

The Farmer Group Empowerment (FGE) Component of the Land Management and Conservation Farming Programme in Zambia

Patrick M. Chibbamulilo

Department for Africa

The Farmer Group Empowerment (FGE) Component of the Land Management and Conservation Farming Programme in Zambia

Patrick M. Chibbamulilo

Sida Evaluation 05/12

Department for Africa

This report is part of *Sida Evaluations*, a series comprising evaluations of Swedish development assistance. Sida's other series concerned with evaluations, Sida Studies in Evaluation, concerns methodologically oriented studies commissioned by Sida. Both series are administered by the Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit, an independent department reporting directly to Sida's Board of Directors.

This publication can be downloaded/ordered from:
<http://www.sida.se/publications>

Author: Patrick M. Chibbamulilo.

The views and interpretations expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, Sida.

Sida Evaluation 05/12
Commissioned by Sida, Department for Africa

Copyright: Sida and the author

Date of Final Report: December 2002
Printed by Edita Communication AB, 2005
Art. no. Sida4772en
ISBN 91-586-8672-X
ISSN 1401—0402

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY
Address: SE-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Sveavägen 20, Stockholm
Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64
E-mail: sida@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to thank the members of the Orgut Consulting at the Programme Support Office (PSO) for their support and advice through out the course of the study. They contributed to the study through their comments and logistical support. Gratitude is further extended to the Provincial Advisors and Coordinators of the LM & CF Programme who provided data and assisted the research teams in the provinces. Last, but not, least the author is indebted to all those, including farmers and camp officers, that took part in the study at district level, but too many to mention.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	I
LIST OF APENDICES	VI
LIST OF ACRONYMS.....	VI
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	VII
CHAPTER ONE.....	1
1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 BACKGROUND.....	1
1.2 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY.....	2
1.3 OUTLINE OF THE REPORT.....	2
CHAPTER TWO	3
2.0 AN OVERVIEW OF THE FARMER GROUP EMPOWERMENT COMPONENT OF THE LM &CF PROGRAMME.....	3
2.1 INTRODUCTION.....	3
2.2 STRATEGIES (SUB –COMPONENTS) THE FGE PROJECT.....	4
2.2.1 <i>Facilitation Training</i>	4
2.2.2 <i>Gender</i>	4
2.2.3 <i>Participatory Monitoring and Reporting</i>	5
2.2.4 <i>Leadership Development</i>	5
2.2.5 <i>Information, Communication and Advocacy</i>	6
2.2.6 <i>Mainstreaming of HIV/ AIDS</i>	6
2.3 TARGETING OF THE FGE COMPONENT	6
2.3.1 <i>Target Groups</i>	6
2.3.2 <i>Geographical Targeting</i>	7
CHAPTER THREE.....	8
3.0 STUDY METHODOLOGY	8
3.1 METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION.....	8
3.1.1 <i>Collection of Secondary Data</i>	8
3.1.2 <i>Collection of Primary Data</i>	8
3.1.3 <i>Validation and Complementary Data Collection</i>	9
3.2 SAMPLING PROCEDURE.....	9
3.2.1 <i>Sampling Provinces and Districts</i>	9
3.2.2 <i>Sampling of Camps</i>	9
3.2.3 <i>Sampling at Zonal Level</i>	9
3.3 DATA ANALYSIS	12
3.4 LIMITATIONS	12
CHAPTER FOUR.....	13

4.0	DELIVERY OF SERVICES BY THE PROGRAMME	13
4.1	QUANTITIES OF DIFFERENT FARMER GROUPS COVERED IN TRAINING	13
4.1.1	<i>Farmers Covered in the Training of Different Subjects</i>	<i>13</i>
4.1.2	<i>Lead Farmers Covered in the Training of Different Subjects.....</i>	<i>14</i>
4.1.3	<i>Local Leaders Covered in the Training of Different Subjects.....</i>	<i>14</i>
4.1.4	<i>Women Groups Covered in the Training of Different Subjects.....</i>	<i>15</i>
4.2	FINANCIAL UTILISATION.....	16
4.2.1	<i>Central Province.....</i>	<i>16</i>
4.2.2	<i>Lusaka Province</i>	<i>17</i>
4.2.3	<i>Eastern Province.....</i>	<i>18</i>
4.2.4	<i>Southern Province.....</i>	<i>19</i>
4.3	CONCLUDING REMARKS ON DELIVERY OF SERVICES	20
CHAPTER FIVE.....		22
5.0	ASSESSMENT OF THE EXTENSION SERVICE.....	22
5.1	ROLES OF THE EXTENSION OFFICER AND THAT OF THE FARMERS IN THE PARTICIPATORY EXTENSION SYSTEM.....	22
5.1.1	<i>The Role of the Farmer in the Participatory Extension System</i>	<i>22</i>
5.1.2	<i>The Role of the Camp Extension Officer in the Participatory Extension System.....</i>	<i>22</i>
5.2	THE VISION OF THE EXTENSION SYSTEM UNDER FGE	24
5.3	TRAINING UNDER THE FGE TO ENHANCE CAPACITY OF CAMP EXTENSION OFFICERS	24
5.3.1	<i>Exposure to Different Courses Among CEOs in FGE and NON FGE Camps.....</i>	<i>24</i>
5.3.2	<i>Perceived Relevance of The Training.....</i>	<i>25</i>
5.4	THE ATTITUDE OF THE CAMP EXTENSION OFFICERS TO THE PARTICIPATORY EXTENSION SYSTEM.....	25
5.5	PARTICIPATION OF FARMERS IN THE EXTENSION SYSTEM.....	26
5.6	INTEGRATION OF HIV/ AIDS IN THE EXTENSION SYSTEM BY THE LM AND CF	27
5.6.1	<i>Beneficiaries in the Training of HIV /AIDS</i>	<i>27</i>
5.6.2	<i>Subjects Covered in Training</i>	<i>28</i>
5.6.3	<i>Indicative effectiveness of HIV /AIDs Awareness.....</i>	<i>28</i>
5.7	CONCLUDING REMARK	28
CHAPTER SIX.....		30
6.0	ASSESSMENT OF COMMUNITY LEADERS.....	30
6.1	ROLES OF THE DIFFERENT LEADERS.....	30
6.1.1	<i>Role of Councillor.....</i>	<i>30</i>
6.1.2	<i>The Role of the Traditional Leadership</i>	<i>31</i>
6.1.3	<i>Summary on Perception of a good Leader.....</i>	<i>32</i>
6.2	THE VISION OF THE PROGRAMME WITH LEADERS	32
6.3	INTERVENTIONS OF THE FGE TO BUILD CAPACITY OF LEADERS IN THE LM AND CF PROGRAMME.....	33
6.3.1	<i>Types of training interventions.....</i>	<i>33</i>
6.3.2	<i>Relevance of the training.....</i>	<i>35</i>
6.3.4	<i>Collaboration in Training.....</i>	<i>36</i>

6.4	THE EFFECT OF FGE INTERVENTIONS ON LEADERS	37
6.4.1	<i>Participation of leaders in LM and CF activities.....</i>	37
6.4.2	<i>Existence of Committees for Decisions on Development.....</i>	40
6.5	CONCLUDING REMARKS ON LEADERSHIP.....	40
CHAPTER SEVEN		42
7.0	ASSESSMENT OF THE PARTICIPATION OF FARMERS.....	42
7.1	GENERAL FARMER CHARACTERISTICS.....	42
7.1.1	<i>Sex Distribution</i>	42
7.1.2	<i>Age Distribution In The Farmer Groups</i>	42
7.1.2	<i>Distribution of Farmers by Marital status.....</i>	42
7.1.3	<i>Educational levels.....</i>	43
7.2	THE VISION OF THE FGE FOR FARMERS AND THE INTERVENTIONS	43
7.3	THE TRAINING TO FARMERS	44
7.4	FARMER GROUP ORGANIZATION.....	44
7.4.1	<i>The Farmer Group Profiles.....</i>	45
7.4.2	<i>The Committees</i>	46
7.4.3	<i>Tenure of Office for Committees Members and Adherence to Rules by Committees.....</i>	47
7.4.4	<i>Stipulation on the Number of Meetings to be Held in a Month and Adherence to the Rule by Committees.....</i>	48
7.5	FARMER PARTICIPATION IN THE EXTENSION SYSTEM.....	49
7.5.1	<i>Initiation of Meetings.....</i>	50
7.5.2	<i>Deciding on the Agenda.....</i>	50
7.5.3	<i>Leading of Deliberations during Farmer Group Discussions</i>	51
7.5.4	<i>Length Period as Group Member</i>	51
7.5.5	<i>Attendance Rates of Meetings</i>	52
7.5.6	<i>Constraints To Participation Among Farmers As Observed by CEOs.....</i>	52
7.6	RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF DIFFERENT INFORMATION SOURCES TO FARMERS...	54
7.7	SUSTAINABILITY OF THE PROGRAMME	56
7.8	CONCLUDING REMARKS ON FARMER PARTICIPATION	56
CHAPTER EIGHT.....		58
8.0	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	58
8.1	SUMMARY.....	58
8.1.1	<i>Delivery of services by the Programme</i>	58
8.1.2	<i>Assessment of the Extension System: Farmers and the Extension Staff</i>	58
8.1.3	<i>Effectiveness of the Programme In Affecting the Local Leadership.....</i>	59
8.1.4	<i>Farmer Participation in Group Management and Other Development Activities.....</i>	60
8.2	RECOMMENDATIONS.....	61
REFERENCES		62

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 1: The Logical Framework For The Farmer Group Empowerment (Fge) Component	47
Appendix 2: Checklist For Extension Worker	51
Appendix 3: Checklist For Leaders (Traditional Leaders)	52
Appendix 4: Checklist For Leaders (Councillors)	53
Appendix 5: Checklist For Committee Members	55
Appendix 6: Farmers' Questionnaire	56

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ADC	Area Development Committees
AIDS	Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
CEO	Camp Extension Officer
CLUSA	Cooperative League for United States of America
DMCO	District Marketing and Cooperative Officer
DWA	District Women Association
FGE	Farmer Group Empowerment
FODEP	Forum for the Democratic Process
GTZ	Germany Technical Assistance to Zambia
HIV	Human Immune Deficiency Virus
LM & CF	Land Management and Conservation Farming Programme
LWF	Lutheran World Federation
MACO	Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
PSO	Programme Support Office
SCAFE	Soil Conservation and Agroforestry Programme
SDA	Seventh Day Adventists
Sida	Swedish International Development Agency
WFC	Women for Change
ZHECT	Zambia Health Education and Communication Trust
ZNBC	Zambia Broadcasting Corporation

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Introduction

This report is an evaluation of the Farmer Group Empowerment (FGE) component¹ of the Land Management and Conservation Farming (LM & CF) programme. The component has been in implementation for one year as of December 2002, having started operating in early 2002. This evaluation comes at the terminal stage of the support by the Swedish International Development Agency (Sida) to the Programme, scheduled to end in December 2002. The ultimate goal of the evaluation is assess the progress made by the FGE component. Lessons drawn from this evaluation could also be incorporated into the implementation of on-going programmes with similar mandates to that of the FGE or those to be implemented in the future.

2. Methodology

The study drew on both secondary and primary data. For secondary data various records in the programme were analysed. In the collection of primary data a total of 29, 10, 22 and 279 committees, councillors, headmen and individual farmers, respectively, were interviewed in the selected agricultural camps. Also interviewed were 13 camp extension officers in each camp visited during the study. Questionnaires and interview guides were used to obtain the data from these sources of information.

Data were processed and analysed using excel. In order to carry out the evaluation, it was inevitable that comparisons of the statistics generated were made between two types of camps (the FGE and Non FGE camps). Comparisons between FGE and Non FGE camps are conducted for selected attributes, including group sizes, length of time one has been a group member, attendance rates in selected meetings, number of women holding positions and so on. Similarly comparisons pertaining to implementing partners are made; i.e the situations between leaders and CEOs in FGE camps compared with the situation obtaining in Non FGE camps. The foregoing approach is referred to as the cross sectional analysis.

Secondly, the study also makes reference to the situation as it obtained at the time of the baseline survey. Additionally, Reference is made to targets that were set in the logical framework of the project at the beginning. Achievements are compared with the planned targets. Following are the findings of the evaluation.

3. Key Findings and Conclusions

3.1 Delivery of services by the Programme

The delivery of services in terms of meeting the targets has been fair, with the planned targets for training farmers (in terms of numbers) being achieved by between 56 per cent and 79.5 per cent. This was satisfactory considering that the programme experienced changes in staff, a factor that stalled implementation in some cases. Another factor that required to be addressed was that of financial management on the part of staff in the provinces; if the provincial staff had been retiring their imprests early, higher rates of

¹ In this document the "FGE component" is sometimes referred to as the "FGE project".

performance would have been achieved, as funds were going to be available on a timely basis.

The differences in efficiency rates implies that there is need for the monitoring to make continuous analyses on how different managers approach the training so as to come up with lessons for increasing efficiency in all the areas, rather than having geographical differences, showing extremely contradicting positions.

3.2 Assessment of the Extension System: Farmers and the Extension Staff

The focus at this point was to find out how the extension system operated. The output stated that, “agricultural Extension staff in LM and CF areas aware of, motivated for and able to promote farmer-to-farmer based extension system”. To a large extent this output was achieved in several respects.

First, all extension staff, both from FGE and Non FGE camps, were trained in gender. However, although not all extension staff were trained in facilitation skills, it was clear that the situation was better in FGE camps, compared to Non FGE camps. About 86 per cent and 66.9 of the staff in FGE and Non FGE camps, respectively, camps were exposed to facilitation.

Second, the study shows that the attitude of extension workers towards the farmer to farmer extension approach is positive. All extension workers depicted a very positive attitude towards the extension system, citing several benefits associated with it.

The third indicator was that “100 % of the extension workers in LM and CF areas develop indicators for monitoring the plans and to be accountable in executing different roles and responsibilities, including use of resources”. This system is developing although it has not reached the full extent. Fieldwork showed that farmers made plans at zone level, fed them into camp committees and then into blocks. However, farmers do not participate fully in the management of resources.

Fourth, farmers have become increasingly involved in extension activities, through electing their lead farmers and other leaders. The lead farmers and other leaders have become important sources of encouragement to other farmers to participate in different agricultural activities, as well as in facilitating other extension activities (such as monitoring progress and guiding others). This signifies the participation of farmers in the extension system.

Fifth, an interesting emerging development is where farmers have been empowered to solve some of their problems working through groups. Of particular interest is how farmer groups are taking up the issue of HIV? AIDS; they use groups to assist the affected families to rotate in taking care of the sick and help out in the fields.

The foregoing shows that there has been considerable progress towards meeting the output on building capacity not only among the extension workers, but also among farmers in the farmer-to-farmer extension approach.

3.3 Effectiveness of the Programme In Affecting the Local Leadership

In terms of developing leadership, a lot of progress has been made in FGE camps. However, it is also worthwhile to indicate that progress was made in Non FGE camps too, as a result of interventions by Programmes other than the FGE component.

The study so far shows that all traditional leaders are interested in FGE activities; which is an achievement of more than the 80 per cent target. About 78 per cent of the leaders have committees in place. Those without committees do consult their people through meetings. These consultations depict democratic forms of governance and transparency on the part of the leadership.

The study also finds that local leaders are willing to support the LM and CF activities. However, despite their positive attitude, they are not able to meet the demands, perhaps due to other heavy responsibilities resting with them. For example, when farmers were asked to indicate who encouraged them to attend meetings only 2 per cent of the farmers cited traditional leaders. Similarly obtained when one looked at how councilors were involved with encouraging farmers to participate in the LM and CF activities; as only 0.7 per cent of the farmers cited a councilor as the source of encouragement to attend FGE meetings.

The study found that all Ward Councillors (in LM & CF areas) worked closely on developmental issues with traditional leaders, rather than compete with them. Depending on where the development activity comes from, one of the leaders responsible takes lead in mobilizing the people while keeping the other informed. For example on projects initiated through the council the Councillor will take the lead and headmen could assist to mobilize people. The two leaders are working in harmony.

Lead Farmers have proved to be capable of bringing together their group members. About 40 per cent and 28 per cent of the farmers in FGE camps and Non FGE camps, respectively, reported that the Lead Farmer was their main source of encouragement for them to attend meetings. From this result it is clear that the role of the lead farmer is more pronounced in FGE camps compared to the Non FGE camps.

Despite the success, there still is the problem of encouraging more women to take up leadership positions. Women are hampered by various cultural factors, including inferiority complex; lack of resources; and where they have access, they lack the control for the resources; and the burden of work (more than that of men) that they are assigned to in their communities. The training in gender is still important if women are to fully participate in different developmental activities.

3.4 Farmer Participation in Group Management and Other Development Activities

The study shows that progress has been made in these areas, as is demonstrated below.

First, on the indicator stating that "Farmers groups initiating at least 80 % of the meetings and agenda therein for extension activities" there has been significant progress. In FGE camps, 85.5 per cent of the meetings are initiated by farmers, only 15 per cent are initiated by CEOs; 7.6 per cent of the farmers cited CEOs as setting the agenda, while 92.4 per cent

indicated that the agenda were set by farmers; in 95 per cent of the cases farmers led discussions in meetings, while only 5 per cent of the meetings were led by CEOs.

Second, the study found that farmers hold elections at stipulated periods (agreed by themselves e.g. every 2 years). In FGE camps, 94 percent of the farmer committees have stipulations on the tenure of office for committee members; only 66.7 per cent of the committees in Non FGE camps have such stipulations. In most cases, in FGE camps, the rules on the tenure of office are adhered to and elections are held at agreed times. It is clear that FGE camps are better organised than the Non FGE camps.

Third, with respect for the desire for women farmers to taking up 50 % of the positions on farmer groups, some progress was towards this direction. In FGE camps about 45 per cent of the people on the executives are women; in the Non FGE camps women constitute only 35 per cent of the committee members. FGE camps made better progress in this indicator.

Fourth, the desire that “at least 60 % of the farmers giving reports on monitoring results”, was achieved, as 82 and 64 percent of the farmers, respectively, in FGE and Non FGE camps claimed they were involved in monitoring activities (See Table 5.2).

Fifth, as regards meeting the target that “80 %of the farmers groups organize study cycle meetings (at least 3 meetings per month)”; this was not achieved, as only 41 per cent of the groups held 3 or more meeting in FGE camps. In Non FGE camps only 25 per cent held at least three meetings. The situation though not achieved as planned, it is definitely better in FGE camps than in Non FGE camps.

Sixth, there were indications that communities have been able to negotiate various goods and services from different providers in all camps. They were able to access seed from organizations like the Programme Against Malnutrition, fertiliser from Government and so on.

It is clear that to a large extent, most activities that the programme had set out to undertake were effective. This is clear from the increased participation of farmers in their affairs such as managing the groups and taking lead in activities affecting them.

4. Recommendations

The Programme has made a lot of progress. However, this could be further enhanced if the pitfalls encountered were addressed. Following are the recommendations.

- (i) There is need to emphasise the importance of adhering to the financial procedures, particularly in the area of retirement of imprests among provincial officers; the imprests in some cases were retired late. The financial management system in the Programme shows good control mechanisms in that it only replenishes funds after the initial disbursements have been well accounted for.
- (ii) There is need for stability of staff involved with programme implementation. Frequent changes in staff slows down progress. One option is for MACO to

seek ways of avoiding the high turnover of staff in programme areas. Another practical option is for development programmes to train a wide pool of staff in activities of the programme so that movement of some will not seriously affect the implementation.

- (iii) There is need for more concerted efforts to train and sensitise farmers in various areas if their participation in development is to continue. The support to areas of gender, leadership and HIV /AIDS awareness should continue if farmer participation in their development is to be sustained.
- (iv) There is need for coordination among organisation implementing different activities in same geographical areas. Competition could be detrimental to others and work against the target groups, as some organisation would pull out. The organisations should have common stances in their approaches as they assist farmers. For example, if they pay allowances, comparable rates should be adopted.

CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report is an evaluation of the Farmer Group Empowerment (FGE) component² of the Land Management and Conservation Farming (LM & CF) programme. The component has been in implementation for one year as of December 2002, having started operating in early 2002. This evaluation comes at the terminal stage of the support by the Swedish International Development Agency (Sida) to the Programme, scheduled to end in December 2002. The ultimate goal of the evaluation is assess the progress made by the FGE component. Lessons drawn from this evaluation could also be incorporated into the implementation of on-going programmes with similar mandates to that of the FGE or those to be implemented in the future.

1.1 Background

The Land Management and Conservation Farming Programme, supported by Sida, has been working in Zambia for a long time, passing through different phases. In its early years, having been operational since 1985, the Programme was referred to as the Soil Conservation and Agro-forestry Extension (SCAFE) programme. The LM & CF Programme's main objective, similar to that of SCAFE, is "to raise agricultural production and productivity, food security and income for small-scale farming households and sustain the increase". The purpose of the Programme is two-folds, as follows:

- (i) to improve the quality of agricultural land use for the production of food and fibre in a sustainable manner
- (ii) to strengthen farmer groups and develop an appropriate extension system which is sustainable

Whereas the Sida support to land husbandry has been under implementation for almost two decades, plans to introduce the FGE component into the Programme only emerged in the course of 2000, emanating from discussions that were held between the Swedish Embassy and Sida supported agricultural programmes in Zambia. During the consultations it was agreed that there was a need to integrate a component related to democratic governance into Sida supported agricultural programmes. This is the component that became known as the "Farmer Group Empowerment."

In order to fully understand the issues pertaining to the component, a consultancy study was commissioned to investigate the strengthening of the farmer group empowerment process within LM&CF (Erasmus and Chiyanka, 2001). The study revealed interesting findings that suggested there existed strong linkages between democratic governance processes and farmers' participation (as well as interest) in the LM&CF promotion work.

In view of the foregoing, the LM & CF Programme drew out a Programme to promote FGE activities. Among other things, the Farmer Group Empowerment component was to develop a farmer-to-farmer based extension system managed by the local communities

² In this document the "FGE component" is sometimes referred to as the "FGE project".

and facilitated by the Ministry of agriculture and Cooperatives (MACO) extension services. The Programme also recognised the importance of the partnerships with Lead Farmers and local leaders (including those in the traditional sector and ward councillors in the political sphere) as a key to the success of this type of extension system. The Programme through the FGE project, therefore, attempted to build the capacity of these partners so that they could deliver the services effectively through exposure to various training activities.

It was envisaged this arrangement, characterised by participation of different partners in service delivery, would lead to increased participation of farmers (at all levels) in the management of their affairs (such as priority setting of agricultural extension activities, planning the *modus operandi* of the extension service, participating in monitoring and reporting and so on). Ultimately, sustainable development would be attained.

The FGE component of LM and CF Programme was scheduled to operate for about one year, after which the support from Sida would come to an end, in December 2002. It becomes appropriate, therefore, undertake a terminal evaluation of the component at such a point in time.

1.2 Objectives of the Study

This evaluation is being undertaken to assess progress of the FGE towards meeting its objectives and other mandates. The evaluation will constitute assessing the following:

- (i) Performance of the implementing institution in the delivery of services as resources were being put to use;
- (ii) Effectiveness of services delivered;
- (iii) The overall relevance of the project in the context of the beneficiaries;
- (iv) Implications of the impact; and
- (v) Sustainability of the project.

1.3 Outline of the Report

This report is divided in nine chapters. The first chapter is this introduction, followed by Chapter 2 that provides background information on the FGE. The third chapter unveils the methodology adopted for the study. Findings and discussions are presented in Chapters 4, 5 and 6. Chapter 4 focuses on matters related to the performance of the programme's implementation of activities. Chapters 5 and 6 examine the changes in capacities of the Programme's implementing partners following the FGE. The partners include MACO agricultural extension officers and local leaders (involving traditional leaders and ward councillors). In addition, Chapter 6 provides suggestions on potential partners for collaboration in FGE related activities. Chapter 7 reveals status of farmers in terms of their participation in various Programme activities and some of those related to their livelihoods, thus giving indications on the effectiveness of FGE activities. The conclusion and recommendations are presented in Chapter 8.

CHAPTER TWO

2.0 AN OVERVIEW OF THE FARMER GROUP EMPOWERMENT COMPONENT OF THE LM & CF PROGRAMME

2.1 Introduction

Over the years the programme's approach was that technology transfer was through the existing MACO extension delivery system, with extension officers taking the lead in planning the messages to deliver, implementing the delivery, as well as monitoring. The participation of farmers, who are the key stakeholders was limited.

It has now become clear that empowerment of farmer groups is crucial if the current LM&CF Participatory Extension Approach is to be fully functional and to ensure that the target group benefit. The approach calls for "Handing over the stick" as some may put. This means that farmers/farmer groups take the lead in various aspects such as electing their representatives, setting extension priorities, participating in drawing up area plans, agreeing on different tasks they would take in contributing to extension services, as well as on monitoring. The involvement of farmers in monitoring suggests transparency, and thus the stakeholders can take part in correcting the direction of implementation. The current approach of the Programme hinges upon issues of democracy, governance and human rights and can be strengthened through capacity building at local level i.e. farmer group level.

Farmer Group Empowerment (FGE) component, as indicated earlier, was introduced into the LM & CF Programme in November 2001 with a view of strengthening the new extension approach. Following are the objectives of the FGE component:

Main Objective: To develop empowered farmer groups and an appropriate extension system which are both sustainable

Programme purpose: To attain sustainable active farmer participation in management of their agricultural extension system.

Outputs: (i) Increased participation of farmers in agricultural development. The focus here will be to ensure that farmers contribute to decision-making processes and a farmer-to-farmer extension system is established,

This implies that farmers should participate in identifying their own problems, opportunities and taking advantage of existing potential, as well as finding solutions to problems;

ii) Democratic leadership development through involvement of the local leaders and lead farmers in the LM&CF activities, especially decision making and monitoring and reporting. Local leaders (political up to ward councillor level, community and traditional) are expected to implement democratic practices in planning and assisting to implement their people's projects; and

- iii) Increased understanding of the concept of agricultural development by all targeted farmers. This could imply a situation where farmers aim to manage their own affairs including resources, planning and implementation, and are able to demand honesty, accountability and transparency from their leaders or service providers.

In order to achieve the objectives set out above strategies to empower farmers were developed. The strategies entailed conducting different courses to enhance capacity among farmers. Planned were training activities to enhance skills in leadership, marketing, facilitation, gender issues and monitoring and reporting in order to fully benefit from the Participatory Extension Approach. Also included is capacity building in improving communication.

2.2 Strategies (Sub –Components) the FGE Project

The LM & CF have discussed comprehensively the types of activities to be implemented under the FGE component. The discussion below (2.3.1 to 2.3.5) provides details of the key activities as discussed by the LM & CF Proposal for the FGE Component.

2.2.1 Facilitation Training

Facilitation is aimed at drawing out full potentials within a community and enabling people to fully benefit from the local resources through empowerment of knowledge and skills. Facilitation allows the farming community to make their own decisions on how different agricultural activities will be carried out.

Prior to the introduction of the FGE project training in facilitation was conducted for all extension staff at Block and Camp level working in LM&CF concentration areas. The Camp Extension officers (CEO) trained in facilitation are expected to change in their approach to extension delivery. Rather than teaching, as was in the past, a CEO trained in facilitation is expected to allow farmers participate in their search for solutions and implementing the solution to attain their agricultural aspirations.

With advent of the FGE project training was to be extended to staff at district level. The purpose of the training to this target group was to bridge the knowledge gap that had existed between extension officers at camp level and those at the district. Additionally, and perhaps more important, training to the district staff was aimed at developing trainers who would extend the knowledge in facilitation to other areas. In this respect, District cooperative Marketing Officers (DMCOs) at the district level were targeted so that they could facilitate the communication of market information to farmers in and outside LM&CF areas.

2.2.2 Gender

Gender attributes were identified as contributing to various limitations to effective extension service delivery. At community and village levels, gender relations are varied due to the different traditions and beliefs.

The gender component within the Programme has been addressing issues of gender equality by focusing not only on women, but also on men. The focus on both sexes has been of utmost priority to the Programme due to the fact that men should be part of the empowerment process for women if the development process in the households for both men and women is to be sustainable.

However, the Programme is paying particular attention to various areas of inequality especially when it comes to women's rights to ownership of property, decision-making and access to various factors of production.

Gender integration within the Programme focuses on raising awareness among the Programme staff and the farmers in all the areas of the Programme's operation. The Programme also makes available to the two groups relevant gender materials and information, not only through workshops and training but also through the radio programmes, that are aired in vernacular languages.

2.2.3 Participatory Monitoring and Reporting

The LM&CF Programme currently engages the Camp Extension Officer or facilitators and farmer groups in joint planning, monitoring and reporting processes. Work plans and budgets which are generated quarterly are submitted to the district and later to the Project Support Office (PSO) for funding. Once funds are released, the district takes on the responsibility of facilitating this demand driven work plan. It is important that the work plan is carefully implemented and monitored to ensure that the farming community develops trust and partnership with the Camp facilitator.

Inadequate information and lack of transparency has often hindered the smooth implementation of the work plans generated at farmer group level. The farming community therefore needs to be empowered with decision making tools, participative techniques, knowledge on how much money is available each quarter and how the costs are shared etc. There are also a number of forms to be filled out at the end of each month or quarter during compilation of the reports. Training of lead farmers and extension staff in participatory monitoring and evaluation formats and methods is crucial.

2.2.4 Leadership Development

The lead farmer concept is still undeveloped and requires strengthening through training and other awareness activities. Lead farmers are going to be expected to take a lead role in the study circle concept currently being introduced in the Programme. Representation of the group, zone and camp committees will also be the responsibility of the lead farmer. Leadership knowledge and skills will have to be imparted.

Currently leaders such as ward councillors, Chiefs, headmen etc are not as involved as desired in the LM&CF activities. There are a few exceptions where certain chiefs are fully involved and have participated in activities such as training courses and study tours.

The farmers elected in the village, zone and camp committees currently have inadequate knowledge in participatory and action oriented approaches, group work and facilitation. The current LM&CF Programme approach demands that farmers taking up leadership in

these groups are competent enough to facilitate the implementation of plans generated within the community.

2.2.5 Information, Communication and Advocacy

The LM&CF Programme currently airs on Zambia National Broadcasting Corporation (ZNBC) radio conservation farming programmes in four languages, namely English, Chitonga, Chinyanja and Chibemba. The inclusion of a farmer group empowerment component requires information dissemination and advocacy to create awareness on ongoing activities.

This strategy involves development of radio materials and presentations on different issues. This activity covers issues such as democratic governance; human rights; gender; land and markets.

2.2.6 Mainstreaming of HIV/ AIDS

HIV is a global disease. HIV/ AIDS is reported to be more prevalent in Sub Sahara Africa where it is estimated that 90 per cent of deaths arising from the scourge occur; and Zambia has not been spared. It is estimated that about 1 million people in Zambia are living with HIV/ AIDS, with prospects for this number to increase to 1.6 million by the year 2015 (LM &CF, 2002, Update Memoire).

The Programme recognized that HIV/ AIDS affects all sectors of the economy. Focusing on agriculture, various the adverse effects can be outlined as follows:

- reduction of land under cultivation as people cannot physically work in the fields
- reduction in crop yields due to delays in carrying out certain critical tasks that are time bound, such as control of pests and weeds, as well as application of fertiliser
- changing of crop patterns as some families shift to crops that are less labour intensive, but could be of less nutritional or monetary value
- decline in crop diversification, leaving families vulnerable to crop failures and
- loss of knowledge as skilled people die from the disease.

The scenario above called for interventions in the LM and CF programme to address HIV/AIDS. Activities to enhance awareness were thus incorporated, targeting staff and lead farmers in all LM and CF provinces.

2.3 Targeting of the FGE Component

The targeting in the FGE component of the LM & CF is in two parts. The first is geographical and the other is by beneficiary group.

2.3.1 Target Groups

The target group for LM&CF in 2002 includes interested small-scale farmers at the grass root level (i.e. farmer groups, associations, co-operatives, etc.) in LM&CF areas. This encompasses approximately 60,000 farm households and 1,000 farmer groups. It was

anticipated that 40% of the farm households (or 24,000 i.e.40% of 60,000) in the Programme area would have adopted improved LM&CF technologies, sustainable farming practices at the end of 2002. Table 2.1 shows that the farmer group empowerment component will reach approximately 17% of the projected adopters assuming that each participant trained is drawn from a separate household³.

Table 2.1: Number of Participants in the FGE activities by Target Group

Target Group	Number of Participants ⁴
Farmer Groups	2340
Lead farmers	595
Local Leaders	300
Women groups	850
Staff (Facilitators)	148
Total	4233

2.3.2 Geographical Targeting

The FGE activities have been concentrated in nine districts and 24 camps within LM&CF concentration areas. Table 2.2 shows the number of camps covered by the FGE activities by province and district.

Table 1.2: Number of Camps Covered by FGE activities by District and Province

Province	District	No. Of Camps
Southern	Mazabuka	2
	Choma	2
	Mazabuka	2
Central	Mumbwa	3
	Kabwe	3
Lusaka	Chongwe	3
Eastern	Katete	3
	Chipata South	3
	Lundazi	3
Total		24

The methodology for assessing progress towards reaching the objectives of the FGE component is fully discussed in the next chapter.

³ Percentage excludes staff

⁴ Note that each participant will represent an individual households; in case of departure to this principle, a maximum of two representatives (One male and one female) per individual Household.

CHAPTER THREE

3.0 STUDY METHODOLOGY

The chapter reveals the research design of the study. The first section relates to the data requirement and how the data were collected from different sources. The second section the sampling procedures that were used to collect primary data, while the third section provides details of how the data were analysed. Limitations are indicated in the fourth section.

3.1 Methods of Data Collection

In order to meet the objectives of the study both secondary and primary data were collected. The study also planned for a presentation, at which forum supplementary data would be collected by way of feedback from key persons involved with implementation of the project.

3.1.1 Collection of Secondary Data

Most data related to assessment of the delivery of services by the programme implementers were collected from secondary sources, in particular monitoring records. The records were obtained from provincial advisors, as well as from the officers at the Programme Support Office in Lusaka. The data focused on how targets were met on such issues as the number of training courses conducted; number of persons trained and timeliness. The financial progression was also assessed with reference to training provided.

3.1.2 Collection of Primary Data

Primary data were collected from three different categories of data sources, including Camp extension officers, local leaders (consisting of councillors and headmen), representatives of committees of farmer groups and individual farmers. Using different questionnaires for each category, personal interviews were conducted in the process of collecting the data.

The data collected from these sources were necessary for use in the assessment of the effectiveness and the indicative impact. The increased knowledge and possibly the change in attitude or behaviour on the part of implementing partners that included Camp Extension Officers (CEOs), councillors and headmen would give indications on the effectiveness of the programme. Questions were posed to these categories of implementing partners with a view of assessing attitude towards the new programme approaches, as well as their participation in the programme.

The data to assess the indicative impact was assessed from the survey conducted among farmers, as well as from interviews with committee members who gave details on attendance rates and participation of farmers in different activities (such as calling of meetings, setting agenda for the meetings, planning and monitoring of activities. Further, with a view of assessing indications towards sustainability, questions were posed to farmers and key informants (extension workers, headmen and so on) to find out whether

or not farmers had started demanding services or goods from different service providers in order to improve their livelihoods.

In order to determine whether or not the interventions of the FGE were relevant, the beneficiaries were asked to indicate how they benefited. All the instruments for data collection are shown in Appendices 2 to 6.

3.1.3 Validation and Complementary Data Collection

The study was designed to incorporate views of different stakeholders at the draft stage. PSO staff, who were key facilitators of the Programme's implementation, were consulted. This activity presented a forum for validation of results and collection of complementary data.

3.2 Sampling Procedure

Four key stages were adopted in obtaining the sample in this study. The stages and respective procedures applied are discussed below.

3.2.1 Sampling Provinces and Districts

The first and second stages involved the selection of relevant provinces and districts, which were both done purposively, as only areas covered by the FGE Project were included in the study. As a consequence, all four provinces in which the LM and CF Programme operated, including Southern, Eastern, Central and Lusaka provinces, were selected. Two districts (Monze and Choma) were selected Southern Province, while Chipata and Lundazi represented Eastern Province. Chongwe district was drawn from Lusaka Province, while Kabwe represented Central Province.

3.2.2 Sampling of Camps

The third stage involved the selection of agricultural camps. Except for Kabwe, where three camps were drawn for the study, two camps were selected. One camp represented an area where FGE activities have been implemented; while the other camp represented the control area, where no significant efforts were made to introduce interventions of the FGE activities. In Kabwe two FGE camps were selected; the other one had not been targeted for FGE activities. At this level, councillors and camp extension officers were interviewed. All thirteen (13) camp officers were interviewed from each camp. Ten (10) councillors were included in the sample. Three of the councillors, representing Kayoozi, Mpima and Kanakantapa, were not readily available at the time of the study and thus were not included in the sample.

3.2.3 Sampling at Zonal Level

In the fourth stage a zone was selected in each camp. A zone is a sub-division of an agricultural camp. At each zone there exist a number of farmer groups, with members drawn from different villages. A zone was considered to be a cluster and hence all farmer group members and others not belonging to groups were interviewed. At this level,

interviews were held with farmer group committee members, headmen and individual farmers. At least one group and 20 farmers therein were targeted per zone.

Table 3.1 below presents the summary data of the numbers CEOs, Councillors, Committees, headmen and individuals that were interviewed in the study.

Table 3.1: Number of Sampling Units Selected by District

District	Types and Number of Sampling Units included in the Sample	Councillors	Headmen	Total Farmers
	Name of Camp and Committee⁵ Status⁵			
Choma	Siamuleya, Non-FGE	2	1	2
	Mboole, FGE	4	1	2
Monze	Nteme, Non FGE	3	1	2
	Njola, FGE	3	1	4
Chongwe	Lukososhi, Non FGE	1	1	2
	Kanakantapa, FGE	1	0	1
Kabwe	Chililalila, Non FGE	3	1	0
	Mpima, FGE	2	0	0
	Wayya, FGE	2	1	1
Lundazi	Emusa, Non FGE	2	1	2
	Mankhaka, FGE	4	1	2
Chipata South	Feni, Non FGE	1	1	2
	Kayoozi, FGE	1	0	2
Totals		29	10	22
				279

⁵ i.e. FGE or Non FGE

Table 3.1 shows that a total of 29, 10, 22 and 279 committees, councillors, headmen and individual farmers, respectively, were interviewed in the selected areas. Also interviewed were camp extension officers in each camp visited during the study.

3.3 Data Analysis

After field data collection, the questionnaires were reviewed with the enumerators that administered them. Where necessary clarifications were sought from the enumerators and corrections made. This activity helped to "clean the data". The questionnaires were entered into Excel for quantitative analysis to produce various statistics including frequencies, averages, sums, cross tabulations and so on. Qualitative data in the questionnaires were incorporated to provide explanations to the quantitative information.

In order to carry out the evaluation, it was inevitable that comparisons of the statistics generated were made between two types of camps (the FGE and Non FGE camps). Comparisons between FGE and Non FGE camps are conducted for selected attributes, including group sizes, length of time one has been a group member, attendance rates in selected meetings, number of women holding positions and so on. Similarly comparisons pertaining to implementing partners are made; i.e the situations between leaders and CEO in FGE camps compared with the situation obtaining in Non FGE camps. The foregoing approach is referred to as the cross sectional analysis.

Secondly, the study also makes reference to the situation as it obtained at the time of the baseline survey. Additionally, Reference is made to targets that were set in the logical framework of the project at the beginning of the Project. Achievements are compared with the planned targets. Appendix 5 shows the logical framework for the FGE project. The logical framework shows indicators upon which progress is gauged. This approach is referred to as the longitudinal type of analysis.

Notably, this approach to analysis is viewed as the most appropriate and comprehensive under the circumstances.

3.4 Limitations

Two minor limitations were encountered in the course of the study. First, it is essential to point out that the study's evaluation of the impact and sustainability was limited. This is because the period in which the FGE project has been implemented is too short to show significant results at higher objective levels that represent the impact and sustainability. The assessment of the factors at this level would only be indicative and not conclusive.

Secondly, due to the limited time remaining before the closure of the project, time-consuming participatory methods could not be adopted in the study. For example in the assessment of behavioural change of extension workers, councillors and headmen, focus group discussions with farmers would have complemented the data collected through personal interviews.

The foregoing notwithstanding, the study went on smoothly and thus the negative impact of the constraints was kept to the minimum.

CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 DELIVERY OF SERVICES BY THE PROGRAMME

This chapter provides an overview of the delivery of service by the LM and CF Programme in its implementation of the FGE project. The programme had undertaken to provide training to farmer groups, Lead Farmers, local leaders and women groups.

Prior to commencing the training to farmers, the Programme made preparations. First, they engaged a partner institution, the In-service Training Trust, to prepare a training manual in the subjects. Upon completion of the manual key agricultural extension staff were trained, prepared as Trainers for farmers (i.e. training of Trainers course). After the preparations the training of farmers commenced around April 2002. The coverage of training by the different target groups is shown in the ensuing sections

4.1 Quantities of Different Farmer Groups Covered in Training

4.1.1 Farmers Covered in the Training of Different Subjects

The training focuses on democratic governance, human rights, leadership styles, participatory and action oriented approaches, group work and facilitation of LM&CF programme activities. Table 4.1 shows the planned target and subsequent achievements in the quantities of farmer groups trained in the different LM and CF areas.

Table 4.1: Number of Farmer Groups Targeted to be Trained and the Actual Number Achieved

	Geographical Area				
	Central	Eastern	Lusaka	Southern	Total
Target	540	780	180	540	2040
Actual achieved	624	390	129	478	1621
% achieved	115.6 %	50.0 %	71.7 %	88.5 %	79.5 %

Note: Apparently, there had been a revision on target number to be met, from 2340 to 2040 farmer groups.

Table 4.1 shows that on the overall the FGE project was able to meet its target up to 97.7 per cent. The highest achieved was in Central province (115.6%), followed by Southern Province (88.5 %), while Lusaka was third (71.7%). Eastern province trailed behind at 50 per cent. The overall result of about 80 per cent appears to be satisfactory.

4.1.2 Lead Farmers Covered in the Training of Different Subjects

The training is intended to build the leadership qualities of the lead farmer. A total of 580 lead farmers were targeted. Table 4.2 shows the planned target and subsequent achievements in the quantities of lead farmers trained in the different LM and CF areas.

Table 4.2: Number of Lead Farmers Targeted to be trained and the actual Achieved

	Geographical Area				
	Central	Eastern	Lusaka	Southern	Total
Target	135	215	110	120	580
Actual achieved	90	142	36	58	326
% achieved	66.7 %	66.1 %	32.7 %	48.3 %	56.2 %

Note: At the beginning of the programme there was a minor revision of the target of lead farmers to be met, from 595 to 580.

Table 4.2 shows that on the overall the FGE project was able to meet only 56.2 per cent of its target in training lead farmers. The highest achievement was in Central Province (66.7%), followed by Eastern Province (66.1), while Southern Province was third (48.3%). Lusaka Province trailed behind (32.7 %). The results, on the overall do not appear satisfactory.

Some reasons were advanced for the relatively low performance (of only 56 %), regarding reaching out to lead farmers. For one thing, delays in retiring financial advances on the part of LM and CF Coordinators and Advisors in some provinces made it difficult for PSO to send more money in time to ensure the continuity of planned activities on time. Whereas it is stipulated that finances should be retired within two weeks after an activity had been undertaken, in some cases officers delayed the retirement by at least one month.

In other cases, staff changes adversely affected the pace of implementation. The fact that new officers had to take over, there emerged a time lag in implementation as new the officers had to undergo some learning process before implementation.

4.1.3 Local Leaders Covered in the Training of Different Subjects

The training is intended to build the leadership qualities of the local leaders. The leaders were provided training in combined modules, covering, leadership, gender, facilitation and participatory work. Initially, a total of 300 local leaders were targeted. Table 4.3 shows the planned target and subsequent achievements in the quantities of lead farmers trained in the different LM and CF areas.

Table 4.3: Number of Local Leaders Targeted to be Trained and the Actual Achieved

	Geographical Area				
	Central	Eastern	Lusaka	Southern	Total
Target	75	75	75	25	250
Actual achieved	75	26	39	30	170
% achieved	100 %	34.7 %	52 %	120 %	68 %

Note: The target for Lead Farmers, which was initially 300, was revised to 250 as above.

Table 4.3 shows that on the overall the FGE project was able to meet 68 per cent of its target in training lead farmers. The highest achievement was in Southern Province (120 %), followed by Central Province (100 %), while Lusaka was third (52.7 %). Eastern Province trailed behind at 34.7 percent achievement rate.

The results regarding the training to local leaders were mixed. On the one hand, there are high rates of achievements in Southern (120 %) and Central Provinces (100%). On the other hand, there were low rates of achievements in Eastern (34.7 %) and Lusaka Provinces (52 %).

The reasons for the poor performance in Eastern and Lusaka Provinces are same as those provided in Section 4.1.2.

4.1.4 Women Groups Covered in the Training of Different Subjects

This training was designed to address the general scenario, where women are disadvantaged. It was envisioned that training would be provided with issues that would increase participation among the women in different development activities. The target was to sensitise 850 women on gender, marketing and land issues. Table 4.4 shows the planned target and subsequent achievements in the quantities of women trained in the different LM and CF areas.

Table 4.4: Number of Women Groups Targeted to be trained and the actual Achieved

	Geographical Area				
	Central	Eastern	Lusaka	Southern	Total
Target	150	350	150	150	800
Actual achieved	150	192	168	106	616
% achieved	100 %	54.9 %	112 %	70.7 %	77.0 %

Note: The target for Lead Farmers, which was initially 850, was revised to 800 as above.

Table 4.4 shows that on the overall the FGE project was able to meet 77 per cent of its target in training women farmers. The highest achievement was in Lusaka province (112 %), followed by Central Province (100 %), while Southern province was third (70.7 %). Eastern Province trailed behind at 54.9 per cent rate of achievement.

The results were satisfactory in Central and Lusaka Provinces. Southern and Eastern provinces did not perform as satisfactorily. The low performance in the latter provinces was explained by similar reasons as explained in 4.1.2 (i.e. staff changes and in some cases delays in retirement of imprest).

4.2 Financial Utilisation

In order to make an assessment of efficiency in the utilisation of resources, the physical achievements were compared with the finances used in selected provinces for which data were available. The finances are shown in Zambian Kwacha (K). The average exchange rate was K 356 per SEK.

Three scenarios were used to assess the efficiency in financial utilisation, as follows;

- (i) It is expected that when all the finances are utilised (100%), the target should also be met 100 per cent. The ratio of the percentage of physical achievement to the percentage of finances utilised to produce the physical output will be equal to 1. This is the benchmark for measuring efficiency levels.
- (ii) Where the ratio of the percentage of physical achievement to the percentage of finances utilised to produce the physical output is less than 1, the operation is inefficient. The smaller the ratio becomes the more inefficient an operation is, i.e. for every unit of the financial resource used less proportion of the physical progress is achieved.
- (iii) Where the ratio of the percentage of physical achievement to the percentage of the finances utilised to produce the physical output is greater than 1, the operation is efficient. The larger the ratio the more efficient an operation is, i.e. for every unit of the financial resource used a higher proportion of the physical progress is achieved.

4.2.1 Central Province

Table 4.5 shows a comparison between the usage of funds and the physical achievement in training different categories of targets in Central Province.

The table shows that there was the highest efficient utilisation of funds towards the training of farmer groups in Central province. Whereas only 83.97 per cent of the funds were spent to train farmer groups, 115 per cent in terms of physical target was met. This means that if 100 per cent of the financial resources were used 137 percent of the physical target would be achieved in the training of farmer groups. The training to local leaders ranked second in terms of efficient utilisation of financial resources. Using 97.8 per cent of the allocated funds, 100 per cent of the planned target in terms of training local leaders was achieved.

Table 4.5: Financial Utilisation and Physical Achievement in Central Province

Category	Budget (K)	Actual Spent (K)	% of Budget Utilised	% of Physical Achievement	Efficiency Ratios (% of Physical Achievement / % finances Used)
Farmer group	47,494,796.6	39,881,708.12	83.97	115	1.37
Lead farmers	38,426,846.48	38,085,054.44	99.11	66.7	0.67
Local leaders	20,000,072.88	19,551,708.68	97.76	100.0	1.02
Women groups	17,099,100.08	17,502,501.48	102.36	100.0	0.98

Note: The figures were initially provided in SEK, but were converted into Kwacha at the exchange rate of K356 per SEK.

In training of women groups, the target was met 100 per cent with a small over-expenditure of finances by 102 per cent. The training to lead farmers was the least efficient, as 99 per cent of the funds were spent only to achieve 66.7 per cent of the targeted lead farmers trained.

On the overall, apart from the training for lead farmers, the other training activities in Central Province appear to have been conducted in an efficient manner. Inefficiency was only observed in the training for lead farmers, where figures suggest that 100 per cent utilisation of the financial resources would lead to attainment of only 67 per cent of the physical target.

4.2.2 Lusaka Province

Table 4.6 shows a comparison between the usage of funds and the physical achievement in training different categories of targets in Lusaka.

The table shows that there was the highest efficient utilisation of funds towards the training of women groups in Lusaka province. Whereas only 97.6 per cent of the funds were spent to train women groups, 112 per cent in terms of physical target was met. This implies that if 100 per cent of the financial resources were used, 115 per cent of the physical target would be met in the training of women groups.

Other activities in Lusaka province were not efficient. Whereas 96.8 per cent of the funds were allocated towards the training of farmer groups, 71.7 per cent of the planned target in terms of training farmer groups was achieved. This was not efficient, as it means that use of 100 per cent of the financial resources would yield only 74 per cent of the physical target.

Table 4.6: Financial Utilisation and Physical Achievement in Lusaka Province

Category	Budget (K)	Actual Spent (K)	% of Budget Utilised	% of Physical Achievement	Efficiency Ratios (% of Physical Achievement / % finances Used)
Farmer groups	6,862,544.36	6,643,999.52	96.82	71.7	0.74
Lead Farmers	Nil	Nil	Nil	32.7	n.a
Local Leaders	20,302,092.60	21,342,093.20	105.12	52	0.49
Women groups	8,364,540.40	8,167,501.52	97.64	112	1.15

Note: (i) The figures were initially provided in SEK, but were converted into Kwacha at the exchange rate of K356 per SEK. (ii) n.a refers to data not being readily available.

In training of local leaders, 102 per cent of the allocated funds were spent, only to meet the target by 52 per cent. This was even more inefficient compared to the training towards farmer groups, as it means that only 49 per cent of the physical target would be achieved upon use of 100 per cent of the allocated finances.

Interestingly, there was an achievement in the training of lead farmer (where 32.7 per cent of the target was met) despite there being no allocation having been made to the category. It appears that lead farmers were integrated into training activities that were offered to other categories.

On the overall, apart from the training for women groups and that to lead farmers, the other training activities in Lusaka Province appear not have been conducted efficiently, in terms of financial utilisation (given the efficiency ratio of 1.15). For a 100 per cent expenditure of the allocated financial resources towards training for farmer groups and local leaders, only 74 per cent and 49 per cent of the respective physical target would be met.

4.2.3 Eastern Province

Table 4.7 shows a comparison between the usage of funds and the physical achievement in training different categories of targets in Eastern Province.

The table shows that there was the highest efficient utilisation of funds towards the training of Lead Farmers in Eastern Province. Whereas only 25.9 per cent of the funds were spent to train lead farmers, 66.1 per cent of the physical target was met (with an efficiency ratio of 2.56). This means that for a 100 per cent utilisation of financial resources, 256 per cent of the physical target would be achieved.

Table 4.7: Financial Utilisation and Physical Achievement in Eastern Province

Category	Budget (K)	Actual Spent (K)	% of Budget Utilised	% of Physical Achievement	Efficiency Ratios (% of Physical Achievement / % finances Used)
Farmer groups	61,926,000	16,566,370	26.75	50	1.87
Lead farmers	43,812,000	11,330,014	25.86	66.1	2.56
Local leaders	21,076,000	15,147,980.35	71.87	34.7	0.48
Women groups	39,745,000	16,415,819	41.30	54.9	1.33

Other activities that were efficiently carried out in Eastern Province included the training that was provided to farmer groups and women groups, for which the efficiency ratios were at 1.87 and 1.33, respectively.

The training of local leaders was inefficient in terms of utilising financial resources. Whereas 71.9 per cent of the allocated funds were spent towards the activity, only 34.7 per cent of the target was met. This gives an efficiency ratio of 0.48, meaning that for a 100 per cent utilisation of the allocated financial resource towards the training of local leaders, only 48 per cent of the physical target would be met.

On the overall, apart from the training for local leaders (with the efficiency ratio of 0.48), the other training activities in Eastern Province have been conducted efficiently, in terms of financial utilisation. A 100 per cent utilisation of the funds allocated to training of lead farmers, farmer groups and women farmers, 256 per cent, 187 per cent and 133 per cent of the respective physical targets would be met in Eastern Province.

4.2.4 Southern Province

Table 4.12 shows a comparison between the usage of funds and the physical achievement in training different categories of targets in Southern Province.

The table shows that there was the highest efficient utilisation of funds towards the training of local leaders in Southern Province. Whereas only 91.1 per cent of the funds were spent to train local leaders, 120 per cent in terms of physical target was met. This means that for a 100 per cent utilisation of the financial resources, 132 per cent of the physical target would be met.

Other activities in Southern Province were not as efficient as the others indicated above. For example, whereas 121.7 per cent of the funds were allocated towards the training of women groups were spent, only 70.7 per cent of the planned target in

terms of training women groups was achieved. This was not efficient, as use of 100 per cent of the financial resources would only yield 58 per cent of the physical target.

In training of farmer groups, whereas 107.4 per cent of the allocated funds were spent, 88.5 per cent of the target was met. In the training towards lead, whereas 77.2 per cent of the allocated funds were spent, only 48.3 per cent of the physical target was met; meaning for a 100 per cent use of financial resources towards training of farmer groups, only 82 per cent of the physical target would be met.

Table 4.8: Financial Utilisation and Physical Achievement in Southern Province

Category	Budget (K)	Actual Spent (K)	% of Budget Utilised	% of Physical Achievement	Efficiency Ratios (% of Physical Achievement / % finances Used)
Farmer groups	39,434,120	36,727,216	107.37	88.5	0.82
Lead farmers	30,391,720	39,351,925	77.23	48.3	0.63
Local leaders	17,622,000	19,345,890	91.09	120	1.32
Women groups	17,921,040	14,722,338	121.73	70.7	0.58

On the overall, apart from the training for local leaders (where the efficiency ratio was 132), the other training activities in Southern Province do not appear to have been conducted efficiently, in terms of financial utilisation. The efficiency ratios for training towards the training of farmer groups, lead farmers and women groups were 0.82, 0.63 and 0.58, respectively.

4.3 Concluding Remarks on Delivery of Services

In this chapter an attempt to assess how efficiently services were delivered has been made. The assessment first focused on the numbers of farmers that were covered in the training activities vis-à-vis the targets set out by the Programme. The overall results showed that in the training towards farmer groups, women groups, local leaders and lead farmers, 79.5 per cent, 77 per cent, 68 per cent and 56.2 per cent, respectively, of the physical targets (in terms of numbers reached) were achieved.

When the overall result was disaggregated by province, generally higher rates of performance were registered in Central Province. Other provinces like Eastern and Lusaka attained low rates of achievement largely due to staff turnover. The changes in staff led to delays in implementation as the new staff had to first undergo some learning process, leading to some stall in implementation. In other cases implementation was delayed due to failure by on the part of LM and CF Coordinators and Advisors in some provinces to retire financial advances in time. This made it

difficult for PSO to send more money in good time to ensure the continuity of planned activities.

Regarding efficiency in the utilisation of financial resources the result was mixed. In some provinces, particularly Eastern and Central Province, the efficiency was generally high. For Central province most activities indicated that for every unit of the financial resource used at least 98 per cent of the physical targets were met. Only one training activity, training to lead farmers appeared to have been less efficient in Central Province.

In Eastern Province, efficiency ratios of 2.56, 1.87 and 1.33 were attained in the training towards lead farmers, Farmer groups and women groups, respectively. Only one training activity, training to local leaders appeared to have been less efficient (with an efficiency ratio of 0.48).

In other provinces, there were more activities that left room for improvement in the utilisation of resources. In most activities in Southern and Lusaka provinces, for each unit of financial resources spent, corresponding less proportions in terms of physical targets were met.

The delivery of services in terms of meeting the targets has been fair, with the planned targets for training farmers (in terms of numbers) being achieved by between 56 per cent and 79.5 per cent. This was satisfactory considering that the programme experienced changes in staff, a factor that stalled implementation in some cases.

Another factor that required to be addressed was that of financial management on the part of staff in the provinces; if the provincial staff had been retired their imprests early, higher rates of performance would have been achieved, as funds were going to be available on a timely basis.

The differences in efficiency rates implies that there is need for the monitoring to make continuous analyses on how different managers approach the training so as to come up with lessons for increasing efficiency in all the areas, rather than having geographical differences, showing extremely contradicting positions.

CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 ASSESSMENT OF THE EXTENSION SERVICE

The LM and CF Programme is integrated into the extension system of the Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives (MACO). The Programme operates through this system which has a number of tiers, starting from the headquarters in Lusaka, through provinces, districts, camps and down to zones. In each zone are farmer groups or villages. Key ministry staff that interact more closely with farmers are CEOs. The CEOs and some farmers have been the targets of the interventions by LM and CF activities under FGE project.

5.1 Roles of the Extension Officer and that of the Farmers in the Participatory Extension System

It was the vision of the FGE project that a new approach to extension is established. The new approach was to be participatory, such that an extension officer and the farmers view each other as partners, with the farmer taking the lead in the system. Some refer to this as the “extension Officer handing over the stick”. Under this arrangement, farmers take the lead in various aspects of extension, including electing their representatives, setting of extension priorities, drawing up plans, sharing of responsibilities at implementation (field day organization, demonstrations for new technologies and dissemination etc) and monitoring levels. Under this system the farmer and the Camp Extension Officer assume specific roles as discussed below.

5.1.1 The Role of the Farmer in the Participatory Extension System

In this arrangement the CEO assumes the role of facilitator, whereas the farmer assumes a pronounced role in most extension activities. Farmers are involved in the following:

- Selecting own representatives in the form of leader farmers and others in the farmer group committees
- Setting extension priorities and resolving on courses of action
- Taking up different roles in implementation of extension activities e.g. where a demonstration plot or field day would be held
- Participating in monitoring
- Encouraging other farmers to participate in the activities such as meetings, study circles and others like farm visits (to look at demonstration plots) and field days

5.1.2 The Role of the Camp Extension Officer in the Participatory Extension System

As earlier indicated the Camp Extension Officer takes up the role of facilitator. As a facilitator, the CEO is expected to:

- Encourage people to participate
- Provide guidance on matters not clear to farmers, through questions or comments
- Assist farmers to reach decisions e.g. by providing alternatives which were not looked at by farmers and allowing them to evaluate them
- Create a harmonious working environment among farmers

While working as a facilitator, the Camp Extension Officer's specific functions vis-à-vis the farmer's activities may be outlined as follows:

- Encouraging farmers into forming groups and strengthening them: An Camp Extension Officer may facilitate the formation of farmer groups in areas where they do not exist. In cases where they exist the Worker will encourage such groups to grow in strength. The categorization of farmers into groups cuts down on transaction costs associated with servicing them.
- Facilitating the organization of activities among farmers such as reminding them to hold planning meetings, share of responsibilities and to participate in different activities such as monitoring.
- Introducing some new ideas to farmers: Extension workers may be more exposed to the developments outside their camps through training, exchange of ideas with other officers in different camps, access to information on new technologies from research, short-term training and so on.
- Coordinates and facilitating transfer of technologies: once technologies appear successful in the camp, the Camp Extension Officer could coordinate and facilitate the transfer of technologies to other parts of the camp and sometimes outside. The Camp Extension Officer could organize field days, demonstration plots, exchange visits and so on. At different points as these activities are taking place, the extension officer may be required to provide technical explanations.
- Acting as advisor, guiding the farmers during meetings e.g. advising them on the desirable criteria for selecting leaders and guiding them on government policy and generally facilitating the meetings so that they are on course. For example, the extension officer may give guidelines of what is expected of one to participate in a demonstration plot, as follows:
 - a. Must be acceptable to other farmers i.e. approachable to them
 - b. Must have the required resources to be able to participate in a given demonstration (e.g. must have free access to land to be used for demonstrations, or oxen in order to be involved in promotion of technologies like using the ripper in conservation farming)
 - c. Must be a resident in the area in which the demonstration is carried out
 - d. Must be willing to participate
 - e. Must have demonstrated to be a good farmer who can take care of the demonstration plot
- With the introduction of the FGE component in some LM and CF areas the Camp Extension Officer to provide back-up services in meetings or sessions that aim at training farmers in courses of gender, participation and leadership.

5.2 The Vision of the Extension System Under FGE

For a long time farmers have been on the receiving end when it came to agricultural extension, with minimum input on their part. Camp extension Officers would plan what to train farmers, take the lead in the training and monitoring of results. Contact farmers under the system, were appointed (by the CEO) rather than elected to assist the CEO in the dissemination of extension messages. Farmers in general were mere recipients of extension messages, expected to adopt whatever they were told. The results were disappointing, characterized with sub-optimal priorities being drawn and farmers loathing the extension activities.

5.3 Training Under the FGE to Enhance Capacity of Camp Extension Officers

5.3.1 Exposure to Different Courses Among CEOs in FGE and NON FGE Camps

Training to extension workers was the major intervention strategy to strengthen the capacity of the extension workers to deliver their services under the new context of the extension system. The Camp Extension Officers were exposed to different courses, including leadership, Participatory Development, Gender and Facilitation.

Due to the importance of the market economy, following liberalization, an investigation on whether or not the extension officers were exposed to entrepreneurship became a vital aspect. Table 5.1 below shows the different areas of training to which extension officers in different types of camps were exposed.

Table 5.1: Frequencies and Percentages of Farmers Trained in the Areas of Leadership, Participatory Development, Facilitation and Entrepreneurship

Camp Type	Total Interviewed	No. of Farmers Trained ⁶			
		Leadership	Participation	Gender	Facilitation
FGE	7 (100)	6 (85.7)	7 (100)	7 (100)	6 (85.7)
Non FGE	6 (100)	2 (33.3)	3 (50)	6 (100)	4 (66.7)
Total	13 (100)	8 (61.5)	10 (76.9)	13 (100)	10 (76.9)

Table 5.1 shows that except for training in gender, which was extended to all CEOs in both FGE and Non FGE camps, there were higher proportions of CEOs in FGE camps than those in Non FGE camps that were exposed to courses in leadership, participatory development and facilitation. Whereas 85.7 percent of the CEO in FGE camps were trained in leadership, only 33 per cent of the CEOs in Non FGE camps were exposed to this subject. As for training in participatory Development, 100 per cent of the CEOs in FGE camps were trained, while only 50 per cent of the CEOs in

⁶ The number in brackets refers to percentage of farmers out of the total interviewed.

Non FGE camps received the training. This trend continued in the training geared to improving facilitation as 85.7 per cent of the CEO in FGE camps were trained, while only 67 per cent of those in the Non FGE camps benefited.

When one compares results in the FGE camps with the situation at the time of the baseline study, there are indications that the FGE project has made a lot of progress. For instance, whereas at the baseline point there were no CEOs trained in leadership, at this evaluation shows that 85.7 per cent of the CEOs have been trained in this field. Similarly, while this evaluation shows that in FGE camps 85.7 percent of the CEOs have been trained in Facilitation, 75 per cent of the CEO had the exposure in the area at baseline study time.

5.3.2 Perceived Relevance of The Training

In all cases, extension workers that were trained indicated that the trainings were beneficial. Regarding training in leadership, they pointed out that the training helped them to provide better advice to farmers on how to elect good leaders. They were able to guide farmers on the qualities they should look for when choosing leaders for their groups. They also felt training in leadership helped them to be more confident when dealing with others.

Regarding training in Participation and Development extension workers indicated that after the training they were able to involve farmers to participate at all levels. They pointed out that because of the training they were able to encourage farmers to identify their problems and seek solutions.

The training in gender relations was also appreciated. The CEOs felt they were now seeking ways of how to encourage the participation of women in various activities and examining how productivity can be increased with better gender relationships.

Training in facilitation helped the CEOs in many ways. First they were able to understand farmers better and became responsive to their requirements, making working relationship more amiable. Secondly, their knowledge increased because through the requirement to also listen as a facilitator, were now getting new ideas from farmers. Thirdly, the CEOs were now finding it easier to mobilise farmers as they worked with partners within the communities.

On the overall, it is clear that the training that was provided under the FGE project to the CEOs was highly appreciated and appears to be contributing positively to the delivery of the extension system.

5.4 The Attitude of the Camp Extension Officers to the Participatory Extension System

The extension workers generally perceive the participatory extension approach as beneficial. First, they pointed out that by allowing farmers to take the lead in most activities, they are able to learn to new ideas and hence become more effective as agents of change. Second extension workers indicated that they spend less time and effort planning for a large number of farmers, this time they simply guide the farmers to generate their own plans. Third, they claimed that farmers' participation makes

their work easier, experiencing a reduced workload while able to achieve desirable results- i.e. increased efficiency. The involvement of farmers in extension has meant that more farmers are covered, unlike in the past where the extension struggled to cover a large number of farmers scattered in distant places. CEOs also feel they are now able to deliver messages more efficiently in terms of time; the information is disseminated faster through the farmer network.

Notably, during the baseline study CEOs had anticipated that the foregoing benefits would be borne into fruition with the introduction of the FGE. Thus far it appears the benefits of the participatory extension system are beginning to emerge.

5.5 Participation of Farmers in the Extension System

Farmers were asked different questions in order to determine their level of participation in the extension system.

Farmers are involved in different activities. Some of these are setting of targets to be met (planning), monitoring of extension activities and guiding others and encouraging them in adopting technologies.

The task of monitoring involves some members of a farmer group or the chairman going round other farmers' (group members) fields to check on progress towards agreed activities and results are reported during zone meetings. this was reported to take place in Mankhaka camp of Lundazi. In some areas there are monitoring committees in place. The participatory monitoring and reporting system is still in the state of evolution.

Extension workers have generally involved lead farmers to carry out demonstrations to other farmers about given technologies. Such farmers are selected on the different criteria revealed earlier. Other farmers' fields are used for field days. The farmers involved in such activities provide guidance to others. Table 5.2 shows the proportions farmers that participated in setting of targets, guiding others and monitoring of agricultural activities their camps.

Table 5.2: Frequency Distributions of Farmers Participating in Selected (No. and percentages) Extension Activities by Type of Camp

Extension Activity	Frequency of Farmers Participating (No. and % ages of Total interviewed)	
	FGE Camp	Non FGE Camp
Setting of Targets	70 (48.3)	49 (36.6)
Guiding other Farmers	97 (66.9 %)	54 (40.3)
Monitoring activities	120 (82.8 %)	87 (64.9)

Note: the percentages were based on the total number of farmers interviewed per camp; 145 farmers drawn from FGE camps, while 134 were from Non FGE camps

Table 5.2 shows that there are higher participation rates of farmers in extension activities in FGE camps than in Non FGE camps. This is consistent in all the three selected activities.

When one refers to some of the results in Table 5.2 and compare them with the situation during the baseline study of the FGE project, it becomes clear that the FGE project has made progress. In the baseline study, for both the monitoring and guiding others the participation rate was about 55 per cent. The FGE camps depict higher participation rates of 82.8 per cent and 66.9 per cent for “monitoring” and “guiding others”, respectively. This suggests that the participatory extension system has become more developed in FGE camps due to the interventions of the project.

5.6 Integration of HIV/ AIDS in the Extension System by the LM and CF

The LM and CF Programme targeted extension staff at district and field levels, as well as lead farmers for HIV/AIDS interventions. These were to become the main channels through which HIV/ AIDS information would be taken to the farming community. In order to enhance the capacity of these partners the Programme organized five awareness workshops in the LM and CF provinces. The workshops were conducted by the PSO in collaboration with the Zambia Health Education Communication Trust (ZHECT) who assisted with workshop facilitation.

5.6.1 Beneficiaries in the Training of HIV /AIDS

Details of the workshops in terms of participants and location are provided in Table 5.3 below.

Table 5.3: HIV/AIDS Awareness Workshops and Participation of Farmers and Extension staff in LM and CF Areas

Workshop Date	Venue and	Participants		
		Extension Staff & advisers	No. of Farmers	Total
Kabwe, June, 2002	26-28 th	20 (6 advisers, 14 extension staff)	10	30
Lusaka, 2002	2-7 th September	10 (2 advisers and 6 staff)	13	23
Choma, 2002	24-26 th September	13 (2 advisers and 11 staff)	16	29
Lusaka, 2002 (TOT)	8-10 th October	n.a	n.a	22
Eastern Province		11	19	30
Total				134

Source: Summarized from various documents obtained from LM and CF Programme

Note: N.a means that it was not possible to disaggregate the data into the 2 categories.

District officers and CEOs carried out further sensitization workshops among farmers. For instance sensitization workshops were held in Eastern Province to include the districts of Katete, Chadiza and Mambwe, covering 197 farmers, consisting of 101 males and 96 females.

Data from the survey among farmers show that 12.4 per cent (18 out of a total of 145 farmers) and 8.2 per cent (or 11 out of 134 farmers) of the farmers from FGE and Non

FGE camps, respectively, had been exposed to some training in HIV/ AIDS. The main source of training was cited to be the LM and CF Programme.

Farmers also cited other sources of information, apart from the extension officers. For example, one farmer in Kanakantapa camp cited the Seventh Day Adventist (SDA); a farmer in Choma cited the health worker, while another referred to Kasisi Training Centre in the Chongwe area (run by the Catholic Church) as the main source of information on HIV/AIDS. This picture shows that there are potential partnerships (to fight HIV/ AIDS) that can be cultivated with churches and others in the health sector.

5.6.2 Subjects Covered in Training

The subjects covered in the HIV/ AIDS awareness workshops were wide. First background information was provided to show the global trends, then zeroing in on to Zambia. Modes of transmission of HIV and HIV related diseases were also covered in the training. Then communication skills to enhance outreach activities (e.g. peer education) were taught to workshop participants. The latter also incorporated issues of how to deal with the scourge in the communities, such as avoiding discrimination of patients and how communities could cope.

5.6.3 Indicative effectiveness of HIV /AIDs Awareness

Monitoring reports⁷, on the subject, from the LM and CF indicate that the awareness programme has been effective. It was revealed that people in the communities are beginning to abandon some cultural practices that can lead to an increase in the incidence of HIV/AIDS. These include marrying off young girls to people with many partners, polygamy and sexual cleansing.

Some interesting achievements towards the impact have been registered. For one thing, farmers have become more open to each other and to their families and thus discuss HIV /AIDS, a topic which used to be avoided and considered as taboo. Further, not only has there been an increasing demand for more information on the subject, but also an increasing demand for condoms (protective devices).

Perhaps the foremost step the communities have taken is how they are beginning to put in place interventions on how to handle the infected and affected families. Communities are now coming up with coping strategies such as identifying the patients and forming groups to assist the patient's family. Assistance may be in the form of volunteering to care for the sick person, on a rotational basis, or assisting to work in the fields of the affected family.

5.7 Concluding Remark

This chapter has focused on assessing one of the outputs of the FGE project, namely, "agricultural Extension staff in LM and CF areas aware of, motivated for and able to promote farmer-to-farmer based extension system". During the baseline study,

⁷ See paper prepared by Glenda Mulenga and Abiud Mwale, Mainstreaming HIV? AIDS in the LM and CF Programme.

indicators were developed for measuring progress in this output. The summary assessment of progress follows below.

- (i) One indicator was that "100 % of extension staff are aware of gender and are of improved facilitation skills" According to the findings, to large extent, significant progress has been achieved. All extension staff, both from FGE and Non FGE camps, were trained in gender. About 86 per cent and 66.9 of the staff in FGE and Non FGE camps, respectively, camps were exposed to facilitation. Although not all extension staff were trained in facilitation skills, it was clear that the situation was better in FGE camps, compared to Non FGE camps.
- (ii) Another indicator was that "100% of the extension workers willing to promote farmer to farmer extension by encouraging farmers to participate in extension groups." The study shows that this has been achieved as all extension workers depicted a very positive attitude towards the extension system, citing several benefits with it.
- (iii) The third indicator was that "100% of extension workers involve farmers to develop agricultural plans and assist them to identify their roles." Field visits indicated that this has been achieved. Farmers make plans at zone level, feed them into the camp committees, then to blocks. However, it appears farmers do not fully participate in managing the budgetary resources.
- (iv) The fourth indicator was that "100 % of the extension workers in LM and CF areas develop indicators for monitoring the plans and to be accountable in executing different roles and responsibilities, including use of resources." This appears to be developing though not to the full extent.
- (v) The farmers have become increasingly involved in extension activities, through electing their lead farmers and other leaders. The lead farmers and other leaders have become important sources of encouragement to other farmers to participate in different agricultural activities, as well as in facilitating other extension activities (such as monitoring progress and guiding others).
- (vi) Another interesting factor is where farmers have been empowered to solve some of their problems through groups. Of particular interest is how farmer groups are taking up the issue of HIV? AIDS; they use groups to assist the affected families to rotate in taking care of the sick and help out in the fields..

In view of the foregoing, there has been considerable progress towards meeting the output on building capacity among extension workers in the farmer-to-farmer extension approach.

CHAPTER SIX

6.0 ASSESSMENT OF COMMUNITY LEADERS

Leadership can be defined in different ways. However, in general terms one would describe leaders those that have the ability to influence others into taking some action. Indeed, the training manual by the In-service Training Trust (2002), put leadership into some interesting perspective when they quoted an old adage that "He who thinketh he leadeth and hath no one following him is only taking a walk". It was thus the vision of the FGE project to build capacity into the targeted leaders to influence their people into participating in the LM and CF activities.

One of the approaches of the FGE Project was to strengthen partnerships between the LM and CF programme with local leaders, including councillors and headmen in the traditional sector, as well as some leading farmers. Each category of these leaders would have different roles to play. The roles of the lead farmers in an extension system have been alluded to in the chapter preceding this one. Hence the roles of the councillors and traditional leaders are revealed here.

6.1 Roles of the Different Leaders

6.1.1 Role of Councillor

In Zambia, a few years prior to 1991, a one-party system of governance was in place and whoever was elected as councilor supposedly represented everybody. With the advent of the current multi-party system of governance (introduced in 1991) in Zambia, it is not clear whether or not some councilors discriminate members of the community that belong to political parties other than theirs. However, the new system is such that whoever is elected should treat all members of the community equally, without politically motivated bias.

It would appear that these leaders wield less power and respect, among some communities compared to traditional leaders, as the latter are supposed to represent everyone in their communities. However, there appears to be a general trend in many communities, councillors are gaining respect, as they work through different sections that have elected leaders. The sections form an Area Development Committee (ADCs). Many farmers, showing recognition of this local governance system, cited the ADCs as channels for development. In such communities councillors usually work together with headmen rather than in isolation. This is the desirable situation the FGE programme looked forward to attain.

From the foregoing, it is clear that the councillor has a role to play in the Programme, if harmony is to be assured. This means that their presence should be recognized and they may be involved in the following ways:

- Informing them about activities the Programme is involved in, and possibly asking them to visit Programme activities
- Requesting them to mobilizing support for the Programme during district development /council meetings. Some resources such as the district constituency

funds are channelled through the councillors and hence the community could benefit in road repair, water and sanitation and so on.

- Asking them to officiate at some functions
- Lobbying on land matters so that land for demonstrations and for general production is made available to farmers. This was evidenced in one Kabwe camp where land was considered scarce and the councillor was lobbying to get the land de-gazetted from the status of Forestry Reserve to be re-allocated as an agricultural land where local people can legally use it for agriculture.
- Requesting them to promote the Programme's activities e.g. launch of new innovations.

However, councillors should not be involved in the operations of the Programme such as choosing lead farmers, distribution of inputs for trials and so on. Their roles should be more of ceremonial in nature and that of facilitation, rather than operational.

6.1.2 The Role of the Traditional Leadership

In the case of the traditional leadership there is no doubt that they are generally well respected and have influence among community members. It is essential that they are encouraged to be part and parcel of development activities in their areas. Traditional leaders have a number of obligations to assure welfare for their subjects. Some of the conspicuous functions that traditional leaders play include the following:

- Empowering people by allocating land to those that need it
- Conflict resolution
- Community mobilization for different development activities e.g. mobilizing people to contribute towards building a school, rehabilitating road infrastructure, construction of wells and so on.
- Enforcement of law and order e.g. controlling the use of natural resources such as wildlife, sustenance of forests and so on.
- Social welfare activities; upon finding out about the vulnerability of particular persons in the community, a traditional leader could mobilize other members to assist such persons. For example, the leader may ask some community members to contribute food or labour to assist very old and helpless people.

From the foregoing, it is clear that traditional leaders provide a wide range of services for the best interest of their communities. As such it would be vital for the Programme to involve the leaders in ways such as the following:

- Informing them about activities of the Programme and their importance to their communities.
- Consulting them about traditions in the areas and how these could be harmonized with Programme activities
- Asking for their interventions in different aspects such as land allocation for different activities of the Programme.
- Traditional leaders may also be involved with the launch of important Programme activities.

Whereas it is important to involve traditional leaders in the activities of the programme, it might not be practical to ask them to take up executive positions in committees. If

they are in those positions it would be difficult to members to demand accountability from them.

6.1.3 Summary on Perception of a good Leader

Leaders, depending on the type of influence, can be beneficial or destructive to development of a society. In the FGE it envisaged that good leaders would be cultivated. From consultation with different sources and analysis of the different roles of the leaders, one could summarise attributes of good leaders as: (i) Being able to communicate their visions to others so that he develops a common goal; (ii) Willingness to listen to others; this calls for a leader to be humble and approachable, able to accept errors and attempt to correct them where necessary; (iii) Ability to encourage people to talk and allow others to think differently; (iv) Ability to display optimism, faith and hope; (v) Ability to display morality and honesty; (vi) Being empathetic: a leader must feel for others.

Leaders with the attributes discussed above are likely to be more successful in influencing others into taking some actions in a given community.

6.2 The Vision of the Programme with Leaders

It was the envisioned that the FGE project would lead to improved knowledge about democratic leadership and participatory extension methods. The project aimed at building the capacity of the leaders, improving coordination between them and stimulating interest in them to participate in encouraging others to participate in LM and CF activities. To measure progress in this area, indicators were developed at the time of the baseline study for the project. Following were the indicators:

- (i) Lead farmers are capable of bringing together their group members more frequently and group sizes increase (as shown by attendance rates). At least 60 % of the group members should consist of older members (members for at least 3 years)
- (ii) 80 % of the local traditional leaders not only start to participate in LM & CF but also encourage their subordinates to attend meetings and allow democratic forms of governance characterized by consultation.
- (iii) All Ward Councillors (in LM & CF areas) work closely on developmental issues with traditional leaders, rather than compete with them i.e. clear roles and responsibilities emerge between the two categories. They start mobilizing resources for and generally supporting the LM & CF groups.
- (iv) Leaders in (i), (ii) and (iii) allow the people they lead to contribute to decision making
- (v) Leaders as specified in (i), (ii) and (iii) are more transparent in their dealings (they communicate with their members on LM & CF).

6.3 Interventions of the FGE to build Capacity of Leaders in the LM and CF Programme

6.3.1 Types of training interventions

Training to leaders was the major intervention strategy to strengthen their capacity of serving their communities better and to enable them encourage their people to participate in the LM and CF. The leaders were exposed to different courses, including leadership, Participatory Development and Gender. Tables 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3 show the percentages and numbers of councillors, headmen and lead farmers, respectively, that had exposure in the subjects.

Table 6.1: Frequencies and Percentages of Councillors Trained in the Areas of Leadership, Participatory Development and Gender

Camp Type	Total Interviewed	No. of Councillors Trained ⁸ out of Total Sample		
		Leadership	Gender	Participation
FGE	4 (100)	3 (75)	3 (75)	3 (75)
Non FGE	6 (100)	5 (83.3)	2 (33.3)	4 (66.7)
Total	10 (100)	8 (80)	5 (50)	7 (70)

Table 6.1 shows that 10 councillors were interviewed; 4 from FGE camps and 6 from Non FGE camps. Table reveals that 75 per cent of the councillors in the FGE camps were trained in each of the fields of leadership, gender and participation issues. In Non FGE camps, the proportions of councillors that were trained in the subjects of Gender and Participation were lower than those of councillors in FGE camps (standing at 33.3 % and 66.7%, respectively).

It might look surprising that in the area of leadership training, a higher proportion (83.3%) of councillors were trained Non FGE camps than in FGE camps (at 75%). This is because there were many other projects that were operating in some Non FGE camps, conducting training in leadership. The Forum for Democratic process, FODEP was active in Chililalila, Nteme and Feni, providing training in leadership, gender and participation. Similarly, The Lutheran World Foundation (LWF) provided training in leadership to councillors in Emusa camp. Hence programmes other than the FGE project trained 4 out of 6 Non FGE camps.

In one area, Waya camp, a councillor was trained in leadership by both MACO and FODEP. The situation emerging here suggests that there is need for different programmes to coordinate among themselves to avoid such duplication.

Comparison with the baseline situation was difficult. This is because at the time of the baseline study no councillor was interviewed. However, the cross-sectional comparison between the FGE and Non FGE camps provides fair grounds to assess the progress of the FGE activities.

⁸ The number in brackets refers to percentage of Councillors out of the total interviewed.

Table 6.2: Frequencies of Headmen Trained in the Areas of Leadership, Participatory Development and Gender

Camp Type	Total Interviewed	No. of Headmen Trained ⁹ out of Total Sample		
		Leadership	Gender	Participation
FGE	12 (100)	12 (100)	12 (100)	12 (100)
Non FGE	10 (100)	5 (50.0)	4 (40.0)	5 (50.0)
Total	22 (100)	17 (77.3)	16 (72.7)	17 (77.3)

Table 6.2 shows that the proportions of headmen trained in the selected subject areas were higher in FGE camps than in Non FGE camps. All (100 %) of the headmen interviewed in FGE camps had training in the subjects of leadership, gender and participation. In the Non FGE camps, 50 %, 40 % and 50 % of the headmen had training in leadership, gender and participation. This suggests that in the FGE project had contributed to the capacity building of the leaders in the areas it operated.

When one compares the current situation in camps with the baseline situation, it becomes clear that there has been progress in the training of leaders in the areas of leadership, gender and participation. During the baseline time, 27.3 per cent had been trained in leadership, while only 22.7 per cent of the leaders had been trained in each of the areas of gender and participation. This suggests that there has been progress in knowledge of the selected subjects among leaders after since the inception of the FGE project.

Programmes other than the FGE project mainly spearheaded the training in Non FGE and this explains the increase in the proportions of headmen that have been were trained at the current time, compared the situation at the time of the baseline study. In Emusa, LWF was involved with training in leadership, gender and participation. In Feni, the Partnership Forum provided training to leaders in all the subjects in the table above. The Seventh Day Adventists (SDA) church was cited as having trained leaders in leadership and participation in Siamuleya camp. Women for Change (WFC) trained leaders in gender in the Nteme camp.

Table 6.3: Frequencies and Percentages of Lead Farmers Trained in the Areas of Leadership, Participatory Development and Gender mainstreaming

Camp Type	Total Interviewed	No. of Lead Farmers Trained ¹⁰ out of Total Sample			
		Leadership	Gender	Participation	Conservation Farming (CF)
FGE	18 (100)	18 (100)	18 (100)	18 (100)	18 (100)
Non FGE	6 (100)	1 (83.3)	4 (16.7)	3 (50.0)	4 (66.7)
Total	24 (100)	19 (79.2)	22 (91.7)	21 (87.5)	22 (91.7)

⁹ The number in brackets refers to percentage of Headmen out of the total interviewed.

¹⁰ The number in brackets refers to percentage of Lead Farmers out of the total interviewed.

Table 6.3 shows the proportions of lead farmers that were exposed, through training, to selected subjects. Notably, Lead Farmers were exposed to more areas of training than the other partners in leadership, whose coverage was relatively limited. This is because, unlike the other leaders (councillors and headmen), Lead farmers are expected to spend more time on extension services.

The table also shows that the proportions of Lead Farmers trained in the selected subject areas were higher in FGE camps than in Non FGE camps. All (100 %) of the Lead Farmers interviewed in FGE camps had training in the subjects of leadership, gender, participation and Conservation Farming. In the Non FGE camps, 83.3 per cent, 16.7 per cent, 50 per cent and 66.7 per cent of the Lead Farmers had training in leadership, gender participation and Conservation Farming (CF), respectively. This suggests that in the FGE project had contributed to the capacity building of the lead farmers in the areas it operated.

As in the case of councillors, comparison with the baseline situation was difficult. This is because at the time of the baseline study the data on farmers were not disaggregated to show Lead Farmers as a category. However, the cross-sectional comparison between the FGE and Non FGE camps is provides some fair foundation for assessing the progress of the FGE activities in terms of training the Lead Farmers.

Programmes other than the FGE project took the lead in conducting the training in Non FGE, explaining the existence of high proportions of Lead Farmers that have been trained in some of the camps. The same programmes that had trained some headmen and councillors were also found to have trained the farmers in their selected courses. Other programmes cited Include the Germany Technical Cooperation (GTZ) that provided training in leadership and gender in Nteme and Siamuleya camps, respectively; the FAO were cited as having had provided training in leadership to farmers in Nteme. World Vision International added to the list of providers of leadership training in the Feni camp.

6.3.2 Relevance of the training

From the assessment the all training activities were considered useful by all that participated in them. For those trained in leadership, they indicated that they have become better leaders. Some cited that following the training their attitudes have changed; they are ready to listen to others and consult to make better decisions.

The leaders claimed the training in gender helped them change their attitude towards women. One of the headmen, in Njola camp pointed out that due to his appreciation about gender, he even allocated land to some women; a situation he would have not done in the past. He understands that women have the right to land too.

Those that trained in participation and development indicated that they were now able to bring people together to plan on how different activities would be implemented. One councillor, in Kabwe revealed that now he is able to use participatory techniques such as listing and ranking to arrive at priority problems that required addressing in the different areas.

None of those trained had reservations on the training provided to them. Evidently, the training became useful in that it assisted them to enhance their performance of their respective different roles.

6.3.4 Collaboration in Training

The emerging picture is that it was clear that some organizations provided training in the same subjects to farmers residing in the same area. It was not clear whether or not the organizations were carrying out the training to complement one another or in it was in duplication. The underlining issue here is that collaboration is necessary.

There are several benefits of collaboration. First, the collaboration could lead to an overall more efficient utilization of resources. For example, if one of the partners has already a well developed curriculum in a given subject area, there would be relatively less resources required to modify or improve the existing materials rather to develop the new ones. Second, with collaboration there would be a forum for sharing of experiences among those implementing similar activities. This could lead to better quality as of implementation as lessons would be drawn from a wide base. Third, the eminent danger of duplicating training on the same beneficiaries by different organizations would be circumvented through collaboration. The avoidance of duplication would entail a larger population being covered by such beneficial intervention.

Table 6.4 below shows an inventory of potential future collaborating partners for those intending to provide training in the subjects of leadership, gender and participation, by location.

Table 6.4: Potential Organizations for Collaboration in Training with the LM and CF Programme in FGE related activities, by their Expertise and Location

Organization Name	Location	Areas of Training Cooperation
District Women Association (DWA)	Chipata	Leadership
LWF	Lundazi	Leadership, Gender and Participatory Development
Forum for Development Process (FODEP)	Chipata, Monze and Kabwe	Leadership, Gender and Participation
Partnership Forum	Chipata	Leadership, Gender and Participation and Development
Women For Change	Monze	Leadership and Gender
Roman Catholic Church	Chipata	Leadership
SDA Church	Choma	Leadership
World Vision	Chipata	Leadership
CLUSA	Monze, Chongwe	Conservation Farming

Further, collaboration would lead to the organisations complementing one another's efforts rather than competing and negating the headway made by others. For example, fieldwork revealed that some organisations paid huge allowances to farmers that participated in their programmes. As a result some farmers have programmes promoted by some organisations to those that provide monetary incentives. There is need for all organisations operating in the same geographical areas to take a common stance in the allowances and other policies so that some organisations do not necessarily thrive at the peril of others.

6.4 The Effect of FGE Interventions on Leaders

6.4.1 Participation of leaders in LM and CF activities

In order to assess their participation in LM and CF activities, leaders were asked to give an account of how they provided support to LM and CF activities. Each of the categories of the leaders gave their activities.

6.4.1.1 Traditional Leaders

All traditional leaders interviewed, except for one from a Non FGE camp, indicated that they encouraged their people to participate in the LM and CF activities. They did this mostly by calling for meetings where they explained the benefits of Conservation Farming (CF) activities and thereafter encouraging participating in the LM and CF activities. Two headmen indicated that sometimes they paid visits to homes of some individuals to encourage them; one headman indicated that he has allocated land for demonstrations on CF; 6 headmen even indicated that they were involved in demonstrations of different CF activities. For the foregoing it appears the traditional leadership have been supportive of the LM and CF activities.

6.4.1.2 Councillors

Similarly, all councillors interviewed indicated that they were supportive of the LM and CF programme. Most of the councillors also indicated they encouraged the people in their areas to participating in CF activities by way of explaining to them the benefits. One of the councillors revealed that he was involved in the demonstration of some CF technology.

However, it must be pointed that in some Non FGE camps, the approach by some councillors left some room for improvement. For example, two of the from such camps, when asked how they encouraged farmers in CF activities they replied that "I instruct them to join, this is a government programme". This suggests that they are not well prepared for leadership approaches; "instructing" alludes to being more authoritarian than democratic in approach. It does not depict the good characteristics of good leaderships discussed earlier.

6.4.1.3 Lead Farmers

Lead farmers, as discussed during the extension system, are involved in many activities. They appear to be more involved in extension activities than the other leaders. A notable, and demanding, function of the Lead Farmers is that of monitoring

progress on other farmers' farms to find out whether or not they are following the recommendation of extension services. About 89 per cent of the Lead Farmers interviewed in FGE camps reported that they participated in Monitoring and Reporting on activities of other farmers to ensure they implement activities correctly. Lead Farmers in Non FGE camps showed lower rates of participation as 66.7 per cent of them were involved in Monitoring and Reporting.

Lead Farmers were also found to be more involved in encouraging other farmers in agricultural activities than the other leaders. For instance, when farmers were asked on who encouraged them to attend meetings the majority cited lead farmers. Only few cited the other leaders (councillors and headmen). Table 6.4 gives the frequency distribution of persons that farmers cited as encouraging them to attend meetings.

Table 6.4: Frequency and Percentages Distribution of Persons/institutions Cited as Being the Main Source of Encouragement For Farmers to Attend Meetings

Source of Encouragement	FGE Camp	Non FGE Camp
Extension Officer	45 (31%)	55 (41%)
Lead Farmer	58 (40 %)	38 (28.3 %)
Farmer Committees	22 (15.2 %)	25 (18.7%)
Traditional Leaders	2 (1.4 %)	0 (0.0%)
Councillors	0 (0.0 %)	1 (0.7 %)
Family members (husband/ wife)	5 (3.4 %)	4 (2.2 %)
Other	13 (8.9 %)	11 (8.9 %)
Total	145 (100%)	134 (100 %)

Note: some figures in the totals may not add up to 100 % due to rounding off errors.

It is clear from the table above that in the FGE camps, lead farmers are the most active as a source of encouragement to farmers, raking first (40%). Extension workers rank second (31%), while committee members of farmer groups rank third (15.2%). All other sources were each only cited by less than 10 per cent of the farmers.

In Non FGE camps, extension workers are the most active as a source of encouragement to farmers, raking first (41%). Lead Farmers rank second (28.3%), while committee members of farmer groups rank third (18.7%). All other sources were each only cited by less than 10 per cent of the farmers.

One interesting feature is that the extent to which the extension workers have handed over the stick to farmers is more pronounced in FGE camps than in Non FGE camps. This is evidenced by the relative importance of the role farmers take lead in encouraging others to participate in group development activities.

The foregoing suggests that there is more progress in FGE camps than in the Non FGE camps in the area of "handing over the stick" to farmers by the extension workers. This is a good indicator of improved facilitation in FGE camps.

6.4.1.4 Women Leaders

It is interesting to note that women do not participate as much as men in different leadership positions. Of all the 10 councillors representing the camps visited, none was a woman. Even among the 22 traditional leaders found in the zones none was a woman.

The councillors and traditional leaders usually work through different committees to come up with decisions that affect their people. The councillor works through the Area Development Committees, while headmen work with some committees of advisors. In most cases the committees are made of men, with few women, generally less than 40 percent of the total committee member. Hence, even at this level the participation of women is limited.

Among the Lead Farmers, there were some women. Even then their representation was generally lower than that of men. Out of the total of 24 Lead Farmers in the whole sample, only 6 or 25 per cent were women.

When the sample of Lead Farmers is disaggregated by camp type (FGE or Non FGE), the FGE camps present a slightly better picture in terms of participation of women as Lead Farmers. In the FGE camps, 27.8 per cent (or 5 out of the total of 18 in FGE camps) of the Lead Farmers were women. In Non FGE camps, 16.7 per cent (or 1 out of the total of 6 in the Non FGE camps) of the Lead Farmers were women.

There are many reasons why the participation of women is low, most of which emanate from cultural dispositions. The culture is characterised by male dominance. One outcome of this is that women are not listened to, as they are considered inferior, as observed by one extension officer. The issue of inferiority is a double-edged dagger. On the one hand the society sees women as inferior; while on the other women themselves lack the courage to stand up to men. As such women trail behind men in obtaining positions.

Another factor hindering women is the household distribution of labour. Women have to contend with three roles; reproductive role (looking after children, cooking laundry and so on), community work (looking after the sick, taking up major roles at funerals, church work and so on) and the economic activities (production in fields for economic gains). This three-pronged burden of work (where men are exempted in some activities) tends to hinder women from participating in some developmental activities.

Women are also hampered by resources; the access to the resources as well and controlling them. For example, a woman may not be able to participate in a demonstration of some technology because even if she could have access to the land, the husband who controls the resource may not allow her to use it for the purpose. This situation has made it difficult for some women to participate in the demonstrations of some technologies.

From the foregoing, the objective of increasing the participation of women in different leadership positions to up to 50 per cent is yet to be achieved. This is

because cultural issue take time to change. It is clear that there is still a need for more concerted efforts to turn the situation round.

6.4.2 Existence of Committees for Decisions on Development

6.4.2.1 Traditional Leadership

According to most traditional leaders (17 out of 22 headmen, or 77 %), in both FGE and Non FGE camps, it was found that there existed committees that headmen relied on for advice when it came to deciding on development activities. The committees were elected from among residents of village communities. Whereas women were encouraged to participate in committees, it was not in all cases that they accounted for 50 per cent of the committee representatives. On the overall, about 40 per cent of the committee members were women.

Of the five traditional leaders that had no committees in place, 3 (60%) of them were from Non FGE camps. Three of the headmen in these camps revealed that they made decisions, with little consultation from the people. Other traditional leaders in the FGE camps indicated that although they did not have committees people in general were consulted and the headmen made the final decisions.

Two issues emerge from the foregoing. First, the majority of the headmen have committees in place. Second, among those leaderships without committees, the those in FGE camps appear to be more democratic in that they still consult their people through meeting before making a final decision. This is in contrast to the situation obtaining in two Non FGE camps where leaders indicated they made decisions on their own accord.

6.4.2.2 Councillors

As in the case of councillors, there is a structural design prescribed by the Government that a committee should be in place. The committee is referred to as the Area Development committee (ADC). Members of the ADCs are elected from sections with the area. It is in these committees that the councillors operate to advance development Programmes. It was not clear at the time of the study to establish the composition of these committees in terms of sex (male –female ratio). However, from the available information on gender relationships in the communities we are dealing with, it is likely that there are less women representatives than men in the committees.

6.5 Concluding Remarks On Leadership

In terms of developing leadership, a lot of progress has been made in FGE camps. However, it is also worthwhile to indicate that progress was made in Non FGE camps too, as a result of interventions by other Programmes.

The study so far shows that all traditional leaders are interested in FGE activities; which is an achievement of more than the 80 per cent target. About 78 per cent of the leaders have committees in place. Those without committees do consult their people

through meetings. These consultations depict democratic forms of governance and transparency on the part of the leadership.

Only few leaders (3 of them), from Non FGE camps indicated that they made decisions on their own with little consultation.

The study also finds that local leaders are willing to support the LM and CF activities. However, despite their positive attitude, they are not able to meet the demands, perhaps due to other heavy responsibilities resting with them. For example, when farmers were asked to indicate who encouraged them to attend meetings only 2 per cent of the farmers cited traditional leaders. Similarly obtained when one looked at how councilors were involved with encouraging farmers to participate in the LM and CF activities; as only 0.7 per cent of the farmers cited a councilor as the source of encouragement to attend FGE meetings.

The study found that all Ward Councillors (in LM & CF areas) worked closely on developmental issues with traditional leaders, rather than compete with them. Depending on the where the development activity comes from, one the leaders responsible takes lead in mobilizing the people while keeping the other informed. For example on projects initiated through the council the Councillor will take the lead and headmen could assist to mobilize people. The two leaders are working in harmony.

Lead Farmers have proved to be capable of bringing together their group members. About 40 per cent and 28 per cent of the farmers in FGE camps and Non FGE camps, respectively, reported that the Lead Farmer was their main source of encouragement for them to attend meetings. From this result it is clear that the role of the lead farmer is more pronounced in FGE camps compared to the Non FGE camps.

Despite the success, there still is the problem of encouraging more women to take up leadership positions. Women are hampered by various cultural factors, including inferiority complex; lack of resources; and where they have access, they lack the control for the resources; and the burden of work (more than that of men) that they are assigned to in their communities. The training in gender is still important if women are to fully participate in different developmental activities.

married and divorced. In Non FGE camps 85.1 per cent and 14.9 per cent of the farmers, respectively, were married and never married.

7.1.3 Educational levels

Education level is necessary in order to facilitate understanding of new and improved technologies in any extension work. Farmers were asked to indicate their education status in terms of "no formal education, primary education, junior secondary, senior secondary, or tertiary education".

In FGE camps, those indicating no formal education, primary education, junior secondary, senior secondary, and tertiary education, respectively, accounted for 5.5 per cent, 46.9 per cent, 27.6 per cent, 17.9 per cent and 2.1 per cent. In Non FGE camps, those indicating no formal education, primary education, junior secondary, senior secondary, and tertiary education, respectively, accounted for 9.7 per cent, 52.2 per cent, 20.1 per cent, 17.9 per cent and 0.0 per cent.

It is clear that farmers in FGE camps have better education than those in Non FGE camps. This means that farmers in FGE camps have better prospects for understanding messages delivered to them than their counterparts in Non FGE camps.

7.2 The Vision of the FGE for Farmers and the Interventions

One of the key outputs of the FGE project was to increase the knowledge of agricultural development among farmers. Success in reaching this output would be indicated by willingness of farmers to work in groups (by way of attending meetings and deriving benefits from the groups membership). As group members it is expected that they will have the capacity to demand services from different service providers for their own good.

On the overall, the FGE project envisioned that its interventions would lead to active farmer management of the extension system. To measure the progress the following indicators were to be used:

- (i) Farmers groups initiating at least 80 % of the meetings and agenda therein for extension activities.
- (ii) Farmers hold elections at stipulated periods (agreed by themselves e.g every 2 years).
- (iii) Women farmers taking up 50 % of the positions on farmer groups
- (iv) At least 60 % of the farmers giving reports on monitoring results
- (v) 80 % of the farmers groups organize study cycle meetings (at least 3 meetings per month)
- (vi) It is also expected that communities would draw on opportunities, negotiate, demand services and transparency from service providers.

7.3 The Training to Farmers

In order to attain the vision of the FGE, the project trained farmers, extension workers and farmer groups in the areas of Leadership, Gender, Participation and Development and others. The next section examines the training provided to farmers under the in the FGE project. Table 7.1 shows the proportions of farmers that were exposed to different training programmes by camp type.

Table 7.1: Frequencies and Percentages of Farmers Trained in the Areas of Leadership, Participatory Development and Gender, Entrepreneurship and CF

Camp Type	Total Interviewed	No. of Farmers Trained ¹¹ out of Total Sample				
		Leadership	Gender	Participation	Entrepreneur	CF
FGE	145 (100)	123 (84.8)	131(90.3)	113 (77.9)	66 (45.5)	121 (83.4)
Non FGE	134 (100)	54 (40.3)	92 (68.6)	64 (47.6)	44 (32.8)	107 (79.8)

Table 7.1 shows that there are higher proportions of farmers in FGE camps than in Non FGE camps that were exposed to the selected training programmes that were provided by the FGE project. In FGE camps, 84.8 percent, 90.3 per cent, 77.9 per cent, 45.5 per cent and 83.4 per cent of the farmers were trained in Leadership, Gender, Participatory Development, Entrepreneurship and Conservation Farming, respectively. In Non FGE camps, 40.3 per cent, 68.6 per cent, 47.6 per cent, 32.8 per cent and 79.8 per cent of the farmers were trained in the respective courses as indicated above.

The scenario above suggests that farmers in the FGE camps are more exposed in most subjects than those in the Non FGE camp. The only exception to this assertion is the exposure to CF technologies where there appears to be no difference between the two types of camps. This is because CF technologies have been the center of focus for the LM and CF Programme in all camps, and as a result all of them have benefited.

When the results in Table 7.1 are compared with those of the baseline study, it is clear that there has been progress from the time the FGE project took off the ground. The proportions of farmers trained in the selected subjects are by far lower than those that have been trained now. At the time of the baseline study, 15.5 per cent, 35.5 per cent, 10 per cent, 14.3 per cent, and 61 per cent of the farmers had been exposed to training in Leadership, Gender, Participatory Development, Entrepreneurship and Conservation Farming, respectively.

7.4 Farmer Group Organization

This section attempts to assess the effectiveness of the training on the farmers. Now that farmers FGE camps have been trained, are they better organized? To answer this question the focus in this subsection will be on group organization.

¹¹ The number in brackets refers to percentage of farmers out of the total interviewed.

7.4.1 The Farmer Group Profiles

A total of 29 committees were interviewed to give details of the group profiles. There were 17 groups representing FGE camps while 12 committees were drawn from Non FGE camps. Table 7.2 gives a summary profile of the groups that the committees represented.

Table 7.2: Profiles of the Groups in FGE and Non FGE camps

Group Attributes	Camp Type	
	FGE Camp	Non FGE Camp
Total no. of members in Groups represented by Committees	406	384
Percentage of female members in groups	48.8 %	48.7 %
Percentage of male members in groups	51.2 %	51.3 %
Percentage of members below the age of 25 yrs in groups	16.5 %	11.1 %
Average age of the groups	2.82 years	2.83 years
Average group size	23.9 members	32 members
Range of group size (Minimum to maximum)	10 to 120 members	10 to 111 members

Table 7.2 shows that the sizes of groups vary. In FGE camps the range is from 10 to 120 members in a group, with an average size of 23.9 members. In Non FGE camps a comparable range of 10 to 111, with an average group size of 32 members was found. It is important to point out that most promoters of group development recommend membership of up to about 20 so that cohesion within groups is retained. When groups grow too large, up to 120 members or so it is better to break them into smaller ones. *This means that the size of the group should not be allowed to compromise the quality within the group.*

In terms of gender representation in membership, the situation is fairly balanced with both female and male members participating in almost equal proportions. Notably, this was the situation found during the baseline situation.

In terms of participation of the youth under the age of 25 years, there are higher proportions of the youth in FGE camps than in Non FGE camps. In FGE camps, the youth constitute 16.5 percent of the members, while in Non FGE camps 11.1 per cent of the members were youth. When one compares this situation with that at the time of the baseline study (where the youth constituted 14 % of the membership), one could conclude that not many youths have joined the groups since the FGE started.

The average age of the groups for both those in FGE and Non FGE camps do not seem to differ. On average all the groups have been in existence for an average of three years. However the range of the years in existence was longer in Non FGE

Table 7.4: Number and Proportions of Women that Hold Specific Positions in Committees by Camp Type (FGE and Non FGE camps).

Type of Camp	No. and percentage of women holding specific positions in Farmer Groups					
	Chairperson	V/Chairperson.	Secretary	V/Secretary	Treasurer	V/Treasurer
FGE camp	5 (29.4%)	7 (41.1%)	6 (35.3%)	3 (17.6%)	11 (64.7%)	1 (5.9%)
Non FGE camp	0 (0.0)	1 (8.3%)	2 (16.7%)	3 (25%)	6 (50%)	0 (0.0%)

Note: the percentages were computed on the basis of 17 committees in FGE camps and 12 committees in Non FGE camps.

When one pries into the types of position held by men and women, as shown in Table 7.4, it becomes clear that fewer women than men hold higher positions of Chairperson, Vice Chairperson, Secretary, Vice Secretary, whereas most women are relegated to relatively lower positions of treasurer down to mere committee members. In FGE camps for positions of Chairperson, Vice Chairperson, Secretary and Vice Secretary, women held 29.4 per cent, 41.1 per cent, 35 per cent and 17 per cent, respectively. In NON FGE camps the situation was worse as there were fewer proportions of women holding such substantive positions.

The problems associated with getting women to hold high positions have been discussed earlier.

7.4.3 Tenure of Office for Committees Members and Adherence to Rules by Committees

Discussions with the committees revealed that committee members are elected. The committees have different rules on how frequent elections should be held to usher into office new committee members. Table 7.5 shows the distribution of the stipulated intervals at which elections may be held to put into place committee members. This is referred to as the tenure of office for committee members.

Table 7.5: Distribution of Responses by Committees on the Stipulated Tenure of Office for Committee Members by Camp Type

Tenure of Office Cited (years)	Number and Percentage of committees in different Camp Types	
	FGE Camp	Non FGE camp
Nothing stipulated	1 (5.9%)	4 (33.3%)
1 year	9 (52.9%)	5 (41.7%)
2 years	3 (17.7 %)	2 (16.7%)
3 years	4 (23.5%)	0 (0.0%)
Above 3 years	0 (0.0%)	1 (8.3%)
Total responses	17 (100%)	12 (100%)

Table 7.5 shows that is a higher proportion of FGE camps that have stipulations on the tenure of office for office bearers in the committees than in NON FGE camps. In Non FGE camps, up to 33.3 per cent of the camps had nothing stipulated on the tenure of office for committee members, while only 5.9 per cent of the FGE camps did not have such stipulation. The foregoing suggests that committees in FGE camps are better organized than those in Non FGE camps.

Queried on whether or not the committees adhered to the stipulated periods of holding elections for new committees, they responded as indicated in Table 7.6 below.

Table 7.6: Responses of Farmer Committees on Whether or Not they Adhered to Stipulated Election Intervals

Response on Adherence to Tenure of Office	Number and Percentage of Committees in Different Camp Types	
	FGE Camp	Non FGE camp
Nothing stipulated/ Not applicable	1 (5.9%)	4 (33.3%)
Yes, adhered	12 (70.6%)	6 (50%)
No, committee exceeded	4 (23.5%)	2 (17.7%)
Total Responses	17 (100%)	12 (100%)

It is clear from Table 7.6 that there is a higher proportion of committees in FGE than in Non FGE camps adhered to the rule on the tenure of office for committee members. About 71 per cent of the committees in FGE camps adhere to the rules while only 50 per cent of the committees in Non FGE camps do so. This implies that the committees in the FGE camps are more democratic than those in the Non FGE camps.

Committees gave different reasons for exceeding their tenure of office. An analysis is required for the 4 committees in FGE camps that indicated that they did not adhere to the rule on the tenure of office. Three of the committees indicated that people had seen no reason for change, due to good performance; therefore, the committee members were re-elected. In one FGE camp they did not meet to hold election as stipulated, hence the exceeding of tenure.

In the Non FGE camp, 2 committees did not adhere to the rules on the tenure of office. One of the committees indicated that no meeting was called hence the committee members continued. In another committee, it was reported that the committee was given another mandate (an extension of tenure through elections) due to good performance.

7.4.4 Stipulation on the Number of Meetings to be Held in a Month and Adherence to the Rule by Committees

Discussions with the committees revealed that farmer groups had different stipulations on the number of times group members were supposed to hold meetings. Table 7.7 shows the distribution responses of committee members regarding their stipulations on the number of times in a month meetings should be held.

Table 7.7: distribution of Responses by Committees on the Stipulated Number of Times their Groups Should hold Meetings per Month By Camp

Number of Meetings to be Held per Month	Number and Percentage of Committees Citing	
	FGE Camp	Non FGE camp
0	0 (0.0%)	2 (16.7%)
1	0 (0.0%)	2 (16.7%)
2	7 (41.2%)	3 (25%)
3 or more	10 (58.8%)	5 (41.7%)
Total Responses	17 (100%)	12 (100%)

Table 7.7 shows that is a higher proportion of FGE camps that have stipulated a higher frequency of meetings for their farmer groups than those in Non FGE camps. In FGE camps, 58.8 per cent of the groups are expected to meet 3 or more times in a month, while only 33.3 per cent of those in Non FGE camps are expected to do the same.

To find out whether or not the committees adhered to the stipulated number of times, they were queried on how many meetings they had in the month of October 2002. They responded as indicated in Table 7.8 below.

Table 7.8: Distribution of Farmer Groups by The Number of Meetings they Held in the Month of October

Number of Meetings in October	Frequency and Percentage of Committees in Different Camp Types	
	FGE Camp	Non FGE camp
0	0 (0.0%)	2 (16.7%)
1	1 (5.9%)	3 (25%)
2	8 (47.1%)	4 33.3%)
3 or more	7 (41.1%)	3 (25%)
Total	17 (100%)	12 (100%)

It is clear from Table 7.8 that there is a higher proportion of committees in FGE than in Non FGE camps that held at least 3 meetings in the month of October. About 41 per cent of the committees in FGE camps held 3 or more meetings while only 25 per cent of the committees in Non FGE camps did so. This implies that the farmer groups in the FGE camps hold meetings more frequently than those in the Non FGE camps.

Notably, the target of ensuring that 50 per cent of the groups meet at least three times per month was not met in all types of camps. However, it must be noted that this situation was worse off for the farmer groups in Non FGE camps.

7.5 Farmer Participation in the Extension System

This subsection attempts to examine the participation rates of farmers in different activities. These will include participation in calling of meetings, setting the agenda

of meetings, leading of discussions during meetings, attendance rates in meetings, length of period as members of groups among farmers and so on.

7.5.1 Initiation of Meetings

Farmers were asked to indicate who in most cases initiated meetings. Table 7.9 shows the frequency distribution of the farmers' responses in the two types of camps. It is clear from Table 7.9 that farmers in both types of camps have started to participate much more than extension officers initiating meetings. In FGE camps only 14 per cent of the farmers indicated that the meetings were initiated by the CEOs, while 26 per cent of the farmers in Non FGE camps cited the CEO. This shows that farmers in FGE camps are more empowered and have started to participate in extension activities much more than the case is in Non FGE camps.

Table 7.9: Frequency and Percentages Distribution of Persons/institutions Cited as Being the Main Initiators of Meetings

Reported Initiator of Meeting	FGE Camp	Non FGE Camp
Extension Officer	21 (14.5%)	35 (26.1%)
Lead Farmer	70 (48.2%)	49 (36.6%)
Farmer Committees	38 (26.2%)	39 (29.1%)
Traditional Leaders	2 (1.4%)	2 (1.5%)
Joint as group	13 (9.0%)	6 (4.4%)
Other/ not applicable	1 (0.7%)	3 (2.2%)
Total	145 (100%)	134 (100 %)

Note: some figures in the totals may not add up to 100 % due to rounding off errors.

7.5.2 Deciding on the Agenda

In order to assess whether or not farmers participate in deciding the course of the discussions during meetings, they were asked to indicate how the agenda were set. Table 7.10 gives the distribution of the answers.

Table 7.10: Frequency and Percentages Distribution of Persons/institutions Cited as Being the Players in Setting the Agenda for Meetings

Main Person Setting Agenda	FGE Camp	Non FGE Camp
Extension Officer	11 (7.6%)	21 (15.7%)
Lead Farmer	26 (17.9%)	26 (19.4%)
Farmer Committees	43 (29.7%)	56 (41.8%)
Joint as group	62 (42.8%)	27 (20.1%)
Other/ not applicable	3 (2.1%)	4 (3.0%)
Total	145 (100%)	134 (100 %)

Note: some figures in the totals may not add up to 100 % due to rounding off errors.

Table 7.10 shows the frequency distribution of the farmers' responses in the two types of camps. It is clear from Table 7.10 that farmers in both types of camps have started to participate much more than extension officers setting the agenda for meetings. In FGE camps only 7.6 per cent of the farmers indicated that the agenda in the meetings

were set by the CEOs, while 15.7 per cent of the farmers in Non FGE camps cited the CEO. This shows that farmers in FGE camps are more empowered and have started to participate in extension activities much more than the case is in Non FGE camps.

7.5.3 Leading of Deliberations during Farmer Group Discussions

Farmers were further asked to indicate who took the lead during their discussion meetings. Table 7.11 gives the distribution of the responses from the farmers.

Table 7.11 shows the frequency distribution of the farmers' responses in the two types of camps. It is clear from Table 7.11 that farmers in both types of camps have started to participate much more than extension officers in leading discussions during the meetings. In FGE camps only 4.8 per cent of the farmers indicated that the meetings were led by the CEOs, while 6.7 per cent of the farmers in Non FGE camps cited the CEO. This shows that farmers in FGE camps are more empowered and have started to participate in extension activities much more than the case is in Non FGE camps.

Table 7.11: Frequency and Percentages Distribution of Persons/institutions Cited as Being the Leaders of Discussions at Farmer Meetings

Leader of Discussions	FGE Camp	Non FGE Camp
Extension Officer	7 (4.8%)	9 (6.7%)
Lead Farmer	75 (51.7%)	49 (36.6%)
Members of committee	56 (38.6%)	64 (47.8%)
Traditional Leaders	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.7%)
Joint as group	4 (2.8%)	3 (2.2%)
Other/ not applicable/don't know	3 (2.1%)	8 (6.0%)
Total	145 (100%)	134 (100 %)

Note: some figures in the totals may not add up to 100 % due to rounding off errors.

It is noteworthy to point out that the target to ensure that at least 60 per cent of the farmer groups participate in initiating meeting, setting the agenda and other activities has been met.

7.5.4 Length Period as Group Member

The length of periods people remain members of a given group provides an indication of the strength of that group. The longer members remain in the group, the more suggestive it is that the group is cohesive. The converse situation applies when more members are only with the groups for short periods of time. Table 7.12 shows the length of time group members have remained in the group.

Table 7.12 shows that there higher proportions of members in FGE camps that have been with their respective groups as members for 3 years or more than those that are in Non FGE camps. In the FGE camps, those that have been with their groups for at least 3 years account for 46.9 per cent. About 25 percent, 15.2 per cent, 6.9 per cent, respectively, have been in the groups for between 2 and 3 years, 1 and 2 years, and for less than one year.

In the Non FGE camps, those that have been with their groups for at least 3 years account for 30.6 per cent. About 22.4 percent, 30.6 per cent, 6.7 per cent, respectively, have been in the groups for between 2 and 3 years, 1 and 2 years, and for less than one year.

Table 7.12 : Frequency Distribution of Respondents By Their Period as Group Members

Period as Group Member	Frequency and Percentage of Respondents	
	FGE Camp	Non FGE Camp
No response	9 (6.2%)	13 (9.7%)
Less than 1 year	10 (6.9%)	9 (6.7%)
1 to less than 2 years	22 (15.2%)	41 (30.6%)
2 years to less than 3 years	36 (24.8%)	30 (22.4%)
3 years or more	68 (46.9%)	41 (30.6%)
Total	145 (100%)	134 (100 %)

Note: some figures in the totals may not add up to 100 % due to rounding off errors.

In terms of length of periods members have been with their respective groups, the current position of farmers groups has improved, compared to the situation at the baseline stage. At the baseline time, only 18 per cent of the members had been with the groups for 3 years or more. About 31 per cent had been members for between 2 and 3 years, while the majority of 38 per cent were only up to 1 year old.

7.5.5 Attendance Rates of Meetings

The commitment to attend group meetings by farmers is an indication of the strength of their group. The attendance rates were computed on the basis of the number of farmers that attended the latest meeting as a percentage of total membership in their farmer group. The data showed that 55 per cent (225 out of a total membership of 406) of the farmers in FGE camps attended the latest meetings in their respective groups. In the Non FGE camps, 51.3 per cent (197 out of a total of 384) of the farmers attended the latest meeting held in their group. The data suggests that there is a marginal difference in the attendance rates between the FGE and Non FGE camps.

The fact that many group members, close to 50 per cent, do not attend meetings calls for introspection. The next section gives the reasons.

7.5.6 Constraints To Participation Among Farmers As Observed by CEOs

Whereas the participatory extension system appears impressive, some farmers have not been able to participate. Extension officers were asked to identify the hindrances to participation among farmers. Table 7.13 below gives the frequency distribution of different factors the CEOs identified.

Table 7.13: Frequency Distribution of Factors Perceived to Hinder Farmers from Participating

Factor For Low Participation	Frequency Cited
Passive/negative attitude (ignorance, illiteracy)/No interest	8
Looking for food especially in drought years	3
No benefits accruing from group membership	3
Attending to funeral and illnesses	3
Poor leadership; favouritism and not worthy of trust	2
Women perceive self as inferior and others do the same	2

The table above shows that although participatory extension system is impressive, there are still some problems encountered when trying to encourage the participation of farmers. Some of the factors may call for immediate action, while others are transitory.

The negative attitude towards group work was the most frequent reason cited (cited by 8 CEOs, 61.5 %) for failure on the part of farmers to attend meetings. The main causes of this problem were considered to be low education levels; ignorance about the benefits of belonging to groups and pride by some farmers that felt they were way ahead of other group members and thus it would be time wasting for them to be group members. For the latter cause it may be valid for farmers that are producing in large quantities and are already experiencing economies of scale. For the former causes, there is need to continue striving towards changing the attitude among farmers. Exposing farmers to courses like “Training for Transformation” can help address the situation.

Another reason for failure among farmers to participate in groups was that they did not accrue any direct benefits from the groups. Farmers join groups so that they can have access to different benefits such as easier access to inputs, extension services and good markets for their output. The groups must thus have the vision that inspires its general membership. Leaders must encourage members and strive to attain the benefits that are holding the group. Training to leaders to be visionary oriented should help address this issue.

Apparently, there are many farmers that are not participating due to having to attend to funerals and illnesses. In some cases this situation could be an indicator of the increasing HIV? AIDS pandemic. There should be more efforts to mainstream HIV? AIDS through awareness activities in all such programmes, with farmer groups as entry points.

Poor leadership in some groups was also cited as one factor that discourages farmers to join groups. Some leaders are perceived to be unfair, harbouring favouritism towards some members. In other cases due to poor communication on the part of the leaders, farmers look at them with suspicion and thus consider them untrustworthy. This finding shows that there still is a need for continued training in leadership. Training in leadership could lead to better management of groups.

It was also felt that women do not attend because of negative cultural attributes. First, women may be discriminated in the cultures where male dominance is pervasive. As such their views are suppressed. On the other hand, it was revealed that women, due to the culture that display male-dominance, will consider themselves inferior to men. As such they may not participate in groups. Women may also not participate because burdened by a lot of work (including, household chores, community work, as well as work for economic purposes). This scenario means that issues of training in gender relations are continue to be crucial.

Another reason for low participation in groups among farmers, herein considered transitory, was that the farmers were searching for food. The survey took place in the drought year (2001/20002 season). As such it was not unusual for farmers to miss some meetings in search of food.

7.6 Relative Importance of Different Information Sources to Farmers

In order to empower farmers it is essential that they have access to information. In so doing it would be essential to have data on the relative importance of the different sources of information for farmers. The FGE Component of the Programme had envisaged providing information that would lead to increased awareness among farmers on matters surrounding them. In this respect, information on issues such gender, markets, land, human rights, democratic governance and HIV? AIDS was made available to farmers.

In order to find out the relative importance of different information channels farmers were asked to indicate their sources of information. Table 7.14 shows the results.

On the overall, Table 7.14 shows that the extension service is the most frequently cited source of agricultural information with 97.7 and 98.5 per cent of the farmers in FGE and Non FGE camps, respectively, citing this source. The radio was second, with 64.9 and 62.7 per cent of the farmers in FGE and Non FGE camps, respectively, citing it.

Interactions with fellow farmers (perhaps, on a one to one basis) represent another source of agricultural information as 29.7 and 39.6 per cent of the farmers in FGE and Non FGE camps, respectively, cited this channel of information. Farmers also interact in groups, through study circles and other groups. About 54.5 and 38.8 per cent of the farmers in FGE and Non FGE camps, respectively, cited study circles as one of their sources of information.

Books and reading materials represented another channel through which farmers received agricultural information. About 26 and 15 per cent of the farmers in FGE and Non FGE camps, respectively, cited reading books and other materials as their sources of agricultural information.

Table 7.14: Frequencies of Farmers Citing Specific Sources Of Agricultural Information By Type of Camp

Camp Type	Total Farmers	Frequencies of Farmers Citing Specific Source of Information				
		Extension Service	Radio	Other Farmers	Books/ Reading	Study Circle
FGE	145	141 (97.7)	93 (64.9)	43 (29.7)	38 (26.2)	79 (54.5)
FGE Camp	134	132 (98.5)	84 (62.7)	53 (39.6)	21 (15.7)	52 (38.8)

Note: The figures in brackets represents percentages out of the total interviewed.

The results above show that the extension service has continued to be an important partner of LM and CF for disseminating information. This is because the extension service that is provided by MAFF in most rural areas is able to interact with farmers. The fact that some farmers receive information from fellow farmers is an indication of the developing farmer-to-farmer extension system.

For one thing, the radio may not be as accessible as the extension service because, due to high poverty levels in the country, not all farmers will own radios. In other cases, where radios may be available, some members of the family, like women may not be able to listen to them. It is important that the timing of broadcasting to the target groups is well designed. For example, daily schedules of chores and other activities may be analyzed so that broadcasting could be done at times suitable to the targeted communities.

Other farmers are important in providing complementary information sourced elsewhere. Farmers share information either informally or formally through meetings or demonstrations organized by the extension service.

Few farmers continue to obtain their information from books and other reading materials. This may be explained by the fact that most farmers in the sample depict low levels of educational attributes.

On the overall, when one compares the situation on access to information through different sources with that of the baseline study, it is clear that more farmers have access to information from the mentioned sources. For example, during the baseline study, about 86 per cent of the farmers had access to extension officers; at the present time at least 95 per cent of the farmers in either FGE or Non FGE camps had access to the information through this source. Similarly, whereas during the baseline study about 34 per cent of the farmers cited "other farmers" as a source of their information, higher proportions have done so now; about 55 and 39 per cent of the farmers in FGE and Non FGE camps, respectively, mentioned the study circles as one of their sources of information. The scenario above generally points towards improved accessibility to information.

7.7 Sustainability of the Programme

The key to sustainability of the groups is the realisation of benefits arising from being members of a given group. In the ultimate members expect to improve their livelihoods, a situation which may be brought about through belonging to groups. One of the benefits of belonging to groups is the reduced transaction costs for both inputs and services and in the output market. Reduced costs entails that it would be cheaper for different service providers to support groups in terms of though bulking and obtain benefits by way of discounts. Groups can also negotiate to bring in buyers for their commodities in their area. They can also negotiate better prices as a group, rather than as fragmented individuals.

As long as such benefits are being realised, many small-scale farmers would continue as members of groups and would be interested to see the continued existence of groups despite some constraints. For example, one question encountered in the field was that "what kind of compensation should be given to lead farmers that sometimes travel long distances to visit others?" or similarly, "how can farmers buy seed to enable them carry out demonstrations for a crop of their interest when the extension service has no resources to facilitate such?" One might also ask "how does the group cover expenses of those who go to source for the market of commodities for the group?" Committed group members might wish to introduce membership fees to cover such costs. The fees may be paid in-kind at harvest time and the funds deposited into some account for use in such eventualities.

Another important factor to ensure continuity of programme activities is collaboration among different institutions implementing programmes in the same geographical areas. It is necessary that this collaboration leads to common stances on policies, such as those relating to providing incentives to farmers for participation. For example, during field work it was reported that some farmers abandoned activities that had been promoted by the LM and CF programme because some programmes would entice the farmers to attend to their programmes through monetary incentives. This adversely affected the activities that had earlier been established. Such unfortunate situations can be circumvented through collaboration among implementing institutions.

7.8 Concluding Remarks on Farmer Participation

At this point is important to sum up how the different indicators regarding farmer participation have been achieved.

- (i) Farmers groups initiating at least 80 % of the meetings and agenda therein for extension activities. This has been achieved. In FGE camps, 85.5 percent of the meeting are initiated by farmers, only 15 per cent are initiated by CEOs; 7.6 per cent of the farmers cited CEOs as setting the agenda, while 92.4 percent indicated that the agenda were set by farmers; in 95 per cent of the cases farmers led discussions in meetings, while only 5 per cent of the meetings were led by CEOs.

- (ii) Farmers hold elections at stipulated periods (agreed by themselves e.g. every 2 years). In FGE camps, 94 percent of the farmer committees have stipulations on the tenure of office for committee members. Elections are held regularly in FGE camps; only 66.7 per cent of the committees in Non FGE camps have such stipulations. In most cases the rules are adhered to. It is clear that FGE camps are better organised than the Non FGE camps.
- (iii) Women farmers taking up 50 % of the positions on farmer groups. This was almost achieved. In FGE camps about 45 per cent of the people on the executives are women; in the Non FGE camps women constitute only 35 per cent of the committee members.
- (iv) At least 60 % of the farmers giving reports on monitoring results. This was achieved, as 82 and 64 percent of the farmers, respectively, in FGE and Non FGE camps claimed they were involved in monitoring activities (See Table 5.2).
- (v) 80 % of the farmers groups organize study cycle meetings (at least 3 meetings per month). This was not achieved, as 41 per cent of the groups held 3 or more meeting in FGE camps. In Non FGE camps only 25 per cent held at least three meetings. The situation though not achieved as planned it is definitely better in FGE camps than in Non FGE camps.
- (vi) It is also expected that communities would draw on opportunities, negotiate, demand services and transparency from service providers. There were indications that communities have been able to negotiate various goods and services from different providers in all camps. They were able to access seed from organizations like the Programme Against Malnutrition, fertiliser from Government and so on.

It is clear that to a large extent, most activities that the programme had set out to undertake were effective. This is clear from the increased participation of farmers in their affairs such as managing the groups and taking lead in activities affecting them.

CHAPTER EIGHT

8.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 Summary

This evaluation report has attempted to assess the progress made during the implementation of the FGE component of the LM and CF Programme. The assessment focused on the delivery of services by the Programme, the effectiveness of the different partners in implementation i.e. the extension officers, lead farmers and traditional leaders. Finally, the evaluation examined how farmer participation has been enhanced following the interventions of the Programme. The findings are itemized below.

8.1.1 Delivery of services by the Programme

The delivery of services in terms of meeting the targets has been fair, with the planned targets for training farmers (in terms of numbers) being achieved by between 56 per cent and 79.5 per cent. This was satisfactory considering that the programme experienced changes in staff, a factor that stalled implementation in some cases. Another factor that required to be addressed was that of financial management on the part of staff in the provinces; if the provincial staff had been retiring their imprests early, higher rates of performance would have been achieved, as funds were going to be available on a timely basis.

The differences in efficiency rates implies that there is need for the monitoring to make continuous analyses on how different managers approach the training so as to come up with lessons for increasing efficiency in all the areas, rather than having geographical differences, showing extremely contradicting positions.

8.1.2 Assessment of the Extension System: Farmers and the Extension Staff

The focus at this point was to find out how the extension system operated. The output stated that, "agricultural Extension staff in LM and CF areas aware of, motivated for and able to promote farmer-to-farmer based extension system". To a large extent this output was achieved in several respects.

First, all extension staff, both from FGE and Non FGE camps, were trained in gender. However, although not all extension staff were trained in facilitation skills, it was clear that the situation was better in FGE camps, compared to Non FGE camps. About 86 per cent and 66.9 of the staff in FGE and Non FGE camps, respectively, camps were exposed to facilitation.

Second, the study shows that the attitude of extension workers towards the farmer to farmer extension approach is positive. All extension workers depicted a very positive attitude towards the extension system, citing several benefits associated with it.

The third indicator was that "100 % of the extension workers in LM and CF areas develop indicators for monitoring the plans and to be accountable in executing different roles and responsibilities, including use of resources". This system is developing although it has not reached the full extent. Fieldwork showed that farmers made plans at zone level, fed them into camp committees and then into blocks. However, farmers do not participate fully in the management of resources.

Fourth, farmers have become increasingly involved in extension activities, through electing their lead farmers and other leaders. The lead farmers and other leaders have become important sources of encouragement to other farmers to participate in different agricultural activities, as well as in facilitating other extension activities (such as monitoring progress and guiding others). This signifies the participation of farmers in the extension system.

Fifth, an interesting emerging development is where farmers have been empowered to solve some of their problems working through groups. Of particular interest is how farmer groups are taking up the issue of HIV? AIDS; they use groups to assist the affected families to rotate in taking care of the sick and help out in the fields.

The foregoing shows that there has been considerable progress towards meeting the output on building capacity not only among the extension workers, but also among farmers in the farmer-to-farmer extension approach.

8.1.3 Effectiveness of the Programme In Affecting the Local Leadership

In terms of developing leadership, a lot of progress has been made in FGE camps. However, it is also worthwhile to indicate that progress was made in Non FGE camps too, as a result of interventions by Programmes other than the FGE component.

The study so far shows that all traditional leaders are interested in FGE activities; which is an achievement of more than the 80 per cent target. About 78 per cent of the leaders have committees in place. Those without committees do consult their people through meetings. These consultations depict democratic forms of governance and transparency on the part of the leadership.

The study also finds that local leaders are willing to support the LM and CF activities. However, despite their positive attitude, they are not able to meet the demands, perhaps due to other heavy responsibilities resting with them. For example, when farmers were asked to indicate who encouraged them to attend meetings only 2 per cent of the farmers cited traditional leaders. Similarly obtained when one looked at how councilors were involved with encouraging farmers to participate in the LM and CF activities; as only 0.7 per cent of the farmers cited a councilor as the source of encouragement to attend FGE meetings.

The study found that all Ward Councillors (in LM & CF areas) worked closely on developmental issues with traditional leaders, rather than compete with them. Depending on where the development activity comes from, one of the leaders responsible takes lead in mobilizing the people while keeping the other informed. For

per cent held at least three meetings. The situation though not achieved as planned, it is definitely better in FGE camps than in Non FGE camps.

Sixth, there were indications that communities have been able to negotiate various goods and services from different providers in all camps. They were able to access seed from organizations like the Programme Against Malnutrition, fertiliser from Government and so on.

It is clear that to a large extent, most activities that the programme had set out to undertake were effective. This is clear from the increased participation of farmers in their affairs such as managing the groups and taking lead in activities affecting them.

8.2 Recommendations

The Programme has made a lot of progress. However, this could be further enhanced if the pitfalls encountered were addressed. Following are the recommendations.

- (i) There is need to emphasise the importance of adhering to the financial procedures, particularly in the area of retirement of imprests among provincial officers; the imprests in some cases were retired late. The financial management system in the Programme shows good control mechanisms in that it only replenishes funds after the initial disbursements have been well accounted for.
- (ii) There is need for stability of staff involved with programme implementation. Frequent changes in staff slows down progress. One option is for MACO to seek ways of avoiding the high turnover of staff in programme areas. Another practical option is for development programmes to train a wide pool of staff in activities of the programme so that movement of some will not seriously affect the implementation.
- (iii) There is need for more concerted efforts to train and sensitise farmers in various areas if their participation in development is to continue. The support to areas of gender, leadership and HIV /AIDS awareness should continue if farmer participation in their development is to be sustained.
- (iv) There is need for coordination among organisation implementing different activities in same geographical areas. Competition could be detrimental to others and work against the target groups, as some organisation would pull out. The organisations should have common stances in their approaches as they assist farmers. For example, if they pay allowances, comparable rates should be adopted.

REFERENCES

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Chibbamulilo P.M.
(2001) | The Baseline Study of the Farmer Group
Empowerment (FGE) Component of the LM and CF
Programme, LM and CF, MACO Lusaka. |
| Erasmus C. and
Chiyanika (2001) | Democracy, Governance, and Human Rights Project
Proposal, LM & CF, Sida , Lusaka. |
| Orgut Consulting AB
(2001) | Farmer Group Empowerment Project Document, LM
& CF, MAFF, Lusaka. |
| Mulenga G. and
Mwale A. (2002) | Mainstreaming HIV? AIDS in the Land Management
and Conservation Farming Programme (LM & CF),
LM & CF, MACO, Lusaka. |

Appendix 1: The Logical Framework for the Farmer Group Empowerment (FGE) Component

The Logical Framework specifies different levels attained during programme implementation. This refers to moving from activities, to outputs (results), the purpose and finally contributing to the goal. For each of these levels monitoring and evaluation indicators are shown, as well as how data on the indicators may be verified. External factors that could adversely affect each level of implementation are considered.

NARRATIVE SUMMARY	INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	ASSUMPTIONS
Main Goal (Development Objective): To contribute to the development of an appropriate participatory agricultural extension system, reaching farmer group level.	Functioning Participatory Extension System	System Evaluation in 2002, years 3 of programme implementation.	Continued support from MAFF and SIDA
The Purpose (Component Objective): Active farmer participation in management of the extension system.	1. Farmers groups initiating at least 80 % of the meetings and agenda therein for extension activities. 2. Farmers hold elections at stipulated periods (agreed by themselves e.g. ever 2 years). 3. Women farmers taking up 50 % of the positions on farmer groups 4. At least 60 % of the farmers giving reports on monitoring results 5. 80 % of the farmers groups organize study cycle meetings (at least 3 meetings per month)	- Field surveys; interviews with farmers and interviews with camp officers, - Records from camps (minutes of meetings, monitoring reports e.t.c.).	Continued support from MAFF management at Provincial and District levels

Outputs (Results)

1. Improved knowledge among Lead Farmers and Local Leaders about democratic leadership and participatory Extension Methods in LM & CF program areas

1.1	Lead farmers are capable of bringing together their group members more frequently and group sizes increase (as shown by attendance rates). At least 60 % of the group members should be comprised of older members (members for at least 3 years) .	- Interviews with key informants such as lead farmers,	- Willingness of ward councilors and traditional leaders to participate
1.2	80 % of the local traditional leaders not only start to participate in LM & CF but also encourage their subordinates to attend meetings and allow democratic forms of governance characterized by consultation.	- Interviews with headmen	- The Programme is not misunderstood to be political oriented.
1.3	All Ward Councilors (in LM & CF areas) work closely on developmental issues with traditional leaders, rather than compete with them i.e. clear roles and responsibilities emerge between the two categories. They start mobilizing resources for and generally supporting the LM & CF groups.	- Interviews with ward councilors	- Willingness of communities, in general, to participate in LM & CF activities. (and willingness of communities to allow a wider participation of women in the activities).
1.4	Leaders in 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 allow the people they lead to contribute to decision making	- Farmer interviews on their feelings about leaders involving/consulting them.	
1.5	Leaders as specified in 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 are more transparent in their dealings (they communicate with their members on LM & CF.	- Same as above.	

2. Agricultural Extension staff aware of, motivated for, and able to promote farmer to farmer based extension.		
	1. No. of extension staff aware of gender and with improved facilitation skills (e.g. No. of extension staff "handing over the stick" during meetings i.e. allowing farmers to take the lead rather than lecture to them).	Willingness of extension workers to take up the new role of facilitator (to change attitude)
	2. No. of extension workers willing to promote farmer to farmer extension by encouraging farmers to participate in extension groups (e.g. increase in the joining ext. groups through the encouragement from extension worker; frequency extension worker organizes farmer-exchange visits, field demonstrations, field days etc.).	- Interviews with extension workers - Interviews with farmer groups through surveys.
	3. Extension workers involve farmers to develop agricultural plans and assists them identify their roles,	
	4. Extension worker working with farmers to develop indicators for monitoring the plans and to be accountable in executing different roles and responsibilities.	

3. Increased knowledge of agricultural development among farmers

Farmers appreciate working in groups (small holder farmers are able to outline benefits of belonging to groups). They attend meetings, ask for services they desire and seek accountability from the service providers as well as their leaders.

Few constraints to group participation reported by farmer.

Farmer interviews, M & E project reports

Willingness of farmer communities to participate in the LM & CF activities.

Activities

See proposal for the FGE component which has comprehensively covered the issues.

Programme records

Trainers and funds for training and for sponsoring radio programmes are available and adequate.

APPENDIX 2: CHECKLIST FOR EXTENSION WORKER

Name....., Sex....., Age....., Camp.....,
District, Education.....

1. What is your understanding of facilitation as an extension worker
2. How extension worker views the farmer-to- farmer extension. What will be the role of extension worker in this system?
3. What are factors that lead to low participation of some farmers in group activities in the camp?
4. Has the extension worker been trained in any of the following:
 - . Leadership
 - . Participatory Development
 - . Gender mainstreaming
 - . Facilitation
 - . Enterprenuership
4. How have these courses helped you in your work? specify for each course trained

-
-
5. In the last year, were farmers in a position to demand the specific messages on given crops or livestock to be provided by you?
 6. If yes in above, what messages on given crops or livestock have they demanded from you?

.....

.....

7. In the current season, have farmers in this group area been able to demand services from different service providers (e.g. fertiliser loans from government, or inputs from other providers like NGOs, and resources from councilors or other leaders) as a group so as to improve their livelihood.....

8. If yes in question 7, indicate the service or goods demanded by the group and from who

Good/service Demanded	From Who

APPENDIX 3: CHECKLIST FOR LEADERS (TRADITIONAL LEADERS)

Name....., Sex....., Age....., Village,
District, Education.....

1. Describe the development activities in your area
2. How do you encourage people to participate in agriculture / SCAFE activities?
3. Who initiates activities to be done? (you as a leader; people giving indications directly, through agents, or other sources)
4. In order to carry out development work, how are decisions on what to do are arrived at (who is present in deciding; who is consulted; if a committee is in place, how are committee members chosen?
5. How are women involved in arriving at decisions
6. Have you had any training in any of the following:
 - . Leadership
 - . Participatory development
 - . Gender mainstreaming
 - . Other
7. If yes in any of the training, how has it helped the respondent?
.....
.....
8. What is the procedure followed by your people when they wish to demand for development assistance through you *they inform headman, come directly, they call you to address meeting etc
.....
9. In the last year, has the farmer group* this one we are interviewing* been able to obtain services through their initiative.....
10. If yes, give examples.....

APPENDIX 4: CHECKLIST FOR LEADERS (COUNCILLORS)

Name....., Sex....., Age....., Ward.....,
District, Education.....

I. Key Activities of a Councillor

1. List your key activities as a councilor in the last year *e.g. delivering speeches at ceremonies, welcoming party visitors, sourcing developmental funds for community, etc., giving examples.
2. How frequently do you go for council meetings
 - . More than once per month
 - . Once a month
 - . Every two months
 - . Every 3 months quarterly
 - . Rare, when called
3. How frequently do you meet the people in your community, formally at meetings
 - . More than once per month
 - . Once a month
 - . Every two months
 - . Every 3 months quarterly
 - . Rare, when called
4. In the last year were you called upon by the community to assist in projects that they initiated Y/N
5. If yes in question 4, give details of the project and how you intervened as a councillor.....

II. General Development Activities

1. Describe the development activities in your area
2. How do you encourage people to participate in agriculture / SSAFE activities?
3. Who initiates activities to be done? (you as a leader; people giving indications directly, through agents, or other sources)
4. In order to carry out development work, how are decisions on what to do are arrived at (who is present in deciding; who is consulted; if a committee is in place, how are committee members chosen?)
5. What is the procedure followed by your people when they wish to demand for development assistance through you *they inform headman, come directly, they call you to address meeting etc
.....
6. How are women involved in arriving at decisions
Training
6. Have you had any training in any of the following:
 - . Leadership
 - . Participatory development
 - . Gender mainstreaming
 - . Other

7. If yes in any of the training, how has it helped you to carry out your functions?
.....

APPENDIX 5: CHECKLIST FOR COMMITTEE MEMBERS

District, Group Name

I. Group Profile

1. How many members are in the group.....
2. How many are women..... and men
3. How many are below the age of 25.....
4. When was the group formed.....
5. How frequently should the group hold meetings...according to your plans/
policy
 . Every 1 week
 . Every 2 weeks
 . Once a month
 . once every 2 months
 . Other.....
6. Last month ..October.., how many times did your group meet.....
7. In the last meeting, how many men attended....., how many women
attended..... Total.....

II. Group Organization

How many leadership (committee) positions are there in your farmer
group?.....indicate the positions

Indicate the number of women on the committee if any:

.....

If some women are committee members, what are positions they occupy?

1.
2.
3.
4.

How are leaders (Lead farmers) put in place in your group? (indicate)

- through elections,
- appointed by extension officer,
- self volunteering-self imposition)

What is the tenure of office for the leaders before you hold new election?

Have the current leaders exceeded their tenure of office? Yes/No

Appendix 6: Farmers' Questionnaire

A. IDENTIFICATION DATA

Province:.....

District:.....

Name of Camp:.....

B. DESCRIPTION OF FARMER

Name of Interviewee:.....

Age:.....

Sex:.....

Marital status

Highest Level of Education Attained:.....

Member of a group?.....

If yes in above, for how long?.....

Position in the group if any.....(e.g. ordinary, chairperson, etc.)

Size of your land cultivated last year (Ha)

maize yield from the area mentioned above (specify unit of measurement)

C. PARTICIPATION IN GROUP AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES

When did you last hold an agricultural/group meeting in your group?.....

How many agricultural/group meetings organized did you attend last month?.....

Who in most cases encourages you to attend agricultural/group meetings?.....
(indicate)

(Lead farmer, Extension worker, ward councilor, traditional leaders, other fellow farmer, Husband/wife)

Did you encourage other farmers/friends to attend any such meetings?.....

Who in most cases calls for the meetings? (Lead farmer, Extension worker, ward councilor, traditional leaders, other fellow farmer, Husband/wife)

Who sets the agenda for the last meeting? (Lead farmer, Extension worker, ward councilor, traditional leaders, other fellow farmer, Husband/wife; or set jointly in consultation)

Why do you think some people do not participate in group (SCAFE) activities.

Reason 1 :

Reason 2.

Reason 3 :

Reason 4.

D. GROUP ORGANIZATION

How many leadership (committee) positions are there in your farmer group?.....indicate the positions

Indicate the number of women on the committee if any:

.....

If some women are committee members, what are positions they occupy?

1.....

2.....

3.....

4.....

How are leaders (Lead farmers) put in place in your group? (indicate)

- through elections,
- appointed by extension officer,
- self volunteering-self imposition)

What is the tenure of office for the leaders before you hold new election?

Have the current leaders exceeded their tenure of office? Yes/No

If yes in Question above, why?.....
explain)

How long do you think your leaders should be in office? (tenure).....

Do the unsuccessful candidates for different positions in the group continue to participate fully in group activities? Yes/No

E. DECISION MAKING/MEETINGS

Who leads the discussions (standing/sitting in front) during such meetings? (Lead farmer, Extension worker, ward councilor, traditional leaders, other fellow farmer)

What responsibilities are given to the group members during meetings?

- writing down minutes;
- setting the agenda for the next meeting;
- monitoring (checking progress) and being asked to report progress on agreed courses of action
- leading /guiding other farmers in a given technology (e.g . ripping composit heap making e.t.c)
- Other responsibilities (specify)

List examples of the decisions /resolutions reached at during the last group meeting (e.g. who should visit who, what type of training, the extension messages to be received from extension officers)

- Agreed on the Training courses required
- Set targets on what farmers would engage in during agiven period (e.g who should visit who among farmers
- Agreed on messages to be given by the extension worker
- Any other (specify).....

F. EXPOSURE

Which training have you been exposed to and by who? (i.e. Leadership; Gender; Participatory Development and Monitoring; Entrepreneurship; Bookeeping; Costing; Conservation Farming and other).

How has this training helped you in your livelihood?

.....
.....
.....

How do you obtain information about farming e.g through visits by other farmers; visits by extension workers; study cycles; radio; reading materials.

- 1
- 2
- 3

G. GENDER

At household level, who makes decisions on? (indicate man, women or joint)

- What crops to be grown on a given land
- Who should attend agricultural meetings
- When field are to be ploughed
- How much of the produce should be sold

Do women attend as many meetings as men?.....

.....

If no, why

When women attend meetings do they participate as much as men (Indicate).....

- More than men
- Same as men
- Less than men

Recent Sida Evaluations

- 04/38 Sida's Work with Culture and Media (Volume 1, Main Report; Volume 2, Annexes)**
Cecilia M. Ljungman, Helge Rønning, Tejeshwar Singh, Henrik Steen Pedersen, et.al.
Department for Evaluation and Internal Audit
- 05/01 The News Agency "Agancia Informativa Púlsar". Project 2001–2003**
Victor van Oeyen
Department for Democracy and Social Development
- 05/02 Sida's Exchange Programme – Evaluation of its Pilot Phase 2002–2004**
Peter Winai
Department for Co-operation with Non-Governmental Organisations, Humanitarian Assistance and Conflict Management
- 05/03 El Apoyo Institucional a la Defensoría del Pueblo de Colombia 2003–2004**
Kimberly Inksater, Carmen Beatriz Ruiz
Department for Democracy and Social Development
- 05/04 Regional Training Programme in Environment Journalism and Communication in the Eastern African Region**
Gustav Böklin
Department for Democracy and Social Development
- 05/05 Sida Support to Teacher Education in Tanzania 1997–2002**
Valdy Lindhe, Kristina Malmberg, Elisei Basil Temu
Department for Democracy and Social Development
- 05/06 Phasing out Ozone Depleting Substances in the Solvent Sector in China**
Darrel Staley, Ann Jennervik
Department for Infrastructure and Economic Co-operation
- 05/07 Swedish Support to Urban Development and Housing in South Africa**
Steve Topham, Ingrid Obery, Hans Hede
Department for Africa
- 05/08 District Heating Projects in Latvia and Russia**
Anders Grettve, Tord Holmström, Christofer Hök, Karl-Erik Ramström
Department for Infrastructure and Economic Co-operation
- 05/09 Gender Projects in Estonia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Russia and Ukraine**
– Projekt Implemented by Språngbrädan
Thomas Bjørnkilde, Karin Attström, Alexandra Wynn
Department for Europe
- 05/10 The World Bank Programmes "Emergency Services Support Project" (ESSP) and "Reform Trust Fund" – West Bank and Gaza**
Carl-Johan Belfrage
Asia Department
- 05/11 Political parties and assistance**
Magnus Ohman, Shirin Ahlbäck Öberg, Barry Holmström, Helena Wockelberg, Viktoria Åberg
Department for Democracy and Social Development

Sida Evaluations may be ordered from:

Infocenter, Sida
SE-105 25 Stockholm
Phone: +46 (0)8 779 96 50
Fax: +46 (0)8 779 96 10
sida@sida.se

A complete backlist of earlier evaluation reports may be ordered from:

Sida, UTV, SE-105 25 Stockholm
Phone: +46 (0) 8 698 51 63
Fax: +46 (0) 8 698 56 10
Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>



SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY
SE-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden
Tel: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Fax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64
E-mail: sida@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>