

CLASSIFICATION
PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

Report Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE <p align="center">Poor, Rural Households</p>			2. PROJECT NUMBER 931-0594	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE DS/AGR/ESP Research
5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY <u>76</u> B. Final Obligation Expected FY <u>78</u> C. Final Input Delivery FY <u>79</u>			6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING A. Total \$ _____ B. U.S. \$ <u>823,431</u>	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) _____ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION 7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION From (month/yr.) <u>January 1977</u> To (month/yr.) <u>January 1978</u> Date of Evaluation Review <u>April 15, 1978</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
<p>The project was evaluated on April 15, 1978 by the project manager. It is determined that the needed adjustments have been made and the project is on schedule. There are no issues or problems which will detract from achieving the purpose for which the project was approved. A review and evaluation is scheduled for December 1978 to assure timely completion of the project report.</p> <p align="center" style="margin-top: 20px;"><i>BEST AVAILABLE COPY</i></p>		

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS <input 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 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) DS/AGR/ESP , Carlton A. Infanger	12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval Signature <u>Leon F. Hesser</u> Typed Name <u>Leon F. Hesser, DS/AGR</u> Date <u>Aug 22, 1978</u>
--	---

13. SUMMARY

In spite of key personnel changes in participating universities the projects are generally on schedule. Progress towards fulfilling objectives I - VI is commendable, i.e. with respect to production systems, time use, participation in labor markets (including efficiency and integration) and farm income (sources & differences) barriers to participation of landless in development process, constraints to adoption of new technologies and their impact on output, income and employment. Objectives VII and VIII (Models analyzing aggregate impact of trade, taxation and domestic agricultural policies, policy and institutional changes to increase participation of rural poor) still await treatment by Purdue and Cornell. Work planned and tentative results appear to be in conformity with original objectives and the prospects for achieving the purpose of project by Dec. 78 are good. One problem seems to exist in Purdue; only very recently all the data were retrieved from Brazil and put on cards and tapes for analysis, which may signal a tight schedule for fulfilling all objectives by year end. Also, at this time the scope and progress on the Mexican part of the study are not entirely clear. For various reasons Michigan State has abandoned the intention to use supplemental information from Ghana, Bolivia and Ethiopia, but added the Nigerian segment.

*DS/AGR Comment: A September 1, 1978 report from Purdue indicates that Mexican data are now being analyzed and readied for reporting.

14. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluation began with on-site visits to the three participating universities in December 1977. These visits brought forth the set of progress reports upon which this phase of the evaluation is made. The project is evaluated as a whole from the components submitted by the individual universities. The evaluation was a regular one and made by several DS/AGR/ESP division members (Drs. Day, Infanger and Elterich) at this time. It was performed in accordance with the Evaluation Plan of the PP with respect to financing, study design scope and methodology. The basis of the evaluation was the first (annual) and the second (semi-annual) reports of the Michigan State, Purdue and Cornell Universities covering the period up to December 1977 and other material attached to these reports and on-site meetings by Dr. C. Infanger.