

Nigeria: Roots and Tuber Expansion Programme (RTEP)

Item	Assessment Remarks	Rating
Country & Project Name	Nigeria: Roots and Tuber Expansion Programme (RTEP)	
Loan Number	525-NG	
Project Id.	1016	
Board Date	Dec 1999	
Effectiveness Date	July 2001	
Original Closing Date		
Final Closing Date	March 2010	
Total Project Cost USD(M)	USD 36.09 million	
IFAD loan USD (M)	USD 23.6 million	
Cofinanciers (if any) US\$	USD 7.18 from Federal Government of Nigeria; USD 5.85 from State Governments.	
Implementing Agency	Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Water Resources (FMAWR) through its Federal Department of Agriculture	
Principal Components	The goal of RTEP was to improve the living conditions, income and food security of smallholder households in the programme areas. The specific objectives were to further raise the level of productivity of the target groups, enhance/improve the processing technologies/techniques and promote the marketing of these commodities, particularly cassava produce and products. The three amended components were: a) Sustainable Roots and Tubers production; b) Support to processing and Marketing; c) programme Management and Evaluation.	
Project Performance		
Design	RTEP design builds on the gains and achievement of a previous project. The design of the project shows many flaws. It was institutionally complex and cumbersome (involving seven implementing agencies at the central/state levels), while the geo-political coverage was too extensive and demanding (26 states). In addition, the initial design of RTEP was largely state-wide, thinly spread and supply-driven. However, after the first TTR in 2004/2005, the project experienced a dramatic shift by adopting an appropriate and correct focus on commodity value-chain as well as more and greater use of community-based, beneficiary driven, market led and participatory approach . It also conducted an intense campaign of sensitization of States, Local Governments and beneficiaries on the re-designed RTEP. In addition, RTEP adopted a more targeted approach by shifting its focus in favour of five selected communities/community groups (based on specified eligibility criteria)	4
Implementation	The project was hindered by the prolonged and avoidable delays in programme loan effectiveness, disbursement effectiveness, payment of initial deposit and implementation start-up, loan amendment, replenishment turn-around as well as insufficiently and untimely counterpart fund contribution . In addition, as a result of IFAD's inability to release its committed funds, during its first years (2001, 2002 and 2003), RTEP implementation was wholly dependent on limited Gov't resources. The programme suffered also from high staff turnover . After the first TTR in 2005, the RTEP was redesigned and the original Loan Agreement was amended. The RTEP geo-political area of operation was re-defined to enhance the programme focus: 5 communities in 5 selected Local Government Areas in the participating states. As far as project implementation, this was initially supervised by the World Bank (2002-2007) and subsequently directly by IFAD (2007-2010).	3
Relevance	PCR says very little about relevance of RTEP. It mentions that the choice of the target crops in 1995 was and remains relevant today, as is the need for increased productivity, production processing and value addition. The potential contribution of roots and tubers is undoubtedly high relating to such topical national issues as the commercialization of the agricultural sector, poverty reduction, food security and reduction of high food prices.	5
Effectiveness	Project's effectiveness was hindered by bureaucratic delays and slow pace of action. However, despite all these major problems, RTEP mostly reached its appraisal targets, by boosting cassava production and productivity, but also particularly by addressing much of the constraints of post-harvest handling processing, product diversification and utilization, as well as marketing.	4
Efficiency	Project's efficiency was hampered by the prolonged and avoidable delays in programme loan effectiveness, as well as disbursement effectiveness. On the other hand, estimates of the economic benefits vis a vis the operating and investment costs of selected farm models and processing enterprises, show internal rates of return (IRR) which range from 25% to 75%. Each of the enterprise models has IRR which is significantly greater than the cut-off rate of 12%. The estimated 37% economic rate of return (ERR) for RTEP is greater than the value of 24% ERR projected at programme appraisal without processing, and 29% with processing.	4
Partner Performance		

Item	Assessment Remarks	Rating
Country & Project Name	Nigeria: Roots and Tuber Expansion Programme (RTEP)	
IFAD	IFAD is responsible for the initial design flaws. It is also accountable for its weak role in guiding the project's implementation, especially between the 2003 and 2008 when IFAD participated in only one of five supervision missions and undertook no direct follow-up missions. IFAD is also deemed responsible for the delay in releasing the initial loan deposit, late start-up of the second tri-term operations, amendment of the Loan agreement, as well as the prolonged turn-around time in processing the withdrawal applications. The takeover of RTEP supervision from the WB in Nov. 2007 had hardly helped matters, with only two supervision missions, one follow-up mission and field visits to only 3-4 participating states.	3
Cooperating Institution	During the initial three years, the WB as the CI in charge of programme supervision. It timely processed the withdrawal applications, fund disbursement and the procurement of goods and services. However, it suffered a lull with the change of the team task management in February 2006, as there was neither a supervision nor a follow-up mission between December 2005 and October 2007.	4
Government	The performance of the Borrower (Federal Government of Nigeria) comprised primarily of the Federal Ministry of Finance, FMAWR and its agencies (notably Federal Department of Agriculture and NFRA) as well as the 26 participating State Governments and Abuja, was mixed. Although most of the covenants were complied with, counterpart fund contribution from both the Federal and State Governments was inadequate and untimely, while the AWPBs were averagely financed to the tune of only 48%. While in the last three years (2007-2009) the positive performance of the Federal Government was adequate and the counterpart funding was released timely, the performance of several of the State Government's was inadequate. In addition, irregular meetings of the programme executive committees (Federal Agricultural Development Executive Council, FADPEC and Agricultural Executive Committee, ADPEC) at the federal and state levels, respectively, caused prolonged delays in the approval of workplans, budgets and procurements. Moreover, in a few of the ADPs, instability of both management and implementation staff affected the smooth operations of RTEP activities.	3
NGO/Other	The Performance of the National Root Crops Research Institute (NRCRI) was mixed, as it was slow during the initial two years of RTEP, primarily on account of internal leadership challenges in the institution. With the institution of a new management board in 2003, the needed support was revitalized and grew. The National Cereals Research Institute (NCRI) complained about problems of inadequate funding in support of its routine operations, while its knowledge about root and tuber crops and roots and tubers-based farming systems was generally low and inadequate. The collaboration with the Nigerian Stored Products Research Institute (NSPRI) was smooth, as services were provided timely and professionally. The Institute of Agricultural Research and Training had adequate financial resources and staff for the effective and efficient provision of support services to RTEP. Finally, the performance of the National Centre for Agricultural Mechanization (NCAM) was affected by the inadequate funding and this implied delays in the provision of support services to the programme.	4
Cofinancier(s)		
Combined Partner Performance	<i>All the partners are believed to be implicated to varying degrees in the implementation delays and inability of the programme to effectively and fully draw down a loan envelop.</i>	3
Rural Poverty Impact		
Physical Assets	RTEP contributed to constructing/upgrading a total of 354 cassava processing sheds/centres, of which 166 centres were functional as at RTEP completion, established, owned and operated by small-scale programme beneficiaries. In addition, at RTEP completion, a total of 65 cassava processing factories had been established by medium-scale operators.	4
Financial Assets	The PCR does not provide specific information on this domain. It only mentions that RTEP contributed to a significant improvement in the lifestyle of cassava producers and processors.	NA
Food Security	Thanks to the RTEP, there is a higher level of awareness about the potentials of roots and tubers, especially cassava, for direct consumption. In addition, the contribution of the programme in increasing the national output of roots and tubers between 2000-2009, infers more and greater resources to farming families and, consequently, improved living standards. From the perspective of crop processing and value addition, the implementation of RTEP has successfully demonstrated the bright future for and the high potential of cassava for household consumption.	4
Environment	Within this domain, the RTEP had a positive impact in well managing two waste products resulting from the processing of cassava tubers: the peels and the effluent discharge. While prior to RTEP, little attention was given to the safe handling of cassava peels and effluent, RTEP had explored means and ways to convert the	4

Item	Assessment Remarks	Rating
Country & Project Name	Nigeria: Roots and Tuber Expansion Programme (RTEP)	
	waste into three safe and usable products: source of organic fertilizers and as animal feed. In addition, during the implementation of RTEP, it was promoted the adoption of farming system for maintenance of soil fertility, especially the planting of leguminous crops and alley cropping, together with the use of organic and inorganic fertilizers.	
Human Assets	The PCR provides very little information in this regard. It only mentions that RTEP contributed to enhance beneficiaries' human capital by providing training and imparting skills on improved crop management techniques, cassava production and processing.	4
Soc. Cap. & Emp.	The PCR provides very little information. It only mentions that RTEP contributed to the setup of processing groups/associations.	4
Ag. Productivity	Within this domain, the RTEP had a positive impact by widening and improving crop varieties and production; field evidence has shown a relatively high adoption rate (70-80%) for recommended cassava varieties. However, the full yield potential of such improved cultivars is still to be achieved. In addition, it has highlighted the potentials of roots and tubers as industrial raw materials (HQCF, starch and chips; as well as cassava pellets for animal feeds).	4
Inst. & Serv.	The PCR provides very few information. It only mentions that RTEP had a positive impact in positioning and upstaging roots and tubers as vitally important crops in the food security and poverty reduction agenda of both the Federal and State Governments of Nigeria. This only sentence is not sufficient to provide a rating on this impact domain.	NA
Markets	At some locations/states, strong linkages were created between processors and end-users, as well as between producers and processors. Overall, 850 processors were linked with end-users.	4
Project Impact		4
Overarching Factors		
Innovation	The effective management of cassava peels and the effluent discharged from cassava processing is believed to be quite ingenious and innovative. The technique was new and unknown, especially at the level of overwhelming majority small scale processing groups/associations. The recovery of starch from septic tanks through which the effluent waste is discharged is equally innovative.	4
Replicability and Scaling-up	With regard to replication, some well to do farmers and processors have started replicating improved processing shed/centres models. However, it is rather too early to have any tangible scale expansion/up scaling of cassava processing, since the improved centre initiative started only in 2007. Scale expansion is more in the area of cassava production, as over 75% of farming groups have seen the need to cultivate more than the 1-2 ha allocated to them under the RTEP. In addition, the huge human capacities developed/built, the skills imparted, the orientation and perspectives inculcated in root and tuber farmers/producers, processors, are likely to be long-lasting, especially in terms of attracting future investments/investors in the subsector and exploring opportunities especially relating to cassava.	4
Innovation, Replicability and Scaling-up		4
Sustainability and Ownership	According to the PCR, the Nigerian small holder farmers, small processors and medium-scale are willing to continue with activities beyond and after the programme period and IFAD support. It is likely that the beneficiaries may further continue their investments in roots and tubers cultivation and processing, long after programme closure. In addition, with the availability of crop varieties whose potential productivity has only been minimally explored, the effort by farmers to enhance production per unit of land is necessarily a continuing agenda even after RTEP. All these statements are not sufficient to justify a positive rating.	4
Targeting	The area of coverage was state-wide in the original Loan Agreement. After the second TTR, RTEP adopted a more targeted approach by shifting its focus in favour of five selected communities/community groups (based on specified eligibility criteria). This change enhanced the effectiveness of the management, service provision and monitoring of enterprise activities.	4
Gender	The RTEP did not have a specific strategy to address gender issue. Women were engaged in activities such as cassava processing activities. In addition, RTEP put a special emphasis on enhanced women membership of community groups - through their mobilization, sensitization, capacitation and empowerment process.	4
Overall Performance		4
Estimated number of beneficiaries	Project beneficiaries included an estimated 1.0-1.2 million rural households, mostly comprised of smallholder root and tuber farmers/producers, small-scale processors, marketers, equipment fabricators, as well as product end-users.	

Item	Assessment Remarks	Rating
Country & Project Name	Nigeria: Roots and Tuber Expansion Programme (RTEP)	
PCR Quality		
Scope	The project was in line with the guidelines, although some sections (like impact) are too short and do not give a comprehensive picture of project's impact.	4
Quality	The report does not provide sufficient quantitative and qualitative analysis. More details and more in-depth analysis are missing.	4
Lessons	Lessons learned are relevant for a future design, but they only dealt with a few number of the many issues the project had to face during its implementation	4