[redacted] 6630162-(6)

AID 1020-25 (10-70) REPORT U-446

abs. 14

PD-AAB-942-F1

PAGE 1

PROJECT APPRAISAL REPORT (PAR)

1. PROJECT NO.	2. PAR FOR PERIOD:	3. COUNTRY	4. PAR SERIAL NO.
663-55-130-162	7/1/72 TO 6/30/73	Ethiopia	73-6 6p.

5. PROJECT TITLE

Ada Agricultural Development

6. PROJECT DURATION: Began FY 71 Ends FY 79	7. DATE LATEST PROP	8. DATE LATEST PIP	9. DATE PRIOR PAR
	4/23/71	1/72	NA

10. U.S. FUNDING	a. Cumulative Obligation Thru Prior FY: Grant $556,000 Loan $1,300,000	b. Current FY Estimated Budget: $ 502,000 Grant	c. Estimated Budget to completion After Current FY: $ 2,343,000 * Grant

Grant/Loan

11. KEY ACTION AGENTS (Contractor, Participating Agency or Voluntary Agency)

a. NAME	b. CONTRACT, PASA OR VOL. AG. NO.
Clapp & Mayne, Inc.	Host Country Contract

I. NEW ACTIONS PROPOSED AND REQUESTED AS A RESULT OF THIS EVALUATION

A. ACTION (X) USAID	AID/W	HOST	B. LIST OF ACTIONS	C. PROPOSED ACTION COMPLETION DATE
X		X	Reach clear agreement on project goals and purposes within AID in cooperation with the IEG.	December 1, 1973
X		X	Clarification of roles of EPID, Project Organization, Contractor, USAID	December 31, 1973
		X	IEG to develop, as soon as possible, a vehicle for the proper formulation of policy guidance for the project.	October 1, 1973 (done)
		X	IEG to seek to improve coordination among various IEG agencies involved in planning and implementation of Ada project activities.	continuing
X	X	X	Resolve issue of implementing agent for socio-economic research component.	November 1, 1973
X			Improvement of AID procedures to achieve better input planning and implementation.	November 1, 1973

D. REPLANNING REQUIRES REVISED OR NEW: [X] PROP [ ] PIP [X] PRO AG [ ] PIO/T [X] PIO/C [ ] PIO/P

E. DATE OF MISSION REVIEW: Sept. 27, 1973

PROJECT MANAGER: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE: Clyde S. Adams BR for

MISSION DIRECTOR: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE: Donald F. Miller 10/11/73

* To be reflected in revised PROP

AID 1020-25 (10-70) PAGE 2 PAR	PROJECT NO. 663-55-130-162	PAR FOR PERIOD: July 1, 1972 to June 30, 1973	COUNTRY Ethiopia	PAR SERIAL NO. 73-8

II. PERFORMANCE OF KEY INPUTS AND ACTION AGENTS

A. INPUT OR ACTION AGENT / CONTRACTOR, PARTICIPATING AGENCY OR VOLUNTARY AGENCY	B. PERFORMANCE AGAINST PLAN: UNSATISFACTORY 1	2	SATISFACTORY 3	4	5	OUTSTANDING 6	7	C. IMPORTANCE FOR ACHIEVING PROJECT PURPOSE (X): LOW 1	MEDIUM 2	3	4	HIGH 5
1. Clapp & Mayne		X										X
2.												
3.												

Comment on key factors determining rating

1. Recruitment of some poorly qualified personnel led to need to replace Team Leader and Marketing Specialist.
2. Project planning of work program was substandard during much of period under review, Contractor's home office actions to replace Team Leader, plus on-site visits led to improved performance in the fourth quarter.
3. For above reasons, adherence to work schedule was deficient.

NOTE: Arrival of new Team Leader and completion of team (occuring after period of review) appear to have improved performance markedly.

4. PARTICIPANT TRAINING	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5

Comment on key factors determining rating

N.A.

5. COMMODITIES	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5
		X								X		

Comment on key factors determining rating Grant-financed commodities have occasioned no problems. Loan-financed commodities have encountered numerous delays, e.g., (1) IEG was extremely slow to fulfill CP. (2) Disagreements between REDSO and AID/W and Mission on procurement procedures. (3) Lack of concerted determination on the appropriateness by the Mission of commodities as proposed by contractor.

6. COOPERATING COUNTRY		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5
	a. PERSONNEL			X									X
	b. OTHER			X									X

Comment on key factors determining rating

1. Policy-making body, presumably the interministerial committee, has not yet begun to function, thus devolving policy-making requirements onto project management which should be more free to focus on policy implementation.
2. Ethiopian project management has been competent, but has been slow in developing an administrative management system.
3. Insufficient cooperation evidenced between IEG agencies with responsibilities for various aspects of Ada development. Note: This now appears to be improving.

7. OTHER DONORS AID	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5
		X									X	

(See Na[illegible]ge for [illegible]) comments on AID)

II. 7. Continued: Comment on key factors determining rating of ~~DEVELOPMENT~~ AID

1. Lack of unanimity within AID as a whole regarding project goals/purposes.
2. AID/W delays in contracting to Ada research component. At least partially caused by lack of coordination between TAB and AFR.
3. Deficiencies in Mission procedures for input planning implementation and review.

II. KEY OUTPUT INDICATORS AND TARGETS

A. QUANTITATIVE INDICATORS FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS		TARGETS (Percentage/Rate/Amount)					
		CUMULATIVE PRIOR FY	CURRENT FY 73 TO DATE	CURRENT FY 73 TO END	FY 74	FY 75	END OF PROJECT
Number of farmers participating in Ada development project	PLANNED	0	256	256	512	1280	10,000
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	0	400				
	REPLANNED			400	700	1500	10,000
Ten centers in operation by end of year five.	PLANNED	0	2	2	4	7	10
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	0	2				
	REPLANNED			-	-	-	-
Ten model farmers established in each of ten trade center areas with operational demonstration plots on each.	PLANNED	0	20	20	40	60	100
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	0	15				
	REPLANNED			15	-	-	-
150 kms. of road constructed or improved within the project area.	PLANNED	0	0	0	48	79	150
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	0	9				
(continued on page 3a)	REPLANNED			9	-	-	-

B. QUALITATIVE INDICATORS FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS	COMMENT:
1. Adequate storage capacity for fertilizer seed and grain develop. by project year five.	Modest storage capacity to be developed within each center plus rented or constructed central storage. Actual total capacity will be dependent on actual production.
2. Production and socio-economics research completed by year five	Problems of recruiting and fielding research team have delayed implementation of research by at least one full crop season.
3.	COMMENT:

H. 7. Continued: Comment on key factors determining rating of Other Donors

KEY OUTPUT INDICATORS (CONTINUED)

III. KEY OUTPUT INDICATORS AND TARGETS

A. QUANTITATIVE INDICATORS FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS		TARGETS (Percentage/Rate/Amount)					
		CUMULATIVE PRIOR FY	CURRENT FY 73 TO DATE	CURRENT FY 73 TO END	FY 74	FY 75	END OF PROJECT
Water facilities constructed in each of 10 centers.	PLANNED	0	0	0	2	4	10
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	0	0				
	REPLANNED			-	-	-	-
Adequate staffing in place to provide extension and credit to 3,300 project farmers by year five	PLANNED	6	12	12	24	33	50
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	8	12				
	REPLANNED			-	-	-	-
Model leases signed for all tenant farmers (approximately 6,500 in project by year five.)	PLANNED	0	175	175	350	800	6600
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	0	200				
	REPLANNED			200	500	1000	6600
	PLANNED						
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE						
	REPLANNED						

B. QUALITATIVE INDICATORS FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS	COMMENT:
1.	
2.	COMMENT:
3.	COMMENT:

AID 1020-22 (10-70) PAGE 4 PAP	PROJECT NO. 663-11-130-162	PAR FOR PERIOD: 7/1/72 - 6/30/73	COUNTRY: Ethiopia	PAR SERIAL NO. 73-6

IV. PROJECT PURPOSE

A. 1. Statement of purpose as currently envisaged.

2. Same as in PROP? ☐ YES ☒ NO

Develop and test in a pilot project in the Ada [illegible] District, new technology, institutions and delivery mechanisms which are financially, technicially, and administratively reproducable within the Ethiopian context by the IRG, and which will facilitate movement of Ethiopia's small holders and tenants from subsistence to market-oriented agriculture.

B. 1. Conditions which will exist when above purpose is achieved.	2. Evidence to date of progress toward these conditions.
1. Cooperatives or farmer associations controlled by farmers have been established to provide credit, production inputs, smallmarket crops, and to disseminate information.	1. Fifteen model farmers and nine loan committees established.
2. IRG agencies working effectively together to achieve project purpose.	2. Administrative and technical cooperation by the Debre Zeit Experiment Station, Ada Woreda Governor's Office, Nazareth Horticultural Station, HSIU/IDR Water Resources Administration and other agencies with Ada.
3. Net farm income for tenants and small holders has increased in the Ada District.	3 - 4. Too early in project for measurable progress in these indicators.
4. Diversification of production has occurred to include export crops and livestock.	5. Signing of 200 model leases.
continued	6 - 9. Too early in project for measurable progress in these indicators.

V. PROGRAMMING GOAL

A. Statement of Programming Goal

Achievement of a primary IRG goal which emphasizes the modernization and monetization of peasant and subsistence agriculture by the development of institutions and infrastructure for improving the socio-economic status of small holder/tenant farmers.

B. Will the achievement of the project purpose make a significant contribution to the programming goal, given the magnitude of the national problem? Cite evidence.

Yes. A successful Ada project will have developed and demonstrated techniques/approaches which the IRG, using its own resources, can replicate in other rural areas to modernize and mobilize peasant subsistence agriculture. As an experimental pilot project, Ada will have demonstrated the viability of certain approaches and the non-viability of others.

AID 1020-25 (10-70)	PROJECT NO.	PAR FOR PERIOD	COUNTRY	PAR SERIAL NO.
PAGE 6 PAR	663-55-130-162	7/1/72-6/30/73	Ethiopia	73-6

IV. PROJECT PURPOSE

A. 1. Statement of purpose as currently envisaged. 2. Same as in PROP? ☐ YES ☐ NO

B. 1. Conditions which will exist when above purpose is achieved.	2. Evidence to date of progress toward these conditions.
Continued-- 5. Maximize opportunities for tenants and small holders to have security of tenure. 6. Agricultural income tax will have increased in proportion to the progression of the tax law. 7. Alternatives developed such as resettlement or off-farm employement opportunities created for any tenants displaced. 8. Continuous attention being devoted to the dynamics affecting the areas human and land resources. 9. Adoption of selected production systems in other areas of Ethiopia.	

V. PROGRAMMING GOAL

A. Statement of Programming Goal

B. Will the achievement of the project purpose make a significant contribution to the programming goal, given the magnitude of the national problem? Cite evidence.