

EVALUATION OF THE PROJETO DE APOIO À INTENSIFICAÇÃO DA PRODUÇÃO ALIMENTAR NA GUINÉ-BISSAU (2008-2013)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

7TH OF ABRIL OF 2016

EVALUATION TEAM

Sónia Frias (coordenação)
João Estêvão
Iolanda Évora
Leonildo Cardoso
Jessica Santos
Ana Filipa Oliveira

CONTRACTING PARTY

Camões, Instituto da Cooperação e da Língua, I.P.,

CEsA-ISEG/ULisboa – Centro de Estudos sobre África, Ásia e América Latina do Instituto Superior de Economia e Gestão da Universidade de Lisboa

Executive summary

This evaluation process is focused on the Portuguese development cooperation with Guinea-Bissau and it mainly focuses in *Projeto de Apoio à Intensificação da Produção Alimentar*¹ (PAIPA), a project developed in the agriculture domain and designed to support the increase of food production. The main objective is to build the project evaluation with a focus on its methodology of intervention. In this sense, we analyze the intervention approach, the activities, and the resources mobilized to achieve the main objective of promoting the transition from a traditional farming, based on family resources, into yield agriculture.

The evaluation took into account the different contributions of our methodological approach, from the analysis of the documentation provided by Camões, I.P., the fieldwork in Guinea-Bissau and a number of interviews conducted, both in Portugal and in the field, which included technicians and agents of the Portuguese development cooperation, local informants and beneficiaries of PAIPA in areas where the project has been implemented.

The PAIPA and its evolution (2008-2013)

PAIPA has, as its antecedent, a resident assistance project on the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MADR) of Guinea-Bissau, signed in 2007. Approved in 2008, PAIPA was intended mainly to work as an advisory project and sought to embody a model of cooperation wider and more consistent, constituting itself as a pilot project in the area of agriculture and rural development.

In its first phase, held in 2008 and 2009, PAIPA was executed in two *tabancas* (villages), having as main objectives the enhancement of production capacity, the creation of conditions of resistance to food insecurity, the enhancement of local infrastructures, the creation of conditions to provide production, and also counseling. In 2010, PAIPA passed to a new stage of implementation, transition explained by the need to start an experimental stage processing and marketing of production. In this new phase, the project was extended to other *tabancas* in the same region, while

¹ *Support Intensification of Food Production Project.*

maintaining its main objectives to support the intensification of production and creating food insecurity conditions of resistance, but also paying attention to new dimensions related to rural development and community, changing its name to Project Support intensification of Food Production and Community Development (PAIPA-DC, in Portuguese). In 2011, the project moved to a third implementation phase, an expansion out of the initial region, seeking to replicate the experience in other poor regions of the country.

As a result of the coup d'état in 2012, PAIPA entered into a fourth implementation phase, which sought to create the conditions for the gradual exit of Portuguese development cooperation and strengthening ADRI (the Guinean NGO partner) for possible future replication of the project. This new phase was planned to last from August to December 2012, and intended to maintain the main objectives and PAIPA features, and adding some adjustments to the new environment. Subsequently the project was renewed in 2013 and 2014, with completion scheduled for December 2015.

Conclusions

1. PAIPA - Support for Food Production Intensification Project in Guinea-Bissau, developed since 2008 in the framework of Portuguese Development Cooperation, is a major project and has contributed to answer many of the problems and needs faced by the target *tabancas*.
2. For the success of the project we need to underline the importance of its methodological approach (a truly partnership approach) and the high degree of informality and capacity to accommodate socio-cultural diversity. This methodology can be considered fundamental and very appropriate in particularistic work, since they stimulate and facilitate the involvement of communities in development processes. Also important is the chosen model of knowledge transfer (based on learning by doing method methodology), which clearly promotes the training of local agents and population.
3. The work methodology developed by PAIPA created the conditions for training farmers (men and women) in various fields of the project. This contributed to a

growing commitment of the beneficiaries, mirrored in the appropriation of knowledge and implementation skills. Equally important, it is also the use, especially in a more experimental work phase, of a *working together* methodology, which in practice leads to a strong drive-generator co-learning environment.

4. The great flag of PAIPA is the machinery, especially the tractor. The introduction of technology seems to be very important with respect to increased production and alleviating the execution of certain very arduous tasks. The tractor is clearly the most played machine because it greatly assists in rice production and maize crops extension, very considered in terms of power, but especially with regard to their commercialization. Other machines, namely the peeling and grain mill, end up having lower visibility, although their use is a fact. The yield which withdraws them is less obvious and less impressive than that provided by the tractor, which is embodied not only in increased production, but also in the increase of land worked.

5. Important changes have been witnessed in the field of agricultural development and production, as effect of PAIPA implementation. There are quite visible results, especially in the *tabancas* where the experience is older, but the experience also seems to have good results in the new *tabancas*. Communities interviewed on this issue confirmed the idea that presently they have means to produce more, in quantity and diversity, which can be confirmed with the agricultural production statistics published in the mission reports of the agents of the Portuguese Development Cooperation. The good results, end up having consequences, both in terms of consumption or income.

6. The implementation of the project has involved men, women and youngsters. In the case of PAIPA, given its scope, it has not been done and well in our view, a gender distinction between who can and cannot be a member of the project. Practice has shown that men and women assume specific responsibilities. The communities make themselves, of course, a division of their roles and ambitions according to their logics, tradition, knowledge and interests.

7. The institutional PAIPA model and management suffered successive adjustments during the project's implementation period. But these models failed. In fact, the partnership with state organizations failed because of the political instability that

characterizes life in Guinea-Bissau. It also failed the model in partnership with a non-governmental organization for reasons that cannot be dissociated from the country's politics landscape. Even though all these difficulties did not prevent the PAIPA from achieving good results in the field of agricultural production and in the introduction of important factors of change in communities.

8. During the first years of PAIPA implementation, an effort was made to funding equipment needed for intervention in agriculture, allowing the realization of the main objectives of the project. However, the total financing of PAIPA remained practically at the same level, which means that in real terms there was a decrease in the project budget. This puts the need not only of a review of PAIPA budget, as well as a reassessment of the fiscal effort for the items related to the main objectives of the project. This budget review will not involve a significant weight in the volume of Portuguese aid flows directed to Guinea-Bissau, once the budget of PAIPA do not represents more than 1.4% of the total public aid development that Portugal has granted Guinea-Bissau during this period.

9. Throughout its implementation experience, PAIPA built a close relationship with the communities (based on knowledge and trust) which is significant and of great practical and symbolic value. This fact results from a strong respect for local cultural references and the choice for work strategies in close collaboration with the people. In fact, PAIPA was able to build a framework for relations with the various actors in the field, which implies a continuous and integrated communication with the communities. Working closely with the people is very important for peasant societies, which they recognize and appreciate.

Recommendations

Recommendations are based on two major fields of issues, macro and micro levels, relating to the Project and the challenges facing its continuity and sustainability. From a macro point of view, the recommendations relate to the suspension of PAIPA and issues concerning the link between labour, gender and community. On a micro level perspective, the recommendations are related with the associations, in particular with the creation of new associations, and with the extension of their intervention areas,

and also with the system of involving new members as well as the importance of the membership contributions.

1. It's important to study and accurately plan in advance, PAIPA's suspension process, in order not put at risk or even neglect the results already achieved, and the amount of experience accumulated by PAIPA in working with rural communities.
2. It is important to consider the creation of new associations in order to allow for a greater scope of the project and alleviate the three existing associations from the seasonal demand by a large number of *tabancas*, whose dwellers simply want to be able to use machinery, especially the tractor, at very convenient prices.
3. Make a meticulous assessment of the vulnerabilities that may affect PAIPA in order not to compromise the best progress of the project or jeopardize its own maintenance.
4. Rethink PAIPA's institutional and management model in order to prioritize the importance of its direct relationship with associations and communities and protect the effects of recurrent political instability in the country.
5. PAIPA's should continue to avoid a formal separation of work areas for men and women. The communities make themselves this division according to their logic and tradition.
6. The change is underway and a chain of results is observed that important to recognize and promote the subsequent process of PAIPA.