PD-ABF-555
81552

PROJECT ASSISTANCE COMPLETION REPORT

Project Title:	Zio River Development
Project Number:	693-0226
Project Amount:	$3,500,000
First Obligation:	1984
Final Obligation:	1988
Country:	Togo
Final Report Evaluation:	June 1989

I. Introduction

The Zio River project began in July 1984 with a Cooperative Agreement between USAID and Partnership for Productivity (PfP). CARE took over as the implementing agency in 1987 after PfP was dissolved. The project completion date was July 31, 1989, with a final evaluation conducted in June 1989.

The project was designed to improve the productivity of 2,000 rural producers and agricultural-related entrepreneurs in the Zio River region. The project itself was divided into two components. The first was geared at developing a wide range of small scale businesses by providing credit, technical assistance and management training. The second component focused on developing a functional model for the productive exploitation of the Zio River irrigated perimeter.

II. Contributions of the Parties

The total project cost was estimated at $3.4 million. The project received in-kind assistance from the Government of Togo (GOT), and funding through USAID. PfP and subsequently CARE International managed the project.

GOT - The GOT in kind contribution was a part-time manager from the Ministry of Rural Development, land in the Zio region for demonstration sites, and periodic maintenance of the irrigation infrastructure within the Zio region.

USAID - The initial cooperative agreement between PfP and USAID called for total Life-of-Project (LOP) funding of $3.5 million. Total expenditures amounted to $3,366,906.

III. Accomplishment of Project Objectives

The project purpose was to enable the people in the Zio region to attain higher levels of economic, human and institutional development by increasing productivity through

better utilization and management of resources. Specific objectives included: a) to develop and strengthen local farmer-producer organizations; b) to improve production and marketing techniques; c) to strengthen local agricultural institutions; d) to institutionalize credit education; f) to create or reinforce rural support infrastructure; and g) to improve productivity of the Zio River irrigated perimeter by collaborating with the Regional Office of Rural Development (DRDR).

According to the final evaluation, most of the stated objectives were achieved. Farmer-producer organizations were developed and strengthened through technical, credit and training support via the project extension service. Production techniques were improved through the introduction and application of specific agricultural technical packages. The rural support infrastructure was strengthened through training local extension agents and by creating and training farmer groups.

The objective to strengthen local agricultural institutions capacity to provide agricultural extension service was not met however, largely due to GOT policies. Instead the project created its own multi-purpose extension operation providing services directly to farmers and rural entrepreneurs. Also, collaboration with DRDR aimed at group promotion in the Zio River perimeter was never fully developed due to pronounced differences between the project's and DRDR's approach.

The project surpassed four out of five planned outputs. The project significantly exceeded the first target of providing credit and technical assistance to 2000 individuals. The Zio project assisted 887 individual clients and 1854 non-clients who attended on-farm demonstrations. Approximately 100 non-clients participated in rural enterprise development training sessions. Management and technical training was conducted with 793 farmers surpassing the second target of 500 farmers.

The project also exceeded the target of "20 producer groups with increased group management skills whose member incomes have been raised because of the organization." Forty-six groups, including a marketing association of rice farmers, were assisted by the end of the project. Training and management assistance far surpassed the target level of 75 clients a year. Approximately 930 agricultural clients, 50 rural enterprise clients, and some 300 non-clients in both sectors received training. The final, and unachieved target was a loans recovery rate of 90 percent.

IV. Recommendations for further monitoring, reporting and evaluation

Monitoring, reporting and evaluation will continue under the new Togo Rural Institutions and Private Sector project (TRIPS, 693-0027), being implemented by CARE.

The Zio River Project final evaluation recommendations were to be carried out by TRIPS/CARE project. Among those mentioned:

- design systems for data collection in order to measure project impact on the individual, rather than producer group level.
- phase-out agricultural supply operation;
- privatize project-supplied repair and maintenance services;
- continue to train and support rural enterprise groups;
- closely examine the benefits of the technical packages.

The status of these recommendations and the others found in the final evaluation have continued to be monitored by AID after the PACD.

V. Lessons Learned

- The project design was overly ambitious. The Project was to work in three different sectors (rain-fed and irrigated agriculture, and rural enterprises), introduce new technologies, provide skills training, and change attitudes and behaviors of rural farmers and entrepreneurs - all within the five-year life of the project. A more focused, less ambitious design may have been more effective at limiting project interventions and achieving measurable results in the targeted sectors.

- The type of "cradle to grave" activities performed by the PVO's in this project ultimately served to discourage the GOT from providing assistance to the region.

- Language used in project design documents to define project objectives and purposes should remain consistent so that the end goals of the project are clear to the implementing agency.

VI. Financial Close-out

Project Authorized Amount	$3,500,000
Total De-obligation as of 9/30/92	133,094
Final Obligation	$3,366,906

Sarah C. Clark
A.I.D. Representative

11 Jan 93
Date

Clearance:

Dennis Panther, RDO _____ Date 5 Jan 93

John Grant, PROG _____ Date 5 Jan 93

4'

ADDENDUM

Up-date report

Zio River Development

Date: December 21, 1992
By: Dennis Panther, RDO

The MAPS and Agribusiness assessments noted that the agriculture sector is totally bogged down due to highly unfavorable policies and conditions i.e., government (mismanaged) input and marketing monopolies and poor communication and transportation links. FUCEC experience for the past four years shows almost no lending in this sector as it is considered too risky.

Another government policy almost insures these types of projects never attain sustainability. The GOT no longer provides extension/encadrement services in an area that is "taken over" by a donor or PVO, thereby committing them to remain in perpetuity if the project is to survive.

For agriculture to graduate beyond the subsistence level in food crops and break-even level in cash crops, major policy reforms must be achieved. The government must either provide affordable services from the profits it derives from the monopolies or end all interventions and encourage the private sector to take over these functions. In order for the latter to happen major fiscal reforms must be initiated, also.