GCP/SRL/049/JPN

Special Programme for Food Security in Sri Lanka

Report of the Mid-Term Evaluation Mission

Colombo, March 2004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary

The evaluation took place at mid-term in the scheduled project implementation period (two years into a four year project), but due to start-up delays, the project had had only one full year of implementation at five out of a scheduled 15 sites, with four additional sites having begun implementation in December 2003 and the remaining six sites still to be identified, with the selection process to begin in March 2004.

Although the number of sites and implementation experience is limited, the project has had encouraging results so far and there are prospects for it to serve as a model for similar rural development activities in Sri Lanka, using Government or other resources.

The project document was not sufficiently well formulated. The implementation plan is largely a shopping list of activities and should eventually be reviewed, as part of an overall recommended project revision. The document does not contain a strategy for transition from project funding to takeover of the SPFS with other funding sources and this needs to be considered already.

The mission has identified three key areas where the project has been particularly successful and feels that these areas are the key to future sustainability. These are:

1. Creation of vibrant, self-reliant farmers' organizations;
2. Unifying Central Government and Provincial Government agricultural services to develop a common approach to village-level agricultural development;
3. Existence of a viable credit mechanism to promote adoption of new or improved technologies.

While the results have been good, the sense of ownership of the programme by Sri Lanka authorities needs to be further strengthened, with a view to sustaining and expanding the programme once the Japanese-funded project ends.

The PMU is composed of sound, technically competent professionals. However, the PMU is a project-specific structure that is not part of the normal Government administration. It effectively coordinates the various central and provincial government authorities involved with the project. How this coordination would be achieved in the absence of a PMU is an important issue for eventual project sustainability.

The mission's recommendations for the project technical components are:

1. Continue to emphasize farmer organization training and skills development in the six new sites to be selected. By the end of the project, prepare a field document on the training methodology, drawing on the project experience, including strengths, weaknesses and lessons learned, for use in farmer organization programmes in other areas of Sri Lanka.
2. Carry out monitoring studies of crop performance and financial returns of the crops produced under the intensification and diversification component. Assist farmers' organizations to identify sources of funding for irrigation rehabilitation where necessary.
3. Focus project livestock activities on cows and goats, depending on income level and skills of target farmers. Poultry should generally not be pursued, as income opportunities are limited due to domination by the well-developed private sector in this area.
4. Ensure appropriate level of training in all aquaculture activities and adequate technical support.
5. Consider opportunities for value addition to products, which represent a potential earning source particularly for women. Identify needs for post-harvest handling training and organize courses as appropriate.

Recommendations for general issues are:

6. The National Steering Committee should consider arrangements for expansion of the project into new sites, not covered by the project. In order to build the momentum created by the SPFS, some sites may be located close to existing sites, to take advantage of working relationships already created. On a limited scale, new sites away from existing ones may also be chosen. However, technical support for the non-project sites should basically come from existing Government sources, rather than the PMU. The SPFS project, in an effort to encourage and promote the expansion of project benefits, may support farmer training and provide funds for micro-credit, to the extent that this is possible.
7. Give more attention to improving opportunities for women. The women's savings schemes should be presented at all sites and established where the women are willing to participate in them. The project should explore agro-processing opportunities that could benefit women. A national consultant could be hired for this purpose if required.
8. The National Steering Committee should decide on the appropriate poverty focus within the SPFS and the advisability of increasing the poverty focus in future site selection, taking into account both the programme objectives and the inherent difficulties of working with farmers who are seriously disadvantaged.
9. Limited amounts of funding should be made available for micro-credit to designated additional SPFS villages, not supported by the PMU but where sufficiently strong farmers' organizations have been developed and central and provincial government agricultural support services are organized and available to support SPFS-type activities.

Recommendations for project management are:

10. Once the costed Community Action Plans are available for the new sites, the PMU should prepare a project revision proposal, for consideration by the Regional Coordinator, TCOS and the donor. The revision, which should be budget-neutral, may extend the project by up to one year. The purpose of the revision would be:
    - to consolidate the work at the existing sites, with two years of technical support and monitoring of experience at each;
    - to plan and assist with the expansion of the SPFS in Sri Lanka, along the lines mentioned under "Project Ownership" above, including provision of some funds for training and micro-credit;
    - to document the experience of the SPFS in Sri Lanka, including strong and weak points and areas requiring particular attention, to guide the future implementation of the Programme once the project ends.

    As part of the revision proposal and based on the experience thus far, the PMU should indicate how many additional sites could be supported, on the understanding that technical and financial support for the new sites would be limited.
11. Within the budget-neutral project revision proposal to be prepared by the PMU, provision should be made for an Accounts Assistant for the remaining project period.

I. Introduction and Background

A. Introduction

The mid-term evaluation of GCP/SRL/049/JPN "Special Programme for Food Security in Sri Lanka" was scheduled in the original project document. The evaluation is being undertaken to make an in-depth assessment of progress achieved thus far and propose recommendations for changes in overall project design and implementation for the remainder of the project period, if deemed necessary. Such recommendations are intended to facilitate and promote national ownership of the programme and, most importantly, to consider the steps needed for sustainability and eventual take-over of the programme from Government and other non-project resources.

The mission visited Sri Lanka from 23 February – 3 March 2004. It held consultations with FAO, the PMU and Senior Government officials in Colombo and attended a meeting of the National Steering Committee on 3 March, at which the mission's findings and recommendations were presented and discussed. The mission undertook a four-day field trip (25-28 February) to visit four of the nine existing project sites, two of which were older sites (Perisandigamum and Kadahathawewa in North Western Province) and two were new sites (Havandhana in Uva Province and Maduwanwela in Sabaragamuwa Province). On 4 March, the mission moved to the FAO Regional Office in Bangkok for a debriefing there. The full mission itinerary is presented in Annex II, along with the list of key persons met.

The mission members were:
Robert Moore, Senior Evaluation Officer, FAO (Team Leader)
Hiroshi Suzuki, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, Representative of the Government of Japan
D.G. Samarasinghe, Additional Director, Department of National Planning, Representative of the Government of Sri Lanka

The mission members wish to thank all the farmers and Government officials with whom we met at the various project sites and for the kind hospitality with which we were received. We would also like to thank the project PMU (Dr. K.S.D.M. Joseph, Dr. D.R.T.G. Ratnayake, Mr. A.M. Jayasekara, Mr. H. Gamage and Ms Shoko Hayakawa, project APO) for their assistance, cooperation and hospitality both in Colombo and in the field. We also appreciated the valuable assistance of Mr. M. Jusoh, the FAO Representative in Sri Lanka and Dr Shin Imai, Regional Coordinator for the Japanese-funded SPFS projects.

B. Background and Context

Rural Poverty and Food Security

While Sri Lanka's economy grew by some five per cent per annum in the 1990s, much less progress was registered in poverty reduction. Evidence of this comes from two household consumption surveys covering the entire nation except the North and East (i.e., the conflict areas), undertaken by the Department of Census and Statistics during the first half of the 1990s. A comparison of the two surveys suggest that absolute poverty increased significantly between 1990/91 and 1995/96, i.e., from 33 to 39 percent according to the higher poverty line, and from 20 to 25 percent, according to the lower poverty line. On the basis of available data, chronic poverty affects around 25 percent of the population and that chronic and transitory poverty combined affects around 40 percent of the population.

The incidence of consumption poverty varies significantly across provincial boundaries, with Uva, North Western and North Central provinces having a significantly higher poverty level than the other provinces surveyed. Those regions disadvantaged in terms of economic and social infrastructure tend to exhibit a high incidence of consumption poverty. This was due to various reasons such as the benefits of economic growth not having trickled down to the poor, limited access to quality education and basic social services, low labour productivity in agriculture and stagnating or declining crop yield, etc..

Almost 90 per cent of Sri Lanka's poor reside in the rural areas. The vast majority of the rural poor derive their living from agriculture and off-farm employment. Successful rural development means revitalizing the rural areas to provide the foundation for accelerated income growth, abundant job opportunities in farm and non-farm activities, sustainable use of natural resources and securing their food security. The SPFS is intended to contribute to most of these goals.

About one-third of Sri Lanka's population is said to be undernourised, 80% of which live in rural areas. Food production has not kept up with population growth and Sri Lanka imports rice, wheat, milk powder and sugar. Annual expenditure on major food imports increased from $500 million in 1990 to $650 million by 1999. Rainfall is the principal determinant of agricultural productivity and rice production is dependent on water availability and its efficient delivery. In recent years, yields and areas under rice cultivation have decreased. Irrigation infrastructure, a system of tanks and conveyance channels, is maintained by local authorities but farmer involvement has been poor. While other food and cash crops are grown under rainfed conditions in upland areas and on rice lands in paddy areas during the dry season, depending on water availability, this has not been done extensively and in many cases farmers are unaware of possibilities for improved technology.

Due to natural disasters and civil unrest, Sri Lanka has received considerable amounts of food aid in recent years, much coming through PL 480 grants and loans from the United States and project-based food aid from the World Food Programme.

Micro-credit schemes, with their emphasis on group based collateral and lending, local savings mobilization and the use of a range of financial intermediaries, have evolved as a preferred alternative to the use of subsidized and directed bank lending to the poor. Micro-credit programs in Sri Lanka have played a valuable role in broadening access to development financing to the poor while contributing to village savings and group formation, particularly amongst poor rural women.

According to the Sri Lanka Integrated Survey, more than 70 percent of the country's poor have access to some form of savings service, and about 26 percent borrow from various sources. About 41 and 25 percent of loans to poor households are made by formal and semi-formal micro- finance providers, respectively.

In general, targeted micro-credit programs suffer from low recovery rates, poor identification of borrowers, low incentive for bank officials to recover loans, and low incentives for borrowers to repay. While loans from state banks are a key source for poor households, improvement in performance is required to ensure that they contribute both to the empowerment of the poor and to the development of sustainable micro-finance institutions, with focus on women.

Brief History of SPFS in Sri Lanka

As a low-income, food deficit country, Sri Lanka was eligible for participation in the SPFS. The Programme began in Sri Lanka with a two-phase project (TCP/SRL/8923 and TCP/SRL/0168), funded by FAO-TCP. The project (formulated under another project - TCP/SRL/8822) was located

at two sites in North Western Province (Kombuwa Mahawewa and Abakolowewa), emphasized improved water management with training provided through Farmers' Field Schools (FFS). The project included field demonstrations and technical training for staff to conduct the FFS. Originally budgeted at $286,000, the two TCPs together spent under $135,000. This was due to a reduction in the number of project sites from four to two and considerable under-spending on both international and national consultants. Also, the project worked with an extremely limited number of farmers – only ten per site.

By the time the second phase TCP project was approved, the Government of Japan had already indicated interest in funding an expanded SPFS in Sri Lanka. The new project was to make use of the results of the TCP project. There has been some interaction between the PMU of the current project and the previous two project sites. However, the TCP project and the Japanese-funded project are different in their implementation methodology at village level. The current project has a much broader scope of intervention than did the TCP, which focused on water management, and formal FFS are not used as the method of extension.

II. Assessment of Project Objectives and Design

A. Justification

The project was designed to address a series of constraints to food security that had been noted in Sri Lanka. These included the low agricultural productivity mentioned previously, an inadequate supply of protein-rich foods in the local diet (as shown by nutrition surveys), lack of farmer participation in "top-down" agricultural development programmes, large post-harvest losses and seasonal gluts that bring low prices to farmers. The project was intended to address all these constraints, by promoting more efficient use of water, diversifying farm production to create additional sources of income (including livestock and fisheries, which would also contribute to improved diets), strengthening farmers' organizations and improving post-harvest processing and storage. By working largely through Provincial authorities and field level technicians, the project was in line with the Government's policy of decentralization.

The emphasis on improving participation of farmers in the identification of their problems and deciding on solutions was a cornerstone of the project justification. Farmers' organizations have existed for a long time in Sri Lanka; since 1991 their primary purpose was to operate and maintain irrigation structures. The project was intended to expand the functions to include negotiation for improved access to production inputs, technology and knowledge (see Project Design below).

Although not expressly stated in the project document, the philosophy of the SPFS is that the projects establish a model for replication or modification in other places. However, the project document does not describe how this should happen, nor were there any activities directed at wider scale adoption. Thus, the project can be said to be justified in terms of addressing key problems related to food security, but it ignored the problem of gearing expansion from a project-driven effort to one relying on Government or other, non-project, sources of assistance.

B. Objectives

The stated development objective is "to assist the country's effort to improve the food security of poor rural and peri-urban communities and households". The project document also states that the project will put special emphasis on *the least food-secure households and women*, on increasing the productivity and resilience of farming systems and improving local food diversity and household income on an economically and environmentally sustainable basis".

The stated development objective suffers from a loose formulation and is not expressed as an end result that can be objectively assessed. However, the document is rather more specific about the intended target beneficiaries – the least food-secure households and women. In actual practice, the SPFS approach does not target the *least* food-secure households. It targets relatively poor farmers who have the possibility to improve their productive capacity, because they have some assets (e.g. land, a certain amount of capital). In absolute terms, the *least food-secure households* are often landless and unlikely to become early adopters of new technology, precisely because their food security is so precarious. In the long term, if the project is successful, there may well be a trickle-down effect to the least food-secure households. But it should be recognized that the project has only limited possibilities to work directly with this target group during the project implementation period. The project does work with women but has not extensively targeted them as beneficiaries (see Section IV.C below).

The project document includes six immediate objectives, each of which relates to one of the project components (constraints analysis, farmers' organization, crop intensification and diversification, livestock, fish production and post-harvest/agro-processing). These objectives also are not expressed as results; however, for each objective there are three or four "success criteria" that are objectives. Curiously, the crop intensification/diversification and fish production components are not designed in the same way as the others, with a much larger number of "success criteria" at the

level of each output, while for the other components the "success criteria" are expressed more normally at the level of the objective itself. This oversight gives the impression that the document was not thoroughly reviewed and, more significantly, has required current project management to interpret what was actually intended.

C. Project Design

The project document is lengthy and detailed in terms of what the project will do, but the results expected are not at all quantified. During project implementation, the PMU, encouraged by the Regional Coordinator, has been requested to make greater efforts to quantify the expected results, in terms of financial benefits to individual farmers and villages.

For each of the project components, there is a list of outputs (many of which are actually objectives). However, in actual practice this list has amounted to a shopping list of activities that may or may not be undertaken at individual project sites. Accordingly, the list of activities is much longer than the activities actually undertaken at any of the project sites. For this reason and in light of project experience thus far, it would be useful for a revision to the project to be prepared, updating the work plan and focusing more on the activities that actually will be undertaken and results that can be expected to be achieved. This would provide a much clearer linkage between the activities undertaken, outputs produced and results achieved.

The project document contains a good description of the institutional set-up that prevailed when the project document was prepared. The institutional arrangements have changed; the most important variance is that there are no more Village Extension Officers under the Provincial Ministry of Agriculture, these staff having been shifted to the Ministry of Home Affairs as general purpose Village Officers. There are local level staff under the central Government's Department of Agrarian Development, but these officers do not have an agricultural background. The net effect is that primary responsibility for agricultural extension is now at the level of the Agricultural Instructor (or Veterinary Surgeon, for livestock), who comes under the supervision of an Assistant Director of the Provincial Ministry of Agriculture. Each Agricultural Instructor may have several thousand households under his remit, thus severely limiting the outreach of extension services at field level. Agricultural Instructors thus prefer to deal with farmers in larger groups, so that more can be reached in the time available. Farmers who are organized can thus more effectively demand extension services under the current arrangements.

Project Management Structure

The project has a special Project Management Unit (PMU), consisting of an Agronomist/Team Leader; a Livestock Specialist; an Aquaculture Specialist; an On-Farm Water Management Specialist and a Japanese APO. The PMU also employs an Administrative Assistant. Besides their technical specialization, each of the subject matter specialists also serves as the Coordinator for one of the four Provinces where the project is currently operating. The PMU is housed in the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock. Because all the PMU staff are FAO staff, the project also has a National Project Coordinator in the Ministry, who signs official correspondence.

The project has a National Steering Committee (NSC) that is intended to provide overall guidance to the project. The NSC is chaired by the Secretary of the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock and includes representatives from the central Ministry, as well as the Ministry of Fisheries, Ministry of Irrigation and the Provincial Secretaries of Agriculture and Livestock. Provincial Steering Committees have also been established, under the Secretary of Agriculture and Livestock. Agrarian Service Centres in the selected sites are the operational base for project activities, with the Department of Agrarian Development taking the leadership for aspects relating to planning and organization and strengthening of farmers' organizations, the National Aquaculture Development Authority for aquaculture activities, and the Department of Agriculture and Department of Animal

Production and Health for crop production and livestock activities. Community Action Plans are implemented at village level by Field Implementation Teams, consisting of village officers and farmers' organization members, assisted by the PMU and field-level staff of the line agencies.

The project receives technical support from the Regional Co-ordinator of the Japanese-funded SPFS projects, based in Jakarta and funded under GCP/RAS/180/JPN. The Regional Co-ordinator supports projects in Bangladesh, Lao PDR and Indonesia, besides Sri Lanka. The project in Sri Lanka is also associated with the Regional Information Management project (GCP/RAS/182/JPN).

III. Assessment of Project Implementation, Efficiency and Management

A. Project Budget and Expenditure

The total project budget for four years is $1,597,811. Since the beginning of project operations (April 2002) until end January 2004, total expenditure was $271,135, or 16.97% of the total project budget, at 46% of the implementation time[1]. The project was very slow to get under way, largely because of the long time taken to recruit the PMU team. Also, the work in sites had to be phased in, so as to make manageable the PMU's supporting task. The overall project budget and expenditures to January 2004 appear as Annex 4.

Because of the late start and because the mission proposes a re-orientation to the project (see Recommendations below), an extension of the project by up to one year is also recommended. If this recommendation is accepted, it will be necessary to re-shuffle the input mix. It would appear likely that the budgets for contracts and training, in particular, will be underspent. The funds for contracts have been used for short-term national consultants and for conduct of the PRAs. While there will be expenditure under this line for similar work in the six new project sites, only $20,003 out of $170,000 had been spent by January 2004, because costs have been much lower than foreseen. Also for training, although a considerable amount has been done and it has been effective, the amount of expenditure has been only 5.45% of the total budget, at $19,625 out of $360,000. This is due to the very low cost of in-country training. These lines in particular should be examined for possible re-phasing of the project budget.

B. Activities and Outputs

1. Site Selection, PRA and Socio-Economic Baseline Surveys

The project was originally to be implemented in 30 sites in 15 districts (two per district) but the target was reduced to one site per district because it was felt that the PMU would not be able to support so many sites over a geographically widespread area. The project is to be implemented in all Provinces except Northern and Eastern Provinces, the former conflict areas. The process for site selection was:

a) An awareness meeting with the senior officials of the stakeholder agencies in the province to introduce the project and discuss the responsibilities and strategies in implementing project activities.
b) Project Launch Workshops were held in each province to introduce the project to district level staff and to discuss and evaluate the potential sites identified by the provincial staff. At the workshop, the sites were evaluated based on the selection criteria and the number of potential sites per district was reduced to 3 -4.
c) Reconnaissance surveys were conducted by the PMU with the participation of field staff to select two potential sites from each district for conduct of Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) and the Socio-economic Baseline Survey (SEBS).

[1] The expenditure figure is based on calculations made by the project itself, which are different than those of FAO HQ. The figure includes Headquarters generated amounts for Technical Support Services and Support Costs, but all other budget lines are based on project-maintained records. The total expenditure figure may be high, as the amount of expenditure for Technical Support Services reported by HQ ($27,764) cannot be reconciled with the HQ missions undertaken.

d) Based on the findings of the PRA and SEBS, one site from the remaining two was selected for the implementation of project activities.
e) Once a site was selected, the approval of the Provincial Steering Committee was obtained prior to the commencement of work.

Conduct of the PRA and SEBS at two sites, prior to actual selection, was done only for the original five sites in North Western and Southern Provinces. For Uva and Sabaragamuwa Provinces, the PRA and SEBS were done only at the selected site, since there had been considerable disappointment at the non-selected sites in the first round of the process.

Selection criteria were:

a) The community is poor and a majority of community members are engaged in agriculture, livestock and fishery;
b) The site demonstrates good prospects for continuity and further spread of benefits;
c) The site has been vulnerable to frequent food insecurity during recent times;
d) The site has adequate natural resources to increase productivity;
e) The community has local organization/groups and some degree of social coherence suggesting that it is amenable to strengthening such groups to make them more effective;
f) The site is accessible to markets, production inputs, and other supporting facilities;
g) The community is representative of a specific larger area;
h) No similar projects are in operation in the site;
i) Provincial and divisional officials are willing to undertake responsibility of implementing project activities;
j) Village communities show interest and commitment in improving the socio-economic conditions of the village.

The mission questioned the degree of consideration of poverty as a selection criteria at some of the sites visited, since it appeared that some of the participating farmers already had well-developed farms. Data from the PRA indicated that the large majority of farmers at all sites were, in fact, poor. However, the PRA did not use a uniform definition of "poor"; this was left up to those conducting the PRA. Furthermore, statistics have not been gathered about the economic classification of the members of the farmers' organizations, i.e. those actually participating in the project.

The mission fully appreciates the difficulties associated with involving the poorest farmers in this type of project; their aversion to change and risk due to a precarious food security situation, the fact that they are often landless or possess the most marginal lands that are least productive, etc. However, the long-term success of the SPFS will depend on finding ways also to involve the poorest and most food-insecure in the Programme.

Participatory Rural Appraisals (PRA) were carried out in each location to determine the exiting physical, socio-economic and institutional situation, to understand the main constraints to increasing food security and potentials and priorities of the communities for project interventions. In order to compile relevant benchmark information on existing farming systems, agro-ecology and socio-economic situation, socio-economic baseline surveys (SEBS) were also carried out. For the SEBS, a questionnaire was prepared, pre-tested and subsequently adjusted. Based on the household list of each location, farmers were randomly selected for the field investigation. The sample size was 20 - 25% of the total farm families. In addition, collection of information was also done by interviewing relevant personnel such as Agriculture Officers and village leaders.

PRA activities were designed to gather mainly the qualitative information in each location. The PRAs, which took place on one day, were conducted with the assistance of national consultants (one per site, four consultants have been used thus far. In the most recent PRAs (in Uva and Sabaragamuwa Provinces), community members and local staff were trained on PRA techniques for two days and then participated in the PRA, which involved 60-90 persons.

2. Community Development and Farmers' Organizations (including Micro-credit)

Based on the finding of the PRA and constraint analysis, Community Action Plans (CAPs) have been developed for the nine sites selected thus far. The Community Action Plans include 4 components:

1. Strengthening of Farmers' Organizations to develop self-reliance, institutional and technical capacity of communities to carry out development activities for food security;
2. Crop intensification and diversification, both in lowlands and uplands, to enhance production and income;
3. Introduction and promotion of livestock to provide a regular and non-seasonal income and to improve the nutrition;
4. Introduction and promotion of local fish production to improve the nutritional status of communities and provide income and employment opportunities especially for landless labourers.

At the inception of the project, Farmers' Organizations (FOs) were established or reorganized at all project sites. At six sites, existing FO were reorganized and new office bearers were appointed. At two sites, no FOs were present and therefore new FOs were established. At one site, an existing NGO, formed by the communities and involved in agricultural development activities, was selected to be the FO. All FOs have opened separate bank accounts for project financial transactions. They have developed their own constitutions in accordance with the Agrarian Services Act of 1991.

At the time of project inception, many farmers thought that only rice farmers could obtain membership in the FO. This was because prior to the project, the FOs were not effective and confined only to a few selected activities such as holding a seasonal meeting to decide water distribution issues for paddy fields. However, after the project began, farmers who cultivate uplands, raise livestock and fishermen have also become members of the FOs. This was achieved through awareness meetings and convincing these farmers that collective action that could bring them increased productivity.

The membership of farmers' organizations has increased with the implementation of activities, but not all farm families in project villages are members, largely due to unsatisfactory past experience with FOs. However, FO membership is increasing in all villages as farmers begin to appreciate the benefits. Besides the main FOs, smaller sub-groups have been formed in specialized areas (i.e.crop intensification and diversification, livestock, aquaculture). These groups operate under the umbrella of the main PO and, in some cases, have separate bank accounts.

In all project sites, many community members do not have the access to credit from government and commercial lending agencies. Even in situations where these facilities are available, farmers prefer local money lenders or other informal sources. The interest rates that pay for these loans are very high and often, the interest amounted to as much as the principal. The situation of multiple debts is also common where they take loans from one person to pay another and then take another loan to pay the second one.

A revolving fund has been established by all FOs and details on the funds released, number of beneficiaries and the recovery are given in the Table below. The value presented is based on the most recent information available, collected in November 2003. These short term and long term loans were provided for purchase of planting material and inputs for productivity improvements, micro-irrigation systems, establishment of small-scale livestock units (including animals), introduction of fingerlings stocks for reservoirs, and purchase of simple agricultural and aquaculture equipments.

Table: Issue of micro –credit to different activities and the recovery

Location	Type of Micro-credit	Total Amount (Rs)	No. of Benificiaries	Recovery Rate (%)
Tammennawa	Crop	135,415.00	57	80%
	Aquaculture	66,190.00	18	45 %
	Livestock	50,000.00	5	*
Uyanwewa	Crop	263,835.00	40	65%
	Aquaculture	174,998.00	21	7 %
	Livestock (LT)	130,000.00	11	8%
Indurannawela	Crop	107,810.00	35	90%
	Aquaculture	28,000.00	03	*
	Livestock (ST)	77,170.00	05	5%
Periyasandi	Crop	220,250.00	36	52 %
	Livestock (ST)	44,000.00	21	83 %
	Livestock (LT)	180,000.00	17	10
Kadahatha	Crop	245,933.00	30	90%
	Aquaculture	100,325.00	20	32 %
	Livestock (LT)	230,000.00	11	*

ST – Short-term, LT – Long-term, * These activities commenced recently and recovery will begin later.

Time taken for recovery of loans depends on a number of factors such as the amount and the purpose for which the loan was obtained, how soon the yield/income will be generated and productivity of the activity. For example, time taken for recovery of loans obtained for livestock production is longer than for crop husbandry.

The recovery of short term loans is satisfactory, but there are defaulters who have failed to pay during the specified time allocated to them. However, it is too early to make a full assessment of recovery rates because farmers have requested extended grace periods, e.g. due to drought. The grace period for long term loans is still on, and therefore, the progress is yet to be assessed. It is important to study the operational process of micro-credit and the factors that affect recovery. The project is planning to hire a consultant to study this situation and make recommendation for future activities.

The project is developing some valuable experience on farmer organization that could be of benefit to other programmes that are trying to break the "donor dependency" cycle often found in projects in Sri Lanka (and elsewhere). At present, there are no plans to prepare a field document on this topic. Such a publication, drawing on the experience of this project, could be useful both for the Government and other donors or NGOs wishing to promote farmer self-help.

3. Crop Intensification and Diversification

Except for one site, farming systems are rice-based and rice is the farmers' primary source of income. The proportion of income from other crops is relatively small. The aim of the crop intensification and diversification component is to increase and stabilize farmers' income. The main factors contributing to food insecurity are landlessness, low productivity and scarcity of capital and water. Cropping intensity of rice lands depends on seasonal rainfall and storage capacity of the tank. Production costs for rice are high (Rs. 40,000/ha) and average yields of 3-

4t/ha are inadequate to earn a profit. However, many farmers prefer to produce rice to cover the family requirement for staple food, rather than growing other crops.

The project strategy is to introduce improved practices, such as timely planting, use of improved varieties with an appropriate maturity period (3.5 months), use of quality seeds, good land preparation, insect and disease management to minimize the use of agro-chemicals, and proper fertilizer, weed and water management strategies. These programs are planned by the agriculture officers and the farmers in participatory manner. For the implementation of this programme, the project provided micro-credit in the form of seeds and fertilizers.

At three of the four sites where the project operated last year, average rice yields increased by 0.75 – 1.00 t/ha. Crop cut surveys showed that there were farmers who obtained 6.5-7.5 t/ha, indicating the potential for increase in the average yields in the future. At the fourth site, the crop was established too late due to the delayed onset of rains. As a result this crop was infested with severe incidence of insects and diseases resulting in low yields.

Scarcity of quality seed paddy of recommended rice varieties at village level is one of the main constraints to achieve better yields. Due to financial difficulties, the normal practice among farmers is to look for seed paddy just before the commencement of the season. Obtaining seed paddy from outside the village needs time and sometimes the required variety is not available in adequate quantities. Hence farmers are compelled to use inferior quality seeds. Yields that could be obtained from crops established with inferior quality seeds produce low yields and fetch low prices when the seeds are mixed and infested with weed seeds.

In order to prevent such situations and to increase the income of some of the farmers, seed paddy production programs were introduced at three sites during 2003. These seed paddy plots were also used as field demonstrations to introduce new rice technologies to farmers. In all locations, the yields obtained from the demonstration plots were high, ranging from 6 -7 t/ha. However, some of the seed lots were not accepted as seed paddy because of heavy rains experienced during the maturity stages. The seed paddy produced from this programme was adequate to meet the local site's requirements and the excess was sold outside. The price of seed paddy is about Rs. 25/kg compared to Rs. 13- 15/kg paid for consumption paddy. The total additional income earned producing seed paddy by these farmers was Rs. 302,500. Farmers are now planning to expand this programme in the coming seasons.

In the rainfed uplands in the dry and intermediate zone, the project has introduced more perennials into upland cultivations presently dominated by low input/low return annual crops. Also, where applicable, introduction of irrigation systems is being promoted to enhance production and minimize risk due to moisture stress. Compared to very small production units existing at present, the area cultivated to a particular crop will be increased so that commercialization of production can be achieved. The species promoted include papaya, guava, banana, mango, cashew, pomegranate, lime and orange. These perennial crops need less management time once established. This system diversifies the risk and labour requirements and balance income throughout the years. Once established, these species are more capable of surviving drought periods compared to annuals.

Seedlings of fruit species were provided to selected farmers to establish in separate plots on a farm plan that the farmer designed with the help of local agricultural extension officer. Initially the programme is implemented on a participatory basis with farmers who could afford to invest on basic inputs after the establishment of crops. The project also provided micro-finance for purchase of planting material as well as other inputs. A few demonstration plots were also established and planting material was provided free of charge. In the following years the revolving fund will be

used for further expansion of the programme among others. The results of this activity are of course too early to assess but will be monitored by the project.

The project has also introduced cultivation of crops other than rice during the dry season in well-drained paddy lands. Crops included in this programme are: watermelon, pumpkin, okra, capsicum, bitter gourd, maize and groundnuts. The project demonstrations covered crop husbandry, on-farm water management and fertilizer use. Results achieved during the 2003 dry season were considered better than farmers would have achieved with rice. For both the fruit trees and vegetable crops, the project may also need to assist in identification of marketing opportunities, particularly if many farmers start to adopt the new crops. Gluts on the market are a bane of the Sri Lankan farmer.

At one project site (Periasandigamum) prior to the project, intensive cultivation of irrigated crops (primarily onions and chilli, but no rice) was carried out. Farmers in this area use ground water for irrigation, carried out daily due to sandy soils. Almost all farmers at this location own a water pump and have established underground water conveyance systems to carry water from the well to different sections of the field. Despite heavy investment, their living standards still remain at very low levels. The main reason is unstable crop yields and highly fluctuating prices for produce, mono-cropping, high incidence of pest and diseases, high interest rates paid for loans obtained from informal sources, and high production costs due to indiscriminate use of agrochemicals and fertilizers.

The main strategy used by the SPFS programme is to introduce diversified cropping so that income generation from the land cultivated is stabilized. The project has introduced new crops, both annual and perennial, to this cropping system as well as livestock. Farmers still continue the previous crops, with the new crops occupying some of the land. The crops introduced are papaya (hybrid), guava, pomegranate, mango, 'murunga' (a local tree vegetable species), vegetables and 'jamboo' (a fruit species) and an improved pasture variety (CO 3). Initially, 12 farmers were selected for the diversification programme, the project providing the planting material and farmers agreeing to provide other inputs and labour.

4. Water Management

Farmer organization has been a key element of improving water management. The project has revived the traditional seasonal village ('Kanna') meeting. During the 2003 dry ('yala') season, farmers addressed the water shortage situation by growing shorter duration rice varieties (requiring less water), with timely land preparation with the onset of the rains, which was completed by dates stipulated at the meeting.

The project has implemented training and carried out demonstrations on soil and moisture conservation, since farmers' awareness on this topic was revealed to be poor. On a limited scale, the project has developed demonstrations of drip irrigation on papaya and improved lift irrigation at one project site where excessive water use raised the cost of production and led to contamination of drinking water from excessive nitrate levels.

The project also provided some minor assistance to rehabilitation of irrigation systems in project villages, after consultation between the FO and the Irrigation Department (up to a maximum of Rs. 470,000 in any one site thus far).

5. Livestock

Livestock is generally not an important component of Sri Lankan farming systems. It contributes only about 2% of GDP, most of this from industrial-scale poultry production. At the project sites, no systematic rearing of animals is practiced. Some households own cattle and buffalos, but they are free grazing and in many instances milking is not done. Few families milk their cows for home consumption. Since milk consumption is not popular among the communities, farmers are not

interested in milking their animal unless there is a collector in the village. When animals are not raised for milk, the main purpose of rearing them is to sell them for meat. Goat farming is practiced only by a few individuals for meat and is not common in most of the sites.

The project strategy has focused on improving service received from the Department of Animal Production and Health. In North Western and Southern Provinces, where project activities started in early 2003, a total of 22 dairy units, 11 poultry units, 6 goat units and a piggery have been established. Since in all project sites grazing land and good quality roughage to feed cattle is very scarce, the SPFS has introduced a high yielding new pasture variety (CO 3) and training programmes were arranged on establishment and maintenance of pasture. Sixty-one farmers have now established this variety in small plots and feed their livestock.

The mission endorses the project activities on dairy because of good earning potential and the fact that a good milk collection system is in place. It also endorses the activities on goats because of their particular appropriateness for small-scale farmers due to ease of feeding and low veterinary costs. However, poultry does not appear very promising due to an already well-developed private sector in this area and there is little interest in pig raising, although it was identified as an activity in the project document.

6. Aquaculture

Fish farmer organizations have been created at seven of the project sites. The relative importance of the aquaculture component has varied because the primary criteria for site selection is their appropriateness for agriculture and livestock. At two sites, activities are taking place to raise fish fry to fingerling size, at one site in net cages and at another in home garden ponds, in order to avoid the high costs and mortality associated with shipment of fingerlings. Credit was granted for this, as well as for nets and canoes to the fish farmer organizations. As there is no household-level fish rearing in Sri Lanka, aquaculture is always a group activity and hence the strength and cohesiveness of the fish farmer organizations is important.

There is evident interest in aquaculture, despite some technical and social problems that faced this component during the first year. Stealing of fish was a problem, particularly at one site where there were conflicting land claims over the tank where fish production was carried out. However, despite losing many fish, the fish farmers' organization intends to continue this year (in ponds clearly on their own village land). At one site, there was infestation with aquatic macrophytes, predatory fish and at another, there were crocodiles and tree stumps in the reservoir bed that adversely affected fishing operations. Training and technical support thus remains very important for aquaculture. Nonetheless, considerable profit potential exists for aquaculture. At one site (Tammennawa), net profit on 4,800 kg. of fish produced was Rs. 54,168 and even after 20% of this amount was paid to the main FO and Revolving Fund, plus interest on the fishing gear loan, each of 18 members received Rs. 2,362 in additional income.

7. Marketing and Agro-Processing

Little has been done in this area so far, partly because the project is at an early stage and perhaps also because there is no specialist in this area in the PMU. One FO has made arrangements with a private rice processor to purchase next season's crop at a guaranteed price. FOs are being encouraged to store paddy for a time to avoid marketing to the extent possible during the harvest glut.

Agro-processing could be a potential avenue for increasing women's opportunities beyond those already offered by mainstream project activities. This has only been investigated to a very limited extent thus far. It may require a separate consultancy particularly for this and possibilities should be investigated particularly in the about to be selected project sites.

C. Government Support

The Government has made its counterpart contribution in kind available without any particular difficulty. The PMU is located in an office within the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock that is ample for its purposes. Government counterpart staff, including a National Project Co-ordinator, as well as Provincial and Central government staff (from the Provincial Ministries of Agriculture and Livestock, Department of Agrarian Development and National Aquaculture Development Authority) have been made available. The PMU has good access to senior decision-makers in the Ministry, largely because of their past employment at senior levels themselves. Thus, government support for the implementation of the project is good.

The SPFS is intended to be a pilot activity that, if successful, is spread to other sites through Government or other, non-project resources. Thus, successful implementation of the SPFS depends not only on Government support during the project period, but also commitment to expanding the Programme once the project ends. While there is material support by the Government of Sri Lanka for the on-going project and verbal commitment to making it effective, the mission's impression is that more concrete steps towards sustainability need to be taken during the remaining project period. The National Steering Committee, which brings together all the relevant Government stakeholders, will need to give support and direction to expanding SPFS, including involvement in the actual planning of any expansion. Ideally, such plans should be made starting this year, while there is still time to take advantage of the presence of the resources that could be made available from GCP/SRL/049/JPN (see Recommendations below).

D. Project Management

The mission feels that project management has been largely effective. As mentioned previously, the project is administered by the PMU that includes four technical specialists (one of whom is the Team Leader) an APO and an Administrative Assistant. The Budget Holder for the project is the FAO Representative, who is well-informed about the project, meets regularly as required with the PMU and attends meetings of the National Steering Committee.

One criticism of the management structure is that the technical specialists are required to devote an inordinate amount of time to making and recording small payments, since the project does not have an Accounts Assistant. As part of the recommended revision of the project budget, the mission would encourage the creation of such a post for the remaining project period, to remove this burden from the technical staff of the PMU and allow them to focus exclusively on technical matters.

E. Technical and Operational Backstopping

The project has had six visits (including during the evaluation mission) by the Regional Co-ordinator, three of which took place on or before February 2003, when project activities got under way at field level. The Regional Co-ordinator performs project assessments and brings experience from the SPFS in other countries to Sri Lanka. The Regional Co-ordinator's visits are charged to a separate project (GCP/RAS/180/JPN). The project has also received two visits from the responsible Headquarters officer in the SPFS Monitoring and Co-ordination Service (TCOS). One of these visits was with the Regional Co-ordinator and the other was an assessment visit that immediately preceeded the evaluation mission.

Three FAO officers, including two Information Management Specialists (the Bangkok-based head of the Regional Information Management project and an officer from Headquarters) and an Agricultural Economist from HQ took part in a two-day training programme on the SPFS Asia Information Management System (SAIMS) in June 2003. A training consultant also participated.

It is understood that technical backstopping is supposed to be provided to the project by the FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (RAP), but that backstopping requirements have not been identified yet. Relevant technical officers in RAP receive progress reports on the project, distributed by the Co-ordinator of the Regional Operations Branch. There do not as yet appear to be any specific problems that could be resolved by backstopping, but such visits could bring valuable experience from other parts of the region. In particular, the mission feels that a backstopping visit related to gender issues could be of benefit.

IV. Assessment of Emerging Results

A. Effects and Impact

As stated previously, the project is at an early stage of implementation and thus it would involve a large measure of conjecture to discuss its long-term impact. However, there are apparent effects from the project at the five sites (two of which were visited by the mission) where it has been in operation for about one year. The most impressive achievement has been in the area of farmer training and organization. In the sites visited, farmers were able to clearly explain the programmes that were being implemented in their villages, performance to date in each of the technical intervention areas (crop intensification/diversification, livestock, aquaculture), the operation of micro-credit programmes and, most importantly, planned future activities. There was apparent enthusiasm at the sites visited for the new technologies being pursued, which were believed to offer greater opportunity for increased and dependable incomes, compared with paddy cultivation. In the new sites, where field level activities had only recently begun, there also appeared to be considerable enthusiasm for the activities to be undertaken. The farmers organizations in North Western Province were said to be somewhat stronger than those in Southern Province (where the project has also been operating for one year) but also there enthusiasm is said to be high.

The project's training programme has been particularly successful. Most of the training thus far has been short-term (one or two days) on very focused topics. This is appropriate for the villages where the project is operating. Such training has been conducted at very low cost. A complete list of the training carried out thus far appears as Annex 5.

Perhaps the best indicator of project effects is the interest shown in the project activities by villages near to the project sites. Villagers and local staff from the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock, and Department of Agrarian Development reported this interest and desire to see the project expanded to nearby areas. This interest offers a ready-made opportunity for the project to begin branching out from the established sites, relying primarily on experienced local staff (rather than the PMU) to provide technical and organizational support.

The mission feels that this opportunity should be pursued while the GCP/SRL/049/JPN is in operation (see following section on Sustainability).

B. Sustainability and Environmental Impact of Results

While the findings of the mission are positive, there is some concern about the eventual sustainability of project results. One reason is historical; many projects in Sri Lanka have operated well during their implementation period, only to revert back to the previous state when the project ended. For example, an ADB project in the mid-1990s created or strengthened farmers' organizations in order to carry out tank rehabilitation, including in one of the SPFS sites. Once the improvements were carried out, the farmers' organizations collapsed, due to lack of interest in other activities. This experience was said to be fairly typical of many projects.

The strategy of the SPFS project in Sri Lanka is to establish working models for increasing the level and diversity of farm income and, through increased production for consumption and sale of various agricultural products, increase food security. However, the strategy for achieving sustainability of

the results (if successful) is less evident. The project, originally to be implemented at 30 sites but now reduced to 15, will end at a certain point and it is not clear from the project document what is supposed to happen next. The mission believes that if a strategy for the transition is not decided during the project period, there is a considerable risk that any good results may not be followed up, due to lack of plans for doing so and resources for implementing the follow-up.

Based on the results achieved at the first five sites after one year, there is a basis for already discussing an expansion of the project, beyond the 15 planned sites. The expansion would have to take place with only limited involvement from the PMU, which will have to devote most of its attention to the four sites where activites began in December 2003 and the six new sites for which the selection process will begin soon. Thus, in any new sites, the technical support for carrying out community organization and survey, deciding on a Community Action Plan, providing technical advice on new technologies, etc., must come primarily from local officials of the Provincial Ministries of Agriculture and Livestock, the Department of Agrarian Development and the National Aquaculture Development Authority. In the time remaining for GCP/SRL/049/JPN, given that there will likely be funds available, the project could provide some limited assistance for costs of local training (which can be conducted with small levels of expenditure in Sri Lanka) and for micro-credit. This course of action would permit a bridging operation to the eventual operation of the Programme entirely by the Government, from its own resources or other resources identified by it. It would also allow a period for Government officials to build confidence in the SPFS approach and their operation of it, before the project ends. The mission feels that this is preferable to simply operating the project at 15 sites (largely by the PMU) and then ending it, without providing for an appropriate period of transition. If plans are made soon, the mission believes that this transition can be managed within the remaining project period. Specific recommendations for doing this are made in Section V below.

C. Gender Equity in Project Implementation and Results

Women play an important role in Sri Lankan agriculture, including home garden production, food crop production and processing, livestock and fisheries. Generally men do the more strenuous tasks while women carry out weeding, transplanting, harvesting, food processing and cooking. Women are also heavily involved in post-harvest operations and engage in non-farm income-generating activities, including home-based cottage industries.

The project has included women as beneficiaries for receipt of micro-credit and as members of farmers' organizations. However, statistics on distribution and repayments of credit and FO membership, by gender, do not appear to be available. Women participate in training activities of the project and gender-based statistics on participation are generally kept. Since women are specifically mentioned as target beneficiaries in the project document, more effort should be put into documenting the project's effects on them – particularly the credit component.

At two sites, the project assisted in the establishment of womens' savings schemes, the proceeds from which are used as a form of insurance for unanticipated family needs of group members. This activity is carried out in cooperation with the Sri Lanka Women's Development Services Corporative Society (Women's Bank) Ltd., an NGO. These schemes have been successful in other locations and could usefully be encouraged at all project sites.

As noted before, the project has done relatively little in the area of agro-processing and this is an area that is traditionally of interest to women. Accordingly, effort should be placed into identifying agro-processing income-generating opportunities, particularly in the sites where the project has recently begun or will be starting soon. This may well require a local consultancy as the required expertise may not be available in the PMU.

D. Cost-effectiveness

The project is to develop a model and is therefore experimental in nature. Since implementation is at a very early stage, it is not possible to draw conclusions about its cost-effectiveness. However, some comments can be made.

First, the project is being implemented at low cost. A major reason is the relative absence of international input, which inevitably costs more. All expertise in the project is national, including the PMU and the consultants/contractors. The training has been conducted at very low cost in the villages, with the cost per trainee at $10 (Rs. 1000) per day or less, sometimes much less.

The micro-credit programme has also been particularly cost-effective. The amount of funds made available at each village has been low. The largest amount in a single village (Uyanwewa) for individual micro-credits was Rs. 569,000 for 72 beneficiaries; the smallest Rs. 213,000 (Indurannawela for 43 beneficiaries). The fact that the credit programme in each village is small has contributed to its effective management by farmers' organizations themselves. The programme is therefore not an administrative burden to the PMU. Furthermore, administration of the micro-credit programme as a revolving fund has increased the management skills of the farmers' organizations. The relatively small size of the micro-credit activity also reflects the reality that resources for small-scale agricultural development are in short supply in Sri Lanka.

Some criticism has been raised that the project has reached a small number of beneficiaries thus far, i.e. 330 loans granted by November 2003. However, not only credit recipients should be counted as beneficiaries. The number of members of farmers' organizations in the villages is growing steadily, e.g. from 40 after the project started to 58 at Periyasandigamum, from 17 before the project at Kadahathawewa to 114 today, 87 members since September 2003 at a new farmers' organization at Havandhena. Furthermore, interest is being expressed in the project from surrounding villages. Eventually, it can be expected that the number of beneficiaries will increase substantially, both at the project sites (which will be 15 total) and, if the mission's recommendation is accepted, at other sites.

V. Main Conclusions, Issues and Recommendations

The overall conclusion is that the project has been largely successful, in terms of implementation and results thus far. There is evident enthusiasm about the project in communities visited, both in terms of empowerment of farmers and adaptation of new technologies that should increase and diversify income, thus leading to greater food security. The original project document contained a number of design weaknesses but these have not, for the most part, adversely affected project implementation. However, the document should be revised.

The mission has identified three key areas where the project has been particularly successful and feels that these areas are the key to future sustainability, both in the present project sites and other areas where the SPFS may expand, either through funding by this project, other donors, or with Sri Lanka Government resources. These are:

1. Creation of vibrant, self-reliant farmers' organizations;
2. Unifying Central Government and Provincial Government agricultural services to develop a common approach to village-level agricultural development;
3. Existence of a viable credit mechanism to promote adoption of new or improved technologies.

While the results have been good, the sense of ownership of the programme by Sri Lanka authorities needs to be further strengthened, with a view to sustaining and expanding the programme once the Japanese-funded project ends. The "level of ownership" is probably normal

for an internationally-funded technical cooperation project at this stage, but it is not too early to begin thinking about the post-project period, even if it is at least two years away.

The PMU is composed of sound, technically competent professionals. However, the PMU is a project-specific structure that is not part of the normal Government administration. It exercises its role as best it can from this position and effectively coordinates the various central and provincial government authorities involved with the project. How this coordination would be achieved in the absence of a PMU is an important issue for eventual project sustainability.

The recommendations of the mission are all made with a view to enhancing programme sustainability with a view to the post-project period.

Project Technical Components

Community Participation and Strengthening Farmers' Organizations

This has perhaps been the strongest component of the project thus far. At all project sites visited, farmers exhibited considerable planning and organizational skills, attributable to the capacity of the farmers themselves and the intensive training programme in this area. Most importantly, farmers have learned to demand services from Government authorities, which is very important in a country where availability of services at field level has been considerably reduced in recent years. Since Government services prefer to deal with farmers in groups, in order to reach the maximum number, strong farmers' organizations are important in generating demand for services. The mission noted that farmers' organizations were strong in both the new and old sites, although it was reported that the old sites in Southern Province not visited by the mission may not be quite as strong as those in North Western.

Recommendation: Continue to emphasize farmer organization training and skills development in the six new sites to be selected. By the end of the project, prepare a field document on the training methodology, drawing on the project experience, including strengths, weaknesses and lessons learned, for use in farmer organization programmes in other areas of Sri Lanka.

Crop Intensification and Diversification

Another strong aspect of the project, the emphasis has been on production of high-quality seed paddy in good paddy areas and on diversification into other field crops (particularly fruits and vegetables) on paddy land where water availability is undependable. While some work has also been carried out on soil conservation and on improving irrigation, the emphasis has been on improving crop production systems. Marketing of products has not received much attention as it is generally assumed that all production can be consumed or sold easily. The validity of this assumption should be closely monitored in the project sites. It would also be important to assist farmer organizations to find funding sources for irrigation rehabilitation works where needed.

Recommendation: Carry out monitoring studies of crop performance and financial returns of the crops produced under the intensification and diversification component. Assist farmers' organizations to identify sources of funding for irrigation rehabilitation where necessary (e.g. Government programmes, WFP-funded, Department of Agrarian Development programme for Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Minor Tanks).

Livestock

While the project document provides a wide shopping list of areas for introducing livestock as a source of income diversification, the project has wisely chosen to emphasize dairy cows, including construction of sheds and production of fodder (CO 3) as the main technical intervention. There is a large, unsatisfied demand for milk in the country and a good milk collection system is in place with considerable under-utilized capacity. Some other minor livestock production has been promoted (e.g. chickens and other poultry, pigs, goats) but of these, only goats seem promising for poor farmers, due to easier food availability and less requirement than cows for veterinary services.

Recommendation: Focus project livestock activities on cows and goats, depending on income level and skills of target farmers. Poultry should generally not be pursued, as income opportunities are limited due to domination by the well-developed private sector in this area.

Fisheries and Aquaculture

This activity has proven very popular with farmers because of the large demand for fresh fish in rural areas. Because there is no tradition of individual fish pond production, fisheries activities are conducted by groups. Thus, effective community and group organization are fundamental to the success of these activities. Most communities wish to raise fingerlings from fry, to lower production cost. Particularly in communities where there is limited experience in raising fish, adequate training is of paramount importance.

Recommendation: Ensure appropriate level of training in all aquaculture activities and adequate technical support.

Processing and post-harvest

Very little has been done in this area thus far, perhaps due to the absence of an expert within the PMU and also due to the fact that the anticipated production gains are yet to be realized. However, post-harvest losses can be considerable among the perishable items being promoted by the project. For example, first-time papaya growers may have difficulties in realizing full benefits from their production efforts if they are not aware of post-harvest handling requirements. Little identification of value-added processing activities has been carried out, which would also involve assessment of marketing opportunities.

Recommendation: Consider opportunities for value addition to products, which represent a potential earning source particularly for women. Identify needs for post-harvest handling training and organize courses as appropriate.

General Issues

Project Ownership

As stated above, the sense of ownership of the programme by national and provincial authorities is not strong at present, with little progress thus far toward developing the SPFS into a truly national programme. Building support for a programme is difficult because of the divided responsibilities for agricultural services between the central and provincial governments. This has not been a major problem at individual project sites within this project, but probably would be in the post-project period, unless proper arrangements are made.

Recommendation: The National Steering Committee should consider arrangements for expansion of the project into new sites, not covered by the project. In order to build the momentum created by the SPFS, some sites may be located close to existing sites, to take advantage of working relationships already created. On a limited scale, new sites away from existing ones may also be chosen. However, technical support for the non-project sites should basically come from existing Government sources, rather than the PMU. The SPFS project, in an effort to encourage and promote the expansion of project benefits, may support farmer training and provide funds for micro-credit, to the extent that this is possible.

Gender Awareness

Women play an important role in Sri Lanka agriculture and are involved in project activities at all sites. However, as women are particular target beneficiaries for the project, more activities could usefully be directed specifically to them. The main initiative of the SPFS of particular interest to women is the establishment of women's savings groups at two sites. These have only recently begun operations.

Recommendation: The project should give more attention to improving opportunities for women. The women's savings schemes should be presented at all sites and established where the women are

willing to participate in them. The project should explore agro-processing opportunities that could benefit women. A national consultant could be hired for this purpose if required.

Site selection

The mission observed that some of the sites and farmers selected appeared to be relatively well-to-do. This was in contradiction to the PRAs that were conducted at some of the same sites, which classified the large majority of farmers in the selected villages as poor. However, the criteria used for income classification of farmers varied from site to site and there is no information about the income level of farmers that actually join the Farmers' Organizations. The project document mentions that the project will put special emphasis on the least food-secure households and women. However, the poorest farmers (and poorest sites) may have little or no opportunity to increase production in the absence of resources that can be developed. Thus, there are some apparent contradictions that ought to be aired and resolved.

Recommendation: The National Steering Committee should decide on the appropriate poverty focus within the SPFS and the advisability of increasing the poverty focus in future site selection, taking into account both the programme objectives and the inherent difficulties of working with farmers who are seriously disadvantaged. This would be a general issue for SPFS programmes in other countries as well.

Micro-credit and Revolving Funds

From all available evidence, the micro-credit component is working well and, most importantly, does not require supervisory time from the PMU. Each Farmers' Organization sets its own rules for recovery, interest rates and late payments. Recovery rates have been satisfactory and in only a few cases have fallen behind schedule due to particular circumstances (e.g. drought). It is expected, however, that all loans will be repaid and funds will continue to revolve. The micro-credit has been an important part of the SPFS, for accelerating the adoption of new or improved technologies. The level of funds made available for credit in each site has been modest, but the mission feels that this is appropriate, as large-scale credit programmes may overwhelm village organizational capacity. Furthermore, it reflects the reality of limited credit availability for small farmers in Sri Lanka.

Recommendation: Because of the success of the micro-credit component, and as a way to pave the road for further expansion of the SPFS, limited amounts of funding could be made available for this to designated additional SPFS villages, not supported by the PMU but where sufficiently strong farmers' organizations have been developed and central and provincial government agricultural support services are organized and available to support SPFS-type activities.

Project Management

As of January 2004, at almost exactly the halfway point in the scheduled project implementation, only about 17% of the project budget had been expended. A major contributing factor was the late start of the PMU due to recruitment delays.

The mission was informed that the site selection process for the remaining six sites will be made in March 2004 and that PRAs and preparation of CAPs will begin by the middle of the year. Thus, it can be expected that by July/August 2004, costed Action Plans will be available for all 15 of the initial sites.

Because of the late start of the project, there is less time available than was originally foreseen for working with the project sites (particularly those about to be chosen) and little time for planning and developing the post-project takeover period. The mission feels that there are opportunities for maximizing project cost-effectiveness by re-programming available resources, in light of project implementation experience thus far.

Recommendation: Once the costed CAPs are available for the new sites, the PMU should prepare a project revision proposal, for consideration by the Regional Coordinator, TCOS and the donor. The revision, which should be budget-neutral, may extend the project by up to one year. The purpose of the revision would be:

- to consolidate the work at the existing sites, with two years of technical support and monitoring of experience at each;
- to plan and assist with the expansion of the SPFS in Sri Lanka, along the lines mentioned under "Project Ownership" above, including provision of some funds for training and micro-credit;
- to document the experience of the SPFS in Sri Lanka, including strong and weak points and areas requiring particular attention, to guide the future implementation of the Programme once the project ends.

As part of the revision proposal and based on the experience thus far, the PMU should indicate how many additional sites could be supported, on the understanding that:

- it may not be possible to determine the exact number and;
- financial support from the project to the additional sites must be less than for the first 15 sites and technical support from the PMU should be very limited. Strong, well-trained farmers' organizations will thus be vital.

In addition, it was noted earlier that the PMU fortunately did not have to become involved in the administration of micro-credit, this being handled efficiently by the farmers' organizations. Unfortunately, this does not apply for the project funds, where PMU staff are often required to make and keep track of a large number of cash payments and other burdensome financial details. Project efficiency would be improved by the addition of a General Service-level Accounts Assistant.

Recommendation: Within the budget-neutral project revision proposal to be prepared by the PMU, provision should be made for an Accounts Assistant for the remaining project period.

Annex 1 – Terms of Reference for the Mid-Term Evaluation

Joint Evaluation Mission by Government of Japan, FAO and Government of Sri Lanka

Project GCPS/SRL/049/JPN (Special Programme for Food Security - SPFS)

1. Background

The SPFS-SRL project addresses the problem of food security at household and national level. Since independence, Sri Lanka has given priority to ensuring food security for its people. Increased food production and making the food available to the poorest strata of the society have been central elements in the policy of successive governments. While emphasis was placed on increasing rice production, more recently equal emphasis has been placed on the production of other food crops, livestock and fish. The FAO sponsored Special Programme for Food Security (SPFS) aims to improve food security and reduce poverty.

The development objective of the project is to assist the country's efforts to improve the food security of poor rural and peri-urban communities and households. It puts special emphasis on the least food-secure households and women, on increasing the productivity and resilience of farming systems, and improving local food diversity and household income on an economically and environmentally sustainable basis.

The SPFS-SRL project is one of the four SPFS projects funded by the Japanese Government and executed by FAO, others being Lao PDR, Indonesia and Bangladesh. The project EOD was 01 March 2002 and NTE is to be 28 February 2006, with the donor contribution of USD 1.598 million and the Sri Lankan Government contribution of USD 0.85 million (in kind).

Originally, the project was to be implemented in 30 representative sites from 15 districts of 7 provinces. However, due to the budgetary and time constraints for implementation only one project site in each district will be selected. This was discussed in close consultation with Regional SPFS Coordinator. Actually, since the EOD only five sites in two provinces have been made operational till now (Thammannawewa village, Uyaanwewa village and Induranwila village in Southern province, and Kadahathawewa village and Periyasandigammam village in North Western province). Preparations for implementing the project in the other ten sites are still being made.

Prior to SPFS-SRL, the phase I of the SPFS programme has been initiated with TCP project assistance at two sites in North-western province with a focus on on-farm water management. The TCP project became operational in November 1999. It introduced improved water management in the low land irrigated rice areas and localised irrigation methods for horticultural crops in the upland area. The present project builds on the working relationships between Central/Provincial Government institutions that were developed under the TCP project.

The Project Steering Committee is chaired by the Secretary of the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MoAL) and Provincial Steering Committees have been established in Southern and North-western Provinces. Field Implementation Teams (FIT) were also organized at the five districts where the project is implemented, in order to assist with project implementation. Community Based Organizations (CBO) have been established and opened bank accounts. Revolving funds for agricultural inputs will be operated through these accounts. Up to now, the most promising activities promoted are milk production, irrigation improvement, vegetable production and inland fisheries production.

The revolving fund has been operated in the several project sites and it will be a major function in supporting SPFS programme. To improve repayment, Social Mobilisers have been hired to monitor the revolving fund system. Farmers Group Development Plans (FGDP), intended to facilitate communication and participatory monitoring and evaluation, have been promoted.

2. Purpose of the Evaluation

The project document states that a tripartite evaluation will take place during the project. The present evaluation, scheduled at the mid-term of the project, is intended to make an in-depth assessment of the progress made in project implementation and propose recommendations for changes in the overall design and orientation of the project deemed necessary, along with operational recommendations on the work-plan for the remainder of the project and for facilitating national ownership of the programme.

3. Scope of the Evaluation

The joint tripartite evaluation mission (hereinafter refer to as "the mission") will assess the:

a) Relevance of the project to development priorities and needs of the country.
b) Clarity and realism of the project's development and immediate objectives, including specification of targets and identification of beneficiaries and prospects for sustainability.
c) Quality, clarity and adequacy of project design including:

- clarity and logical consistency between, inputs, activities, outputs and progress towards achievement of objectives (quality, quantity and time-frame);
- realism and clarity in the specification of prior obligations and prerequisites (assumptions and risks);
- realism and clarity of external institutional relationships, and in the managerial and institutional framework for implementation and the work plan;
- likely cost-effectiveness of the project design.

d) Efficiency and adequacy of project implementation including: availability of funds as compared with budget for both the donor and national component; the quality and timeliness of input delivery by both FAO and the Government; timeliness and quality of activities; managerial efficiency in dealing with implementation difficulties; adequacy of monitoring and reporting; the extent of national support and commitment; and the quality and quantity of administrative and technical support by FAO.

e) Actual and potential project results, including a full and systematic assessment of outputs produced to date and progress made towards achieving the immediate objectives:

- Development of self-reliance of poor rural and peri-urban communities, local organizations and associations in diagnosing opportunities and constraints, planning, management and development of practical solutions to improve food security
- Strengthening the institutional and technical capacity of Farmers' Organizations and related community-based organizations to carry out various activities in food security
- Intensifying and diversifying crop production
- Increasing livestock production

- Increasing local fish production and distribution
- Improving small-scale agro-processing, post-harvest handling and storage.

f) The prospects for sustaining the project's results by the beneficiaries and the host institutions after the termination of the project, particularly regarding:.

- intensive livestock and fisheries production system;
- marketability of agricultural products;
- strengthened government extension, communication and training services;
- organization and management of farmers groups, including management of village revolving fund;
- general socio-economic improvements (in particular for groups, women and disadvantaged people);
- capacity of government to sustain the project initiatives (central, provincial and district government) and;
- replicability of the project results by the Government of Sri Lanka.

g) The overall cost-effectiveness of the project, especially in terms of serving as piloting various development activities, including the identification of appropriate approaches and lessons/issues for future.

In conducting the evaluation, the mission will pay particular attention to the following issues: project ownership, partnerships among stakeholders, gender awareness, appropriateness of site selection, relevance of planning and training approaches, and viability of the micro credit and revolving fund systems.

Based on the above analysis the mission will draw specific conclusions and make proposals for any necessary further action by Government and/or FAO/donor to ensure sustainable development, including any need for additional assistance and activities of the project prior to its completion. The mission will draw attention to any lessons of general interest and comment on the long-term relevance to the overall objectives of the SPFS-SRL.

4. Composition of the Mission

The mission will comprise:

Team leader (FAO-PBEE)
Specialist in “Rural Development” (Japan)
Specialist in “food security” (Sri Lanka)

The mission will be supported in its field work by the Regional SPFS Coordinator. It should be briefed and debriefed by the responsible FAO operations (TCOS) and technical officers. Mission members should be independent and thus have no previous direct involvement with the project either with regard to its formulation, implementation or backstopping. They should preferably have experience of evaluation.

5. Timetable and Itinerary of the Mission

The timetable and Itinerary is shown as follows. This trust funded programme is supported by the Government of Japan therefore a courtesy call to the Embassy of Japan and discussion is planned. (see Annex-1.)

6. Consultations

The mission will maintain close liaison with the representatives of the donor and FAO and the concerned national agencies, as well as with national and international project staff. Although the mission should feel free to discuss with the authorities concerned anything relevant to its assignment, it is not authorized to make any commitments on behalf of the Government, the donor, or FAO.

7. Reporting

The mission is fully responsible for its independent report which may not necessarily reflect the views of the Government, the donor or FAO. The report will be written in conformity with the headings as given in the Annex-2.

The report will be completed, to the extent possible, in the country and the findings and recommendations fully discussed with all concerned parties and wherever possible consensus achieved.

The mission will also complete the FAO Project Evaluation Questionnaire.

The mission leader bears responsibility for finalization of the report, which will be submitted to FAO within two weeks of mission completion. FAO will submit the report to Government(s) and donor together with its comments.

Annex 2 – Mission Itinerary and Persons Met

			Activities	Place
1	21/02/04	Sat	Arrival of Mr Suzuki	Colombo
2	22	Sun	Document Review	Colombo
3	23	Mon	00:30 Arrival of Mr Moore 09:00 Meting with FAOR 10:30 Meeting with ERD 13:30 Meeting with MoAL, Secretary 14:00 Debriefing by PMU	Colombo
4	24	Tue	Discussion/Document Review	Colombo
5	25	Wed	07:00 Leave for Periasandigamum site 11:30 Discussion with Periasandigamum FG 14:00 Leave for Kurunegala 18:00 Arrive at Kurunegala	Kurunegala
6	26	Thu	08:30 Leave for Kadahatawewa site 09:30 Discussion with Kadahatawewa FG 12:30 Leave for Kurunegala 14:00 Meeting with Provincial Secretary of Agriculture 16:30 Leave for Kandy 20:00 Arrive at Kandy	Kandy
7	27	Fri	08:00 Leave for Havandhana site 11:00 Discussion with Havandhana FG 14:00 Leave for Embilipitiya 19:00 Arrive at Embilipitiya	Embilipitiya
8	28	Sat	08:30 Leave for Maduwanwela 10:00 Discussion with Maduwanwela FG 14:00 Leave for Colombo 21:00 Arrive at Colombo	Colombo
9	29	Sun	Report Writing	Colombo
10	01/03/04	Mon	Report Writing	Colombo
11	02	Tue	09:30 Discussion with PMU, Report Writing	Colombo
12	03	Wed	10:00 National Project Steering Committee meeting 15:00 Debriefing with Japanese Ambassador	Colombo
13	04	Thu	01:50 Leave for Bangkok 06:10 Arrive at Bangkok 13:30 Debriefing meeting in RAP	Bangkok
14	05	Fri	Departure of Mr Moore	Bangkok
15	06	Sat	Departure of Mr Suzuki	Bangkok

Annex 3 – List of Key Persons Met

FAO Colombo & Programme Management Unit

1. Mr. M. Jusoh, FAO Representative
2. Dr. D. Kuruppuarachchi, Programme Officer
3. Dr. M. Joseph, PMU Team Leader, Agronomist
4. Mr. H. Gamage, PMU Water Management Specialist
5. Dr. D. Ratnayake, PMU Livestock Specialist
6. Mr. A. M. Jayasekra, PMU Aquaculture Specialist
7. Ms Shoko Hayakawa, PMU Associate Professional Officer

Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock

1. Mr. D. Hettiarachchi, Secretary,
2. Mr. S. V. Ariyarathne, Addl. Secretary
3. Mr. B. Perera, National Project Coordinator
4. Mr L. Hathurusinghe, Director (Projects)
5. Ms. S. Niunhella, Deputy Director (Projects)
6. Mr. N. Vithange, Assistant Director, ERD
7. Mr. P.M. Siriwadena, Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture, Southern Province
8. Mr. T. A. Wimalasena, Provincial Director of Agriculture, Southern Province
9. Mr. M. Gunawansa, Additional Secretary, Ministry of Fisheries
10. Mr. MS. Wickramaarachchi, Secretary, Ocean Resources, Ministry of Fisheries

Project Site –Periyasandigramum, Puttalum District

1. Mr. K. M. A. Sukoor, Assistant Director (Agriculture)
2. Mr. S. A. P. M. Ayub, Agriculture Instructor
3. Dr. Sarath Premasiri, Veterinary Surgeon
4. Mr. Sunil Kumara, Community Development Officer
5. Ms. W. Rodrigo, 'Grama Niladari"

Project Site –Kadahathawewa, Kurunegala District

1. Mr. D. M. M. Dissanayaka, Deputy Director (Agriculture)
2. Mr. M. Tikiri Banda, Agriculture Instructor
3. Dr. Malani Dhrmadasa, Veterinary Surgeon
4. Mr. Nimal Karunarathilake,Community Development Officer
5. Ms. H. M. S. K. Herath, Livestock Development Officer
6. Mr. M. B. Rajakaruna, Regional Aquaculture Extension Officer
7. Mr. Karunatilake, Technical officer, Dept. of Agrarian Development
8. Ms. A. M. T. G. Alahakoon, Divisional Officer, Dept. of Agrarian Development

Project Site –Havandana, Badulla District

1. Mr. Nimal Bandara, Provincial Director (Agriculture), Uva province
2. Dr. . J. P. Athapathu, Deputy Director (Agriculture), Moneragala
3. Mr. R. M. Sudu Banda, Agriculture Instructor

4. Dr. J. Nadarajaha, Veterinary Surgeon
5. Dr. Sarath Gamage, Veterinary Surgeon
6. Mr. D. J. S. S. Jayalath,Community Development Officer
7. Ms. J. M. Kiribanda, Livestock Development Officer
8. Mr. R. S. K. Bandara, Regional Aquaculture Extension Officer
9. Mr. H. M. D. Gunathilake, Dept. of Agrarian Development
10. Mr. S. M. Jayasundara, Divisional Officer, Dept. of Agrarian Development
11. Ms. K. B. G. Dhammika, Development Coordinator
12. M. P. Dissanayake, Livestock Development Officer
13. Mr. K. Nandalal, "Grama Niladari"
14. Mr. A. M. Jayasekera, Subject Matter officer (Agric)
15. Ms. A. S. Dissanayeka, Assistant Director (Agriculture)
16. Mr. A. B. Wijetunga, Agricultural Officer,
17. Mr. W. M. W. C. Wimalarathne, Subject Matter officer (Agric)
18. Mr. A. M. M. Aththanayeka, Assistant Director (Agriculture)
19. Ms. R. M. Sudumenike, Agric. Res. & Dev. Officer
20. Ms. S. K. N. Rubasinghe, Assistant Director (Agriculture)

Project Site –Maduwanwela, Ratnapura District

1. Mr. E. Chandrasena, Secretary (Agriculture), Provincial Ministry of Agriculture
2. Ms. Hasanthi Werasagoda, Assistant Director (Agriculture)
3. Mr. P. M. Pushpakumara, Agriculture Instructor
4. Mr. P. A. Piyasena, Livestock Development Officer
5. Mr. Jagath Keerthi, Regional Aquaculture Extension Officer
6. Mr. S. H. Thilakarathne, Agric. Res. & Dev. Officer
7. Mr. A. H. Kodikara, Divisional Officer, Dept. of Agrarian Development
8. Dr. D. P. Wanasundara, Provincial Director (Animal production & health)
9. Mr. Kumudu Ariyarathne, Veterinary Surgeon
10. Ms. S. H. Wimalawathi, Agric. Res. & Dev. Officer
11. Mr. S. Wickramanayake, Livestock Development officer
12. Mr. K. P. Karawita, Deputy Director (Agriculture)

Provincial Council North Western Province

1. Mr. R. A. Thilakarathne, Secretary (Agriculture), Provincial Ministry of Agriculture
2. Mr. M. M. Premachandra, Provincial Director (Agriculture)
3. Dr. A. Chandrasoma, Provincial Director (Animal Production & Health)

Annex 4 – SPFS Project Statement of Expenditure April 2002 to January 2004

	REVISED TOTAL BUDGET	BUDGET Y1 & Y2	APR-DEC 2002 EXPENDITURE	JAN-DEC 2003 EXPENDITURE	JAN 2004 EXPENDITURE	TOTAL EXPENDITURE Y1 & Y2	TOTAL BALANCE AVAILABLE FOR Y3 & Y4	EXPENDIT (%)
SALARIES GENERAL SERVICE	**13,100**	**4,800**	1,365.15	4,408.04	368.59	6,141.78	**6,958.22**	46.88
CONSULTANTS	**162,400**	**99,600**	14,168.49	33,004.10	2,843.62	50,016.21	**112,383.79**	30.80
CONTRACTS	**170,000**	**102,000**	2,690.72	15,692.43	1,619.51	20,002.66	**149,997.34**	11.77
OVERTIME	**4,500**	**4,000**	164.88	2.85	0.00	167.73	**4,332.27**	3.73
TRAVEL	**72,000**	**39,600**	4,347.17	14,129.17	1,156.63	19,632.97	**52,367.03**	27.27
TRAINING	**360,000**	**180,000**	1,621.37	16,019.07	1,984.13	19,624.57	**340,375.43**	5.45
EXPENDABLE	**400,000**	**232,000**	0.00	39,672.43	5,493.14	45,165.57	**354,834.43**	11.29
NON-EXPENDABLE	**55,500**	**55,500**	6,364.47	24,413.83	0.00	30,778.30	**24,721.70**	55.46
TECHNICAL SUPPORT SERVICES	**104,000**	**72,000**	10,337.00	17,427.00	0.00	27,764.00	**76,236.00**	26.70
GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES	**47,900**	**25,000**	4,687.48	9,527.03	877.19	15,091.70	**32,808.30**	31.51
SUPPORT COST	**208,411**	**122,175**	11,681.00	25,069.00	0.00	36,750.00	**171,661.00**	17.63
TOTAL	**1,597,811**	**936,675**	**57,427.73**	**199,364.95**	**14,342.81**	**271,135.49**	**1,326,675.51**	16.97

Annex 5 – Training carried out under GCP/SRL/049/JPN

New Sites- Havandana, Batahelayaya, Maduwanwela, Ruwanwella

No	Title of the Training programme	Project Site	Period	Duration days	Cost (Rs.)		Participants		Gender	
							Officers	Farmers	M	F
HAVANDANA, KANDAKETIYA										
1	Awareness programme on fish farming	Havandana	29/12/03	1	8,460	00	04	48	46	06
2.	Poultry Management	Havandana,	18/12/03	1	1,895	00		23		
BATAHELAYAYA,WELLAWAYA										
1	Training of Farmers at Nikaaveratiya Livestock Trai. Centre	Batahelayaya	18-19/12/03	2	34,127	00		36	19	17
2	Fish Farming in Seasonal Tanks	Batahelayaya,	18/12/03	1	5,119	00		08	5	3
MADUWANWELA, RATNAPURA										
1	New Paddy Production Technology	Maduwanwela	11/12/03	1	3,620	00		27	25	2
RUWANWELL, KEGALLE										
1	Paddy Production New Technology	Ruwanwella	13/01/04	1	4,292	00	03	23	07	16
2	Accounts and Book Keeping	Ruwanwella	13/12/03	1	7,552	00	03	23	07	16

Progress of Training in Project Sites
Induranawela

No	Title of the Training programme	Period	Duration days	Cost (Rs.)		Participants		Gender	
						Officers	Farmers	M	F
1	Training in efficient seeding and weeding	03/04/03	01	17,000	00	10	15	20	05
2	Awareness on livestock farming	27/05/03	01	1,664	00		34	21	13
3	Field visit to Labuduwa and Mapalana Livestock Farms			15,008	00		24		
4	Promotion of artificial insemination	27/06/03	01	1,196	00		26	19	07

5	Mushroom Cultivation	03/08/03	01	9,327	00		25		
6	Accounts and Book Keeping	26/07/03	01	13,184	00	05	36	NA	NA
7	Compost Production Methods	21/11/03		2,405	00		25	15	10
8	Pests and Decease control in paddy	08/07/03		13,754	00		30		
9	Value addition of Agricultural Produce			1,313	00				
10	Inland and pond fish culture	21/07/03	01	12,795	00		14	12	02
11	Poultry-Broiler and egg production	13/08/03	01	146	00		3	3	
12	Pasture Production		01	3,550	00		15	15	
13	Awareness Training Programme on up-grading existing stock		01	2,604	00		17	17	
14	Water Management for paddy and OFC	16-17/10/03	2	26,810	00		20	18	02
15	Goat Farming	06/09/03	1	903	00		8	5	3
16	Bee Keeping		1	9,010	00				
17	Cattle Mgt and construction of cattle sheds	20/09/03	01	2,995	00		24	24	

Progress of Training in Project Sites
Kadahathawewa

No	Title of the Training programme	Period	Duration days	Cost (Rs.)		Participants		Gender	
						Officers	Farmers	M	F
1	Fish Farming in seasonal tanks	15/03/03	01	8,125	00		27	27	
2	Accounts and Book Keeping	2-3/4/03	02	36,288	50		15	13	02
3	2nd Training Prog. On Fish farming		02	35,015	00		24	20	24
4	Farmers Field School to improve productivity of paddy cultivation	During yala season		8,000	00		15	12	03
5	Cross visits to farmers fields, Mahawa,Nagollagama,Ambanpola fields	13/05/03	01	6,100	00		30	30	
6	Field visit to Livestock Farm, Nikaweratiya	1/07/03	01	8,250	00	2	16	12	04
7	Training of Trainers on Water Management	18-19/08/03	02	24,457	40		30	27	03
8	Value Addition and rice processing Technology	31/7-1/8/03	02	16,649	00	13	13		
9	Field Day-OFC and Crop Diversification	15/07/03	01	6,840	00		76	50	26

10	Training on grass cultivation & feeding	18/12/03	01	5,500	00		20	20	
11	Field visit to livestock farm		01	8,250	00				
12	First training programme on fish farming	17/03/03	01	8,250	00	02	25	27	

Progress of Training in Project Sites
Uyanwewa

No	Title of the training programme	Period	Duration	Cost (Rs.)	Participants		Gender	
					Officers	Farmer	M	F
1	Farmers and officers field tour to Rice Rice station, Agri . Exhibition, Farmers field, Dambulla.	17/7-19/7/03	03	76,644.00	07	43	43	07
2	New technology in paddy production	30/06/03	01	8,043.00	04	23		
3	Crop diversification OFC training	22/06/03	01		06	35		
4	Use of organic fertilizer and other inputs (Field school)	Over the season(Yala)	16	13,200.00	02	25		
5	Land development and soil conservation							
6	OFC and water management training at ASTI A'pelessa	22-24, June,03		29,539.00	05	18	23	-
7	Study tour to Mapalana farm by livestock farmers	21/07/03		15,084.10	-	25		
8	Training in livestock farming	21/08/03				20		
9	Training on value addition rice	31/07/03		2,300.00		30		

Progress of Training in Project Sites
Thammennawewa

No	Title of the training programme	Period	Duration	Cost (Rs.)	Participants		Gender	
					Officers	Farmer	M	F
1	Reproduction cattle and buffaloes	13/11/03		1,709.00		13	13	
2	Field visit model livestock farm Tissamaharamaya	22/11/03		6,996.00		20	16	04

3	Training in paddy cultivators	-		15,500.00	10	30		
4	Training in book keeping in farmer organization	28/11/03	01	4,625.00		25		
5	Training in OFC cultivation	28/11/03	01	31,250.00			40	10
6	Livestock farming awareness workshop	28/11/03	01	776.00	01	06	06	01
7	Field visit to agriculture exhibition MI, rice research Batalagoa and OFC cultivation Dambulla	16/07-18/07	3 days		04	50	40	14
8	Second training programme on fish farming Udawalawa Aquaculture development centre	28/02/03	01		12	5	17	
9	Training on paddy and crop diversification	25-26, March, 03	Two day	14,493.86	30	5	28	07
10	First training programme on fish farming, Sulu Deewara, Badagiriya	28/02/03	01	4,262.00		17	17	

Progress of Training in Project Sites
Periyasandhigama

No	Title of the training programme	Period	Duration	Cost (Rs.)	Participants		Gender	
					Officers	Farmer	M	F
1	Field visit to Agriculture exhibition MI	17/7/03	01	11,200.00	3	47	35	15
2	Cross visit to Siatel model farm to study integrated farming	20/03/03	01	4,725.00	2	20	8	14
3	Training on accounts and book keeping	12/04/03		2,880.00	5	10		
4	Study tour for livestock development livestock Livestock farm Nikaweratiya	24/06/03	01	14,000.00		50		
5	Integrated farm management ISTI, Gannoruwa	15-17/10/03	2	39,578.50	11	30		

6	Poultry training Livestck traing centre Wannigama	06/08/03	01	15,770.00		15	12	3
7	Water pump repair training	20/10/03	01	1,700.00				

Workshops

No	Workshop	Date	Participants		Gender	
			Officers	Farmers	M	F
1	Project launching - North Western Province	08-08-02		62	2	60
2	Project launching- Southern Province	16-08-02		44	3	41
3	Project launching – Uva Province	19-06-03		48	5	43
4	Project launching – Sabaragamuwa province	05-06-03		61	6	55
5	CAP workshop, Kurunegala	18-12-02	07	69	56	13
6	CAP workshop, Puttalum	07-01-03	06	69		
7	CAP workshop, Galle	05-03-03	21	41	18	23
8	CAP workshop, Matara	12-12-02	10	83	52	31
9	CAP workshop, Hambantota	11-12-02	14	52	46	06
10	CAP workshop, Kegalle	23-09-03	13			
11	CAP workshop, Ratnapura	26-09-03	09	97	63	34
12	CAP workshop, Badulla	20-10-03	13			
13	CAP workshop, Monaragala	23-10-03	15	103	59	44
14	National project launch workshop	14-02-03	54	-	-	-

Studies and surveys support by the project

PRA & Socio economic Baseline Survey- North Western Province	PRA	SEBS	Consultants
1.Kadahatha	07-10-02	01/10/02 - 07/10/03	Dr. Miss. AMTP. Athauda , Department of Agribusiness management , Faculty of Agriculture and Plantation Management, Wayamba University, SriLanka
2.Thelabiyagedara	31-10-02	31/10/02 – 01/11/02	
3.Periayasandhigama	15-11-02	27/11/02 – 28/11/02	
4.Nawadankulama	20-11-02	21/11/02 – 25/11/02	

PRA & Socio economic Baseline Survey – Southern Province			
5.Thammennawewa	01/11/02	31/10/02 - 2/11/02	Prof. Mahinda Wijeratna, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Ruhuna
6.Nawaneliya	05/11/02	04/11/02 – 06/11/02	
7.Uyanwewa	14/11/02	13/12/02 – 15/12/02	
8Makavita	21/11/02	18/11/02 – 20/11/02	
9.Indurannawila	27/01/03	22/01/03 – 24/01//03	
PRA &Socio economic Baseline Survey - Sabaragamuwa Province			
10.Doranuwa	01/09/03	02/09/03 – 04/09/03	Mr. MGM. Razak, Environment Development consultant,32, Old Galaha Road, Peradeniya
11.Maduwanwela	08/09/03	10/09/03 – 12/09/03	
PRA and Socio economic Baseline Survey Uva Province			
12.Kandeketiya	01/10/03	02/10/03 -04/10/03	Mr. Lional Tilakaratne, Rural Centre for Development, 97, Kurunegala Road, Nikaweratiya
13.Batahelayaya	06/10/03	07/10/03 – 10/10/03	