

PROJECT INCEPTION REPORT

Project title: Improvement of maize marketing through adoption of improved post-harvest technologies and farmer group storage: A case study of Kiboga and Apac districts.

R number: R8274
Z number: ZB0343
Date: June 2003

Part 1: Review of the Logical framework

The purpose has been rephrased in order to be realistic and remain in line with the CPHP-EA theme of improved market access. The outputs and OVIs have been changed to fit in line with the DFID financial year.

The new Log-frame is shown below.

Project Log Frame

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Risks
Goal			
National and international crop-post harvest innovation systems respond more effectively to the needs of the poor.	By 2005, a replicable range of different institutional arrangements which effectively and sustainably improve access to post-harvest knowledge and/or stimulate post-harvest innovation to benefit the poor have been validated in four regions.	Project evaluation reports. Partners' reports Regional Coordinators' Annual Reports. CPHP Annual Reports. CPHP Review 2005.	National and international crop-post harvest systems have the capacity to respond to and integrate an increased range of research outputs during and after programme completion. National and international delivery systems deliver a range of services relevant to poor people in both focus and non-focus countries. Livelihood analysis provides accurate identification of researchable constraints or opportunities that lead to poverty reduction.

Purpose			
Improved market access of rural maize farmers in Kiboga and Apac districts through sustained use of improved post-harvest technologies and institutional framework.	<p>1.1 Increased knowledge and use of at least 3 PHT by selected farmer groups in target sub-counties (Kibiga, Nsambya, Abongomola and Loro) by end of project.</p> <p>1.2 The quality of maize from target farmers' groups improved by at least 5% and levels of market rejection reduced to a maximum of 5%.</p> <p>1.3 A sustainable, cohesive and dynamic partnership that enhances farmers' capacity to access information, knowledge, technologies and markets in place by end of project.</p>	<p>1.1 Project progress reports</p> <p>1.2 CPHP annual reports</p> <p>1.3 Evaluation protocols and reports</p> <p>1.4 Farmer group records</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Farmers willing to change from traditional practices • Policies on agricultural production and marketing remain favourable. • No civil strife in areas of project implementation.
Outputs			
1 Cohesive, dynamic and sustainable partnerships and institutional mechanisms for linking the rural maize producers to markets in place	<p>1.1 By the end of 4th quarter year 2 at least 8 farmer groups (averaging at least 20 members of which 30% are women) in the 4 target sub-counties are sensitised and incorporated into the partnership. [Extension/NGOs]</p> <p>1.2 At least 1 more non-core partner in the target districts is identified and integrated within the partnership by the end of 3rd quarter year 2. [Farmers/Extension]</p> <p>1.3 Institutional mechanisms, processes and innovations for a sustainable, dynamic and cohesive coalition in Kibiga, Nsambya, Abongomola and Loro sub-counties proposed by end of 2nd quarter year 2. [Contrator and Managing partner]</p> <p>1.4 The proposed institutional arrangements tested, monitored and evaluated in a participatory manner by the coalition, beginning year 2. [Managing partner]</p>	<p>1.1 Consultant's report</p> <p>1.2 Annual Report</p>	<p>Unfavourable prices of maize</p> <p>Continued demand for maize within the region</p> <p>Supportive market infrastructure</p> <p>Relationships between other service providers are in place</p>
2 Relevant PHT and knowledge base that increase access to	2.1 A consolidated work plan developed by coalition partners, including	2.1 Work plan developed 2.2 Field report	

<p>markets by small-scale rural maize farmers adopted</p>	<p>farmers' groups in place and implemented by beginning of 1st quarter of year 2. [Managing partner]</p> <p>2.2 At least 2 PH constraints (marketing systems, storage and value addition) limiting maize storage and marketing of resource poor farmers in each target sub-county appraised by the end of year 2. [KARI]</p> <p>2.3 By end of year 2 at least 3 appropriate PHT from CPHP & coalition partners are validated availed and being used by 2 farmer groups in each of the target sub-counties. [KARI]</p>	<p>2.3 Farmers Group records</p> <p>2.4 Project Progress report</p>	
<p>3 Capacity of rural people involved in maize enterprises enhanced and systems for continuously improving the capacity in place</p>	<p>3.1 Target farmer groups in the selected sub counties are conversant and using at least 3 appropriate PHT by the end of year 2. [Extension]</p> <p>3.2 Quality of maize improved as a result of training 8 farmer groups in the identified need areas by end of year 2 [Extension, NGOs, and technical backstopping from KARI and contractor]</p> <p>3.3 Development, production and packaging of training/dissemination materials for extension, farmer groups, NGOs and the public by end of year 2 [KARI, printing firm]</p> <p>3.4 Farmers' capacity to access resources that address food security and credit increased by providing information on opportunities [Contractor]</p>	<p>3.1 Project progress report</p> <p>3.2 Training modules</p> <p>3.3 Information packs developed</p> <p>3.4 Farmers Groups Records</p> <p>3.5 CPHP Annual Reports</p> <p>3.6 Consultant's report</p>	

Part 2: Monitoring Plan

Table 1: **STAKEHOLDER MONITORING TABLE**

Group / stakeholder	General role	Specific monitoring responsibility
Dr Ambrose Agona. National Post Harvest Programme (KARI)	Managing partner. Oversees the overall management of the coalition project	To oversee that partners are working to the specified tasks and schedules.
Researchers. National Post Harvest Programme (KARI)	Conduct post harvest and marketing research	Conduct M&E studies, prepare reports,
CPHP-RO	Oversee the coalition projects in the region	Guide projects, provide technical backstopping on monitoring and evaluation of coalition, review progress of projects
Farmer groups (Kiboga and Apac districts)	Primary target group. Participation in maize storage	Monitor the utilization of the stores, quantities of maize produced and stored
NGOs (ASDI and BUCADEF)	Disseminate research outputs to primary target group	Monitor farmer groups joining coalition,
Grain trader (Afro-Kai)	Product market outlet	Maize quantities and quality sold by farmer groups

Table 2: MONITORING FRAMEWORK

Objective	Objectively verifiable indicator	Information required	Data collection method and frequency	Person / institution responsible	How and when reported
<u>Purpose:</u> Improved market access of rural maize farmers in Kiboga and Apac districts through sustained use of improved post-harvest technologies and institutional framework.	1.1 Increased knowledge and use of at least 3 PHT by selected farmer groups in target sub-counties (Kibiga, Nsambya, Abongomola and Loro) by end of project.	Adoption rates of maize post harvest technologies (PHT)	Adoption studies conducted annually	KARI	Final report by end of project
	1.2 The quality of maize from target farmers' groups improved by at least 5% and levels of market rejection reduced to a maximum of 5%.	Quality change before during and at end of project	Needs assessment studies and adoption studies	KARI	Needs assessment report by end of July 2003, and final report by end of project

Objective	Objectively verifiable indicator	Information required	Data collection method and frequency	Person / institution responsible	How and when reported
	1.3 A sustainable, cohesive and dynamic partnership that enhances farmers' capacity to access information, knowledge, technologies and markets in place by end of project.	Evidence of partners working within agreed terms	Review of project quarterly reports	Managing partner	Project quarterly report
<u>Output 1 :</u> Cohesive, dynamic and sustainable partnerships and institutional mechanisms for linking the rural maize producers to markets in place	1.1 By the end of 4 th quarter year 2 at least 8 farmer groups (averaging at least 20 members of which 30% are women) in the 4 target sub-counties are sensitised and incorporated into	Compliance with stipulated procedures on identification and selection; mobilisation and sensitisation of farmer groups	Project quarterly report	Extension, BUCADEF, ASDI, farmer groups	Quarterly report by July 2003
		Timeliness of farmer group identification and selection; sensitization	Interviews with target beneficiaries	Extension, NGOs and KARI	Quarterly reports of year 2

Objective	Objectively verifiable indicator	Information required	Data collection method and frequency	Person / institution responsible	How and when reported
	the partnership. [Extension/NGOs]	Farmer awareness of project objectives, activities; intended outputs and their roles	Sensitisation reports	Extension, NGO	Partners' quarterly progress reports
		Use of funds in group selection and sensitisation	Accountability reports	Managing partner	Annual financial report
	1.2 At least 1 more non-core partner in the target districts is identified and integrated within the partnership by the end of 3 rd quarter year 2. [Farmers/Extension]	Adherence to agreed procedures on identification of non core partners	Memorandum of Understanding	Managing partner	Project report June 2003
		Adherence to set time frame	Memorandum of Understanding	Managing partner	Project report June 2003
		Suitability of the new partners assessed against set criteria	Document reviews	Managing partner	Annual report March 2004
		Evidence of participation of new partners in project activities	Partners' reports	All coalition partners	Annual report March 2004

Objective	Objectively verifiable indicator	Information required	Data collection method and frequency	Person / institution responsible	How and when reported
	1.3 Institutional mechanisms, processes and innovations for a sustainable, dynamic and cohesive coalition in Kibiga, Nsambya, Abongomola and Loro sub-counties proposed by end of 2 nd quarter year 2. [Contrator and Managing partner]	Evidence of institutional mechanisms proposed and partners following them	Project implementation report reviews	MP, consultant	Consultant's report by end of September 2003
	1.4 The proposed institutional arrangements tested, monitored and evaluated in a participatory manner by the coalition, beginning year 2. [Managing partner]	Evidence of partners' roles in monitoring process and schedule	Project implementation report reviews	CPHP-RO, coalition partners	Project quarterly reports for year 2

Objective	Objectively verifiable indicator	Information required	Data collection method and frequency	Person / institution responsible	How and when reported
<u>Output 2 :</u> Relevant PHT and knowledge base that increase access to markets by small-scale rural maize farmers adopted	2.1 A consolidated work plan developed by coalition partners, including farmers' groups in place and implemented by beginning of 1 st quarter of year 2. st quarter of year 1. [Managing partner]	Partners, work plans and scheduling	Project implementation reports	MP	Project quarterly report
	2.2 least 2 PH constraints (marketing systems, storage and value addition) limiting maize storage and marketing of resource poor farmers in each target sub-county appraised by the end of year 2. [KARI]	Marketing surveys conducted Number of planning workshops addressing PH constraints	Market surveys Workshop reports	KARI Coalition partners	Market survey report by July 2003 Workshop reports quarterly

Objective	Objectively verifiable indicator	Information required	Data collection method and frequency	Person / institution responsible	How and when reported
	2.3 end of year 2 at least 3 appropriate PHT from CPHP & coalition partners are validated availed and being used by 2 farmer groups in each of the target sub-counties. [KARI]	Target groups using technology	Adoption surveys conducted annually	KARI, Coalition members	Annual adoption survey reports
<u>Output 3 :</u> Capacity of rural people involved in maize enterprises enhanced and systems for continuously improving the capacity in place	3.1 Target farmer groups in the selected sub counties are conversant and using at least 3 appropriate PHT by the end of year 2. [Extension]	Number of training workshops including subject matter Target farmer groups using technology	Training reports Quarterly surveys of project progress	NGOs, Extension	Progress report Adoption reports

Objective	Objectively verifiable indicator	Information required	Data collection method and frequency	Person / institution responsible	How and when reported
	3.2 Quality of maize improved as a result of training 8 farmer groups in the identified need areas by end of year 2 [Extension, NGOs, and technical backstopping from KARI and contractor]	Change in quality of maize of trained farmer groups	Review of lab reports, and market studies	KARI	Technical report
	3.3 Development, production and packaging of training/dissemination materials for extension, farmer groups, NGOs and the public by end of year 2 [KARI, printing firm]	Type of dissemination packages developed and disseminated	Progress report	MP	Annual report

Objective	Objectively verifiable indicator	Information required	Data collection method and frequency	Person / institution responsible	How and when reported
	3.4 Farmers' capacity to access resources that address food security and credit increased by providing information on opportunities [Contractor]	Information on partners who can provide this service Other services the farmer groups are able to access	Review of consultants profiles Review of consultant's report	MP	Consultant's report

Part 3: Description of the Institutional Context

1. The organizations involved

There are mainly four categories of organizations involved in this coalition project viz. research institute, agricultural extension, grain trader, civil society (NGOs) and the farmer groups. The functions of the various partners include generation of technology, facilitating the process of dissemination of technologies, marketing/exporting, production and storage. The hypothesis here is that by working as a coalition these functions will work better and this will provide better access to maize markets for the farmers in the study areas.

2. Other institutional factors important for the project

Other important institutional factors that are include the historical and existing relationships between the coalition partners. These relationships have been formed from past collaborative work. Partners at district level; extension, NGOs and farmer groups all have existing working relationships. Research and the grain trader have worked together in marketing research and also with the partners at the district level.

Coordination of the project is also another important factor, and it was agreed among the partners that the research process will be spearheaded by the National Post Harvest Programme. At the district level, the coalition partners have formed a district coordinating committee that will handle the management of the project at district level. This keeps all the partners abreast of the project progress.

The National Post Harvest Programme has developed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) that forms the regulatory framework with the coalition partners. This spells out the roles and responsibilities, the project purpose and outputs, the duration of the relationship in regards to the project, and the financial management of funds received.

The coalition project has also received attention from the local district of Kiboga. The project will form part of the local government development plan 2003/2004. The project also intends to access funds through this plan.

Barriers to achieving project objectives are mainly environmental factors including infrastructure like roads which makes some parts of the district inaccessible. Factors like price of maize, indicates that there is a steady rise in price and demand (domestic and regional).

3. How project outputs affect the institutional setting

The analysis of how the outputs will affect the institutional setting is based on what each partner needs from the partnership and what they bring into the partnership. This analysis was conducted during the CN stage (Annexed). The linkages between the partners will be strengthened by providing information, skills, inputs, and technology.

4. Assumptions being made

The assumptions about the institutional environment were not extensively elaborated upon in the log-frame, but those that do are:

- The coalition partners are still interested in providing their services and that the relationships are in place.
- Farmers are willing to change from traditional practices. This mainly refers to adopt new post harvest management of stored crops.

- Maize prices remain favourable for farmers to produce and sell it. This is also related to its demand, and it is assumed that there will be continued domestic and regional demand for maize. Recent media reports support this assumption.
- Another important assumption is the security situation in the district of Apac. Apac is neighbours Gulu, Pader and Lira. In some parts of the district, there have been rebel attacks, however these are not the project implementation areas. The situation will however be monitored.
- Maize taken alone is not profitable as has been shown in some studies. It is assumed that the skills of post harvest handling and marketing will also be applied to other crops in order to improve household food security and incomes.
- The behaviour of all the partners is expected to comply as stated in the MoU and based on past work relationships to continue in harmony.

5. Monitoring needs

As mentioned in table 2, the monitoring information needs have been spelt out. The institutional aspects referred to here are the processes involved in building the institutional relationship, timing or scheduling of activities, whether what was set can be achieved within the resources and time frame, hurdles (constraints) met during project implementation, changes and impacts experienced by the target beneficiaries.

Monitoring of the institutional context has improved through a skills development workshop organized by the CPHP-EA RO. Their expertise will be called upon to improve the monitoring process.

Annex

What each partner brings into the partnership

Partner	What each partner brings	What each partner needs
Afro-Kai Ltd	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Links with Uganda Grain Traders Association 2 Inputs (production and post harvest) 3 Market information: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) quality ii) volume (external markets) iii) talk to farmers 4 Share experiences on partnership 5 Support collecting centres (where it is economical) 6 Offer premium prices on high quality 7 Provide transport 8 Offer market for the maize 9 Affiliating with farmer groups (identify others who can do so) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Information on production 2 Volume 3 Quality
KARI/PHP	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Training on available appropriate technologies (drying, shelling, processing, storage, etc.) 2 Develop/adapt/test technologies 3 Technical backstopping 4 M & E 5 Market information (linkage) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Organized farmers 2 Information on farmer needs 3 Information on markets and market prices 4 Information on quality standards/grades
BUCADEF / ASDI	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Mobilization and sensitization 2 Farmer groups 3 Facilitate advisors/extension 4 Market information 5 Inputs 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Access information and technologies 2
Extension workers	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Mobilization and sensitization 2 Demonstrations 3 Training 4 Field days 5 Exchange visits 6 Follow up 7 Information (volume of production, statistics, etc.) 8 Group formation/dynamics 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Facilitation/fees 2 Inputs 3 Technical backstopping
Farmers	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Produce 2 Production inputs (land, labour, management, capital) 3 (Under certain circumstances) contract service providers (advisors, researchers) 4 Information 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Technologies/information/knowledge 2 Entrepreneurial skills 3 Organizational skills 4 Market information
DFID-RO	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Resource for M&E 2 Resources for partnerships 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Information 2 Accountability

POST HARVEST PROGRAMME COALITION MATRIX

		If this partner needs (from the Partnership)					
		Farmer groups	Afro-Kai	Extension workers	BUCADEF/ASDI	CPHP-DFID	KARI
This partner shall provide	Farmer groups		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Production information • Quality produce 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Production information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information • Production inputs (land, labour, management) 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information/ feedback on performance of technologies on-farm • Contract research service
	Afro-Kai	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Market information • Market, links to UGT • Transport • Support collecting centres • Inputs (production and post harvest) 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Market information • Share experiences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Link farmer groups with others • Market information 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Market information • Links to UGT • Post harvest inputs
	Extension workers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mobilization and sensitization • Demonstrations • Field days • Group formation/dynamics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Production statistics 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exchange visits • Information • Group formation/dynamics • Training?? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mobilization and sensitization • Information • Demonstrations

BUCADEF/ ASDI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mobilization and sensitization • Market information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information on farmer groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitation 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mobilization and sensitization • Information • Demonstrations
CPHP- DFID			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resources 			
KARI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic analysis of new enterprises • Technologies/post harvest inputs • Training (PH techniques, marketing, • Market linkage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information on PH technologies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training • Technical backstopping • Information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adaptation of CPHP outputs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical information and backstopping on use of CPHP outputs