

Organization: Catholic Relief Services
Mailing Address: 209 West Fayette Street
Baltimore, MD 21201

Date: June 20, 2005
HQ Contact Person: Susan Moffson
Telephone: 410-951-7238
FAX: 410-234-3189
Email Address: smoffson@catholicrelief.org
Field Contact Person: Raymond Studer
Telephone: 231-6-516-493
Email Address: rstuder@crsliberia.org
Software: Microsoft Word 2000

Catholic Relief Services/Liberia

Emergency Agriculture Rehabilitation 2004 Project

Final Report

February 20, 2004 through February 28, 2005

CRS Project Number: 5407-6520077

Program Title: Emergency Agriculture Rehabilitation 2004
(Margibi, Bong, Grand Kru, Nimba, and Sinoe Counties)
USAID/OFDA Grant No: DFD-G-00-04-00094-00
Country/Region: Liberia/West Africa
Type of Disaster/Hazard: Complex

Catholic Relief Services/Liberia

Emergency Agriculture Rehabilitation 2004 Final Narrative Report



February 20, 2004 through February 28, 2005

CRS Project Number: 5407- 6520077

Agreement # DFD-G-00-04-00094-00

PREPARED FOR: CTO (Cognizant USAID Technical Officer)

Diane De Bernardo
DCHA/OFDA
U. S. Agency for International Development
1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Room 8.06
Washington, D.C. 20523-2052

Photo: Clearing overgrown farmland in preparation for 2004 planting season in Nimba county, with tools provided through the Emergency Agriculture Rehabilitation Project.

I. Executive Summary

In late September 2003, the Catholic Relief Services Liberia Program (CRS/L) contracted Jackollie and Associates Consultancy for the assessment of the Agriculture Sector of post-war Liberia. The results of this assessment gave rise to a proposal entitled "Emergency Agriculture Rehabilitation 2004" which was presented to OFDA in late December. This project was initially designed to ensure that the food security of vulnerable farm families in post-war affected counties (Bong, Margibi, Nimba, Lofa and Sinoe) was durably improved, through strengthening the farming systems.

The original request was for 26,573 farm family households. The donor tentatively approved the project on the 26th of February 2004 when OFDA issued a PAL (pre-authorization letter) allowing CRS/LR to spend approximately 25% of the total grant. These funds were prioritized for:

- a) the provision of operational funds to eight implementing partners in order for them to conduct the necessary registration of farmers in their assigned areas; and
- b) the overseas purchase of the farm tools (with the exception of the scratching hoes) for the 2004 season.

Both of these activities were initiated immediately. On April 9th CRS/Liberia received word the grant had been signed. CRS immediately began soliciting bids for remaining procurement, including seed (both local and imported) and locally supplied scratching/dibbling hoes. Both tools and seeds were delivered to CRS and distributed by our implementing partners to the beneficiaries in the various counties.

With prices being lower than anticipated for purchase of inputs, CRS increased the targeted number of families from 26,573 to 30,574 for seeds and tools. CRS also submitted requests for a two no-cost extensions for this program in July and September 2004. The first extension requested authorization to provide agricultural tools to an additional caseload of 4,500 farm families in Grand Kru, while the second request was to cover an additional 10,000 farm families in two counties. With the donor's approval, the grant end date was extended to February 28, 2005.

Over the course of the program, CRS and its partners provided seeds and tools inputs to 30,574 farm families for the 2004 planting season, or 115% of the original target. 14,500 additional farm families were also provided with agricultural tools in preparation for the 2005 planting season. The evaluation indicated that beneficiaries of the program for 2004 were able to increase their rice cultivation by 39% over 2003 levels, while harvest data (though incomplete at the time of the evaluation) indicated a 16% increase in production levels over the previous year.

II. Program Overview

This food security intervention was within the context of agricultural rehabilitation in Liberia. It covered the period from February 20, 2004 to February 28, 2005. Beneficiaries of this emergency agriculture assistance (rice seed and farming tools) included 45,074 rice-farming residents and returnees in Bong, Nimba, Margibi, Sinoe, Maryland and Grand Kru Counties.

The initial target for the project was 26,573 farming households living in Lofa, Bong, Nimba, Margibi and parts of Sinoe County. In coordination with other intervening agricultural agencies, however, it was agreed that ICRC would distribute agriculture inputs to a large caseload of farmers

in Lofa and CRS therefore redirected inputs allocated for Lofa to assist additional caseloads in the other targeted counties.

There is no doubt that the security situation was a concern for all stakeholders in light of the delicate state of affairs in Liberia at the time this project was being developed. The project initially targeted only 25% of the Ministry of Agriculture's 2001 baseline farmer population estimates in Lofa, Bong, Nimba, and Sinoe Counties and 50% of the baseline estimate for Margibi County (which was more secure than the other counties), providing the original target of 26,573 families. Given the improvements in security over the course of the project, the target for seeds and tools distributions was increased by 4,000 families for the 2004 agricultural season.

Given the success of the first phase of the program, CRS requested two no-cost extensions to assist additional farmers prepare for the 2005 planting season. Under these extensions, 14,500 additional farm families were targeted for agricultural tools clearing tools distributions: 4,500 farm families in Grand Kru County, 2,500 families in Maryland and 7,500 families in Nimba County. These families were to receive additional support in the form of rice seed and seed protection rations under a follow-on FY05 program.

Women head of households made up a large percentage of the population that received agricultural inputs under this grant. CRS mandated the local implementing partners to specifically target women head of households, as they were most vulnerable during the civil conflict and also play a central role in agriculture within the Liberian family. Women are traditionally tasked to assist in clearing the fields and are central to the planting, maintenance and harvesting of rice farms.

Coordination and collaboration among the agriculture sector agencies, implementing partners, and the Ministry of Agriculture was vital to the success of this project. CRS continued its key role in encouraging cooperation among international (INGOs) and local non-governmental organizations (LNGOs), and other agencies in the agriculture sector in Liberia. CRS' Agriculture Manager regularly attended and provided briefings to members of the Agriculture Coordinating Committee (ACC), headed by the UN's Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). This forum has allowed the sharing of updated information on each agency's operation including geographic location, local partners, number of beneficiaries, input types and quantity of inputs.

III. Program Performance

The goal of the project was for the food security of vulnerable farmers in post-war affected counties of Liberia to be durably improved. The strategic objective of the program was for staple crop production to be increased in the targeted project counties of Lofa, Bong, Nimba, Margibi and Sinoe Counties. Grand Kru and Maryland Counties were later added to the target counties, while Lofa was dropped due to the heavy presence of other agricultural agencies. The project targeted farm families that had been adversely affected by the war. This included farmers in areas where there had been persistent hostilities over the past two cropping years, and where crop production had been adversely affected as a result. Areas of high return were also given priority.

The following table provides the project results framework, with a brief description of results achieved during the project.

Program Results Framework

Objectives Statements	Performance Indicators	Data Sources	Critical Assumptions
<p>Goal: The food security of vulnerable farmers in the post-war affected counties is durably improved.</p>			
<p>Strategic Objective # 1 (SO1): Staple crop production is increased in targeted project counties of Bong, Nimba, Margibi, and Sinoe.</p>	<p>Beneficiaries report an average 50% increase in rice production over previous season</p>	<p>Beneficiary survey as part of final evaluation</p>	<p>1. Security conditions allow for continued return of IDPs to villages and sustained farming; conditions allow for evaluation of results and planning for 2nd phase of support for next season.</p> <p>2. Seeds and tools provided were of appropriate type/ quality and quantities to allow some sustainability (keep as seeds for next season)</p>
<p>PROGRESS - A total of 30,574 vulnerable farm families, representing over 150,000 beneficiaries, received seed and tool assistance from CRS under this project for the 2004 planting season. Germination and yield tests for the seed indicated that the seed was of satisfactory quality, and that on average farmers had planted 80% of the seed rice provided. An evaluation was undertaken in November 2004, to meet the closing date from the first no-cost extension. The evaluation was therefore conducted before the full crop had been harvested in many areas and data was therefore somewhat skewed. Overall, farmers providing data on the 2004 harvest indicated a 16% increase in rice production over 2003 levels (or 32% of the target). Approximately 20% of the sample of farmers surveyed, however, had not completed their harvest at the time of the evaluation and therefore did not respond to these questions.</p> <p>An additional 14,500 vulnerable farm families, representing over 72,500 beneficiaries, received tools assistance from CRS for the 2005 agricultural season under the second phase of the project. At the time of this report, farms were in the process of being cleared and no information is yet available on planting or harvest levels. Reports for the follow-on OFDA-funded CRR project will include harvest data for these beneficiaries.</p>			
<p>Intermediate Result 1 Farmers in targeted counties have cleared their fields with the tools received.</p>	<p>Targeted farmers report a 50% or more increase in fields cultivated in 2004 as compared to 2003</p>	<p>Beneficiary survey as part of final evaluation (pre- & post- questions). Rapid field assessments</p>	<p>1. CRS is able to procure and distribute the tools in time. 2. Beneficiaries have sufficient manpower (including nutrition) to cultivate fields in time. 3. Security conditions prevail – no loss of tools of looting or fleeing.</p>
<p>PROGRESS: Under the first phase of the project, tools were provided to 30,574 farm families by May 2004. Field reports indicated that the tools distributed by CRS contributed to the increase in the number of people who were able to cultivate farms in 2004 and the assistance also enhanced the size of land area cultivated by the recipient farmers. A final project evaluation conducted in November for this first phase of the project indicated that farm sizes for project beneficiaries in 2004 had increased on average by 39% over 2003 farm sizes (or 78% of the target). Monitoring reports indicated that over 80% of respondents receiving tools packages from CRS used the tools to cultivate rice fields during the 2004-planting season, while 90% indicated that they also used the tools for other agricultural activities. According to the beneficiaries, the increase in farm size was primarily due to the tool and seed assistance provided by CRS and the additional manpower realized from the return of family members from IDP camps to the farming communities. There were no reports of looting or other losses.</p> <p>For the second phase of the project, tools distributions for 14,500 farm families were on-going at the end of the grant period and are being completed under an OFDA funded follow-on project for 2005. Farmers were still in the process of brushing and clearing their farms as this grant ended. Information on changes in farm size for 2005 will be reported under the new grant.</p>			

Objectives Statements	Performance Indicators	Data Sources	Critical Assumptions
<p>Intermediate result 2 Farmers in targeted counties have planted the seed rice received.</p>	<p>At least 80% of the seed-rice distributed was planted (vs sold or eaten).</p>	<p>Rapid field assessments Seed security assessment.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CRS is able to procure and distribute seeds in time; 2. Targeted farmers have sufficient land cleared/ prepared to plant seeds 3. Beneficiaries have manpower (including nutrition) to plant all seeds received in due time 4. Seeds distributed meet beneficiary preferences / knowledge
<p>PROGRESS: Under the first phase of this project, CRS provided 764 MT of seed to 30,574 targeted farm families. CRS was fortunate to be able to utilize the services of a local firm to procure suitable varieties in Guinea and import them into Monrovia, which were added to a more limited local purchase. Two seed technicians were hired to perform checks on the seed to confirm the variety, quality and viability upon receipt. All of the germination tests performed by the seed technicians in the warehouses and in the rice fields, after planting, proved to meet high standard. . In general, beneficiaries were happy with the seed variety they received. They had sufficient manpower and most of them were able to complete the planting in line with the farming calendar. Results from the yield test conducted by CRS were also positive. A project evaluation conducted in November 2004 indicated that 80% of the seed rice provided was planted (reaching 100% of the target), while 16.5% of the seed rice was consumed, 1% was stored for future use, and less than 1% was sold or given away. There were no reports of "taxation" or looting.</p>			
<p>For the 14,500 farm families targeted for tools distributions under the second phase of the project, seed distributions will be provided under an OFDA-funded follow-on grant. Reports on their use of the tools and seed rice will be given under the new grant.</p>			

IV. General Information

Beneficiaries and Locations

CRS originally anticipated targeting 26,753 families in the counties of Lofa, Bong, Nimba, Sinoe and Margibi through this project. At the time of implementation, in coordinating its agricultural activities with other actors on the ground, CRS adjusted its target locations to allow for a large-scale agricultural recovery project being implemented by ICRC in Lofa County. During the beginning of the distribution process, field officers noticed that most of the communities in Nimba County included a fairly large number of unregistered farmers, also in need of inputs. Seeing this need, CRS and its implementing partners made a request to OFDA for the use of some balance funds from the initial purchase of inputs to extend seed and tool assistance to an additional 4,000 farmers in Nimba County. This brought the total beneficiaries to 30,573 farm families for the 2004 agricultural season. This request was endorsed by OFDA.

The grant was originally scheduled to end in late August, 2004. CRS technical staff undertook field visits in Bong, Nimba and the Southeast in July 2004, in order to assess farming activities, constraints and security levels. Their findings indicated a high need for additional support. As a result, CRS/Liberia submitted a request to OFDA for a three-month no-cost extension for this program in July, to finalize distributions in Sinoe and to expand tools support to include 4,500 farm families in Grand Kru County.

A subsequent no-cost extension was then submitted in September, to increase the targets for tools distributions by an additional 10,000 farm families for the 2005 agricultural season. Both of these extensions were approved, with the grant consequently closing on 28 February 2005.

The second grant extension focused on Maryland and Bong counties. After further discussions with partners and other agricultural agencies beginning their planning for 2005, however, CRS decided to target beneficiaries in Nimba instead of Bong. The need in Nimba was high, with fewer agencies interested in undertaking seeds and tools distributions in this area.

The following table provides an overview of beneficiary families targeted by location.

	County	Number of Farm Families Targeted	Package
Phase I (2004 season)	Margibi	4,217	Seed Rice and Tools
	Bong	7,409	
	Nimba	11,094	
	Sinoe	7,854	
Phase II (2005 season)	Grand Kru	4,500	Clearing Tools only
	Maryland	2,500	
	Nimba	7,500	
	Total	45,074	

Packages Supplied

CRS provided the following inputs to each farm family targeted during the first phase of this project.

Input type	Approved Allotment per Farm Family
Upland Cutlass	1
Lowland Cutlass	1
File	0.5
Axe	0.5
Scratching / Dibbling Hoe	2
Regular Hoe	0.5
Seed Rice- Upland/Lowland variety	25 Kilogram

For the 2004 main planting season distributions, CRS purchased and received assorted pieces of farm tools from Townsend International in South Africa. The tools were brought into the country through the Roberts International Airport and Free Port of Monrovia. The total consignment of tools received by CRS from Townsend during the reporting period are 64,565 cutlasses, 13,320 files, 10,884 axes, and 13,296 regular hoes. Additional tools were purchased locally.

One problem that developed was with the design and specifications of one of the desired cutlasses. Although the supplier (Townsend, South Africa) had received the specifications, complete with a drawing, the cutlass supplied was incorrect. This was not noticed until the air shipment had arrived on March 19. CRS immediately notified the supplier and proceeded to obtain a reaction from farmers as to the design. The supplier acknowledged receiving the specifications and agreed that the

cutlass sent did not meet those specifications. The farmers stated that while the design would not be suitable for upland brushing, it would be good for lowland brushing. Later, CRS also learned that farmers in Nimba also felt they liked the design for use in sugar cane fields.

Given these results, CRS then agreed with the supplier to accept all of the air shipment and a portion of the sea shipment, which would result in approximately 50% of the overall order being rejected. The supplier appreciated CRS' willingness to work with them, sent a sample of another cutlass of the correct specification for inspection, and also accepted the order for the correct tools for the balance shipment. This shipment arrived in Sinoe County in October 2004. The cutlasses from Townsend that did not meet the original specification have proven acceptable by many farmers, and were utilized for the additional caseload in Nimba County.

One of the major issues brought forward during the monitoring of the project was the sharing of tools. Files, axes and regular hoes were to be shared by two beneficiary farmers. This proved highly problematic in the field, as these families often needed the tools at similar times. Farmers indicated that files and axes were more important than hoes. As a result, the tools packages were adjusted during the second phase of the project. As the Grand Kru purchases were beginning to be made before feedback had arrived from the field, packages were similar to those under the first phase of the project. Modifications were made in the subsequent distributions in Maryland and Nimba. The following table provides an overview of the tools packages provided under Phase II.

Input type	Approved Allotment Per Farm Family	
	Grand Kru	Maryland & Nimba
Upland Cutlass	1	1
Lowland Cutlass	1	1
File	0.5	1
Axe	0.5	1
Scratching / Dibbling Hoe	1	1
Regular Hoe	0.5	0

Remaining cutlasses from the Townsend purchase were allocated for the distribution in Grand Kru County. In September, CRS made a local purchase of assorted tools to cover the remaining needs for Grand Kru County. This consignment included 5,481 cutlasses, 2,250 garden hoes, 2,250 files and 2,250 axes. CRS, through Caritas Cape Palmas, distributed these tools in November. The second no-cost extension for tools for Maryland and Nimba Counties consisted of 20,000 cutlasses, 10,000 files and 10,000 axes. These tools were purchased locally and distributions were completed by mid-March 2005. Scratching hoes for Grand Kru, Maryland and Nimba were also purchased in February, but delivery is to take place in conjunction with the seed rice in May – June.

At the end of the project, CRS distributed basic agricultural inputs to a total of 45,074 resource poor farm families in six counties in Liberia. The counties included Bong, Nimba, Margibi, Sinoe, Grand Kru and Maryland. A total 30,574 farm families received tools and seed rice, while 14,500 farm families received only farm tools. The quantity of tools distributed by CRS were as follows: 90,148 cutlasses, 17,539 regular hoes, 27,539 files, 25,583 axes, and 61,088 scratching/dibbling hoes while CRS and its implementing partners also distributed 764 metric tons of seed rice. An additional

14,500 scratching hoes were procured under this grant, for distribution with the seed rice for the 2005 planting season. The breakdown of distributions by county and partner are provided below.

TOOLS DELIVERED TO FARMERS BY COUNTY:

COUNTY	PARTNER	DISTRICT	# OF FARMER SERVED	CUTLASS Upland	CUTLASS Lowland	Reg. Hoes	FILE	AXE	Sc or D Hoe*
PHASE I									
Margibi	LECO	Mamba	222	222	222	111	111	111	444
		Kakata	2308	2308	2308	1154	1154	1154	4616
	IRDO	Gibi	1687	1687	1687	844	844	844	3374
SUB-TOTAL			4,217	4,217	4,217	2,109	2,109	2,109	8,434
Bong	IRDO	Salala	700	700	700	350	350	350	1400
		Fuamah	733	733	733	367	367	367	1466
		Sanoyea	766	766	766	383	383	383	1532
	LECO	Jorquelleh	1338	1338	1338	669	669	669	2676
		Kokoyah	110	110	110	55	55	55	220
	SDP	Panta	785	785	785	393	393	393	1570
		Kpaii	633	633	633	317	317	317	1266
		Suakoko	808	808	808	404	404	404	1616
CARITAS/Gbanga	Zota	1536	1536	1536	768	768	768	3072	
SUB-TOTAL			7,409	7,409	7,409	3,706	3,706	3,706	14,818
Nimba	ARS	Gbelay-Geh	2288	2288	2288	1144	1144	1144	4576
		Sanniq-Mah	2428	2428	2428	1214	1214	1214	4856
		Zoe-Geh	2570	2570	2570	1285	1285	1285	5140
	ZADC	Saclep-Mah	3108	3108	3108	1554	1554	1554	6216
		Yarwen	700	700	700	350	350	350	1400
SUB-TOTAL			11,094	11,094	11,094	5,547	5,547	5,547	22,188
Sinoe	LAS	Tarjuwon	464	464	464	232	232	232	928
		Butaw	519	519	519	260	260	260	1038
		Sanquin	558	558	558	279	279	279	1116
		River Dugbe	1400	1400	1400	700	700	700	2800
		Kpanyan	1000	1000	1000	500	500	500	2000
		Juazon	1650	1650	1650	825	825	0	3300
		Pyne Town	500	500	500	250	250	0	1000
		Gbeapo	773	773	773	386	386	0	1546
		Greenville	200	200	200	100	100	0	400
Jeadeapo	790	790	790	395	395	0	1520		
SUB-TOTAL			7,854	7,854	7,854	3,927	3,927	1,971	15,648
PHASE I SUBTOTAL			30,574	30,574	30,574	15,289	15,289	13,333	61,088
PHASE II									
Grand Kru	Caritas/Cape Palmas	Jloh	634	634	634	317	317	317	0
		Barclayville	1,226	1,226	1,226	613	613	613	0
		Grandcress/Wedabo	1,072	1,072	1,072	536	536	536	0
		Butah	687	687	687	344	344	344	0
		Dorbor	382	382	382	191	191	191	0
		Trehn	499	499	499	249	249	249	0
SUB-TOTAL			4,500	4,500	4,500	2,250	2,250	2,250	0
Maryland	Caritas/Cape Palmas	Pleboo/Sodokan	1,500	1,500	1,500	0	1,500	1,500	0
		Karluway	1,000	1,000	1,000	0	1,000	1,000	0
SUB-TOTAL			2,500	2,500	2,500	0	2,500	2,500	0
Nimba	ARS	Gbelay-Geh	2,900	2,900	2,900	0	2,900	2,900	0
		Sanniq-Mah	1,700	1,700	1,700	0	1,700	1,700	0
		Zoe-Geh	2,900	2,900	2,900	0	2,900	2,900	0
SUB-TOTAL			7,500	7,500	7,500	0	7,500	7,500	0
PHASE II SUBTOTAL			14,500	14,500	14,500	2,250	12,250	12,250	0
GRAND TOTAL			45,074	45,074	45,074	17,539	27,539	25,583	61,088

- Scratching or Dibbling Hoe

SEED RICE DELIVERED TO FARMERS BY COUNTY:

COUNTY	PARTNER	DISTRICT	# OF FARMERS SERVED	TOTAL 50 KG BAGS	TOTAL MTs
Margibi	LECO	Mamba	222	111	5.6
		Kakata	2308	1154	57.7
	IRDO	Gibi	1687	843.5	42.2
SUB-TOTAL			4,217	2,108.5	105.5
Bong	IRDO	Salala	700	350	17.5
		Fuamah	733	366.5	18.3
		Sanoyea	766	383	19.2
	LECO	Jorquelleh	1338	669	33.5
		Kokoyah	110	55	2.8
	SDP	Panta	785	392.5	19.6
		Kpaii	633	316.5	15.8
		Suakoko	808	404	20.2
	CARITAS	Zota	1536	768	38.4
	SUBTOTAL			7,409	3,704.5
Nimba	ARS	Gbelay-Geh	2288	1144	57.2
		Sanniq-Mah	2428	1214	60.7
		Zoe-Geh	2569	1284.5	64.2
	ZADC	Saclepea-Mah	3108	1554	77.7
		Yarwen	700	350	17.5
SUB-TOTAL			11,093	5,546.5	277.3
Sinoe	LAS	Tarjuwon	464	232	11.6
		Butaw	519	259.5	13.0
		Sanquin	558	279	13.9
		Riv. Dugbe	1400	700	35.0
		Kpanyan	1000	500	25.0
		Juazon	1650	825	41.3
		Pyne Town	500	250	12.5
		Gbeapo	773	386.5	19.3
		Greenville	200	100	5.0
Jeadeapo	790	395	19.8		
SUB-TOTAL			7,854	3,927	196.4
GRAND TOTAL			30,573	15,286.5	764.5

Seed Quality and Viability

To provide quality control on the seed being purchased and distributed, CRS employed two seed technicians to check the seed for purity, age, and variety, as well as on the viability of the seed through germination testing.

In total the technicians conducted 44 germination tests showing an overall average germination percentage of over 93%. All of the seed provided by the suppliers was deemed acceptable. The

following table shows the various germination test results by seed variety. Above 85% is considered acceptable.

SEED SAMPLING SURVEY (% Germination)

Date	LAC-23		ROK-3		Suacoco-8		Gissi		Local upl	
	Sample	% Germ.	Sample	% Germ	Sample	% Germ	Sample	% Germ	Sample	% Germ
Apr 27	1	89	1	88	1	95			1	88
	2	89								
May18	1	89	1	88	1	95	1	92	1	93
	2	89	2	89	2	96				
	3	90								
May24	1	92	1	95	1	98	1	98		
	2	91	2	96	2	99				
	3	92	3	95	3	96				
	4	91	4	96						
			5	96						
June 2	1	96	1	97	1	98	1	98		
	2	94	2	98	2	99				
	3	95	3	97	3	97				
			4	96	4	98				
			5	97	5	97				
			6	95						
			7	94						
			8	94						
Ave.	12	91.4%	16	94.4%	11	97.1 %	3	96%	2	90.5 %

To further verify the results of the quality test performed during seed purchase, on-farm visits were carried out to confirm that seed germination was satisfactory in the field. In each location, three separate samples of seedlings (from a 4 m² area) were taken from farms, to determine average seed germination rates on these farms. Reports of seed performance conducted in Bong and Margibi counties indicated that the average percentage on farm germination results were 85.4% for Bong and 81.5% for Margibi. The results are summarized in the table on the following page.

In September, CRS agricultural staff undertook a yield check exercise for farmers receiving seed and tools under the first phase of the project. The average yield for the four counties was considered quite good, at 2112 Kg/ha. (A yield of 1600 kg/ha and below is considered poor.) Nimba had the highest average yield (2614 Kg/ha), followed by Bong (2224 Kg/ha), Sinoe (1859 Kg/ha), and Margibi (1750 Kg/ha). Yield results for the four seed varieties provided were as follows:

- Suakoko-8 (Lowland) - 2365 Kg/ha
- LAC -23 (Upland) - 2154 Kg/ha
- ROK-3 (Dual purpose) - 2127 Kg/ha
- Local varieties (Upland) - 1719 Kg/ha

ON FARM SEED GERMINATION RESULTS FOR BONG & MARGIBI COUNTIES

District	Clan	Town	Ecology	On Farm Germination Result					Visual observation on Initial Germination/Seedling growth performance		
				Sample							
				1	2	3	Total	Ave.			
BONG COUNTY											
Zota	Banama	Pelelei	UPL	185	215	300	700	84%	Good	Vigorous Growth	
			UPL	192	192	205	737	88%	Good	Vigorous Growth	
			UPL	179	222	298	699	93%	V. Good	Vigorous Growth	
			UPL	306	232	165	703	94%	V. Good	Vigorous Growth	
			UPL	301	200	270	771	92%	V. Good	Vigorous Growth	
			UPL	253	261	159	673	80%	Good	Vigorous Growth	
			UPL	296	300	170	756	90%	V. Good	Vigorous Growth	
			UPL	188	210	209	687	82%	Good	Vigorous Growth	
	Gwelipolo	Kpoloyah	UPL	302	290	188	780	89%	Good	Vigorous Growth	
			UPL	196	401	175	772	92%	V. Good	Vigorous Growth	
		Yowee	UPL	288	194	275	757	90%	V. Good	Vigorous Growth	
			UPL	170	300	602	676	81%	Good	Vigorous Growth	
	Gweipolu	Kpo	UPL	204	188	307	699	93%	V. Good	Vigorous Growth	
			UPL	304	260	159	723	86%	Good	Vigorous Growth	
			UPL	205	301	206	712	85%	Good	Vigorous Growth	
	Gwaolapolu	Melequah	UPL	207	261	259	727	87%	Good	Vigorous Growth	
			UPL	229	207	281	777	86%	Good	Vigorous Growth	
			UPL	231	252	173	5656	79%	Fair	Fair Growth	
			UPL	263	109	247	619	74%	Fair	Fair Growth	
		Kpoloyeah	UPL	239	261	198	689	84%	Good	Vigorous Growth	
UPL			229	253	208	690	83%	Good	Vigorous Growth		
UPL			241	250	209	700	84%	Good	Vigorous Growth		
UPL			229	288	208	675	81%	Good	Vigorous Growth		
Kokoyah	Botota	LL	229	207	281	717	89%	Good	Vigorous Growth		
		LL	306	232	165	703	84%	Good	Vigorous Growth		
		LL	183	300	215	700	85%	Good	Vigorous Growth		
MARGIBI COUNTY											
Kakata	Bainda	26 Gate	LL	208	253	238	699	84%	Good	Vigorous Growth	
			UPL	200	210	240	650	78%	Fair	Fair Growth	
	Borlorla	Gbar-biegan	Cinta	UPL	225	200	223	658	80%	Good	Vigorous Growth
			LL	100	218	230	548	66%	Fair	Fair Growth	
			UPL	240	160	300	700	84%	Good	Vigorous Growth	
Mamba	Garnee	Gull Farm	UPL	200	312	198	710	85%	Good	Vigorous Growth	
			LL	225	325	197	747	89%	Good	Vigorous Growth	
Gibi	Gbenfen	Worhn	UPLL	198	202	350	750	90%	V. Good	Vigorous Growth	
			UPL	250	249	200	703	83%	Good	Vigorous Growth	
		Peter town	LL	129	280	250	659	79%	Fair	Fair Growth	
			UPL	280	290	278	748	78%	Fair	Fair Growth	

* Formula used: Average Germination = ((Total seedlings) * (Total area sampled in m²) * (100%))/(10,000 m²)

Project Supervision and Technical Support

CRS/Liberia Agriculture field officers continuously visited the beneficiary communities to guide and provide technical support to the local partners as well as the farmers that benefited from the seeds and tools assistance package. During these follow-up visits, the field officers were able to gather first hand information on the status of the project (i.e. use of seeds and tools, extent of farming activities, stages of the farming, number of family members participating, etc) and determine other needs of the farming communities, as well as evaluate the return of IDPs, refugees and ex-combatants in these communities.

A key component of the field officer's activities, after the distribution of inputs to farmers, was to also offer technical guidance on issues such as weed and rodent control methods in order to improve rice yield. The beneficiaries were also provided with relevant post-harvest information in advance to educate them on the need to properly and adequately save seeds for the next farming season.

Monitoring and Evaluation

The verification of the distribution of inputs to the registered farmers under Phase I of the project was accomplished with monitoring officers traveling to Nimba, Margibi, Bong and Sinoe Counties to participate in the distribution activities. In July, the CRS/Liberia Monitoring Department conducted post distribution monitoring of the tools and seed rice distributed to target farmers. The monitoring focused on gathering information on the appropriateness and durability of the tools for the farmers' agriculture activities.

Overall, the monitoring exercise found that 98% of the 424 beneficiaries interviewed in the four counties received seed rice varieties based on the approved allotment of 25 kilogram. Eighty percent of the respondents indicated planting some or all of their seed rice; 6% indicated that they kept a portion of the seed for future planting and 6% indicated that they had given some of the seed to other needy farmers. Approximately 10% indicated that they had eaten all of their seed. Reasons given for consumption of the seed were hunger and late delivery of inputs (primarily in Sinoe).

From the same group of respondents, 81% indicated that they used the tools for clearing their farmlands for the main planting season. Tool supply was slightly delayed for 20% of the recipients in some areas in Sinoe County, due to problems with vendors and transport once the rains had commenced. Distribution of tools was still ongoing at the time of this July monitoring visit in Sinoe. In addition, there were issues experienced in some areas regarding the sharing of files and axes, resulting in a family receiving either one or the other. Over 90% of the respondents in this region indicated that they were either using the tools for other agricultural activities, or were storing them for the next rice cultivation season. In general, beneficiaries were satisfied with the quality of the inputs.

An evaluation for the first phase of the project was conducted in November 2004 by the CRS Monitoring Department, in collaboration with the Programming Department and local partners. Under this evaluation, CRS used a two stage sampling methodology based on counties and districts to then randomly select 1,070 farmers (or 3% of overall beneficiaries) for interviews. This methodology was used to ensure that farmers from each county and district (and therefore each partner) were included in the survey. A total of 921 of these farmers were able to respond and provide information for the survey.

The results of the evaluation are provided in Appendix 1. Overall, the evaluation indicated that the beneficiaries of the project planted 80% of the seed that they received, while 16.5% of the seed was consumed and 1% was stored for future use. Detailed information on planting and harvest levels for 2004 was provided by 727 of the respondents (or 78% of those sampled). Of these, 79% were involved in upland rice production while 23% were involved in lowland rice cultivation. Based on the information from this sample, the average amount of seed planted by beneficiary farmers increased by 39% over 2003 levels. The biggest increase was in Sinoe, which had been largely cut off during the last round of the conflict. While this increase is encouraging, farmers indicated that

they are still at approximately 85% of pre-war cultivation levels. 96% of beneficiaries indicated that they would have liked to plant a larger farm in 2004; limiting factors included insufficient seed (69% of respondents), insufficient tools (53% of respondents), lack of time to complete agricultural activities (41% of respondents) and insufficient labor (23% of respondents).

From the available data, the evaluation results indicated that beneficiaries of the project experienced a 16% increase in rice production levels in comparison to the previous year, with the biggest gains seen in lowland rice production. Harvest information, however, was somewhat skewed as not all farmers had harvested at the time of the evaluation and therefore did not provide data. As a result, farmers with smaller harvests had greater representation in the final survey results. Respondents also noted that they experienced problems this year with heavier rains and higher levels of rodent/animal pests than normal. These, combined with a lack of other farm inputs such as fertilizer, pesticides and bird nets, contributed to keeping yields below normal. Farmers indicated that production levels are still well below pre-war levels and requested further assistance in future.

V. Resource Use / Expenditures

CRS originally requested \$2,008,125 to undertake this project. A budget realignment was submitted in November, when the second no-cost extension was requested. The following table provides a breakdown of expenses against the major budget categories. As seen below, the budget was 100% expensed.

Equipment and Supplies included all the partner administrative costs, seed and tools (as detailed in Section IV above), and sixteen motorcycles for field implementation and monitoring. CRS experienced a 6% savings in this line item. Commodity expenses also experienced a savings, largely due to the decision to procure all tools under the second phase of the project from local vendors rather than import, given the limited time remaining in the project following the second no-cost extension.

Funds from these line items were allocated to cover additional costs in other line items, primarily materials transport, personnel and staff field travel. The transport costs were higher than anticipated as CRS initially planned to use its own trucks for much of the internal transport necessary for moving the tools and seeds to the various district centers for distribution to the farmers. However, the funding delay in the beginning required CRS to distribute as rapidly as possible so as to not hold up planting any more than necessary. In order to do this it was necessary to use rental trucks operating on roads that were in very deplorable condition, due to the seasonal rainfall and prolonged neglect. With demand for CRS trucks high during the second phase of the project, the same was done with the transport of the additional tools. Personnel and field travel costs were also higher than anticipated, as field implementation continued into February.

Budget Expenditures

Description	Original Budget	Revised Budget (Nov 17, 2005)	Expenditures	Balance
Personnel	\$109,530	\$118,820	\$146,225	(\$27,405)
Equipment & Supplies	\$1,353,576	\$1,353,576	\$1,279,727	\$73,849
Professional Fees & Services	\$5,460	\$4,460	\$2,450	\$2,010
Office Expenses	\$13,301	\$18,301	\$22,599	(\$4,298)
Occupancy Expenses	\$14,071	\$20,071	\$23,989	(\$3,917)
Representation & Training	\$9,650	\$11,650	\$23,842	(\$12,191)
Vehicle Expenses	\$25,150	\$25,150	\$75,449	(\$50,299)
Commodity Expenses	\$50,464	\$29,171	\$5,461	\$23,710
Miscellaneous Expenses	0	0	1,439	(\$1,439)
Total Direct Costs	\$1,581,201	\$1,581,201	\$1,581,181	\$20
CRS Indirect Costs (NICRA)	\$426,924	\$426,924	\$426,919	\$5
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$2,008,125	\$2,008,125	\$2,008,100	\$25

Appendix A: Evaluation Results
Information by County

General Information

	# of Respondents	% of total	% Male	Average Family Size	Would you have made a larger farm (% of respondents)					
					Yes	Not enough seed	Not enough tools	Not enough labor	Started too late	Other (count)
Bong	234	25.4%	66.2%	8.49	96.2%	62.8%	36.8%	22.2%	46.6%	32.5%
Margibi	128	13.9%	61.7%	8.37	98.4%	62.5%	27.3%	19.5%	47.7%	38.3%
Nimba	290	31.5%	76.2%	9.76	93.8%	62.1%	58.6%	26.6%	27.9%	26.6%
Sinoe	269	29.2%	77.3%	8.78	98.5%	76.6%	66.2%	17.8%	43.1%	23.8%
total	921	100.0%	72.0	8.96	96.4	69.0	52.8	22.7	41.3	0.0

Planting and Harvest Data

	# of respondents	% of respondents who planted in 2004	conversion factor	planted 2004	Average in Kg				verification		
					harvested 2004	planted 2003	harvested 2003	planted pre-war	harvested pre-war	planted 2004	harvested 2004
BENEFICIARIES											
Upland											
Bong	152.0	74.3%	16.60	35.5	352.5	28.7	479.0	57.9	1082.6	36.1	353.4
Margibi	98.0	38.8%	16.60	14.3	79.5	15.9	136.3	48.3	983.5	15.2	80.2
Nimba	233.0	83.7%	16.58	61.0	934.4	49.5	777.3	67.3	1649.8	73.9	1189.1
Sinoe	244.0	93.0%	16.06	53.8	344.7	30.4	231.1	58.6	1424.6	55.6	345.0
upland average				47.0	498.1	34.1	443.0	59.8	1366.9	51.9	581.6
Lowland											
Bong	152.0	28.3%	16.60	10.3	132.1	4.8	19.5	6.0	91.1	10.2	124.0
Margibi	98.0	58.2%	16.60	17.6	87.9	11.4	110.7	14.6	249.4	22.6	87.1
Nimba	233.0	20.2%	16.58	7.4	77.9	7.6	91.9	1.8	42.2	7.3	66.3
Sinoe	244.0	8.6%	16.06	4.0	38.0	1.9	13.8	3.5	38.8	4.2	39.0
lowland average				8.2	76.8	5.6	52.6	5.0	78.8	9.0	72.0
Overall											
Bong	152.0	96.1%	16.60	45.8	484.6	33.5	498.5	63.9	1173.8	46.3	477.5
Margibi	98.0	89.8%	16.60	31.8	167.3	27.3	247.0	62.8	1233.0	37.8	167.3
Nimba	233.0	96.1%	16.58	68.3	1012.3	56.9	868.8	69.1	1692.0	81.2	1255.4
Sinoe	244.0	97.5%	16.06	57.9	382.7	32.3	244.9	62.1	1463.4	59.9	384.1
overall average				55.3	574.9	39.7	495.6	64.8	1445.7	60.9	653.6

Planting and Harvest Comparisons

	# of respondents	Planting Data Comparison		Harvest Data Comparison		Yields			
		2004 vs 2003	2004 vs pre-war	2004 vs 2003	2004 vs pre-war	pre-war	2003	2004	2004 verification
BENEFICIARIES									
Upland									
Bong	152.0	1.24	0.61	0.74	0.33	18.7	16.7	9.9	9.8
Margibi	98.0	0.90	0.30	0.58	0.08	20.4	8.6	5.6	5.3
Nimba	233.0	1.23	0.91	1.20	0.57	24.5	15.7	15.3	16.1
Sinoe	244.0	1.77	0.92	1.49	0.24	24.3	7.6	6.4	6.2
upland average		1.38	0.79	1.12	0.36	22.9	13.0	10.6	11.2
Lowland									
Bong	152.0	2.17	1.72	6.76	1.45	15.2	4.1	12.8	12.2
Margibi	98.0	1.54	1.21	0.79	0.35	17.1	9.7	5.0	3.8
Nimba	233.0	0.97	4.07	0.85	1.85	23.3	12.1	10.6	9.0
Sinoe	244.0	2.12	1.14	2.75	0.98	11.0	7.2	9.4	9.2
lowland average		1.47	1.65	1.46	0.97	15.8	9.4	9.4	8.0
Overall									
Bong	152.0	1.37	0.72	0.97	0.41	18.4	14.9	10.6	10.3
Margibi	98.0	1.17	0.51	0.68	0.14	19.6	9.0	5.3	4.4
Nimba	233.0	1.20	0.99	1.17	0.60	24.5	15.3	14.8	15.5
Sinoe	244.0	1.79	0.93	1.56	0.26	23.6	7.6	6.6	6.4
overall average		1.39	0.85	1.16	0.40	22.3	12.5	10.4	10.7