

PO-ARM-80P

UNCLASSIFIED  
CLASSIFICATION

5960083/115-  
Report Control  
Symbol U-447

15M-29106 PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

1. PROJECT TITLE  Small Farm Production Systems			2. PROJECT NUMBER  596-0083	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE  ROCAP
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) <u>83-3</u>	
A. First PRO-AG or Equipment FY <u>79</u>	B. Final Obligation Expected FY <u>83</u>	C. Final Input Delivery FY <u>84</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION	
6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING			7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION	
A. Total \$ <u>10,339</u>			From (month/yr.) <u>Dec., 1981</u>	
B. U.S. \$ <u>7,403</u>			To (month/yr.) <u>Sept. 1982</u>	
			Date of Evaluation Review <u>Sept. 1982</u>	

8. 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
1. Extend the life of project to allow time for the completion of planned outputs.	ROCAP	5/31/83
2. Incorporate a strong extension and communication element into the overall Project to better assure the utilization of the project's findings.	CATIE	9/30/83

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Paper	<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____
<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P	_____

10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT

A. <input type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change
B. <input type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or <input type="checkbox"/> Change Implementation Plan
C. <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinue Project

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)

Rafael Franco  
ROCAP Evaluation Officer

12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval

Signature <i>Paul A. Montavon</i>
Typed Name Paul A. Montavon
Date <u>4/29/83</u>

### 13. Summary

The Small Farm Production Systems Project (SFPS) has been capably managed, has produced very positive and observable results and offers potential for significant impact on the welfare of the region's small farmers.

A pragmatic farm-based research methodology has been developed by CATIE and is being utilized in national programs in cropping systems and large animal livestock systems. Development of mixed crop-animal system methodology is just getting underway.

The national institutions have been subjected to very considerable instability over the project period. Personnel turnovers, fluctuating financial resources and program content modifications have influenced institutional capability to support the SFPS projects at national levels. In spite of these factors, the project has been effective in maintaining continuity of farming systems research in the region.

Although the project has gone far in closing the gap between researchers and farmers, the project outreach via national extension transfer entities is very limited. The project has not identified, developed or tested alternative technology transfer methodologies.

Training of national personnel in farming systems research by CATIE has exceeded intended project outputs.

The project has improved CATIE's capability to do research in farming systems and to advise and assist national agencies. CATIE is now recognized as one of the leading institutions in such work.

### 14. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation was conducted over a two and one-half week period by a four-person team. Findings are based on information obtained through an intensive series of project site visits, interviews, and review of project documents. On-site visits to field research were conducted in all six participating countries. Over 85 percent of the team's total working days were devoted to site visits.

The nature and magnitude of the SFPS project and the very brief time available to review work at multiple sites in six countries required the team to focus on specific implementation issues which were identified by ROCAP. These covered the organizational and administrative structure (including reports and finances) of CATIE and national institutions in carrying out the project, the methodologies and procedures used in site selection, experimental design and execution, monitoring, data collection, processing, analysis and dissemination, the cost effectiveness of the research and training methodologies, and the perceptions of the farmers on the systems being developed.

#### 15. External Factors

There are no external factors which have had an impact on the project.

#### 16. Inputs

There were no problems reported in the evaluation with respect to commodities, technical services, training or other inputs as to quality, quantity or timeliness.

#### 17. Outputs

The key project elements are:

- Developing methodologies (10 for crops, 6 for animals and 6 for mixed crop-animal) for farming systems implementation;
- Developing a methodology for extrapolating cropping systems from one area to others;
- Developing a model for technology transfer; and
- Training regional personnel in systems research and outreach.

Project progress towards meeting the intended outputs is more than satisfactory. The methodologies for the cropping and animal systems have been developed. Under the cropping component, 10 systems have already been developed and three more will be completed soon. For the animal component, one system has been completed and progress is being made on five more. Training activities have exceeded planned outputs in the areas of short courses, seminars and workshops, but is a little behind in long-term M.A. training. Also, the amount of data

which has been collected is much greater than anticipated and attention is needed to review and define actual data requirements.

Two activities require further development. One is the mixed systems (crop-animal) methodology which is just getting underway, and the second is the project outreach via national extension/technology transfer entities which has been limited. The project has not yet identified, developed or tested an alternative technology transfer methodology and, as a consequence, the results already available under the project have not been transmitted beyond the limited number of small farmers who have been cooperating closely in the implementation of the research activities.

18. Purpose

The project purpose is to develop a continuing Central American expertise to conduct and convey small farmer crop, animal and mixed farming production systems research. For the cropping system, CATIE has the ability to fill this research role. By the end of the project, it will also have the ability in the other two systems as well. To be fully institutionalized, however, support (particularly financial) from national institutions must be increased.

19. Goal

The goal of the project is to improve the regional condition in which rural poor will have increased output and income from the land they work.

20. Beneficiaries

The ultimate beneficiaries are the small farmers of Central America. The extent to which benefits are received, however, will depend on the national level extension networks. The project includes training for national personnel to promote the farm systems, and additional emphasis in this area is planned over the remainder of the implementation period.

Other beneficiaries are CATIE and national institutions which have improved their capacity to carry out farming systems research.

21. Unplanned Effects

The project has not had any unplanned results.

22. Lesson Learned

The evaluation has shown that small farm systems research can be done effectively, in terms of level of effort and cost, on a regional basis. In reaching this conclusion the evaluation noted that, for systems research to be effective, a high level of technical competence in diverse disciplines is required and that researchers must work as a unit. In one centralized organization, such as CATIE, it is possible to maintain this level of competence, but it cannot generally be expected to be available from individual national institutions.

The regional approach adopted by the project also demonstrated that, through that approach, it is possible to stimulate national interest, provide on-the-job training to enhance national capabilities, and to accelerate national research progress.

An important, related lesson is that regional research projects must include specific activities aimed at both enhancing the links between regional and national institutions and at disseminating research results at the farm level. This does not mean that regional institutions should take on an extension function; that responsibility must rest with the national institutions. However, by forging strong linkages between them, the regional institutions can ensure that the capacity exists at the national level to promote technological advances at the farm level. Without efforts aimed at wide-spread dissemination, the impact of improved technology will be limited and result in the cost per beneficiary for the project being unnecessarily high.

23. Special Comments or Remarks

None