

PD-AA-Y-134

CLASSIFICATION  
PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

Report Symbol U-447

|  |  |   |   |                                     |
|--|--|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| 1. PROJECT TITLE<br><br>BAZEGA FISH FARM<br><br>(Accelerated Impact Project)   |  |   | 2. PROJECT NUMBER<br>698-0410.08                            | 3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE<br>USAID/UV |
| 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)<br><br>5. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION |  |   |   |                                     |
| 6. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES  |  |   | 7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION                             |                                     |
| A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent<br>FY <u>77</u>  | B. Final Obligation Expected<br>FY <u>80</u> | C. Final Input Delivery<br>FY <u>81</u> | From (month/yr.) <u>6/76</u><br>To (month/yr.) <u>12/82</u> |                                     |
| 8. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING   |  |   | Date of Evaluation Review                                   |                                     |
| A. Total \$ <u>350,000</u>   |  |   |   |                                     |
| B. U.S. \$ <u>313,682</u>  |  |   |   |                                     |

| B. 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., airgram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.) | B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION | C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED |
| 1. Making receipts from fish harvest proceeds available for fish farm operations, or otherwise budgeting for fish farm operations.   | MET                                       |                                |

|  |  |  |   |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| 9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS  |  |  | 10. ALTERNATIVE DECISION ON FUTURE OF PROJECT               |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper   | <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) | A. <input type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan  | <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T                                 |  | B. <input type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or    |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework   | <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C                                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) | <input type="checkbox"/> Change Implementation Plan         |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement   | <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P                                 |  | C. <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinue Project             |  |
| 11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER BANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)                       |  |  | 12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval                  |  |
| Project Officer: Mr. John Figueira, OHR-USAID  |  |  | Signature<br><i>Emerson J. Melaven</i>                      |  |
| Host Country Counterpart: Mr. Urbain Poda<br>Director of Fisheries and Fish Culture<br>Ministry of Environment and Tourism |  |  | Typed Name<br>Emerson J. Melaven, Director                  |  |
|  |  |  | Date<br>JAN 28 1985   |  |

## PES/BAZEGA EVALUATION

### 13. SUMMARY

#### A. Summary description of Project:

The project, an Accelerated Impact Program Project, was funded at \$314,000 in 1977. The purpose of the project was to create a fishing farming center at Bazega, a dam located between Ouagadougou and Po. the Project provided equipment, commodities, machinery rental fees and labor costs for the construction of 2.8 hectares of fish farming ponds and canals, access roads and buildings, and was to have promoted intensive commercial production and marketing of fish as well as the equipping and organization of local fishermen into a fishing cooperative using modern fishing techniques.

#### B. Summary findings:

The Bazega fish farm project, despite a delayed start and some problems during implementation, has accomplished its primary objectives. The Direction de la Pêche et de la Pisciculture of the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) has technically capable personnel who have expended considerable time and effort in successful project implementation. The physical facilities have been constructed and are operational, and two harvests from the farm have been made. Fishermen in the local pre-cooperative are utilizing the training and equipment provided under the project. It is not ascertainable at this point in time what impact the project will have on the development of fish farming in Upper Volta, which was one of the projects overall objectives.

### 14. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

This evaluation was started in August 1981 in view of the approaching PACD of September 30, 1981, and finalized in January 1983. Part of the purpose was to consider the need for an extension for wrapping up project activities. The evaluation examined the then current status of the project against project goals and objectives. Project documentation was reviewed, site visits made, and GOUV and USAID officers in charge of project implementation interviewed. The evaluation was conducted by the USAID Program Office.

At the time of this evaluation, the USAID decision not to further extend the project had been made, and the project terminated as planned on September 30, 1981.

### 15. EXTERNAL FACTORS

It was assumed that the GOUV would make personnel available on a timely basis for project implementation. The GOUV project manager did not become available until a year into the project. One other factor which had a slowing-down effect on project implementation was the application of new and more stringent control procedures of fund expenditures by the regime which assumed the reins of Government in November 1980. According to the GOUV Project Manager, this resulted in a delay

of the construction of the fence and other remaining construction activities. The real extent of this impact cannot be assessed.

16. INPUTS

Project implementation activities were delayed by nearly a year as both the COUV Project Manager and his assistant were receiving training outside Upper Volta. The Acting Project Manager lacked experience and was not qualified technically to resolve various construction problems. Compounding this problem, the Office National des Barrages et de l'Irrigation (ONBI), the only qualified organization in Upper Volta engaged in such construction start-up, but relatively slower than planned progress in pond and canal construction.

In June 1981, the Direction de la Peche et de la Pisciculture voiced its concern to USAID due to earlier construction delays, the first harvest of fish from the farm was not expected until December 1981. The Project had envisioned that harvest sales would have established a source of revenue enabling basic self-sufficiency in procurement of fish food. This had not happened, and an extension or some other means was sought to make sure that adequate funds were available for feed purchase.

All other Project commodities have been procured. However, fence construction still had not been completed as of December 1982. Just prior to the PACD, a large quantity of feed - more than six month supply - was purchased, some will undoubtedly spoil before it is used up.

17. OUTPUTS

Project files do not contain a logframe matrix as such, but rather, an enumeration of inputs, expected outputs, purpose and goal statements.

Quantifying indicators are lacking.

| <u>OUTPUTS</u>   | <u>STATUS</u>  |
|--|--|
| A. Employment of local people  | Construction activities gave employment to about 50; fish farm operation employs between 8-12 depending on the need.   |
| B. Fish ponds and buildings constructed and operating, including canals, gates and intake apparatus. | All planned ponds, canals and buildings have been completed. Unfinished at the PACD were the enclosure wall and fence, water storage tank and well.                |
| C. Large quantities of fish produced and marketed both locally and in Ouagadougou.                   | No fish has been harvested as of September 30, 1981, PACD. However, as of December 1982, two harvests had been made totalling 1,950 kgs and sold for 950,000 FCFA. |

.../...

OUTPUTS

STATUS

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| D. Fingerlings for other fish farms and pond stocking and either distributed or sold | To date, sale of fingerlings has not occurred.  |
| E. Local fishermen trained, equipped and organized into a fishing coop.              | A group of approximately 20 local fishermen were given training, equipped and organized into a Cooperative. |
| F. Fisheries agents trained and deployed.  | A total of five agents were trained.  |
| G. Local farmers embarked on small scale fish farming endeavors of their own.        | To date no fish farming per se has been undertaken, i.e. no private fish farm ponds.                        |

18. PURPOSE

The purposes of the Project, as stated in the Project paper, are to:

- 1) "test and implement a small scale fish farming operation;
- 2) create a local fingerling production facility which can supply future fish farms;
- 3) provide practical experience and exposure to fisheries agents;
- 4) generate funds for other fisheries activities; and
- 5) provide technical experience for the dissemination of fish and fish farming techniques."

It is the opinion of the evaluator that these "purposes" are better viewed more as a set of EOPS conditions than as purpose statements for the project. The purpose of the Project, as stated in the Activity Implementation Letter is "To test and implement a small-scale fish farm in order to lay the groundwork for the development of fish farming in Upper Volta". Progress towards achievement of all the above is evident.

The Bazega fish farm has been created and is being successfully operated. The physical plant is in place and two cycles of production from fingerlings through harvesting of fish occurred (as of December 1982). Breeding stock at the farm is producing fingerlings for the farm and to fill other requests, which to date, have been minimal. The two harvest to date totaled 750 kgs and 1,200 kgs respectively. These funds have been deposited in the National Treasury, and thus are not directly available for either Bazega fish farm operating expenditures or other fisheries activities.

## 19. GOAL/SUB-GOAL

The goals to which this project addresses itself are:

- 1) " improve the quality of life in Upper Volta by increasing the per capita consumption of animal proteins;
- 2) improve the quality of rural life in Upper Volta by developing a lucrative alternative income-producing secondary occupation;
- 3) improve the economy and environment of Upper Volta by providing a more rational and efficient utilization of existing natural resources; and
- 4) strengthen the Voltaic national economic security by limiting national dependence on fish importation".

It is difficult to measure any real movement, as a result of Project activities, towards the above goals. The Project has resulted in the starting up of a fish farm which has produced harvests of fish. The quantities to date, however, have been relatively small and would not have made a significant impact on improvement of the quality of life by increasing protein consumption or improving the quality of rural life through development of "lucrative alternative income". Likewise, the quantities harvested to date have not significantly affected our imports. It will take a much more concerted effort on the part of the MET to realize "measurable" movement towards goal achievement. The initial results offer hope, but it is still too early to state categorically that the project will contribute significantly to goal achievement.

## 20. BENEFICIARIES

There are three groups of beneficiaries. The first, direct beneficiaries are the five MET cadre who received training in pisciculture under the Project. They have gained skills in fish farming which, if utilized as envisioned, could result in expanded fishing and fish farming activity in Upper Volta.

The second group of beneficiaries is the group of 20 local farmers who were given training, equipped and formed into a fishing cooperative. They were provided modern fishing equipment as a means to increase their incomes and provide additional protein to their diets through fishing on Bazega dam lake.

Finally, there is the much larger general populace for whom an expanded, less expensive supply of fish will mean more ready access to an improved diet. Accurately quantifying this group is difficult, but fish harvested has gone to the Ouagadougou market as well as some sold locally around Bazega dam. In that the fish harvested to date has been small, the benefit to this group, has been negligible.

21. UNPLANNED EFFECTS

None noted.

22. LESSONS LEARNED

The Bazega Fish Farm Project, like virtually all AID projects in Upper Volta to date, experienced start-up delays and the usual implementation problems. And like most of the others, it, too, was extended beyond the original PACD.

One reason for this situation is undoubtedly less than adequate planning, given implementation realities in Upper Volta. AID has a tendency, in the evaluator's opinion, to bend over backwards in trying to put together projects/programs which may not be ready for the implementation phase. It could be characterized as an over-willingness to assume the GOUV will share the same enthusiasm as AID has. AID either over-estimates or quickly ignores the capability and/or capacity of the GOUV to meet AID expectations.

These comments are made not solely in reference to the Bazega Project, but to the USAID/UV total project implementation experience to date. One lesson that should be learned is, as a donor, AID should be more in tune with the management setting in which a proposed project will be implemented.

23. SPECIAL COMMENTS OR REMARKS

Attached, as Attachment A, is the Executive Summary, as per 82 STATE 08177.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Question 1: What constraints does this Project attempt to overcome and who does it constrain?

This Project addresses the under-utilization of fish production potential in Upper Volta. Project intent was to create a fishing and fish farming center at the Bazega dam which, with project-trained human resources, would encourage the development of local fishermen using modern fishing techniques. It helped alleviate the constraint of a lack of fisheries stations for the development of fishing and fish culture techniques.

Question 2: What technology does the Project promote to relieve this constraint?

This Project provided training to GOUV Direction de la Peche et de la Pisciculture cadre in modern fish farming techniques. They, in turn, are working with fishing cooperatives to encourage adoption of those techniques including use of improved fishing equipment for lake - and stream-fishing and creation of fish farming ponds.

Question 3: What technology does this Project attempt to replace?

During the life of the Project it attempted to enhance present fishing techniques rather than replace them. Trained extension agents are disseminating this information in working with the rural populace.

Question 4: Why do Project planners believe that intended beneficiaries will adopt the proposed technology?

Project planners assumed that fishing and fish farming would be viewed by the intended beneficiaries as a means to augment and diversify their source of income.

Question 5: What characteristics do intended beneficiaries exhibit that have relevance to their adopting the proposed technology?

Volians quite often engage in small commercial activities to provide themselves with a secondary source of income. If they are convinced that fish-pond construction and raising of fish will improve not only their food supply, but their incomes, it is likely a significant number will engage in fish growing activities.

Question 6: What adoption rate has this project or previous projects achieved in transferring the proposed technology?

A cooperative of 20 fishermen has been formed at the Bazega Dam. Exact numbers are not known, but estimated at 50-100. individuals occasionally visit the fish farm to inquire about procurement of fingerlings to stock small ponds and river pools during the rainy season. The cadre in charge of the fish farm noted a total of 10-12 such requests for fingerlings have been made.

Question 7: Will the Project set in motion forces that will induce further exploitation of the constraint and improvements to the technical package proposed to overcome it?

USAID has received a request for a follow-on fisheries project and is considering its merits.

Private enterprise interest in fisheries and fish production on a commercial scale remains nascent. The Peace Corps (two volunteers) is also addressing the issue of fish production with an inland fisheries project concentrating on fish pond construction.

Question 8: Do private input suppliers have an incentive to examine the constraint addressed by the Project and come up with solutions?

Fish is a relatively expensive food commodity, with a high percentage of the supply being imported - an estimated 1,200 metric tons annually. Additionally, the majority of professional fishermen in Upper Volta are non-Voltans who export a significant portion of their catch. The result is a good demand for fish.

This should provide private input suppliers with an incentive to actively exploit the situation and come up with solutions.

Question 9: What delivery system does the Project employ to transfer the new technology to intended beneficiaries?

Five fisheries extension agents were trained to work with fisheries stations and local fishermen's cooperatives as well as private individuals interested in fish farming. To date, demands on their service have not been great, though they continue to disseminate information to interested parties.

Question 10: What training techniques does the Project use to develop the delivery system?

Five male fisheries agents received AID-funded training in the Ivory Coast. All five were previously employed by the Ministry of Environment and Tourism, and the training provided to them added a new dimension to their extension expertise.

11

Post Script:

In a magazine article which appeared in the Carrefour Africain issue of December 2, 1983, the subject of Upper Volta Fisheries and Fish Production was featured together with an interview with Mr. Urbain Poda, Director of Fisheries and Fish Production of the Ministry of Environment and Tourism.

The article makes much of the fact that fishing as an economic activity is virtually neglected and unknown in Upper Volta and has been dubbed a "phantom" activity of the government. Perceived as equal in importance as agriculture and livestock and a rich source of protein for the masses, it has not received the serious attention it deserves. The article wonders why this particular activity is not grouped with livestock and agriculture under the Ministry of Rural Development, rather than in the Ministry of Environment and Tourism. It attributes the lack of public knowledge of fisheries in general and the lack of dynamic follow up to this "mis-assignment" of Ministerial responsibility.

Mr. Poda cites the greater exploitation of Upper Volta fishing resources by foreigners notably the Nigerians, the Ivorians and the Ghanians and the absence of more active participation by Voltans to lack of financial means to purchase equipment and other needed supplies.

On the Bazega Fish Farm, the article stressed some of the technical problems besetting the Farm. Generally it listed the following:

1. lack of a laboratory to study and categorize fish species;
2. lack of national government interest and appreciation for this type of activity; and
3. lack of means of transportation for the movement of fingerlings.

9