

PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT
SEED FARM DEVELOPMENT - 504-0065

A. SUMMARY

The purpose of this project was to improve and expand the capacity and capabilities of the Guyana Seed Program and to assure an adequate and timely supply of foodcrop seed.

Achievements under this project included improving and equipping of the Central Seed Station. Personnel have been trained, both in the U.S. and through on-the-job experience with the U.S. Resident Seed Advisor. Improved operational policies and procedures for seed production, processing and storage have been instituted upon the recommendations of the Seed Advisor.

However, the project objectives were only partially attained since the four planned satellite seed centers were not completed and a national seed committee is not operative.

B. SPECIFIC COMPONENTS OF THE PROJECT AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

1. Creation of a National Seed Committee to Formulate Policies Related to Seed Production and Supply.

A national Seed Board began with the establishment of a National Seed subcommittee of the National Coordinating Committee (NACC). The sub-committee consisted of representatives from the Seed Technology Unit, Research and Extension Divisions of the Ministry of Agriculture (MOA), the Guyana Sugar Corporation (GuySuco), the Guyana Rice Board (GRB), the Guyana Marketing Corporation (GMC), and the Guyana National Service (GNS). The USAID-financed seed consultant sat on the Sub-Committee as a co-opted, non-voting member. It was decided at the inaugural meeting that the Sub-Committee would convene on a monthly basis.

The Sub-Committee made a good job beginning under its active and conscientious chairman. Nevertheless, problems developed in attempting to get all members together. Meetings were not held as scheduled and became infrequent (especially after the resignation of the first chairman). Very few decisions were made and the body lacked legal status. At a meeting held in March, 1981, the consultant was requested by the Sub-Committee to revise the terms of

reference for the organization. This was done with a recommendation to legalize the Committee under the name of "The National Seed Board."

The document was presented to the MOA in June 1981. Several attempts were made by the Principal Agriculture Officer at the Central Agriculture Station and the Seed Consultant to obtain a response and action from the MOA. However, these attempts were unsuccessful and no further meetings of the seed sub-committee were held:

2. Establishment of a Seed Processing (or Conditioning) Unit and Expansion of Other Facilities at the Central Ag Station at Mon Repos.

The conditioning unit, quality control laboratory, and storage room were upgraded and improved in accordance with proposals made in the original project document. The laboratory is presently the best equipped in the Caribbean. Seed testing operations are being carried out on a regular basis in accordance with International Seed testing association regulations. A corn elevator was purchased and installed in the seed plant. This machine has served to speed up shelling operations with less labor involved.

A portable sprinkling irrigation system was provided as part of the project. This system permits the irrigation for seed production of approximately 10 acres during periods of below normal rainfall.

Finally, a seed treater was purchased and installed for the seed center.

3. Establishment of Four Seed Satellite Centers or Sub-centers.

The project called for construction by the GOG of four sub-centers for seed processing throughout the country and the equipping of these using AID funds.

The objective was to decentralize processing and seed distribution. Regrettably, not one of these centers was constructed. The following factors were identified as contributing to this failure:

- a) Six months postponement in Technical Assistance input because of a delay in contract approval.
- b) Lack of expertise for the design of the facilities and failure of the MOA through USAID to request timely assistance.

- c) Misunderstandings concerning detail required in the construction plans.
- d) Insufficient action on the part of both the GOG and USAID in advancing the planning and design process. Although USAID set deadlines, the MOA failed to take action. Part of this can be explained by complex and cumbersome administrative procedures.
- e) Increasing costs of construction due to inflation.
- f) Failure to supply electric power to two of the sites.

4. Technical Assistance

USAID financed a Seed Advisor who assisted MOA seed officers with technical and managerial functions associated with the program for a period of 30 months.

5. Training

Two participants from the Seed Technology Unit, Central Agriculture Station(CAS) were accepted for the two-year M.S. Seed Technology degree at Mississippi State University (MSU). One agricultural officer successfully completed the degree in May, 1982 and has since returned to Guyana. The other participant (the Project Manager of the Seed Technology Unit) is due to complete this course in May, 1983.

The training component also involved a three-month program for an intensive seed course at MSU designed for individuals at the seed laboratory technician level. One technical assistant from CAS successfully completed this course in mid-1979.

Finally, a 3-week in-country training course, for 17 Guyana Seed Workers was conducted by Mississippi State University in September-October, 1980.

C. PLANNED VERSUS ACTUAL INPUTS

The following table shows planned inputs for the project. Actual expenditures of AID amounted to approximately \$320,000. Actual expenditures by the GOG are not available but are expected to be only about 25% of planned expenditures since their major input was to be the construction of the satellite seed centers which were never built.

Planned Contributions of AID and GOG

	(US\$ 000)		
	<u>AID</u>	<u>GOG</u>	<u>Total</u>
Technical Assistance	186	10	196
Commodities/Equipment	135	30	165
Facilities - construction	128	139	267
Training	51	29	80
Personnel and Labor	-	558	558
Expendable supplies	-	217	217
Total	<u>500</u>	<u>983</u>	<u>1,483</u>

D. POST PROJECT MONITORING OF PROJECT

The only remaining project activity which has been carried over beyond the PACD is the U.S. training of one of the two long-term participants. The training program of Mr. Neville McAndrew was switched from a 12 month duration to one of 120 weeks in order for him to obtain a M.S. degree in Agronomy Seed Technology. However, the funding responsibility for his training was changed to the GOG after September 2, 1982. Upon his return to Guyana in mid 1983, Mr. McAndrew will assume the position of Production Manager - Seed Technology, Ministry of Agriculture.

There are still invoices from the contractor - Experience Inc. to be processed and paid by USAID. These have been delayed pending the processing of a required amendment to the Contract. The final billing on the project vehicle purchased by Experience Inc. and also payment for unused annual leave of the U.S. seed consultant are also being negotiated.

A terminal evaluation of the project was not carried out due largely to the fact that a comprehensive evaluation had been conducted by Mississippi State University at a point in the project when most of the components or activities had been completed or nearly so. Further, given the modest level of project funding, the cost of another evaluation could not be justified in terms of possible benefits. This was particularly true given the lack of Mission funds available for this purpose.

E. LESSONS LEARNED

- 1. Due to a rigid departmentalized organization, there is insufficient cooperation between divisions of the Ministry and other state agencies. As a result, there was insufficient delegation of decision making and authority to lower subordinate levels.**
- 2. There has been considerable "down time" in equipment due to lack of essential spare parts and delays in importing them. The point is that whenever equipment is ordered, spare parts should be requested at the same time.**
- 3. The construction of four satellite sub-centers should have been spread over a longer period (3-5 years) with the higher priority centers receiving initial attention.**
- 4. A seed program will be much more effective if farmers are encouraged to participate in evaluating trials and research processes. Conducting trials in the farmers' field in a way to both test new technology and compile information. Farmers should also be contracted to grow certified seed.**
- 5. Farmers are generally suspicious of anything free or at low cost. Free or heavily subsidized seed will not lead to a good seed program because incentives are lacking to accumulate capital to invest in the seed program.**

Date Prepared: March 28, 1983