

ANNEX 4 DFID PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT

Monitoring ID :

Type of Report: Project Completion Report

For Project Completion Reports complete Parts A B and C but it is not necessary to complete the Outputs/OVI field in Part A.

(Italics: additions following Mid Term Review)

PART A.

Country:	Bangladesh	Project:	Fisheries Training and Extension Project – Phase 2
Project Officer	Tim Robertson	Start Date:	July 1997
Date of Visit:	26 May – 7 June 2003	End Date:	June 2003
Date of Report:	June 2003	MIS Code:	39-504-027
		Risk Category:	Medium

Goal Statement	OVI
<p>Super Goal:</p> <p>A sustainable increase in the living standards and economic security of poor people in Bangladesh.</p>	<p><i>Income from aquaculture for 33,800 adopting farmers increases by an average of Tk1,000 (sales and consumption) for a seasonal pond farmer and Tk2,500 (sales and consumption) for perennial pond farmers.</i></p>
<p>Goal:</p> <p>To sustainably increase aquaculture production by poor farmers in Bangladesh.</p>	<p>Fish production by at least 33,800 pond farmers (defined at purpose level) increases from 2 - 6Kg/decimal for seasonal pond farmers; and from 6 - 10Kg/decimal for perennial pond farmers, increasing production by at least 3,200 tonnes by the year 2002.</p>

Purpose Statement	OVI
--------------------------	------------

Purpose Statement	OVIs
<p>Capacity of DoF to deliver directly and/or indirectly appropriate support to pond farmers and their families improved.</p> <p><i>Revised following the Mid Term Review (MTR): Improved capacity of DoF to deliver directly and/or indirectly appropriate support to pond farmers and their families, in a sustainable manner.</i></p>	<p>Country - wide (excluding Faridpur, Chandpur and Natore Districts)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 95,500 primary stakeholders of which 40,000 have less than ½ acre of pond, 19,000 of which have less than ½ acre of cultivable land and 10,000 of which have a household income of less than Tk20,000 per year, trained by AFOs/FAs at pond side sessions. • 30,000 farmers (12,000 < ½ acre of ponds; 5,500 < ½ acre of cultivable land; 3,000 < TK20,000 HH income) adopting cost effective and appropriate guidelines for fish culture after receiving training from AFOs and FAs. <p>Faridpur, Chandpur, Natore districts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7,500 farmers receive 6 small group pond side training sessions in fish culture delivered by AFOs/FAs in each of the 30 Thanas of Faridpur, Natore and Chandpur. • 5,000 women receive training in small groups on appropriate pond culture activities. • 3,800 farmers adopting cost effective and appropriate guidelines for fish culture. • DoF field staff contact and collaborate with 75 small NGOs working in fish culture, group formation and education by EoP. • One secondary school in each of the 30 Thanas establish and maintain a fertile school pond in collaboration with DoF by EoP. • 4,500 children of which 50% will be girls, in G6-G10 in participating secondary schools, understand the basic steps of

Purpose Statement	OVIs
	<p>good fish culture by EoP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14,400 children, of which 50% will be girls, from 1,440 villages understand the basic steps of good fish culture from child-child extension kits <p><u>Added following the MTR:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>80% of Upazillas conducting PGTS second production cycle are funding at least one group per Upazilla from DoF budget</i> • <i>UFO/AFO/FAs undertake at least one follow up visit to schools in addition to the five visits supported by the project</i> • <i>UFO/AFO/FA undertake follow up visits to NGOs, banks making aquaculture loans, kishoree in CtC programme</i> • <i>75% of all DoF-funded courses use Divisional Trainers as trainers to run the courses</i> • <i>Participating Upazillas (where FTEP II is working) carry out DoF-supported fisheries planning</i>

General progress assessment - Project Purpose	2 (largely achieved)
Justification	
<p>The OPR position remains at EoP. The project scores 1 on the original Logical Framework and 3 on the document revised during MTR. On this basis the OPR gave an average assessment of 2 reflecting the overall merit of the Project response to the project objectives. At EoP, however, it is necessary to consider whether the formal Purpose as stated in the current logframe has indeed been largely achieved.</p> <p>The Purpose requires improvements to DoF capacity to be achieved in a sustainable manner. Given that this capacity is invested largely in the staff of the DoF, and they have clearly improved dramatically, and will not suffer a memory loss at EoP, the Review Team has elected to</p>	

interpret the sustainability element in this context and has awarded a 2 for the Purpose. This counters the limited success enjoyed with the new OVIs added to the Purpose at MTR. Performance against the original Purpose and OVIs was outstanding and merits 1.

The reasons for failure/ limited progress on the new Purpose/OVIs sustainability agenda remain as at the OPR:

- Progress towards the ‘sustainability’ outputs requires first establishing active engagement with senior DoF staff and thoroughly analysing the institutional and organisational context - activities that the project did not have to do during its earlier phase.
- The change of project emphasis exposed the fact that three of the original assumptions at Purpose level were faulty. These related to DoF’s commitment to the development of fish culture for poor farmers (implying commitment to the necessary organisational change), DoF’s revenue budget being sufficient to sustain extension activities and DoF’s management capable of supporting continuous extension service.
- With the ‘sustainability’ agenda being simply added onto the original logframe, the project subsequently found themselves pulled in two different directions, one towards achieving the original Purpose and the other towards achieving the amended Purpose.
- The MTR would have served the Project better if it had either completely re-worked the logframe to reflect a new purpose (including re-visiting the assumptions), or left it as it stood.

General progress assessment - Project Outputs	2 (largely achieved)
Justification	
<p>The same dilemma exists for the OVIs. Progress against Outputs 2,3 and 4 (unchanged at MTR) has been good in most cases.</p> <p><u>Output 2.</u> The training and extension materials produced are an excellent resource for the DoF, and the materials circulated to schools and to village children have been widely utilised (individual score 1)</p> <p><u>Output 3.</u> A great deal of progress was made, but the final results are somewhat patchy. The NGO Extension Forums were established but were found to be difficult to sustain; links with the PTIs were followed up by DoF, but there was less commitment to the Teacher Training Colleges; credit schemes through banks failed to take off (individual score 3)</p> <p><u>Output 4.</u> A substantial M&E system has been established and has produced a substantial capacity to assess the impact of Project activities (individual score 1)</p> <p><u>Output 1.</u> This was changed radically from just a “staff trained” remit to require that new strategies, procedures and organisational structures should be in place and operational by EoP. Given a 21 month timescale with no extra resources, no fundamental Project restructuring and an institution not yet ready for change, this was an over-optimistic revision. The Project responded well and the key OVI with respect to formalising the Training Cell (now a Wing) has been achieved. Irrespective of the sustainability of that institution, this has been a major</p>	

achievement on the part of DoF and the Project team. Given that this Wing has only just been set up, the appropriate score for that OPVI should be X since it is too early to know its fate. However, taking into account the varying degrees of progress on the other new OVIs and the strong performance on the original OVIs, the score for this Output is given as 3. The clear point is made that on the original targets this would have been 1, leading to an overall score for Outputs of just over 1. Summing the scores for the four Outputs now yields a score of 2. This is perhaps an unsatisfactory use of the scoring method, but necessary under the circumstances.

Log Frame Level			
Inputs/Activities		Performance Rating	Comments
(a) Appropriateness (quality):	(a) DFID	Rating	
	(b) Partner	Rating	
(b) Efficiency (quantity):	(a) DFID	Rating	
	(b) Partner	Rating	
(c) Sufficiency (timeliness)	(a) DFID	Rating	
	(b) Partner	Rating	
OVERALL ASSESSMENT ¹ :		Rating	

¹ Including conditionality aspects where relevant

PART B. (*Italics: Additions following Mid Term Review*)

Purpose	Progress	Comments
<p>Capacity of DoF to deliver directly and/or indirectly appropriate support to pond farmers and their families improved.</p> <p><i>Improved capacity of DoF to deliver directly and/or indirectly appropriate support to pond farmers and their families, in a sustainable manner.</i></p>	<p>The capacity of DoF in these respects has demonstrably improved as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All DoF staff from Division level down (together with a few HQ staff) have an enhanced understanding of training planning, delivery and evaluation. • Their confidence and competence have increased, particularly at field level. • They have experience of working with and through other agencies involved in extension and training. • A significant number of NGO staff, bank staff, school teachers and teacher trainers have enhanced confidence and competence in training, extension and/or teaching. • DoF has an in-house team of 72 highly competent staff trainers (DTs). • A fledgling Training Wing has been established, with the support of the DG. • The department has a rationalised and enhanced stock of appropriate training and extension materials. <p>While the above are finite resources, they will erode over time. Replenishment of these resources (i.e. sustainability) will require further programmatic support. DoF, in its current form, will not (or cannot) do this.</p>	<p>Against all the original indicators, FTEP II has been very successful. However, since project design, both DFID and DoF agendas have changed. This is particularly true for DFID, who no longer support production-orientated projects, TCO staffing or single (sub)-sector approaches.</p> <p>The changed agendas were added on to the project at Mid-Term. Whilst the project has done the best it could to accommodate these new agendas, it could not have been expected to achieve the new OVIs without a more fundamental revision of the project log frame.</p>

OVIs	Progress	Comments
<p>Country - wide (excluding Faridpur, Chandpur and Natore Districts)</p> <p>1. 95,500 primary stakeholders of which 40,000 have less than ½ acre of pond, 19,000 of which have less than ½ acre of cultivable land and 10,000 of which have a household income of less than Tk20,000 per year, trained by AFOs/FAs at pond side sessions.</p>	<p><i>Numbers trained countrywide:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 105,424 farmers trained by FTEP II (i.e. 98% of target). • (Of these 39,798 have completed evaluation session). <p>In addition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15,058 Farmers trained through NGOs. <p>Note re secondary impact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 24,985 additional ‘Fellow Farmers’ trained following session 6 commitment to train fellows. • Estimated 800,000 additional farmers aware of DoF and fish culture through the programme (30% of communities). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target number of farmers trained achieved by September 2002 . • All planned Districts were carrying out PGTS training by EoP, so will have relevant skills in-house. • PGTS group formation by trained NGO staff has been poor to date (424 staff trained), but monitoring and evaluation results suggest that these NGOs use the training for their own ends (which may not be carp polyculture training). These results suggest that the training has built the general human capacity of the NGOs in training management and delivery...this is a positive outcome but may not be an appropriate use of scarce resources of DoF.

OVIs	Progress	Comments
	<p><i>Targeting:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 93,317 <= 0.5 Acre of pond (89%)..... • 38,715 <= 0.5 Acres of crop land (37%)..... • 48,471 <= 20,000 Tk per year household income (46%)..... <p>In addition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 21,840 = Fulfil all above criteria (20%) • 24,495 = Female farmers (23%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As against 40% in the OVI • As against 20% in the OVI • As against 10% in the OVI • The success of in exceeding OVI targets shows that, with appropriate guidance, DoF staff can focus on specified groups if this is a project-driven objective • However, analysis of targeting following the MTR and impact assessment at EOP showed that most of the project's direct beneficiaries were within the categories of middle income and socially poor. The helpless and bottom poor, because they do not own ponds, are only reached through spillover effects. Thus the rich and middle income categories have had disproportionately greater access to the programme • No mention of women in the indicators. • Increased use of PRA has focussed project development activities beyond the simple criteria in this OVI.

OVIs	Progress	Comments
<p>2. 30,000 farmers (12,000 < ½ acre of ponds; 5,500 < ½ acre of cultivable land; 3,000 < TK20,000 HH income) adopting cost effective and appropriate guidelines for fish culture after receiving training from AFOs and FAs.</p>	<p>Adoption estimated through the number of farmers carrying out advice given during training and successfully growing more fish. Data collected during evaluation session (No. 6).</p> <p><i>Overall:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 29,788, out of 34,881 evaluated were classified as adopters (85.19%). <p><i>Targeting and adoption:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 79,497 Adopters with <= 0.5 Acre of pond (46%)... • 32,918 Adopters with <= 0.5 Acres of crop land (37%)..... • 41,292 Adopters with <= 20,000 Tk per year household income (46%)..... • 20,867 Adopters women (23%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Adoption' not defined in logframe, however, the project has developed an evaluation approach based on adoption of practices and an understanding of these. • In addition, the project has continually developed M and E tools, increasingly incorporating participatory approaches. • Overall adoption far exceeds target of 28%. • Analysis indicates that stocking recommendations were not adopted substantially by any of the trained categories of stakeholder (farmers trained by DoF, schools, NGO, CtC). Farmers continued to overstock despite recommendations. Analysis of the reasons for this (better indigenous knowledge, training, inability due to supply problems) should be investigated further before a similar training/approach is used. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As against 11% in OVIs. • As against 5% in OVIs. • As against 3% in OVIs. • No indicator for women in OVIs

OVIs	Progress	Comments
<p>Faridpur, Chandpur, Natore Districts</p> <p>3. 7,500 farmers receive 6 small group pond side training sessions in fish culture delivered by AFOs/FAs in each of the 30 Thanas of Faridpur, Natore and Chandpur.</p>	<p>Numbers trained in Model Districts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10,252 farmers trained, i.e 127% of target. • (All of these have completed evaluation session) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Totals exceeded by September 2002. • The programme started earlier here than in other Districts and therefore exceeded targets
<p>4. 5,000 women receive training in small groups on appropriate pond culture activities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2,770 women trained, i.e. 55% of target (37% of farmers trained) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The logic of this indicator is unclear, as women are not mentioned in country-wide OVIs (1 and 2) but in the Model Districts represent 67% of the target group. Does this proportion reflect the gender-wise training needs of fish farmers? Does it allow for the considerable cultural and religious differences from region to region? Is it realistic/appropriate when 97% of AFOs and FAs are male?
<p>5. 3,800 farmers adopting cost effective and appropriate guidelines for fish culture.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8,734 farmers adopting in FCN, 85.19% of farmers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As against project target of 30%. • As with country-wide figures for adoption, achievement is impressive. But meaningful measurement of adoption is difficult.

OVIs	Progress	Comments
<p>6. DoF field staff contact and collaborate with 75 small NGOs working in fish culture, group formation and education by EOP.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 420 NGO staff trained by project from 314 NGOs. • 199 NGOs agreed to accept DoF's offer of follow up. Out of a possible 995 (FTEP II supported) visits only 240 (24%) were carried out by 123 AFO/FA. • UFOs have attended NGO District Forums. <p><i>Notes:</i> Livelihoods assessment indicates that where AFO/FA support NGOs well and NGOs are committed then the programme is successful.</p> <p>Production of farmers trained overall did not increase significantly over control farmers indicating although knowledge increased for NGO trained farmers, this was not sufficient to allow them to grow more fish/increase profit.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many more NGO staff trained than planned due to interest from NGOs and relatively low costs to project. • Low rates of subsequent collaboration between these NGO staff and DoF staff (particularly with respect to requesting follow-up visits from AFOs/FAs) with 'hands off' approach by project. • The AFOs/FAs who worked with the NGOs reached 94 farmers (through training and follow-up of NGO staff) each per year. • Contrast lack of support (offered by DoF or requested by NGOs) for small local NGOs with high levels of support to CtC programme (OVI 9.) (BRAC). This indicates a "relationship" issue with small local NGOs.
<p>7. One secondary school in each of the 30 Thanas establish and maintain a fertile school pond in collaboration with DoF by EoP.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 331 School teachers from 268 rural secondary schools received 12 day residential training course in pond aquaculture and teaching resource box. • 304 School teachers were provided with at least 5 follow up visits from DoF (UFO). The remaining 27 teachers were from "control" schools and are currently receiving follow up support. <p><u>Additional Outcomes:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A range of indicators show that management of school ponds has improved substantially, these include fertility, production, record keeping and inputs. E.g. production from the ponds of trained school teachers increased from 4.61 kg/decimal before to 7.71 kg/decimal after training. An increase of on average 3.31 kg/decimal for each school. This generated more income (439 compared to 232 Tk 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many more schools than planned as OVI numbers were too low to justify developing and running courses. • Could not achieve OVI 8. Numbers of children to be taught from 30 schools.

OVI	Progress	Comments
	per decimal from controls) and more profit (207 compared to 132 Tk/decimal).	
8. 4,500 children of which 50% will be girls, in G6-G10 in participating secondary schools understand the basic steps of good fish culture by EoP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 300,064 Children trained through Agriculture courses to EoP. • Co-educational, rural schools targeted (female registration = 45%). However, only 40% (120,064) of trained agriculture students were girls • Baseline and impact assessment completed. • Secondary impacts: 420,224 parents (70%) and 60,032 community members (20% of the number of children trained) said they received useful information from the trained children. <p><u>Additional outcomes:</u></p> <p>a) The number of students achieving an “A” grade in agriculture increased for both the G8 (from 23 to 42%) and G10 (from 47 to 74%) pupils. This is compared to a reduction in the number of students receiving grade A (G10 and G8) in the control schools (and compared to other topics)</p> <p>b) Significant increase in pre-post training aquaculture knowledge scores of children</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whatever the criteria used in the impact assessment, targets achieved for ‘understanding the basic steps...’ will be massively over the OVI targets. • This is more of an awareness programme than an extension programme and was thus measured as such, i.e looking at spread within the family/community etc.
9. 14,400 children, of which 50% will be girls, from 1,440 villages understand the basic	<p>Child to Child Extension programme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 247 “Kishoree” girls trained in training of village children course. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targets met by EoP. • Again an awareness programme, • Apparently significant transfer of knowledge

OVIs	Progress	Comments
<p>steps of good fish culture from child-child extension kits</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14,690 Village children (52% girls) trained by kishoree girls. Children trained from 1,300 villages. • Pre training survey carried out on 2,924 village children. Impact assessment carried out in 2002. <p>Secondary impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Each trained child played with on average 3 friends resulting in direct outreach to an additional 44,070 children. An additional 8 children on average saw but did not play the games. - All parents of trained children had played or seen the games (29,380 people). 	<p>to the community, but....</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited impact in terms of production improvements. Why?
<p>10. 80% of Upazillas conducting PGTS second production cycle are funding at least one group per Upazilla from DoF budget</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On average 37% of Upazilla's carrying out DoF funded groups from revenue budget to September 2002. Since that time no additional groups by DoF carried out. <p><u>Note:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target set after project steering committee meeting in Sept 2001. • Massive District to District variation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This requires a commitment of Tk1,500 for a PGTS series of 11 sessions (5 group formation, 5 training sessions and 1 evaluation session). • This means using less than 10% of the Upazilla 'contingency' fund of Tk19,000 p.a. (which is officially supposed to cover 144 field visits per year). • Letter from DG to all DFOs required all AFos/FAs to allocate 10 days field visit per year to PGTS activities, i.e. from group formation to session six, to be funded from the Upazilla travel budget head (the major part of the contingency fund). • This order needs further follow up by senior DoF staff.

OVIs	Progress	Comments
<p>11. UFO/AFO/FAs undertake at least one follow up visit to schools in addition to the five visits supported by the project</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 34% of schools received an additional visit under revenue budget <p><u>Notes:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All project supported DoF follow up visits carried out (target = 1,225) • Target set after project steering committee in September 2002. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This DoF funded follow up is dependant on the personal interest of the UFO. In some individual cases it was well over one per year, in others it was none. • DoF HQ and Upazilla level planning is needed to establish priorities. Follow up to the schools programme may not be considered a high priority.
<p>12. UFO/AFO/FA undertake follow up visits to NGOs, banks making aquaculture loans, Kishoree in CtC programme</p>	<p>Follow up visits to NGOs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Out of 421 NGO staff trained by the project, 199 agreed to receive formal follow up from DoF. However, AFO/FA collaborated and agreed follow up with 123. • Out of possible 995 FTEP II supported follow up visits, 24% carried out. Out of 199 possible follow up visits under revenue budget, 35% carried out <p>Follow up visits to banks making aquaculture loans:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Janata Bank: All banks and NGOs that participated in project training visited by the UFO. No loans forthcoming. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planned substantial increase in the post-training 'contact and collaboration' not significantly achieved. • Apparent inability of FTEPII to address internal bank issues, therefore powerless. Potentially good way for DoF to provide support to banks and NGOs, but many problems to overcome. • However, discussions with farmers indicated that lack of credit was not usually a major constraint to adoption of improved aquaculture practices; however, lack of appropriate credit for other purposes is a problem.

OVIs	Progress	Comments
	<p><i>Follow up visits to Kishoree:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only AFO/FA involved: 1085 visits from total of 1235 (88%) of targeted. Under revenue budget, 163 out of a possible 192 (88%) achieved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The one secondary 'extension' activity where follow up has been enthusiastically undertaken by DoF staff. Why?
<p>13. 75% of all DoF-funded courses use Divisional Trainers as trainers to run the courses</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>There are very few DoF funded courses and no central monitoring of these. Of these some have employed DTs (Galda Project, Bagda Project, Package Programme). One has even used the DHRDS (Broodbank Project).</i> <i>Some donor projects (where the bulk of training takes place) have requested DTs to run (or manage) them, e.g. FFP, ADP, CBFM, DANIDA Programme.</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Problems of verification. Training Cell should be notified of all DoF courses and forms have been distributed for the purpose. However, few training providers have completed and returned these.
<p>14. Participating Upazillas (where FTEP II is working) carry out DoF-supported fisheries planning</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 120 (29%) of Upazillas have returned completed plans (format developed by FTEP II) since September 2002. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This task successfully completed by many Upazillas though plans not returned to FTEP II. Despite training of all offices in planning and providing an agreed format, this activity not enthusiastically applied. This planning was in response to a request by many UFOs for help in areas where FTEP II overlapped with FFP. Now this is no longer an issue planning may not be a problem for Upazilla offices. Further, all extension planning carried out by projects (top-down)

Attribution

The project has achieved its quantitative targets and so has delivered increases in fish production and income in the villages where it has been working as a result of its activities.

The PGTS extension model has been refined and proven to be highly effective. Other secondary extension models were piloted with varying degrees of success. The results have been thoroughly analysed and reported.

There is highly skilled core of staff trainers (DTs) and a higher level of professionalism and competence amongst UFOs, AFOs and FAs due to the project's staff training programmes.

There is a well-documented training and extension materials resources centre together with a wide range of new training manuals and associated training aids. These are valuable resources for DoF.

Training and extension management systems are in place within DoF, (most notably the Training Wing and the Divisional Human Resource Development Strategy) that bring together all the elements of aquaculture training and extension necessary to provide a high quality, needs-based service to farmers. These are not yet fully established.

The project has demonstrated values of professionalism and commitment that have 'rubbed off' on DoF staff who have been associated with it.

There has been a change in attitude of some HQ DoF staff towards HRD and targeting poor farmers. However this has been limited and the project has been severely constrained by three assumptions in the log frame that were unrealistic in terms of the level of this commitment and DoF's ability to fund and manage extension activities.

Purpose to Goal

Insofar as the project has achieved its original Purpose it has exceeded the Super Goal OVI targets of increased returns for both seasonal and perennial pond farmers:

Seasonal pond target: Tk1,000, achieved: Tk2,411

Perennial pond target: Tk2,500, achieved: Tk4,278

The project has also exceeded both the Goal OVI targets of increased production for seasonal and perennial ponds and total increased production by 2002:

Seasonal pond from 2.87 to 5.93 kg/dec. (3.06 kg increase)
Perennial pond from 4.11 to 7.28 kg/dec. (3.17 kg increase)

Total production increase from 39,798 farmers who have completed one production cycle: 9,229 tonnes.

The project has not, however, reached the point where these increases can be achieved across the remaining villages in Bangladesh in its absence, i.e. *sustainably*. This would require further commitment by, and capacity building of, DoF.

This emphasis has significantly increased since the MTR but, given that organisational change is a slow process and that FTEP II only started taking a 'root and branch' approach 21 months prior to the PCR, it is not surprising that demonstrable change to date has been limited.

DOES LOGFRAME REQUIRE REVISION?

N/A

DO PIMS MARKERS REQUIRE REVISION [Mandatory for projects approved prior to 1.8.98]

No

Quality of Scoring

Given the short duration (12 days), the review relied heavily on the substantial project documentation and wide ranging discussions with Project staff and with other stakeholders both inside and outside the DoF. The previous OPR provided a very clear guide as to what questions to ask and where to focus. The FTEP II team provided a large working paper and a set of 8 chapters of lessons learned from a draft publication. Only two one day field trips were made to ground truth specific issues.

Lessons learned, and suggested dissemination. For PCRs comment on (i) Project Level Lessons, (ii) Sector Level or Thematic Lessons, and (iii) General Development Lessons.

The project has been very successful in generating both direct benefits and a very wide range of lessons have been learned. These are detailed in the EoP Review Report. Some key points are extracted here

Project level lessons

DoF staff training

1. Sustained and progressive staff development can yield improved services to beneficiaries even in the absence of a coherent strategy
2. Improved self-esteem can be as important as cash rewards to staff, but lack of operational funds can erode enthusiasm & benefits
3. For junior staff, training is not enough; follow-up support in getting started with farmers is essential
4. NGOs benefit substantially from training; they offer a nation wide presence, built in women and poor focus and access to funds
5. However, DoF/NGOs attitudes preclude strategic partnerships for service delivery; this is a constraint to maximising client benefits
6. A coherent in-service training planning process can work in DoF, but requires the Training Wing and Training Centres working together
7. It is not clear whether DoF has the resources or the inclination to sustain either the Training Wing or the Training Centres
8. Survival of the Training Wing and the strategic approach to HR development piloted by FTEP II requires wider institutional change
9. The training and extension materials produced are an excellent resource, but this requires careful nurturing if it is to be sustained

Extension approaches

10. The PGTS has proven to be highly effective, but it cannot be sustained without management and funding through DoF (or donors?)
11. The schools approach is also successful and should hopefully survive through the enthusiasm of teachers and UFOs
12. Farmer exchange visits have been highly valued by all, but are also unlikely to survive without further funding
13. Other than NGOs, there has been little progress linking DoF and other service delivery institutions; DoF remains inward looking
14. These issues are all exacerbated by the failure to strengthen the capacity of the DoF Extension Cell
15. Aquaculture extension can substantially increase the incomes of the poor, but may not directly help the landless very poor
16. Aquaculture extension can be used to specifically target the livelihoods of women, and may bring wider social capital benefits
17. Networking forums at District level offer advantages but are very difficult to maintain outside a project envelope

Role of the private sector and NGOs

18. Whilst networking NGO forums are potentially valuable are they practical? The problems of BADS and COFCON illustrate reality
19. The DoF/NGO mutual negative view of each other requires adjustment and perhaps a government policy directive as guidance
20. The private sector is a major player, but the role for DoF remains ill-defined; they still compete through hatcheries & farms. A clear mandate is required based on a coherent sector strategy

Strategic planning

21. Sub-component planning (e.g. the Aquaculture Extension Strategy) can usefully take place in the absence of an overall sector strategy, but joining the bits together is not the ideal way to formulate the way forward for DoF
22. Better collaboration between projects and sub-groups of DoF is vital to sustainability of FTEP II gains and to DoF's future development

General

23. The ultimate pro-poor benefits of the project will depend not so much on DoF but on the farmers themselves and their ability to capitalise
24. The project has imparted status, self esteem and professional confidence to DoF staff, and this will endure irrespective of other issues

Sector Level Lessons

25. The need for NR sector service delivery continues to far exceed the capacity of government agencies despite many extension projects
26. New solutions must be found, and the focus must be at the Local Government level to reduce leakage and increase accountability
27. But, it is not appropriate to totally by-pass the central line agencies (especially in fisheries) since overall guardianship of national resources cannot be delegated to a large and diverse number of local authorities and communities
28. This implies that the sector requires a two pronged approach with primary focus on Local Government sectoral support plus carefully targeted support to Ministries and departments. There are good lessons in the DANIDA approach to sector development in Bangladesh
29. Supporting sectoral Human Resource Development projects in the absence of an overarching sector or sub-sector strategy with an appropriate institutional framework is not a practical approach to the problems – HRD for what is the obvious question
30. The reluctance for inter-institutional collaboration in NR management is a worldwide phenomenon, and requires serious attention from the donor community. Only demonstration of tangible benefits will serve; papers and forums alone will convince nobody
31. Donor cooperation in terms of actions as well as policies and information exchange offers excellent opportunities to promote change

General Development Lessons

32. It is inevitable that donor policies and priorities will change over the course of a five year project. The temptation to move the goalposts should be resisted during project review unless the necessary resources and time frame to address major change can be provided
33. Annual OPR is essential as a means of avoiding the need for radical change at MTR as a result of internal and external issues arising
34. It is also inevitable that projects cut across wider development issues in a country; in this case, the role of government in the delivery of extension services. The likely impact that the need for wide institutional or sector reform may have on a project should be considered during design
35. Commitment to strategic change must be sought at a very senior level; departmental heads do not have the necessary authority
36. Donor agencies need to make their policies very clear, along with the kind of support they are prepared to offer
37. The capacity for change management is very scarce in developing country public services and carefully targeted advisory support is key
38. Pro-poor drivers for institutional change must be identified within stakeholder communities, not just by donor agencies
39. Keep it simple – policy formation and institutional development are not linear processes, but beware a piecemeal approach
40. Many of the constraints on project sustainability would be negated under a programme approach
41. Not all components of a development project need, in themselves, be sustainable to make a successful project in poverty/gender terms

Part C

Key Issues / Points of information. For PCRs comment on sustainability

The major changes made at the MTR left the Project Team 21 months (after the approval process) to design and promote uptake of institutional change - to have new organisational structures and processes **in place and operational** by EoP. This would be an ambitious target in any institutional environment. In fact, the DoF made a major commitment in principle by establishing a Training Wing, and appointing a number of staff. Not surprisingly, this did not happen until the penultimate month of the Project, and it is not possible to assess whether or not the changes will be sustainable. The early indications are that, as a result of a wider need for institutional change in DoF, and the very limited availability of revenue funds, the Training Wing will be unlikely to flourish without further external support.

On the other hand, the direct and tangible benefits to the DoF staff will remain, at least in the medium term. The benefits passed on to poor communities by trained staff should also remain in terms of increased income from aquaculture production, and resultant livelihoods opportunities. The downside of this is that, in the longer term, in the absence of funds to train new staff entrants, or to deliver extension training, the benefits will erode to an extent, and the opportunities for multiplier effect will not be fully realised. The solution to this situation perhaps lies both with the GoB and the donor community.

Recommendations	Responsibility	Date for completion
1. No attempt should be made (by donors) to protect the Training Wing in the absence of a MoFL commitment to wider reform of DoF via the development of a comprehensive plan for implementation of national sector policy	Local Coordinating Group (LCG)	As soon as possible
2. Intermittent support to the Training Wing could be part of a package, contingent upon commitment of MoFL/DoF to participate in a full donor-funded functional analysis resulting in production of a national strategy for the sector	DFID/LCG	
3. Should such a process be agreed promptly, provision could be made for FFP to provide some immediate consultancy support (local or international) to help the Training Wing establish itself in DoF	DFID/Fourth Fisheries Project	Ideally within 3 months
4. Such an institutional analysis should be founded upon the conclusions of the FSRFDS and should adopt the approach already piloted by Danida in the Department of Livestock Services (ie	LCG	

Recommendations	Responsibility	Date for completion
already approved by MoFL)		
5. Funding for this process would best come via the LCG rather than any single donor to emphasise their commitment to the FSRFDS approach	LCG	
6. The donors may wish to send a clear signal that the step wise project-based approach has been abandoned, and that the process of functional analysis and identification of strategic funding gaps, is a pre-condition for further support to DoF (any such support being programmatic)	LCG	
7. If DFID proceed with their planned Local Government Agricultural Development Programme (LGADP), it would send an excellent message if the DoF Training Wing and Extension Cell could participate in the process as a formal liaison point for the DoF Upazilla staff	DFID	

Review team:	Barry Blake, Jim Parker, Shamsun Nessa
---------------------	--

People met:	Alan Brooks, Team Leader, FTEP II
	David Brown, Regional Coordinator, FTEP II
	Ferdous Parveen, Project Director, FTEP II
	Tim Robertson, DFID
	Martin Leach, DFID
	Nasaruddin Ahmed, Director General, DoF
	Arne Andreasson, Team Leader FFP
	Richard Gillet, Institutional Specialist, FFP
	Md. Nazrul Islam, Director Inland, DoF
	Momtaz Begum, DC Training Wing
	Duncan King, DFID
	Jorgen Hanson, PPSU, DANIDA

	Md. Shahidul Islam, DD (Aquaculture), DoF
	Rafique Islam, PCD FFP
	Giasuddin Khan, Chief Fisheries Extension Officer/DD Shrimp Cell, DoF
	Mr Sanaullah, Designate Head of Training Wing, DoF
	Nasir Uddin Humayan, AD Planning Cell, DoF
	Abul Hashem Sumon, AD Training and Extension, FFP
	Mustafizar Rahman, AD Training Wing
	Mr Akhter Ali Sarkar, AC Training Wing
	Nazmud Huda Khan, AC Training Wing
	Zillur Rahman, FFP
	Md Saraj Uddin, DFO Chandpur
	Zoarder Shibendra Nath, Principal, FTEC, Faridpur
	Nibedita Dey, Instructor (DT), FTEC, Faridpur
	Mesba Uddin Ahmed, PCD, IFAD Project, Faridpur/Director Training DoF
	Sarder Golam Mostafa, FA, Boalmari, Faridpur
	Md. Babar Ali, AFO, Boalmari, Faridpur
	Ali Azam, DFO, Faridpur
	Zia Haider Chowdhury, UFO (DT), Alfadanga, Faridpur
	Paul Thompson, CBFM 2
	Mark Walker, Policy Specialist, ASIRP, DAE
	Michael Akester, Advisor, DANIDA
	Professor Salahuddin Ahmed, University of Dhaka
	Keith Fisher, Sectoral Advisor, ASIRP, DAE

Scoring system:

1 = completely achieved

2 = largely achieved

3 = partially achieved

4 = only achieved to a very limited extent

5 = not realised

x = too early to judge extent of achievement