

PDBBT 890

Official File Copy

PROJECT ASSISTANCE COMPLETION REPORT

1.a. Name: Small Holder Agricultural Development 1 - Congo  
Project No.: ~~679-0001~~  
PACD: December 31, 1986  
Life of Project Funding: \$ 3,475,000  
Cumulative obligations: \$ 3,475,000  
Cumulative commitment: \$ 3,206,000

b. The project, implemented under a Cooperative Agreement by CARE/Congo, has successfully attained its project objective to help alleviate constraints to farmer productivity and income. All original project elements, including procurement, construction, technical assistance and training have been effectively handled and completed in their entirety, as called for in the Project Paper and Cooperative Agreement. The project has been turned over to and is functioning under the control of the Government of the People's Republic of the Congo (GPRC) counterpart organization, PAPAN (Projet d'assistance aux Petits Agriculteurs - Niari).

c. Elements of the project added by PP amendment, in 1984, concerned with the establishment and operation of a seed farm have not been as successful. Organizational, personnel and seed procurement difficulties prevented the seed farm from attaining its objectives of multiplying and supplying higher quality seeds to farmer groups to increase production. By recommendation of a July, 1985, evaluation, work with seed production was discontinued and alternate uses for the facility were investigated and commenced. The farm and project constructed training center now act as a technical training center and support base for farmer groups, providing them both classroom training and field experience.

d. All planned contributions by donor, grantee and crops agreement were made. Summary is as follows:

	<u>AID</u>	<u>CARE</u>	<u>GPRC</u>
Projected	\$3,475,000	\$750,000	\$450,000
Actual	\$3,475,000	\$750,000	\$450,000

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

2. Project Accomplishments

a. As noted, the project has been most successful in attaining its objectives and outputs. In particular, the following list shows what was planned and what was achieved.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Planned</u>	<u>Achieved</u>
Construct new storage hangars	9	9
Refurbish old storage hangars	11	11
Construct training center	1	1
Construct housing	5	5
Construct office	1	1
Establish seed farm	1	1
Establish revolving fund	1	1

Additionally, there was the ongoing training of farmers in pre-cooperative groups. This training entailed weighing, bagging fumigating and storing farm production. This activity was successfully accomplished in 20 villages in which there were warehouses.

b. There was one major design change during the project, the addition of a seed farm. This was intended to multiply seeds for use by farmer groups, with the intention of increasing production and thus farmer income. A collaborative agreement between the project contractor, CARE, and the Government of the Congo's Agricultural Research Center was envisioned. Seed harvesting and storage preparation machinery was purchased, as were tractors and land preparation equipment. Buildings were constructed and some repaired at a site provided by the GPRC that was previously a chicken and hog farm. Though plans and intentions were well conceived, the seed farm did not succeed in producing any significant quantities which could be used by farmers. The first problem was in acquiring seed from the GPRC research station. This station, located in the savanna areas of Congo, could not supply forest environment seeds to the project for testing and multiplication. Without this foundation seed, success could not be achieved. The expected collaboration between the project and the research station also never materialized, with the station agents never being available to come to the project area due to a lack of logistical support.

c. It was most difficult for the project contractor to find appropriate staff for the site, and this contributed to the difficulties of the seed farm. Towards the end of the project a staff of three was in place at the farm, and did begin to make changes in its operations for the better. However, the previously noted lack of seed still affected the project.

**BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT**

7

3.a. The purpose of the project was to increase the productivity and income of small holder farmers. It is questionable if the project did achieve the purpose. In the last year of the project, a new system of having farmers multiply seed on their farms was begun, and this was successful. The number of farmers, 60-70, does not represent a significant number within the project region. For these few, there were increases in productivity, as there was one good crop year where production was higher. It has not been calculated if per hectare yield increased in this year, or if there were simply more hectares planted. Looking at productivity in another sense, as greater output for a measured input, no data was obtained which would verify this.

b. In regard to the increasing of income, the project had several weather and economic problems which seriously curtailed increasing farmer income. First and foremost, the lack of rain and drought conditions completely destroyed one year's crop; therefore no seeds were produced. Farmers then cut back planting the following year and total production was correspondingly reduced. For the third year of the project, the GPRC abolished the buying monopoly agency, thus creating a void in the marketing of farmer production. When the buying monopoly was abolished, there were no traders who had either enough capital or vehicles to begin buying farmer production. In the one year of the project when rains were good, and when money was available to buy production, farmers did receive prompt payment. No statistics are available to show if there was an increase of farmer income or merely prompt payment. What has been achieved towards the purpose is that farmers now know what they can expect if they use the training and facilities of the project to help them increase production and marketing.

4.a. There are no recommendations for adjustments in design, since these were accomplished in the final year of the project. No conditions remain to be met and the contractor is completing all reporting requirements.

b. USAID is continuing to monitor the project through its connection with the follow-on project in an adjoining region. The contractor has turned over all buildings and equipment to the GPRC, which is now in total control of the entire operation. No other resource monitoring is needed.

c. Some data is available concerning the amount of produce marketed and the amount of money used to purchase it. This will be reviewed by the contractor and presented to A.I.D. A major evaluation was conducted in July 1985, which was followed by an end of project review in December 1986. No additional evaluations are required.

**BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT**

5.a. There are two lessons which can be learned from this project regarding the design of future projects. The first is not to base assumptions on something which has not been carefully researched by the design team. In designing a project which was reliant on seeds from a GPRC research station that did not produce seeds relevant to the project area, a mistake was made that hindered the project. A second lesson learned is to be wary of dealing with government parastatal organizations which neither have political importance, enough money to be able to do what the project assumes, nor the interest to make the project successful. The government buying monopoly had little influence in political life, was never given enough money to permit efficient operation, and could not see what betterment it would derive by doing a good job in marketing farmer produce. These two factors have importance in both design and implementation of future projects.

USAID/Zaire  
June, 1967

**BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT**