



United Republic of Tanzania

COSOP completion review 2016–2021

Contents

Abbreviations and acronyms	ii
Map of IFAD-funded operations in the country	iii
I. Introduction	1
II. Relevance	3
III. Effectiveness	4
IV. Policy engagement	7
V. Knowledge management	9
VI. Strategic partnerships	9
VII. South-South and Triangular Cooperation	10
VIII. Lessons learned and recommendations	12

Appendices

I.	COSOP results framework (at the time of design in 2016)
II.	COSOP results management framework: progress since COSOP results review
III.	Ratings matrix (in line with IOE methodology)
IV.	Comments from government

Abbreviations and acronyms

AfDB	African Development Bank
AFDP	Agriculture and Fisheries Development Programme
AGRA	Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa
ASWG	Agricultural Sector Working Group
BASIC	Bagamoyo Sugar Infrastructure and Sustainable Community Development Programme
CGAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CIAT	International Center for Tropical Agriculture
COSOP	country strategic opportunities programme
CRR	COSOP Result Review
DDP	Dryland Development Programme
FYDP	Five-year Development Plan
GEF	Global Environment Facility
ILRI	International Livestock Research Institute
LDFS	Reversing Land Degradation Trends and Increasing Food Security in Degraded Ecosystems of Semi-arid Areas of Central Tanzania
M&E	monitoring and evaluation
MIVARF	Marketing Infrastructure, Value Addition and Rural Finance
MVIWATA	<i>Muungano wa Vikundi wa Wakulima</i>
SHMDP	Southern Highlands Milkshed Development Project
SSTC	South-South and Triangular Cooperation
VC	Value Chain
TAF	Technical Assistance Fund

Map of IFAD-funded operations in the country



United Republic of Tanzania

COSOP completion review

I. Introduction

1. The country strategic opportunities programme for the United Republic of Tanzania [henceforth referred to as Tanzania] (2016–2021) was approved by the 117th session of IFAD’s Executive Board in April 2016.¹ The overall country strategic opportunities programme (COSOP) objective was to contribute to a transformation of Tanzania’s agriculture sector that created higher and more sustainable productivity, profitability, commercialization and increased small farmers’ incomes and resilience. The COSOP had four strategic objectives (SOs), namely: (i) SO1: improved institutional performance, coordination and accountability to IFAD target groups and their organizations at central and local levels; (ii) SO2: more inclusive and resilient value chains of priority commodities, driven by expanded and sustainable access to markets and financial services and by a more inclusive private sector; (iii) SO3: improved climate-resilient technologies aimed at increasing productivity in priority crop-livestock-fishery commodities; and (iv) SO4: strengthened land governance enabling more inclusive public and private investments in agriculture.

2. IFAD’s financing of the COSOP was projected at US\$150 million, with additional cofinancing of US\$70.8 million. The programme portfolio under the COSOP featured two lending projects: (i) Marketing Infrastructure, Value Addition and Rural Finance Support Programme (MIVARF) (2011–2020); and (ii) Agriculture and Fisheries Development Programme (AFDP) (2021–2026), approved in December 2020, and its financing agreement signed in April 2021 but yet to start implementation (start-up workshop was conducted in November 2021). Thus, at the time of drafting this review (June-September 2021), the programme portfolio did not have an active lending project. The programme portfolio included three grant projects: (i) Interactive ICT in Tanzania, closed in 2017; (ii) Reversing Land Degradation project (2017–2023), funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF); and (iii) IFAD’s COVID-19 Rural Poor Stimulus Facility (RPSF) (2021–2022).

Table 1
List of projects during COSOP 2016–2021

	Project	Non-IFAD financing	IFAD financing	Cofinancing ¹		Total
				Domestic	International	
A	Completed 2016–2021					
A.1	MIVARF (closed in December 2020)	61,620,000	90,000,000	2,793,000	995,000	169,460,000
A.2	Reversing Land Degradation - (GEF)	70,000				
A.3	Interactive ICT in Tanzania Grant		1,500,000	n/a	n/a	1,500,000
A	Total Completed (A)	61,690,000	91,500,000	2,793,000	995,000	
B	Ongoing 2021–2026					
B.1	GEF for Land Degradation/Food Security project (LDFS) 2021–2023	7,155,963			n/a	7,155,963
B.2	AFDP		\$58,850,000	2,417,000	-	77,400,000
				7,732,000	-	
				8,425,000	-	
B.3	RPSF – 1 st tranche	882,481		n/a	n/a	882,481
B.4	RPSF – 2 nd tranche	1,078,362		n/a	n/a	1,078,362

¹ EB 2016/117/R.11.

	Project	Non-IFAD financing	IFAD financing	Cofinancing ¹		Total
				Domestic	International	
B.5	Planned (Approved but cancelled)	None	None	n/a	n/a	
	Bagamoyo Sugar Infrastructure and Sustainable Community Development Programme (BASIC)	70,000,000				
	Dryland Development Programme (DDP)	22,325,565				
	Southern Highlands Milkshed Development Project (SHMDP)	41,278,000				
B	Total Ongoing (B)	9,116,806	58,850,000	18,574,000	0	
A+B	Total COSOP 2016–2021	70,806,806	150,350,000	21,367,000	995,000	

3. The COSOP was implemented during the fifth-phase administration (2015–2020), under President John Pombe Magufuli, who promoted a policy of large infrastructure projects and greater reliance on domestic revenue for development financing. The new political context that followed his death in 2021 resulted in the cancellation of different lending operations already approved or under development, including: Bagamoyo Sugar Infrastructure and Sustainable Community Development Programme (BASIC); Dryland Development Programme (DDP); and Southern Highlands Milkshed Development Project (SHMDP). It is important to underscore the difficult country context marked by an absence of dialogue between the Government and development partners, which resulted in the freezing of agriculture portfolios for a long period of time. Hence it was not possible for the COSOP to deliver as expected.

4. Nonetheless, several important non-lending initiatives materialized and new partnership opportunities emerged in response to the pandemic. The Ministry of Agriculture implemented a COVID-19 Response Plan for Agriculture and Food Security that mobilized funding from the RPSF to support rural recovery and strengthen community resilience, markets, and trade. The RPSF further supported development of M-Kilimo mobile applications for agricultural e-marketing and services. There are also several regional grants that involve Tanzania as a participating country. These include: Fostering Good Land Governance for Inclusive Agricultural Development in Tanzania (FGLIAD); Sustainable Rangeland Management (SRMP); Regional East African Community Trade in Staples (REACTS); Heifer Dairy Hub initiative (for Zanzibar and Rwanda); and Farm Radio International (FRI-ICT).

5. The objective of this COSOP completion review (CCR) is to assess the programme's overall performance and its contributions to national agricultural policies and the United Nations sustainable development goals (SDGs) in Tanzania. The CCR followed IFAD's guidelines for project completion report validation and project performance assessment.² The specific objectives of the CCR were: (i) to assess the relevance of programme interventions at the time of project design and in today's context; (ii) to assess the effectiveness of programme implementation, or the extent to which project objectives were met; (iii) to assess the performance of the programme in terms of policy engagement, knowledge management, strategic partnership and South-South and Triangular Cooperation (SSTC); and (iv) to generate and document useful lessons and recommendations from COSOP implementation.

² IFAD (2012). Guidelines Project completion report validation and project performance assessment. Independence Office of Evaluation, 2 June 2012, Rome. The ratings use the 6-point Likert scale, with 6 representing highly satisfactory.

6. The CCR was conducted through an extensive consultative process with diverse stakeholders groups in both mainland Tanzania and Zanzibar. IFAD, in collaboration with the Government of Tanzania, organized a two-day stakeholder workshop in Dodoma in June 2021 to obtain inputs from various groups on the performance of the COSOP. Participants included officials from the Prime Minister Office, the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries and the Ministry of Finance and Planning. Representatives of farmers' organizations (*Muungano wa Vikundi wa Wakulima* [MVIWATA]), civil society and academia also took part. The CCR team reviewed the COSOP Result Review (CRR) conducted in 2018 and project completion reports, as well as various reports from IFAD-funded projects in Tanzania. At the end of the consultations, a feedback and validation workshop was organized in September 2021.

II. Relevance

7. **The COSOP is rated moderately satisfactory (4) in terms of relevance to the national priorities of Tanzania and the needs of small farmers and the rural poor.** The COSOP's overall objective, SOs and interventions contribute to the Tanzania National Development Vision (TDV 2025) and the Zanzibar Development Vision (ZDV 2050) which aim at transforming Tanzania into a diversified and semi-industrialized economy. The COSOP is also anchored in SDGs 1 (No poverty) and 2 (Zero hunger); 5 (Gender equality); 8 (Decent work and economic growth); 10 (Reduced inequalities); 13 (Climate action); and 14 (Life below water).

8. The four SOs are fully aligned with the Government's Agriculture Sector Development Strategy and, more explicitly, with the second Agriculture Sector Development Programme II's (ASDP II's) four priority programme areas, or components.

- (i) **Component 1:** Sustainable water and land use management. SO4 (land governance) contributes to component 1.
- (ii) **Component 2:** Enhanced agricultural productivity and profitability. SO3 (climate-resilient productivity-increasing technologies) is supported by ASDP II component 2.
- (iii) **Component 3:** Commercialization and value addition. SO2 (Inclusive and resilient value chains) is fully aligned with component 3.
- (iv) **Component 4:** Strengthening sector enablers. SO1 (improved institutional performance) is aligned with ASDP II component 4.

9. The COSOP was prepared during the fifth-phase administration (2015–2020). The change of administration at the beginning of the COSOP period (2016), translated into new policy directions expressed in the second Five-year Development Plan (FYDP II 2016–2020) and the ruling party (Chama Cha Mapinduzi) manifesto, which prioritized industrial transformation and large-scale flagship infrastructure projects, with less emphasis on smallholder agriculture and social and human development. The fifth-phase administration also promoted a policy of greater reliance on domestic revenues for development financing. These changes resulted in the cancellation of three COSOP lending operations, which were developed, based on the four COSOP SOs and IFAD's mission to support smallholder producers, and farmers' and civil society organizations.

10. The COSOP design was highly ambitious, with four SOs and no systematic diagnostic assessment of institutional capacity. The CRR, conducted at COSOP midterm, recommended strategic repositioning of the COSOP's SOs to demonstrate more explicitly IFAD's contributions to the Government's industrialization strategy and to competitive agricultural transformation. However, these recommendations could not be fully implemented due to the limited space for dialogue with the Government.

11. The formulation of the AFDP confirms IFAD's financial re-engagement with the Government by balancing investments in production and post-harvest infrastructure

(fishing vessels, fish processing and market facilities) and support to public institutions (Agriculture Seed Agency, Tanzania Agriculture Research Institute, Tanzania Fishing Corporation, Aquaculture Development Centre), with investments in smallholders' access to, and use of, seeds, fishing gear, post-harvest technologies and markets, and promotion of public-private-producers partnerships. Thus, the AFDP will finance one of 17 flagship government programmes – purchase of vessels for deep-sea fishing.

12. The new sixth-phase administration has maintained the continuity of the political agenda while adjusting its policies and programs to reflect an evolving social and economic context. The broad policy objectives of the new administration remain guided by the Tanzania Development Vision 2025 and have been outlined in FYDP III) launched in July 2021. The FYDP III reaffirms the importance of agriculture as a key productive sector and an engine of economic growth. The plan also reaffirms the need to proactively engage with multilateral and bilateral partners to accelerate and sustain the delivery of Tanzania Development Vision 2025.

13. Overall, the four SOs and interventions remain highly relevant to FYDP III, and are fully aligned with the strategic priority of realizing an inclusive and competitive economy for human development. The plan reaffirms the role of agriculture as a central pillar of Tanzania's industrialization and defines the broad direction planned for agriculture, emphasizing competitiveness, forward and backward linkages, and increased investments in research and development on strategic crops. They also remain relevant to the next United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework's (UNSDCF's) outcome of inclusive, sustainable growth and reduced multi-dimensional poverty.

III. Effectiveness

14. **The COSOP's effectiveness is rated moderately unsatisfactory (3).** The CCR found mixed results in terms of COSOP performance and effectiveness. On the one hand, there is evidence of positive impacts from the two projects (MIVARF and LDSF) that were effectively funded and implemented as well as several successful non-lending operations. On the other hand, there were significant challenges in the performance of the COSOP as a whole due to the lack of dialogue between the Government and development partners. There is also mixed performance in terms of progress with respect to the four SOs (see appendix 2 for details on the progress of the various performance indicators), with significant progress on SOs 2 and 4, while SO1 and 3 lagged behind.

15. Significant progress has been achieved with respect to SO2: (value chain development and access to finance). The total number of people benefiting from improvements in agriculture is estimated at over 3.5 million. The Rural Micro, Small and Medium Enterprise Support Programme, closed in March, 2017, registered an overall satisfactory performance, benefiting over 329,000 farmers and rural micro, small and medium Enterprises, which accessed market information and received rural business support services.

16. One of the successful programmes in Tanzania, MIVARF, can be seen as an exemplary model of value chain development. The programme has achieved and even surpassed its development objective of sustainably enhanced incomes and food security for over one million rural households. MIVARF's Smallholder Credit Guarantee Scheme (SCGS), implemented by the Tanzania Agricultural Development Bank, achieved a breakthrough in Tanzania's agricultural financing. By the end of the programme, approximately 2.5 million rural people (46 per cent female) were accessing credit. It also generated a wealth of lessons and innovations that can be scaled up. MIVARF has made tangible contributions to value chain development in its project area, supported by the introduction of the public-private-producer partnership (4P) model and expanded access to financial services. Under MIVARF, about ten 4P- consortiums have been providing good support for cross-border trading.

17. With respect to SO4 (land governance), there has been considerable progress on the three outcomes (number of project beneficiaries with secure access to land and natural resources); number of project beneficiaries with legally recognized land and natural resource rights; and reduced conflicts over land and natural resources. The Reversing Land Degradation Trends and Increasing Food Security in Degraded Ecosystems of Semi-arid Areas of Central Tanzania (GEF-LDFS) project funded the activities of facilitating community Certificates of Customary Right of Occupancy (CCROs) regarding communal land rights. To date, the GEF-LDFS project has finalized 1654 community CCROs in four of its participating districts. The GEF-LDFS will continue to facilitate resolution of conflict on land use between the Hadzabe community and pastoralists in Munguli village and conclude the Village Land Use Plan³. However, the effectiveness of this facilitation will need to be assessed further through an outcome survey.

Box 1: Key Highlights of MIVARF Impact

MIVARF was designed as a seven-year nationwide programme with a total cost estimated at USD 169.46 million and distributed as follows: IFAD USD 90.59 million, the African Development Bank (AfDB) USD 62.91 million, the Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA) USD 6.92 million, the Government of Tanzania counterpart fund USD 3.76 million, Tanzania Districts USD 3.10 million, unidentified Co-Financier USD 2.00 million and Beneficiary Communities USD 0.18 million. The programme was led by the Prime Minister's Office and implemented via a Programme Coordination Team.

The overall goal of the MIVARF programme was to reduce rural poverty and accelerate economic growth on a sustainable basis. The programme development objective was to enhance incomes and food security of over one million rural households on a sustainable basis. The programme goal and development objective were to be achieved through value chains development by improving skills and knowledge, developing sustainable and profitable linkage to markets for the active rural households as well as enhancing their access to a broad range of financial services.

At programme completion MIVARF had reached a total of 1,588,450 households (HH) (159% of initial target of 1,000,000 HHs), involving 3,176,899 persons receiving direct services from the programme (116% of initial target of 2,750,000 persons) across 72 districts/LGAs in all 29 regions of Tanzania. One of the key outcomes of MIVARF was to increase sustainable financial access to the rural population. By the end of the programme a total of 2,483,796 rural individuals (46% female) were accessing financial services in the form of credit. This was 129% of MIVARF target. Accessibility of financial services to support production activity increased from a mean of 20.7% to 73.7% and availability of financial services to support value addition increased from an overall mean of 25.2% to 61.9%. This is definitively a breakthrough in Tanzania's agricultural financing, which has been made possible by the specific features of this SCGS, meant and designed for smallholder farmers. Overall, MIVARF's Contribution to rural poverty reduction is high as demonstrated by significant improvements of physical, natural, social and human capitals among the direct beneficiaries, which led to enhanced food security, productivity, income, and increased assets. MIVARF was efficiently managed and achieved most of its output targets and a cumulative disbursement of about 92% of the budget. Cost-benefit analysis yielded an overall IRR of 74% of the project with a positive NPV of USD 340.34 million, at a discount rate of 10%.

18. Conversely, there is little documented evidence and data on SO3 (climate-resilient technologies). As stated in the MIVARF PCR, the project was solely designed to improve the downstream part of the value chain (i.e. storage, access roads, value addition, marketing and access to finance), and did not invest in improving productivity and production. Lessons from MIVARF have shown that most of the target groups were not able to achieve meaningful production increases despite programme interventions. The other projects planned to improve productivity were cancelled. Increasing productivity remains

³ Village Land Use Plans are effective instruments to secure rangelands and contribute to land and resource conflict resolution between farmers, pastoralists and other land users

a critical segment of value chain projects, along with post-harvest management, access to finance and/or marketing (holistic value chain development approach).

19. Similarly, there is little progress (approximately 10 per cent) with respect to the two main outcome indicators of SO1: M&E system established and functional; and Number of enabling policies and regulations promulgated and operational. There is uneven policy and institutional performance, including: (i) slow progress in the launching of an improved M&E system; (ii) limited progress in the improvement of the content and prioritization of district plans; (iii) limited support to enhance capacities at the district level. The two studies proposed in the COSOP to provide operational inputs to support ASDP II's policy objectives were not carried out. These were the Rural Growth and Economic Empowerment Strategy and Operational Plan, and Value Chain Development Strategy and Operational Plan. However, the regional grants were implemented and produced an impressive list of knowledge products and policy outputs.

20. The effectiveness of the COSOP was hampered by five key factors. First, several of the COSOP pipeline projects for lending and non-lending activities were cancelled. As a result, Tanzania did not fully access two cycles (IFAD9 and IFAD10) of IFAD financing. The cancelled projects were:

- BASIC, including a concessional loan of SDR 40.3 million and a grant of SDR 7.1 million, approved by IFAD's Executive Board in December 2015 under the IFAD9 financing cycle. This was cancelled in May 2018 for failure of the Government to sign the financing agreement within two years of Executive Board approval.
- DDP was also cancelled after significant investments in the preparation of the full project design report in 2017.
- SHMDP: the full project design report was approved through the IFAD review process but the operation was cancelled in 2017 by the Government based on a recommendation by the National Debt Management Committee (NDMC).
- ASDP-II: the project concept note for support to ASDP II (see below) was submitted for review by IFAD's Operational and Policy Committee in April 2017, but did not go into the pipeline given the unsatisfactory performance of the portfolio and cancellation of approved projects.
- The Zanzibar Agricultural Sector Development Programme, targeted for approval in 2019, did not materialize.

21. Second, three of the four non-lending activities initially planned as grants did not materialize: (i) Rural Growth and Economic Empowerment Strategy and Operational Plan; (ii) Value Chain Development Strategy and Operational Plan; and (iii) Proposal for Zanzibar Agriculture Sector-wide Programme. Only the Fostering Good Land Governance for Inclusive Development in Tanzania, approved in December 2015, became operational.

22. The CRR concluded that the implementation of IFAD's proposed lending activities was "off track", due to a series of complex factors including the shift in government strategic focus to large infrastructure and industrialization projects; coordination failures between the Ministry of Finance and Planning and the sponsoring Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries; and an expanded role of the NDMC in the more rigorous scrutiny and approval of grants and loans. This situation, which was largely outside the direct control of IFAD, was not unique to the Fund. The CRR reported that the Development Partners Group Main (DPG-M) estimated that the total revenue loss to the Government resulting from the current situation amounted to US\$200 million for FY 2017–2018, plus US\$716 million of commitments pending approval for FY 2018–2019.

23. Third, the COSOP portfolio was reduced to a single lending operation (MIVARF), which was rated moderately satisfactory at completion (box 1). The performance

evaluation of MIVARF concluded that the effectiveness of the programme was predicated on an appropriate sequencing of interventions. MIVARF was highly complex, aiming to bring change at all levels, macro, meso and micro. There was insufficient assessment of institutional capacity and willingness to undertake planned interventions. In addition, MIVARF suffered from several design flaws (national coverage in a country that covers close to 1,000,000 km², a complex range set of interventions across 14 value chains, diversity of target groups, etc.) There were also implementation challenges (weak M&E capacities, withdrawal of key partners, and parallel implementation of interventions) that led to substantial delays in the first five years of implementation.

24. The programme was seriously affected when two key implementing partners pulled out: (i) AGRA, which was supposed to contribute US\$6.92 million; and (ii) the Financial Sector Deepening Trust (FSDT), which was expected to manage the US\$5.00-million Innovation Fund foreseen at design. The programme was consequently extended for two years. Fourth, there were also several regional grants that involved Tanzania, including FGLIAD, Sustainable Rangeland Management (SRMP) and REACTS. These were designed to support the lending programmes, and particularly the DDP and SHMDP projects. However, the cancellation of the three projects created some disconnect between the grants and the programme portfolio. The knowledge generated could not be fully leveraged for policy advocacy and decision-making, and for supporting programme implementation.

25. Fifth, there were weaknesses of the M&E system both for both ASDP and ASDP II. The four SOs were rather complex and overlapping, resulting in 12 outcomes and a multiplicity of loosely defined indicators that were not explicitly linked either to the ASDP M&E system or to IFAD Operational Result Management System. As reported in the CRR, 67 per cent) of the eight outcome indicators and 75 per cent of the ten milestone indicators did not have baseline and targets, making it difficult to evaluate performance. The COSOP relied on ASDP II M&E systems which experienced significant delays and major implementation challenges, including lack of funding and weak capacities. There is a dearth of information regarding the actual performance of key indicators to assess progress through the COSOP's Results Management Framework/RMF).

26. Sixth, the COSOP did not have a clear and coherent strategy, geographic targeting or thematic focus or subsector focus. There was no clarity on its targeting approach nor specific activities for promoting the inclusion of vulnerable, marginalized and disadvantaged groups. Lessons learned from ASDP I show that most projects faced implementation challenges and generated fragmented results, spreading resources too thinly. While MIVARF had ambitious national coverage, initially involving 141 districts (eventually reduced to 72), its implementation has been challenging from the beginning, with uneven performance from one pace to another.

IV. Policy engagement

27. **Policy engagement is rated as moderately satisfactory (4).** Throughout the COSOP period, IFAD actively pursued high-level engagement, involving the IFAD Country Office and Headquarters. Both formal and informal channels were used. However, these initiatives did not translate into the expected outcomes. In May 2019, IFAD's President visited Tanzania⁴ and held meetings with the Tanzanian President and senior government officials. This visit signaled a period of renewed partnership and cooperation with IFAD and resulted in the design and approval of a new project in December 2020, the project, AFDP, was designed to align with one of the Government's flagship programmes and Tanzania was thus able to use its allocation under the FAD11 financing cycle.

⁴ IFAD (2019): www.ifad.org/en/web/lastest/tanzania quoted the visit of IFAD's President Gilbert F. Hounbo, meeting with URT's President John Pombe Joseph Magufuli during his visit to Tanzania in May 2019.

28. During the COSOP, intensive country-level policy engagement and non-lending activities produced some impressive outputs. Most notable are results from the Fostering Good Land Governance for Inclusive Agricultural Development in Tanzania (GLIAD) project, which resulted in: (i) preparation of National Land Use Planning Guidelines and the National Environmental Management Policy of 2019; (ii) establishment of the Land Policy Technical Review Team of the Ministry of Lands on alternative policy proposal in favour of women, small-scale producers and other marginalized groups; (iii) preparation of a policy brief on women's land rights as a contribution to drafting a new land law and reviewing the 2019 National Agriculture Act.

29. Through its non-lending activities, IFAD also supported the strengthening of grassroots producers' associations, the establishment of a rural producers' forum, and the organization of a civil society National Dialogue on Rangelands in February 2018. IFAD's country office was one of the leading voices in the Agricultural Sector Working Group (ASWG) it chaired in 2015–2017 and co-chaired in 2021.

30. The COSOP developed an Action Plan for Policy Engagement in Tanzania for the 2017–2021 period. The plan focused on different stages of the project cycle, (from identification of policy issues to assessment of policy results), and defined the outcomes, the outputs and activities to be undertaken together with responsibilities and partnerships to be established. However, given the existing context, it is difficult to determine the extent to which IFAD's engagement with the Government and other stakeholders influenced policy priorities, or the design and implementation of policies for inclusive and sustainable rural transformation. Furthermore, this engagement did not achieve the expected results in terms of close alignment with the FYDP and the ruling party manifesto, as well as the budget speeches that provided directions and indications on government priorities. The policy environment was challenging during the COSOP's implementation as there has been negligible policy dialogue between the central Government and other stakeholders (e.g. consultation forums have not been convened; absence of sharing and discussing budgetary proposals and priorities with development partners as experienced in the past).

Box2: AFDP (2021–2027)

In order to accelerate ASDP II's delivery of scalable results, the Government has requested support to implement two priority areas of the ASDP II – Agriculture and Fisheries. The overall objective of the (AFDP 2021–2026) is to contribute to inclusive food systems for improved livelihoods, food security, nutrition and resilience. Its development objective is to enhance sustainable productivity, climate resilience and commercialize selected crop seeds, fisheries and aquaculture, while devoting particular attention to women's empowerment and youth participation. The programme targets 41 districts (out of 169) in 11 regions (out of 31) of the central Tanzania mainland corridor, as well as four marine conservation areas in Unguja and Pemba, Zanzibar. The total number of direct beneficiary households is 260,000, corresponding to some 1,300,000 people.

The programme focuses investments in crop seed systems development (maize, sunflower and beans/pulses), and promoting the use of improved seeds of preferred varieties for production. It supports the livelihoods of artisanal fishers, fish farmers and seaweed producers by: (i) promoting sustainable use of fisheries resources in marine inshore waters; (ii) financing a public-private-producer partnership joint venture for the acquisition and operation of eight long-line fishing vessels and two fish-processing plants; (iii) developing the capacity of aquaculture development centres and delivering effective extension services; and (iv) increasing the quality of seaweed seeds and promoting labour-saving production methods. The Programme will finance investments in infrastructure and technologies for reducing post-harvest losses, including ice-making plants, cold supply chain facilities, solar dryers/tents and drying racks. The programme will also finance the rehabilitation of two multipurpose modern fish markets in Pangani and Bagamoyo, and market linkages for increasing income from aquaculture and seaweed production.

The total programme cost is US\$77.4 million, cofinanced by IFAD under IFAD11 in the amount of US\$58.8 million complemented by the Government's contribution, estimated at US\$7.8 million (10.1 per cent), mainly in the form of tax exemption, and private sector investments of US\$8.6 million (11.1 per cent); and beneficiary contributions of US\$1.7 million (2.2 per cent).

V. Knowledge management

31. **Knowledge management is rated as moderately satisfactory (4)**, with several positive outcomes. However the lack of a fully operational country portfolio limited the possibility of their dissemination and use by national policymakers, stakeholders and IFAD target groups. Regional grants to international research organizations of the Consultative Group for International Agriculture Research (CGIAR) such as International Institute for Tropical Agriculture (IITA), International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI), International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT5) and ICRAF^{6,7,8} generated a number of knowledge products. These include: a "How-to-Do Note on Gender and Pastoralism" (ILRI, 2020);⁹ and "Strengthening sorghum and millet value chains for food, nutritional and income security in arid and semi-arid lands of Kenya and United Republic of Tanzania" (International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics, 2020).

32. The International Land Coalition (ILC) produced eight research-driven advocacy papers on land rights; five knowledge-sharing and training sessions; six advocacy and policy engagement initiatives; three joint village land use planning processes; five successful initiatives against land grabbing, and other knowledge products on women's land rights; accessing land related information; conflict prevention and transformation; gender mainstreaming; and investigative reporting on land rights and climate change. Farm Radio International (FRI-ICT)¹⁰ conducted a participatory radio programme titled "On-Air Dialogues – Listening to rural people", that discussed the future of farming, climate change, improving livelihoods, and food security and nutrition. However, there was no evidence of the extent to which knowledge management effectively contributed to the achievement of the SOs.

VI. Strategic partnerships

33. Overall, **partnership is rated as moderately unsatisfactory (3)**. While the COSOP developed strategic partnerships with a number of stakeholders (table 2), some of them did not materialize or failed to produce desired outcomes. Partnerships with the Government faced some significant challenges due to the change in official priorities and reduced space for engagement with development partners. Scarce responsiveness on the part of Government for key administrative actions resulted in cancellation of several planned projects and delayed the implementation of lending operations.

34. Although the programme developed a successful cofinancing partnership with the AfDB for MIVARF, the lack of operational synergies and harmonization of implementation methods resulted in parallel implementation of AfDB- and IFAD-funded interventions. Furthermore, the cofinancing and technical partnerships with AGRA and the FSDT did not materialize, creating a financing gap of about US\$12 million.

⁵ <https://ciat.cgiar.org/ciat-projects/global-cassava-partnership-gcp21/>.

⁶ <https://www.worldagroforestry.org/news/ifad-team-visits-and-reviews-progress-cgiar-projects-east-africa>.

⁷ A study funded by IFAD include: Wells Harry B. M. and Leigh A. Winowiecki (2017). Critical Review of Dryland Restoration in Tanzania: Elements of Success and Failure & Technologies Employed. January 2017. World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF), Nairobi, Kenya.

⁸ Respectively: International Institute of Tropical Agriculture; ILRI; the International Center for Tropical Agriculture; the International Council for Research in Agroforestry.

⁹ Prepared other series of policy briefs on different topics concerning pastoral communities (see for example: [When 'Do no harm' is harder than 'doing good' | ILRI news](#)).

¹⁰ The series of dialogues were published in September 2021 under the title "On Air Dialogues – Listening to rural people", September 2021 (see: www.dialogues.farmradio.org).

Table 2

Strategic partnerships for COSOP implementation

<i>Partnering objectives</i>	<i>Strategic partners</i>
Engaging in policy and influencing development agendas	Prime Minister's Office: coordination and implementation of ASDP II; coordination of IFAD's activities in Tanzania with other development partners' initiatives through the ASWG. Limited opportunities for policy dialogue between central government and other stakeholders during the fifth-phase administration. Agricultural Non-State Actors Forum and MVIWATA farmers' organization: engagement with MVIWATA has been limited to consultations through questionnaires.
Leveraging cofinancing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AfDB: cofinancing of MIVARF and implementation of AfDB-funded activities took place in parallel with IFAD ones, at least in the first half of the project. Limited attention was given to capacity-building support. AGRA and the Tanzania Incentive-based Risk-sharing System for Agricultural Lending (TIRSAL): the partnerships with AGRA and TIRSAL did not materialize, either financially or technically, and this created a major hindrance in the implementation of the rural innovation and guarantee facilities. AGRA's withdrawal created a financing gap of US\$6.92 million. The French Development Agency (AFD), building on the success of MIVARF, has invested about US\$20 million in the SCGS.
Enabling coordinated country-led processes	AWG: as the chair of the AWG, IFAD effectively contributed to coordinated, country-led processes in the agricultural sector during an extremely challenging time. However, given the policy environment during the COSOP period, no major policy outcomes were achieved.
Developing and brokering knowledge and innovation	CGIAR and the ILC produced a wide range of knowledge products and policy outputs.
Strengthening private sector engagement	TADB, which had a memorandum of understanding with other local banks to manage the SCGS as part of strengthening Community-based Financial Institutions). Interventions enabled 3.17 million beneficiaries to access financial services.
Enhancing visibility	The Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations and the World Food Programme.

VII. South-South and Triangular Cooperation

35. **The programme's performance in terms of promoting SSTC is rated as moderately satisfactory (4).** Through regional grants, cooperation was enhanced with Kenya and Rwanda through exchange visits involving farmers belonging to national platforms. REACTS promoted cross-border agricultural markets and trade among Burundi, Rwanda, Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania. Through MIVARF, Tanzania established a partnership between the Africa Confederation of Cooperatives and Savings Credit Associations, the Co-operative Development Foundation of Canada and the Irish League of Credit Unions (also implemented in Malawi and Ethiopia). This exposed national apex organizations to cutting-edge approaches and provided a viable exit strategy to MIVARF to further strengthen Savings and Credit Co-Operative Society apex organizations in mainland Tanzania and Zanzibar.

36. SSTC was also facilitated by the CGIAR through different research programmes involving international research and exchange of knowledge on a variety of topics. IITA and Alliance Bioversity International – CIAT have developed a project under the China-IFAD SSTC facility to strengthen linkages between Tanzania and China, to boost the export of cassava chips to China, and transfer sunflower oil processing technologies, equipment and knowledge. SSTC was also facilitated through the East African Community regional institutions and networks.

Table 3
Regional grants facilitating SSTC

Title	Recipient	Approved amount	Approval	Completion	Focus countries
Climate-smart crop-livestock systems through improved forages and feeding	CIAT	2,000,000	22/12/2016	30/06/2021	Tanzania Rwanda
RF through cooperative	Canadian Cooperative Association: Uganda	2,660,000	12/10/2016	3/31/2021	Ethiopia, Malawi, Tanzania
Consultative Group to Assist the Poor (CGAP) Inclusive Rural Finance	CGAP	2,250,000	28/07/2017	31/12/2022	Mozambique, Nigeria, Tanzania, Uganda
Green Technologies for VC crops	SunDanzer	2,200,000	11/12/2017	30/06/2021	Malawi Mozambique , Rwanda, Tanzania , Zimbabwe
TAF for the Agri-Business Capital Fund	Stichting Agriterra	3,500,000	30/12/2018	05/07/2022	Ghana, Madagascar , Mozambique, Rwanda, Senegal , Tanzania
Leveraging SSTC to share rural development solutions for private sector engagement	AGRA/IFPRI	500,000	29/11/2018	31/03/2022	Burkina Faso , Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya , Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Nigeria , Rwanda, Tanzania , Uganda + APR countries
Building livelihoods and resilience to climate change	CIAT	4,200,000	21/02/2019	30/09/2021	Tanzania , Ke, Eth. Mali, Sen, Niger, Ghana
Eco-PPR Epidemiology and Control of Peste des Petits Ruminants	ILRI	3,156,122	25/02/2019	30/09/2021	Eth, Ke, Tanzania , Sen, BF, Mali
Reversing Land Degradation	Vice President' s Office	7,155,963	01/06/2017	30/09/2022	Tanzania
FoodSTART – Africa	International Potato Centre	1,500,000	22/12/2018	30/06/2022	Madagascar, Moz, Rwanda, Eswatani Tanzania
Securing Territorial Land and cultural identity for the Akiye/Dorobo people	Ujamaa-community Resource Team	50,000			Tanzania

Title	Recipient	Approved amount	Approval	Completion	Focus countries
Strengthening Advocacy for Agricultural and Rural Development to Amplify the Collective Voice of Rural Farmers	American Council for Voluntary International Action (InterAction)	1,179,360	11/2/2019	30/09/2021	Uganda, Tanzania and Rwanda

VIII. Lessons learned and recommendations

37. The **overall performance of the COSOP is rated as moderately unsatisfactory**, mainly due to the difficult country context marked by the absence of dialogue between the Government and IFAD as well as other development partners. This resulted in the cancellation of most lending projects and prevented the COSOP from delivering as expected. The present review provides several valuable lessons and recommendations to guide the design and implementation of the next COSOP in Tanzania.

38. First, the COSOP SOs remain highly relevant to the country's priorities and the needs of small farmers, and is fully aligned with the new Five-year Development Plan III and the new UNSDCF. The four SOs were explicitly linked to the four ASDP II programme areas with varied levels of investments. However, the complex formulation of the SOs, the lack of geographical focus (nationwide coverage in a vast country of close to 1,000,000 km²) and the multiplicity of value chains (14 VCs) presented significant implementation challenges and delays that impaired the effectiveness of the programme. The next COSOP should build on successes such as MIVARF and aim to sustain and deepen impacts by concentrating interventions in priority value chains (edible oil, fisheries, horticulture, maize) in smaller area.

- **Recommendation.** The Government has expressed strong preference for a few large, well- targeted and impactful projects that can attract cofinancing and increase IFAD's visibility and policy engagement.

39. Second, several lending operations and non-lending activities identified at COSOP design stage were cancelled. Consequently, Tanzania missed almost two IFAD financing cycles, resulting in the COSOP failing to fully achieve the SOs and targets set at design.

- **Recommendation.** While the change in government priorities and the lack of dialogue between the Government and development partners were factors beyond IFAD's control, future programmes should use: (i) relevant tools (such as the Integrated Project Risk Matrix – IPRM) and instruments for risk assessment and management, including continuous systematic assessment of the country policy context and institutional capacity; and (ii) COSOP annual reviews and CRRs as strategic tools for restructuring and refocusing the country programme to a few SOs and areas for which lending projects and grants have materialized.

40. Proactive engagement of IFAD senior leadership and adaptive policy engagement in a period of uncertainty helped to renew the partnership and created opportunities for re-engagement. There is a new momentum generated by the approval and signing of the AFDP and the current conducive policy environment to re-engage with IFAD and other development partners. The new political landscape in Tanzania provides an opportunity to reaffirm IFAD's leadership and strategic positioning with the Government within the United Nations Country Team and with development partners in the ASWG.

- **Recommendation.** The Country Programme will need to intensify its strategic communication, using conventional media (radio, television, newspapers), social media and digital platforms to amplify key messages and increase IFAD’s visibility in Tanzania.

41. Third, the COSOP produced an impressive amount of knowledge products. Through its non-lending activities, IFAD will continue to fund the development of specific knowledge products, individual thematic studies (e.g. on mainstreaming priorities and accelerators) and organize high-level knowledge-sharing events targeting different stakeholder groups. The aim is to build the capacity of all stakeholders to use knowledge to inform decision-making, policy and practice as well as improve portfolio performance.

- **Recommendation.** Upcoming COSOPs should further increase focus on knowledge management and dissemination as well as provide more support to the uptake and use of results to influence policy and practice. This would also help to raise IFAD’s visibility in the country and region.

42. Fourth, one of the main weaknesses of the COSOP was a partially functioning M&E system. This can be attributed to the vagueness of indicators in the result framework, the absence of baselines and targets and the lack of simple tools for collecting and analysing data. The Government has recognized the need to strengthen its overall M&E systems emphasized in the new FYDP III strategy.

- **Recommendation.** Upcoming COSOPs should devote special attention to building national project M&E capacities and deploying digital tools to ensure real-time data collection and analysis to inform programme decision-making.

43. Fifth, the COSOP has generated and supported several innovations that have the potential to be scaled up.

- **Recommendation.** Scale up institutional innovations such as the consortium model for public-private-producer partnership (4Ps), trading platforms, the SCGS, digital tools such as the M-Kilimo extension service, emerging agritech facilities (e-vouchers, e-seed certification, e-marketing), and fintech services.¹¹ As demonstrated by MIVARF, 4Ps as well as the cluster approach are effective in promoting backward and forward linkages of smallholder farmers. They have been crucial in bringing together the different actors of the targeted value chains (farmers, input suppliers, offtakers, financial institutions, local government). They also played a key role in terms of small farmers’ empowerment. MIVARF demonstrated too that engaging quality service providers during implementation in value chains development projects is a prerequisite for success.

44. Sixth, MIVARF’s SCGS, implemented by the TADB, achieved a breakthrough in Tanzania’s agricultural financing. Village Community Banks have proven to be important in promoting access to, and use of, financial services in rural areas. By the end of the programme, approximately 2.5 million rural people (46 percent female) were accessing financial services. The number of rural people using mobile phones for financial transactions significantly increased. The widespread uptake of mobile phones offers opportunities of scaling up SCGS and other emerging fintech innovations at the disposal of rural people. Digitalization will help increase farmers’ productivity and incomes, strengthen resilience to climate change and improve access to markets. Digital revolution is a key priority for FYDP III and IFAD’s 2016–2025 Strategic Framework.

¹¹ UNCDF’s Fintech Startup Mapping Landscape report (2021) identified 33 fintech startups currently operating in Tanzania.

- **Recommendation.** Upcoming COSOPs should prioritize digitalization and access to financial services as key accelerators for impact, sustainability and scaling up.

45. Seventh, the success of MIVARF could be explained by the performance of a strong Project Management Unit and district facilitation teams. IFAD provided regular, hands-on support throughout the implementation with supervision missions as well as ad hoc technical assistance.

- **Recommendation.** There is need to strengthen the Prime Minister Office to gradually move towards a programme approach, which consists of integrating all IFAD-funded interventions in a coherent framework, guaranteeing a consolidated M&E system and an efficient use of human resources for project management. It also involves pooling certain cross-cutting functions but keeping technical responsibilities at the level of each project.

Appendix I: COSOP results management framework (at the time of design in 2016)

COSOP results management framework

Strategic objectives (What will be different at the end of the RB-COSOP period?)	Outcome indicators -Baseline (BL) refers to 2015 -Target refers to by end of 2021):	Milestone indicators (based by end-2018) but were not set until 2019).
<p>SO1: Institutional performance, coordination, and accountability to IFAD target groups and their organizations at central and local levels have improved so as to enable greater effectiveness and transparency in policy formulation, greater collaboration and partnerships, and enhanced programme implementation and results</p>	<p>* (i) ASDP II M&E system established & functional with relevant indicators on institutional coordination and performance, and accountability mechanisms to non-state actors at national, regional and district level for usage by ASLMs BL: Partially functional Target: Fully functional</p> <p>(ii) Number of enabling policies and regulations promulgated and operational related to agriculture (crops, livestock and fisheries) and rural development benefiting IFAD target groups BL: 28 Target: TBD (by ASDP II/IFAD)</p>	<p>(i) % of DADPs which have a result framework BL: TBD (by ASDP II) Target: 90%</p> <p>* (ii) number of enabling policies promulgated and operational; (b) number of pro-poor policies, legislation and regulations enforced at the local or central level BL: 28 Target: TBD (by ASDP II)</p>
<p>SO2: Value chains of priority commodities become more inclusive and resilient, driven by expanded and sustainable access to markets and financial services and by a more inclusive private</p>	<p>* (i) No. of PPP partnerships/ agreements involving IFAD target groups established and operational (by priority value chain) BL: TBD (by ASDP II) Target: TBD (by ASD II)</p>	<p>* (i) No. of PPP partnerships/ agreements involving IFAD target groups established and operational (by priority value chain): BL: TBD (by ASDP II) Target: TBD (by ASD II)</p>

Strategic objectives (What will be different at the end of the RB-COSOP period?)	Outcome indicators -Baseline (BL) refers to 2015 -Target refers to by end of 2021):	Milestone indicators (based by end-2018) but were not set until 2019).
	(ii) % of emerging small and medium agro-processing enterprises (e.g., climate resilient storage, nutrient- preserving storage and processing, refrigerated transport and labeling) undertaking post-harvest/value added activities with continued operations beyond 3 years of establishment BL: small: 63; medium: 30 Target: TBD (by ASDP II)	(ii) No. of emerging small and medium agro-processing enterprises (e.g., climate resilient storage, nutrient-preserving storage and processing, refrigerated transport and labeling) BL: small: 63; medium: 30 Target: TBD (by ASDP II)
	(iii) % of households/farmers with access to or benefiting from processing facilities for priority VCs (for major commodity groups) through grain/oil milling; fruits and vegetables; and roots and tubers machines BL: 30-50 % (ref. to ASDP II) Target: 37-60% (ref. to ASDP II)	(iii) Total volume and value of ag. production processed and marketed (using priority commodities, per above) BL: TBD (by ASDP II) Target: TBD (by ASDP II)
	* (iv) % increase in sales of smallholder producers due to additional market channel (e.g., WRS, fair trade, etc.) BL: TBD (by ASDP II) Target: TBD (by ASDP II)	(iv) No. of smallholder producers participating in priority commodity VCs with income increase BL:TBD (by ASDP II) Target: TBD (by ASDP II)
	* (v) % of farmers' groups with access to rural financial services BL: 36.5 (ref. to ASDP II) Target: 57	* (v) % of smallholder farmers' groups with access to rural financial services BL: 36.5 (ref. to ASDP II) Target: 41

Strategic objectives (What will be different at the end of the RB-COSOP period?)	Outcome indicators -Baseline (BL) refers to 2015 -Target refers to by end of 2021):	Milestone indicators (based by end-2018) but were not set until 2019).
SO3: Climate-resilient, productivity-increasing technologies in priority crop-livestock-fishery commodities are improved and their adoption scaled up based on more effective agricultural support services reaching IFAD target groups	* (i) Average annual yield for targeted/priority commodities (a) Maize: BL: 1.6 MT/ha (ref. to ASDP II: 1.8) Target: 2.9 MT/ha (ref. to ASDP II:2.7) (b) paddy: BL: 1.8 MT/ha (ref.to ASDP II: 2.7) Target: 3.6 MT/ha (ref.to ASDP II: 4.05) (c) milk: BL: 6-15 litre/cow/day (ref.to ASDP II: 2 It) Target: 8-20 litre/cow/day (ref.to ASDP II: 3) (d) meat: BL: TBD (by ASDP II): (ref.to ASDP II: 145) Target: TBD (by ASDP II) (ref.to ASDP II: 167)	(i) Enhanced adoption rates: (a) % of smallholder farmers adopting enhanced climate resilient technologies and practices: BL: TBD (by ASDP II); and Target TBD (by ASDP II) No. of farmers/area (has.) practicing integrated soil fertility mgt. BL: 1.5 M farmers (ref. to ASDP II) Target: 3.0 M farmers (ref. to ASDP II) BL: 0.7 M has. (ref. to ASDP II) Target: 1.7 M has. (ref. to ASDP II) % of rural households using improved inputs (seeds, fertilizers, agro-chemicals, tools, feed supplements for dairy cattle) BL: 37 (ref. to ASDP II) Target: TBD (by ASDP II)
	(ii) % of farmers satisfied with the level and quality of agric. extension services (crops/livestock) BL: TBD (by ASDP II) Target TBD (by ASDP II)	(ii) % of smallholder farmers having access to extension services BL: TBD (by ASDP II) Target :TBD (by ASDP ii)
		* (iii) % average households. dietary score (by ASDP ii)
SO 4: Land governance is strengthened to enable more inclusive agriculture public and private investments, based on more equitable access to land and effective mechanisms to address land/natural resource conflicts arising from competition between smallholder crop farmers, agro-pastoralists and pastoralists	(i) No. of project beneficiaries with secure access to land and natural resources BL:TBD Target: TBD based on BASIC, SRMP and Drylands Development Project assessments	Participation of CSOs and community groups (particularly marginalized groups) involved in decisions over land governance
	(ii) No. of project beneficiaries with legally-recognized land and natural resource rights. This could include the recognition of individual, familial or group/community rights either with the issuing of CCROs, leases or titles or the designation and gazetting of land-use plans or designated grazing or forest areas	% of government, CSOs and communities showing satisfaction for village land use planning and grazing land registration

Strategic objectives (<i>What will be different at the end of the RB-COSOP period?</i>)	Outcome indicators -Baseline (BL) refers to 2015 -Target refers to by end of 2021):	Milestone indicators (<i>based by end-2018</i>) but were not set until 2019).
	BL: TBD Target: TBD based on BASIC, SRMP and Drylands Development Project assessments	
	(iii) Reduced prevalence of conflicts over land and natural resources involving smallholder farmers, agro- pastoralist and pastoralist groups BL: TBD Target: TBD based on BASIC, SRMP and Drylands Development Project assessments	(i(iii) % of village land-use plans and grazing areas registered and implemented

Appendix II: COSOP results management framework: progress since COSOP results review

Strategic objectives <i>(What will be different at the end of the RB-COSOP period?)</i>	Outcome indicators -Baseline (BL) refers to 2015 -Target refers to by end of 2021):	Milestone indicators <i>(based by end-2018) but were not set until 2019).</i>	Status of Indicators as at 2021 Completion Review <i>(based on the original RMF indicators at Design)</i>
SO1: Institutional performance, coordination, and accountability to IFAD target groups and their organizations at central and local levels have improved so as to enable greater effectiveness and transparency in policy formulation, greater collaboration and partnerships, and enhanced programme implementation and results	* (i) ASDP II M&E system established & functional with relevant indicators on institutional coordination and performance, and accountability mechanisms to non-state actors at national, regional and district level for usage by ASLMs - BL: Partially functional - Target: Fully functional	(i) % of DADPs which have a result framework - BL: TBD (by ASDP II) - Target: 90%	Outcome Indicator: Not fully functional at completion. Still partially functional as at BL ¹² evidence from the MIVARF PCR. This partial progress can be estimated to approximately 10%. Milestone Indicator: As at the Midline Review (CRR), the Unguja district in Zanzibar was reported as the only fully achieved. Representing an insignificant percentage out of 169 districts. In the completion year, no progress on these developments were elaborated concluding to less than 90% target achievement. However, results on early indication of contributing evidence to related areas were achieved as referenced. ¹³
.	<i>(ii) Number of enabling policies and regulations promulgated and operational related to agriculture (crops, livestock and fisheries) and rural development benefiting IFAD target groups</i> BL: 28 Target: TBD (by ASDP II/IFAD)	* (ii) number of enabling policies promulgated and operational. <i>(b) number of pro-poor policies, legislation and regulations enforced at the local or central level</i> BL: 28 Target: TBD (by ASDP II)	Completion results combines both planned Outcome and Milestone Indicators: The target and indicator definitions were the same at the outcome and milestone level. At midline, 9 ((4 Mainland and 5 Zanzibar) were achieved. As at completion: At end-line, less than 10 were commenced at different stages ¹⁴ .

¹²The CCR noted that the MIVARF PCR was the main project throughout in this RB-COSOP period. The MIVARF PCR stated that “the logframe was rather used for reporting to IFAD and it did not appear to be utilized by the PCT as a tool for management purposes.”

¹³ (i) All districts have adopted the ASDP-II initiated results framework prepared in 2019 as per the completion analysis; (ii) COSOP investments have contributed establishment of Farmer Filed Schools and, (iii) Supported the establishment of district and national level Farmers’ Platforms and appointment of ANSAF as its secretariat.

¹⁴ They include: (i) The livestock modernization Initiative 2016, (ii) The national agricultural policy (iii) The national export strategy (iv) Farm to Market Agricultural Strategic Plan (v) Cassava crop development strategy, As reported 100 legislations pertaining to levels of taxes, duties, and tariffs were repealed.

Strategic objectives <i>(What will be different at the end of the RB-COSOP period?)</i>	Outcome indicators -Baseline (BL) refers to 2015 -Target refers to by end of 2021):	Milestone indicators <i>(based by end-2018) but were not set until 2019).</i>	Status of Indicators as at 2021 Completion Review <i>(based on the original RMF indicators at Design)</i>
SO2: Value chains of priority commodities become more inclusive and resilient, driven by expanded and sustainable access to markets and financial services and by a more inclusive private	* (i) No. of PPP partnerships/ agreements involving IFAD target groups established and operational (by priority value chain) - BL: TBD (by ASDP II) - Target: TBD (by ASD II)	* (i) No. of PPP partnerships/ agreements involving IFAD target groups established and operational (by priority value chain): - BL: TBD (by ASDP II) - Target: TBD (by ASD II)	Outcome and Milestone Indicators targets are the same, therefore the completion results and analysis: At PCR, MIVARF reported 2,127 (approx. 115% of the project end target) of direct Producer Organizations (Constituting of approx. 355,000 rural SHFs) linked to formal partnerships and agreements with private or public entities. ¹⁵
	(ii) % of emerging small and medium agro-processing enterprises (e.g., climate resilient storage, nutrient-preserving storage and processing, refrigerated transport and labeling) undertaking post-harvest/value added activities with continued operations beyond 3 years of establishment - BL: small: 63; medium: 30 - Target: TBD (by ASDP II)	(ii) No. of emerging small and medium agro-processing enterprises (e.g., climate resilient storage, nutrient-preserving storage and processing, refrigerated transport and labeling) - BL: small: 63; medium: 30 - Target: TBD (by ASDP II)	Outcome and Milestone Indicators targets are the same, therefore, the completion results and analysis: The GEF-LDFS project focused more on climate resilience indicators pertaining to IFAD guidelines. ¹⁶ Which are yet to be assessed. As Proxy indicators for documentation, MIVARF has reported: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) About 136,405 beneficiaries trained in good production and improved processing technologies and packaging (ii) About 13 post-harvest training centres established by 2020 (iii) About 56 farmer groups trained on marketing of their products (iv) About 1,776 groups organized to access agro-inputs collectively and competitive prices

¹⁵ Since the targets from ASDP II on this were not provided, there is no baseline nor end-line targets to make an analysis regarding the overall COSOP achievement on this indicator.

¹⁶ Some key proxy indicators evident in GEF-LDFS logframe indicators that measure climate resilience are: (i) Number of farmers adopting conservation and climate smart farming and SLM practices disaggregated by gender and age; (ii) Percentage increase of targeted households with increased resilience to climate variability and change (using household resilience scorecard); and (iii) Number of groups operating tree nurseries and practicing woodland management (% women and %youth participating). So far, the project has not provided progress on point (i) and (ii) as they still need to conduct an outcome survey. However, for (iii) it is reported that 198 groups have emerged as operating tree nurseries and practicing woodland management. If this criterion fits the definition of this indicator and the baseline results, we may say there was a small contribution.

Strategic objectives <i>(What will be different at the end of the RB-COSOP period?)</i>	Outcome indicators -Baseline (BL) refers to 2015 -Target refers to by end of 2021):	Milestone indicators <i>(based by end-2018) but were not set until 2019).</i>	Status of Indicators as at 2021 Completion Review <i>(based on the original RMF indicators at Design)</i>
	(iii) % of households/farmers with access to or benefiting from processing facilities for priority VCs (for major commodity groups) through grain/oil milling; fruits and vegetables; and roots and tubers machines - BL: 30-50 % (ref. to ASDP II) - Target: 37-60% (ref. to ASDP II)	(iii) Total volume and value of ag. production processed and marketed (using priority commodities, per above) - BL: TBD (by ASDP II) - Target: TBD (by ASDP II)	Outcome Indicator: The MIVARF PCR has reported that 217,795 households (89% of the project end target) reported physical access to markets, processing, and storage facilities. This target is assessed to be in line with the ASDP II target, but this still needs to be validated. Milestone Indicator¹⁷: Indicator not included in MIVARF logframe. However, as a proxy of impact, IFAD has constructed/rehabilitated 1,079 kms of feeder roads and 35 storage and processing facilities in the country. In addition, 13 post-harvest training centres have been rehabilitated through IFAD support. As proxy the following referenced can be noted. ¹⁸
	* (iv) % increase in sales of smallholder producers due to additional market channel (e.g., WRS, fair trade, etc.) - BL: TBD (by ASDP II) - Target: TBD (by ASDP II)	(iv) No. of smallholder producers participating in priority commodity VCs with income increase - BL: TBD (by ASDP II) - Target: TBD (by ASDP II)	Outcome and Milestone Indicators Analysis: Unfortunately, MIVARF and GE-LDFS provide no evidence of increase in sales or profit from producers at the time. Hence an evidence-based analysis of the variable cannot be provided. However, a few some relevant notes referenced. ¹⁹

¹⁷ Baseline and End-Line targets were still not provided by the ASDP II Results Framework.

¹⁸ Under MIVARF: Matching grants provided private sector processors for graded paddy, sunflower oil production, maize flour, dairy and spices such as garlic and lime. Included provision of matching grants to 30 companies (against target of 25) and establishing 13 post-harvest training centres (PHTC) as per plan.

¹⁹ It is key to note that with the success of MIVARF in providing market linkages to SHFs and improving market facilities, it has been noted in the MIVARF PCR that this has contributed to the increase of incomes of targeted beneficiaries. Moreover, specifically, for the GEF-LDFS, this indicator is outlined but still subject to assessment from an outcome survey that has not been conducted yet. Hence will contribute to the next CRR assignment.

Strategic objectives <i>(What will be different at the end of the RB-COSOP period?)</i>	Outcome indicators -Baseline (BL) refers to 2015 -Target refers to by end of 2021);	Milestone indicators <i>(based by end-2018) but were not set until 2019).</i>	Status of Indicators as at 2021 Completion Review <i>(based on the original RMF indicators at Design)</i>
	* (v) % of farmers' groups with access to rural financial services - BL: 36.5 (ref. to ASDP II) Target: 57	* (v) % of smallholder farmers' groups with access to rural financial services - BL: 36.5 (ref. to ASDP II) Target: 41	Outcome and Milestone Indicator achievements: It was reported in the PCR logframe that 2,483,796 beneficiaries (129% of the PDR Target) accessed rural financial services. This comprised of 1,138,464 women and 1,345,332 men at the outcome indicator level. This has largely contributed to the ASDP II Targets of this indicator. More evidence of contribution is cited here. ²⁰
SO3: Climate-resilient, productivity-increasing technologies in priority crop-livestock-fishery commodities are improved and their adoption scaled up based on more effective agricultural support services reaching IFAD target groups	* (i) Average annual yield for targeted/priority commodities (a) Maize: - BL: 1.6 MT/ha (ref. to ASDP II: 1.8) - Target: 2.9 MT/ha (ref. to ASDP II:2.7) (b) paddy: - BL: 1.8 MT/ha (ref.to ASDP II: 2.7) - Target: 3.6 MT/ha (ref.to ASDP II: 4.05) (c) milk: - BL: 6-15 litre/cow/day (ref.to ASDP II: 2 It) - Target: 8-20 litre/cow/day (ref.to ASDP II: 3) (d) meat: - BL: TBD (by ASDP II): (ref.to ASDP II: 145) - Target: TBD (by ASDP II) (ref.to ASDP II: 167)	(i) Enhanced adoption rates: (a) % of smallholder farmers adopting enhanced climate resilient technologies and practices: BL: TBD (by ASDP II); and Target TBD (by ASDP II) (b) No. of farmers/area (has.) practicing integrated soil fertility mgt. BL: 1.5 M farmers (ref. to ASDP II) Target: 3.0 M farmers (ref. to ASDP II) BL: 0.7 M has. (ref. to ASDP II) Target: 1.7 M has. (ref. to ASDP II) (c) % of rural households using improved inputs (seeds, fertilizers, agro-chemicals, tools, feed supplements for dairy cattle) - BL: 37 (ref. to ASDP II) Target: TBD (by ASDP II)	Outcome and Milestone Indicators: No documented results with may derive to no evidence-based results from projects in the RB-COSOP period. However, through MIVARF, it can be reported that about 1,776 groups accessing inputs collectively at competitive prices."

²⁰ At the output level indicator of: - *Enhanced access to financial services for the low-income population in rural areas on a sustainable basis:* - 3,171,452 (115% of the MIVARF project overall target) rural clients were accessing financial services (savings, credit, insurance, remittances etc.) including PEML beneficiaries as of December 2020.

Strategic objectives <i>(What will be different at the end of the RB-COSOP period?)</i>	Outcome indicators -Baseline (BL) refers to 2015 -Target refers to by end of 2021);	Milestone indicators <i>(based by end-2018) but were not set until 2019).</i>	Status of Indicators as at 2021 Completion Review <i>(based on the original RMF indicators at Design)</i>
	(ii) % of farmers satisfied with the level and quality of agric. extension services (crops/livestock) - BL: TBD (by ASDP II) Target TBD (by ASDP II)	(ii) % of smallholder farmers having access to extension services - BL: TBD (by ASDP II) Target: TBD (by ASDP ii)	Outcome and Milestone Indicators: No results and associated indicator in the active projects.
		* (iii) % average households. dietary score (by ASDP ii)	No results provided from all active projects.
SO 4: Land governance is strengthened to enable more inclusive agriculture public and private investments, based on more equitable access to land and effective mechanisms to address land/natural resource conflicts arising from	(i) No. of project beneficiaries with secure access to land and natural resources - BL: TBD - Target: TBD based on BASIC, SRMP and Drylands Development Project assessments	(i) Participation of CSOs and community groups (particularly marginalized groups) involved in decisions over land governance	Outcome and milestone Indicator Analysis: It was found that in the GEF-LDFS ²¹ projects, there have been activities of facilitating community Certificates of Customary Right of Occupancy (CCROs) regarding addressing communal land rights. To date, the GEF-LDFS project has finalized 1654 community CCROs in 4 of its participating districts. There have been challenges to this initiative as referenced. ²²
competition between smallholder crop farmers, agro-pastoralists and pastoralists	(ii) No. of project beneficiaries with legally recognized land and natural resource rights. This could include the recognition of individual, familial or group/community rights either with the issuing of CCROs, leases or titles or the designation and gazettement of land-use plans or designated grazing or forest areas - BL: TBD - Target: TBD based on BASIC, SRMP and Drylands Development Project assessments	(ii) % of government, CSOs and communities showing satisfaction for village land use planning and grazing land registration	(iii) Outcome and milestone Indicator Analysis: The GEF-LDFS project has finalized 1654 community CCROs in 4 of its participating districts. Regarding the 'land use planning and grazing land registration' indicator, a comprehensive outcome survey has not been conducted yet.

²¹ In addition, the project has supported in facilitating the Zanzibar land use planning commission to undertake a joint use plan in the 8 Shehia's of the Micheweni District.

²² Although DDP, SRMP and BASIC, which had specific interventions to support improved land governance, were not implemented as planned, the government under ASDP-II continued to support resolving challenges related to participation of marginal groups in land governance

Strategic objectives <i>(What will be different at the end of the RB-COSOP period?)</i>	Outcome indicators -Baseline (BL) refers to 2015 -Target refers to by end of 2021):	Milestone indicators <i>(based by end-2018) but were not set until 2019).</i>	Status of Indicators as at 2021 Completion Review <i>(based on the original RMF indicators at Design)</i>
	(iii) Reduced prevalence of conflicts over land and natural resources involving smallholder farmers, agro- pastoralist and pastoralist groups - BL: TBD Target: TBD based on BASIC, SRMP and Drylands Development Project assessments	(iii) % of village land-use plans and grazing areas registered and implemented	<p>Outcome Indicator: Coupled with the challenges mentioned above, one of the key activities for the GEF-LDFS in their 2021 annual work plan was the following: - <i>“to facilitate resolution of conflict of land use between Hadzabe community and Pastoralists in Munguli village and conclude the VLUP by June 2021.”</i> As of date, the project has reported this facilitation. It has been acknowledged as an activity from the beneficiaries, however, the extent of the effectiveness of this facilitation will need to be assessed further through an outcome survey. The planned targets at design may have not been achieved as no evidence has been provided.</p> <p>Milestone Indicator: This milestone indicator was not measured as at the COSOP review period. The GEF-LDFS project is aligned with this indicator and it may be assessed when they conduct an outcome survey.</p>

Appendix III: Ratings matrix (in line with IOE evaluation methodology)

<i>Evaluation of country programme</i>	<i>Rating (1-6 scale)</i>
– Relevance	5
– Effectiveness	3
– Policy engagement	4
– Knowledge management	4
– Strategic partnerships	3
– South-South Triangular Cooperation	4
Overall country programme achievements	3.8

Appendix IV: Comments from government

MINISTRY OF LIVESTOCK AND FISHERIES COMMENTS ON THE COSOP COMPLETION REVIEW (2016-2021)

Ratings used for review and evaluation

- The ratings (effectiveness) should consider implemented projects not those five (5) projects, which were not implemented (refer page 5), thus, the overall rating should be adjusted. Because there were genuine reasons for Government not accepting some projects.

We recommend evaluation should consider the following projects:

- (i) Marketing Infrastructure, Value Addition and Rural Finance Support Programme (MIVARF) (2011- 2020) closed in December 2020, and
- (ii) Agriculture and Fisheries Development Program (2021-2026) approved in December 2020 and its financing agreement signed in April 2021 but yet to start implementation.

Lessons and Recommendations

The Government gave comments on each bullet of the submitted lesson and recommendation as follows:-

- The new COSOP should seek possibilities to consider alignment with 4 existing strategic priorities with ADSP II and strengthening M&E.
- The success stories should be well documented in the main report. Also, there should be well documented success stories with tangible/physical evidences.
- Government accepted provided lesson and recommendation but consider ranking as **moderately satisfactory** instead of moderately unsatisfactory as emphasis was implemented projects
- IFAD should consult the Government in co-financing of project and strengthen coordination