

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

Report Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE  
 PD-AAS-774. *acid/w*  
 AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

2. PROJECT NUMBER  
 522-0139

3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE  
 USAID/Honduras

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)  
 REGULAR EVALUATION     SPECIAL EVALUATION

5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES

A. First P/O-AG or Equivalent Y 1979	B. Final Obligation Expected FY 1982	C. Final Input Delivery FY 1983
---	---	------------------------------------

6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING

A. Total	\$2,359,000
B. U.S.	\$1,914,000

7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION

From (month/yr.)	10/78
To (month/yr.)	1/80

Date of Evaluation Review

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 regional 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
---	--------------------------------

- Revised project budget under preparation. Revised budget will include modest shift of funds, in accordance with this evaluation, from technical assistance line item to material support to cover costs associated with dispersed in-field research experiments. No revision of Project Design (Project Paper) is seen as needed. Revised Budget to be submitted/approved by A.I.D.
- Lessons learned:
  - Agriculture Research must be conducted within the framework of a defined and long range research program.
  - Closer coordination with the MNR extension services are essential.
  - Closer coordination among other donor research programs is required.
- To address lessons learned, GOH is developing a defined, long range research plan which will detail relationships/cooperative ties between other donors and GOH agencies.

Oberbeck

8/30/80

Oberbeck

11/30/80

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS

- |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper             | <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan & O. CPI Network | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan | <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T                                | _____                                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework         | <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C                                | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement         | <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/A                                | _____                                    |

10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT

- A.  Continue Project Without Change
- B.  Change Project Design and/or  Change Implementation Plan
- C.  Discontinue Project

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER HANDING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Name and Title)

Charles D. Oberbeck - Project Officer  
 Julio Schlottbauer - *Project Officer*  
 Adan Bonilla - Director, PNIA

*Charles Oberbeck*  
*Pso - [Signature]*

12. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE APPROVAL

Signature: *[Signature]*  
 Type: Leo L. Kucinas, Acting Mission Director

Date: 8-19-80

### 13. Summary

The Agricultural Research Project represents the introduction of a very new concept, multidisciplinary farm-level research, into the existing Honduran research and extension institutions. The project actually is comprised of two levels of activities: First, because the whole project concept is relatively new, there is a substantial need for imaginative planning, project design, participant training, and, generally, communication of the project concept to people in research and extension who will be involved with it; and, secondly, the project calls for deployment of research teams, design and execution of the farm level experiments, and the dissemination to farmers of the results. In summary, the activities thus far have primarily been of the first type, and progress has been significant. The project, now, is in a period of transition into the second type of activity, and the project evaluation raises the possibility that institutional barriers may make progress more difficult in the second stage of activity.

To date, the project would have to be considered highly successful. A talented and experienced administrative team has been established, technical assistance has been provided by several contractors with experience in multidisciplinary research, a training course has been designed and implemented, two research teams have been formed, a comprehensive evaluation has been conducted, and project administrators are beginning to address problems cited in the evaluation. In short, an excellent foundation has been laid.

In the future, the primary problem likely to confront the project, as mentioned in the comprehensive evaluation, will be the possible lack of a strong, centralized policy of support for the program by the Secretariat of Natural Resources. The reason for this potential barrier is the regionalized administration of the PNIA. Because regional research stations are highly autonomous, acceptance and support for the new research concepts of the project will be on a region by region basis. To the extent that this regionalization impedes both the material and institutional support needed by the project, progress toward a strong national program of farm level research will be slowed.

#### 14. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation was a regular evaluation scheduled for November, 1979, but postponed until February 1980 in order to broaden the scope of inquiry. In addition to the evaluation called for by A.I.D. of specific project guidelines, the evaluation committee conducted more extensive interviews and visits to research stations in order to make substantive recommendations about a wide range of PNIA activities. The evaluation was primarily concerned with analyzing the institutional effectiveness of PNIA and the Research Project's contribution to increasing effectiveness; and, therefore, the evaluation was qualitative rather than quantitative. Members of the evaluation team were: Ing. Astolfo Fumagalli, from Tecun S.A., Guatemala; Dr. Reggie Laird, Rockefeller Foundation, Chapingo, Mexico; Dr. Franklin Martin, from ROCAP, Costa Rica; Dr. Manuel Ruiz, CATIE, Costa Rica; and Dr. Robert Waugh, Rockefeller Foundation, advisor to PNIA in Honduras.

## 15. External Factors

There are indications that support for the project is not uniform from region to region, and there is no strong central program to provide coherent administration nationally. There is a lack of clear definition of the responsibilities of Research and Extension Programs that presents a further administrative barrier to project implementation. In general, however, the GOH support for the Research Project continues to be strong.

## 16. Inputs

Project inputs to be provided by A.I.D. have been delivered as requested. They include: contracts for project administration and technical assistance, financing of two Masters Degree Programs, rental and purchase of vehicles, and purchase of some commodities.

Inputs provided by the GOH include salaries and operational support. While the GOH has provided salaries for staff and trainees to date, there have not yet been significant improvements in the commodities and supplies at research stations. Moreover, Project Administrators have expressed concern over whether the GOH would be able to budget the future salary requirements (28 additional research technicians are called for in the Project Description, Annex 1 of Implementation Letter No. 2). Whereas it may be premature to expect the delivery of these specific inputs at this stage of the project, the evaluation concludes, generally, that budgetary problems within the GOH would slow down Project implementation.

## 17. Outputs

The project is comprised of five distinct outputs:

1) extension of multidisciplinary research teams from one to seven, 2) strengthening of research stations' support of multidisciplinary, farm-level research through reorientation of policy and provision of laboratory and other materials, 3) delivery of research results to the extension service, 4) development of a long-range national research plan, and 5) evaluations of Project progress and impact.

The evaluation concludes that progress toward the first output is good. A training course is operating in Comayagua, and two research teams are operating - one in three zones of Comayagua, and another in two zones of La Esperanza. Additionally, three researchers are working in Olancho, although this is not yet a full research team.

Progress toward the second output is only beginning. The evaluation concludes that there is much to be done in regards to equipping experiment stations, strengthening the staff, and reorienting research policy.

Generally, because of the regional nature of PNIA administration, and because of the lack of uniform support for the Research Project among regions, the evaluation concludes that it may be premature to expand the program to all seven regions presently. The evaluation suggests that concentration of the first two outputs in only three of four regions might be best. Furthermore, the Project Administrators are finding that increased research team field activities are creating budgetary pressures which were not fully anticipated. That is, the type of research work done by a farm level team, while very effective, can be expensive. Expansion of the number of multidisciplinary teams and reorientation of regional research station policies and activities will be constrained by PNIA's ability to find increased material support for the teams.

The third output, delivery of research results to extension agents, will be one of the last accomplished, and it is premature to expect research results after just over one year. However, the evaluation does point out that extension agents in Comayagua have begun to familiarize themselves with farm level research through some of the training activities (with a total of 194 participants).

The evaluation notes no progress toward development of a national research strategy.

The first annual evaluation is complete and is considered to be quite comprehensive.

As noted above, outputs 1 and 2 are somewhat constrained by the regional nature of PNIA administration. Moreover, PNIA has not developed a long-range national strategy. In order to address these problems of Project Implementation, PNIA has made some

adjustments in its 1980 work plan. Primarily, they have changed somewhat the type of technical assistance sought, emphasizing experience in farm level research. It is hoped that the new T.A. will be able to contribute to development of a long-range strategy. Moreover, PNIA has requested that an accountant be included in T.A. for the life of the project, for the purpose of designing an improved system of administering the program. It is anticipated that an improved accounting system would facilitate the central administration's auditing of progress from region to region.

## 18. Purpose

The Project purpose is to help the Government of Honduras expand its agricultural research service and make it more responsive to the technological needs of small traditional and agrarian reform farmers. By the PACD, the Project is to have helped the PNIA (National Program for Agricultural Research) develop and test, on farms, improved farm systems, basic grain varieties, livestock, and other crops with the participation of an estimated 7,000 small traditional and agrarian reform farmers.

Progress toward End-of-Project-Status includes: establishment of Program Administration, contracting of technical assistance, purchase of vehicles and some materials, design and implementation of a training course in farm level research, initiation of activities of two full, multidisciplinary, farm level research teams, and completion of a comprehensive evaluation of the Research Program progress to date.

Achievement of the End-of-Project-Status, i.e., the eventual participation of an estimated 7,000 farmers in the project, can reasonably be projected to occur within the next three years. Shortfalls in progress so far have been small, and are generally caused by the highly regionalized nature of PNIA administration. Without a strong national policy and budget control, the project's progress has varied from region to region. It may be possible, then, that the Project will receive greater institutional and material support in some regions than in others, and that End-of-Project-Status will be reached sooner in those regions that provide the strongest support.

## 19. Goal/Subgoal

The goal of the project is to increase the incomes and employment opportunities of small scale traditional and agrarian reform farmers in Honduras. Progress toward this goal will be measurable in 1983 (PACD) by changes in farm income of families who have adopted technology developed by this Project. At present, it is too early to measure changes in farm income, but progress toward the goal can be seen in the overall project implementation. As mentioned below, two full research teams are operating; one in three zones of Comayagua and the other in two zones of La Esperanza. Additionally, three researchers are working in Olancho and programs to familiarize extension agents with the research program have involved almost 200 persons.

Other projects which are contributing directly to the same goal (through development of PNIA) include a 3 year World Bank (IDA) Loan for research training, technical assistance, and materials, an I.D.R.C. (Canada) loan for support of PNIA's programs, and an annual CATIE program of support for training and technical assistance within PNIA. When the measure is taken of progress toward the Project goal, a certain amount of that progress will be attributed to these auxiliary programs. However, these programs are basically providing assistance only on a year-by-year basis, and do not contribute to a certain long range support for the project activities.

## 20. Beneficiaries

The beneficiaries of the Project will be small, traditional and land-reform farmers in Honduras. By 1983 the Project can be expected to reach approximately 7,000 farmers. Direct benefits to the farmers will be improved production and marketing techniques leading to increased income and improved employment opportunities among small farmers. Because this is a program of agricultural research, it is expected that the Project will affect many farmers not directly contacted by field level research teams, and that these farmers will indirectly benefit by increased income and employment. The direct and indirect benefits, then, are improved income distribution among farmers, reduction in rural unemployment, an increase in food supply, and improved nutrition.

**21. Unplanned Effects**

**None.**

## 22. Lessons Learned

The Research Project is characterized by an extremely capable and dedicated staff from the Director to the field. The high degree of motivation can be attributed partially to the fact that the program was conceived by and for Hondurans. AID/H plays a strong supporting role, but does not attempt to take the initiative away from the GOH. The result is a well-administered Project and an excellent working relationship between AID/H and the GOH.

23. Special Comments or Remarks

Not pertinent at this time.