

I. PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

1. PROJECT TITLE
AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT

APPENDIX ATTACHED
 YES NO **Proj. Descrip**

2. PROJECT NO. (M.O. 1025.2)
521-15-190-069

3. RECIPIENT (specify)
 COUNTRY **Haiti**
 REGIONAL INTERREGIONAL

4. LIFE OF PROJECT
BEGINS FY **73**
ENDS FY **74**

5. SUBMISSION
 ORIGINAL **11/6/73**
 REV. NO. _____ DATE _____
CONTR./PASA NO. _____

II. FUNDING (\$000) AND MAN MONTHS (MM) REQUIREMENTS

A. FUNDING BY FISCAL YEAR	B. TOTAL \$	C. PERSONNEL		D. PARTICIPANTS		E. COMMODITIES \$	F. OTHER COSTS \$	G. PASA/CONTR.		H. LOCAL EXCHANGE CURRENCY RATE: \$ US _____ (U.S. OWNED)		
		(1) \$	(2) MM	(1) \$	(2) MM			(1) \$	(2) MM	(1) U.S. GRANT LOAN	(2) COOP COUNTRY	
										(A) JOINT	(B) BUDGET	
1. PRIOR THRU ACTUAL FY	58	53	10	4	1	1						
2. OPRN FY	74	180	65	24		25		90	24			
3. BUDGET FY												
4. BUDGET +1 FY												
5. BUDGET +2 FY												
6. BUDGET +3 FY												
7. ALL SUBQ. FY												
8. GRAND TOTAL	238	118	34	4	1	26		90	24			

9. OTHER DONOR CONTRIBUTIONS

(A) NAME OF DONOR	(B) KIND OF GOODS/SERVICES	(C) AMOUNT
	Technical Services	

III. ORIGINATING OFFICE CLEARANCE

1. DRAFTER: USAID/Haiti; revised by AID/W.	TITLE	DATE 11/6/73
2. CLEARANCE OFFICER	TITLE	DATE

IV. PROJECT AUTHORIZATION

1. CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

2. CLEARANCES

BUR/OFF.	SIGNATURE	DATE	BUR/OFF.	SIGNATURE	DATE
LA/CAR	[Signature]	12/12/73	LA/OPNS	[Signature]	12/19/73
PH/DIR	[Signature]	12/13/73	CA/DIR	[Signature]	12/20/73
LA/GC	[Signature]	12/17/73			

3. APPROVAL AAs OR OFFICE DIRECTORS SIGNATURE: John R. [Signature] DATE: 12/26/73 TITLE: Director, LA/DR	4. APPROVAL AID (See M.O. 1025.1 VI C) SIGNATURE: [Signature] DATE: 12/26/73 ADMINISTRATOR, AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
---	---

NON-CAPITAL PROJECT PAPER (PROP) - PROJECT DESCRIPTION
AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT - 521-15-190-069

I. THE PROJECT GOAL

A. Goal Statement

The goal of the project is to support the planning of an expanding agricultural program in the Republic of Haiti.

B. Measurement of Goal Achievement

The achievement of the project goal will be measured by the progressive development of sectoral activities, either grant or loan funded, both short and long term, addressed to the solution of key problems currently inhibiting the development of agriculture, and thus contributing to the extremely low levels of income in the rural community.

C. Assumptions of Goal Achievement

The attainment of the project goal is contingent upon the following assumptions which are beyond the control of this project:

1. GOH policy will continue to place a high priority on the development of the rural economy, and this stated policy will be followed by the allocation of real budgetary and manpower support for agricultural activities.

2. All donors will continue to work together in a collaborative effort to solve the major ills of the rural community.

II. THE PROJECT PURPOSE

A. Statement of the Purpose

This project will provide the means for USAID participation in a cooperative evaluation of the state of the rural economy from which decisions can be formulated relating to priority areas for investment.

B. Conditions expected at the end of the Project

If the project purpose is achieved, the following conditions will exist:

1. A current and accurate analysis of the Haitian rural sector will have led to the establishment of priorities for the allocation of development assistance.

2. The USAID and GOH will have selected for U.S. assistance that portion of the sector (or those portions) judged compatible with U.S. objectives within the levels of available funding.

C. Basic Assumptions

Information relevant to the agricultural sector is presently incomplete, unsubstantiated or non-existent. There is reason to believe, however, that the technical information that will be produced as a result of this project will create the conditions described above, subject to the following assumptions:

1. The assessment process that is undertaken represents a reasonably thorough description of the significant

components of the rural sector, presented in a logical sequence, and provides a clear picture of the discrete operating systems comprising the sector and the relationships between and within subsectors and how they fit together.

2. Other donors, principally the IDB and the IBRD, will have made available to the USAID planners the results of their collaborative investigations.

III. PROJECT OUTPUTS

A.	<u>Kind of Outputs</u>	<u>Magnitude</u>	<u>Target Completion Date</u>
1.	<u>U.S.</u>		
(a)	Assessment Studies	Evaluation of fertilizer marketing, grain handling and storage, soil survey capabilities, agricultural credit programs, rice production, fresh-water fish production, irrigation, integrated crop production potentials, extension and research services.	12/15/73
	Preliminary assessment prepared.	To include all studies except the feeder road	

<u>Kind of Outputs</u>	<u>Magnitude</u>	<u>Target Completion Date</u>
	economic evaluation.	2/20/74
Assessment subjected to analysis, U.S. priorities selected.	One to three sub-sectoral areas.	3/31/74
Projects designed.	One to three sub-sectoral areas.	3/15/74 - 6/30/74
Grant or loan funding committed.	One to three sub-sectoral areas.	5/15/74 - 6/30/74
(b) Short-term development assistance. Additional assistance to pilot projects.	Three projects (freshwater fisheries, swine production and Cul-de-Sac cooperatives)	12/31/74
2. <u>Other Donors</u>		
(a) Assessments & Studies (IDB-IBRD-FAO)	Evaluation of agricultural public administration, beef and dairy cattle production, horticulture, irrigation, community (cooperative) development.	12/31/73

B. Basic Assumption

If the outputs are to be realized, the following basic assumption is considered essential: The schedule established for the conduct of subsectoral examinations will be adhered to, and the other donors cooperating (IBRD and IDB) will make copies of their studies available to USAID on December 31, 1973.

IV. PROJECT INPUTS

A. <u>Kind of Inputs</u>	<u>Magnitude</u>	<u>Date Scheduled for Delivery</u>
1. <u>U.S.</u>		
(a) Assessment & Studies	General agricultural planning USAID/TAB	
	4 weeks TDY.	8/73
	Evaluation of extension & research capability	
	USAID/TAB 2 weeks TDY.	8/73
	Evaluation of freshwater fisheries program. Auburn Univ.	
	2 weeks TDY.	9/73
	Evaluation of fertilizer use and marketing. TVA	
	4 weeks TDY.	10/73
	Evaluation of condition of Arcahaie/Leogane irrigation	

<u>Kind of Inputs</u>	<u>Magnitude</u>	<u>Date Scheduled for Delivery</u>
systems. USAID/TAB	2 weeks TDY.	10/73
Evaluation of capability in soils classification. USAID/TAB	2 weeks TDY.	10/73
Evaluation of agricultural credit programs. CUNA	4 weeks TDY.	11/73
Evaluation of rice production in the Artibonite Valley. LSU	3 weeks TDY.	11/73
Evaluation of grain marketing and storage problems. KSU	4 weeks TDY.	11-12/73
Evaluation of seed multiplication programs. MSU	4 weeks TDY.	11-12/73
Senior agricultural planner analyst	6 weeks TDY.	1-2/74

(b) Short-term Development Assistance

<u>Kind of Inputs</u>	<u>Magnitude</u>	<u>Date Scheduled for Delivery</u>
Cash grants to complete three pilot projects financed in FY 71, FY 72.	\$10,000 to complete electrification of Cul-de-Sac vegetable processing plant.	
(SDAA projects) includes generator, construction costs, and training.	\$10,000 to pay increased costs for swine project feed mill construction.	
	\$5,000 for special equipment not foreseen in original projects.	by 6/30/74
(c) Project support provides funds for project manager(s), and overhead administration.	U.S. direct-hire rural development officer, plus local staff, transportation and miscellaneous costs.	7/1/73 - 6/30/74

BUDGET SUMMARY

FY 1974

Evaluation and studies (excluding feeder roads)	\$90,000
Assistance to pilot projects	25,000
Project support (includes US direct-hire and trg.)	<u>65,000</u>
	\$180,000

A. <u>Kind of Inputs</u>	<u>Magnitude</u>	<u>Date Scheduled for Delivery</u>
2. <u>Cooperating Country</u>		
(a) <u>Assessment & Studies.</u>		
Government officers to confer with individuals conducting assessments and to participate in analyses.	38 weeks of officer time.	8/73- 12/73
(b) <u>Short-term development assistance.</u>		
Pilot projects (SDAA)	Full-time (3) GOH project managers.	continuous through life of project.
3. <u>Other Donors</u>		
Assessments & Studies (IDB-IBRD-FAO).	\$75,000 for 128 man/weeks of specialist time in the fields of public administration, beef and dairy cattle production, horticulture, irrigation and community (cooperative) development.	8/73- 12/73
Assistance to pilot projects (OAS-Israel).	2 full-time, third-country technicians in rural development.	Continuous

V. RATIONALE

From 1962 on, USAID assistance to Haiti was limited to humanitarian activities principally in the fields of malaria eradication and Title II, PL-480, programs. In 1966, a community action project was begun in the Northwest with USAID support (HACHO). By 1972, as the development climate appeared to show a gradual improvement, so too did the opportunity for renewing a program of cooperative assistance. At that time three modest pilot projects were undertaken with USAID assistance totalling \$145,000 under the provisions of the Special Development Authority Assistance (SDAA) project which previously had been limited to projects generally restricted to costs of under \$5,000. A preliminary evaluation of the performance of these projects has been undertaken in late FY 73 and shows that despite some soft spots, principally as a result of a lack of on-site technical assistance, overall performance has been satisfactory. In those cases where corrective action or project modification has been required, the Minister of Agriculture has responded quickly and favorably to USAID requests for action.

At the same time that the pilot project evaluation was undertaken, a more intensive examination of the existent developmental environment was begun. This examination recognized the weakness of GOH institutions, while at the same time heeding the urgent need for increasing assistance to the rural sector which produces 45 percent of the Gross National Product and where a full 80 percent of the population is employed.

In order to substitute an objective choice of action for development planning for what must at this time be considered a subjective judgment, the USAID decided with the IDB and the IBRD to initiate and conduct selected commodity and subsectoral investigations. This pooled assessment effort should lead to the acquisition of sufficient meaningful data which, when subjected to analysis, will identify priorities for assistance. When this analysis has been completed, the USAID will, in cooperation with other international and bilateral donors, make such decisions as are relevant within the limits of funding availabilities, for additional grant or loan assistance to the rural sector.

Additional U.S. assistance will also be required for the successful completion of the three pilot projects previously mentioned that were undertaken in FY 72. Specifically, the swine project and the cooperative at the Cul-de-Sac may require additional technical assistance, training and some material financing for the final and successful attainment of the goals assigned to these projects.

VI. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE AND COURSE OF ACTION

In that the purpose of the project is divided into two separate but related parts, the implementation schedule for each purpose has been prepared separately.

A. 'To provide the means for USAID participation in a cooperative evaluation of the state of the rural economy, from which decisions can be formulated relating to priority areas for investment.'

1. Undertake specific evaluations of subsectors as decided by the participating donors. July 1 - December 31, 1973.
2. Make first assessment from combined data, including that furnished from other donors and define areas of probable high priority. January 1 - February 28, 1974.
3. Establish priorities with the GOH and other donors, and select possible areas for U.S. assistance. March 1 - 31, 1974.
4. Prepare IRR(s) for rural sector development loan(s) or seek commitment of U.S. grant funds for investment objectives to begin in April, 1974.
5. Prepare loan papers or design grant-funded projects (when IRRs are approved).

NARRATIVE STATEMENT

A current assessment of the agricultural economy is generally considered by all parties concerned a necessary prelude to investment. The period 1962-71 saw not only the stagnation of the efforts undertaken in earlier years, but also a general deterioration of the infra-structure and of institutional strength. It, therefore, appears essential that the first steps taken in reversing this trend should be based upon an updated appraisal of the current situation to include a measure of the frailties and strengths of the development environment.