

9310786(B)
 PD-ADD-905-F1

931 0786 00

CLASSIFICATION
PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

Report Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE TA Food Grain Drying, storage and processing 1721/010 01/21/80			2. PROJECT NUMBER 931-0786	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE DS/AGR 110/05/80
5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES			4. EVALUATION NUMBER (Enter the number maintained by the reporting unit e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No. beginning with No. 1 each FY)	
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY 1975	B. Final Obligation Expected FY 1980	C. Final Input Delivery FY 1980	<input type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION 7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION From (month/yr.) June 1977 To (month/yr.) Dec. 1979 Date of Evaluation Review	
6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING				
A. Total \$ 4,640.000				
B. U.S. \$ 4,640.000				

B. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regions; office action should specify type of document, e.g., airgram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
1. Appoint a project manager immediately	R. Solem	1/80
2. Preparation of Project Paper for a five year extension	Proj Mgr.	3/80
3. Change project design as follows:	Proj. Mgr.	3/80
a. Include SEARCA activities in the project design to handle S.E. Asia		
b. Establish a system for feedback to KSU to measure success and/or impact of the services provided.		
c. Increase project manager's responsibility to assure that the services provided are associated with activities designed to provide the highest social/economic payoff.		
d. Change the mode of implementation to a cooperative agreement		

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS			10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Paper	<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify)	A. <input type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PIO/T		B. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change Implementation Plan		
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P		C. <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinue Project		

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)		12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval	
DS/AGR, R. Ray Solem M. Mozynski <i>MEM</i> 1/14/80		Signature <i>Keith M. Byergo</i>	
		Typed Name DS/AGR Keith Byergo	
		Date 1/14/80	

13. Summary:

Current Situation: The Kansas State University staff are meeting the demands for services from the Missions, LDC officials, Regional Bureaus and DS/AGR. Closer attention is needed in targeting assistance to assure that KSU energies are directed toward areas/countries/crops, etc. which will have the most pay-off in terms of economic benefits and reducing post-harvest food losses - whether in national level storage (for cities) or at the subsistence farm level for small farmers.

Prospects for demonstrating reductions in losses are weak, partly because of the multiplicity of factors affecting availability of data and partly because of very weak LDC/Mission feedback to KSU and DS/AGR. A system must be developed to provide the feedback necessary to demonstrate the effectiveness of the services provided.

Postharvest food losses are so great in the LDCs (between 15-30 percent) that it is mandatory to continue the KSU activities and to expand them into additional geographical areas covering new technological innovations to produce low energy storage and preservation systems. KSU is to contact the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) of Canada to arrange for the funding of SEARCA, Los Banos, Philippines to provide the needed assistance in South East Asia. KSU will concentrate in other regions and geographic areas.

KSU, the world leader in this field, will acquire, through consortia, affiliation, and occasional contracts, additional scientific and other talent to meet the growing demands for services.

The project paper should be written for a five-year extension and the implementation method changed to a cooperative agreement.

PROJECT REVIEW TEAM

AID/ta-C-1162

December 10-12, 1979

Dec. 10, 1979 (Monday)

3:30 p.m. AID Team Arrival - Frontier #504

3:45 p.m. Meeting with Director and Advisory Group--
Dr. Charles W. Deyoe, Director, Food and Feed
Grain Institute

Introduction of Staff--Room 204 (Conference Room)
Shellenberger Hall

3:45-5:00 p.m. Overview of Project Activities--John R. Pedersen
(Slide Presentation)

Evening Dinner

Dec. 11, 1979 (Tuesday)

7:15 a.m. Visit with Dr. Roger Mitchell, Vice President for
Agriculture and Dr. Floyd Smith, Director, Agricul-
tural Experiment Station, KSU

Discussion of current Contract Scope of Work:

8:30 a.m. I. Technical Assistance Effort - Staff

9:45 a.m. II. Information Services - J. Pedersen

10:00 a.m. Break

10:15 a.m. III. Training: In-Country--Robert E. Julian
Degree Program--J. Pedersen

10:30 a.m. IV. Laboratory and Development Services

a. Engineering and Entomology--J. Pedersen

b. Agricultural Economics--Roe Borsdorf

11:15 a.m. V. KSU Post-harvest Documentation Service -
Cherie Geiser

11:45 a.m. VI. Other - R. Julian

12:00 noon Lunch

Dec. 11 (Tuesday) continued

1:30 p.m.	Tour of Facilities and Development Activities-- Carl Stevens
2:30 p.m.	Discussions of future direction of Contract Scope of Work
	a. Additions or changes to Scope of Work
	b. Staffing
3:45 p.m.	Break
4:00-5:00 p.m.	AID Team: Visits with individual staff members

Dec. 12, 1979 (Wednesday)

8:30 a.m.	Discussions on Scope of Work - New Contract Proposal--Deyoe, Julian, Pedersen
9:30 a.m.	Budgeting
11:00 a.m.	Final Discussions
12:00 noon	Lunch
1:30 p.m.	Discussion and interviews regarding IPA position
2:15 p.m.	Leave for Airport
3:00 p.m.	Leave Manhattan

1. List of KSU Personnel involved in Evaluation - December 10-12, 1979

Dr. Roger Mitchell, Vice President for Agriculture
Dr. Charles Deyoe, Director, Food and Feed Grain Institute
Dr. Milton Manual, Agr. Economist (Acting Head, Dept. of Agricultural Economics)
Dr. Robert E. Julian, Training Development Specialist

Economics

Dr. Richard Phillips, Agricultural Economist
Dr. Roe Borsdof, Agricultural Economist
Dr. C. Hugo, Agricultural Economist
Dr. H. Kison, Agricultural Economist

Entomologist

Dr. Robert Mills, Grain Storage Entomologist
Dr. John Pedensen, Quality/Preservation Entomologist
Dr. Valerie Wright, Agricultural Entomologist

Engineering

Dr. Do Sup Chung, Agricultural Engineer
Dr. E. Haque, Agricultural Engineer
Mr. Carl Stevens, Storage Specialist

Librarian

Ms. Cherie Geiser

Linguist

Ms. Cathy Foster

Agronomist

Mr. Carl Reed, Grain Grading

Pathologist

Ms. Rose Mary Burroughs, Mycologist

IPA

Mr. Bob Meisner

14. Evaluation:

Methodology: On December 10 - 12, 1979 a Special Evaluation was conducted at Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas to set the course for future involvement of KSU in A.I.D.'s Postharvest Food Loss programs.

The following issues were discussed:

1. The need to continue the KSU services and other activities at the same level of effort, but at a reduced funding level for DS/AGR to stay within the budgetary constraints of the FY 1980/81 DS/AGR budget
2. Include the "Postharvest Food Losses in SE Asia" program with the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) of Canada under the KSU agreement; and
3. Convert the method of implementation to a cooperative agreement.

The evaluation team was composed of senior A.I.D. professionals with the background and experience needed to discuss the above issues with the representatives of KSU: a project design officer (Mr. Richard Ray Solem) with experience in designing A.I.D. projects; a contracting officer (Mr. Mort Darvin) who designed the first cooperative agreement for field support services; and a program officer (Ms. Mary Mozynski) experienced in the budgetting and implementing processes of A.I.D. The KSU team scheduled a presentation that was void of pressure, turmoil, crisis, critical issues or complacency.

The evaluation team members were familiar with the KSU activities, the background documents and the existing contract. The KSU staff provided additional background documents which were distributed and reviewed. An intensive briefing of the activities funded under the existing contract was presented to the evaluation team, including a slide presentation by Dr. Pedersen and a tour of the facilities and development activities. The newly developed KSU postharvest documentation service was also discussed and hand-outs presented to the evaluation team.

There was an open exchange of views during the three days of the evaluation in which the team members expressed their concern regarding the need to reduce the funding level of the DS/AGR agreement with KSU because of budgetary constraints within the total DS/AGR budget.

The evaluation team views its report as an integral part of the systematic program development and execution process and urges that, if its recommendations are acceptable, they be incorporated in the new project paper which must be prepared within the next 90 days.

15. External Factors

The external factors which influenced the KSU contract are as follows:

1. The demand for the services of KSU scientists, technicians and other professionals and for materials from the Documentation Service Library are well established;
2. Requests are received from Private Voluntary Organizations and host countries, in addition to the established contacts of the Missions, LDCs and Regional Bureaus;
3. Requests for technical assistance in sophisticated technology are increasing; and
4. The Southeast Asian Regional Centre for Graduate Study and Research in Agriculture (SEARCA) has emerged as the predominant supplier of technical assistance in S.E. Asia

16. Inputs:

The technical services provided under this contract are of the highest quality and have met a substantial portion of the demands of the LDCs, Missions and Regional Bureaus. The following changes are recommended to be included in the project design of the proposed 5-year extension:

1. More emphasis on data and information gathering and dissemination;
2. KSU seek additional sources of funding in order to stay within the budgetary constraints of the DS/AGR FY 1980/81 budget; and
3. The method of implementation be changed to a cooperative agreement mode whereby KSU will become a center of expertise with the assistance of A.I.D. who will use KSU as a resource center in the area of postharvest food losses.

17. Outputs

The evaluation team found the outputs (services and materials provided) under the contract to be of the highest quality, responsive, prompt, and thoughtful to the needs of the Missions, Regional Bureaus and LDCs. However, the team thought that there was room for an increase in field contacts based on a stronger central direction as to where to work, not leaving the vital PHFL work to the option of the missions alone.

KSU's efforts in training LDC students on campus have been supplemented by courses prepared and given in the LDCs which are designed to meet the specific needs of the country involved. Special attention has been given to countries in Africa in recent years, as well as, in Latin America and Asia.

DS/AGR needs to improve the project management and do more to make the LDCs and USAIDs aware of the need to tackle PHFL issues; i.e., to shift the agricultural strategy to add 'productivity' including conservation and grain loss prevention to the more popular "grow more" theme.

As to assumptions underlying outputs, the most that can be reasonably expected of the LDCs is that under favorable political conditions, the advice and assistance provided by KSU will be followed and implemented. A.I.D. Missions can play an important role by bringing to the attention of the LDCs major problems and issues in the postharvest food loss area.

KSU Postharvest Documentation Service This resource was developed by KSU specifically to respond to the requests of the A.I.D. (RBs, Missions, and DS/AGR), LDC host country agencies and institutions, and other national and international organizations concerned with postharvest

food losses in the LDCs. The materials and information collected on postharvest food losses, include those in the fields of agricultural engineering, agricultural economics, entomology and grain science.

Missions should be made knowledgeable of this service and encourage the host country scientist and experts to use it.

18. Purpose

The project purpose is "to provide upon request by cooperating LDCs and USAIDs assistance in grain preservation programs to include planning, analysis, training, and technical assistance to minimize grain losses after harvest." The purpose of this project is being achieved. However, the objectively verifiable indicators are too ambitious for this project. Unless, KSU is given the money and mandate to follow-up on the technical advice and services and materials which are provided, it is impossible to determine the ultimate benefit of the services. As the agreement is now written, KSU does not have the mandate to follow up on the assistance provided to determine: a) reduced losses of grains, b) economical storage facilities constructed on small farms, and c) the existence of an effective marketing and price stabilization program. Finally, under item d) which deals with the establishment of linkages, KSU has been very successful in establishing linkages with Missions, LDCs, RBs, national and international organizations and institutions dealing with postharvest food losses.

It should be recognized that when the project paper is amended, an additional purpose must be added; i.e., to provide assistance to KSU to develop, broaden and strengthen its resources and capacity to respond to a variety of requirements designed to meet the needs of LDCs in the area of post-harvest food losses.

However, there has not been enough direction to identify the critical areas of losses which stems in part from the unstructured nature of the project - responding to demands for services irrespective of priority in terms of size of "savings" to be achieved. In addition there has been a lot of work done on national level grain storage systems and facilities, as distinguished from work at the farm level. The outreach to the small farm storage practice may be achieved through in-country training and extension services which KSU has been promoting.

19. Goal/Subgoal

The broader objective to which this project contributes is to increase the quantity and quality of food in cooperating LDCs, and to develop a system of grain handling, storage and marketing which will minimize grain losses and maintain high food quality.

The team found the goal and subgoal to be valid and legitimate, especially in light of the likelihood of increased and continuing pressure on world demand for food grains and the limited land suitable for cultivation. However, we find that verification of the additional food grains made available as a result of the project's activities can only be measured on a site by site basis as related to specific activities.

However, whether we are concerned over the vaunted 85 mmt. deficit in 1985 (main components in South Asia and Egypt) or over small incremental losses occurring in the fields, on farms largely outside the market economy or in local storage, there is fully adequate evidence that losses are sufficiently large, system-wide, that a continuing effort in this area needs to be mounted

to devise innovative technologies to cut such losses. Actual reduction, however, will only likely be significant, if the use of the technologies is profitable. Such "profitability" may reflect normal profit concepts of individuals or groups or national appreciations of food security threats.

Creating these conditions in which action and investment to cut losses are profitable are largely beyond the scope of this project. However, such conditions may be abetted by timely advice to LDC entities by KSU on such policy issues as farm product pricing.

In regard to the stated indicators, they are too broad to be meaningful - it will not be feasible to measure goal achievement in the ways set forth in the logframe; e.g., better food quality, more grain available, increased income for farmers. A more practical measuring tool would be quantified acceptance by farmers to a set of practices, buttressed by regularly scheduled followup inspection visits by national extension agents.

20. Beneficiaries

The beneficiaries under this project are the LDC institutions, organizations and scientists, experts and other professionals dealing with policies, procedures, and scientific problems in the postharvest food loss areas.

The ultimate beneficiaries, however, are the farmers and consumers of agricultural grains.

21. Unplanned Effects

The demand for services of KSU staff continues to increase causing a budgetary problem as the funds are inadequate to cover all the services requested. KSU must strive to find other sources of funding.

22. Lessons Learned

The contractors, grantees, etc., must be selected with utmost care. They must be the most qualified to carry out the scope of work outlined in the project paper and/or agreement to achieve the goals and purposes of the project. The project manager must play an important role in directing the contractor to perform the services required. In addition, the coordination of the activities by the contractor is critical to the success of the project. For example, the Food and Feed Grain Institute of KSU is able to draw on the services of the scientists and experts in all of the other Departments within the University and from other sources outside of the University. This requires the cooperation and coordinated efforts of all of the University Departments and Staff.

23. Special Comments of Remarks

As the KSU technical assistance requests are directed more toward reduction of grain losses through in-country training programs in storage management, etc., an evaluation tool can be designed for follow-up data or impact and effectiveness of the training and services provided.

Before determining the impact of technical assistance to reduce food loss, a valid and reliable method is needed to determine, to a high degree of accuracy, actual losses that are occurring in each country, and possibly regions of a country. A priority should be placed on post-harvest loss evaluations that would develop a basis for approving technical assistance that would have a measurable impact from the small farmer to the consumer. Increased efforts by KSU should be made to develop a means of determining an accurate measurement of postharvest loss.

KSU follow-up teams should be requested by missions, in regard to both technical assistance and training programs, to determine the impacts such programs have accomplished. This, in turn, will strengthen the Missions' activities

DS/AGR:Wlozynski

1/9/80