Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Initiative on Soaring Food Prices

Synthesis of the Beneficiary Satisfaction and Impact Assessment Reports for ISFP TCP Projects in the Caribbean Region

FAO Subregional Office for the Caribbean
Bridgetown, Barbados

June 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables

LIST OF ACRONYMS

CARICOM	Caribbean Community
CFA	Comprehensive Framework for Action
FADs	Fish Aggregating Devices
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations
FHH	Female headed household
GPS	Global Positioning Sensors
IICA	Inter American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture
ISFP	Initiative on Soaring Food Prices
JM$	Jamaican dollars
LOA	Letter of Agreement
MHH	Male headed household
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MoA	Ministry of Agriculture
ODA	Official Development Assistance
pks	Packages
RADA	Rural Agriculture Development Authority
SVG	St. Vincent and the Grenadines
TCP	Technical Cooperation Programme
UN	The United Nations
USD	US Dollars

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The downward trend of real food prices for the past 25 years came to an end when world prices started to rise in 2006 and escalated into a surge of price inflation in 2007 and 2008. Prices of staple foods, such as rice and vegetable oil, doubled between January and May 2008. The upturn coincided with record petroleum and fertilizer prices. For low-income and high import-dependent countries, higher food prices and a larger import bill become a major challenge, particularly for those with limited foreign exchange availability and high vulnerability to food insecurity. High food prices, in combination with high and volatile petroleum prices, had the potential of spurring inflationary pressures, competing for public expenditures intended for alleviating poverty or meeting Millennium Development Goals (MDG) targets, and fuelling political unrest. Poorer households with a larger share of food in their total expenditures were suffering the most from high food prices, due to the erosion of purchasing power, which has a negative impact on food security, nutrition and access to school and health services.

The Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations anticipating the problem that this crisis would have on the most vulnerable in society developed a programme collective called the Initiative on Soaring Food Prices (ISFP) and launched it worldwide. The initiative was supplied with USD 17 million from readily available funds and contributions from the Government of Spain which were earmarked to help farmers secure the next harvest through improved access to agricultural inputs, such as seeds, fertilisers and animal feeds. The initiative (ISFP) also contributed to the Comprehensive Framework for Action (CFA) which was developed by the UN System and its partners to address the Global Food Security Crisis. These initiatives were well received and appreciated in the Caribbean sub region by the CARICOM member states in which they were implemented. Technical cooperation projects (TCP) were implemented in Antigua and Barbuda, The Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Dominican Republic, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines and Suriname. These projects were designed to enhance the supply of agricultural inputs to benefit small farmers and vulnerable households in the above mentioned countries and to have an immediate impact on food supply.

Individual projects were allocated an eighteen (18) month time frame. The 18 months short term policies involved providing seeds, fertilizers, feeds and small fisheries supplies to the most vulnerable in the society while in the medium to long term strengthening policies and prioritizing existing development programmes for agricultural and rural sector. Overall, projects were implemented, monitored and evaluated by personnel of the various Ministries of Agriculture with technical assistance from the FAO. Beneficiaries of the project included small farmers, backyard gardeners, youth groups, women in agriculture, 4H clubs, women-headed households, schools, infirmaries and fisher folks. Within the small farmers group both crops and livestock were included which encompassed rabbits, sheep, goats and chickens (broilers and layers). Farmers' organisations also benefitted during the initiative either as a group or through its individual members.

This synthesis covers an evaluation of the project by way of an individual beneficiary satisfaction and impact assessment surveys in each of the participating countries. Surveyors assessed the impact of the initiatives on the individual countries, the beneficiaries, the implementing agencies and the suppliers of the inputs used in the initiative. Beneficiaries were assessed on the impact of the initiative on their household, general food supply and duration of their food supply over a year. The input distribution system was also evaluated in terms of its efficiency, timeliness, appropriateness and the quality of the inputs received. Gender issues as their related to agriculture and the effect rising prices on female headed was incorporated into some of the surveys. The gender evaluation produced a 65:35 male to female ratio over the region in term beneficiaries who received assistance during the initiatives.

The initiatives were well received in the countries which participated and generally had a positive impact on beneficiaries' households and agricultural production. Beneficiaries were able to improve on the quantity and quality of their food supply and in some cases had surplus for sale. In some countries the surplus in agricultural produce resulted in gluts on the market. Although this caused an increase in food for the general consumer, the producer had to settle for a lower sale price. This resulted in a call for future initiatives to include a marketing component to offset such occurrences.

The importance of adequate monitoring, and reporting was highlighted in the evaluation. Although well received a number of difficulties were highlighted, namely a lack or breakdown in communication between the Ministry of Agriculture and beneficiaries, some organisations and their members and project coordinators and their immediate staff. In such cases information (reports and updates) was not supplied on time and beneficiaries were not adequately advised with regards to some of the inputs distributed. Adequate monitoring of the project was critical in ensuring that all of it goals were achieved and these surveys highlighted a number of avenues for consideration for any future endeavors.

1. INTRODUCTION:

1.1 Brief Background on Soaring Food Prices at the Sub-Regional Level

During the period between 2006 and 2008, international prices for basic food commodities shot up by 60 percent while grain prices doubled. By mid-2008, food prices on international markets had reached their highest level in nearly 30 years. This increase was particularly harsh for low-income countries heavily dependent on staple food and fuel imports. The main causes that attributed to the soaring food prices were:

- poor harvests in major producing countries linked to extreme weather events
- declining food stocks – world stocks were at their lowest since the 1970s
- high oil and energy prices raising the cost of inputs, irrigation and transportation costs
- lack of investment in the agricultural sector
- subsidized production of bio-fuels that substitute food production
- speculative transactions (including large commercial traders hedging in futures markets and small traders hedging and building up storage)
- the imposition of export restrictions leading to hoarding and panic buying

In many developing countries, the cost of basic staple foods remains stubbornly high and the downturn in the global economy was making food less accessible to the world's poor. Diminished incomes and less money being sent from relatives working abroad placed a squeeze on household food security. This fact was highlighted by a survey which showed that the poorer members of society spend two-thirds or more of their income on food, with less for healthcare and education. In addition, during tough economic times people eat fewer and opt for cheaper and less nutritious food predisposing themselves to malnutrition.

The continued economic instability and population growth in developing countries such as those in the Caribbean, the negative impact of climate change on agriculture in many areas, inefficient use of land and water resources and the continuing demand of bio-fuels were strong factors which continued to exert pressure on food prices. Market volatility was also strongly influenced by rising energy prices and a sliding US dollar which was anticipated to have a long-term destabilizing effect on food security.

One of the possible solutions identified to avert another food crisis was to critically address the root cause of the problem. This involved strengthening the resilience of smallholder farmers to future shock and to improve food and nutrition security over the long-term. A previous food crisis in Asia in the 1970s saw Asian governments investing in irrigation and agricultural research and this set the stage for rapid productivity growth that saved millions from poverty and hunger. This initiative resulted in around 40 percent of the arable land in Asia currently under irrigation.

To repeat this initiative would require a commitment at all levels to scale up investments in agriculture in the developing world. This means increased Official Development Assistance (ODA) and private investments, but also greater agriculture expenditures in the national budgets of developing countries. Greater attention to agriculture in domestic and international policies is also critical, including policies that focus on increased investments in agricultural infrastructure, the research and development of new technologies and the sustainable management of soil and water resources.

1.2 Summary of Government Responses to the Soaring Food Prices

Faced with difficult choices on how to respond to the global increases in food prices, many governments were prompted to implement a number of policy responses aimed at ensuring food supplies remain affordable. The availability of cheap food on the international market was one of the factors that contributed to reduced investment and support to agriculture by developing countries. This factor is generally put forward as one of the reasons for the recent crisis. Several food importing countries reduced or suspended

their import restrictions, while many exporting countries limited, or even banned, exports in order to avoid food shortages and higher domestic prices. Other countries released stocks in order to stabilize domestic prices. Further to that a range of measures were taken to mitigate the adverse impacts of high prices on vulnerable households, including subsidized food sales or food distribution to targeted households in distress.

In the Caribbean Sub-region, a net importer of food, a number of short-term measures were implemented aimed at supporting producers and production. Technical assistance was offered to farmers, farmers groups and organisations. A number of public/private sector negotiation meetings were held geared at reducing prices of food to the consumer. Governments also made general appeals to farmers and householders to grow more of their own foods and to increase the production of staple foods such as cassava, sweet potatoes, yams, dasheen etc.

1.3 FAO Response to the Crisis in the Region/Sub-Region

The Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO) response to the International food crisis was an initiative aimed at assisting countries in achieving a rapid increase in domestic food production by:

- providing agricultural inputs to small holder farmers in time for that forthcoming planting season
- providing advice on policy measures and any such assistance as requested by members

This programme was collectively called the Initiative on Soaring Food Prices (ISFP). Aimed at stimulating a global response the initiative was supplied with USD 17 million from readily available resource and contributions from the Government of Spain. These funds were earmarked to respond to the crisis and to help farmers secure the next harvest through improved access to agricultural inputs, such as seeds, fertilisers and animal feed. The initiative (ISFP) also contributed to the Comprehensive Framework for Action (CFA) which was developed by the UN System and its partners to address the Global Food Security Crisis.

These initiatives were well received and appreciated in the Caribbean Sub-region by the CARICOM member states in which they were implemented. Technical Cooperation Projects (TCP) were implemented in Antigua and Barbuda, The Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Dominican Republic, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines and Suriname.

An eighteen (18) month time frame was allocated for the programme, but due to the urgency of the measures and to facilitate immediate implementation, attention was given to planning the assessments, analysis and investments required to provide a comprehensive and sustainable response to the issue of higher food prices in the medium and long-term. The 18 month short-term policies involved the distribution of seed, fertilisers, feeds and small fisheries supplies to the most vulnerable in the society while the medium to long term policies involved strengthening and prioritising existing development programmes for agricultural and rural sector. The short term policies were implemented by the use of national TCP of which most of the countries benefited from the immediate effects. These projects were designed to enhance the supply of agricultural inputs to benefit small farmers and vulnerable households in the above-mentioned countries and to have an immediate impact on food supply. The medium to long-term policies involved the use of regional TCPs to strengthen systems, such as extension education and training, greenhouse production and development and strengthening the capacity of the region in small ruminant production.

1.4 Purpose of ISFP TCP Project Assessments

The ISFP TCP projects (74 agricultural inputs distribution and 45 technical assistance TCPs) were developed as an emergency response to the rising food prices. The agriculture input distribution projects were developed without the integration of a beneficiary impact assessment component into the original project design. This resulted in a lack of standardized baseline data for all the input supply projects. Although such information is available for some countries and have been incorporated in an impact assessment activity; the

methodologies used and the level of information collected have differed. To correct this, the ISFP TCP Beneficiary Satisfaction and Impact Assessment Survey was developed and undertaken to:

1. Assess the level of satisfaction of beneficiaries with the FAO ISFP TCP projects and the impact that it had on their lives.
2. Collect the views of project beneficiaries, implementing agencies and input suppliers on the major constraints or problems they faced with the projects and suggestions they have for improving them.
3. Contribute to a lesson learning process that will be useful for optimising future emergency responses.

1.5 Brief Description of Beneficiary Satisfaction and Impact Assessments carried out

Beneficiary Satisfaction and Impact Assessments were undertaken in the countries in which the programme was implemented. A generic questionnaire survey was developed by the ISFP Secretariat to collect the necessary information from the beneficiaries of the projects for assessment. Leverage was given by the ISFP Secretariat for the questionnaire to be altered to accommodate the collection of specific information depending on the country, the replies of the individual farmers and the context and nature of the TCP project being evaluated. National Consultants were recruited from within the countries to collect, evaluate and document this information.

The questionnaire was divided into two sections. The aim of section one was to collect information from beneficiary households by:

1. Examining how beneficiary farmers used the inputs received;
2. Gauging their satisfaction with the received inputs;
3. Getting their opinions on how the TCPs have impacted on their food production and food security; and
4. Collecting their views on problems faced and suggestions for improving the TCP project.

The aims of section two was to gather the opinions of the implementing agencies and the input suppliers on the major constraints of the TCP projects and suggestions for improvement.

A general guideline for the sample size and the method of selection was supplied by the ISFP Secretariat, but the National Consultant had the final determination. A minimum of 100 households was recommended per country. However, in countries with large numbers of beneficiary households, efforts were made to survey a greater number of beneficiaries to have a more significant representation. Allocation was made for the training of surveyors which was previously identified as a critical component in conducting surveys. Surveyors were instructed not to distribute the questionnaires to the beneficiaries and return for the completed forms. Forms were to be completed by the trainers or national consultants after on-farm discussions with the beneficiaries which would allow for some visual verification of the information.

A beneficiary list was developed by the various Ministries of Agriculture (MoA) and delivered to the National Consultants from which the surveyed households, individuals or farmers groups were taken. Selection from the list was taken, 1) randomly from the overall list, 2) the list was divided into districts and then individuals were chosen randomly based on organised agricultural production and 3) in other cases individuals were selected from farmers groups based of their financial standing (annual paid-up subscriptions/membership).

2. SUMMARY OF TCP PROJECTS IN THE SUB-REGION

2.1 Overview of TCP Projects in the Sub-region

The Food and Agriculture Organisation implemented a number of TCP projects in the sub-region. All of the FAO affiliated regional countries except Trinidad and Tobago were involved in the Initiative on Soaring Food Prices. The initiatives were geared towards the stimulation of rural agriculture with emphasis being placed on the most vulnerable in society. This group included single parent homes, female headed households, women in agriculture, youth groups, small farmers groups, farmers organisations and youth in agriculture particularly 4-H clubs. In some countries schools were targeted particularly those with school gardens and school feeding programmes. In other countries (e.g. Jamaica) inmates of rural infirmaries were assisted in reducing their operating cost by producing vegetables, meat (chicken) and eggs for the inmates as well as the sale of surplus output to surrounding communities. Ministries of Agriculture (e.g. Antigua and Barbuda) obtained assistance in the form of strengthening and upgrading of infrastructure at agricultural stations to ensure the sustainability of the support system to the small producer/farmer in fruit tree plants and vegetable seedling production.

In other countries emphasis was placed in the production of livestock. Small ruminant in the form of rabbits were given to schools (Barbados-4H clubs) and small backyard producers (Dominica and St. Lucia). In Antigua and Barbuda a small ruminant unit was renovated and restocked to serve as a demonstration and training Centre for livestock farmers. The unit provides genetic improvement services as part of its overall mandate to improve the breeding stock on the island. Two pure bred Barbados Blackbelly rams were supplied under the ISFP project and some 40 ewes were bred. Supplies in the form of salt blocks supplied and utilised by the Unit as well as 55 small livestock farmers as part of the improved feeds and feeding activity.

Land preparation in the form of land clearing, ploughing and rotavation was undertaken in Antigua and Barbuda and Barbados. In Antigua and Barbuda, three rotary cultivators were supplied one to a government agricultural station for training and demonstration purposes, one to the extension service from which 35 farmers benefited and in Barbuda to the Barbuda Council and fifteen (15) farmers benefited. Fishing equipment to benefit the most vulnerable in the fishing industry was distributed in Dominica, St. Lucia and Barbados. St Lucia received GPS and FADs while Barbados and Dominica received hooks, buoys, lines and swivels. In the case of St. Lucia the inputs were to support the beneficiaries who were previously affected by the passage of Hurricanes Dean and Omar. Table 2.1 outlines the projects in the sub region by country, target areas and households, objectives, outputs and the total budget over the project period.

Table 1: Overview of TCP projects in Caribbean Region

Country	TCP Project code	Brief project description			
		Objectives	Outputs	Target areas and households	Total budget (USD)
Antigua and Barbuda	TCP/ANT/3201	1) Catalyse the implementation of the National Food Production Plan 2) Increase production through the use of drip irrigation 3) Increase the consumption of locally produced agricultural produce	1) Improved food and nutrition security 2) House hold food security through home based food production 3) Change consumption patterns through increased utilization of locally produced food 4) Increased income security to farmers	Small farmers, migrant groups, physically and mentally challenged, home based producers and senior citizens. Vegetable and fruit growers, small ruminant and green house producers	250,000
The Bahamas	TCP/BHA/3202 (E)	To contribute to the efforts of the Government in their support to the poorest rural families and farmers affected by increased food prices.	1) Provide agricultural produce supplement school canteens and school feeding programmes. 2) Reactivation of the agricultural activities in the country.	Estimated 2000 small farmers and women-headed households, schools with school gardens	250,000
Barbados	TCP/BAR/3201	1) To stimulate increased production of vegetables, root crops and livestock 2) Ensure adequate availability of food at reasonable prices 3). To facilitate marketing and distribution of agricultural produce	1) A reactivation of agricultural activities in small farming communities. 2) Stabilization of farmers' household income, cheaper prices. 3). Year round supply of vegetable and livestock products	276 farmers from vulnerable groups including small farmers, young farmers (4-Hers) and women farmers 13 schools	250,000

Country	TCP Project code	Brief project description			
		Objectives	Outputs	Target areas and households	Total budget (USD)
Belize	TCP/BZE/3201	To support the worst affected marginal producers by supplying agricultural inputs for the planting season. To contribute to the efforts of the donor community and the Government in their support to the poorest rural families affected by rising food prices	1). Increase the availability and use of improved seeds for food crops 2). Increase food production and availability at the farm level 3). Create job opportunities by providing inputs for crop and livestock production	1,350 beneficiaries including backyard farmers, small farmers, schools and community based organisations	250,000
Dominica	TCP/DMI/3201	1). Stimulate production of vegetables, root crops and livestock 2). Increased income of farmers 3). Contribute to making food more available and accessible	1). Reduce vulnerability in families in four poverty stricken areas 2). Contribute to the stability of food and nutrition security at the rural level and to stabilize the rural population.	400 backyard producers, including 200 women headed households, 16 schools, 1025 small farmers-producing crops, rabbits and fisheries and 3 agro-processors	250,000
Dominican Republic	TCP/DOM/3201	1). Support agricultural activities of small farmers through the distribution of quality seeds and other farming supplies 2). To increase yields and improve farmers' income	1) Increase availability and yield of staple crops (beans, corn, vegetables pigeon peas) 2) Improve the standard of living of small farmers with scarce resources	5434 small farmers with scarce resources and land areas between 0.06 to 0.63 hectares who received little support from the Government authorities in the recent past and who are willing to participate in the project.	250,000

Country	TCP Project code	Brief project description			
		Objectives	Outputs	Target areas and households	Total budget (USD)
Grenada	TCP/GRN/3201 (E)	1) Supply agricultural inputs to support the worst affected marginal producers. 2) To complement the efforts of the Government and donor communities in their support of the poorest rural farmers affected by increased food prices	1) Increased availability and use of improved seeds for basic grains and the food crops 2) Increased food production and availability at the farm level 3). Creation of job opportunities and strategic seed reserves at farm and community level.	2140 small farmers, women headed poor households	250,000
Guyana	TCP/GUY/3201	1). Contribute to the efforts of the donor community and of the Government in their support to the poorest rural families affected by food price increases 2). Support the worst affected marginal producers by the supply of agricultural inputs for the forthcoming planting season.	1). Increased the availability and use of improved rice seed and the creation of job opportunities 2). Provide support to smallholders in the most seriously affected areas. 3). To achieve food self-sufficiency from the assistance given limiting the future dependence on food aid.	2000 vulnerable farming families	250,000
Jamaica	TCP/JAM/3201	1). To support the root and tuber crop to increase food security by supplying agricultural inputs. 2). To support targeted institutional homes to increase food security and self sufficiency by supplying agricultural inputs for the expansion of their food gardens and farming activities	1). Increased availability and use of root and tuber crops. 2). Direct support provided to a target group of most vulnerable persons 3). Improved food security for participating institutions 4). Contribute to the strategic initiative of the government to reduce the food import bill and create import substitution.	The planned direct beneficiaries included 110 small-scale root and tuber farmers located in nine parishes, 1,200 indigent and destitute residents of seven homes/infirmaries and 330 inmates at an adult correctional facility to complete 1,640 direct beneficiaries.	250,000

Country	TCP Project code	Brief project description			
		Objectives	Outputs	Target areas and households	Total budget (USD)
St. Kitts and Nevis	TCP/STK/3201	1). Stimulate overall production of vegetables, root crops and livestock. 2). Maintain or improve nutrition security in targeted school feeding programme 3). Increase vegetable and meat production and productivity 4). Secure food security and livelihoods of selected farmers.	1). Increased access to vegetables and meats and secured livelihoods 2). Increased food production and availability at the farm level 3). Increased access to improved seeds and tested food production technologies	481 backyard producers of crops, and livestock activities including pigs, poultry small ruminants and rabbit; single female headed households, 21 schools supporting the National School Feeding programme	250,000
St. Lucia	TCP/STL/3201	1). To halt the further decline in production within the non-banana crop and livestock sector. 2). Improve the availability and accessibility of food in response to the problem of food security 3). Heighten the consumption of locally produced foods as part of the government's diversification thrust.	1). Increased the availability of locally produced food over the short term. 2). Food self sufficiency enabling beneficiary families to produce a variety of commodities. 3). Development of technical and management capacity at the rural level	Small crop farmers (26% females), small livestock, fishers and bee keepers in a total of 288 kits distributed	250,000
St. Vincent and the Grenadines	TCP/STV/3201	1). Increase vegetable and meat production productivity and farmers income 2). Stimulate consumption of locally produced fruits and vegetables as part of the government's wellness campaign 3). To expedite Government's National Food Policy	1). Increased access to vegetables and meats 2). Reduced vulnerability for 90 families in four poverty stricken areas-Coulls, Barrouallie, Byera and Sandy Bay 3).Refurbished greenhouses for 40 farmers with plastic covering.	1700 small farmers and women headed poor households	250,000

Country	TCP Project code	Brief project description			
		Objectives	Outputs	Target areas and households	Total budget (USD)
Suriname	TCP/SUR/3201	1). To bring idle rice land in the Saramacca district into production 2). Increase vegetable production sand productivity 3). Stabilise and increase farmers income.	1). Development of the technical and management capacity at the rural level 2). Food self-sufficiency arising from the assistance reducing dependence on food aid.	A 70:30 ratio of male to female farmers - including backyard vegetable farmers, rice farmers, livestock farmers in the Coronie district and small pig farmers	250,000

2.1.1 Sub-Regional Overview of Inputs Distributed

Throughout the region and within the projects implemented during ISFP programme a varying amount of inputs were distributed. Inputs were distributed to cover various areas of agricultural productivity. These main areas were crop production, livestock production, fisheries, post-harvest technology and processing. The following table outlines the inputs distributed over the main area. List of inputs provided to ISFP countries are shown in the following table.

Inputs were supplied based on the beneficiaries needs in consultation and discussion with Ministry of Agriculture personnel, suppliers and the Food and Agriculture Organisation. The availability of the supplies (by suppliers) also influenced the final inputs distributed to the beneficiaries. Beneficiaries questioned the quality of some of the supplies provided in the various countries. In St. Vincent and the Grenadines a shipment of fertiliser had to be replaced due to its arrival in an unsatisfactory condition. Many of the countries (beneficiaries) reported problems with the seeds and seedlings provided. Some of the seeds provided exhibited poor germination and some of the seedlings were reportedly pass the stage of time to planting from sowing. This resulted in stunted and retarded growth and poor yield (returns) to the beneficiaries.

In the provision of planting material for root crops, it was reported that some of the planting materials provided (cassava and sweet potatoes) were not the regulated length and a high percentage of loss was incurred due to excessive water loos of the planted piece which resulted in poor plant stand and reduced returns from the land area planted. This raised the point of having certified providers of planting materials (Dominica, Grenada and St Lucia) to reduce or eliminate the high percentages of planting material loss at planting. Some farmers were able to improve the management and better utilize the use of water in their production through the use of drip irrigation (Barbados) and reduce chemical use with the use of plastic mulches (St. Vincent and the Grenadines).

Feeds and medication provided to the producers of livestock were well received. Beneficiaries commented on the assistance arriving at a time when the cost of feed rose above their financial means and the assistance provided a safety net for the animal they were rearing and prevented the loss of their stock (Barbados). In other instances, the livestock (chickens) provided supplemented the diet of their families (Jamaica) and even resulted in the provision of extra money from the sale of surplus. This was also true for pigs and layer chicks where some of the beneficiaries were able to sell eggs to their neighbours.

Table 2: List of inputs provided to ISFP countries

Crops			**Livestock**
Seeds	**Root Crops**	**Pesticides**	**Cattle**
Tomatoes	Yams	Roundup	Pigs
Carrots	Dasheen	Newmectin	Sheep
Lettuce	Sweet potatoes	Regent	Rabbits
Onions	Eddoes	Bio Neem	Goats
Pigeon peas	Cassava	Phyton	Poultry
Corn	Pineapple plantlets	New BT	Broilers
Okras	Bananas and plantain plantlets	Gramoxone	Layers
Kentucky Beans	Potatoes	Caparol	
Beets		Karate	
Squash		Decis	**Rations and medication for the above**
Herbs	**Fertilisers**	Confidor	Waterers
Pumpkin	15:15:15	Dipel	Feeders
Soyabeans	Nitrophoska Blue	Gesapax	Lanterns
Sweet peppers	24:0:18	Diametrin	Nesting boxes (layers)
Watermelon	$12:12:17^{+2}$	Amistar	Bedding (rice hulls)
Honey dew melons	4:0:2	Diuron	A cooler (Igloo)
Cantaloupes	8:1:5	Malathion	Thermometer
Cabbage	11:22:22		Slaughtering knives
Chinese cabbage	46:36:12		Stoves and gas
Maize	19:19:19	**Post Harvest/Processing**	Killing cones
Beans	18:18:18	Cassava peelers	Bleeding pans
Corn	18:46:0	Cassava graters	Stainless steel
R.K. beans	Poly feed		Building supplies (housing, fencing)
Black beans	14:28:14		Invomectin
Hot peppers	16-8-24;	**Tools and equipment**	Iron
Lima beans	11-4-27	Greenhouses and greenhouse supplies	Hunter
Red beans	Triple super phosphate	Small machinery	Panacur
Black eye beans	Sulphate of Ammonia	Garden hand tools	Nipples
Broccoli	$13\text{-}7\text{-}23^{+3.5}$	Irrigation equipment	Vaccines
Cascarilla	Urea	Drip irrigation	
Mango	Limestone	Garden hoses	
Guavas	7-14-7		**Fisheries**
Limes	9-12-15		Fishing supplies
Oranges	Calcium		GPS systems
Sugar apples			FADs
Soursop			

2.1.2 Socio-economic Profile of Sample Beneficiary Households

The socio-economic profile of the beneficiary household varied according to the country in which the survey occurred. The major beneficiaries of the project were residents of poor and food insecure rural and peri-urban communities, mainly poor farm households. Beneficiary households also included single female headed households from rural and peri-urban areas and home based producers. Fisher folks were targeted from the coastal communities where fish supplies a ready injection of protein into the diet of these communities. Small-scale agro processors were also incorporated into the programme in some of the countries to process excess of food crops such as cassava into flour to reduce wastage and supplement the use and importation of wheat flour. In some countries (Jamaica) infirmaries were included in the programme to reduce their dependence on the Government for financial support in providing food for their inmates. In most cases they produced meat and eggs to supplement the organisation and also had surplus to sell to the surrounding communities. Some schools were also included in the programme to assist in providing produce to maintain the school meals service which provides meals to the less fortunate pupils in the school. In other cases schools were included to support the youth in agriculture programmes which are promoted by governments in the region.

Most of the beneficiary households were from the low and lower middle class grouping. Included in that group were unemployed and single mothers, women in agriculture groups, female headed households, small backyards producers of both crops and livestock and landless farmers. The age group of the beneficiaries throughout the region ranged from 23 to 90 years. The largest percentage of beneficiaries fell within the range of 50 to 70 years. This result was consistent with the frequently lamented problem of the aging farming population in the region. This problem is observed across both genders and in no small part contributed to the governments of the region placing great emphasis on the inclusion of a youth in agriculture component in the ISFP programme. This was most noticeable in Barbados in the involvement of the 4H movement and in the involvement of schools in countries like St.Kitts and Nevis and Grenada.

The family size ranged from 1 to 17 persons per family with the regional average of around 4 persons per family. Although the rising cost of food affected most of the beneficiaries, families had access to food (self sufficiency) for at least 10 months of the year. A high percentage of the farmers were landless (in particularly livestock farmers) and this was dependent on country. The animals were either reared on commercial feed or occupied the land of their neighbour or Government owned lands. Individual land holdings ranged from as low as 1 hectare in Dominica to as high as 63 and 52 hectares in Belize and Jamaica respectively. Land ownership also factors high in the survey with a high percentage of the beneficiaries being landless farmers. This phenomenon was particularly evident in Grenada, Antigua and Barbados and posed great problems between landless livestock farmers and crop farmers where untethered livestock would wander into crop production areas and destroy crops.

Table 3: Socio economic characteristic of sample household in the sub region

Country	All sample Households	Gender		Average family size			Average age (yr)			Food self sufficiency (mths)		Average landholding (ha)	
		Male (%)	Female (%)	Sample	MHH	FHH	Sample	MHH	FHH	MHH	FHH	MHH	FHH
Bahamas	64	87.5	12.5	4.2	4.4	3.4	61	60	68	11 (overall)	-	6.87 (overall)	-
Barbados	90	83.0	17.0	4.0	4.0	5.0	52	51	52	12	12	1.84	1.80
Belize	100	64.0	36.0	7.0			52	50	50	6 (overall)		63.80	40.00
Dominica	89	76.4	23.6	4.0	3.9	4.4	54	55	53	10.6	9.8	2.47	1.04
Dominican Republic	143	95.8	4.2	5.0	-	-	53	-	-	9 (overall)	-	2.77 (overall)	-
Grenada	136	42.0	58.0	5.0	-	-	-	47	44	10 (overall)	-	0.71 (does not include institutions)	-
Jamaica	91	87.0	13.0	-	6.0	6.0	-	48	43	11	12	52.70	1.80
St. Kitts and Nevis	100	75.0	25.0	-	4.7	4.6	-	-	-	11	9	3.34	1.34
St. Lucia	100	83.0	17.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	52	52	50	10	11	5.75	4.01
St. Vincent and the Grenadines	103	60.2	39.8	4.6	-	-	-	-	-	10 (overall)	-	1.75 (overall)	-

FHH – female headed household MHH – Male headed household

2.2 Input Distribution Systems used in TCP Projects

2.2.1 Description of Beneficiary and Site Selection Process (including criteria)

The beneficiary and site selection process also varied according to country. Generally the selection was based on those individuals who were registered through the Ministries of Agriculture and the various agricultural groups as farmers. Apart from those farmers registered with the Ministries of Agriculture, the extension officers through the extension department/services made a comprehensive list of the clients they service on a daily basis. In some countries, bulletins were placed on the radio and television to make the general farming community aware of the assistance being provided by the ISFP programme urging them to come into the Ministry of Agriculture and register to be entitled for assistance through the programme.

Antigua and Barbuda

In Antigua and Barbuda the targeted groups were home based producers, small vegetable and livestock farmers, the Green Castle Agricultural Station, Betty Hope Small Ruminant Unit and three secondary schools (Jennings, Pares (in Antigua) and Sir McChesney George (in Barbuda). Farmers were validated for the programme after an assessment and approval exercise of the participants (by application form) by a technician from the Ministry of Agriculture. The two agricultural stations (the Green Castle Agricultural Station and the Small Ruminant Unit) benefitted from the programme although they did not meet the original criterion as a beneficiary. The strengthening and up grading of these two stations would ensure the sustainability of the support system to small producers in fruit tree and vegetable production as well as the production of good Black Belly sheep breeding stock for sheep farmers. The Small Ruminant Unit would also serve as a demonstration area and training unit for livestock farmers.

The Bahamas

The ISFP/TCP project in the Bahamas included three components. They were an education component, an input supply component and a component for the production of planting material by the Inter American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA).

> The education component was expected to introduce agriculture to young persons, reduce the stigma attached to agricultural activities and encourage healthy eating habits. Green Houses were to be established in thirty-one schools, fifteen (15)in New Providence, three (3) each in Grand Bahama, Andros and Eleuthera, two (2) each in Abaco and Cat Island and one each in Bimini, Exuma and Long Island. This component also supplied inputs for the operation of the Green Houses;
>
> The input supply component anticipated an expenditure of $250,000 and was expected to reach one thousand three hundred and ninety two (1,392) farmers in ten (10) islands as follows: Ninety-five (95) farmers in Abaco; two hundred and ninety-six (296) in Cat Island; twenty-four (24) in Crooked Island; two hundred and ninety-nine (292) in Eleuthera; ninety-six (96) in Exuma; twenty-four (24) in Grand Bahama; two hundred and twenty-five (225) in Long Island; twelve (12) in Mayaguana; two hundred and ninety-one (291) in North Andros; and thirty (30) in San Salvador. This data excludes inputs presented to schools. Crops grown under this component included Sweet Potato, Corn, Cassava, Lima Beans, Okra, Hot Pepper, Tomato, Watermelon, Limes, Oranges, Potatoes, Sugar Apple, Soursop, Cascarilla, Banana, Plantains, Pineapple, Mango, Red Beans, Black Eye Beans, Onions, Pigeon Pea, Guavas, Carrot, Broccoli and Lettuce.
>
> The IICA Component included a letter of agreement (LOA) under which IICA agreed to produce Sixty-eighth thousand (6,000) sweet potato slips, twenty-one thousand (21,000) cassava plantlets for distribution to farmers and the training of nursery men in the preparation of root crop planting material.

The recipients included both male and female farmers with 12.5% of the recipients being females. In addition an education component geared towards the introduction of agriculture to young persons, reduce the stigma that is attached to agricultural activities and encourage healthy eating habits increased the recipients

of the project through schools. This drive was complemented by the establishment of greenhouses and the supplying of inputs in thirty-one schools throughout the islands.

Barbados

The major persons targeted were livestock, fruit and vegetable farmers. An added criterion was those small farmers who used farming to supplement their family income. The small farmer in Barbados was considered as those who utilise less than 0.25 acres (0.1 hectares) of land usually in mixed farming of crops and livestock. The Barbados 4-H Foundation (a group comprising thirteen (13) different youth clubs) also benefitted from the ISFP programme. These groups were either community or school (both primary and secondary) and catered for students between the ages of 7-11 and 11-17 years respectively. Farmers' organisations in Barbados were the major administrators of the programme and selection in the first instance was based on financial membership with the various agricultural associations/groups. A more specific criterion was devised by the Barbados Egg and Poultry Producers Association which selected farmers for inputs who reared greater than 500 but less than 5000 chicks on their farms for benefits.

Belize

The project document suggested some guidelines for the selection of beneficiaries which generally included families from vulnerable groups most affected by high food prices. Specific groups would have included small farmers, female headed poor households and youth involved in agriculture for their basic livelihood. Throughout the evaluation a number of reports were made with regards to political interference in the selection process. Extension personnel also claimed a lot of consultation and participation in the selection process. A call was made for the involvement of an independent consultant in the selection of the final beneficiary list.

Dominica

In Dominica the targeted beneficiaries were subsistence farmers and fisher folk throughout the seven agricultural regions in Dominica, particularly disadvantaged indigent communities. Schools across all regions with agriculture programmes and school feeding programmes were also targeted for some support. The agro-processors are to receive their equipment following the necessary improvements to their respective plants. The National Association of Fisheries Cooperatives (NAFCoop), which was only recently formed (three months) at the time of the project, also benefited through use of the inputs to initiate the development of an input revolving fund for the membership.

Dominican Republic

In the Dominican Republic study was carried out in the northeast of the country, covering the provinces of Valverde, Montecristi, Santiago Rodriguez and Dajabon. A significant part of the population lives in these areas which are characterised by high levels of poverty, illiteracy and a significant part of the population lives in a very vulnerable state. Five thousand four hundred and thirty-four beneficiaries were targeted which included both male and female headed households. Of the 5,434 beneficiaries 143 were randomly selected and interviewed for the survey analyses. This survey sample included 95.8% males and 4.2% females. Other selection criterion included a working land area of between 0.06 and 0.63 hectares and a willingness to participate in the project.

Grenada

In Grenada, the criteria for selection was based on the ownership of less than one hectare of land, the nature and level of family support, the state of health of the beneficiary and the domestic context and setting of the individual or the family. These criteria were used to establish the priority rankings for assistance under the project. The following persons were established as beneficiaries target groups based on the criteria. Small farmers with less than one hectare of land, women heading households, single parents with resident children, single women, families with underweight children, persons receiving public assistance from the Ministry of Social Development and farmers classified as "resource poor", i.e., farmers who had lands but in the past were provided with fertilizer and seeds by the Ministry because they were unable to purchase them.

Jamaica

The beneficiaries and target sites were identified by the parish management through the submission of the Area Development Projects. The beneficiaries identified were based on a criteria selection guide that included e.g. farmers being registered farmers and who should be members of Production and Marketing groups also the Jamaican Agricultural Society (JAS) group. The farmers should be planting on less than two acres and showed a need for assistance to increase production of the crops grown. A working knowledge of the crops to be grown and ready access to a market /consumption source was an asset. The farmers' ability to be trained and contribute to the project in the form of labour cost was also a major criterion. Experience in the production of the identified crop and a willingness to take technical advice from RADA extension personnel and the accessibility of the farm to authorised project personnel increased the chances of the farmer to benefit from the project. Infirmaries were chosen based on FAO standards as well as the availability of land, water and infrastructure on the facility and the readiness and availability of funds at the infirmary after a site visit.

St Kitts and Nevis

Targeted support was geared towards the poorest rural families and the worst affected marginal producers that were being affected by the food price increases. These families were identified by the Government of St. Kitts and Nevis from among the small farmer crop and livestock sub-sector. It particularly recognized that female headed households were among the most vulnerable in terms of their inability to purchase adequate quantities of foods for their families.

St. Lucia

The most vulnerable groups identified in St. Lucia included single parent households headed by women, the small livestock and crop farmers and fishermen and these were the main groups targeted in the programme. In additional, farmers were selected from districts where agricultural production was practiced in an organized manner based on consultation with key stakeholders, extension officers, processors and other agricultural agencies such as CARDI.

St. Vincent and the Grenadines

In St. Vincent and the Grenadines beneficiaries lists were provided by the MAFF as obtained from extension personnel and farmers groups. The consultant made a "qualified" random selection of the sample from the obtained lists. In order to ensure that females were well represented in the sampling process the names were divided along the gender lines and a sample was taken from each group. A further division of the beneficiaries was made along the lines of quantity of inputs received (large, medium and small) therefore an attempt was made to capture samples from each of these groups. The final beneficiary sample list was made to ensure an equitable distribution of male and female farmers as well as farmers who obtained inputs in three quantities described above.

2.2.2 Description of Method/System for Distributing Inputs

The inputs distributed were procured based on list produced by the various countries. Consultations would have been undertaken between the Ministries of Agriculture (Extension Divisions) and the farmers as to the inputs that were required for the coming planting season. The various input lists were delivered to the FAO who secured quotations for the supply of these inputs before the individual suppliers were selected. Suppliers were selected from local, regional and international sources. Inputs were ordered and purchased from the selected suppliers by the FAO and where ever possible inputs were purchased from within the countries in which they were needed. After purchase the respective purchase orders were sent to the individual islands (Ministry of Agriculture) and notification of delivery was then forwarded to the FAO.

From this stage a number of distribution methods were used. Some inputs were distributed by the Ministry of Agriculture through the extension departments. Farmers were notified by written and or oral correspondence of the availability of the inputs for collection from the Ministries of Agriculture. In some countries farmers/beneficiaries were allowed to collect the inputs directly from the commercial suppliers due to lack of storage space at the Ministries. Some of the seeds were distributed directly to the farmers who

produced they own seedlings. While in other cases the seeds were delivered to seedling producers who produced the seedlings which were then collected by beneficiaries.

In some countries (St Vincent and the Grenadines) a revolving scheme was established by the Ministry of Agriculture. Some of the inputs (animal feeds) were distributed through the revolving scheme, where the inputs were purchased by the farmers at a reduced price and the proceeds of the purchases were used to procure further supplies for distribution and to extend the assistance to other farmers. This measure ensured some sustainability in the project and more farmers were covered than those initially targeted by the initiative.

2.3 Farmers' Impressions of Receiving Agriculture Inputs

The farmers' participation in the beneficiary survey based on gender and country is shown in Table 5. Based on the beneficiaries' surveys over all countries the average male beneficiaries were 64.8 % while females were 35.2%. The country with the highest male beneficiaries was the Bahamas with 87.5% followed by Jamaica and Barbados (83%) and Dominica (76.4%). In contrast the countries with the highest female beneficiaries were Antigua and Barbuda (77%), Grenada (58%) St. Kitts and Nevis (45%) (Table 5). In Grenada the higher percentage of the livestock distributed went to female headed households, while the root crop planting material was distributed to the male headed households. Females headed households recorded improvements in both crop and livestock production (St. Kitts and Nevis). In St. Kitts and Nevis, animal health, household food accessibility and the ability to sell more agriculture produce during the period of assistance of the TCP was improved.

Table 4: Beneficiary division based on gender

Countries	Beneficiaries		
	Male (%)	Female (%)	Total number of beneficiaries
Antigua and Barbuda	23	77	
Barbados	83	17	289 (includes 13 schools)
Dominica	76.4	23.6	1644 (includes 16 schools and 3 agro-processors)
Dominican Republic	95.8	4.2	5434
St Lucia	83	17	288 (number of kits distributed)
St. Kitts and Nevis	55	45	481
Jamaica	87	13	209 (includes 4 institutions)
Belize	64	36	761
The Bahamas	87.5	12.5	2000
Grenada	42	58	2140
St. Vincent and the Grenadines	60.2	39.8	1700
All countries	**64.8**	**35.2**	**13276**

*The overall country average does not consider the different number of beneficiaries in each country.

Interestingly, coming out of the Jamaica report the women played a great role in assisting with markets and made a great overall contribution to the economic status of their families. Even in cases where women played the greater role in farm production and management and apparently were the main bread winner, they did not consider themselves as household heads, nor portray the image that they had absolute control over the operations of the farm. In cases where they reported to being the head of their household, they had either separated from their spouses, were the eldest in a nuclear family situation, or the male spouse had died.

2.3.1 Awareness of Farmers as to why they received Agriculture Inputs vs Actual Beneficiary Targeting Criteria

The farmers' impressions of why they received the agricultural inputs were quite variable from country to country. Although the inputs were an initiative of the Food and Agriculture Organisation it was clear that a large percentage of the beneficiaries were not aware of this. Following is a list of the replies given by the respondents as to why they received the inputs:-

It was an initiative of the Government to assist farmers
The assistance was due to their good relationship with extension officers, the Director of Agriculture or the Veterinary Officer
The assistance given because they were leading or progressive farmers
They were Ex-sugar industry workers
They heard about the programme from someone and decided to contact the DOA
The assistance was due to the recession or to help with high input prices
Cooperation, experience and willingness to participate in the project
To assist in a sustainable food supply
Assistance due to membership in the farmers' organisation

The responses obtained from the beneficiaries showed a clear picture of those involved in the projects. The project targeted those most vulnerable in society and the replies given above showed that although some of these were covered by the inputs distributed others out of that category were covered as well. The actual selection criteria were not adhered to in all instances and this was a function of country, the strength of supervision and the collaborative efforts of all involved. As highlighted throughout the national reports, a lack of communication could have contributed to the differences in selection of who actually benefited and who were the intended beneficiaries.

2.3.2 Knowledge of the Agriculture Inputs Received and Willingness to Adopt;

The range of experience of the beneficiaries involved in the agricultural input distribution ranged from as little as 2 years to as much as 25 years. Most of the farmers were confident that they had sufficient knowledge to be efficient and use best practices on their farms. Farmers indicated that they did not received extensive amounts of formal training, but gathered information from other farmers, extension officers, seminars and agricultural salesmen. Instructions and information on the proper use of agricultural products are also gathered by way of seminar delivered by farmers' organisation and product suppliers.
Farmers indicated that they were familiar and normally purchased the inputs they received under the project but the cost of the product was sometimes a limitation. Respondents (over 96%) were aware that the inputs can be purchased locally and virtually a similar percentage of them (95%) indicated a willingness to adopt the use of the inputs by purchasing them on the local market if they are available. An undetermined but significant number of these respondents did add the comment that their decision to buy the inputs will depend on their affordability.

2.3.3 Satisfaction Level with Inputs Received;

The majority of the respondents reported being satisfied to highly satisfied with the inputs received. In some countries satisfaction levels were related to the parish or area and not to gender. A low satisfaction level was reported by respondents who felt that promises of inputs did not materialise. Others were not satisfied with the quantity received and gave a low or indifferent response. Some of these lower and indifferent responses were reported for timelines of delivery related to seasonality. Some respondents received input well into the planting season and although they could be stored and used in the following planting season expressed dissatisfaction with delivery. A small percentage of farmers reported no improvement in yield and reported low satisfaction with the project but a consultant reported no visible signs or clear visible links to the project or inputs. Overall, above 60 % of the participants reported an improvement on their livelihood. This

resulted from their ability to sell more produce due to increased availability. One of the major areas of dissatisfaction was in the seeds distributed. In most of the countries, some of the seeds distributed failed to germinate when planted or exhibited poor growth and retarded developmental rates. In St. Vincent and the Grenadines this was evident in onions and carrots and in St Lucia some vegetable seedlings (tomatoes and squash) exhibited retarded growth. Some beneficiaries attributed this to poor seeds due to their extended time in storage.

SATISFACTION LEVEL WITH SEEDS

Table 5: Satisfaction level with receiving seeds

Country	Number of answers	% Highly dissatisfied			% Dissatisfied			% Indifferent			% Satisfied			% Highly Satisfied		
		All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Fe-male	All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Female
Barbados*	3	67.0	67.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.0	33.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Belize	51	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.8	12.8	0.0	7.8	7.7	8.3	82.4	79.5	91.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Dominica	89	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	25.0	10.0	16.7	0.0	60.0	50.0	75.0	20.0	33.3	0.0
Dominican Republic	80	0.0	-	-	8.8	-	-	5.0	-	-	38.8	-	-	47.0	-	-
Grenada	37	0.0	-	-	2.7	0.0	0.0	18.9	-	-	67.6	-	-	10.8	-	-
Jamaica	21	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.5	10.5	0.0	23.8	21.0	50.0	66.7	68.4	50.0
St. Kitts and Nevis	34	5.8	6.8	0.0	8.8	10.3	0.0	2.9	3.4	0.0	35.2	37.9	20.0	47.0	41.4	80.0
St. Lucia	15	13.3	18.2	0.0	6.7	9.1	0.0	6.7	9.1	0.0	40.0	36.4	50.0	33.3	27.3	50.0
St. Vincent and the Grenadines	21	14.0	12.0	20.0	19.0	12.0	40.0	10.0	13.0	0.0	38.0	50.0	0.0	19.0	12.0	40.0

Grenada's results is a weighted average of seeds and root crops

*In Barbados only 3 beneficiaries provided answers with respect to their satisfaction on receiving seeds – the results are not significant

Antigua and Barbuda, The Bahamas, Suriname and Guyana have not completed their assessment reports.

Table 6: Satisfaction level with timeliness of seeds

Country	Number of answers	% Highly dissatisfied			% Dissatisfied			% Indifferent			% Satisfied			% Highly Satisfied		
		All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Female
Barbados	3	0.0	67.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Belize	51	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.2	35.9	41.7	7.8	10.3	0.0	54.9	53.8	58.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Dominica	89	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	16.7	0.0	70.0	50.0	100.0	20.0	33.3	0.0
Dominican Republic	80	1.3	-	-	5.0	-	-	6.3	-	-	33.8	-	-	53.8	-	-
Grenada	37	0.0	-	-	27.0	-	-	18.9	-	-	40.5	-	-	13.5	-	-
Jamaica	21	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.5	10.5	0.0	23.8	21.0	50.0	66.7	68.4	50.0
St. Kitts and Nevis	34	2.9	3.4	0.0	11.7	13.8	0.0	5.8	6.8	0.0	32.4	31.0	40.0	47.1	44.8	60.0
St. Lucia	15	20.0	27.3	0.0	26.7	27.3	25.0	13.3	9.1	25.0	13.3	18.2	0.0	26.7	18.2	50.0
St. Vincent and the Grenadines	21	5.0	0.0	20.0	19.0	18.0	20.0	10.0	12.0	0.0	57.0	63.0	40.0	10.0	7.0	20.0

Grenada's results are a weighted average of seeds and root crops.
Antigua and Barbuda, The Bahamas, Suriname and Guyana have not completed their assessment reports.

Table 7: Satisfaction level with <u>appropriateness</u> of seeds

Country	Number of answers	% Highly dissatisfied			% Dissatisfied			% Indifferent			% Satisfied			% Highly Satisfied		
		All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Fe-male	All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Female
Barbados	3	0.0	33.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	67.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Belize	51	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	98.0	97.4	100.0	2.0	2.6	0.0
Dominica	89	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	25.0	10.0	16.7	0.0	70.0	66.7	75.0	10.0	19.7	0.0
Dominican Republic	80	0.0	-	-	2.5	-	-	10.0	-	-	33.8	-	-	53.8	-	-
Grenada	37	0.0	-	-	18.9	-	-	18.9	-	-	48.6	-	-	13.5	-	-
Jamaica	21	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.5	10.5	0.0	23.8	21.0	50.0	66.7	68.4	50.0
St. Kitts and Nevis	34	2.9	3.4	0.0	8.8	10.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	17.4	17.2	20.0	70.6	68.9	80.0
St. Lucia	15	6.7	9.1	0.0	20.0	27.3	0.0	6.7	0.0	25.0	53.3	54.5	50.0	13.3	9.1	25.0
St Vincent and the Grenadines	21	5.0	0.0	20.0	14.0	18.0	0.0	14.0	12.0	20.0	62.0	63.0	60.0	5.0	7.0	0.0

Grenada's results is a weighted average of seeds and root crops

Antigua and Barbuda, The Bahamas, Suriname and Guyana have not completed their assessment reports.

Table 8: Satisfaction level with quality of seeds

Country	Number of answers	% Highly dissatisfied			% Dissatisfied			% Indifferent			% Satisfied			% Highly Satisfied		
		All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Fe-male	All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Female
Barbados	3	0.0	33.0	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	67.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Belize	51	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.8	7.7	16.7	5.9	7.7	0.0	82.4	82.1	83.3	2.0	2.6	0.0
Dominica	89	20.0	2.2	0.0	20.0	25.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	60.0	75.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Dominican Republic	80	0.0	-	-	3.8	-	-	5.0	-	-	25.0	-	-	66.3	-	-
Grenada	37	8.1	-	-	13.5	-	-	18.9	-	-	48.6	-	-	13.5	-	-
Jamaica	21	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.5	10.5	0.0	23.8	21.0	50.0	66.7	68.4	50.0
St. Kitts and Nevis	34	5.9	6.8	0.0	11.8	10.3	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.8	13.8	0.0	70.6	68.9	80.0
St. Lucia	15	13.3	18.2	0.0	6.7	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	53.3	54.5	50.0	26.7	18.2	50.0
St Vincent and the Grenadines	21	24.0	24.0	20.0	24.0	18.0	40.0	14.0	18.0	0.0	29.0	18.0	40.0	10.0	12.0	0.0

Grenada's results is a weighted average of seeds and root crops

Antigua and Barbuda, The Bahamas, Suriname and Guyana have not completed their assessment reports.

SATISFACTION LEVEL WITH FERTILISER

Table 9: Satisfaction level with receiving fertilizers

Country	Number of answers	% Highly dissatisfied			% Dissatisfied			% Indifferent			% Satisfied			% Highly Satisfied		
		All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Fe-male	All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Female
Barbados	N/A	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	52.0	50.0	0.00	44.0	50.0
Belize	14	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Dominica	76	1.3	1.8	0.0	11.8	10.7	15.0	10.5	12.5	5.0	59.2	58.9	60.0	17.1	16.7	20.0
Dominican Republic	106	4.7	-	-	18.9	-	-	0.0	-	-	30.2	-	-	46.2	-	-
Jamaica	28	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	7.4	0.0	28.6	25.9	100.0	64.3	66.7	0.0
St. Kitts and Nevis	43	2.3	2.9	0.0	18.6	22.9	0.0	2.3	2.9	0.0	34.9	31.4	50.0	41.9	40.0	50.0
St. Lucia	34	2.9	3.3	0.0	2.9	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	46.7	75.0	44.1	46.7	25.0
St. Vincent and the Grenadines	62	3.0	3.0	0.0	13.0	16.0	10.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	53.0	55.0	55.0	27.0	23.0	32.0

Antigua and Barbuda, The Bahamas, Suriname and Guyana have not completed their assessment reports.

Table 10: Satisfaction level with timeliness of fertilizers

Country	Number of answers	% Highly dissatisfied			% Dissatisfied			% Indifferent			% Satisfied			% Highly Satisfied		
		All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Female
Barbados	N/A	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	52.0	50.0	0.0	44.0	50.0
Belize	14	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	92.9	90.9	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Dominica	76	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.5	0.0	5.0	15.8	16.7	50.0	44.7	50.0	60.0	25.0	33.3	30.0
Dominican Republic	106	1.9	-	-	3.8	-	-	3.8	-	-	39.6	-	-	50.9	-	-
Jamaica	28	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	7.4	0.0	28.6	25.9	100.0	64.3	66.7	0.0
St. Kitts and Nevis	43	2.3	2.9	0.0	9.3	8.6	12.5	2.3	2.9	0.0	44.2	45.7	37.5	41.9	40.0	50.0
St. Lucia	34	0.0	0.0	0.0	17.6	16.7	25.0	5.9	6.7	0.0	50.0	53.3	25.0	26.5	23.3	50.0
St Vincent and the Grenadines	62	3.0	6.0	0.0	11.0	13.0	10.0	6.0	7.0	7.0	52.0	58.0	45.0	27.0	16.0	38.0

Antigua and Barbuda, The Bahamas, Suriname and Guyana have not completed their assessment reports.

Table 11: Satisfaction level with appropriateness of fertilizers

Country	Number of answers	% Highly dissatisfied			% Dissatisfied			% Indifferent			% Satisfied			% Highly Satisfied		
		All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Female
Barbados	N/A	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	52.0	50.0	0.0	44.0	50.0
Belize	14	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Dominica	76	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.5	10.7	10.0	17.1	16.1	20.0	46.0	46.4	45.0	36.3	26.8	25.0
Dominican Republic	106	0.0	-	-	0.0	-	-	10.4	-	-	42.5	-	-	46.2	-	-
Jamaica	28	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.7	11.1	0.0	32.1	29.6	100.0	57.1	59.3	0.0
St. Kitts and Nevis	43	2.3	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.8	8.6	0.0	27.9	25.7	37.5	62.8	62.9	62.5
St. Lucia	34	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.9	3.3	25.0	70.6	73.3	50.0	23.5	23.3	25.0
St Vincent and the Grenadines	62	2.0	0.0	3.0	8.0	6.0	10.0	10.0	6.0	13.0	53.0	58.0	45.0	27.0	20.0	32.0

Antigua and Barbuda, The Bahamas, Suriname and Guyana have not completed their assessment reports.

Table 12: Satisfaction level with quality of fertilizers

Country	Number of answers	% Highly dissatisfied			% Dissatisfied			% Indifferent			% Satisfied			% Highly Satisfied		
		All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Fe-male	All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Female
Barbados	N/A	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	52.0	50.0	0.0	44.0	50.0
Belize	14	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Dominica	76	2.6	1.8	5.0	13.2	14.3	10.0	6.6	5.4	10.0	55.3	58.9	45.0	22.4	19.6	30.0
Dominican Republic	106	0.0	-	-	0.0	-	-	0.0	-	-	26.4	-	-	73.6	-	-
Jamaica	28	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	7.4	0.0	35.7	33.3	100.0	57.1	59.3	0.0
St. Kitts and Nevis	43	4.7	5.7	0.0	2.3	2.9	0.0	4.7	5.7	0.0	20.9	14.0	50.0	67.4	71.4	50.0
St. Lucia	34	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.9	6.7	0.0	5.9	3.3	25.0	41.2	40.0	50.0	47.1	50.0	25.0
St Vincent and the Grenadines	62	3.0	0.0	3.0	15.0	0.0	12.0	6.0	0.0	7.0	44.0	0.0	39.0	32.0	0.0	39.0

Antigua and Barbuda, The Bahamas, Suriname and Guyana have not completed their assessment reports.

SATISFACTION LEVEL WITH PESTICIDES

Table 13: Satisfaction level with receiving pesticides

Country	Number of answers	% Highly dissatisfied			% Dissatisfied			% Indifferent			% Satisfied			% Highly Satisfied		
		All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Fe-male	All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Female
Barbados	15	53.3	0.0	0.0	46.70	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Belize	6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Jamaica	28	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	7.4	0.0	28.6	25.9	100.0	64.3	66.7	0.0
St. Kitts and Nevis	12	0.0	0.0	-	25.0	25.0	-	0.0	0.0	-	41.6	41.6	-	33.3	33.3	-
St. Lucia	18	5.6	5.9	0.0	11.1	5.9	100.0	5.6	5.9	0.0	38.9	41.2	0.0	38.9	41.2	0.0

Antigua and Barbuda, The Bahamas, Suriname and, Guyana have not completed their assessment reports.

Table 14: Satisfaction level with timeliness of pesticides

Country		% Highly dissatisfied			% Dissatisfied			% Indifferent			% Satisfied			% Highly Satisfied		
	Number of answers	All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Fe-male	All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Female
Barbados	15	46.7	0.0	0.0	53.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	46.0	100.0	0.0	54.0	0.0
Belize	**6**	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Jamaica	28	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	7.4	0.0	28.6	25.9	100.0	64.3	66.7	0.0
St. Kitts and Nevis	12	0.0	0.0	-	8.3	8.3	-	8.3	8.3	-	41.6	41.6	-	41.6	41.6	-
St. Lucia	18	5.6	5.9	0.0	38.9	35.3	100.0	16.7	17.6	0.0	22.2	23.5	0.0	16.7	17.6	0.0

Antigua and Barbuda, The Bahamas, Suriname, Guyana and St Vincent and the Grenadines have not completed their assessment reports.

Table 15: Satisfaction level with appropriateness of pesticides

Country	Number of answers	% Highly dissatisfied			% Dissatisfied			% Indifferent			% Satisfied			% Highly Satisfied		
		All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Fe-male	All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Female
Barbados	15	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	-	46.0	100.0	-	54.0	0.0
Belize	6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Jamaica	28	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	7.4	0.0	28.6	25.9	100.0	64.3	66.7	0.0
St. Kitts and Nevis	12	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0	-	8.3	8.3	-	91.7	91.7	-
St. Lucia	18	11.1	11.8	0.0	16.7	11.8	100.0	11.1	11.8	0.0	55.6	58.8	0.0	5.6	5.9	0.0

Antigua and Barbuda, The Bahamas, Suriname and Guyana have not completed their assessment reports.

Table 16: Satisfaction level with quality of pesticides

Country	Number of answers	% Highly dissatisfied			% Dissatisfied			% Indifferent			% Satisfied			% Highly Satisfied		
		All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Fe-male	All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Female
Barbados	15	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0.0	-	46.0	100.0	-	54.0	0.0
Belize	6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Jamaica	28	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	7.4	0.0	28.6	25.9	100.0	64.3	66.7	0.0
St. Kitts and Nevis	12	0.0	0.0	-	8.3	8.3	-	0.0	0.0	-	0.0	0	-	91.7	91.7	-
St. Lucia	18	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	11.8	0.0	5.6	5.9	0.0	11.1	5.9	100.0	72.2	76.4	0.0

Antigua and Barbuda, The Bahamas, Suriname and Guyana have not completed their assessment reports.

SATISFACTION LEVEL WITH OTHER INPUTS

Table 17: Satisfaction level with receiving other inputs

Country	Number of answers	% Highly dissatisfied			% Dissatisfied			% Indifferent			% Satisfied			% Highly Satisfied		
		All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Fe-male	All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Female
Barbados	81	-	6.0	17.0	-	1.0	8.0	-	0.0	0.0	-	36.0	42.0	-	57.0	25.0
Belize	16	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.2	12.5	0.0	93.8	87.5	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Dominica	11	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	36.4	36.4	0.0	63.6	63.6	0.0
Dominican Republic	115	0.0	-	-	7.8	-	-	6.1	-	-	31.3	-	-	54.8	-	-
Grenada	89	0.0	-	-	2.2	-	-	2.2	-	-	64.0	-	-	31.5	-	-
St. Kitts and Nevis	68	3.4	4.7	0.0	4.4	3.1	8.4	2.2	3.1	0.0	37.9	43.2	23.8	52.2	46.2	68.0
St. Lucia	59	10.2	12.7	0.0	15.3	14.0	4.2	6.8	3.5	8.5	47.5	52.7	10.2	20.4	17.2	77.1
St Vincent and the Grenadines	36	3.0	4.0	0.0	14.0	19.0	0.0	6.0	8.0	0.0	53.0	42.0	80.0	25.0	27.0	20.0

Antigua and Barbuda, The Bahamas, Suriname and Guyana have not completed their assessment reports.

Table 18: Satisfaction level with timeliness of other inputs

Country	Number of answers	% Highly dissatisfied			% Dissatisfied			% Indifferent			% Satisfied			% Highly Satisfied		
		All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Fe-male	All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Female
Barbados	81	-	6.0	17.0	-	1.0	0.0	-	0.0	8.0	-	33.0	50.0	-	59.0	25.0
Belize	16	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.8	37.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	81.2	62.5	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Dominica	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	27.3	27.3	0.0	72.7	72.7	0.0
Dominican Republic	115	0.0	-	-	3.5	-	-	5.2	-	-	31.3	-	-	60.0	-	-
Grenada	89	0.0	-	0.0	2.2	-	-	7.9	-	-	69.7	-	-	20.2	-	-
St. Kitts and Nevis	68	3.4	4.7	0.0	2.2	3.1	0.0	4.4	6.2	0.0	37.9	40.1	32.1	52.2	46.2	68.0
St. Lucia	59	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	3.5	0.0	15.3	10.5	14.4	54.3	55.1	66.9	27.2	30.9	18.6
St Vincent and the Grenadines	36	3.0	4.0	0.0	14.0	19.0	0.0	11.0	16.0	0.0	47.0	42.0	60.0	25.0	19.0	40.0

Antigua and Barbuda, The Bahamas, Suriname and Guyana have not completed their assessment reports.

Table 19: Satisfaction level with <u>appropriateness</u> of other inputs

Country	Number of answers	% Highly dissatisfied			% Dissatisfied			% Indifferent			% Satisfied			% Highly Satisfied		
		All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Fe-male	All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Female
Barbados	81	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Belize	16	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Dominica	11	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.2	18.2	0.0	72.7	72.7	0.0
Dominican Republic	115	0.0	-	-	1.7	-	-	12.2	-	-	27.0	-	-	59.1	-	-
Grenada	89	0.0	-	-	10.1	-	-	7.9	-	-	58.4	-	-	23.6	-	-
St. Kitts and Nevis	68	3.4	4.7	0.0	1.1	1.5	0.0	1.1	1.5	0.0	40.0	41.6	35.9	54.4	50.8	64.1
St. Lucia	59	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7	1.7	0.0	17.9	20.2	0.0	62.9	60.5	81.4	17.5	17.5	18.6
St Vincent and the Grenadines	36	3.0	4.0	0.0	11.0	15.0	0.0	11.0	12.0	10.0	44.0	39.0	60.0	31.0	30.0	30.0

Antigua and Barbuda, The Bahamas, Suriname and Guyana have not completed their assessment reports.

Table 20: Satisfaction level with quality of other inputs

Country	Number of answers	% Highly dissatisfied			% Dissatisfied			% Indifferent			% Satisfied			% Highly Satisfied		
		All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Fe-male	All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Female	All sample HH	Male	Female
Barbados	81	-	3.0	17.0	-	1.0	0.0	-	1.0	17.0	-	39.0	42.0	-	55.0	25.0
Belize	16	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	87.5	75.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Dominica	11	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	9.1	0.0	90.9	90.9	0.0
Dominican Republic	115	0.0	-	-	0.9	-	-	4.3	-	-	24.3	-	-	70.4	-	-
Grenada	89	1.1	-	-	11.2	-	-	4.5	-	-	48.3	-	-	34.8	-	-
St. Kitts and Nevis	68	3.4	4.7	0.0	3.4	1.5	8.4	2.2	3.1	0.0	31.1	35.4	19.9	60.0	55.4	71.8
St. Lucia	59	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.5	10.4	0.0	11.9	10.9	8.5	47.5	45.8	77.1	32.2	32.9	14.4
St Vincent and the Grenadines	36	17.0	0.0	0.0	14.0	15.0	10.0	3.0	4.0	0.0	53.0	54.0	50.0	31.0	27.0	40.0

Antigua and Barbuda, The Bahamas, Suriname, Guyana and St Vincent and the Grenadines have not completed their assessment reports.

2.3.4 Perceived Impacts of TCP on Beneficiary Households

Evaluation of the reports showed that beneficiaries gained some economic benefits as a result of the inputs received. Some beneficiaries were able to reallocate funds to other important needs. Poorer households were the most vulnerable to the impact of rising food prices as a larger portion of their income would have been used in food expenditure, by improving their purchasing power their nutritional status improved. The inputs led to increased food production and availability for home consumption. One of the most insecure food groups (female headed households) was afforded the ability to have a ready supply of food for use. This increased involvement in food crop production led to improvements in diet, In addition food use and nutrition education activities assisted rural households in utilizing food crops in a more effective manner resulting in improved consumption habit.

Improved social and economic benefits were reported by beneficiary household over the project period. A positive impact was reported due to the livestock inputs and this was reported as improvement in the health and production of the livestock over the year pervious to the TCP assistance. Increased production of meat and eggs enable poorer households to improve their purchasing power and nutritional status. Although increases in crop production were reported, in some cases the increased production resulted in a higher supply than demanded and this did not equate into higher returns for the producer. This situation caused farmers to suggest the need for a marketing or post harvest component in future projects.

PERCEIVED IMPACTS OF TCP PROJECT ON BENEFICIARY HOUSEHOLDS

Table 21: Perceived impacts of TCP project on crop production of beneficiary households

Country	Deteriorated a lot (%)	Deteriorated a little (%)	Unchanged (%)	Improved a little (%)	Improved a lot (%)
The Bahamas	0.0	3.1	60.0	23.1	13.8
Barbados	0.0	0.0	24.0	32.0	43.0
Belize	19.6	10.7	17.9	48.2	3.6
Dominica	1.2	1.2	22.1	50.0	23.3
Grenada	3.2	6.2	50.0	37.5	3.1
Jamaica	0.0	8.8	27.0	28.0	32.0
St. Vincent	16.7	10.3	2.6	48.7	21.8
All countries	**5.8**	**5.8**	**29.1**	**38.2**	**20.1**

Table 22: Perceived impacts of TCP project on food accessibility of beneficiary households

Country	Deteriorated a lot (%)	Deteriorated a little (%)	Unchanged (%)	Improved a little (%)	Improved a lot (%)
The Bahamas	1.5	1.5	49.2	33.8	13.8
Barbados	0.0	0.0	29.0	41.0	29.0
Belize	6.9	4.2	26.4	43.1	19.4
Dominica	0.0	1.2	23.5	52.9	21.2
Grenada	0.0	8.0	52.3	36.4	3.4
Jamaica	0.0	0.0	36.0	26.0	37.0
St. Vincent	4.3	4.3	5.7	70.0	15.7
All countries	**1.8**	**2.7**	**31.7**	**43.3**	**19.9**

Table 23: Perceived impacts of TCP project on ability to sell more as a result of the TCP programme production

Country	Deteriorated a lot (%)	Deteriorated a little (%)	Unchanged (%)	Improved a little (%)	Improved a lot (%)
The Bahamas	1.5	1.5	46.2	33.8	16.9
Barbados	3.0	0.0	25.0	43.0	28.0
Belize	5.9	11.8	32.4	41.2	8.8
Dominica	2.4	0.0	22.4	52.9	22.4
Grenada	2.5	7.6	62.0	22.8	5.1
Jamaica	0.0	8.8	25.0	28.0	43.0
St. Vincent	4.9	11.1	6.2	53.1	24.7
All countries	**2.9**	**5.8**	**31.3**	**39.3**	**21.3**

Table 24: Perceived impacts of TCP project on animal production of beneficiary households

Country	Deteriorated a lot (%)	Deteriorated a little (%)	Unchanged (%)	Improved a little (%)	Improved a lot (%)
Barbados	0.0	0.0	19.0	33.0	47.0
Grenada	0.0	0.0	49.1	28.3	22.6
St. Vincent	3.0	3.0	17.0	47.0	31.0
All countries	**1.0**	**1.0**	**28.4**	**36.1**	**33.5**

Table 25: Perceived impacts of TCP project on animal health of beneficiary households

Country	Deteriorated a lot (%)	Deteriorated a little (%)	Unchanged (%)	Improved a little (%)	Improved a lot (%)
Barbados	0.0	0.0	59.0	14.0	25.0
Grenada	0.9	4.7	48.1	28.3	17.9
St. Vincent	0.0	6.0	23.0	29.0	46.0
All countries	**0.3**	**3.6**	**43.4**	**23.8**	**29.6**

3. ANALYSIS OF INPUT DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS OF TCP PROJECTS

3.1 Main Types of Input Distribution Systems used in the Sub-region

The distribution of inputs was the responsibility of both the Ministries of Agriculture in the various countries and the FAO. The procurement of local and international inputs was obtained through a process of bidding. A minimum of three quotations were required for review before the providers of the inputs were chosen. Quotations were requested by the Ministry of Agriculture and then submitted to the FAO or requested directly by the FAO's procurement personnel. After procurement the inputs were delivered by one of three methods:

1. delivered directly to the farmers.
2. delivered to the various Ministries of Agriculture.
3. delivered to the various farmers organisations.

In the latter two methods the inputs were either delivered to or collected by the farmer depending on their means of transportation. In addition, farmers' organisations particularly in Barbados included the additional criteria of being in current financial status with the organisation to be considered for assistance.

3.2 Effectiveness of Input Distribution Systems

3.2.1 Knowledge of the Agriculture Inputs Received and Willingness to Adopt

The range of experience of the beneficiaries (which ranged from as little as 5 months to as much as 40 years) affected their knowledge and their willingness to adopt. Most of the beneficiaries during the survey were familiar with most of the inputs distributed during the programme. The overwhelming factor which prevented the farmers from purchasing and using the inputs was the price. In some countries (Barbados, St. Vincent and St. Lucia) some beneficiaries stated that they would normally purchase the distributed inputs but the rising prices prohibited purchase. Some small growers and backyard producers involved in the programme stated that the size of their holdings or production units prevented them from adopting and purchasing some of the inputs that were distributed by the project. Over the sub-region between 70 to 80% of the beneficiaries acknowledged prior experience of the materials received, while around 20 % had little or no prior experience with the inputs.

In relation to the chemicals and fertilisers that were distributed to some of the island some of the beneficiaries (the Bahamas-91%) had neither training nor knowledge in the use of the material, while in Barbados the feed manufacture (Pinnacle Feeds) gave instructions with purchase/collection on the proper use of their feeds. Baby chicks' producers (Gale's Agro Product) provided support to chicken farmers by visiting farms and giving advice. Most of the implementing agencies (Ministries of Agriculture and Fisheries) have extension personnel in all of the countries who are mandated to provide knowledge and advice to farmers/beneficiaries. Willingness to adopt the technology was also hampered by the unavailability of the material by the suppliers and or the lack of trained personnel by the Ministry of Agriculture to impart knowledge of the technology. A case in point was plastics in St. Vincent for mulching and greenhouse cover and irrigation/fertigation in Barbados.

In the individual countries, more than 90% of the respondents reported having some form of training in the use of inputs given. Most of the inputs were available on the local market but the beneficiaries purchasing ability depended on cost. Fertilisers produced at the Eastern Caribbean Fertiliser Company in Barbados are shipped to the Eastern Caribbean countries (St. Vincent and the Grenadines, St. Lucia and Grenada). This company offers training to farmers in soil sampling and undertakes soil analyses for the farmers, all geared towards appropriate and efficient use of the product.

3.2.2 Constraints of Input Distribution Systems

Some implementing agencies express concern in handling the inputs in the quantities that were supplied. Some of the pesticides supplied to the Ministries of Agriculture were supplies in bulk and therefore presented a challenge in distribution to the beneficiaries. Distribution to the beneficiaries required redistribution and decantering into smaller quantities which presented great challenges to personnel and on the resources in the Ministries of Agriculture. The handling of delicate seeds such a peanut and beans resulted in a number of seeds being damaged resulting in poor germination due to the unfamiliarity of the personnel in dealing with such large quantities at any one time. The lack of adequate storage facilities in some of the countries was a major constraint. Fertiliser supplies in one of the participating countries were subjected to deterioration due to the quantities received from the suppliers and the lack of adequate transport and storage facilities.

Some implementing agencies also suggested the need for an FAO Liaison Officer in the field as a mediator between the farmers and the suppliers. One specific instance relates to supply and installation of irrigation equipment. The supplier was concerned with the selection of sites for the positioning of water storage tanks as it relates to height of the tanks off the ground to affect the pressure of the water in the irrigation lines. In some cases structures were already constructed when the equipment was delivered without their consultation. They highlighted the need to take advantage of the expertise available in designs and set-up to obtain the best results from the inputs delivered to the farmers/beneficiaries. Overall they seemed to be a breakdown or a lack of communication between the farmers, extension personnel and the input suppliers at various stages of the project.

Beneficiaries' constraints included promises not being fulfilled and the limited technical advice and training available for farmers. In some countries limited travelling resources was reported by members of the implementing agencies as being a hindrance to the providing regular technical advice to the farmers. On the other hand beneficiaries reported a lack of travelling resources as preventing them from collecting inputs on time and in quantities to adequately service their farms. Severe weather conditions (heavy rains or drought) affected and were a major constraint to input distribution and use. In many countries, beneficiaries expressed the view that there were insufficient extension personnel per farmers to cover the activities of the project thereby stretching the limited resources of the Ministry of Agriculture. This fact was suggested as one of the reasons why the project was not adequately monitored in the field. In-house administrative problems such as slow processing of paper work, unavailability of transportation when needed and lack of reporting by the field officers had a serious effect on the outcome of the project.

3.2.3 Suggestions for Improving Input Distribution Systems (Views of beneficiaries, implementing agencies, input suppliers, and FAO staff)

The views of the input suppliers varied from country to country. Some of the suppliers were not aware that they were providing inputs for an FAO initiative. On the other hand some of them saw the initiative as a means of increasing sales and suggested the project continue on a larger scale. Some input suppliers voiced concerns of not having contributed in the planning process of the project which would have affected their ability to provide inputs in a timely manner and in quantities that were required. More frequent consultation between the Ministries of Agriculture and the input suppliers in the different countries was regularly cited as one of the ways to improve the input distribution system. Frequent follow-ups with farmers were also suggested to ensure the proper application of fertilisers and other chemicals as well as more public education. Suggestions were also made for the identification and certification of local suppliers for the production of disease and pest free planting materials for any future projects. Certification of the suppliers of pest and disease free planting material would ensure consistency in the planting material and reduce the complaints obtained from beneficiaries.

Lengthy administrative protocols and bureaucratic procedures (such as obtaining invoices, length of the bidding process, actual procurement and shipping, storage and distribution of inputs to respective ISFP

territories) involved in obtaining inputs from overseas sources significantly slowed down the implementation process. These procedures resulting in inputs arriving 6 months later than originally expected and caused considerable delay in the implementation process. A reduction in these procedures should drastically improve the distribution system as stated by suppliers and agents of the implementing agencies. Beneficiary farmers also complained of delays in receiving seeds and seedlings for planting which seriously affected their planting schedules.

Problems with transportation hindered, to some extent, efficient distribution of the inputs to targeted beneficiary farmers. Improper transportation arrangements such as using inappropriate vehicles to transport livestock, not having transport at the best time to transport baby chicks and poor monitoring of distribution presented a problem. Farmers who did not have their own means of transportation had difficulty in collecting their inputs. Interference and preferential treatment (Barbados, Grenada, St Lucia and St. Vincent) in the distribution of feed in particular was a problem. There was some disparity in the distribution of feed, seedlings and some other inputs. Inputs were delivered to farmers who were not on the list of target beneficiaries and this affected the overall outcome of the project and the distribution system.

One of the main and recurring suggestions from suppliers of feed for the establishment of a revolving fund for feed purchase and distribution. This was suggested as a more sustainable process than delivering the feed suppliers free to beneficiaries. It was also suggested that the revolving scheme organised through the farmers' organisation to have maximum effect and to reach a larger cross section of participants. Improvement in lines of communication within the Departments of the Ministry of Agriculture would also improve the distribution system. A number of reports implied that specific department were not consulted when selecting beneficiaries, when recommendations were being made for the purchase of inputs from reputable and traditional suppliers, and when the distribution process was being undertaken. Project coordinators complained of being overworked and not being able to adequately monitor and manage the project which resulted in persons obtaining inputs who were not on the original list, resulting in original selectees not obtaining which created a number of disgruntled persons during the survey. Some disgruntled and dissatisfied beneficiaries were recorded in most countries during the final evaluation.

3.3 Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats (SWOT) Analysis of Input Distribution Systems

STRENGTHS: Generally, satisfaction levels for all inputs distributed as it relates to quantity received, timeliness in distribution, input appropriateness and quality of inputs were very high. The distribution of the inputs under one umbrella in-country was one of the strengths of the system. The beneficiaries were pleased with the distribution, few complaints were registered, distribution was easily monitored even if better records could be kept. The distribution system afforded beneficiaries access to inputs at a time and in quantities when they were needed to offset increasing input food prices.

WEAKNESSES: Farmers complained of poor guidance on the part of the Ministry of Agriculture with respect to which inputs they should select and the reasons for exclusions and changes applied to the final beneficiaries list. The reasons for the ISFP TCP inputs and its limitations were not clearly communicated to the beneficiaries and factored into the decision making process.

When distribution was disjointed and delivered by more than one entity (Ministry of Agriculture, Farmers' organisations and commercial suppliers) major complaints were registered. Farmers complained of not receiving the quantities of inputs or not receiving inputs at all. Farmers without transportation were unable to collect inputs within the prescribed collection period while some beneficiaries with transportation were able to collect multiple inputs.

A lack of adequate record keeping on the part of the beneficiaries was one of the weaknesses of the distribution system and the importance of this was evident during the evaluation and survey stage of the project. In some instances the inability to engage the expertise of input suppliers in determining the most appropriate specifications for inputs and the methodology for delivery was a major weakness. Another

weakness of the system was a lack of adequate monitoring and supervision in some countries, which was associated with the use of multiple distribution sites. Lack of adequate monitoring and supervision resulted in some beneficiaries households/input receivers obtaining benefits on more than one occasion while others did not receive inputs. An apparent lack of or breakdown in communication between farmers, suppliers and the implementing agencies was obvious in some countries and was also registered as a major weakness.

The late arrival of inputs in some cases was reported as a weakness by a small percentage of the beneficiaries. Lateness was in relation to the supplying of seeds in time for the beginning of the planting season (onions) or to coincide with the start of the rainy season (root crops) or farmers with no irrigation. This was related to the input suppliers not being in the country of distribution, with supplies having to be procured internationally or the extended time period taken to provide quotations. Some representatives of some of the implementing agencies in country claimed the FAO procurement procedures were lengthy and contributed to some of the lateness in the arrival of inputs to be distributed.

OPPORTUNITIES: One of the major opportunities offered by the input distribution system was the chance for open dialogue between all the stakeholders involved in the project.

The distribution system offered opportunities in countries like St. Vincent and the Grenadines and St. Lucia which enable the implementing agency to establish a revolving scheme for feed distribution and the purchasing and distribution of some medical supplies. The feed stocks supplied were sold to the farmers at reduced prices and the monies obtained were utilised to purchase more feed which was distributed to a wider cross section of beneficiaries. This can be considered a more sustainable option than the free distribution of feed in some countries. An opportunity was offered by the input distribution system to stimulate the agricultural sector in all the countries involved. By providing inputs to the most vulnerable they were able to provide enough food to feed their families for an extended period (10 months on average) and also to have surplus available to be sold to neighbours or supply to market.

THREATS: A lack of transportation was reported as one of the major threats to the distribution system. Input delivery was severely hampered by a lack of or inadequate availability of transportation. In the delivery of some livestock (particularly baby chicks) a high mortality rate was incurred. This was attributed to accumulated heat in the transportation vehicles. This was of particular concern to the suppliers when they were requested by the farmers to replace the birds which died. This again spoke to a lack of adequate transportation or transport equipment in the case of livestock - baby chicks and sheep. Transport facilities were also one of the major constraints in relation to the transportation of seedlings, other planting materials and feed supplies as mentioned earlier. In the case of sweet potato and cassava cuttings not having transportation for moving from the supplier to the beneficiary resulted in dehydration of this material which produced poor germination when planted. Not having start-up material (seedlings, baby chicks etc) was a serious threat to the distribution system and the outcome of the project. Administrative and personnel problems (employees implementing agencies) was also a threat to the distribution system and the project. Some disgruntled and apparently overworked personnel did not follow up and adequately monitor the distribution system which presented problems. These problems were manifested during the surveys as unhappy and disgruntled beneficiaries who although notified to receive inputs did not receive such inputs.

4. INTEGRATION OF TCPS INTO OVERALL GOVERNMENT RESPONSES TO SOARING FOOD PRICES

The global economic crisis resulted in sharp increases in food prices worldwide in 2007-08. This created significant burdens for developing countries including the countries of the Caribbean sub region. These countries were facing severe economic, social and political consequences; in addition, the high prices of agricultural inputs became a major obstacle to the increase of agricultural production and food security. Some countries were forced to remove the duties from a number of groceries items such as cereals, baking powder infant formula and cooking oil which had minimal effect as consumers had to pay more for milk flour and rice.

In the Caribbean sub region some of the countries were severely impacted by the passage of two hurricanes, Dean and Omar. In the post Hurricane Dean Period (September 2007), the Government of Dominica implemented several relief programmes to facilitate the smooth return of farmers to their farming activities. These programmes included a cash support system for crop and livestock farmers and fertiliser support for to all farmers who reported crop damage. Subsequently in 2008, Hurricane Omar inflicted further damage to agricultural production which was slowly recovering. The Government of Dominica implemented a cash support programme for crop and livestock producers as well as fertiliser support to all farmers who reported crop damage. Input support was also provided to support commercial enterprises at the sub-sector level like plantain, root crop vegetable and floriculture production as well as the rehabilitation of greenhouse infrastructure. The fisheries sector was also provided with an investment of 4 million dollars to replace fishing gear, repair boats and purchase boats. These initiatives along with the ISFP programme were the Government of Dominica overall response to the soaring food prices.

In other cases the Government (Barbados) created a “basket of necessaries” which was a number of food commodities which were considered as staples for each family and the prices of these goods were controlled. Although this bought some relief, no large scale initiative was undertaken other that the ISFP project to create immediate relief to those most vulnerable in society. On the whole most of the Caribbean Governments were grappling with the increase in prices with talk of import substitution by the use of local crops like sweet potatoes, yams, cassava eddoes and dasheen. There was also talk of import reduction by increasing duties on imported goods but subsidising commodities such as flour. With more that 50% of the food that is consumed in the region coming from external sources and most of the inputs for agricultural production also coming from similar sources the region was struggling to have adequate quantities of foods available at prices which were affordable to all sectors of society. This initiative from FAO not only aided in jump starting the agricultural production but provided immediate access to cheap locally produced food.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The surveys revealed that the beneficiaries from some of the countries were not aware that the inputs distributed were an initiative of the FAO Initiative on Soaring Food Prices. Beneficiaries did not know why they were selected for assistance or from whom assistance came. They were just given the animals, seeds and inputs. This could probably be one of the reasons why some did very little to make full use of materials and inputs. Beneficiaries in these instances used the inputs distributed but as they felt the inputs were freely distributed as a hand out they did not make maximum use of them. Lacking at the time of distribution was information with regards to the evaluation process which would have possibly encouraged the beneficiaries to do more with the inputs in case a follow up was initiated. The situation was confounded further because the assistance came immediately following relief programmes in some of the countries, following the passage of damaging hurricanes systems in the region. Following the relief programmes and not being given clear indications of the FAO involvement, beneficiaries were not forthcoming in releasing some of the information with regards to yields and areas planted during the assessment.

Some beneficiaries thought the inputs were the results of handouts from politicians. This highlights the need for beneficiaries to be fully informed and sensitized as to why assistance is given and who or what organisation is responsible for providing the assistance. It is hoped that this information would make beneficiaries more responsible and more open to accept advice from providers. In addition it should make them more aware of the objectives of the project, thus making monitoring and evaluation more effective. In some countries, complaints surfaced with regards to a high degree of political interference. This occurred with reference to the selection of the final beneficiary list. Field extension officers highlighted a lack of consultation in the selection of the final beneficiaries list which resulted in a number of beneficiaries receiving inputs that did not adequately utilise and follow the direction of the extension with regards to use and administration of the various inputs.

The divide between implementing agencies and farmers was continually highlighted during the survey as one of the constraints to the project and to agricultural development. This divide varies among the countries and was apparent by the lack of adequate follow-up on the part of the extension services in some of the countries. This brought to light the need for a comprehensive look at the extension services in the countries and their administration. There is also a need for improvements in the communication process between the Ministries' of Agriculture and the farming community since a high percentage of the respondents were not aware that this project was essentially an FAO initiative to combat soaring food prices. A lack of follow up by extension officers as stated by beneficiaries' highlights a need for more supervision, personnel or a reduction in the workload of the extension personnel.

Suggestions were made as it relates to the target beneficiaries. Some input suppliers suggested that a target group of small farmers rather than vulnerable persons would have achieved better results over the project. In some cases beneficiaries (vulnerable persons) were given livestock and supplies (chicks, sheep and rations) with no prior knowledge of animal husbandry. This resulted in either the animals dying or the beneficiaries collecting the inputs and offering them for sale. In such cases selected beneficiaries should be exposed to some means of training in livestock rearing before inputs are distributed. Alternatively, the selection process should be better monitored or a criterion included in the process where beneficiaries receiving inputs have some previous exposure or experience in the inputs they received whether it be livestock or crops.

The project in its current concept might mean that some beneficiaries were given inputs with which they were not familiar. For example, the concept of distributing inputs to the most vulnerable in society meant that some beneficiaries (urban dwellers and inner city residents in St. Vincent and the Grenadines and St. Lucia) were given inputs to which they were not familiar. However, in general the approach achieved good results. Being unfamiliar with the inputs the beneficiaries could not make full use of the inputs and did not attain the full benefits of the initiative. Case in point was highlighted in countries like St Vincent and Antigua and Barbuda were in one instance baby chicks were distributed to households who had never raised chick and they were at a lost as to correct husbandry to bring them to maturity. Other instances were the distribution of seedlings and chemicals to home growers without proper growing instruction and application

directions. This highlights the need for a greater amount of technical assistance on the ground in the countries mentioned. The need for proper management and supervision of the project on the ground was lacking. Beneficiaries complained of not receiving adequate assistance and visitations from extension officers. Coordinators complained of being overworked and not having time to manage the project with their substantive duties highlights a serious breakdown in communication.

Communication in relation to the reasons for the project, the expected results, and persons who were expected to benefit although written in the project documents was not fully explained and distributed to all parties involved and the general public. This resulted in several complaints throughout all the countries, as the public (potential beneficiaries) claimed favouritism and political victimization during the evaluation phase. A more focus and directed public education and launched of the programmed would possibly and reduced such complaints. In most of the countries the initiatives were seen as either a rapid response to aid in the recovery of the agriculture sector after the passage of recent Hurricanes or as a Government assistance package. In a high percentage of the responses during the survey the participants did not know that the assistance was an initiative of the Food and Agriculture Organisation. In countries where adequate communication, management and organisation were in placed; the opportunity provided under the Initiatives on Soaring Food Prices for the deployment to and utilisation by the producers of the inputs resulted in the beneficiaries reducing their food bill, providing more local and nutritious food for their families and in some cases having excess for sale to their neighbours or the open market to provide them with a little extra finance. For example in Antigua and Barbuda the assistance resulted in a return to normal production levels in 3 months, demonstrating the benefits that can be derived from immediate and affordable access to resources in disaster management.

REFERENCES

Agriculture Sector Development Unit. 2010: Draft Report on the Input Supplies to Vulnerable Population under the Initiative on Soaring Food Prices TCP/GUY/3201 (E) – Cooperative Republic of Guyana.

Berkeley, E. 2010: Report on the Level of Beneficiary Satisfaction and Impact Assessment for the ISFP project in the Bahamas.

Carballo, E. 2010: Beneficiary Satisfaction and Impact Assessment Survey Report Project TCP/BZE/3201 (E) - Input supply to vulnerable populations under the Initiative on Soaring Food Prices (ISFP).

Collins, L. S. 2009: Report on ISFP TCP Beneficiary 'satisfaction and Impact Assessment survey - Grenada

Durant, C. 2009: ISFP TCP Beneficiary Satisfaction and Impact Assessment Survey Report-Barbados

FAO, 2009: General guidelines for the implementation of the ISFP TCP Beneficiary Satisfaction and Impact Assessment Survey.

FAO, 2008: Initiative for Soaring Food Prices Programme Document.

Isaacs, P. 2010: ISFP TCP Beneficiary Satisfaction and Impact Assessment Survey Report-St. Vincent and the Grenadines.

Kelly, C. 2009: ISFP TCP Beneficiary Satisfaction and Impact Assessment Survey Report-St.Kitts

Ross, J. 2010: Initiative on Soaring Food Prices (ISFP) FAO Project: TCP/ANT/3201 End of project evaluation, Antigua and Barbuda.

Magloire, W. 2009: Report on FAO /ISFP/ TCP Beneficiary Satisfaction and Impact Assessment Survey – Commonwealth of Dominica

Valmont, V. A. 2009: ISFP TCP Beneficiary Satisfaction and Impact Assessment Survey Report-St. Lucia

West-Hayles, N. 2009: ISFP TCP Beneficiary Satisfaction and Impact Assessment Survey Report- Jamaica.
Annexes: Summary of inputs distributed by country

APPENDIX 1: SUMMARY OF INPUTS DISTRIBUTED IN ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA

Inputs distributed	Volume (kg)	Area planted (ha)	Number of beneficiary households	Value (USD)	Districts
Seeds		**2.25**			
Tomatoes	**30 tins (1000 seeds/each)**	**2.25**			**Island wide**
Cabbage	**30 pks (1000 seeds/each)**	**10**			**Island wide**
Carrot	**50 tins (500g each)**	**1.2**			
Lettuce	**10 pks (25g/each)**	**1.2**			**Island wide**
Sweet pepper	**40 pks (1000 seeds/each)**	**3**			**Island wide**
Melon	**10 pks (1000 seeds/each)**	**4**			**Island wide**
Butternut squash	**30 tins (500g/each)**	**6.5**			
Onions (Mercedes)	**15 pks (500g/each**	**3.5**			
Onions (H-7)	**15 pks (500g/each)**	**3.5**			
Total					
Fertilizers					
Complete mix (NPK)	**2,500 kg**	**10**			**Island wide**
Triple super phosphate	**2,500 kg**	**15**			**Island wide**
Sulphate of ammonia	**2,500 kg**	**15**			**Island wide**
Urea	**2,500 kg**	**20**			**Island wide**
Sulphate of potash	**2,500 kg**	**15**			**Island wide**
Total					
Pesticides					
Rizolex	**15 kg**				
Banrot	**12 kg**				
Acrobat	**3 kg**				
Bellis	**4 kg**				
Xentari	**5 kg**				
Newmectin	**15 litres**				

Total					
Other inputs					
Irrigation equipments lines, fittings and injection equipment	**25 hectares under fertigation**				
Breeding rams	**2 and 40 serviced ewes**				
Veterinary supplies	**500 salt blocks**				
Rotatory cultivators	**3 machines (50 farmers & 19 hectares)**				
Greenhouse and misting facilities	**1 system**				**Green Castle Agricultural station**
Total					

Summary of inputs distributed in Barbados

Inputs distributed	Volume (kg)	Area planted (ha)	Number of beneficiary households	Value (USD)	Parish
Seeds					
Herbs seeds (a variety)					
Vegetable seeds (a variety)					**Island wide**
Total					
Fertilizers					
Nitrophoska Blue	**159**	**1.17**			
24-0-18	**127**	**1.06**			**Island wide**
12-12-17^{+2}					
Epsom salts (Magnesium sulphate)	**45 kgs**	**0.03**			
Total					
Pesticides					
Regent (Fipronil)					
Newmectin	**4 litres**				
Phyton 27	**1 unit**				**St. John**
Neem-X	**12 l/16 packs**			**500**	
New BT					
Roundup	**4 units**				**St. John**
Panacur ^{TM}					
Total					
Other inputs					

Red poll calves					
Broiler chicks					
Layer chicks					
Piglets					**St. Andrew**
Rabbits					
Animal rations					
Chicken feeding equipment					
Water nipples					
Veterinary Cod liver oil					
Irrigation systems					
Water tanks					**St. Andrew**
Mechanical and gardening tools					
Shade house supplies					
Building materials					
Land clearing/cultivation services					
Total					

Summary of inputs distributed in the Bahamas

Inputs distributed	Volume (kg)	Area planted (ha)	Number of beneficiary households	Value (USD)	Districts
Seeds					
Corn	**Not presented**				**The inputs**
Lima beans					**were distributed**
Okra			**Not available**		**In the islands of**
Hot pepper					**Abaco**
Watermelon	**Not presented**				**Grand Bahama**
Onions					**Long Island**
Carrots					**Eleuthera**
Broccoli	**Not presented**		**Not available**		
Lettuce					
Sweet peppers					
Tomatoes	**Not presented**				
Red beans			**Not available**		
Mango					
Limes					
Oranges	**Not presented**		**Not available**		
Soupsop and sugar apple					
Total					
Pesticides					
Total					
Other inputs					
Potato slips	**68,000**				
Cassava plantlets	**21,000**				
Bananas and Plantains					
Pineapple plantlets					
Total				**24,000**	

Summary of inputs distributed in Belize

Inputs distributed	Volume (kg)	Area planted (ha)	Number of beneficiary households	Value (USD)	Districts
Seeds					
Corn	**3106.3 kg**		250		
Beans	**10,330 kg**		**279**		**Country wide**
Vegetable seeds	71,206 seeds 126 pks. 644 gm				
Vegetable seedlings	43,248 seedlings		**136**		
Total					
Fertilizers					
14-36-12	**136 kg**				**Country wide**
19-19-19	7.3kg		**Not available**		**Country wide**
18-18-18	**3091 kg**				**Country wide**
18-46-0					
12-43-12	7.3kg				**Country wide**
20-5-30	7.3kg				**Country wide**
Complete formula (?)					
Poly feed	21.8Kg 7 pks				**Country wide**
Total					
Pesticides					
Confidor	10pk				**Country wide**
NewMectin	2Lt		**Not available**		**Country wide**
Regent	640ml				**Country wide**
Diametrin					
Dipel	**8 pk**				**Country wide**
Amistar	96 gm				**Country wide**
Gesapax					
Diuron					

Malathion					
Gramoxone					
Delthametrin	1000ml				**Country wide**
Ivermectin	1500cc		**Not available**		
Vitamins	1500cc				
Phyton	6Lt.				
Total					
Other inputs					
Irrigation materials					**Country wide**
50 kg Cement bags	**386 bags**				
Nails	**40.6 kg**				
Waterers	**63**		**Not available**		
Feeders	**46**				
Nipples	**45**				
Wire	**29 rolls**				
Animal feed	**35,527 kg**				
Broilers	**2438**				**Country wide**
Layers	**1985**				
Pigs - Boars	**76**				
Pigs - Gilts	**86**				
Black roofing	**646 sheets**				
Water tanks	**16**				
Hoses	**8**		**Not available**		**Country wide**
Mist blower - Motorized	**6**				
Spray tank	**5**				
Chipper shredder	**6**				
Grain Dryer	**4**				
Rototiller	**4**				
Net	**4**				**Country wide**
Water pump	**10**		**Not available**		
Water tank	**16**				
Hoes	**12**				
Picks	**12**				
Forks	**12**				

Spades	**6**	[redacted]			**Country wide**
Rakes	**12**	[redacted]			
Post hole digger	**2**	[redacted]			
Wheelbarrow	**2**	[redacted]			
Spray pump	**1**	[redacted]			**Country wide**
Total		[redacted]			

Summary of inputs distributed in Dominica

Inputs distributed	Volume (kg)	Area planted (ha)	Number of beneficiary households	Value (USD)	Regions
Seeds					
			Incomplete data	18,659.43	All regions
Total					
Fertilizers					
Dolomite limestone	13,550 kg		768	97,619.15	All regions
Total					
Pesticides			Incomplete data		All regions
Total					
Other inputs					
Grating equipment			1 rural agro-processor		East region
Peeling equipment			1 rural agro-processor		East region
Fencing materials			51	2,494.09	All regions
Fishing equipment			77	42,242.60	All regions
Tools and equipment			Incomplete data	9,601.21	All regions and schools
Total					

Summary of inputs distributed in Grenada

Inputs distributed	Volume (kg)	Area planted (ha)	Number of beneficiary households	Value (USD)	Districts
Seeds					
Corn					
Pigeon peas					**Island wide**
Kentucky beans					
Okra					
Total					
Fertilizers					
15;15:15	**2.27 -50 kg depending on the size of the farm**				**Island wide**
Total					
Pesticides					
Total					
Other inputs					
Broilers	**72,000**				**Island wide**
Layers	**36,000**				
Sheep	**91**				
Rabbits	**440**				
Piglets	**43**				**Island wide**
Total					

Summary of inputs distributed in Guyana

Inputs distributed	Volume (kg)	Area planted (ha)	Number of beneficiary households	Value (USD)	Districts
Seeds					
Sweet corn	**28 kg**				
Tomato	**40 kgs**				
Egg plant	**80 kgs**				
Butternut squash	**52 kgs**				**Specific areas not identified**
Okra	**22 kgs**				
Celery	**32 kgs**				
Pakchoy	**52 kgs**				
Bunching onion	**52 kgs**				
Celery	**20 kgs**				
Cabbage	**80 kgs**				
Total					
Fertilizers					
Urea	**600 bags**				
Triple super phosphate	**650 bags**				
Total					
Pesticides					
Ant version	**10**				
Total					
Other inputs					
Spray cans/blowers	**18**				
Total					

Summary of inputs distributed in Jamaica

Inputs distributed	Volume (kg)	Area planted (ha) (Average)	Number of beneficiary households	Value (USD)	Districts
Seeds					
Yellow Yam	**7,238**	**0.46**	**38**		**St. James, Portland**
Sweet potatoes	**40,800**	**0.88**	**24**	**5,532.22**	**Portland, Manchester**
Dasheen	**8,800**	**0.52**	**11**		**St. James, Manchester**
Coco	**9,581**	**0.42**	**11**	**0**	**Portland, St. James**
Cassava	**5,400**	**20**	**1**		**Manchester**
Total	**71,819**	**22.28**	**85**		
Fertilizers		**Ave. area covered (ha)**			
14-28-14	**5,800 kgs**	**0.30**	**52**	**4,931.95**	
11-22-22	**1,750 kgs**	**0.16**	**15**	**1,494.95**	
Sulphate	**14,950 kgs**	**0.22**	**1**	**8,262.92**	
Total					
Pesticides		**Ave. area covered (ha)**			
Actara	**10**	**0.46**	**30**	**3,719.10**	
Decis	**8.5 L**	**0.23**	**12**	**166.22**	
Diazinon	**12 L**	**0.88**	**12**	**166.22**	
Newmectin	**10 L**	**0.88**	**1**	**208.53**	
Gramoxone	**47.5 L**	**0.23**	**27**	**281.79**	
Roundup	**90 L**	**0.23**	**1**	**829.21**	
Topsin	**20 kgs**	**0.46**	**20**	**4,500.00**	
Total					
Other inputs					
Livestock (Poultry)	**500**		**1**		**St. Thomas**
	199		**1**		**Manchester**
	150		**1**		**Westmoreland**
Chicken Feed	**6,000 kg**		**3**	**2,435.00**	
Machetes	**43**		**6**	**192.77**	

Forks	**5**		**5**	**227.20**	
Other inputs	**Volume (kg)**	**Area planted (ha) (Average)**	**Number of beneficiary households**	**Value (USD)**	**Districts**
Hoes	**50**		**13**	**310.11**	
Files	**10**		**1**	**11.23**	
Mist Blower	**1**		**1**	**642.19**	
Spray can	**10**		**1**	**752.90**	
Water pump	**1**		**1**	**580.50**	
Cash	**117,000.00JM$**		**13**	**1,314.60**	**Hanover**
Total					

Summary of inputs distributed in St. Kitts and Nevis

Inputs distributed	Volume (kg)	Area planted (ha)	Number of beneficiary households	Value (USD)	Districts
Seeds			N/A		
Peanuts	55 bags		N/A	8,140.000	Both Islands
Vegetables		75 acres	N/A	19,529.00	Both Islands
			N/A		
			N/A		
			N/A		
Total					
Fertilizers					
15:15:15	298 bags		N/A	20,000.00	Both Islands
Total					
Pesticides					
Prowl, Karate and protective gear		75 acres	N/A	28,344.00	Both Islands
Total					
Other inputs					
Banana suckers			N/A	2.000.00	Both Islands
Bags (Mesh)	7,500		N/A	3,804.00	Both Islands
Hand seeders	6		N/A	2,592.00	Both Islands
Drying trays	12		N/A	2,175.00	Both Islands
Knapsack sprayers	15		N/A	1,354.00	Both Islands
Chlorophyll meters and training	3		N/A	7,062.00	Both Islands
Land preparation	100 acres		N/A	12,000.00	Both Islands
Total					

Summary of inputs distributed in St. Lucia

Inputs distributed	Volume (kg)	Area planted (ha)	Number of beneficiary households	Value (USD)	Districts
Seeds			**36 farmers**		**All regions**
Broccoli	**10,000 seedlings**			**1,104.20**	
Honey Dew	**10,252 seedlings**			**1,132.03**	
Sweet pepper	**10,000 seedlings**			**1,104.20**	
Cantaloupe	**10,000 seedlings**			**1,104.20**	
Pumpkin	**8,000 seedlings**			**883.36**	
Zucchini	**1,400 seedlings**			**154.59**	
Butternut squash	**1,700 seedlings**			**187.71**	
Tomatoes	**20,000 seedlings**			**2,576.47**	
Lettuce	**30,000 seedlings**			**2,208.40**	
Cabbage	**20,000 seedlings**			**2,208.40**	
Cauliflower	**7700 seedlings**			**850.23**	
Watermelon	**17700 seedlings**			**1,954.43**	
Salad beans	**3 lbs**			**16.56**	
Total					
Pesticides			**65 farmers**		**All regions**
Cypro	**5 litres**			**202.44**	
Mankocide	**2 kilograms**			**80.97**	
Ricolex	**3**			**193.23**	
Kocide	**4**			**117.78**	
Bellis	**1**			**331.26**	
Cure	**2**			**368.07**	
Pronto	**3**			**419.60**	
Fastac	**6**			**256.17**	
Copper plus	**3**			**220.84**	
Newmectin	**2 litres**			**588.91**	
Vydate	**10 gallons**			**467.44**	
Banrot	**1 (12 lb bag)**			**115.94**	

Furadan	**2 (25 kg bags)**			**218.63**	
Touchdown	**55 litres**			**906.92**	
Roundup	**5 litres**			**82.45**	
Deadline slug bait	**2 (50 lb bags)**			**357.02**	
Total					
Fertilizers					
NPK fertilisers	**533 (50 kg bags)**			**34,910.14**	**All regions**
Total					
Other inputs					**All regions**
CP3 sprayers	**5**			**1,041.32**	
Bee applicator pads	**2,000 pads**		**5 producers**	**3,386.21**	
Formic Acid	**165 gallons**			**3,308.62**	
Chain link fencing	**50 rolls**		**10 farmers**	**6,242.78**	
Broiler Grower	**800 (30 kg bags)**		**12 farmers**	**16,995.84**	
Broiler Finisher	**1.400 (30 kg bags)**			**29,304.72**	
Layer Feed	**1,000 (30 kg bags)**		**23 farmers**	**20,545.47**	
Pig Grower	**300 (30 kg bags)**		**66 farmers**	**5,967.09**	
Pig Starter	**150 (30 kg bags)**			**3,175.68**	
Broiler chicks	**21,000**		**12 farmers**	**17,561.58**	
GPS Units	**30 units**			**6,214.99**	
FADS	**assorted**			**20,135.35**	
Cassava Sticks	**34,000 pieces**		**9 farmers**	**12,514.26**	**All regions**
Sweet potato cuttings	**92,400 slips**		**8 farmers**	**3,400.93**	
Plantain plants	**6,925 plantlets**		**12 farmers**	**7646.58**	
Total					

Summary of inputs distributed in St. Vincent and the Grenadines

Inputs distributed	Volume (kg)	Area planted (ha)	Number of beneficiary households	Value (USD)	Regions
Seeds/Seedlings					
Lettuce	1 lb tin/409g		N.A	14.81	1
	42 1lb tins/19kg		14	622.00	2
	35 1lb tins/16kg		55	518.35	3
Carrots	N.A		N.A	N.A	1
	7 1lb tins/3.2kg		22	51.87	2
	9 1lb tins/4kg		27	66.69	3
Cabbage	4pks/400g		N.A	527.76	1
	12pks/1.2kg		N.A	923.58	2
	N.A		N.A	N.A	3
Seedlings	57,176				
Tomatoes	3pks/300g		N.A	222.00	1
	8pks/800g		N.A	592.00	2
	N.A		N.A	N.A	3
Seedlings	39,996				
Sweet Peppers	7pks/700g		N.A	414.82	1
	40pks/4kg		N.A	2,370.40	2
	7pks/700g		N.A	414.82	3
Seedlings	63,052				
Broccoli	2pks/200g		N.A	22.22	1
	11pks/1.1kg		N.A	122.21	2
	2pks/200g		N.A	22.22	3
Seedlings	11,795				
Mixed Seedlings	5,089		63		1
	30,477		84		2
	26,098		103		3
Total					
Fertilizers					

NPK (16:8:24+2MgO)	**623**		**538**	**37,224.25**	**1**
	421		**255**	**25,154.75**	**2**
	461		**379**	**89,923.75**	**3**
Total					
Animal Feed					
Pig Grower	**32,936**		**77**	**15,036.00**	**1**
	21,666		**39**	**9,891.04**	**2**
	10,741		**26**	**4,903.50**	**3**
Sow Ration	**7,015**		**22**	**2,879.20**	**1**
	4,163		**15**	**1,708.64**	**2**
	3,473		**5**	**1,425.44**	**3**
Pullet Grower	**2,760**		**3**	**1,359.60**	**1**
	0		**0**	**0**	**2**
	0		**0**	**0**	**3**
Broiler Grower	**3,082**		**7**	**1,695.10**	**1**
	345		**1**	**189.75**	**2**
	1,265		**4**	**695.75**	**3**
Broiler Starter	**529**		**5**	**276**	**1**
	3,496		**11**	**1,824.00**	**2**
	5,520		**15**	**2,880.00**	**3**
Layer Crumble	**15,545**		**15**	**5,847.40**	**1**
	8,970		**10**	**3,375.50**	**2**
	5,405		**6**	**2,032.75**	**3**
Layer Pallet	**6,969**		**7**	**3,120.38**	**1**
	10,189		**8**	**4,559.00**	**2**
	3,105		**4**	**1,390.50**	**3**
Dairy Ration	**0**		**0**	**0**	**1**
	2,116		**5**	**972.44**	**2**
	920		**3**	**422.80**	**3**
General Purpose Ration	**5066**		**3**	**154.00**	**1**
	3,542		**9**	**1,078.00**	**2**
	1,748		**4**	**532.00**	**3**
Total					
Other inputs					

Greenhouse plastics	**1**		**N.A**	**352.00**	**1**
	16		**3**	**5,623.00**	**2**
	1		**5**	**352.00**	**3**
Mulching plastics	**N.A**		**N.A**	**N.A**	**1**
	1		**5**	**696.00**	**2**
	2		**55**	**1,392.00**	**3**
Total					