

CLASSIFICATION  
PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

Report Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE  Niger Rural Sector Human Resource Development			2. PROJECT NUMBER 683-0226	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE USAID/Niger
			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>683-84-01</u>	
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION	
5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES		6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING		7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY <u>79</u>	B. Final Obligation Expected FY <u>82</u>	C. Final Input Delivery FY <u>84</u>	A. Total \$ <u>19,159,000</u> B. U.S. \$ <u>5,030,000</u>	From (month/yr.) <u>June, 1979</u> To (month/yr.) <u>November, 1983</u> Date of Evaluation Review

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
A. Extend Project Assistance Completion Date to 30 September 1986.	USAID/GON	August 30, 1984
B. Prepare a Project Implementation Letter for GON concurrence on earmarking of unearmarked funds.	USAID	August 30, 1984
C. a. Extend two PSC contracts for two AID-financed technical assistance teachers, for 3 months. (May 1 - July 31, 1984).	USAID	May 15 1984
b. Extend one host country contract for one teacher for 3 months (May 1 - July 31, 1984).	GON	May 30, 1984
D. GON provide assurances in written form that participants in training will be given teaching assignments at IPDR.	GON	August 30, 1984
E. Begin discussions with GON concerning their assuming financial responsibility for the Village Operations Program by January 1985.	EHRDO/GON	August 1, 1984

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS	10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PIO/T      _____ <input checked="" 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      _____	A. <input type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change B. <input type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or <input checked="" 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)	12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval
G. Corinaldi, Project Officer Y. Abdou, Project Director T. Doggett, Evaluation Officer	Signature  Typed Name <u>Abbe Fessenden</u> Date <u>May 14, 1984</u>

## PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) – PART II

The following topics are to be covered in a brief narrative statement (averaging about 200 words or half a page per item) and attached to the printed PES facesheet. Each topic should have an underlined heading. If a topic is not pertinent to a particular evaluation, list the topic and state: "Not pertinent at this time". The Summary (Item 13) should always be included, and should not exceed 200 words.

**13. SUMMARY** - Summarize the current project situation, mentioning progress in relation to design, prospects of achieving the purpose and goal, major problems encountered, etc.

**14. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY** - What was the reason for the evaluation, e.g., clarify project design, measure progress, verify program/project hypotheses, improve implementation, assess a pilot phase, prepare budget, etc? Where appropriate, refer to the Evaluation Plan in the Project Paper. Describe the methods used for this evaluation, including the study design, scope, cost, techniques of data collection, analysis and data sources. Identify agencies and key individuals (host, other donor, public, AID) participating and contributing.

**15. EXTERNAL FACTORS** - Identify and discuss major changes in project setting, including socio-economic conditions and host government priorities, which have an impact on the project. Examine continuing validity of assumptions.

**16. INPUTS** - Are there any problems with commodities, technical services, training or other inputs as to quality, quantity, timeliness, etc? Any changes needed in the type or amount of inputs to produce outputs?

**17. OUTPUTS** - Measure actual progress against projected output targets in current project design or implementation plan. Use tabular format if desired. Comment on significant management experiences. If outputs are not on target, discuss causes (e.g., problems with inputs, implementation assumptions). Are any changes needed in the outputs to achieve purpose?

**18. PURPOSE** - Quote approved project purpose. Cite progress toward each End of Project Status (EOPS) condition. When can achievement be expected? Is the set of EOPS conditions still considered a good description of what will exist when the purpose is achieved? Discuss the causes of any shortfalls in terms of the causal linkage between outputs and purpose or external factors.

**19. GOAL/SUBGOAL** - Quote approved goal, and subgoal, where relevant, to which the project contributes. Describe status by citing evidence available to date from specified indicators, and by mentioning the progress of other contributory projects. To what extent can progress toward goal/subgoal be attributed to purpose achievement, to other projects, to other causal factors? If progress is less than satisfactory, explore the reasons, e.g., purpose inadequate for hypothesized impact, new external factors affect purpose-subgoal/goal linkage.

**20. BENEFICIARIES** - Identify the direct and indirect beneficiaries of this project in terms of criteria in Sec. 102(d) of the FAA (e.g., a. increase small-farm, labor-intensive agricultural productivity; b. reduce infant mortality; c. control population growth; d. promote greater equality in income; e. reduce rates of unemployment and underemployment). Summarize data on the nature of benefits and the identity and number of those benefitting, even if some aspects were reported in preceding questions on output, purpose, or subgoal/goal. For AID/W projects, assess likelihood that results of projects will be used in LDC's.

**21. UNPLANNED EFFECTS** - Has the project had any unexpected results or impact, such as changes in social structure, environment, health, technical or economic situation? Are these effects advantageous or not? Do they require any change in project design or execution?

**22. LESSONS LEARNED** - What advice can you give a colleague about development strategy, e.g., how to tackle a similar development problem or to manage a similar project in another country? What can be suggested for follow-on in this country? Similarly, do you have any suggestions about evaluation methodology?

**23. SPECIAL COMMENTS OR REMARKS** - Include any significant policy or program management implications. Also list titles of attachments and number of pages.

Project Evaluation Summary (PES)  
Part II

Niger Rural Sector Human Resource Development

Project 683-0226

Expansion and Reform of the  
Practical Institute for Rural Development/Kolo

13. Summary

The project, developed by the Government of Niger (GON) in conjunction with nine donor institutions, represents an effort by the Government to meet its training needs at the village and farm level by producing extension workers whose training is adapted to field requirements and who are ready to transfer their skills to farmers effectively. USAID participation in the Kolo expansion-reform project is thus part of a multi-donor effort elaborated by UNDP/FAO in 1977. The expansion/reform program is designed in three phases, with USAID participating in phases I and II (presently being implemented). Phase III is a construction phase under the direction of the World Bank. The primary objective of the total effort is to expand the Practical Institute for Rural Development (IPDR) at Kolo, allowing it to produce 150 extension agents per year, and to reform the curriculum and teaching methodologies at the Institute so that the training received is more directly relevant to field needs and conditions.

USAID has provided a major contribution to the multi-donor effort supporting the expansion and reform of IPDR. USAID contributions have concentrated on construction, technical assistance to the Socio-Economic Department, training for seven IPDR instructors, and equipping of laboratories. A major outreach function of the reform, Operation Villageoise (VOP), is also funded by USAID. Operation Villageoise works in ten villages around Kolo. USAID participation in the expansion and reform project dates from 1979, and was designed to cover the five years ending September 1984.

Other donor involvement includes UNDP/FAO (who are the primary coordinators of donor activity), France, European Development Fund, Belgium, Switzerland, the Netherlands (with CILSS) and volunteers from Germany and the Netherlands. With the exception of the FAO/UNDP coordination and pedagogy unit effort, donors have concentrated their activities within specific disciplinary areas of the Institute. UN and other donor participation will continue at least through 1986.

Assistance to IPDR represents a primary means for donors such as USAID to help the GON in training its mid-level extension field personnel. Despite the fact that the GON is moving toward increasing direct farmer participation in training, basic extension methods will still have to be transferred to groups of technicians. Kolo is the institution charged with responsibility for training these technicians.

A recent multi-donor UN evaluation (October-November 1983), in which USAID also participated, found that significant progress had been made in implementing the reform, but that progress was still required in the area of "Nigerienization" of the Institute. This entails replacing current expatriate-held staff positions with Nigeriens. Linkages with the field and MDR to provide realistic position descriptions on which to base training at IPDR are also needed.

USAID project management has been good in terms of construction, commodities and training, but USAID financed technical assistance has been generally weak. Liaison and coordination with other donors also could be strengthened.

The evaluation recommends that USAID extend the FACD for at least two years to complete training commitments to long-term participants, and to consider options for programming additional activities. No additional project funding is proposed although the evaluation gives recommendations for programming additional funds if such funds are made available.

#### 14. Evaluation Methodology

Information required to complete the evaluation was gathered during October-November 1983 in Niger. The preliminary phase of data gathering included interviews with USAID personnel and examination of the approximately 120 files which comprise the project records. Additional documentation provided by the UN/FAO was also reviewed. From November 7-10 field interviews were conducted with IPDR staff and donor personnel at Kolo to complete the information gathering process (see Annex, list of persons contacted).

The evaluation prepared by the UNDP/FAO multidonor team was completed October 27, 1983 and this analysis draws upon its findings for evaluation of the total impact of the overall reform-expansion project on agricultural training and its appropriateness in Niger. The present evaluation, however, focuses chiefly on USAID participation in the implementation of the IPDR project and uses the findings of the UN evaluation as a framework within which to examine AID-specific issues.

The evaluation was carried out by Ms. Janet Tuthill. Ms. Dorothy Leroux, who represented USAID on the UNDP/FAO evaluation team, assisted in the preparation of the USAID-specific evalua-

tion through background briefings, analysis of findings and explanation of recommendations. The complete report of the UNDP/FAO coordinated evaluation is available from FAO. The summary of conclusions and recommendations is attached as Annex A.

## 15. External Factors

The project was designed during a period when GON resources were plentiful as a result of revenues earned from the export of uranium. Subsequent economic contractions have forced the GON to reduce funding for certain programs, including their participation in development projects financed by outside donors. The GON continues to put emphasis on the rural sector development despite the present economic crisis, but has modified its planning considerably. IPDR has been provided a budget adequate to meet its 1983-84 operating expenses by the GON but has been forced to cut back on student enrollment to lower expenses and reduce the number of agents to be placed in the field each year. The enrollment for the current school year at IPDR (1983-84 was 50 direct candidates (recruited from outside the existing extension agent pool), down almost one-half from the number admitted the previous year, with total enrollment currently at 387, down from 450. While this will reduce the total number of students graduated over the life of the project, it represents, in the eyes of the evaluation, responsible fiscal management on the part of the GON. The GON now plans to institute an enrollment quota for IPDR tied to five year field requirements.

Assumptions made during project design, including those on GON willingness to make difficult resource allocation decisions; availability of funds; and appropriateness of training to meet rural needs, continue to be valid. The earnest and active implementation of field training programs and village operation activities demonstrate the IPDR commitment to bringing the curriculum more closely in line with the field conditions that will confront technicians, as well as giving villagers and farmers the opportunity to influence the orientation of the technical agents' training.

## 16. Inputs

In general, USAID was able to provide the inputs called for in the Project Paper, but implementation planning proved overly optimistic. Actual times required to deliver technical assistance, commodities and construction services, for example, exceeded original estimates, sometimes by as much as a year. Commodity and construction procurement were begun on time but took longer to complete because of delays on the GON side in construction plan approval. The absence of a master plan for infrastructure expansion likewise slowed delivery and coordination of donor construction inputs. Decisions made early in the project concerning the modes of technical assistance delivery influenced the timing of its delivery as well. Finally, the length of time

taken by the GON to select candidates for participant training, coupled with longer than anticipated periods of time required for English language training (programming three participants for Bachelor's rather than Masters degree) also caused delays in carrying out the project's training program.

As a result, three of the seven participants currently in training will not be able to complete their degree within the present PACD September 30, 1984.

Table 1  
Long-Term Technical Assistance

<u>Planned</u>	<u>P/M</u>	<u>Actually Provided</u>	<u>Start</u>	<u>Complete</u>	<u>Total P/M</u>
Project Management/ Rural Development Specialist	30	Ag. Extension/ Rural Development Specialist	07/80	04/84	34
Rural Sociologist	30	Rural Sociologist	09/80	09/82	24
Soil Scientist	30	Soil Scientist	12/80	07/82	18
Soil Scientist	24	Rural Economist	12/80	04/84	16
Economist	30	Ag. Economist	04/80	04/84	48
<u>TOTALS:</u>	144				140

a. Technical Assistance

Project design called for 12 person years and five positions to be staffed. These positions were to be divided between the socio-economic department and the general instruction department (soil science). Fourteen person months of short-term technical assistance from rural development specialists and environmentalists was also provided for. Technical assistance was to be timed to allow for eight Nigeriens to receive advanced training in their specialty areas and return to IPDR. The allowance of 30 person months per position was insufficient to allow for continuity in some of the teaching assignments. Participants are, in most cases, taking more than 30 months to complete their U.S. training. A total of 140 person months of long-term technical assistance has been provided under the project (see Table 1). All but 18 months of this assistance was provided to the socio-economic department. Instructors spend considerable time on field work with students during the two teaching quarters and in practical training during the village operation program during the third academic quarter.

In terms of evaluation of performance, two of the three instructors presently at Kolo (both economists) were the most respected of the USAID technical assistance personnel to date. Criticisms by IPDR staff of other team members centered around problems in communicating clearly in French in the classroom. It appears that technical assistance provided by USAID could have played a more active role in the activities of the Pedagogy Unit and in elaborating field outreach programs to enhance the quality of the U.S. effort.

It should be noted that the instructors in the socio-economic unit carry a heavy course load, and that the skills taught in its courses are central to the curriculum reform initiatives. In addition, this unit trains personnel for UNCC and the Service de l'Animation. In view of the fact that instructors away for long-term training will not return before the present technical assistance contracts expire, planning with the socio-economic unit for coverage of its courses in the interim period becomes a priority issue. Instructors in the department are currently expressing frustration due to the large number of course preparation tasks, added administrative burdens caused by project innovations (Village Operations Program Pedagogy Unit) and lack of time to complete research work vital to professional development.

The original project design called for 14 person months of short-term technical assistance. One month was provided by a sociologist who gave USAID an assessment of the curriculum reform and of recommendations made by the Technical Committee. No other short-term assistance was requested. In retrospect, however, it seems unlikely that additional short-term assistance would have provided significant help in promoting the main objectives of the Kolo reform.

Evidence also suggests that the use of an institutional contracting mode by USAID to provide technical assistance would have greatly reduced USAID/Niger's administrative burden with respect to project management and could have facilitated personnel recruitment as well. In addition, it is apparent that language skills should have been more carefully evaluated.

#### b. Training

Original project planning called for eight Nigeriens to receive two year masters level training each plus two to three months of English language training. This target was chosen to ensure that at least six positions at IPDR would ultimately be staffed. Additional resources were allocated for short trips by 10 Nigerien officials to visit U.S. and other African institutions to observe programs similar to the reforms being instituted at IPDR.

### c. Long-Term

The objectives of participant training in the U.S. or third countries centered on providing IPDR staff with advanced degrees in Rural Sociology, Economics, Biology and Soil Science. Approximately 18 person years of long-term training were planned for the project. As demonstrated in Table 2, participants left Niger later than planned and will consequently be returning later than planned. Most of the delays once in the U.S. have been caused by the need for additional English language training in order to begin studies. Three participants are receiving bachelor's degrees, however, which take three to four years to complete, rather than the master's level called for in the design. It is felt that a minimum of 21 person years are needed to complete training for the seven participants in the program. The eighth participant will not be sent under the project as the four year program he requires would extend to 1988.

While different from subject areas in the original project plans, which called for sociology, economics and project management, the degrees being sought fit well into the present curriculum needs of the socio-economic department. Two rural sociologists, an additional agricultural economist and specialists in agricultural business resource development and entomology are being trained.

One economist has already returned from U.S. training and has taken up duties teaching in the socio-economic unit. Three more participants are due back in 1984. Three others will not complete studies until 1986 and the evaluation recommends that steps be taken to allow them to complete training, e.g. through a PACD extension. Without these staff members in place, it will be impossible for the socio-economic department to meet its teaching and outreach requirements.

The project paper alluded to teaching commitments being signed by participants prior to departure for U.S. training but the GON does not have a system for ensuring placement in appropriate slots upon return. This matter should be taken up with the GON. All donors voiced concern on this issue during the UN evaluation. Housing facilities presently being built at Kolo may act as an additional incentive for instructors to continue in their present positions.

Table 2  
Long-Term Participants

<u>Participant</u>	<u>Dep. Date</u>	<u>Est. Compl. Date</u>	<u>Degree Program</u>	<u>Institution</u>	<u>Present Function at IPDR</u>
Djibo Moumouni	03/82	06/84	M.S. Entomology	Univ. of Delaware	Instructor/ Head Ag. Prod.
Moussa Souleymane	03/82	05/86	B.S. Agribus.	Univ. of Wisconsin	Formateur Exploitation Agricole
Mahamane Siddo	03/82	05/86	B.S. Rural Soc.	Univ. of Missouri	Economic/Instruc- tor Nutrition
Moussa Soussou	04/82	06/86	B.S. Ag Econ.	Sam Houston Univ.	Personnel/Equip- ment Manager
Salissou Aboubacar	10/81	07/86	M.A. Rural Soc.	Ahmadou Bello Univ.	Rural Sociology Instructor
Adamou Dodo	04/81	09/83	M.A. Economics	W'ern Illinois Univ.	Head of Socio- Economic Unit
Adamou Guisso	04/81	03/84	M.S. Resource Dev.	Michigan State Univ.	

\*\*\*\*\*

	<u>Proposed IPDR Position</u>	<u>Cumulative Expenditure (To Nearest \$000)</u>	<u>Funds Required to Complete Training (Est.)</u>
Djibo Moumouni	Entomology Instructor	46,000	Fully Funded
Moussa Souleymane	Instructor Socio-Economic Unit	76,000	25,000
Mahamane Siddo	Instructor	45,000	30,000
Moussa Soussou	Instructor	45,000	30,000
Salissou Aboubacar	Instructor	30,000	20,000
Adamou Dodo	Ag. Economics Instructor	52,000	N/A (Returned)
Adamou Guisso	To Be Determined	58,000	Fully Funded
<u>TOTALS:</u>		<u>\$ 352,000</u>	<u>\$ 105,000</u>

#### d. Short-Term

Five heads of department and instructors at IPDR participated in a study tour in 1982 to Benin, the Ivory Coast and Dakar to observe training institutes using different pedagogical methods. Visits were made to the Centre Pan-Africain de Formation Cooperative in Cotonou, the Institut Agricole at Boake (IAS) and INADES in the Ivory Coast, and the Ecole Nationale d'Economie Applique (ENEA) in Dakar. Faculty members seemed most impressed with the IAB for its practical emphasis on field training and flexible teaching methods.

#### e. Construction

USAID is responsible for Phase II of the expansion of infrastructure at IPDR. An approximately one year delay was, as noted above, experienced in commencing construction activities. These delays were due primarily to the length of time taken by the architect in preparing final plans, and to the length of time needed by GON to give final approval for construction to begin. Similar delays have been experienced by other donors.

New infrastructure build by USAID includes:

- new administration building (offices, documentation center, meeting room, materials production workshop and audio-visual center);
- kitchen and storerooms;
- agriculture laboratory;
- specialized classrooms;
- dormitory (50 bed);
- refurbishing of three dormitories;
- sanitary facilities; and
- two dining halls.

Renovations are also being completed on a set of office and classroom buildings. Those will be finished by March 1984. All of USAID's commitments for infrastructure will then have been fulfilled. In addition to these, USAID has carried out improvements on IPDR's water system and pumps.

The renovated old administration office is presently being used by the socio-economic unit for offices. The audio-visual department and materials center in the administration building is fully functional.

#### f. Commodities

All USAID commodity commitments have been fulfilled. Two laboratories (general chemistry and soil science) are fully equipped and essential equipment for the curriculum materials production workshop is in place and is being utilized effectively. Office equipment has been purchased for the socio-economic unit. USAID purchased four vehicles for IPDR use. Two are used by faculty for transport and for field liaison work and two larger vehicles are used for field training and in the Operation Villageois.

#### g. Village Operations Program

Now in its second year, the USAID-financed Village Operations Program is fully functional and represents an important new dimension to IPDR's involvement in rural development. During the second year four-year students implement rural development projects with villagers in 10 villages in the Kolo area. These activities include: food production projects, food processing, marketing, fire protection, and food preservation. Appropriate activities are identified in each village jointly by the villagers and teaching staff. USAID provided start-up inputs for these programs (food mill, cement, wood, etc.) and continues to subsidize the operational costs of student participation which are primarily vehicle maintenance and gasoline.

Each school department prepares detailed reports of Village Operation activities. The Socio-Economic Department in particular provides additional training in the field to students in other specialists in the outreach techniques needed to work with villagers. The UN evaluation team judged this village program to be one of the most positive new activities at Kolo, although it was not in active operation during the time of the evaluation and therefore could not be observed first hand. IPDR plans to identify additional groups of villages which this activity will be expanded in the future.

#### h. Other Donor Inputs

Other donor inputs to the project are estimated at \$11,762,500, of which all are grant funds except \$5,000,000 in loan credits from the World Bank. Other donors include UNDP/FAO (the primary coordinators of donor activity at Kolo), FAC, FED, Switzerland, the Netherlands (with CILSS), and volunteers from Germany and the Netherlands. With the exception of the FAO/UNDP coordination and Pedagogy Unit effort, donors have concentrated their activities within specific disciplinary areas of the Institute. Construction is being implemented in three main phases, with the first phase (workshops and laboratory) undertaken by FAO and Switzerland, the second phase (renovation of existing buildings and construction of new administrative buildings, kitchen, storage, laboratory, dormitory and classroom buildings) being

funded by USAID, and the third phase (housing, workshops, dining room, farm buildings, infirmary) financed by the World Bank. A complementary construction phase may be financed by Belgium.

## 17. Outputs

To date, a major portion of the planned outputs called for in the design have been produced and they are contributing directly to fulfilling the project's purpose. The administration of IPDR along with the donors have taken the reform mandate very seriously. While many areas of needed improvement remain, there have been no attempts to thwart progress or to let inertia set in as might be expected in such an endeavor. Resistance to change on the part of the faculty asked to implement pedagogical reforms is to be expected, and may actually be a sign that innovation is indeed taking place. Table 3 recapitulates outputs and measures of success.

The only adjustment from design plans seems to be the emphasis on environmental studies. (There is no environmental unit per se at the IPDR.) Environmental studies are covered in agronomy and general science courses. It is uncertain whether the environmental emphasis included in the project paper reflected a USAID or GON concern.

The number of evaluations called for originally seems excessive in view of the fact that other donors conduct their own separate evaluation exercises. This year alone six evaluations were undertaken. Collaboration with multi-donor evaluations (rather than mounting separate USAID-only evaluations) should meet USAID requirements. Another such effort is scheduled for 1985, and USAID could use this activity with few modifications for its end of project evaluation.

The Village Operation Program will require a separate evaluation at a later date to determine impact. Sufficient student reports and analyses will then exist to determine progress over time and will be available to provide needed information without incurring additional costs.

## 18. Purpose

The defined project purpose is "To increase the capacity of the IPDR at Kolo for producing competently trained middle-level rural development agents to staff MDR field activities." This purpose statement appears to be sound and is still agreed to by those implementing the reform.

The End of Project Status (EOPS) lists these elements as measures of purpose:

- IPDR functioning as integral part of MDR and producing 140 graduates annually including increasing numbers of women;
- IPDR trained staff perform competently;
- All IPDR reforms including VOP are successfully implemented;
- IPDR faculty and administration completely staffed with Nigerien personnel.

-----

Table 3  
Anticipated Project Outputs

<u>Logframe Outputs</u>	<u>Logframe Indicators</u>	<u>Actual Measures To Date</u>
1. Programs established for Socio-Economic and Environmental units	1. Curricula Reform	1. Curricula being taught in current year
2. Practical training procedures incorporated into both training cycles	2. All Students in VOP and applied training programs	2. AT2 students in VOP, all students in field study during academic quarters
3. Construction and Equipment funded by USAID provided.	3. Renovation of S-E bloc and dormitory facilities construction of environmental bloc, kitchen and d.r. student dorm	3. All construction but one office extension and a classroom renovation completed
4. Instructors trained to Masters level	4. Eight instructors trained and six teaching	4. by 1984, four trained; by 1986 seven trained, one currently teaching, three B.S. and four M.S.
5. Evaluations completed with UNDP	5. Four evaluations completed	5. One UNDP/FAO intermediate evaluation (1981), one multi-donor evaluation coordinated by UNDP (1983), one USAID evaluation (1983)
6. Productivity improvement projects designed, implemented and evaluated in villages near Kolo	6. Projects covering 600 farm plots	6. Ten villages involved in two annual campaigns. Evaluation available in student reports. Positive impact identified.

-----

According to information collected by the UN evaluation team the planned end of project status (EOPS) is close to being achieved. IPDR is a separate unit of the Ministry of Rural Development, but it could improve the overall field-school coordination. There are 145 graduates who have completed training in 1982-1983 for the Agent Technique level. As many as 50 Techniciens de Developpement Rural were produced. This rate will be lower in the future as admissions were deliberately reduced due to the present economic crisis facing Niger. Performance of IPDR staff in the field is difficult to evaluate since MDR is not providing adequate feedback to IPDR. IPDR reforms are being implemented, but Nigerienization will not be possible before 1988.

#### 19. Goal

The defined project goal is "Increased productivity of the rural sector to enable Niger to: (a) achieve self-sufficiency in basic food production and (b) improve the basic well being and standard of living of the population. The linkage between the purpose level of improving the capacity at Kolo to send well-trained personnel to the field and the goal of improving Niger's capability to be self-sufficient in food production is dependent on variables such as availability of suitable agricultural expertise to transfer to farmers, Government pricing structures which encourage production, and suitable climatic conditions. Improvements in IPDR will not in and of itself satisfy this goal, but coupled with other GON and donor efforts it should contribute to its achievement.

#### 20. Beneficiaries

The direct beneficiaries of the project are the 387 students currently enrolled at IPDR, along with the 497 trained during the project's previous years. This latter group is receiving additional training in socio-economic areas, and the *Agents Techniques* are receiving an academic quarter of field experience in villages as a direct result of USAID funding.

Women student enrollment stands at around 30 but will be increased when new dormitories are completed this year. Women follow the same course of study as men. Faculty (seven by the end of the project) are being trained to expand their knowledge in their fields of instruction.

Indirect beneficiaries fall into two groups: The villagers in the ten villages participating in the VOP and that portion of the rural population of Niger who interact with agricultural extension agents. Increased numbers of practically trained agents should enable farmers to increase their production. Villagers in the ten villages receive technical and physical inputs as a result of being involved in the VOP.

## 21. Unplanned Effects

No unexpected results have been identified in the course of the evaluation. One positive effect generated by field work and the VOP has been significant amounts of data gathered by IPDR students and available in the Documentation Center and *Service des Stages*. This data base can be used for planning purposes by the Ministry of Rural Development and the donor community.

## 22. Lessons Learned

There have been primarily managerial and policy lessons learned thus far in implementing the project. Delays in the sending of participants and in construction completion were partly due to slowness on the part of the GON in approving these activities. This factor should be anticipated and planned for in future projects.

A recent (March 1983) assessment of the USAID Sahel Development Program identified several major factors affecting project success. Two of these, contractor technical assistance problems and AID project management, are applicable to this project. Technical assistance required too much AID staff time and would have been implemented more easily through an institutional contracting mode. USAID management should have maintained closer information links with Nigerien and other donor staff at IPDR, and not have relied to the extent that it did on the technical assistance Team Leader for information. The climate at Kolo is positive with regard to receptivity to the idea of increased AID monitoring on an informal basis. As USAID increases its involvement in Niger's human resource sector, close contact with IPDR and its training programs will be essential sources of information on MDR field and program activities.

In addition, both the UN and the USAID evaluations remarked on the lack of a formal administrative mechanism for ensuring donor coordination. It is clear that this has been a problem at Kolo, and thus both evaluations recommended creation of such an institutional mechanism to coordinate the activities of the various donor agencies and provide needed management skills for addressing critical problem areas. The UN evaluation recommended that all donors involved in the project meet together at least once a year, and that each donor receive an update on IPDR activities and progress in semestrial reports.

Finally, as noted in Section 16.A., the evaluation remarked that USAID's use of an institutional contracting mode for the provision of technical assistance might well have reduced the Mission's administrative burden with respect to project management and could have facilitated recruitment of technical assistance as well.

Information Appendix for Executive Level Personnel

1. What constraints does this project attempt to overcome and who does it constrain? Does the project attack labor, policy or other constraints?

The project addresses the absence of practical agricultural extension know how among mid-level agricultural technicians and extension workers. The project is changing teaching methodologies which stress passive and theoretical learning to those which permit active, practical training more closely tied to rural realities and independent problem-solving.

2. What technology does the project promote to relieve these constraints?

The project promotes the technology of "teaching by objectives" and field application of all skills learned. This is a variation of programmed learning technology used in the U.S. whereby skill requirements are targetted and learning is geared to mastering specific skills.

3. What technology does the project attempt to replace?

The new teaching methodology replaces the previous learning system of theoretical, rote learning which could not be transferred effectively at the farm and village level. Future agricultural agents learn concepts in the classroom, apply the skills in the field, and analyze their successes and failures as part of their training program.

4. Why do the project planners believe that the intended beneficiaries will adopt the proposed technology?

The learning method is institutionalized within the Institute by the Pedagogy Unit and the instructional departments, and has already become a part of the curriculum for academic classes and the basis for practical field application.

5. What characteristics do the intended beneficiaries exhibit that have relevance to their adopting the proposed technology?

The agricultural agents in training are applying their classroom and practical training in field situations and being evaluated by their instructors. Students pass national exams for admission to the school or are admit-

ted after a certain number of years in the field. A standard level of education is required for admission and this level is sufficient to participate in the courses required. There is a program of complementary manual skills training, at the Institute to assure that future field agents will be able to perform as well as explain tasks to farmers.

6. What adoption rate has this project or previous projects achieved in transferring the proposed technology? Why have or have not the intended beneficiaries adopted this technology?

After a two year transition period during which instructors at the school adopted the new teaching method, the students are now all being trained in the new methods and have been applying them in field situations. Additional information of rates of application of new field methods can be obtained through observation of outreach programs and information gathered from other development projects which come in contact with agents trained at the Institute.

7. Will the project set in motion forces that will induce further exploration of the constraints and improvements to the technological package proposed to overcome them?

Present teaching objectives within courses are based on information gathered by the Ministry of Rural Development which develops the job descriptions used in curriculum design. The Pedagogy Unit at the Institute provides feedback to instructors on the application of new methods and helps to coordinate field and classroom training with the instructional departments. Over the course of time adjustments in curriculum will be necessary because of changes in field conditions.

8. Do private input suppliers have incentives to examine the constraints addressed by the project and come up with solutions?

Since the transfer involves an institutional mechanism and the institution being used is state-supported, it seems unlikely that any private sources would have an incentive to replicate this effort. If commercial firm input suppliers develop at some point in Niger's future, they may have an incentive to participate in some of the field outreach activities of the curriculum reform in order to reach farmers. This would be subject to GON policy on input distribution systems.

9. What delivery system does the project employ to transfer the new technology to intended beneficiaries?

15

The instructors at the Institute with support training and evaluation by the Pedagogy Unit implement the transfer of the new teaching methodology to the students. In addition, instructors and extension agents in the field are involved with the transfer of skills in the practical portions and in evaluating student use of those skills.

10. What training techniques does the project use to develop the delivery system?

The skills to make the transfer of the technology are found in the faculty of the Institute who have received training of trainers and frequent planning and evaluation sessions with the Pedagogy Unit. In addition, seven faculty members connected with the USAID funded component are receiving advanced degree training in the U.S. so as to be able to train their students more effectively.