

**Annex 1A:  
Reports of the Three Visits  
to Tanzania**

## **REPORT ON THE SECOND VISIT 16<sup>th</sup> NOVEMBER 2015**

*By Owino Abraham Yeyo & Johnson Kagugube*

**ANNEX 1: REPORTS ON THE THREE VISITS TO TANZANIA AND CÔTE D'IVOIRE AS PART OF THE RESEARCH ON IMPROVING METHODOLOGIES FOR COMPILATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE DATA FOR AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS (Note that the reports of the first (pre-pilot) visits to the two countries were part of the report for Task 5)**

## **Introduction**

The Research Team comprised of Carola Fabi FAO Rome, Johnson Kagugube Research Associate MAK and Owino Abraham Yeyo reported to the NBS Offices on Monday the 16<sup>th</sup> of November 2015 and met Mr. Mwisomba Titus who introduced the Team to the Director Economic Statistics Directorate of the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS), Mrs. Joy Sawe. Titus also led the Team to pay courtesy calls to the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Assistant Director Mr. Ruboha and Mr. Elias Masunga Head M&E Unit both from Ministry of Agriculture; Mr. Munjaka M&E Director Ministry of Livestock and other staff of the Ministry of Livestock.

The Director, Economic Statistics of NBS was briefed on the Global Strategy Mission to Tanzania (TZ) explaining why TZ was chosen, the purpose of the pilot, and explaining how it will be implemented right from the village level using the Agricultural Routine Data System (ARDS) structure. The Director expressed interest in being debriefed by the team after returning from the field.

## **Key Informant Interview (KII) with Mr. Ruboha the M&E Assistant Director on ARDS in Ministry of Agriculture and Mr. Munjaka of Ministry of Livestock**

### *Brief History on ARDS*

There existed a routine system in which all Extension Workers were under one Ministry, i.e., Ministry of Agriculture. Regional Officers were submitting monthly reports to headquarters. Submission of reports was tagged to monthly salaries. This system collapsed after decentralization.

There was an effort to rebuild the system with the support of JICA. JICA support enabled the establishment of an improved Agricultural Routine Data System. The pilot was 2 years then it was rolled out. There are 13,000 villages and the intention is to have an Extension Officer in each village. Currently there are a total of about 9,000 Extension Officers: 3,000 for Livestock and 6,000 for Agriculture. Currently there are Extension Officers in each Ward. Each Ward is made up of about 5 villages (3 to 7 villages).

The establishment of the ARDS led to the following:

- Harmonized reporting formats for all administrative areas; and
- Harmonized requirements for Sector Ministries and Local Administrative Areas (LAA). The LAAs had more frequent requirements than the Ministries; these reporting frequencies were harmonized to have monthly, quarterly and annual reporting formats.

### *Management of ARDS:*

There is a body that monitors the ARDS activities called the **Thematic M&E Regional Working Group** under the **Agriculture Sector Development Programme** which meets monthly and each Regional Officer is expected to report. These coordination meetings take place at zonal level (a zone is made up of a number of regions). They look at thematic technical issues where ARDS is one of the components being monitored and reviewed.

### *Strength of the ARDS*

1. The Government of Tanzania is financing the implementation of the ARDS.
2. The Thematic M&E Working Group brings together key stakeholders of the ARDS.
3. Every region has a National Level Supervisor to enhance supervision and technical support with the aim of improving the quality of data generated by the System.
4. The data generated can facilitate the computation of village level estimates.
5. Livestock and Agriculture Extension officers work together and one tool is used for all parameters for the last 3 years. This approach minimizes duplication of efforts.

### *Challenges with the ARDS*

1. How to get information from lower level to the headquarters. JICA developed a data base system for data capture by District Supervisors at district level and transmission to Server at the Ministry.
2. Staff at lower level not knowledgeable with Excel being used to compile the data. The University of Dar es Salaam did simplify the data capture form but there are problems with the developed web-based system which are yet to be resolved.
3. Production data especially has problems as there over-estimates realized from the extension workers than actual production data from households. *The village extension workers are supposed to measure but they normally don't, they just guess estimate.* Village level data is not necessarily from households but from estimates of the village extension workers.
4. Expectation is that village reports to Wards and Wards to districts are monthly while district to regional and regional to national level are done quarterly.
5. There are complaints about the web-based data system: It is not properly operational and needs improvement. Some districts do not have internet connectivity and some have very slow internet connection. The regional managers certify the data entered at the district level checking for correctness of information.
6. Very few districts (18%) are currently reporting due to technical mishaps with the software.

7. Data quality is not guaranteed as there are possibilities of data forging and these may not be easily checked due to limited facilitation.
8. Not every village has an extension worker. The set up is for every village to have two extension workers. One to handle livestock and another for crop farming.
9. There is limited facilitation of staff at Ward and Village level to enable them report regularly.

#### *Data Uses*

- Production data at district level is needed by politicians.
- Web portal to be accessed by researchers; it has a tracking system where number of those who visit the website are recorded.
- Quarterly bulletin is disseminated to create awareness on this data and how to use it especially during agricultural shows.

#### *Way forward*

There is need to extend beyond donors to include more stakeholders for the ARDS. In addition, the University of Dar el Salaam has developed a web-based database system of the ARDS.

## Day Two - Training and Field work

On Tuesday (17<sup>th</sup> November) two teams were formed for Morogoro and Bagamoyo. Both teams travelled to Morogoro arriving late in the afternoon around 3pm. The district officials were contacted and arrangements were made to conduct the training the next day. There was a consultative meeting with NBS, the Ministry of Agriculture Food Security and the Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries Development. As part of the consultative meeting, officials were informed about the tools and equipment which were to be used in the field work including the questionnaires, the GPS and the tablets. NBS provided four (4) GPS machines for the field exercise. The consultative meeting enabled the Team to get acquainted with the tools and equipment. This enabled them to be prepared to provide support during the training of the Village Extension Officers the following day.

### *Fieldwork in Morogoro*

On Wednesday the teams travelled to the Mkambarani Ward where the training took place. The Ward is about 15km out of Morogoro town.

The Team paid courtesy call to the Ward Chief, Mr. John Kirion. The Ward Chief also made welcoming remarks during the training. He assisted the Team to select two villages for the pilot exercise namely; Mkambarani and MkonoWa Mara. He also shared the listing of farm holdings for those two villages. The training which had classroom and practical sessions covered the following areas; fieldwork protocol; construction of a comprehensive listing of the village farm holdings to facilitate the sampling of 15 farmers for the pilot exercise; training on the data collection instruments; using handheld devices to capture location points and also to measure area, and how to capture data using tablets. The training took a whole day.

During the training the Statistician of Morogoro challenged the use of mobile devices where data is sent directly to the servers before approval at every stage, i.e. ward, district, region and national. The approval at every stage is a requirement in Tanzania according to the law relating to data sharing. Mr. Mwisomba Titus was contacted to guide on the course of action. He (Titus) talked to the District Statistician explaining that the ongoing activity was a pilot and an MOU was about to be signed between MAK and NBS.

Fieldwork started the following day (Thursday) and continued up to Saturday in Mkandarani village which has 4 sub-villages and 15 Enumeration Areas (EAs); and in Mkono Wamara village which has 3 sub-villages and 5 EAs. On the first day of fieldwork, the Senior Officer from the Ministry of Agriculture received a call from the Permanent Secretary seeking for information on the Pilot Study. We supplied the information and continued with fieldwork. The NBS vehicle and motorcycles were employed to reach the sampled farm holdings. In order to avoid breaking the household interviews to pick the location points and measuring of the land holding areas as per the flow of questions on the tablets, it was decided to fill the hardcopy of the questionnaire before capturing the data in the tablet. In most of the cases, the farm holdings were very distant (over 2 kilometres) from the houses of the holders.

The key observations in relation to the first visit are:

1. For most of the farmers, planting intentions were covered especially for the seasonal crops, like maize, peas, water melon and Irish potatoes. However, this was not the case with farmlands in valleys and wetlands;
2. The village extension workers need more training on using handheld devices in data collection;
3. The handheld devices (tablets) work for about 5 hours when fully charged. There is therefore a need for power backups while in the field;
4. When two tablets are used to measure the same plot, variance in estimates is noted.
5. Due to long distances it was not possible for the extension workers to walk and cover all the selected households in the villages. The villages in Tanzania have many sub-villages. The use of motorcycles will be required.

### *Field Work in Bagamoyo*

The Bagamoyo Team then left for Bagamoyo at 12.15pm on Wednesday arriving after 4pm in Bagamoyo. Ms. Carola Fabi and Mr. Titus Mwisomba had arrived from Dar-es-Salaam and mobilized the District and village staff. The evening ended with a training of the field team on what is expected of them and going through the questionnaires. Thursday morning training continued with GPS location and area measurement and how to capture data using the tablet. Field work began at 11.30 am by visiting the ward, getting the lists of farmers, randomly selecting a sample of farmers. One village used the NBS vehicle while the second village team hired motor cycles.



The filling in of the tablet and then the paper questionnaires was seen as cumbersome so the extension workers were encouraged to first fill in the paper questionnaires. On Friday morning they completed the Crop card administration then entered data onto the tablets till 5pm when the team set off for Dar-es-Salaam.

## **Appreciation**

Appreciation goes to Mr. Mwisomba who did everything possible to make the pilot visit a success. Appreciation also goes to the three Institutions for the partnership spirit they showed in teaming up with us and joining us in the field exercise and committing all the time that was needed for the field work to be completed within the week.

## **Annex 1: List of Persons Met in Tanzania**

1. Mr. Mwisomba Titus, Manager –Agricultural Statistics, NBS
2. Ms. Sawe Joe, Acting Director, Economic Statistics, NBS
3. Mr. Ruboa, Assistant Director, Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation, MOAFS
4. Mr. Munjaka, Director, Monitoring and Evaluation, MOLFD
5. Mr. Masunga Elias, MOAFS
6. Ms. Sagamilwa Shija, Statistician, NBS
7. Mr. Mhehe Abel, Statistician, MOLFD
8. Mr. Mwemutsi Festo, Statistician, NBS
9. Mr. Mashenene Emmanuel, Statistician, NBS
10. Ms. Leshalu Maria, Morogoro District Agricultural Officer
11. Mr. Morune Joseph, Statistician, Morogoro District
12. Ms. Rwassa Leah, Village Agricultural Extension Worker, Mkambarani Village, Morogoro
13. Ms. Mwilongo Evelyne, Village Agricultural Extension Worker, Mkono Wa Mara Village, Morogoro
14. Ms. Ngowo Anna, Ward Supervisor, Mkambarani Ward, Morogoro
15. Mr. Kirion John, Ward Chief, Mkambarani, Morogoro district
16. Mr. Hizza Christopher, Village Chairperson, Mkono Wa Mara
17. Mr. Mwanaisha Seifu, Village Executive Officer, Mkono Wa Mara

**REPORT ON THE TANZANIA THIRD VISIT 18<sup>th</sup> to 21<sup>st</sup>  
JANUARY 2016**

*By Dr. A. Y. Owino & Dr. E. Muwanga Zake*

## Introduction

The Research Team comprised of Dr. Elijah Muwanga Zake a Research Associate MAK and Owino Abraham Yeyo researcher from MAK who reported to the NBS Offices on Monday the 21<sup>st</sup> of January 2015 and met Mr. Mwisomba Titus who introduced the Team to the Director Economic Statistics Directorate of the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS), Mrs. Joy Sawe and the Executive Director of NBS. Titus also led the Team to pay courtesy calls to Executive Director EASTAC before proceeding to the field to monitor the field activities that were on going. The Team first went to Bagamoyo and then proceeded to Morogoro.

### THE BAGAMOYO UPDATE 19<sup>th</sup> JANUARY 2016

A meeting was held with the two field extension officers, their Supervisor and the district Agriculture and Livestock officials.

Data from two villages in Bagamoyo was entered on the hard copy questionnaires and the tablets in the previous visit of 19th November 2015. In this visit, a discussion was held to get feedback from the field officers on their experience with the questionnaire and tablets. Also issue of the internet connection was discussed. The following were their feedback:

*How easy is it to fill the questionnaire? Do farmers give information easily?*

According to Hanifa (Extension Officer), the questionnaire was clear and easy to fill but she encountered two problems. The first problem is that farmers give information but they do not telling the truth. Secondly, it is difficult to walk around the fields and from one farmer to another as the farmers are scattered. According to Ali (Extension Officer), the questionnaire was not difficult to fill. However, Farmers were not prearranged so when selected they were scattered. Secondly, the time was too short for the data collection to cover all the farmers in time before it gets dark. More time was needed.

*Feedback from Farmers*

Farmers liked the experience but they were expecting a reward in form of money.

### *Tablet entry experience versus Hard Copy Questionnaire*

Which one would you prefer, Tablet or hard copy? Both enumerators experienced difficulty using the tablet at the beginning but during the discussion, they both said they preferred the tablet to hard copy but they needed further training.

### *Crop Card Experience*

Ali reported that none has been filled. Only one farmer had started harvesting but had not filled the crop card. Hanifa reported that only three farmers partially filled the crop card. Farmers fill in themselves. Most farmers had not harvested and had not therefore had data to fill in the crop card.

### *Network*

The network was very weak making it difficult to use the GPS sometimes. It was noted that the most wide spread network was Airtel which was said to be up to village level reaching most places in the country. It was therefore suggested as the best option. Other networks only reach the towns.

### *Way forward*

It was agreed that the extension workers go to the field in the week to collect the next round of data. The field work was to be completed and information submitted within a week.

## **THE MOROGORO UPDATE 20<sup>th</sup> JANUARY 2016**

The Team went to Morogoro after consultation with the Bagamoyo Team in the evening. On 20<sup>th</sup> January, the Team paid a courtesy call to the district agricultural officer and proceeded to the Ward where they held a meeting with the extension staff.

The disappointing thing was that the Morogoro field team seemed to have not done anything since the last visit. They claimed that all the farmers lost their crops and therefore there was no data to record other than the planting intentions that were recorded. Even the crop cards had not been filled by anyone.

They also complained that the previous training was not adequate and requested to be retrained on area measurements and locating coordinates of places using the GPS. Whereas this would have been done, there was a heavy cloud cover

and the GPS equipment could not work despite several attempts. The exercise was abandoned and it was suggested that Mr. Mwisomba arrange another team to spot check on the farmers at a later date to verify the claims of the field Team.

The Morogoro component of the trip was therefore not successful.

**REPORT ON THE TANZANIA FOURTH (FINAL) VISIT 25<sup>th</sup>  
TO 27<sup>th</sup> APRIL 2016**



## Introduction

The fourth and final visit to Tanzania was conducted between the 24<sup>th</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup> April, 2016 undertaken by Mr. Felix Wamono and Dr. E.S.K. Muwanga-Zake. The Persons met are attached at Annex 1. During the fourth and final visit a review was made of the coordination and supervision structure and there were the following findings:

- a) There is an M&E Thematic Group for the agricultural sector ministries chaired by the Director Planning and NBS is a member. This committee, inter alia, co-ordinates the ARDS activities;
- b) The new 2015 Statistics Act gives more powers to the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) to co-ordinate and supervise all statistics activities in the country. This should enable it to put in place the required regulations to co-ordinate and supervise ARDS technical committees;
- c) During the pilot, the supervision by the District Supervisor, NBS and MOAFS staff was minimal. Both groups, in general, made only two visits. For the latter two groups, it was only while accompanying the SSP Teams. However, a team of two NBS staff visited Morogoro District to sort out problems with the Tablet. The District Supervisors claimed to have accompanied the Research Assistants to the field during data collection; and
- d) TOR for the M&E Thematic Group (Summary)

## The Institutions Involved in the Pilot with the Respective Roles for Tanzania

**Table 1: Involvement in Pilot**

<p><b>National Bureau of Statistics (NBS)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Over-all co-ordination and guidance</li> <li>✓ Supervision of Pilot – a specific official was designated</li> </ul>
<p><b>MOAFS and MLFD ( for crops and livestock, respectively) – specific officials were also designated</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Recruitment/designation and training of field staff</li> <li>✓ Supervise the data collection, flow, analysis and dissemination</li> </ul>
<p><b>JICA/USAID</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Assist in the field activities</li> <li>✓ Provide any existing MOUs</li> </ul>

This collaboration and structure for supervision with staffing levels at the NBS, MOAFS and MLFD can be adapted to continue especially with the Statistics Act 2015 which gives more powers to NBS to co-ordinate and supervise all statistics activities in the country. What is required are a requisite technical committee and regulations.

## **Skills and knowledge in agricultural data management and analysis**

The pilot survey activities have included:

- a) Review of the uses and users of administrative data, including the reports produced, and recommendations for improvements; and
- b) Identification of capacity gaps among staff engaged in the compilation of administrative data. These are expected to be used to develop an improved system. (See 8 below).

For example, in Tanzania, we wanted to determine how the District Quarterly and Annual Integrated Reports (Operations Guide p14) are used. The ARDS data used in any capacity by the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) when compiling national accounts is also of great interest.

Based on information learnt during the first (pre-pilot) visit to Tanzania, it appeared that national level technical stakeholders - crop and animal products specialist areas – are currently not using data generated through the ARDS apparently out of concerns about data quality. The Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) working group had therefore been formed to improve the ARDS data quality among other things. However, crop and livestock products specialists continue to collect their own data for planning and policy formulation.

According to the MALF web-site: The published data were collected from the department of policy and planning (budget allocation to agricultural subsidies), department of crop development (amount of subsidies supplied and area covered), the National Bureau of Statistics Crop subsector GDP.

During the fourth visit, the Director General, NBS informed the SSP Team that ARDS data is used in the compilation of national accounts. Further, the Agricultural Officer, Morogoro District reported using ARDS data for various purposes at their level.

## Nature of core (associated) data items covered

The current Village, Ward and Regional forms have been considered to be too long. Further, the main food crops grown in the country are reported to be maize, sorghum, millet, cassava, sweet potatoes, bananas, pulses, paddy and wheat. Cash crops grown in Tanzania include coffee, Cashew nut, Tea, cotton, tobacco and sisal. Therefore, while designing the Pilot, it was agreed to get information on a few core items given the table below.

**Table 2: Crop and Livestock Core Items and Associated Data Collected During the Pilot Survey**

Item	Tanzania
Crop Types	Cassava, plantain banana, paddy, , water melon, and maize.
Crop Associated Data	Production, Areas planted and harvested, yield, and producer or Farm gate prices:
Livestock Types	Cattle, Chicken, Pigs, Goats and Sheep
Livestock Associated Data	Inventory, production of products (meat, skins, milk, and eggs), and producer and/or consumer prices.

### Notes:

1. *The current village questionnaire does not cover livestock numbers, eggs.*
2. *Data on meat and skins are collected from slaughtering and other facilities - Training manual p10*
3. *Data on milk is from milk collecting centres. There are issues of completeness on data from slaughtering facilities and milk*

During the fourth visit, it was however, felt by those met that the data contained in the questionnaire is a good start but needs further review. According to the

Assistant Director, Monitoring, Evaluation and Statistics, Ministry of Agriculture, Food Security & Cooperatives, administrative agricultural data should produce only routine administrative data e.g. No. of farmers, No. of livestock, No. of tractors, etc. Extension Officers should have this data from their routine administrative work/activities. He noted that ARDS can only provide data on some inputs and outputs but not data on outcomes. He therefore contends that ARDS should not be expected to produce data on all inputs, outputs and outcomes. This data should come from surveys or even censuses. However, it is known that surveys, or even censuses, can never produce data with acceptable levels of accuracy below the region, especially for the rare commodities. The required sample sizes would be prohibitive and very expensive. In turn, the Director General (DG), National Bureau of Statistics (NBS), argues that ARDS should cover as much data as possible. Indeed, the ARDS should produce good quality routine data.

## Comprehensive Methodologies in Data Collection

The fourth visit aimed to review the adequacy of content, length of the questionnaire; crop card and Instructions manuals.

- a) The team noted that, data was not collected on Section 3: Rainfall, Disasters and Section 4: Plant Health Livestock Production and Health. The field staff claimed that they had not been trained on both of these sections of the questionnaire. It was also claimed that the VAEOs involved in the pilot were only those responsible for crop farming extension work. VAEOs responsible for livestock extension services did not participate in the pilot study and this explains why data on livestock production was not collected. It appears the field staff made only two visits to the respondents. The third visit was not made;
- b) The introduction of a questionnaire and crop card and the respective instructions' manuals were considered to be very good innovations. Data collection under the ARDS is based on assessments made by field staff – VAEOs as they perform their extension work. There was therefore no way of cross-checking the data accuracy. An extension worker in Bagamoyo noted that the pilot study enabled him for the first time to have face to face interviews with farmers on issues concerning acreage planted, production, etc., and have the opportunity to take actual measurements of planted areas using the GPS. He observed that the practice had been for the extension worker to provide extension information to the farmer, yet during the pilot, the extension worker was obtaining information from the farmer. He noted that the procedures introduced by the pilot-household questionnaires, tablets, GPS-would lead to more precise agricultural statistics The Director General, NBS proposed to program the Crop Card on the mobile phone so that farmers can report regularly and electronically.

## Methods for collecting production data

For the pilot study, data was collected in order to make comparisons between the farmers' estimates and measurements using GPS equipment by the extension workers who were the enumerators for the pilot.

Need to analyse the data for comparison between the two methods.

- There are however clear over/under-estimates by the farmers;
- There appears to have been confusion on reporting areas under mixed cropping plots. In a number of cases the different crops on the same plot are given different areas. This is probably was an attempt to give the proportion of the area covered. Others reported the same area for all the crops on the mixed plot (need to review the instructions); and
- There are generally very few plots – in most cases one or two

### *Technologies Used in Collection*

The fourth visit aimed to review the usefulness (advantages and dis-advantages) of the tablet/GPS equipment and adequacy of the instructions. There were the following findings:

- a) Morogoro District had problems with data entry and transmission. The training on the use of tablets was not sufficient in terms of time and therefore enumerators failed to use them for data collection as intended;
- b) The use of the GPS equipment was believed to provide accurate area measurements. These were useful even to the farmers who were now in position to know their areas cultivated, or even owned, more accurately. An enumerators in Morogoro region, informed the SSP Team that, a farmer told her that he could now better determine the price to pay for the tractor-hire service as he now knows the actual area he owns;
- c) Similarly, everyone involved thought that use of the Tablet was another good innovation as it could provide more timely data and possibly cut down some costs, e.g. number of printed questionnaires required. However, the direct data transmission using the Tablet was not tried out during the pilot. It was reported that, under the ARDS, Local Governments are experiencing difficulties in printing summary forms for ward and district summary forms due to lack of funding-Deputy Director MAFSC

- d) Area measurement was carried out using stand-alone GPS tools (why?) after training by NBS staff. This is because the measurement taken by tablets were giving different figures due to poor internet service at that particular location;
- e) Further, data entry for Morogoro region was also carried out by NBS staff, due to reason mentioned above. Among the two districts (Morogoro and Bagamoyo), Bagamoyo district used the Tablets to capture and transmit data to supervisors, while Morogoro failed to do the same due to the above mentioned reason.



## **Recruitment and training of field staff**

It was decided to use the current field staff in the Pilot. These were already familiar with the work and farmers, however given extra training before the Pilot.

The fourth visit wanted to find out whether the training had been adequate. Further, were the current field staff suited for the (increased) work/roles? Were there any challenges? Refer to Table 4 in the Protocol.

Findings:

- a) The field staff reported that the training had been adequate. However, the fact that Sections 3 and 4 were not covered (except for a few cases in Bagamoyo) during the data collection is a clear indication of a complete misunderstanding of what was expected. Further, the field staff did not practice at all on both the Tablet and GPS tools on these Tablets. There were also problems on the use of the Tablets, especially in Morogoro District for data entry and transmission.
- b) There was a feeling among some officials that the younger staff could more easily adapt the new technology than the older ones;
- c) There are no extension workers in some villages due to shortage of funds.

## Field data collection

The fourth visit wanted to record any findings and observations on the data collection.

- a) Due to a combination of factors, the data collection took place during the short (Vuli) season – October to February. In Morogoro and actually Bagamoyo, the rains are said to have been inadequate. It started but stopped. So production was very low, with very little harvest. Indeed, on the crop card, production was reported mostly for one or two crops. It would have been better to collect the data during the long (Masika) season- March - June. Can the experiment be continued for at least one long (Masika) season? Say, under funding by JICA/NBS/USAID?? However, both NBS and the ministry were non-committal on this issue;
- b) Bagamoyo reported that some farmers feared to disclose some of the information, apparently due to lack of sensitization before the pilot. There were also reports that some respondents wanted to be paid. The former is most likely due to lack of sensitization before the pilot. It had been assumed that the field staff were already known in the respective villages. On the other hand, the payments to respondents must be discouraged;
- c) The field staff claimed that there were big distances between respondents and that they need transport – either bicycles or even motor-cycles;
- d) It was reported that the farmers had capacity to fill the crop card. Either, themselves or by some member of the household;
- e) The field staff visited the respondents twice – once per month. (On each visit, on average, spent about TSh 2,000/ on *Boda Boda* (Motor cycle)); and
- f) The filled questionnaires were collected – 10 questionnaires and 5 crop cards for each district. However, in many cases the data is very scanty.

The fourth visit was to review the adequacy of the incentives provided during the pilot with implications for the future.

It was noted that the field staff seemed happy with the incentives provided under the pilot. However, the headquarters' staff only went to the visit twice.

And this was while accompanying the SSP Teams. Similarly, the District Supervisors only visited the field

## **Persons Met**

1. Dr. Albina Chuwa – Director General, National Bureau of Statistics (NBS)
2. Ms Joyce Sawe – Director, Economic Affairs, NBS
3. Mr. Titus Mwisomba – Manager, ASM, NBS
4. Mr. Emmanuel Mashenene – NBS
5. Ms. Sophia Majura, NBS
6. Mr. Elias Abel Mhehe–Ministry of Agriculture, Food Security & Cooperatives (MAFSC)
7. Mr. Elias Masunga – Principal Economist, MAFSC
8. Ms. Aloyce S. Valentine – Agricultural Officer, Bagamoyo District – 0762 212792
9. Ms. Hanifa Hamisi Bushiri – Livestock Extension Officer, Bagamoyo District– 0717 317872
10. Mr. Ali MohdBakar – VAEO, BagamoyoDistrict – 0656 420654
11. Mr. Joseph Mnyude – Agricultural Officer, Morogoro District
12. Ms. Anna Ngowo – Supervisor, Morogoro District– 0788 888970
13. Ms. Evelyne R. Mwilongo, Research Assistant, Morogoro District– 0784 769223
14. Ms. Leah Rwassa, Research Assistant, Morogoro District – 0786 5276

Annex 1B:  
Reports of the Three Visits  
to Côte d'Ivoire

**REPORT ON THE SECOND VISIT TO COTE D'IVOIRE**

*BY*

*AGNES M.N. SSEKIBOOBO (MRS.)*

## **Second Visit Aims and Objectives**

The second visit to Cote d'Ivoire took place between 7th and 11th December 2015. The starting of the field tests as earlier envisaged after the first (pre-pilot) visit was postponed because of a number of reasons, namely, the national elections in Cote d'Ivoire and also poor communication that necessitated making a second visit by Makerere University and FAO to prepare better for the field tests, with the aim of finalizing the arrangements for the field tests and reach clear agreements on the roles and responsibilities of the respective stakeholders in the pilot. FAO was ably represented by Mr. Naman Keita.

## **Proceedings**

Different bodies and institutions that are generating agricultural administrative data were met to understand how agricultural statistics and most importantly administrative agricultural data is compiled and utilized in Cote d'Ivoire. Time did not allow arrangements to be made to meet as many of these institutions as had been planned. The visits made though, helped to confirm the analysis that had been made in Task 3 of this project and also to get information on a number of aspects as highlighted in the checklist. The institutions visited were ONDR (National Office for Rice Development), ARECA (Cotton and Cashew Regulatory Authority), INS (National Statistics Institute) and ANADER (National Support Agency for Rural Development). Since fewer institutions were met, the programme as earlier planned had to change from what had been proposed to take into account the fact that more time had to be taken on discussing and finalising: the data collection instruments/tools to suit them to the Cote d'Ivoire environment, the MoUs for MINAGRI and ENSEA to ensure that the roles and responsibilities of the different institutions are well stipulated for the smooth implementation of the field tests as well as the budget to take into account the uniqueness of the field organisation of the agricultural data collection system.

The Team that included different stakeholders that will be involved in the field tests from SSP, DSDI-MINAGRI, ENSEA and ANADER also met, discussed and finalised the pilot methodology, the data collection tools, the proposed field organization and budget. During the various meetings held, a brief on the administrative data project and a background to the field tests was given, discussions were held on: areas/villages for the field tests, timing of the field tests, crops in season, livestock and poultry, staff to do the field work, supervisors/coordinators, training, staff obligations and facilitation, etc. In addition, it was important to find out from ANADER about the current

supervision arrangements (existence of supervision manuals, levels of supervisors, facilitation, frequency, etc) and the possibility of piggybacking the field tests on to the activities of ANADER. What was noted in the pre-visit in June was that the on-going ANADER data collection activities were the closest there was to ARDS in Tanzania and to avoid re-inventing the wheel, SSP was to piggyback its tests on what ANADER is currently doing to come up with a system that can be directly supervised by MINAGRI.

Findings as guided from the checklist were as follows:

1. It was found out that in **Côte d’Ivoire** (Ivory Coast), production and dissemination of agricultural statistics are provided by the Department of Statistics and Documentation of the Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources (MINAGRI). The data comes from two major sources of collection: the census and administrative data collection.

The last census of agriculture was carried out in 2001. Due to the insecurity in the country, no census of agriculture was carried out until recently as the agricultural census is actually ongoing.

Hence, the administrative agricultural data collection being undertaken by a number of national organisations/institutions for the cash crops is increasingly essential for the production of agricultural statistics as the estimates based on the sampling frame and input from the 2001 census is actually obsolete. Unfortunately, most of the food crops are not covered in the administrative data collection.

There is therefore no system to collect administrative agricultural data from the households as is the case in Tanzania. So there was no system to compare with. The field tests in Cote d’Ivoire were therefore to test the tools being proposed to improve the administrative agricultural data collection system in Tanzania as there was no operational system in Cote d’Ivoire to compare with.

1. The districts of Abengourou and Adzopé were chosen as these were not too far from Abidjan and were districts that were still in crop (Cassava, Rice, Banana, yams) given the delay in starting the field tests.
2. The MINAGRI did not have a list of conversion factors for the various crops. It was therefore agreed that a mini-survey to generate these conversion factors will have to be done for the study districts of Abengourou and Adzopé.



3. ANADER had a survey structure and team in place but did not collect data regularly. The field staff could be used for the field study as they were well acquainted with the areas under study.
4. The questionnaires had to be revised to customize them to the conditions/environment of Cote d'Ivoire and to be translated as well. Crop list and codes to be used were those for the on-going census.
5. There is no collaboration between MINAGRI (now MINADER) with the NSO (INS) in the production of agricultural statistics.
6. The MoU for MINAGRI had to be revised and another MoU drafted for ENSEA. The MoU for the Ministry has since been revised again to take into account the change in name of the Ministry from MINAGRI to MINADER.
7. As defined in the MoU, ENSEA was to assist in the implementation of the field tests by:
  - Assisting in the training of the field staff.
  - Supervising the field work for the entire period of data collection;
  - Providing technical assistance e.g. translations, CAPI application, etc. as needed.

# PROPOSED PROGRAMME FOR THE MISSION TO COTE D'IVOIRE

**7<sup>th</sup> - 11<sup>th</sup> DECEMBER 2015**

The mission objectives will be to:

1. Identify and describe the existing administrative data
2. Understand roles, responsibilities and working modalities of the various institutions to identify critical weaknesses in the system
3. Identify and discuss possible improvements to the existing system, including pure data issues and institutional arrangements/governance/coordination issues
4. Organise for the data collection field tests (which data; which institution; logistics, budget and country inputs; ENSEA contribution).

## **DAY I**

Meeting with DSDI to:

1. Introduce them to the Global research plan and the project on administrative data
2. Provide a brief background to the field tests
3. Get information on the following:
  - The current coordination structure of the agricultural statistics system,
  - Mandates of partners (NSO and Ministries) in collecting agricultural-related information
  - Whether User / Producer Fora exist, their composition, and frequency of meetings, etc.
  - If there is a national agricultural statistics technical Committee, its membership, TOR and frequency of meetings
  - The existing agricultural administrative data sources

Agree on the agenda for the week and who to meet for the different sessions/meetings

## **DAY 2**

Meeting with the different stakeholders that will be involved in the field tests (DSDI, ANADER, ENSEA) to:

1. Provide a brief on the administrative data project and a background to the field tests
2. Hold discussions on: areas/villages for the field tests, timing of the field tests, crops in season, livestock and poultry, staff to do the field work, supervisors/coordinators, training, staff obligations and facilitation, etc.
3. From ANADER, find out the current supervision arrangements (existence of supervision manuals, levels of supervisors, facilitation, frequency, etc.) and the possibility of piggybacking the field tests on to the activities of ANADER

ToT at ENSEA to familiarize the resource person/consultant on:

The data collection instruments: the household questionnaire, the cop card and their respective instructions.

## **DAY 3**

Meet with the bodies/institutions that are generating agricultural administrative data to get information from each of them on the following:

- ✓ Objectives/Role
- ✓ Scope/Activity
- ✓ Geographical coverage
- ✓ Items on which information is collected
- ✓ Methods and technologies used in data collection
- ✓ Periodicity
- ✓ Use of standard data collection instruments
- ✓ Existence of a database
- ✓ Reports produced, structure, frequency, dissemination
- ✓ Reporting Authority
- ✓ Source of funding
- ✓ Cost of maintaining the administrative data, payments made to get the data
- ✓ Quality control and Assessment
- ✓ Accessibility of the data
- ✓ Users of the data and uses to which the data is put

- ✓ Existence of a statistics unit/department, staffing, qualifications, periodicity of training of staff
- ✓ Challenges in data collection, analysis, reporting, dissemination and storage

#### **DAY 4**

Continue with other boards/institutions on items covered as on Day 3

#### **DAY 5**

Synthesis of previous meetings:

- ✓ Discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the agricultural statistics system of Cote d'Ivoire in general and the agricultural administrative data generation in particular
- ✓ Discuss possible improvements to the existing system and how these could be put in place and the responsibility centres.
- ✓ Finalise the operational plan for the field tests

### Actual Programme of Visits in the Relevant Offices in CÔTE D'IVOIRE

Date/ Office / Organisation	Persons /Institution Met or Visited
Sunday 6 December, 2015	Travel from Entebbe to Abidjan, CÔTE D'IVOIRE
Monday, 7 December, 2015	
FAO	FAO Resident Representative
Ministere de l'Agriculture; Direction de la Statistique de la Documentation et l'informatique (DSDI)	Dr. Nouhoun Coulibaly, Mr. Soro Kouhonan, Mr. Koffi Gabriel, Mr. Konan Hilaire, Kouame Yoboua Malan Mathieu, Mr. Robert Touboui
Tuesday, 8 December 2015	
Other Institutions/Bodies producing agricultural administrative data	ONDR
	ARECA
	Coffee-Cocoa Council - Not met. Failed to schedule an appointment.
INS	Deputy Director General of INS
<b>Wednesday, 8 December, 2015</b>	
Ministere de l'Agriculture; Direction de la Statistique de la Documentation et l'informatique (DSDI), ENSEA	Mr. Koffi Gabriel, Mr. Konan Hilaire, Kouame Yoboua Malan Mathieu, Mr. Robert Touboui and Mr. Jean Stephane Nzi
<b>Thursday, 9 December, 2015</b>	
Ministere de l'Agriculture; Direction de la Statistique de la Documentation et l'informatique (DSDI), ENSEA	Mr. Koffi Gabriel, Mr. Konan Hilaire, Kouame Yoboua Malan Mathieu, Mr. Robert Touboui and Mr. Jean Stephane Nzi
École Nationale Supérieure de <b>Statistique et d'Economie Appliquée</b> (ENSEA)	Mr. Hugues Kouadio – Director, ENSEA and Mr. Ankouvi Nayo
<b>Friday, 10 December, 2015</b>	
Agence Nationale d'Appui au Développement Rural (ANADER)	Ms. Camara Walley
Ministere de l'Agriculture; Direction de la Statistique de la Documentation et l'informatique (DSDI), ENSEA	Mr. Koffi Gabriel, Mr. Konan Hilaire, Kouame Yoboua Malan Mathieu, Mr. Robert Touboui, Mr. Ankouvi Nayo and Mr. Jean Stephane Nzi
École Nationale Supérieure de <b>Statistique et d'Economie Appliquée</b> (ENSEA)	Mr. Hugues Kouadio – Director, ENSEA and Mr. Ankouvi Nayo

**REPORT OF THE THIRD VISIT TO COTE D'IVOIRE**

*BY*

*AGNES M.N. SSEKIBOORO (MRS.) AND DR. LEONARD ATUHAIRE*

### **Third Visit Mission Aims and Objectives**

The third visit was held from the 18<sup>th</sup> January 2016 to 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2016. The major objective of the third visit was to launch the field tests. Efforts were also made to get responses to some of the issues that were not covered during the second visit in December.

A summary of activities undertaken was as follows:

#### **Monday 18<sup>th</sup> Jan 2016**

AM

Courtesy call on Mr Soro. Advised us that our counterpart would be Mr. Konan Hilaire.

Meeting with the MINADER & ANADER teams chaired by Mr Konan. Agreed on Work Plan and Logistics.

PM

Purchase of airtime and sim-cards for the tablets

Courtesy call on the Director of ENSEA.

ToT on Questionnaire and Tablets. ENSEA suggested further automation of the CSEntry application.

#### **Tuesday 19<sup>th</sup> Jan 2016**

AM

Travelled to Adzope.

PM

Training on Questionnaire. Hosted by Chief of Adzope Dept, ANADER.

#### **Wednesday 20<sup>th</sup> Jan 2016**

AM

Training on application.

PM

Travelled to Abengourou

**Thursday 21<sup>st</sup> Jan 2016**

AM

Training on Questionnaire. Hosted by Chief of Abengourou Dept, ANADER

Visited farm (not in sample)

PM

Training on application

Debriefing meeting with trainers.

Agreed:

- ENSEA to review application.
- MINADER, ANADER & ENSEA to conduct survey for conversion factors
- Enumerators to update lists of farmers
- Sampling to be done by MINADER/ENSEA/ANADER
- Training to be continued in Adzope and Abengourou on 28<sup>th</sup> & 29<sup>th</sup> respectively
- Data collection to be carried out beginning 1<sup>st</sup> Feb

**Friday 22<sup>nd</sup> Jan 2016**

AM

Travelled to Abidjan

Debriefing at MINADER.

PM

Debriefing at ENSEA. Received signed MoU between SSP and ENSEA.

Purchase of more airtime at Orange.



## **Summary of Proceedings:**

This began with a meeting with the MINADER (formerly MINAGRI) & ANADER teams to finalise the Work Plan and logistics. This was followed by Training of Trainers (ToT) on the questionnaire and tablets. Subsequent to this ToT, ENSEA carried out further customization of the data entry application in order to make it user friendly which will subsequently improve the data quality. The Consultant from ENSEA was to schedule a second mission of training to the study districts after updating the CAPI application and reviewing the crop card. The CAPI application was to be revised in the following areas: automating the capturing of GPS coordinates by the device to avoid any typing and customizing the name of the data file generated in order to facilitate the synchronization and avoid overwriting of files coming from the different devices. The items and sections in the application were to be rearranged, programs revised and customized in order to make the application user friendly.

The combined team travelled to the departments of Adzopé and Abengourou and jointly trained the enumerators and supervisors, who were all ANADER field staff. Field staff was trained and got a good understanding of the questionnaire and the tools to be used on the field and ensured that the CAPI application is operating well.

The training in both districts was conducted in two phases namely, paper based and CAPI training (theory) and the practical done on a selected field.

The paper based training was to enable the enumerators have a good understanding of the concepts and issues addressed in the study. The CAPI training was to allow the enumerators to master the use of the tablets for data collection and be able to synchronize data collected.

Thereafter the enumerators updated the lists of farmers in the selected villages from which the sampling of farmers was done by MINADER/ENSEA/ANADER.

Data collection was to start on 1<sup>st</sup> February 2016. Because of the delayed start, the first round of data collection will collect data on both planting intentions (retrospectively) and planted area. Supervision of the field work is being done by both MINAGRI (MINADER) and ANADER with support from ENSEA especially on the CAPI especially since the SSP team was not available throughout the data collection period.

MINADER, ANADER & ENSEA were to conduct a mini survey for conversion factors before the data collection could commence and a report written for this exercise.

### Detailed Programme for the Launching of the field tests

Day of the Mission	Activities	Institutions Involved	Remarks (if any)
Day 1	<p>Meeting with MINAGRI and ANADER to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Confirm certain aspects of the agricultural statistics system for Cote d'Ivoire e.g. the current coordination structure; the mandates of partners (NSO and Ministries) in collecting agricultural-related information; the existence of a User / Producer Forum, its composition, and frequency of meetings, etc; the existence of a national agricultural statistics technical Committee, its membership , TOR and frequency of meetings; the current supervision arrangements like in the case of ANADER (existence of supervision manuals, levels of supervisors, facilitation, frequency, etc)</li> <li>✓ Discuss agenda for the week</li> </ul>	<p><b>MINAGRI/ ANADER/ENSEA/SSP</b></p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Training of Trainers who will be involved in the training of field staff</li> <li>✓ Identify the server that will receive the data</li> </ul>		
Day 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Travel to the first pilot district of Adzopé</li> <li>✓ Courtesy calls on regional, district and lower levels</li> <li>✓ Setting up the pilot including briefings to all concerned Informing the respective staff of their obligations and facilitation to be provided</li> <li>✓ Selection of sample holdings from the villages under study</li> <li>✓ Setting up the experiments</li> <li>✓ Training of respective staff to participate in the pilot villages of Adzopé district (in use of tablets, crop card, household questionnaire, data transmission, etc.)</li> </ul>	<b>MINAGRI/ ANADER/ENSEA/SSP</b>	
Day 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Practical data collection, discussion, testing the transmission of data</li> <li>✓ Trial Dissemination of</li> </ul>	<b>MINAGRI/ ANADER/ENSEA/SSP</b>	

	<p>the data to emails, websites of the research team and key people in MINAGRI, ANADER, ENSEA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Travel to the second pilot district of Abengourou</li> </ul>		
Day 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Courtesy calls on regional, district and lower levels</li> <li>✓ Setting up the pilot including briefings to all concerned Informing the respective staff of their obligations and facilitation to be provided</li> <li>✓ Selection of sample holdings from the villages under study</li> <li>✓ Setting up the experiments</li> <li>✓ Training of respective staff to participate in the pilot villages of Abengourou district (in use of tablets, crop card, household questionnaire, data transmission, etc.)</li> </ul>	<b>MINAGRI/ ANADER/ENSEASSP</b>	

Day 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Practical data collection, discussion, testing the transmission of data</li> <li>✓ Trial Dissemination of the data to emails, websites of the research team and key people in MINAGRI, ANADER, ENSEA</li> <li>✓ Debriefing and way forward</li> <li>✓ Travel back to Abidjan</li> </ul>	MINAGRI/ ANADER/ENSEA/SSP	
Day 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Departure</li> </ul>		

**REPORT OF THE FOURTH (FINAL) VISIT TO COTE  
D'IVOIRE**

*BY*

*AGNES M.N. SSEKIBOBO (MRS.) AND DR. ANDREW MUGANGA  
KIZITO*

## **FINAL VISIT TO COTE D'IVOIRE**

The third and final mission to Cote d'Ivoire took place between 18<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> April 2016. The main objective was to wind up the field tests and also get answers to the questions that had been posed to the relevant stakeholders in the study countries but had not been responded to. The checklist given below was prepared for this purpose.

As per the programme, a meeting with the various stakeholders that had been involved in the pilot, namely MINADER, ANADER and ENSEA was held in the morning of the first day (18<sup>th</sup> April). This was after paying a courtesy call to Mr. Soro and Dr. Coulibaly and informing them about the purpose of the visit and thanking them for their contribution in the entire exercise. The mission was informed about the paper Dr. Coulibaly had written and presented at a meeting in Yamoussoukro on the challenges of agricultural data collection and dissemination. He said that he looks forward to the outcomes of the pilot. The mission also requested for a copy of the paper. The rest of the morning was spent on getting the answers as per the checklist. It was agreed in principle that Mr. Soro and Mr. Konan be responsible for beefing up the answers and ENSEA will be responsible for the translation.

In general, it was brought to our attention that MINADER is responsible for receiving and validating all the agricultural administrative data that comes in from the different institutions. The administrative data so collected especially on the food crops is mainly from along the value chain which implies that the production that is utilized at the household level is left out. MINADER is aware of these underestimations including the informal trade as no informal cross border trade surveys are done.

The ANADER came into being as a result of economic reforms and is responsible for extension but not for serving the statistics data collection function.

There is therefore no system for generating crop area and production estimates for the food crops. However whenever data is collected, it is validated at the regional level between MINADER and ANADER. Meetings are regularly held between INS, MINADER, ANADER, ONDR for Rice and other institutions responsible for generating statistics on the cash crops to discuss the reliability of the data generated. In the past there was a TWG at MINADER to check the validity of agricultural data under the CountryStat country program but this ceased to function in 2014. MINADER however produces a Yearbook. INS on

the other hand receives the data from MINADER and improves it where it is suspect. There is also a Data Reconciliation Report of 2008 for which we requested a copy so that we could look at the methodology used.

However the Ministry is in the process of revamping the Permanent Statistics Data collection System and therefore the recommendations from the pilot are eagerly being waited for.

As far the costing of such a system is concerned, SSP was tasked to come up with an official request but also provide the list of items to guide the costing. It was also noted that given that the census is being concluded in June, some of the costs/investment in setting up the administrative data collection system can be offset for example by using the equipment used in the census.

### **Visit to Adzopé:**

The mission together with MINADER staff that had been supervising the field work at national level, travelled to Adzopé during the lunch hours. A meeting was held in the afternoon first with the Regional Representative of MINADER and later with the field staff both supervisors and enumerators.

### **Challenges:**

- Availability of farmers to interview
- Time frame for the pilot was too short
- Most of the plots were far away from the villages and scattered and not easily accessible
- Continuous harvesting especially where the crop card was not administered.
- Farmers who did not want to be identified because they are squatters and have encroached on other people's land.
- Some problems with the synchronization of the data and sometimes lack of internet
- Given the fact that some farmers were illiterate, they found it difficult to quantify their responses i.e. areas and production. On the other hand farmers for some reason feared to give exact areas of their fields even if they had a close idea; so they would give underestimates.
- While conversion factors had been provided for production, none had been done for area yet local units of area were being used.



## **Positives:**

- The experience was very good for the team; there were a number of lessons learnt: how to handle farmers during interviews, the exercise of listing the farmers as well as sample selection and the use of tablets for data entry and transmission. The crop card was also being used for the first time.
- The tablets were not heavy and therefore could easily be moved about.
- On the other hand, the gradual filling of the questionnaire in phases was a good thing as it would give the enumerator ample time to internalize the questionnaire.

## **Proposals:**

- Efforts should be made in future similar exercises to take into account the agricultural seasons.
- The report format should have been provided
- There was need to provide more facilitation so that the enumerators could use their motorbikes given that the fields were far.
- It was necessary to have sensitized the farmers before the pilot
- It would be good to factor in the education level of the farmer as the tablet estimates compared well with farmers' estimates of area in the case of the educated farmers.
- Such exercises should be given enough time, like for example cover the entire season and the training for both supervisors and enumerators given more time especially since there are measurements to be done.
- All instructions should be put in the instructions manual. Those in the questionnaires should be removed to make it less bulky; in any case when using the tablet, the instructions can be programmed within, so that one can just click to go into the instruction manual.
- Have separate instructions manuals for supervisors and enumerators.
- There is need to clearly specify the roles of the supervisors at the different levels to avoid duplication of work.
- The different stakeholders involved in the exercise to meet and work out the costing of such an exercise since if such a system was put in place it would help to get real time data on area and production of most especially the food crops.
- To consider making crop card estimates of a smaller crop plot within the field than for the entire field especially for continuously harvested crops (it would act as yield estimation plot).

- A proposal had been made that phones can be used to check on the farmers by calling them to find out the progress they were making with the crop card instead of almost daily visits but it was agreed that the farmers prefer seeing the enumerators face to face.

### **CAPI versus PAPI:**

- No need for internet for PAPI.
- CAPI was preferred but it worked better with paper questionnaires filled as back-up.

### **Visit to Abengourou:**

After the meeting in Adzopé, the Team left for Abengourou in the evening of the 18<sup>th</sup> April. The meetings in Abengourou were held the following day on the 19<sup>th</sup> April starting with a meeting with a group of some of the farmers that had been involved in the pilot.

The farmers stated that:

- The exercise took them by surprise and though it went well, sensitization of the farmers was necessary.
- The benefits were two-way in that the enumerators got the information they wanted but the farmers also got extension advice and also got to know the exact size of their fields; and this is the reason why using extension workers for such a system would work well.
- There was also need to come up with conversion factors for areas as practices vary from area to area in Cote d'Ivoire.
- According to them, this was not a normal year and so the weights were lower and therefore the need to revise the working conversion factors upwards.

### **Meeting with the supervisors and enumerators:**

It was noted that in the case of the crop cards, for those fields that had not been completely harvested and in the case of continuously harvested crops, the proportion of the field that had been harvested was also given. This was easy to give because the harvesting is done in such a way that the entire plant is uprooted. If tubers are removed from one plant and then from another, then it is not done by the farmer but by thieves.

ANADER mostly uses the traditional methods of the ropes, measuring tapes and the compass and they were happy with the use of the tablet since it covers the entire field in a short time and therefore timely. The field staff did not have serious problems with the use of the tablet since they had been using smart phones for data collection from time to time and knew how to manipulate them; though the training was still relevant and needed to have been given more time.

### **Observations:**

- There was need to consult the crop calendar for better timing of the pilot.
- The pilot should have covered the entire season.
- Very close monitoring was needed especially for the crop card as it was harvesting time. The enumerators had to visit the farmers quite often to ensure that the card was being filled in. The mentality of the farmers was that they are not supposed to fill the card/questionnaire.
- There was a proposal to give something to the farmers who had participated in the pilot to show appreciation but this was totally discouraged.
- The farmers' area estimates were generally higher than the GPS readings.
- Distances between the homesteads to the fields were generally long.
- The conversion factors were very useful as most farmers were giving their production figures in local units.
- Teamwork was very important and every week on Wednesdays, the entire team would meet to discuss the progress made, the challenges met and way forward.

### **Proposals:**

- It would be good to geo-reference the plots as well since they are quite far from the homesteads and also provide the necessary space for this in the questionnaire.
- To use farmers who can read and write for the crop card or use a diary so as to reduce the burden on the enumerators. However it was thought better to stratify for literate and illiterate farmers. This becomes a design issue so that information is not lost out on the experiences of the farmers who are illiterate.
- Call the farmers instead of visiting them all the time to find out whether they have completed the crop cards every time they made a harvest.

After the meeting in Abengourou, the Team travelled back to Abidjan and arrived in the evening. The following day 20<sup>th</sup> April, a debriefing meeting was held with the very stakeholders met on the first day to map out a way forward regarding the expected deliverables. These included:

- Accountability of the funds received (Done)
- Responses to the items listed on the checklist (Mr. Soro and Konan responsible for the documentation and Mr. Nayo of ENSEA for translation)
- Reports from Adzopé and Abengourou (Mr. Nayo to get soft copies of the reports and ENSEA to do the translation)
- Detailed report of the survey on conversion factors (Mr. Konan responsible and ENSEA to translate)
- Paper of Dr. Coulibaly (Mr. Konan to get the paper and ENSEA to translate)
- Data set (ENSEA to do the editing and data files structured according to the analysis needed. SSP to come up with the data analysis plan and compare notes with ENSEA)
- Possibility of comparison of the data collected with census data for the villages enumerated in the pilot (Mr. Konan and Mr. Soro to find out the possibility of doing this).

Everything will be done by the end of May. The fact that all the documents have to be translated needs to be appreciated in coming up with the timelines.

### **CHECKLIST OF ISSUES THAT HAVE TO BE COVERED**

- a) Confirming the current coordination structure of the agricultural statistics system,
- b) Confirming the mandates of partners (NSO and Ministries) in collecting agricultural-related information
- c) Finding out whether User / Producer Fora exist, their composition, and frequency of meetings, etc.
- d) Finding out if there is a national agricultural statistics technical Committee, its membership, TOR and frequency of meetings
- e) Finding out current supervision arrangements (existence of supervision manuals, levels of supervisors, facilitation, frequency, etc.). (ANADER?)

**Skills and knowledge in agricultural data management and analysis** The pilot activities included:

- a) Review of the uses and users of administrative data, including the reports produced, and recommendations for improvements; (Some findings could be extracted from Mr. Nayo's submission to TR3 of the Project).
- b) Identification of capacity gaps among staff engaged in the compilation of administrative data, (What capacity gaps were identified during the field study especially with ANADER staff but also MINADER staff?).

The following activities were to be carried out during the supervision visit:

- a) Finding the conversion factors as these did not exist. A mini-survey was undertaken by MINADER, ANADER and ENSEA. (A summary draft report was written; but a final report for the survey on conversion factors is needed).
- b) Discussions on the costs of generating administrative data e.g. training per person, supervision, etc.
- c) Identify other potential sources of administrative data. The objective is to identify any organizations, private or government that have the potential to provide administrative agricultural data on a regular basis. (Mr. Nayo had done substantial work on the other sources in TR3. All that is needed is for Mr. Nayo to see if additional information can be got on items in the checklist below as was indicated in the protocol).

The checklist of issues:

- a) Name, membership, - numbers and definition;
- b) Objectives – specialty, scope, geographical coverage/distribution;
- c) Regulating/controlling authority – if any, licensing system, legal basis;
- d) Any regular returns with period, any standard forms;
- e) Does the organization have a data base, if so what information is kept?
- f) Is there a report produced? Over what period? To whom do they report?  
What information is given in the report?
- g) Quality aspects of the potential data sources.

Comments will be needed on:

- Review adequacy of content, length of the questionnaire; crop card and Instructions manuals.
- Use of the Tablet for data entry and transmission.
- Adequacy of the training.
- Suitability of the ANADER staff for data collection and supervision.
- Lessons learnt from the experiments on production estimation, area measurement, data collection and transmission.

### **Agricultural Statistics Dissemination Strategy**

The pilot activities included:

- a) Finding out if there is a data dissemination strategy; and
- b) Reviewing the current dissemination strategy and making recommendations.

It was stated in the pre-visit that for Cote d'Ivoire, the Ministry of Agriculture does not currently have a dissemination strategy although they reported to be developing one in partnership (or with support from) ADB, EU, FAO, USAID, and *Comité Inter-Etate pour la Lutte contre la Sécheresse au Sahel (CILSS)* (French: *Permanent Inter-State Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel*). (What is the status of the Dissemination strategy?)

### **Quality Control**

Comments on:

- a) Whether a Technical Working Group exists in MINADER to ensure quality control measures and data validation mechanism/processes are put in place and adhered to.
- b) Data quality dimensions that are more relevant for assessing quality of administrative data.
- c) An institution that should ultimately be responsible for ensuring data quality given the coordination arrangements as well as the legal framework that is in place.
- d) Sustainability of the Administrative data system in terms of financial and user support and
- e) On what performance assessments of the administrative data system can be done?