

PD-ABD-258

73775

C
6

Zimbabwe

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

EVALUATION OF LOCAL CURRENCY PROGRAMS

Drought Relief Crop Packs

JULY 1987

AGRISERVE (PVT.) LTD.
Box HG 357
Highlands
Harare
Tel. 706706
Telex 2596 ZW

AGRISERVE
(PVT.) LIMITED

INTRODUCTION

Zimbabwe suffered a severe drought in the years from 1982 to 1984. Food aid was distributed to avert widespread famine. By 1984, after successive crop failures it was realised that the communal farmers were unlikely to have the resources to grow another crop. Even in the event of good rains, lack of money for seed and fertilizer would result in non-production and prolong the need for direct food aid.

For these reasons the "Drought Relief Crop Pack Scheme" was devised. All the necessary inputs for 0,5 ha of crop were purchased, assembled into packs and distributed to centers as near as possible to the farmer. From here the farm collected the pack free of charge.

USAID granted \$3 900 000 to the project from the counterpart funds generated from the PL-480 "Food for Peace" programme. The other major donor to the project was the EEC.

MAJOR FINDINGS

Effects of the Drought Minimised

In general the project was exceptionally successful. Crop production from the communal areas rose dramatically after the distribution of the packs, and has continued to rise since. The need for food aid to these stricken areas rapidly diminished.

Administration Effective

The project was administered by the Department of Agricultural and Technical Services of the Ministry of Lands, Agriculture and Rural Resettlement. Administration was both efficient and effective.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Model for Future

The project was effective. It should serve as a model should the need for this type of aid arise again.

CONTENTS

Summary
Introduction
Methodology
Background
Project Implementation
Input Production and Supply
Transportation
Distribution
Expenditure
Effect of the Drought Relief Crop Packs
Quotes
Quotes from Farmers
Conclusions and Recommendations

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 Individual Interviews by Organisation and Location
Appendix 2 Farmer Interviews
Appendix 3 Discussions with Farmers
Appendix 4 Drought Relief Survey Questionnaires
Appendix 5 Interview with Recipients
Appendix 6 Acknowledgements

SUMMARY

Findings

Drought relief crop packs donated to the smallholders in the drought stricken areas of Zimbabwe in 1984 were received with joy and gratitude. The provision of aid in the form of resources for self-reliance greatly reduced the need for direct food aid. Despite the fact that the drought broke in 1984, if the smallholder had not had the resource to grow a crop, he and his family would have been dependent on food handouts. Grain production has been on the increase since that year. While many factors are responsible for the increase there is no doubt that the packs had a part to play. Some of the farmers having used the inputs (especially with improved seed and fertilizer) for the first time experienced the benefit and have used them ever since.

The project was, to a great extent, administered successfully. The suppliers of inputs, transporters, local authorities, Department of Agricultural, Technical and Extension Services (AGRITEX) officials and those farmers that received the packs expressed satisfaction with the outcome of the project. In some areas, however, the packs were received late, necessitating the recipients storing the inputs for the next season.

The selection of beneficiaries was a difficult and sensitive task. It was tackled differently at different locations. For examples, in the two districts surveyed, the packs were divided so that they could reach a large number in one, while in the other they were given to those farmers who it was believed could make best use of them.

Z\$3 900 000 was allocated to the project, Z\$3 300 000 was spent, leaving Z\$600 000 that reverted to the Treasury. As the total funds available from all sources was 37% of those required it was unfortunate that some were not actually used.

Recommendations

The supply of drought relief crop packs has a long term effect. This form of aid as opposed to direct food aid, we believe, should be encouraged where feasible.

It is important to the farmer that inputs reach him in time for the planting season. This concern was aired throughout the interviews. It is recommended that plans be drawn up far in advance of the implementation of the project. It is noted, however, that this project was in effect emergency aid and as such, time for planning was limited.

It is recommended that the criteria to be applied in identifying beneficiaries of such assistance be standardized and spelled out to all involved so as to avoid anomalies.

Accurate budgeting and careful planning is necessary for full and efficient use of project funds.

Generally this was a most successful project. The concept of providing the smallscale and communal farmer with the inputs for agricultural production rather than direct aid has long term benefits. We believe, however, that this sort of programme should not be confined to drought relief situations. Such a programme could be used for the relief of poverty in the poorer communal areas of the Country.

Page 2 - Drought Relief Crop Packs

At the present time in Zimbabwe there is a surplus of grain, and Government has introduced measures to curtail production of maize, sorghum and the various millets. This surplus is due in some degree to the success of the drought relief pack project. There is a shortage of oil seed in Zimbabwe and we believe that a scheme similar to the 1984 Drought Relief Crop Pack programme that would supply the balanced inputs for the cultivation of sunflower, groundnuts and perhaps cotton could alleviate the shortage of vegetable oil and enhance the viability of the communal farmers, who are the primary target for USAID in Zimbabwe.

INTRODUCTION

Zimbabwe suffered a severe drought in the years 1982, 1983 and 1984. Food aid was distributed to avert widespread famine. By 1984, after several successive crop failures it was realized that the smallscale and communal farmers were unlikely to have the resources to grow further crops. It was realised that, even in the event of good rains, failure of the farmers to produce through lack of resources, would prolong the need for direct food aid.

For this reason a scheme to procure the inputs for food crop production and to distribute these to smallscale farmers was devised. The basic idea of the "drought relief crop pack scheme" was that all the necessary inputs for the production of appropriate food crops on 0.5 ha of land should be bought, assembled into "packs" and transported to distribution centres as near as possible to the farmer, where the farmer would collect the "pack" at no charge.

The fundamental rationale behind the programme was that it was better to provide the means of production for food than to supply the food itself. The programme, however, ran the risk of disaster should the drought have continued and crops failed. In the event, the drought broke and full benefits of the programme were felt.

Funds for the "Drought Relief Crop Pack Programme" were obtained from several sources. In the case of USAID these funds were derived from the PL 480 Program. Specifically, the monies were obtained from the counterpart funds generated from the sale of 30 000 tonnes of maize donated to Zimbabwe under Grant Number 614-XXX-000X4604-1.

The drought relief crop pack programme was selected by the United States Agency for International Development and the Zimbabwean Ministry of Finance, Economic Planning and Development as one of the ten projects to be evaluated under the "Local Currency Project Evaluation".

METHODOLOGY

This report is based on 38 individually interviewed officials and farmers, (Appendix 1) plus a collection of documents obtained from AGRITEX offices, both central and regional. We interviewed 19 farmers using a standard interview guide developed prior to our proceeding to field work. An example appears in Appendix 2 and the results in Appendix 3. In these interviews we sought appropriate data and opinions on:

- Factors leading to the formulation of the project.
- Project aims and objectives.
- Project management.
- Input production and supply.
- Transportation.
- Input distribution.
- Project impact on the smallholder.

During discussions with AGRITEX officials at the provincial office at Masvingo we ascertained that their office had sent out a questionnaire in June 1985, also with the aim of evaluating the drought relief crop packs project. 277 completed copies were returned. (See Appendices 4 and 5.)

The drought preceding the donation of the crop packs affected almost the whole country. Packs were distributed to all areas except for the Victoria Falls area. In the limited time available, we chose the Masvingo Province as a representative area. We conducted our survey in Masvingo province and visited two of the districts, namely Gutu and Chivi where most of the aid was distributed. Our findings in Masvingo are only representative, but we believe that they give a fair reflection of what transpired.

The field trip, including travelling time from and back to Harare, took four days. During that time we covered 309 Kilometres inside Gutu and 225 in Chivi.

All interviews with officials were in English and all with farmers in Shona. Three of the 19 farmers we interviewed were invited to wait for us at the AGRITEX district office. We were escorted by an AGRITEX official to visit nine. As for the last seven, we travelled on a heavily populated road and stopped every 10 Kilometres or so to conduct an interview.

We were given enthusiastic assistance from officials, many of whom set aside pressing tasks to help us find data or to guide us in our enquiry. Although the farmers were busy tilling the land and planting, in not one incident were we turned away. On the contrary, all we met wished we had stayed longer. We are thankful for this generous help.

BACKGROUND

The 1983/84 season was the third successive drought year in Zimbabwe. Apart from some of the northern areas such as Centenary, Mvurwi, Guruve and Doma where reasonable rainfall occurred, most of the regions were affected in varying degrees, increasing in severity towards the south. In his letter to the Secretary of Agriculture at the end of January 1984, Mr N L Thomas, the AGRITEX Liaison Officer wrote, "Rainfall records show that out of the 84 recording stations only 6 are above normal for the season. 21 have deficits of between 0 and -100 mm, 44 of more than -100 mm deficit, 12 of more than -200 mm deficit and one more than -300 mm. Evapo-transpiration and temperatures have been higher than normal." It became evident at this time that 1984 was going to be yet another drought year. As such it was necessary to initiate drought relief plans.

The areas very badly affected were the Manicaland, Matabeleland North and South and Masvingo. These provinces are situated in regions III, IV and V and have a relatively low rainfall. On communal farms, besides growing crops for commercial purposes, they are also grown as a means of subsistence. Livestock provides draught power and at the same time represents the wealth of communal farmers.

The drought resulted in large numbers of cattle dying, and crop failures in most of these areas. In January 1984 Mr R Dodd of AGRITEX published a detailed analysis of crop losses as a result of the 1982/83 drought alone. The summary is as follows:

Table 1

Provinces	Z\$'000 Losses due to Yield Variation	Z\$'000 Losses due to Area Cultivated Variation	Total Z\$'000
Manicaland	14 420	18 131	32 551
Mashonaland	82 100	0	82 100
Matabeleland	28 807	0	28 807
Midlands	27 310	13 620	40 930
Masvingo	899	31 148	32 047
TOTAL	153 536	62 899	216 435

This left the communal population with virtually nothing to live on. The Country, as of the 1982 census, had a total population of 7,5 million, of which approximately 56% resided in the communal areas.

Page 6 - Drought Relief Crop Packs

It was necessary, therefore, under such circumstances, for the Government to come to the assistance of this part of the population. Food aid was distributed. While this was necessary to overcome immediate and pressing requirements, the policy decision was made to seek to rehabilitate the smallscale farmer and ensure that he would be in a viable situation to produce in 1984/85. It was felt that, in the longer term, this would be the best form of food security for the communal population. The drought relief crop packs project was, thus, formulated.

The original terms of the project were that crop packs be distributed to those farmers in the communal areas who suffered badly from last seasons' drought and who depended entirely on their land for livelihood.

Each pack was to be for 0,5 ha and would contain all the requirements of seed, fertiliser and - in the case of maize and sorghum - storage insecticide. Four different packs were to be given out, namely maize, sorghum, mhunga and rapoko. These were to be distributed in accordance with the requirements of the different natural regions. That, it was felt, would ensure a reasonable yield, given satisfactory rain and good management.

The Secretary for Agriculture instructed AGRITEX to take full control of the administration of the project.

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

AGRITEX head office in Harare sent out a letter to all the provincial offices inviting them to submit estimates of crop packs requirements for their areas. A total of 160 000 farmers eligible for assistance were identified and this at a cost of about Z\$21 000 000. Apart from the Federal Republic of Germany, which donated sugar beans packs, three donors came forward with an offer of assistance in the form of drought relief crop packs as follows:

Table 2

FUNDING AGENCIES FOR THE 1984 PROJECT

DROUGHT RELIEF CROP PACKS

United States Agency for International Development	Z\$3 900 000
European Economic Community	3 090 000
Australia	800 000

	Z\$7 790 000
	=====

As this represent 37% of the total requirement of the drought affected farmers, the packs were allocated to the provinces pro rata. The following is the total number of packs allocated by all the donors:

Table 3

	MAIZE	SORGHUM	MHUNGA	RAPOKO	TOTAL

USAID	23 827	23 803	13 236	6 618	67 484
EEC	18 877	18 858	11 561	4 168	53 464
Australia	4 000	6 000	4 000	-	14 000

	46 704	48 661	28 797	10 786	134 948
=====					

Page 8 - Drought Relief Crop Packs

Funds to support the USAID project were sourced from the PL 480 programme. Maize donated to the Government of Zimbabwe by USAID was sold, and the proceeds were used to finance this project, besides others. Ministry of Finance, Economic Planning and Development wrote to USAID on June 18, 1984. In their letter dated June 25, 1984, USAID concurred. Project implementation then started mid-October 1984 and was completed about two months later.

Of this the USAID funded crop packs were allocated as in Table 4 below:

Table 4

ALLOCATION OF PACKS

PROVINCE	%	MAIZE	SORGHUM	MHUNGA	RAPOKO	TOTAL
Midlands	18	5 285	4 349	1 513	920	12 067
Mashonaland East	10	1 732	3 241	1 283	827	7 083
Matabeleland North	10	2 426	1 973	1 178	1 357	6 934
Matabeleland South	18	4 333	4 111	3 572	-	12 016
Masvingo	26	5 285	6 256	3 572	2 640	17 753
Manicaland	18	4 766	3 873	2 118	874	11 631
TOTAL	100	23 827	23 803	13 236	6 618	67 484

The budgeted cost of each pack was as follows:

Table 5

DROUGHT RELIEF CROP PACKS 1984

Maize Pack for 0,5 ha

2 x 50 kg Comp. D	\$27,00
1 x 50 kg A/N	\$16,00
1 x 10 kg R201 Seed	\$ 8,50
1 x 1 kg Dipterex	\$ 2,00
1 x 2 kg Storage Insecticide	\$ 1,50

	\$55,00
	=====

Sorghum Pack of 0,5 ha

2 x 50 kg Comp D	\$27,00
1 x 50 kg A/N	\$16,00
1 x 10 kg non hybrid seed	\$ 4,00
1 x 2 kg storage insecticide	\$ 1,50

	\$48,50
	=====

Mhunga Pack for 0,5 ha

1 x 50 kg Comp D	\$14,00
1 x 50 kg A/N	\$16,00
1 x 5 kg Seed	\$ 3,00

	\$33,00
	=====

Rapoko Pack for 0,5 ha

1 x 50 kg Comp D	\$14,00
1 x 50 kg A/N	\$16,00
1 x 5 kg Seed	\$ 3,00

	\$33,00
	=====

The budgeted value of packs allocated appears below:

Table 6

ALLOCATION OF CROP PACKS - Z\$'000

PROVINCE	MAIZE	SORGHUM	MHUNGA	RAPOKO	TRANSPORT + TRAVEL	CONTIN- GENCIES	TOTAL	%
Midlands	291	211	50	30	116	30	728	19
Mash East	95	157	42	27	64	16	401	10
Mat North	133	96	39	45	62	16	391	10
Mat South	238	199	118	-	110	28	693	18
Masvingo	291	304	118	87	160	41	1001	26
Manicaland	262	188	70	29	109	28	686	17
TOTAL	1310	1155	437	218	621	159	3900	100

INPUT PRODUCTION AND SUPPLY

Nine organizations were approached for the production and supply of inputs. Fertilizer was purchased from ZFC Limited (60%) and Windmill (Private) Limited (40%). Maize and sorghum seed was purchased from Seed Co-op Company of Zimbabwe Limited. Although mhunga and rapoko seed was packed by Seed Co-op Company of Zimbabwe Limited and ZIMPAK, it was supplied by the Grain Marketing Board. Dipterex for stalk borer control was sourced from Spraying Equipment (Private) Limited and Bayer Zimbabwe (Private) Limited while grain storage insecticides were purchased from Shell Chemicals and Agricura (Private) Limited.

Suppliers interviewed experienced no difficulties with the project, and expressed their satisfaction at that. They were alerted of this additional requirement in good time. They, in turn, took the necessary measures, such as the hiring of additional labour, promptly. There were therefore, no reports of the suppliers' inability to fill orders due to lack of foreign exchange or otherwise. AGRITEX officials have been praised for the manner in which they handled the ordering of inputs from producers.

TRANSPORTATION

The approach in transporting the packs was to get them to the recipients by the least expensive means. They were, therefore, railed from Harare to the nearest railway siding. From there the Road Motor Service of the National Railways of Zimbabwe or District Development Fund (DDF) trucks moved the packs to the AGRITEX offices. They were then stored either in cooperative warehouses or in AGRITEX facilities.

Local AGRITEX officials then hired transporters and labourers to move the packs to the respective distribution points. Requisitions for the payment of transporters and labourers were prepared. These were sent to Harare via the provincial office for approval and payment.

Various problems were encountered in the transportation phase:

1. There were cases where goods spent a few days at a railway siding as no trucks were available to pick them up. Demurrage charges, albeit small, were incurred and precious time lost.
2. The time it took for a transporter or labourer to be paid could be as long as 60 days from the day services were rendered. This caused cash flow strain resulting in bitterness on the part of transporters, impatience on the part of labourers and AGRITEX officials spent a lot of valuable time attending to queries as to when payment would be made. In some cases the amount due to a labourer would be say only \$10, but he would travel frequently to the office to ask for payment. In order to avoid unpleasantness the then Regional Agricultural Extension Officer, Lowveld, in his report writes that he used his personal money to pay them.
3. Packs were loaded and offloaded three times before they reached their final destination, thus losing time and incurring unnecessary additional expenditure.

It was reported that in the projects that followed, for example that of the European Economic Community (EEC), Swift Transport in Harare was charged with the task of coordinating the transportation of the packs. Its own vehicles plus others sub-contracted, hauled the packs from Harare to the District centres. The transporters paid their own labour and AGRITEX officials were not involved. This, it is reported, went very well. "The distribution of the 10 000 tonnes was completed in 30 days." (Commerce, November 1985, page 2.)

DISTRIBUTION

The responsibility for the distribution of the packs varied from District to District. Different combinations of AGRITEX officials, District Councillors and members of Farmers Groups made up the distribution authority. The criteria applied in identifying recipients also varied with location.

In some areas packs were shared between two or three families to overcome the shortage. In Chivi South only members of recognized farmers groups could receive the packs as it is they, the officers said, who could make good use of them. They expressed fears that, given to a non-compliant farmer, he would sell them. While the officers' fears may be justified, we feel that this was a departure from one of the most important terms of the project.

A case of interest that we came across near Chihambabwe School in the Chikwanda Communal Area was where villagers used a single pack on a communal plot, then shared the proceeds.

EXPENDITURE

Of the Z\$3 900 000 that was allocated, Z\$600 000 remained unexpended at the completion of the project. We were informed that this amount has since reverted to the Treasury. It is sad to see that monies donated for emergency relief was not all put to use, especially in view of the fact that the need for packs far outstripped the supply. Table 7 tabulates the cause of the under-expenditure.

Table 7

PROJECT EXPENDITURE

DESCRIPTION	B U D G E T			A C T U A L			IVARIANCE
	QUANTITY	COST Z\$	VALUE	QUANTITY	COST Z\$	VALUE	VALUE
			Z\$'000			Z\$'000	Z\$'000
Seed: Maize (10kg)	23 827	8,50	202	23 827	8,50	202	-
Sorghum (10kg)	23 803	4,00	95	23 803	3,12	74	(21)
Mhunga (5kg)	13 236	3,00	40	13 236	1,90	25	(15)
Rapoko (5kg)	6 618	3,00	20	6 618	2,13	14	(6)
Fertilizer: Comp D (50kg)	115 114	13,59	1 564	115 114	13,26	1 527	(37)
A/N (50kg)	67 484	16,00	1 080	67 484	15,32	1 034	(46)
Dipterex (1kg)	23 827	2,00	48	23 827	1,26	30	(18)
Storage Insecticide (2kg)	47 630	1,50	71	47 630	1,26	60	(11)
Total Inputs			3 120			2 966	(154)
Transport and Travel			62			32	(29)
Sales Tax			-			5	5
Contingencies			159			-	(159)
TOTAL			3 900			3 300	(600)

\$154 000 was underspent on the purchase of inputs alone. Note that the full budgetted quantity was procured, this variance was due only to price. We feel that the budget would have been more accurate had it been based on contract prices agreed between AGRITEX and the suppliers. Alternatively examination of actual data against budget should have revealed that

more packs could have been distributed. 12 000 additional packs would have been available to the farmers had the full amount of the USAID funds been utilised.

While we appreciate the time constraints that AGRITEX officials worked under in this project, the variance between budgetted and actual expenditure is wide. Note that the performance against budget for the subsequent EEC programme (Table 8) was improved, however, nearly 3 000 additional farmers could have benefitted from the EEC Project.

Table 8

PROJECT EXPENDITURE - EEC FUNDS

DESCRIPTION	BUDGET	ACTUAL	VARIANCE Z\$'000
Materials	2 472	2 400	(32)
Transport and Labour	464	485	21
Sales Tax	-	21	21
Contingencies	154	-	(154)
	3 090	2 946	(144)

We were not able to establish the reason why "sales tax" appears in the financial accounts.

EFFECT OF THE DROUGHT RELIEF CROP PACKS

Table 9 shows a marked increase in communal area crop production in 1985; more than four-fold in the case of maize.

Table 9

CROP PRODUCTION IN COMMUNAL AREAS 1980 - 86

	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986
<u>Maize</u>							
Production ('000 Tonnes)	600	1000	595	285	353	1558	1200
Sown Area ('000 Hectares)	900	1000	1100	1050	1136	1018	1000
Yield (kg/hectare)	667	1000	541	271	311	1530	1200
<u>Sorghum</u>							
Production	66	100	50	44	37	76	59
Sown Area	120	200	200	280	156	211	140
Yield	550	500	250	157	237	360	421
<u>Mhunga (1)</u>							
Production	-	-	-	-	-	121	78
Sown Area	-	-	-	-	-	241	169
Yield	-	-	-	-	-	502	462
<u>Rapoko (2)</u>							
Production	-	-	-	-	-	72	48
Sown Area	-	-	-	-	-	93	107
Yield	-	-	-	-	-	774	449

(1) Source: Central Statistical Office. Statistical Year Book 1985 pp 139-140 (1980-83 figures) and Crop Forecasting Committee estimates (1984-86 figures).

(2) Mhunga and rapoko were not controlled crops until 1984/85.

While the good rains must account for much of the improvement, we believe that the crop packs also influenced production to a great extent. Farmers had all the necessary inputs in the correct balance.

The purpose of the crop packs was not to increase production but to provide food. Using the 1985 yields and the area covered by the packs we can quantify the amount of food that they provided. (Table 10)

Table 10

CROP PACKS INDUCED PRODUCTION 1985

	No of Packs	Area Planted (Ha)	Yield (tonnes/ Ha)	Production (tonnes)	Price	Value Z\$
Maize	23827	11914	1,530	18228	180	3281040
Sorghum	23803	11901	0,360	4284	180	771120
Mhunga	13236	6618	0,502	3322	250	830500
Rapoko	6618	3309	0,774	2561	300	768300
TOTAL	67484	33742		28395		5650960

As far as the provision of food is concerned the beneficial effect of the packs is unquestionable.

QUOTES

Following are quotations from people directly involved in the programme.

AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION OFFICERS

(extracts from letters from Provincial Agritex Officers)

Manicaland

"The problems experienced were the late start of the operation. The embargo at Mutare station imposed a bottleneck which delayed delivery even more. These problems aside, the rest was a success story."

"The choice of recipients was left to local councils and in most cases these were wise."

"The late arrival especially of the small grains was actually a blessing in disguise, as the season has favoured late planting. The finest stand for 10 years is to be seen in Regions IV and V."

"The benefit of the fertilizer can be observed in Regions II and III but is not obvious in the other two Regions."

"Cooperation is mentioned by both Councillors and recipients and all Regions report the gratitude with which the packs were received."

Masvingo

"All recipients were extremely happy with the programme ... but most felt that it would be best for all concerned if such programmes were initiated well in advance of the start of the rainy season."

"As a whole a majority of the crop packs received by farmers have been used to good effect with a few storing them for the next season."

"The method of payment for labour and transport was very, very poor."

"All in all the crops supplied were right for this Region as we relocated them to their better performing areas."

"That drought relief packs should be given to those that can use it to best advantage is diametrically divergent from political view."

"12 bags of fertilizer were left uncollected in Chiredzi and 30 in Mwenezi." (1)

"In Nyahombe most of the farmers received two packs of either sorghum, mhunga or rapoko yet in the communal lands there was not enough to go round."

Matabeleland South

"Some transporters were reluctant to accept the negotiated haulage rates resulting in delays to move the fertilizer."

"DDF also had other pressing transport commitments apart from ours."

"All in all the exercise went well."

Midlands

"In some wards councillors could not identify the drought affected farmers, hence they ended up sharing the packs in small quantities to all the ward families."

"In Zvishavane the Youth Brigades eventually came to the rescue of a very difficult labour situation."

"Most of the packs were well received and farmers are looking forward to a good harvest if the rainy season keeps up its present rate. The recipients are very grateful for what the Government did for them." (2)

- (1) Chiredzi soils are richer than normal. With their clay soils and low rainfall they did not require the type of fertilizer that was given to them. AGRITEX have themselves admitted this error.
- (2) Nowhere in our interviews did we come across a recipient that was aware of donor involvement in the free crop packs. They were referred to as "mbeu dzaMugabe" - "inputs from Prime Minister Mugabe".

QUOTES FROM FARMERS

What follows below is a selection of quotes from farmers gathered during discussions. They are reproduced in Shona as interviews were conducted in this language. An English translation follows and, where necessary, an explanation of the background to the quotation.

"Kusatenda uroyi. Pamunodzokera kuHarare muvati zvaKaonekwa hazvo." "He who is not grateful of such assistance is as evil as a witch. When you return to Harare tell them how thankful we are for their help."

"Mbeu dzapachena? Chii ichocho?" "What is drought relief crop packs?" This farmer, like many others, heard of the free packs for the first time during the interview. We asked further from what resources he planted that season. His answer was that his nephew who works in Masvingo gave him the seed. From their income, people employed in the towns do help, within their means, their relatives in the communal lands particularly during times of hardship.

"Zvembeu dzaMugabe izvi ndezvavakuru-vakuru chete nehama dzavo." "Why should the councillor and his brothers share the packs among themselves while we go empty-handed?"

"Tinofarira kurima isu nokuti ndiko kwatinoriritira mhuri dzedu nako. Asizve zvinotifadza kuziva kuti kana izvi zvakona Hurumende yedu haitikanganwi." "We find pleasure in tilling the land and can support our families that way. But what is even more pleasant is the knowledge that when the rains fail our Government will not forget us." Farmers expressed a feeling of security. They can, and enjoy fending for themselves but sometimes may not be able to do so for reasons outside their control. They appreciated the fact that if that happens somebody will come to their assistance.

"Dai mbeu idzi dzaisvika nenguva kwayo zvaitibatsira zvikuru." "Assistance will be even more appreciated if the packs arrive in good time."

"NdaKatotangawo kushandisa feteraizi pandaKapiwa yaMugabe, ndikaona zvichindi-yamura. Kare ndaingoisa mupfudze woga. Asi kubva nguva iyoyo ndinoshandisa feteraizi yandinopiwa nechikwereti." "I experienced for the first time the benefit of using fertilizers. Now I am buying them with AFC assistance and it is paying off tremendously."

"Hakuna mbeu dzakambopiwa venhu pachena kuno. Zvaive zvikwereti zvaizofanira kubhadharwa." "Crop packs have never been given free in this area. They were advanced as a repayable loan." This quotation was obtained from a farmer who belonged to no farming association. When he saw neighbours collecting the crop packs he was under the impression that they were loaned as is done by AFC. (3) In fact, it was reported to us that some farmers refused to accept the packs for fear that they may be unable to repay the 'loan' when it falls due.

"Zvenyu izvozvo zvokuti motipa mbeu pachena, asi mozotibatira pakutenga zvatakohwa, hazvifambi." "If you give us free crop packs, do not take them back in the form of a lower producer price." It is evident here that the purpose of the project had not been understood by some recipients. The objective was not to induce productivity for the economic benefit of the recipient, but to provide him with food.

"Tinofara tichikuonai pano, vana'ngu. Zvinotiratidza kuti muchagara muchitiyeka kana zvaipa." "It is nice to see you (4) here, sons. This is a sign that you will remember us again in future lean years."

"Regai kupa vose vose. Vamwe vanozvitengesa." "Do not hand them out indiscriminately; they will end up getting sold."

"Dai muchitanga mapa avo vakanyanya kupiswa nezuva, vamwe vozotevera." "Consideration should, in the first instance, be given to the needy and most heavily affected by the drought."

"Ndizvo zvakatoita kuti tirime zvakanyanya." "The packs motivated us to grow more crops."

"Vakuru vomusangano havafaniri kuve ndivo vanogova mbeu. Dai vairega vanamurimisi vachiita nokuti ndivo nyanzvi mune zvokurima." "Political leaders should not be involved in the distribution of crop packs. They should leave that to agricultural personnel who are knowledgeable in that field."

"Dai nzvimbo dzokugovera dzaiwanziwa. Vamwe vaitakura nomusoro kwechinhambo chirefu kwazvo." "Distribution points should be increased so that no-one is too far from them."

"Pakugovana apa pakaita rusarura." "There were cases of discrimination in the distribution of the packs."

"Ndakarima mbeu dzapachena pabindu radzo dzoga. Ndakakohwa ndikatengesa. Nemari yacho ndakatenga tsiru. Ndinotenda zvikuru." "I planted the pack on a separate plot. The proceeds bought me a cow. I am grateful."

"Seiko ini ndisina kupiwa asi vamwe vakapiwa?" "Why is it that I did not receive the packs yet others did?"

"Zvinofadza kuona Hurumende ichitipa mbeu, yotirimira, yozotitakurirazve zvinimwa zvedu." "It is pleasant to see the Government supply us with crop packs, plough for us and transport the produce." (5)

(3) The AFC (Agricultural Finance Corporation) is a parastatal body whose main task is to provide farmers, both commercial, smallscale and communal, with agricultural finance.

(4) We were seen as agents of the providers of drought relief crop packs.

(5) The District Development Fund (DDF), a wing of the Ministry of Local Government, Rural and Urban Development, was engaged in the ploughing and transportation of produce for the communal farmers as their livestock was too weak to provide adequate draught power. Together with the crop packs this was seen by many as one on-going project.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Throughout the study, in particular during interviews with AGRITEX officials and beneficiaries of the drought relief crop packs, appreciation and gratitude were expressed. The packs undoubtedly achieved their main objective, that of providing benefit to the drought affected smallholder. They have been seen as a clear manifestation of the Government's commitment to the "development of the peasant sub-sector in its post independence development effort". (3) Mention of any faults that may have been identified during the evaluation is done solely as an indication of factors that may be considered for the improvement on any similar future project.

It was noteworthy that in the province surveyed AGRITEX supervised and monitored the use of the crop packs. A questionnaire was sent out for completion by farmers who benefited from the project. (4) Results indicated that the packs were put to good use. Such follow-up is commendable. We were not able to establish whether or not similar follow-ups were carried out in the other four beneficiary provinces.

The inception of the project was late. This resulted in plans being drawn up in a hurry. We feel that this is one of the reasons why \$600 000 of the project allocation was not utilised. We recommend that the planning of such a project be carried out far in advance of its implementation for the timely delivery of inputs is crucial to the farmer.

We further recommend that during the planning stage firm quotations be obtained from the suppliers of inputs. The budget would, thus, be based on contract prices and not mere estimates. This way, the pitfall of high under-expenditure can be avoided.

Delays in the payment of transporters and labourers was mentioned elsewhere in the report. We suggest that, especially with regard to labour, a cash float be kept at the district office so that payments can be effected immediately services are rendered. The officer in charge of the station would then account for monies expended to his head office. Another way of getting round the problem is (as the EEC project did) to engage one contractor to take care of the whole transport operation, with the authority to subcontract if necessary. This however, is expensive; while in the USAID project transport costs were 11% of the cost of inputs, in the EEC project it was as high as 19%.

AGRITEX was charged with the full responsibility for the administration of the project. In practice, this was done to the distribution phase only. At this point other organizations, especially district councils, became involved to varying degrees from one district to another. For this reason in some areas the packs did not reach the farmer as packs but as subdivided components. The criteria applied in choosing beneficiaries appeared unclear to the distributors. In many cases they used their own judgement. We recommend that the manner of distribution be documented in detail. A committee composed of AGRITEX, farmers organisations and district council would be responsible. AGRITEX should chair such a committee as, we believe, they are best placed to identify recipients and to monitor their use of the drought relief crop packs.

(3) Republic of Zimbabwe, First Five Year National Development Plan, 1986-1990, Volume 1, April 1986, p. 28.

(4) See Appendices 4 and 5.

Appendix 1

INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEWS BY ORGANIZATION AND LOCATION

<u>Organization</u>	<u>Harare</u>	<u>Masvingo</u>	<u>Chivi DC</u>	<u>Gutu DC</u>	<u>Total</u>
Ministry of Finance, Economic Planning & Development	2	-	-	-	2
Agritex	2	2	3	3	10
Central Statistics Office	1	-	-	-	1
DDF	1	-	-	-	1
USAID	1	-	-	-	1
Zimba Agencies	1	-	-	-	1
ZFC	1	-	-	-	1
Swift Transport	1	-	-	-	1
Ward 32 Gutu	-	-	-	1	1
Farmers	-	-	10	9	19
TOTAL	10	2	13	13	38

=====

Appendix 2

DROUGHT RELIEF CROP PACKS 1984

FARMER INTERVIEWS

1. THE FARMER

1.1 Name:

1.2 Province: District:

Village:

1.3 Other occupation:

1.4 Number of dependants 1984: 1986:

2. PACKS RECEIVED

2.1 Main crop grown 1984:

2.2 Area under cultivation:

2.3 Crop packs received:

Type	Quantity
Maize
Sorghum
Mhunga
Rapoko
TOTAL	_____

2.4 Who transported the packs?

3.3 Reasons for increase/decrease:

- rains YES/NO
- availability of inputs YES/NO
- input costs YES/NO
- producer price YES/NO
- other
-

3.4 Livestock:

	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986
Cattle						
Goats						
Sheep						
Other						
TOTAL						

3.5 Reasons for increase/decrease:

- drought YES/NO
- good harvests YES/NO
- injection of funds from external sources YES/NO
- other
-

4. COMPARISON

4.1 Which of the two aid projects did you find good? USAID/EEC

4.2 How did you rate them?

	USAID		EEC	
	Good	Poor	Good	Poor
Conditions packs received				
Time received				
Proximity to collection point				
Other				

5. OTHER

5.1 What did you find good in the USAID project:

.....

5.2 In what way have the packs assisted you?

.....

5.3 What did you not like about the project?

.....

5.4 What are your recommendations for improvement in similar future projects?

.....

.....

.....

.....

NOTES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. The Farmer

The purpose of this section was to locate the farmer and to find out whether or not he was eligible for assistance by way of the crop packs, ie, that he solely depends on farming for his livelihood.

2. Packs Received

Here the aim is to determine whether the packs received were those of the main crop grown. In addition, we also tried to find out if any of the farmers received more than one pack. Questions on distribution sought information on the mode used in the different areas, the distance between the farmer's home and the pick-up point and whether the packs reached him in time for planting. The question on the transport company that was involved was a way of finding out which project it was as different transporters were hired for the different projects. Answers to the question were, however, not available for, by the time the recipients arrived at the distribution centre, the transporter had already left.

3. History

The purpose of this section was to investigate the impact of the crop packs on the recipient's farming habits, eg, the use of chemicals. While in a different study on communal farmers growing a cash crop (cotton) the farmers had a fresh memory of their farming history, in this one they could not remember. The difference came out clear. The cash crop farmer with his commercial outlook to agriculture remembered the history of his performance. Some even kept records.

Data was either not available from the farmer or if it was one got the impression that the farmer made a stern effort to remember, making the information unreliable.

4. Comparison

Although the different projects were administered in much the same way, some variations occurred, eg, with transport. We attempted to draw any useful lessons from the EEC project.

5. Other

Reactions to this section are summarised under the heading "Quotes from Farmers".

Appendix 3

DISCUSSIONS WITH FARMERS (for the questionnaire see Appendix 2)

In the introduction we discussed the limitations imposed on us by our small sample. Furthermore, it was confined to only one provincial area.

Other occupations

Of the 19 farmers interviewed, 6 had alternative sources of income. They included a teacher, 3 retail shop owners, a veterinary assistant and a private in the Zimbabwe National Army. All but two of them received the crop packs.

Crop packs received

Packs were received as follows:

Table 2

PACKS	FARMERS		
	GUTU	CHIVI	TOTAL
NIL	4	5	9
1	4	4	8
2	-	1	1
3	1	-	1
	9	10	19

Some of the packs reported above were incomplete. Where more than one was received we felt that more than one donor was involved.

Distribution

Most distribution points used were AGRITEX offices, schools, training centres or townships. In Gutu the distance from the centre to the farmer's home ranged from 3 to 8 Kilometres, with an average of 5,3, while in Chivi the range was 1 to 15 with an average of 9.

The following were responsible for distribution:

Table 3

	GUTU	CHIVI	TOTAL
Drought Relief Committee	1	2	3
Ward Councillor	2	1	3
AGRITEX Official	2	-	2
Farmers' Club Chairman	-	2	2
TOTAL	5	5	10

While Chivi favour farmers associations, Gutu preferred AGRITEX officials, but this only at the inception of the project. The councillors then took over.

The packs were received:

Table 4

	GUTU	CHIVI	TOTAL
In time	1	1	2
Late	4	4	8
TOTAL	5	5	10

Inputs and Production History

Data was scanty here. An interesting observation however, was a farmer from the Tadi area in the Chivi district. He had not used any fertilizer on his land, but manure, his whole farming life. The first opportunity was when he received it free, applied it and it paid off. He has been and is determined to continue using it ever since.

Comparison

There was no means of comparing the different drought relief crop packs projects for reasons mentioned before. But the 'first' assignments (funded by USAID) were preferred as they were the earliest. Transporters and labourers were, however, bitter due to delays in payment.

Other

See pages 19 and 20 for reactions to the questions.

Appendix 4

DROUGHT RELIEF SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRES

PERSON TO BE INTERVIEWED - Recipient of Pack

1. What crop packs did you receive?
Seed (type)
Compound D
Ammonium Nitrate
2. What did you do with the input?
Seed
Compound
Ammonium Nitrate
3. When did you plant the drought relief crops?
4. Why did you not use the seed?
5. How much did you harvest from this plot?
6. Did you have any crop which you planted from your own money?
7. What type of crop and area to each crop?
8. When did you plant your own crop?
9. What yields did you get from the non-drought relief crop? (crop and yield)
10. What problems did you face in the planting of the drought relief crop?
11. When would you prefer these packs to arrive in your area?
12. Did you plant S/beans in the last three years? If no, why?
13. Are you satisfied with the contents of the pack? Would you like to receive seed by itself etc?
14. Did you keep any of the packs for next season? If yes, why?
15. Do you think that the packs were distributed properly, ie, did the right people receive the packs?

25th June 1985

SA/njc

The first four pack types were donated by USAID and the EEC while the fifth was received from the Federal Republic of Germany. Australian crop packs were donated to the Matabeleland provinces only.

Of the total number of packs recorded, 75 (27,1%) were received incomplete, ie, made up of one or two components only. In some cases, even the one component was further subdivided. Gutu has the highest number of such cases, 38 incomplete packs out of 65 (58,5%).

Planting

Some of the inputs came in late. As such, some farmers had already used inputs procured from their own resources and no more land was available. As for others, although land was available, the season was simply too far advanced, so they stored the inputs for the next season (Table 7).

Table 7

	Planted	Stored for 1985	Total
Gutu	35	30	65
Chivi	57	6	63
Zaka	45	9	54
Chiredzi	31	6	37
Bikita	24	5	29
Nyahombe	27	2	29
TOTAL	219	58	277
Percentage	79	21	100

In some cases although the packs came in late the farmers still planted.

When Planted

Drought relief packs were planted as follows:

Table 8 (1)

	October	November	December	January	After January	Total
Gutu	1	-	21	3	10	35
Chivi	-	11	22	16	8	57
Zaka	-	33	10	1	1	45
Chiredzi	-	3	14	11	3	31
Bikita	1	15	8	-	-	24
Nyahombe	11	15	-	1	-	27
TOTAL	13	77	75	32	22	219
Percentage	6	35	34	15	10	100

A comparison of the time when the farmers planted crops they financed from their own resources is given below:

Table 9

	September	October	November	December	Total
Gutu	9	41	10	3	63
Chivi	2	27	24	6	59
Zaka	-	20	19	8	47
Chiredzi	-	16	21	-	37
Bikita	-	9	20	-	29
Nyahombe	1	10	13	5	29
TOTAL	12	123	107	22	264
Percentage	5	47	40	8	100

A summary of tables 8 and 9 appears below:

	September	October	November	December	January	After January	Total
Drought Relief Inputs	-	13	77	75	32	22	219
Non-drought Relief Inputs	12	123	107	22	-	-	264
TOTAL	12	136	184	97	32	22	483

Note that the crop planted in January in Table 8 was sugar beans.

The above tables show that although the normal planting season is October to November (Table 9) most of the drought relief crop packs were planted in November and December. This fortifies the farmers' assertion that the packs came in late.

The difference in number between the total answers in Table 9 and the total number of respondents is due to those few farmers who did not plant any crops utilizing their own resources.

Yields

Table 10 gives yields per crop per area resulting from the use of drought relief packs and table 11 gives the same information on non-drought relief crops.

Table 10

DROUGHT RELIEF CROP PACKS - AVERAGE YIELD (TONNES/HA)

	Maize	Sorghum	Mhunga	RapoKo
Gutu	3,8	-	-	1,1
Chivi	1,8	1,7	-	-
Zaka	2,5	-	-	-
Chiredzi	-	1,3	1,1	-
Bikita	4,1	-	-	-
Nyahombe	-	-	1,0	1,0
TOTAL	12,2	3,0	2,1	2,1
Average	3,1	1,5	1,1	1,1

Table 11

NON-DROUGHT RELIEF CROPS - AVERAGE YIELDS (TONNES/HA)

	Maize	Sorghum	Mhunga	Rapoko
Gutu	1,9	-	1,2	0,4
Chivi	3,0	2,2	0,4	1,9
Zaka	1,8	1,3	0,9	-
Chiredzi	3,0	0,8	1,5	1,1
Bikita	3,3	1,1	1,0	1,0
Nyahombe	3,2	-	1,0	0,8
TOTAL	16,2	9,2	6,0	5,2
Average	2,7	2,3	1,0	1,0

Figures on sugar beans, groundnuts and other crops have been omitted as comparative figures are not available. Sugar beans is not normally grown in the areas covered by the study and the other crops were not included in drought relief crops packs donated.

With the exception of sorghum, drought relief yields were higher than normal reflecting the difference caused by the use of balanced inputs.

Only 23 out of the 277 farmers did not plant their own crops in addition to the drought relief packs. This is a small figure and seems to suggest that the rest were self-sufficient. 196 of them, although they did plant from their own resources, could not fill the land available to them so that when the drought relief packs came a month later they still planted. There were only 58 who planted entirely from their own resources. This goes to show the extent of the desperate situation the farmers found themselves in.

Problems encountered

Table 12 outlines the problems that farmers encountered in the use of the packs:

Table 12

PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED BY FARMERS

	Gutu	Chivi	ZaKa	Chiredzi	Bikita	Nyahombe	Total
Late delivery of packs	23	25	15	6	5	13	87
Too much rain	12	-	17	4	2	5	11
Poor germination	-	-	-	2	-	9	11
Not enough land	5	4	-	-	1	-	10
Pests	-	-	-	1	3	-	4
Too little rain	-	9	-	-	-	-	9
No draught power	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
TOTAL	40	38	32	14	11	27	162

Note: Of the farmers who planted only 57 report no problems.

Distribution

The vast majority of the farmers (248 out of 277) replied that they were happy with the way that the packs were distributed and that they did reach the right people. 21 were dissatisfied and 8 partially satisfied.

Note that only recipients were canvassed.

We note from one of the answers that the recipient's understanding of the 'right people' is master and trainee farmers.

Appendix 6

This report is the result of a one month study carried out in November 1986 by Mr C M Gadzikwa under the supervision and guidance of Mr M J Boyd-Clark, both of Agriserve (Private) Limited. Mr P Chingombe of the Ministry of Finance, Economic Planning and Development worked closely with the team and assisted during field work.

Visits to Masvingo, Gutu and Chivi were conducted from 3rd to 6th November 1986.

We are indebted to the following organizations and people for information contained in the report:

Ministry of Finance,
Economic Planning and
Development:

Mr L Chitongo
Mr A Jecka

Department of
Agricultural,
Technical and
Extension Services
(AGRITEX):

Mr P Silk
Mr P Johnson
Mr M Froude
Mr S Alibaba
Mr L Vengesai
Mr J Ndlovu
Mr W Mukoroverwa
Mr L Makonyere
Mr E Hove
Mr E Gumbu

Central Statistical
Office:

Mr C Maxwebo

District Development
Fund (DDF):

Mr J Chataurwa

United States Agency
for International
Development:

Mr J Mushauri

Zimba Agencies:

Mr C Chitongo

Zimbabwe Fertilizer
Corporation (ZFC):

Mr T O'Brian

Swift Transport:

Mr J Rushton

Ward 32 Gutu:

Mr H Makore

Chivi District:

Mr D Chapungu
Mr V Chigava
Mr R Chimhangwa
Mr S Chitatu
Mrs M Chiveya
Mr M Manyeza
Mr N Mawarire
Mrs O Musindo
Mr M Njovo
Mr D Takawira

Gutu District:

Mr P Chese
Mr P Chifandabara
Mr P Chigerebwe
Mr V Govere
Mr J Jaravaza
Mr C Kufonya
Mr M Mafeta
Mr S Mugege
Mr S Mupepa

The following publications were reviewed:

AGRITEX drought relief files.

USAID files.

Republic of Zimbabwe, First Five-Year National Development Plan 1986-1990, Volume I, April 1986.

Statistical Yearbook 1986.

Crop Forecasting Committee records.