

698040701501
1701

6980407.01
PD-AIAJ-334

CLASSIFICATION

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PE - PART I

Report Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE Intermediate Rural Technology, (IRT) Sierra Leone Fishpond Outreach			2. PROJECT NUMBER 698-0407.01	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE USAID/Freetown
5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES			4. EVALUATION NUMBER (Enter the number maintained by the reporting unit e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No. beginning with No. 1 each FY) <u>1</u>	
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY <u>79</u>	B. Final Obligation Expected FY <u>80</u>	C. Final Input Delivery FY <u>82</u>	6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING A. Total \$ <u>150,000</u> B. U.S. \$ <u>51,000</u>	
			7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION From (month/yr.) <u>9/79</u> To (month/yr.) <u>1/81</u> Date of Evaluation Review	

REGULAR EVALUATION SPECIAL EVALUATION

8. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., sirgram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
Preparation of PID for expansion of present limited effort under AIP (698-0410).	C. Uphaus USAID/Freetown	6/81

<p>9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS</p> <table> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T</td> <td>_____</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P</td> <td>_____</td> </tr> </table>	<input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper	<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T	_____	<input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P	_____	<p>10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT</p> <p>A. <input type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change</p> <p>B. <input type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or <input type="checkbox"/> Change Implementation Plan</p> <p>C. <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinue Project</p>
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper	<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____											
<input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T	_____											
<input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____											
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P	_____											
<p>11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)</p> <p>Charles Uphaus, Agr. Economist, USAID/Freetown</p> <p>Naib Iscandri, Chief Inland Fisheries Officer, Ministry of Natural Resources</p> <p>Thomas Osborn, Associate Peace Corps Director for Agriculture and Fisheries</p>	<p>12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval</p> <p>Signature _____</p> <p>Name <u>Alex Dickie</u> Alex Dickie, AAO</p> <p><u>6/10/81</u></p>												

13. The present limited pilot effort appears to be a success. Small scale, farm pond fish culture is technically feasible, economically sound and has been well-received by farmers. An expanded, longer-term effort building on experiences to date, with the objective of firmly establishing farm pond fish culture in the NE region of the country, seems warranted. Preparation of a PID for funding under AIP (698-0410) is recommended.
14. The purpose of this evaluation was to assess a pilot effort relative to its stated objectives and determine whether a continuation or expansion was warranted. A two person team from Auburn University was contracted for the evaluation (total of four person-weeks), to work with GOSL Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) and Peace Corps personnel. The methodology included review of documentation, site visits, interviews with farmers, MNR fisheries personnel, PC Volunteers and various GOSL, USAID and PC officials, and market analysis.
15. There has been no significant change in external factors affecting the project. The assumptions underlying the effort remain valid.
16. There have been some delays and shortages of inputs which have affected performance, the most important being personnel inputs by both Peace Corps and MNR. The recruitment, training and placement of Volunteers can stand improvement, as can MNR recruitment, training and support of its Fisheries Technicians.
17. Outputs in terms of numbers of participating farmers and ponds constructed are below target, a result both of unrealistically high targets and the personnel problems mentioned above. Where Volunteers and Fisheries Technicians are working the record is positive. An important conclusion of the evaluation is that emphasis should be placed on intensification of fish farming with already participating farmers (i.e., a greater number of better-managed ponds per farmer) rather than a large increase in the number of participating farmers. This change of emphasis is deemed essential if the effort is to move beyond the "interesting novelty" stage to that of establishment within normal farming patterns.
18. The purpose of this activity has been to test the receptivity of farmers in specific areas to the introduction of small-scale fish farming in managed ponds. This purpose has been largely achieved with positive results; as of the date of the evaluation thirty-three farmers were actively engaged in fish farming with many more evincing interest.

19. The goal is to help relieve the twin problem of insufficient protein in the diet and the absence of income-generating activities in NE Sierra Leone. While, as a pilot effort, its overall impact is minimal, the potential contribution of fish farming relative to this goal appears significant. Most fish raised thus far have been consumed within the family group; however the economics of fish production are highly positive, and with its establishment the proportion and total volume marketed can be expected to increase.
20. Beneficiaries are the farmers beginning to integrate farm pond fish culture within their farming systems, and their families. Benefits take the form of improved nutrition and increased family income. Land is more intensively used, labor can be productively employed during the slack season, and food supply can be assured during the pre-harvest "hungry season." Benefits through backward (supply of inputs for fish culture) and forward (fish marketing) linkages have also been identified and can be expected to increase.
21. No significant unplanned affects were observed.
22. The lessons learned are that an entirely new technology (farm pond fish culture) can be successfully introduced and positively received if the innovation meets real needs and is appropriate, and if its introduction is properly planned and managed. In this case fish were already an accepted (through scarce and expensive) element of local diets, the fish culture technology was simple and did not require establishment of a new input supply or support infrastructure, and existing paddy rice fields could be fairly readily adapted for the purpose. Extension work with farmers was the primary requirement, capably met in this case through the use of Peace Corps Volunteers. The restriction of geographical scope helped minimize the logistical requirements (primarily for transport of fingerlings).

Within these parameters site selection still proved to be of major importance, both in terms of physical suitability (soil type and water supply) and in terms of popular interest/response, particularly (in the initial stages) from the local "big men" who tend to be the opinion leaders and innovators in the community. In promoting such innovations with real commercial possibilities emphasis should be placed on commercialization of production rather than on subsistence.
23. No other significant policy or program management implications were drawn. The Contractor's evaluation, eighteen pages, is attached.