PD BBC 671
Official File Copy

MANAGEMENT EVALUATION

for the

RWANDA NATIONAL FISH CULTURE PROJECT

(AID Project 696-0112)

April 1986

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
1.	SUMMARY	1
2.	INTRODUCTION	2
3.	FINDINGS	4
	3.1. Management of Fish Culture Stations	4
	3.2. Extension Service	5
	3.3. Training	7
	3.4. Project Administration	9
	3.5. Project Relations with AID and MINAGRI . . .	13
4.	RECOMMENDATIONS	15
	4.1. Improved Management	15
	4.2. Future Approaches	16

ANNEXES

A. Principal Recommendations from 1984 Evaluation

B. Persons Contacted

1. SUMMARY

The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the management of the Rwanda National Fish Culture Project (AID Project No. 696-0112). It examines progress made by the project in response to the management-related recommendations made by the last evaluation, completed in December 1984.

The project (PPN) has made some progress since the last evaluation. Stations are better managed, good training of monitors (fish culture extension agents) has taken place, and many fish farmers have adopted improved techniques introduced by PPN.

However, achievements in the field continue to be far below the project's potential, and it is extremely doubtful that even the current level of progress can be sustained after AID support for the project stops. The reason for this is that since the last evaluation, management of the project has improved to only a limited extent. Financial management of local costs has slightly improved, and relations are more cordial and a bit more collaborative between the PPN Director and technical advisors (provided under contract from Auburn University). Nonetheless, basic problems persist in the project's overall supervision. In some respects, project supervision has worsened since the last evaluation.

One especially serious problem concerns supervision of the extension service, particularly at the agronomist (agronome) level. Owing to a convoluted chain of command that has developed between the Director, the heads of the extension service and the agronomes, dissension has been created and the agronomes have performed poorly.

Other major problems include inadequate planning, lack of introduction of just-trained monitors to local authorities, and the passing of many project management responsibilities from the Director to the chief of the technical assistance team.

Relations between the PPN Director and AID are now nearly nonexistent, and they are not always adhered to between the Director and the Direction General of Livestock (Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Forestry). Otherwise, Direction General and AID support for the project has been satisfactory.

This evaluation offers several recommendations to improve project management. However, it is not at all certain that these recommendations will accomplish anything without a radical change in the PPN Administration, which is headed by the Director. Unless effective management for the project is introduced soon, PPN will not obtain sustainable results. It would be difficult under existing management conditions to consider a second phase for the project.

2. INTRODUCTION

2.1. Project Title/Number — National Fish Culture Project
AID Project No. 696-0112

Country — Rwanda

2.2. Project Description

In order to help Rwanda meet its growing food needs, the Government of Rwanda (GOR) and Agency for International Development (AID) entered into an Agreement on 26 September 1981 to undertake the National Fish Culture Project. As stated in the Project Agreement, the purpose of the project is to develop a fish culture extension service which will provide the assistance and technical advice to Rwandan families to revitalize production and effectively manage at least 80% of the estimated 3,000 existing fish ponds.

According to the recently revised Amplified Project Description, which was just formally approved by the GOR, the purpose is slightly changed: to develop the capacity of Rwandan farm families to build and maintain profitable on-farm ponds through improvement of fish culture extension.

Under the terms of the Agreement AID provides US$ 2,450,000 for the project and the GOR provides the U.S. equivalent in Rwandan francs of $589,000, for a total project cost of $3,039,000.

2.3. Purpose of this Evaluation

The purpose of this evaluation is to follow-up on the mid-term evaluation completed in December 1984, focusing on that evaluation's management-related recommendations. This evaluation considers:

(1) what corrective actions have been taken by the GOR, the Technical Advisors to the project (Auburn University) and the Office of the AID Representative in Rwanda (OAR/Rwanda) to improve project management; and

(2) what further steps should be taken to improve project management.

The December 1984 Evaluation made over forty recommendations to improve the project. The twelve most important ones are attached as Annex A.

2.4. Team Composition and Membership

It was agreed by OAR/Rwanda and the GOR implementing agency, the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Forestry (MINAGRI) that the evaluation team should be composed (as was the previous evaluation) of members from both organizations. It was also agreed that the team leader should be the MINAGRI Chief of the Fisheries and Fish Culture Division. Team membership:

(1) Leader: Mr. Jean Bosco Kabagambe, Aquaculturist and Chief of the Division of Fisheries and Fish Culture.

(2) Mr. Prosper Cyiza, Chief of the Rural Development Division, Ministry of Plan

(3) Mr. Andrew Sisson, Project Development Officer, OAR/Rwanda

(4) Mr. Charles Shorter, Project Development Officer, AID/Washington.

The team wishes to particularly thank Dr. Alphonse Karangwa, the PPN Project Director, Ms. Rose-Marie Depp, Program Officer OAR/Rwanda, Ms. Karen Veverica, Training Officer and Chief of the Technical Assistance team and Mr. John Moehl, extension advisor, for their valuable support and contributions.

2.5. Evaluation Methodology

In its initial meetings the team established a work plan for the evaluation which included review of project files and discussions with persons knowledgeable about the project. These people were visited in the following two weeks and included all levels of project personnel, officials knowledgeable about the project in the GOR and OAR/Rwanda, and fish farmers. A list of persons contacted is attached as Annex B.

3. FINDINGS

3.1. Management of Fish Culture Stations

In the 8 zones covered by the National Fish Culture Project, the project works with the 7 following fish stations:

- Runyinya	South Butare
- Nkungu	Gikongoro and East-West Butare
- Rugeramigozi	Gitarama
- Rushashi	Kigali
- Bwafu	South Gisenyi
- Ndorwa (Karago)	North Gisenyi
- Kigembe	Butare

The management plan of the stations was established as follows:

Kigembe: Production of fingerlings of varied species and of fish for consumption. Hatching ponds for trainees' practical works.

Nkungu: Pilot center for commercial fish culture.

Runyinya:
Rushashi:
Bwafu :
Production of Tilapia nilotica fingerlings.

Rugeramigozi: Production trials for Tilapia nilotica, Tilapia macrochir and Tilapia rendalli.

Ndorwa: High altitude trials for Tilapia nilotica.

Production trials are in progress and are carried out in parallel with fingerling production for stocking. Compared to the management level of these stations during the 1984 Evaluation, considerable progress has been made, particularly as regards pond management and fingerling production.

The 1984 Evaluation team had noted the bad condition of the ponds; the dikes had steep slopes; they also had leaks; in short, the classical characteristics of fish ponds were missing whereas these stations were to serve as demonstration centers for fish culture management and fish production. At this time, half of the zonal stations have renovated almost all their ponds.

As far as fingerling production is concerned, more than 180,000 fingerlings were produced in 1985. Fingerling production techniques have been improved; the small quantity of fingerlings produced last year is due to the fact that most ponds were not operational since they were being renovated. With the fingerling production techniques that are presently being used, the project could meet the demand without any problem.

Construction activities for the office-warehouse-storage tank complex at the different stations are at last under way. Construction has been completed at Runyinya (Butare) and Nkungu (Gikongoro); it is in progress at Rugeramigozi (Gitarama) but has not started elsewhere.

Fish culture stations have not yet reached self-financing and cost-effectiveness, but efforts have been made to that end. In February 1986, the project began to sell fingerlings at the rate of FRW 3 per unit for fish farmers and of FRW 5 for projects having some external funding. The cost price calculated for the production of one Tilapia nilotica fingerling is FRW 5, but it will soon decrease as fingerling production by surface area rises.

The lack of economic data on fish production through fish culture in Rwanda hinders the calculation of the break-even point for these stations in particular and for Rwandan fish culture in general.

This lack of data is also felt with the interest in privatizing fish culture activities. At this time, one cannot guarantee that fish culture will be cost-effective although a potential exists. The team thinks that the procedure to follow to reach privatization of fish culture activities should first be considered.

3.2. Extension Service

3.2.1. Agronomists

Six A2 agronomists are working in the National Fish Culture Project. Among them, five have received appropriate training for 9 months at the Centre de Formation Piscicole in Bouaké, Ivory Coast. The other one will be trained later. These agronomists manage the zonal fish stations and are in charge of supervising monitors and all other fish activities in their zone of assignment.

At the technical level, considerable progress was made in the different stations, especially in 1985. It is unfortunate that there has been a misunderstanding between agronomists and chiefs of extension concerning report submission. Extension chiefs complain about the fact that the reports that must be completed by the agronomists every month are not submitted on time and that they contain many errors.

Agronomists agree that delay and errors do occur, but this is because the extension service does not keep to a single report form but often changes these forms, which causes comprehension and interpretation difficulties and hence errors might occur.

A control system has been devised. Project Administration agreed that agronomists will receive monthly indemnities only after the extension service has approved the reports. Despite these measures, some reports for December 1985 have still not been submitted to the project

7

extension service. This situation has worsened to the point where the project hired a third person to collect the missing data. A FRW 150,000 contract was entered into between that person and the project. This represents a weak spot in the project management.

While carrying out their tasks, the project agronomists informed the evaluation team about the problem of travel indemnities being insufficient. Presently, each agronomist receives FRW 10,000 per month, about FRW 5,500 of which is held as reimbursement charges for a motorcycle that the project gives on credit to each agronomist. Therefore, each agronomist is left with FRW 4,500. They say that this is not enough to cover maintenance costs and fuel.

The evaluation team believes that this amount of FRW 10,000 is enough to cover maintenance and fuel costs. It reminds the agronomists that indemnities are not meant for the repayment of credit related to the motorcycles, but rather for covering the above-mentioned costs. On the other hand, when one examines the schedule of visits by agronomists to monitors, the average is as follows: average visits per month = 5 (whereas at least 2 visits/monitor/month are necessary); average km/month = 572. With this average of 572 km/month, at the present official rate, indemnities should amount to:
572 x 10 = FRW 5,720/agronomist/month.

Another problem encountered by agronomists is the requirement of reports for those who are responsible for zones that cover 2 prefectures. The report form that is presently used is such that one cannot know the separate data for each prefecture. The prefectural veterinarians who need this data will not be able to get them unless they ask the agronomists to present them in separate reports. In this case, it was noticed that it requires too much time for agronomists to prepare them.

Project Administration has planned in its data collection program to make a systematic census of fish ponds by sector and by commune, twice a year. The data collected in this census would be sufficient to meet the prefectural veterinarians' demand. Unfortunately, such a census has not been done to date.

3.2.2. Monitors

Thirty trained fish culture monitors are working in the project. Thirteen are being trained. The project Technical Assistance team leader thinks that 60 to 75 monitors would be enough for areas where fish culture is feasible. According to the training program, the project will have trained 62 monitors by 1987, when AID terminates its financing of the project.

Fish monitors already in place are working well, they are motivated and satisfied with their work. The problems they meet are inherent to their extension role. Fish farmers do not always understand the techniques that are taught to them. One other problem, that some monitors face, concerns relations with local authorities and is discussed below.

Monitors in mountain areas have pointed out to the evaluation team that the 2 year period planned for the amortization of bicycles is relatively long. They think that in these areas, the amortization time for bicycles should not exceed one year.

3.3. Training

One of the most important elements of the project is training. Initially, the project was to train 7 supervisors or agronomists and 50 fish monitors who would be in charge of fish culture extension. Due to start-up difficulties and to the delay that occurred during implementation, especially for the construction component of the project, the project, which aimed essentially at fish extension, did not show any progress. It is actually only after a few years that the project obtained its first results in the training area.

Number of monitors trained by the PPN:

Before 1984 - 13
1984 - 0
1985 - 17
1986 - 13 being trained.

According to the information received from monitors having received this training, the training was fruitful and they are satisfied with the way it was given. Major problems at the technical and extension levels have been largely addressed. It must be remembered that fish culture training is intended for monitors (real links between the project and the farmers), agronomists, personnel from various institutions (CERAIs, SCOUTS, etc.) and fish farmers.

3.3.1. Training for Monitors

This training was given after a selective review of local conditions, which facilitates the training. As pointed out above, trainees were satisfied with the training they received. However, after their training, some monitors met some difficulties with local authorities.

In fact, as fish culture is a new endeavor, burgmeisters tend to believe that these agents are almost under-employed, and they provide them with additional tasks outside fish culture. This is especially the case for monitors trained in 1985, when the bourgmeisters were not invited to attend the December 1985 monitor "graduation" (unlike the previous year when they did attend), and hence were less informed about the project.

It should also be pointed out that after their training, a few monitors are financially supported by the project until their contracts are officially signed.

Concerning the construction of training houses, one part has been completed but some houses remain to be rehabilitated to receive more participants. According to monitors interviewed, the dormitory should be extended so that trainees are more comfortable (they are all sleeping in the same hall). The project acquired a minibus to ease the transport of trainees.

It should also be noted that the delayed payment to monitors of their indemnities during and after the training gives them a poor impression of the project.

Overall, the present training program is progressing satisfactorily, except for the previously mentioned difficulties as well as other administrative problems such as equipment purchase for trainees and delay in the transmission of monitor contracts. All these problems are such that there is lack of understanding between the Project Director and the trainers (Head of Training and her counterpart).

3.3.2. Training for Agronomists

A2 project agronomists receive fish culture training in Bouaké (Ivory Coast). On average, the project sends 2 agronomists for training each year. For the current year, a refresher course is planned in September at Kigembe. Five agronomists have been trained . The sixth should be departing in 1986.

At the time of this report, training is under way at the International Aquaculture Center in Auburn for Rwandan counterparts (extension and training). Regarding women's participation in fish culture, the training counterpart should be cited as an example.

3.3.3. Women's Participation

It should also be noted that in 1986, 15 nutritional center female monitors owning ponds will take training for approximately 2 weeks at Kigembe. However, Rwandan women are more concerned with household tasks than with other tasks. This is why tasks that demand more strength (pond construction, etc.) are often reserved for men and that women deal only with part of the pond management. This explains why the number of women who individually own their ponds is not impressive.

3.3.4. Training for Personnel from Other Institutions and for Fish Farmers

This training is given to the extent possible at Kigembe, where infrastructure is more or less satisfactory for the moment. Regarding rural fish farmers, no training has yet been carried out for them. In the 1986 work plan, 3 sessions of one week each are planned, or a total of 30 fish farmers to train.

3.4. Project Administration

3.4.1. Overview

PPN's Administration is headed by the Project Director and includes the project's two technical advisors and their two counterparts.

Supervision by the Administration has improved to a limited extent since the 1984 Evaluation; financial management of local costs has slightly improved and activities in the field are progressing. Moreover, relations are more cordial and a bit more collaborative between the Director and technical advisors. Nonetheless, basic problems in the project's overall supervision persist. In some respects, supervision has worsened since the last evaluation. If drastic action is not taken to remedy these problems, achievements in the field will continue to be far below the project's potential and it will be impossible for PPN to become a viable, sustainable project after AID funding and technical assistance stops.

3.4.2. Collaboration

The 1984 Evaluation called for improved cooperation between the Project Director and technical assistance team leader. Superficially there has been an improvement. Unlike previous years, when the Director called for replacement of the Auburn University technical advisors (TA), he now claims that he is satisfied with both. Moreover, unlike previous years, when the Director alone prepared important project documents, now the TA participates. Unfortunately, the technical assistance complains that document preparation has gone to the other extreme -- the TA, especially the team leader, prepares most of the important documentation (e.g. work plans, budgets), and the Director just signs off on them with little or no input of his own. The TA team leader has in fact taken over much of the day to day management for the project. This includes not only paperwork but interactions with AID on project finances and other implementation matters. The Director has virtually ceased all interactions with AID. His only significant meetings with AID personnel in 1985 were at the semiannual meetings of the Project's Comite de Gestion (Management Committee). The TA team leader does not think she should have to take over this role but feels she has been forced to due to a lack of action on the Director's part. Not only does this leave her less time for her own responsibilities, but one wonders who will fill the vacuum when she leaves.

Collaboration between the technical advisors and their respective counterparts is excellent. On-the-job training with real sharing of responsibilities is taking place, and everyone in the Project Administration is confident that the counterparts will soon have the technical and managerial competence to assume the extension and training functions of the TA.

Collaboration between the two counterparts and the project Director has soured and is now practically nonexistent. For a variety of reasons, some big (e.g. concerning agronome supervision, overseas training of the counterparts), others small and even petty (e.g. the Director at times delegating control over vehicles to his typist), distrust has developed between these parties. The counterparts' effectiveness for the project derives only from their links to the TA. They are frustrated because their future involvement in the project after the TA leaves is dubious. This is a major reason for the evaluation team's concern about the project's sustainability after AID funding stops.

3.4.3. Planning

The 1984 Evaluation called for greater effort in preparation of project annual work plans, and in preparation of position descriptions and work plans for all project personnel. Clearly the Administration has made some progress on this front. Overall, the 1985 and 1986 Work Plans were good documents. They gave good summaries of the previous year's progress and described project personnel, training and budget needs well. A drawback is that they did not quantify targets for future testing and trials at the stations or for numbers of ponds and fish production in the countryside. Of greater concern is that these documents were prepared primarily by the TA, with assistance from their counterparts, but with only minimal inputs or leadership from the Director. There was no participation by the project agronomes or other personnel. This raises doubts about these documents actually being useful for implementation.

Position descriptions were prepared for all project personnel, although the one for the Director remains vague. (As stated in the 1985 Plan, it is simply "coordination de toutes les activités du projet.") However, the agronomes and monitors did not participate in the preparation of their job descriptions.

The major failing has been in preparation of work plans for project personnel. They were not done for project agronomes and monitors in 1985, and they were done only for monitors in 1986. This is symptomatic of, if not a cause for their lack of supervision (discussed below). The Director believes that the agronomes' 1986 work plans should be prepared within the context of the 1986 Project Work Plan, so they cannot be started until it is approved. The fact remains though that no personnel plans were done for 1985, and it is already well into 1986. Moreover, in their monthly reports agronomes are supposed to describe their next month's plan of action, but these too have not been done or only superficially.

3.4.4. Supervision of Extension Service

The greatest problem in project management lies in the supervision of the extension service, and it appears that this has worsened since the

1984 Evaluation. The extension service (stations, agronomes, monitors) is supposed to be under the supervision of a technical advisor and his counterpart. In the last year, however, the agronomes (who assist with management of the stations, supervise the monitors, and are responsible for statistical reporting in their regions; thus a critical link in the chain of command), have increasingly come to report directly to the Project Director. There are many indications of this. For example, the Director does not permit the extension supervisors to issue written directives to agronomes. Only he can. A few agronomes now participate in the weekly meetings of the Administration, which makes it difficult for the extension service supervisors to be frank with the Director in discussing problems which concern the agronomes. When a technical advisor and her counterpart asked a station foreman to correct a problem, he responded that only the Director can correct him.

The results of this convoluted chain of command have been disastrous. Overall, great dissension has been created in the ranks, especially with disruption of the agronome-extension counterpart link. Agronome performance in the field has been poor and their reporting shoddy. And the ostensible supervisors of the agronomes have been powerless to deal with the problem. To the Administration's credit, a system was instituted in 1985 where indemnities for agronomes are to be withheld if their monthly reports are not submitted or are poorly done. The counterpart in charge of agronomes must sign off on the report before an agronome is paid. Although there are several instances of this approval being withheld and the sanction being applied, only limited improvements in reporting have been observed. Although the Director has asked the agronomes on several occasions to improve their reporting, he could have been more effective in enforcing it.

In several letters to the Director in 1985, the extension technical advisor and his counterpart asked for clarifications or actions concerning supervision of the extension service. The Director has still not responded to these letters.

One bright spot in the supervision of agronomes has been the institution of rotating bimonthly meetings in different project zones. This keeps Project Administration in better touch with the field, and agronomes benefit from viewing the progress of their colleagues.

Although the performance of monitors has generally been good, five of them have been recommended for dismissal by the technical advisors and their counterparts. One monitor, who was not trained under PPN (he twice failed the entry exam for the training course), has simply performed poorly in the field. MINAGRI has asked for a written statement from the Director to justify his dismissal, but the Director has not acted on the request. The other four were not trained under PPN and are not part of its extension service, but are acting as monitors for MINAGRI nonetheless. In order to receive training like other monitors, they took

a simple qualifying test. Since they failed the test they are unsuitable for training or work as monitors, and the PPN technical advisors have recommended their dismissal. However, the Director has not pursued their dismissal.

The PPN training program for monitors has been less problematic than the extension program. In order to encourage better project relations with local authorities, the training advisor and her counterpart asked the Director in 1983 to invite bourgmeisters to attend the January 1984 "graduation" of monitors from PPN's training program. The Director did this, the bourgmeisters came, and project relations in the monitor's zones benefitted. However, for the closing of the 1985 monitor training programs, the bourgmeisters were not invited. Now these monitors complain that the bourgmeisters lack understanding of the project.

3.4.5. Financial Management

The evaluation team was unable to thoroughly investigate the financial management of PPN. Nonetheless, the team can offer a few observations. In some respects financial management of local costs has improved. The number of workers at the Kigembe station has been reduced from 80 to 50. Monthly indemnities for the Project Director were reduced from 35 thousand FRW to 15 thousand FRW and for the agronomes from 15 thousand FRW to 10 thousand FRW. February 1986 was the first time that the project received an advance from AID for local costs before the previous one had been entirely disbursed. Due largely to the efforts of the AID Project Officer, timing of funding from RFMC/Nairobi has improved considerably since the last evaluation, and it is now satisfactory. (It is interesting to note that even monitors cited Nairobi funding problems as the cause for the delay in their being paid.)

However, other financial management problems persist. Superfluous trips are still being made to Kigali to procure commodities and carry project personnel. There were insufficient funds made available to cover the entire monitor training program last year, forcing the technical advisor to loan her personal funds to finish the program. She was reimbursed later.

While trainees have been enthusiastic about the training program they have been discouraged by the project's administrative problems, e.g. by the fact that they seem to be the last ones in the project to be paid. Last year they were further demoralized by food disappearing during the training program.

Construction at PPN headquarters in Kigembe has been delayed for several months in 1985 because funds were not paid by the project to the contractor in a timely manner, even though AID had advanced the necessary funds to PPN.

3.4.6. Training and Indemnity for the Director

The 1984 Evaluation recommended that the Project Director receive short-term training in project management. This training has not taken place. The Director was reluctant to take training in project management, thinking it not necessary, and in the 1985 Project Work Plan he proposed a "Voyage d'études" instead. AID has not acted on this proposal, believing it not appropriate at this time.

The Project Director is understandably disappointed that his indemnity has been more than halved. The Director estimates that this permits him only 4.3 overnight trips per month to Kigali or to the prefectures to visit project sites. He is discouraged from making more trips. Since the Director has been observed to go to Kigali roughly once each week, usually just for the day, without advising his TA or their counterparts, it is unclear how much money remains for other trips. A few observations are in order. First, such frequent trips to Kigali have not been adequately justified and might not be necessary. Secondly, if the Director made only 1 or 2 trips to Kigali each month, that would leave him enough funds, accordingly to his estimation, for 2 or 3 trips each month to the prefectures. However, the team also notes that at least a few project sites (e.g. Butare, Gikongoro, Gitarama) can be visited without any overnight lodging costs since they are less than a two-hour drive from Kigembe. Consequently, there is inadequate justification at this time to change the level of his indemnity.

The evaluation team believes that it is important for PPN Administration to visit the various PPN zones to better supervise project activities. The team notes that although the Project Director has visited many but not all fish culture stations in Rwanda, one MINAGRI support officer for PPN has visited all the stations, and without benefit of a monthly indemnity.

3.5. Project Relations with AID and MINAGRI

3.5.1. Relations with AID

The 1984 Evaluation recommended that OAR/Rwanda should take a stronger role in project management. The team believes that this role should be an indirect one. The team agrees with the OAR project officer that given her multiple diverse portfolio responsibilities a direct managerial role is neither feasible nor appropriate. With this understanding in mind, the team found that good efforts have been made by the OAR project officer to: function as a facilitator of documentation flow; raise issues and problems at the Management Committee meetings, and discuss various issues with GOR and contract personnel at other times (e.g. informal meetings at MINAGRI, site visits).

For implementing PPN, OAR relations with MINAGRI (Direction General of Livestock) in Kigali have clearly been positive. The two parties have had frequent and frank discussions concerning the project.

However, OAR relations with the Project Administration in Kigembe have been problematic. The OAR project officer, PPN technical advisors and counterparts have maintained an effective working relationship, but collaboration between the OAR project officer and the PPN Director has been virtually nonexistent. The only substantive dialogue between the Project Officer and PPN Director has taken place at semi-annual meetings of the PPN Management Committee. In terms of dialogue with AID, the team finds it unfortunate that the TA team leader has taken over much of the functions of the Project Director.

3.5.2. Relations with MINAGRI

Within the MINAGRI hierarchy, the PPN comes under the Direction General of Livestock, with the Project Director reporting to the Director General. Within the Direction General of Livestock, the Division of Fisheries and Fish Culture plays a support and monitoring role for the project. A problem that has persisted since the 1984 Evaluation, though, is that the Director at times has continued to bypass the Direction General and go directly to the highest levels in the Ministry to discuss project issues. This has at times left the Direction General uninformed and created confusion.

Although staff of the Division of Fisheries and Fish Culture have done an admirable job in monitoring project activities through site visits, the team observes that the Division's project files lack several important project documents (as do OAR files).

The Direction General of Livestock has played an effective role in the project's management through the PPN Management Committee. The Director General chairs this committee, and in semi-annual meetings the committee has exerted a positive influence on the project.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1. Improved Management

4.1.1. Agronomes

1. The Project Director and heads of the Extension Service should immediately convene all project agronomes to discuss their job description, responsibilities and work plans for 1986. They should also establish, once and for all, the format for the agronomes' periodic reports.

2. PPN should institute a 3 month probationary period for the agronomes, beginning May 1, during which their reporting must demonstrate dramatic improvement in promptness and accuracy. The Project Director and heads of the extension service should closely monitor the reporting performance of the agronomes during this period. If an agronome does not demonstrate improved reporting performance by the end of the period, he should be replaced by a new agronome or by an existing superior monitor.

3. The system of withholding agronomes' indemnities until approval of their reports should be scrupulously respected.

4. The monthly indemnity of 10 thousand FRW appears adequate to cover motorcycle maintenance and fuel. Nonetheless, the Management Committee should request PPN staff to provide detailed information on maintenance and fuel costs, and then reassess the indemnity level. It should be made clear to agronomes that this indemnity is not intended to cover their payments to purchase the motorcycles.

5. There should be only one form for prefecture reporting that is required of agronomes. This report should be designed so that it provides data by prefecture for agronomists whose zones cover more than one prefecture.

4.1.2. Monitors

6. In order to improve the performance of monitors, PPN should offer prizes (e.g. T-shirts) and cash bonuses to the best performers.

7. In order to improve monitor morale and encourage their exchange of experience, PPN should organize social events for them in which the Director, technical assistance, counterparts, and agronomes would participate.

8. The extension service should examine the policy of replacing bicycles; for monitors in certain regions, this appears necessary every year instead of every two.

4.1.3. Counterpart

9. A 250 cc motorcycle with spare parts should be provided to the extension counterpart to facilitate travel to project zones.

4.1.4. Training

10. The appropriate bourgmeisters should be invited to the graduations of all monitor trainees.

4.1.5. Project Relations with OAR and MINAGRI

11. The Management Committee should hold formal meetings on a quarterly rather than semi-annual basis.

12. Monthly meetings should be held, alternating between Kigali and Kigembe, by the PPN Director, OAR Project Officer, Chief of the MINAGRI Fisheries and Fish Culture Division, and head of the TA team.

13. Lines of authority between PPN and MINAGRI should be clearly respected.

4.1.6. Project Administration

14. In 1-13 above, the team has made several recommendations to improve the management of PPN. However, even if all these recommendations are implemented, it is not certain that they will be effective without a radical change in the Project Administration. There is now the same danger of happening as what transpired following the 1984 Evaluation: many recommendations were made but few were respected. Thus, this team recommends that the GOR consider making such a change.

4.2. Future Approaches

4.2.1. Privatization

The team finds that there is a good potential in Rwanda for privatization of the PPN stations. However, steps leading to this must be carefully considered. As a first step, fingerling production should be further concentrated at fewer stations and very accurate records kept. Concentrated fingerling production plus successful trials and improvements in station management should be important elements for a GOR decision in favor of privatization. A study of privatization of the stations should be done by an outside consultant before the project ends to help the GOR determine the feasibility of privatization and appropriate measures to implement it.

4.2.2. Future AID Assistance for PPN

Although the team was not specifically charged with recommending whether or not AID should continue assistance for PPN, it felt obliged to do so given the interest expressed by various officials. Of course, this, like the others above is only a recommendation, and and it is for MINAGRI and OAR to decide whether or not to accept it. The team believes that major, substantive changes must occur soon in project management for PPN to obtain sustainable achievements. Unless the GOR starts now to develop an effective management for PPN, AID should not consider assistance for a PPN Phase 2. The team urges the GOR and OAR to cooperate in implementing immediately the recommendations in this evaluation so that AID and the GOR are in a position to consider continued AID assistance to the Project.

4.2.3. Wetlands (Marais) Development

If the GOR and OAR should decide to continue AID assistance for fish culture, they should consider it in the context of wetlands development. This is because all fish culture must take place in the wetlands, but there are competing demands for potentially valuable land there. However, through careful planning it is also possible that fish culture and other agricultural activities in the wetlands can be complementary.

ANNEX A

PRINCIPAL RECOMMENDATIONS FROM 1984 EVALUATION

1. Change the focus of the field activities from all 10 prefectures to 5 zones of high fish culture potential. Construction activities should also be limited to these zones.

2. Revise the amplified project description as contained in the project agreement to correct inconsistencies and to reflect the above decision.

3. Greater effort should go into the preparation of the annual work plans; they should contain a summary of achievement, objectives for the next period, a list and description of planned activities and a budget.

4. Position descriptions and work plans should be prepared for all personnel involved in the project, including, the project director, the technical assistance team and counterparts, the agronomes and monitors.

5. Financial management of the local costs funds provided by AID should be improved significantly. This involves preparing detailed annual budgets and closer control of expenditures. Cost-savings should be affected by closer supervision and better management. The GOR should be aware of the recurrent cost implications of the policies now being established and every effort should be made to make the operations of the fish stations self-financing.

6. The project director should receive short-term training in project management.

7. Data collection efforts, both that of the monitor in collecting pond information and that of the socio-economic studies, should be strengthened.

8. Production trials should begin immediately.

9. Maintenance of physical facilities, ponds, canals and streams at the National Center should be improved.

10. The project director and team leader must cooperate and consult one another regularly. Greater attention should be given to the timely and accurate preparation of project documentation.

11. OAR should take a stronger role in project management.

12. The relationship of the Ministry of Agriculture to the project should be clarified.

JD

ANNEX B

PERSONS CONTACTED

- Dr. Callixte Mirasano, Director General of Livestock, Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, and Forestry.

- Mr. Bernard Mutwewingabo, Director of Studies and Planning, Ministry of Agriculture.

- Dr. D.D.Moss, Associate Director and Professor, International Center for Agriculture, Department of Fisheries and Allied Aquacultures, Auburn University.

- Dr. Lyman S. Willardson, Professor, Department of Irrigation and Agricultural Engineering, Utah State University.

- Dr. Boyd J. Hanson, Professor, Fish Culture Research Program, University of Rwanda, Butare.

- Dr. Alphonse Karangwa, Director, National Fishculture Project (PPN).

- Ms. Karen Veverica, Chief of Technical Assistance and Training Officer.

- Mr. John Moehl, Chief of Extension Service.

- Ms. Pélagie Nyirahabimana, Training counterpart.

- Mr. Nathanial Hishamunda, Extension counterpart.

- Ms. Alphonsine Murekeyisoni, Laboratory Research Technician, University of Rwanda, Butare.

- Mr. Emerson Melaven, Representative, OAR/R.

- Ms. Rose-Marie Depp, Program Officer, OAR/R.

- Mr. Viet Dong Trong, Engineer, OAR/R

Agronomes

- Mr. Isaie Habimfura
- Mr. Claver Karasira
- Mr. Justhas Munyakimani
- Mr. Emmanuel Mugenzi

Monitors

- Mr. Epimaque Ngaragazababo
- Mr. Sylvain Niyibizi
- Mr. Martin Ruhumuliza
- Mr. Joseph Hategekimana
- Mr. Jean Baptiste Munyandege

Fish Farmers in Gikongoro Zone