup>21</sup> The coverage has greatly improved since the appointment of the new FAOR in April 2011.

policy changes are unlikely to be fully completed by early 2014. Similarly, activities aimed at behavioural and social changes, e.g. facilitating a market-orientation in smallholder farming enterprises, will need a longer time frame.

SADP has, however, the potential to make some strategic investments in the MoA resource base, by building capacity among staff through continued training courses, study tours, on-the-job training etc., and also through strategic assessments that clearly analyse the existing status of different systems and approaches and provide perspectives for the future.

Given the current budget limitations in MoA, the rehabilitation works started by SADP (such as RDA offices, Farmer Training Centres, small dams, etc.) could take on an added significance: without external support, MoA's infrastructure particularly in rural offices has only limited functionality. However, SADP should not be seen as a facility for hardware supply: the programme should strive to invest strategically and develop models that can be replicated even in a severely constrained budget environment. Should component 3 be successful, SADP would have succeeded in catalysing a vibrant agro-industry/business sector that could thrive, creating jobs and having other social spin-off effects despite the extreme fiscal constraints impacting on the Swazi economy.

#### ***e. Sustainability***

This visionary project was intended to address the perennial concern about the sustainability of donor-supported investments in public sector institutions by developing institutional capacity within the key institution (MoA), and fostering business approaches to marketing agricultural commodities by rural communities. It could still achieve this, but certainly not within the time frame left for the programme. It will now require an extension if the substantial delays incurred are to be rectified, and a streamlining of the management structure to enhance the programme's efficiency.

Key to increasing the chances of sustainable outcomes is the greater engagement with a wide range of implementation partners, and a greater involvement of the private sector. This is not straightforward in Swaziland as the number of players is small.

Some of the activities initiated by SADP have contributed to an increased visibility of MoA on the ground, and will provide welcome support to field-level development workers, as for example the backyard gardening initiative. However, the future sustainability of the initiative is still uncertain: so far, backyard gardening depends on operational (transport) and economic (seeds and other inputs) support from SADP. It will be important to consider how these initiatives can be sustained, through partnership with NGOs for example.

#### ***f. Partnerships***

SADP initially placed emphasis on developing partnerships within the FAO team, and between the FAO and MoA teams through a series of workshops, which sometimes also included implementing agencies such as the Swaziland Dairy Board. Some field activities (e.g. development and monitoring of demonstration sites) have been commissioned to NGO implementing partners (World Vision – Swaziland, ACAT and Swaziland Farmer Development Foundation) through Letters of Agreement (LoAs). In at least two instances (with University of Swaziland<sup>22</sup> and IRD – International Relief & Development), approaches by SADP concerning collaboration were (initially) turned down.

---

<sup>22</sup> University of Swaziland turned down the offer claiming they needed a contractual agreement with MoA.





## 6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### a. Conclusions

#### *i. General*

- The SADP is a large, well-funded and high profile programme of critical importance to agricultural development in Swaziland; it provides a unique opportunity to strengthen institutions, foster marketing opportunities along different value chains, and contribute to food security of rural populations. However, to date the programme has not capitalised on this opportunity.
- The SADP is a highly ambitious programme which in the design phase did not take into consideration adequately the institutional resources and working relationships necessary to achieve the intended outcomes. Some of these have been, or are being, addressed, but there is need for further streamlining of the programme itself, and of clearer definitions of leadership responsibilities and lines of reporting and communication. Particular attention must continue to be given to fostering a team approach to project execution.
- There continues to be inadequate buy-in of SADP by MoA. The MTE team acknowledges that MoA staff may have originally had other duties that competed with SADP activities, but concludes that this argument is no longer valid given the time that has elapsed since SADP was initiated, and given that SADP evolved from the national priorities identified at the SNAS in 2007.
- As is well recognised by many SADP staff, the ambitious programme has been given the task to support a collection of projects. These divergent projects need to be rationalised and transformed into a coherent integrated national programme as part of a structured re-design process.
- At the current implementation rate, the programme will fail to achieve the three overarching outcomes of improved smallholder agricultural practices, improved research and service delivery and improved smallholder links to markets.
- The MTE concludes that given the potential impact of the programme, the progress that has been made on both the technical and team-building fronts, the MoA and the FAO should jointly seek a no-cost extension of the programme for a period of two years under the auspices of Articles 4.5 and 4.6 of the Financing Agreement between the GoS and the EU. The MTE considered other scenarios, including simply focussing on a few well-prioritised activities and terminating at the designated date, and even one of terminating the programme at this point. However, it is considered that firstly a considerable amount has been achieved and much good will has been created, despite all the delays, and it would be highly inappropriate to discard these assets. And secondly a minimal programme or a terminated programme would inevitably have other negative spill-over implications for the GoS, as well as for the EU and FAO which are not worth risking.

#### *ii. Technical*

- There is no single unifying programme document to serve as a blueprint for SADP; this inadequacy needs to be addressed urgently.
- The delay in many of the baseline studies, and particularly of the assessments of farming systems and best-bet interventions, has compromised the objective assessment of the

programme progress to date; a significant part of programme activities are still at the evaluation and planning stage rather than the implementation stage.

- The SADP has completed valuable assessments of the extension and research needs for Swaziland which lay the foundation for future policy and strategy development.
- There is no uniform human resource capacity for project implementation within the different departments of the MoA; this weakness has affected programme implementation in some areas. The area of in-service human resource capacity development deserves greater attention by TAT , MoA and FAO than is currently given.
- There has been substantial progress in establishing a sound monitoring and evaluation system for the programme, and initial steps have been made to establish an M&E system within the MoA.
- Most staff on the TAT are highly qualified in their respective technical fields but some exhibit gaps in knowledge and skills related to the institutional and inter-personal aspects of programme implementation, which are critical to effective operation in an environment characterized by little international programme experience and varied personal motivation within a government system.

### iii. Efficiency

The slow and inconsistent operating procedures and processes have undoubtedly been SADP's area of greatest weakness. The development of consistent and productive routines for supporting capacity and team building activities, as well as the discharge of operational and administrative duties, have been hampered by delays in recruitment, staff unfamiliarity with rules and regulations of the various organizations involved in SADP (MoA and TAT), frequent changes (and sometimes insufficient availability) of MoA counterparts or focal points, staff changes within TAT, and misunderstandings about their respective roles by the various parties involved in SADP.

- In the absence of dedicated operational support, a number of crucial administrative activities were delayed and exacerbated by the unfamiliarity of SADP's staff (MoA and TAT) with FAO procedures.
- There has been an insufficient awareness by the TAT and MoA of the lead time required to enable quality action, and consequently a lack of forward planning.
- The absence of "champions" has hampered progress: there was no dedicated FAO Budget Holder for most of 2010 (the FAO Representative position in Maputo was vacant from April to September 2010; effectively, the position was filled only in April 2011 with the double accreditation of the FAOR Zimbabwe), the NPD position has been vacant since December 2010 (and the incumbent was not accepted by some stakeholders), there have been few backstopping visits, and even fewer FAO Backstopping Task Force meetings.
- Vague provisions in FAO project document have led to differences of opinions about mandates and approaches: the MoA counterpart staff positions were inadequately defined, and MoA staff eventually deployed were sometimes below senior staff in MoA; precise TOR for Focal Persons were developed only in 2011; and buy-in by MoA Heads of Departments was limited and variable.
- Progress reporting has not adhered to the prescribed reporting frequency; workshop and travel reports are prepared and distributed, but have not been made available on FAO's FPMIS (Field

Programme Management Information System). Furthermore, backstopping reports by HQ staff have not been distributed to government, despite repeated requests by MoA.

- SADP has tried to tackle the procedural issues by sending staff for specific training (Procurement Training course, Budget Holder training course) and then in turn offering briefings to TAT staff and MoA officials. In addition, forms were developed, a FAO Procurement Committee was set up, and advance planning procedures were proposed. Finally, FAO HQ recently sent a dedicated operations consultant on a six-week mission to analyse, advise and train staff in SADP operations.

In conclusion, the reasons for the multiple delayed processes in SADP include “... the prolonged, and at times insufficient FAO programme support, including transaction and turnaround times for recruitment processes and procedures involving FAO Maputo, Budapest and FAO headquarters<sup>23</sup>”, poor advance planning by the SADP management, both on the TAT the MoA side, slow GoS inputs and responsiveness, changes in key backstopping staff and SADP staff, and unfamiliarity with workflow patterns and processes.

#### *iv. Prioritisation and readjustment of resources*

- A programme prioritisation process has been initiated by SADP, which is commended. The emerging lists of so-called priorities in each component are still far too long, and are without adequate supportive evidence and justification of their inclusion and position in the list.
- A much more rigorous prioritisation process must now emerge, based on clear, well-articulated and agreed criteria. This process must be handled urgently by SADP leadership and team.
- The MTE team concludes that the prioritisation and re-planning process must have the full and public endorsement of the GoS, FAO and the EU.

#### *v. Leadership and management*

- **The priority of SADP in the MoA.** The leadership in MoA has until recently inadequately emphasised SADP as a priority to its staff. Some Department Heads and focal points say that their existing workload limits the time they can allocate to SADP. Given that the SADP has emerged directly from the SNAS in which MoA priorities were established in a public forum, the MTE team considers this argument has little validity, and that full commitment by all MoA staff should be given; most importantly, the team concludes that MoA leadership at the level of PS should strongly endorse this.
- **The need for SADP leadership and management.** In terms of leadership and management within the FAO element of SADP, the MTE team considers that there is inadequate dialogue with, and understanding of, the MoA. As indicated above, the MoA component has not displayed effective leadership in driving SADP, and further, the extended absence of a person in the NPD post, a critical management position, has also contributed to the leadership and management vacuum.
- **Staff performance and relationship management.** Issues of staff performance and relationship management are not being dealt with adequately by the FAO and MoA leadership. There is serious underperformance in Component 3 (marketing), as well as relational issues which should

---

<sup>23</sup> CTA comment to the evaluation team’s draft report

have required immediate and decisive action for resolution. This inaction has resulted in a loss of trust between the MoA and the FAO side within SADP and has severely constrained progress in this component. From an HR procedural point of view, SADP practice has been too casual.

- **Urgency in leadership and management.** Given that progress has been extremely slow in many areas of programme activity, and that SADP oversight bodies failed to respond effectively, there is a need for a sense of urgency in leadership and management approaches through, among other measures:
  - More frequent meetings with consistent senior-level attendance to drive programme development;
  - The introduction of innovative approaches to addressing the partnership and interface between TAT and the MoA staff, both formally and informally.
  - An increase in the intensity of dialogue with potential and existing implementation partners within the private sector, NGOs, farmer forums etc.
  - More frequent, and more effective, technical backstopping from FAO
- **Visionary leadership and management at CTA and NPD levels.** The MTE team concludes that there is a need for much stronger strategic leadership and management from the CTA and NPD, with support from the ASC. These positions, working as a team, should drive initiatives within the MoA, as well as with FAO external contributions (regionally and from HQ). This should be carefully planned, holding team members in MoA and TAT to account for slow progress, coalescing the team around a shared SADP vision.
- **Backstopping by FAO.** FAO backstopping has been described as belonging to an out of date paradigm, being overly prescriptive, of inconsistent quality and consistency, and often not timely. Given the slow programme start, unfamiliarity with the relevant FAO procedures within the TAT and other programme challenges, FAO did not provide strong, consistent and steady leadership at a strategic level, and not enough effective backstopping at a technical level. There is a need for better planned, and more strategic as well as more output-orientated programme visits from technical consultants in Harare and Rome.
- **Team approach by TAT to FAO contributions.** At the same time, due to the weak relationship between the FAO team and FAO Rome, the FAO team have tended to guard their independence from Rome, and have appeared somewhat dismissive of the support offered from Rome. A strong working relationship with the backstopping team in Rome and regionally in Harare is one of the elements critical to fast-tracking implementation, but has yet to be established.
- **The importance of timely report submission.** While the Monitoring and Evaluation Officer is strong technically, reporting support from the rest of the team is not seen to be as consistent; progress reports are sometimes not delivered on time and there is not a strong enough performance management system nor strong enough leadership in place to enforce timely submission.

#### b. Recommendations

The recommendations made by the MTE team generally follow the main conclusions reached, and are documented below under the same five headings. Much emphasis is placed on recommendations which support the prioritisation of activities and the redesign of the programme, and the leadership, management and unity of SADP; there is less emphasis given to the technical aspects of the programme. The recommendations are designed to assist the SADP programme in

making tough decisions regarding the directions, leadership and management of the remaining time allocated to the programme.

i. General

**1. Intensify and finalise the prioritisation and programme redesign.**

The SADP now has a well-documented history and understanding of its evolution. The programme originated from a multi-stakeholder assessment of the needs of the agriculture sector in Swaziland, fortuitously supported financially by the EU; the noble goals embedded in this initiative must not be lost, and the MoA and the FAO and their partners have a collective responsibility to see this important initiative through. There has been much confusion regarding the three different documents under which the programme operates. The MTE recommends that this unfortunate position is brought to an immediate end through the drafting of a single unifying project document.

- A clear programme should be drawn up for the prioritisation and redesign of SADP activities currently underway and/or planned, with an emerging draft document submitted to the EU through the appropriate channels by September 30<sup>th</sup> 2011.
- This programme should explicitly state the roles and responsibilities of each partner, including overall leadership responsibilities, and lines of communication. The original budgetary allocation will need to be revised in the light of identified needs.

**2. Institutionalise and publicly document the buy-in and commitment of the MoA and its partner GoS institutions**

The SADP must be reconfirmed as a strategic and operational priority that is of key relevance to the daily duties and responsibilities within the MoA. The SADP was built on a strategic planning process developed by Swazis for Swazis. The MTE team consider it should be a national responsibility to provide full commitment to achieve the planned outcomes of the SADP, duly enforced by the Minister of Agriculture, through his Principal Secretary. The MTE team was given the personal assurance of this commitment by both the Minister of Agriculture and the PS.

**3. Seek a no-cost extension of the SADP from the EU**

The MTE concludes that given the potential impact of the programme, the progress that has been made on both the technical and team-building fronts, and the inevitable negative consequences of a possible programme failure, the MoA and the FAO should jointly seek a no-cost extension of the programme for a period of two years under the auspices of Articles 4.5 and 4.6 of the Financing Agreement between the GoS and the EU. It will be very important that SADP indicates its intentions to the EU urgently so that this option can be considered.

ii. Technical

**4. Component 1. Fast track the delayed evaluation of “best-bet” interventions.**

The critical “opener” of the SADP was to be the identification of a number of “best-bet” interventions, the analysis of which was to be completed within a year from project initiation, opening the door to four years of activity. The inventory has not yet been completed. This activity must be fast-tracked, and additional resources allocated if required, to ensure that this rudimentary pillar of the SADP concept does not delay further. It will be important to ensure that the inventory of best bests is as broad based as possible and encompasses not just national but regional success stories in smallholder production, marketing and other enterprises.

**5. Component 2. Develop a clearer vision of target and accessible beneficiary groups in the extension service**

Much emphasis was placed in the original conceptualisation of the SADP on making extension services more demand driven, and on identifying the key categories of demand beneficiaries. These were originally clustered into four groups, namely rain-fed crops & livestock; irrigation-based systems; household/community-based agricultural enterprises; vulnerable groups (including women, youth, HIV/Aids affected). The MTE understands there are now three core categories for farmer support and development across SADP – (1) Smallholder Vulnerable Groups; (2) Rain Fed SH Crop and Livestock Farmers capable of attaining HH food security; (3) Smallholders with Potential to Commercialise as Individuals or Groups (FOs) – including producers on irrigation plots/schemes. The MTE recommends that the SADP gives high priority to identifying and updating key target groups for extension services, considering both the impact on the target beneficiaries, as well as the field capability to effectively deliver the desired services.

- 6. Component 2. Resuscitating Swaziland’s capacity in agricultural research:** developing a capacity that is in tune with the research to extension demands, but of a size and structure that respects the limitations of resources, and the benefits from engagement with regional research partners.

The SADP has commissioned the development of a strategy and investment framework for agricultural research in Swaziland, which has presented its draft plans. These are indeed ambitious, and while recognising the need for research resuscitation, the MTE queries the relevance and scale of the draft recommendations. In developing a research strategy, it will be important to take into account not only the research gaps and opportunities, but also the economic and sustainability context of expanding research capacity and institutions, and the investment implications in terms of rational resource allocation and opportunity cost. This perhaps requires an in-depth exploration of scenarios which seek to expand regional cooperation with the ever increasing number of networking institutions, such as the newly emerging Centre for Agricultural Research and Development in Southern Africa (CARDESA), for example.

**7. Component 3. Fast tracking of support to key smallholder value chain enterprises.**

The entry into, and engagement with, key value chains for produce by smallholders was a fundamental ingredient of SADP which is yet to get off the ground. The better understanding of where public sector can support and enhance market engagement is central to the aspirations of SADP. The MTE recommends that much greater dialogue with, and engagement of, local NGOs and

small private enterprises should be undertaken under a strategic framework that identifies genuine opportunities, and valuable delivery partners.

#### **8. Develop Standard Operating Procedures**

Many routine activities (such as development and clearance of TOR) have often taken an inordinately amount of time. FAO, MoA and SADP need to agree on standard procedures for routine activities, and in particular define the periods within which action must be completed.

#### **9. Develop a revised and mutually agreeable work plan, including recruitment, procurement and backstopping requirements**

In order to increase mutual understanding among the SADP team and also to alert SADP stakeholders concerning their expected inputs, SADP should develop a revised work plan that includes backstopping requirements, pending procurement and recruitment issues, and other operational issues with a clear indication to all parties as to which inputs are expected, and when.

#### **10. Provide additional operations training, and increase operational support capacity**

FAO operational procedures may be complex, but SADP seems to have suffered from excessively lengthy delays at several levels. Further training of SADP staff would be beneficial (especially of the newly recruited Accountant/Procurement Officer), as well as strengthening the operational support.

iii. Prioritisation and readjustment of resources

#### **11. Develop a redesigned SADP based on agreed priorities, initial successes, documented GoS and delivery partner commitment and the presence of champions**

Further to Recommendation 1, the MTE recommends that a structured and facilitated process is initiated by the end of July 2011 which picks up on the recent SADP Programme Review dialogue and prioritisation exercise. This process will be the central forum for SADP redesign and the corresponding reallocation of budgetary resources. Central to this will be the development of a clear set of criteria on which priority activities will be selected (see page 29 of this report). The MTE recommend that this process be facilitated professionally. The process should lead to the development of a redesigned SADP for presentation to the EU by 30<sup>th</sup> September 2011.

iv. Leadership and management

#### **12. The urgent need to give priority to SADP activities within the MoA**

Clearly the MoA has multiple tasks and responsibilities. Nevertheless, for the second half of the SADP the MTE recommends that clear priority be assigned to the SADP within MoA, and that the human resource and time allocations to SADP activities by MoA staff are agreed by all SADP staff (MoA and TAT) and are recorded in workplans, performance agreements, etc. As a beginning, the MTE recommends that an appraisal of MoA staff resources and training needs assessment be conducted so as to gain a clearer picture of existing strengths and bottlenecks.

### 13. The need to strengthen SADP leadership at the CTA level

There is an urgent need to strengthen the leadership in SADP with emphasis on partnership, dialogue, understanding and trust in the relationship between MoA, FAO staff and other partners.

The MTE suggests that the SADP CTA position requires the following principles:

- documented leadership of multidisciplinary teams in developing country settings
- the ability to inspire
- the ability to take the initiative,
- strong emotional intelligence,
- the ability to work at multiple levels in often difficult environments and organizationally different cultures,
- the ability to hold team members accountable for slow progress, to be able to develop a strong programme vision and to coalesce the team around that vision,
- the ability to be innovative when standard approaches and procedures fail,
- the ability to build positive incentives,
- the ability to stay engaged under difficult circumstances in recognition that the weaker the capacity, the greater the need

FAO should take all necessary measures to ensure that the leadership issue is addressed as a matter of priority.

### 14. The need to better manage staff performance and intra-institutional relationships

The MTE team strongly recommends that efforts continue to build a strong working relationship within the SADP team, and to foster a culture of teamwork, accountability, service orientation and effective communication. Improved leadership and management is required from both the TAT and the MoA. The MTE team proposes four mechanisms be considered to achieve this; these are not meant to be mutually exclusive.

- **Utilise operations management tools and approaches.** Develop a transparent performance management system within SADP (involving both the TAT and MoA elements). For MoA staff, this should be linked to training and development, with clear incentives such as study tours. If successfully managed and administered, this could serve as an example within the MoA of the benefits of a good performance management system<sup>24</sup>, which has accountability at its core. Individual and group performance targets should be negotiated within the programme, with targets both realistic and achievable.
- **The TAT adopt a “coaching” approach to capacity building.** SADP could become a nucleus for a broader transformation in organizational culture within the MoA. Each member of the TAT should demonstrate strong leadership and management skills, not just technical expertise and advice; likewise, consultants should transfer skills and leave behind tools and systems that contribute in the longer term to building MoA capacity.

---

<sup>24</sup> It may help with sustainability by piloting within SADP and then extending to the rest of the MOA. It may create an opportunity for the MOA to create a performance management culture.



The TAT should emphasize on-the-job training, coaching and mentoring as a learning methodology, especially for promoting communication, collaboration and complementarity amongst the various legs of SADP and more broadly within the MoA.

- **Consideration of External Organizational Development Support to MoA.** In order to sustain the momentum achieved by SADP planning and team building workshops, commissioning an external organisation to continue the organizational development process, aimed at orientating MoA towards a culture of teamwork, accountability, service and improved communication. This could include provision of professional coaching services to managerial level staff (including SADP CTA, TAs, ASC and NPD), the development of leadership, management and performance tools; and coaching and team building. Securing the right kind of external assistance is important – the support provider must have proven experience of successfully implementing change management/organizational culture/team building improvements in large public sector programmes, and should be able to provide continued, rather than one-off, support.
- **Creating the position of Operations Officer (OO).** The OO should be considered as part of the SADP team to coordinate operational work of the different components with TAT, and on particular the CTA, NPD and ASC. The OO would establish a schedule of planned and pending recruitment and procurement actions, as well as support, and follow up on, issues related to backstopping, study tours, workshop organization, etc. The OO would follow up to ensure that deliverables are met on time and serve as the key operational link between the SADP FAO and MoA teams. It is strongly recommended that some of the savings within the programme be used to create and fund such a position. It is further recommended that this position is locally filled.

### **15. The urgent need for strong leadership in, and streamlining of, Component 3.**

The MTE was struck by the poor performance of Component 3, and the absence of effective working relationships between project personnel working in this area. This situation is not viable, and the MTE recommends that FAO takes measures to address this situation as a matter of urgency.

### **16. Revitalising the technical backstopping by FAO**

There is a need to introduce more structure, urgency and feedback mechanisms into the “backstopping” support from Rome (and where appropriate from Harare). Such support needs to be both demand driven (from Rome and Swaziland), of a dynamic and iterative nature, and raised to a peer review level rather than undertaken in a supervisory mode. The MTE recommends that the LTU re-evaluates its role and its leadership in the light of these conclusions.

## ANNEX 1: Evaluation Terms of Reference

Food and Agriculture Organization  
of the United Nations



**"Swaziland Agricultural Development Programme - SADP" -  
GCP/SWA/016/EC**

***Terms of Reference for the Project Mid-Term Evaluation***

***May 2011***

### Acronyms

CTA	Chief Technical Adviser
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FAOR	FAO Representative
FO	Farmer Organization
GOS	Government of Swaziland
IPs	Implementation Partners
MoA	Ministry of Agriculture
MTE	Mid-Term Evaluation
NAMBOARD	National Agricultural Marketing Board
NAO	National Authorising Officer
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development/ Development Assistance Committee

PAE	
PSC	Project Steering Committee
PTC	Project Technical Committee
RDA	Rural Development Area
SADP	Swaziland Agriculture Development Programme
SWADE	Swaziland Water and Agricultural Development Enterprise
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group

## 1. Background

Increasing agricultural productivity and competitiveness is key to addressing the root causes of poverty and food insecurity in Swaziland and was recognized as a national priority by the National Agricultural Summit (NAS) in 2007. Many of the activities of the Swaziland Agriculture Development Programme (SADP) are based on the findings and conclusion of that summit.

The SADP was designed as a Government of Swaziland programme, with funding from the EU (€ 14,220,000) and an FAO contribution (€ 341,000). It has as overall objective: "Overall increased equitable economic national growth and development", supported by the specific objective: "Improved smallholder production, and marketing systems which lead to sustainable food security and an improved quality of life for rural households".

In addition, there are three results area:

- Feasible improvements to current smallholder agricultural practices are identified, tested and documented.
- Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) capacity to effectively undertake field activities, research and service delivery is reoriented, strengthened and delivery performance is improved.
- Smallholder links to markets are increased

The results areas are designed to be achieved through three components: i) Improved and Sustainable Agricultural Production; ii) Agricultural Research and Service Delivery; and iii) Agricultural Marketing, Finance and Agribusiness Development.

SADP is implemented by the MoA and Implementing Partners (IPs) under the leadership of a National Project Director. The National Project Director is supported technically, operationally and financially by FAO, through (i) the FAO office in the region (Budget Holder); (ii) a Technical Assistance Team (TAT), composed of a Chief Technical Adviser, a Financial Controller, four Technical Advisers (comprising Agricultural Services, Marketing, Production and Monitoring and Evaluation/Information Systems Adviser) and other general support staff; and through (iii) technical monitoring and backstopping from FAO's headquarters and/or decentralized offices, as appropriate.

Two additional committees complement the governance structure of SADP:

A *Project Steering Committee (PSC)* comprised of representatives from related ministries has been set up to oversee and validate the overall direction and policy of the project, including project work plans as well as technical and financial reports. The PSC is chaired by the National Authorizing Officer of the Ministry of Economic Planning and Development.

A *Project Technical Committee (PTC)* has been established under the chairmanship of the Principal Secretary of MoA. This committee has the responsibility for ensuring that approved work plans are carried out effectively and according to schedule, and that expenditures correspond both to technical activities and budgets. It also reviews and provides feedback to the findings of studies and assessments carried out using project resources and determine their implication for future work.

It is important to note that the year 2010 was the first full calendar year of implementation for SADP. With a full staff complement on board by January 8 2010, all activities came into full operation and attempted to recover from time lost as a result of delays in project initiation. In

2010 the TAT continued to focus on carrying out fact-finding field visits; participating in formal and informal forums to establish networks and links both locally and regionally as well as to understand the local agricultural sector and; putting emphasis on more frequent TAT/MoA level meetings to develop a better and common understanding of the project document and map out a strategy to implement the many planned activities.

2010 also saw important changes in SADP support structure, with the retirement of the FAO Representative (FAOR) for Mozambique and Swaziland and the subsequent appointment of an interim Representative<sup>25</sup>. The absence of a full time FAOR introduced some challenges in the support of SADP, and corrective measures were discussed during three backstopping missions: two from FAO HQ and one from the sub-regional office in Harare. Several interactive management meetings were conducted with the local EU office and the MEPD, and Focal Persons were appointed in all the key programme areas. Implementation delays have resulted in a shorter timeframe to achieve the planned objectives, so that a redesign of the project work plan might need to be tabled. However, significant achievements have been made across the four component areas; these will be presented to the evaluation team during the mission in Swaziland.

## **2. Purpose of the Mid-term evaluation**

2.1 The Mid-Term Evaluation is commissioned by FAO in consultation with project partners (EU, NAO) to review the achievement to date and generate lessons learnt in order to improve SADP operations, and to provide decision makers in the Government of Swaziland, the EU and FAO with an independent and objective analysis which can be used to make informed decisions on the project's future direction. This analysis will assess the project's relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and potential impact, and will make recommendations on possible changes which the project might need to consider, including duration, financing, management arrangements, etc.

Specifically, the evaluation will:

- review the progress of the project to date, based on the above criteria, and identify its key strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and threats;
- generate conclusions and recommendations which will guide all parties, including programme management, on the mode of operation, programme priorities and focus, implementation strategy, in an effort to improve the likelihood of achieving agreed programme deliverables.
- revisit the programme design in view of the time frame remaining for implementation and advance proposals for adaptation or revision as considered necessary and appropriate.

## **3. Scope of the Evaluation**

3.1 The mid term evaluation will provide an evaluation of the SADP from the date the project document was signed until to date. In this evaluation, it will have as a starting point the original project documents, including its log frames and work plans but will take into consideration challenges that have affected the implementation of the programme.

---

<sup>25</sup> Budget Holder responsibilities have in the meantime been transferred to FAO's Sub-regional Office in Harare.

3.2 The independent evaluation will assess the overall results of the programme to date and analyse them against the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development/ Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC) and UNEG (United Nations Evaluation Group) criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability and potential impact - while considering the stage of the project. In addition, the SADP will also be assessed in terms of its performance on gender equality and social inclusion. The evaluation should be incisive, critical and focus on capacity development dimensions for all parties (FAO, MoA, NAO, IPs and EU), with emphasis on the learning process involved to date in the programme and through this evaluation.

3.3 Audience and potential users of the evaluation include mainly government authorities (MoA, NAO), the implementation partners and representatives of the target group, the EU as well as FAO, including management and programme staff at country level, FAO Representative, and technical backstopping officers.

#### **4. Key issues/key evaluation questions**

4.1. The evaluation analysis will be developed around the OECD criteria as presented below. An initial list of key sub questions has been identified through discussions with project stakeholders. The evaluation team may identify other issues in the course of evaluation.

#### **Relevance**

Relevance and contribution of the programme to:

- the target groups and their needs as defined in the project document (gender-differentiated);
- agricultural and rural development challenges and needs (as reported e.g. in the National Agricultural Summit Report & Action Programme)(2007);
- National development priorities (Swaziland Country UNDAF, National Development Strategy / NDS, Poverty Reduction Strategy and Action Programme / PRSAP);
- FAO's Strategic Framework;
- EU – GoS Country Support Strategy NIP and NAS; and
- Millennium Development Goals.

Quality, clarity and adequacy of each of the overall design and components, including:

- clarity and logical consistency between inputs, activities and outputs and progress towards achievement of objectives; appropriateness of the designed geographical coverage of the project;
- realism and clarity in the specification of prior obligations and prerequisites (assumptions and risks) and adequacy of resources (time, funding, human resources) for the successful implementation of the project;

- relevance , measurability and appropriateness of indicators in the logframe (original and revised logframe);
- clarity of relevance, measurability and appropriateness of indicators selected at the various result/objective levels/hierarchy, respectively;
- realism of the time frame for implementation and resource allocations, and if needed provide concrete input for redesign of components of the programme;
- institutional relationships, and in the managerial and institutional framework for implementation and translating the work plan into action;
- likely cost-effectiveness of the programme design;
- adequacy and appropriateness of the technical solutions proposed (level of sophistication) with respect to the existing (or expected) capacities in GoS institutions and implementing partners (including producer organizations) expected to take them over.

#### Appropriateness of technical assistance provided at country level

- how the design addresses relevant issues for Swaziland and how it links to the subsequent assumptions and targets set;
- how technical assistance can be re-designed so that available funds can be fully used until the end of the project period.

#### **Effectiveness**

- assessment of project outputs (including the unplanned ones that the team deemed critical steps for success) and outcomes (if any) produced to date (quantity and quality as compared with work plan) and progress towards achieving the immediate objectives and planned outcomes;
- extent to which communication and visibility activities have being carried out as well as quantity, quality and impact of messages and public relation;
- quality of information management and reporting, and the extend to which key stakeholders are kept adequately informed and planned of project activities;
- coverage of information and data being generated, disseminated (sectoral coverage, geographic coverage of most vulnerable groups, etc.) and used for management;
- baseline studies and their use for effective conceptual and planning purposes;
- cost-effectiveness of budget allocations in relation to project objectives.

Gender and social equality, including (the extent and focus of this aspect should clearly be guided by what the design and log frame planned for):

- extent and quality of women's and minority groups' participation in project activities, their access to project resources and benefits, including capacity development;
- contribution to women's and minority groups' visibility, participation in focal development processes and empowerment; and
- extent to which gender and social equity is being pursued in project management.

#### **Efficiency of the programme and its implementation**

Efficiency and adequacy of programme implementation including: use of resources, timely and cost effective start up and implementation of the project to date; the quality and timeliness of input delivery by FAO, the Government and other implementation partners;

- capabilities, absorptive capacities and commitment of MoA and other implementing partners for the programme;

- checking on the coherence and cohesiveness of the components structure and if needed provided options for improvement. Check the links and causal relationships between inputs, activities, outputs and outcomes outlined in the Results/Logical Framework and Annual Work Plans, and provide recommendations;
- review beneficiary identification and stakeholder participation;
- review extent to which communication and visibility work is being carried – this will address quantity and quality issues as well as impact of the messages.

Assessing project management and timeliness of implementation, including:

- effectiveness and efficiency of operations management (CTA, FAOR/budget holder, NPD, financial controller, backstopping of operations);
- adequacy, efficiency and effectiveness of strategic management;
- project governance structure and project coordination and steering bodies and mechanisms specifically looking at the PTC and PSC composition, generic TOR, functions and responsibilities;
- set-up, efficiency and effectiveness of monitoring and internal review and reporting processes, including progress reports, 6 monthly reports of advisers, etc.;
- adequacy and timeliness of project technical backstopping;
- implementation challenges and delays if any, their causes and consequences, reflecting on the variance between planned and implemented outputs and outcomes;
- explore the challenges and implications of merging the EU result framework and the FAO logical framework; and
- review the adjustment made by the programme to the original design – in strategic direction and implementation – and provide an analysis about their relevance and effectiveness and if appropriate provide recommendation to include them in a new design;
- assess the number and quality of any remedial decisions and measures taken to improve implementation.

Project financial resources and financial management, including:

- rate of delivery vis-à-vis budget allocations;
- relevance and adequacy of budget allocations in the project document and subsequent budget revisions;
- cost-effectiveness (see above).

## **Sustainability**

The prospects for sustaining and possibly up-scaling the programme's results by the beneficiaries and the host institutions after the termination of the programme. The assessment of sustainability will include:

- how the current concepts, approaches and processes contribute to sustainability and up-scaling;
- likelihood of programme sustainability and strategy to sustain and build upon achievements made and possibilities for up-scaling;
- institutional, technical, economic and social sustainability of proposed technologies / innovations / processes;
- programme contribution and/or impact on natural resources in terms of maintenance and/or regeneration of the natural resource base (environmental sustainability).



## Actual and Potential impact

Any other issue that the review team may consider relevant and important for the successful completion of the project.

Based on the above analysis the evaluation will draw specific conclusions and make proposals for any necessary action to ensure sustainable development and successful project implementation. The evaluation will draw attention to any lessons of general interest. Any proposal for adjustment of project activities in order to ensure full use of funds and implications out of this adjustment related to equipment, human resources, stakeholders, etc.

## **5. Evaluation methodology and organization**

### **5.1 Evaluation design/Methodology**

FAO Independent Office of Evaluation will manage this evaluation in full transparency, while ensuring that it remains completely independent and external to the project management. FAO staff in Swaziland will take responsibility for liaising with the GoS (represented by NAO and the PS MOA), EU, Project Steering Committees and relevant stakeholders for all aspects related to the evaluation. The evaluation team, once in country, will be facilitated by the project and the FAO office in Swaziland for administrative issues but will conduct its work independently.

The evaluation methodology will be consultative and will draw upon the views and perspectives of government (in particular NAO and MoA), FAO and EU, beneficiaries within Swaziland and backstopping units at FAO HQ and decentralized offices. The evaluation tools will include data and documentation reviews, and interviews with key decision makers and partner stakeholders.

The methodology will include but not limited to, the following principles:

- a. The MTE will adopt a participatory learning review approach
- b. Triangulation will be a key method for validation of information and evidence.
- c. The MTE will follow a consultative, iterative and transparent approach with internal and external stakeholders throughout the whole process.

- d. A range of tools and methods will be used: desk review of existing programme documents like plans and reports, semi-structured interviews with key informants, beneficiaries and stakeholders, focus group discussions supported by check lists and/or protocols, direct observation during field visits, etc.
- e. The Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) framework will be one major tool for assessment of the projects' results.
- f. Key informants at country level will be drawn from TAT staff, PSC and PTC, MoA staff, the central ministries including MoF and MEPD/NAO, the EU Delegation, HODs, RDA staff, the Marketing Boards (NAMBOARD, Dairy Board, etc.), the University of Swaziland, Technoserve, NGOs, consultants and/or SWADE regarding dams<sup>26</sup>.

The evaluation will refer to the specific objectives and results presented in the project document and consider/ propose revisions to the project design. The team will structure its analysis around the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria as defined above with a particular emphasis on examining the current relevance of the project, efficiency of the project implementation, and effectiveness of the work completed to date. While at the mid-term mark the assessment of sustainability and impact of the project may be premature, the evaluation will consider how the project design and current progress in implementation is/is not adequate for achieving these goals.

The achievement of the tasks described above, will require the use of the following evaluation methods and tools: (i) Desk Review: Review of literature, including the documents detailed under Annex I (reference material); (ii) preparation of an evaluation matrix with related evaluation questions and benchmarks; (iii) Stakeholder Review; (iv) Semi-structured interviews at field level; and (v) meetings in the field to discuss and validate findings, and explore possible recommendations.

## 5.2 Reporting

### **The expected deliverables:**

The mission is fully responsible for its independent reporting which may not necessarily reflect the views of the government, the donor or FAO. The reports will be written in conformity with FAO reporting guidelines, but will be flexible to respond to suggestions.

---

<sup>26</sup> The idea is to include all relevant actors (including counterparts, focal persons, FO representatives, etc) involved in programme implementation and supervision; a draft meeting schedule will be drawn up by the project for review and approval/modification by the evaluation mission.

- a) The Evaluation team will present to all project parties in Swaziland at the end of the mission an aide-memoire with the main conclusions and recommendations of the mission.
- b) The evaluation report will illustrate the evidence found that responds to the evaluation issues and meets the evaluation criteria listed in the ToR. The report will be as clear and concise as possible, will focus on findings, conclusions and recommendations and include an executive summary. Supporting data and analysis should be annexed to the report when considered important to complement the main report and for future reference.
- c) The structure of the report should facilitate in so far as possible the links between body of evidence, analysis and formulation of recommendations that will be addressed to the different stakeholders: they may be strategic and operational and will have to be evidence-based, relevant, focused, clearly formulated and actionable.
- d) The Evaluation Team Leader and the team will agree on the outline of the report early in the evaluation process, based on the outline provided in annex to the ToR. The report will be prepared in English, with numbered paragraphs.
- e) The mission leader bears responsibility for submitting the final draft report to FAO within four weeks from the conclusion of the mission. Within two additional weeks, FAO will submit to the team its comments and suggestions that the team will include whenever appropriate in the final report.
- f) The Budget Holder will consult the project stakeholders for the preparation of the Management Response, and circulate the final evaluation report by July 2011 to all key stakeholders (including the Contracting Authority/NAO) and to the donor, through the relevant FAO Unit for external relations (TCAP). The BH will also upload the report in FPMIS.
- g) FAO Office of Evaluation will be responsible for making available as public documents the final evaluation report and the FAO Management response on its website.

## **6. Composition of the Mission**

6.1 Under the responsibility of the Independent Office of Evaluation of FAO, the evaluation team will be composed of two international and one evaluator based in the region.

- a) The evaluation team shall comprise a mix of skills and competences required to assess the initiative and the issues at stake; among others, it will include competence and skill in evaluation and preferably, experience in the country or region; it will be balanced in terms of geographical and gender representation to ensure diversity and complementarity of perspectives.
- b) The evaluation team will combine among its members the following fields of expertise:
  - Agricultural development (particular related to the key components of agricultural production, research and extension, marketing and agro-business)
  - Programme and project design, management and evaluation.
  - Food Security
  - Gender issues

- Social development and participatory processes
  - Institutional and organizational reform, and
  - Knowledge of FAO and EU policies and operations
- c) FAO will take the lead in proposing to the key project stakeholders a suitable team composition; other project parties are free to propose suitable candidates. The team will be tentatively composed by 3 team members, who together will cover all the fields of expertise listed above.
- d) All team members will have a university degree and a minimum of 15 years of professional experience in their respective areas and in the field of development aid. All will be fluent in English. Mission members will have no previous direct involvement with the project either with regard to its formulation, implementation or backstopping. All will have signed the FAO Evaluation Service Declaration of Interest form.
- e) The final composition of the team will be the responsibility of FAO Office of Evaluation, according to the criteria set out above.

The Team Leader will be an independent professional with experience in leading large complex evaluations and a solid understanding of agricultural systems and institutional frameworks in sub-Saharan Africa. He/she will have a postgraduate qualification in a discipline relevant to the assignment, with a minimum of 15 years work experience. Experience in the evaluation of technical assistance programmes, preferably EU-funded, is particularly relevant, as well as proven capacity in working with institutions at different levels. The Team Leader will have overall responsibility for leading the team, preparing the evaluation matrix, coordinating the team members' inputs and compiling the evaluation report and drawing conclusions and recommendations. Excellent report writing skills are a requirement.

## 7. Timetable and Itinerary of the Mission

The MTE will be carried out on the following schedule:

Activity	Timing	Lead person in FAO
Development of the TOR	Early April 2011	FAOR and LTU
Agreement on the Team	15 April 2011	FAO Evaluation Office
Briefing of Team Leader and second international consultant by task force in HQ	Early May 2011	LTU

Evaluation mission in Swaziland; presentation of aide-memoire	May 2011	CTA and other persons identified by the evaluation team
Submission of draft evaluation report	June 2011	FAO Evaluation Office
Comments from FAO, and preparation Management Response	June/July 2011	Budget Holder, LTU and CTA
Final Report	July 2011	FAO Evaluation Office

List of key reference documents for the evaluation team

**Policy documents:**

- a. Millennium Development Goals – LTU
- b. Swaziland Country UNDAF - CTA
- c. National Development Strategy (NDS) - Vision 2022 (1999; 2002)-PAE
- d. National Physical Development Plan (NPDP, 1996 - PAE
- e. Comprehensive Agriculture Sector Policy (CASP, 2005)- PAE
- f. National Food Security Policy (NFSP, 2005) - PAE
- g. Comprehensive Africa Agricultural Development Programme (CAADP, 2010) - PAE
- h. Poverty Reduction Strategy and Action Programme (PRSAP, 2006) - PAE
- i. National Adaptation Strategy (NAS) (2006) - PAE
- j. Five Year Government Policy Statement - PAE
- k. National Agricultural Summit Report & Action Programme (2007) - PAE
- l. Performance Targets (2009 – 2013 – PAE

**Project documents:**

- m. Contribution Agreement
- n. Financial Agreement
- o. Swaziland Agricultural Development Programme (SADP, 2009-2014) - CTA
- p. SADP Operational plan (2009-2013) – CTA
- q. SADP Work Plan (2009-2010) – CTA
- r. SADP Work Plan ( 2010-2011) – CTA
- s. All programme narrative Reports (annual and quarterly) – CTA
- t. Assessment reports - CTA
- u. 6-monthly reports of the Advisers - CTA
- v. ROM report – LTU
- w. Back to office reports backstopping missions – LTU/task force
- x.



## Annex 2: List of People Met

### SADP midterm evaluation plan/schedule: May 10 – 24, 2011

Date	Time	Activity	Person to meet	Location	Contact Details	Remarks
<b>10/05/11 Tuesday</b>	1500	Meet FAO team	AFAOR	Mbabane - FAO office	(+268)7602-7557 <a href="mailto:Khanyisile.mabuza@fao.org">Khanyisile.mabuza@fao.org</a>	<b>Confirmed</b>
	1530	Meet Programme leader	CTA	Mbabane -FAO-SADP office	(+268) 76027758 <a href="mailto:Alwin.schuchmann@fao.org">Alwin.schuchmann@fao.org</a>	<b>Confirmed</b>
	1630	Meet all Advisers and ASC	MEA, ASC, ASA, PA, FC	Mbabane -FAO Training room	(+268) 2404-7220	<b>Confirmed</b>
<b>11/05/11 Wednesday</b>	1030	Meet MoA Senior Management	PS	Mbabane – PS’s office in MoA	(+268) 7606-2601 <a href="mailto:robertthwala@yahoo.com">robertthwala@yahoo.com</a>	<b>Confirmed</b>
	1530	Meet MoA senior management	US-DAD	Mbabane - US-DAD’s office in MoA	(+268) 7602-2602 <a href="mailto:bsmasuku@ymail.com">bsmasuku@ymail.com</a>	<b>Confirmed</b>
	1700	Meet Research Assessment Team	Research Assessment. Team	Timbali Lodge	Malcom Blackie <a href="mailto:mblackie@netcom.co.uk">mblackie@netcom.co.uk</a> William Otim-Nape <a href="mailto:wonape@yahoo.com">wonape@yahoo.com</a>	<b>Confirmed</b>
<b>12/05/11 Thursday</b>	0800	Meet EU Delegation	Chargé D’Affaires	Mbabane – EU office at Lilunga House	(+268) 2404-2908 <a href="mailto:Amadou.traore@eeas.europa.eu">Amadou.traore@eeas.europa.eu</a> <a href="mailto:Raniero.letto@eeas.europa.eu">Raniero.letto@eeas.europa.eu</a>	<b>Confirmed</b>
	0930	Meet the NAO	PS – MEPD	Mbabane - PS – MEPD	(+268) 2404-8144 <a href="mailto:bstewart@realnet.co.sz">bstewart@realnet.co.sz</a>	<b>Confirmed</b>
	1100	Meet MoA HODs individually	Cooperative department – Ms Nonhlanhla Mnisi	Mbabane – Ministry of Commerce industry and trade	(+268) 7606-2606 <a href="mailto:kuneneno@gov.sz">kuneneno@gov.sz</a>	<b>Confirmed</b>



	1200	Meet individual Advisers and ASC	ASC- Wilson and	Mbabane – MoA offices	(+268) 76027759 <a href="mailto:sikhondzew@yahoo.co.uk">sikhondzew@yahoo.co.uk</a>	<b>Confirmed</b>
	1400	Meet MoA HODs individually	PHEO – N. Nxumalo	Mbabane – DoA – MoA	<a href="mailto:nxumalono@gov.sz">nxumalono@gov.sz</a>	<b>Confirmed</b>
	1500	Meet MoA HODs individually	PAE – Lindiwe Madonsela	Mbabane – EPAS Offices	(+268) 76073902 <a href="mailto:madonselal@gov.sz">madonselal@gov.sz</a>	<b>Confirmed</b>
	1600	Meet individual Advisers	ASA; MA – Mike	Mbabane FAO/SADP offices (NPD’s Office)	(+268) 76023391 <a href="mailto:Michael.connolly@fao.org">Michael.connolly@fao.org</a>	<b>Confirmed</b>
<b>13/05/11 Friday</b>						
	0900 – 0950	Meet MoA senior management	All HODs and senior staff	Mbabane-FAO Training room		<b>Confirmed</b>
	1030 – 1100	Meet SADP focal person	HE- Nikiwe Dlamini	Manzini – Regional office	(+268) 76055000 <a href="mailto:nikiewp@gmail.com">nikiewp@gmail.com</a>	<b>Confirmed</b>
	1115 – 1145	Meet IPs and farmer organization	SNAU – President and CEO –J. Tsabedze	Manzini - SNAU offices	(+268) 76055943 <a href="mailto:jabuemkholo@gmail.com">jabuemkholo@gmail.com</a>	<b>Confirmed</b>
	1230	Meet SADP focal person	TCP National Coordinator – Dr. Sihle Mdluli	Manzini Vet-Manzini	(+268) 76085133 <a href="mailto:Mdlulisihle8@gmail.com">Mdlulisihle8@gmail.com</a>	<b>Confirmed</b>
	1400	Meet SADP focal person	Crops – Nelson Mavuso	Mbabane - MoA DoA offices	(+268) 76117338 <a href="mailto:nelsonmavuso@ymail.com">nelsonmavuso@ymail.com</a>	<b>Confirmed</b>
	1430	Meet SADP focal person	Earth dams - Makhosini	Mbabane- NPD’s office	(+268) 76224233 <a href="mailto:mmabhuta@yahoo.com">mmabhuta@yahoo.com</a>	<b>Confirmed</b>
	1500	Meet individual Advisers	PA- Luca	Mbabane FAO/SDAP offices	(+268) 76023600 <a href="mailto:Luca.fornasari@fao.org">Luca.fornasari@fao.org</a>	<b>Confirmed</b>
	1600	Meet individual Advisers	MEA – Bho	Mbabane FAO/SDAP offices	(+268) 76023602 <a href="mailto:Bho.mudyahoto@fao.org">Bho.mudyahoto@fao.org</a>	<b>Confirmed</b>

<b>16/05/11 Monday</b>	0800-0900	Meet SADP Adviser	FC - Justin	Mbabane FAO offices	(+268) 76023390 <a href="mailto:Justin.mandizha@fao.org">Justin.mandizha@fao.org</a>	<b>Confirmed</b>
	0900-0930	Meet SADP focal person	Livestock – T. Ngubane	Mbabane – MoA DVLS offices	(+268) 76158250 <a href="mailto:Ngubane104@yahoo.com">Ngubane104@yahoo.com</a>	<b>Confirmed</b>
	1000 – 1030	Meet SADP focal person	Forestry – Futhi Magagula	Mbabane - Ministry of Tourism and Environmental Affairs	(+268) 76770643 <a href="mailto:magagulaf@gov.sz">magagulaf@gov.sz</a>	<b>Confirmed</b>
	1100	Security Briefing	Security Team	UNDP Offices	(+268) 2404-2301	<b>Confirmed</b>
	1300	Meeting EU	L. Raniero	EU Offices	(+268) 2404-2908 <a href="mailto:Raniero.letto@eeas.europa.eu">Raniero.letto@eeas.europa.eu</a>	<b>Confirmed</b>
	1400	Meet National Training Officer	Hamilton Khoza	Mbabane –MoA offices	(+268) 76210430 <a href="mailto:Hamiltonkhoza@yahoo.com">Hamiltonkhoza@yahoo.com</a>	<b>Confirmed</b>
	1500-1600	Meet IPs and farmer organization	ACAT director – Enock Dlamini	Mbabane – ACAT offices	(+268) 76028860 <a href="mailto:emdlamini@acat.org.sz">emdlamini@acat.org.sz</a>	<b>Confirmed</b>
<b>17/05/11 Tuesday</b>						
	0900-0930	Meet SADP focal person	M&E – Zweli/Hendry	Mbabane -MoA EPAS offices	(+268) 76347500 <a href="mailto:f.nkambule@yahoo.com">f.nkambule@yahoo.com</a>	<b>Confirmed</b>
	0930-1000	Meet SADP focal person	MAU – Bheki Ndwandwe	Mbabane - MoA MAU offices	(+268) 76528552 <a href="mailto:Bhekitovey1@yahoo.com">Bhekitovey1@yahoo.com</a>	<b>Confirmed</b>
	1130-1230	Meet IPs	CEO, SDB – Tony Dlamini	Manzini, SDB offices	(+268) 76025566 <a href="mailto:tmdlamini@dairyboard.co.sz">tmdlamini@dairyboard.co.sz</a>	<b>Confirmed</b>
	1100-1130	Meet SADP focal person	Research – Mr. S Mavimbela	Malkerns – Research station	(+268) 76050780 <a href="mailto:seemelo@yahoo.com">seemelo@yahoo.com</a>	<b>Confirmed</b>

	1300-1400	Meeting EU	L. Raniero	EU Offices	(+268) 2404-2908 <a href="mailto:Raniero.letto@eeas.europa.eu">Raniero.letto@eeas.europa.eu</a>	Confirmed
	1400-1630	Visit RDAs	Hluthi RDA	RDA Manager		Confirmed
	1400	Meet MoA HoDs individually	DAE – George Ndlangamandla	Mbabane -MoA DAE offices	(+268) 76062603 <a href="mailto:ndlangamandlag@gov.sz">ndlangamandlag@gov.sz</a>	Confirmed
	1420-1500	Meet HoDs individually	US – Bongani Masuku	Mbabane – MoA US office	(+268) 76062602 <a href="mailto:bsmasuku@ymail.com">bsmasuku@ymail.com</a>	Confirmed
	1500-1540	Meet SADP Coordinator	ASC – Wilson Sikhondze	Mbabane – MoA ASC office	(+268) 76027759 <a href="mailto:sikhondzew@yahoo.co.uk">sikhondzew@yahoo.co.uk</a>	Confirmed
	1540-1620	Meet SADP Adviser	CTA - Alwin	Mbabane – FAO offices	(+268) 76027758 <a href="mailto:Alwin.schuchmann@fao.org">Alwin.schuchmann@fao.org</a>	Confirmed
	1620-1700	Meet SADP Adviser	ASA - Michael	Mbabane – FAO offices	(+268) 76023391 <a href="mailto:Michael.connolly@fao.org">Michael.connolly@fao.org</a>	Confirmed
<b>18/05/11 Wednesday</b>	0730 - 1400	Visit Community level projects	RDA BYG group; RDA CYDP group; CA demonstration	Tikhuba RDA, (Simon-driver) Prof. Mwala		Confirmed
	0730 - 1400	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Mpatheni Dam Site</li> <li>▪ Nhlangano Training Centre</li> <li>▪ Visit Gege Farm</li> </ul>	Mandla Mdlovu (The Principal)	(Amos- driver) Prof. Brian Gege Dairy Manager	(+268) 76252998	Confirmed
	0800	Meet MoA US	Mr. B. Masuku	MoA offices	(+268) 76062602 <a href="mailto:bsmasuku@ymail.com">bsmasuku@ymail.com</a>	Confirmed
	0900	Meet M & E Adviser	Bho	FAO offices	(+268) 76023602 <a href="mailto:Bho.mudyahoto@fao.org">Bho.mudyahoto@fao.org</a>	Confirmed
	1000 - 1400	Visit Community level projects	RDA BYG group; RDA CYDP group; CA demonstration	Dvumako RDA, (Lucky-driver) Bernd, Naidoo		Confirmed
<b>19/05/11 Thursday</b>	0800-0900	Meet SADP Adviser	FC- Justin	Mbabane – FAO offices	(+268) 76023390 <a href="mailto:Justin.mandizha@fao.org">Justin.mandizha@fao.org</a>	Confirmed

	0900-0930	Meet GAP Consultant	Phinda Dlamini	Mbabane – FAO offices		<b>Confirmed</b>
	1000 – 1030	Meet IPs and farmer organization	SFDF Director – Timothy Dlamini	SFDF offices	(+268) 76031265 <a href="mailto:sfdf@realnet.co.sz">sfdf@realnet.co.sz</a>	<b>Confirmed</b>
	1130-1230	Meet IPs	NAMBOARD	NAMBOARD offices	(+268) <a href="mailto:ceo@namboard.co.sz">ceo@namboard.co.sz</a>	<b>Confirmed</b>
	1400-1430	Meet SADP focal person	Cooperative department – Charles Khumalo	Mbabane – Ministry of Commerce Industry and Trade	(+268) 76123199 <a href="mailto:Charles.khumalo@ymail.com">Charles.khumalo@ymail.com</a>	<b>Confirmed</b>
	1500-1530	Meet SADP Adviser	CTA - Alwin	Mbabane – FAO offices	(+268) 76027758 <a href="mailto:Alwin.schuchmann@fao.org">Alwin.schuchmann@fao.org</a>	<b>Confirmed</b>
<b>20/05/11 Friday</b>						
	1100-1200	Meet SMS	Malkerns	Malkerns Research		<b>Confirmed</b>
	1230-1330	Meet IPs	Technoserve Tech. Adviser – Cooper Swift	Technoserve Offices – 4 <sup>th</sup> Floor Lilunga Hse	(+268) 76504931 <a href="mailto:cswift@tns.org">cswift@tns.org</a>	<b>Confirmed</b>
	Whole day	Report preparation	None	FAO offices		<b>Confirmed</b>

<b>22/05/11</b>	1500-	Meet SADP Adviser	Marketing	Mountain Inn Hotel	(+268) 76023601	<b>Confirmed</b>
-----------------	-------	-------------------	-----------	--------------------	-----------------	------------------

<b>Sunday</b>	1600		Adviser –Miranda		<a href="mailto:Miranda.jabati@fao.org">Miranda.jabati@fao.org</a>	
<b>23/05/11 Monday</b>	1400-1600	Debriefing	FAO Staff	FAO offices	(+268) 2404-7220	<b>Confirmed</b>
	1600-1700	Debriefing senior management	PS and US – MoA	Mbabane-MoA offices	PS – <a href="mailto:thwalar@gov.sz">thwalar@gov.sz</a> – 0026824042731 US - 0026824042731	<b>Confirmed</b>
<b>24/05/11 Tuesday</b>	0900 - 1300	Presentation of findings to stakeholders	All SADP stakeholders	Mpophoma Centre	<b>List details attached as attendance list</b>	<b>Confirmed</b>

## **Annex 3: Reported achievements under the components 1, 2 and 3**

### **Component 1. Improved and Sustainable Agricultural Production**

- Legume seed multiplication commenced at Low veld Experiment Station (LES) in Big Bend in September 2010
- CA lead farmers identified/selected and 4 regional level CA refresher workshops for 2011 Lead farmers (60 females and 141 males) carried out
- 9 male staff and 5 female staff attended capacity building and planning workshops
- 31 demonstration sites established by MoA in all 17 RDAs and across all four agro ecological zones (16 CA demonstrations and 15 other lime application and maize variety demonstrations)
- Study tour for four officers to Lowveld Agricultural Research Centre in Nelspruit in 2011
- 48 fruit nursery sites selected
- 3 LOAs with World Vision (WV), Swaziland Development Foundation, and African Cooperative Action Trust (ACAT)
- CA seminar was held at UNISWA in 2010 and attended by 25 females and 24 males
- Draft Farmer's Guide on CA, Agro-forestry, Seed production and other crop husbandry practices being finalized
- pre-feasibility studies for earth dams completed (3 sites selected for rehabilitation and 7 new sites identified for a further feasibility studies)
- Tenders issued for the supervision and design of the 3 dams to be rehabilitated, and for the feasibility study for 7 new earth dam sites
- Study tour to the Kenya dairy sector organized for 7 participants (farmers and SDB and MoA staff)
- Quarantine station plan was developed for a pig quarantine station

### **Component 2: Improved and Sustainable Agricultural Production**

- Assessment of the National Agricultural Extension System carried out by 4 consultants in September 2010
- Assessment of the National Agricultural Research System finalized in May 2011.
- RDA profiles completed for Tikhuba and Hluti RDAs
- TOR finalized for the profiling of Farmer Associations/Organisations (to start in May 2011)
- 6-day study tour to South Africa conducted for 3 female and 14 male participants (farmers, MoA, farmer associations, NGOs and parastatals)
- 2 RDAs (Central RDA and Motshane) and two FTCs selected for rehabilitation and equipment supply
- 60 motor cycles and 60 helmets procured
- 53 (11 female and 42 male) extension field staff (MOA and NGOs) trained as certified motorbike riders
- JFFLS (Junior Farmer Field and Life Schools) National Stakeholders Workshop in Jan 2010
- JFFLS consolidated with 4S Programme into the Children and Youth Development Programme (CYDP)
- 4 2.5 day regional Facilitators Workshops (JFFLS)

- 3-day Planning Workshop (for JFFLS) involving 30 Officers, mainly from HE (28 females and 2 males)
- 16 Community Sensitization and Mobilization meetings by HE Unit in RDAs
- 160 households participating in the Home Improvement Programme (mainly backyard gardens)
- 2-day meeting for exploring the M&E practices was conducted
- Training module on basic M&E concepts and processes developed
- Two 4-day training workshops on M&E concepts carried out for 22 extension officers
- M&E consultant fielded in September 2011; final draft under discussion

### **Component 3: Marketing and Agribusiness Development**

- Tender issued for analysis of Vegetable Value Chain/Competitiveness and NAMBOARD Institutional Assessment
- Compilation of inventory of studies on Mushroom; Sweet potato; livestock and range; Beef Production, Processing and Marketing; Marketing and NAMBOARD
- Marketing Management Audit as well as Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats (SWOT) Analysis to assess opportunities and constraints in product/markets as well as in the relevant Divisions - MAU, Home Economics, Co-operative Department and NAMBOARD.
- Preliminary outline of a Comprehensive and Integrated National Agribusiness 5 Year Plan prepared for EPAS/MAU
- Strategic partnership established with the Honey Council
- Preliminary screening and identification of five products for market development on domestic, regional and international markets
- Weekly fruit and vegetable prices were collected from 3 markets for the benefit of farmers, traders and consumers
- Monthly and quarterly price trend analysis was undertaken and disseminated
- Market Investment Fund Committee reportedly established
- Compilation of names of some stockists in urban as well as rural areas for information purposes and the future development of a network
- Contacts with Swazi Secrets and Swazi Marula Company for needs assessment concerning the development of the marula value chain.
- Contacts with El Ranch and Swazi Marula Company on pilot project in order to analyse the existing value chain with a view to future projects and programmes involving rural communities
- Conceptual framework developed to identify gaps in the existing MAU delivery of services
- 2-day training workshop on some basic marketing principles for 7 participants from EPAS/MAU
- One-day component planning workshop for key Departments and Units

## **Annex 4: Swaziland National Agricultural Summit Priorities**

Top 15 project identified by SNAS:

1. Establishment of an Agricultural Price Support Mechanism for Swaziland (policy/marketing)
2. Feasibility Study for the Establishment of an Agricultural Bank (marketing)
3. Re-focussing Disaster Preparedness Strategy Framework for Swaziland (policy)
4. Capacity Building for Farmers, Extension Workers and Research Staff (capacity building)
5. Construction of Mushroom Spawn Laboratory and Seed Supply to Farmers - Phase 2 (production)
6. Design of a National Livestock Identification and Traceability System in Swaziland (policy)
7. Pre-feasibility Study for Mkhondvo River Basin Development (production)
8. Rehabilitation of the Rural Development Areas and Farmer Training Centres (infrastructure)
9. Purchase of Heavy Plant Equipment and earthdam construction (infrastructure)
10. Water and Irrigation Development at Nceka (production)
11. Resuscitation of Mfumbaneni Poultry Breeding and Hatchery (production)
12. Revitalizing Beef Cattle Breeding Stations (production)
13. Water and Irrigation Development at Ngwempisi (production)
14. Control of Alien Invasive Plants (Sandanezwe) - Phase 2 (environment)
15. Buseleni Irrigated Organic Cotton (production)

Top 14 important areas:

1. Establishment of a Fingerling Hatchery (production)
2. Integrated Land Management Programme for Combating Land Degradation (environment)
3. Feasibility Study for Lavumisa Irrigation Development Project (production)
4. Enhancing Dairy Production Through Rehabilitation of Gege Dairy Breeding Farm (production)
5. Promotion of Sustainable Feed and Fodder Production and Utilization (production)
6. Institutionalising and Strengthening the National Early Warning System (policy)
7. Rehabilitation of Mpisi Pig Breeding Farm (policy)
8. Commercialisation of Indigenous Plants (Aloe) (marketing)
9. Re-construction of Agricultural Research Stations (infrastructure)
10. Indigenous Goat Breeding Scheme (production)
11. Water and Irrigation Development at Gege (production)
12. Water and Irrigation Development at Mpuluzi (production)
13. Water and Irrigation Development at Ngcoseni (production)
14. Establishment of a Livestock and Veterinary Research Centre (infrastructure)



## Annex 5: Detailed Expenditure Record (EU format, expressed in €)

Progress Financial Report : 16 Jan 2009 - 31 March 2011

		ORIGINAL BUDGET			UNSPENT BALANCES
Item	Linked To Main Activity In Financial Agreement	Number of Units	Total Cost	Project Expenditure To Date	EURO '000
		All Years	All Years	Cumulative	Year 1 & 2
<b>1. Infrastructure</b>					
Dam construction	R1.A2	8	801.72	5.38	796.34
Irrigation systems equipment	R1.A2	8	262.00	0.00	262.00
Water storage	R1.A2	8	52.40	0.00	52.40
Supervision and Management of construction works	R1.A2	8	37.30	0.00	37.30
Engineering supervision for production and irrigation (Contract)	R1.A2	8	37.30	0.00	37.30

RDA upgrade	R2.A1	17	547.29	0.00	547.29
			1,738.00	5.38	1,732.63
<b>Subtotal Infrastructures</b>			1,738.00	5.38	1,732.63
<b>2. Equipment, Vehicles and Operations</b>					
Data Processing Equipment (desktop, printer, monitor)	4.1	19	28.00	30.82	-2.82
Vehicle - twin cab pickup	4.1	16	324.88	271.81	53.07
Saloon Car	4.1	2	33.80	34.90	-1.10
Motor bikes (125cc)	4.1	103	165.29	110.10	55.19
Vehicle and Motorbikes Operations & Maintenance (12% capital cost annually)	4.1	0	253.35	24.52	228.83
Office Furniture	4.1	1	4.72	21.00	-16.28
Office Supplies	4.1	60	41.27	44.11	-2.84
MOAC Regional Offices/RDA - Equipment and upgrading	4.1	21	302.61	3.28	299.33
MOAC/Headquarters offices - Equipment and upgrading	4.1	3	31.44	44.31	-12.87
Research stations - facilities and equipment	4.1	2	36.68	0.00	36.68
Survey material	4.1	2	13.10	6.55	6.55

Support to IT/communications	4.1	5	47.49	28.93	18.56
Agricultural tools and supplies (Comp1 from TCP)	4.1	2	76.14	0.00	76.14
Travel/DSA - International consultants	4.2		187.70	38.08	149.62
Travel/DSA - FAO technical support	4.2		50.54	16.95	33.59
			1,597.00	675.36	921.64
<b>Subtotal Equipment, Vehicles and Operations</b>			1,597.00	675.36	921.64
<b>3. Training, Workshops, Consultations and Study Visits</b>					
Travel (in-country & exposure visit) (10p/visit)	R1.A1;R2.A4; R2.A3;R2.A4;	50	163.75	28.31	135.44
Regional Study Tours (7p/ visit)	R2.A3;R3.A3;	6	176.85	39.43	137.42
Stakeholder consultations and workshops	R2.A3;R2.A4;	75	245.63	88.13	157.50
In-Service Training incl TOT (20p X14d)	R2.A3	32	157.20	0.00	157.20
Pre-Service Training (mainly UNISWA) incl TOT	R2.A3	14	275.10	0.00	275.10
External Short Courses	R2.A3	10	98.25	0.00	98.25
Short-term training (including 15 from TCP)	R2.A3	31	152.29	0.00	152.29
Basic training: for IT, equipment maintenance etc.	R2.A3	1	2.19	0.00	2.19
Training experts/Develop. training material	R2.A3;R3.A3;	73	129.10	5.45	123.65

Capacity dev plan meetings (FO,...)	R2.A3;R3.A4	90	135.59	7.96	<b>127.63</b>
Training (Meals and other related costs)	R1.A1	90	76.64	0.00	<b>76.64</b>
Training material (printing costs, materials..) (including 1 from TCP)	R3.A3;R2.A4	25	57.31	0.00	<b>57.31</b>
Training of extension staff (Contract)	R3.A3	3	35.37	0.00	<b>35.37</b>
Training of small producers (Contract)	R3.A3	45	58.95	0.00	<b>58.95</b>
Carry out research and development studies on new markets (LoA)	R3.A3	1	52.40	0.00	<b>52.40</b>
Support Gov agency to improve market linkages (LoAs)	R3.A3	1	39.30	0.00	<b>39.30</b>
Develop synergies between NGOs and project activities (LoAs)	R3.A3	2	52.40	0.00	<b>52.40</b>
Improve market and collection centres (LoAs)	R3.A3	1	78.60	0.00	<b>78.60</b>
TA for Dept. of Cooperatives (LoA)	R3.A3	1	19.65	0.00	<b>19.65</b>
TA marketing boards (LoA)	R3.A3	1	56.99	0.00	<b>56.99</b>
workshop/ value chain round tables	R3.A3	16	25.15	0.00	<b>25.15</b>
Training of local authorities in market ops.	R3.A3	8	10.39	0.00	<b>10.39</b>
Inception/ Final workshop	4.2	2	13.10	2.50	<b>10.60</b>
Project Steering Committee attendance	4.2	42	5.50	0.50	<b>5.00</b>
PSC travel/miscellaneous expenses	4.2	5	1.31	0.72	<b>0.59</b>
			<b>2,119.00</b>	<b>173.00</b>	<b>1946.00</b>
<b>Subtotal Training, Workshops, Consultations, Study visits</b>			<b>2,119.00</b>	<b>173.00</b>	<b>1946.00</b>

<b>4. Community Level Activities &amp; Supplies</b>					
Demonstrations plots - materials/ inputs	R1.A1	57	56.00	6.47	<b>49.53</b>
Agricultural tools (jab planters, rippers, knapick ox-drawn planters)	R1.A1	210	137.55	0.00	<b>137.55</b>
Feedlot trials (1 demo unit/Gvt ranch)	R1.A3	10	52.40	0.00	<b>52.40</b>
Monitoring demonstartion plots (LoAs with NGOs)	R1.A1	20	65.50	0.00	<b>65.50</b>
Promoting upscaling of good agricultural practices (LoA with NGOs)	R1.A1	20	65.50	0.00	<b>65.50</b>
Support to implementation of institutional reform	R2.A2	2	56.00	0.00	<b>56.00</b>
National Consultants (1 persons) training for smallholders	R2.A4	21	37.14	0.00	<b>37.14</b>
Farmer Field Schools - training of trainers (2 courses + study tour)	R2.A4	1	56.33	0.00	<b>56.33</b>
Farmer Field Schools operations (486 FFS)	R2.A4	486	222.83	0.00	<b>222.83</b>
Community Gardens	R2.A4	680	44.54	0.00	<b>44.54</b>
Junior Farmer Field and Life Schools (60 FFS)	R2.A4	56	220.08	7.23	<b>212.85</b>
Training (1/Tinkhundla/55 X 40p X 3d @ US\$3/day) X 2 + materials/transport (including 65 from TCP)	R2.A4	227	148.69	0.00	<b>148.69</b>
Group promotion (marketing & organizational)	R2.A4	10	13.71	0.00	<b>13.71</b>

Water users' associations	R2.A4	10	9.83	0.00	<b>9.83</b>
Production techniques under irrigation	R2.A4	10	9.83	0.00	<b>9.83</b>
Backyard gardens, water harvesting	R2.A4	500	32.75	0.00	<b>32.75</b>
Food processing/drying/packaging supplies	R2.A4	330	21.62	0.00	<b>21.62</b>
Small livestock production	R2.A4	1,700	111.35	0.00	<b>111.35</b>
Nutritional/food preparation advice/backyard gardens	R2.A4	560	73.36	0.00	<b>73.36</b>
Food processing/drying/packaging supplies	R2.A4	820	53.71	0.00	<b>53.71</b>
Select and construct input/output markets	R3.A3	8	89.08	0.00	<b>89.08</b>
Training courses on processing, marketing, enterprise development (LoA) (including 3 from TCP)	R2.A4	9	100.22	0.00	<b>100.22</b>
			<b>1,678.00</b>	<b>13.68</b>	<b>1,664.32</b>
<b>Subtotal Community Level Activities &amp; Supplies</b>			<b>1,678.00</b>	<b>13.68</b>	<b>1,664.32</b>
<b>5. Market and Investment Support Fund</b>					
Studies and Marketing and Investment Fund proposal (LoA)	R3.A2	1	67.47	0.00	<b>67.47</b>
Marketing and Investment Fund	R3.A2	12	1,061.10	0.00	<b>1,061.10</b>
Allowances for committee	R3.A2	4	65.50	0.00	<b>65.50</b>
Bank charges	R3.A2	8	1.57	0.00	<b>1.57</b>

Ex-post evaluation of grant projects (Contract)	R3.A2	28	23.84	0.00	23.84
Audit - appraisal and fund mgmt. (Contract)	R3.A2	4.5	10.02	0.00	10.02
Awareness campaign	R3.A2	2	16.38	0.00	16.38
RURALINVEST training	R3.A2	3	39.30	0.00	39.30
Training of regional evaluation committees	R3.A2	22	28.82	0.00	28.82
			1,314.00	0.00	1,314.00
<b>Subtotal Market and Investment Support Fund</b>			1,314.00	0.00	1,314.00
<b>6. Personnel and Related Costs</b>					
National Project Director /1	4.1	5	176.44	40.52	135.92
Chief Technical Advisor /1	4.1	5	613.96	237.69	376.27
Financial Controller /1	4.1	5	547.23	262.40	284.83
Agricultural Service Advisor /1	4.1	5	547.23	294.28	252.95
Marketing Advisor /1	4.1	50	457.17	217.53	239.64
M&E/Information Systems Advisor /1	4.1	3	285.87	207.95	77.92
Production Advisor	4.1	25	225.98	74.84	151.14
FAO Repr Office Staff Time Support	4.1	60	69.56	13.85	55.71
FAO Technical Supports (salaries & honoraria)	4.1	353	204.86	4.05	200.81
FAO Technical Supports (From TCP)	4.1	0	76.34	0.00	76.34

Int. Consultants	R2.A3	36	212.22	146.47	65.75
Senior national consultants	R2.A3	35	119.21	12.42	106.79
Junior national consultants	R2.A3;R3.A1;R3.A3	59	173.90	71.10	102.80
Accountant/Procurement Officer	4.1	5	94.98	34.91	60.07
Administrative support/ Secretary	4.1	5	32.75	16.36	16.39
Secretary (2)	4.1	10	78.60	30.93	47.67
Secretary (2)	4.1	10	65.50	34.03	31.47
Drivers (6)	4.1	30	157.20	66.04	91.16
			4,139.00	1,765.37	2,373.63
<b>Subtotal Personnel and Related Costs</b>			4,139.00	1,765.37	2,373.63
<b>7. Visibility</b>					
Visibility & publications (brochures, posters, pamphlets, stickers, etc)	R1.A1;R2.A3	12	31.44	4.15	27.29
Media costs	R1.A1;R2.A3	15	29.48	2.86	26.62
Documentation costs (draft and final extension policy publication) 5,000 copies	R2.A3	2	27.51	0.00	27.51
Duplication of draft materials	R2.A3	1	1.51	0.00	1.51
Professional layout/design of materials & publication	R2.A3	3	43.43	0.00	43.43



Production of visibility/outreach materials	R2.A3	1	4.59	0.00	4.59
Project visibility campaign (project and above-project level)	4.2	5	72.05	13.47	58.58
			<b>210.00</b>	<b>20.48</b>	<b>189.52</b>
<b>Subtotal Visibility</b>			210.00	20.48	189.52
<b>8. Monitoring and Internal Evaluation</b>					
Baseline data	R1.A1	1	9.91	0.00	9.91
Monitoring of baseline data	R1.A1	4	13.10	0.00	13.10
Consultation/ Meetings / Workshops (1d/7 sites)	R1.A1	3	9.83	0.00	9.83
Mid term and final internal evaluation	4.2	2	32.75	0.00	32.75
Baseline and completion survey	4.2	2	73.62	0.00	73.62
Annual field data collection	4.2	5	75.79	0.00	75.79
			<b>215.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>215.00</b>
<b>Subtotal Monitoring and Internal Evaluation</b>			215.00	0.00	215.00
<b>9. Subtotal direct eligible costs of the Action (1-8)</b>			<b>13,010.00</b>	<b>2,653.27</b>	<b>10,356.74</b>
10. Provision for contingency reserve (maximum 5% of 9, subtotal of direct eligible costs of the Action)			640.00		640.00
<b>11. Total direct eligible costs of the Action (9+10)</b>			<b>13,650.00</b>	<b>2,653.27</b>	<b>10,996.74</b>

12. Administrative costs (maximum 7% of 9, total direct eligible costs of the Action)			911.00	133.41	777.59
<b>13. Total eligible costs (11+12)</b>			<b>14,561.00</b>	<b>2,786.68</b>	<b>11,774.33</b>
<b>EC contribution (max 97,66% of 13)</b>			<b>14,220.00</b>		

Rate of Exchange : Dollar/Euro : 0.655 ( Per Contribution)

## **Annex 6: List of Documents Consulted**

The MTE consulted the comprehensive SADP-related briefing documents (including email records) provided by SADP and the project backstopping officers, the available documentation from FAO's FPMIS (Field Programme Management Information System), as well as the following documents:

- The Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) Compact, Swaziland, 3-4 March 2010
- Acceleration of the Implementation of the Comprehensive Africa
- Agriculture Development Program (CAADP) in Swaziland, Stocktaking Report, Nov 2008
- National Agriculture Summit: Projects and Programmes, Final Report, Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives, January 2008
- Performance Targeting – Outcome / Output/Results Targets / Activities For 2010; Ministry: Agriculture
- Kingdom of Swaziland, UNDAF 2011-15, Nov 2009