

# **Working with NGOs in Bangladesh**

## **A Ten Year Review**

**Volume 3**

# 1992 - 2003



**Agricultural Support Services Project (ASSP)**



**Agricultural Services Innovation and  
Reform Project (ASIRP)**

November 2003

## Contents

<i>List of Acronyms</i>	<i>ii</i>
<i>Foreword</i>	<i>iii</i>
<i>Executive Summary - Costs and Performance</i>	<i>iv</i>
1. Background	1
2. The First Four Years (ASSP - 1992-1995)	1
3. The Second Four Years (ASSP - 1996-1999)	3
4. The Third Four Years (ASIRP - 1999-2003)	7
5. Conclusions	12
6. The Future	13
<b>List of Annexes</b>	
Annex A Summary of Contracts Awarded under ASSP Homestead Component (Phase 1)	15
Annex B Summary of Contracts Awarded under ASSP Homestead Component (Phase 1A)	18
Annex C Summary of DPIF and NPIF (Round 1) Contracts Awarded under ASIRP	21
Annex D Summary of DPIF and NPIF (Round 2) Contracts Awarded under ASIRP	24
Annex E Comparison of Contracting Processes	25
Annex F Summary of DPIF (Round 2) Contracts Awarded under ASIRP	26
Annex G Summary of NPIF (Round 2) Contracts Awarded under ASIRP	29
Annex H Summary Time-Line of Activities and Lessons, 1992-2003	30
References	32

## List of Acronyms

ADAB	Association of Development Agencies in Bangladesh
ASIRP	Agricultural Services Innovation and Reform Project
ASSP	Agricultural Support Services Project
ATC	Agricultural Technical Committee
DAE	Department of Agricultural Extension
DAEPC	District Agricultural Extension Planning Committee
DEPC	District Extension Planning Committee
DFID	Department for International Development
DG	Director General
DLS	Department of Livestock Services
DoF	Department of Fisheries
DPIF	District Partnership Initiative Fund
EATP	Extension Approach Training Programme
EEIME	Extension and Environmental Impact Monitoring and Evaluation
EPICC	Extension Policy Implementation Co-ordination Committee
EPSC	EPICC Partnership Sub-Committee
ESP	Extension Service Provider
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation
FD	Forest Department
FLE	Farmer Led Extension
GO	Government Organisation
GoB	Government of Bangladesh
IDA	International Development Association
IEA	Integrated Extension Approach
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NAEP	New Agricultural Extension Policy
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NPIF	National Partnership Initiative Fund
ODA	Overseas Development Administration
ODI	Overseas Development Institute
PEC	Project Evaluation Committee
PIF	Partnership Initiative Fund
T&V	Training and Visit (system of extension)
TA	Technical Assistance
TAECC	Thana Agricultural Extension Co-ordination Committee
TAO	Thana Agricultural Officer
UAECC	Upazila Agricultural Extension Co-ordination Committee
UAO	Upazila Agricultural Officer
UPIF	Upazila Partnership Initiative Fund

## Foreword

DFID has provided 10 years of support to public sector agricultural extension in Bangladesh. It was felt that significant information on successes and failures has been generated, and that a history of involvement would provide a consolidated record and provide important learning. The motive for this is partially caused by increasing recognition that project based approaches (particularly process projects) have a tendency to regularly re-invent earlier approaches. This is partly due to the lack of an institutional home for information, the time and area bound focus of projects, and the lack of institutional memory.

This series of documents has been prepared with the considerable advantage of hindsight. They also take advantage of the fact that there has been an extensive period of engagement at all levels (village to policy), recognising that significant resources have been available.

The series of 10-year review papers comprise:

1. Agricultural Extension with DAE
2. Human Resource Interventions With DAE
3. Working With NGOs

The views presented in the review papers are those of the ASIRP TA Team, and not necessarily those of DAE/MoA/GoB, any of the ASSP or ASIRP donors or the managing agents.

ASIRP  
6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Front Building  
Khamarbari, Farmgate  
Dhaka, Bangladesh

**Executive Summary - Costs and Outcomes**

<p><b>Total cost ASSP: £ 34 million (actual)</b></p> <p>GoB £ 5.6 million IDA £ 13.6 million (80% underspent) (Credit) DFID £ 13.4 million (Grant)</p> <p>(ASIRP PEC, September 1998)</p> <p><u>Total TA ASSP:</u> National 254 months International 241 months</p> <p><u>Total TA ASSP (Phase 1A)</u> National 200 months International 163 months</p>	<p><b>Total cost ASIRP: £ 18.76 million (budgeted)</b></p> <p>GoB £6.19 million IDA £ 3.38 million (LIL) DFID £ 9.24 million FAO £0.3 million</p> <p>(ASIRP PEC, September 1998)</p> <p><b>Estimated actual cost £ 14.3 million.</b> (DAE Revised PP, September 2003)</p> <p><u>Total TA ASIRP:</u> National 419 months International 283 months</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Outcomes

1. ASSP Phase 1: 26 contracts covering 60 Upazilas in 20 Districts with 34,963 beneficiaries (80% female headed households). Tk 44,590,440 (Average cost of **Tk 1,275** per beneficiary)<sup>1</sup>.
2. ASSP Phase 1A: 29 contracts Tk 33,534,678 with 25,000 direct beneficiaries<sup>2</sup>, at an average cost of **Tk 1,341**.
3. DAE directly and individually contacting 7.7% and 1.7% of male and female farming population respectively, whilst NGOs contacting 2.3% and 2.7% respectively for vegetable production extension (ESS2000). Annual cost of service delivery by BSs between £ 1 and £ 2 per rural household per year, or £ 18 (**Tk 1,692**) per contacted household per year.
4. UPIF projects implemented with 734,160 direct beneficiaries over three years at a cost of **Tk 165** per beneficiary.
5. Cost of NGO service per farm household based on NPIF Round 1 (mainly NGO only) **Tk 4,500** per beneficiary (simple average) where 91% were women, though only 6.5% were landless (ASIRP, 2002). In NPIF Round 2, there were 8,129 direct beneficiaries serviced at an average cost of **Tk 2,063**.
6. Cost of service in partnership (NGO/GO) per farm household based on DPIF Round 1 (mainly NGO-GO partnership contracts) **Tk 2,605** per beneficiary (simple average) where 58% were women, though only 6% were landless (ASIRP, 2002). Under DPIF Round 2, there were 16,553 direct beneficiaries serviced at an average cost of **Tk 1,352**.
7. UAECs and DAEPs operationalised around PIF project management, but unlikely to be sustained once ASIRP closes.

A brief summary of contracted outcomes is given below. For comparison, the DAE cost per directly contacted household is £ 18 (**Tk 1,692**).

<sup>1</sup> Of 34,963 stated beneficiaries, 10,000 under one contract with RDRS were indirect beneficiaries. If these are excluded, the total cost per direct beneficiary is Tk 1,786.

<sup>2</sup> Although the ASIRP PEC document identifies 125,000 beneficiaries, one contract with RDRS accounted for 100,000, but these were indirect beneficiaries.

Programme	Direct Beneficiaries	Beneficiary Profile	Cost per Beneficiary
ASSP Phase 1	34,963	80% female	Tk 1,275
ASSP Phase 2	25,000	80% female	Tk 1,341
ASIRP UPIF	734,160 <sup>3</sup>	26% female 17% marginal / landless	Tk 165
ASIRP DPIF I	8,496	58% female 6% landless	Tk 2,605
ASIRP DPIFII	16,553	72% male 70% landless / marginal <sup>4</sup>	Tk 1,351
ASIRP NPIF I	18,000	91% female 6.5% landless	Tk 4,500
ASIRP NPIF II	8,129	65% female 70% landless / marginal <sup>5</sup>	Tk 2,603
<b>Total</b>	<b>845,301</b>		

A large number of rural households have benefited from service delivery in a contractual framework under ASSP and ASIRP - this has been a significant achievement, and there is no doubt that livelihoods have been improved as a result. However, this achievement has been in a projectised framework that has had little impact on macro-service delivery across Bangladesh. Further, there is evidence (Howes, 2002) that livelihood development has been most tangible in relation to physical and financial capital, with no enduring impact on social capital, and thus less tangible progress has been made in poverty reduction.

There is essentially no mainstream national extension service as operated by DAE. DAE have staff across Bangladesh (concentrated in resource-rich areas) who implement projects on the basis of the annual development programme. DAE is a project implementation unit and farmer access/entitlement to services depends on where they live and farm and where time/space/subject bound projects (funded by donors and GoB) are active. Partnership with NGOs is part of the framework of most of these projects and thus partnership is projectised. Partnership with NGOs has largely concentrated on group formation around specific agricultural technologies (for example, IPM, or homestead gardens or village nurseries) or methods (such as Farmer Field Schools or Farmer Led Extension). Such approaches are generally not inclusive within rural society, and there is a tendency for the land-poor to be excluded.

Many NGOs in Bangladesh had their origin more in the empowerment movement. Some might argue that the rapid availability of donor funding for discrete agricultural technology service delivery shifted NGOs away from the broader engagement with civil society as a means of poverty reduction (now seen as critical for pro-poor development).

Within ASSP/ASIRP, it is the UPIF that has proven most successful and provides grounds for considering this approach in the future - essentially providing programmatic direct budget support for decentralised and pluralistic (GO-NGO) local extension service provision. In the long run, this will need to be done in partnership with local government, and cost-recovery will be essential.

<sup>3</sup> Based on Year 1 beneficiaries multiplied by 3 for the 3 Years total

<sup>4</sup> Based on evaluation of five case studies.

<sup>5</sup> Based on evaluation of five case studies.

## 1 Background

ASSP was designed against the perceived rigidity and non-performance (especially for the poor) of public sector T&V based extension, in particular as operated by the Department of Agricultural Extension (DAE)<sup>6</sup>.

The catalyst to supporting the development of partnerships between public and non-government extension service providers was the view that the public sector was ineffective at servicing the needs of poorer households and families, particularly women. There was also a perception that DAE concentrated on field crop extension, paying little attention to homestead agriculture, which was of more importance to the landless, and women.

Outside the public extension system, NGOs were engaged in agricultural extension and were having some success, especially with regard to special crops and with reaching women. The latter particularly addressed improving the efficiency of homestead production. This led to the design of the ASSP Homestead Production Component (SAR, 1991:5), clearly founded on filling gaps in the service offered by the state.

## 2 The First Four Years (ASSP - 1992-1995)

At the start of ASSP, there was no formal contact between DAE and NGOs, and in reality there was considerable tension, mistrust and even dislike between the two sectors, and this characterised the period to 1994 (EEIME, 1994).

Contract-based linkages between DAE and NGOs, managed through an NGO Liaison and Contract Unit within DAE, were emphasised as the primary partnership route. Under the design of the component, DAE's relationship with NGOs was that of a funding agency, with no clear partnership in service provision.

Between 1992 and 1994, progress was extremely slow. DAE rejected the notion that NGOs were any better at service provision, saw no merit in supporting a process by which resources were transferred to NGOs, and failed to establish the Liaison and Contract Unit.

The ASSP mid-term review (ODI, 1994) emphasised the fact that national level contracting procedures outside of the DAE mainstream were somewhat counterproductive in the context of attempting to increase decentralisation. A focus on collaborative proposal development at district level was proposed, though this was never to fully materialise.

In late 1994, DAE approved the Terms of Reference for the DAE-NGO Liaison Committee<sup>7</sup> (to replace the contract unit), and invited a list of 25 'pre-qualified' NGOs to submit proposals. Some 37 proposals were received and these were processed and vetted by the committee. However, DAE were hesitant to countersign contracts, preferring to defer to the Ministry<sup>8</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> There was very little objective statistically valid information proving T&V had failed the Bangladeshi farmer. In 1992, DAE was thought to be contacting roughly 10% of the farming population – largely in line with international trends for public sector contact performance.

<sup>7</sup> Comprising 6 DAE; 2 ADAB; 1 CARE and BRAC representative, and TA Team representatives.

<sup>8</sup> During ASIRP, DAE adopted the "Project Director" system, which resolved the 'authority' question at the expense of further projectising ASIRP interventions.

In 1995, the Joint Secretary: Extension (MoA) countersigned 26 contracts, fully committing all available funds (Annex A). Contract implementation began in March/April 1995, by which time there were only 10 months of active programming left under ASSP. A number of issues were identified:

1. NGOs were using professional proposal writers which over-rated NGO capability.
2. NGOs need assistance in proposal development and presentation, reporting and budgeting.
3. External pressure for contract awards undermines transparent processes.
4. Contract duration must be tied to the agricultural cycle for which the intervention is planned<sup>9</sup>.

Although the contracts were with NGOs, they involved some form of partnership with DAE. In total, the contracts covered 23 districts and 60 Thanas.

In June 1995, DAE published their first Agricultural Extension Manual since the T&V manual of 1985. The manual recognised the utility of non-contractual partnership mechanisms such as sharing technical information and publications, joint participation in agricultural fairs, and for GOs to work with NGO groups. However, NGOs were not part of DAEs formal committee structure. At this time, this structure comprised District Extension Planning Committees (DEPCs) and Agricultural Technical Committees (ATCs). The extension manual also required all DAE extension staff in a Thana to come together under the chairmanship of the TAO for planning an annual Thana extension programme, though this 'committee' was unnamed (DAE, 1995).

The growing acceptance of the need for change within DAE, and the rapid pilot-led development of extension methods, tools and processes provided the opportunity to train DAE staff in new ways of working. The Extension Approach Training Programme ran from 1995 to 1999, and contained 9 core courses and 6 additional courses.

Many of these courses referred to specific non-contractual partnership opportunities for DAE and NGOs to work together - most notably in extension planning and working with groups. This was a significant achievement – the climate within DAE began to accept change, and champions of change emerged within DAE's head office.

Outcome	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. DAE-NGO Liaison Committee established</li> <li>2. 26 NGO Contracts signed and implemented with 34,963 beneficiaries (80% women)</li> <li>3. NGO (non-contractual) partnership principles beginning to appear in DAE mainstream documents, 1995 Extension Manual and EATP.</li> </ol>
Cost of Contracts (Phase 1)	Tk 44,590,440 (Average cost of Tk 1,275 per beneficiary)
Time to Achieve	3 Years
TA (International)	29 Months
Impact	Not assessed

<sup>9</sup> These four issues remain in 2003. Matching contract cycles to agricultural cycles is problematic in the NR sector as projects are designed with funding cycles matching financial years.

### 3 The Second Four Years (ASSP - 1996-1999)

Relationships between DAE and NGOs became less strained, and DAE issued letters to all Deputy Directors to invite NGOs to committee meetings, and outlined procedures for them to work together with contracted NGOs in their districts. Nonetheless, NGOs essentially operated in isolation during contract implementation.

The New Agricultural Extension Policy (GoB, 1996a), approved by the caretaker government, ensured a formal mandate for DAE-NGO partnership, and recognised NGOs as part of the national agricultural extension system, whilst establishing an integration 'component' to frame partnerships.

Some DEPCs began to invite NGOs to participate in their meetings, but there remained confusion about NGO roles. Representivity was questionable insofar as one NGO participating in a formal committee structure appeared to have to represent the interests of all NGOs in the District or Thana<sup>10</sup>.

Some of these issues were clarified in the NAEP Implementation Strategy (GoB, 1996b). Although the NAEP intention was to work through the pre-existing framework of local government, the Implementation Strategy established a parallel structure based on DAE's own committee system:

1. Thana Agricultural Extension Co-ordination Committee (TAECC), previously an informal DAE planning forum but now formalised with expanded membership including NGOs;
2. District Agricultural Extension Planning Committee, previously a DAE planning committee; but now with expanded membership including NGOs;
3. Agricultural Technical Committee (ATC) which remained unchanged, apart from the formal addition of NGO representatives;
4. Extension Policy Implementation Co-ordination Committee (EPICC), a new national forum which formally included NGOs.

There remained problems with the contracting process itself, with the EEIME (1996) noting that:

1. Contracted NGOs were not properly monitoring their own activities;
2. Delays in accepting an NGO contracting processes (1992-1994) had led to rapid issuance of contracts (in 1995) that were no longer based on the agricultural cycle for which support was to be provided;
3. Contracted NGO record keeping was poor, and in many cases it was not even possible to verify from these records that events/activities were held<sup>11</sup>.

Questions of sustainability, cost-effectiveness and scale were not raised or addressed. By this time, most of the Homestead Component contracts were nearing completion. Participants at several joint DAE/NGO workshops during the period made recommendations concerning how best to improve partnerships:

1. Enable access to each others activities and frequent exchange of materials and reports;
2. DAEP minutes to be sent to all NGOs in a district, not just NGOs who sit on the DAEP.

<sup>10</sup> This remains an issue in 2003.

<sup>11</sup> All these remain issues in 2003.

3. Issue reciprocal invitations to workshops/seminars/field days as well as programme planning meetings;
4. Ensure responsibilities for monitoring DAE-NGO partnerships are assigned<sup>12</sup>.

These recommendations were of a mainstreaming rather than contracting nature. By this time, NGOs and DAE were reciprocally inviting one another to attend field days, their staff were receiving joint training, and facilities began to be shared, though post interaction training was low (ASSP, 1996a). Such mainstreaming processes were designed to be no cost and non-contracted, and the Block Supervisor Handbook (DAE, 1996) required every BS to:

1. Find out which NGOs were working in every block, and which existing NGO affiliated farmer groups were in the block;
2. Offer services to NGO affiliated groups;
3. Liaise with NGOs when collecting information for planning purposes.

There is no evidence that these roles were ever implemented on a broad scale. Towards the end of 1996, ODA approved a no-cost extension (ASSP Phase 1A) to match their support to the end of the World Bank loan. The Project Evaluation Committee documentation of the time clearly noted three key lessons:

1. NGO contracting had led to increased DAE awareness of the opportunities for collaboration, but the future programme should be more firmly rooted and mainstreamed in DAE, particularly at district level.
2. Nearly all NGOs run credit schemes, and if such schemes are part of contracts, appropriate repayment procedures should be included, particularly in relation to the production enterprise for which loans are being used<sup>13</sup>.
3. Contracting NGOs to provide training and support to other NGOs (so called 'umbrella arrangements') has proven effective at improving NGO management and technical capability<sup>14</sup> (ODA, 1996).

In relation to micro-finance, there was (and has remained within the ASIRP PIF) clear fungibility in the use of donor grant funding. Grant funds were used by the NGOs to ensure continued provision of loans to their constituencies, ensuring the sustainability of patron-client relationships whilst continuing to exclude the hardcore poor. Nationally, Mallorie (2002) assesses that around 7 million rural households (36%) use NGO micro-finance services<sup>15</sup> and a further 1 million (5%) access formal bank loans. Some 4.3 million households (20%) find it difficult to use micro-finance packages, and are thus excluded. The same 20% of households appear to be excluded from most development service entitlements. Howes (2002) shows how land based extension programmes default to small farmers, excluding the landless, except in the case of large national NGOs such as BRACs Poultry Programme and Proshikas Social Forestry Programme.

<sup>12</sup> As of 2003, DAEPs were demanding invitations to field events such as field days in order to strengthen monitoring of services being provided under ASIRP PIF contracts.

<sup>13</sup> Of the 28 contracts 14 were used to generate revolving funds for providing credit support to beneficiaries implementing homestead based agricultural income generating activities. Up to February 1997, a total of 7,448 loans were disbursed, to a total of Tk 9,127,617, using ASSP funds. The NGOs used a range of disbursement and repayment systems, with interest rates varying from zero to 12 per cent.

<sup>14</sup> By 1999-2000, and the implementation of the ASIRP PIF, there was little evidence of capacity in these areas amongst (particularly smaller) NGOs.

<sup>15</sup> Excluding finance from Grameen Bank, only 13% of loans were used for agricultural (crop) development because NGO programmes are almost exclusively based on weekly re-payments which do not fit well with the seasonality of agricultural operations.

The ODA PEC of 1996 identified two clear thrusts for the future of NGO contracting under ASSP:

1. DAE/NGO contracts based on umbrella arrangements such that one NGO is contracted to support other NGOs and DAE.
2. NGOs would be encouraged to develop funding proposals at district level in partnership with DAE, and to be included as part of local extension plans.

In concluding ASSP Phase 1, the Homestead Completion Report (ASSP, 1997a) made clear observations regarding contracting processes:

1. NGOs shared information concerning their proposals prior to submission (3 identical proposals were received during one of the rounds);
2. NGOs may have satisfied selection criteria concerning adequate administrative and technical personnel to implement proposals, but subsequently reduced staff numbers during implementation;
3. NGO performance was limited by key weaknesses, namely the lack of clear strategy; poor mid level programme management and authority; lack of skilled staff; poor follow up to field activities; lack of skills in disseminating information and poor financial management;
4. Many NGOs used contract funds to provide free inputs for demonstrations<sup>16</sup>.

Despite a rationale for making adjustments to procedures and processes during Phase 1A, this did not occur. Sixteen new NGO contracts were processed, six of which were with partners from Phase 1 (Annex B), with management via the DAE-NGO Liaison Committee. Although there was a requirement for NGOs proposing to establish revolving loans with ASSP funds to sign a post-project memorandum of understanding (ASSP 1997a) outcomes were not assessed.

The trend to support larger NGOs with contracts continued. There is evidence that donors as a whole were interested in supporting the development of non-governmental service providers within the rhetoric of partnership, and concentrating on service delivery rather than empowerment *per se*. This was not a trend that GoB was willing to support in the first place, and remained one that they would never fund alone. There were therefore serious sustainability questions, particularly in the context of a project rooted in a single GoB line agency, whilst the development discourse of today has 'returned' to concerns over inclusive participation, engagement, entitlement, civil society and essentially empowerment.

Contracting retained division in service provision rather than building complementarity or pluralism, and NGOs developed as competitors for donor funds. Although competition is a positive outcome, the financial framework within which funds are made available and accessed by NGOs have not been conducive to pluralism and sustainability. Also, contracting may have furthered NGO competition for rural constituencies – developing their own networks of allied groups to which monopoly services are provided to fulfill project purposes whilst retaining patron-client structures.

During 1997, further awareness raising in the NGO community was conducted to clarify NAEP roles (in particular in the committee structures). Moves towards developing

---

<sup>16</sup> This has remained a perpetual issue over the 10 years, with NGOs (and GOs) utilising the provision of free inputs to further benefactor relationships with rural clients. Howes (2002) notes that subsidised input provision tends to increase post-project drop out by participant households, whilst over half the participants in ASIRP DPIF and NPIF projects (in 2002) would not participate again if free inputs were not provided.

guidelines for collaborative programming were made. Statements of intent from GO and NGO partners were developed through workshop processes; partnership leaflets and letters were sent to NGOs from the DG: DAE. Mainstreaming attempts were further strengthened in 1998, when new DAE staff Job Descriptions were developed, and included monitoring of DAE/NGO partnerships by District Training Officers, whilst DAE nominated the DD: Extension in HQ as a Liaison Focal Point. At the same time, the EPICC Institutions Sub Committee recommended rotating the chair at TAECC, DAEPC and ATC meetings.

DAE reports of attendance in DAEPC and TAECC showed NGO representation in all meetings at all levels had increased from 47% to 63% over the last 12 months (ASSP, 1998).

The first (and only) no-cost DAE-NGO MoU (1999) was between CARE INTERFISH and DAE for effect in 5 districts of North Bengal for the replication and dissemination of rice-fish culture. As the MoU was developed in Dhaka, it was divorced from field reality and role clarity remained absent, whilst joint work programming for DAE and CARE staff remained problematic.

ASSP evidence collected from DAE in early 1998 in 79 Thanas of 20 districts showed that 61% and 45% of these thanas and districts respectively could name NGOs they were working with. In these cases, contact (non-contractual) was frequent (ASSP, 1998). Nonetheless, 13 more contracts were signed in a second round, bringing the total number to 29 contracts for Phase 1A (Annex B).

The ASSP Phase 1A proposal stated that NGOs would be encouraged to develop partnership proposals with DAE at district level as part of the district extension plan, and that monitoring would be implemented through DAE monitoring systems. This was not followed outside the 'contracting' process. ASSP (Phase 1 and 1A) concluded in 1998. The final evaluation observed the dichotomy between contracting and mainstreaming:

1. Although contracted "activities appear to be generally well managed and have resulted in benefits for resource-poor women farmers, it must be questioned whether the NGOs would have carried out the activities in any case, even without ASSP funding" (ULG & ODI, 1998: Executive Summary).
2. Contracting procedures largely ran counter to efforts for decentralised partnerships as they were run from Dhaka, largely by the TA team, in consultation with the DAE-NGO Liaison Committee.
3. There were external pressures brought to bear to select NGOs that didn't conform to criteria.
4. Contracts were basically "arranged marriages" and as "relationships enter the partnership phase, perhaps it is best to allow the contracts component to be phased out" (ULG & ODI, 1998:36).
5. In the future, use the 'group approach' as a means of fostering partnership between DAE and NGOs, and upgrade the DAE-NGO Liaison Committee to be a subcommittee of EPICC.

By 1998, arrangements were already well advanced in the preparation of further support to GoB in the implementation of the NAEP. These arrangements were being realised in the form of the Agricultural Services Innovation and Reform Project (ASIRP).

Outcome	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. NGO representation in DAE committee structures reached circa 50%</li> <li>2. 29 (Phase 1A) NGO contracts signed and implemented with 25,000 direct beneficiaries (primarily women)</li> <li>3. Continuing mainstreaming attempts via the EATP</li> </ol>
Cost of 29 (Phase 1A) contracts (Tk)	Total Tk 33,534,678. Average cost per beneficiary of TK 1,341.
Time to Achieve	4 Years
TA (International)	37 Months (Homestead component only)
Impact	Not assessed

The NGO Agricultural Rehabilitation Programme (NARP) is worth noting at this point. Subsequent to the devastating floods of 1998, DFID decided to use ASSPs strong relationship with agriculture related NGOs as a means of rapidly disbursing relief aid. Just over £ 1 million (additional to the ASSP budget) was provided through 26 NGOs for seed packs and cash relief for 152,748 farmers in 172 Upazilas of 48 districts. NARP was clearly founded on strong ASSP-NGO relationships, and took a total of six months (October 1998 – February 1999) to administer. DAE were involved in the NARP design committee. DAE participation at field level varied – in some cases, DAE provided support to the NGOs, or assisted in ensuring ‘orderly’ distribution. It is uncertain if there was any residual (positive or negative) effect of NARP on partnership. What is certain is that the floods were devastating, a rapid response was required, and the ASSP Homestead Component served the situation well as a mechanism.

With the end of the Homestead Component in 1999, the DAE-NGO Liaison Committee stopped functioning. All committee costs had been met by ASSP, the committee purpose was basically the management of a time-bound project component, and decision making was generally TA driven. The committee thus had no reason for being post ASSP.

#### **4 The Third Four Years (ASIRP - 1999-2003)**

The third four-year period needs to be discussed under three discrete areas due to the complexity of the changes that occurred. The three discrete areas are a) Mainstream DAE Extension ('Change Management') b) Partnership Initiative Funds and c) Integrated Extension Piloting.

##### **a) Mainstream DAE Extension ('Change Management')**

The final products of ASSP support to DAE were the January 1999 Agricultural Extension Manual (supporting mainstreaming) and the DAE Strategic Plan (1999-2002) which included partnership as one of seven headlines. Several change management working groups were established with TA assistance. The Partnership Social Development and Gender Working Group met frequently<sup>17</sup>, held several workshops and retreats but failed to support implementation beyond the production of a partnership leaflet. The group did propose the development of a district level DAE-NGO partnership pilot in Netrakona and

<sup>17</sup> 15 meetings are recorded between the end of 1999 and mid 2000, at which DLS attended 93%, DoF attended 33%, FD attended 60%, and ADAB attended 93%. This level of interaction failed to produce action.

Chapai Nawabganj. Block Supervisors conducted farmer needs assessment and a simple survey of extension service providers as first steps.

In 2000, the results of an Extension Services Survey (ESS2000) were discussed with DAE<sup>18</sup>. The results reveal important indicators concerning the state of GO and NGO service provision on a macro scale across Bangladesh:

- 1 4.7 % of male farmers had received crop information, and 3.3 % vegetable information, from a GO in the last 12 months
- 2 1.4 % of male farmers had received crop information, and 0.2 % vegetable information, from an NGO in the last 12 months
- 3 1.1 % of female farmers had received crop information, and 1.2 % vegetable information, from a GO in the last 12 months
- 4 1.2 % of female farmers had received crop information, and 2.7 % vegetable information, from an NGO in the last 12 months

So, GOs were always more important information sources for male farmers, on all subjects. NGOs marginally outperformed GOs on advisory services to female farmers. However, across the board, service delivery was poor. Overall, DAE was thought to be directly and individually contacting 7.7 % (baseline 10% in 1992) of the male farming population, and 1.7 % of the female farming population. The highest report for NGO service delivery was the fact that 2.3 % of male farmers and 2.7 % of female farmers reported an NGO visit to discuss vegetable production.

Thus, there was no evidence to support any improvement in service delivery, and no evidence to conclude contracting or mainstreaming NGO-GO partnership had resulted in improvements. Nonetheless, farmers involved in the programme had undoubtedly gained a benefit – though within the confines of time/space/subject bound project/contract frameworks, and more in physical/financial than social capital in terms of rural communities as a whole (as opposed to direct project beneficiaries).

Also in 2000, DAE recognised that the demise of the (ASSP promoted) DAE-NGO Liaison Committee left them with no mechanism to communicate / network and share with NGOs. In 2001, it was decided to revitalize the committee under a different structure. Representatives of all DAE projects (not just ASIRP) were invited to become members, as were representatives of the National Agricultural Research System, along with ADAB and 14 larger agriculturally oriented NGOs. One NGO, ITDG, acts as member-secretary, and all members contribute Tk 2,000 per year, making the committee self-financing. The ToRs cover networking, a forum for sharing and joint decision-making and reviewing DAE-NGO partnerships. The committee has met regularly since 2001 and has conducted self-initiated joint activities such as field trips. The committee is not dependent on ASIRP funds (though requests for financial support have been made, they have been rejected and the committee has continued to function). Also, no TA support has been provided.

The review of ASIRP in 2001 (Blackshaw et al 2001a and 2001b) led to the cessation of 'change management' support – the review concluded these were costly and unproductive. DAE's Working Groups stopped with TA withdrawal, and largely disappeared. The initiative in Netrakona and Chapai Nawabganj also ceased, and no further mainstreaming support was provided to DAE.

<sup>18</sup> Survey results were limited by the methodology, which extrapolated contact levels on the basis of the type of farm enterprises being operated by farmers and the type of advice received. So, for example, a farmer with cropland who received advice on crops was assumed to have got that advice from DAE. Nonetheless, survey results are widely thought to be broadly accurate.

In 2002, ASIRP supported research into the livelihood impact of extension services. Howes (2002) examined six case studies that included two DAE projects, and four NGO programmes including BRACs Poultry Programme, the Proshika Social Forestry Programme and Helen Kellers NGO Gardening and Nutritional Education Surveillance Project. It was found that:

1. The programmes contributed to modest improvements in physical and financial capital, but there was little evidence of improvement in social capital. Even within the Proshika programme, which encouraged the formation of federated groups, these federations depended more on the social capital of the sponsoring NGO than their own internal capital as federations or constituent groups.
2. Programmes were often based on project interventions that led to the formation of intervention specific groups which had little sustainability after the end of the project.
3. Large national NGO programmes were more likely to target the poorest, though overall, land based interventions defaulted to support to small farmers with the 15-20% of the population (the 'hardcore poor') essentially excluded.

#### b) Partnership Initiative Funds

Somewhat contrary to the conclusions of ASSP, the ASIRP design included Partnership Initiative Funds for contracted partnerships at three levels:

**UPIF** Upazila Partnership Initiative Fund. Tk 75,000 per year for each of 468 Upazilas, controlled by the UAECC via a special bank account established by the UAO, to support very low cost partnership activities. IDA (50%) and GoB (50%) funded.

**DPIF** District Partnership Initiative Fund. Competitive funds available in 12 districts, 9 supported by DFID and 3 by IDA.

**NPIF** National Partnership Initiative Fund. Competitive funds available for initiatives which, whilst impacting at a local level, would have national implications and would best be organised nationally. Entirely DFID funded.

UPIF was implemented in all 468 Upazilas from 2000 to 2003, with a systematic evaluation conducted on the results of the first round. The evaluation showed UPIF to be generally successful (ASIRP, 2003). DAE preferred to act as the lead partner (in 84 per cent of cases), though they involved NGOs as partners in 23 per cent of cases. Delivery through UPIF was low cost (average of Tk 165 per beneficiary), though male farmers in the larger farm sizes benefited disproportionately. Only 26 % of beneficiaries were female, and marginal / landless households comprised only 17 % of beneficiaries.

Outcome	UPIF implemented in 486 Upazilas over 3 years with 244,720 beneficiaries in Year 1 (using this figure over 3 years, total beneficiaries 734,160).
Cost of UPIF (Tk)	Year 1 - Tk 35 million (Tk 165 per beneficiary) (using this figure over 3 years, total cost Tk 121 million). 50% funded by GoB, 50% by World Bank.
Time to Achieve	4 years
Impact	Year 1 - In 93% of cases, average return to beneficiaries > costs by 25%. 89% of beneficiaries adopted agro-technologies promoted through UPIF and intend to repeat adopt. 74% of farmers implementing activities as a result of UPIF claim them to be successful.

DPIF Round 1 was conducted from September 2000 to February 2003, and NPIF Round 1 from March 2001 to May 2003. The process had transparency failures, but resulted in the implementation of 68 contracts (Annex C). Benefits were skewed to female farmers, but in larger farm size categories, and were largely subsidised - continuing the ASSP Homestead Component trend to support distribution of free inputs. During a major review of ASIRP, Blackshaw et al (2001a and 2001b) recognised implementation of the NPIF and DPIF was weak and unlikely to support achievement of the project purpose.

Outcome	10 NPIF projects implemented (with DFID grants) 59 DPIF projects implemented
Cost of NPIF (£)	£ 900,000. Average project cost Tk 18,700,000 with 1,800 farmers, implemented by 4-5 partners. Average value of free inputs per beneficiary Tk 1,756
Cost of DPIF	Average project cost Tk 3,900,000 with 144 farmers (58% female; 6% landless)
Time to Achieve	2 Years
NPIF Impact	93% of beneficiaries made a profit from involvement in projects
DPIF Impact	If value of free inputs included, 30% of activities promoted were not economically viable, and 52% of beneficiaries would only participate again on condition of free inputs <sup>19</sup> .

More robust and comprehensive procedures for DPIF and NPIF were designed, including comprehensive access criteria, separate external technical review of proposals, and the constitution of a Partnership Sub Committee of EPICC (EPSC)<sup>20</sup>. Revised objectives and procedures were completed in January 2002, and a second round of DPIF and NPIF launched. NPIF and DPIF Round 2 were conducted in 2002, leading to the approval and implementation of 38 contracts (9 NPIF, 29 DPIF) (Annex D).

There were significant differences between contracting procedures between DPIF and NPIF in the first and second rounds (with the second round seeking to support a reformist agenda in line with the NAEP). These differences are examined in Annex E. Despite reforms, by the end of 2003, all parties concluded that DPIF and NPIF had been disappointing.

The approach failed to develop a sustainable means of facilitating genuine partnership – partnerships were put together as ‘marriages of convenience’ in order to access funds. No further rounds of DPIF/NPIF would be permitted, and in essence the programme was cancelled and the fund withdrawn.

<sup>19</sup> Clearly there are problems with the quality of agricultural technical information being provided to farmers if it depends on free input provision to be economically viable.

<sup>20</sup> This was first proposed in 1998.

Outcome	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 9 NPIF (Round 2) projects implemented (with DFID grants) with 8,129 direct beneficiaries</li> <li>2. 28 DPIF (Round 2) projects implemented</li> <li>3. EPSC constituted</li> <li>4. Revitalised DAE-NGO Liaison Committee established and self-sustaining</li> </ol>
Cost of NPIF II (£)	Total cost Tk 16,766,949. Average project cost Tk 1,862,994 (£ 20,249) with 903 farmers (Tk 2,063 / beneficiary), implemented by 3-4 partners.
Cost of DPIF II	Average project cost Tk 771,946 (£ 8,390) with 1,839 farmers, implemented by 3-4 partners (79% involving DAE). 45% of projects homestead oriented (i.e. repetition/continuation of ASSP Homestead contracts)
TA (International)	26 months
TA (National)	26 months
Time to Achieve	2 Years
NPIF II Impact	Under assessment – results to be published
DPIF II Impact	Under assessment – results to be published

### c) Integrated Extension Piloting

The beginning of ASIRP in 1999 also saw the design of the Integrated Extension Pilot. Twelve upazilas were selected, and the aim was the delivery of improved partnership between GO and NGO ESPs, under the co-ordination of UAECs, with minimal external resources and premised on a non-fund driven process. The DAE Partnership Working Group did facilitate some planning processes in the 12 Upazilas and supported the development of 54 proposals for DPIF funding.

Also in 1999, piloting of FLE as a collaborative initiative of DAE, RDRS and FIVDB began. Both RDRS and FIVDB had been contracted under the ASSP Homestead Component, though the lessons learnt from these contracts were not evaluated prior to FLE engagement<sup>21</sup>.

By the end of 2001, DAE in partnership with RDRS (in Rangpur Region) and FIVDB (in Sylhet Region) had formed 51 FLE groups. Most groups were projectised (i.e. they were developed specifically for the FLE Pilot) though some of those in Rangpur were originally RDRS credit groups. RDRS intend incorporating 'their' groups into their own general programme, whilst those formed by FIVDB may be less likely to be 'sustained'. This is largely because RDRS see their FLE groups as another set of clients that can be linked to their system. The pilot began life as non-contractual, but financial support was provided from the project to the NGOs in the form of an administration fee from mid-2002, aligned

<sup>21</sup> RDRS had been contracted with a budget of Tk 3,603,589 in 1995 for an integrated homestead agriculture programme with marginal farmers and the strengthening of networks (plus media production and dissemination). RDRS were awarded a further 3 contracts in 1997/8, including one for Tk 7,594,750 to form 150 marginal farmers groups in Kurigram. FIVDB were contracted in 1997 to develop women farmers as livestock para-professionals in Sylhet. The need for FLE to have formed new groups was questionable.

to quarterly planning meetings at which targets were repeatedly set and missed. A separate evaluation of FLE will be published in 2003.

Blackshaw et al (2001a and 2001b) concluded that there was a worrying lack of clarity in the 12 Upazila pilot integrated extension strategy. The link between the 12 Upazilas and developing proposals for possible DPIF support was identified as flawed, with proposals presenting a wish list of resources to fund routine extension. The review recommended development of a new strategy, which led to three models for piloting in five separately selected Districts - a) UAECC Strengthening; b) Specialist Co-operation Model and c) Resource Centre/Local Government Model. All models implicitly (rather than explicitly) involved strengthening collaboration between GO and NGO ESPs.

Under the IEA, strengthened large scale NGO-GO partnership began to materialise in Bagerhat. BRAC participated in the IEA inception, and their Upazila level Programme Officers attended Technical Briefings provided by governmental service providers. BRAC field staff (80 operating in each Upazila in the crops, fisheries and livestock sectors) did start to participate in collecting farmer problems using Problem Issue Recording Sheets (PIRS), and provided written advice and solutions using Farmer Advice Record Sheets (FARS). However, by the end of the pilot in September 2003, BRAC had adopted an Entrepreneur Development Programme – although the Programme Officers continued to participate in technical briefings, field staff stopped using the problem and advice record sheets. Moreover, it was found that the local BRAC regional office had little power to fully participate in the model in the absence of specific instructions from their Head Office. A full evaluation of all IEA models will be published separately in 2003.

## 5 Conclusion

Annex H provides a summary of actions and lessons over the 10-year process. Main conclusions are:

- 1 Lessons were learnt across 10 years, but there was a tendency for them to be forgotten, or not internalised, then learnt again. This is readily apparent at the transition from ASSP to ASIRP, where ICR recommendations were not internalised in ASIRP design.
- 2 A key lesson learnt repetitively over the 10 years related to weak NGO capacity. Given competitive processes are designed to award contracts to the best provider for the job, the context of weak capacity across the board meant that competitive funding was bound to fail. Capacity has been found to be weak in both administration and project management, and not linked to the size of the NGO.
- 3 Audit comments (ASIRP, 2003) note that "40-50% compliance with accounting/auditing practice is the underlying trend", and this is apparently acceptable within the donor community.
- 4 Small farmers were the predominant beneficiaries, whilst the hardcore poor were generally excluded. Women were significant beneficiaries when project design demanded so.
- 5 The operationalisation of a 'group approach' generally defaulted to group formation by NGOs around projectised agro-technologies, rather than as a means of strengthening civil society.
- 6 DPIF and NPIF (Rounds 1 and 2) essentially supported the same kind of homestead interventions that had been done under the ASSP Homestead Component. The 'innovative' technologies and extension methods used remained the same over the ten years – for example, homestead gardening; mini nurseries; rice-fish culture; duck-fish culture and IPM, promoted through farmer networks; demonstrations; visits, farmer groups and para-professionals.
- 7 There has been an extremely limited impact on internalising partnership for added value, and no evidence that Bangladeshi farmers are getting a better agricultural extension service because of 'partnership'.

- 8 GO (DAE) and NGO service delivery benefits an extremely limited proportion of farmers (below 7.7 % at present) against a 1992 base of 10%.
- 9 Contracting as introduced in the environment of Bangladesh has proliferated through projects and possibly undermined genuine partnership. Although the PIF ensured that NGOs could be as innovative as possible in proposing new approaches to extension, in practice the process became one of NGO alignment to secure funds as advertised.
- 10 Partnerships as implemented through contracts have provided mechanisms for service providers (GO and NGO) to gain financial resources to provide free inputs; pay themselves allowances and substitute for normal routine extension delivery.
- 11 Despite the weaknesses, large numbers of households benefited from the delivery of service (0.8 million households over 10 years). However, service delivery has not improved sustainably – it was contract linked, whilst livelihood improvement has been more apparent in the physical and financial spheres rather than in relation to social capital.
- 12 There has been no progress in clarifying the respective roles of the public sector, private sector, or the NGO sector. Only 4 private sector companies have been involved in contracts over the 10 years. It could be argued that expanding NGO contracting has squeezed out the private for profit sector, and blurred the edges further between NGOs and businesses. Pluralism has not been reached, and is unlikely to be in the absence of a level playing field.
- 13 The NAEP, DAE Agricultural Extension Manual and DAE Strategic Plans have all provided a framework for partnership. 10 years ago, even the concept of working with NGOs was unsupported in the Department - this has been a major improvement, but the contracting process has failed to mainstream partnership in the framework. The DAE Extension Manual provided the basis of extension approaches/models presented in PIF proposals.
- 14 The process of piloting PIF at three levels has shown the UPIF as generally successful, and the DPIF and NPIF as generally unsuccessful. Large numbers of households benefited from UPIF. Secondary adoption in Year 1 was shown to be 3.8:1. Applied to direct beneficiaries in all three years, a total of 2.79 million households benefited (14% of all rural households). DFID grant funds and TA were used to support DPIF and NPIF, whilst UPIF was supported under the World Bank loan (50%) and GoB (50%) with minimal TA. DFID funded the UPIF evaluation. There is certainly the opportunity of moving away from TA-heavy investment, looking towards the possibility of making finance available for local extension.

## 6 The Future

UPIF type funding arrangements have proven the utility of programmatic (budget) support to extension. Funds were provided to Upazilas and under the control of the UAO with minimal guidelines. Despite the considerable risk, funds were used cost-effectively to provide services to nearly 3 million farm households - most were provided in partnership, with DAE in the lead. Any future support to extension could follow this basic approach, but within the constitutional context of local government. DPIF/NPIF type processes controlled from the centre with high transaction costs<sup>22</sup> should not be repeated.

The continually learnt lesson that NGOs have "weak capacity" may lead to a future based on capacity building, but the question remains capacity for what - roles of the government/private and NGO sectors remain undefined.

In the context of 'capacity for what', it is worth noting that many Bangladeshi NGOs have their roots in the empowerment movement, and subsequently shifted (with donor grant

<sup>22</sup> High transaction costs were associated with DPIF/NPIF not simply because of the lengthy process, but also due to the requirement for a Secretariat headed by international TA to deflect pressure for patronage in selection/contracting.

support) into discrete service delivery to make up for weaknesses in state delivery. This process has done little to strengthen civil society, and it is unlikely that there can be a simple translation of NGO groups to Civil Society Organisations (as groups are exclusive rather than inclusive). This is particularly problematic in the context of the re-emergence of local government in Bangladesh, and increasing donor interest in developing and engaging civil society from a governance perspective.

Fundamentally, there is a need to bring into reality an equitable mainstream extension service across Bangladesh. This will require direct budget support in a programmatic approach providing the opportunity of entitlement to citizens in all 468 Upazilas and 4,479 Union Parishads. UPIF has proven DAE are capable of organising low-cost (Tk 165 or £1.79 per beneficiary plus the core DAE cost of £1.00 to £2.00 per rural family per year). The NGO contracting process has generally been more costly, and would be fiscally unsustainable for GoB to adopt on the national budget.

Finally, the ASSP ASIRP projects alone have entered contractual relationships with over 160 NGOs. It has been readily apparent that these NGOs have had varying degrees of proficiency, accountability and probity. However, there is no NGO regulatory body in Bangladesh - a body needs to be established with the ability to track and present performance and non-performance. Accreditation standards for registration would be necessary for any regulatory body, and falling below these standards would have to result in suspension of NGO registration.

**Annex A**  
**Summary of Contracts Awarded under ASSP Homestead Component (Phase 1)**

NAME OF NGO	TITLE AND CONTRACT	CONTRACT PROGRAMME AREA AND DESCRIPTION
Assistance for Social Organization and Development (ASOD)	Women and Homestead Gardening 320757/1/H2/2/101 Tk <b>788,590</b>	Bogra District 300 beneficiaries
Bangladesh Agricultural Working People's Association (BAWPA)	Integrated Homestead Agricultural Programme 320757/1/H2/2/102 Tk <b>2,948,900</b>	Thakurgaon, Nilphamari, Lalmonirhat, Dinajpur, Bogra, Naogaon, Jessore, Kushtia, Magura, Manikganj, Gazipur Districts 1.5 years. Integrated programme target at 910 marginal farmers
Bangladesh Organization for Development Cooperation (BODC)	Extension Education for Homestead Production Development 320757/1/H2/2/103 Tk <b>454,750</b>	Dhaka and Shariatpur Districts 1.5 years. Farmers' need identification develop an action oriented training module for homestead activities. 60 farmers.
Development centre International (DCI)	Extension Services in Homestead Production Programme 320757/1/H2/2/104 Tk <b>2,189,701</b>	Narayanganj and Gazipur Districts 1.5 years. Income generating skills of women through utilization of the homestead. 600 farmers.
Gono Kallyan Trust (GKT)	Implementation of Innovative Technology and Extension Service in HPP 320757/1/H2/2/105 Tk <b>3,788,610</b>	Manikganj District 1.5 years. Use of hormones for summer tomato production. Emphasis on summer vegetables. Link with BARI/AVDC. 1,300 farmers
HEED Bangladesh	Homestead Gardening Programme 320757/1/H2/2/105 Tk <b>1,645,500</b>	Moulvibazar District 1.5 years. To increase income and improve nutrition of partners through maximising homestead land for vegetable, fruit and timber production. 2,000 farmers.
Helen Keller International (HKI)	a. Homestead Garden Inventory of Technology and Users 320757/1/H2/2/107 Tk <b>84,700</b> b. Homestead Garden Promotion through Training 320757/1/H2/2/108 Tk <b>4,708,000</b>	A nation-wide inventory of technology and users 0.5 years.  Co-operative training programme with partner NGOs and DAE for central nurseries, homestead gardens, live fencing, and saplings. Panchagarh, Thakurgaon, Bogra, Tangail, Netrakona. 1.5 years, 5,100 farmers
Organization for Rural Development (ORD)	Homestead Kitchen Gardening and Environment Project 320757/1/H2/2/109 Tk <b>1,844,268</b>	Thakurgaon (Sadar Thana) 1.5 years. Kitchen gardens and roadside tree plantation mainly with 200 tribal women.
Padakhep Manabik Unnayan Kendra (PMUK)	Homestead Production Programme 320757/1/H2/2/110 Tk <b>2,329,375</b>	Barisal and Pirojpur Districts 1.5 years. Integrated homestead activities with 1,000 farmers. Technical assistance from DAE is indicated.
PRODIPAN	Homestead Production Programme 320757/1/H2/2/111 Tk <b>3,197,249</b>	Khulna District 1.5 years. An integrated homestead program with 1,430 farmers

NAME OF NGO	TITLE AND CONTRACT	CONTRACT PROGRAMME AREA AND DESCRIPTION
Rangpur Dinajpur Rural Services (RDRS)	a. Homestead Agril. for Marginal Farmers 320757/1/H2/2/112 Tk <b>2,748,589</b> b. Network and Targeting 320757/1/H2/2/113 Tk <b>855,000</b>	Thakurgaon District. Integrated homesteads, 1.5 years, 1,350 farmers  Strengthening of farmer networks, production of farmer publications with technological support from DAE. 1 year. Area - Rajshahi region, target 10,000 farmers
Save the Children (USA)	Expanding Homestead Production by Enhancing Extension Capabilities of Local NGOs 320757/1/H2/2/114 Tk <b>3,093,045</b>	Brahmanbaria District, and ADAB chapter NGOs of Comilla Region 1.5 years. Training of partner NGOs in homestead productive activities for income generation and improved nutrition DAE to be member of the planning and steering committee for this programme. Target 1,525 farmers.
Technical Assistance for Rural Development (TARD)	Utilization of Homestead for IGA 320757/1/H2/2/115 Tk <b>1,122,055</b>	Manikganj District 1.5 years. Integrated homestead activities with 2,000 farmers. Mainly training of own staff in homestead activities with development of training modules. Technical assistance to be sought from DAE and others.
Village Education Resource Centre (VERC)	Promotion of Homestead Farming 320757/1/H2/2/116 Tk <b>2,666,763</b>	Dhaka, Manikganj, Narayanganj Districts 1.5 years. Homestead activities including food preservation and vegetable gardening as activities for income generation, with 925 farmers
World Vision	Regenerative Homestead Agricultural Programme 320757/1/H2/2/117 Tk <b>2,731,000</b>	Gazipur District 1.5 years. Bio-Intensive production, training and demonstrations for 1,200 girls, youths, tenant farmers.
Worldview (Bangladesh)	Comprehensive Nutrition and Blindness Prevention Programme 320757/1/H2/2/118 Tk <b>2,873,750</b>	Dinajpur District 1.5 years. Involves homestead gardens, targeted at mothers and the use of folk media to spread information with 2,304 farmers
Association for Community Development (ACD)	Agro-based Training Programme 320757/1/H2/2/119 Tk <b>502,575</b>	Rajshahi and Naogan Districts 1 year. Homestead gardening with close technical co-operation from DAE and dissemination of technology to smaller local NGOs. Direct beneficiaries 96.
OMWE	320757/1/H2/120 Tk <b>193,300</b>	200 farmers
DUS	320757/1/H2/121 Tk <b>631,400</b>	325 farmers
SEDS	320757/1/H2/122 Tk <b>606,650</b>	50 farmers
PEEP	320757/1/H2/123 Tk <b>665,060</b>	390 farmers
JC	320757/1/H2/124 Tk <b>628,540</b>	300 farmers
JAC	320757/1/H2/125 Tk <b>507,760</b>	300 farmers
SUS	320757/1/H2/126 Tk <b>390,300</b>	230 farmers
GUS	320757/1/H2/127 Tk <b>184,000</b>	130 farmers
BEES	320757/1/H2/128 Tk <b>193,010</b>	750 farmers
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>Tk 44,590,440</b>	<b>34,963 farmers (80% women)</b>

**Annex B**  
**Summary of Contracts Awarded under ASSP Homestead Component (Phase 1A)**

<b>NAME OF NGO</b>	<b>TITLE AND CONTRACT NUMBER</b>	<b>CONTRACT PROGRAMME AREA AND DESCRIPTION</b>
Rangpur Dinajpur Rural Services (RDRS)	School Agriculture Programme Contract No. : A8.8.1/01 Tk <b>900,000</b>	Thakurgaon District Development of agro-based basic skills for rural children through non-formal primary education. Linked with DAE.
Save the Children (USA)	Continuation and Consolidation of Project on Expanding Homestead Production by Enhancing the Extension Capacities of Local NGOs Contract No. : A8.8.1/02 Tk <b>4,480,587</b>	Brahmanbaria District Promoting GO:NGO and NGO:NGO partnership through informal network (GO:NGO) for exchange of experience and (homestead production / consumption). Establish 960 home gardens by women saving group members, 50 seed vendors and nursery holders
Rangpur Dinajpur Rural Services (RDRS)	Integrated Homestead Farming Pilot Project Contract No. : A8.8.1/03 Tk	Panchagarh, Thakurgaon, Nilphamari, Lalmonirhat, Kurigram District. RDRS partnership to involve staff of the service providers (DAE, DLS etc) in implementation. 290 demonstration farms with an estimated 100,000 farmers benefiting.
HEED Bangladesh	Homestead Gardening Programme (HSG) Contract No. : A8.8.1/04 Tk <b>3,366,519</b>	HEED DAE partnership on homestead gardening with 2000 farm women
World Vision Bangladesh	Regenerative Homestead Agricultural Programme Project Contract No. : A8.8.1/05 Tk <b>101,575</b>	Gazipur District Improved technology transfer through training, demonstration and field days linked with DAE, DoF and DLS. 100 direct beneficiaries. Spread to 1200.
Mennonite Central Committee (MCC)	PARE Programme : Homestead Farming Project Contract No. : A8.8.1/06 Tk <b>3,929,000</b>	Faridpur, Rajbari, Jhenaidah, Jessore, Kushtia, Pabna, Sirajgonj and Noakhali Districts Support to 13 NGOs agricultural technology extension linked to DAE.
Bangladesh Agricultural Working Peoples Association	Integrated Homestead Agro-based Production Programme Contract No. : A8.1.07 Tk <b>1,898,507</b>	Noagaon, Manikgonj, Jessore Districts. Transferring improved agro-based technologies suitable for homestead areas in co-operation with DAE and DLS. 548 direct beneficiaries.
Agricultural Advisory Society (AAS)	DAE/ASS Crop Management Phase 1 Contract No. : H8.1/08 Tk <b>2,246,320</b>	Gaibandha and Jessore Districts. Production of high value crops with 30 farmers. Link with DAE. Mobilise Revolving Funds. Spread to 500 farmers.
Social Upliftment Society (SUS)	Homestead Production and Training Programme for Women Contract No. : H8. 1/09 Tk <b>738,525</b>	Dhaka District. Exclusively with 50 women. Technology transfer of improved homestead technologies. Mini-nurseries / small scale food processing.
Dushtha Shasthya Kendra (DSK)	Homestead Production Collaborative programme Contract No. : H8. 1/10 Tk <b>1,223,460</b>	Kishoregonj and Netrokona Districts. Package project with emphasis on improving the skills of 1,600 group members. Credit support. Links to DAE, Livestock and Fisheries Department.

NAME OF NGO	TITLE AND CONTRACT NUMBER	CONTRACT PROGRAMME AREA AND DESCRIPTION
Service Civil International (CCI)	Homestead Production Towards Food Security Contract No. : H8. 1/11 Tk <b>1,169,465</b>	Patuakhali District. A nursery will be developed in every Union of the project area A total of 954 women, of which 100 will implement an integrated project.
Action Aid Bangladesh	A diversified Homestead Gardening - A Pilot Project Contract No. : H8. 1/12 Tk <b>445,500</b>	Skill development for adolescent girls to establish homestead gardens. Links to DAE. 600 direct beneficiaries, out of these 200 will get training and materials support and the rest 400 will get only training.
Barisal Social Development Organization (BSDO)	Homestead Production Programme Contract No. : H8. 1/13 Tk <b>709,940</b>	Homestead gardening, tree plantation, poultry feed production, cow rearing, goat rearing, small-scale fish culture, fruit gardening. 1030 (direct) beneficiaries.
Village Research and Service Centre (Gram Kendra)	Homestead Production Through Collaborative Programming Contract No. : H8. 1/14 Tk <b>374,850</b>	Narayangonj District. Introduction of improved vegetable varieties, compost making through training, demonstration and field days with the co-operation of DAE. 100 farm families to benefit directly.
Voluntary Organization for Social Development (VOSD)	Homestead Production and Nursery Development Programme Contract No. : H8. 1/15 Tk <b>1,033,770</b>	Barisal and Barguna Districts. Training and dissemination on vegetable production. 250 direct beneficiaries, plus one nursery in every Thana.
Thengamara Mohila Sabuj Sangha (TMSS)	Goat Breeding Project with Internet NGO Contract : H8. 1/16 Tk <b>826,100</b>	Bogra District Goat rearing, goat feed production, feeding and medication. Link with DLS. 300 direct beneficiaries.
Friends in Village Development Bangladesh (FIVDB)	Initiative for Training Women Farmers in Agricultural Techniques Using Mentor Farmers Contract No. : A8. 1/17 Tk <b>210,000</b>	Sylhet Practical farm based training in poultry rearing, goat keeping and horticulture to selected 150 women farmers. Package of inputs provided. The project will develop working relationship between disadvantaged farmers and GO service providers to maximise farmers access to services and demand.
Samaj Unnayan Projash (PSD)	District Level Collaborative Project with DAE on Nursery cum All Year Round Vegetable Gardening Contract No.: A8. 1/18 Tk <b>100,000</b>	Jhenaidah District All year round homestead gardening through training, demonstration and field days with the co-operation of DAE.
Together for Service of People	District Level Collaborative Project with DAE on Nursery cum All Year Round Vegetable Gardening Contract No. : A8. 1/19 Tk <b>100,000</b>	Pabna District All year round homestead gardening through training, demonstration and field days with the co-operation of DAE.
Singher Khajura Bastuhara Samaj Kalyan Samity	Homestead Production Demonstration Contract No. : A8. 1/20 Tk <b>100,000</b>	Jessore District Homestead vegetables gardening and tree plant nursery with the co-operation of DAE. 18 homestead gardening demonstration plots / nurseries.

<b>NAME OF NGO</b>	<b>TITLE AND CONTRACT NUMBER</b>	<b>CONTRACT PROGRAMME AREA AND DESCRIPTION</b>
Family and Child Welfare	District Level Collaborative Project with Department of Agricultural Extension on Nursery cum All Year Round Vegetable Gardening Contract No. : A8. 1/21 <b>Tk 100,000</b>	Tangail District All year round homestead gardening through training, demonstration and field days with the co-operation of DAE.
Development Organization of the Rural Poor	Collaborative Programming with DAE in Homestead Production Contract No. : A8. 1/22 <b>Tk 100,000</b>	Kishoreganj Sadar Thana Vegetable gardening, vegetable seedlings and multipurpose trees saplings production through training, demonstration and field days.
Society Development Committee (SDC)	A Nursery cum All Year Round Vegetable Gardening Contract No. : A8. 1/23 <b>Tk 100,000</b>	Boalmari Thana of Faridpur District Production of vegetables through training, setting up demonstration plots and field days with the co-operation of DAE.
Surid Sangha	Nursery-cum-All Years Round Vegetable Gardening Demonstration Project in Collaboration with DAE Contract No. : H8. 1/24 <b>Tk 153,300</b>	To set up 10 demonstration plots on nursery cum all year round vegetable gardening.
Social Progress Services	Technology of Homestead Vegetable Production, Seed Seedling Contract No. : H8. 1/25 <b>Tk 282,400</b>	Sherpur District To transfer improved homestead vegetables production technology through training, demonstration and field days. A total of 140 demonstration plots will be established.
HEED and DAE Bangladesh	Collaborative Project on Homestead Gardening between HEED Bangladesh and the DAE Contract No. : H8. 1/26 <b>Tk 909,060</b>	The programme provides training, inputs and technical supports to approximately 3000 of HEED's female group members to develop vegetable gardens. 17 full-time Agriculture cadre (HEED) with 18 DAE BSs.
Association for Community Development (ACD)	Homestead Gardening and Network Building Contract No. : H8. 1/27 <b>Tk 341,050</b>	Rajshahi and Chapai-Nawabgonj District. Transfer of improved homestead gardening cum vegetable seedlings raising technologies.
Rangpur Dinajpur Rural Service (RDRS)	Development of Small Farmer Groups in Kurigram to Combat Marginalization Contract No. : A8. 1/28 <b>Tk 7,594,750</b>	Formation of 160 small farmer groups consisting of 16 member's households. DAE / NGOs partnership and support working with groups.
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>Tk 33,534,678</b>	25,000 Direct Beneficiaries

**Annex C**  
**Summary of DPIF Round 1 Contracts**

DISTRICT	DONOR	BUDGET	CODE	PROJECT NAME	PARTNERS
BAGERHAT	DFID	269,175	01-BAG-01	Integrated Agril. Development	DAE / BRDB / DLS / BRAC
BAGERHAT	DFID	269,175	01-BAG-02	Integrated Agricultural Development	DAE / BRDB / DLS / BRAC
BAGERHAT	DFID	269,175	01-BAG-03	Integrated Agricultural Development	DAE / BRDB / DLS / BRAC
BAGERHAT	DFID	269,175	01-BAG-04	Integrated Agricultural Development	DAE / BRDB / DLS / BRAC
BAGERHAT	DFID	269,175	01-BAG-05	Integrated Agricultural Development	DAE / BRDB / DLS / BRAC
BAGERHAT	DFID	137,100	01-BAG-06	Integrated Agricultural Development	DAE / BRDB / DLS / BRAC
BAGERHAT	DFID	137,100	01-BAG-07	Integrated Agricultural Development	DAE / BRDB / DLS
BAGERHAT	DFID	181,850	01-BAG-08	Integrated Agricultural Development	DAE / BRDB / DLS
BAGERHAT	DFID	487,620	01-BAG-09	Goat Rearing Technology Dissemination to destitute women	HELP / DLS
CHAPAINAWA BGANJ	DFID	275,940	01-CHA-01	Seedless Lemon Project	CCDB / DAE
COX'S BAZAR	DFID	456,000	01-COX-01	Homestead gardening and reforestation	SARPV / DAE
COX'S BAZAR	DFID	46,694	01-COX-02	Homestead vegetable gardening	DAE / BRDB
COX'S BAZAR	DFID	164,640	01-COX-03	Upazila nursery project	DAE / LGED / BRDB
COX'S BAZAR	DFID	151,000	01-COX-04	Acti Bari Acti Khamar	DAE / DLS / DoF / BRDB
COX'S BAZAR	DFID	164,000	01-COX-05	One house one farm	DAE / BRDB
COX'S BAZAR	DFID	114,600	01-COX-06	Variety demonstration of Boro, Brri 28,29	DAE / BRDB / DLS / BRAC
JAMALPUR	DFID	983,598	01-JAM-01	Improvement of household nutrition through plantation of fruit trees and poultry.	FHD / DAE
JAMALPUR	DFID	939,120	01-JAM-02	Goat rearing project	SUS / AFF / PRATYASHA
JAMALPUR	DFID	352,170	01-JAM-03	Nutritional improvement through fruits and vegetables.	HC / GUS / ADMS / SHD / FHD
JAMALPUR	DFID	324,700	01-JAM-04	Intensive vegetable cultivation project	GUS / DAE
JAMALPUR	DFID	908,313	01-JAM-05	Homestead gardening, tree plantation and improvement of soil fertility.	ASED / DAE / MUS / PRAC
MAGURA	WBANK	386,263	01-MAG-01	Beef fattening	ALO / DLS
MAGURA	WBANK	326,027	01-MAG-02	Cattle fattening	DIPAN / DLS
MAGURA	WBANK	326,085	01-MAG-03	Poultry rearing and feed	DLS / NGO
MAGURA	WBANK	397,635	01-MAG-04	Homestead development	DAE / DOF
MAGURA	WBANK	275,800	01-MAG-05	Fish pond and dike tree plantation	DOF / DAE

DISTRICT	DONOR	BUDGET	CODE	PROJECT NAME	PARTNERS
MAGURA	WBANK	405,290	01-MAG-06	Year round vegetable growing	SRIZONY / NGO
MAGURA	WBANK	369,642	01-MAG-07	Homestead development	CHETONA / DAE
NAOGOAN	DFID	332,125	01-NAO-01	Agricultural extension activities strengthening package program	DAE / DoF / DLS / DABI
NAOGOAN	DFID	708,700	01-NAO-02	Integrated homestead production project	ARCO / DAE / DLS / ASUS
NETRAKONA	DFID	802,200	01-NET-01	Round the year vegetable cultivation program	POUSH / DAE
NETRAKONA	DFID	807,450	01-NET-02	Round the year vegetable cultivation program	GHARANI / DAE
NETRAKONA	DFID	474,968	01-NET-03	Intensive vegetable, fruit and poultry production in homestead area.	SUS / DAE / DLS
NETRAKONA	DFID	739,200	01-NET-04	Promotion of fish production using multiple technology package.	FHD / DoF
NETRAKONA	DFID	900,900	01-NET-05	Improved duck rearing and local breed upgrading technology transfer at grassroots.	RDA / DLS
NETRAKONA	DFID	634,200	01-NET-06	Homestead vegetables, nutrition and cooking	JUS / DAE
NETRAKONA	DFID	861,630	01-NET-07	Integrated agricultural extension through collaborative effort.	SUS / DAE / DLS
PIROJPUR	WBANK	439,510	01-PIR-01	Akti bari Akti khamar	DoF / DAE / DLS
PIROJPUR	WBANK	273,961	01-PIR-02	Akti bari Akti khamar	DAE / DLS / DoF
PIROJPUR	WBANK	117,000	01-PIR-03	Aman seed production	DAE / BRDB
PIROJPUR	WBANK	505,300	01-PIR-04	Integrated fish and vegetables	NGO / DAE / DoF
PIROJPUR	WBANK	248,755	01-PIR-05	Rice fish culture project	DoF / DAE
RANGAMATI	DFID	No projects			
SHARIATPUR	DFID	390,730	01-SHA-01	Promotion of environmentally friendly technologies	BODC / DAE / DLS / DoF
SHARIATPUR	DFID	247,700	01-SHA-02	Block demonstration HYV seed production boro rice	DAE / NUSA / BRAC
SHARIATPUR	DFID	231,939	01-SHA-03	Home model farm through mini nursery	NUSA / DAE / DF
SHARIATPUR	DFID	432,950	01-SHA-04	A home is a model farm	DAE / NUSA / BRAC/DLS /DoF
SUNAMGANJ	WBANK	427,560	01-SUN-01	Homestead horticultural development	FIVDB / DAE
SUNAMGANJ	WBANK	458,930	01-SUN-02	Land use and cropping patterns	DAE / SRDI
SUNAMGANJ	WBANK	855,960	01-SUN-03	Promotion of integrated homestead production	NGO / DAE

DISTRICT	DONOR	BUDGET	CODE	PROJECT NAME	PARTNERS
SUNAMGANJ	WBANK	760,846	01-SUN-04	Duck raising in haor areas	NGO / DLS
THAKURGAON	DFID	382,725	01-THA-01	Akti bari Akti khamar	DAE / DLS / DoF
THAKURGAON	DFID	493,038	01-THA-02	School gardening program	WIF / DAE / IDE
THAKURGAON	DFID	418,478	01-THA-03	IPM farmer field schools on rice/vegetables	CRWDO / DAE
THAKURGAON	DFID	450,829	01-THA-04	Expanded integrated homestead development	HESPERUS / MBSS
THAKURGAON	DFID	366,345	01-THA-05	Transfer of low cost feed preservation and feeding technology	FEED / DLS
THAKURGAON	DFID	434,120	01-THA-06	Development program for rural women	DWA / DAE / DLS / DoF
THAKURGAON	DFID	298,830	01-THA-07	Crossbreed calf rearing technology	DLS / APCD
THAKURGAON	DFID	382,011	01-THA-08	Intensive cultivation of Bari seem	PGSP / DAE

**Annex D**  
**Summary of NPIF Round 1 Contracts**

ACTIVE DISTRICTS	DONOR	BUDGET	CODE	PROJECT NAME	PARTNERS
SATURIA / MANIKGONJ	DFID	1,830,556	01-NPIF-01	Promotion of women's role in horticultural production, processing and marketing for improved income and nutritional status	GKT / DAE / DWA
BRAHMANBARI	DFID	1,953,021	01-NPIF-02	Promotion of sustainable agriculture program for resource poor farmers to ensure food security.	CHANGE / VDC / SUK / KB
PABNA, NATORE, RAJSHAHI	DFID	2,116,510	01-NPIF-03	Eco-friendly sustainable agriculture farm family development	KGUK / UABSKS / MBSKS / EKK / BDSC / ROSA / GUA / LUSTRE / PUP / PKSS / SDC / DSKS
RANGAMATI	DFID	1,884,432	01-NPIF-04	Sustainable agriculture for economic development	CDA / GBK / MKP / SKS / SERP / DGUS
SYLHET	DFID	2,484,625	01-NPIF-05	Intensive vegetable cultivation in homestead garden	VARD / AWARD / CRIS
KUSHTIA	DFID	1,791,009	01-NPIF-06	Sustainable agriculture development program through participation of small and marginal farmers.	BVDP / RELATED / PROGATI SANGHA
SHERPUR / MYMENSINGH	DFID	2,371,188	01-NPIF-07	Comprehensive vegetable and poultry production project.	PRIP TRUST / ASPADA / MPUP / SBSKS / UBSKS / SBP / US
SIRAJGONJ	DFID	2,592,793	01-NPIF-08	Sustainable and innovative agricultural technology transfer project.	GKS / SWNDAR / DNK / RURO / TKS / NKS
RANGAMATI	DFID	1,991,750	01-NPIF-09	Integrated vegetables and spices crops production for household food security.	CDS / SHIPA / PROTTAYASI
KHAGRACHARI	DFID	2,019,512	01-NPIF-010	Strengthening partnership initiative with small local NGOs for agricultural technology transfer.	SAP / PAJURECO / ZABARANG

## Annex E

## Comparison of Contract Processes

DPIF Round 1	NPIF Round 1	DPIF Round 2	NPIF Round 2
Advertisement for Proposals by DAEPCC	Advertisement for Concept Note	EPSC convenes. Advertisement for Expression of Interest	EPSC convenes. Advertisement for Expression of Interest
Proposals submitted to UAECC	Concept note submitted to Partnership Unit	Those meeting access criteria invited to prepare Concept Notes	Those meeting access criteria invited to prepare Concept Notes
5 members of UAECC vet proposals with criteria suggested by Partnership Unit	Partnership Unit reviews Concept Notes on basis of criteria developed by Partnership Unit	TA Team selected Ad-hoc Technical Advisors (ATAs <sup>23</sup> ) review Concept Notes on basis of criteria provided	TA Team selected Ad-hoc Technical Advisors (ATAs) review Concept Notes on basis of criteria devised by TA in consultation with EPICCC
UAECC selects 3 best proposals for submission to DAEPCC	Partnership requests full proposals from approved Concept Notes	DAEPCC selects Concept Notes for development to Proposal stage by bidders	EPSC selects Concept Notes for development to Proposal stage by bidders.
DAEPCC vet proposals on basis of same criteria suggested by Partnership Unit, plus local presentation by bidders	Partnership Unit reviews proposals on basis of criteria developed by Partnership Unit	Proposal writing workshops held for selected bidders	Proposal writing workshops held for selected bidders
Partnership Unit selects proposals	Field verification by TA Team <sup>24</sup>	Proposals received and reviewed by ATAs according to further set of criteria	Proposals received and reviewed by ATAs according to further set of criteria
Partnership Unit informs DAEPCC and UAECC of successful proposals	Contract awarded and signed	DAEPCC selects proposals for contracting on basis of ATA observations and comments with TA Team support	EPSC selects proposals for contracting on basis of ATA observations and comments with TA Team support
Contracts awarded and signed	Monitoring conducted by TA Team and Partnership Unit	Contract awarded and signed. DAEPCC responsible for M&E with TA support and external auditing	Contract awarded and signed. EPICCC review and endorse recommendations from external monitoring and audit

<sup>23</sup> ATAs were not always able to critically assess concept notes / proposals, and in some cases had a lack of understanding of the NAEP, upon which criteria had been based.

<sup>24</sup> This proved a costly process that had no influence over decision making in the Partnership Unit.

## Annex F

## Summary of DPIF Contracts Awarded Under Round 2

DISTRICT	DONOR	BUDGET	CODE	PROJECT NAME	PARTNERS
BAGERHAT	DFID	499,695	02/002/BAG	Technology and information dissemination on prawn-fish poly-culture. 100 farmers.	RUSTIC / RUNNER / TWIN TRADERS
BAGERHAT	DFID	476,725	02/090/BAG(2)	Development of Knowledge and skills of school going adolescent girls on nutrition and environment. 400 farmers.	DAK DIYE JAI / DAE / DLS
CHAPAINAWABG ANJ	DFID	997,961	02/143/CHA	Dissemination of sugarcane intercropping technologies using homogenous farmer groups. 938 farmers.	BSRI / DAE / PROTTASHA
CHAPAINAWABG ANJ	DFID	999,809	02/177/CHA	Dissemination of improved lac and jujubee technologies. 1,200 farmers	BIYS / DAE/ BARI/ BCKS
COX'S BAZAR	DFID	993,636	02/068/COX	Technology transfer of vegetable production through establishment of female village resource base. 80 farmers.	BASTOB / DAE / PHALS / MUKTI
COX'S BAZAR	DFID	925,157	02/259/COX	Dissemination of improved technology on homestead gardening for indigenous communities. 90 farmers.	RDF / SPDNM / DAE
COX'S BAZAR	DFID	978,075	03/267/COX	Increasing local production and consumption of calcium-rich agriculture products. 100 farmers.	SARPV / SO / DAE
COX'S BAZAR	DFID	996,240	02/271/COX	Dissemination of technology for pineapple based multi-strata fruit and vegetable gardens on denuded hills. 50 farmers.	ISDE / BARI / PROTTAYA

DISTRICT	DONOR	BUDGET	CODE	PROJECT NAME	PARTNERS
JAMALPUR	DFID	600,000	02/201/JAM	Integrated duck cum fish farming extension for destitute women organisation. 100 farmers.	ORNOB / FEDSB / DAE / DAE
MAGURA	WBANK	826,914	02/258/MAG	Dissemination of improved seedling production of winter vegetables. 125 farmers.	ROVA / DAE
MAGURA	WBANK	999,800	03/362/MAG	Popularising vermiculture through audio-visual mobile school programme. 2,050 farmers.	BWDB / SHURID
NAOGOAN	DFID	806,515	02/199/NAO	Dissemination of post harvest and storage technologies for crop seeds. 360 farmers.	VAFWSD / DAE / BCKS
NETRAKONA	DFID	592,725	02/073/NET	Dissemination by group approach to increasing vegetable production. 600 farmers.	CDA / DAE / DAE
NETRAKONA	DFID	788,571	02/169/NET	Develop people centred extension approach through partnership building for sustainable aquaculture management. 180 farmers.	DISHARI/SEC AA/DoF
NETRAKONA	DFID	714,157	02/195/NET	Integrated rice-duck farming. 60 farmers.	AHD / DAE / DLS
NETRAKONA	DFID	798,367	02/230/NET	Year Round Vegetable Cultivation through modern technology. 400 farmers.	WDO / DAE / DAE
PIROJPUR	WBANK	757,300	02/011/PIR	Integrated fruit tree plantation and management by the rural poor. 510 farmers.	PPC / DAE / PDF
PIROJPUR	WBANK	724,000	03/335/PIR	Bamboo Jhaar management technology for increased production. 500 farmers.	PPC / DAE
PIROJPUR	WBANK	747,436	03/343/PIR	Dissemination of technologies for betel nut tree management. 300 farmers.	PGUS / DAE

DISTRICT	DONOR	BUDGET	CODE	PROJECT NAME	PARTNERS
RANGAMATI	DFID	499,233	02/024/RAN	Strengthening the participation of women in homestead agro-production. 50 farmers.	PROTTYASHI / DAE
SHARIATPUR	DFID	578,781	02/056/SHA	Capacity building on intensive vegetable cultivation on homesteads. 300 farmers.	NUSA / KMSKP / DAE
SUNAMGANJ	WBANK	824,300	02/045/SUN	Dissemination of information on beef and dairy cattle vaccination. 500 farmers.	AJKS/ DLS / DLS
SUNAMGANJ	WBANK	952,984	02/050/SUN	Dissemination of agricultural technologies to the rural poor. 2,400 farmers.	ERA/ DAE / DLS / DFO
SUNAMGANJ	WBANK	999,600	02/050/SUN(4)	Dissemination of proven technologies for sustainable farm practices. 1,440 farmers.	ERA / DAE / DFO
SUNAMGANJ	WBANK	900,000	03/314/SUN	Social initiative to improve crop production. 1,400 farmers.	VARD/DAE/ DAE/DAE
SUNAMGANJ	WBANK	918,485	03/315/SUN	Information dissemination for the improvement of livestock production. 1,400 farmers.	VARD/DLS/D LS/DLS
THAKURGAON	DFID	499,485	03/270/THA	Development of knowledge on organic farming for women. 200 farmers.	JSS / DAE / DAE
THAKURGAON	DFID	499,617	03/275/THA	Dissemination of technologies for increased soil fertility. 270 farmers.	DAE / RDRS / SRDI / DAE
THAKURGAON	DFID	490,875	03/305/THA	Technology transfer on soil fertility using organic manure. 450 farmers.	UDP / DAE / CUS / BFA
<b>Total</b>		<b>22,368,444</b>		<b>16,553 farmers</b>	

## Annex G

## Summary of NPIF Contracts Awarded Under Round 2

ACTIVE DISTRICTS	DONOR	BUDGET	CODE	PROJECT NAME	PARTNERS
KISHOREGANJ / COMILLA / PANCHAGARTH	DFID	2,000,000	02-NPIF-01	Strengthening farmer led extension services for NRM through partnership building. 364 farmers.	PROSHIKA / ORA / ZAGRONI
COMILLA	DFID	1,852,200	02-NPIF-02	Improvement of extension service through capacity building of women co-operative society. 2,720 farmers.	AID COMILLA / DWA / SHRISTY / HOLODIA
KUSHTIA	DFID	1,896,090	02-NPIF-03	Integrated rice-fish-vegetable-maize cultivation. 1,000 farmers.	BMUS / DAE / DOEL / PPUS
KUSHTIA / RAJBARI	DFID	1,946,330	02-NPIF-04	Promotion of farmer's interaction and innovation in agricultural extension services. 600 farmers.	BVDP / SS / PDS / BADC
GAIBANDHA	DFID	1,385,750	02-NPIF-05	Access to farm machinery for the rural farmers. 50 farmers.	ITDG / GUK / MEW (PS)
RAJBARI	DFID	1,953,784	02-NPIF-06	Strengthening agricultural (livestock) extension services. 245 farmers.	PROVA / DLS / S&T CONSULTANTS / UP CHAIRMAN
SIRAJGANJ	DFID	1,995,000	02-NPIF-07	Integrated agricultural charland farming for the improvement of livelihoods of resource poor women. 610 farmers.	SUMS / BSS / UPPO / SS
SATKHIRA	DFID	1,930,320	02-NPIF-08	Strengthening research/extension linkages through dissemination of knowledge and information. 200 farmers.	SUSHILAN / BINA / UTTARAN
NATORE	DFID	1,807,474	02-NPIF-09	Development of watershed sustainable agricultural practices. 2,340 farmers.	SHIDHULAI SS / DBS / DAE
<b>Total</b>		<b>16,766,948</b>		<b>8,129 farmers</b>	

**Annex H**  
**Summary Time-Line of Activities and Lessons, 1992-2003**

YEAR	ACTION	RESULT/LESSONS LEARNED NOTED IN REPORTS
1992	ASSP Commenced	No DAE/NGO contact - tension prevailed
1992- 94	NGO Liaison and Contract Unit established	DAE funding role only - no partnerships or service delivery. Unit did not function.
1994	Identified need for district level DAE/NGO collaborative contracts. DAE/NGO Liaison Committee established.	NGOs submitted partnership proposals. DAE refuses to sign - could not see value in working with NGOs and scarce resources redirected.
1995	MoA signs 26 contracts.	Insufficient time to implement. Weak capacity noted in NGO planning and management.
1995	Agricultural Extension Manual published	Signs that non-contract resource sharing was being adopted.
1995-99	Training modules for DAE staff	DAE/NGO partnerships promoted
1996	DAE district invitations to NGOs to attend committees	Relationships less strained, but NGOs continued to work in isolation.
1996	NAEP published. Formal recognition of NGO as part of NARS and partnerships promoted.	Provided framework within which GO extension providers could work with NGOs
1996	EPICC structure established. NAEP Implementation strategy published	Lessons learned from 1995 reconfirmed - weak capacity of NGOs.
1996	Workshops and guidelines to Block Supervisors regarding identification of NGO activities.	Recommendation made for closer mainstream activities to improve partnerships.
ASSP II - 1996	Project extended to build on the increased awareness of DAE for collaboration with NGOs.	Collaboration needs to be mainstreamed. M/Credit activities and large/small NGO capacity building the way forward.
1996	End of Homestead Gardening component	Weak capacity noted in NGO planning and management.
1997	Adopted earlier contracting procedures, 16 new contracts (6 with earlier NGOs)	GoB not supportive, would not support in future - sustainability? In NGO contracting, no complementarity nor pluralism.
1997	NGO NAEP familiarisation and other mainstream activities promoting closer ties with DAE.	At this time CARE/DAE signed a no cost MOU (Interfish) - problems and the only known incidence of such an MOU. Increased collaboration.
1998	13 new contracts signed	Same system as earlier.
1998	ASSP finishes. Final Evaluation Report	Questions if activities would have been done by NGOs anyway. No decentralised decision making - Dhaka run by TA and DAE/NGO Liaison Committee. Patronisation evident. Suggest phase out contracts, group approach through the DAE/NGO Liaison Committee, and bring under EPICC
1999	Agricultural Extension Manual & DAE Strategic Plan	Manual supports mainstreaming, Plan supports Partnerships. Several Change Management Groups established. District level DAE/NGO partnership pilot attempted and stopped. DAE M&E abandoned.

YEAR	ACTION	RESULT/LESSONS LEARNED NOTED IN REPORTS
ASIRP - 1998	Mainstream DAE Extension (Change Management), Partner-ship initiative Funds, Integrated Extension Piloting.	Contract approach to partnerships adopted - UPIF/DPIF/NPIF. IEA testing three models. ESS reveals no improvement in extension service delivery through contracting or mainstreaming GO/NGO Partnerships.
1999	Integrated Extension Pilots (12 Upazilas - GO/NGO) and FLE (DAE/RDRS/FIVDB).	IEA/UAECC developed 54 projects for DPIF funding - flawed process. New Strategy of 3 models promoting GO/NGO partnerships through mainstreaming approaches with little external funding.
1999	Farmer Led Extension	FLE continued funding - substantial funds earlier under ASSP Homesteads to RDRS & FIVDB. 54 FLE groups formed.
2000	Design and contracting of Partnership Funds	UPIF - 468 Upazilas - low cost with male farmer and large farm emphasis. No TA involvement. DPIF/NPIF significant transparency problems - 68 contracts signed. Female emphasis but in larger farm size. Similar activities to ASSP Homestead component with significant inputs.
2001	Blackshaw Report.	Change Management support ceased - costly and unproductive. DPIF/NPIF ceased under current procedures. New design included access criteria, external technical review. EPICC Partnership Sub Committee established. DAEPD responsible for DPIF. Relunched with short contract period.
2002	Partnership Funds re-launched	29 DPIF, 9 NPIF contracted. Increased transparency of operations, attempts at patronisation. Attempt to bring closer to NAEP and promote an Agricultural Knowledge & Information System. Despite more rigorous, result very similar to first round (45% DPIFs ASSP Homesteads). External audits and evaluations showing weak capacity of NGOs and GOs in planning and management.

## References

1. ASIRP 2003a "Performance of Extension Service Providers in Bangladesh: Quality or Quantity of Service?", Dhaka, Bangladesh, ii+12
2. ASIRP 2003b "An Occasional Paper on Human Resource Interventions in the Department of Agricultural Extension - 10 Year Review", Dhaka, Bangladesh
3. ASSP 1993 "Progress Report July-December 1993", Dhaka, Bangladesh
4. ASSP 1994a "Progress Report July-December 1994", Dhaka, Bangladesh
5. ASSP 1995a "Progress Report January-June 1995", Dhaka, Bangladesh
6. ASSP 1995b "Progress Report July-December 1995", Dhaka, Bangladesh
7. ASSP 1996a "Progress Report January-June 1996", Dhaka, Bangladesh
8. ASSP 1996b "Progress Report July-November 1996", Dhaka, Bangladesh
9. ASSP 1997a "Report Number 79, Homestead Component Phase 1 Completion Report", Dhaka, Bangladesh
10. ASSP 1997b "Progress Report June-December 1997", Dhaka, Bangladesh
11. ASSP 1998 "Progress Report January-September 1998", Dhaka, Bangladesh
12. Bangladesh Agricultural University (2001) "Communication Behaviour and Job Description Performance of Male and Female Block Supervisors", Mymensingh, Bangladesh
13. DAE 1995 "Agricultural Extension Manual", Dhaka, Bangladesh
14. DAE 1996 "Block Supervisors Handbook: A Guide to Extension Responsibilities", Dhaka, Bangladesh
15. EEIME 1994 "ASSP Baseline Report", Dhaka, Bangladesh
16. EEIME 1996 "Progress Report No. 4" Dhaka, Bangladesh
17. GoB 1996a "New Agricultural Extension Policy", Dhaka, Bangladesh
18. GoB 1996b "A Strategy for Implementing the New Agricultural Extension Policy", Dhaka, Bangladesh
19. Howes, M. (2002) "Extension for Sustainable Livelihoods in Bangladesh: The Evidence from Six Case Studies" Report prepared for ASIRP, iii+42, Dhaka.
20. Mallorie, E. (2001) (Draft) "Agricultural Credit Concept Note", Dhaka.
21. ODA PEC 1996 "Bangladesh: Agricultural Support Services Project - Phase 1A", Dhaka, Bangladesh
22. ULG & ODI 1998 "Evaluation Mission Agricultural Support Services Project Final Report" Volume I (Main Report) Volume II (Technical Annexes), Dhaka, Bangladesh
23. World Bank 1991 "Staff Appraisal Report. Bangladesh Agricultural Support Services Project" Report No. 9071-BD, Bangladesh
24. Blackshaw (et al) 2001a "Bangladesh: Project Assessment Agricultural Services Innovation and Reform Project" Unpublished draft, April 2001, Dhaka, Bangladesh
25. Blackshaw (et al) 2001b "Bangladesh: Project Assessment Agricultural Services Innovation and Reform Project" Unpublished draft, December 2001, Dhaka, Bangladesh
26. ASIRP (2002) "An Evaluation of the Upazila Partnership Initiative Fund", Dhaka, Bangladesh
27. ASIRP (2002) "An Evaluation of the District Partnership Initiative Fund", Dhaka, Bangladesh
28. ASIRP (2003) "An Evaluation of the National Partnership Initiative Fund", Dhaka, Bangladesh
29. ASIRP (2003) "Partnership Initiative Funds: A Synthesis of Findings", Dhaka, Bangladesh