

100-122017
 100-122017 / 22
 100-122017

PROJECT REVIEW SUMMARY

PROJECT TITLE: Weed Control Systems
AID - TA - c - 1295 Oregon State U.
 PROJECT NO. 931-0463.11
 OSB OFFICE/DIV. AGR/AGR. PROD.

DATE OF REVIEW 9/80

List actions to be taken (or issues to be resolved) as a result of Project Review Meeting	Action Officer	Date Action to be Completed
<u>A. Progress Toward Goals</u>		
1. Send cable to all principal posts re-informing missions of services offered under project.	Project Mngr.	10/80
2. Continue research on adaptive technologies/hand equipment testing.	OSU	on-going
3. Economic assessment studies	OSU	on-going
4. Discuss herbicide position statement.	OSU/DS techs	9/80
5. Establish pesticide application equipment minimum standard.	OSU/DS techs	9/80
<u>B. Evaluation</u> - Organize 18-month evaluation (determine team make-up timing, sites to visit, scope of work, etc.)	PM/OSU	11/80
<u>C. Forward Planning</u> - Determining alternative for future of project as part of (B) evaluation	PM/OSU	During evaluation & ongoing
<u>D. Personnel Review</u> - Monitor new field personnel doing economic research (cont.)	OSU	ongoing

Rebecca J. Niec, DS/AGR
 Project Manager
Mary Mozynski, DS/AGR
 Program Analyst
 Attachments: OSB Project Data Sheet
 Project Review Information Sheet
 Other:

Donald Fiester, DS/AGR
 Chief Director
John M. Yohu, DS/AGR/AP
 Division Chief
 Distribution: Project Files
 OS, DAA
 OS/PO: Program Analyst

PROJECT REVIEW SUMMARY

PROJECT TITLE: Weed Control Systems

DATE OF REVIEW 9/80

AID - TA - c - 1295 Oregon State U.

PROJECT NO. 931-0463.11

OSB OFFICE/DIV. AGR/AGR. PROD.

List actions to be taken (or issues to be resolved) as a result of Project Review Meeting	Action Officer	Date Action to be Completed
(cont.) E. <u>Funding</u> - Prepare PIO/T's to add \$362,000 thus fully funding project to 5/31/82. F. <u>Reports</u> 1. Finalize Annual Report 2. Submit trip reports	PM OSU OSU	9/80 10/80 on-going

Rebecca J. Nier, DS/AGR
Project Manager

Donald Fiester, DS/AGR
Chief Director

Mary Mozynski, DS/AGR
Program Analyst

John M. Yohe, DS/AGR/AP
Division Chief

Attachments: OSB Project Data Sheet
Project Review Information Sheet
Other:

Distribution: Project Files
OS, DAA
OS, PO: Program Analyst

PROJECT REVIEW INFORMATION

(3 of 4)

PROJECT TITLE Weed Control Systems DATE OF REVIEW 9/80
AID - TA - c - 1295 Oregon State U.
PROJECT NO. 931-0463

1. Briefly state principal subject(s) to be discussed during the review.

A. Progress Toward Goals

--continued adaptive research of available weed control technologies to ensure acceptability to small farmers (i.e. chemical mulch, testing of hand planter/hand pesticide application, etc.)

--continued publication of research results

(cont.)

11. Please respond to the following questions. Additional detail can be given below if warranted or necessary.

- a. Is project implementation on schedule as planned in the PP or implementation plan? yes
- b. Are there any short falls or delays of project inputs? no
- c. Are project assumptions holding up? yes
- d. Are progress/annual reports being submitted in a timely fashion? yes
Are such reports informative? yes
- e. Is there any monitoring/progress information being received from other than project or contractor personnel (e.g., project manager site visits, USAID reports etc.)? yes
- f. Has an evaluation been carried out? yes July 26-27, 1979
- g. Are there any audit or evaluation recommendations outstanding? no
- h. Are there any special or restrictive requirements imposed by RAC or stipulated in the PP? no

Attachments: ABS Project Data Sheet
*Logical Framework

*3-year extension PP does not have log frame attached LF from original PP covering FY 76-78, which is still applicable.

PROJECT REVIEW INFORMATION

PROJECT TITLE Weed Control Systems DATE OF REVIEW 9/80
AID - TA - c - 1295 Oregon State U.
PROJECT NO. 931-0463

(cont. from "A")

- economic cost/benefit studies of weed control technologies
- on-farm demonstrations, small farm survey/monitor change
- pesticide equipment standards
- herbicides glyphosate/parquat use statement
- assessment of aquatic weed problems/technologies

B. Evaluation - Project Pater (page 22) calls for "team review" following eighteen (18) months of activity. Last PES was accomplished July 26-27, 1979, covering period from August, 1978 to August, 1979

C. Forward Planning - For continuation of project activities after May 31, 1982 under the Integrated Crop Protection CRSP or thru another extension of existing contract

D. Personnel Review - Close monitoring of new personnel in field doing economics research

E. Funding - Addition of final increment to fully fund project thru May 31, 1982

F. Reports - Annual Report due; trip reports be submitted in a timely fashion

PROGRAM: CENTRALLY FUNDED

ACTIVITY DATA SHEET

PROJECT MANAGER: Douglas Grove

TITLE Weed Control Systems in the Developing Countries - Research		FUNDS Agriculture, Rural Development and Nutrition	PROPOSED OBLIGATION (In thousands of dollars)	
NUMBER 931-0463		PRIOR REFERENCE FY 1981 Annex V, Centrally Funded p.	FY 82 0	LIFE OF PROJECT 4,405
GRANT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	LOAN <input type="checkbox"/>	NEW <input type="checkbox"/>	CONTINUING <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ESTIMATED FINAL OBLIGATION FY 82
			INITIAL OBLIGATION FY 66	ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE OF PROJECT FY 82

Purpose: Develop environmentally sound weed control systems and adapt them to developing country farmer and food crop production.

Background and Progress to Date: Weeds are a worldwide problem. Crop losses due to weeds often exceed 25%; uncontrolled weeds can cause complete crop failure. Some weed control technologies, however, may cause severe social dislocation through loss of jobs and subsequently reduced income. Selecting appropriate weed control technology which minimizes adverse effects and is consistent with small farmer resources requires care and sensitivity. Since 1966, Oregon State University has conducted this important weed control activity. Adaptive research has been conducted in several Latin American countries, and since 1976 in the Philippines to find suitable improved weed control systems for small and medium sized farmers. Economic aspects of new weed control technology have also been studied. Progress in Central America has been encouraging. Research in Costa Rica indicates that use of a chemical mulch in seedbed preparation may lead to a major improvement in small-farm weed control. Cost reductions have ranged from 28% to 67% compared to traditional methods. This and similar project activities indicate exciting potentials, but require extensive testing and adaptation. Many LDC counterparts have been trained in weed control research methods and publications have been prepared and distributed.

Host Country and Other Donors: Countries where project staff are stationed provided office, laboratory and field facilities, and staff counterparts.

Beneficiaries: Ultimately the small farmer, rural poor, and village level consumers in LDCs will benefit from this project; initially agricultural researchers and extension personnel.

FY 1982 Program: Continue activities in Latin America and the Philippines with expansion of the economic research.

Major Outputs (and A.I.D. Unit Cost):

Serious weed problems assessed and weed control programs to solve them initiated.
 Currently available weed control technologies modified through adaptive research for use by small farmers in LDCs and new techniques suitable for LDC situations developed.
 The economics of present methods and the effect of new methods on the social and economic environments studied.

unit	(\$ thousands)	
	All years	(cost)
25		(96)
15		(100)
7		(72)

Minimum

Current

Proposed

U.S. FINANCING (In thousands of dollars)

	Obligations	Expenditures	Unliquidated	Funding Period	Principal Contractors or Agencies
Through September 30, 1979	3,927	3,462	465		Oregon State University
Estimated Fiscal Year 1980	-	310			
Estimated through September 30, 1980					
Proposed FY 1981					
Estimated through Fiscal Year 1981					
Proposed FY 82		Future Year Obligations	Estimated Total Cost		

731-0463

PROJECT DESIGN SUMMARY
LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Title of Project _____
From FY _____ to FY _____
Total U.S. Funding _____
Date Prepared: _____

Project Title & Number: Weed Control Systems for Representative Farms in Developing Countries

NARRATIVE SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	IMPORTANT ASSUMPTIONS
<p>Purpose or Sector Goal: The broader objective to which this project contributes:</p> <p>A1. Sector Goal: To increase the quality & quantity of food crop production and the welfare of the small and medium size farmers of the cooperating LDCs by assistance in integrated weed control.</p>	<p>Measures of Goal Achievement: A2. 1. Increase crop production in the cooperating LDCs. 2. Improved welfare of farmers both economically and socially. 3. Institutional initiatives for implementing weed control programs.</p>	<p>A3. a) Numerous publications disseminated. b) Several weed science societies formed in LDCs. c) Substantial crop yields gained world-wide d) New weed control programs and projects in LDCs. e) LDC records and on-site inspection.</p>	<p>Assumptions for achieving goal targets: A4. Assumption for Achieving Purpose: a) That weed control systems will substantially increase food crop yields. b) That LDCs will emphasize programs for integrated weed control on small farms c) That rural population welfare will improve through project activities.</p>
<p>Project Purpose: B1. Purpose: a) Develop weed control systems for small and medium farms in selected developing countries to increase crop yields. b) Evaluate the new weed control technology in terms of the social and economic goals in LDCs. c) Improve weed research capabilities of the LDCs to increase food crop production and welfare of rural population.</p>	<p>Conditions that will indicate purpose has been achieved: End of project status: B2. End of Project Status: a) Existence of a functioning research control system for weeds in the LDCs for small and medium sized farmers. b) Quantitative data of benefits and costs of weed control systems using multiple objective criteria. c) Trained weed specialists capable of working in multidisciplinary pest management integrated control systems.</p>	<p>B3. a) Reports of weed control systems. On-site inspection. b) Cost-benefit reports of weed control systems. c) Report on training performed. LDC, USAID, contractor records on participants.</p>	<p>Assumptions for achieving purpose: B4. a) LDC recognition of need for modification of practices for small farmers. b) Size and sophistication of farm will influence cost/benefit of system. c) There is a lack of trained research personnel.</p>
<p>CI. Outputs: a) Effective and economic weed control systems for small and medium farm in the LDCs. b) Evaluation of social and economic effects of weed control systems. c) Trained LDC technicians in weed control technology, systems research, survey analysis, and multidisciplinary research.</p>	<p>Magnitude of Outputs: C2. a) Unquantified; depends on area of adoption of systems developed in LA and EA. Systems will be developed for several farm sizes. b) Unquantified; depends on area of adoption. The quantity of the effects is precisely what is being evaluated. c) In each country not less than six researchers should be trained in weed control.</p>	<p>C3. Report records, publications of LDCs, USAID, and contractor. The development of various weed control systems for small and medium farms.</p>	<p>Assumptions for achieving outputs: C4. a) That the procedures and plans promulgated will evolve into national and institutionalized programs for integrated weed control systems. b) That social and economic status will effect level of technology of most adaptive system. c) There are researchers desiring training.</p>
<p>E1. Inputs: a) Budgetary support, project monitoring, technical support and assistance AID/Washington. b) Contractor will provide staff, administrative, logistic support, and technical expertise to carry out programs. c) The LDCs will provide adequate counterparts and physical facilities for technicians.</p>	<p>Implementation Target (Type and Quantity) D2. Contractor: Oregon State Univ. (OSU) a) AID Funding FY 77 78 79 b) OSU 239,000-263,000-290,000 Core staff 26 26 26 Support staff 18 18 18 Field staff CA 12 12 12 Consultant 0 0 0 c) LDC funding as required</p>	<p>D3. a) AID/W records. b) OSU contract, reports, records. c) LDC and OSU reports and on-site inspection.</p>	<p>Assumptions for providing inputs: D4. a) Necessary support and project monitoring will be available through AID/Washington b) OSU will maintain subject discipline and continue to supply technical assistance in timely fashion. c) The LDCs will support the work with adequate counterpart personnel and necessary logistic support.</p>