

-1

PD-AAX-680

ECPR  
Issues Paper

ECPR scheduled for Tuesday, September 16, @ 2:00 p.m., Room 6941

- A. COUNTRY : Sierra Leone
- B. PROJECT NAME & NUMBER: Cropping Systems Development (636-0170)
- C. LOP FUNDING : \$8.5 million
- D. AUTHORIZATION VENUE : AID/W

ISSUE #1:

Is this project the right choice at this juncture in Sierra Leone, i.e., should AID attempt to help the GOSL to develop an effective unified research-outreach core system or should AID first focus upon expansion of market forces? This is essentially a PID issue which was decided in 1984, but Agency/Bureau priorities have shifted since then, and the question may need to be re-examined.

Subsidiary Issue:

Should AID go forward with this project before ACRE (PACD June 1987) has been evaluated, and lessons learned have been assessed?

Discussion: The IMF is in the process of negotiating a structural adjustment loan (SAL) with the GOSL which will specifically address monetary and price policies. AID's assistance to GOSL is not significant enough to play a lead role in influencing policy change. There is a need to effectively link research and extension in Sierra Leone. The ACRE project did not effectively address this issue. However, it did show that farmers are amenable to research and extension if application is dealt with on a more systematized basis than ACRE afforded. Although ACRE has not been finally evaluated, it does not preclude the current project from establishing an institutionalized systems approach to research methodology, and the application thereof to an extension system which addresses small holder needs.

Recommendation: This project is the correct choice at this juncture. The ACRE project is scheduled to be evaluated in November 1986, at which time this project should be amended, if circumstances dictate. Although the PID guidance suggested that the Mission incorporate policy-linked conditionality, present circumstances dictate that the IMF take the lead. The Mission may wish to attach conditionality to the ProAg, if the IMF accords are perceived to be lacking in some major respects.

ISSUE #2:

Is there sufficient evidence that the GOSL is committed to and has the capacity to sustain this project, including managerial talents, and recurrent costs?

Discussion: Although the GOSL development budget has not yet been approved, it shows commitment to agriculture. Additionally, the GOSL established the National Ag. Research Coordination Committee (NARCC) in January 1986 which reports directly to the Minister of Agriculture and Natural Resources (MANR). The NARCC will maintain a position of independence with a broad range of talent to re-direct agriculture in Sierra Leone, and provide effective leadership and management for this project. The GOSL is in a very poor financial position and without committed donor assistance, will probably not be able to sustain the core of this project after PACD. The idea inherent in this project of a core of excellence embodied within the NARCC can only work if the economic situation shows at least marginal improvement. Other donor flows are critical so that the GOSL doesn't have to depend on only its own resources.

Recommendation: This project is clearly not self-sustainable in the short term, and it is unclear whether the GOSL will be able to sustain the project beyond PACD from inherent budget resources. The PC believes, however, that if successful, agricultural research will receive continued donor support.

ISSUE #3:

Will the Mission have the ability to adequately manage the project? Will an additional direct hire be required?

Discussion: The project calls for an ADO and a program economist. Staffing considerations may dictate fewer direct hires than requested.

Recommendation: The PC recommends the addition of a direct hire ADO to the Mission staff. The program economist slot, if needed, can be filled by a PSC.

ISSUE #4:

Given the time required for institution building and the substantial recurrent costs inherent in this project, is the commitment in time and financing required in the out-years consistent with AID's posture in Sierra Leone, and with future budget priorities?

Discussion: None.

Recommendation: The ECPR should resolve this.

Drafted: AFR/PD/CCWAP:CShorter:sb:2637K:9/15/86

-4-

September 12, 1986

MEMORANDUM TO: Norm Rifkin, AFR/PD/CCWAP  
FROM: Nancy Pielemeier, PPC/PDPR/SP  
SUBJECT: Sierra Leone Cropping Systems Development  
Project

We have a concern about this project document regarding the nutrition/consumption effects of the project. Although nutrition concerns are addressed in the Evaluation Section and the Social Soundness Analysis, they are not dealt with explicitly in the main document, especially in terms of inputs to the project which are likely to address these concerns. Where is the TA, training, etc., which will address the nutrition/household concerns discussed in the Social Soundness Analysis and Annex J.6 (p. 139)? Since these matters are recognized as essential in achieving the goals of the project, they should be explicitly dealt with in the document itself.

Wang4505X, PPC/PDPR/SP, 9/12/86.