



SUGAR BOARD OF TANZANIA

Phasing Out Plan for the Accompanying Measures Sugar Protocol (2011 – 13) Projects

FINAL REPORT

Boniface H. J. Massawe and Judith S. Kahamba

BACAS

Bureau of Agricultural Consultancy and Advisory Service
Sokoine University of Agriculture,
Morogoro. Tanzania

MAY, 2018

Phasing Out Plan for the Accompanying Measures Sugar Protocol (2011 – 13) Projects

FINAL REPORT

Boniface H.J. Massawe (PhD) and Judith S. Kahamba (MA)



BACAS

Bureau of Agricultural Consultancy and Advisory
Service
Sokoine University of Agriculture,
Morogoro, Tanzania
bacas@suanet.ac.tz



SBT

Sugar Board of Tanzania
6th Floor, Sukari House,
Dar Es Salaam
sbt@sbt.go.tz,

Table of Contents

ACRONYMS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	v
APPENDICES	vi
1.0.INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Background information	1
1.2. AMSP 2011-2013 objectives and expected results	2
1.2.1. Outgrowers infrastructure development (R1)	2
1.2.2. Outgrowers capacity building in a sustainable manner (R2)	3
1.2.3. Research and Training for outgrowers (R3)	3
1.3. Major program activities	3
1.4. Implementation arrangements and responsibilities	4
1.5. Rationale for the exit strategy	4
1.6. Objectives of this assignment	5
2.0.METHODOLOGY	6
3.0.OTHER INTERVENTIONS SIMILAR TO TANZANIA’S AMSP 2011-2013	6
4.0.PROJECT ACHIVEMENTS AND IMPLEMENTATION CHALLENGES	8
4.1. Achievements	8
4.1.1. Result 1: Outgrower infrastructure developed:	8
4.1.2. Result 2: Outgrower capacity building in a sustainable manner	8
4.1.3. Result 3: Research and Training for outgrowers	10
4.2. Implementation challenges	10
5.0.FINDINGS FROM THE INTERVIEWS WITH DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS	11
5.1. Outgrowers Capacity Building	11
5.1.1. Provision of Technical support to small holder farmers	11
5.1.2. Trainings and supervision by SBT’s local area officers	12
5.1.3. Establishment and maintenance of Synchronized and block farms	12
5.2. Support to Community Trusts	13
5.2.1. Technical Assistance to Outgrowers Community Trust	13

5.2.2. Support to Mtibwa Outgrowers in availing an investment of small scale sugar processing plant	14
5.3. Outgrowers Registration System	14
5.4. Environmental Conservation	14
5.4.1. Continuation of the Biomass Study in TPC	14
5.4.2. Development of Millers Effluent Treatment systems	15
5.5. Infrastructural Support	15
5.5.1. Farm access roads rehabilitations and maintenances	16
5.5.2. Constructing new access roads	17
5.5.3. Msolwa Ujamaa Irrigation System Management	17
6.0.IMPROVEMENT AREAS FOR SUSTAINABILITY	18
7.0.INTEGRATION OF BENEFICIARIES AND STAKEHOLDERS IN THE PHASING OUT PLAN	19
7.1. Outgrowers capacity building:	19
7.1.1. Technical support to small holder farmers via Village Extension Officers	19
7.1.2. Supervision of Technical support to small holder farmers via Local Area Officers	20
7.1.3. Trainings on Business skills, Advocacy , Gender and Environmental conservation	20
7.1.4. Trainings on Best farming practices.....	21
7.1.5. Maintenance of existing and establishment of new synchronized farms.....	21
7.2. Support to Community Trusts.....	22
7.2.1. Technical Assistance to Outgrowers Community Trust	22
7.2.2. Support to Mtibwa Outgrowers to get mini sugar processing plant.....	22
7.3. Outgrowers Registration System	23
7.3.1. Upgrade and maintainance of the database	23
7.4. Environmental Conservation	23
7.4.1. Continuation of the Biomass Study in TPC	23
7.4.2. Development of Millers Effluent Treatment systems	24
7.4.3. Strategic consideration of Climate Change in the sugar sub sector	24
7.4.4. Strategic consideration of green harvest technology in the sugar sub sector	24
7.5. Infrastructural Support	25
7.5.1. Farm access roads rehabilitations and maintenances	25
7.5.2. Expanding the network of Farm access roads by constructing new roads	26
7.5.3. Flood control dykes maintenance.....	26

7.5.4. Additional Flood Control dykes construction.....	26
7.5.5. Msolwa Ujamaa Irrigation System Management	27
8.0.ROAD MAP AND WORK PLAN FOR THE PHASING OUT ACTIVITIES.....	28
9.0.CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	39
10.0.REFERENCES.....	41
11.0.APPENDICES.....	42

ACRONYMS

AMSP	Accompanying Measures Sugar Protocol
BACAS	Bureau for Agricultural Consultancy and Advisory Services
EU	European Union
KASGA	Kagera Sugarcane Growers Association
KCCT	Kilombero Community Charitable Trust
KCGA	Kilombero Cane Growers Association
KSC	Kilombero Sugar Company
LGA	Local Government Authority
MCGA	Muungano Cane Growers Association
MCGT	Missenyi Cane Growers Trust
MSE	Mtibwa Sugar Estate
MUCGCS	Msolwa Ujamaa Cane Growers Cooperative Society
NEMC	National Environmental Management Council
NSI	National Sugar Institute
OCT	Outgrowers Community Trust
OGA	Outgrowers Association
RCGA	Ruhembe Cane Growers Association
RCGAMC	Ruhembe Cane Growers Agriculture and Marketing Cooperative Society
SBT	Sugar Board of Tanzania
SRI	Sugar Research Institute
STRIT	Sugar Training and Research Institute of Tanzania
SUA	Sokoine University of Agriculture
TASGA	Tanzania Sugarcane Growers Association
TIC	Tanzania Investment Center
TPC	Tanganyika Plantation Company

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Proposed Phase out action plan for the AMSP 2011 – 2013 program	28
--	----

APPENDICES

Appendix 1. SBT's own proposed hand over plan	42
Appendix 1.1. Outgrowers Capacity Building activities	42
Appendix 1.2. Support to Community Trusts activities	42
Appendix 1.3. Outgrowers Registration System activities.....	42
Appendix 1.4. Environmental Conservation Activities.....	43
Appendix 1.5. Infrastructural Support Activities.....	43
Appendix 2. Tool for collecting information from Sugar Board of Tanzania (SBT).....	44
Appendix 3. General tool for outgrowers associations and outgrowers community trusts	49
Appendix 4. General tool for local government and millers.....	58
Appendix 5. Detailed achievements based on the project logical framework matrix.....	62

1.0. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background information

Sugarcane production is an important subsector in Tanzania's agricultural sector. It contributes approximately 35% of the gross output of the food-manufacturing sector and some 7 to 10% of total manufacturing value added. Being among the largest agro-processing industries in the country, the sugar subsector is a major employer with direct labour force of approximately 18,000 people, indirect labour force of 57,000 people with 75, 000 households and dependents. The Tanzanian sugar cane production can be categorized into two subsectors: outgrowers subsector and estate subsector. The outgrowers are associated with estates because they don't own sugar processing mills, thus sell their crops to the mills owned by estate subsector. There are four major players in the estate subsector owning five processing plants. These are Kilombero Sugar Company (owning two mills) in Morogoro, Mtibwa Sugar Estates (MSE) also in Morogoro, TPC Ltd in Kilimanjaro, and Kagera Sugar Ltd in Kagera

Large-scale plantations have been the predominant model for sugarcane production in Tanzania and elsewhere in Sub-Saharan Africa. However, due to limited land for horizontal expansion of sugarcane estate farming, the sugar companies in Tanzania specifically Kilombero Sugar Company Limited (KSCL) and Mtibwa Sugar Estate in Morogoro region have strongly encouraged outgrowers production. Outgrowers schemes in Tanzania account for approximately 27% of all cane production and 48% respective mills' throughput. However, their efficiency is hampered by several factors. Outgrowers production in Tanzania is constrained by several factors the main ones being poor management of outgrowers' associations, poor infrastructure and haulage facilities, poor cane husbandry practices, lack of access to finance to invest in sugarcane production, high harvesting and production costs, and fire outbreaks in outgrowers' fields before harvesting, and dependence on rain-fed agriculture. Despite the challenges faced, outgrower production is seen as an appropriate model to increase sugarcane production hence fill the existing supply gap of sugar in the country.

Tanzania was affected by the reform of the European Sugar Market. The government developed a National Strategy on how to adjust to new EU Sugar market regime. The EU Commission in response outlined a strategy for the period 2006-2013 on how to support National plans for adjusting to the new price regime and drafted a Multi-annual Indicative programme for the period 2007-2010 thereby improving Tanzania's competitiveness with other sugar-producing countries.

The current programme known as Accompanying Measures Protocol (AMSP) 2011-2013 builds on the achievements of the previous Multi-Annual Indicative Programme (MIP) 2007-2010. It has been designed in line with the MIP 2011-2013 and it takes stock of the new Sugar Industry Development Plan and Strategy (SIDPS) 2011/12-2015/16.

1.2. AMSP 2011-2013 objectives and expected results

The Accompanying Measure for Sugar Protocol (AMSP) 2011-2013 project for Tanzania is an EU funded intervention designed to complement other support provided in the sugar sector by different stakeholders such as the Government, the Sugar Board of Tanzania (SBT), and the Sugar Industry Development Trust Fund (SIDTF).

The overall objective (OO) of the programme is “the sustainable development of the Tanzanian sugar sector and the improvement of living standards of small scale outgrowers; thereby support the Government's efforts to increase the competitiveness of the Tanzanian sugar sector, while specifically targeting small scale farmers in the sugar production chain.”

The specific objective (OS) is the “support of outgrower systems to increase their efficiency and thereby to improve living standards of small scale farmers, reduce poverty and ensure the sustainability of the Tanzanian sugar sector whilst safeguarding the environment.”

The program has three main components. The main components correspond to the 3 expected results (R) shown below:

- (R1) Outgrowers infrastructure developed (block farms, roads and irrigation schemes), works, supplies and services contracts managed by the National Authorising Office for an overall amount of 3,200,000 Euros;
- (R2) Outgrowers capacity building in a sustainable manner, 2,000,000 Euros grant to the Sugar Board of Tanzania (SBT); and
- (R3) Research and Training restructured, a grant of 1,100,000 Euros to the Sugar Training and Research Institute of Tanzania (STRIT).

1.2.1. Outgrowers infrastructure development (R1)

Activities of the action under this result targeted to increase smallholder sugarcane producer efficiency through addressing infrastructure and production bottlenecks. Specifically, the action supported improvement of farm access roads as a means to reduce transport costs of sugarcane from farm to factory, consolidation of smallholder plots into block farms to easy provision of extension services, mechanized farming and introduction of small scale irrigation systems. Most of the activities under this result have been implemented through works and or services contracts in which the procurement process was managed by the Office of National Authorising Officer, whereas supervision and coordination of stakeholders including final beneficiaries was the role of the Sugar Board of Tanzania (SBT).

1.2.2. Outgrowers capacity building in a sustainable manner (R2)

Activities under this result targeted to build capacity of smallholder farmers in sugarcane production and ensure sustainability of established infrastructure. Therefore, the focus was directed towards filling the capacity gap in sugarcane related Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) through establishment of pilot synchronized farms which were used as a training point for outgrowers in a given geographical coverage. The approach was also meant to demonstrate the benefits of collective actions so as to take advantage of economies of scale and overcome the obstacles of fixed costs in sugar cane production via collective management of inputs and mechanization. Capacity building was also offered in terms of trainings. The training offered included Business Skills, Advocacy , Gender and Environmental conservation. Also, for ensured sustainability of the outgrowers infrastructure established through the project specifically under result 1, the action adopted the Kilombero Sugar Company model of Community Trust. Through this action it was expected to establish similar trusts in Mtibwa and Kagera which among other responsibilities would have been tasked with maintenance of infrastructure related investments and provision of other social services to smallholder farmers. Other activities planned for implementation under this result relate with mapping and putting in place a registration system that will facilitate identification of sugarcane outgrowers. Also, the action implemented activities related to environment management in particular addressing pollution and effects of climate changes.

1.2.3. Research and training for outgrowers (R3)

The management of activities for this result was expected to be under the Sugar Training and Research Institute of Tanzania (STRIT). However, in the course of implementation of the project activities, the restructuring of STRIT who would manage activities under result 3 could not materialize as anticipated hence all planned activities under this result somehow became redundant. The non-operationalization of STRIT was mainly caused by failure of the Government to transfer assets from Sugar Research Institute (SRI) and National Sugar Institute (NSI). As a result STRIT became non-operational.

1.3. Major program activities

The Sugar Board of Tanzania (SBT) was the implementer of two out of the three components of the program. As described above, component R3 on Research and Training by the Sugar Training and Research Institute of Tanzania (STRIT) was not implemented. The components implemented by SBT are (1) Outgrowers infrastructure development (R1) and (2) Outgrowers capacity building in a sustainable manner (R2). The components were broken down into five activities here described as major program activities:

- i. Outgrowers capacity building
- ii. Support to Community Trusts

- iii. Outgrowers Registration System
- iv. Environmental Conservation
- v. Infrastructural Support

1.4. Implementation arrangements and responsibilities

AMSP implements its activities in major sugar production areas. The major sugar production areas are associated with sugar milling plants i.e. Kilombero Sugar Company (two mills) in Morogoro, Mtibwa Sugar Estates (MSE) also in Morogoro, TPC Ltd in Kilimanjaro, and Kagera Sugar Ltd in Kagera

The implementation of the project activities involve various stakeholders ranging from Central Government and Agencies, Local Government Authorities, Sugarcane Outgrower's Associations, Community Trusts and Millers. The Sugar Board of Tanzania is the overall coordinator of the action and supervises implementation of activities for all results of the action.

Furthermore, a specific steering committee was formed to provide policy guidance and to oversee and validate progress of project execution to ensure the intended objectives are achieved. The steering committee meets annually and its composition includes representatives from the key stakeholders specifically the Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Finance and Planning, Sugar Board of Tanzania, EU Delegation, Sugar Industry, and Outgrowers Farmers Associations.

For proper execution of the project activities, a project management unit (PMU) was established within SBT which was responsible for the day-to-day management of project activities. The PMU composed of the project coordinator, assistant project coordinator and Local Areas Officers (LAO) operating at local level and whose responsibilities among others include coordination and management of field activities. Public agricultural extension service providers in the project areas were also integrated as part of the action and they worked hand in hand with the LAOs.

In terms of monitoring and evaluation a special M&E team composing technical staff from SBT was formed to monitor and follow-up on regular basis of the implementation progress. The M&E reports were very useful especially in providing necessary information for decision making by the management and steering committee.

1.5. Rationale for the exit strategy

In the world of development projects, it is well understood that, exit strategy are key for ensured sustainability of any development interventions. In the past, most of the donor funded projects failed to take into account exit strategies and therefore their interventions and or new initiated projects ended to be unsustainable. Recognizing this weakness, the AMSP 2011-2013 for Tanzania has clearly defined that a phasing out strategy shall be prepared to guide exit of funding from the project. In view of this, BACAS,

has been engaged to assist SBT in defining how the project achievement would be maintained in view sustainability and possible continuation of certain activities under future funding from EU or any other financier including the Government of Tanzania.

In this case, the current exit strategy has been prepared using participatory approaches and offers a framework and modalities upon which the realized project outputs would be mainstreamed into strategies and plans of key stakeholders. This is fundamental for ensured sustainability of the project interventions beyond its lifecycle and replication of best practices resulting from implementation of the project activities.

1.6. Objectives of this assignment

The AMSP (2011-13) is phasing out. SBT has hired BACAS to prepare the phasing out plan for sustainability of the project achievements and activities.

The purposes of this assignment are as follows

- 1) To internalize the whole context of the project and conduct post-project review of the project deliverables and highlight the achievements of the project
- 2) To go through the performance indicators of the project and advise on areas where the project can be improved for sustainability of the infrastructures
- 3) To enquire stakeholders opinion on the execution of the project and provide elaborated summary of opinions given by stakeholders on the project
- 4) To perform literature review of similar undertakings and line with the project for cross reference sustainability
- 5) To develop tools and guidelines on how to integrate beneficiaries and stakeholders in the phasing out sensitization/transfer of knowledge and handing over
- 6) To develop a road map and work plan for the phasing out activities
- 7) To conduct post-project assessment and achievements and provide documented recommendations for other projects of similar size and scope

The general result expected from this assignment is to provide detailed document of project phasing strategy with road map and work plan for the phasing out activities. The expected specific results is to provide recommendations on the tools and guidelines for the phasing-out strategy and detailed road map and work plan for the phasing out activities

2.0. METHODOLOGY

To familiarize with the AMSP (2011-2013) program, we reviewed project documents availed to us by the SBT. The project documents included effluent treatment design reports, irrigation project reports, year 1 and year 2 annual progress reports, year 3 interim report, final baseline report, and green harvesting feasibility study report.

We proceeded to prepare checklists of information we wanted from different stakeholder involved with the project. The SBT prepared a list of stakeholders involved in the project implementation and their proposed hand over plan (Appendix 1). This proposed hand over plan guided preparation of our semi-structured questionnaires tools which were directed to three broad groups.

Sugar Board of Tanzania (SBT) (Appendix 2). SBT is the implementer of the AMSP program. This tool was used to get information as per the implementer's perspectives

Outgrowers associations and outgrowers community trusts (Appendix 3). In this tool, specific questions were formulated to target the two major groups who are directly linked to the welfares of the outgrowers component of sugar subsector.

Local government, millers and other organizations (Appendix 4). In this general tool questions targeted stakeholders other than farmers and implementers on their current and future roles to sustain project activities.

The questionnaires were administered physically and via emails.

The information collected from the interviewees and literature review were synthesized and used to prepare the contents of this exit strategy document.

3.0. OTHER INTERVENTIONS SIMILAR TO TANZANIA'S AMSP 2011-2013

The AMSP 2011-2013 for Tanzania was designed to respond to constraints facing smallholder sugar production in particular addressing outgrower's production inefficiencies. In the global context, outgrower production model is gaining popularity because of the need of sugar estates to expand the cultivated area and to attract foreign investment. The literature review confirms that smallholder sugarcane production through outgrower schemes across African, Caribbean and Pacific countries have largely been pushed by the EU AMSP initiative. Further, the literature confirms that similar interventions on improvement of sugarcane outgrower efficiencies funded through AMSP exist in other ACP countries such as Barbados, Trinidad and Tobago, Belize, Mozambique, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Malawi, Kenya, Uganda, Madagascar and Mauritius to mention a few. However, the magnitude and scope of the projects varies across countries and the supports range from improving competitiveness to promoting diversification depending on the needs of a given country.

Unfortunately, the details of the AMSP projects in other countries could not be accessed during the review of literature. The only practical option that could assist SBT to make cross-reference and compare the performance of the Tanzania's AMSP with other countries is to arrange study tour to learn successes achieved in those countries. Of interest could be Malawi where the information available in the EU website (https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/aap-acp-sugar-infrastructure-malawi-af-2008_en_11.pdf) indicates that the allocation of the Malawi's AMSP was Euro 4,911,000. The Malawi and Tanzania programmes they are similar in terms of design which could facilitate comparison on the performance of the two programmes. The only distinction between the two programmes is on implementation arrangement whereby the Malawi programme is implemented through a combination of direct award of grants to identified outgrowers schemes and Call for Proposal (CfP). The EU support was expected to complement expansion of additional 1,000 hectares of irrigated sugarcane by smallholder outgrowers in Kasithula and Dwangwa. On the other hand, the CfP was expected to target Non State Actors (NSAs) that were first identified by the Sugar Steering Committee and by the scoping study conducted during preparation of the respective programme. Contrary to this arrangement, the Tanzania's AMSP was a direct award of grant to a Government entity (SBT) with a mandate to oversee the sugar sector in Tanzania.

Therefore, the distinct implementation arrangement could be an important aspect to learn from Malawi on how involvement of private sector in the execution of the AMSP has impacted the growth and efficiency of outgrowers schemes in particular smallholder irrigated sugarcane production and strengthening of outgrowers associations. Similarly, the Malawi AMSP could provide opportunity for Tanzania to learn the of rehabilitation and construction of farm access roads on transport cost reduction from farm to the factory as the first result of the programme focused on improvement of feeder roads at the Dwangwa outgrowers scheme.

The literature also shows that similar interventions to that of Tanzania AMSP were implemented in Trinidad and Tobago. The only component that different between the two programmes is agricultural diversification where the Trinidad and Tobago programme emphasized crop diversification from sugarcane to other crops. This was not emphasized on the Tanzania AMSP probably due to the importance of the sugar sector in the national economy. All in all, the example of Malawi provides a good opportunity for cross-reference of the sustainability of the Tanzania AMSP and future design of similar interventions. In fact the AMSP for Tanzania is the first of its kind whose success especially on irrigated block farming and synchronized farming could be adopted in other commodity crops in Tanzania and elsewhere in Sub-Sahara Africa.

4.0. PROJECT ACHIEVEMENTS AND IMPLEMENTATION CHALLENGES

4.1. Achievements

The review of various reports specifically the project progress and monitoring reports, indicate that, so far significant achievements have been recorded especially in the areas of infrastructure development, outgrower productivity and institutional development, environment and project management. It is important to note that the original logical framework matrix of the project were slightly amended to take into account the findings of the baseline and experience in the course of implementing project activities. Therefore under this section, summarized achievements based on the revised logframe are presented hereunder, whereas, the details are shown in Annex 5. The review of progress reports and M&E reports for the period ended March 2018 depict the following achievements per result:

4.1.1. Result 1: Outgrower infrastructure developed:

- A total of 33.5 km of out-grower farm access roads have been rehabilitated (12.5 km in Kilimbero, 7 km in Mtibwa and 14 km in Kagera) representing 134% of the target. This km of roads have positively impacted reduction of time spent for transportation of outgrower sugar cane from farm to the factory hence reduced cost and increased profit margins to outgrowers.
- A total of 10.5 km of flood control dyke along Ruembe River for controlling water in out-grower fields has been constructed in Kilombero area. The percentage achievement is 150% of the original target of 7.0 km. The area is now suitable for sugar cane cultivation because the water logging condition caused by floods has been controlled.
- A total of 100 hectares irrigation infrastructure composing primary canal, night storage reservoir, secondary canals, tertiary canals, drainages and 6 km farm access roads has been constructed at Msolwa Ujamaa village. This represents 100% achievement of the target.
- A total of 180 hectares of sugarcane block farms (100 hectares at Msolwa Ujamaa village, 40 hectares at Nyarubungo sub-village and 40 hectares at Nyameza sub-village) representing 100% of the target have been established in Kilombero. The block farms were established in view of demonstrating good husbandry of cane farming and the benefits of collective actions for taking advantages of economy of scale. Overall, the performance of the block farms is impressive and outgrowers' income in a given block is expected to double and even more.

4.1.2. Result 2: Outgrowers capacity building in a sustainable manner

Result 2.1: Outgrowers' capacity building developed in Kilombero, Mtibwa and Kagera

- A total of 1,137 outgrowers farmers have been trained on business and entrepreneurship skills, leadership skills, and cross-cutting issues on gender and environment. This represent equivalent to 76% of the 1,500 targeted number of outgrowers.

Result 2.2: Outgrowers' community trusts established in Mtibwa and Kagera

- One (1) outgrower trust community has been established in Kagera, whereas that of Mtibwa has not been established. This represents 50% achievement.
- A total of 100 hectares of trust sugarcane farm have been secured and established in Kagera. This is 100% achievement of the target.

Result 2.3: Outgrowers' synchronized farms established for Kilombero, Mtibwa and Kagera

- A total of 487 acres of land for synchronized farms were secured and established representing 86% of the total target of 566 acres. Harvesting for the first year has been done and maintenance for the farms for the second year is ongoing. However, it is important to point out that part of the synchronized farms in Kagera and Mtibwa were seriously affected by drought and livestock respectively.
- A total of 250 hectares of women groups' synchronized farms have been established in Kagera. This is 100% achievement of the target.

Result 2.4: Mapping and registration system for outgrowers' area developed

- Outgrowers' web based registration system has been developed and currently it is in a stage of data uploading and hosting. The achievement by end March 2018 was 95% as accessibility in outgrowers' areas and automatic generation of outgrowers' identification number is still a challenge.

Result 2.5: Environment management

- Study and design of effluent treatment plant for the four sugar factories in Kilombero I&II, TPC, Kagera and Mtibwa has been done. This represents 90% of achievement as still the recommendations of the study are yet to be implemented by the respective factories which suggest a need for close follow-up with NEMC to ensure the recommendations are implemented.
- Supporting the Biomass study at TPC has been completed representing 100% achievement. Through this study, out 17 tree species tested, two species (Acacia Xanthophloea and Eucalyptus) were found to be resistant to sodic and saline soil conditions. Thus tree seedlings of the two species have been transplanted to seven trials of equivalent 25 acres.
- Environmental impact assessment for the Msolwa Ujamaa Irrigation Scheme has been conducted and approved by NEMC for subsequent construction of the scheme. This is equivalent to 75% achievement as environment audit for the same scheme is expected to be done soon.

Result 2.6: Project management and coordination

- A baseline assessment and design of the monitoring system were done in the early stage of the project implementation
- Routine and periodic monitoring and evaluation of the project activities have been done.

- Communication and visibility activities have been implemented in different ways such as production of sign boards, Tshirts, Khanga, calendars and diaries.
- Various strategic activities including steering committee meetings and workshops have been implemented.
- Project funds utilization and accountability have been ensured throughout the implementation of the project.

4.1.3. Result 3: Research and Training for outgrowers

As already mentioned under section 3.1.3 activities under this result were not implemented because of non-functional of STRIT. However, the funds allocated for this result were allocated to reinforce the other two results above i.e. Outgrowers infrastructure development and Outgrowers capacity building in a sustainable manner.

4.2. Implementation challenges

The interview conducted with various stakeholders and reviews of project reports confirm that the project faced various challenges in the course of implementation of project activities. The main ones are:

- Delayed payment by the donor (EDF) in some cases was reported as among the challenges experienced during implementation of the project. The delay was not just to SBT, but also to contractors who were engaged to execute service and works contracts. The delay was partly contributed by the complex payment system of EU which takes long period to validate and confirm the payment request.
- Poor performance of Mtibwa Sugar Estate has significantly affected the performance of interventions planned for Mtibwa outgrowers. As a result of nonperforming of the sugar factory, many outgrowers in Mtibwa have opted to abandon sugarcane production because it is no longer profitable. Due to this most of the interventions planned for Mtibwa such as establishment of community trust and farms, installation of min-processing plant and others were not implemented.
- Prolonged drought was also one of the challenges reported which affected significantly the performance of rainfed sugar production in 2016/2017 production season especially in Misenyi district in Kagera region.
- Another challenge specific for Mtibwa was conflict between farmers and livestock whereby many acres of synchronized farms were severely affected.
- Political related challenge on the construction of irrigation scheme and establishment of block farm at Msolwa Ujamaa Irrigation was reported to affect timely completion of the project.

5.0. FINDINGS FROM THE INTERVIEWS WITH DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS

Various useful findings were collected through the AMSP project stakeholders' interviews. The interviews were conducted to get stakeholders understanding and opinions regarding the implementation of project and their views on their capacities to sustain the projects outputs and activities during and after the phasing out of the AMSP project. The SBT's own proposed hand over plan (Appendix 1) was predominantly used to guide our checklists and identification of the stakeholders. The presentation of the findings is organized in terms of the project activities and respective stakeholders to which the hand over is targeted.

5.1. Outgrowers Capacity Building

5.1.1. Provision of Technical support to small holder farmers

The community beneficiaries of the project (outgrowers) are administratively under the District Councils (DCs). Responses from the interviews show that the District councils were involved in the provision of technical assistance to the outgrowers through extension officers to promote sense of ownership. Such assistance include provision of trainings to the farmers on good agricultural practices, pest and water management. To achieve these, district extension staff were trained on select technical issues which were offered to the outgrowers.

The District council officials have also acknowledged that support has been received from the Sugar Board of Tanzania (SBT) in terms of working facilities— provided motorcycles to the extension staff for easy access to the farmers and tablets for data collection and information storage. The Missenyi DC in Kagera received three motorcycles and Tsh.250, 000/= as allowance for each extension officer. According to them, this has put the DC in a position of being capable of carrying out activities which will be handed to them after the project phased out.

However, for the Kilombero District council to continue implementing the project activities (after the phasing out of the project), the District council reported to still need capacity building of extension agents on new technologies. They also need transport facilities particularly motorcycles to facilitate extension staff transportation to the farmers and study tours. This assistance is needed during the 2018/2019 fiscal year.

Missenyi DC reported the need for assistance to repair the motorcycles which have been provided and the timing of this assistance in October this year (2018). Missenyi DC also needs technical support on sugarcane pests and diseases control, use of herbicides and testing of new varieties.

In Kilombero, both Kilombero Sugar Company (KSC) and SBT have been in discussion to work on a programme for improved extension services in order to maintain sustainable agricultural productivity. Also, the KCCT function is currently in the process of being restructured to better serve the demands of

the KSC and Grower community needs through a shared value approach. In addition the Grower Affairs Department is being restructured to improve the KSC and Grower interface.

It was also noted that training to the beneficiaries is under SBT and all training materials are prepared by project coordination unit (PCU) in collaboration with KSC (ILOVO) and Kilombero DC.

5.1.2. Trainings and supervision by SBT's local area officers

Various capacity development trainings were targeted by SBT to outgrowers from the initial implementation of the project. Issues targeted for capacity development included business skills, gender integration in the project activities, improved agronomic practices, environmental issues and establishment of Block and Synchronized farms. According to SBT, all these were successfully covered where leaders and some group members participated. Facilitation was done using competitively solicited consultants in collaboration with extension officers.

In Kagera, the sugarcane farmers and Missenyi Cane Growers Trust reported to have received trainings on sugarcane farming and entrepreneurship under the AMSP. In addition to that, Missenyi Cane Growers Trust and Kagera Sugar Cane Growers Association (KASGA) have reported to be trained on advocacy, negotiation and leadership skills. They have declared these training to be very useful to them. However, the sugarcane farmers in Kagera think that for them to be more competent and effective in carrying the project activities after it has phased out, they need capacity building training on sugarcane pest and diseases management strategies. They suggest the best timing for these capacity building trainings to be at the onset of the season in June, 2018.

Interview of OCT revealed that its members and leaders still need more capacity building on sugarcane farming and entrepreneurship which would enable them carry out the activities that will be handed to them after the project phased out. The suggested timing by the Outgrowers Trust for capacity building is this year (2018) November. KASGA believes that capacity building on leadership and financial management is still needed. It suggests the appropriate timing to be May next year (2019).

For sustainability of the capacity building DCs and SBT local area officers are charged with the responsibility while SBT would carry out time to time supervision. However, SBT admits that some of the stakeholders are still unaware of the hand over process; thus, SBT is currently not in a good position to know their willingness and capacity to carry over the activities for sustainability. In regard to this, SBT is planning to carry out sensitization meetings and identify the capacity gaps.

5.1.3. Establishment and maintenance of Synchronized and block farms

In Kilosa, according to MCGCS leader, one synchronized farm was established involving the outgrowers' cooperatives.

In Kagera, the sugarcane farmers and Missenyi Cane Outgrowers Trust have acknowledged their involvement in the sugar cane block farm establishment. They were involved in the selection of the areas where sugarcane block farm was established. The Missenyi Cane Growers Trust believes synchronized farms/sugarcane block farm is the long lasting change which has been generated as the result of the project because so far through synchronized farms, outgrowers have been able to generate more profit than individual farmers. In addition to that, increased number of their farmers, acquired farming knowledge and decreased cost of transporting sugarcane were also mentioned to be other positive changes experienced by the Kagera Sugarcane Growers Association (KSGA).

In Kilombero, the MUCGCS leaders reported that due to the capacity training and experience the cooperative has acquired in general regarding establishment of the block farms, they are capable of carrying out the roles of supervision and monitoring of already established sugarcane block farms after the project has phased out. Specifically, capacity building training was given to the six MUCGCS leaders and 5 project committee members.

However, according to the MUCGCS leaders' views, they still need more capacity building training on irrigation scheme management, IPM in sugarcane production and irrigation infrastructure maintenance. They suggest that the good timing for these training should be between June and November this year (2018).

In Kilosa, RCGAMCS was involved in the establishment of sugarcane block farms. Another change which has been made by the project in Kilosa is the construction of storage reservoir. The RCGAMCS leaders mentioned that they are aware that after the project has phased out, the management of some of the activities will be handed to them. However, these leaders feel that they are not ready to be handed over project activities because they still need more technical and advisory support. They think that they might be ready after one year. Some of the capacities or resources which would enable them to handle those activities efficiently are on the management of sugarcane block farms, operation and maintenance of irrigation scheme, good sugarcane agricultural practices and IPM training. They suggested the most appropriate time for capacity building to RDGAMCS is between October 2018 and January 2019.

5.2. Support to Community Trusts

5.2.1. Technical Assistance to Outgrowers Community Trust

One of the project activities was to establish Outgrowers Community Trusts (OCTs) in order to support local community and take over supporting the project activities; and address social welfare of the outgrowers. According to SBT one OCT was supposed to be developed in each area (i.e. Kilombero, Kagera and Mtibwa). The study reveals that in all three areas initial preparation were done involving the however, up to now, only one OCT has been able to start operating in Kilombero, while the OCT in Kagera is slowly getting started. The OCT in Mtibwa was not started due to lack of collaboration among stakeholders.

While the stakeholders are required to support and maintain the operations of the established OCTs, SBT has not yet worked to identify capacity gaps and needs. SBT plan to identify them during the handover sensitization meetings. SBT is aware that in case gaps will be identified; they will have to work in collaboration with millers to address them.

The Missenyi Cane Outgrowers Trust reported to have no assets of its own. In the interview they pointed out need of support to obtain some assets including a tractor to be able to maintain production in the established block farm and establish new block farms. They also requested considerations for financial support. While the Missenyi OCT reported to have no assets, the outgrowers association of the same area (KASGA) reported to have a tractor, a plot and running a farm. The tractor was acquired through the grant received from SBT, the plot was purchased using association money and the farm is being hired from Tanzania Sugar cane growers Association (TASGA).

5.2.2. Support to Mtibwa Outgrowers in availing an investment of small scale sugar processing plant

SBT admits that the implementation of the project in Mtibwa has not been successful. One of the reasons pointed out was the market of sugar cane produced by the outgrowers due to unsatisfactory performance of the current mill. SBT reported on efforts to establish a mini sugar processing plant so as to avail the market and stimulate the outgrowers activities in Mtibwa. SBT has already contacted Tanzania Investment Center (TIC) for marketing the opportunity. However, the process has not been successful yet. Worries are also on the time, as the project is approaching its end. This may lead to donor reclaim of the fund assigned to support this activity.

5.3. Outgrowers Registration System

SBT has been the sole custodian charged with the responsibility of maintaining and managing the outgrowers' registration systems. The roles involve upgrading and maintenance of the database for the Outgrowers, milling and the entire sugar sub sector information. However, the system is hosted by a service provider known as INETS. According to SBT, there is no or very little involvement of other sugar sector players in this registration and database management systems.

5.4. Environmental Conservation

5.4.1. Continuation of the Biomass Study in TPC

The biomass study in TPC involves the community, SBT and TPC. It was started to find out how the surrounding community would participate in the factories activities as outgrowers in growing trees for the factory to be used in steam turbines. There are no sugar cane outgrowers in TPC. It is therefore, expected that the sugar industry will eventually have more multiplier effect in terms of employing more people by involving trees outgrowers. While the costs of conducting this study are shared between SBT

and TPC, other roles such as supervision and data collection are done by TPC. To some extent, SBT has been providing technical assistance to supplement TPC staff in conducting the biomass study.

According to SBT, the biomass study is expected to take more than 10 years. Apparently, SBT does not know if TPC is technically capable of carrying over the biomass study once the project phases out. This is planned to be identified during the sensitization meetings hence included in the phase out activities.

5.4.2. Development of Millers Effluent Treatment systems

The interviews revealed that the current Millers' effluent treatment systems are not effective in preventing soil/land pollution. Despite the fact that the project is towards its end, the development of millers' effluent treatment systems are still in the planning phases. This has been caused by the budgetary constraints and miller's technologies. The planning phases were supported by SBT.

For example, Kilombero Sugar Company (KSC) has reported its factory to have not yet developed its effluent treatment system, but has managed to develop the effluent treatment system for its distillery. KSC reports to have extended communication with both NEMC and SBT regarding the establishment of the effluent system for its factory. Through this communication, they have decided to have a 5 year plan to reduce the effluent loading. However, at present KSC is facing a challenge of securing funding for the project.

It was also noted that the effluents have alternative beneficial uses. These include, for example, being used as raw materials for fertilizers; road surfacing, and molasses for ethanol.

5.5. Infrastructural Support

The study revealed that various infrastructure have been established in the course of the project implementation including roads, bridges, earth flood control dykes and an irrigation scheme. Establishment of these infrastructure involved different stakeholders such as cooperatives, District councils and millers.

To sustain such infrastructure, SBT plans to hand them over to cooperatives, community trusts, district councils, village leaderships and millers. SBT will carry out sensitization meetings with such stakeholders to create a common understanding on what should be done to ensure the sustainability of established infrastructure in the project area.

5.5.1. Farm access roads rehabilitations and maintenances

This role is proposed to be handed over to the cooperatives. They are expected to use the money they receive as deduction from outgrowers harvested cane to fund the rehabilitation and maintenance. Some of the outgrowers associations/cooperatives are aware of this expectation while others are not. The interviews revealed also that the modality of implementation and how the funds will be managed are also not clear yet.

The outgrowers' cooperative in Msolwa Ujamaa, Kilombero (MUCGCS) is aware that after phasing out of the project, farm access roads rehabilitation and maintenance will be done using funds deducted from outgrowers' sales of sugarcane. However, MUCGCS seem unaware on how this will be possible. Currently, the sources of revenues of the MUCGCS are members' fees, member shares and sugarcane collection (deduction funds). Therefore, it might be the members feeling that using funds deducted from the sugarcane sales will shake the financial sustainability of this cooperative. For example this cooperative has assets such as cane loader motorcycles, offices consumables (computers, printers, chairs, tables, files, and land for office building) which have been acquired using financial resources from various sources including loan, grants from SBT, procurement by using cooperative funds. The MUCGCS has also reported that maintenance of these assets is done using the sugarcane collection fees.

Also, cooperative leaders from Ruhembe, Kilosa (RCGAMCS) reported that they were not aware that after the project phasing out, the farm access roads rehabilitation would be done using the funds from the outgrowers' sales of sugarcane. They also did not seem to be aware how this will be implemented. Like Cooperative in Kilombero, The cooperative in Kilosa has different sources of revenues which are members' fee entry, members' shares, cane loader fee and membership fee. The cooperative has also various assets— four cane loaders, vehicles, grader, two tractors and office consumables which were acquired using the bank loan and whose maintenance might depend on the revenues collected. The outgrowers' cooperative in Kilosa has been able to contribute to the project implementation in different ways including leadership, land, water and sugarcane cuttings.

On the other hand, the outgrowers association in Kagera (KASGA) is aware and has agreed that after the project phasing out, the farm access roads rehabilitation would be done using the funds from the outgrowers' sales of sugarcane. It has reported about its outgrowers to have already agreed to contribute TSH. 50 from each ton delivered.

In Kilombero, it was reported by District officials that there might be a challenge of conflict from outgrowers because some outgrowers are near the access roads, therefore expansion of those roads might lead to conflicts.

5.5.2. Constructing new access roads

SBT is planning to encourage the DCs to construct new access roads in the outgrowers fields using the money received from factories as levies from sugar cane production. From the study, several challenges are expected in implementation of this. This is basically because the money collected as levies in sugar production is put in the same basket as other incomes of the DCs and allocation of spending does not necessarily look at the source of the fund. This may lead to inadequacy of funds for construction of new access roads.

The Missenyi DC, for example, is foreseeing a challenge of financial resources which will be needed to expand the road networks. To deal with this challenge Missenyi DC is expecting to increase the areas of levies collection. This might have other implications. The Missenyi DC reported to be collecting 1% of each farmer's earning (currently Tsh. 535) which is allocated towards improving sugarcane production and other uses.

The Kilombero DC has reported to get around TShs.260 and 330 million from the sugar cane levy in years 2015/16 and 2016/17 respectively. The DC claims not to be represented in establishing how much money the company got, to be sure how much they deserve as levy.

5.5.3. Msolwa Ujamaa Irrigation System Management

The study revealed that the Kilombero district officials, Msolwa Ujamaa village officials and Msolwa Ujamaa Cane Growers Cooperative Society (MUCGCS) representatives were involved at different stages of development of the Msolwa Ujamaa Irrigation System. It has also been revealed that KCCT, Msolwa Ujamaa village and Kilombero DC are aware of the roles they will play in managing the irrigation system after the phase out of the project. However, several capacity building interventions are required. These will be well articulated in the phasing out awareness meeting to be conducted by SBT.

The scheme management is expecting to construct tertiary canals after income from the harvest expected on a 103 ha farm. SBT also reports that the budget for construction of tertiary canals is available, and that the implementation has delayed due to problems with the constructor. SBT has therefore instructed the constructor to deposit the funds to KCCT, thus KCCT will handle the assignment of constructing the tertiary canals for the Msolwa Ujamaa Irrigation System. Kilombero DC is currently preparing a training manual for operational and maintenance and it is looking forward to assist the Msolwa Ujamaa Village Irrigation Scheme to get water use right.

6.0.IMPROVEMENT AREAS FOR SUSTAINABILITY

The interview with the project implementation team and key informants confirmed that many of the above challenges are no longer a threat to the project as solutions have been sought for most of them. However, it is important that the project should monitor them continuously. On the other, in order to sustain achievements and outcomes recorded, the project should pursue to improve the following areas:

- **Effective linkage with LGAs:** Despite the fact that public extension service providers are an integral part of the action, but still there is a missing link in terms of effective linkage with LGAs at the District councils. Effective linkage with the councils should be created to ensure integration of some of the project initiatives in the council's plans and budget. Currently, the way it appears the sustainability of capacity building component and maintenance of established infrastructure particularly roads are not clearly articulated in the districts development plans. Therefore, during the remained period of the project SBT should engage seriously with the districts to clarify the importance of sustaining the interventions for the benefits of the final beneficiary and districts in general.
- **Engagement with millers and NEMC on environmental related interventions:** Most of the activities carried out under the environment component relates with studies and research. Among the implemented activities are study on effluent treatment for the sugar factories and the ongoing research biomass study at TPC. However, it is not clear how the two activities will continue after end of the project. Therefore, it is high time that SBT should organize a specific forum involving the responsible entities including the authority responsible for environmental issues in the country (NEMC) to agree implementation of recommendations emanated from the studies. On the other hand, the sustainability of the biomass studies depends on the willingness of TPC to continue with the next phase of the study. Discussion should be held with TPC and other parties with a stake in the study should be involved.
- **Research and trainings:** The fact that activities under result three of the programme were scaled down, does not mean that, research is not important. Research will continue to play key role in achieving a vibrant sugar sector in the country. Given the fact that some research related activities such as study on green sugar cane harvesting technologies were implemented, SBT should plan to meet SRI, Sokoine University of Agriculture and the Department of Research in the Ministry of Agriculture to agree the possibilities of integrating all the sugarcane related research interventions into the ongoing research of those institutions. On the part of training, there is a great need to build further the institutional capacity of Outgrowers Associations to understand that one of their basic roles is service provision to their members including extension service. Therefore, the short term solution could be to conduct TOT to few members who will then be used to support their fellow members. However, in a long term, SBT should target to bring other actors in the sector especially NGOs who would attract more capacity building funds in the sector. Also Outgrowers Associations should be reminded on the importance of allocating budget from their own sources to cater for training to their members

7.0. INTEGRATION OF BENEFICIARIES AND STAKEHOLDERS IN THE PHASING OUT PLAN

A project phase out plan can be looked as a description of how the project intends to withdraw resources while ensuring the achievement of project goals. Some projects aim to phase out after having implemented self-sustaining changes. Some projects produce a “phase-over” strategy, which means that local institutions or communities sustain the activities. The latter describes what AMSP is intending to do, that is, to produce a phase-out strategy which describes how the project is going to be handed over to the project partners. This section of the report describes how the project should interact and engage the partners and stakeholders in sustaining the project outputs and activities. The text is arranged under the subheadings of the project activity and the stakeholders proposed to carry over the activity.

7.1. Outgrowers capacity building:

7.1.1. Technical support to small holder farmers via Village Extension Officers

This activity is proposed by SBT to be handed-over to the district councils via village extension officers.

- This is the most ideal decision with regard to agronomic practices. However, it is not very clear what the term ‘technical support’ means in this context. In the process of handover, this need to be clearly defined. If technical support means more than agronomic techniques, the respective hand over need to be channelled to the right departments of the district councils, as the technical issues referred might be out of scope and skills of extension officers
- Some villages may not have extension officers due to a number of reasons including shortages and internal operational structure of the respective districts. There is need to check who will be directly responsible for technical support in such cases.
- Conduct technical support need assessment. Involve farmers, district council and extension staff in this exercise
- Assess capability of the DCs and extension officers to address the technical needs
- Develop a plan to equip the DCs and extension officers to the capacity they will be able to deliver the technical support
- Assess needs for refresher courses and the way to deliver them in case of needs.
- Support increased visibility of extension officers to the outgrowers farming activities. This can be done by organizing joint visits and extension services provision by both village extension officers and SBT’s local area officers

7.1.2. Supervision of Technical support to small holder farmers via Local Area Officers

This role will still remain with SBT as the local area officers report to SBT. However, since the project will be phasing out, the following need to be considered:

- Establish how technical support activities will be affected under reduced funding during phasing out and after phasing out of project
- Forge out stronger collaborations between the extension officers and the SBT local area officers by identifying areas of collaboration which will enhance technical support to small holder farmers
- Formalize the agreed collaborations through memorandum of agreement or any other formal manner which can be referred to in the course of implementation.
- Device reporting strategy for accountability, i.e. where the two parties report for commonality
- Establish if there are areas which can be improved in form of training, resource addition or transport facilitation to enable the local area officers deliver to the expectation

7.1.3. Trainings on Business skills, Advocacy , Gender and Environmental conservation

These activities are vested to SBT. According to SBT, all these training have been conducted using qualified consultants in collaboration with village extension officers. We propose the following to be done for sustainability of this activity.

- Only select members/leaders were trained with expectation that they will train other members. The project is advised to establish how effectively this was done and devise a mechanism for better implementation.
- To identify if there are needs for refresher courses and when they will be needed
- To establish if extension officers have gained enough experience and expertise to carry the training by themselves without support by the consultants after the phase-out of the project.
- To establish if capacity building is needed by the extension officers to be able to carry out this exercise for the new small holder farmers and refreshers in the future. Extension officers were involved in offering these trainings, but the leads were the commissioned consultants.
- In the interview process to come up with this report, some groups requested some additional training they think will be useful to make them more effective. The requested training included

Leadership skills and financial management training requested by Kagera Sugar Cane Growers Association (KASGA). We propose also to see a possibility of offering training in group dynamics

7.1.4. Trainings on Best farming practices

This activity is left to National Sugar Institute and Sugar Research Institute via Sugar Industry Development Trust Fund (SIDTF).

- STRIT was not functional. It is not known so far when and if they will be functional. We propose the project to find other alternatives to offer the best farming practices
- We suggest documentation of learning and best practices evolved during the course of implementation of the project
- We also suggest development of a plan to widely share the published best practices

7.1.5. Maintenance of existing and establishment of new synchronized farms

SBT is proposing to hand over this activity to the individual synchronized farming groups under supervision of their Outgrowers community trust (OCTs). We suggest the following to be done for sustainability of synchronized farms and establishment of new synchronized farms

- Do capacity building need assessment to the OCTs and offer them accordingly
- Help OCTs set targets and implementation plans.
- Put in place a monitoring system to gauge the implementation
- Link the OCTs with financial services for financial sustainability
- Link with inputs/farm implements suppliers
- Find a possibility of facilitating a training which will offer assets management skills to OCT
- Exchange visits/peer learning for Kagera OCT to fasten its growth and sustain Kilombero OCT's growth
- Find a possibility to use the outgrowers associations present in Mtibwa to carry over the activities intended for the OCT, since no OCT was formed at Mtibwa.

7.2. Support to Community Trusts

7.2.1. Technical Assistance to Outgrowers Community Trust

This activity is proposed to be handed over to Sugar Board, respective millers, and Co-operative Societies Apex. The objective is to ensure the OCTs growth of their economic and technical strength to be able to support the small holder farmers. In the phasing out we propose the following to be done to enable sustainable functioning of the community trusts:

- Identify technical assistance still needed by the OCT
- Chart out roles for each partner (SBT, millers, cooperative societies apex) and areas of collaboration in supporting the OCTs.
- Encourage formal commitment by the partners to implement their roles
- Devise reporting mechanism
- Identify capacity gaps of SBT, millers and Coop Society apex to offer the technical assistance
- Device a tool to monitor the engagement of the supporting partners
- Device a tool to monitor progress of the OCTs
- SBT to play a coordinating role

7.2.2. Support to Mtibwa Outgrowers to get mini sugar processing plant

This activity is proposed to be a responsibility of Sugar Board, and Tanzania Investment Centre. The activity is specific to Mtibwa because they are facing falling market and non competitive prices of their sugar cane due to underperformance of the existing factory. We propose:

- SBT to continue liaising with TIC on marketing the opportunity to investors
- SBT to see a possibility to seek for project extension from EU to be able to implement this and avoid returning the funds intended for this activity to the donors

7.3. Outgrowers Registration System

7.3.1. Upgrade and maintenance of the database

Sugar Board of Tanzania is responsible to carry over this activity of Upgrading and maintaining the database for the outgrowers, milling and the entire sugar sub sector information for its sustainability. We propose:

- Creation of an environment which will facilitate increased involvement of others stakeholders in making use of the database to improve the sugar subsector
- Consider training in record keeping to leaders and some members of outgrowers associations, community trusts and extension officers to build their capacity on modern techniques of record keeping and sharing. This will help to ensure SBT is getting the needed data timely, at a low cost and at the required quality for updating the database

7.4. Environmental Conservation

7.4.1. Continuation of the Biomass Study in TPC

SBT propose this activity to be left to TPC Ltd. We suggest the following to be done:

- Establish budgetary support needed to continue the biomass study and possible sources of funding
- Establish willingness and conditions (if any) of TPC Ltd to carry over the activity for its sustainability
- Establish technical support needed and capacity of TPC Ltd to provide it
- Establish support needed by the tree growers to proceed with the biomass trial without as much funding from the project after the phase out
- Establish if the trees grown have a more attractive use in the society such that may conflict with the interests of TPC Ltd to supply fuel for their boilers
- Consider the possibility of involving other stakeholders such as local government, forestry/agroforestry research organizations, NGOs etc for budgetary and technical support for sustainability of the biomass study
- Define the roles of TPC Ltd and of the other partners while creating a formal agreement and monitoring tool

7.4.2. Development of Millers Effluent Treatment systems

This activity is proposed by SBT to be a responsibility of the respective millers. We propose the following to be done:

- Establish the current status of the effluent treatment systems for each miller
- Work with the millers to prepare their implementation plans to have their SBT supported designs fully implemented.
- Prepare a feedback or monitoring mechanism
- Establish the possibility of putting some effluents to other beneficial uses so as to reduce the effluent load.
- NEMC as a regulatory body should be involved in providing a push to the implementation

7.4.3. Strategic consideration of Climate Change in the sugar sub sector

This activity is proposed to be handed to Sugar Board and Sugar Industry Development Trust Fund (SIDTF) and Sugar Board. To achieve it, the following is suggested:

- Hold workshops on awareness and effects of climate change to the sugar cane production involving main sugar cane producers
- Encourage estate sugar cane growers to include measures to combat climate change in their short and long term strategic plans. This will trickle down to the outgrowers
- Attract more funds to implement research on climate related issues in sugar sector including sugar research institutes and other players

7.4.4. Strategic consideration of green harvest technology in the sugar sub sector

This role is proposed to be handed over to the respective millers and Outgrowers' Cooperatives. Challenges on moving from burnt harvesting to green harvesting have been studied in the sugar cane growing areas of Tanzania. It is clear that green harvesting is more environmentally friendlier than the burn harvesting. The main huddles are higher costs of green harvesting, technology used in millers factories, non supportive current sugar cane fields lay outs, need for mechanization, trash handling and safety of labourers. The project need to:

- Start discussions with other stakeholders to lobby for incentives (e.g. less cess or tax for green harvested sugar, etc) which will motivate millers to strategically change from burn harvesting which is relatively cheaper to green harvesting
- Liaise with sugar research institutes to promote research on self trashing cane varieties which are also high yielding and drought tolerant for introduction in the millers and outgrowers fields. This will facilitate green and mechanical harvesting
- Introduce enforceable regulations which will direct millers when replanting or open new fields to consider factors which will not be a hindrance to mechanical harvesting eg levelling, spacing, farm roads and size of apron
- Share results with other stakeholders eg. TPC was/is conducting trials on mechanical harvesting which is the best tool for green harvesting
- Start a forum of sugar cane producers and stakeholders on green harvest and environmental conservation in sugar industry

7.5. Infrastructural Support

7.5.1. Farm access roads rehabilitations and maintenances

SBT is proposing this role to be handed over to Co-operatives via the deductions made from each outgrowers harvested cane proceeds. The following is also suggested:

- Assess the capacity of the cooperatives financially and technically to carry over this capacity and react accordingly
- Strengthen the Financial management systems and skills of the cooperatives
- Assist to make sure suitable procurement systems are in place and adhered to
- Involve other stakeholders in the rehabilitation and maintenance eg the local governments and millers since they all benefit by well maintained access roads
- SBT presence is highly recommended especially in the early years to support and guide in modalities of effecting the deductions, how much of it should go to road access and how chances of embezzlement will be minimized.

7.5.2. Expanding the network of Farm access roads by constructing new roads

This role is proposed to be handed over to District Councils using funds sourced from the Levies annually collected from the millers. For successful sustainability of this, the following is suggested:

- Do strategic involvement of district in maintenance and rehabilitation before the project phase out
- Lobby for an agreement that would set a minimum amount (e.g. in percentage) collected from sugar cane related levies be directed to expansion and rehabilitation of sugar cane fields access roads

7.5.3. Flood control dykes maintenance

Like the maintenance of the access roads, flood control dykes maintenance is left to be an activity of the Co-operatives via the deductions made from each outgrowers harvested cane proceeds.

- Assess the capacity of the cooperatives financially and technically to carry over this activity and react accordingly
- Help the cooperatives put in place a voluntary system of maintain the dykes using the members who are directly benefitting
- Strengthen the Financial management systems and skills of the cooperatives
- Assist to make sure suitable procurement systems are in place and adhered to
- Involve other stakeholders in the rehabilitation and maintenance eg the local governments

7.5.4. Additional Flood Control dykes construction

This activity is proposed by SBT to be done by the Outgrowers Community Trusts (OCTs) after the project phase out. We propose the following:

- Assess the capacity and technical requirements needed by the OCTs to be able to construct additional flood control dykes
- Help the OCTs put in place suitable procurement system
- Strengthen the Financial management systems and skills of the OCTs

- Help the OCTs put targets and implementation plan in terms of need assessment, number and places for constructing the dykes

7.5.5. Msolwa Ujamaa Irrigation System Management

Support to Msolwa Ujamaa Irrigation System management is left to KCCT, Msolwa Ujamaa Village and Kilombero District Council. Apart from management of the irrigation system, the stakeholders are supposed to guide the system to reach compliance standards set for irrigation systems including co-operative standards, environmental standards and acquiring and maintaining the water rights. The following are proposed:

- Establish needs required for sustainability of Msolwa Ujamaa Irrigation system.
- Establish capacity of KCCT, Msolwa Ujamaa Village and Kilombero District Council to provide the needs/support
- Prepare and implement capacity building as a response to identified gaps
- Chart out roles per each of the three stakeholders and areas of collaboration in supporting the irrigation system
- Contact other stakeholders for assistance such as Rufiji Basin Development Agency (RUBADA) for technical support on issues of water right and management
- Assist in preparing requirements and processes required to be followed in fulfilling the required standards
- Guide the Msolwa Ujamaa irrigation system management to initiate processes to comply to the standards set for irrigation systems
- Set a monitoring system to follow up on implementation
- Give a critical look on the management/leadership structure of the irrigation system and see if there are rooms for improvements. Implement accordingly.

8.0. ROAD MAP AND WORK PLAN FOR THE PHASING OUT ACTIVITIES

The road map and work plan for phasing out of the AMSP 2011 – 2013 program is shown in Table 1 below:

Table 1. Proposed Phase out action plan for the AMSP 2011 – 2013 program

Activity	Responsibility	Timing	Remarks
1.0 Outgrowers Capacity Building			
1.1 Technical support to small holder farmers via Village Extension Officers			
1.1. Establish areas which do not have village extension officers. Work with DC to find solutions	SBT & DCs	June, 2018	
1.1.2. Conduct technical support need assessment. Involve farmers, district council and extension officers	SBT & DCs	June, 2018	
1.1.3. Assess capability of the DC and extension officers to address the technical needs	SBT & DCs	June, 2018	
1.1.4. Develop and effect plan to equip the DC and extension officers with the capacity they need to deliver the technical support	SBT & DCs	June, 2018	
1.1.5. Support increased visibility and engagement of extension officers in technically supporting the outgrowers. This can be through organized joint visits and extension services provision with SBT's local area officers	SBT & DCs	June - December, 2018	
1.2 Supervision of Technical support to small holder farmers via Local Area Officers			
1.2.1. Establish how technical support activities will be affected under reduced funding during phasing out and after phasing out of project	SBT	June – July, 2018	
1.2.2. Forge out stronger collaborations between the extension officers and the SBT local area officers by identifying areas of collaboration which will enhance technical support to small holder	SBT & DCs	June – December, 2018	

Activity	Responsibility	Timing	Remarks
farmers			
1.2.3. Formalize the agreed collaborations through memorandum of agreement or any other formal manner which can be referred to in the course of implementation.	SBT & DCs	June – December, 2018	
1.2.4. Device reporting strategy for accountability, i.e. where the two parties report for commonality	SBT & DCs	June – July, 2018	
1.2.5. Establish if there are areas which can be improved in form of training, resource addition or transport facilitation to enable the local area officers deliver to the expectation	SBT	June – July, 2018	
1.3 Trainings on Business Skills, Advocacy, Gender and environmental conservation			
1.3.1. Only select members were trained with expectation that they will train other members. Establish how effectively this was done.	SBT, DCs, OGA, OCTs	June – July, 2018	
1.3.2. Establish if there are needs for refresher courses and when they will be needed	SBT, DCs, OGA, OCTs	June – July, 2018	
1.3.3. Establish if extension officers have gained enough experience and expertise to carry the training by themselves without support of consultants after the phase-out of the project.	SBT, DCs	June – July, 2018	
1.3.4. Establish if capacity building is needed by the extension officers to be able to carry out this exercise for the new small holder farmers and refreshers in the future	SBT, DCs	June – July, 2018	
1.3.5. See the possibility of organizing and conducting Leadership skills and financial management training	SBT	August, 2018	
1.3.6. Consider training in group dynamics and leadership skills	SBT	August, 2018	

Activity	Responsibility	Timing	Remarks
1.4. Trainings on Best farming practices			
1.4.1. Organise the training on best farming practices	SBT, NSI, SRI, SIDTF, DCs	September, 2018	
1.4.2. Carry out documentation of learning and best practices evolved during the course of implementation of the project.	SBT, NSI, SRI, SIDTF, DCs	September, 2018	
1.4.3. Devise mechanism to share widely the published best practices	SBT, NSI, SRI, SIDTF, DCs	September, 2018	
1.4.4 Encourage Co-operatives to employ Extension officers/advisors who will be directly responsible to technically support their members in farming best practices	Co-operatives	September, 2018	
1.5 Maintenance of existing synchronised farms and starting of new synchronized farms			
1.5.1. Do capacity building need assessment to the OCTs and offer them accordingly	SBT, OCTs	June – December, 2018	
1.5.2. Help OCTs set targets and implementation plans.	SBT, OCTs	June – July, 2018	
1.5.3. Put in place a monitoring system to gauge the implementation	SBT, OCTs	June – July, 2018	
1.5.4. Link the OCTs with financial services for financial sustainability	SBT, OCTs	June – December, 2018	
1.5.5. Link with inputs/farm implements suppliers	SBT, OCTs		
1.5.6. Find a possibility of facilitating a training which will offer assets management skills to OCT	SBT	October, 2018	
1.5.7. Exchange visits/peer learning for Kagera OCT to fasten its growth and sustain Kilombero OCT's growth	SBT, OCTs	July – December, 2018	

Activity	Responsibility	Timing	Remarks
1.5.8. Find a possibility to use the outgrowers associations present in Mtibwa to carry over the activities intended for the OCT, since no OCT was formed at Mtibwa.	SBT	June – July, 2018	
2.0 Support to Community Trusts			
2.1 Technical Assistance to Outgrowers Community Trust to ensure growth of their economic and technical strength to be able to support the small holder farmers			
2.1.1. Identify technical assistance still needed by the OCT	SBT, OCTs	June – July, 2018	
2.1.2. Chart out roles for each partner (SBT, millers, cooperative societies apex) and areas of collaboration in supporting the OCTs.	SBT, millers, cooperative societies apex, OCTs	June – July, 2018	
2.1.3. Encourage formal commitment by the partners to implement their roles	SBT	July – August, 2018	
2.1.4. Devise reporting mechanism	SBT, millers, cooperative societies apex, OCTs	July – August, 2018	
2.1.5. Identify capacity gaps of SBT, millers and Coop Society apex to offer the technical assistance	SBT, millers, cooperative societies apex, OCTs	July – August, 2018	
2.1.6. Devise a tool to monitor the engagement of the supporting partners	SBT, millers, cooperative societies apex	July – August, 2018	
2.1.7. Devise a tool to monitor progress of the OCTs	SBT, millers, cooperative societies apex, OCTs	July – August, 2018	

Activity	Responsibility	Timing	Remarks
2.2 Support to Mtibwa Outgrowers in availing an investment of small scale sugar processing plant that will improve their falling market and non competitive prices of their cane due to under performance of the existing factory			
2.2.1. SBT to continue liaising with TIC on marketing the opportunity to investors	SBT, TIC	June – October, 2018	
2.2.2 SBT to see a possibility to seek for project extension from EU to be able to implement this and avoid returning the funds intended for this activity to the donors	SBT, Donor	June, 2018	
3.0 Outgrowers Registration System			
3.1 Upgrade and maintenance of the database for the Outgrowers, milling and the entire sugar sub sector information			
3.1.1. Creation of an environment which will facilitate increased involvement of others stakeholders in making use of the database to improve the sugar subsector	SBT	June – August, 2018	
3.1.2. Consider training in record keeping to leaders and some members of outgrowers associations, community trusts and extension officers to build their capacity on modern techniques of record keeping and sharing. This will help to ensure SBT is getting the needed data timely, at a low cost and at the required quality for updating the database	SBT	June – August, 2018	
4.0 Environmental Conservation			
4.1 Continuation of the Biomass Study in TPC			
4.1.1. Establish budgetary support needed to continue the biomass study and possible sources	SBT, TPC	June – August, 2018	

Activity	Responsibility	Timing	Remarks
of funding			
4.1.2. Establish willingness and conditions (if any) of TPC Ltd to carry over the activity for its sustainability	SBT, TPC	June – August, 2018	
4.1.3. Establish technical support needed and capacity of TPC Ltd to provide it	SBT, TPC	June – August, 2018	
4.1.4. Establish support needed by the tree growers to proceed with the biomass trial without as much funding from the project after the phase out	SBT, TPC, Tree growers	June – August, 2018	
4.1.5. Establish if the trees grown have a more attractive use in the society such that may conflict with the interests of TPC Ltd to supply fuel for their boilers	SBT, Wood/tree utilization expert	June – August, 2018	
4.1.6. Consider the possibility of involving other stakeholders such as local government, forestry/agroforestry research organizations, NGOs etc for budgetary and technical support for sustainability of the biomass study	SBT, TPC	June – August, 2018	
4.1.7. Define the roles of TPC Ltd and of the other partners while creating a formal agreement and monitoring tool	SBT, TPC, Other identified partners	June – August, 2018	
4.2 Development of Millers Effluent Treatment systems			
4.2.1. Establish the current status of the effluent treatment systems for each miller	SBT, Millers	June – September, 2018	
4.2.2. Work with the millers to prepare their implementation plans to have their SBT supported	SBT, Millers	June – September, 2018	

Activity	Responsibility	Timing	Remarks
designs fully implemented.			
4.2.3. Prepare a feedback or monitoring mechanism	SBT, Millers, NEMC	June – September, 2018	
4.2.4. Establish the possibility of putting some effluents to other beneficial uses so as to reduce the effluent load.	SBT, Millers	June – September, 2018	
4.2.5. NEMC as a regulatory body be involved in providing a push to the implementation	NEMC	June – December, 2018, after project phase out also	
4.3 Strategic consideration of Climate Change as an agenda to the sugar sub sector			
4.3.1. Hold workshops on awareness and effects of climate change to the sugar cane production involving main sugar cane producers	SIDTF, SBT, millers, OGA	June – December, 2018,	
4.3.2. Encourage estate sugar cane growers to include measures to combat climate change in their short and long term strategic plans. This will trickle down to the outgrowers	SBT, SIDTF	June – December, 2018,	
4.3.3 Attract more funds to implement research on climate related issues in sugar sector including sugar research institutes and other players	SBT, SIDTF, SRI	From June 2018 onwards	
4.4 Strategic Consideration of Green harvest technology as the measure towards the best environmental conservation practice to the Sugar Sub sector			
4.4.1. Start discussions with other stakeholders to lobby for incentives (e.g. less cess or tax for green harvested sugar, etc) which will motivate millers to strategically change from burn harvesting which is	SBT, NEMC, Millers	From June 2018 onwards	

Activity	Responsibility	Timing	Remarks
relatively cheaper to green harvesting			
4.4.2. Liaise with sugar research institutes to promote research on self trashing cane varieties which are also high yielding and drought tolerant for introduction in the millers and outgrowers fields. This will facilitate green and mechanical harvesting	SBT, SRI, Millers	From June 2018 onwards	
4.4.4. Introduce enforceable regulations which will direct millers when replanting or open new fields to consider factors which will not be a hindrance to mechanical harvesting eg levelling, spacing, farm roads and size of apron	NEMC	From June 2018 onwards	
4.4.5. Share results with other stakeholders eg. TPC was/is conducting trials on mechanical harvesting which is the best tool for green harvesting	Millers, SRI, SBT	From June 2018 onwards	
4.4.6. Start a forum of sugar cane producers and stakeholders on green harvest and environmental conservation in sugar industry	SBT, Millers, OGA	From June 2018 onwards	
5.0 Infrastructural Support			
5.1 Farm access roads rehabilitations and maintenances			Co-operatives via deductions made from outgrowers' harvested cane proceeds
5.1.1. Assess the capacity of the cooperatives financially and technically to carry over this capacity and react accordingly	SBT, Cooperatives	June – August, 2018	
5.1.2. Strengthen the Financial management	SBT, Cooperatives	June – December,	

Activity	Responsibility	Timing	Remarks
systems and skills of the cooperatives		2018	
5.1.3. Assist to make sure suitable procurement systems are in place and adhered to	SBT, Cooperatives	June – August, 2018	
5.1.4. Involve other stakeholders in the rehabilitation and maintenance eg the local governments and millers since they all benefit by well maintained access roads	SBT, Cooperatives, Millers, LGAs	June – October, 2018	
5.2 Expanding the network of Farm access roads by constructing new roads			DCs from the Levies annually collected from the miller
5.2.1. Do strategic involvement of district in maintenance and rehabilitation before the project phase out	SBT, DCs	June – December, 2018	
5.2.2. Lobby for an agreement that would set a minimum amount (e.g. in percentage) collected from sugar cane related levies be directed to expansion and rehabilitation of sugar cane fields access roads	SBT, DCs	June – December, 2018	
5.3 Flood control dykes maintenance			Co-operatives via deductions from outgrowers harvested cane proceeds
5.3.1. Assess the capacity of the cooperatives financially and technically to carry over this activity and react accordingly	SBT, Cooperatives	June – August, 2018	
5.3.2. Help the cooperatives put in place a	SBT,	June –	

Activity	Responsibility	Timing	Remarks
voluntary system of maintain the dykes using the members who are directly benefitting	Cooperatives	November, 2018	
5.3.3. Strengthen the Financial management systems and skills of the cooperatives	SBT, Cooperatives	June – August, 2018	
5.3.4. Assist to make sure suitable procurement systems are in place and adhered to	SBT, Cooperatives, Experts	June – August, 2018	
5.3.5. Involve other stakeholders in the rehabilitation and maintenance eg the local governments	SBT, DC, Cooperatives	June – August, 2018	
5.4 Flood control dykes construction			Outgrowers Community Trusts
5.4.1. Assess the capacity and technical requirements needed by the OCTs to be able to construct additional flood control dykes	SBT, OCTs	June – August, 2018	
5.4.2. Help the OCTs put in place suitable procurement system	SBT, OCTs, Millers,	June – August, 2018	
5.4.3. Strengthen the Financial management systems and skills of the OCTs	SBT, OCTs, Experts	June – October, 2018	
5.4.4. Help the OCTs put targets and implementation plan in terms of need assessment, number and places for constructing the dykes	SBT, OCTs	June – August, 2018	
5.5 Msolwa Ujamaa Irrigation System Management and Compliance to all national standards,			
5.5.1. Establish needs required for sustainability of	SBT, DC, KCCT, Msolwa Ujamaa	June – August, 2018	

Activity	Responsibility	Timing	Remarks
Msolwa Ujamaa Irrigation system.	Village		
5.5.2. Establish capacity of KCCT, Msolwa Ujamaa Village and Kilombero District Council to provide the needs/support	SBT, DC, KCCT, Msolwa Ujamaa Village	June – August, 2018	
5.5.3. Prepare and implement capacity building as a response to identified gaps	SBT	June – December, 2018	
5.5.4. Chart out roles per each of the three stakeholders and areas of collaboration in supporting the irrigation system	SBT, DC, KCCT, Msolwa Ujamaa Village	June – August, 2018	
5.5.5. Contact other stakeholders for assistance such as Rufiji Basin Development Agency (RUBADA) for technical support on issues of water right and management	SBT	June – August, 2018	
5.5.6. Assist in preparing requirements and processes required to be followed in fulfilling the required standards	SBT, Msolwa Ujamaa Irrigation management team	June – August, 2018	
5.5.7. Guide the Msolwa Ujamaa irrigation system management to initiate processes to comply to the standards set for irrigation systems	SBT, DC, Msolwa Ujamaa Irrigation management team	June – August, 2018	
5.5.8. Set a monitoring system to follow up on implementation	SBT, DC, Msolwa Ujamaa Irrigation management team	June – August, 2018	
5.5.9. Give a critical look on the management/leadership structure of the irrigation system and see if there are rooms for improvements. Implement accordingly.	SBT, DC, Msolwa Ujamaa Irrigation management team, Experts	June – August, 2018	

9.0. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings of this study indicate that the AMSP 2011-2013 programme for Tanzania generally has been well executed in TPC, Kilombero and Kagera. TPC does not have outgrowers, thus only one main output has been realized i.e. identification of tree species resistant to saline soil condition. The project performance in Mtibwa was generally poor as many of the planned activities were either partially implemented or not implemented at all. The main reason is the existing hostile situation between outgrowers and Mtibwa Sugar Estate on the one hand and outgrowers and livestock keepers on other part. This situation is implicating the sugar cane production and income in the area because some outgrowers have opted to abandon sugar cane production as it is considered as unprofitable.

On the hand various positive achievements have been recorded in Kilombero and Kagera. The key achievements realized range from community trust strengthening, increased sugar cane production due to introduction and adoption of synchronized farming and block farming, establishment of irrigation infrastructure, rehabilitation of farm access roads, to mention some.

Despite the positive outcomes realized in Kilombero and Kagera some improvement is still needed in order to sustain the project benefits. Among the area which needs improvement before the project is phased out are as follows:

- More capacity building especially trainings on business skills and entrepreneurship, irrigation scheme management, IPM in sugar cane production and maintenance of irrigation schemes are still needed;
- Effective linkage with LGAs is needed so as to integrate some of the project actions into the routine LGAs functions in particular maintenance and repair of irrigation and roads infrastructure. A modality can be discussed and agreed with LGAs to set a certain percent of the levies collected from the sugar sector in the given area to maintain the infrastructure;
- Engagement with millers and NEMC to discuss enforcement of recommendations and designs of effluent treatment for sugar factories;
- Liaise with other institutions with a research mandate such as SUA, SRI and the Department of Research in the Ministry of Agriculture to discuss the possibilities of mainstreaming research related interventions of the AMSP to the research agenda of those institutions.

Parallel to the above, in order to effectively implement the exit strategy and sustain the benefits of the AMSP project, we are recommending the following:

- Create awareness to final beneficiaries and organizations and institutions with a stake to the project on the exit from project funding and hand over.
- All best practices should be well documented and shared with all stakeholders in view of sustainability and replication
- Avail training manuals of the trainings conducted to outgrowers for references
- Empower extension staff and Local Area Officers to carry activities previously done by consultants

- Reduce visibility of SBT and increase visibility of the partners who would take over some of the activities. This is critical in ensured ownership of the actions by the partner.
- Establish gaps that would need further technical support to outgrowers associations and trusts. The identified gaps will assist designing practical mitigation measures after the phasing out.
- Encourage formal commitments by the partners for monitoring of implementation of the phase out plan

10.0. REFERENCES

BACAS. 2015. A baseline of the European Union – Accompanying Measures Sugar Protocol (2011 – 13) countries in project areas of Kilombero, Ruembe, Mtibwa, Moshi & Kagera in Tanzania. Final report submitted to Sugar Board of Tanzania

Boniface HJ Massawe and Lydia Mhoru. 2017. Feasibility Study of Green Harvest Technology in the Sugarcane Farming in Tanzania, under the Accompanying Measures Sugar Protocol (2011 – 13). BACAS. Final report submitted to Sugar Board of Tanzania

Gardner, A., Greenblott, K. and Joubert T. (2005). What we know about exit strategy. Practical Guidance for Developing Exit Strategies in the Field. SAFE Regional learning Spaces Initiative, Zimbabwe. 28 pg.

Harmonic Biosphere Company Ltd. 2016. Detailed Study Report on the Current Effluent Treatment System for Kilombero Sugar Company Ltd. Factory, Proposed New Customized Effluent Treatment System Designs and Sustainability Conservation Plan Report submitted to Sugar Board of Tanzania

Harmonic Biosphere Company Ltd. 2016. Detailed Study Report on the Current Effluent Treatment System for TPC Sugar Sugar Factory, Proposed New Customized Effluent Treatment System Designs and Sustainability Conservation Plan Report submitted to Sugar Board of Tanzania

Harmonic Biosphere Company Ltd. 2016. Detailed Study Report on the Current Effluent Treatment System for Kagera Sugar Ltd. Factory, Proposed New Customized Effluent Treatment System Designs and Sustainability Conservation Plan. Report submitted to Sugar Board of Tanzania

IFAD (2009). Sustainability of Rural Development Projects. Best Practices and Lessons Learned by IFAD in Asia. [www.ifad.org/opearitions/projects.pdf].

Rogers, B and Macias K. 2004. Program Graduation and Exit Strategies: A focus on Title II Food Aid Development Programs. FANTA Technical Note No. 9.

Sugar Board of Tanzania. 2015. Year 1 Annual Progress Report (2014-2015). Accompanying Measures for Sugar Protocol (AMSP) Countries (2011-13) – Tanzania

Sugar Board of Tanzania. 2016. Year 2 Interim Progress Report. Accompanying Measures for Sugar Protocol (AMSP) Countries (2011-13) – Tanzania

Sugar Board of Tanzania. 2017. Year 3 Interim Progress Report. Accompanying Measures for Sugar Protocol (AMSP) Countries (2011-13) – Tanzania

11.0. APPENDICES

Appendix 1. SBT's own proposed hand over plan

Appendix 1.1. Outgrowers Capacity Building activities

Project activity	Proposed institution for hand over
Technical support to small holder farmers via Village Extension Officers	District Councils
Supervision of Technical support to small holder farmers via Local Area Officers	Sugar Board of Tanzania
Trainings on Business Skills, advocacy , Gender and environmental conservation	Sugar Board of Tanzania
Trainings on Best farming practices	National Sugar Institute, and Sugar Research Institute via SIDTF
Maintenance of existing synchronised farms	Individual synchronised farming groups under supervision of their Outgrowers community trust
Establishment of Synchronised farms	Outgrowers Community Trusts

Appendix 1.2. Support to Community Trusts activities

Project activity	Proposed institution for hand over
Technical Assistance to Outgrowers Community Trust to ensure growth of their economic and technical strength to be able to support the small holder farmers	Sugar Board, Millers, and Co-operative Societies Apex
Support to Mtibwa Outgrowers in availing an investment of small scale sugar processing plant that will improve their falling market and non competitive prices of their cane due to under performance of the existinf factory	Sugar Board, and Tanzania Investment Centre

Appendix 1.3. Outgrowers Registration System activities

Project activity	Proposed institution for hand over
Upgrade and maintainance of the database for the Outgrowers, milling and the entire sugar sub sector information	Sugar Board of Tanzania

Appendix 1.4. Environmental Conservation Activities

Project activity	Proposed institution for hand over
Continuation of the Biomass Study in TPC	TPC Ltd
Development of Millers Effluent Treatment systems	All the Millers
Supervision of the Millers in ensuring they develop the required effluent treatment systems	NEMC
Strategic consideration of Climate Change as an agenda to the sugar sub sector	SIDTF and Sugar Board
Strategic Consideration of Green harvest Technology as the measure towards the best environmental conservation practice to the Sugar Sub sector	All the Millers and Outgrowers' Cooperatives

Appendix 1.5. Infrastructural Support Activities

Project activity	Proposed institution for hand over
Farm access roads rehabilitations and maintenances	Co-operatives via the deductions made from each outgrowers harvested cane proceeds
Expanding the network of Farm access roads by constructing new roads	District Council sourced from the Levies annually collected from the miller
Flood control dykes maintenance	Co-operatives via the deductions made from each outgrowers harvested cane proceeds
Additional Flood Control dykes construction	Outgrowers Community Trusts
Msolwa Ujamaa Irrigation System Management and Compliance to all national standards, (irrigation standards, environmental standards, water rights, co-operative standards etc)	KCCT , Msolwa Ujamaa Village and Kilombero District Council

Appendix 2. Tool for collecting information from Sugar Board of Tanzania (SBT)

Date:	
Place:	
1. Administrative and contractual procedures:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In donors' perspective, is there legal or contractual obligation that limit/dictate/direct the exit strategy? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is SBT implementing the legal/contractual obligation (if there is obligation) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the context of the donor (EU?), what is involved in the administrative closure and hand-over (from HR, assets, reporting etc)? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is SBT implementing the donor context of what is involved in the administrative closure and hand over? 	
2. Asset and knowledge management and transfer:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What key assets (including infrastructure, farm machineries etc) have been procured through the project funds? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What assets should be retained by your organization and what should be transferred? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To whom the assets will be transferred and how? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What IT databases have been generated? Who do you hand it over for sustainability? 	
3. The need for exit strategy:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is exit strategy foreseen from inception of the project? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the nature of the project, do you think exit strategy is important? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there any mechanism to monitor implementation of the exit strategy? 	
4. Roles and responsibilities	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have you established any formal agreements with any organizations/partners which will have effects in carrying over the project activities for sustainability? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What roles will be played by each of the 	

organization/partner during and after exit?	
5. Timing:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given your hand over plan, what is your proposed time and sequence of hand over? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What procedure will be used in the hand over process (meetings etc?) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	
6. Capacity and Infrastructure Development:	
6.1. Out growers Capacity development:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What capacity development activities were targeted to outgrowers in the initial project planning 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What capacity development activities have been implemented with the outgrowers? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How were these activities delivered to the outgrowers? (by whom, how many beneficiaries, what was the mechanism to reach wider outgrowers' community after capacity building to representatives, etc) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What capacity development activities targeted to outgrowers in the initial project planning that have not been implemented 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How will these activities be carried after project phase out 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What activities need to be continued after end of the project? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How will the capacity that has already built be sustained? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the organizations you want to hand over these activities for sustainability aware of the intention and willing to carry the responsibilities? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How were these organizations you want to hand over the activities involved in the planning, implementation and management of the stipulated project activities? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How were these organizations prepared to carry over the activities in terms of technical capacity, time resources, human resource, financial resources 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What gaps have you identified in terms of their capacity to carry over the activities after the project phase out? 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What plans are in place to address the gaps? 	
6.2. Support to community trusts	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How were the outgrowers community trusts (OCTs) started? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What was the target number of OCTs in each sugar cane growing area? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What was the objective of starting and supporting the OCTs? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the existing OCTs performing as expected? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If NOT, what are the shortfalls and reasons? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has it been established what the OCTs need to perform as expected? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there any plans in place to avail the support they require for the OCTs to perform as expected? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the organizations you want to hand over these activities for sustainability aware of the intention and are willing to carry the responsibilities? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How were these organizations you want to hand over the OCTs support involved in the planning, implementation and management of the OCTs? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How are these organizations prepared to carry over the activities in terms of technical capacity, time resources, human resource, and financial resources? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What gaps have been identified in terms of their capacity to carry over the OCTs support activities after the project phase out? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What plans are in place to address the gaps? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What plans are in place for Mtibwa outgrowers to be supported to get the proposed small scale sugar mill? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who is going to manage the mill? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have TIC been contacted on this already? What was the response? 	
6.3. Outgrowers Registration System	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is SBT the sole custodian charged with the responsibility of maintaining and managing the outgrowers registration 	

system?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is SBT the sole custodian charged with the responsibility of maintain and managing the sugar database system? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the role of other sugar sector players in registration and data base management systems? 	
6.4. Environmental conservation	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What was the objective of starting the biomass study in TPC? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With an understanding that there are no sugar cane outgrowers in TPC, how is the study going to help the sugar industry? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who is managing the study in terms of costs, supervision, data collection, etc? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who are other players in this study? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How long is the study expected to take place? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What technical and logistic assistance is needed in the study? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is TPC Ltd technically capable and willing to support/carry over the study when the project will be phased out? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What other players can possibly participate in this study? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the current status of millers' effluent treatment systems? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the effects to the environment are caused by the current status of the millers' effluent treatment systems? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has NEMC been in contact with the millers regarding their effluent treatment systems? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What were the resolutions between NEMC and the millers regarding the status and way forward for improving the effluent treatment systems? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the major challenges in improving the millers' effluent treatment systems? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do the effluents have an alternative use? 	
6.5. Infrastructure development:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What infrastructure has been established in the course of project implementation? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent the local institutions and organization were involved during 	

establishment/construction of the infrastructure?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What arrangements are in place to ensure local organizations have access to those infrastructures after the exit? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What plans have been prepared to ensure sustainability of those infrastructure 	
6.6. Cross-cutting issues:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What cross-cutting activities (gender & HIV/AIDS) have been implemented? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How beneficiaries were involved in the implementation of cross-cutting activities? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which cross-cutting activities will need continuity? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To whom the cross-cutting activities will be handled to? 	

Appendix 3. General tool for outgrowers associations and outgrowers community trusts

1. General information:	
Date	
District	
Ward	
Village	
Name of the association	
Address and contacts	
Roles within the association: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chairman • Secretary • Treasurer • Member • Other (specify) 	
2. General awareness of the project:	
• Are you aware of the AMSP project?	
• Who is funding the project?	
• Can you mention some of the activities implemented by the project?	
• How the outgrowers association/outgrowers community trust was involved in the implementation of the project activities?	
• Are you are aware when the project implementation will end?	
• Are you aware that after the project end the management of some of the activities will be handled over to your association/trust?	
• Do you feel your outgrowers association/outgrowers community trust is ready to handle the project activities?	
• When do you think your association/trust will be ready?	
• What capacities or resources would you need to be able to handle the activities more efficiently?	
• What long lasting changes have so far being generated as a result of the project?	
3. Resources and assets:	
• What are the sources of revenue of your outgrowers associations/outgrowers community trust?	
• What assets are being owned by the outgrowers associations/outgrowers community trust?	
• How did you get the assets?	
• How are you maintaining/servicing the assets?	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What resources have been contributed by the outgrowers association/outgrowers community trust in the implementation of the project? 	
4. Capacity building	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What capacity building activities were done by the project to your association/trust? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who from your association/trust participated in the capacity building activities offered by the project? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the capacity building was done through some members of your association/trust, what was the arrangement to make other members also benefitted? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Looking at what you are doing and expected to do in your association/trusts, do you think the capacity building activities were useful? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Which of the capacity building activities offered to you were/are most useful? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If you were to choose, what other capacity building activities would you want to be offered to you to make you more competent and effective? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When would have been the most appropriate time to have the capacity building done to your association/trust? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is your Community Trust capable to carry over the activity of maintaining synchronized farms when the project will phase out? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What do you need to make your Trust more efficient in maintaining the synchronized farms? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is your Community Trust capable to carry over the activity of establishing new synchronized farms when the project will phase out? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What do you need to make your Trust more efficient in establishing the new synchronized farms? 	
5. Infrastructural support	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is your outgrowers association aware that after phasing out of the project, farm access roads and flood control dykes rehabilitation and maintenance will be done using funds deducted from outgrowers sales of sugar cane? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do you agree with this? 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have you agreed the modality of effecting the deductions 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have you agreed on the modality of controlling the funds used for access road and flood control dykes rehabilitation and maintenance? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you have an alternative way you would suggest to fund maintenance and rehabilitation of the farm access roads and flood control dykes? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is your outgrowers community trust aware that they are expected to construct new flood control dykes? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the trust capable to construct new flood control dykes? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there any assistance the outgrowers trust need to able to construct new flood control dykes more effectively? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When is this assistance needed? 	

Appendix 4. General tool for local government and millers

1. General information:	
Date	
District	
Ward	
Village	
Name: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• LGA• NGO• SPC• Community leader	
Name and position	
Address and contact	
Role within the institution/company/community	
2. General awareness about the AMSP project:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Are you aware of the AMSP project implemented by Sugar Board of Tanzania?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• In which way your organization has been involved in the implementation of the project?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• In which aspects you think the project has been successful?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• What makes you think it has been successful in those aspects	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• In which aspects you think the project has failed	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• What makes you feel the project has failed in those aspects?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Are you aware that the project is now phasing out?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Are you aware of the project activities that are going to be handled to your organization for sustainability of the project activities?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• What are the activities which are being handled to your organization?	
3. Capacity building	
District councils	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Have you been involved in offering technical assistance to small holder sugar cane growers through village extension staff during the implementation of the project?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• What assistance have you been receiving	

from SBT in offering the technical support to small holder sugar cane growers?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are you capable of offering the technical support when the project has phased out? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there any assistance you will need to be able to effectively offer the technical support? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What assistance will you need 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When is the assistance needed? 	
National sugar institute, Sugar research institute, SIDTF)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has your organization/institute been involved in the training of best practices with AMSP project? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are you aware that AMSP is phasing out and leaving the training of best practices to sugar cane outgrowers with you via SIDTF? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are you capable of carrying over the activities? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What challenges are you anticipating to face in the implementation? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What can be done now to address the challenges? 	
4. Support to community trusts	
Millers (SPC) - Mtibwa, Kilombero, Kagera; and cooperative societies apex	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are you aware that AMSP project is phasing out and the project will hand over the outgrowers community trust to you and SBT for technical assistance to ensure their economical and technical strength to be able to support the outgrowers? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have you, together with SBT, identified what technical support is needed by the community trusts? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If YES, what technical support is needed? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What challenges will you be facing in offering the technical support to the community trusts? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How your organization is prepared to address the challenges? 	
5. Infrastructural support	
District council (LGA)	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How much money do you collect as levies from sugar industry (factories, cane producers etc) in your district per year? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What problems your district is facing during collection of the levies from sugar cane producers? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the money collected from sugar cane levies directed only to improving sugar cane production, or can be allocated to other uses? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are you aware that the AMSP project which supported establishment, rehabilitation and maintenance of some access roads in small holder sugar cane growers areas is phasing out? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was your district involved in the establishment, rehabilitation and maintenance of the access roads in the outgrowers areas? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apart from the use of the road by the sugar cane outgrowers, how is district benefitting from the access roads established and maintained by the AMSP project? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is your district aware that the phasing out AMSP project expects your district to expand the access road networks via the levies you collect from sugar cane producers and millers? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is your district capable and ready to allocate the collected funds from the levies in expansion of the access roads in the sugar cane outgrowers areas? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What problems are you expecting to face in implementing the access road network expansions? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How are you prepared to face the problems? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What support your district is prepared to give to manage Msolwa Ujamaa Irrigation system in terms of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management Compliance to national standards (irrigation standards, environmental standards, water rights and cooperative standards) 	

KCCT & Msolwa Ujamaa village	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How was KCCT/Msolwa Ujamaa village involved in establishment of the Msolwa Ujamaa Irrigation System? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How was KCCT/Msolwa Ujamaa village involved in rehabilitation and maintenance of the Msolwa Ujamaa Irrigation System? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What incomes are generated by the Msolwa Ujamaa Irrigation System? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who is responsible in collecting and spending incomes generated by the Msolwa Ujamaa Irrigation System? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What capacity building activities were done by the project to you (KCCT/Msolwa Ujamaa village) to enable you to manage the Msolwa Ujamaa Irrigation System? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What type of support KCCT/Msolwa Ujamaa Village need to be able to effectively manage the Msolwa Ujamaa Irrigation System? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What plans are in place for you to get the support you need to effectively support and manage the Msolwa Ujamaa Irrigation System? 	

Appendix 5. Detailed achievements based on the project logical framework matrix

Intervention logic	Performance indicator	Baseline	Target	Achievement
Result 1: Outgrower infrastructure developed				
Block farms consolidated	Ha. of block farms consolidated		200 ha	180 ha of block farms have been established and consolidated in Msolwa Ujamaa village, Nyarubungo sub-village and Nyameza sub-village equivalent to 90% achievement.
Outgrowers' irrigation infrastructure kick-started	Ha. of outgrower irrigated in the sugar belt	0 Outgrower irrigation infrastructure	100 ha irrigation infrastructure constructed	100 ha of outgrower sugar cane infrastructure constructed at Msolwa Ujamaa Village which is 100% achievement.
Rural roads built/rehabilitated	No. of kilometre of rural roads built/rehabilitated and/or maintained		25 km of sugar cane farm access roads	33.5 km of out-grower farm access roads have been rehabilitated (12.5 km in Kilimbero, 7 km in Mtibwa and 14 km in Kagera) representing 134% of the target
Result 2: Outgrower capacity building in a sustainable manner				
<i>Outgrowers' capacity building developed in Kilombero, Mtibwa and Kagera</i>				
Sensitization to outgrowers on synchronized farming	No. of sensitization meetings conducted		20 sensitization meetings	
Establishment of pilot synchronized	Ha. of pilot synchronized		566 acres	487 acres has been

Intervention logic	Performance indicator	Baseline	Target	Achievement
farms	farms established			established equivalent to 86% achievement
Outgrower training on business and advocacy skills Conducting training of trainers (TOT) course to outgrowers	No. of Farmers trained on business skills, advocacy and TOT		1,500 outgrowers trained on business and advocacy skills 50 outgrowers trained on TOT	1,137 outgrowers have been trained equivalent to 76% achievement
Women empowerment in sugar cane farming	No. of women enrolled in sugar cane farming		100 women enrolled into sugar cane farming	
- Secure and establish 250 acres for women synchronized farms	250 acres of land and women synchronized farms established		250 acres of women synchronized farms	250 hectares of women groups' synchronized farms have been established in Kagera which is equal to 100% achievement
<i>Outgrowers' community trusts and farms established in Mtibwa and Kagera</i>				
Establishment of community trust in Mtibwa and Kagera	No. of functional community trust established	1 community trust in Kilombero	2 community trust in Mtibwa and Kagera	1 community trust has been established in Kagera equivalent to 50% achievement
Secure land and establish community trust sugar cane farms	Ha. of land secured for trust farms in Kagera		100 ha secured and sugar cane farms established	100 hectares of trust sugarcane farm have been secured and established in Kagera which is equal to 100% achievement.
Establishment of mini sugar processing plant in Mtibwa	No. of mini sugar cane processing plant	0 mini sugar processing plant	1 mini processing plant established	So far the mini sugar processing plant is not yet

Intervention logic	Performance indicator	Baseline	Target	Achievement
	established		in Mtibwa	established = 0% achievement
Mapping and registration system for outgrowers' area developed				
Developing/upgrade outgrower's registration system	Outgrower registration system developed		1 system developed	1 system has been developed and currently data loading and hosting is ongoing
Procurement of computer, GPS, plotter printer, executive chair and table	No. of computer, GPS, plotter printer, executive chair procured	0 equipment	5 computers, 4 GPS, 1 plotter printer, 1 executive chair and 1 table	All the equipment have been procured except stationary for GIS data system
Study tour on outgrower database management and registration system	No. of personnel attended study on outgrower's database management		20 personnel	7 SBT staff attended exposure training on best outgrower's registration practices in India and Swaziland equals to 35% achievement
Environment management				
Study and detailed design of the effluent treatment plant to sugar factories	No. of study conducted Designs prepared	0 study	1 study	The study on effluent treatment and designs for sugar factories were done and completed which is 100% achievement
Biomass study for the Tanzania Planting Company to identify tree species that can withstand saline soil conditions	At least 3 species identified resistant to saline soils	0 study	1 study	The biomass study was conducted and 2 tree species (Acacia Xanthophloea and Eucalyptus) were identified to be resistant to saline soil conditions.
Conduct environmental impact	No. EIA reports	0 reports	1 report	1 EIA was conducted for

Intervention logic	Performance indicator	Baseline	Target	Achievement
assessment (EIA) for sugar cane irrigation schemes				Msolwa Ujamaa irrigation scheme was conducted and report produced = 100%
Study on the green harvesting technology for sugar cane	No. of study conducted	0 study	1 study	1 study was conducted and recommendations shared with various key stakeholders
<i>Project management and coordination</i>				
Carry out baseline assessment and design monitoring system	No. of baseline assessment reports Project monitoring system designed	0 report	1 report Monitoring system in place	Baseline assessment was conducted and final report shared M&E system was designed and is being used to monitor progress of the project
Undertaking communication and visibility activities	No. of communication and visi	0 activity		The project has mainly produced various communication and visibility materials such as sign boards, Tshirts, Khanga, calendars and diaries
Conducting monitoring and evaluations	No. of monitoring and evaluation reports	0 reports	16 quarterly reports 8 semi-annual reports 4 annual reports	Project monitoring is being done regularly and reports are produced quarterly, semi-annual and annually.
Conduct study on phasing out strategy	No. of phasing out strategy	0 report	1 report	1 report to be produced by a consultant
To facilitate project steering committee meetings	No. of meetings and conducted	0 meetings	4 steering	3 project steering committee meetings have been conducted
Attending workshops and managerial skills training	No. of staff attending workshops and training	0 workshops and training	staff have attended workshops, conferences and

Intervention logic	Performance indicator	Baseline	Target	Achievement
				managerial skills training inside and outside the country
Supervision of outgrower infrastructure contracts	No. of supervision visit conducted		supervision visit have been conducted in relation to management of infrastructure contracts
Research and Training for outgrowers	-	-	-	This result was dropped, hence no activity implemented