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Background and Objectives

The planning meeting on the impact assessment study of the Cassava Enterprise Development Project (CEDP) was held on Friday, 6 November 2009, at IITA Ibadan, to brief the would-be resource persons on the project and to work out modalities for the activities ahead.

Dr Tarawali, the Project Manager, briefed the participants about the project that has been in operation for the past 5 years (2004-2009). There was a need to conduct and document the impacts that this important empowerment project has had in the life of the beneficiaries, the participating States, the Nigerian Government, and the spill-over effect on indirect beneficiaries and other countries in the region.

Participants were briefed on the two components of the project, consisting of the Pre-emptive Management of the virulent Cassava Mosaic Virus Disease (CMD) in Nigeria and CEDP. The CMD project was meant to increase the productivity of cassava through improved germplasm and management practices. CEDP was aimed at facilitating the processing, marketing, and commercialization of cassava to enhance income generation and job creation for all stakeholders. CMD was funded mainly by the Federal Government of Nigeria, participating States, and other donors (NDDC, USAID, etc.). CEDP was sponsored by USAID and SHELL. IITA implemented the project in all the 11 South-South and South Eastern States of Nigeria (Fig. 1).

Participants were briefed on the set targets and the current levels of achievement of the project in terms of income generation, employment, the numbers of technologies introduced, area under sustainable management, the numbers of clients adopting or using the new technologies, business development services provided, and sustainable associations formed.

Thereafter, a session was led by Dr Jim Ellis Jones, the consultant from the UK, to identify the various beneficiaries of the project and the expected benefits. This was to ensure that the assessment focuses on the task of capturing the impact of CEDP on the lives of the people. During this interactive session, the beneficiaries and their perceived benefits, together with those factors which are likely to have contributed to the project’s achievements, were identified and listed below. This exercise will be followed-up by compiling a comprehensive list of all the institutions, prior to the field work.

1 Beneficiary identification

Producers
Farmers (male and female)
Farmer Groups
Processors
Farmer Groups Processors (male and female)
Farmer-Processors (male and female)
Processors (Individuals-male and female)
Machine Fabricators
Agro-dealers (fertilizer and other agrochemicals)
Large distributors, such as Candel (herbicide company)
Small individual dealers
Farmer groups
Marketing agents (middlemen)
Weed Control Groups (youth)
Research Institutes and Universities
IITA, NARS, and Universities
NGOs
Women NGOs, others
Special Projects (Donor-supported) linked to CEDP
Credit Institutions
Banks
North-South Development, a micro-finance organization
Government Institutions
State Ministries of Agriculture
ADPs
LGs
Industries
Starch production, millers
Food manufacturing, bread makers

Regulatory bodies
NAFDAC, SON

National benefits
Export earnings and Import savings
Increased GNP

II Possible or expected benefits
(to be verified through focus group discussions, individual interviews, and formal survey questionnaires)

Farmer, household, and community benefits
Increased knowledge of new varieties and management practices
Adoption of new varieties
New varieties grown in increased area
Increased yields, productivity (more income, lower costs) and household income
Improved household food security
Reduced poverty
Income for asset purchases

Processor Benefits
New knowledge of improved technologies, more and better equipment, and variety of products
Adoption of new production methods and improved quality of products
Expanded market
Increased sales and income
Increased productivity (more income-lower costs) and profit
Job creation and income for new employees

Machine Fabricators
New knowledge and new opportunities
New skills and markets for products
Increased production, sales, and income
Increased productivity and profits
Improved collaboration among fabricators
Formation of the Association of Cassava Machinery Fabricators (ACMA)
Export opportunities
Linkage with Brazil/NARS (SEDI)
Increased employment and income for employees

**Agro-dealers**
Increased knowledge of products sold
Increased customer base amongst farmers
Increased sales and profit
Job opportunities for more agro-dealers

**Marketing agents (product buyers, either freelance or employed by processing companies)**
Improved marketing outlet channels with more sales opportunities
Increased sales, income, and profit
More marketing agents

**Weed Control Groups**
Change in orientation from hand weeding to use of sprayers and herbicides
New skills and new job opportunities
New income sources (weeding, farming, and others)
Increased income
Reduced unrest and crime

**Industrial Users**
Increased utilization of existing machinery in existing companies
Opportunities created and new companies established
Increased markets (domestic and export) with sales from new cassava products
Increased production, sales, income, and profits
New employment and income for employees
Export opportunities and wider market

Research
Opportunities for research
Industrial training, BSc, MSc and PhD opportunities.
Attendance at conferences & workshops
Improved linkages with partners
Publications and sources of baseline information for other projects
Activities with other projects

NGOs
Better relationship with their communities and donor organizations
New sources of income from variety sales and products
Faster scaling out of project benefits

Special Projects
Increased knowledge and technologies
Backstopping
Faster scaling out of project benefits

Credit Institutions
Increased knowledge and awareness of the role of cassava in income generation
Increase in number of credit-worthy clients
Increased loans, repayments, and profits

Government Institutions
  • ADPs
New opportunities and increased relevance
Better staff motivation, increased job satisfaction, and sustainability of activities after project completion
  • NAFDAC/SON (Regulatory bodies)
Increased relevance, role, and activities
Increased income through payments for services

- National economy benefits

FOREX, reduced imports, increased exports

- Non-Farmer Consumers

Price stability of an affordable food (food security)

Safer cassava food products (packaging and quality assurance)

- Spill-over effects outside direct project areas

Within Project States

Outside (in States neighboring project areas)

Regional (other similar projects established)

International

### III Key factors contributing to success (to be confirmed)

Improved partnerships and collaboration among stakeholders, value chain approach

Availability of improved technologies with relevance to farmers, processors, and fabricators

Improved linkages between farmers and input and output marketing agents

Gender mainstreaming to ensure male, female, and youth participation

Capacity building of all stakeholders

Advocacy to create an enabling policy environment

### Development of methodology

This session was closely followed by presentation by Prof. Raphael Omolehin on the methodology to be used for the impact study.

A team comprising of ten consultants, including the team leader, with the support of CEDP Station Managers in each State will carry out the assignment. The team will break into three groups to carry out the task simultaneously to reduce the number of days spent on the field for data collection. Five days would be spent in each State, the team would re-assemble to complete the remaining two States. Altogether, 21
days would be needed for the field work. At the end of this activity, the entire team would converge at IITA, Ibadan, for another 2 weeks to tidy up the data. Then the team leader and 2 other members of the team will use 1 week to put the first draft together and a Power point presentation for IITA. This team of three will use 1 week to produce a full report, and if need be, make a final presentation to stakeholders. The report will be structured State by State, based on the impacts on beneficiaries that have been identified, as earlier presented.

Other issues that will be dealt with in the report are as follows:

- CEDP’s direct and indirect beneficiaries
- Levels of acceptability and adoption of CMD varieties in the project area
- Reduction in CMD infestation in the area of implementation
- Impact of adoption of CMD varieties on cassava productivity
- Impact of the project on employment generation in the project areas (number of employed people in production, processing, marketing, and related services).
- Impact of the project in terms of increased income over and above the baseline period
- Extent of increased commercialization brought about by the project
- Overall social impact of the project to the beneficiary communities and States
- Project spill-over to other States and other countries
- Conclusions and recommendations
- Annex

The impact study will adopt a mix of methodologies to ensure that the diversity of issues and questions are properly addressed. The impact assessment will commence with orientation meetings at IITA for team members and a comprehensive review of program documents, reports, and planning for field studies. Based on the identified beneficiaries and the expected benefits as listed above, it was agreed that structured questionnaires, Focus Group Discussions (FGD-Table 1), and individual in-depth interviews will be adopted to generate the data needed for the report of the study. Individuals, groups, organizations, NGOs, and government agencies would be interviewed during the field work and the study will cover all the 11 States where the project has been implemented. The impact study team will visit all the communities to be chosen to conduct the interviews and Focus Group Discussions.

**Conclusions and recommendations**

It was agreed that Prof. Raphael Omolehin should draft and circulate the questionnaires and checklists for others for necessary inputs with the aim of fast-tracking the study.

It was also agreed that since the year is far spent and the preparation’s just beginning, there is a need to develop the field instruments between now and end of December so that the field work can commence in January and the report be produced by March/April 2010.
**South-South:** Akwa Ibom, Bayelsa, Cross River, Delta, Edo, and Rivers State

**South-East:** Abia, Anambra, Ebonyi, Enugu, and Imo States

Figure 1: CEDP target States and in the South-South and South-East of Nigeria.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community (to be decided)</th>
<th>LGA (to be decided)</th>
<th>States</th>
<th>Senatorial (to be decided)</th>
<th>Focus Group</th>
<th>No. in attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Akwa Ibom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male  Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bayelsa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male  Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cross River</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male  Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male  Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male  Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rivers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male  Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Abia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male  Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anambra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male  Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ebonyi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male  Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Enugu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male  Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Imo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male  Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: The CEDP target communities selected for Focus Group Discussions