

**IMPROVING COMMUNITY LIVELIHOODS THROUGH IMPROVED
CASSAVA PRODUCTION FOR NGETA VILLAGE COMMUNITY IN KIBAHA
DISTRICT, COAST REGION**

DADI HORACE KOLIMBA

**A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTERS IN COMMUNITY
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (MCED) OF THE OPEN UNIVERSITY OF
TANZANIA**

2013

CERTIFICATION

The undersigned certifies that I have read and hereby recommend for the acceptance by the Open University of Tanzania (OUT) a project entitled, Improving Community livelihood through improved Cassava production in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Community Economic Development of the Open University of Tanzania.

Signature.....

Dr. D. Ngaruko

(Supervisor)

Date.....

COPYRIGHT

This dissertation is a copyright material which is protected under the Berne Convention, the copy right Act 1999 and other International and National enactments, in the behalf on intellectual property. It should not be produced by any means, in full or in part, except for short discourse with an acknowledgement, written permission of the author or the Open University of Tanzania in that behalf.

DECLARATION

I Dadi Horace Kolimba, declare that this CED project report is my own original work and that it has not been presented and will not be presented to any other university for similar or any other degree award

Signature:.....

Date:.....

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my wife, Evelyn M. Kolimba, who encouraged and supported me to undergo the programme, also to my beloved Son; Brian Kolimba for his patience, integrity and obedience during my study period. Others include my beloved late father Horace Kolimba, and mother Philomena C. Kolimba.

ABSTRACT

This project Report is an outcome of the research study conducted and the project being implemented on Improving Community livelihood through improved cassava production in Ngeta village, Kikongo Ward, Ruvu Division, Kibaha District - Coast Region. The Project Goal is enhancement of living standard of Ngeta village community at household level by raising income, employment opportunities, and food security through improved cassava production. While project objective are; To sensitize and train 190 head of households on improved cassava production techniques, entrepreneurial and business management skills by December 2012, Raise cultivated area from 0.5 ha per household of the year 2011 to 2 ha per household by the year 2013, Impart cassava best practice to Heads of households and reliable to the Market by the year 2013. The Community Needs Assessment was carried by using participatory methodologies such as Focused Group Discussions, Interview and Observations. Research tools used are Questions, Discussion Guide, and Interview guide, came out with five major community needs which needed to be urgently addressed. However the project anticipates achieving the following specific objectives on successful completion of improved Cassava production project. 190 head of households sensitized and imparted with improved cassava production techniques, entrepreneurial and business management skills. Cultivated areas have been raised from 0.5 ha per household of the year 2011 to 2 ha per household the year 2013. Heads of households practiced cassava production techniques of which 380 ha planted cassava, moreover after cassava harvesting and sold to Kibaha Mango Empire Company Ltd income will be increased as the result standard of living improved as they will afford to access basic needs.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my sincere thanks to the Community Development Agenda Countrywide members, Ngeta Village Council, Project Committee, and Kibaha LGA officers who cooperated with me tirelessly from the beginning of this project. I would like to thank my Project Supervisor Dr. Deus D. Ngaruko whose supervision, guidance, and facilitation made this project report to come the way it looks. Special thanks should also go to the following faculty members who taught us various subjects during the nine coursework sessions, Dr. Deus D. Ngaruko, Mr. James C. Kalanje, Dr. Felician Mutasa, Dr. William Pallangyo and Dr. Chacha A. Matoka.

I would also like to express my sincere thanks and appreciations to class group members, John Basil, Mbena S, Richard Kazimoto, Dauda Salmin Ibrahim and colleagues like Cesilia D. Nkwamu, Vick Manganga, Norman Gimbi, Mtage Kindole, and Mbelu Njawa for their moral and material support.

It would like to express my thanks to the Research respondents, Focus Group Discussion, Village Chairperson Mr. Izaki Kilindi, and Village Executive Officer (VEO) Salumu Daudi and the Ngeta Ward Agriculture Extension Officer Mr. Jobiso K. Msangi for his extension and advisory services to the project. However this type of research and project undertaking has involved the efforts of many people who are to be on an infinite list thus it behoves me to mention just few as above and I sincerely thank them for their cooperation and assistance in various aspects pertaining to the successful completion of this project report and the course in general.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-------------|
| CERTIFICATION..... | ii |
| COPYRIGHT..... | iii |
| DECLARATION | iv |
| DEDICATION | v |
| ABSTRACT | vi |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | vii |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | viii |
| LIST OF APPENDICES | xiv |
| LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS..... | xv |
| | |
| CHAPTER ONE | 1 |
| 1.0 PARTICIPATORY NEEDS ASSESSMENT | 1 |
| 1.1 Introduction..... | 1 |
| 1.2 Community Profile | 1 |
| 1.2.1 Location | 1 |
| 1.2.2 Topography and Vegetation | 2 |
| 1.2.3 Climate and Precipitation | 2 |
| 1.2.4 Population | 2 |
| 1.2.5 Administrative Structure..... | 2 |
| 1.2.6 Health Services | 3 |
| 1.2.7 Education Services..... | 3 |
| 1.2.8 Transport and Communication Network | 3 |
| 1.2.9 Agriculture and Livestock | 4 |
| 1.2.10 Financial Services..... | 4 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 1.2.11 Ethnicity..... | 4 |
| 1.3 Community Needs Assessment | 4 |
| 1.3.1 Community Needs Assessment Objectives..... | 5 |
| 1.3.2 Research Questions | 5 |
| 1.3.3 Research Methodology | 5 |
| 1.4 Community Needs Assessment Findings | 9 |
| 1.4.1 Finding on Person Particulars..... | 9 |
| 1.4.2 Finding Major Community Needs | 11 |
| 1.4.3 Finding Sources of Community Income..... | 12 |
| CHAPTER TWO..... | 19 |
| 2.0 PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION..... | 19 |
| 2.1 Background to Research Problem | 19 |
| 2.2 Problem Statement..... | 22 |
| 2.3 Project Description | 22 |
| 2.3.1 Target Community | 24 |
| 2.3.2 Stake holders | 25 |
| 2.3.3 Project Goal..... | 28 |
| 2.3.4 Project Objectives | 28 |
| 2.4 Host Organization | 28 |
| 2.4.1 The Organisation Vision | 29 |
| 2.4.2 The Organisation Mission Statement | 29 |
| 2.4.3 The Organisation Values Statement | 30 |
| 2.4.4 The Organisation Administration | 30 |
| 2.4.5 The Organisation Objectives | 30 |
| 2.4.6 Organisation Implemented Activities | 31 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 2.4.7 Organisation Challenges | 31 |
| CHAPTER THREE..... | 33 |
| 3.0 LITERATURE REVIEW | 33 |
| 3.1 Introduction..... | 33 |
| 3.2 Theoretical Literature | 33 |
| 3.2.1 Agricultural Sector Perspective..... | 33 |
| 3.3 Empirical Literature | 38 |
| 3.4 Policy Review | 44 |
| 3.4.1 Current Agricultural Policies | 44 |
| 3.5 Literature Review Summary | 48 |
| CHAPTER FOUR | 50 |
| 4.0 PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION..... | 50 |
| 4.1 Introduction..... | 50 |
| 4.2 Outputs and Products | 51 |
| 4.2.1 Project Outputs | 51 |
| 4.2.2 Project Products..... | 53 |
| 4.3 Project Planning | 53 |
| 4.3.1 Implementation plan | 58 |
| 4.3.2 Project Budget | 71 |
| 4.3.3 Project implementation Gantt Chart..... | 79 |
| CHAPTER FIVE | 82 |
| 5.0 PARTICIPATORY MONITORING, EVALUATION AND | |
| SUSTAINABILITY | 82 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| 5.1 Introduction..... | 82 |
| 5.2 Participatory Monitoring | 82 |
| 5.2.1 Information System | 83 |
| 5.2.2 Participatory Monitoring Methods/Tools..... | 84 |
| 5.2.3 Participatory Monitoring Plan | 86 |
| 5.3 Participatory Evaluation..... | 90 |
| 5.3.1 Performance Indicators | 90 |
| 5.3.2 Participatory Evaluation Methodology..... | 93 |
| 5.4 Project Evaluation Summary..... | 93 |
| 5.4.1 Project Sustainability..... | 98 |
| 5.4.2 Institutional Sustainability | 98 |
| 5.4.3 Financial /Economic Sustainability..... | 99 |
| 5.4.4 Political Sustainability..... | 99 |
| CHAPTER SIX | 100 |
| 6.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS..... | 100 |
| 6.1 Introduction..... | 100 |
| 6.2 Conclusion | 100 |
| 6.3 Recommendations..... | 103 |
| REFERENCES | 106 |
| APPENDICES..... | 109 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 1: Sample Distribution | 6 |
| Table 2: Sex of Respondents | 9 |
| Table 3: Education Level of Respondents | 10 |
| Table 4: Major Community Needs | 11 |
| Table 5: Average Monthly Income..... | 12 |
| Table 6: Major Sources of Community Income in the Village | 12 |
| Table 7: Type of Crop to be improved by Community in the Village | 13 |
| Table 8: Areas that Household Grow Cassava | 14 |
| Table 9: Reasons for Low Cassava Production in Ngeta | 14 |
| Table 10: Major Use of Cassava..... | 15 |
| Table 11: Pairwise Ranking..... | 16 |
| Table 12: Problems, Causes, Effects and Assets/Opportunities | 20 |
| Table 13: Analysis of Stakeholders involved in the Project..... | 26 |
| Table 14: Project Output..... | 52 |
| Table 15: Project Planning..... | 54 |
| Table 16: Implementation Plan Schedule | 59 |
| Table 17: Project Logical Framework Matrix | 63 |
| Table 18: Project Inputs..... | 67 |
| Table 19: Staff Pattern | 70 |
| Table 20: Project Financial Budget | 72 |
| Table 21: Project Implementation Gantt Chart..... | 79 |
| Table 22: Participatory Monitoring Plan | 86 |
| Table 23: Performance Indicators..... | 91 |
| Table 24: Project Evaluation Summary | 94 |

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 Ngeta Village Cassava Nursery 77

Figure 2 Ngeta Village Project Committee Members 78

Figure 3 Head of Households Training at Ngeta Village 78

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix i: Semi Structured Questionnaire 109

Appendix ii: Interview Guide 110

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

| | |
|--------|---|
| ASDP | Agricultural Sector Development Programme |
| ASDS | Agricultural Sector Development Sector |
| CBO | Community Based Organization |
| CDAC | Community Development Agenda Countrywide |
| CED | Community Economic Development |
| CMD | Cassava Mosaic Disease |
| FAO | Food and Agriculture Organization |
| FGD | Focus Group Discussion |
| GDP | Gross Domestic Product |
| MCED | Masters of Community Economic Development |
| MDG | Millennium Development Goals |
| NAFCO | National Agricultural Food Cooperation |
| NGO | Non Governmental Organization |
| NSGRP | National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty |
| PASS | Private Agricultural Sector Support |
| PRSP | Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper |
| RIU | Research into Use |
| SACCOS | Savings and Credit Cooperative Society |
| TAP | Tanzania Agriculture Partnership |
| TASAF | Tanzania Social Action Fund |
| TDV | Tanzania Development Vision |
| TTCL | Tanzania Telecommunication Company Limited |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Programme |
| VEO | Village Executive Officer |

VICOBA Village Community Bank

WAEO Ward Agriculture Extension Officer

CHAPTER ONE

1.0 PARTICIPATORY NEEDS ASSESSMENT

1.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the findings of the Participatory Needs Assessment conducted in March 2012 in Ngeta Village, Kikongo ward, Kibaha District, Coast Region. Extended Rural Participatory Appraisal was used to ensure community and other stakeholders' participation in identifying resources and real needs of the community. It further explains how the community need the project and accepted. The assessment was carried by using participatory methodologies such as Focused Group Discussions, Interview and Observations. Research tools used are Questions, Discussion Guide, and Interview guide.

The assessment was concentrated in four main sectors namely community, economic, health and environment. The findings of community needs assessment created a base for identification of problems facing Ngeta Village Community. This information is very important in setting grounds for a successful CED project planning, implementation, management and sustainability. Community needs prioritization was conducted through Pair wise ranking. Five priority needs were noted as follows; Improved agriculture production to address the income poverty was ranked as the first, followed by Food security; Access to clean and safe water; Good health and lastly was Environmental protection

1.2 Community Profile

1.2.1 Location

Ngeta is one of the four (4) villages in Kikongo Ward, Ruvu Division, Kibaha District - Coast Region in Tanzania. Other village found in Kikongo Ward are Mwanabwito,

Kikongo and Lupunga. Ngeta is located 14km from Mlandizi Township which are along the Dar es Salaam – Morogoro road. The Village has the area of 3,414.13Ha. It borders Misufini Village to the North and Kisarawe District to the South, Kikongo Village to the West, and while to the East it borders Soga Village. The Village has 2 hamlets which are Ngeta and Makutopora.

1.2.2 Topography and Vegetation

The village is situated at an altitude range of 0 - 200 m from sea level. (Indian Ocean) no notable mountain only coastal belt small hills and most of the village is covered with grasses and Savannah trees.

1.2.3 Climate and Precipitation

The Village experience dual rain seasons, November and December commonly known as Vuli rains. March and April commonly the rains are known as Masika/long rains. Ngeta Village has the mean annual rainfall of 850mm normally June to October is dry months. The village has average temperatures varying from 24⁰C to 30⁰C.

1.2.4 Population

Ngeta village has a total number of 261 households with a total population of 1,249 people out of which 645 are male and 604 are female. According to 2002 Census, Kibaha District population was 132,045, which indicated an annual growth rate of 4.9%.

1.2.5 Administrative Structure

The village Administration comprises of the following of the Village Chairperson Mr. Izaki Kilindi, and Village Executive Officer (VEO) Salumu Daudi. The supreme body in the Village is Village council, which comprising 25 members. Under this, there are 3

committees. These committees are Administration, Finance and planning committee, security committee, community development services committee (which include issues of Health, Community Development, Land, environment and Education). Each Committee comprising of 10 members. The committees normally meet once per week. The village council meets every month and the Village General Assembly usually meets every quarterly to approve issues discussed by the village council and committees. Revenue and Expenditure of the Village are also presented and discussed during this meeting.

1.2.6 Health Services

There is one Dispensary in Ngeta village which serves the whole village that comprises of two hamlets. The Dispensary has only one Assistant Medical Officer and two Nurses, experiences a number of problems including lack of laboratory services, lack of nurses as there are only 2 nurses and critical lack of drugs, referral cases are forwarded to Mlandizi Health Centre

1.2.7 Education Services

The village has one primary schools which cater for the two hamlets and unfortunately, there is no Secondary School in the Village. Secondary services are found at the nearest Village Soga in the East of Ngeta Village where there is Soga Secondary, Ruvu Village (Ruvu Secondary School) and at the nearest Town Mlandizi.

1.2.8 Transport and Communication Network

The village has reliable transport network, where the moraine road of 14 kms covers from Ngeta Village to Mlandizi Township, where the road join across tarmac road of Dar es Salaam – Morogoro, it is 15km from Mlandizi Town to Kibaha Headquarter. Mobile phone services are well-organized to cover the whole area of the Village. However there are no TTCL phone and Postal services in the village. (Participatory Survey, 2012)

1.2.9 Agriculture and Livestock

Ngeta community basically comprise of small-holder farmers. They cultivate mainly cassava, sunflower, maize, and cashew nuts. Most of people in Ngeta Village keep indigenous chicken.

1.2.10 Financial Services

There are no Banking services in the village; the services are available at Kibaha District Headquarters. However the community established 2 VICOBA group. Members of the groups contribute every week and after three month start borrowing, and after a year they re-establish by dividing interest and capital, at this time it's where new members join and others withdraw their membership. There is one centre for M – Pesa which serve community. M-Pesa is the only quickest means of transferring and receiving money in the village (Participatory Survey, 2012)

1.2.11 Ethnicity

The major dominant ethnic group in Ngeta Village is the Zaramo who constitute about of the whole population of the village 65% others are Matumbi, kwere and Wayao. Most of the village residents are Muslims. (Participatory Survey, 2012)

1.3 Community Needs Assessment

The community Needs Assessment was conducted by the researcher in collaboration with Community Development Agenda Countrywide (CDAC) members, Ngeta Village Chairperson, Village Executive Officer (VEO), and four hamlet leaders two from each hamlet, village community and three influential people. The assessment was concentrated in four main sectors namely community, economic, health and environment targeting at identifying community opportunities, problems, and causes of the problems. It focused at

designing and implementing a project that will address solutions to the identified problems.

1.3.1 Community Needs Assessment Objectives

The overall objective of community Needs Assessment was to gather information from the community so as to identify needs, opportunities, and obstacles which will be used to improve community livelihoods in Kibaha District particularly in Ngeta Village.

While specific objectives of community needs assessment are as follows

- i. To identify the major community needs.
- ii. To examine community livelihood opportunities and obstacles.
- iii. To identify possible interventions for the identified community needs.

1.3.2 Research Questions

The assessment was guided by the following questions

- i. What are the problems do community faces? (specifically to four sector community, economic, health and environment)
- ii. What are the sources of community income and obstacles in the Village?
- iii. What should be done to address the identified problems?

1.3.3 Research Methodology

(i) Research Design

Descriptive survey was applied in conducting the study which involved both qualitative and quantitative methods for data collection together with Participatory Rural Appraisal Research methods. Qualitative approach was used because they give an opportunity analysis of collected data since different data analysis techniques can be such open - coding and content analysis can be used interchangeably during data analysis (Bell, 1998).

Quantitative approach involves collection of quantifiable data which are normally inters of numbers, tables, and charts and figures to mention a few. In this case, quantitative research approach is the approach which is used to collect quantified data.

(ii) Sampling Techniques

Ngeta village has a total number of 261 households with a total population of 1,249 people. The sample was drawn from the population and 30 households, 4 Village officials, 3 influential people, and 3 members of Community Development Agenda Countrywide (CDAC) were sampled and interviewed during eleven days (Table 1 indicates sample Distribution). Since it was not possible to cover the whole population in the village, sampling is inevitable. Random sampling (Probability) and Non probability sampling were applied. In Random sampling, systematic or interval Sampling were applied. The researcher interviewed one household after every ten houses.

In non probability sampling Purposive sampling was applied to get village community Officials, influential people, Community Development Agenda Countrywide members as well as other Village officials (Village Chairperson, hamlet and Village Executive Officer)

Table 1: Sample Distribution (N = 40)

| Number of Respondents | Sample Size | Percent |
|---|--------------------|----------------|
| Head of households | 30 | 75 |
| Village officials | 4 | 10 |
| Influential people | 3 | 7.5 |
| Community Development Agenda Countrywide (CDAC) Members | 3 | 7.5 |
| TOTAL | 40 | 100 |

Source: Field Survey Findings 2012

(iii) Data Collection Methods

Interviews, Observation and Documentary review research method were used to collect data. Instrument used included research interview questions, observation and documentary review schedules.

(a) Questionnaire

A questionnaire with nine (9) questions was administered to 40 household respondents with ability to write and read but also those who were not unable to write were assisted by their fellow members. Both open and closed ended questionnaire were used in collecting general information about the interviewee such as age, sex, Major sources of income, monthly income and Major community needs in the village. The questionnaire was pre-tested to ten respondents and amendments made as regards to clarity and times spent for interview.

(b) Interview (key Informants)

Interview is method of collecting information through oral or verbal communication between the research and the respondents (bell, 1998). The researcher used unstructured questions to find broad information which do not have specific answers such as what are the problems do community faces specifically to four sector of community, economic, health and environment. Structured question were used to solicit information which need specific answers. 4 Village officials, 3 Influential people and 3 CDAC Members were interviewed.

(c) Focus Group Discussions

The researcher formed four group discussions of elderly male, elderly female, male youth, and female youth with 8 members. The researcher formed four groups mentioned above so

as to get different view form different groups, as well as to avoid cultural differences which may hinder inner information. Discussions were based on the existing opportunities; problems that community faces specifically to four sector of community, economic, health and environment and how to address the identified problems. Institutional analysis was also discussed by focus group discussion. All focus group meet in day eight of the assessment were consolidate what they had discussed in their respective group. Focus Group members were participated full in prioritization the major problems which face the Village.

(d) Observation and Observation Guide

Observation is a research method which was used to acquire first hand, live, sensory accounts of phenomena as they occur in a real world setting (Goetz and Lecompte, 1994) Non participants observation method was used during the assessment, in this case, the researcher was not included into respondents' activities was moving around observing their day to day activities which may increase their income, Village environment as well as opportunities available in the Village.

(e) Documentary Review

Documentary review is a process of reading various extract found in offices or places dealing with or associated with the issue related to what the researcher is investigated (Miles and Huberman, 1996). Documents identified and reviewed are Coast Regional Profile District Socio-Economic Profile, District Investment Profile, Environmental Profile, Village Plan (O&OD) and District Agricultural Development Plan

(f) Data Analysis Methods

Data analysis is an important step towards data presentation and analysis. In this case types of data that is qualitative and quantitative data were analyzed. For qualitative data,

data were collected and transcribed because some was in Kiswahili language. Quantitative data were tabulated and other computed into percentage by using SPSS Programme for easy analysis and discussion. Descriptive statistics used comprise percentages, frequencies and bar charts.

1.4 Community Needs Assessment Findings

1.4.1 Finding on Person Particulars

Table 2: Sex of Respondents

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Male | 24 | 60.0 | 60.0 | 60.0 |
| Female | 16 | 40.0 | 40.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 40 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Source: Field Survey Findings 2012

The table above shows the respondents interviewed where male constitute 60% and female 40%, the number of male is higher than female because most of head of households are male. This reflects that more males by 20% of the respondents interviewed, and this is gender imbalance. However it also expresses that views were obtained from difference sex to avoid biasness.

Table 3: Education Level of Respondents

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Primary | 23 | 57.5 | 57.5 | 57.5 |
| Secondary | 6 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 72.5 |
| Technical education/vocational | 5 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 85.0 |
| College | 4 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 95.0 |
| Higher education | 2 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 40 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Source: Field Survey Findings 2012

Findings from the survey (table 3) above shows that 57. % had attained Primary school education followed by those who attained secondary school education level 15%. Findings show that 12. Attained technical education/ vocational skills while 10% attained College and 5% attained higher education. The information above was gathered so as to understand capacity of the community lived at Ngeta village, if they can manage to run project after sensitization and training.

1.4.2 Finding Major Community Needs

Table 4: Major Community Needs

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Food security | 10 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 |
| Improved agriculture production | 15 | 37.5 | 37.5 | 62.5 |
| Access to clean and safe water | 7 | 17.5 | 17.5 | 80.0 |
| Good health | 5 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 92.5 |
| Environmental protection | 3 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 40 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Source: Field Survey Findings 2012

The researcher was finding the major community needs as seen on the table above. The table above indicate that 37. % of respondents interviewed revealed that in order to handle their daily life in Ngeta Village they should improve agriculture production, followed by 25% who pinpoint food security, access to clean and safe water was mentioned by 17%. Respondents, followed by Good health 13% and Environmental protection was mentioned by 8% respondents. The findings above reflects that income poverty is the major problem of the community in Ngeta Village, which causes community, cannot afford to buy enough food, through increased income majority can afford to buy enough food and even accessing better health services.

1.4.3 Finding Sources of Community Income

Table 5: Average Monthly Income

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Less than 39,999 | 7 | 17.5 | 17.5 | 17.5 |
| Tsh. 40,000 - 79,999 | 17 | 42.5 | 42.5 | 60.0 |
| Tsh. 80,000 - 99,999 | 5 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 72.5 |
| More than 100,000 | 11 | 27.5 | 27.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 40 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Source: Field Survey Findings 2012

It was revealed that 42% earning an income of between Tshs.40,000-79,000, followed by those earning over Tshs 100,000 which is about 27%. This is an indication that there is lack of viable income generating opportunities. Through this assessment community and other change agent will be in a position to identify viable activities which will increase income to the community.

Table 6: Major Sources of Community Income in the Village

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Farming and business | 7 | 17.5 | 17.5 | 17.5 |
| Farming | 26 | 65.0 | 65.0 | 82.5 |
| Livestock keeping | 2 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 87.5 |
| Business | 3 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 95.0 |
| Employment | 2 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 40 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Source: Field Survey Findings 2012

The findings above revealed that 65 percent of Ngeta community engaged in farming, which means farming, is the major source of income in Ngeta Village. Those engaged in farming and business mutually are 17.5 percent. Those who engaged in Business only are 7.5 percent while 5 percent each are engaged in Livestock keeping and Employment. That means in order to raise majority income in Ngeta, efforts should base on farming.

1.4.4 Ways to Address the Identified Major Source of Income in the Village

Table 7: Type of Crop to be improved by Community in the Village

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Maize | 7 | 17.5 | 17.5 | 17.5 |
| Cassava | 24 | 60.0 | 60.0 | 77.5 |
| Cashew nuts | 7 | 17.5 | 17.5 | 95.0 |
| Sunflower | 2 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 40 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Source: Field Survey Findings 2012

Since the findings in table 6 revealed that 65 percent of Ngeta community engaged in farming, as a major source of income in Ngeta Village, the researcher asked which crop will increase community income. As per table above, 60 percent of respondent declared that cassava will raise their income for the following reasons, “*if cassava produced in large quantity can be used as cash crop, cassava also is utilized for food (Ugali and vegetables) and can be used morning during tea (Porridge). Cassava can also use in production of livestock feed*”.

Table 8: Areas that Household Grow Cassava

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Less than 0.5ha | 22 | 55.0 | 55.0 | 55.0 |
| 0.5 to 1ha | 7 | 17.5 | 17.5 | 72.5 |
| 1ha to 1.5ha | 4 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 82.5 |
| 1.5ha to 2ha | 3 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 90.0 |
| 2ha and above | 4 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 40 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Source: Field Survey Findings 2012

The table above revealed that 55 percent of respondents grow cassava below 0.5 ha, followed by 18 percent grow cassava from 0.5ha to 1ha. Only 10 percent grow cassava from 1ha to 1.5ha. While 7 percent grow cassava from 1.5ha to 2ha and those grow from 2ha and above are 10 percent only. Growing cassava below 0.5ha per households will not increase income of the community. It is recommended that at least 2ha will fulfill the real needs of the community. This is one of the obstacles to the development of cassava production in Ngeta.

Table 9: Reasons for Low Cassava Production in Ngeta

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Lack of appropriate farming implements | 12 | 30.0 | 30.0 | 30.0 |
| Shortage of planting material | 16 | 40.0 | 40.0 | 70.0 |
| Lack of credit facilities | 5 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 82.5 |
| Market unavailability | 7 | 17.5 | 17.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 40 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Source: Field Survey Findings 2012

The table above shows that about 40 percent of respondents declared that shortage of planting material is one of the obstacles to development of cassava production in Ngeta Village, while 30 percent argue that, the lack of appropriate farming implements, cause small area of cultivation that contributing to low level of cassava production. From the table above 18 percent of respondents pinpointed that unavailability of Market that is one of the factors which cause community to produce cassava in low quantity. The factors mentioned above should be taken in to consideration by the community themselves in collaboration with other stakeholders so as to improve cassava production in Ngeta.

Table 10: Major Use of Cassava

| | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Domestic expenditure | 18 | 45.0 | 45.0 | 45.0 |
| Source of food | 22 | 55.0 | 55.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 40 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Source: Field Survey Findings 2012

From the table above majority of respondents 55 percent utilize cassava as source food while 45 percent use to earn income which is used to resolve a variety of domestic requirements, such as school fees for their children, and health expenses and excess served for future use, this is very important because season is predictable.

1.4.5 Findings from Key Informants and FDG

All key informants were supported the idea of promoting cassava production in Ngeta Village since they are familiar with the Project. If they will be supported with Cassava steam, appropriate farming implements and planting material as well as capacity building

to head of households on cassava production techniques, entrepreneurial and business management skills, target group will be ready to achieve the project. They requested disease resistance varieties to Kibaha District Agriculture and Livestock Officer.

1.5 Community Needs Prioritization

Community Needs Assessment was conducted involved Focus group discussion needs were mentioned and prioritized in order to come up with one most pressing need which required to be addressed through a project which had to be designed by community of Ngeta and others stakeholders. Prioritization was conducted through pair wise ranking were researcher facilitate Focus group members to compare mentioned needs and ranked by voting as indicated below.

Table 11: Pairwise Ranking

| | Access to clean and safe water | Good health | Improved agriculture production | Environmental protection | Food security | Score | Position |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------|----------|
| Access to clean and safe water | | Access to clean and safe water | Improved agriculture production | Access to clean and safe water | Food security | 2 | 3 |
| Good health | | | Improved agriculture production | Good health | Food security | 1 | 4 |
| Improved agriculture production | | | | Improved agriculture production | Improved agriculture production | 4 | 1 |
| Environmental protection | | | | | Food security | 0 | 5 |
| Food security | | | | | | 3 | 2 |

Source: Field Survey Findings 2012

Key: Higher score means first priority.

From Table 11 above Focus group members were agreed by voting needs as follows Improved agriculture production to address the income poverty was ranked as the first, followed by Food security; Access to clean and safe water; Good health and lastly was Environmental protection.

1.6 Conclusion

Community needs assessment was conducted in eleven days at Ngeta Village which involved Community Development Agenda Countrywide (CDAC) members, and Village officers. Extended Rural Participatory Appraisal was used to ensure community and other stakeholders' participation in identifying resources and real needs of the community. The researcher collected baseline data from District officials and Village officers which helped during Focus group discussion. Information was gathered by through research tools which are Questions, Discussion Guide, and Interview guide.

Research tools were aiming to answer three research question, through research findings and pair wise ranking was revealed that Improved agriculture production to improve Community livelihood was ranked as the first, followed by Food security; Access to clean and safe water; Good health and lastly was Environmental protection

Since the findings in table 6 revealed that 65 percent of Ngeta community engaged in farming, as a major source of income in Ngeta Village; It was also declared by respondent (table 7) that cassava will raise their income for the following reasons, *“if cassava produced in large quantity can be used as cash crop, cassava also is utilized for food (Ugali and vegetables) and can be used morning during tea (Porridge). Cassava can also use in production of livestock feed”*.

Members of Community Development Agenda Countrywide (CDAC) an organization and Ngeta community formed a committee to look for District support especially in improved cassava steam, fertilizers, market and other extension services.

CHAPTER TWO

2.0 PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION

2.1 Background to Research Problem

Community Needs Assessment was the base for problem identification carried by using participatory methodologies such as Focused Group Discussions, Interview and Observations. Through the process five needs was obtained and prioritized through Pair wise ranking. Five priority needs were noted as follows; Improved agriculture production to improve Community livelihood was ranked as the first, followed by Food security; Access to clean and safe water; Good health and lastly was Environmental protection.

Through improving agriculture production as the major community problem will improve Community livelihood since the main economic activity in rural Tanzania is agriculture and it accounts for about 45% of country's GDP and is the main occupation of 70% of the Tanzanian population (FAO 2003). Focused Group Discussions was used to identify the causes, effects, opportunities hence intervention or project as shown on the table 12 below.

Table 12: Problems, Causes, Effects and Assets/Opportunities

| Problem | Causes | Effects. | Assets/Opportunities |
|------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 1.Low agriculture production | Lack of appropriate farming implements and planting material Small area of cultivation | Low purchasing power Low crop output due to less Inputs. Less capital for business creation | Availability of human capital Availability of Land for cultivation Drought resistant crops (cassava) NGOs volunteering to offer skills |
| 2.Food insecurity | Low agriculture production Lack of appropriate farming implements and planting material | Low purchasing power Low crop output due to less Inputs. | Availability of human capital NGOs volunteering to offer skills Availability of Land for cultivation Drought resistant crops (cassava) |
| 3.Lack of clean and | Higher cost of water installation | Diseases | Water Department in |

| Problem | Causes | Effects. | Assets/Opportunities |
|------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| safe water | Low income to meet installation cost | Lack of human capital | Kibaha District council |
| 4.Adequate health facilities | Lack of drugs and laboratory services Lack medical nurses | Diseases Lack of human capital | Ngeta Dispensary Health Department in Kibaha District council |
| 5.Environmental degradation | Lack of Knowledge | Diseases Lack of human capital | Health and Enviromental Department in Kibaha LGA NGOs volunteering to offer skills |

Low agriculture production as the major community problem is caused by so many factors as mentioned above intervention should reflect on improving agriculture specifically in cassava production as opportunity available in the Village as well as crop cultivated by majority.

2.2 Problem Statement

Ngeta Village is located 14km from Mlandizi Township which are along the Dar es Salaam – Morogoro road. About 65 percent of Ngeta community engaged in farming, as a major source of income while 60 percent cultivate cassava. Cassava contributes to an average of 15% in the national food production basket and is second to maize, which is the leading staple food crop for many Tanzanians (Mtambo, 2007). The dwellers of Ngeta Village fail to meet essential social and economic obligations due to low income earnings. Low income earnings have an effect on low crop output due to less Input, low purchasing power, and less capital for business creation.

Although some efforts to improve Community livelihood have been taken by some organizations in the village such as TASAF which supported road construction of Ngeta – Mlandizi through cash for works project, yet Ngeta communities face income poverty. Moreover, for countries where majority of the people still live below the poverty line as Tanzania (ASDS, 2001), cassava could be used to bridge the income gaps. Therefore this project will improve Community livelihoods through improved Cassava production.

2.3 Project Description

Improving Community livelihood through improved Cassava production for Ngeta Village community in Kibaha District, Coast Region Tanzania. The project aimed at improving the productivity of Cassava at Ngeta Village. Cassava is very potential in Tanzania Eighty-four (84) percent of the total production in the country is utilized as human food; the remaining percentages are for other uses like starch making, livestock feed and export to earn income.

As per the pair wise ranking Improved agriculture production to improve Community livelihood was ranked as the first priority, being low agriculture production a problem, Focused Group Discussions was used to identify the causes, effects, opportunities hence intervention or project. Among the Opportunity available in Ngeta Village is Land, being the case it was agreed by Focused Group Discussions that improving cassava production will also improve community livelihoods to sense that Ngeta Community will be in a position to have food, and excess cassava will be sold to earn income, given the fact that formal employment opportunities are limited in the village.

People living in Ngeta Village had been cultivating cassava and other crops for a long time but the productivity remained low because the dwellers of Ngeta Village do not practise modern agriculture. Community Development Agenda Countrywide (CDAC) with expectation to get funds from Tanzania Agriculture Partnership (TAP) and Kibaha District Agriculture Development grants (DADG) shall fight against income poverty to improve their livelihood. The Organisation participated full in the process of community needs Assessment and prioritization. The Organisation will improve cassava production through providing capital for one season cassava growing; Apart from that, the researcher and four staffs, 3 from CDAC and 1 from Kibaha District Council will facilitate training to Ngeta dwellers as well as support commercialization initiatives, market information and linkages among cassava stakeholders.

The project is expected to start with 190 households which is about 72 percent of the total household. Each 190 households should cultivate two hectares, which means 380 hectares are planned to be cultivated. During village meeting conducted on 4th April, 2012, People living in Ngeta selected a committee of 10 Village members to administer the project in collaboration with Community Development Agent Countrywide (CDAC) members.

Committee members also elected their leaders Omari Salum Omari Chair Person and Ashura Rashid Selemani Secretary.

Three days training will be facilitated through District capacity building fund to head of households and 10 project committee members, the committee shall be responsible to administer and assist other members of household. Through applying modern cassava cultivation a farmer can get 7 to 9 tons of cassava per hectare, while local cultivation, they always get 1 to 2.5 tons. Negotiation has already done by Kibaha District Council, Community Development Agenda Countrywide (CDAC) and Kibaha Mango Empire Company that, the Company will buy all Cassava from Ngeta village. For that matter, The Company is expected to buy 3,040 tons of cassava from Ngeta Village. The beneficiaries of the project are expecting to establish Agriculture Cooperative Association.

The community decided to establish the project which they realized that they have resources and easy to manage compared to others projects. Cassava is vulnerable to a broad range of diseases caused by viruses. Cassava mosaic disease (CMD) is the most severe and widespread, limiting production of the crop in sub-Saharan Africa. CMD produces a variety of foliar symptoms that include mosaic, mottling, misshapen and twisted leaflets, and an overall reduction in size of leaves and plants. International Institute of Tropical Agriculture has bred several improved varieties that are resistance to diseases. According to ward Agriculture Extension Officer kiroba breed will be used.

2.3.1 Target Community

The project aimed at improving the productivity of Cassava at Ngeta Village. Cassava is perennial, vegetative propagated shrub, grown throughout the lowland tropics. It is a drought resistant crop grown mainly in dry areas and contributions significantly to the

nutrition and livelihood of many farmers. It is also said to be more productive per unit of land and labour than even the high yielding cereals and the highest producer of carbohydrate (Nweke, 2003). Cassava is being more and more perceived not only as food security crop, but also as a raw material for various types of industries. Cassava can be converted in to large number of products ranging from tradition and novel food products, to livestock feeds ethanol and starch and earn income.

The first target group is 190 households which is about 72 percent of the total household. Each 190 households should cultivate two hectares' members of Ngeta Village and the host organization (Community Development Agenda Countrywide) which would implement the project and secondly latter on the project would be extended to other people who are residents of the village.

2.3.2 Stake holders

Stakeholders are people affected by or can influence the impact of an activity/project. They can be individuals, groups, community or an institution. Stakeholder groups are made up of people who share a common interest such as an NGO, or community. Such groups often contain many sub groups. These subgroups may be affected by the project in different ways and some sub groups may have a lot more influence on the impact of the project than others.

The following stakeholders were identified Ward Agriculture Extension Officer, Community Development Agenda Countrywide, MCED student, Government Institutions (KDC, and Ngeta Village Council), and Donors such as Tanzania Agriculture Partnership (TAP), Cassava Consumers (Kibaha Mango Empire Company).

Table 13: Analysis of Stakeholders involved in the Project

| Stakeholder | Roles of the stakeholder | Concerns | Expectations | Assumptions |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| Community Development Agenda Countrywide | Key project implementers | Income poverty reduction and improved socio-economic status of the community | Contribute to improved community livelihood opportunities of the village | Positive cooperation among members |
| Ward Agriculture Extension Officer | Provide advisory and extension services to project including monitoring and backstopping | Community empowerment on cassava production | Improve cassava productivity through extension and advisory services | Continued project support for sustainability |
| Government Institutions and Donors (KDC, TAP and Ngeta Village Council) | Production of fertilizers, funds provider, Market, provision of technical expertise, and disease surveillance in case of outbreak | Higher cassava productivity | Contribute to more productivity and improved livelihoods | Continued supply of fertilizers and Market |
| Cassava Consumers | Buyer and processor of | Availability of cassava | Improved health and | Stable price |

| Stakeholder | Roles of the stakeholder | Concerns | Expectations | Assumptions |
|--------------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| (Kibaha Mango Empire Company). | cassava | flower, cassava chips, starch and animal raw material at the right time, place, price, quality and quantity | nutritional status as well as contribute to improved community livelihood | |
| CED Student | Provide technical assistance through training and advisory services | Achievement of outputs, specific objectives and overall project goal | Improved cassava productivity to ensure maximum yield | Good cooperation among major stake holders |

2.3.3 Project Goal

The Project Goal is enhancement of living standard of Ngeta village community at household level by raising income, employment opportunities, and food security through improved cassava production.

2.3.4 Project Objectives

The project expects to achieve the following objectives.

- (i) To sensitize and train 190 head of households on improved cassava production techniques, entrepreneurial and business management skills by December 2012.
- (ii) Raise cultivated area from 0.5 ha per household of the year 2011 to 2 ha per household by the year 2013.
- (iii) Impart cassava best practice to Heads of households and reliable to the Market by the year 2013

2.4 Host Organization

The name of the organization hosting the project is Community Development Agenda Countrywide. CDAC is a Non Governmental Organization, established under NGO Act of 2002 with Registration Number OONGO/0272 of 21/01/2008 and to operate throughout Tanzania Mainland. The CDAC is an outgrowth of “Shirikisho la Mabaraza ya Mikopo Kibaha” (Shirikisho), the Department of Community Capacity Building which was operating in Kibaha District only.

Shirikisho was a registered NGO, with Registration Certificate Number SO No 11581 of 25/09/2002. Community Based Initiatives (CBI) started as a participatory partnership programme for UNDP, United Nations Volunteers and Tanzania Government through the Ministry of Labor and Youth Development in 1998, covering four regions and fifteen

districts including Kibaha, Bagamoyo and Mkuranga in Coast Region. The project targeted CBO's at grassroots level. It involved three components which included advocacy, training in managerial, entrepreneurship and technical skills, and finally credit or grant for capital support for income generating activities. CBI used participatory and partnership approach.

After the first three years of the project UNDP withdrew its funding support. The established Kibaha CBO Councils joined to form a federation (Shirikisho) which was registered as an NGO to continue with the services to the community. Eventually Shirikisho introduced a department to deal with Community Capacity Development to extend its cumulative experiences beyond the CBO members but operating within Kibaha district only. Finally it is this department that has now grown to extend its experiences countrywide, thus forming and registering the CDAC.

2.4.1 The Organisation Vision

By the end of the implementation of the National Development Vision 2025 CDAC becomes a reliable and dependable organization countrywide providing quality and timely facilitation services to inclusive communities so as to be poverty free, participate actively in civic life, competent in civic engagements and live with dignity in accordance with the Human Rights as stipulated in the United Republic of Tanzania (URT) Constitution.

2.4.2 The Organisation Mission Statement

To develop Community capacities through participatory and various approaches in civic engagements, civic life and the general socio-economic and cultural development

2.4.3 The Organisation Values Statement

The common thread that runs throughout CDAC is our belief that, as a significant social, economic and technological development driver, our value is a public resource that remains open and accessible to all without discrimination. With this in mind, our efforts are ultimately driven by our mission of encouraging choice, innovation and opportunity.

To achieve our goals, we use a highly transparent, extremely collaborative and partnership approach that would bring together thousands of dedicated individuals, CSO's and communities with our small dedicated members of staff to coordinate the creation of our products like facilitating communities in planned parenthood, Civic Education and engagements, Entrepreneurship with Small and Medium Business Management Skills Training, Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights for Women and Youths, Participatory Planning and Researches, Public, Private Partnership processes, both rural and urban application and advancement of appropriate technologies. These processes are supported by CDAC through facilitating Local Government and Community Collaboration for Accountability and Cohesion hence creating a good governance base.

2.4.4 The Organisation Administration

CDAC has the following office bearers The Executive Chairperson, The Vice Chairperson, Secretary, Deputy Secretary, and Treasurer.

2.4.5 The Organisation Objectives

(i) Facilitate communities through participatory approaches to be able to identify their needs, prioritize them, develop Community Based Action Plans, implement, monitor and evaluate, lobbying their development plans to the district and eventually the parliament for central government funding hence leading a very vibrant civic life.

- (ii) Develop capacities of groups of women and youths in entrepreneurial and business management skills and with the use of appropriate technologies to improve income earnings to meet family care expenses.
- (iii) Facilitate the advancing of gender understanding and sensitivity among young people and the rights to sexual reproductive health and fight against spread of HIV/AIDS
- (iv) Support groups and communities to establish and formalize micro lending systems ranging from credit associations to cooperatives for improving their capital growth in their businesses as well as to Solicit fund to support community Initiatives

2.4.6 Organisation Implemented Activities

The Community Development Agenda Countrywide has so far carried the following activities.

- (i) The Organisation applied 25 ha of land to the village Government and village Government has already authorized 7 ha to use for nursery.
- (ii) The Organisation managed to sociality Tsh. 89,422,500 from Kibaha District Council (District Agriculture Development Grant) and already received is 32,626,200/= cassava production.
- (iii) The Organisation managed to cultivate 7 ha for nursery which already planted cassava known as kiroba.

2.4.7 Organisation Challenges

- (i) The Organisation does not have office in the village; the office is situated at Mlandizi town. Normally conducts meetings using village office building. However the Organisation is in the process of constructing its own building.

- (ii) The group lacks funding to accomplish various projects in the blue print and there is low response from members when it comes to contribution of funds for self initiated projects.

CHAPTER THREE

3.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a review of the literature on the issues pertaining to community livelihood opportunities through cassava production and enterprise development as documented and conducted by other people. Review of the existing literature, journals and research papers provides essential data and information.

Information was gathered from the theoretical literature where definitions of key concepts have been given in relation to best practice of cassava production. Whereas the empirical literature review focused at describing the experience of other countries in Africa and Tanzania were these projects implemented also contributed to analysis of the existing gaps that need to be addressed by this study. While policy review focused at searching the national level policy review.

3.2 Theoretical Literature

3.2.1 Agricultural Sector Perspective

Cassava is one of the important food crops grown in Tanzania providing energy from its roots and protein, minerals and vitamins from leaves. Cassava plays an important role as famine reserve, rural food staple, cash crop, urban food staple; industrial raw material and livestock feed. The stems that are often used as planting materials, when dry are sometimes uses as fire wood. What is more important for rural farmers, they can manage to produce cassava under conditions where other crops may fail. Cassava tolerates poor soil, adverse weather and can thrive well across a wider range of agro-ecological zones. The advantage of cassava over other staple food in Tanzania are tolerance to drought,

capacity to provide yields in agro-ecologies and season where other crops would fail, low requirements for external inputs like fertilisers, flexibility in planting and harvesting, and convenient in ground storability. The most important cassava producing areas in Tanzania include areas around Lakes Victoria, Tanganyika, and Nyasa; along the coastal strip of the Indian Ocean and along the Ruvuma valley (Msabaha and Rwenyagira, 1989).

(i) Cassava Production

Cassava production in Tanzania is 6.8million MT per year (FAOSTAT, 2003). According to National Sample Census of Agriculture (2006), cassava production is higher than any other roots or tuber crop in Tanzania with a total production of 2,102,838 tons representing 84.6 percent of the total root and tuber crop production. The number of households growing cassava during 2002/2003 cropping season was 1,213,958 representing 25 percent of the total crop growing households in Tanzania. The area planted with cassava is approximately 81 percent of all area under root and tuber crops. It is the only root and tuber crop that has increased its production over the period 1995 – 2000, whereas the production of other roots and tubers was stable over the 1994 to 2003 period. The average planted area of cassava is 0.52 ha per household.

Van der Land and Uliwa (2007) documented that Tanzania produces about 6.8 million tons of cassava annually, which is 5.5% and 14% of world's and African's cassava production, respectively. However this cassava is predominantly produced by smallholder farmers in many places. Although differences exist in cassava production, consumption, processing and level of commercialization between areas where cassava is considered as staple food and areas where it is non staple, it is generally considered as an inferior crop compared with maize and rice. On the other hand the Government recognises cassava as a food security crop, but little or no effort has been done to commercialize it. As a result

cassava production in Tanzania it is generally characterized by low yields and low marketable surplus

(ii) Cassava Consumption

Cassava is mainly consumed by low-income earners, both in rural and urban area. It is a cheap food which can be afforded by poor household budgets. There is no significant processing of cassava i.e. drying, making chips and pounding into flour takes place at farmer, trader or consumer level. Much of the consumers processing in the form of boiling and drying. The major form in which cassava is consumed is boiled fresh roots. This is mainly taken as breakfast. Other common forms in which cassava is eaten include '*futari*' which is a very common meal during the Moslem fasting month of 'Ramadan'. Also fried cassava chips and cassava stiff porridge (*ugali*) made out of cassava flour, are common meals both in the coast and up-country regions. In some instances cassava is locally processed into dry *makopa* whose flour is mixed with either major food crops or sorghum/millet flour at a ratio of 25 percent cassava during periods of no food shortages and up 50 percent cassava during food shortages.

Considering cassava is relatively cheaper than cereals, and is available during direr years, it inevitably constitutes an important energy source of food for the low-income households. The major source of cassava for both urban and rural consumers is retailers entailing vendors (*magenge*) and hawkers. However, rural consumers manage to obtain cassava directly from producers (farmers). Due to underdeveloped storage and processing facilities, rural consumers prefer to access cassava direct from farmers so as to be assured that the produce is still fresh, avoiding loss of taste and nutritive value.

Of recent cassava has been transformed from a crop that is being cultivated solely as a food security crop to a commercial crop for income generating and livelihood improvement in most parts of rural Tanzania where the crop is grown. The different domestic and industrial applications of cassava include Fresh market/consumption; High quality cassava flour used as *ugali*, in biscuits, other confectioneries and chipboard; Cassava chips and leaves for animal feeds; Cassava starch; and Cassava leaves for human consumption.

It has been demonstrated that high quality cassava flour can substitute up to 20 percent of wheat in biscuits and bread without affecting the quality of the produce. However, the challenge is price competitiveness of cassava flour with that of wheat. Use of cassava starch in the industry is still limited although the International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA) Starch Project in Tanzania identified about 20 companies most of which are located in Dar es Salaam as potential users of cassava starch.

3.3 Constraints Facing Cassava Production

The question of how best to exploit the potential of domestic food crop production needs to be addressed. It well known that all that the farmers need to increase production of crops and good price. Although a good price is necessary for returns to labour to be worth the effort to increase production, there are several other constraints which are responsible for limiting the increase of production in a sustainable way. The following are constraints to increased Cassava production, marketing and processing of cassava products in Tanzania.

3.3.1 Inadequate Support from Extension Officers

Since the Government of Tanzania has introduced strict budgetary control in order to qualify for debt relief, many of the public services have been hampered by lack of funds.

Also, the agricultural extension has been affected and subsequently, many farmers are not being reached by the extension department. Generally, the extension officers lack the means and the time to visit the large number of small farmers. Moreover, most of the small farmers live in not well informed about appropriate farm inputs and management. It is not surprising that their yield has been decreasing while costs of production increase.

3.3.2 Lack of Credit Facilities

There are hardly and appropriate credit facilities for farmers, i.e. the small-scale farmers. Only in places where there are proper functioning savings and credit associations (SACCOS) are farmers able to access funds for input financing. However, the majority of the farmers have to finance the inputs and the farm management costs themselves, and only few are able to buy what they need. Furthermore, the input prices have increased considerably since the liberalization of inputs supply.

3.3.3 Insufficient and Inadequate Inputs

Though input agents are present in most of the villages, it does not guarantee that the appropriate inputs are adequately available. Due to their lack of working capital, many of these agents can neither buy in bulk nor a wide variety of input. As a result, farmers often return home without the appropriate variety and quality. Also, many agents are not sufficiently exposed to the unique qualities of each of the varieties and hence, are unable to advise the farmers well. As a result traditional farming practices limit output per acre. Farmers do not invest sufficiently in fertilizer, improved seeds and pesticides and as a result yields are low and irregular.

3.3.4 Lack of Storage Facilities

Only the medium and large farmers have adequate storage facilities. On the contrary, the small farmers have hardly any proper storage facilities, and even if they had, they lack the

funds to buy chemicals to fumigate the storage in time. There losses are twofold. Since they are not able to store, they are forced to sell during the peak season when prices are generally low. But even during the short period that they would have incurred the post harvest losses as a result of poor storage facilities and practices.

3.3.5 Lack of Reliable Markets

Only large farmers are able to produce under forward contracting and have reliable market outlet. Nearly, all small-scale farmers depend on the village collectors, brokers and agents. There are no permanent and fixed arrangements if and when they come. Even though these traders appear to compete with each other, they often have (informal) price arrangements with their fellow traders in order to avoid fierce price competition.

3.3.6 Lack of Scale Economies

Since small-scale farmers' only produce small quantities, they are not an interesting trading partner for large buyers and hence are missing the opportunities for a better bargain. By selling in small quantities, they also lose in another way. The traders normally use tins or buckets from the farmers, in other words they use volume terms and in the process they underrate the volume they buy. When they sell in weight and benefit from the additional kilos they obtained from the farmers. Collection of the produce from remote rural areas is expensive due to poor infrastructure. Roads in many areas are not passable during the rain season. In addition, seasonality of the crop makes it difficult to utilize effectively the installed processing facilities.

3.3 Empirical Literature

In some African countries, cassava is being more and more perceived not only as a food security crop, but also as a raw material for various types of industries. Cassava can be

converted into a large number of products ranging from traditional and novel food products, to livestock feeds, ethanol and starch and its numerous derivatives. In such countries, there are concerted efforts on cassava development being initiated, sometimes with strong political support at the highest level (Nang'ayo *et al.*, 2007). For example special presidential initiatives on cassava exist in Nigeria and Ghana to make cassava the engine for economic growth. The New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) has also recognized cassava as crops which can reduce poverty in Africa and has recommended a Pan-African Cassava Initiative based on a broad based strategy which emphasizes better markets, better organization of producers for collective action, and better participation by the private sector.

Africa now produces more cassava than the rest of the world combined. The producing nations are Nigeria (35% of total African production and 19% of world production), the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ghana, Tanzania, and Mozambique. Cassava production in West Africa has doubled from 25.8 million t in 1990 to 52.3 million t in 2004 (FAO, 2007). Across the countries, cassava production has witnessed a tremendous increase for different reasons, the introduction of high-yielding, disease-resistant varieties, for example, in Nigeria.

Nigeria is known to be the leading producer of cassava globally; harvesting from 3.81 million ha, it produced 45.72 million ton in 2006, 18% higher than its production in 2004. This increase in production between 2004 and 2006 came about as a result of the interventions of the Nigerian Government and some developmental agencies. The Nigerian Government facilitated the development of new disease-resistant cassava varieties by the joint efforts of IITA, National Root Crops Research Institute (NRCRI), Root and Tuber Expansion Program (RTEP), and the Federal Ministry of Agriculture, in

conjunction with State Agricultural Development Programs and cassava farmers (Sanni, L.O et al., 2009:1)

IITA, through its Integrated Cassava Project (ICP), implemented in the south-south and south-east States of Nigeria in 2002, campaigned extensively for commercializing cassava production. It distributed planting materials of high-yielding varieties of cassava resistant to cassava mosaic disease (CMD) with on-farm training on appropriate agronomic technologies and management practices. Findings showed that farmers' yields have doubled from an average of 11 ha to 25 ha

Under the pre-emptive management of CMD, 10 improved cassava varieties selected from the 43 varieties screened were officially released. Newly bred varieties were multiplied on more than 500 ha by IITA, NRCRI, RTEP, ADP, and other farmers using certified stocks. Large-scale cassava farms (> 1000 ha) e.g., Obasanjo Farms, Nigerian Starch Mill, Zimbabwe farmers, and Ekha Agro Farms, had began production (Sanni, L.O et al., 2009:2)

Similarly, Benin has recorded increased production of cassava over time, although not as much as that of Nigeria. The crop is grown all over the country and, by total production, the Atlantic Department had the highest recorded volume in 2006 (934,511 t), followed by Plateau (307,262 t) and Collines (287,864 t), all in the south. Communities with registered high production volumes are spread in the far south and north central parts of the country (Sanni, L.O et al., 2009:6)

There is increased availability of land for commercial cassava cultivation, according to some farmers, NGOs, and government workers. At the inaugural stakeholders' workshop of the cassava value chain development project, held on 16 June 2008 in Abomey, the

representative from the Ministry of Commerce and Industry said that the Benin's Government strongly supported the idea of a policy to include at least 10% cassava flour in bread flour, as they had witnessed the success of the same policy in Nigeria. Assuming this will be realized, the level of cassava production in Benin will surely be different in the next couple of years. (Sanni, L.O et al., 2009:13)

Sierra Leone has the lowest volume of production among the three beneficiary countries. It produced only 350,000 t in 2006. In relation to this, it is important to note that the country is still in the process of recovery from a decade-long civil war that was officially declared over in January 2002. It was then that economic activities started to regain strength. Sanni, L.O et al., (2009:14) Cassava is also grown all over the country, just as in Nigeria and Benin. Major production (based on production area), however, is recorded in different chiefdoms in the south-west, central, and far north regions of the country.

The three countries have shown remarkable success in cassava processing at both domestic and commercial scales, although to varying degrees. The introduction of machines for most unit operations of processing has greatly eased the labour-intensiveness of the trade, releasing time for women into other income-generating activities and allowing them to attend to family responsibilities. In all three countries, cassava is processed into some common products: *gari* (Gari is further milled into a fine, smooth powder and consumed as a complementary food), *lafun* (Lafun is another cassava-based food commonly consumed in Nigeria, Benin and Sierra Leone), and starch. Each country also has some exclusive cassava-based products being traded: *gari* and cassava bread (very thin, small, flat, round pieces) are traded mainly in Sierra Leone. *Gari*, starch, chips, and high quality cassava flour (HQCF) are common, mainly in Nigeria, and *gari* and starch in Benin (Sanni, L.O et al., 2009:18)

Direct involvement by Governments in the promotion of the cassava subsector and sometimes policy directives has enhanced development in Nigeria and other countries of West Africa. The Nigerian Government's Cassava Initiative that started in 2003 was highly successful in promoting new entrants and investment into cassava micro-processing as well as encouraging both small and large-scale processing industries. Most micro- and small-scale processors are involved in producing traditional foods or intermediate products, such as chips, HQCF, or starch (Sanni, L.O et al., 2009:22)

Medium-scale factories, processing cassava into HQCF, starch, and high-grade *fufu* (Fufu is a fermented wet paste widely consumed in eastern and south-west Nigeria and in other parts of West Africa) for export, have also been established by local entrepreneurs near cassava farming communities. Ekha Agro Co. along Lagos–Ibadan road was commissioned in March 2007 to produce 26% of the annual national demand for glucose syrup. The company currently supplies cassava-based glucose syrup of high quality to Nestlé, Cadbury, and Guinness for the manufacture of beverages and malt production. However, many companies in Nigeria are yet to obtain the technology for processing cassava into adhesives and glucose syrup. Many manufacturing industries, again, are yet to adopt the use of cassava-based refined products, such as glucose syrup.

Nevertheless, apart from HQCF being used in the food industries, cassava also has found uses in other industries, especially feed and non-food industries, including starch for the manufacture of textiles, paints, adhesives, and other chemicals. In Nigeria, the industrial utilization of cassava is not merely emerging but increasing day by day (Sanni, L.O et al., 2009:25)

However, in Tanzania cassava is still perceived as a food security crop rather than a raw material for other industries. Cassava contributes to an average of 15% in the national

food production basket and is second to maize, which is the leading staple food crop for many Tanzanians (Mtambo, 2007). Moreover, for countries where majority of the people still live below the poverty line as Tanzania (ASDS, 2001), cassava could be used to bridge the income poverty gap.

In 2007, global production capacity of cassava amounted to 228.14 million tons. Thailand was by far the third largest producer at 26 million tons, following the lead by Nigeria and Brazil. Nevertheless, since domestic consumption in Thailand is minimal Thailand is the largest exporter accounting for more than 80% of world trade. In the year 2006, the export generated income to the country more than USD 1,400 million. The export of cassava is concentrated in three product areas: chips, pellets, and starch. Due to Thailand's strong development on breeding, technology and transportation for over 30 years along with more than 200 exporters, it is able to respond any kinds of demand. Its major markets include China, Europe, Japan, Indonesia, South Korea, Australia, New Zealand, Malaysia, India, and Russia (C.S.T.R.U 2007:3)

Thailand is also the leader in breeding, planting, producing and trading of the world cassava. Cassava are one of the crucial trading products of Thailand that are used for human consumption, animal feed, and other products More importantly, in face of the world's food and energy crisis, cassava can be used in the renewable energy industry, as ethanol (T.T.D.I 2008)

Since food, energy and environment have become the world crisis, has focused on food commodity by helping maintain the price, and negotiating with foreign investors. Long-term strategic solution is still needed; especially in agricultural development and food

security. As one of the economic plant for the population of over 600 million, cassava can be a part of the solution (C.S.T.R.U 2007:4)

However, as the world's food and energy shortage are still ongoing, and there is a chance after shock of crisis might occur. Cassava, as a magic plant, which can be used as both food and energy, will definitely be a buffer and alternative in alleviating such shortages. The key to success is the stabilization of the cassava price. Emphasis should be put on the reduction of raw material costs, and policy that advocates the production of bio-fuel. In this connection, price can be stabilized, and new products will be created by higher technologies and innovation (C.S.T.R.U 2007:5)

3.4 Policy Review

In recognition of the importance of Agriculture sector, the Government has continued to design and implement a number of policies and programmes supportive to the development of the sector.

3.4.1 Current Agricultural Policies

The agricultural sector is guided by two main policies. The *Agriculture and Livestock Policy of 1997* seeks to ensure that the direction and pattern of development in the agricultural sector meets social objectives and outputs. The policy emphasizes the importance of competitive markets, with the Government providing priority public goods and services and the conservation of the environment as a rational basis for agricultural development.

Objectives of the Agricultural and Livestock Policy of 1997 are assure food security for the nation, including improvement of national standards of nutrition improve standards of

living in rural areas, Increase foreign exchange earnings, to Produce and supply raw materials and expand the role of the sector as a market for industrial outputs, Develop and introduce new technologies for land and labour productivity and Promote integrated and sustainable use and management of natural resources (environmental sustainability)

The *Cooperative Development Policy of 1997* evolved on the basis of experiences in implementing the Cooperative Development Act of 1991. It marks a change from cooperatives being state controlled institutions to becoming autonomous and member-controlled private organizations. The policy provides the framework for the restructured co-operatives to operate on an independent, voluntary and economically viable basis and to develop into centers for providing and disseminating agricultural inputs, implements, technologies and information. This will empower farmers to enhance their bargaining position in the market. The Ministry is currently facilitating consultative meetings among cooperative stakeholders to review the 1997 Policy and the Cooperative Act of 1991 to make them meet the needs of stakeholders even more effectively.

3.4.2 Agriculture Related Policies

Several other policies have a bearing on the development of agriculture. The overall aim of the *National Land Policy* is to promote and ensure a secure land tenure system, encourage the optimal use of land resources, and facilitate broad-based socio-economic development without endangering the ecological balance of the environment.

Water Policy; One of its objectives of the *Water Policy* is to establish a multi-sector platform and framework for participatory agreements on the allocation of water use in a coordinated and rational manner. This will eventually ensure that the interests and rights of various water users, particularly the requirement of catchments, crops and livestock, are taken into account during the process of allocating water.

The National Micro-finance Policy forms the long-term basis for developing an efficient and effective micro-financial system and provides a framework for empowering farmers and livestock keepers through access to credit.

The Gender Policy of 2000 aims to mainstream gender issues in all aspects of policy, planning, resource allocation and implementation. Special attention is directed towards ensuring that women have access to land, other productive resources, training and labour saving technologies. Nevertheless, it will be important under ASDS to formulate special programmes to enhance women's access to technology, training and credit.

The Government has also enacted a *National Environment Policy*, which lays the foundation for coordinated, multi-sectoral action in this field.

3.4.3 Agricultural Sector Development Strategy

Tanzanian agriculture, like the entire economy, is in a transition from being a command- to a market based production system. The transition process started in the mid-1980s as part of the economic adjustment and structural reform programmes supported by the development partners. Despite some impressive macroeconomic achievements resulting from the reform programmes, agricultural growth and rural poverty reduction continue to present daunting challenges. In response to these and other pertinent development issues, the Government recently adopted the *Tanzania Development Vision 2025 (TDV)* to provide broad guidance on the strategic goals of social and economic development in the country. The TDV envisages raising the general standard of living of Tanzanians to the level of a typical medium-income developing country by 2025, in terms of human development. It identifies three priority goals: ensuring basic food security, improving

income levels and increasing export earnings. Agriculture is one of the priority sectors for achieving these goals. (U.R.T, 2001:11)

Subsequent to the TDV, Government, with the support of the development partners, has initiated a national strategic policy framework aimed at progressively achieving the Vision's goals in the country. The completion of a *Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP)* in 2000 was a contribution to this. Poverty reduction has become the overarching priority objective in the national economy and the PRSP provides the medium term national framework for this focus. The PRSP recognises that agriculture is critical to poverty reduction. (U.R.T, 2001:11)

According to the (1991/92) Household Budget Survey in Tanzania, the majority of the poor are found in rural areas, where agriculture is the mainstay of livelihoods. Agriculture has a dominant role in the economy that it is the most critical of the sectors that have been identified as the *priority poverty reduction sectors* in the PRSP. In the long run, commercializing smallholder agriculture and accelerating its growth rate are critical in pulling the majority of the rural poor out of abject poverty. The ASDS lays the foundation stones for this long run objective but also proposes interventions with a more immediate impact on rural poverty alleviation through diversified and increased production and productivity of smallholder agriculture. (URT, 2001:12)

In the rural sector, these poverty reduction objectives will be achieved through a ***Rural Development Strategy (RDS)*** and a complementary *Agricultural Sector Development Strategy (ASDS)*. The RDS will cover the entire rural sector, including agriculture, non-farm economic activities, social services, and economic and social infrastructures (URT, 2001:12)

Globally; Tanzania is a showcase for public-private partnership in agricultural growth, exemplified by the development of its Southern Agricultural Growth Corridor (SAGCOT). The Government of Tanzania and the G8 members commit to the “New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition” and to working together to generate greater private investment in agricultural development, scale innovation, achieve sustainable food security outcomes, reduce poverty and end hunger (URT, 2012:2)

The Government of Tanzania intends to pursue the policy goals set out below in order to build domestic and international private sector confidence to increase agricultural investment significantly, with the overall goal of reducing poverty and ending hunger.

The Government of Tanzania intends to focus its efforts, in particular, on increasing stability and transparency in trade policy; improving incentives for the private sector; developing and implementing a transparent land tenure policy; developing and implementing domestic seed policies that encourage increased private sector involvement in this area; and aligning the National Food and Nutrition Policy with the National Nutrition Strategy (URT, 2012:3)

The Government of Tanzania reaffirms its intention to provide the human and financial resources and the mechanisms for dialogue with the private sector, farmers and other stakeholders, and across government ministries that are required for the achievement of tangible and sustainable outcomes, the acceleration of Tanzania’s development, and the delivery of tangible benefits to smallholder farmers, including women (URT, 2012:3)

3.5 Literature Review Summary

Cassava is considered as staple food and areas where it is non staple, it is generally considered as an inferior crop compared with maize and rice. On the other hand the

Government recognise cassava as a food security crop, but little or no effort has been done to commercialize it. As a result cassava production in Tanzania is generally characterized by low yields and low marketable surplus.

Basing on the above information, there are problems relate to lack of appropriate processing technologies for adding value of cassava and poor farmers' organization and coordination as a result farmers find it difficult to access demand sectors in urban markets, hence farmers end up complaining that there is unreliable and unprofitable market for their unprocessed or locally processed cassava products. Other problem is related to farmers' mindset as far as cassava production is concerned where farmers perceive cassava as a subsistence food crop, and if sold, it is just roots (fresh) or locally processed cassava grits at local market.

In order to serve this untapped demand for cassava products much has to be done to increase cassava productivity and changing of policy makers and farmers' (as a crop of great potential of commercialization) mindsets towards cassava. This will encourage public and private investments in the cassava sub-sector also facilitate farmers to actively participate in the value chain effectively. As a result contribute to reducing income poverty among cassava smallholders. Therefore this project will improve Community livelihoods in Kibaha District particularly in Ngeta Village through improved Cassava production.

CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

4.1 Introduction

Project implementation plan is a schedule of activities which indicates time frame within which the activity carried out over the project implementation period. The activities should follow a logical flow, that is, activities that have to be done first have to appear during initial period. Implementation plans helps to get things done on time and thus get good value for money by enabling the project committed to allocate resources efficiently and within the budget. This chapter presents the products and outputs of the project, details of project planning, project implementation and the implementation report is provided at the end, highlighting on the important activities performed and the end results. Ngeta Community in corroboration with Community Development Agenda Countrywide (CDAC) are the owners of the project thus the main project implementers. The Researcher was the project facilitator providing some advices. The improving community livelihood through improved Cassava production project started Mach, 2012 where 19 Head of households facilitated on Cassava agricultural best practices and entrepreneurial and business management skills. Those 19 farmers each of them train other 10 Head of households which make the total number of those who trained 190. Cultivated areas have been raised from 0.5 ha per household of the year 2011 to 2 ha per household the year 2013. Tanzania Agriculture Partnership one among stakeholders contributes materials such as Manure and Kiroba Cassava steam amounting to Tsh.44, 132,000.

It was planned that by June 2013 the project would accomplish its activities except evaluation. The planned project product is the improvement in community livelihood

opportunities achieved through improved Cassava production. However this is yet to be realized as the project is just at the end. It will be more evidenced after the project evaluation by the end of July 2013. It is anticipated Ngeta community will improve livelihood in terms of their basic needs and savings for other obligations such as Health and Education. It is expected that, the private firm Kibaha Mango Empire Company Ltd. which owns and runs a medium scale cassava processing plant shall acquire all cassava from Ngeta Village. The company also intends to introduce contract cassava farming for smallholder farmers.

4.2 Outputs and Products

During the project implementation period it was expected to achieve the following products and outputs out of the planned activities.

4.2.1 Project Outputs

The project is expected to accomplish the following outputs.

- (i) 190 Head of households (Farmers) sensitized and trained on Cassava agricultural best practices and entrepreneurial and business management skills.
- (ii) Cultivated areas have been raised from 0.5 ha per household of the year 2011 to 2 ha per household the year 2013.
- (iii) Heads of households practiced cassava production techniques of which 380 ha planted cassava, moreover after cassava harvesting and sold to Kibaha Mango Empire Company Ltd income will be increased as the result standard of living improved as they will afford to access basic needs.
- (iv) Tanzania Agriculture Partnership contributes materials such as Manure and Kiroba Cassava steam amounting to Tsh.44, 132,000.

Table 14: Project Output

| Objective | Output | activity |
|---|--|---|
| 1- To sensitize and train 190 head of households on improved cassava production techniques, entrepreneurial and business management skills by December 2012 | 1-18 members attend Meeting | 1- To conduct Advocacy Meeting to members of Ngeta Village council |
| | 2-Five needs were mentioned and prioritized. | 2- Conducting Community Needs Assessment. |
| | 3-702 Community members sensitised | 3-To conduct one day Sensitization Meeting to Ngeta Community Members |
| | 4- 19 Farmers facilitated | Capacity building on Cassava agricultural best practices and entrepreneurial and business management skills |
| | 5-171 Participants attended the training. | Cassava growing procedure and demonstration training |
| 2- Raise cultivated area from 0.5 ha per household of the year 2011 to 2 ha per household by the year 2013. | 1-7 ha planted cassava | Preparation and Planting of cassava to Nursery |
| | 2- 380ha hollow out | Preparation of farm plot (2 hectares) |
| | 3- 380ha planted cassava | Planting of Kiroba cassava stick stem into the farm Plots |
| 3- Impart cassava best practice to Heads of households and | 1- 2,660 tons harvested | Harvesting of cassava (Kibaha Mango Empire Company Ltd |

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| reliable to the Market by the 2013 | | acquires cassava for processing.) |
| | 2-5 People participated | Conducting Project Monitoring |
| | 3- 5 People participated | Conducting Mid and Annual Project Evaluation |

4.2.2 Project Products

The main project product is the improved community livelihood opportunities in Ngeta village as a result of Cassava production. This would be achieved after realization of income from the sale of cassava which utilized as human food other uses like starch making, livestock feed in income generating avenues.

4.3 Project Planning

(i) The following steps was involved during project planning; Identification of project objectives, Sequencing the identified project activities, Identifying Preparation responsible people, Identifying facilities equipments and services needed and Preparing the Budget plant as shown below

Table 15: Project Planning

| Objective | Output | Activity | 2012 | | | | | | | | | | | | 2013 | | | | Resources/ Inputs | Responsible people |
|---|--|---|------|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|------|--|--|
| | | | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | July | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | Jun | July | | |
| To sensitize and train 190 head of households on improved cassava production techniques entrepreneurial and business management skills by December 2012 | 1-18 members attend Meeting | 1- To conduct Advocacy Meeting to members of Ngeta Village council | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Personnel, Fund, Stationery | CED student, CDAC Execv. committee members |
| | 2-Five needs were mentioned and prioritized. | 2- Conducting Community Needs Assessment. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Personnel, Fund, stationery and transport. | CED student, CDAC members, Focus group discussion. |
| | 3-702 Community members sensitised | 3-To conduct one day Sensitization Meeting to Ngeta Community Members | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Personnel, Fund, stationery and transport. | CED student, CDAC members, Village community |

| Objective | Output | Activity | 2012 | | | | | | | | | | | | 2013 | | | | | Resources/ Inputs | Responsible people |
|---|---|---|------|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|------|--|--|--|
| | | | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | July | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | Jun | July | | | |
| | 4- 19 Farmers facilitated | Capacity building on Cassava agricultural best practices and entrepreneurial and business management skills | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Training Personnel, venue, fund, stationary and transport. | Facilitator, CED student. CDAC |
| | 5-171 Participants attended the training. | Cassava growing procedure and demonstration training | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Personnel, transport. Fund and Demonstration material | WAE0, CED student, 19 Farmers, CDAC members. |
| Raise cultivated area from 0.5 ha per household of the year | 1-7 ha planted cassava | Preparation and Planting of cassava to Nursery | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Fertilizers, Cassava | WAE0, CED student CDAC members, Head |

| Objective | Output | Activity | 2012 | | | | | | | | | | | | 2013 | | | | | Resources/ Inputs | Responsible people |
|--|--------------------------|--|------|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|------|--|---|---|
| | | | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | July | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | Jun | July | | | |
| 2011 to 2 ha per household by the year 2013. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | a steam | of household |
| | 2- 380ha hollow out | Preparation of farm plot (2 hectares) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Fertilizes, Tractor Cassava a steam | CED student members, Head of household |
| | 3- 380ha planted cassava | Planting of Kiroba cassava stick stem into the farm Plots | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Cassava stem | WAE0, CED student CDAC members, Head of household |
| Impart cassava best practice to Heads of households and reliable to the Market by the 2013 | 1- 6,840 tons harvested | Harvesting of cassava (Kibaha Mango Empire Company Ltd acquires cassava for processing.) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Hand hoe Fund and transport. | Head of household, WAE0, CED student CDAC members, Head of household. |
| | 2-5 People participated | Conducting Project Monitoring and Evaluation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Fund and transport | WAE0, CED student CDAC members, Head |

| Objective | Output | Activity | 2012 | | | | | | | | | | | | 2013 | | | | | Resources/ Inputs | Responsible people |
|-----------|--------------------------|---|------|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|------|----------------------|--|-----------------------|
| | | | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | July | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | Jun | July | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | rt. | of household. | | |
| | 3- 5 People participated | 3- Conducting Mid and Annual Project Evaluation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Fund and stationery. | WAE0, CED student CDAC members, Head of household. | |

As per Planning above the project is started March 2012 through implementing five activities as the base for project. These are advocacy Meeting to members of Ngeta Village council, Community Needs Assessment, Sensitization Meeting to Ngeta Community Members, Capacity building on Cassava agricultural best practices and entrepreneurial and business management skills and Cassava growing procedure and demonstration training. Planning shows that the project will phase out on July 2013 where evaluation will be conducted.

4.3.1 Implementation plan

Implementation plan portrays how the project was carried out to achieve project outputs, objectives and the overall goal. In the implementation process the project involved the following key stakeholders, Community Development Agenda Countrywide (CDAC), Community Economic Development (CED) student and the Ngeta Ward Agriculture Extension Officer. The roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder are summarized in table 16. Resources which were deployed in the project were contributed by both partners.

Table 16: Implementation Plan Schedule

| Objective | Output | Activity | 2012 | | | | | | | | | | | | 2013 | | | | Resources/ Inputs | Responsible people |
|---|--|---|------|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|------|--|--|
| | | | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | July | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | Jun | July | | |
| To sensitize and train 190 head of households on improved cassava production techniques entrepreneurial and business management skills by December 2012 | 1-18 members attend Meeting | 1- To conduct Advocacy Meeting to members of Ngeta Village council | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Personnel, Fund, Stationery | CED student, CDAC Exev. committee members |
| | 2-Five needs were mentioned and prioritized. | 2- Conducting Community Needs Assessment. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Personnel, Fund, stationery and transport. | CED student, CDAC members, Focus group discussion. |
| | 3-702 Community members sensitised | 3-To conduct one day Sensitization Meeting to Ngeta Community Members | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Personnel, Fund, stationery and transport. | CED student, CDAC members, Village community |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | 4- 19 Farmers facilitated | 4- Capacity building on Cassava agricultural best practices and entrepreneurial and business management skills | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Training Personnel, venue, fund, stationery and transport. | Facilitator, CED student. CDAC |
| | 5-171 Participants attended the training. | 5- Cassava growing procedure and demonstration training | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Personnel, Fund, stationery, transport, and Demonstration material | WAEO, CED student, 19 Farmers, CDAC members. |
| Raise cultivated area from 0.5 ha per household of the year 2011 to 2 ha per household by the year 2013. | 1-7 ha planted cassava | 1- Preparation and Planting of cassava to Nursery | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Fertilizes, Cassava steam, Tractor | WAEO, CED student CDAC members, Head of household |
| | 2- 380ha hollow out | 2- Preparation of farm plot (2 hectares) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Fertilizes, Tractor Cassava steam | CED student CDAC members, Head of household |
| | 3- 380ha planted | 3- Planting of Kiroba cassava | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Cassava stem | WAEO, CED student CDAC |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|------------------------------|---|
| | cassava | stick stem into the farm Plots | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | members, Head of household | |
| Impart cassava best practice to Heads of households and reliable to the Market by the 2013 | 1- 6,840 tons harvested | 1- Harvesting of cassava (Kibaha Mango Empire Company Ltd acquires cassava for processing.) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Hand hoe Fund and transport. | Head of household, WAEO, CED student CDAC members, Head of household. |
| | 2-5 People participated | 2- Conducting Project Monitoring | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Fund and transport. | WAEO, CED student CDAC members, Head of household. |
| | 3- 5 People participated | 3- Conducting Mid and Annual Project Evaluation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Fund and stationery. | WAEO, CED student CDAC members, Head of household. |

As per Implementation planning schedule above, the project expected to implement three objectives and ten activities started March 2012 to July 2013. In Objective one the following activities were implemented advocacy Meeting to members of Ngeta Village council, Community Needs Assessment, Sensitization Meeting to Ngeta Community Members, Capacity building on Cassava agricultural best practices and entrepreneurial and business management skills and Cassava growing procedure and demonstration training.

In Objective two the following activities were implemented Preparation and Planting of cassava to Nursery, Preparation of farm plot (2 hectares), and Planting of Kiroba cassava stick stem into the farm Plots. While in Objective three following activities were implemented harvesting of cassava (Kibaha Mango Empire Company Ltd acquires cassava for processing.), and Project Monitoring. Evaluation is expecting to be done on July.

(i) Project Logical Framework Matrix

Table 17: Project Logical Framework Matrix

| Intervention Logic | Objectively verifiable indicators (OVI) | Means of verification | Assumptions/risks |
|--|--|---|--|
| Goal: Income Poverty reduced and standard of living of Ngeta Community improved. | Increased income and improved standard of living of cassava growers. | Reports, records and household survey data available at CDAC. | Good cooperation and participation in project implementation among various stakeholders. |
| Objective: To sensitize and train 190 head of households on improved cassava production techniques entrepreneurial and business management skills by December 2012. | | | |
| Output 1: Members of NgetaVillage council familiarized with the aim of conducting CNA and Project identification. | Response of NgetaVillage council Members | Community Needs Assessment report | Members of Village council became aware of CNA and know the importance of Project identification |
| Activities: | | | |
| 1.1 Advocacy meeting done to NgetaVillage council members. | 18 members attended | Project Reports | Readiness of the Council members to support the Project. |
| 1.2 Community Needs Assessment done | 5 needs were mentioned and prioritized. | Project Reports | Readiness of the Council members to support the Project. |

| Intervention Logic | Objectively verifiable indicators (OVI) | Means of verification | Assumptions/risks |
|---|--|------------------------------|--|
| 1.3 Project Sensitization Meeting done to Community members. | 702 Members attended | Meeting Minutes | Readiness of the Community members to support the Project. |
| 1.4: Training to Farmers (Head of households) on Cassava agricultural best practices and entrepreneurial and business management skills | 19 Participants attended the training. | Training report | Positive Participants attitude towards Cassava agricultural best practices |
| 1.5: Cassava growing procedure and demonstration training | 171 Participants attended the training. | Survey (demonstration plot) | Positive cooperation among Head of households |
| Objective: 2 Raise cultivated area from 0.5 ha per household of the year 2011 to 2 ha per household by the year 2013. | | | |
| Output 2: 380 hectares planted taken care and harvested tons of cassava purchased | 190 Famers (Head of households) participated | Survey (Cultivated plot) | Positive cooperation among Head of households |
| Activities: | | | |
| 2.1: Preparation of Nursery and Planting of cassava done | 7ha planted cassava | Survey (Planted area) | Positive cooperation among Head of households |
| 2.2: Preparation of farm plot done | 380ha hollow out | Survey (Cultivated plot) | Positive cooperation among Head of households |
| 2.3: Planting of Kiroba cassava stick stem into the farm Plots done. | 380ha planted cassava | Survey (Planted plot) | Positive cooperation among Head of households |

| Intervention Logic | Objectively verifiable indicators (OVI) | Means of verification | Assumptions/risks |
|--|--|-----------------------|---|
| Objective: 3 Impart cassava best practice to Heads of households and reliable to the Market by the 2013 | | | |
| Output 3: 6,840 tons of cassava harvested and sold | 2,660 tons harvested | Survey and Report | Positive cooperation among Head of households |
| Activities: | | | |
| 3.1: Harvesting of cassava (Kibaha Mango Empire Company Ltd acquires cassava for processing.) | 2,660 tons harvested | Survey and Report | Positive cooperation among Head of households |
| 3.2: Conducting Project Monitoring, and Mid and Annual Project Evaluation | 5 People participated | Evaluation Report | Willingness of members of the Team |

The Logical frame matrix above directs the project implementers through intervention logic and Objective Verifiable Indicators on what to do through reasons. That means by implementing objective one (To sensitize and train 190 head of households on improved cassava production techniques entrepreneurial and business management skills by December 2012.), project implementers expect to have the following output; Members of NgetaVillage council familiarized with the aim of conducting CNA and Project identification. In order to achieve the mentioned output five activities were implemented as mentioned above. The Logical frame matrix also help to track if planned activities implemented at the right way through means of verification.

(ii)Project Inputs

To fulfil the project goal, which is reducing income Poverty and improving living standard of of Ngeta Community some inputs were required. These are financial, material and resource person and services necessary for carrying out activities. Resource Person were CDAC Officers, Extension staff from Kibaha District Council and other development Partners like Tanzania Agriculture Partnership (TAP). Financial resources were used for Capacity building, purchase and haring of project equipments. Normally inputs are supposed to be stated in specific and measurable terms. Details on inputs/resources are as shown on table below.

Table 18: Project Inputs

| Objective | Output | Activity | 2012 | | | | | | | | | | | | 2013 | | | | | | Resources/ Inputs | Responsible people |
|---|--|--|------|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|------|--|--|----------------------|--------------------|
| | | | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | July | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | Jun | July | | | | |
| To sensitize and train 190 head of households on improved cassava production techniques entrepreneurial and business management skills by December 2012 | 1-18 members attend Meeting | 1- To conduct Advocacy Meeting to members of Ngeta Village council | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Personnel, Fund, Stationery | CED student, CDAC Exev. committee members | | |
| | 2-Five needs were mentioned and prioritized. | 2- Conducting Community Needs Assessment. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Personnel, Fund, stationery and transport. | CED student, CDAC members, Focus group discussion. | | |
| | 3-702 Community members sensitised | 3-To conduct one day Sensitization Meeting to Ngeta Community Members | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Personnel, Fund, stationery and transport. | CED student, CDAC members, Village community | | |
| | 4- 19 Farmers facilitated | 4- Capacity building on Cassava agricultural best practices and entrepreneurial and business management skills | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Training Personnel, venue, fund, stationery and transport. | Facilitator, CED student. CDAC | | |

| Objective | Output | Activity | 2012 | | | | | | | | | | | | 2013 | | | | | | Resources/ Inputs | Responsible people |
|--|---|---|------|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|------|---|---|----------------------|--------------------|
| | | | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | July | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | Jun | July | | | | |
| | 5-171 Participants attended the training. | 5- Cassava growing procedure and demonstration training | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Personnel, Fund, trant., Demonstration material | WAE0, CED student, 19 Farmers, CDAC members. | | |
| Raise cultivated area from 0.5 ha per household of the year 2011 to 2 ha per household by the year 2013. | 1-7 ha planted cassava | 1- Preparation and Planting of cassava to Nursery | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Fertilizes, Cassava steam, Tractor | WAE0,CED student CDAC members, Head of household | | |
| | 2- 380ha hollow out | 2- Preparation of farm plot (2 hectares) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Fertilizes, Tractor Cassava steam | CED student CDAC members, Head of household | | |
| | 3- 380ha planted cassava | 3- Planting of Kiroba cassava stick stem into the farm Plots | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Cassava stem | WAE0, CED student CDAC members, Head of household | | |
| Impart cassava best practice to Heads of households and reliable to the Market by the 2013 | 1- 6,840 tons harvested | 1- Harvesting of cassava (Kibaha Mango Empire Company Ltd acquires cassava for processing.) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Hand hoe Fund and transport. | Head of household, WAE0, CED student CDAC members, Head of household. | | |
| | 2-5 People participated | 2- Conducting Project Monitoring | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Fund, stationery and transport. | WAE0, CED student CDAC members, Head | | |

| Objective | Output | Activity | 2012 | | | | | | | | | | | | 2013 | | | | | | Resources/ Inputs | Responsible people | | | | | |
|-----------|--------------------------|---|------|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|------|--|--|----------------------|--------------------|--|--|--|---------------------------------|--|
| | | | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | July | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | Jun | July | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | of household. | |
| | 3- 5 People participated | 3- Conducting Mid and Annual Project Evaluation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Fund, transport and stationery. | WAE0, CED student CDAC members, Head of household. |

(iii) Staffing Pattern

The project would run under the Project Committee elected by Village Meeting with consultation from CDAC Executive Committee. However Project Committee is reporting to Village council. Project Committee led by the Chairperson who would chair the meetings. The Secretary supervises day to day duties including project and keeps all project records. The Treasurer keeps all project financial records. CDAC Executive Committee assigned one staff to advice on day to day duties in collaboration with Ward Agriculture Extension Officer, Staff Pattern are shown on the table below

Staff Pattern

Table 19: Staff Pattern

| Staff Position | Responsibility |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Project Committee - Chairperson | 1- Chair of all Project meetings 2- Supervisor of implementation Plan Schedule 3- Chief spokesperson of the project 4- Submission of quarterly report to Village council. |
| Project Committee - Secretary | 1- Supervises day to day duties 2- keeps all project records 3-Follow up of project inputs to the stakeholders in Collaboration with CDAC officer 4- Direct other Project members on daily duties |
| Project Committee Treasurer | 1- keeps all project financial records 2- Follow up of project inputs/funds from stakeholders in Collaboration with Secretary and CDAC officer |
| Project Committee Members | 1- Project households' supervisors and implementers. |

Ward Agriculture Extension Officer played a big role in running the project by providing the necessary extension and advisory services with regard to agriculture best practice which necessitated in the increase in productivity. The CED student concentrated more on entrepreneurial and business development skills. The Project Committee planned establish Ngeta cassava SACCOS and employ qualified persons who will run the established SACCOS.

4.3.2 Project Budget

Project budget was prepared after preparing project implementation plan which indicated activities, time frame, resources/inputs and responsible people. The total Project Budget was Tsh. 95,318,200/= Out of the total budget Community Contribution was Tsh. 18,560,000/= estimated through work force. Kibaha District Council contributes Tsh. 32,626,200/=. The rest 44,132,000/= was donated by Tanzania Agriculture Partnership through CDAC, actual TAP contribute all material required such as Kiroba Cassava steam, Manure, and Hiring of tractor

Table 20: Project Financial Budget

| Objective | Output | Activity | Resources needed | Days | Quantity | Unity price | Total TZS | |
|--|--|---|------------------------|------|----------|-------------|-----------|--------|
| To sensitize and train 190 head of households on improved cassava production techniques entrepreneurial and business management skills by December 2012. | 1-18 members attend Meeting | 1- To conduct Advocacy Meeting to members of Ngeta Village council | Flip Chart | | 2 | 7,000 | 14,000 | |
| | | | P. Copy papers Ream | | 2 | 6,500 | 12,000 | |
| | | | Marker Pen Box | | 1 | 8,000 | 8,000 | |
| | | | Facilitator Allowances | 1 | 4 | 45,000 | 180,000 | |
| | | | Driver Allowances | | 1 | 30,000 | 30,000 | |
| | | | Fuel lt. | | 50 | 2,200 | 110,000 | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | 2-Five needs were mentioned and prioritized. | 2- Conducting Community Needs Assessment. | Marker Pen Box | | | 5 | 8,000 | 40,000 |
| | | | Flip Chart | | | 8 | 7,000 | 56,000 |
| | | | P. Copy papers Ream | | | 2 | 6,500 | 12,000 |
| | | | Facilitator Allowances | 10 | 3 | 45,000 | 1,350,000 | |
| | | | Driver Allowances | 10 | 1 | 30,000 | 300,000 | |
| | | | Fuel lt. | | 90 | 2,200 | 110,000 | |
| | 3-702 Community members sensitised | 3-To conduct one day Sensitization Meeting to Ngeta Community Members | Flip Chart | | | 2 | 7,000 | 14,000 |
| | | | P. Copy papers Ream | | | 2 | 6,500 | 12,000 |
| | | | Marker Pen Box | | | 1 | 8,000 | 8,000 |
| | | | Facilitator Allowances | 1 | 4 | 45,000 | 180,000 | |
| | | | Driver Allowances | | 1 | 30,000 | 30,000 | |
| | | | Fuel lt. | | 50 | 2,200 | 110,000 | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | 4- 19 Farmers facilitated | 4- Capacity building on Cassava agricultural best | Note Book | | | 20 | 600 | 12,000 |
| Ball pen | | | | | 20 | 300 | 6,000 | |

| Objective | Output | Activity | Resources needed | Days | Quantity | Unity price | Total TZS |
|--|---|--|------------------------|------|----------|-------------|------------|
| | | practices and entrepreneurial and business management skills | Flip Chart | | 4 | 7,000 | 28,000 |
| | | | Soft drink and Snacks | 3 | 24 | 600 | 43,200 |
| | | | Driver Allowances | 3 | 1 | 30,000 | 90,000 |
| | | | Fuel lt. | | 70 | 2,200 | 154,000 |
| | | | Facilitator Allowances | 3 | 3 | 45,000 | 405,000 |
| | | | Lunch | 3 | 24 | 5000 | 360,000 |
| | 5-171 Participants attended the training. | 5- Cassava growing procedure and demonstration training | Hiring of tractor | 1 | 1ha | 60,000 | 60,000 |
| | | | Manure | | 10kg | 2,000 | 20,000 |
| | | | Kiroba Bundle | | 14 | 4000 | 56,000 |
| | | | Facilitator Allowances | 3 | 3 | 45,000 | 405,000 |
| | | | Driver Allowances | 3 | 1 | 30,000 | 90,000 |
| | | | Fuel lt. | | 70 | 2,200 | 154,000 |
| Raise cultivated area from 0.5 ha per household of the year 2011 to 2 ha per household by the year 2013. | 1-7 ha planted cassava | 1- Preparation and Planting of cassava to Nursery | Hiring of tractor | 1 | 7ha | 60,000 | 420,000 |
| | | | Manure | | 70kg | 2,000 | 180,000 |
| | | | Kiroba Bundle | | 98 | 4000 | 392,000 |
| | | | Facilitator Allowances | 3 | 3 | 45,000 | 405,000 |
| | | | Driver Allowances | 3 | 1 | 30,000 | 90,000 |
| | | | Fuel lt. | | 70 | 2,200 | 154,000 |
| | | | Remove of foliage | | 7ha | 100,000 | 700,000 |
| | 2- 380ha hollow out | 2- Preparation of farm plot (2 hectares) | Hiring of tractor | 1 | 380ha | 60,000 | 22,800,000 |
| | | | Manure | | 3,800kg | 2,000 | 7,600,000 |
| | | | Remove of foliage | | 7ha | 100,000 | 700,000 |
| | | | Distribution of Kiroba | 2 | 1 | 30,000 | 60,000 |
| | | | Fuel for distribution | | 100 | 2,200 | 220,000 |

| Objective | Output | Activity | Resources needed | Days | Quantity | Unity price | Total TZS |
|--|--------------------------|---|--|------|----------|-------------|-------------------|
| | | | Allowance -AE Officers | 7 | 10 | 30,000 | 2,100,000 |
| | 3- 380ha planted cassava | 3- Planting of Kiroba cassava stick stem into the farm Plots | Sowing cost | | 380ha | 10,000 | 3,800,000 |
| | | | Weeding | | 380ha | 15,000 | 5,700,000 |
| Impart cassava best practice to Heads of households and reliable to the Market by the 2013 | 1- 2,660 tons harvested | 1- Harvesting of cassava (Kibaha Mango Empire Company Ltd acquires cassava for processing.) | Harvesting cost | | 380ha | 20,000 | 7,600,000 |
| | | | Transportation cost | | 714 | 50,000 | 35,700,000 |
| | | | | | | | |
| | 2-5 People participated | 2- Conducting Project Monitoring | CED student, CDAC member, WAEO, | 7 | 3 | 45,000 | 945,000 |
| | | | Driver Allowances | 7 | 1 | 30,000 | 210,000 |
| | | | Fuel lt. | | 70 | 2,200 | 154,000 |
| | | | 3 members of village council and Chairperson of Project committee. | 7 | 4 | 10,000 | 280,000 |
| | 3- 5 People participated | 3- Conducting Mid and Annual Project Evaluation | CED student, CDAC member, WAEO, | 3 | 3 | 45,000 | 405,000 |
| | | | Driver Allowances | 3 | 1 | 30,000 | 90,000 |
| | | | Fuel lt. | | 70 | 2,200 | 154,000 |
| GRAND TOTAL | | | | | | | 95,318,200 |

(i) Project Implementation

This section describing of actually implemented project activities started at March 2012. The implemented activities were among those which were planned during project design phase. Many of the planned activities were actually implemented as reflected in the implementation plan. This part is divided into two major subsections; project implementation report and the project implementation Gantt chart which shows when the actual implementation of activities happened and for how long.

(ii) Project Implementation Report

Actual execution of the project started in March 2012 by the CED Student in collaboration with target group Farmers (Head of Households) and CDAC Members having prepared the process as it can be seen in the Project Plan. The Project implementation was done base on three aspects, which is sensitization and training to 190 head of households on improved cassava production techniques, entrepreneurial and business management skills. To rise cultivated area from 0.5 ha per household of the year 2011 to 2 ha per household by the year 2013 and Impart cassava best practice to Heads of households and reliable to the Market by the 2013. The following activities have been conducted and some have been accomplished and some are still going on.

Through aspect one of sensitization and training to 190 head of households, meeting was conducted to 18 members out 25 members of Ngeta Village council as part of familiarization aimed at conducting CAN and project identification. After blessing of Village council, Community Needs Assessment was conducted was conducted. Major task implemented was selection of focus Group discussion, collection of basic information data, focus Group discussion and Pair wise ranking where 5 needs were mentioned and prioritized. Project Design and budgeting was done.

Awareness to Ngeta Community on improved Cassava production was done by one day Sensitization Meeting about the Project where 702 Community members attended meeting. In the meeting 19 lead Farmers were selected to attend training on Cassava agricultural best practices and entrepreneurial and business management skills. Three days training was conducted to 19 lead Farmers on Cassava agricultural best practices and entrepreneurial and business management skill. Methods of training used are Lecture, Brainstorming, Discussion, Case Study and Demonstration. As per project plan 19 farmers each of them train other 10 Head of households on cassava growing procedure which make the total number of those who trained 190 with assistance from WAEO, CDAC Officer and CED Student. Training based on Cassava growing procedure.

As strategy to raise cultivated area from 0.5 ha per household of the year 2011 to 2 ha per household by the year 2013, Preparation of 7ha for nursery by remove of foliage and Planting of cassava to nursery was done. The CED student in collaboration with CDAC members and other stakeholders like Tanzania Agriculture Partnership participated in all arrangement of project take off. Monitoring of day to day was conducted to by project committee. The CED student, CDAC member, WAEO, 3 members of Village council and Chairperson of Project committee conducted monitoring once after every two month. Normally Evaluation is meant to measure long term impact and sustainability in terms of achievement of purpose and goal, evaluation was carried during May 2013 (Midterm) aimed at assessing the ongoing project activities and provide information to improve the project.

Project Objective and planned activities were done accordingly expect two activities that is harvesting of cassava which will be done at June, 2013 and Annual Evaluation. All two activities will successful implemented due to skills obtained during training. Training to

Farmers (Head of households) on Cassava agricultural best practices and entrepreneurial and business management skills will contribute to the success of the Project as well as Contribution from stakeholders such as Kibaha District Council and Tanzania Agriculture Partnership. The beneficiaries are expected to harvest 2,660 tons of cassava of which some will be reserved for home consumption and others will be sold to Kibaha Mango Empire Company Ltd.



Figure 1 Ngeta Village Cassava Nursery

In Objective two activity number one is Preparation and Planting of cassava to Nursery, which was done in April and early May according to implementation plan. Cassava seen on picture was used as cassava stick stem during farm Plots planting where 7ha planted. Standing in front is senior Agriculture Officer from Kibaha District Council when checking if cassava steams are ready for Plot planting.



Figure 2 Ngeta Village Project Committee Members

Seen on picture above are Project Committee elected by Village Meeting to Supervises day to day duties and making follow up of required resources/ inputs with consultation from CDAC Executive Committee. Project Committee is responsible to Village council. Project Committee led by the Chairperson who would chair the meetings. The Secretary supervises day to day duties and the Treasurer who keeps all project financial records.



Figure 3 Head of Households Training at Ngeta Village

Among the Project objective is to sensitize and train head of households on improved cassava production techniques entrepreneurial and business management skills. Above picture shows head of households listen one of the topic from Ward Agriculture extension Officer Mr. Msangi, training was conducted in three days to one of Ngeta Primary class room. 19 head of households were attended participated full.

CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 PARTICIPATORY MONITORING, EVALUATION AND SUSTAINABILITY

5.1 Introduction

This chapter explains the participatory monitoring, evaluation and sustainability for the improved cassava production in Ngeta village. The first section covers participatory monitoring which explains as being a systematic and continuous, sometimes periodic collection of data as specified in the related indicator of a specific activity/action planned in a project. Whereas Evaluation is a process of gathering and analysing information in order to determine if the project is implemented according to planned objectives and activities and the extent to which the project has achieved its stated objectives through activities. Without monitoring and evaluation, it would be impossible to judge if work was going in the right direction, whether progress and success could be claimed, and how future efforts might be improved. While project sustainability is the ability of the project to generate the required results after the project has come to an end or after the project sponsors have finished their duty of financing or providing technical assistance to the project.

5.2 Participatory Monitoring

The objective of conducting participatory monitoring was to gather information on all aspect of activities that involve Ngeta Farmers in project implementation. It was done by analysing the current situation, identifying problems and finding solutions to problems, keeping project activities on schedule, measuring project progress towards success and formulating and making decision. Participatory monitoring method used as the major tool and approach in all levels of monitoring. It was done using the set indicators in the logical

framework matrix. Through Monitoring beneficiaries easily identify failure and success of the project.

Monitoring was based on assessing relevance of the project; do the project/activities attend to its broader development objective, Effectiveness and Efficiency; to prove whether activities of the project have been achieved and within optimum use of the resources and time. Sustainability of the project was assessed, project members plan to establish SACCOS to have savings and credit services, they also plan to have cassava processing machine which it helps to increase their income

Monitoring was conducted to every second week of the second month basing on monitoring tools developed and verifiable indicators such as Number of meetings held, Number of Community Needs Assessment meetings held with the community, Number of trainings, type of training and number of participants who attended, Area cultivate, Application and quantity of manure, Cost and expenditure, Tools and equipment received

5.2.1 Information System

This section explain a system which was designed to collect and report information on project activities to enable the researcher/supervisor to plan, monitor, evaluate and report the operations and performance of the project. For this project the Monitoring Information System was prepared through a consultative process that involved among other stakeholders; Kibaha District Council, Tanzania Agriculture Partnership, Kibaha Mango Empire Company Ltd and others Ward Agriculture Extension Officer and CED student and CDAC. Information required was Work plan/activities, Cost and expenditure, staff and supervisor knowledge, commodities, tools and equipment. Area cultivated application and quantity of manure and finally results

5.2.2 Participatory Monitoring Methods/Tools

Three participatory methods were applied in monitoring the project implementation. These are structured interviews, direct observation, Focus Group Discussion. Structured interviews were used to gather information about area cultivate, application of manure and other information regarding to weeding and cassava treatment. Observation is a classical method of social science inquiry where eyes were used rather than ears in observing and noting how farmers (head of households) prepare their plots, the way cassava grow as well as observing application of manure those issues was recorded accordingly.

Focus Group Discussion was applied by involving a small group of only 8 people in discussing issues related to project performance in detail and were allowed to talk freely. Facilitation skills were taken applied by the CED student that an individual should not dominate the discussion. Participants group were freely talking from their experiences.

(i) Monitoring Tools

The main monitoring tool was the Project Work-plan, Monitoring Plan and the Project Budget. The monitoring exercise was also done through review of reports, which provided relevant monitoring information.

(ii) Sampling and Sample Size

In this monitoring exercise non probability (deliberate/purposive) sampling was applied where 29 stakeholders were interviewed 13 heads of Households and others 16 whereby four people selected from members of Village council, four from project committee and sixteen people from beneficiaries which interviewed and others form 4 focus group discussion. Monitoring was conducted by Monitoring was conducted by CED student,

CDAC member, WAEO, 3 members of village council and Chairperson of Project committee.

(iii) Monitoring Findings and Results

Information gathered during the monitoring process was keeping on record book processed, analysed and compared to different responses and information gathered. The data was used to see whether the planned activities of the project were going well and challenges encountered during implementation and what action should be taken to overcome those challenges.

5.2.3 Participatory Monitoring Plan

Table 22: Participatory Monitoring Plan

| Objectives | Output | Activities | Indicators | Data source | Methods/Tools | Person responsible | Time frame |
|--|--|---|--|------------------------------|---|---|------------|
| To sensitize and train 190 head of households on improved cassava production techniques entrepreneurial and business management skills by December 2012. | 1-18 members attend Meeting | 1- To conduct Advocacy Meeting to members of Ngeta Village council | List of attendants | CDAC Project progress report | Meeting CED student, CDAC member and WAEO, Project Committee members | CED student, CDAC member, LGA Officer | March 2012 |
| | 2-Five needs were mentioned and prioritized. | 2- Conducting Community Needs Assessment. | CNA reports, | CDAC Project progress report | Observation, FGD, Interviews, | CED student | March 2012 |
| | 3-702 Community members sensitised | 3-To conduct one day Sensitization Meeting to Ngeta Community Members | List of attendants, List of 19 farmers elected | CDAC Project progress report | Meeting | CED student, CDAC Officer and WAEO, LGA Officer | Apr 2012 |

| Objectives | Output | Activities | Indicators | Data source | Methods/Tools | Person responsible | Time frame |
|---|---|--|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|-------------------|
| | 4- 19 Farmers facilitated | 4- Capacity building on Cassava agricultural best practices and entrepreneurial and business management skills | List of Participants, Training Report | CDAC Project progress report | Lecture, Group Discussion, Demonstration. | CED student, CDAC Officer and WAEO, LGA Officer | Apr 2012 |
| | 5-171 Participants attended the training. | 5- Cassava growing procedure and demonstration training | List of Participants, Training Report | CDAC Project progress report | Group Discussion, Demonstration. | CED student, CDAC Officer and WAEO, LGA Officer, Project Committee members | Apr 2012 |
| Raise cultivated area from 0.5 ha per household of the year 2011 to | 1-7 ha planted cassava | 1- Preparation and Planting of cassava to Nursery | Number of hectors planted | CDAC Project progress report | Observation | Head of Households CED student, CDAC Officer and WAEO, LGA Officer, Project Committee members | Apr 2012 |

| Objectives | Output | Activities | Indicators | Data source | Methods/Tools | Person responsible | Time frame |
|--|--------------------------|---|--|------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------|
| 2 ha per household by the year 2013. | 2- 380ha hollow out | 2- Preparation of farm plot (2 hectares) | Number of hectors planted | CDAC Project progress report | Observation | Head of Households CED student, CDAC Officer and WAEO, LGA Officer, Project Committee members | June 2012 |
| | 3- 380ha planted cassava | 3- Planting of Kiroba cassava stick stem into the farm Plots | Number of hectors planted | CDAC Project progress report | Observation | Head of Households CED student, CDAC Officer and WAEO, LGA Officer, Project Committee members | Nov. 2012 |
| Impart cassava best practice to Heads of households and reliable to the Market by the 2013 | 1- 6,840 tons harvested | 1- Harvesting of cassava (Kibaha Mango Empire Company Ltd acquires cassava for processing.) | Tons Harvested | CDAC Project progress report | Observation | Head of Households CED student, CDAC Officer and WAEO, LGA Officer, Project Committee members | June 2013 |
| | 2-5 People participated | 2- Conducting Project Monitoring | Number of Monitoring conducted, List of participants | CDAC Project progress report | Interviews, Observation, Focus Group Discussion | CED student, CDAC Officer and WAEO, LGA Officer, Project Committee members | From Apr 2012 on wads |

| Objectives | Output | Activities | Indicators | Data source | Methods/Tools | Person responsible | Time frame |
|-------------------|--------------------------|---|--|------------------------------|---|---|-------------------|
| | 3- 5 People participated | 3- Conducting Mid and Annual Project Evaluation | Number of Evaluation conducted, List of participants | CDAC Project progress report | Participatory Evaluation (Group Discussion) | CED student, CDAC Officer and WAEO, LGA Officer, Project Committee members Stakeholders | July 2013 |

5.3 Participatory Evaluation

Participatory evaluation is the collective examination and assessment of a programme or project by the stakeholders and beneficiaries. Participatory evaluations are reflective, action-oriented and seek to build capacity. Whereas evaluation in general is an assessment at one point in time that concentrates specifically on whether the objectives of the project have been achieved and what impact has been made. In participatory evaluation, stakeholders assume an increased role in the evaluation process as question-makers, evaluation planners, data gatherers and problem solvers. Because evaluation has important capacity development and learning dimensions, decisions about who is involved and to what degree will impact upon the results. In general the greater the level of involvement the more likely it is that evaluative knowledge will be used.

Evaluation was conducted September 2012 (mid way) and Annual Evaluation were planned to be conducted July 2013. Mid Evaluation were involved The CED student, CDAC Officers, leaders of Project Committee, Officers from Kibaha District Council and officer from Tanzania Agriculture Partnership. Evaluation were based to assess the extent to which the project objectives were realized, to assess the extent to which people's expectations were fulfilled and Suggest ways for improvement.

5.3.1 Performance Indicators

Indicators are variables that show the extent of change that resulted from the project. They help to measure quantity, quality and timeliness against what was planned. They measure progress in achieving outputs and outcomes. They show relevance, performance and effectiveness of the project as well as progress towards meeting its outputs and outcomes. Project goals and Project objectives performance indicators were developed as shown in Table 23.

Table 23: Performance Indicators

| Objectives | Output | Activities | Resources Needed | Performance Indicators |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| To sensitize and train 190 head of households on improved cassava production techniques entrepreneurial and business management skills by December 2012. | 1-18 members attend Meeting | 1- To conduct Advocacy Meeting to members of Ngeta Village council | Stationary, Allowances Facilitator | Number of members attended |
| | 2-Five needs were mentioned and prioritized. | 2- Conducting Community Needs Assessment. | Stationary, Allowances Facilitator | Needs were prioritized. 1. Improved agriculture production 2. Food security 3. Access to clean and safe water 4. Good health 5. Environmental protection, |
| | 3-702 Community members sensitised | 3-To conduct one day Sensitization Meeting to Ngeta Community Members | Stationary, Allowances Facilitator | Percentage of Community Members attended meeting |
| | 4- 19 Farmers facilitated | 4- Capacity building on Cassava agricultural best practices and entrepreneurial and business management skills | Stationary, Allowances Facilitator, Soft drink and snacks | Number of Trainees attended training |
| | 5-171 Participants attended the training. | 5- Cassava growing procedure and demonstration training | Demonstration Plot Tractor, Manure (Miyingu), Kiroba Bundle, Facilitator, Allowances | Number Participants attended the training. |

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|---|---|--|
| Raise cultivated area from 0.5 ha per household of the year 2011 to 2 ha per household by the year 2013. | 1-7 ha planted cassava | 1- Preparation and Planting of cassava to Nursery | Demonstration Plot Tractor, Manure (Miyingu), Kiroba Bundle, Facilitator, Allowances , Fuel | Number of hectors planted |
| | 2- 380ha hollow out | 2- Preparation of farm plot (2 hectares) | Tractor, Agriculture Extension Officer | Number of hectors of cultivated |
| | 3- 380ha planted cassava | 3- Planting of Kiroba cassava stick stem into the farm Plots | Manure (Miyingu), Kiroba Bundle, Facilitator, Allowances , Agriculture Extension Officer Fuel, | Number of hectors planted |
| Impart cassava best practice to Heads of households and reliable to the Market by the 2013 | 1- 2,660 tons harvested | 1- Harvesting of cassava (Kibaha Mango Empire Company Ltd acquires cassava for processing.) | Transport | Household demand for cassava markets rises |
| | 2-5 People participated | 2- Conducting Project Monitoring | Allowances, Fuel | Number of Monitoring conducted, |
| | 3- 5 People participated | 3- Conducting Mid and Annual Project Evaluation | Allowances, Fuel | Number of Evaluation conducted, |

From the performance indicator table above, there are link between Project Objective Output, activities to be implemented, and Resources Needed. If resources requested at the right time and used effectively then output will be seen and Objective will be achieved.

During Monitoring and Evaluation Participants were referring Output and performance indicators to check whether they are in truck or not.

5.3.2 Participatory Evaluation Methodology

(i) Evaluation Methods /Tools Used

Participatory Rural Appraisal was used during the project midterm evaluation exercise conducted in September 2012; specifically the following data collection methods were used Structured-Interviews, Participatory Observations, Focus Group Discussions and Documentary and Records Review. While meetings, checklists, effective listening, group discussions, and appreciative inquiry and review of monitoring reports, Project Committee minutes were the major evaluation tools applied during the midterm evaluation exercise.

5.4 Project Evaluation Summary

During evaluation three major project objectives were examined using several performance indicators for each objective. Expected outcomes and actual outcomes were also examined and noted in detail during the midterm evaluation exercise which was conducted in September 2012. Below here find the table which presents the evaluation summary.

Table 24: Project Evaluation Summary

| Project objectives | Output | Activities | Performance Indicators | Expected Outcomes | Actual Outcomes |
|---|--|--|--|---|---|
| 1 To sensitize and train 190 head of households on improved cassava production techniques | 1-18 members attend Meeting | 1- To conduct Advocacy Meeting to members of Ngeta Village council | Number of members attended | Positive responses, Cassava production improved | Out of 25 Members 18 members of Ngeta Village council attended. |
| entrepreneurial and business management skills by December 2012. | 2-Five needs were mentioned and prioritized. | 2- Conducting Community Needs Assessment. | Needs were prioritized. 1. Improved agriculture production 2. Food security 3. Access to clean and safe water 4. Good health | project Identified | 5 needs prioritized |

| | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|--|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | 5. Environmental protection, | | |
| | 3-702 Community members sensitised | 3-To conduct one day Sensitization Meeting to Ngeta Community Members | Percentage of Community Members attended meeting | Positive responses, Cassava production improved | 702 Community members trained |
| | 4- 19 Farmers facilitated | 4- Capacity building on Cassava agricultural best practices and entrepreneurial and business management skills | Number of Trainees attended training | Improved knowledge on cassava production techniques and proper entrepreneurial and business management | 19 Farmers trained |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| | 5-171 Participants attended the training. | 5- Cassava growing procedure and demonstration training | Number Participants attended the training. | Improved knowledge on cassava production techniques and proper entrepreneurial and business management | 171 Farmers (Head of households) trained |
| Raise cultivated area from 0.5 ha per household of the year 2011 to 2 ha per household by the year 2013. | 1-7 ha planted cassava | 1- Preparation and Planting of cassava to Nursery | Number of hectors planted | Improved cassava kiroba stem | 7 ha planted |
| | 2- 380ha hollow out | 2- Preparation of farm plot (2 hectares) | Number of hectors of cultivated | practice effectively skills and knowledge on cassava production | 380ha hollow out |
| | 3- 380ha planted cassava | 3- Planting of Kiroba cassava stick stem into the farm Plots | Number of hectors planted | practice effectively skills and knowledge on cassava production | 380ha planted |

| | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|---|---------------------------------|---|---|
| Impart cassava best practice to Heads of households and reliable to the Market by the 2013 | 1- 2,660 tons harvested | 1- Harvesting of cassava (Kibaha Mango Empire Company Ltd acquires cassava for processing.) | Number tons Harvested | practice effectively skills and knowledge on cassava production | Tons of cassava harvested, Increased of income |
| | 2- 5People participated | 2- Conducting Project Monitoring | Number of Monitoring conducted, | Positive responses | Implementation follow working plan |
| | 3- 5 People participated | 3- Conducting Mid and Annual Project Evaluation | Number of Evaluation conducted, | Positive responses | Implementation follow working plan and new thinking developed |

5.4.1 Project Sustainability

Sustainability refers to durability of positive programme or project results after the termination of the technical cooperation channeled through that programme or project. It is the ability of the project to generate the required results after the project itself has come to end or after the project sponsors have finished their duty of financing or providing technical assistance. Therefore a sustainable project is one that can deliver benefits to the target group for an extended period of time after the main assistance from a donor has come to end. Sustainability means more than just development activities that are environmentally sensitive, it implies that the project would lead to improvements that will persist and spread beyond the project boundary and time span and not create dependency. However it is very important to for CBO/NGO to develop its own definition of sustainability, the organisation link of its own context, focus and the state of affairs.

5.4.2 Institutional Sustainability

The sustainability of improved cassava project is most likely to be sustainable since human resources Project committee, Head of Households, extension staff and Kibaha LGA staffs are available ready for implementation. The beneficiaries have agreed to contribute 15% of their income after sold cassava which will be used for buy material next season. Beneficiaries also plan to establish SACCOS and to buy processing machine which help to increase income and make project sustainable. Capacity bulging done on improved cassava production techniques entrepreneurial and business management skills which help beneficiaries to improve production as well as to be committed of what they are doing being the case project sustainability. In view of that it is expected that the project will get full support of the Community members bearing in mind that they are the primary beneficiaries of project. In addition Community participation in Identifying,

planning, implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation is the key issues that creates sense of ownership that leads to sustainability of the project

5.4.3 Financial /Economic Sustainability

The project started by support from Kibaha LGA where contributed Tsh. 32,626,200/= and Tanzania Agriculture Partnership of Ts. 44, 132,000/=. Next season expenses, project will not depend from the above mentioned institutions, the growing demand of cassava products is an obvious positive indicator of the project sustainability. Income from the project will ensure sustainability of the project because the income will finance different project material such as manure and Kiroba cassava steam.

The project committee is thinking of establishing a SACCOS, it is through this scheme that project members would raise funds to purchase processing machine which help to increase income and make project sustainable.

5.4.4 Political Sustainability

The Councillors of Kibaha District Council, Management team, The Ngeta village leadership which includes Chairperson, Village Executive Officer and the Village Council in totality collectively support the project as it would the source of helping the community at in the village. However Tanzania Agriculture Partnership supported the project because the Project supports National Strategy for Growth and reduction of Poverty II.

CHAPTER SIX

6.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the conclusion and recommendations and the way forward towards the project being under taken by Community Development Agenda Countrywide (CDAC) at Ngeta Village, Kibaha District, Coast Region. This conclusion summarizes the findings of the participatory needs assessment, literature review, reasons which guided the choice of the project, the report on the project implementation. This chapter also shows the summary of the findings of the project participatory monitoring, evaluation and the sustainability plan and description of the outcomes that may be expected if the project is successfully completed.

6.2 Conclusion

Participatory Needs Assessment conducted in March 2012 in Ngeta Village, Kikongo ward, Kibaha District, Coast Region. The assessment was carried by using participatory methodologies such as Focused Group Discussions, Interview and Observations. Research tools used are Questions, Discussion Guide, and Interview guide. The findings of community needs assessment created a base for identification of problems facing Ngeta Village Community. This information is very important in setting grounds for a successful CED project planning, implementation, management and sustainability.

Community needs prioritization was conducted through Pair wise ranking. Five priority needs were noted as follows; Improved agriculture production to address the income poverty was ranked as the first, followed by Food security; Access to clean and safe water; Good health and lastly was Environmental protection

From the literature review it was learned that in some African countries, cassava is being more and more perceived not only as a food security crop, but also as a raw material for various types of industries. Cassava can be converted into a large number of products ranging from traditional and novel food products, to livestock feeds, ethanol and starch and its numerous derivatives.

However, in Tanzania cassava is still perceived as a food security crop rather than a raw material for other industries. Cassava contributes to an average of 15% in the national food production basket and is second to maize, which is the leading staple food crop for many Tanzanians (Mtambo, 2007). Moreover, for countries where majority of the people still live below the poverty line as Tanzania (ASDS, 2001), cassava could be used to bridge the income poverty gap.

The reasons which guide the choice of the Project are findings of community needs assessment and result of Community needs prioritization where low agricultural production to address the income poverty was ranked as the first. However as per community needs assessment findings about 65 percent of Ngeta community engaged in farming, as a major source of income while 60 percent cultivate cassava. Moreover, for countries where majority of the people still live below the poverty line as Tanzania (ASDS, 2001), cassava could be used to bridge the income gaps. Therefore the project chosen is improving Community livelihoods through improved Cassava production.

Actual execution of the project started in March 2012 by the CED Student in collaboration with target group Farmers (Head of Households) and CDAC Members having prepared the process as it can be seen in the Project Plan. The Project implementation was done base on three aspects, which is sensitization and training to 190 head of households on

improved cassava production techniques, entrepreneurial and business management skills. To rise cultivated area from 0.5 ha per household of the year 2011 to 2 ha per household by the year 2013 and Ensuring cassava best practice to Heads of households and reliable to the Market by the year 2013.

The project was implemented successfully, where all Project Objective and planned activities were done accordingly expect two activities that is harvesting of cassava which will be done at June, 2013 and Annual Evaluation. All two activities will successful implemented due to skills obtained during training. Training to Farmers (Head of households) on Cassava agricultural best practices and entrepreneurial and business management skills will contribute to the success of the Project as well as Contribution from stakeholders such as Kibaha District Council and Tanzania Agriculture Partnership. The beneficiaries are expected to harvest 2,660 tons of cassava of which some will be reserved for home consumption and others will be sold to Kibaha Mango Empire Company Ltd.

Monitoring was conducted to every second week of the second month basing on monitoring method, tools developed and verifiable indicators. Three participatory methods were applied in monitoring the project implementation. These are structured interviews, direct observation, Focus Group Discussion. Verifiable indicators used are Number of meetings held, Number of Community Needs Assessment meetings held with the community, Number of trainings, type of training and number of participants who attended, Area cultivated, Application and quantity of manure, Cost and expenditure, and Tools and equipment received. There was no something bad which hinder working plan rather than Kiroba steam used to the Nursery was provided late four days by Tanzania

Agriculture Partnership but that was not affect the work plan since we used one weekend to fill the gap.

Evaluation was conducted September 2012 (mid way) and Annual Evaluation were planned to be conducted July 2013. Mid Evaluation were involved The CED student, CDAC Officers, leaders of Project Committee, Officers from Kibaha District Council and officer from Tanzania Agriculture Partnership. Evaluation were based to assess the extent to which the project objectives were realized, to assess the extent to which people's expectations were fulfilled and Suggest ways for improvement.

So far no unexpected occurrences which could greatly affect the ability to complete the project and achieve the overarching goal and the specific project objectives. However the project anticipates achieving specific objectives on successful completion of improved Cassava production project. Heads of households practiced cassava production techniques of which 380 ha planted cassava, moreover after cassava harvesting and sold to Kibaha Mango Empire Company Ltd income will be increased as the result standard of living improved as they will afford to access basic needs.

6.3 Recommendations

The following are recommendations concerning the experience gained out of conducting the project titled 'Improving Community Livelihoods through Improved Cassava Production. Participatory Assessment should be conducted before undertaking any development project. It was realized that Participatory methodologies and Research tools if are used effectively, then Community or beneficiaries creates sense of project ownership, we feeling, togetherness, and Cooperation. Participatory Assessment also creates a room for local people and Stakeholders to plan together.

Community needs prioritization was conducted through Pair wise ranking. Five priority needs were noted as follows; Improved agriculture production to address the income poverty was ranked as the first, followed by Food security; Access to clean and safe water; Good health and lastly was Environmental protection. Low agriculture production as the major community problem is caused by so many factors such as lack of appropriate farming implements, planting material and Small area of cultivation. Improved Cassava production Project will improve Ngeta Community livelihood but Cassava chain should be accomplished by established other branches of project such as Processing machine and credit Association so as maximise profit.

In order to create Project destiny to the Community or beneficiaries, the Project design should be done immediately after prioritizing the community need starting with stakeholder analysis, logical framework analysis and project implementation which involve activity planning and shows who will do what, when to do, types of inputs needed. Literature review shows that Government recognise cassava as a food security crop, but little or no effort has been done to commercialize it. As a result cassava production in Tanzania is generally characterized by low yields and low marketable surplus. In order to improve this situation the Government should do the following;

- i. Promote Group or individual smallholder cassava farmers and s policy directives so that they can be in a position to produce in large quantity.
- ii. Create Market opportunities
- iii. Investment into cassava micro-processing as well as encouraging both small and large-scale processing industries.
- iv. Direct involve in the promotion of the cassava subsector and sometimes policy directives enhance development of Cassava.

The researcher used four methods during data collection. All applied methods were most appropriate as they assisted the researcher and community members to easily identify the community need that led to project design and implementation. Among the best methods used include Interview and the Focus Group Discussions. Through using interview, it was easier to cross check answerers by twisting question. Focus Group Discussions is the best since members of the group can challenge themselves and rich to consensuses through facilitation skills. Data collected was very useful during Focus Group Discussions.

REFERENCES

- Abele, S. and Twine E, Ntawuruhunga P. (2007). Development and dissemination of improved cassava varieties in Uganda: Analysis of adoption rates, variety attributes and speed of adoption, AAAE Conference proceedings (2007) 479-482.
- ASDS. (2001). Agricultural Sector Development Strategy. Taking account of rural development in public expenditure management – the case of Tanzania. United Republic of Tanzania. 97pp.
- Bell, J. (1992). Doing your research project, Milton Keynes: Open University Press, Uk.
- Goetz and Lecompte (1984), Methods of social sciences Research, London, Macmillan publishers.
- Bell, J. (1993). Doing Research in Education and Social sciences, London: St Edmundsbury Co. Ltd.
- Cassava/ Sorghum with other cereal and tubers*. Held at Kibaha from 13 -14 December 2007.
- CEDPA (1994), Project Design for Program Managers; Conducting a Workshop on Planning Community Based Projects; *The CEDPA Training Manual Series, Volume N.W*, 11.The Centre for Development and Population Activities,1400 Sixteenth Street Suite 100, Washington, DC 20036, USA.
- Kothari R.C (1990) Research Methodology, Methods and Techniques, 2nd Ed, New Delhi: International Printing limited.
- Kothari R.C (1990) Research Methodology, Methods and Techniques, New Delhi: Wishwa Prakashan.
- Lekule, F.P and Sarwatt, S.V. (2004). Processing and utilization of cassava for livestock feed in Tanzania. [<http://www.fao.org/>]. Site visited on 11/03/2012.

- Mtambo, K. B. (2007). Status and potential of cassava and sorghum in food blending. In: Mulwa, F.W (2008) *Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation of Community Projects*; 1st Edition; Pauline Publications, Africa, Nairobi-Kenya.
- Mutabazi, K., Mdoe, N. et al. (2008). Unlocking market opportunities for small scale cassava farmers in Tanzania. In: *Proceedings of the Cassava value chain and mapping workshop*, 9th October, 2008, SUA, Morogoro, Tanzania.
- Nang'ayo F, Omanyua G, et al. (2007). A strategy for industrialization of cassava in Africa. In: *Proceedings of a small group meeting*, 14–18 November 2005, Ibadan, Nigeria. Nairobi, Kenya: African Agricultural Technology Foundation, 25pp.
- Nweke F.I. (2003). New challenges in cassava transformation in Nigeria and Ghana. In Went, IFPRI, NEPAD, CTA Conference. Success of African agriculture, Pretoria 1-3, December, 2003. 166pp.
- Proceedings of the National Stakeholder's Workshop on Blending Technologies for*
- Silayo, V.C.K. Mpagalile, J. et al. (2004). Processing and utilization of cassava. Swahili monograph. TAPRIISUA project. 33pp.
- Silayo, V.C.K., Laswai, H.S. et al. (2006). "The status of cassava production, utilization, processing and marketing in Tongwe, Kabuku, Chanika and Mikongeni villages. In: *Proceedings of the First Annual PANTIL research workshop*. (Edited by Kinabo, L.D.B. and Abel, W.S.), 25-27 September 2006, Morogoro, Tanzania. 220-226pp.
- UNIDO (2006), Master plan on cassava development in Nigeria. Abuja, Nigeria.
- URT (2005). Crop and Livestock Private Sector Development (Mainland). NEPAD–CAADP Bankable Investment Profile.
- URT (2008). *Agricultural Sector Reforms in Tanzania: Perspectives from Within*. Government Printers

URT (2009) Kibaha District Socio – Economic Profile Dar es Salaam: Government Printers.

URT/WB (2000) *Tanzania Agriculture: Performance and Strategies for Sustainable Growth*

Van der Land and Uliwa. (2007). Cassava Sub Sector Value Chain Analysis, Match Maker

World Bank (2000) Agriculture in Tanzania since 1986: Follower or Leader in Growth.

World Bank/IFPRI, Washington DC.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Semi Structured Questionnaire

Q 1: Gender

- (1) Male..... (2) Female.....

Q 2: Education level of the respondent.

- (1) Primary (2) Secondary(3) Technical/ Vocation
(4) College..... (5) Higher Education

Q 3: Major community needs in the village?

Q 4: What is your average monthly income?

- (1) Less than Tshs.39, 999..... (2) Between Tshs 40,000 and 79,000.....
(2) Between Tshs 80,000 and 100,000..... (4) More than Tshs 100,000.....

Q 5: Major sources of livelihood.

- (1)Farming and Business..... (2) Farming..... (3) Livestock keeping.....
(4) Business.....(5)Employment.....

Q 6: If farming what type of crop are to be improved by community in the village? If others, mention.

Q. 7: What are the areas that household grow

Q. 8: Mention the major use of crop as mentioned on question 6 (depend with question 6)

Q.9: How to improve the identified situation.

THANK YOU FOR LISTENING

Appendix ii: Interview Guide

INTERVIEW GUIDE TO GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

DATE OF INTERVIEW ____/____/2013 PLACE OF INTERVIEW _____

1. Is there any program me which support the Micro Enterprises?
2. What kind of support?
3. How many CBO's are dealing with income generating activities?
4. What is the percentage of CBO poorly performing in IGA?
5. What are the reasons for poorly performing?
6. What measures do the Kibaha LGA and other Stakeholders take to support the CBO's entrepreneurial operations or Community livelihoods
7. What measures have been taken to improve the Major source of income?
8. Suggest measures to improve Community livelihoods