

W/O BES

CLASSIFICATION

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

Report Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE Somalia Agricultural Delivery Systems			2. PROJECT NUMBER 649-0112	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE USAID/Mogadishu ^{Op 1240}
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	B. Final Obligation Expected FY 82	C. Final Input Delivery FY 86	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION 6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING A. Total \$ 32,352 B. U.S. \$ 7,752 7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION From (month/yr.) August 1981 To (month/yr.) December 1982 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., a/gram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
---	---	--------------------------------

Based on this Evaluation,

- PD-AAP-503 35474 -

- | | | |
|---|---------------------|---------------|
| 1. USAID and PMU will prepare a Project Paper Revision. The revised Project Paper will address all the issues raised by the Evaluation. | Neptune/
Leifert | June 1, 1983 |
| 2. In view of the above, a Contract Amendment will be prepared and negotiated with the Contractor (USU). | Neptune/
Leifert | Sept. 1, 1983 |

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Paper	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) HHC
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C	
<input 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 checked="" 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)

J.G. Neptune Agr. Deve. Officer	M.A. Abukar General Manager
G.F. Fuller Project Manager	A. Martinez Program Officer

12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval

Signature	<i>Jim Kelly</i>
Typed Name	Jim Kelly
Date	5/19/83

-1-

SOMALIA AGRICULTURAL DELIVERY SYSTEMS PROJECT NO. 649-0112

INTERIM EVALUATION STATEMENT

MOGADISHU, SOMALIA

DECEMBER 1982

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

DISCUSSION:

The project was established in a five year time frame to strengthen the National Agricultural Extension Service through the creation of one national and two regional training centers and the deployment of skilled extension officers at the field, district, regional and national levels. The evaluator believes that the designers of the project were overly optimistic in determining the absorptive capacity of the Ministry of Agriculture, and the time period needed to develop a purposeful agricultural extension institution; they also misjudged the required linkages between extension and research.

The evaluator found that progress is being made in each of the training areas, the academic training program in particular. However, achievement in the training of field agents has been somewhat slow. The Project Paper stated that, originally the U.S. Contractor was to focus its efforts in two regions and five districts. Currently, the Contractor is providing assistance in three regions and ten districts. The expansion of the area of project operation has led to some start up problems such as providing adequate guidance to field agents and subject matter specialists and conducting field level training sessions.

During the evaluation it was established that relationships between the Project Management Unit and the Contractor were not always harmonious. However, with recent assistance from the USAID Mission and the Contractor's Office of International Programs, it now appears that the working environment will be improved.

The major problems encountered by the project, as determined by the evaluator, have been: (1) a multi-donor design that involved three entities to implement a single component; (2) a cumbersome administrative hierarchy, and (3) the Contractor's ability to field a team made up largely of professionals with previous foreign development experience. These three factors, it seems to the evaluator, have made it difficult to coalesce the directing and building of a unified approach in planning and implementing project activities at the field, district, regional and national levels.

The evaluation report offers some thoughts on how to make the extension officer training program more practical, and involve the agricultural research service with the extension program. Incorporating adaptive research trials at the Afgoi Research Station into the extension training program will strengthen both the training effort and the development of technology to be transferred to farmers. Expanding project activities to the Afgoi Research Station will require modifications to the Project Paper.

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.

DISCUSSION:

This internal evaluation was conducted by REDSO/ESA and the USAID Mission. Its purpose was to review progress to date and make recommendations to possibly modify project design. The procedure followed involved a review of the Project Paper and documents in the USAID files, Contractor work plans and reports, PIO/C's and PIO/T's and work plans directives and reports issued by the Project Management Unit. Discussions were held with the Vice-Minister of Agriculture, the General Manager and officers of the Project Management Unit, Contractor team members, and the USAID Mission staff. Also, field visits were made to the Afgoi area and the Genale region to observe extension and research activities.

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.

DISCUSSION:

The project is a multi-donor effort to build and operate a National Extension Service, and a National Farm Management and Extension Training Center. Besides the Government of Somalia, it involves the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the African Development Fund, the European Economic Community, and the U.S. Agency for International Development. AID's contribution to the project includes

technical assistance, participant training, commodities and other minor costs for the institutional development of both National Extension Services and the National Farm Management and Extension Training Center. The required civil works, local costs, and land components were to be provided by other donors. The civil works component includes numerous staff houses, offices, classrooms, library, workshops and other physical facilities (all to be constructed at Afgoi); staff houses and offices at regional National Farm Management headquarters, and renovation of two Extension Training Centers, at Bonka and Genale. Also a 60 ha irrigated farm, was to be developed and equipped at Afgoi as part of the National Farm Management and Extension Training Center's facilities for practical training. The Project Paper implementation schedule called for completion of the civil works component in January 1982. At the time (December 1982) of this evaluation, no work has been started at the Afgoi site. The latest information on the civil works component is that a contract has been recently negotiated, and actual construction is to commence in January 1983, with completion of the works expected in December 1983. In view of the delay in implementation of the civil works component, the contract team has had to lease living quarters in Mogadishu and use temporary training facilities there. The training program has suffered from the lack of adequate training facilities as well as the near complete lack of practical on farm training.

RECOMMENDATION:

(a) A new assessment should be undertaken as to the need for the Afgoi Training Center facilities. The current discussions between USAID, the Contractor and the GSDR regarding the use of the Afgoi Research Station as a training center should further explore the possibility of expanding existing physical facilities and establishing an irrigation trial area at the Station in support of extension activities. The joining of the research and extension institutions will strengthen the linkage of technology development and transfer.

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?

DISCUSSION:

Commodities - The budget in the Project Paper allocated \$1,370,800 dollars for the procurement of commodities. The AID Mission has prepared PIO/C's for a total of \$1,266,416 dollars, leaving a balance of \$104,384 dollars. In general, the commodities have been received in a timely manner.

It was noted in the contract between the Project Management Unit and Utah State University that: "The Contractor is authorized to procure from contract funds a limited amount of imported commodities directly related to the needs and performance of the Contract employees, i.e., office, demonstration and training equipment and supplies and which are not otherwise available from non-contract funds. Contracts campus backstopping may be required for the purchase and delivery of those items to be utilized in carrying out the responsibility of the Advisory team. However, the procurement of the major commodity lists for the FMETC will be the responsibility of the PMU to be paid from non-contract funds. Contract personnel will assist in formulating the lists of needs equipment and other commodities." However, no funds for the procurement of commodities were included in the budget either in the original contract or in contract amendment Number 1.

Participant Training - The Project Paper allocated \$600,000 dollars which would fund 40 person years of academic training (20 participants) and \$266,000 dollars to fund study trips and field visits for officers of the NES and senior staff of the MOA. The total amount of funds earmarked for participant training to date, is \$563,185 dollars.

At the time of this evaluation, the USAID Mission has prepared eleven PIO/T's for academic programs (10 Master of Science degree programs and one non-degree program) and 6 PIO/Ts for short term training programs. The rate of progress in the processing of the long-term participants is excellent. The GSDR, the Mission and the Contractor must be complimented for that. A list of the participants is presented below, with their respective field of study, their location and the dates of the training period.

LONG TERM TRAINING PROGRAM

<u>NAME</u>	<u>PIO/PNO</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>FIELD STUDY</u>	<u>DATE OF TRAINING</u>
1. Mohamed Jama Dinbal	00013	Univ. of Kansas	M.S. Ag Extension	3/82 to 6/84
2. Abdullahi Abali Mohamed	00014	Indiana Univ.	M.S. Ag. Communications	3/82 to 6/84
3. Abdullahi Mohammed Hassan	00015	Kansas State Univ.	M.S. Plant Protection	3/82 to 6/84
4. Mohamad H.H. Ali	00016	South Dakota State Univ.	M.S. Agronomy	3/82 to 6/84
5. Abdul Kadil Mohamed Elim	00017	Virginia State Univ.	M.S. Farm Management	3/82 to 6/84
6. Bashir Mohamed Mohamoud	00018	Univ. of Arizona	M.S. Farm Management	1/82 to 1/84
7. Zahr Ali Hersi	00019	Univ. of California	M.S. Agronomy	3/82 to 3/84
8. Ali Mohamend Nur	00020	North Carolina Art. Univ.	M.S. Ag. Extension	awaiting call forward
9. Ibrahim Mohamed Omer	90112	Univ. of Nebraska	M.S. Ag Mechnization	4/82 to 4/84
10. Abdi Mohamed Uluso	90121	Utah State Univ.	M.S. Ag Extension Admin.	6/82 to 6/84
11. Salako Ahmed Ali	20019	Indiana State Univ.	Assoc. Degree Ag. Commun.	6/82 to 9/84

SHORT TERM TRAINING PROGRAM

1. Mohamed Burale Farah	90078	Wash., D.C. USDA	Ag. Policy Seminar	8/81 to 9/81
2. Abdul Wahab Ahmed Mohamed	90094	Wash., D.C. USDA	Mgt. & Organization	6/81 to 8/81
3. Mohamed Salah Abdulla	90092	Kenya	Pest & Vector Mgt. Syst.	7/81 to 8/81
4. Hawa Muse Yusuf	90109	Senegal	Quelea Birds	February '81
5. Mohamed Bural Farah	90115	USDA	Irrig. Pblems & Pract.	6/81 to 9/81
6. Mohamed Ali Abukar	90116	USDA	Mgt. & Organization	5/81 to 6/81

Technical Assistance - A total of 40.5 person-years of technical assistance was planned for in the project. According to the implementation schedule in the Project Paper a four-person team was to begin work in the National Extension Service in October 1979 and a team of seven specialists was to begin teaching at the FMETC in October 1980. The original contract passed between the Project Management Unit and Utah State University in September 1979, called for the fielding of 11 specialists for a total of 41 person years. Amendment Number 1 to the contract February 1982, added one position for in-country administration and general services. The Contractor has recruited and placed in position the following long-term professional staff:

<u>NES</u>	<u>ARRIVAL DATE</u>
1. Extension Specialist - Chief of Party	August 1981
2. Communication Specialist	February 1982
3. Extension Specialist	September 1982
4. Plant Protection Specialist	September 1982

<u>FMETC</u>	
1. Agronomist	September 1981
2. Master Mechanic	September 1981
3. Training Specialist - Principal	December 1981
4. Livestock Specialist	June 1982
5. Farm Management Specialist	August 1982
6. Agricultural Engineer	September 1982

1. General Services Specialist	March 1982
--------------------------------	------------

In reviewing the bio-data for the technical assistance team, it was noted that few professionals had previous foreign development experience. It is the opinion of the evaluator that the Contractor should have made a greater effort to recruit team members with such experience. An eleven member team should have included at least five members with foreign experience. It is noted that the Contractor staff arrived in-country later than projected in the implementation plan. However, the delay has not, by itself, seriously affected the objectives of the project especially since the training facilities for the FMETC are still awaiting construction as noted earlier in this report.

Short Term Consultants - The Contractor has provided two short term consultants, one to conduct English language training for local project staff and the other to assist in setting up in-country training programs in extension leadership and methodology.

Research Strategy - The Project Paper provided for the development of a national strategy for agricultural research. At the time of this evaluation, the Mission has requested the International Service for National Agricultural Research (ISNAR) to undertake that task. It is anticipated that an ISNAR team of consultants will arrive in-country during January 1983.

Financial Status - The USAID Mission Quarterly Report, as of September 30, 1982 for the project, states the general fiscal situation as follows:

Quarterly Financial Report as of September 30, 1982

Life of Project Funding	\$ 7,752,000
Amount Obligated	\$ 7,752,000
PACD	September 30, 1984

Prog. Ag. Documents

FY 79 Prog. Ag. 79-6	\$ 1,500,000
FY 79 Prog. Ag. 79-6	
Amendments 1 and 2	2,000,000
FY 80 Prog. Ag. 81-5	1,600,000
FY 82 Prog. Ag. 82-4	2,652,000

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>EAR MARKED</u>	<u>DISBURSED</u>	<u>UNLIQUIDATED</u>
Technical Assistance	\$ 3,588,727	\$ 654,699	\$ 2,943,024
Commodities	1,266,416	736,727	529,689
Participants	563,185	154,452	408,733
Other Costs	15,522	13,190	2,332
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$ 5,433,850	\$ 1,550,068	\$ 3,883,778

NOTE: Total unearmarked funds are \$2,318,150 as of 30 September 1982.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The evaluator recommends that:

(b) the next time an amendment is made to the contract, an amount of \$80,000 to \$100,000 dollars be provided for Contractor procurement of such commodities as library materials, laboratory supplies and materials needed to support applied research trials and demonstrations.

(c) the PMU, USAID and the Contractor consider funding a number of short-term training programs for the subject matter specialists of the NES and the research scientists of the Afgoi Station. These programs of three to nine months should be undertaken at the International Agricultural Research Centers, e.g. ICRISAT, CIMMYT, and IITA. It appears that the participant training program of the project may be underfunded. Hence, the Mission should perhaps consider using unearmarked funds in the Agricultural Extension, Training and Research Project 649-0101.

(d) the PMU, USAID and the Contractor undertake a reassessment of the professional services being provided to the project with a view to form an Extension/Farming Systems core team that would be reinforced by consultant services.

As noted earlier in the Technical Assistance section of this report, the Contractor team in-country presently consists of 11 professionals. It is believed a smaller team will be able to function more effectively by assisting with adaptive research trials at the Afgoi Research Station and on farmer's fields and formal extension training. A six member team should be able to collaborate with existing staff in research and extension to meet the needs of the national training program and provide guidance to the field extension agents. Modifications in the Contractor team as to numbers and disciplines could be carried out over the next 12 to 18 months.

In the evaluator's judgement, disciplines appropriate for a core team would be as follows:

1. Agronomy - Dryland
2. Agronomy - Irrigated
3. Agricultural Economics - Production/Farming Systems
4. Agricultural Engineering/Machinery
5. Agricultural Extension
6. Administration - GSO

Consultant services in support of the core team on a sustained basis should always be provided by the same professionals in the following disciplines:

1. Plant Protection
2. Training
3. Livestock Production
4. Extension Communication

The Master Mechanic and Farm Management positions would be eliminated.

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?

DISCUSSION:

The logical framework (Annex 1 of the Project Paper lists four major outputs for the project. This evaluation will comment on each specific output.

(9) 'Enhance Management of the Extension Service' - The National Extension Service is slowly being staffed up by the Ministry of Agriculture. As of this time, there is a professional complement of five national level officers who are currently working with the Contractor team in Agronomy, Plant Protection, Extension and Communications. The position of Director of the NES has not been filled by a MOA officer, however, as a result of a series of meetings between the PMU and the Contractor (December 2-16, 1982) it has been resolved that the MOA will designate a Somali officer to service in the position of National Director.

The Project Paper called for 75 field extension agents to be trained each year at the regional training centers. This verifiable indicator was optimistic in the judgement of the evaluator. To date the planned physical renovation of the Bonka and Genale training centers has not been started, nor is the training staff available. In 1982, 18 newly recruited field agents completed a one-year program conducted by the Contractor staff at the temporary training facility in Mogadishu, and a new class of about 40 is expected to begin similar training in December 1982.

In regard to enhancing management of the Extension Service, the evaluator strongly believes that there exists a basic difference between the PMU and the Contractor. As prescribed in the Project Paper. The PMU is approaching the management task along the lines of the Training and Visitation model advocated by the World Bank, while the Contractor's approach is based on the research/extension model commonly followed in the U.S. and most developing nations. Neither model can be transplanted in its original form in Somalia. What is needed and required is a Somali Extension Management System based on the most practical and sensible aspects of each model adapted to fit Somali conditions.

To accomplish the goal of a Somali extension system will require close monitoring and periodic assessments and evaluations of the training programs as well as the field trials and demonstrations. Modifications to ongoing activities will require minor adjustments in the types of training programs and methods used in designing and executing field work.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The evaluator recommends that:

(e) an assessment be undertaken to determine (1) if an intake of 75 field agents per year over a four year period is realistic and (2) if the National Extension Service can provide the required technical and training backstopping for these agents.

(f) the upcoming revision of the Project Paper define more accurately the work responsibilities of the Contractor team and the geographical scope of its activities.

(2). "Provide Well Trained Extensionists" - The pre- and in-service training being provided for field agents and the district and regional officers has been well planned, implemented and monitored. Activities to strengthen the skills of newly recruited agents include both classroom and practical work. Lectures were given in extension philosophy and methodology, crop and livestock production, irrigation practices, soil management and farm management, guidance was also provided during the periods of practical training in the field. In addition seasonal and bi-monthly field training sessions were conducted. Subject matter specialists and regional and district officers were given training through bi-annual and seasonal work sessions. Four training summary reports prepared by the Contractor indicates that during the period of December 1981 to November 1982, a total of 29,969 hours of training was provided as follows:

<u>Type of Training</u>	<u>Hours</u>
(a) English Language	2236
(b) Leadership	2220
(c) Fortnight	7020
(d) Seasonal	5270
(e) Specialist	150
(f) Bi-Annual	3870
(g) Pre-Service for Extension Agents	4530
(h) Farm Manager	250
(i) Individual Training in Field	3323
(j) Orientation	500

RECOMMENDATIONS:

(g) The PMU, USAID and the Contractor should assess the twelve training types currently being provided to ascertain if it is possible to reduce the number to a more manageable level. Four or five training functions would probably be more in line with the manpower available and the absorptive capacity of the PMU.

(3). "Enhance Practicality of Training Programs" - The training programs provided during the first year of the Contractor's technical services have been sound and well targeted. Training course outlines and materials have been prepared and utilized by Contractor professionals and the PMU staff.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

(h) The PMU and the Contractor should assess the need for individualized "one-on-one" training and guidance for the field agents. This follow-up will become important as the agents commence actual on-farm trials and demonstrations and farmer training meetings.

(4). "Develop a Research Strategy" - The USAID Mission has initiated action toward the development of a research strategy. At the time of this evaluation, the International Service for National Agricultural Research (ISNAR) has agreed to field a team of professionals in January 1983 to prepare the scope of work for a full study to be conducted in April - May 1983.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

(i) The Mission should proceed with the negotiations to contract with ISNAR for the development of the research strategy. The study should include specifically a review of the current situation in

extension with the objective of integrating the research and extension services into one technology development and transfer institution.

(j) The Mission should accelerate its on-going effort to place the subject matter professionals on the Contract team at the Afgoi Central Research Station.

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.

DISCUSSION:

The logical framework in the project paper lists four verifiable indicators to measure progress toward the purpose;

"To revitalize the institutional base for delivering technological information and training to farmers."

Progress toward the End of Project Status as stated in the Project Paper is that 300 field extension agents will be posted. A report prepared by the Monitoring and Evaluation Study unit of the PMU indicates that 50 field extension agents and subject matter specialists have already been assigned to the field during the period of this evaluation. Hence, progress to meet the goal of 300 field agents at the end of the project appears to be achievable. Furthermore at the time of the evaluation, the PMU had recently recruited another 41 field agents who commenced training in December 1982, therefore, it appears that the end of project target will be achieved in 1985.

Another verifiable indicator was the identification of 1500 leading farmers participating in the extension programs. A report submitted by the General Manager of the PMU in October 1982, states that the field staff is currently cooperating with 57,000 farm families and 11,000 refugee families, hence the target of 1500 participating farmers at the end of project will be more than met.

The third indicator of "supervision, follow up and referral system operational" is difficult to judge. First, the PMU was only recently assigned a number of agents to field positions therefore, supervision and follow up have not received much attention during the first year of the Contractor's efforts.

Secondly it is unknown what was meant by "referral system". In the evaluator's judgement, supervision and follow up for field extension agents and subject matter specialists is just in the beginning stages, consequently more implementation time will be required to determine if a satisfactory system can be set up to follow the activities of the extension workers.

The fourth indicator, "feedback occurring" is quite meaningless as the project was original designed. The Project Paper did not describe a mechanism for integrating the extension institution into the agricultural research service in any fashion, nor was the development of technology made part of the project. Consequently, the feedback indicator has no meaning. The feedback indicator will have significance once the Mission makes the needed modification to incorporate an adaptive research component in the Project Paper. In summary, it is the opinion of the evaluation that the verifiable indicators were poorly thought out and did not reflect the building of an extension institution which is the real purpose of the project.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

(k) that the Mission develop a new set of verifiable indicators to reflect institutional development as the Project Paper is being modified.

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.

DISCUSSION:

The goal stated in the Project Paper is "Increase productivity in the small farmer segment of the Agricultural Sector." With the slow start of project implementation, it is impossible at this time to comment very thoroughly on progress of goal achievements. It is believed a more meaningful discussion of goal achievement can be made after implementation of the project has run at least for two more years.

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.

DISCUSSION:

The major implementation activity undertaken in the project has been in the area of training field extension agents and subject matter specialists. Training has been provided to approximately 50 extension staff members through pre-service and in-service work sessions. Thus, the recipient beneficiaries have been extension agents assigned to regional and field level positions. Also the 57,000 farm families have benefitted by cooperating with the extension program by participating in production demonstrations on such crop as maize, sorghum, cowpea, mungbean and sesame. The demonstration program has been carried out for only one crop season, hence the actual benefits occurring to the farmers is difficult to measure at the time of this evaluation. In the future the Contractor will develop some baseline data which can be used to more accurately measure increases in food crop production and cash returns from surplus production.

Farmers have benefitted to some degree from the introduction of improved crop seeds, advantages of using fertilizer and pesticide materials and plant populations adjusted to moisture availability. However, the real benefits received by farmers from these technological improvements will be better ascertained after three or four crop cycles.

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 those effects advantageous or not? Do they require any change in project design or execution?

DISCUSSION:

No comments are being provided in this evaluation on the unplanned effects, because of the early stages of project implementation.

22. LESSON 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?

DISCUSSION:

This internal evaluation has revealed several pertinent issues which contribute to a slow rate of implementation as well as providing a difficult working environment for the Mission and U.S. Contractor.

1. One of the major issues contributing to implementation problems has been the design of the project. The project was designed to be a multi-donor effort with four different entities contributing to six separate components. The following table in the Project Paper (page 13) illustrates a complicated structure for various donor support to implement activities.

DONOR ASSISTANCE TO VARIOUS COMPONENTS

COMPONENT
AGRICULTURE

ITEM	NES	FMAS	FMETC	SECONDARY	CSD	PMU
Civil Works	ADF	ADF	ADF	-	-	ADF
Technical Assistance	AID	IDA	AID	EEC	IDA	IDA
Training	AID	IDA	AID	EEC	IDA	IDA
Commodities	AID	ADF	AID	EEC	IDA	IDA
Local Costs	GSDR/ IDA	GSDR/ IDA	GSDR/ IDA	GSDR	GSDR/ IDA	GSDR/ IDA
Land	GSDR	GSDR	GSDR			GSDR

ADF - African Development Fund

IDA - Low Interest Window of World Bank

GSDR - Government of Somali Democratic Republic

EEC - European Economic Commission

CDS - Central Statistical Department

It is noted in the above table that the civil works for the project will be carried out by the African Development Bank with AID providing the technical assistance. The project description charges AID with implementation of a training program for extension agents in facilities constructed by another donor. The civil works was scheduled to run for a period of two years which at the same time the technical assistance team was scheduled to arrive in-country and begin training. It appears the project designers were oblivious to the inordinate time required to construct training facilities. In the judgement of the evaluator, the project designers were inexperienced and used little forethought in scheduling implementation activities. The evaluator was informed by GSDR officials that construction of the training facilities will probably begin in early 1983. Therefore it is doubtful that training facilities will be completed during the first five years of the project.

Also, local costs to support project activities are to be funded by an IDA credit, thus complicating local expenditures required to finance field demonstration, transportation and training costs. The splitting of project implementation costs three ways makes it extremely difficult for the Mission and Contractor.

2. Project designers exhibited little knowledge of the absorptive capacity in the GSDR to implement an extension institution building project. To design a project requiring a technical assistance input of eleven high level U.S. professionals to assist an extension institution with a dearth of qualified technical staff is just poor judgement. Technical assistance inputs should be based on the absorptive capacity of the institution to be assisted, this was not the case for Project 649-0112.

3. An extension delivery systems project without heavy emphasis on an agricultural research component to develop an improved technology is very short sighted. Furthermore, this project was designed to have a total life of five years, while it is an established fact that extension institutional building efforts require assistance for a minimum of 15 to 20 years.

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

DISCUSSION:

The most significant program management problem facing project implementation has been the lack of consideration in the Project Paper for the extension service to receive support from

the agricultural research service. The development of relevant technology for transfer by the extension institution to farmers is essential. Therefore, the Mission should continue to seek ways for getting the Contractor to conduct adaptive research trials at the Afgoi research station, so the extension service will have improved technology to disseminate to the farmers. The extension service will also be able to provide feedback to the research service on the types of problems encountered by farmers when improved technical practices are demonstrated at the field level.