

Annex 7: DFID Project Progress Report
Type of Report: Output to Purpose Review¹

PART A.

Country:	Bangladesh	Project:	REFPI
Project Officer	Najir Khan	Start Date:	<i>April 2000</i>
Date of Visit:	27 – 29/05/02	End Date:	<i>Dec.31st 2003 (revised from April 2003)</i>
Date of Report:	12/01/04	MIS Code:	<i>139-500-022</i>
		Risk Category:	

Goal Statement	OVI
Increased access to, and efficiency and effectiveness of farm power in small farm systems ² in Bangladesh.	To be identified by DFID-B, in collaboration with the project.
Purpose Statement	OVI
Strengthened capacity of GoB/ NGO/private sector to carry out appropriate research and extension in farm power issues for rural poor ³ .	<p>1- BAU (especially DFPM) and key partners⁴ are attracting/ allocating additional research and extension resources to address priority farm power needs⁵ of rural poor.</p> <p>2- Information is being shared between GOs, NGOs and private sector on farm power issues, and is reflected in their activities.</p> <p>3- Rural poor in project areas have improved access to appropriate farm power information, equipment and services.</p> <p>4- BAU's participation in the policy debate on farm power issues is enhanced.</p>

¹ **Review team:** Donald Brown (external consultant from ITAD), Enamul Huda (SocioConsult)

² Small farm systems cover small farm households engaged in production & processing of agricultural & horticultural crops, suppliers of inputs & services, traders, labourers, etc.

³ Rural poor may include marginal and landless farmers, rural traders, artisans and labourers – both men and women.

⁴ Key partners include BAU departments and a selection of GO, NGO and private sector institutions.

⁵ These are defined according to the findings of the Farm Power Needs Assessments commissioned by REFPI.

Outputs	OVI	Progress Score and Comments
<p>Output 1 Farm power research and extension needs for small farm systems identified.</p>	<p>1- Five field surveys and one institutional survey completed in Year 1.</p> <p>2- 5 priority research and extension themes focusing on the rural poor identified by end of Year 1.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Score: 1</p> <p>Substantially completed (<i>see 2002 OPR</i>)</p> <p>.</p> <p>7 research priorities were included in 3 calls for concept notes. Though this indicator is limited to year 1 of the project, needs were continually reviewed and refined.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Output 2 Effective research and extension system to address identified farm power needs is established.</p>	<p>1 Calls issued by REFPI for RD&E proposals that address priority farm power issues affecting rural poor men and women.</p> <p>2- Research commissioning process is established for screening RD&E proposals against agreed criteria by end of month 6.</p> <p>3- At least two PAC meetings held per year, and operate as per agreed TOR.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Score: 1</p> <p>Three calls issued. Considered achieved under 2001 OPR.</p> <p>System established. 40 sub-projects commissioned. Considered achieved under 2001 OPR.</p> <p>REFPI PAC met at least twice a year. PAC is proactive and participatory and a strong source of guidance and support. The 2002 OPR recommended that REFPI clarified PAC's role as it shifted towards monitoring and evaluation and longer-term issues of communication, dissemination and sustainability. Although the Inception report clarified that the PAC will not continue after EoP, the 2002 OPR recommended consideration be given as to how BAU would benefit from continued PAC expertise. REFPI. It remained unclear at the EoP as to how this would be implemented.</p>

	<p>4-. The research portfolio represents an approximately even balance between projects that address farm power issues affecting men and women, by EoP.</p> <p>5- All RD&E projects are sensitive to possible environmental impacts; health & safety and nutritional impacts; and socio-economic impacts.</p> <p>6- Monitoring and evaluation system for RD&E projects is operational by end of Year 1.</p>	<p>As reported in the 2002 OPR this balance largely achieved.</p> <p>During CN/proposal screening, the aspects of environment and impacts on the poor were screened, and those with a clear negative impact screened out. It is difficult to make reliable predictions on the impact new technologies may have on the wider environment, health, safety and socio-economic aspects. The majority of partners lack capacity to determine environmental impacts should wide spread dissemination of specific technologies take place. It will be more effective to hire the services of a qualified consultant, especially for those technologies that are likely to become more wide spread such as mechanised threshing and harvesting. Determining nutritional impacts of specific technologies is beyond the scope of REFPI, though there may be opportunities for exploration within future monitoring case studies of existing sub-projects.</p> <p>There are a number of projects dealing with issues such as soil fertility changes caused by power tiller operations (PP 42), health and safety of operators (PP 267, 363), sprayer operators (PP 326), work environment in rice mills (PP 132, 348) and socio economic impact of mechanisation (PP 27). The project could have done more to pull together the findings across several sub-projects.</p> <p>As reported in earlier OPR's the financial monitoring procedures were successfully implemented. The REFPI management also has visited many of the ongoing projects over the last year to monitor progress in the field. These visits are an opportunity to determine impact and discuss possible weaknesses in the RD&E projects and ways how to improve. Field visits are summarised in visit reports. REFPI also engaged national consultants on 2 occasions (November 2001 and in September 2003) to review all the sub-projects.</p>
--	---	---

<p>Output 3 Effective partnerships are operating with and between relevant institutions on farm power research, extension and service provision.</p>	<p>1- Extension materials have been generated and disseminated by sub-projects; and are in use by target partners.</p> <p>2- Database of existing and potential partners has been initiated and circulated.</p> <p>3-Partner institutions are regularly interacting with the project and each other, through joint activities organised by REFPI (eg training events, exchange visits, etc).</p> <p>4- Training has been extended to non-BAU partners and to areas outside Dhaka and Mymensingh.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Score: 2</p> <p>Most projects have printed leaflets, training manuals and posters. Other dissemination material produced includes videos on power tiller operator safety and health. DAE have been involved in poster and leaflet distribution. BTV has also aired programmes.</p> <p>Although REFPI started to collect information of its partners including introductory leaflets, annual and special reports. The staff member responsible for this work left the project and the database has not been completed.</p> <p>As reported in the 2002 OPR the project management has initiated contact and regular meetings/workshops whereby interaction is encouraged between projects that are involved in similar or supplementary activities. Although this has proved difficult to formalise</p> <p>Training and meetings have been held with several organisations outside the BAU</p>
<p>Output 4 Enhanced BAU capacity to carry out effective teaching, research and extension on farm power issues affecting the rural poor.</p>	<p>1. Skills in social development, gender, environmental impact assessment, health and safety issues (including nutrition), PCM, participatory methods for needs assessment, research and M&E are available to DFPM.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Score: 2</p> <p>The project has not limited itself to the Department or even the Faculty of Agricultural Engineering and Technology (FAET). It has built relationships with others especially with the Extension Department of the Agricultural Faculty and the Department of Agricultural Economics. This has led to changes in personal attitudes and interest of a number of staff. They are more involved in fieldwork and link with other institutions. The longer-term impact is more difficult to judge.</p> <p>DFPM and FAET recognise the need to incorporate more social science subjects, particularly gender in the undergraduate courses. REFPI has contributed to this</p>

	<p>2- BAU inter-departmental collaboration is enhanced.</p> <p>3- DFPM is attracting additional funds from outside REFPI for research and extension activities that address priority farm power needs.</p> <p>4- BAU staff are incorporating training provided by REFPI into own teaching and research.</p> <p>5- BAU post-graduate students are involved in RD&E projects in order to gain on-farm experience.</p>	<p>particularly gender, in the undergraduate courses. REFPI has contributed to this growing sense for change through its own research agenda and also through the provision of in country and overseas training courses for a number of staff. This includes PRA survey methodologies and more advanced ToT courses on the subject attended by teaching staff from the DFPM, others within the BAU from engineering, extension, veterinary science and economics departments in combined sessions with NGO participants. Some BAU projects are using PRA tools in their field work after attending the PRA courses though they may not fully understand their application or be fully participatory in their project approach (Datta review). Sustaining these achievements will be an issue.</p> <p>Unclear as to how much additional funds has been mobilised.</p> <p>Two DFPM staff attended a 3-week course on participatory monitoring (IIRR) in March 2001. Two staff went to AIT, Bangkok for a range of subjects (engineering to ergonomics, environment and gender issues) in specialised courses. Many issues were new to the participants. Some new subjects have already been incorporated in course curricula by individual teachers. Also the Department has formally introduced and got approval from the Academic Council in 2001 to include extension methodologies as an obligatory subject in the undergraduate courses.</p> <p>The BAU does not have any reliable figures on graduate students from the last 10 years</p>
--	---	---

	<p>6- BAU reputation as a reliable source of information on farm power is enhanced.</p>	<p>Teachers who have attended REFPI-funded training have adapted some of the subjects that they have learned into the courses that they are conducting. The logical framework and analysis of the problem tree have been introduced while others have tried PRA survey methods and new teaching methods that they learned in a course arranged by the SUFER project.</p> <p>The profile of the DFPM has increased over the last two years through the training sessions, the study visits to other countries such as Thailand, China, India and Philippines have brought new ideas as have the RD&E contracts requiring collaboration with NGOs and the private sector.</p> <p>The farm machinery divisions of BARI and BRRI are traditionally the first port of call for information on agricultural equipment. BAU receives less attention. There are a number of reasons as both BARI/BRRI have been more involved in fieldwork a larger machinery display. BRRI has also profited from links with the engineering division of IRRI. Plus, a visit to Gazipur only takes a few hours from Dhaka while Mymensingh requires a full day.</p> <p>The DFPM needs to work hard to increase and maintain its reputation as a reliable source of information. REFPI attracts visitors but this may not continue after the project ends. Individual staff members will certainly be sought by other parties for their sound advice. The improved standing of the DFPM as an engineering institute might have some positive influence on the BAU as a whole but this will be difficult to qualify.</p>
--	---	---

<p>Output 5 A strategy is developed to raise awareness of farm power issues amongst relevant professional organisations and policy makers.</p>	<p>Strategy document, for implementation beyond the life of the project by BAU and other partners.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Score: 3</p> <p>The 2002 OPR pointed out that this output had not received the attention it deserves; and that a problem for the project had been that the DAE was considered initially as the natural partner for the REFPI project in all the extension work. This had resulted in discussion and high-level contacts with MoA but has not led to any tangible improvements in the field.</p> <p>REFPI had several projects that aim to work on national policy issues and these are encouraged to use their own network. However, this has had limited impact. The project could have worked to produce evidence based policy briefs on specific findings and on practical application of sustainable livelihoods principles in RD&E approaches.</p> <p>The Government has not played a significant role for many years in the use of various farm power sources, tools and equipment. The role, which sat with BADC, has been successfully taken over by private companies. Thus REFPI's scope and capacity to influence national policy is limited. The EoP meeting with the PAC identified several action points that could be taken to initiate further action on policy level issues. Further action is needed on this aspect.</p>
<p>General progress assessment - Project Outputs</p>		<p>Score: 2</p>
<p>Justification</p>		
<p>The project has largely achieved both Outputs 1 and 2. Output 3 was achieved with the exception of the database of existing and potential partners. Output 4 was largely achieved although there was only ;limited success in achieving external funding. The integration of gender training and principles of genuine participation into undergraduate courses has been initiated but has et to be mainstreamed within the BAU. Output 5 has presented a significant challenge, given the limited interest of GoB in farm power issues and lack of policy entry points, and indeed has proven problematical. However, the project has had some success in informing other 'policy' environments and professional groups, especially linkages with the private sector (particularly the non-farm rural economy). The project has also identified potential entry points and develops appropriate materials and networks to promote key REFPI findings.</p>		

PART B.

Purpose /OVIs	Progress	Comments
1- BAU (especially DFPM) and key partners ⁴ are attracting/ allocating additional research and extension resources to address priority farm power needs ⁵ of rural poor.	Not achieved within the project but interest has been raised and there are hopeful signs that some funding will be secured.	There is no substantive indication that any additional resources are being attracted or allocated at present. However, there is an increasing recognition by some partners of the possible role DFPM and other BAU departments can play in technology generation and dissemination so there is some scope to achieve this indicator by EoP. The case studies and manufacturers survey (see 2002/3 milestones) provide more evidence of progress towards this indicator.
2- Information is being shared between GOs, NGOs and private sector on farm power issues, and is reflected in their activities.	Indicators under output 3 would demonstrate that good progress is being made and information sharing will increase over the life of the project.	PAC meetings, planned workshops, dissemination materials and case study results/policy briefs etc. have taken place.
3- Rural poor in project areas have improved access to appropriate farm power information, equipment and services.	The data has not been collected to verify this premise	Routine progress monitoring of RD&E projects together with the qualitative case studies provides information on achievement of this indicator
4- BAU's participation in the policy debate on farm power issues is enhanced.	Increased recognition for the need to engage and engagement itself in policy debates.	There is limited scope to influence GoB policy on farm power issues due to the low level of debate and limited number of entry points. There is more scope for engagement in non-farm rural economy issues and the project has developed links with relevant private sector partners and associations.

⁴ Key partners include BAU departments and a selection of GO, NGO and private sector institutions.

⁵ These are defined according to the findings of the Farm Power Needs Assessments commissioned by REFPI.

General progress assessment - Project Purpose	Score: 2
Justification	
The capacity of GoB/ NGO/private sector to carry out appropriate research and extension in farm power issues for rural poor ³ has been strengthened and thus the purpose has been largely achieved.	
Attribution	
The project has informed partners (PAC, BAU, Sub-project partners, through workshops and meetings) on the role of agricultural technology in poverty alleviation and rural development more generally, including rural non-farm employment, and the role of women. Formalised information sharing and improved networking has been promoted by REFPI however, indication is that a lot more informal processes are also occurring. Direct benefits from training and exposure to international institutions etc. are reflected in research approaches. The calls issued as part of the competitive research process has attracted wider interest by applicants who are now aware of REFPI objectives. Awareness of the needs of the rural poor, including women, and for appropriate research approaches has increased in BAU and project partners.	
Purpose to Goal	
<i>It is too early to determine the influence of REFPI in achieving its goal. However, qualitative judgement indicates the Goal is being at least partially achieved. Goal level indicators were not well developed. The networking, information sharing, changes in research and teaching approaches and consideration of 'livelihoods' principles have increased in all partners and changes in behaviour are likely to be sustained since increased exposure to 'real life' context/conditions has influenced individual and organisations to change. This appears to have resulted, on a limited scale, to improvement in the 'supply side' of pro-poor service provision</i>	
Does logframe require revision?	
NO, the OPR was modified in an OPR undertaken in 2002	
Lessons learned	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refining the research commissioning process required a lot of technical support and time and the costs for managing a competitive fund are high • Commissioning of more projects than planned facilitated more capacity building and wider range of entry points. • Improved monitoring (combined quarterly reporting by the sub-projects and field visits by the Management Team members) improved the quality, management, learning and interaction among the partners 	

³ Rural poor may include marginal and landless farmers, rural traders, artisans and labourers – both men and women.

- Most sub-project NGO partners lacked in engineering/sound technical knowledge and the academia lacked in action/ participatory research knowledge.
- Exposure to international institutions, training and different ways of working have influenced change in personal behavior, research, in teaching and curricula revision initiative at BAU
- The project had limitations for embedding this learning as it runs over three years.
- The projects varied in success. But important findings indicated by most projects
- Three years period for this kind of process development and agriculture based project is not adequate and a no-cost extension is proposed
- Search for alternative extension and dissemination mechanisms is building the capacity of potential organizations. It has potentials for widening the process
- REFPI faced a difficult challenge to ensure effective communication and uptake pathways are developed to roll-out research findings and outputs; a communication strategy should have been developed at an early stage in the project
- Developing a broad PAC has provided the project with a real strength in terms of expert guidance and decision making
- Most sub-projects have limited capacity to assess the possible gender and environmental impacts of their proposed activities, but gender issues were found to be both very important and were successfully tackled by the project; although a specific emphasis on gender was necessary.

PART C.**Key Issues / Points of information**

Recommendations	Responsibility	Date for completion
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		

5.		
----	--	--

Review team:	Donald Brown; Enamul Huda
People met:	See Annex 4

*Scoring system: 1 = likely to be completely achieved 2 = likely to be largely achieved 3 = likely to be partially achieved
4 = only likely to be achieved to a very limited extent 5 = unlikely to be realized x = too early to judge extent of achievement*