

Evaluation

of

**Emergency Rehabilitation of Agri-Based Livelihood for**

**Disadvantaged Farmers and Returning Internally Displaced**

**People in Mindanao**

**(OSRO/PHI/501/JPN)**

**Report of the Evaluation Mission**

**July 2007**

## Preface

The following document represents the views of the independent evaluation mission on the performance and achievements of the project Emergency Rehabilitation of Agri-Based Livelihood for Disadvantaged Farmers and Returning Internally Displaced People in Mindanao (OSRO/PHI/501/JPN). The project's official starting date was March 2005 with a planned duration until February 2007, later extended until May. (Actual operations did not start until August 2005.)

The evaluation was initiated with a view to providing the Government, FAO and the donor with an independent and objective assessment of the results of the project, as well as formulating recommendations on further steps necessary to consolidate progress and ensure achievement of objectives. The evaluation started on 8 February 2007 and ended on 28 February 2007. The mission met with FAO and government officials as well as donor representatives in Metro Manila and Davao, and undertook extensive field trips in Mindanao in order to meet project beneficiaries at project sites, and to hold discussions with project collaborators from the regional down to the barangay level.

The mission's main views regarding the projects are presented in the Executive Summary, followed by more specific Conclusions and Recommendations. The main body of the report presents additional views and amplifications, while annexes provide information on the mission background as well as statistical information on the main features of the project.

The evaluation methodology used the following methods: document analysis, (semi-structured) interviews with officials at various administrative levels as well as representatives of development agencies, field visits and group as well as individual meetings with beneficiaries and local officials, SWOT analysis with project staff and stakeholders, and repeated feedback sessions with project experts. The field visits were useful to give the mission a first-hand impression of the project performance, and the response by project beneficiaries. They do not substitute, however, for an in-depth assessment of the impact of the project at the field level.

The evaluation mission is most appreciative of the support given to the mission by the project Team Leader, the project staff, the FAO Representation, and the government officials and counterparts in the places visited. Thanks also go to all other interlocutors, who provided information and discussed issues in a frank and constructive manner. Last, but not least, the mission is grateful to the project beneficiaries met: without exception, they gave a warm welcome to the mission and provided valuable insights.

### The Evaluation Mission<sup>1</sup>

Bernd Bultemeier, Evaluation Service, FAO, Rome (Team Leader)  
Alberto R Robles, Government Representative/Resource Person (Livestock)  
Marianito R Villanueva, Resource Person (Agronomy)

---

<sup>1</sup> A Japanese Government Representative was expected to participate, but this proved impossible for the dates scheduled.

## List of Acronyms

Act for Peace	-	(Successor to MDP III)
ARMM	-	Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao
CAHV	-	Community Animal Health Volunteer
CRS	-	Catholic Relief Service
CSO	-	Civil Society Organization
DA	-	Department of Agriculture
DA-RFU	-	DA Regional Field Unit
DSWD	-	Department of Social Welfare and Development
FAO	-	Food and Agriculture Organization (of the UN)
FIES	-	Family Income and Expenditure Survey
GDP	-	Gross Domestic Product
GOJ	-	Government of Japan
GOP	-	Government of the Philippines
IDP	-	Internally Displaced Person (People)
KR	-	Kennedy Round
LGU	-	Local Government Unit
MAO	-	Municipal Agricultural Officer
MDP	-	Multi-Donor Programme
MEDCo	-	Mindanao Economic Development Council
MILF	-	Moro Islamic Liberation Front
MNLF	-	Moro National Liberation Front
NDCC	-	National Disaster Coordinating Council
NGO	-	Non-Government Organization
NP	-	New People's Army
NSO	-	National Statistical Office
PAO	-	Provincial Agricultural Officer
PBEE	-	Evaluation Service (FAO)
PBG	-	Project Beneficiary Group
PDC	-	Peace and Development Community
PMO	-	Project Management Office
SWOT	-	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats
UN	-	United Nations
WFP	-	World Food Programme

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>PREFACE</b> .....	<b>I</b>
<b>LIST OF ACRONYMS</b> .....	<b>II</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b> .....	<b>III</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....	<b>4</b>
THE WAY FORWARD .....	7
<b>A. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>B. PROJECT DESIGN</b> .....	<b>10</b>
B.1 Objectives and Outputs.....	10
B.2 Indicators, Work Plans and Assumptions.....	11
B.3 Institutional Arrangements.....	11
B.4 Beneficiaries.....	12
<b>C. IMPLEMENTATION</b> .....	<b>12</b>
C.1 Project Budget and Utilization .....	12
C.2 Implementation Status .....	14
C.3 Technical and Operational Backstopping.....	16
C.4 Government Support.....	17
C.5 Project Management.....	17
<b>D. RESULTS</b> .....	<b>18</b>
D.1 Increased food security for disadvantaged farmers/IDPs and restoration of agri based livelihood activities..	18
D.2 Increased crop yields - at least during the project duration - through basic agricultural input distribution .....	18
D.3 Increased protein in the beneficiaries' diet through backyard production of poultry and small livestock .....	19
D.4 Increased self-reliance of beneficiaries, as the emergency activities may provide livelihoods diversification in a longer term.....	20
<b>CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - PROJECT SPHERE</b> .....	<b>22</b>
Project design.....	22
Technical and Operational Backstopping .....	22
Project Management .....	23
Government Ownership and Commitment .....	23
Implementation Difficulties.....	23
<b>RESULTS SPHERE</b> .....	<b>24</b>
Immediate Objective 1: Increased food security for disadvantaged farmers/IDPs and restoration of agri-based livelihood activities.....	24
Immediate Objective 2: increased crop yields - at least during the project duration - through basic agricultural input distribution .....	24
Immediate Objective 3: Increased protein in the beneficiaries' diet through backyard production of poultry and small livestock.....	24
Immediate Objective 4: increased self-reliance of beneficiaries, as the emergency activities may provide livelihoods diversification in a longer term.....	25
<b>SPECIFIC TOPICS AND ISSUES</b> .....	<b>25</b>
Cost-Effectiveness.....	25
Collaboration With Non-Governmental Organizations And Other Development Initiatives And Agencies.....	26
Sustainability .....	26
Annex 1 Terms of Reference .....	27
Annex 2 Itinerary and List of People Met .....	31
Annex 3 Summary Table – Project Inputs Delivered (as of October 2006).....	35

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Mindanao is a major producer of agricultural products in the Philippines. In 2000, Mindanao accounted for nearly 40 percent of the national gross domestic product (GDP) and contributed considerably to the country's total agricultural production. However, agricultural development in Mindanao has been frequently interrupted by armed conflicts to the extent that areas became inaccessible and inhabitants were forced to relocate. It is estimated that 50,000 to 90,000 families have been displaced by the continuing conflicts. In addition, there are problems of poverty and unequal distribution of wealth: Mindanao continues to have the highest incidence of poverty in the Philippines, with all regions having at least 45 percent of the population below the poverty threshold<sup>2</sup>, and at least during the 1990s, the poor got relatively poorer compared to the rich. At the same time, the signing of a peace agreement with one major rebel group followed by a multi-donor programme and other government-backed activities provided an opportunity to bring the poorer segments of Mindanao back into the mainstream of development.

Against this background, the project was developed in 2004 in order "to assist the Government of the Philippines' efforts to ensure food security in rural households and alleviate poverty among disadvantaged families in Mindanao"<sup>3</sup>. The project was in principle approved in February 2005 (but formally signed only in August 2005) with a total budget of US\$ 1,810,000 (increased to US\$ 1,850,000 due to currency fluctuations) and a duration from March 2005 to February 2007<sup>4</sup>. The project targeted "communities that have not received any donor assistance after the conflicts that took place between the MNLF rebels and government forces; and other related events in 2000 and 2003", and the intended beneficiaries of the project include "rebel forces and their families, evacuated residents, internally displaced persons (IDPs) and residents living below poverty level in the same communities as the IDPs"<sup>5</sup>.

The project strategy was to "... focus on delivery of basic agriculture inputs (seeds, fertilizer and hand tools, small equipment and implements) for enhanced small-scale agriculture and livestock production. In addition, the project includes a component of capacity building of women organizations and farmers in order to promote self-reliance and sustainability". Main expected project outputs include "increased food security for disadvantaged farmers/IDPs and restoration of agri-based livelihood activities", and "... increase in crop yields and protein content in beneficiaries' diet".

The project document contained a section on Specific Objectives, which however, mixed up project activities (such as "conduct needs assessment") with actual objectives (e.g. "enhance farmers' self reliance"). A more accurate reflection of the project's objectives was in the "Expected Outputs" section:

- increased food security for disadvantaged farmers/IDPs and restoration of agri-based livelihood activities for some 19,880 cassava growers, 15,720 corn growers; 23,480 poultry and small livestock breeders; and 201,736 vegetable growers<sup>6</sup>;
- increased crop yields - at least during the project duration - through basic agricultural input distribution;

<sup>2</sup> The overall poverty incidence in the Philippines is 37 percent.

<sup>3</sup> The project was classified as an emergency project, although it clearly had at least a dual focus on rehabilitation as well as development (increased self-reliance, improved food security). The classification as emergency project probably conditioned the project to put emphasis on delivery of supplies and equipment.

<sup>4</sup> The delay was apparently due in order to comply with accounting procedures of the donor, and ongoing discussions among the project parties regarding the final project set-up. The project duration was initially not adjusted, and only in early 2007 extended until May 2007.

<sup>5</sup> The target communities were said to be "randomly distributed in several regions of Mindanao", to be selected in "consultations with local government units, NGOs in the respective areas including UN agencies and international organizations already operating in the area".

<sup>6</sup> The number of expected beneficiaries fluctuated in the project document. (Other numbers were 38,087 and 58,286 beneficiaries.)

- increased protein in the beneficiaries' diet through backyard production of poultry and small livestock;
- increased self-reliance of beneficiaries, as the emergency activities may provide livelihoods diversification in a longer term.

Towards the attainment of these objectives, important results have been achieved, including:

- Identification of initially 112 project beneficiary sites and development of project proposals jointly with the beneficiaries and local counterparts (savings in project expenditure allowed for the inclusion of another 67 sites);
- Completed delivery of most planned inputs for the above 112 sites, including fertilizers, corn seeds and processing equipment, farm machinery, carabaos, goats, chicken, cassava planting material and processing equipment, and solar drying pavement (new projects also include ferro-cement tanks, roofing and fencing materials for animal husbandry, etc)<sup>7</sup>;
- Provision of beneficiary training through Farmers' Field Schools (13 Season-Long Farmers Field Schools on Corn & Vegetable Production<sup>8</sup>), and other short-term technical training<sup>9</sup> (78);
- Development of collaboration routines with counterparts in the Local Government Units as well as offices of the DA;
- Conclusion of partnership agreements with the World Food Programme (WFP) and the Catholic Relief Service (CRS) for joint activities to support training, provision of reliable water sources, backyard gardening and livestock raising.

Due to the very limited time frame of the project, it is too soon to judge the impact of the project in terms of its wider-reaching objectives: it remains to be seen whether the assistance provided will lead to future more self-reliance of beneficiaries and increased livelihoods diversification. The project has overall been effective in fulfilling its mandate regarding provision of inputs: the project has exceeded its original targets and appears to be on track to finalize input deliveries also for the additional projects by March 2007. However, the mission also noted constraints in the project that could affect its performance and future impact, and which should be addressed in a proposed follow-up project. These constraints relate to various factors:

- Significant differences among project beneficiary groups in their capacity to manage joint activities (thus raising doubts about the sustainability of project interventions);
- Limited operational resources and technical expertise in some local administrations;
- Continuing security risks in some areas;
- Uneven interaction and communication with some institutional partners;
- Remote project sites requiring complex logistical arrangements; and
- Project reporting focused on recording deliveries, but not covering impact (project benefit) monitoring.

In the view of the mission, the longer-term impact of the project is not yet guaranteed. The project has tried out various approaches in supporting beneficiaries (integrated approach providing whole assistance packages to a community versus selected individual interventions targeting a beneficiary group): the lessons learned from these approaches still need to be analysed and consolidated. Within the given time frame, not much progress could be expected in terms of better organization building and enterprise development among beneficiaries (interventions 5.1.1.9 and 5.1.1.10 in the project document); these involve longer-term social processes. Also, in some isolated cases problems have

<sup>7</sup> Annex 3 lists inputs delivered as of October 2006; approximate value then was US\$ 1,000,000.

<sup>8</sup> Ranging from four to six months duration.

<sup>9</sup> Topics included organic vegetable production, corn seed production, nursery & beekeeping, corn husk handicrafts, and animal husbandry. Total expenditure on training has been approximately US\$ 50,000.

been observed regarding the correct application of agreed-upon procedures by beneficiaries<sup>10</sup>. Furthermore, as many project inputs (such as seeds and animals) have not yet gone through a productive cycle, it remains to be seen whether the passing-on scheme stipulated by the project (returning offspring, harvested seeds and other benefits to the community for other beneficiaries lower down the waiting list) will work and lead to an equitable distribution of benefits to all members of the beneficiary community.

Thus, the current project phase can be regarded as a pilot period: while delivery of inputs has exceeded the original target, the objective of increased self-reliance of beneficiaries and livelihoods diversification needs a longer-term perspective. In addition, the project has so far benefited only a few beneficiaries out of a much larger number of eligible families in the target areas (estimates by local officials ranged from 5% to 20%): also for reasons of social equity and harmony, it appears essential to continue (and increase) assistance to other eligible families.

For these reasons, the mission recommends that the project should be followed up: to reach at least a majority of eligible beneficiaries in the target areas, to support organizational strengthening and enterprise development (including livelihood diversification), and to ensure an equitable distribution of benefits.

Emphasis should be given to intensifying the development character of the project, with a preference for strengthening and fine-tuning project activities rather than expanding their range. Also, the project should promote transparency about project deliveries and services, and make sure that conditions regarding cost recovery and passing on of benefits are observed. (This may involve forging even stronger links with local government units and traditional leaders.) A consolidation and intensification is also recommended for the geographical target area: already now the spread-out project area places high demands on the project in terms of logistics. Finally, the follow-up project should analyse and document successful project interventions, with a view to identifying lessons learned that can be taken up and replicated in the context of larger programmes.

The mission recognizes that improving food security and livelihoods in Mindanao is a challenging task, as living standards in many rural areas are depressed while the administration is constrained by limited resources. The momentum built by the project can be kept: at the minimum, this will require continued monitoring and follow-up by government units at all levels. The scenario preferred by the evaluation mission is a new project phase: to consolidate successful project interventions, and to contribute to more social equity by reaching a larger number of eligible beneficiaries.

---

<sup>10</sup> Such as selling an animal by a project beneficiary to a trader, who in turn sells it to the project for delivery to the same beneficiary.

## **THE WAY FORWARD**

The project has achieved encouraging results, but progress has been slower than anticipated due to delays in setting up the project and recruiting all staff. The project so far has concentrated on delivery of relief items: in a next phase, it has to focus on nurturing the development processes it has set in motion, and on identifying and optimizing interventions which can be replicated by GOP and development partners on a wider scale.

For this reason, a follow-up project is recommended to consolidate and upscale achievements of current project.

In the follow-up/consolidation project, there should be a clearer concentration on the development character of the project. The aim should be to reach at least a majority of eligible beneficiaries in the existing target areas, to support organizational strengthening and enterprise development (including livelihood diversification), and to ensure an equitable distribution of benefits.

Emphasis should be on strengthening and fine-tuning project activities rather than expanding the diversity of activities. Also, the project should promote transparency about project deliveries and services, and make sure that conditions regarding cost recovery and passing on of benefits are observed. (This may involve forging even stronger links with local government units and traditional leaders, as well as involving external monitors.) A consolidation and intensification is also recommended for the geographical target area: already now the spread-out project area places high demands on the project in terms of logistics. Finally, the follow-up project should analyse and document successful project interventions, with a view to identifying lessons learned that can be taken up and replicated in the context of larger programmes.

Guiding principles for the project should be:

- Essentially same project set-up (a PMU in Davao, collaboration/coordination with Regional and lower-level agricultural offices as well as NGOs and CSOs)
- Project area: final decision would depend on resources made available, but preference for no change of project area, for reasons of logistics as well as social equity (but additional barangays could be selected in current project area)
- Continuing focus on household food security and nutrition
- Secondary focus on income generation (more emphasis on off-farm activities), with increased attention on long-term sustainability
- Emphasis on consolidating and documenting successful interventions, providing the basis for upscaling and replication by larger programmes
- Reinforced Steering Committee: (more regular meetings, oversight visits);
- Re-definition of Technical Task Force members in conceptualization and guidance (should expertise come from FAO Bangkok or Rome HQ, or to be found mainly within the Philippines?);
- Improved reporting and M&E system: not only reporting against input (activities, services) delivery, but also impact monitoring (so as to be able to identify and analyse advantages and constraints of project interventions);
- Assess interventions undertaken regarding their impact and sustainability (environmental, technical, social, financial);
- Better documentation of interventions undertaken, both for wider audience (awareness raising) and for a development audience (e.g. circulation of manuals,



analytical reports on intervention processes, presentations in technical workshops, etc)

- Emphasis on interventions that can be sustained and replicated by farmers themselves, or with minimum external support;
- Development of an exit strategy (handing-over) for projected end of follow-up project.

Stress on following areas:

Staff:

- Full-time Project Coordinator
- Continue with at least current project team composition

Management:

- If possible, keep current office facilities – improve IT facilities (launch website?)
- Simplify monitoring procedures – regular consolidation of delivery figures

Collaborative arrangements:

- Develop joint planning routine with CSOs and regional/local agricultural offices
- Closer contacts with NGOs for joint projects, avoidance of overlaps, and possible continuation of project activities
- Use external monitors to safeguard equitable distribution of project goods (including monitoring the passing-on schemes), and to guide the development activities in villages (providing help with the running of income-generating activities, etc)

Approaches:

- Main target group to be poor, but able-bodied farmers (who can make productive use of project assistance), collaborate with NGOs and Government for possible inclusion of most disadvantaged groups (aged, infirm, destitute people) in welfare activities;
- Develop manuals (in English and local languages) on development (and distribution) approaches derived from project experience so far, to facilitate replication
- Use village bulletin boards and other public information channels for publicizing list of beneficiaries, deliveries made, etc. in order to improve transparency;
- Give priority to households eligible for project assistance in current project areas (including neighbouring barangays) in future project;
- Continue providing technical assistance (not necessarily new material support) to existing receivers of project assistance;
- Avoid concentration of project assistance packages in single households;
- Document and analyse experience with package approach vs wide-spread distribution of assistance in project areas;
- Introduce welfare component: consider direct transfers from project beneficiaries to destitute households in village as part of loan repayment, to increase social cohesion and commitment;
- Fine-tune input packages and business plans according to local agro-ecological as well as socio-economic conditions (based on available labour, resources and educational background)
- Experiment with small-scale industries where market seems available (soap-making, handicrafts, etc);
- Increase coverage of project activities to include clean drinking water, latrines, waste-pits;

Training:

- Establish need for follow-up and refresher training;
- Explore whether training on nutrition, health, hygiene, sanitation should be included;
- Offer training to as wide a range of participants as possible: to spread the project's messages, and to build up a reserve of trained training collaborators in project areas;
- Training courses should be designed to be short (so as not to interfere too much with other activities), and supported by manuals (in the case of brief hand-outs for farmers, improvements such as lamination should be considered)
- Exchange visits among villages/regions (farmers as well as officials) would reward active participants and lead to a widening of horizons;

## **A. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND**

Mindanao is a major producer of agricultural products in the Philippines. In 2000, Mindanao accounted for nearly 40 percent of the national gross domestic product (GDP) and contributed considerably to the country's total agricultural production. However, agricultural development in Mindanao has been frequently interrupted by armed conflicts to the extent that areas became inaccessible and inhabitants were forced to relocate. It is estimated that 50,000 to 90,000 families have been displaced by the continuing conflicts. In addition, there are problems of poverty and unequal distribution of wealth: Mindanao continues to have the highest incidence of poverty in the Philippines, with all regions having at least 45 percent of the population below the poverty threshold<sup>11</sup>, and at least during the 1990s, the poor got relatively poorer compared to the rich. At the same time, the signing of a peace agreement with one major rebel group followed by a multi-donor programme and other government-backed activities provided an opportunity to bring the poorer segments of Mindanao back into the mainstream of development.

## **B. PROJECT DESIGN**

Against this background, the project was developed in 2004 in order "to assist the Government of the Philippines' efforts to ensure food security in rural households and alleviate poverty among disadvantaged families in Mindanao"<sup>12</sup>. The project was in principle approved in February 2005 (but formally signed only in August 2005) with a total budget of US\$ 1,810,000 (increased to US\$ 1,850,000 due to currency fluctuations) and a duration from March 2005 to February 2007<sup>13</sup>. The project targeted "communities that have not received any donor assistance after the conflicts that took place between the MNLF rebels and government forces; and other related events in 2000 and 2003", and the intended beneficiaries of the project include "rebel forces and their families, evacuated residents, internally displaced persons (IDPs) and residents living below poverty level in the same communities as the IDPs"<sup>14</sup>.

The project strategy was to "... focus on delivery of basic agriculture inputs (seeds, fertilizer and hand tools, small equipment and implements) for enhanced small-scale agriculture and livestock production. In addition, the project includes a component of capacity building of women organizations and farmers in order to promote self-reliance and sustainability". Main expected project outputs include "increased food security for disadvantaged farmers/IDPs and restoration of agri-based livelihood activities", and "... increase in crop yields and protein content in beneficiaries' diet".

### **B.1 Objectives and Outputs**

The project document contained a section on Specific Objectives, which however, mixed up project activities (such as "conduct needs assessment") with actual objectives (e.g. "enhance farmers' self reliance"). A more accurate reflection of the project's objectives was in the "Expected Outputs" section:

---

<sup>11</sup> The overall poverty incidence in the Philippines is 37 percent.

<sup>12</sup> The project was classified as an emergency project, although it clearly had at least a dual focus on rehabilitation as well as development (increased self-reliance, improved food security). The classification as emergency project probably conditioned the project to put emphasis on delivery of supplies and equipment.

<sup>13</sup> The delay was apparently due in order to comply with accounting procedures of the donor, and ongoing discussions among the project parties regarding the final project set-up. The project duration was not adjusted and thus effectively was reduced to 19 months.

<sup>14</sup> The target communities were said to be "randomly distributed in several regions of Mindanao", to be selected in "consultations with local government units, NGOs in the respective areas including UN agencies and international organizations already operating in the area".

- increased food security for disadvantaged farmers/IDPs and restoration of agri-based livelihood activities for some 19,880 cassava growers, 15,720 corn growers; 23,480 poultry and small livestock breeders; and 201,736 vegetable growers<sup>15</sup>;
- increased crop yields - at least during the project duration - through basic agricultural input distribution;
- increased protein in the beneficiaries' diet through backyard production of poultry and small livestock;
- increased self-reliance of beneficiaries, as the emergency activities may provide livelihoods diversification in a longer term.

## **B.2 Indicators, Work Plans and Assumptions**

The project document proposed some indicators for monitoring: the number of farming households benefiting from input distribution; specifications and amounts of inputs distributed; timing of input distribution; utilization of inputs distributed with reference to design; impact of assistance; effectiveness of field coordination of the operation. This was done, however, without making adequate provision for the project staff assigned to this task (International Consultant – Programme Monitoring and Development Planning, and Project Coordinator/Team Leader). In conjunction with the delayed project start and the late recruitment of the Project Coordinator, it is little wonder that launching the more ambitious part of the monitoring component (utilization of inputs, impact of assistance) was not attempted.

A rudimentary work plan was included in the prodoc; updated and more comprehensive versions were provided once the project was operational.

The prodoc listed technical risks, risks posed by the partners' limited capacity, security risks, social risks, environmental risks, timing and quality of agricultural inputs, calamities, and access to land by beneficiaries, as possible risks. All of these were deemed manageable. Social risks also implicitly included the areas of social acceptability and sustainability without however proposing real solutions.

## **B.3 Institutional Arrangements**

The prodoc specified that project implementation would be “spearheaded by FAO through the FAO Representation in the Philippines, in close collaboration with its implementing partners from the GOP ... NGOs would be selected as implementation partners based on their strong presence in the target districts and with proven activities in the agricultural sector in their districts. FAO and NGOs will jointly identify and select the beneficiaries, and prepare a distribution plan by district, based on the needs.”

Furthermore, a Steering Committee was to be established “at project start-up or at soonest possible date thereafter”, to consist of: DA Undersecretary for Special Concerns (Manila), DA Regional Field Units, LGUs (Governors), FAO – Manila, and FAO Consultants. The Steering committee was to meet on a quarterly basis to review and plan the implementation of project activities. Field level project activities were to be executed by the Local Government Units (LGUs) in coordination with the concerned Department of Agriculture (DA) Regional Field Units (RFUs) with assistance from the project consultants, while project implementation was to be

---

<sup>15</sup> The number of expected beneficiaries fluctuated in the project document. (Other numbers were 38,087 and 58,286 beneficiaries.)

monitored by FAO and the Field Operations Service (FOS) of the DA Central Office, with assistance from DA-RFUs.

As it turned out, the Steering Committee met only very infrequently (twice until February 2007).

#### **B.4 Beneficiaries**

The prodoc listed its intended beneficiaries in a number of places; alas, not always consistently. The main criterion seems to be that the beneficiaries would “comprise the disadvantaged families considered living below poverty line and IDPs as a result of the various armed conflicts in Mindanao”. Elsewhere, it was specified that the beneficiaries of the project would include rebel forces and their families, evacuated residents, internally displaced persons (IDPs) and residents living below poverty level in the same communities as the IDPs.

The target given for the estimated number of beneficiaries varied between 38,087 (beneficiary table); 58,286 (introductory section); and the numbers of 19,880 cassava growers, 15,720 corn growers; 23,480 poultry and small livestock breeders; and 201,736 vegetable growers (Expected Outputs section).

The geographical areas targeted included most parts of Mindanao: “the Central, Southern, Northern and Western Mindanao where there are significant incidents of conflict and poverty”. One beneficiary selection criteria was hardly realistic and potentially counterproductive: the prodoc stipulated that “as much as possible, this project will operate in areas not presently covered by external assistance nor considered for interventions in the near future”. Strictly interpreted, this would have precluded most partnership arrangements and was thus not strictly followed by the project. The evaluation mission supports this decision.

### **C. IMPLEMENTATION**

The project document was formally signed only in August 2005. An initial project team was formed subsequently and produced in November 2005 and Inception Report, which formed the basis for the Project Launching and Inception Workshop in December 2005. A full-time Project Coordinator was finally deployed in January 2006. The first delivery of inputs (chicken to Marahan Project Beneficiary Group) took place in March 2005, in April 2006 a first meeting of the Steering Committee was organized (a second one in September 2006).

#### **C.1 Project Budget and Utilization**

The original budget proposed in the project document is reproduced below.

PROJECT INDICATIVE BUDGET COVERING FAO INPUTS (from Prodoc)  
(in US\$)

Accts	Input Description	Sub/Child Account	Main/Parent Account
5013	Consultants		181 000
5542	International Consultants (8 man-months)	88 000	
5543	National Consultants	93 000	
5014	Contracts		50 000

5650	Contracts (Letter of Agreement)	50 000	
5020	Overtime		33 000
5652	Casual labour	33 000	
5021	Travel		82 000
5661	Duty Travel	50 000	
5684	Consultants - International	32 000	
5023	Training		90 000
5920	Training Budget	90 000	
5024	Expendable Equipment		1 120 445
5921	Agricultural tools	348 000	
5924	Other Expendable Equipment	597 695	
5940	Plants and seeds	174 750	
5025	Non Expendable Equipment		50 000
6011	Vehicles	39 000	
6012	Other Non-Expendable Equipment	11 000	
5027	Technical Support Services		44 000
6111	Report Costs (Donor reporting)	20 000	
6116	Project Evaluation Costs (Mid-term Evaluation)	15 000	
6150	Technical Support Services	9 000	
5028	General Operating Expenses		49 080
6300	General Operating Cost <sup>1</sup>	49 080	
	Sub-Total		1 699 525
5029	Support Cost		110 475
6118	Direct Operating expenses (6.5%)	110 475	
	Grand Total		1 810 000

The table below reflects the budget situation as of October 2006; in particular the equipment budget line shows a significant surplus that was earmarked to finance additional sub-projects (village-level activities). (These were authorized by the Steering Committee in September 2006.)

Account. Codes	item	Original budget (US\$)	Available Budget FAO HQ (US\$) at 10/10/2006
5013	Consultants	181,000	54,497
5014	Contracts	50,000	0
5020	Casual Labour:	33,000	10,300
5021	Travel	82,000	18,595
5023	Training	90,000	30,000
<b>5024</b>	<b>Expendable procurement</b>	<b>1,120,445</b>	<b>169,685</b>
5025	Non Expendable procurement	50,000	15,340
5027	Technical Support Services	44,000	44,000
5028	General Operating Expenses	49,080	49,196
5029	Support Cost	110,475	106,214
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,810,000</b>	<b>497,827</b>

## C.2 Implementation Status

The following table reflects the main activities of the project, listed by type of activity:

**Number of Deliveries to PBGs (25 February, 2007)**

	Project Title	No of PBGs	No of Deliveries			Completed Projects
			Estimated Total	Finished	Remaining	
1.	Goat Production	32	32	13	22	10
2.	Corn Production with Sheller and Trailer	21	105	84	21	
3.	Integrated Framing Systems	18	84	18	18	
4.	Goat & Chicken Production	8	24	3	8	
5.	Chicken Raising	7	21	3	7	
6.	Corn and vegetable production + Carabaos	6	43	11	32	
7.	Cassava Production, Carabaos, Plough & Harrow	5	20	5	15	
8.	Multi-purpose drying pavement	3	10	3		3
9.	Cassava & goats	3	12	3	9	
10.	Corn production + Vegetable Production	4	16	16	1	4
11.	Cassava Production with Chipping Machine	2	2	2	2	
12.	Fruit tree Production + Chicken Raising	1	6	1	5	
13.	Cassava Production + Chicken Raising	1	4		4	
14.	Chicken Raising + Vegetable Production	1	5	4	1	
	<b>Total</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>384</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>17</b>

The above table does not completely reflect all activities, but gives a general idea of the types of inputs delivered. More detailed information is available in Annexes 4 and 5. The implementation records show that deliveries started essentially only in 2006, and that they covered a wide range – in technical terms as well as in terms of geographical distribution. The project thus worked with a large number of beneficiaries and counterparts, with different backgrounds in terms of material resource base as well as skills and educational background. The emphasis on delivery (accentuated by the late project start) meant that there was little space for experimentation with delivery approaches; the project had to work with what it found.

It appears that the deliveries have been successful and in most cases appreciated by the recipients. (Some recipients in Peace and Development Communities stated that this was the first time they had actually received material support, after so many training sessions by other organizations.) Compared to input delivery, training activities appear as a secondary activity; the following activities were implemented:

State	Village	Start	Finish	Male	Female	Total
Province	Venue					
<b>Season-Long Farmers Field School on Corn &amp; Vegetable Production</b>						

Bukidnon	Brgy. Anga-an	3-Mar-06	19-Jul-06	14	23	37
Davao City	East Marahan	26-Jun-06	14-Nov-06	18	20	38
Lanao del Sur	Brgy. Sugod	28-May-06	28-Oct-06	3	49	52
	Brgy. Western	21-Sep-06	23-Jan-07		45	45
Maguindanao	Brgy. Tambak	10-Aug-06	20Jan.07	54	3	57
North Cotabato	Brgy. Dungguan1	7-Aug-06	01feb.07	25	0	25
	Brgy. Dungguan2	11-Sep-06	1-Feb-07	25	0	25
	Brgy. Nalapaan	23-May-06	23-Sep-06	3	41	44
South Cotabato	Brgy. Tubeng	9-Aug-06	16-Nov-06	30	10	40
Sultan Kudarat	Brgy. Chua	6-Jul-06	16-Nov-06	37	6	43
	Brgy. Laguilayan	26-Sep-06	17-Jan-07	66	3	69
	Brgy. Tinaungan	30-Aug-06	18-Jan-07	20	10	27
	Brgy. Sn Jose	30-Aug-06	18-Jan-07	21	4	28
<b>Total</b>				<b>316</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>530</b>

#### Short Duration Training

Maguindanao	Brgy. Bagoinged	28-Jan-07	28-Jan-07	70	0	70
	Brgy. Maitumaig	27-Jan-07	27-Jan-07	59	0	59
North Cotabato	Brgy. Natutungan	29-Jun-06	30-Jun-06	36	20	56
	USM-ATI	16-Jan-07	17-Jan-07	6	88	94
Sarangani	Brgy. Tangu	18-Dec-06	19-Dec-06	0	50	50
South Cotabato	Brgy. Bunao & Tubeng	13-Feb-07	14-Feb-07	10	50	60
Sultan Kudarat	Poblacion	20-May-06	20-May-06	34	6	40
	Brgy. Titulok	4-Jul-06	5-Jul-06	59	23	82
	Distor's Place	14-Feb-07	15-Feb-07	9	59	68
<b>Sub-total</b>				<b>283</b>	<b>296</b>	<b>579</b>

#### Farmer Field Research (Technology Demonstration)

Bukidnon	Brgy. Anga-an	3-Mar-06	19-Jul-06	14	23	37
Davao City	East Marahan	26-Jun-06	14Nov.06	18	20	38
Lanao del Sur	Brgy. Sugod	28-May-06	28-Oct-06	3	49	52
	Brgy. Western	21-Sep-06	23-Jan-07		45	45
Maguindanao	Brgy. Tambak	10-Aug-06	20-Jan-07	54	3	57
North Cotabato	Brgy. Dungguan1	11-Sep-06	1-Feb-07	25	0	25
	Brgy. Dungguan2	11-Sep-06	1-Feb-07	25	0	25
	Brgy. Nalapaan	23-May-06	23-Sep-06	3	41	44
	Brgy. Natutungan	26-Jun-06	30-Oct-06	0	50	50
South Cotabato	Brgy. Tubeng	9-Aug-06	16Nov.06	30	10	40
Sultan Kudarat	Brgy. Chua	6-Jul-06	16-Nov-06	37	6	43
	Brgy. Laguilayan	26-Sep-06	17-Jan-07	66	3	69
	Brgy. Tinaungan	30-Aug-06	18-Jan-07	20	10	27
	Brgy. Sn Jose	30-Aug-06	18-Jan-07	21	4	28
<b>Sub-total</b>				<b>316</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>580</b>

#### Proposed Additional Training

Lanao del Norte	Various PBGs	13-Mar-07	14-Mar-07	20	30	50
	Various PBGs	21-Mar-07	22-Mar-07	20	10	30
Lanao del Sur	Various PBGs	10-Mar-07	11-Mar-07	10	20	30



Sarangani	Poblacion	15-Mar-07	17-Mar-07	0	30	30
	Poblacion	22-Mar-07	24-Mar-07	0	40	40
South Cotabato	Brgy. Morales	6-Mar-07	7-Mar-07	0	50	50
<b>Sun-total</b>				<b>50</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>230</b>
<b>Total</b>				<b>965</b>	<b>954</b>	<b>1,919</b>

A total of 13 season-long Farmers Field School (FFS) sessions and 9 short duration trainings were conducted from 3 March 2006 to 15 February, 2007. The 12 FFS on corn production and 1 FFS on vegetable production were conducted to support the crop based livelihood projects (farm inputs provided by the project) of the farmer-beneficiaries. These FFS were implemented by the project in partnership with the Agricultural Training Institute (ATI) of the DA-Regional Field Units, Provincial Agriculture Office and Municipal Agriculture Office. A total of 530 farmers (316 males and 214 females) benefited from the FFS.

Thirteen Technology Demonstrations (Farmer Field Research) were also organized in support of the FFS.

As regards the short duration training, nine were conducted from May 2006 to February 2007. The trainings were on Seed Production of Corn (OPVs), Vegetable Production, Corn Production, Cornhusk Craft Skill and Organic Vegetable Production for a total of 769 individuals (313 males & 456 females).

Four short duration trainings (2 cornhusk craft trainings, 1 on organic vegetable training & 1 beekeeping training) are scheduled from 6 March to 17 March, 2007.

Three short duration trainings on corn husk craft skill were held from December 2006 to February 2007. The trainings involved the use of corn husk as basic raw material. The total number of livestock training sessions was 60, out of which 32 were on goat production, 12 on chicken production, 11 combination training on chicken and vegetables and cassava as well as 16 training sessions on swine production. The total beneficiaries were 4,551 (3,068 men and 1,483 women).

### **C.3 Technical and Operational Backstopping**

There have been not many backstopping visits by FAO staff. Mostly it was the FAO Representation in Manila that provided backstopping in person. Operational backstopping by FAO HQ was provided by email and seemed satisfactory. (for example, the authorization given to the FAO Representative to approve purchases up to US\$ 50,000 per supplier significantly improved the procurement procedure.)

The prodoc specified that technical support would come from FAO's Regional Office in Bangkok<sup>16</sup>. This did not happen; FAO HQ technical officers provided clearance of reports and equipment orders, and briefed visiting consultants.

A technical task force to review and discuss the project concept and implementation was not assembled (and was perhaps difficult to organize within the limited time available).

<sup>16</sup> The "FAO Representative in the Philippines will remain in continuous contact with the FAO Regional Office in Bangkok (Thailand) who have their own experts in various fields. They can provide the mission with technical support."

The baseline survey planned for the beginning of the project was conducted almost half way through the implementation. Its value was thus much reduced: instead of providing a basis for decision-making, at best it validated choices already made by the project.

#### **C.4 Government Support**

The GOP clearly has a sense of ownership for the project, but seem to have taken an overly long time to decide on their candidate for the Coordinator position. Within Mindanao, government involvement in project operations varies: sometimes, there are close contacts at regional level, sometimes collaboration with the project is closer at the municipal level.

The project has been useful to alleviate government resource constraints in some instances, for example where animal distribution programmes were scheduled on paper, but hardly existent for lack of funds.

#### **C.5 Project Management**

Project management took some time to get in gear: the project start-up was delayed, and the Coordinator position was filled only after a long delay. Considering these circumstances, the project was well run and managed to meet its primary objectives: the delivery of relief items to needy communities.

Perhaps as a result of the delayed formation of the management team and the heavy workload, there seems to have been at times an unclear decision making structure, as well as difficult follow-up on management decisions.

## **D. Results**

The objectives adopted by the project conformed well with the overall objectives set by the Philippine government for the region which focus on promoting food security and peace and order in the area. The commodities covered had been chosen in consultation with the beneficiaries themselves, considering also the priorities set by the donor, the Government of Japan. Likewise, the project design considered strongly the circumstances of the targeted beneficiaries and the prevailing physical conditions in the area. It was noted that, even with several months of delay, the project was able to meet its target, but only as far as distribution of inputs to the initial targets were concerned. Time did not allow the project to make sufficient follow ups for the sustenance of the inputs delivered so that they could be ascertained to serve as instruments and to mature into sustainable livelihood activities. It is therefore too soon to judge the overall impact of the project on the living conditions of the beneficiaries, and whether the project will have a lasting effect.

### ***D.1 Increased food security for disadvantaged farmers/IDPs and restoration of agri based livelihood activities for some 19,880 cassava growers, 15,720 corn growers; 23,480 poultry and small livestock breeders; and 201,736 vegetable growers***

The numbers detailed in the project document were certainly over-ambitious, and confused - different sections of the project document gave much different (and much lower) target figures.

The project managed to meet and even exceed the target figures as revised in the work plan .

In the original Project Document, there were 85 target barangays located in 65 municipalities and 15 provinces; in the course of project implementation, actually about 160 barangays in 92 municipalities and cities have been assisted: originally 112 projects were supported and later (2nd Steering Committee Meeting September 2006) project savings were earmarked for additional projects (60, plus additional 18 under evaluation by February 2007).

By February 2007, the project had implemented 46 sub-projects involving corn, 35 involving goat, 7 chicken, 6 goat + chicken and 7 cassava projects. Among others, the project also supported the construction of 6 solar dryers; 5 cassava grating machines, 1 cassava chipper, and 9 mini corn mills.

The project has met and actually overshot its revised (and more realistic) delivery targets, and can be commended for this achievement. With some exceptions (corn mills, swine in a few places), no major delays have been encountered.

### ***D.2 Increased crop yields - at least during the project duration - through basic agricultural input distribution***

Under the above immediate objective, the prodoc included a number of subordinate objectives:

***D.2.1 Corn production: The assistance package shall include hybrid seeds and fertilizer input for one (1) hectare of corn per family beneficiary. Each beneficiary gets a second package in the following season if he follows a monoculture system.***

D.2.2 Cassava production: Assistance will be given in the form of inputs including propagation materials and fertilizers and fencing.

D.2.3 Vegetable production (Kitchen Garden): The vegetable package will include about 30 gm of assorted seeds and a few kilos of fertilizer. Species will be limited to eggplant (*Solanum melongena*), string beans, bitter melon, and squash (*Cucurbita maxima*).

D.2.4 Fruit growing: The species of trees will depend upon the location, but the choices include mango, durian, rambutan, lanzones and Philippine lemon (*Calamansi*).

Based on sites visited by the mission where crops were still standing in the field, there is no doubt that crop yields have increased, at least during the project's cropping cycle. This was also confirmed in interviews. The difference in agronomic features between the project's plot and those of the farmers' practice was quite evident.

However, while farmers interviewed indicated that they will adopt the project's recommendation and buy inputs for the next cropping, some doubts may be allowed given the circumstances many of them live in. Many upland dwellers have less resources than their counterparts in the lowland and many of them still practice the slash-and-burn farming.

In some instances, alternative strategies of increasing crop yields using appropriate cropping practices and other systems might have been more appropriate, especially in remote areas far from the source of inputs. For example, in a site in Zamboanga, a recipient of corn inputs was farming the hillside that was distinctly eroded. Although the fertilized area was better than his other plots, he must have lost considerably the effectiveness of his fertilizer part of which got washed down the hill every time it rained. Input delivery should have gone hand-in-hand with advice on proper cultivation practices, e.g. contour farming.

As a general conclusion, there is no doubt that the inputs provided by the project helped to raise yields – but there are some doubts as to whether this will be a lasting effect as agricultural practices – at least in some areas – have not improved.

### **D.3 Increased protein in the beneficiaries' diet through backyard production of poultry and small livestock**

Again, there were a number of sub-objectives:

D.3.1 Poultry and small livestock: For families living far from the sea, it is most desirable to have a few heads of small livestock around the house. Native chickens, swine and goats are easy to raise and feeds can be sourced without cost from farm by-products.

D.3.2 Enhanced native chicken backyard production: This family-based project shall be provided to 9 120 upland farming and 2 100 fishing IDP families in the 17 identified conflict-affected areas, particularly in the corn growing uplands, where there is abundance of natural feed resources. The project shall provide assistance to housewives and the youth to give them the opportunity to contribute to the family income. Each family shall be provided with 13 native or upgraded ready-to-lay pullets and two breeder cockerels or roosters of improved heavy breeds/strains.

*D.3.3 Enhanced backyard swine fattener production: Under the project, selected beneficiaries, obviously non-Muslim, will be given two weanlings as fatteners. The family will be allowed to decide whether to slaughter, dispose or keep them as breeders after four months.*

This is an objective difficult to verify for the mission, also because no impact monitoring data exist. From the mission observations and interviews, it was clear that effects varied according to location and/or category of recipient. Some livestock and poultry came down with diseases very quickly (at least so the records show). In some cases, this was attributed to disease, in other cases to high feed requirements (especially of kabir chicken). Frequently, beneficiaries would sell chicken or livestock when they need cash to cover other needs of the family like clothing, shelter and education of the children. (They would also, on special occasions, eat poultry and pork from their own backyard flock or piggeries.)

It appeared that the quality of animals purchased by the project varied – sometimes goats were not very productive and/or produced sickly kids, and in some locations the chicken mortality rate was extraordinarily high.

Sometimes the technical requirements for chicken or livestock rearing seemed to be too demanding for the recipients, or the animals were possibly not valued highly enough as they were received as gifts. Some Project Beneficiary Groups, on the other hand, had a very tight management scheme to make sure animals were well looked after.

The animal distribution scheme organized by the project involved a passing-on scheme – first recipients are expected to pass on offspring to other eligible beneficiaries. This still has to happen and needs to be monitored by staff of the LGU, and preferably also by a follow-up project in order to monitor and analyse the experiences.

#### ***D.4 Increased self-reliance of beneficiaries, as the emergency activities may provide livelihoods diversification in a longer term***

The project document combined sub-objectives of a technical character with more social development oriented features:

*D.4.1 Installation of Communal Solar Dryer: The project shall construct and install 420 m<sup>2</sup> solar drying pavement and turn over the facilities to qualified farmer cooperatives. Each solar dryer measures 420 m<sup>2</sup> cement pavement with about 15 cm thick of concrete.*

*D.4.2 Livelihood activities in support of women/women's organizations: Through provision of specific livelihood inputs and training for women's organizations, the material and physical well-being of women will be improved, and access to resources and services to improve their productive work will be ensured. Moreover, they shall be provided with technical assistance and training to equip them with the necessary knowledge and skills in food production and other income-generating activities (e.g. soap-making using papaya extracts, mushroom culture, vermiculture, etc.) that would provide them with higher income*

*D.4.3 Capability Building for Farmers: Based on the needs assessment, assistance will be provided to build capacities for farmers and their organization through social infrastructure (organization building and strengthening; provision of technical*

*assistance in agri-fishery production and marketing) and enterprise development support to manage and sustain viable operations.*

Some of the envisaged activities were not taken up by the project (e.g. soap making, fishery activities). According to the project, also activities related to rice production were apparently excluded due to higher-level decisions (reflecting a wish of the donor?).

In the end, this sub-objective was used to support training activities in the form of Farmers Field School (FFS) training sessions (12 long, 9 short) as well as Technology Demonstrations (13) on corn seed production, vegetable production, corn production, cornhusk craft skill and organic vegetable production. A total of 530 farmers (316 males and 214 females) benefited from the FFS, while 769 recipients (313 male & 456 female) benefited from the other courses. In addition, there were sessions on livestock production (60), which benefited 4,551 recipients (3,068 men and 1,483 women).

There is enough evidence that beneficiaries have participated actively in the formulation of project activities. They have also assumed responsibility for certain project components and provided labour for the construction of chicken houses, goat sheds and drying pavements, built components for small machinery provided by the project like cassava grater attachment, and contributed locally available construction materials needed for small infrastructures for the animals, such as fencing.

Nevertheless, it is too soon to draw any conclusions regarding the lasting impact of these efforts. Problems were evident in some locations where despite training insufficient attention was given to good agricultural practices in livestock rearing and crop production. In addition, increased self-reliance as well as livelihoods diversification is a long-term process: a two-year project can just provide the first initiative.

## **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS - PROJECT SPHERE**

### Project design

The project strategy was to "... focus on delivery of basic agriculture inputs (seeds, fertilizer and hand tools, small equipment and implements) for enhanced small-scale agriculture and livestock production. In addition, the project includes a component of capacity building of women organizations and farmers in order to promote self-reliance and sustainability". Main expected project outputs include "increased food security for disadvantaged farmers/IDPs and restoration of agri-based livelihood activities", and "... increase in crop yields and protein content in beneficiaries' diet".

The project was thus to follow a dual strategy: on the one hand, it was to deliver inputs in an effort to facilitate post-conflict rehabilitation efforts. On the other hand, it was to foster development efforts aimed at increasing food security (including improved diets) and enhancing self-reliance of poor farmers, especially women. Project components (activities, outputs and immediate objectives) were logically supporting each other, with the exception the project document mixed up project activities (such as "conduct needs assessment") with actual objectives (e.g. "enhance farmers' self reliance")<sup>17</sup>, and that development activities (i.e. increased food security and self-reliance) were difficult objectives to achieve within the given time frame of the project.

Institutional arrangements did not function as planned: the Project Steering Committee met only infrequently (not quarterly as envisaged<sup>18</sup>), and did not have the complete suggested membership (e.g. Governors) as foreseen.

**Recommendations:** The project document should have been developed with a clearer perspective: the food security and self-reliance objectives were over-ambitious and could potentially lead to frustration. Given the wealth of experience existing now, a follow-up project should feature a more development-oriented approach.

For a follow-up project, it would be beneficial to have a Steering Committee meeting perhaps annually for general oversight as well as an Executive Committee meeting more frequently to decide on important management issues.

### Technical and Operational Backstopping

There have been not many backstopping visits by FAO staff. Mostly it was the FAO Representation in Manila that provided backstopping in person. Operational backstopping by FAO HQ was provided by email and seemed satisfactory. (for example, the authorization given to the FAO Representative to approve purchases up to US\$ 50,000 per supplier significantly improved the procurement procedure.)

The prodoc specified that technical support would come from FAO's Regional Office in Bangkok<sup>19</sup>. This did not happen; FAO HQ technical officers provided clearance of reports and equipment orders, and briefed visiting consultants.

---

<sup>17</sup> A more accurate reflection of the project's objectives was given in the "Expected Outputs" section. Also target numbers (of expected beneficiaries, inputs to be delivered) fluctuated in the project document.

<sup>18</sup> Only two meetings until Feb 2007.

<sup>19</sup> The "FAO Representative in the Philippines will remain in continuous contact with the FAO Regional Office in Bangkok (Thailand) who have their own experts in various fields. They can provide the mission with technical support."

A technical task force to review and discuss the project concept and implementation was not assembled (and was perhaps difficult to organize within the limited time available).

The baseline survey planned for the beginning of the project was conducted almost half way through the implementation. Its value was thus much reduced: instead of providing a basis for decision-making, at best it validated choices already made by the project.

**Recommendation:** The technical backstopping arrangements should be clarified for a follow-up project. In the opinion of the mission, the closer the backstopping could get to the project sites, the better it would be for the project in terms of timeliness and familiarity with local conditions.

### Project Management

Project management took some time to get in gear: the project start-up was delayed, and the Coordinator position was filled only after a long delay. Considering these circumstances, the project was well run and managed to meet its primary objectives: the delivery of relief items to needy communities.

Perhaps as a result of the delayed formation of the management team and the heavy workload, there seems to have been at times an unclear decision making structure, as well as difficult follow-up on management decisions.

**Recommendation:** A second phase should review not only the project orientation, but also project management as already now the project team sometimes seems to work in isolation due to frequent duty travel and absences from the office.

### Government Ownership and Commitment

The GOP clearly has a sense of ownership for the project, but seem to have taken an overly long time to decide on their candidate for the Coordinator position. Within Mindanao, government involvement in project operations varies: sometimes, there are close contacts at regional level, sometimes collaboration with the project is more close at the municipal level.

At the local level, government counterparts seemed to appreciate the project: while they acknowledged an increased workload due to the project, they also regarded the project as a means to provide tangible benefits to their constituents.

The project has been useful to alleviate government resource constraints in some instances, for example where animal distribution programmes were scheduled on paper, but hardly existent for lack of funds.

**Recommendation:** Active government collaborators would benefit if a follow-up project could involve them in exchange visits to observe successful project features (e.g. where passing-on schemes have succeeded), and to offer short training on how to replicate such successes.

### Implementation Difficulties

Perhaps the biggest implementation difficulties were the reduced time frame for actual implementation, and the wide-spread project area. While the former led to a



very much reduced time for preparation and review, the latter put a great burden on staff movement and affected the formation of a close-knit management team.

## **RESULTS SPHERE**

*Immediate Objective 1: Increased food security for disadvantaged farmers/IDPs and restoration of agri-based livelihood activities for some 19,880 cassava growers, 15,720 corn growers; 23,480 poultry and small livestock breeders; and 201,736 vegetable growers<sup>20</sup>*

The numbers detailed in the project document were certainly over-ambitious, and different sections of the project document gave much reduced target figures. However, the project managed to meet and even exceed the target figures as revised in the work plans.

The project has met and actually overshot its revised (and more realistic) delivery targets, and can be commended for this achievement. With some exceptions (corn mills, swine in a few places), no major delays have been encountered.

**Recommendation:** A follow-up project should be formulated with more realistic numerical targets, and should altogether be more consistent. When it comes to objectives such as improved livelihoods, delivery targets are in any case less important than reliable information regarding sustainability.

*Immediate Objective 2: increased crop yields - at least during the project duration - through basic agricultural input distribution*

Based on sites visited by the mission, there is no doubt that crop yields have increased, at least during the project's cropping cycle. This was also confirmed in interviews. However, while farmers interviewed indicated that they will adopt the project's recommendation and buy inputs for the next cropping, some doubts may be allowed given the circumstances many of them live in. Many upland dwellers still practice slash-and-burn farming.

As a general conclusion, there is no doubt that the inputs provided by the project helped to raise yields – but there are some doubts as to whether this will be a lasting effect as agricultural practices – at least in some areas – have not improved.

**Recommendations:** The project has made a positive beginning; in order to bring about lasting changes, additional efforts have to be made to ensure that the new methods can actually take root in the project areas.

*Immediate Objective 3: Increased protein in the beneficiaries' diet through backyard production of poultry and small livestock*

From the mission observations and interviews, it was clear that effects varied according to location and/or category of recipient. Some livestock and poultry came down with diseases very quickly - this was attributed to disease, in other cases to high feed requirements. Frequently, beneficiaries would sell chicken or livestock when they need cash to cover other needs of the family like clothing, shelter and education of the children, rather than eating them themselves.

---

<sup>20</sup> These objectives follow the rendering in the "Expected Outputs" section of the project document.

Sometimes the technical requirements for chicken or livestock rearing seemed to be too demanding for the recipients, or the animals were possibly not valued highly enough as they were received as gifts. Some Project Beneficiary Groups, on the other hand, had a very tight management scheme to make sure animals were well looked after.

The animal distribution scheme organized by the project involved a passing-on scheme – first recipients are expected to pass on offspring to other eligible beneficiaries. This still has to happen and needs to be monitored by staff of the LGU, and preferably also by a follow-up project in order to monitor and analyse the experiences.

**Recommendation:** The very diversified experience with the animal component should be analysed: what type of recipient does well with what input package, and appropriate input packages should be devised for a follow-up project. Especially the passing-on scheme (of animal offspring to other members of the recipient group) should be monitored to make sure the principle works.

*Immediate Objective 4: increased self-reliance of beneficiaries, as the emergency activities may provide livelihoods diversification in a longer term.*

There is enough evidence that beneficiaries have participated actively in the formulation of project activities. They have also assumed responsibility for certain project components and provided labour for the construction of chicken houses, goat sheds and drying pavements, built components for small machinery provided by the project like cassava grater attachment, and contributed locally available construction materials needed for small infrastructures for the animals, such as fencing.

Nevertheless, it is too soon to draw any conclusions regarding the lasting impact of these efforts. Problems were evident in some locations where despite training insufficient attention was given to good agricultural practices in livestock rearing and crop production. In addition, increased self-reliance as well as livelihoods diversification is a long-term process: a two-year project can just provide the first initiative.

**Recommendations:** Bringing small farmers to new levels of well-being (increased self-reliance and livelihoods) needs a longer-term commitment. Especially in view of the limited agricultural resource base of the target groups, the project has taken a right step off-farm by promoting income generation activities and skills training, which could even be scaled-up in a follow-up project.

## ***SPECIFIC TOPICS AND ISSUES***

### *Cost-Effectiveness*

For a technical assistance project, cost-effectiveness is notoriously difficult to determine. (The financial and economic of productive packages provided by the project is another matter.) However, a few principles stand out:

- Development cooperation works best in conducive policy environment
- Development should lead to improvements in institutions and policies;
- Effective development cooperation complements private investment; and
- Development cooperation should identify ways and means of how services can be delivered more effectively.

In the context of this project, certainly the first and last principles are present. The government is supportive of the project and accepts the principle of partnership, and the project has worked on improved service delivery to its target beneficiaries. The future challenge is to make these improvements sustainable: find ways of making them replicable on a larger scale, and identify opportunities for making the beneficiaries more self-reliant by generating their own capital for investment.

#### *Collaboration With Non-Governmental Organizations And Other Development Initiatives And Agencies*

Consultations made with other stakeholders, particularly the regional field units (RFU) of the DA, the LGUs and others like the Mindanao Economic Development Council (MEDCO) revealed that the FAO project conformed both with the national and local development plans. A partnership was started with the World Food Programme (WFP) whereby WFP provided rice (food for work) to beneficiaries of FAO-assisted projects (6,125 kg of rice to 5 PBGs = 245 families).

A partnership with ACT for Peace Programme of UNDP and MEDCo led to the inclusion of 58 PDCs (Peace and Development Communities) in the project, whereby field personnel of ACT and volunteers of the Peace and Development Advocates League (PDAL) assist in the monitoring of the FAO-assisted projects. The project also assisted 6 sites out of the 35 target sites of the Government of the Philippines-United Nations Development Programme (GOP-UNDP) Programme on Rehabilitating Internally Displaced Persons and Communities in Southern Philippines. With the available savings from the equipment budget line, the project also started a collaboration with the Catholic Relief Services (CRS) for water storage facilities for community use and for watering vegetable gardens.

The project's collaboration arrangements with NGOs and other development agencies so far have been limited; most field activities were implemented with government counterparts. Perhaps this was a result of a stipulation in the project document that ... "as much as possible, this project will operate in areas not presently covered by external assistance nor considered for interventions in the near future".

#### *Sustainability*

The short duration of project is not sufficient to measure impact and sustainability; in at all, the changes in the economic status of recipients have been limited to this date. Most activities initiated by the project will need good backup support from the government. The most significant project contribution at this stage has probably been the learning of working as a group in the community and the knowledge gained from training.

## **Annex 1 Terms of Reference**

### **Emergency Rehabilitation of Agri-Based Livelihood for Disadvantaged Farmers and Returning Internally Displaced People in Mindanao OSRO/PHI/501/JPN**

---

#### **Terms of Reference**

#### **Evaluation Mission 8 February to 28 February 2007**

#### **1. BACKGROUND**

As requested by the Government of the Philippines (GOP) through the Department of Agriculture (DA) and the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) as executing agency, OSRO/PHI/501/JPN project draws support from the financial contribution of US\$ 1.85M from the Government of Japan (GOJ) under its Grant Aid for Under-privileged Farmers (KR II). It particularly targets women beneficiaries, disadvantaged farmer groups and vulnerable households of returning internally displaced persons or IDPs who are disturbed by the recurring armed conflicts in Mindanao.

The Project OSRO/PHI/501/JPN provides direct livelihood assistance to 112 Project Beneficiary Groups (PBGs) involving about 7,058 households with 58,300 beneficiaries who have been affected by the armed conflicts as well as those living in harsh conditions in 16 provinces, 6 major cities, 54 municipalities and 111 Barangays in 6 regions in Mindanao. It provides agricultural inputs like seeds/planting materials of corn, cassava and fruit trees, inorganic and organic fertilizers, goats and upgraded native chicken, small farm equipment and tools, and agricultural and livelihood training to enhance food security and alleviate poverty in the selected areas.

The two-year project started operations in August 2005. The OSRO/PHI/501/JPN Project Management Office (PMO) operates under the direct supervision of FAO-Philippines and the operational and technical guidance of the Office for Special Relief Operations (OSRO) at FAO Headquarters. It is located at Unit 75 7/F LANDCO PDCP Centre, J.P. Laurel Avenue, Bajada, Davao City, PHILIPPINES.

#### **Development Objective**

The project aims to respond to the call of the GOP for assistance in bringing about food security in rural households that are recurrently being affected by the crisis in Mindanao, with the fervent hope that this would lead to long term peace and stability in the area. The project also aims to help the government in its poverty alleviation campaign among disadvantaged families in the remote areas of Mindanao.

#### **Immediate Objectives**

The four specific objectives or purposes are as follows:

1. Conduct needs assessment of the affected farming communities that shall be the basis in coming up with sustainable agri-based livelihood programs to address household food security in the identified project sites;
2. Provide assistance to local government units in resettling internally displaced persons (IDPs) from their original homes to other more suitable areas;
3. Provide basic agricultural inputs (seeds, fertilizers and hand tools, small equipment and implements including farm animals) and small livestock such as goats and chickens as well as agricultural training to augment the recipients' capability to produce food for their families; and
4. Enhance the capability of farmers and promote self-reliance by promoting the development of sustainable agricultural practices including cooperative management and marketing assistance.

#### **Target Beneficiaries and Areas**

The primary target beneficiaries of the project are:

1. Disadvantaged families living below the poverty line and IDPs resulting from the various armed conflicts in Mindanao;
2. Areas not presently covered by external assistance nor considered for interventions in the near future;
3. Geographical areas targeted include the Central, Southern, Northern, Western and Eastern Mindanao

#### Institutional and Operational Arrangements

The project has a Project Steering Committee (SC), which operates at national level and provides overall guidance in project implementation and reviews progress of activities. At the local level, the Municipal or City Agriculturists and Veterinarians serve as the local counterparts of the FAO National Consultants, and PBGs are represented by contact persons, who serve as the FAO consultants' direct link to the PBG.

#### Project Activities, Achievements and Issues

A baseline survey was conducted to determine the socio-cultural, economic and political situation in 15 provinces and 5 major cities that are covered by the project. Around 10 percent of 6,654 direct beneficiaries belonging to 55 organizations were selected as respondents.

#### 2. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

This Terms of Reference has been prepared for a team to undertake an evaluation of the implementation of the project "Emergency Rehabilitation of Agri-Based Livelihood for Disadvantaged Farmers and Returning Internally Displaced People in Mindanao" or OSRO/PHI/501/JPN as it approaches its date of completion. The evaluation will provide recommendations to FAO, the Government of the Philippines, and GOJ on further steps necessary to consolidate progress and ensure achievement of objectives. Further external assistance or support to beneficiary groups, following its completion in February 2007 will depend on the success factors and experience gained from implementation. It will also be a basis for a follow-up phase based on an indicative support of the Japanese Government as mentioned in the debriefing report of the project's International Consultant, Mr. Fumihiko Nagao.

#### 3. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

In general, the Evaluation Mission will review in detail the project objectives, outputs and activities since its inception, and assess what has been achieved by the project in relation to its immediate objectives. It will identify major factors that have facilitated or impeded the progress of the project in achieving the intended outputs and its effects (planned and unplanned) on direct beneficiaries and on the ultimate target group(s). Based on the foregoing, the Evaluation Mission will make specific recommendations for any follow-up measures, taking into account the sustainability of the project results.

In particular, the Evaluation Mission will pay special attention to the following aspects:

- a. Examination of the continued relevance of the project's immediate and long-term development objectives to Government priorities, needs of the target group(s), and with regard to peace and stability in Mindanao.
- b. Adequacy/relevance of the project design in light of identified needs, local conditions, and sustainability.
- c. Adequacy of institutional set-up for project implementation, and the validity of key assumptions.
- d. Extent to which the project is integrated with other related projects and into the national and local development programme/plan.
- e. Overall efficiency of project management and implementation, including:
  - adequacy in the formulation of workplans for the various components covered by the project.
  - Extent to which the project has been adequately supported by the Government, and complementarity with other agencies operating in Mindanao, e.g. MEDCo, ACT for Peace, WFP and other FAO projects.

- Implementation progress, especially in producing target outputs (including their quality), and in involving each category of target beneficiaries in the project activities.

f. Achievements of results in terms of:

- attainment of peace and stability in project sites
- gender mainstreaming
- prospective impact and sustainability of the project in particular with regard to the benefits of the final target group(s).

g. Factors which have promoted or impeded the effectiveness and efficiency of project implementation, including the availability of human resources and direct participation of the beneficiary group.

h. Identification of any potential areas which require further technical support from external sources, including possible assistance from other agencies with regard to institutional strengthening in support to peace and development through participatory means.

i. Any significant lesson learned that can be applied in similar projects or programmes.

#### 4. DURATION AND COMPOSITION OF THE EVALUATION TEAM

The evaluation work will complete the field work in the Philippines within four weeks (Date: 8 to 28 February 2007). Another week in Rome is planned for report writing.

The Evaluation mission is composed of the following:

- FAO - to be nominated by FAO (Team Leader)
- Government of the Philippines - to be nominated by DA
- GOJ - to be nominated by the Japanese Government

The mission members should have the following expertise:

- Team Leader – should have a wide expertise in agricultural project development and management, and project evaluation;
- GOP Representative – with experience in various livelihood and on-farm employment activities for small farmers' organizations including small ruminant, poultry ;
- GOJ Representative - with experience in participatory planning, farm planning and management, smallholder agriculture, monitoring and evaluation;
- Resource Person – Agronomy

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 must have experience in evaluation work.

#### 5. CONSULTATIONS

The Mission will liaise closely with the FAO Representative and the DA, FAO Project Staff and their counterpart 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 commitment on behalf of FAO or the donor.

#### 6. REPORTING

The mission is fully responsible for its independent report, which may not necessarily reflect the views of the donor or FAO. The report to which all the Mission members are expected to contribute will be written in conformity with the following outline:

- Executive Summary (maximum 3 pages)
- Major Conclusions and Recommendations
- Introduction
- Background to the Project
- Assessment of Project Objectives and Design

6. Summary Assessment of Project Implementation, Efficiency and Management (including Budget and Expenditure)
7. Assessment of Results and Effectiveness, including:
  - a. Outcomes
  - b. Development Process
  - c. Project Effects and their Sustainability and Impact
  - d. Cost effectiveness
8. Major Factors Affecting Project Results
9. Lessons Learned

Annexes as required, including Mission's Terms of Reference, and Itinerary and Persons Met

To facilitate meaningful discussion with the project partners in the country, the Mission will prepare an Aide Memoire, including a summary of conclusions and recommendations, for discussion in a wrap-up meeting with representatives of the Government of the Philippines, the Embassy of Japan, FAO and the Project.

The Team Leader bears responsibility for finalizing the report, which will be submitted to the Government of the Philippines, the donor and FAO within three weeks of the completion of the mission.

The Report will include detailed recommendations for follow-up by the Philippine Government, national institutions and FAO.

The FAO Team Leader will also be responsible for submitting the Project Evaluation Questionnaire to FAO HQ during debriefing.

## Annex 2 Itinerary and List of People Met

Date	Name	Position/Designation	Office	Location
Feb 8, 2007 (Metro Manila)	Mr Kazuyuki Tsurumi	FAO Representative	FAO Representation	Makati, Metro Manila
	Mr Mitsuhiro Ito	First Secretary (Agriculture)	Japanese Embassy	Pasay City, Metro Manila
	Mr Peter Diawuoh	Deputy Security Adviser	United Nations Office	Makati, Metro Manila
	Mr Roy Abaya	Director Field Operations	Department of Agriculture	Quezon City, Metro Manila
	Ms Tess Bernardo	Executive Assistant	Department of Agriculture	Quezon City, Metro Manila
	Mr Ada Estrada	Special Program Coordinator	Department of Agriculture	Quezon City, Metro Manila
	Mr Rene Manantan		Department of Agriculture	Quezon City, Metro Manila
	Mr Ichiro Tsurusaki	JICA Expert	Department of Agriculture	Quezon City, Metro Manila
Feb 9, 2007	Gerardo A. Santos	Team Leader	FAO -OSRO	PMO - Davao
	Fumihiro Nagao	International Consultant		
	Mr. Cesar Galvan	IPM Specialist		
	Dr. Ernesto Aragon	Agronomist		
	Dr. Noel Gemeniano	Livestock Specialist		
	Lynn Solomon	Admin/Finance Asst.		
	Mr. Nasroden Mangondato	Liaison/Driver		
	Mr. Peter Hassan Madale	Liaison/Driver		
Ms. Rose Neli Lelis	Admin. Asst.			
Feb 10	Ms. Minda Delgado	ATI Coordinator	DA RFU XI	East Marahan, Marilog District, Davao City
	Ms. Cecilia Dacillo	President,	East Marahan, Namnam Hydro Farmers Association	
	Mr. Ludovico Ramirez, Jr.	Project Officer	Catholic Relief Services	Saloy, Calinan, Davao City
Feb 12	Mr. Diosdao Palacat	City Agriculturist	Zamboanga City	CA's Office, Tumaga, Zamboanga City
	Dr. Mario Ariola	City Veterinarian	Zamboanga City	CA's Office, Tumaga, Zamboanga City
	Mr. Medardo Lozada	Ag. Technician	Labuan District, Zamboanga City	CA's Office, Tumaga, Zamboanga City
	Dr. Macario Cavan, Jr.	Livestock Specialist	Office of the City Vet. Zamboanga City	CA's Office, Tumaga, Zamboanga City
	Mr. Raul Ramon Bucoy	Project Coordinator	DA-RFU IX, Zamboanga City	DA-RFU IX, Zamboanga City
	Dr. Oscar Parawan	Regional Executive Director (RED)	DA-RFU IX, Zamboanga City	Office of the RED, DA-RFU IX, Zamboanga City
	Mr. Cedric F. Paule	Livestock Specialist & DA Focal Person for FAO Projects	DA-RFU IX, Zamboanga City	DA-RFU IX, Zamboanga City
	Mr. Marciano Tumales	Farmer	Labuan District, Zamboanga City	Labuan District, Zamboanga City
Feb 13	Hj Capral Abdurajak	President/Chairman	Tiktapul Peace & Development MPC	Tictapul, Vitali District, Zamboanga City



	Ms. Huraida Malik	Secretary	Mangusu Women's Asso.	Mangusu, Vitali, Zamboanga City
	Hj Abbas Callam	President/Chairman	Mangusu Men's Association	Mangusu, Vitali, Zamboanga City
Feb 14	Dr. Roger C. Chio	Regional Executive Director (RED)	DA-RFU XI, Davao City	Office of the RED, DA-RFU XI, Davao City
	Ms. Janet Lopez	Executive Director	Mindanao Economic Development Council (MEDCO)	4 <sup>th</sup> Floor, SSS Bldg., Bajada, J.P. Laurel St., Davao City
	Mr. Reyzaldy B. Tan	Deputy Programme Manager	ACT for Peace Programme	Juna Subd., Davao City
	Ms. Diosita T. Andot	Programme Manager	ACT for Peace Programme	Juna Subd., Davao City
	Mr. Jesus Dureza	Secretary, Presidential Asst. on the Peace Process	Office of the President	Office of the ACT for Peace, Juna Subd., Davao City
Feb 15	Mr. Toren Paguilidan	Member, Board of Directors, Bunao Farmers' MPC	Bunao Farmers' MPC	Bunao, Tupi, So. Cotabato
	Mr. Nasser Modin	Project Coordinator	DA RFU XIII, Cotabato City	Distor's Place, Isulan, Sultan Kudarat
Feb 16	Ms. Kalipa Suleik	Farmer	Nalapaan RIC	Nalapaan, Pikit, North Cotabato
	Ms. Susan Uy	ATI Coordinator		
	Ms. Noria Budtong	President	Nalapaan, Pikit, North Cotabato	
	Mr. Ismail Alagasi	Kagawad (Councilor)		
	Mr. Ibrahim Alagasi	Kagawad (Councilor)		
Feb 16	Ms. Norisa Salangao	President	Mainline II Women's Asso.	Mainline II, Liliongan, Carmen, Cotabato
	Ms. Nenita Saberola	Municipal Agriculturist	Carmen, North Cotabato	
	Ms. Marilou Salac	Agricultural Technician		
Feb 17	Mr. Leopoldo Dacera	Goat Raiser	Gen. Santos City	Rabaniya's Farm
	Mr. Eddie Ampodia	Municipal Agriculturist	Maitum, Sarangani	Pinol and Kalaong, Maitum, Sarangani
	Mr. Rolando Delcano	Livestock Technician		
	Ms. Lamia Mala	Barangay Chairperson		
	Mr. Adzaman Mala	Chairman, Pinol Community Farmers Organization		
Feb 19	Mr. Jalil Baulo	FAO Focal person	Balindong, Lanao del Sur	
	Mr. Abdullah Mohammad	Chairman, Salipungan Farmers' Association		
	Mr. Alimbusar Romandian	Chairman, Kadapaan Farmers' Asso.		
Feb 20	Engr. Papala Lawanza	DA ARMM Focal person for FAO Projects in Lanao Sur	DA ARMM, Marawi City	Bagong Buhay MPDP Project, Dimayon, Bubong, Lanao Sur
Feb 20	Ms. Asnia Macaalain	Ag. Technician	DA ARMM, Marawi City	Bagong Buhay MPDP Project, Dimayon, Bubong, Marawi City
	Mr. Sultan Balintao	President, Bagong Buhay MPC	Dimayon, Bubong, Lanao del Sur	
	Mr. Makmud Ala	Member, Bagong Buhay MPC		
	Ms. Amina Ala	(Wife of Sultan Balintao)		
	Hon. Usop Munder	Mayor of Bubong		
	Magdara Diongal	President, Kilogay Spring MPC	Karigongan, Bubong, Lanao Sur	Chicken Project, Karigongan, LDS
	Hon. Abdul Jafar Jalil	Board Member, LDS	Marawi City	
	Ms. Baicon Macaraya	Program Manager, Iligan Sub Office	WFP, Luinab, Iligan City	WFP, Luinab, Iligan City
Feb 21	Mr. Roel R Ravanera	Dean, College of Agriculture (formerly	Xavier University	Cagayan de Oro City

		with ANGOC/Asia-Japan Partnership Network for Poverty Reduction)		
	Ms Lealyn A Ramos	OiC, Regional Executive Director	Department of Agriculture, Reg Field Unit 10	Cagayan de Oro City
	Mr Janen T Paradero	OiC, Crops Division	Department of Agriculture, Reg Field Unit 10	Cagayan de Oro City
	Mr Constancio C Maghanoy, Jr	OiC, Regional Technical Director, Operations	Department of Agriculture, Reg Field Unit 10	Cagayan de Oro City
Feb 22	Mr Ludigario Hilario	President, Baclise Farmers Association	Angas	Agusan del Sur
	Ms Myrna S Catangcatang	Agricultural Technologist,	Municipal Ag Office St Jozefa	Agusan del Sur
	Mr Abel F Wagas	Agriculturist II (OSRO Focal Person)	DA RFU XIII	Butuan City
	Mr Ronald Maravilla	President, Binongan Farmers Association	Binongan	Agusan del Sur
	Mr Salvador Valeriano	Barangay Captain	Binongan	Agusan del Sur
	Mr Enrique T Talimodao	Ag Technologist	Virulea	Agusan del Sur

### **Annex 3 Project Staff**

The project is staffed by six national consultants, e.g., Team Leader (Gerardo A. Santos), 2 Agronomists (Drs. Jaime G. Montesur & Ernesto L. Aragon), 2 Livestock Technicians (Dr. Noel C. Gemeniano & Dr. Ernelito A. Buenaventura) and 1 IPM Specialist (Mr. Cesar V. Galvan); and four support staff, e.g. Administrative & Finance Assistant (Ms. Lynnne Solomon); 2 Liaison Assistants/Drivers (Mr. Peter Hassan Madale & Mr. Nasroden Mangondato) and 1 Office Assistant (Ms. Rose Neli Lelis).

#### **Current Condition of Contracts of the Consultants**

Name	Position	TOR/ Specialist	Contract Period
1. Fumihiro Nagao	International Consultant	Programme Monitoring / Development Planning	17 January 2007 - 12 March 2007 (5 <sup>th</sup> mission)
2. Gerardo Santos	Team Leader	Agronomist	20 January 2006 - 31 March 2007
3. Jaime Montesur	National Consultant	Agronomist/Farming Specialist	4 September, 2005 - 28 February, 2007
4. Noel Gemeniano	National Consultant	Livestock and Poultry Specialist	1 January 2006 - 31 March 2007
5. Ernesto Aragon	National Consultant	Agronomist	2 May 2006 - 28 February 2007
6. Cesar Galvan	National Consultant	IPM Specialist	1 January 2006 – 31 March 2007
7, Ernelito Buenaventura	National Consultant	Livestock and Poultry Specialist	1 January 2006 – 31 March 2007

**Annex 4 Summary Table – Project Inputs Delivered (as of October 2006)**

INPUT	UNIT	BID PRICE	QUANTITY		TOTAL COST
			Foreseen in INCEPTION REPORT	Actually PURCHASED	
Hybrid Corn Seeds	bags	2,470.00	1,947	1,609	3,974,230.00
OPV Corn Seeds	bags	800.00	205	456	364,800.00
Cassava Cuttings	pc	0.45	3,200,000	1,150,000	517,500.00
Chicken	heads	180.00	33,540	20,766	3,737,880.00
Goats	heads	2,720.00	4,661	5,157	14,027,040.00
Complete Fertilizer	bags	780.00	11,178	10,004	7,803,120.00
Urea Fertilizer	bags	890.00	4,344	4,217	3,753,130.00
Muriate of potash	bags	730.00		103	75,190.00
Solophos	bags	450.00		27	12,150.00
Ammophos	bags	680.00		203	138,040.00
Carabao	heads	20,400.00	59	44	897,600.00
MPDP	unit	131,000.00	12	11	1,441,000.00
Corn Sheller w/ Kubota Engine	unit	116,444.00	35	33	3,842,652.00
Heavy duty trailer	unit	38,000.00	35	23	874,000.00
Hog wire, 39' x 40 yards	rolls, 39"x40yds	1,224.10	20,000	458	560,637.80
Honda 6.5 HP Gasoline Engine	unit	13,750.00		12	165,000.00
Cassava Chopper	unit	100,000.00	1	1	100,000.00
Fruit trees	seedlings	8.00	4,000	10,000	80,000.00
Fruit trees (LPM)	seedlings	90.00		664	599,760.00
Native Cardaba Plantlets	seedlings	17.00	10,000	5,500	93,500.00
Swine	heads	2,400.00	505	538	1,291,200.00
BIOLOGICS	lump	1,027,625.00	LUMP	LUMP	1,027,625.00
Eartag (# 0)	pc	52.00	NONE	1,500	78,000.00
Eartag Applicator (permaflex)	unit	3,750.00	NONE	1	3,750.00
Soil Test Kit	kit	1,500.00	NONE	4	6,000.00
Budding Knife	unit	270.00	NONE	24	6,480.00
Chick Broiler Finisher	bags	880.00	NONE	75	66,000.00
Hog Starter	bags	885.00	NONE	195	172,575.00
Vegetable seeds	packet	46.00	12 kg, 1,800 packets	7,168	329,728.00
Plough	unit	-	35	-	-
Harrow	unit	-	35	-	-
Hand tools	set	-	344	-	-
Abaca Stripper	unit	63,000.00	4	5	315,000.00
Corn Mill (small)		235,000.00	11	8	1,880,000.00
Corn Mill (medium)	unit	420,000.00	1	1	420,000.00
<b>T O T A L</b>					<b>48,653,587.80</b>

**Annex 5 Status of livelihood projects, OSRO/PHI/501/JPN (as of January 29, 2007)**

PBG (112)	Region (6)	Livelihood Project	VALUE OF INPUTS DELIVERED in Dollar (using the rate of USD 48.955 per one peso)	No. of Members			STATUS
				Male	Female	Total	
	<b>REGION IX (3)</b>						
001	Zamboanga del Sur (4)	Goat Raising	12,138.77	80	20	100	COMPLETED
002		Goat Raising	4,248.57	35		35	COMPLETED
112	Zamboanga City	Chicken Raising	4,510.26		92	92	COMPLETED
003		cassava; carabao; fertilizers ; cassava grater	6,957.41	50		50	LPO for P& H on process
004		Hybrid Corn Production with Corn Sheller & Trailer	11,694.41	50		50	COMPLETED
005	Zamboanga del Norte (2)	Cassava Production	6,939.03	50		50	COMPLETED
006		Goat Raising	9,711.02	70	10	80	COMPLETED
007	Zamboanga Sibugay (4)	Goat & Chicken Raising	8,649.87	28	25	53	COMPLETED
008		Goat Raising	8,497.14	60	10	70	COMPLETED
009		Goat & Chicken Raising	19,695.18	168	10	178	COMPLETED

010		Cassava Production w/ carabao; fertilizers	6,939.03	50		50	LPO OK
			<b>99,980.69</b>	<b>641</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>808</b>	
	<b>REGION X (2)</b>						
011	Bukidnon (1)	Corn & Vegetable Production with Draft-Animals	11,886.43	70		70	COMPLETED
012	Lanao del Norte (5)	Corn Production: corn sheller+trailer	8,388.19	20	33	53	COMPLETED
013		Corn Production with Corn Sheller & Trailer	5,943.09	20	5	25	COMPLETED
014		Poultry Production	3,309.16	50	50	100	COMPLETED
015		Goat & Chicken Raising	7,433.04	49	18	67	COMPLETED
016		Goat Raising	6,312.16	49	3	52	COMPLETED
			<b>43,272.07</b>	<b>258</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>367</b>	
	<b>REGION XI (1)</b>						
017	Davao del Sur (2)	Vegetable & Chicken Production	3,987.99	47	20	67	COMPLETED
018		Chicken Raising	11,030.54		57	57	COMPLETED
			<b>15,018.53</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>124</b>	
	<b>REGION XII (5)</b>						

019	Cotabato City (4)		6,069.39	40	10	50	COMPLETED
020		Goat Raising	5,462.45		45	45	COMPLETED
021		Goat Raising	4,855.51	40		40	COMPLETED
022		Goat Raising	4,248.57		35	35	COMPLETED
023	North Cotabato (9)	Goat Raising	7,283.26		60	60	COMPLETED
024		Goat Raising	4,855.51	25	15	40	COMPLETED
025		Corn Production with Corn Sheller & Trailer	10,559.58	47	3	50	COMPLETED
026		Solar Dryer	2,465.73		50	50	COMPLETED
027		Solar Dryer	2,244.39		70	70	COMPLETED
028		Corn Production with Corn Sheller & Trailer	12,065.04		60	60	COMPLETED
029		Corn & Vegetable Production with Draft-Animals	11,858.24	70		70	COMPLETED
030		Goat Raising	6,069.39		50	50	COMPLETED
031		Corn Production with Corn Sheller & Trailer	10,559.58		50	50	COMPLETED

032	Sarangani (7)	Goat Raising	5,098.28	35	7	42	COMPLETED
033		Goat Raising	5,098.28	33	9	42	COMPLETED
034		Goat & Chicken Raising	6,711.80	42	18	60	COMPLETED
035		Goat & Chicken Raising	8,433.60	43	17	60	COMPLETED
036		Corn & Vegetable Production with Draft-Animals	4,169.13	19		19	COMPLETED
037		Goat Raising	5,341.06	35	9	44	COMPLETED
038		Goat Raising	5,462.45	45		45	COMPLETED
039	South Cotabato (4)	Goat Raising	5,826.61		48	48	COMPLETED
040		Goat Raising	7,283.26		60	60	COMPLETED
041		Cassava Production with Chipping Machine & Solar dryer	7,275.21	44	6	50	COMPLETED
042		Corn & Vegetable Production	11,996.73	70		70	COMPLETED
043	Sultan Kudarat (23)	Corn Production with Corn Sheller & Trailer	11,312.31	55		55	COMPLETED
044		Fruit Trees and nursery management	5,106.73	54	11	65	



045		Goat Raising	8,497.14	40	30	70	COMPLETED
046		Goat Raising	8,497.14	50	20	70	COMPLETED
047		Goat Raising	4,005.79	24	9	33	COMPLETED
048		Goat Raising	8,497.14	36	34	70	COMPLETED
049		Goat Raising	9,832.41	56	25	81	COMPLETED
050		Goat Raising	7,283.26	45	15	60	COMPLETED
051		Corn Production with Corn Sheller & Trailer	13,570.50	40	30	70	COMPLETED
052		Corn & Vegetable Production	11,996.73	70		70	COMPLETED
053		Goat Raising	3,641.63	30		30	COMPLETED
054		Corn Production with Corn Sheller & Trailer	13,419.96	35	34	69	COMPLETED
055		Goat Raising	9,711.02		80	80	COMPLETED
056		Corn Production with Corn Sheller & Trailer	10,559.58	44	6	50	COMPLETED
057		Goat Raising	3,884.41	26	6	32	COMPLETED
058		Goat Raising	5,341.06	34	10	44	COMPLETED

059		Corn Production with Corn Sheller & Trailer	13,570.50	45	25	70	COMPLETED
060		Goat Raising	7,283.26	60		60	COMPLETED
061		Goat Raising	4,855.51	27	13	40	COMPLETED
062		Corn Production with Corn Sheller & Trailer	10,559.58	48	2	50	COMPLETED
063		Corn Production with Corn Sheller & Trailer	10,559.58	44	6	50	COMPLETED
064		Corn Production with Corn Sheller & Trailer	13,570.50	60	10	70	COMPLETED
065		Corn Production with Corn Sheller & Trailer	10,559.58	48	2	50	COMPLETED
				<b>1,559</b>	<b>990</b>	<b>2,549</b>	
	<b>REGION 13 (3)</b>						
066	Agusan del Sur (8)	Complete Fertilizer; urea; hybrid corn; sheller; Carabao; Cassava; Swine; Mini corn mill; Feeds	13,518.18	128	20	148	Supplier is still fabricating MCM; Swine ?

067		Complete Fertilizer; urea; hybrid corn; sheller; Carabao; Cassava; Swine; Mini corn mill; Feeds	15,843.79	25	25	50	Supplier is still fabricating MCM; Swine ?
068		Complete Fertilizer; urea; hybrid corn; sheller; Carabao; Cassava; Swine; Mini corn mill; Feeds +MPDP	17,515.06	24	20	44	Supplier is still fabricating MCM; Swine ?
069		Complete Fertilizer; urea; hybrid corn; sheller; Carabao; Cassava; Goat; Mini corn mill; Feeds +MPDP	16,863.50	67	20	87	Supplier is still fabricating MCM; Swine ?
070		Complete Fertilizer; urea; hybrid corn; sheller; Carabao; Cassava; Swine; Chicken; Goat; Mini corn mill; Feeds +MPDP	15,856.96	97	29	126	Supplier is still fabricating MCM; Swine ?
071		Complete Fertilizer; urea; hybrid corn; sheller; Carabao; Cassava; Swine; Chicken; Goat; Mini corn mill; Feeds	14,778.42	43	21	64	Supplier is still fabricating MCM; Swine ? Chicken?

072		Complete Fertilizer; urea; hybrid corn; sheller; Carabao; Cassava; Swine; Chicken; Goat; Feeds	9,167.04	35	20	55	Supplier of MPDP materials still undecided?
073		Complete Fertilizer; urea; hybrid corn; sheller; Carabao; Cassava; Swine; Chicken; Goat; Feeds	9,450.46	25	20	45	Supplier of Swine undecided?
074	Surigao del Norte (3)	Chicken; Swine; Feeds	3,478.19	40	40	80	Supplier of Swine undecided?
075		Complete Fertilizer; urea; hybrid corn; sheller; Carabao; Cassava; Swine; Chicken; Goat; Mini corn mill; Feeds +MPDP	8,576.75	78	30	108	Supplier of Swine undecided?
076		Complete Fertilizer; urea; hybrid corn; sheller; Carabao; Swine; Chicken; Goat; Feeds; MPDP	6,506.59	22	40	62	Supplier of Swine undecided?
077	Surigao del Sur (7)	Complete Fertilizer; urea; hybrid corn; sheller; Carabao; Swine; Goat; Feeds; Abaca stripper; MPDP	11,459.97	57		57	Supplier of Swine undecided?

078		Goat; coffee; swine; feeds; mpdp	10,669.47	51		51	Supplier of Swine undecided?
079		Fertilizers; hybrid corn seeds; goats; HVCC	10,231.09	89	89	178	COMPLETED
080		Fertilizers; hybrid corn seeds; goats; sheller; swine; abaca stripper; feeds; corn mill	20,384.39	68	32	100	Supplier is still fabricating MCM; Swine ?
081		Fertilizers; goats; HVCC; carabao; abaca stripper; MPDP	10,771.30	40	30	70	COMPLETED
082		Hybrid Corn Seeds; sheller; goat; swine; feeds; corn mill; carabao; fertilizers	13,917.43	30		30	Supplier is still fabricating MCM; Swine ?
083		Hybrid Corn Seeds; sheller; goat; swine; feeds; corn mill; carabao; fertilizers	13,917.43	35	25	60	Supplier is still fabricating MCM; Swine ?
				<b>954</b>	<b>461</b>	<b>1,415</b>	
	<b>ARM (3)</b>						
084	Lanao del Sur (11)	Chicken Raising	6,397.71	52	6	58	COMPLETED
085		Solar Drying Pavement	2,655.50	75		75	COMPLETED
086		Chicken Raising	5,735.88	42	10	52	COMPLETED
087		Goat Raising	6,312.16	46	8	54	COMPLETED

088		Chicken Raising	6,508.02	55	4	59	COMPLETED
089		Corn Production with Corn Sheller & Trailer	10,860.67		52	52	COMPLETED
090		Goat Raising	7,283.26	60		60	COMPLETED
091		Corn Production with Corn Sheller & Trailer	9,032.79	45	15	60	COMPLETED
092		Corn Production with Corn Sheller & Trailer	8,280.05	51	4	55	COMPLETED
093		Corn Production with Corn Sheller & Trailer	12,933.18		70	70	COMPLETED
094		Corn Production with Corn Sheller & Trailer	12,065.04		60	60	COMPLETED
095	Maguindanao (12)	Poultry Raising (Broiler)	11,030.54	45	15	60	COMPLETED
096		Goat Raising	9,832.41	76	5	81	COMPLETED
097		Goat Raising	7,283.26	50	10	60	COMPLETED
098		Corn Production with Corn Sheller & Trailer	11,462.85	56		56	COMPLETED
099		Corn & Vegetable Production with Draft-Animals	11,858.24	70		70	COMPLETED
100		Goat Raising	7,283.26	50	10	60	COMPLETED

101		Corn Production with Corn Sheller & Trailer	11,312.31	50	5	55	COMPLETED
102		Corn Production with Corn Sheller & Trailer	10,559.58	30	20	50	COMPLETED
103		Corn Production with Corn Sheller & Trailer	10,559.58	45	5	50	COMPLETED
104*	Tawi-Tawi	Goat Raising	3,641.63	15	35	50	COMPLETED
105	Maguindanao	Goat & Chicken Raising	7,433.04	122	54	176	COMPLETED
106		Corn Production with Corn Sheller & Trailer	11,312.31	45	10	55	COMPLETED
107		Corn Production with Corn Sheller & Trailer	11,271.45	51	4	55	COMPLETED
108	Tawi-Tawi (6)	Cassava & GOAT Production	5,705.65	30	20	50	COMPLETED
109		Cassava & GOAT Production	6,342.97	62	28	90	COMPLETED
110		GOAT Production	6,334.94	50		50	COMPLETED
111		137 rolls hog wire; 16 heads goats; 2heads carabao; 120 complete; 2 units honda; cassava cuttings	8,412.38	40	10	50	COMPLETED
				1,313	460	1,773	
	<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>4,772</b>	<b>2,264</b>	<b>7,036</b>	

<b>Table 2. Proposed additional agri-livelihood projects, OSRO/PHI/501/JPN (as of January 2007).</b>							
PBG	Region (6)	Proposed Agri-Livelihood Project	VALUE OF INPUTS DELIVERED in Dollar (using the rate of USD 48.955 per one peso)	No. of Members			STATUS
	Province (17)				Total		
	<b>REGION IX (1)</b>						
01	Zamboanga Sibuguey(4)	Native Chicken Production	2,451		50	50	LPO APPROVED
02		Communal Goat Production	2,424	20	30	50	LPO APPROVED
03		Communal Goat Production	2,424	34	16	50	Repeat Order for goats
04		Vegetable Growing cum Water Project c/o CRS	613	57	56	113	LOA APPROVED
06		Vegetable Growing cum Water Project c/o CRS	613	61	61	122	LOA APPROVED



07		Communal Goat Production	2,424	20	24	44	Repeat Order
		<b>T O T A L for Region IX</b>	10,951	192	237	429	
	Region X (2)						
08	Bukidnon	Corn production	4,800	25	25	50	Completed
09		Vegetable Growing cum Water Project c/o CRS	613	220	219	439	LOA APPROVED
10		Vegetable Growing cum Water Project c/o CRS	613	144	145	289	LOA APPROVED
11		Vegetable Growing cum Water Project c/o CRS	613	54	54	108	LOA APPROVED
		Vegetable Growing cum Water Project c/o CRS	613	106	107	213	LOA APPROVED

		Vegetable Growing cum Water Project c/o CRS	613	73	73	146	LOA APPROVED
12	Lanao del Norte	Honey bee culture	2,043	25	25	50	INPUTS BEING PROCURED
13		Honey bee culture	2,043	25	25	50	INPUTS BEING PROCURED
14		Honey bee culture	2,043	25	25	50	INPUTS BEING PROCURED
15		Honey bee culture	2,043	25	25	50	INPUTS BEING PROCURED
16		Honey bee culture	2,043	25	25	50	INPUTS BEING PROCURED
		<b>T O T A L for Region X</b>	<b>18,081</b>	<b>747</b>	<b>748</b>	<b>1,495</b>	
	Region XI (2)						
	Davao City	Vegetable Growing cum Water Project c/o CRS	613	63	63	126	LOA APPROVED
18		Vegetable Growing cum Water Project c/o CRS	613	74	74	148	LOA APPROVED
		Vegetable Growing cum Water Project c/o CRS	613	47	47	94	LOA APPROVED

19	Compostela Valley	Vegetable Growing cum Water Project c/o CRS	613	87	86	173	LOA APPROVED
20		Vegetable Growing cum Water Project c/o CRS	613	62	63	125	LOA APPROVED
21		Vegetable Growing cum Water Project c/o CRS	613	62	63	125	LOA APPROVED
22		Vegetable Growing cum Water Project c/o CRS	613	83	83	166	LOA APPROVED
23		Vegetable Growing cum Water Project c/o CRS	613	211	211	422	LOA APPROVED
24		Vegetable Growing cum Water Project c/o CRS	613	63	63	126	LOA APPROVED
		Vegetable Growing cum Water Project c/o CRS	613	100	100	200	LOA APPROVED

		Vegetable Growing cum Water Project c/o CRS	613	85	80	165	LOA APPROVED
		Vegetable Growing cum Water Project c/o CRS	613	73	73	146	LOA APPROVED
25		Vegetable Growing cum Water Project c/o CRS	613	58	58	116	LOA APPROVED
		<b>T O T A L for Region XI</b>	7,974	1,068	1,064	2,132	
	Region XII (3)						
26	Sultan Kudarat	MPDP & Water Supply for Vegetables	4,800	25	25	50	Evaluation
27		MPDP & Water Supply for Vegetables	4,800	25	25	50	Evaluation
28	Sarangani	Communal Goat Production	4,245	37	3	40	Completed
29		Communal Goat Production	4,245	24	26	50	Goats delivered
30		Backyard Chicken Production	1,021		25	25	LPO Approved

31		Communal Goat Production	4,245		50	50	Goats delivered
		Vegetable Growing cum Water Project c/o CRS	613				LOA APPROVED
		Vegetable Growing cum Water Project c/o CRS	613				LOA APPROVED
32	Cotabato	Corn seeds + Fertilizers	5,995		50	50	Repeat Order
		<b>T O T A L for Region XII</b>	<b>30,578</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>315</b>	
	<b>ARMM (2)</b>						
33	Basilan	Cassava production	4,902	40	10	50	LPO APPROVED
34		Cassava production	4,902	40	10	50	LPO APPROVED
35		Communal Goat Production	4,245	25	25	50	LPO Approved
36		Communal Goat Production	4,245	25	25	50	LPO Approved
37		Communal Goat Production	4,245	25	25	50	LPO Approved

38		Communal Goat Production	4,245	25	25	50	LPO Approved
39		Communal Goat Production	8,489	25	25	50	LPO Approved
40	Lanao del Sur	MPDP	2,860	25	25	50	Evaluation
41		Communal Goat Production	4,245	40		40	Evaluation
42		Communal Goat Production	4,245	40		40	Evaluation
43		Fertilizer Support	4,085	50		50	Bidding
44		Fertilizer Support	4,085	50		50	Bidding
45		Communal Goat Production	4,245	50		50	Bidding
46		Fertilizer Support	4,085	50		50	Bidding
47		Fertilizer Support	4,085	50		50	Bidding
		<b>T O T A L for ARMM</b>	<b>67,209</b>	<b>560</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>730</b>	
	<b>Region XIII (1)</b>						
48	Agusan del Sur	Vegetable Growing cum Water Project c/o CRS	613	61	62	123	LOA APPROVED

49		Vegetable Growing cum Water Project c/o CRS	613	190	190	380	LOA APPROVED
50		Vegetable Growing cum Water Project c/o CRS	613	45	48	93	LOA APPROVED
		Vegetable Growing cum Water Project c/o CRS	613	73	60	133	LOA APPROVED
		Vegetable Growing cum Water Project c/o CRS	613	45	48	93	LOA APPROVED
		<b>T O T A L for Region XIII</b>	3,067	414	408	822	
		<b>TOTAL for Additional Projects</b>		<b>3,092</b>	<b>2,831</b>	<b>5,923</b>	
		<b>REGIONAL TOTAL</b>		<b>No. of Members</b>			
				<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>	
		<b>Region IX</b>	10,951	192	237	429	
		<b>Region X</b>	18,081	747	748	1,495	
		<b>Region XI</b>	7,974	1,068	1,064	2,132	
		<b>Region XII</b>	30,578	111	204	315	

		<b>Region XIII</b>	3,067	414	408	822	
		<b>ARMM</b>	67,209	560	170	730	