PD-AAX-936
ISN 56629

UNCLASSIFIED

VOLUME I

BURKINA FASO

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH/TRAINING SUPPORT

686-0270

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

UNCLASSIFIED

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

PROJECT DATA SHEET

1. TRANSACTION CODE: A (A = Add, C = Change, D = Delete) — Amendment Number: ____ — DOCUMENT CODE: 3

2. COUNTRY/ENTITY: Burkina Faso

3. PROJECT NUMBER: 686-0270

4. BUREAU/OFFICE: USAID/Burkina — 686

5. PROJECT TITLE (maximum 40 characters): Agricultural Research/Training Suppo

6. PROJECT ASSISTANCE COMPLETION DATE (PACD): MM 08 DD 30 YY 93

7. ESTIMATED DATE OF OBLIGATION (Under 'B.' below, enter 1, 2, 3, or 4)
A. Initial FY 88 B. Quarter 4 C. Final FY 90

8. COSTS ($000 OR EQUIVALENT $1 =)

A. FUNDING SOURCE	FIRST FY 88 B. FX	C. L/C	D. Total	LIFE OF PROJECT E. FX	F. L/C	G. Total
AID Appropriated Total	914	386	1300	3800	1047	4847
(Grant)	(914)	(386)	(1300)	(3800)	(1047)	(4847)
(Loan)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Other U.S. 1.						
Other U.S. 2.						
Host Country		185	185		1810	
Other Donor(s)						
TOTALS	914	571	1485	3800	2857	6657

9. SCHEDULE OF AID FUNDING ($000)

A. APPROPRIATION	B. PRIMARY PURPOSE CODE	C. PRIMARY TECH. CODE 1. Grant	2. Loan	D. OBLIGATIONS TO DATE 1. Grant	2. Loan	E. AMOUNT APPROVED THIS ACTION 1. Grant	2. Loan	F. LIFE OF PROJECT 1. Grant	2. Loan
(1) SS	100	968				4850		4850	
(2)									
(3)									
(4)									
TOTALS						4850		4850	

10. SECONDARY TECHNICAL CODES (maximum 6 codes of 3 positions each): 070, 080

11. SECONDARY PURPOSE CODE: 210

12. SPECIAL CONCERNS CODES (maximum 7 codes of 4 positions each)

A. Code	R/AG	BSW	ENV	XII
B. Amount	4850	4850	4850	4850

13. PROJECT PURPOSE (maximum 480 characters)

To strengthen INERA's on-Farm research performance in adapting productivity-oriented technologies and practices.

14. SCHEDULED EVALUATIONS
Interim MM 08 YY 90 MM 08 YY 91 Final MM 08 YY 92

15. SOURCE/ORIGIN OF GOODS AND SERVICES
[X] 000 [X] 941 [X] Local [ ] Other (Specify) ____

16. AMENDMENTS/NATURE OF CHANGE PROPOSED (This is page 1 of a ____ page PP Amendment.)

17. APPROVED BY
Signature: [signature]
Title: Herbert N. Miller, Director, USAID/Burkina
Date Signed: MM 06 DD 16 YY 88

18. DATE DOCUMENT RECEIVED IN AID/W, OR FOR AID/W DOCUMENTS, DATE OF DISTRIBUTION
MM DD YY

AID 1330-4 (8-79)

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING SUPPORT

VOLUME I

Page

PART I. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS 1

A. Recommendations.....1
B. Project Summary.....1
C. Financial Summary.....2
D. Summary Problem Statement.....2
E. Project Rationale.....3
F. Project Issues.....3
G. Summary Findings and Recommendations.....6
H. Project Development Team.....7

PART II. BACKGROUND 8

A. Overview of the Agricultural Sector in Burkina.....8
B. Productions Systems Research (RSP) in Burkina:.....
Lessons Learned.....10
C. Agriculture Extension in Burkina.....11
D. Agriculture Education in Burkina.....13
E. Agriculture Research and Development Priorities.....14
F. Relationship to Mission Program and Strategy.....16
G. Relationship to World Bank/Other Donor Activities.....17

PART III. DETAILED PROJECT DESCRIPTION.....18

A. Project Goal.....18
B. Measures of Goal Achievement.....18
C. Project Purpose.....18
D. End of Project Status/Indicators.....18
E. Project Strategy.....18
F. Project Assistance Methodology.....20
1. Background.....20
2. Basic Elements.....20
a. RSP Methodology.....20
b. RSP Linkage with Education.....21
c. RSP Linkage with Extension.....21
d. RSP Linkage with Other Research Programs.....22
3. Target Areas/Technolgies.....23
a. Mossi Plateau.....23
b. Southwestern Region.....23

F. Project Activities and Outputs.....24

1. Research Management Support.....24
2. Human Resource Development.....26
3. Production Systems Research (RSP) Support.....26

G. Project Inputs Summary.....26

PART IV. PROJECT ANALYSES SUMMARIES.....28

A. Institutional Analysis.....28
B. Social Soundness Analysis.....29
C. Technical Analysis.....29
D. Economic Analysis.....31
E. Financial Analysis.....33
F. Environmental Analysis.....34

PART V. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION.....37

A. Project Management and Coordination.....37
B. Project Management Plan.....39
C. Project Implementation Schedule.....39
D. Monitoring and Evaluation.....40
E. Project Procurement Plan.....45
F. Conditions Precedent, Covenants and Negotiating Status...46

Annex I. STANDARD ATTACHMENTS.....

A. Logical Framework Matrix
B. Country Checklist
C. Project Checklist
D. Draft Authorization
E. Grantee Request
F. Environmental Threshold Decision
G. Gray Amendment Certification
H. 611 (e) Determination
I. PID Approval Cable and Mission Response to Issues.

VOLUME II

ANNEX II. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

A. Background

Exhibit 1: Design Bibliography
Exhibit 2: World Bank Agricultural Research Project Description

B. Economic/Financial Analysis

Exhibit 1: Economic Analysis
Exhibit 2: Financial Analysis

C. Social Soundness Analysis

Exhibit 1: Social Soundness Analysis

D. Technical Analyses

Exhibit 1: Technical Analysis.

E. Institutional Analysis.

Exhibit 1: Institutional Analysis.

F. Project Implementation

Exhibit 1: In-Country Training Plan.

ACRONYMS

ACPO	Accelerated Crop Production Officer
AgHRD	Agricultural Human Resources Development
AID	Agency for International Development
ARTS	Agricultural Research and Training Support
BIFAD	Board for International Food and Agricultural Development
CNRST	National Center for Scientific and Technological Research (Centre Nationale de la Recherche Scientifique et Technologique)
CRSP	Collaborative Research Support Program (Programme de Soutien a la Recherche Collaborative)
DH	Direct Hire
FAAS	Foreign Affairs Agency Support
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FSN	Foreign Service National
FSR	Farming Systems Research
FY	Fiscal Year
GOB	Government of Burkina
HBCU	Historically Black Colleges and Universities
IBRAZ	Burkina Institute for Agricultural and Livestock Research (Institut Burkinabe de Recherches Agronomiques et Zootechniques)
ICRISAT	International Crop Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics
IDA	International Development Association
IDR	Rural Development Institute (Institut pour le Development Rural)
IEE	Initial Environmental Examination
IITA	International Institute for Tropical Agriculture
INERA	Agricultural Research Institute (Institut d'Etudes et de la Recherche Agricole)
IQC	Indefinite Quantity Contract
IRBET	Institute for Biological Research and Tropical Ecology (Institut de Recherche en Biochimie et Ecologie Tropicales)
ISNAR	International Service for National Agricultural Research
IVRAZ	Upper Volta Institute for Agricultural and Livestock Research (Institut Voltaique de Recherches Agronomiques et Zootechniques)
JAO	Joint Administrative Office
LT	Long-Term
MHESR	Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research (Ministere de l'Enseignement Superieur et de la Recherche Scientifique)
MS	Master of Science
NAR	National Agricultural Research (World Bank Project)
OE	Operating expense
OYB	Operational Year Budget
PhD	Doctor of Philosophy
PID	Project Identification Document
PIO/P	Project Implementation Order/Participant
PM&R	Planning Management and Research
POL	Petrol, Oil, Lubricants
PP	Project Paper
PSA	Procurement Services Agent
PSC	Personnel Services Contractor
REDSO/WCA	Regional Economic Development Services Office
RIG/A	Regional Inspector General/Audit
SAFGRAD	Semi-Arid Food Grains Research and Development
SECID	South-East Consortium for International Development
ST	Short-Term
TA	Technical Assistance
TDY	Temporary Duty
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING SUPPORT

PART I. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Recommendations

USAID/Burkina recommends the authorization of a grant in the amount of $4.85 million dollars in DFA funds to the Government of Burkina Faso to strengthen the production systems research program (RSP) within the national agricultural research institute, INERA. The project life is planned for five years and all funds will be obligated by FY 1990.

The Grantee will be Burkina's Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research. Coordination will be carried out by INERA and project activities will be implemented by INERA personnel at the Ouagadougou headquarters and in the regions surrounding the research stations at Farako-Ba and Kamboinse. Signatories for the GOB will be the Ministers of Finance and Higher Education and Scientific Research.

B. Project Summary

The Agricultural Research and Training Support (ARTS) project is the first phase of a planned three-part program to strengthen INERA's adaptive on-farm production research program (RSP) performance and is aimed at producing technologies and agricultural practices adapted to the constraints and conditions of Burkina's small farmers. The project is part of a multi-donor $17.9 million agricultural research strengthening effort initiated by the World Bank.

Burkinabe agriculture is highly underdeveloped and characterized by low levels of technology and inappropriate farming practices. This condition reflects, in large measure, the failure of public agricultural institutions to provide technologies and practices appropriate for and responding to farm-level agro-ecological conditions. Fortunately, a significant amount of station research and farming-practice development has been carried out in Burkina. What is missing and what this project will provide is the institutional capacity and human resource base to translate these results through farm-level research into adapted technologies and practices which can be be disseminated and adopted within shorter timeframes.

The project goal is to foster economic growth through increased agricultural production, productivity and income in the principal regions of highest potential in Burkina within the context of sustainable agricultural systems. Measures of goal achievement are (1) increased yields per hectare of Burkina's priority crops; (2) growing use of improved agricultural technologies and practices; (3) Improved food self-sufficiency; and (4) increased quantities of crops and livestock marketed. The project purpose is to strengthen INERA's on-farm research performance in adapting

productivity oriented technologies and practices. The project will finance training, technical assistance, equipment and materials with USAID grant, GOB counterpart and PL 480 Title II local currency generation funds leading to (1) a strengthened adaptive research program; (2) an improved human resource base; and (3) strengthened linkages with relevant ministries as well as regional and international agricultural research bodies.

Total project funding is $7,341,000, of which USAID will provide $4,850,000 in grant funds. The Government of Burkina contribution is $2,494,000 which includes $1,809,000 in PL 480 local currency generations.

C. Financial Summary

USAID grant and GOB counterpart funds will be allocated for project activities as follows:

Summary Financial Plan
($ 000)

	AID/GRANT	GOB	TOTAL
1. Training	978	-	978
2. Technical Assistance	2,603	-	2,603
3. Research Personnel	-	427	427
4. Commodities & Equipment	521	6	527
5. Operational Support	512	1,809	2,321
6. Maintenance Support	-	252	252
7. Evaluation & Audit	233	-	233
	4,847	2,494	7,341

C. Summary Problem Statement

Burkina's economy is based on agriculture. Economic growth in Burkina is therefore a function of growth and development in agriculture. A prerequisite for increasing agricultural productivity, production, and income is the development, diffusion and adoption of improved agricultural technologies and farming practices. As a result of in-country donor-financed research, there are available a set of improved farming methods and technologies; however, these have yet to be adapted to prevailing farm-level agro-ecological constraints and conditions, thereby mitigating against their widespread adoption and consequent impact on agricultural production.

The project addresses, therefore, the specific problem of the lack of adapted technologies and practices for Burkina's farmers. Its resolution is focused on strengthening the institutional performance of Burkina's national agricultural research program to perform farm-level research and to adapt production technologies and practices to local technical, economic, environmental and social circumstances.

E. Project Rationale

"In most developing countries accelerated agricultural growth represents the best means for stimulating overall economic growth. In Africa, the effort needs to be on instituting technological change in agriculture simply to get the now stagnant rural sector moving." (Mellor, Food and Development: The Critical Nexus)

This statement is particularly true in Burkina where technologies and practices exist but have yet to be adapted to differing farm-level agroecological conditions and constraints. The project rationale, therefore, is that agricultural research/extension in Burkina will continue to have only marginal impact on economic growth unless farm-level conditions and constraints are explicitly taken into account. Even the most marginal improvements at the farm-level, if diffused widely, would have dramatic impact on agricultural and consequently national economic growth. Thus, while USAID/Burkina will be expanding policy dialogue efforts and activities in the critical/complementary areas of price policy, input supply and marketing, this project addresses what we consider to be the *sine qua non* of short and medium-term economic growth in Burkina, rural technological change.

Producing technological change depends on adoption by farmers. Such adoption requires that proposed technologies be suited to the technical, economic, environmental and social circumstances of the small farmer, and that the policy environment supports their application. The project will strengthen the institutional capacity and human resource base necessary to provide the adapted technologies required for agricultural growth as well as enhancing the sustainability of the natural resource base. At the same time, Mission policy dialogue and targeted human resource development activities will be undertaken to assure that the policy and administrative climate for growth is supportive of future production and productivity increases.

F. Project Issues

Seven major issues were identified during the project design process. They are summarized below (not in rank order) along with the design and negotiation efforts to alleviate or mitigate their potential negative impact on the project. Further discussion appears in the Detailed Project Description and Project Implementation sections.

1. RSP Management

The Mission and World Bank have endeavored in their project designs to support an INERA which has sufficient personnel to do the job but does not present an excessive recurrent cost burden. At the same time, there is a point where stretching existing resources is not an acceptable alternative. This was the case during the design when the director of the RSP program was named

head of INERA, thereby being responsible for the management and coordination of the eight individual research programs which comprise the national agricultural research portfolio, while concurrently maintaining his day-to-day RSP management duties.

The USAID design team examined the situation and concluded that such sharing of management responsibilities was in neither USAID's nor the Government of Burkina's best interest, particularly in view of the complexity of integrating different donor projects into a relatively young institution. Consequently, the Mission has negotiated a condition precedent to first disbursement with INERA which calls for the appointment of a separate RSP program director.

2. In-Country Training

A reading of Annex II.F. In-Country Training Plan, shows an ambitious in-country short-term training program. On its face, nine activities per year is high. However, when broken down by institution, three per year appears more manageable. Yet there is still a strong possibility of not meeting targets. The Mission and the design team have agreed that in addition to actual training which creates linkages between INERA's RSP and other ministries i.e. Ministry of Agriculture's Extension Services, that the development of a short-term training capacity outside of INERA is of critical importance for long-term RSP program effectiveness.

INERA/RSP working with non-INERA participating institutions such as University of Ouagadougou/IDR and Matourkou etc. in the initial joint training efforts will serve to institutionalize practical training on research methods, diagnostic techniques, experimental design of on-farm trials and demonstrations. Following the initial years of join training efforts, the project will rely more and more heavily on these institutions to carryout the training programs while funds are provided in the project to cover the institutions participatory costs in carrying out such training. In-country training will be monitored closely by both the Mission and the technical assistance team with the aim of providing the required resources for developing this in-country non-INERA capacity as soon as possible.

3. Financial Management

The INERA portfolio consists of eight different research programs, a headquarters and a set of decentralized field operations as well as a group of donors providing support. All of which could lead to a financial management nightmare regarding individual accounting system needs. One of the requirements of World Bank support to INERA was the establishment of a computerized accounting system. This system has been reviewed by both the USAID/Burkina controller and the Sahel Regional Financial Management project and found to meet USAID financial management and accounting standards. Later the design team noted a series of potential operational difficulties which have been discussed with

the Bank's accounting system software installation contractor. As a result, the World Bank's INERA-wide computerized accounting system will be used for the ARTS project instead of a separate system for USAID funds. This will be the case for other donors as well. The system is capable of separately accounting for each different donor's funds within one unified accounting system and could serve as a model for other future multidonor efforts as well.

4. Donor Activity Overlap

Considerable concern was expressed by the design team over overlapping activities and responsibilities of the World Bank and USAID projects with regard to the RSP program and whether this would cause management and implementation difficulties. As a result, Mission personnel and the design team worked with the World Bank design team to shift selected activities resulting in an RSP support program which is totally a USAID responsibility yet full integrated into the larger Bank agricultural research project.

5. Agro-ecological Zone Coverage/Selection

As the ARTS design began, INERA fully expected USAID support to be channeled on a nationwide basis. The Mission's position with the full support of the design team and the World Bank was that such strategy would (1) dilute potential project impact, (2) be economically inefficient, and (3) be well beyond INERA's current institutional capacity. After discussion and negotiation, the issue has been resolved to the satisfaction of both parties. Accordingly, RSP activities for the first project phase will be focused on two regions only. The first is southwestern Burkina which is the country's highest potential agricultural growth region with consequent impact on economic growth. The second region is the central Mossi plateau which is Burkina's most heavily populated area and the place where improved farming practices are most urgently needed to stem severe environmental degradation.

6. Increased Participation/Targeting of Women

Critical to the success of the RSP program will be the participation of women at the farm-level. The social soundness analysis points out the importance of gender-related research which is a central tenet of the RSP program. However, the Mission and the design team expressed concern that while this was accepted on a theoretical basis, the actual personnel structure of INERA which is heavily male works against such increased participation.

As a result, certain targets for women's participation in the project have been negotiated with INERA: Two of six long-term training slots will be set aside for women and six of the fifteen field technician positions will be so designated. In addition, of the four new professional staff to be hired by INERA, two will be women.

7. Funding Adequacy/Availability

At the time of PID development the Mission was concerned whether the $3.5 million of proposed USAID funding would be adequate in the light of proposed project activities and constrained bilateral budgets. This concern proved correct during the design phase. Thus, while reducing the scope of the INERA RSP request significantly, the design team has produced a minimum overall project package calling for additional funding from both parties. The resolution of this issue has come from both sides. First, the Mission's annual bilateral OYB was increased from $1.0 to $2.5 million, thereby permitting an increase in the USAID contribution. This will be further facilitated by a planned reobligation of $407,000 from two closed bilateral agricultural projects which consequently will reduce the actual mortgage increase on Mission OYB's from $1.35 million to $943,000. From the host country side, the GOB, in addition to its own direct financial and in-kind support, has agreed to utilize $1.8 million in PL 480 Title II local currency generations.

G. Summary Findings and Recommendations

The Mission Project Review Committee has reviewed all aspects of the proposed Agricultural Research and Training Support project and finds it to be financially, socially, economically and technically sound, and consistent with both Mission and GOB development objectives. It has further concluded that INERA, in conjunction with the USAID-provided technical assistance and training, is institutionally capable of administering and implementing the project as presented in this project paper.

H. Project Development Team

USAID/Burkina
Dennis McCarthy PhD, ADO
Roger A. Bloom, ADO
Donald R. Mackenzie/OPR
Bonaventure Traore/OAG
Ernest S. Hardy, Controller
Fati Ouedraogo, Training Officer

REDSO/WCA
Murl Baker, PDO
Jeff Goodson, Environment Off.
Richard Fraenkel, Ag. Economist
Ahmal Rassam, Sociologist
Gerald C. Render, RCO
Anthony Vance, RLA

Contract Consultants
John Lichte, FSR/Trg. Specialist
Allen Fleming, Economist
James Hawes, Agricultural Generalist
Jan Adamec, Agronomist

AID/W
Emmy Simmons, Economist
John Lewis, Anthropologist

Sahel Reg. Financial Mgmt Project
James Zervas, Team Leader
Bassega Zinkone, Financial Analyst
Joseph Luc Traore, Financial Analyst

INERA
Celestin Belem, Dir.
Michel Sedogo, Agronomist.
Sibiri Zoundi, Animal Sci.

University of Ouagadougou/IDR.
Alfred Traore, Dir.
Kimsey Sawadogo PhD, Prof.

USAID/Burkina Support Staff
Adele Ouedraogo/OPR
Veronique Kaboui/OAG
Alizeta Kabore/OPR
Richard Dialougou/C&R

PART II. BACKGROUND

A. Overview of the Agricultural Sector in Burkina.

With a per capita GNP of $140 in 1985 and a 1985 population of 7.9 million, Burkina Faso is one of the poorest countries in the world one of the most densely populated in Africa: According to the latest available census data (December 1985), the population growth rate is 2.6% per annum. The country's soils are generally poor and rainfall is scarce and highly variable, among regions as well as from one year to the next. The lack of a permanent water flow in the country's river system severely limits the potential for irrigation and hydroelectric power. The landlocked position and poor road network further constrain development potential in all sectors. Of the approximately 60 ethnic groups, the sedentary Mossi make up 50%; the pastoral and nomadic Peuhl, the second largest group, account for 10%.

Improved performance in the agricultural sector will be crucial for future growth, since an estimated 80-90% of the population depends for its livelihood on this sector. The concentration of over half of the population on the central plateau has resulted in the almost total disappearance of woodlands to meet fuelwood demands, excessive shortening of fallow periods, uncontrolled grazing and the abandonment of traditional shifting cultivation. These factors have combined to do nearly irreversible damage to the carrying capacity of parts of the central plateau. This impoverishment has provoked spontaneous migration into southern and western areas recently freed of onchocerciasis (river-blindness). The newly settled areas are in turn also being degraded by improper cropping practices. To be able to arrest this environmental degradation and eventually boost productivity, more and better-focussed research is needed on the technical and economic constraints to the intensification and integration of crop/forest/livestock production systems.

Agriculture employs 80-90% of the population, and accounts for about 40% of GDP and almost all exports. Of the country's total geographic area of 27.4 million ha, agricultural land (including forest and grazing lands) covers about 24 million ha, or nearly 90%. Arable land is estimated at about 9 million ha, of which about 3 million ha is cropped each year; this translates into about 2.3 inhabitants per cropped hectare. Population densities are much higher in the Mossi plateau, however, where half of the country's population lives.

Based on climate, soils and socio-economic factors, the country can be divided into five agro-ecological zones: the Sahel, the Central Plateau, the West, the Southwest and the East. The Sahel, in the north, is the driest region. It has a three-month rainy season (June-September) and receives less than 600 mm of erratic rainfall per annum. Evapotranspiration is high and differences between day and night temperatures are large. Livestock is the main economic activity. The populous Central Plateau, with rainfall ranging from less than 600 mm in the north to 900 mm in the south (received during a span of less than 6 months) is mainly

devoted to cropping. It falls within the Sudano-Sahelian climatic zone. Due to population pressure and the gradual breakdown of the traditional system of shifting cultivation, the area is suffering from severe environmental degradation. The West receives from 600 mm in the north to over 800 mm in the south and its main economic activity is also livestock. With stocking rates below those in the Sahel and Central zones, the degree of environmental degradation ranges from moderate to severe. The Southwest, which falls within the Sudano-Guinean climatic zone, has the best productive potential of the five regions and, following a successful campaign to eradicate riverblindness, has become the major receiving area for migrants from the Central and Sahel regions. It is the only region in the country with permanent water courses. Rainfall, distributed over about 6 months, ranges from 900 to 1200 mm and environmental degradation is still limited. The East is the least developed, least populous and also the least degraded part of the country. Rainfall there ranges from 600 to 900 mm per annum.

Overall, the relative contribution of the agricultural sector to the economy has decreased progressively, from 53% of GDP in 1965 to 45% in 1985. Although nearly 90% of the country's cultivated land is planted to sorghum and millet in association with root crops and grain legumes, cereal production has barely kept pace with population growth. Overall increases in production have largely been obtained through expansion of surface area. Maize and rice cultivation are limited by the low rainfall and lack of irrigation potential. Although cotton, grown mostly in the Southwest, is the major export crop, its aggregate cash value to farmers, except in that region, is still less than that earned from the marketed share of cereals. Cereals therefore, while most important as a subsistence food crop, are also an important cash crop.

While cotton acreage has continued to expand in the Southwest, it has regressed elsewhere, to be replaced by cereals. Cotton yields have risen markedly since 1968 due to the shift to more fertile areas, the increased use of fertilizers and insecticides, and improved extension. Cotton's share in total exports increased from 2% in 1960 to 33% in 1978 and 54% in 1985. The industry is in crisis, with total output steadily increasing to 175,000 T of seed cotton for the 1987/88 crop season, while national ginning capacity is only about 115,000 T.
Large producer price subsidies were paid to shield smallholders from the low world market prices of the past few years. Recent improvements in World Market prices appear to have returned cotton production to profitablility and world prices are projected to rise through the early 1990s.

Oil seed crops include groundnuts, karite and sesame. Groundnuts, the most important of these, are raised throughout the country and occupy about 140,000 ha, with great annual variations. Despite the potential for increased production, groundnuts have not benefited to any significant extent in recent years from production or marketing support policies. SOFIVAR has been

created to provide production support, but domestic prices have been higher than world market prices over the last three years. Karité, the second most important agricultural export commodity (about 13% of agricultural exports by value in 1984) is harvested by hand mostly in the Sudano-Guinean area. Sesame is a traditional oil seed crop of some importance.

Fruits and vegetables have some potential, as evidenced by the creation in 1968 of the Union Burkinabé des Coopératives Maraïchères (UBOCAM). These crops are traditionally grown during the dry season in kitchen gardens and on valley bottom lands. Green beans are exported at a rate of about 2,000 T per annum, much of it to France.

Livestock production is one of the single most important activities in the economy, and crop and livestock production are greatly dependent on one another. The livestock subsector is estimated to contribute about 25% of the agricultural GDP and nearly 21% of all exports in 1984. In 1982 the national herd was estimated at 2.8 million head of cattle, nearly 2 million sheep and 2.5 million goats. In addition, there were some 200,000 pigs and about 20 million head of poultry. Fifty percent of all cattle (and 48% of all sheep and goats) are in the central (Sudano-Sahelian) zone, with the remainder divided equally between the Sahelian and Sudano-Guinean zones. Production systems are extensive agro-pastoral and nomadic, and are characterized by poor husbandry practices, year-round low nutritional levels, and deteriorating grazing resources.

B. Production Systems Research (RSP) in Burkina: Lessons Learned.

1. History of RSP in Burkina. The national RSP program came into being in February of 1985 with the creation of INERA. It was staffed by a mixture of national researchers and French (CIRAD) researchers. The presence of CIRAD researchers within INERA and the Purdue University SAFGRAD Farming System Unit (FSU) have had both positive and negative influences on the RSP program's focus and orientation (note Annex II.D. Technical Analysis). CIRAD researchers effectively managed Research stations but with very little delegation of responsibilities to their Burkinabe counterparts. The FSU teams although demonstrating the potential of improved technologies did not have the opportunity to work within the national program. Their regional mandate and institutional setting essentially isolated them from the national programs. The methodology which is accepted by the RSP today is the Purdue/ICRISAT Economic Program example and model of intensive survey work, of the more efficient rapid approach suggested by the head of ICRISAT's Economic Program and by Purdue in its final report. In addition, wide geographical dispersement of on-farm research activities modeled after the FSU and ICRISAT work presents recurrent cost burdens far beyond the national program's capacity.

The project will focus on providing scientific, financial, training and administrative support to the RSP (Farming Systems Research) program within the national agricultural research institute (INERA). The objectives of previous AID funded farming systems activities in Burkina were strongly focused on achieving research results. Some good research was accomplished but both the Michigan State University (MSU) and Purdue technical assistance teams spent most of their time and energy carrying out field research activities themselves. Few resources were devoted to training and supporting Burkinabe researchers to do the job, nor to developing the institutional capacity to continue such activities after the technical assistance team left.

As Mellor points out, the future growth of such countries depends on a continuing process of agricultural technology development and transfer. But developing the capacity to do quality agricultural research and to transfer the results is a long term process. Therefore, this project is the first phase of a broader 15 year commitment to improving agricultural research and technology transfer in Burkina Faso.

Previous project assistance to agricultural research in Burkina relied principally on regional research organizations for implementation. In general they have carried out sound and applicable research, but the results are not being used. More importantly, the national research organization has not been substantially strengthened by the presence and activities of these organizations. To improve project performance in terms of institution building, this project is:

1. bilateral in nature rather than regional.
2. focusing the project on institutional objectives rather than on research results.

C. Agriculture Extension in Burkina.

Since 1966, extension services have been provided by the Regional Development Organizations (ORDs). During the 1970s, the era of integrated rural development, the ORDs under the Ministry of Rural Development accumulated responsibility for most aspects of rural development. These responsibilities included: promotion of agriculture, development of physical infrastructure, literacy training, some health and social programs, training animals and farmers for animal traction, input and credit delivery, building roads, collecting agricultural statistics, installing village grain mills, setting up cereal banks, marketing, etc. The ORDs were provided with the legal status of public industrial and commercial enterprises and were expected to undertake activities which would generate income for the ORD. In the cotton production zone, ORDs were able to generate income as a commission on the sale of cotton and inputs. At times, income was also generated by marketing other cash crops, such as groundnuts and sesame. Unfortunately, weak marketing structures and unstable world prices often made this a losing proposition, rather than a profitable one. Many of the activities like road building and providing

social services, provided only expenses, rather than any possibility of generating income. For several years, the ORDs also shared a national cereal marketing monopoly with the National Cereals Office (OFNACER). After some experience it was recognized that the ORDs were inefficient cereal marketing structures and could only provide such services at a high cost. Over time, the allure of the notion of integrated rural development has worn off and it has been recognized that one organization can not efficiently provide all of the services needed by the rural populations.

Since 1985, the Ministry of Rural Development has been disassembled in the move away from integrated rural development towards more limited and better defined tasks for the institutions and field agents. The tasks previously united under one ministry are now divided between:

The Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock
The Ministry of Farmers Affairs
The Ministry of Water

The Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAE) retains the responsibility for technical aspects of crop and livestock production as well as input delivery and basic extension services. In mid 1987 the ministry had 1089 field level extension agents, 2422 field technicians, and 280 senior level personnel with university level training; for a total of 2710 personnel.

The MAE is also undergoing a major reorganization. The ORDs were officially disbanded in May of 1987 and have been replaced by the new Regional Agro-pastoral Promotion Centers (CRPAs). There is still relatively little information about the structure and program of the new CRPAs. They will nevertheless have the legal status of public industrial and commercial enterprises, the same as the ORDs.

The CRPAs are considered to have become functional with the naming of directors in mid April, 1988, but in fact will have little or no budget until the planned World Bank Extension Support Project comes on line in late 1988 or early 1989. The project being prepared may cost as much as $8 million to $10 million a year to implement the extension system on a nation wide basis. The project is oriented towards different programs in each CRPA based on the agro-ecological and socio-economic conditions of each region. What these different programs might be will depend to a large extent on what is available from adaptive research programs.

The World Bank papers call for the implementation of the training and visit (T&V) system, working with village groups, a strong emphasis on regular training sessions for extension agents, and a serious upgrading of the research and development liaison units within the CRPAs. A close working relationship with INERA and particularly with the RSP component is envisioned to help adapt and integrate technologies appropriate for local conditions.

Some of the NGOs in Burkina have a reputation of doing good work in the promotion of agricultural production as part of their rural development activities. Vertically integrated private companies exist, producing high value cash crops, primarily for exportation. Some of these organizations have developed sophisticated production schedules in order to allow them to take advantage of time specific marketing opportunities. Although most operate on a relatively small scale, the extension services provided are more sophisticated than those provided by the government extension services, and implemented with very few personnel. These companies have spent several years developing the production of export quality produce (primarily vegetables and fruit) and have demonstrated an ability to produce on a basis which is profitable for both the company and cooperating farmers. Activities like these can help provide crop diversification and a highly profitable cash crop. This is an important complement to World Bank/GOB extension activities, particularly in the traditional cereal cropping production systems of the northern half of the country.

D. Agriculture Education in Burkina.

Training of agricultural technicians is provided by several institutions. The basic source of agricultural engineers is the Institute of Rural Development (IDR) at the University of Ouagadougou. The IDR has three basic training programs in the areas of crop production, livestock production and forestry. The majority of the agricultural technicians in the government services and in the private sector have received their degrees from the IDR at the equivalency of the Bachelor's Degree. Most higher level degree training is done outside of Burkina. The IDR has proposed and is attempting to find financing for a program to give the equivalent of Master's Degree.

Under USAID's Agriculture and Human Resources Development Project (AgHRD) a team sponsored by the University of Georgia is in the process of preparing a long term plan for IDR. One of the questions is whether to build and move IDR to facilities at the Gampela research station developed under the project, located 25 km East of Ouagadougou. The primary purpose of this would be to provide more practical training to students and to encourage faculty to become more involved in practical research. At present faculty members are only paid for the number of hours they teach. There is no orientation and little incentive for them to become involved in research. IDR also provides very little in the way of non-degree training or continuing education. There is a real need to provide better training to research and extension personnel already in the field, but no ready source of such training. Part of the ARTS training program is oriented towards initiating and facilitating the start up of such in-service training at IDR for personnel already in the field.

Matourkou is the traditional training center for non-university agricultural development training at the mid-level. Prior to 1976, with funding from UNDP, Matourkou also provided a 9 month training course for basic extension agents. With the loss of funding and personnel this training stopped and ORDs had to train their own extension agents. Here also the ARTS project will initiate continuing education activities in collaboration with Matourkou.

The Ministry of Farmers Affairs maintains a training center near Kamboinse for training the trainers responsible for the Young Farmer Training Centers (CFJA's).

The Dinderesso Forestry School has not been accepting new students for the last several years and has had serious operating problems since the end of the USAID project. However, it will start a new group of students this year. In the interim it has been providing some short term technical training primarily in aspects of forestry and environmental protection.

E. Agriculture Research and Development Priorities in Burkina.

One of the GOB's major objectives for the agricultural sector is to increase agricultural output and its share in GDP by providing improved and better coordinated production support services to as many crop farmers and pastoralists as possible. As far as research is concerned, available technical messages often prove to be applicable only on a limited scale as they have not been geared to farmers' needs, constraints and socio-economic characteristics. As far as agricultural extension is concerned, the field extension worker and his supervisor are often inadequately informed of the latest research findings, as well as inadequately trained. The Government is well aware of the need for further strengthening of linkages between research and extension, particularly at the grass roots level, and between extension and the farmers. Functional linkages already exist at the central and field level, between INERA (in the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research) and Extension (in the Ministry of Agriculture). This linkage is primarily through regular training by INERA researchers of extension staff; through joint planning and implementation of field demonstrations; and through informal but regular contacts between INERA researchers and extension workers.

Until recently the organization of agricultural research closely resembled the structure inherited from colonial times. Agricultural research activities were largely organized around the programs of the specialized French research organizations of CIRAD and other regional or international research programs such as SAFGRAD and projects under UNDP, FAO, and INSAH. With limited human and financial resources, Burkina found it necessary to take maximum advantage of the resources available through these different organizations. These organizations and their programs were relatively autonomous, and there was no unified national agricultural research program with global priorities across the various programs.

To make agricultural ltural and livestock research more responsive to farmers' needs, the Government of Burkina created a national research institution in 1981 called IVRAZ (Institut Voltaïque de Recherche Agronomique et Zootechnique). IVRAZ was one of the specialized institutes of the National Center for Scientific and Technological Research (CNRST) under the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research.

In July 1982, the Burkinabé Government invited FAO, the World Bank, and the International Seminar for National Agricultural Research (ISNAR) to help formulate a long term agricultural research program. After separate exploratory missions, a joint FAO/ISNAR/Bank mission drew up an inventory of ongoing research programs, and presented its recommendations to the Government in March 1983. The report, entitled "Agriculture and Livestock Research", detailed appropriate institutional infrastructures and outlined a plan for a long-term research program, taking into consideration the country's needs and resources, and provided a general framework for external technical and financial assistance.

The report concluded that in the short and medium term, research and development activities should be aimed at eliminating constraints now hampering agricultural productivity, economic development and existing production systems. In addition to these short-term objectives of increasing food and export crop production, the long-term plan for the agricultural sector called for the stabilization of farming systems and the protection of the environment, including soil, water, forestry, and grazing resources. The report recommended that IVRAZ establish a programming and coordination unit responsible for formulating a national research program in support of Government's agricultural policy.

Several national workshops in 1984 and 1985 continued this reflection and led to the official adoption of a National Agricultural Research Program consisting of the following eight programs ams listed in order of priority:

1. RSP - Production Systems Research
2. ESFIMA - Water, soil, Fertilization, Irrigation, and Agricultural Equipment
3. Animal Production
4. SOMINA - Cereals Program (Sorghum, millet, maize)
5. Proteagineux - Oilseed and leguminous crops
6. Fruit and Vegetables
7. Rice
8. Cotton

As a result of this process, and under the impetus of the impending World Bank support project, IVRAZ was reorganized and renamed The National Institute for Agricultural Studies and Research (INERA) and given the responsibility of implementing the new national program. An 16.8 million dollar project was negotiated with the World Bank to serve as an umbrella for other donor participation.

RSP is given first priority among the eight programs because of the existing system's recognized weakness in adaptive research. Although numerous technologies have demonstrated promise when tested under research conditions, few have been readily adopted by farmers. Adapting such technologies to farmers' conditions in different agro-ecological zones and finding ways to integrate them into farmers existing production systems is a key element of translating technical potential into increased productivity and economic growth. There is a recognized need to improve the cotton-maize production system of the Southwest and to find ways to integrate migrants without destroying the natural resource base. Cash crops must be integrated into the cereal production system of the Mossi plateau, to provide the means to purchase cash inputs which can help stabilize both production and the natural resource base.

On the other extreme, cotton is given low priority because cotton research has already been extremely successful. The present cotton variety used in Burkina gives yields which are double those of its predecessor, and four times higher than the variety used only a few years ago. A new variety is about to be released which will increase fiber quality and ginning efficiency.

The ARTS project strategy is to improve INERA's adaptive research capacity and provide a better balance between on-station and on-farm research to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the total research program. This in turn will translate into better performance of the technology generation and transfer system, and result in more appropriate technologies being developed and transfered to the extension services and higher rates of adoption of technologies by farmers. This will translate, over the long term, into higher production, productivity, and income for the adopting farmers and the agricultural sector as a whole.

i. Relationship to Mission Program and Strategy.

The Mission's approved Program Rationale Statement presents a program portfolio focused on specific components in two sectors: agricultural research/education and health/population. The ARTS project will be one of two complementary bilateral projects in agriculture, the other being the ongoing AgHRD Project with the University of Ouagadougou's Rural Development Institute.

Major elements of USAID/Burkina's development assistance strategy are (a) resource leveraging, (b) comparative assistance advantage, and (c) building upon prior AID investment. As discussed elsewhere, the ARTS project is a product of these strategic elements by respectively leveraging with World Bank/other donor resources; focusing on production systems research (an area of U.S. comparative advantage); and building upon previous efforts under the $36 million SAFGRAD project series.

G. Relationship to World Bank/Other Donor Activities

The AID-financed ARTS project coincides with the Bank's agricultural strategy for Burkina which gives priority to agricultural research and the development of improved technical and extension services for small farmers and livestock holders through the institutional development of Burkina's national agricultural research program.

An improved research capacity directly complements USAID/Burkina's support to Burkina's principal advanced agricultural training institution (IDR) and is a logical next step in implementing a cohesive agricultural strategy. IDR graduates provide the high-level staff vital to implementing quality research programs and support those senior scientists currently on-board and to be trained under the World Bank and USAID/Burkina interventions.

World Bank RSP support will focus on the upgrading of the necessary infrastructure required for the present and future development of the INERA/RSP Program together with the crucial financial accounting system used within the joint project, INERA wide. The ARTS project will provide all Long and Short-term RSP technical assistance requirements, training, and commodities and equipment necessary for the RSP portion of the project.

Regarding participant training, the Bank and the GOB recognize the strength of the U.S. Land-Grant system in agricultural education. Accordingly, and in line with AID policy on human resource development and technology transfer, AID will finance 6 long-term participants at U.S. land-grant institutions under the ARTS project.

The GOB and the World Bank have encouraged and solicited other donor involvement in the National Agricultural Research program. The French have had a long influence on and interest in agricultural research in Burkina, in general focusing on cash or export crop research. With the reorganization of the national program, many of these French-supported efforts are now under INERA's purview.

PART III. DETAILED PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. Project Goal:

To increase agricultural production, productivity and income in the principle and highest potential regions of Burkina within the context of sustainable agricultural systems.

B. Measures of Goal Achievement:

1. Increased yields per hectare of Burkina's priority crops;

2. Growing use of improved agricultural technologies and practices;

3. Improved food self-sufficiency; and

4. Increased quantities of crops and livestock marketed.

C. Project Purpose:

To strengthen INERA's on-farm research performance in adapting productivity-oriented technologies and practices.

D. End of Project Status (EOPS)

1. Strengthened Adaptive Research Program

A functioning national RSP program, staffed by Burkinabe, capable of (a) collecting information, data and feedback from farmers and extension workers about constraints and potential improvements in localized production systems; (b) based on this information and feedback, developing or assisting in the development of appropriate technologies and agronomic practices as well as relevant organizational linkages.

2. Improved Human Resource Base

An improved human resource base of national scientists able to provide technical and managerial leadership for INERA's research program, capable of raising the technical, sociological and economic quality and impact of research, and able to improve overall program performance.

3. Improved National Agricultural Research Policy

An improved national agricultural research policy directing INERA's program which (a) addresses high priority constraints to production systems and (b) permits relevant results and practices to be disseminated within shorter time frames.

E. Project Strategy

1. Resource Leveraging: In the face of limited bilateral funds, the project focuses a relatively small amount of funds - $4.85 million - on the critical technical component of the INERA program. This allows the USAID funds, which make up only 20%

of the overall support to INERA, to be leveraged 5-fold by $17.9 million from the world Bank, and $ 2.5 million from the Government of Burkina.

2. Targeted Institutional Focus: The project will focus on those major horizontal and vertical linkages necessary for creating and sustaining a viable adaptive farm-level research program. It is not an INERA-wide institutional development effort. Such activity is programmed under the larger World Bank effort of which RSP is one integrated component. The institutional development activities proposed under the AID-financed effort will only be those required for the implementation and sustained operation of the RSP program.

3. Beneficiary Participation: The underlying strategy of RSP is the involvement of the ultimate users of adapted technologies and practices. Small farmers, both men and women, are considered both colleagues and clients with whom and for INERA works and serves.

4. Compact Operational Zone Focus: Traditionally, national research activities have been widespread, expensive in time and effort, and almost impossible to monitor and service properly. The ARTS project will relocate RSP field efforts within easy access of research centers with the aim of achieving both a manageable project and eventual significant production impact.

5. Commodity Focused: Adaptive research activities and on-farm testing will focus on those priority commodities in each agro-ecological zone consonant with Government of Burkina agricultural development priorities.

6. Research-Extension-Education Linkages: Critical horizontal linkages
- operational and coordinative as well as programmatic - will be forged by formal and informal interaction between INERA's RSP and Ministries of Agriculture and Higher Education personnel at the national, regional and most importantly field levels.

7. Self-Contained Project: While the project will leverage and work with other resources, donors and ministries, the first phase is designed to be implementable should other donor resources not be available as planned, albeit geographic coverage and absolute amount of on-farm testing would be necessarily reduced.

8. Area-Focused: The project focuses on two major areas of Burkina: first on the southwest which is the area with the highest agricultural potential; second on the Mossi plateau which is the area with the highest concentration of population and the region most seriously in need of sustainable agricultural systems in the face of severe environmental degradation.

F. Project Assistance Methodology

1. Background

The national production research system in Burkina has been traditionally staffed by a mixture of national, French (CIRAD) and SAFGRAD/IFAD researchers. The research methodology utilized to date is nominally called production systems research and concentrates heavily on socio-economic data collection whose analysis theoretically provides an understanding of farming systems, farmer constraints and research opportunities as well as a baseline for evaluating changes over time.

The precedent for such multi-disciplinary farm-level research in Burkina had been set by Michigan State University whose team in eastern Burkina focused on intensive surveys to the point that there was little time for on-farm testing. While the Michigan State effort was state of the art in terms of multi-disciplinary data collection and survey activities, it was not necessarily farming systems research.

INERA was further influenced by the USAID-financed Purdue University Farming Systems Unit within the SAFGRAD I project (698-0393) which also gave heavy emphasis to data collection rather than on-farm trials. The use of intensive surveys and data collection activities was therefore the pre-project orientation of choice for RSP. This was more than ironic given Purdue's own final report which noted that it should have spent less time and effort on intensive survey work and proceeded much more quickly to focus on on-farm trials. Thus, the principle purpose of the ARTS project is to reorient INERA's RSP program and ultimately all of its research efforts toward a primary emphasis on on-farm adaptive research leading to rapid dissemination of technologies and practices. Accordingly, data collection is not to be considered an end in itself and will be characterized by inexpensive, rapid reconnaissance surveys.

2. Basic Elements

a. RSP Methodology: A production systems research program should perform the following functions related to the generation and transfer of technologies:

1. To support a problem-solving approach, based on a systems perspective, within research and extension which is fundamentally oriented to farmers as the primary clients of research.

2. To contribute to the application of an inter-disciplinary perspective between research and extension.

3. To characterize major farming systems and client groups, using agro-ecological and socio-economic criteria, in order to diagnose priority production problems as well as identify key opportunities for research, extension and other interventions with the objective of improving the productivity and/or stability of those systems.

4. To adapt and integrate existing technologies and/or contribute to the development of alternative technologies for targeted groups of farmers sharing common production problems by conducting experiments or tests under farmers' conditions.

5. To promote farmer participation in research and extension as collaborators, experimentors, testers, evaluators and disseminators of alternative technologies.

6. To provide feedback to the agricultural research and extension priority-setting, planning and programming processes so that experiment station and on-farm research, and extension, are integrated into a coherent national research program focussed on farmers' needs.

7. To promote collaboration with extension and development agencies in order to improve efficiency of the technology generation and diffusion process.

b. RSP Linkage with Education. RSP is presently involved in two types of training activities. One is the practice by INERA researchers of supervising the thesis work of 4th and 5th year IDR students. The supervising researcher selects a topic within the context of his/her research program and if that program is approved, the subject is submitted to IDR as a potential thesis topic. Project funding is provided to support and expand all such collaborative research efforts between INERA and the University of Ouagadougou. INERA/RSP Program has the advantage of being able to provide students with practical field research experience within the context of an on-going program. The students provide INERA with some relatively inexpensive manpower. The process is also an important means of evaluating potential candidates for recruitment. The expansion and development of the RSP regional teams should allow RSP to expand the number of students doing thesis work in the program.

The training provided to RSP staff along with some possible support from project technical assistance personnel should improve RSP's capabilities for supervising thesis work.

c. RSP Linkage with Extension. The second existing training program which RSP is responsible for is the extension specialist (ES) training activity. This program is off to a rather shakey start, but has important potential in several respects. The ES training, was solicited in the preliminary document for the future World Bank National Extension Support Project. Much of the training strategy for the World Bank National Extension Support Project is based on these extension specialists providing training for the rest of the extension personnel. The background documents for the project also call for the ES to be integrated into the Research and Development (R/D) units which are the liaison with RSP from within the extension services. The R/D units would rely on the expertise of the ES for diagnostic, experimentation and analysis activities within the CRPA's. The ES training program allows RSP the opportunity to improve the capabilities of its primary partners within the extension services, and to expand its

impact on the extension services by training the ES who in turn train the extension agents. For a more detailed discussion of the specific training programs to be developed and specific benefits see Annex. II.F. In Country Training Plan.

d. RSP Linkage with Other Research Programs. The RSP Program is the liaison between INERA research programs on one hand, and extension services and farmers on the other hand. The orientation of technical assistance activities in the ARTS project towards training and support of RSP teams and other researchers at the regional level will strengthen the existing linkages between RSP and the commodity research programs. Researchers in commodity programs or ESFIMA (Water, Soil, Fertilization, Irrigation and Equipment Research Program) wanting to do on-farm testing of varieties, practices or other technologies will be doing this research in cooperation with RSP. Since RSP teams will work regularly in farmers' fields they will have knowledge of what is likely to be acceptable to farmers and can help screen the types of tests which are implemented on farmers' fields. RSP teams will be present at each of the regional stations and each regional team will be in direct contact with the headquarters of the commodity programs located in that region. These field research activities, done in cooperation with researchers from the commodities programs, will be one of the closest and direct linkages. A second linkage will be in the form of feedback to the commodity researchers from other RSP research activities to provide information about farmer conditions and/or specific aspects of the farming systems. Research programs, and particularly the on-farm research programs, will be planned jointly with commodity program researchers, analyzed jointly, and submitted to joint peer review and evaluation. These joint responsibilities as well as the ability to provide some funding to help commodity researchers undertake on-farm research activities will help maintain strong and functional linkages with on-station research.

The RSP relationship with ESFIMA will be similar to that with other research programs, except that ESFIMA's mandate also covers all of the agro-ecological zones. Many of the basic constraints to improving agricultural productivity in Burkina Faso are related to the soil-water-plant relationships for which ESFIMA is responsible. RSP will be able to call on ESFIMA researchers to help explore such problems in farmers' fields, and ESFIMA will utilize RSP to test potential solutions to such problems in farmers' fields. The fact that the headquarters for both ESFIMA and RSP will be at the same location, Kamboinsé, will help maintain close collaboration and coordination between the two programs.

As a result of the ARTS project RSP will have resources available which will allow it to share the cost of field supplies, inputs and per diem to facilitate commodity researchers becoming more active in on-farm research. This will include specifically on-farm testing related to their

respective programs, as well as diagnosis of specific problems in their fields. Cost sharing will be negotiated at the time that commodity researchers and RSP personnel jointly design protocols for field research activities. RSP will be able to share costs on both researcher managed and farmer managed trials, but pick up a larger share of the cost of farmer managed trials. This will provide RSP some leverage in persuading other researchers to simplify their trials to the point that they are appropriate for farmer managed trials.

3. Target Areas/Technologies

a. Mossi Plateau. The RSP field team at Kamboinse will be responsible for RSP research interventions in the Central Region, Mossi Plateau. Due to population pressure and the gradual breakdown of the traditional system of shifting cultivation, the area is suffering from severe environmental degradation. The Mossi Plateau is of strategic importance in Burkina's agricultural sector because of its large population and its importance in cereal production. This cereal production needs to be increased or at least maintained to meet the needs of a rapidly growing population. Although migration to the South is generally to be encouraged, if lack of food pushes people south too fast, the regions being settled will not be able to establish production systems which permit the rational exploitation of resources without destroying the natural resource base. Unfortunately, drought and population pressures are rapidly bringing about the destruction of the natural resource base on the Mossi Plateau. Increasing cereal production is important, but sustaining the productive capacity of the region is an even greater priority.

Past farming systems research work in Burkina has demonstrated the potential of various technologies which can specifically address the natural resource degradation and constraints to production in this region. One of the most promising technologies for the lower rainfall areas of Burkina, like the Mossi Plateau, is the tied ridger. Tied ridging attains its effectiveness by providing water retention and soil conservation at a micro level. Adoption of manual tied ridging has been very limited, and indications are that farmers thought it was simply too much work. Use of a mechanical tied ridger attached to a donkey or oxen cultivator/ridger has been shown to be better received by farmers. Other water retention and soil conservation techniques will be explored and disseminated for use on the Mossi Plateau. For a further discussion of constraints and potential of the Central Region note Annex II.D. Technical Analysis.

B. The Southwest Region. The RSP field team at Farako-Ba will be responsible for RSP research interventions in the Southwest Region of Burkina. This region has the highest productive potential of all five regions of the country and, following a successful campaign to eradicate riverblindness, has become the major receiving area for migrants from the Central and Sahel

regions. The cotton-cereal system of the Southwest is the most promising production system in Burkina and is also applicable to a large portion of the South and Southeast. With migration, the Southwest is coming under increasing population pressure. Over time, the system will lead to a continuous decline in soil fertility, unless farmers have access to both production and resource (soil, water etc.) conservation oriented technologies. Production data from similar neighboring regions (Southern Mali) demonstrates that the systems productivity in this region can be considerably improved while also improving the natural resource base. Note Annex II.D. Technical Analysis.

The region lends itself to a multitude of improved production technologies already demonstrated through past research. But at present, few of these potential solutions are generally applied by farmers in the region. The maize/millet intercrop is probably the most productive system represented. Tied ridging is appropriate for those areas with less than 800 to 900 mm of rainfall but in view of declining rainfall trends, this may cover an increasing part of the Southwest. In the higher rainfall areas, anti-erosive measures need to be applied and farmers need to be encouraged to move towards practices which are based on the contour farming concept. This concept is not part of traditional farming practices in the region today. Considerable potential exists for crop diversification such as cash crops, tree crops, citrus etc., some of which are already produced and exported from the region on a limited scale.

The development strategy must deal with the probability that many resource poor migrant farmers will need 5 to 10 years of improving income and technical capacity before they are ready to enter the cotton production system of the region. Unless alternatives are offered, resource poor farmers tend to mine the land, as a partial substitute for their lack of labor and capital resources.

F. Project Activities and Outputs.

1. Research Management Support.

The Project will provide three long term expatriate technical assistance personnel to the INERA/RSP Program Headquarters as follows;

RSP Team Leader - Experienced researcher with strong Farming Systems Research and Extension (FSR/E) background and knowledge of managing on-farm research programs in developing countries. Agronomist by choice. Capable of providing guidance and leadership in short course training activities, planning RSP program, diagnostic, design of on-farm trials and interventions, and analysis and interpretation of on-farm trials.

Agricultural Economist - Experienced FSR/E researcher with short course training and computer data management/analysis experience. Will add agricultural economic perspective to planning RSP activities, diagnostic, design of on-farm tests and interventions, analysis and interpretation of trial and survey data, etc.

Social Scientist - Experienced FSR/E researcher with short-course training experience. Additional background relating to the agricultural and technological aspects of rural migration and land tenure issues would be useful. Will add social science perspective to planning RSP activities, diagnostic, design of on-farm trials and interventions, analysis and interpretation of trial and survey data, etc. Help plan studies of the technology and agricultural practices used by migrant farmers.

Various short term experts will also be provided to support research management development efforts both at RSP headquarters as well as in the field in such areas as computer data analyses, short course/workshop syllabus development and execution, agro-forestry, animal science, rural sociology, anthropology etc. as needed.

All expatriate technical assistance personnel will be provided through a U.S. University Title XII Contract with an institution with demonstrated expertise in appropriate fields of research. The contractor will be responsible for assisting the RSP Program manager develop a multi-year program development plan and provide services to the program as defined in annual work-plans prepared by the contractor in conjunction with the RSP Program manager and approved by INERA and USAID.

In addition, a local hire Administrative Assistant/Accountant will be provided to the Project To help the team leader with accounting and administration of the contract team, AID administrative obligations, and additional RSP administrative requirements resulting from Project activities.

Approximately 33% of the team leader's time and 50% of the administrative assistant's time will be devoted to overall RSP Program administration and management matters within the INERA/RSP Headquarters Office. Approximately 50% of the time of the Agr. Economist's and the Social Scientists will be devoted to short course and on the job training. Perhaps 1/6th of the team leader's time will be devoted to training activities.

In addition, operational support costs and various commodity and equipment items necessary for the efficient operations of the RSP Program management unit at INERA headquarters will be provided by the project.

2. Human Resource Development.

RSP Research Staff. Six Senior Researchers from within the INERA/RSP Program will be trained in appropriate scientific disciplines either to the M.S. or Ph.D. levels in the United States, depending on educational level at the start of the long-term training program. All these participants will be reintegrated into the national RSP Program upon their return to Burkina.

All national researchers within the RSP program will attend various short term specialized courses at International Research Centers, U.S. Universities or other appropriate third country institutions on specific subject areas within their disciplines as well as general research techniques/methodology. In addition, an extensive in-country training program, outlined in Annex II.F., will be developed and carried out over the life of project assisted by both long and short-term TA provided by the project.

3. Production Systems Research (RSP) Support.

Two small RSP Regional Field Teams, one at Farako-Ba for the Southwest Region and one at Kamboinse serving the Central Mossi Plateau Region, will be made operational through the Project. Each field team will have 8 research technicians, 6 of whom will be permanently based in project villages. With the exception of a moderate supply of commodities and equipment provided by AID grant funds, all operating costs for both field teams will be covered through GOB direct contributions to the project in the form of existing counterpart funds generated through prior PL 480 sales (note Annex II.B. Financial Analysis for details).

Approximately 50% of the time of the Agr. Economist and the Soc. Scientist and 1/6 of the time of the team leader will be devoted to scientific support for regional teams. This may include participation in specific aspects of field research, planning, and disciplinary support. Many of the day to day activities in which technical assistants provide support will result in small training sessions for groups of both RSP and commodity researchers.

G. Project Inputs Summary

Within the categories of Research Management Support, Human Resource Development, and Research Activity Support, the project will finance activities which will include training, technical assistance, materials development, related equipment and materials, project management and coordination, and evaluation.

AID project inputs and their associated costs are detailed in Figure III. A. Derivation of specific costs can be found in the Financial Analysis, Annex II.B.

Figure III. A.

PROJECT INPUTS

Component	Input	Quantity	AID Grant Funds
I. Research Management Support			3,304
	1. Long-Term TA	144 p/m	2,369
	2. Short-Term TA	12 p/m	234
	3. Operational Support Headquarters	Various	512
	4. Commodities & Equipment	Various	189
II. Human Resources Development			978
	1. Long-Term Training	261 p/m	585
	2. Short-Term Training	24 p/m	150
	3. In-Country Training	473 p/m	243
III. Research Activity Support			332
	1. Commodities & Equipment Kamboinse Field Team	Various	166
	2. Commodities & Equipment Farako-Ba Field Team	Various	166
IV. Evaluation & Audit			233
	TOTAL		4,847

PART IV. PROJECT ANALYSES SUMMARIES

A. Institutional Analysis

Prior to 1986 the institutional framework for managing and conducting agricultural research was greatly influenced by institutions carried over from the colonial period and the country's own decentralized development strategy, neither of which contributed to the development of the performance-oriented and unified national structure required to coordinate and manage agricultural research in Burkina. Recognizing the weakness of the past system, the Burkina Government reorganized its agricultural research structure in April 1986. The project design team has reviewed the current structure and finds it appropriate to the organization's mandate, particularly with regard to developing a broad ministerial consensus, the sharing of research responsibilities, and the ability to incorporate concerns of those ministries using research results.

Analysis by the World Bank and the USAID design team has shown that INERA needs to have a stable financial base upon which to plan long-term research; greater influence on the allocation of resources to agricultural research; and a sound capacity to plan, manage and implement a research program which produces usable agricultural production technologies. The recently approved World Bank Agriculture Research Program will provide the overall financial, administrative and technical support requirements for successfully strengthening all other INERA research programs associated with RSP.

AID's institutional strengthening efforts will be focused solely on the INERA/RSP program. In order to minimize future recurrent cost burdens, INERA has agreed that only four additional researchers will be hired as permanent staff. Negotiations also led to a significant reduction in project-funded staff. The 15 field technicians (the original INERA request was thirty-two), an executive assistant/accountant, 3 secretaries, 3 administrative assistants, six drivers, and a data processing expert to be hired on a temporary contractual basis are considered by the project design team to be the minimum necessary to carry out the technical and administrative tasks of the project.

A significant amount of human resource development activities have been programmed to strengthen the technical research capacity of INERA. These include long-term, short-term and on-the-job training. Long-term training has been phased in order to avoid significant administrative burden on INERA's limited resources. In addition, USAID resources together with World Bank resources will also be focused on improving the financial and managerial capacity of INERA staff. The former will include directed training as well as support from the USAID/Sahel Regional Financial Management Project (SRFMP) while the latter will consist principally of on-the-job training provided by technical assistance personnel supplemented by short-courses and orientation tours as warranted.

B. Social Soundness Analysis

The ultimate beneficiaries of a strong and effective INERA/RSP program will be Burkinabe farmers in the target regions. The successful development and diffusion of appropriate packages of agricultural/livestock technologies should, in time, enhance productivity, reduce the work load of men and women farmers, improve nutrition and foster a better sense of security and well being among the rural population.

The analysis concluded that both the RSP research methodologies and those of the Research /Development cellules (units) of the CRPA's extension services are well set up to identify social settings in which a sufficient number of farming units would be predisposed to innovative experimentation.

The analysis showed that cereals-based farming systems of Central Burkina, the Mossi Plateau, which have experienced severe demographic circumscription, and therefore pushing migrants out, could be readily motivated to change traditional land use techniques. The adaptation of labor saving technologies would effectively alleviate the increasing pressure on women in these areas who are increasingly pressed to intensify their labor input in order to cope with the decrease in available male labor.

Alternatively, those areas receiving farming migrants such as the Southwest with changing social structures and population pressures would be the most likely to explore new techniques for enhancing productivity. The historic l presence of donor projects in the Southwest, due to its favorable production environment, has stimulated the development of numerous local level organizations such as farmers cooperatives, cereal banks, credit unions, etc. The existence of such local village organizations predisposes the area to the successful execution of the RSP methodology of on-farm collaborative research interventions.

The results of the analysis showed that the project does not appear to present any serious socio-feasibility issues. The project's institution strengthening component which seeks to develop INERA as a functioning national research institution fits in with the desire of Burkina to bring donor supported agricultural research under national control, and to gradually replace the existing expatriate staff by Burkinabe.

C. Technical Analysis

Burkina Faso has natural resources which remain underexploited and which hold out the possibility of Burkina attaining and sustaining food self-sufficiency and generating exportable surpluses. Developing these resources has been -and continues to be- the long term objective of the Burkina Government.

The Design team concluded that the RSP research methodology provides a viable approach to agricultural development given the organizational and socio-economic context of the country. With its emphasis on village level multidisciplinary research and

client oriented approach to production constraints identification, the RSP research methodology is well adapted to the conditions of Burkina's low-resource farmers. This view is shared by the World Bank and other international agricultural research organizations working in Burkina.

The presence in Burkina of long-term resident research programs run by ICRISAT, IITA/SAFGRAD, CIRAD/IRAT and FAO has resulted in the development of a rather enviable inventory (from the point of view of some neighboring countries) of research results already well along in the testing cycle (note Annex II.B. Technical Analysis). These technologies, together with those provided by research networks will form the raw materials which the RSP program will attempt to refine and combine to increase adoption by farmers. Regional networks currently based in Burkina include ICRISAT/SAFGRAD's West African Sorghum Research Network, IITA/SAFGRAD's Regional Maize and Cowpea networks, and OAU/STRC/SAFGRAD's West African Farming Systems Research Network (WAFSRN).

Purdue University's Farming Systems Unit (FSU) under SAFGRAD developed, during its eight years in Burkina (1978-86), successful methodologies and a cadre of well-trained technicians. It also made technical recommendations that remain valid today. However, the fact that FSU, being part of a regional project, was not integrated within INERA mitigated against acceptance of its results. Nonetheless, many of the methodological and technical lessons learned by FSU/SAFGRAD (plus trained technicians) have, in fact, been passed on to INERA's incipient national RSP research program. The national RSP program envisioned under the ARTS project will take full advantage of these resources together with important lessons learned.

The Government is well aware of the importance of strengthening linkages between the national programs of agricultural education and research and extension, particularly at the grass roots level. Functional linkages, although limited due to lack of funds, already exist between INERA and Agricultural Education as well as Extension. Fourth and fifth year agriculture students at the University of Ouagadougou (IDR) regularly participate, under the direction of experienced INERA researchers, in joint practical research projects in the field required for the students degree programs . Regular training by INERA researchers of Extension staff is an ongoing responsibility of INERA's RSP Program in addition to joint planning and implementation of field demonstrations and informal but regular contacts between researchers and extension workers.

As a direct result of past adaptive research activities in Burkina, the government has designated the RSP Program of INERA as the research program of first priority. As such it has primary responsibility for the identification of agricultural production constraints at the farmer level which provides the direction of research priorities for all national commodity research programs. In addition, RSP personnel are responsible for organizing and carrying out the regular in country training programs and workshops for extension service personnel of the CRPA's.

The design team concluded that improving INERA's RSP adaptive research program will effectively strengthen education-research-extension linkages in Burkina and greatly improve the future effectiveness and sustainability of the total national research program. This will translate into better performance of the technology generation and transfer system, and result in more appropriate technologies being developed and transfered to the extension services and disseminated to the farmer, and finally, higher rates of adoption of technologies by farmers. This will bring about higher production, productivity, and income for the adopting farmers and the agricultural sector as a whole.

The ARTS Project provides Burkina with the key elements necessary for the perpetual and autonomous translation of demonstrated technical agricultural production potential into increased productivity and economic growth.

The ARTS project focuses on improving the particular area which is consistently recognized as the weak link in the technology development-adoption continuum in most countries of sub-Saharan Africa: i.e., the research-extension connection. The World Bank is in the process of designing a National Agricultural Support Services (Extension) Project (NASSP) which is intended to parallel the National Agriculture Research Project, in an equally large context, from the side of extension. To the extent that the NASSP is successful in strengthening the extension system, the results of the ARTS project will be even more effectively utilized.

D. Economic Analysis.

Link to Economic Growth. The recent Economic Growth Assessment completed by a team of both private consultants and AID/W staff concluded that Economic Growth in Burkina Faso is clearly linked to the productivity of the agricultural sector. Primary production of crops, livestock, fisheries and forest products accounts for just under one-half of GDP. Nearly 80 percent of the roughly 8,000,000 Burkinabe derive their livings from employment in agricultural production. Approximately 600,000 family farms are the characteristic economic unit.

The assessment lays out several options which donors might follow for increasing economic growth in Burkina Faso. One of these is the strengthening of public organizations to do their job more efficiently. This approach implies AID working with institutions which are presently public sector entities but in which there are, at the organizational level, some prospects for good management and a commitment to having the institution playing a growth-promoting rather than a growth constraining role.

The World Bank has adopted this option in shaping its whole IDA assistance program in Burkina - with major projects focussing on agricultural research, extension, and natural resource management. Parallel or co-financing with the World Bank, therefore, is both an effective and efficient way for AID to pursue this option. The Agricultural Research Training and Support project does just this, focussing AID's efforts on the

development of one part of the national agricultural research system, that tasked with production systems research.

Improved efficiency in use of research resources through improved coordination of donor and GOB efforts, as well as through improvements in research-extension linkages, will be a tangible benefit of the project. Other benefits such as the increased productivity, through training programs of human resources, and the resultant increased output of INERA as an institution, are real and important, though very difficult to quantify economically.

The design team identified several reasons why farm-level yields have not appreciably increased in Burkina, mostly related to adaptation problems of improved production technologies and varieties to local conditions and the inability of farmers to change their management practices due to labor or capital constraints. It is only recently that researchers have begun taking farm-level constraints, particularly labor and capital, into account when recommending changes to long-established cropping systems. Production Systems Research addresses directly these sorts of questions.

Based on past research of regional programs and research networks RSP teams will be confronted with a wide variety of potentially profitable lines of inquiry. Taking full advantage of indigenous perceptions of the most critical problems faced by both farmers, researchers and extension personnel, in the development of a national RSP research capability represents a profitable and economic approach to exploiting the best of both worlds.

Microeconomic Case Studies. Two indicative break-even analyses were carried out in an effort to provide tangible evidence of potential economic benefit resulting from the project. The method used was to compare the projected cost stream for the project over 20 years with the projected benefit stream over the same period, observing the number of years until cumulative discounted net benefits were positive. The discount rate, or opportunity cost of capital in Burkina, was estimated at 12 percent.

A. Tied Ridging on the Mossi Plateau. Results of the analysis showed that potential production increases of sorghum and millet resulting form the use of a single technology, tied ridging, based on projected conservative yield increases of 40 percent, and an adoption rate of two percent by year 5 and one percent per year thereafter would pay for the ARTS project in fourteen years after its inception, and provide an IRR of 8.7 percent. Only when the most negative assumptions for all three major variables were combined, did the benefit stream reduce to the point that it did not provide a positive IRR. The most optimistic assumptions produced a 16.5 percent IRR, and scenarios which seem likely produced IRRs ranging from 4 to 12 percent.

B. Cotton-Maize Production System of the Southwest. A second set of analyses was done to estimate the flow of benefits which might be derived from improvements in the cotton-maize production system in the Southwest. Sorghum production increases were estimated

based on a technology successfully introduced in neighboring southern Mali whereby cereals grown in the second year of the cotton-cereal rotation benefit from residual fertilizer placed on the cotton field the previous year. Again only when the most negative assumptions for all three major variables were combined did the project fail to provide an acceptable rate of return. The most positive assumptions produced a 24 percent rate of return, and scenarios which seem likely produced 10 to 19 percent IRRs.

These cases serve as legitimate examples of the magnitude of economic gains which are possible from agricultural research, even when rather conservative assumptions are made regarding adoption rates.

The design team concluded that the best hope for an economic payoff from an agricultural research project is through a long-term commitment on the part of donors and host countries alike to sustain an efficiently coordinated and well-planned national research program around which the national agricultural research system is consciously and consistently strengthened.

E. Financial Analysis.

As the activities proposed for financing under the project are not in themselves revenue producing, the financial analysis will not attempt to justify the project's financial soundness in the traditional sense. This section covers the basis for the development of the project budget, the allocation of costs between the AID Grant and the GOB Counterpart, the projected expenditures by year during the life of the project and the recurring costs to the GOB of the project.

Budget Analysis. The total estimated cost of the project is $7.34 million ($4.85 million AID Grant, $0.68 million GOB direct and $1.81 million GOB counterpart budgetary support). The overall project financial plan is presented in Table 4-1 and shows, by component, the AID Grant and GOB direct and counterpart costs.

Most of the GOB budgetary support for the project consists of counterpart fund operational support to the two field teams (Kamboinse and Farako-Ba) together with some in-kind contributions, principally salaries of personnel already on the government payroll. Minimal budgetary increases will have to be undertaken in the following areas: (1) Personnel (four additional researchers at INERA and promotions or increased salaries of employees returning with Master's or Doctoral degrees); (2) Logistics Support (primarily any additional general maintenance support expenses not forseen by the project).

Annex II.B. Financial Analysis, presents the detailed budgets for Grant, direct in-kind and counterpart funded activities. The figures therein show the estimated costs within each project component and how these costs were developed.

Allocation of Costs and Projected Expenditures by Year. The Grant will finance 66% of the total project costs, the GOB direct in-kind 9% and counterpart 25%. The major grant funded

activities are: Research Management Support, $3,304,000 (68%); Human Resources Development, $978,000 (20%); Research Activity Support, $332,000 (7%). The remaining $233,000 (5%) will pay for periodic evaluations and audits throughout the life of project. Of the total GOB contribution, direct in-kind costs will be: personnel, $427,000 (17%); maintenance support, $252,000 (10%); and commodities & equipment $6,000 (0.3%) while GOB counterpart costs will be: personnel 635,000 (35%); per diems $182,000 (10%); supplies & analyses $286,000 (16%); research cooperation $248,000 (14%); logistical support (primarily vehicle fuel, oil and maintenance) $300,000 (17%); and misc. other (including allowances, field demonstration support, international conferences, rent/utilities, office equipment servicing, printing/reproduction, communications etc.) $158,000 (9%). Projected disbursements by component by year over the five-year LOP period are shown in Table 4-2.

F. Environmental Analysis.

The Regional Environmental Officer, REDSO/WCA, has granted a categorical exclusion for the research, research-extension linkages, technical assistance, and training components of this project relative to the environmental threshold decision and a negative determination for the acquisition of commodities other than pesticides, the provision of funds for operational support of the technical assistance team and for project evaluation and audit. (note standard attachment F.)

TABLE 4-1
PROJECT FINANCIAL PLAN
($000's)

COMPONENT/ACTIVITY	AID GRANT	GOB DIRECT	GOB COUNTERPART	TOTAL
A. Research Management Support	3304	427	-	3731
1. Technical Assistance	2603	-	-	2603
2. Research Personnel	-	427	-	427
3. Operational Support Headquarters	512	-	-	512
4. Commodities & Equipement	189	-	-	189
B. Human Resources Development	978	-	-	978
1. Long Term Training	585	-	-	585
2. Short Term Training	150	-	-	150
3. In-Country Training	243	-	-	243
C. Research Activity Support	332	258	1809	2399
a) Kamboinse Field Team				
1. Personnel	-	-	315	315
2. Maintenance Support	-	126	-	126
3. Commodities & Equipement	166	3	-	169
4. Per Diems	-	-	91	91
5. Supplies & Analyses	-	-	143	143
6. Research Cooperation	-	-	124	124
7. Logistical Support	-	-	150	150
8. Other	-	-	79	79
b) Farako-Ba Field Team				
1. Personnel	-	-	320	320
2. Maintenance Support	-	126	-	126
3. Commodities & Equipement	166	3	-	169
4. Per Diems	-	-	91	91
5. Supplies & Analyses	-	-	143	143
6. Research Cooperation	-	-	124	124
7. Logistical Support	-	-	150	150
8. Other	-	-	79	79
D. Evaluation & Audit	233	-	-	233
TOTALS	4847	685	1809	7341

TABLE 4-2
PROJECTED EXPENDITURES BY YEAR
($000's)

COMPONENT	Year No.1 AID	Year No.1 GOB direct	Year No.1 GOB counterpart	Year No.2 AID	Year No.2 GOB direct	Year No.2 GOB counterpart
A. Research Management Support	266	85	-	523	85	-
B. Human Resources Development	144	-	-	331	-	-
C. Research Activity Support	249	52	185	42	52	405
D. Evaluation & Audit	-	-	-	20	-	-
TOTALS	659	137	185	916	137	405

COMPONENT	Year No.3			Year No.4		
A. Research Management Support	983	85	-	994	85	-
B. Human Resources Development	284	-	-	111	-	-
C. Research Activity Support	21	52	405	11	52	405
D. Evaluation & Audit	60	-	-	135	-	-
TOTALS	1348	137	405	1250	137	405

COMPONENT	Year No.5		
A. Research Management Support	537	85	-
B. Human Resources Development	107	-	-
C. Research Activity Support	11	52	409
D. Evaluation & Audit	20	-	-
TOTALS	675	137	409
GRAND TOTALS	4847	685	1809

PART V. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION.

A Project Management and Coordination.

The GOB will be the project Grantee. The host government implementing agency is INERA. Within INERA, the RSP program chief will exercise project management functions. The project resources are a contract for institutional development assistance which provides technical assistance and training. The contractor will provide assistance in accordance with annual workplans approved by INERA and USAID Ouaga. The other project resource is RSP program financing using a combination of project funded program financing and PL 480 local currency generations. Program financing will be linked to a review of RSP annual workplans and budgets and USAID's acceptance of an Annual RSP Financing Request. The roles and responsibilities for implementing the project are more fully described below.

1. INERA. The Institute National d'Etudes et de Recherche Agricoles (INERA) under the Centre National de Recherche Scientifique et Technologique (CNRST) in the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research (MESRS) has the mandate to carry out agricultural research within the general guidance of the policies of the Government of Burkina (GOB).

INERA is responsible for planning and carrying out the RSP program. INERA will establish and strengthen two RSP teams to implement a program of adaptive research. The regions limit will be based on agroecological criteria. The two zones funded in this phase of the project as defined in the technical analysis, will be staffed and managed by INERA according to the project objectives over the life of the project. INERA will also be responsible for establishing stronger linkages between the the RSP program and the national extension service and other adaptive research and farm level experimentation activities carried out by other ministries, especially the Minister of Agriculture and Livestock. For this purpose, INERA will plan and undertake a training program for the extension specialists of the local Regional Centers for Agro-Pastoral Production (CRPAs). It will also upgrade the skills of the Research and Development Units in the CRPAs which are responsible for liaison with research.

RSP has been defined as a horizontal program supporting commodity/crop oriented programs. As such, the RSP program and its integration with the vertical commodity research programs is crucial to the results of the whole research program of INERA. It is seen as a complement, not a substitute, to national or regional commodity research programs. The RSP program incorporates, but is not limited to the following steps:

(I) A series of socioeconomic and farm management surveys to assess farmer problems and constraints to achieving production increase goals.

(II) Farm level tests of research station trials in different agroecological zones.

(III) Pre-extension trials of promising technologies under researchers supervision.

(IV) Economic, technical and related analyses of those trials proven adequate.

(V) Extension of those technologies proven viable to a broadend group of farmers.

The RSP program will be managed by its headquarter based at Kamboinse. The RSP Program Director and his staff will have the lead responsibility of coordinating and monitoring the field teams' activity. The headquarters will manage the administrative tasks, supervise the relation with the other programs and coordinate the research data and results of the different field teams. For these purposes, RSP headquarters will participate in the normal meetings of the technical research committee of INERA. The RSP Program Director will be the national counterpart of the TA team leader. The RSP Program Director in conjunction with the technical assistance team leader will be responsible for preparing RSP multi-year and annual research plans and budgets, and will be responsible for managing the GOB resources (including PL 480 and other local currency program financing) allocated to the program. The administration of these funds will follow the INERA financial accounting system being established with World Bank assistance. The TA Team Leader is expected to work with the RSP Program Director and INERA administration to establish procedures and mechanisms to allocate financial resources to various program elements (stations, headquarters, regional teams etc.) and monitor expenditures.

2. U.S. University Contract Team. An AID-financed technical assistance team will be provided through a contract with a title XII US Land Grant University. USAID/Burkina, through competitive bidding, will recruit a three-member team from a US University and locally hired administrative staff as required to assist INERA in carrying out the tasks prescribed in the project.

The contractor will be responsible for providing institution building assistance to INERA's adaptive research program. Services to be provided by the contractor include long and short term technical assistance, and a wide variety of training services (long-term training, short-term non-degree training within the region and the U.S.). The contractor will be responsible for assisting the RSP program manager develop a multi-year program development plan and provide services to the program as defined in annual workplans prepared by the INERA Director and the contractor and approved by USAID. The contractor is also responsible for preparing annual and semi-annual reports on contract execution.

3. USAID Ouagadougou. USAID will monitor the progress of the project in terms of the orderly provision of project inputs and achieving specified project outputs. USAID will insure that multi-year and annual workplans (one for Institution Building and one for RSP research Program) specify appropriate measurements of output achievements and that planned activities are carried out in accordance with these plans.

B. Project Management Plan.

USAID will play a more active role in monitoring the expected outcomes of the project. It will coordinate with other donors and international research organizations to facilitate the coordination of RSP research activities in Burkina. USAID will be actively maintain relationships with Burkina policy-makers to facilitate making the intended improvements in national research policies. USAID will facilitate efforts of both the ARTS project and the SAFGRAD II to strengthen the relationships between regional ARC's and the national research institution. In exercising these responsibilities, USAID will be assisted by the planned annual project review using an outside consultant.

During the initial year of the project, USAID will be responsible for preparing various documentation leading to the procurement of an institution building contractor, assisting INERA and the RSP program manager work out satisfactory implementation and management arrangements and initial some urgently needed training programs.

USAID will approve annual workplans prepared by INERA and the Title XII contractor and the annual funding request for RSP research program financing. USAID will approve payment vouchers for the contractor and may agree to procure limited commodities and supplies for the project's use. USAID will periodically review the project's financial management arrangements and provide 121(d) certification and an audit as needed. USAID is also responsible for planning and fielding the final project evaluation team in conjunction with the institution building contractor and organizing the conduct of the evaluation with INERA and other donors.

C. Project Implementation Schedule.

The anticipated sequence by quarter of major events in the implementation of this project is as follows:

	FY88				FY89				FY90				FY91				FY92			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
A. Implementation Actions Summary.																				
1. Grant Agreement signed.		X																		
2. Meeting of Conditions Precedent.		X																		
3. Issue RFP.		X																		
4. Select Contractor.						X														
5. Contractor Mobilized							X													
6. Additional INERA Researchers Identified.							X													
6. Annual Research Plans.							X				X				X				X	
7. Equip/Comm Procurement Plan.							X													
8. In-Country Training Plan.									X											
8. USAID Quart. Project Reviews.					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
9. Evaluations.							X				X				X				X	

	FY88	FY89	FY90	FY91	FY92
	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4
B. Human Resource Development					
1. Long Term Training.		X	X X X X	X X X X	X X X X
2. In-Country Training.		X	X X X X	X X X X	X X X X
3. International Seminars/ Observation Trips.		(to be arranged)			

D. Monitoring and Evaluation.

I. Introduction. A considerable amount has been written on rural society in Burkina and how the development process can affect rural people. Farm family profiles have been developed, on limited project area bases, by past FSR work in Burkina. Accurate production, income, savings, and consumption data are difficult to obtain. To implement this project effectively, data on these and other topics are essential for project decision-making. Therefore, this project (1) supports the development of a data collection, analysis, monitoring, and evaluation capacity within INERA and (2) includes a preliminary framework (below) for a data collection, monitoring, and evaluation plan.

Users of the Information. The major information users will be the Project Management Committee, INERA Program Management Headquarters, RSP Program personnel, RSP Field Team Researchers, Extension Agents, and Farmers. These groups, working with long and short-term consultants, will develop a comprehensive data collection, monitoring, and evaluation plan for the project during the first year of implementation.

Institutional Locus. One objective of this project is to develop the capacity of INERA to plan and implement project data collection and analysis. The RSP Program agricultural economist and rural sociologist will receive training under the project between years 1 and 3. During this time, it will be the responsibility of the project team leader, working with the RSP Program Director, to oversee data collection and analysis. By the fourth year, with continued short-term technical assistance, the two staff members will begin to plan, implement, and supervise the data collection and analysis for this project.

II. Project Goal, Purpose and Output Questions, Indicators, and Methodologies.

The following questions will be examined during project implementation. Indicators and methods are identified below.

Project Goal. The goal of this project is to increase sustainable agricultural production, productivity and income in the principle and highest potential regions of the country.

-Goal-level questions: Using farm households as the unit of analysis, to what extent is per-hectare yield of Burkina's priority crops increasing in the two agro-climatic zones? To what extent are improved production technologies and practices being used in the two zones? To what extent have marketed quantities of crops and livestock been increased in the two zones?

-Indicators: Per-hectare yield of Burkina's priority crops in the two zones; quantities of crops and livestock marketed.

-Data collection methodology: Examination of administrative records. Data on per-hectare yields are maintained in the Agriculture Ministry's Direction of Studies and Projects (DEP). To the extent that these records are not precise enough, procedures for collecting further more specific information will be developed. INERA RSP Headquarters will be responsible for analyzing these data, preparing annual report, and sending this report to the users identified above.

Project Purpose. The purpose of the project is to strengthen INERA's on-farm research performance in adapting appropriate productivity oriented agricultural technologies and practices.

-Purpose-level questions: To what extent has INERA's on-farm research performance in adapting appropriate productivity oriented agricultural technologies and practices been strengthened as a result of the project.

-Indicators: Number of trained staff; development of and adherence to manpower and research plans; degrees attained by researchers; relevance of research to the farmer's needs; linkages to International Agricultural Research Centers and programs; and turnover rates.

-Data collection methodology: Examination of INERA's RSP Program administrative records and interviews with staff members. Data on purpose-level indicators are not currently a part of administrative records. To gather data on these indicators, one of the long-term consultants will be responsible for supervising this process during the early years of the project until the RSP Program is fully staffed and capable of taking on this work. In the early years this consultant will also be responsible for ensuring that this information is summarized and prepared as an annual report on the institutional development of INERA.

Project Outputs. A multitude of specific project outputs are envisioned to achieve Project objectives. In order to provide an illustrative example of the data collection/monitoring procedure to be followed in the project we will consider one of the outputs here. Additional specific activity outputs and planned means of verification, both qualitative and quantitative, are further detailed in Annex II.F. Monitoring and Evaluation Parameters.

-Output: Increased number of on-farm production oriented research trials and the development of specific agronomic practices suitable for each of the two different agro-climatic zones in which these crops are grown.

-Output-level questions: What specific agronomic practices suitable for increased production of Burkina's priority crops in each of the two different agro-climatic zones have been developed and/or adapted under this project? To what extent have these practices been adopted by farmers in the two zones? What factors facilitate or hinder adoption of these practices in the two zones?

-Indicators: Number/type of specific agronomic practices developed and or adapted by each RSP Field Team annually; percentage of target farmers adopting these practices annually.

-Data collection methodology: Rapid reconnaissance surveys. To gather data on the types of agronomic practices and technological packages developed by each RSP Field Team in the two target zones, the adoption rate by farmers, and factors facilitating or hindering adoption, rapid, low cost, reconnaissance surveys of approximately 50-100 farmers in each zone will be undertaken annually starting in the third or fourth year of the project. Fifty to 100 farmers in each zone who have not adopted these technologies will also be interviewed. These surveys will be undertaken by the RSP Program Headquarters assisted by short-term technical assistants under the project. The results will be provided to the INFRA Headquarters and project planning personnel.

III. Special Studies.

Informal Survey on Village Prosperity. An informal survey will be undertaken annually of three villages in each zone in which the majority of farmers have adopted the new technologies and three villages in which the majority of farmers have not. The purpose will not be to gather precise income data but rather to conduct an informal survey of village prosperity. An anthropologist and a rural sociologist will spend eight weeks in the field gathering data and writing their report. The data gathering techniques will be largely observation and guided interviews. The researchers will examine indicators of village prosperity such as quality of housing and clothing, availability of radios, bicycles, motorbikes and food consumption habits etc.

Special Study of the Extension System. Included in the responsibilities of the INERA/RSP Research Program under the project is regular periodic extension agent training activities. An effective extension system is of singular importance for the project and the planned future World Bank support project to the extension services will be an important addition to Burkina's agricultural development plan and the project. For this reason, special small-scale studies of the effectiveness of the extension systems in each of the target zones will be conducted in the first and third years of the project. Rapid, low cost methods will be used to assess whether the extension service is delivering appropriate, relevant, and timely information and technology to farmers in each of the two zones. Indicators might include number of extension agents in each zone, number of extension agents per X

number of farmers, lag time between availability of technology and dissemination to farmers, type and relevance of information conveyed to farmers, and use of the information by farmers.

IV. Feedback. At first, the long-term, technical assistance consultants will be responsible for preparing an annual report which interprets the results of data analyses in light of the project's purposes and goals. Once the RSP Program is fully staffed and adequately trained, these tasks will fall to staff members. The results of all data analyses will be provided regularly to the INERA/RSP Headquarters project management personnel and USAID so that project modifications can be made in a timely way.

V. Budget. Approximately 5 percent ($233,450) of the $4.8 million USAID Grant funds requested for this project has been set aside for project monitoring and evaluation purposes.

VI. Review and Appraisals.

INERA uses a peer review system to evaluate and plan the activities of the eight national agricultural research programs. This review is done by experienced national and expatriate researchers in each area and is to be repeated on a triennial basis. Three years is an appropriate planning period and research programs should be submitted to review by appropriate members of the research community as well as by administrators. USAID and ARTS project personnel will participate in this triennial review process.

INERA also does several yearly reviews of results and proposed research activities. One review is internal to INERA and focuses on technical aspects of the research programs. A second takes place at the level of each regional research station and includes the participation of those regional extension services (CRPAs) served by each research center. These reviews will provide an appropriate opportunity for USAID and the ARTS project technical assistance personnel to participate in an established review procedure.

VII. Reporting Requirements.

Both RSP and the institutional contractor will provide detailed annual workplans within the context of the multi-year program development plan approved by USAID/Ouaga early in the project. Both will also prepare semi-annual financial and project implementation reports.

VIII. Evaluation.

A. Annual Monitoring/Evaluation Visit.

An experience practitioner of on-farm adaptive research from outside the project and contracting institution will be engaged to visit the project for a month each year. The role of this outside expert is to assess the project from a fresh point of view and

provide advice to the project managers. He/she will assist in monitoring progress towards the achievement of outputs and expected project accomplishments by the implementing agency. Having the same person visit regularly each year maintains continuity and allows the time in country to be used more effectively. It avoids using half of each visit to learn people, places and other background information. It also allows the advisor to recommend changes and help reorient project activities in a friendly and constructive manner, without the negativism which often accompanies mid-term evaluations.

B. Final Evaluation.

An IQC firm will be contracted to provide four consultants for a final evaluation in year 4 of the project. This evaluation will assess progress towards the achievement of the project purpose and propose recommendations for future actions, particularly with regard to continuation into a second phase.

E. Project Procurement Plan.
The following project procurement plan is based on Project Paper approval in the fourth quarter of FY88.

ACTIONS	Responsible agent	Project Month	Planned Date of Action
Draft PIO/T	USAID	1	8/1/88-8/8/88
Draft RFP	USAID	1	8/8/88-8/22/88
Advertise in CBD	USAID	1-2	8/22/88-9/6/ 8
Receipt of Proposals	USAID	2-4	9/6/88-11/3/88
Proposal Reviews & Set Competitive Range	USAID/GOB	-5	11/3/88-12/5/88
Request & Receipt of Revised Proposals	USAID	5-6	12/5/88-1/4/89
Site Visits	USAID/GOB/RCO	6-7	1/4/89-2/4/89
Evaluation of Site Visits	USAID/GOB/RCO	7-8	2/4/89-3/5/89
Memo to REDSO/RCO Re; Contractor selected	USAID/GOB	8	3/5/89
Notify Unsuccessful Offerers.	RCO	8	3/6/89
Request & Receipt of Cost Proposal	RCO	8-9	3/6/89-4/4/89
Evaluate Cost Proposal	RCO	9	4/4/89-4/18/89
Negotiate Cost	RCO	9	4/18/89-4/25/89
Request & Receipt of final Cost Proposal	RCO	9-10	4/25/89-5/9/89
Sign Contract	RCO	10	5/16/89

A high level of U.S. source procurement consistent with AA/AFR Delegation of Authority 551, as revised on January 26, 1988 (STATE 105351/01, AA/AFR approved DFA procurement policy recommendations and Africa bureau instructions dated April 4, 1988), will be saught in the procurement of all technical assistance, equipment and commodities under this project.

F. Conditions Precedent, Covenants and Negotiating Status.

Conditions Precedent to First Disbursements.

1. At present the Director of INERA retains the responsibilities of chief of the Programs Division, and also director of the RSP program. The administrative responsibility for the World Bank umbrella project will undoubtedly absorb most or all of the Directors time. Designating a new RSP director will be necessary to assure proper management of RSP an this project. The naming of a new RSP director will be a condition precedent for the project.

Covenants.

The GOB agrees to assign and integrate returned participants into INERA's National Agricultural Research Program.

The GOB agrees to assign no less than two female participants to the long-term degree training program financed by this project.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING SUPPORT (686-0270)

LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX

NARRATIVE SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	IMPORTANT ASSUMPTIONS
PROJECT GOAL: To increase sustainable agricultural production, productivity and income in the principle and highest potential regions of the country.	MEASURES OF GOAL ACHIEVEMENT: 1. Increased yields per ha. of Burkina's priority crops; 2. Growing use of improved technologies and practices. 3. Improved Food Self-sufficiency. 4. Increased quantities of crops and livestock marketed.	Ag. Survey Data Project Evaluations GOB Production Statistics Extension Service Records Sector Analyses Marketed produce data.	Purpose to Goal Assumptions 1. Complementary efforts by GOB, World Bank and other donors in extension, marketing, rural infrastructure, and input provision take place. 2. Appropriate GOB agricultural policies, regarding land tenure, commodity pricing natural resource conservation and rural organizations are favorable to small farmers. 3. Rainfall does not singificently deviate from current averages. 4. Input/output prices provide production incentives 5. This project represents part of a first phase of a 20-year effort in agricultural research.
PROJECT PURPOSE: To strengthen INERA's on-farm research performance in adapting productivity oriented agricultural technologies and practices.	END OF PROJECT STATUS (EOPS): 1. A functioning national RSP program, staffed by Burkinabe, capable of (a) collecting information, data and feedback from farmers/extension workers about problems and potential improvements in localized production systems; (b) based on this information and feedback, developing or assisting in the development of appropriate technologies, agronomic practices and the relevant organizational linkages.	University Transcripts IT/Advisor Reports Theses/Dissertations Publications Research Results Feedback from Int'l Ag Research Center Staff TA Team Reports. INERA Annual Reports Research Policy Statements Project Evaluations.	

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING SUPPORT (686-0270)

LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX

NARRATIVE SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	IMPORTANT ASSUMPTIONS
	2. An improved human resource base of national scientists able to provide technical and managerial leadership for INERA's research program, capable of raising the technical, sociological and economic quality of research, and able to improve overall program implementation.		6. Process for and committment to bring research results to attention of national policy makers.
	3. Improved national agricultural research policy directing INERA's program which (a) addresses high priority constraints of farming systems and (b) permit relevant results and practices to be disseminated and adopted within shorter timeframes.		Outputs to Purpose Assumptions 1. GOB support for Ag Research remains a high priority as translated in budgetary, infrastructure, and human resource support. 2. GOB maintains long-term commitment to adaptive farm level research.
OUTPUTS: A. Improved production systems research capacity.	MAGNITUDE OF OUTPUTS: A.1 Growth Oriented Annual Research Plans by Program Zones. A.2 Field Work Manuals A.3 INERA Personnel Trained in	A.1 Annual Research Plans A.2 FSR Manuals A.3 INERA Training Records	

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING SUPPORT (686-0270)

LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX

NARRATIVE SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	IMPORTANT ASSUMPTIONS
	A.4 An on-going monitoring and feedback system for multi-local, pre-extensions tests and trials, surveys and observations.		
B. Human Resources Development.	B.1 Masters Degrees being pursued B.2 Doctorates being pursued B.3 INERA personnel receiving OJT B.4 Staff receiving ST training	B.1 AID Training Records B.2 AID Training Records B.3 TA Team Reports B.4 AID/INERA Records	
C. Research Management System.	C.1 Research Program Directives C.2 INERA Management Committee Meetings C.3 Reginnal Technical Meetings	C.1. Policy Documents Project Evaluations C.2 Meeting Proceedings Project Off. Reports C.3 Meeting Proceedings Project Evaluations	Input to Outputs Assumptions 1. French speaking TA Team is able to develop strong working relationships with INERA staff, extension personnel and small farmers. 2. Qualified candidates for LT training available from INERA and other sources. 3. Unanticipated increases in costs for training, TA, commodities and equipment do not exceed contingency set-aside.
PROJECT INPUTS: A. Technical Assistance	48 p/m Farming Systems Specialist/ team leader 24 p/m Training Specialist 24 m/p Agronomist 12 p/m short-term TA Specialist	Contract Deliverables AID/University Contract AID Quarterly Reports TA Team Reports	
B. Training	6 Masters/PhD Scholarships at U.S. Land-grant Universities. INERA staff available for OJT. INERA staff sent for ST training.	AID Training Records	

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING SUPPORT (686-0270)

LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX

NARRATIVE SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	IMPORTANT ASSUMPTIONS
C. Commodities	7 4WD vehicles, 1 sedan, 12 mobylettes, Various Research Equipment, Supplies	AID Receiving Reports	C.P.'s/PRIOR CONDITIONS
D. Field Activities Support (including in-country training)	Support for Field/Annual Meetings Publications/Printing Travel/Per Diem POL	Project Officer Reports TA Team Reports Submitted Vouchers INERA Records	
E. Evaluation/Audit	E.1 5 p/m for annual monitoring/eval E.2 3 p/m for final evaluation. E.3 1 p/m for compliance audit.	Evaluation Documents Audit Document	

4.	FAA Sec. 620(c). If assistance is to a government, is the government liable as debtor or unconditional guarantor on any debt to a U.S. citizen for goods or services furnished or ordered where (a) such citizen has exhausted available legal remedies and (b) the debt is not denied or contested by such government?	No
5.	FAA Sec. 620(e)(1). If assistance is to a government, has it (including any government agencies or subdivisions) taken any action which has the effect of nationalizing, expropriating, or otherwise seizing ownership or control of property of U.S. citizens or entities beneficially owned by them without taking steps to discharge its obligations toward such citizens or entities?	No
6.	FAA Secs. 620(a), 620(f), 620D; FY 1988 Continuing Resolution Sec. 512. Is recipient country a Communist country?	No
	If so, has the President determined that assistance to the country is vital to the security of the United States, that the recipient country is not controlled by the international Communist conspiracy, and that such assistance will further promote the independence of the recipient country from international communism?	N/A
	Will assistance be provided directly to Angola, Cambodia, Cuba, Iraq, Libya, Vietnam, South Yemen, Iran or Syria?	No
	Will assistance be provided to Afghanistan without a certification?	No
7.	FAA Sec. 620(j). Has the country permitted, or failed to take adequate measures to prevent, damage or destruction by mob action of U.S. property?	No
8.	FAA Sec. 620(l). Has the country failed to enter into an investment guaranty agreement with OPIC?	No

61

9. FAA Sec. 620(o); Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 (as amended) Sec. 5. (a) Has the country seized, or imposed any penalty or sanction against, any U.S. fishing vessel because of fishing activities in international waters? No
(b) If so, has any deduction required by the Fishermen's Protective Act been made? N/A

10. FAA Sec. 620(q); FY 1988 Continuing Resolution Sec. 518. (a) Has the government of the recipient country been in default for more than six months on interest or principal of any loan to the country under the FAA? No
(b) Has the country been in default for more than one year on interest or principal on any U.S. loan under a program for which the FY 1988 Continuing Resolution appropriates funds? No

11. FAA Sec. 620(s). If contemplated assistance is development loan or to come from Economic Support Fund, has the Administrator taken into account the percentage of the country's budget and amount of the country's foreign exchange or other resources spent on military equipment? (Reference may be made to the annual "Taking Into Consideration" memo: "Yes, taken into account by the Administrator at time of approval of Agency OYB." This approval by the Administrator of the Operational Year Budget can be the basis for an affirmative answer during the fiscal year unless significant changes in circumstances occur.) N/A

12. FAA Sec. 620(t). Has the country severed diplomatic relations with the United States? No
If so, have relations been resumed and have new bilateral assistance agreements been negotiated and entered into since such resumption? N/A

92

13. FAA Sec. 620(u). What is the payment status of the country's U.N. obligations? If the country is in arrears, were such arrearages taken into account by the A.I.D. Administrator in determining the current A.I.D. Operational Year Budget? (Reference may be made to the Taking into Consideration memo.)	1981 Not in arrears
14. FAA Sec. 620A. Has the President determined that the recipient country grants sanctuary from prosecution to any individual or group which has committed an act of international terrorism or otherwise supports international terrorism?	No
15. FY 1988 Continuing Resolution Sec. 576. Has the country been placed on the list provided for in Section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (currently Libya, Iran, South Yemen, Syria, Cuba, or North Korea)?	No
16. ISDCA of 1985 Sec. 552(b). Has the Secretary of State determined that the country is a high terrorist threat country after the Secretary of Transportation has determined, pursuant to section 1115(e)(2) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, that an airport in the country does not maintain and administer effective security measures?	No
17. FAA Sec. 666(b). Does the country object, on the basis of race, religion, national origin or sex, to the presence of any officer or employee of the U.S. who is present in such country to carry out economic development programs under the FAA?	No
18. FAA Secs. 669, 670. Has the country, after August 3, 1977, delivered to any other country or received nuclear enrichment or reprocessing equipment, materials, or technology, without specified arrangements or safeguards, and without special certification by the President?	No
Has it transferred a nuclear explosive device to a non-nuclear weapon state, or if such a state, either received or detonated a nuclear explosive device? (FAA Sec. 620E permits a special waiver of Sec. 669 for Pakistan.)	No

19. FAA Sec. 670. If the country is a non-nuclear weapon state, has it, on or after August 8, 1985, exported (or attempted to export) illegally from the United States any material, equipment, or technology which would contribute significantly to the ability of a country to manufacture a nuclear explosive device? No

20. ISDCA of 1981 Sec. 720. Was the country represented at the Meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs and Heads of Delegations of the Non-Aligned Countries to the 36th General Assembly of the U.N. on Sept. 25 and 28, 1981, and did it fail to disassociate itself from the communique issued? If so, has the President taken it into account? (Reference may be made to the Taking into Consideration memo.)

21. FY 1988 Continuing Resolution Sec. 528. Has the recipient country been determined by the President to have engaged in a consistent pattern of opposition to the foreign policy of the United States? No

22. FY 1988 Continuing Resolution Sec. 513. Has the duly elected Head of Government of the country been deposed by military coup or decree? No If assistance has been terminated, has the President notified Congress that a democratically elected government has taken office prior to the resumption of assistance? N/A

23. FY 1988 Continuing Resolution Sec. 543. Does the recipient country fully cooperate with the internaticnal refugee assistance organizations, the United States, and other governments in facilitating lasting solutions to refugee situations, including resettlement without respect to race, sex, religion, or national origin? Yes

B. FUNDING SOURCE CRITERIA FOR COUNTRY ELIGIBILITY

1. Development Assistance Country Criteria

FAA Sec. 116. Has the Department of State determined that this government has engaged in a consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights? If so, can it be demonstrated that contemplated assistance will directly benefit the needy? — No / N/A

FY 1988 Continuing Resolution Sec. 538. Has the President certified that use of DA funds by this country would violate any of the prohibitions against use of funds to pay for the performace of abortions as a method of family planning, to motivate or coerce any person to practice abortions, to pay for the performance of involuntary sterilization as a method of family planning, to coerce or provide any financial incentive to any person to undergo sterilizations, to pay for any biomedical research which relates, in whole or in part, to methods of, or the performance of, abortions or involuntary sterilization as a means of family planning? — No

2. Economic Support Fund Country Criteria

FAA Sec. 502B. Has it been determined that the country has engaged in a consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights? If so, has the President found that the country made such significant improvement in its human rights record that furnishing such assistance is in the U.S. national interest? — N/A

FY 1988 Continuing Resolution Sec. 549. Has this country met its drug eradication targets or otherwise taken significant steps to halt illicit drug production or trafficking? — N/A

5C(2) - PROJECT CHECKLIST

Listed below are statutory criteria applicable to projects. This section is divided into two parts. Part A includes criteria applicable to all projects. Part B applies to projects funded from specific sources only: B(1) applies to all projects funded with Development Assistance; B(2) applies to projects funded with Development Assistance loans; and B(3) applies to projects funded from ESF.

CROSS REFERENCES: IS COUNTRY CHECKLIST UP TO DATE? HAS STANDARD ITEM CHECKLIST BEEN REVIEWED FOR THIS PROJECT?

A. GENERAL CRITERIA FOR PROJECT

1. FY 1988 Continuing Resolution Sec. 523; FAA Sec. 634A. If money is sought to obligated for an activity not previously justified to Congress, or for an amount in excess of amount previously justified to Congress, has Congress been properly notified? — YES

2. FAA Sec. 611(a)(1). Prior to an obligation in excess of $500,000, will there be (a) engineering, financial or other plans necessary to carry out the assistance, and (b) a reasonably firm estimate of the cost to the U.S. of the assistance? — Yes

3. FAA Sec. 611(a)(2). If legislative action is required within recipient country, what is the basis for a reasonable expectation that such action will be completed in time to permit orderly accomplishment of the purpose of the assistance? — N/A

4.	FAA Sec. 611(b); FY 1988 Continuing Resolution Sec. 501. If project is for water or water-related land resource construction, have benefits and costs been computed to the extent practicable in accordance with the principles, standards, and procedures established pursuant to the Water Resources Planning Act (42 U.S.C. 1962, et seq.)? (See A.I.D. Handbook 3 for guidelines.)	N/A
5.	FAA Sec. 611(e). If project is capital assistance (e.g., construction), and total U.S. assistance for it will exceed $1 million, has Mission Director certified and Regional Assistant Administrator taken into consideration the country's capability to maintain and utilize the project effectively?	N/A
6.	FAA Sec. 209. Is project susceptible to execution as part of regional or multilateral project? If so, why is project not so executed? Information and conclusion whether assistance will encourage regional development programs.	No N/A
7.	FAA Sec. 601(a). Information and conclusions on whether projects will encourage efforts of the country to: (a) increase the flow of international trade; (b) foster private initiative and competition; (c) encourage development and use of cooperatives, credit unions, and savings and loan associations; (d) discourage monopolistic practices; (e) improve technical efficiency of industry, agriculture and commerce; and (f) strengthen free labor unions.	Project wil improve technical efficiency c farmers in Burkina Fas
8.	FAA Sec. 601(b). Information and conclusions on how project will encourage U.S. private trade and investment abroad and encourage private U.S. participation in foreign assistance programs (including use of private trade channels and the services of U.S. private enterprise).	N/A
9.	FAA Secs. 612(b), 636(h). Describe steps taken to assure that, to the maximum extent possible, the country is contributing local currencies to meet the cost of contractual and other services, and foreign currencies owned by the U.S. are utilized in lieu of dollars.	Host govern ment is contributin 648,440,000 FCFA

61

10. FAA Sec. 612(d). Does the U.S. own excess foreign currency of the country and, if so, what arrangements have been made for its release? — No

11. FY 1988 Continuing Resolution Sec. 521. If assistance is for the production of any commodity for export, is the commodity likely to be in surplus on world markets at the time the resulting productive capacity becomes operative, and is such assistance likely to cause substantial injury to U.S. producers of the same, similar or competing commodity? — N/A

12. FY 1988 Continuing Resolution Sec. 553. Will the assistance (except for programs in Caribbean Basin Initiative countries under U.S. Tariff Schedule "Section 807," which allows reduced tariffs on articles assembled abroad from U.S.-made components) be used directly to procure feasibility studies, prefeasibility studies, or project profiles of potential investment in, or to assist the establishment of facilities specifically designed for, the manufacture for export to the United States or to third country markets in direct competition with U.S. exports, of textiles, apparel, footwear, handbags, flat goods (such as wallets or coin purses worn on the person), work gloves or leather wearing apparel? — No

13. FAA Sec. 119(g)(4)-(6). Will the assistance (a) support training and education efforts which improve the capacity of recipient countries to prevent loss of biological diversity; — Yes
(b) be provided under a long-term agreement in which the recipient country agrees to protect ecosystems or other wildlife habitats; — No
(c) support efforts to identify and survey ecosystems in recipient countries worthy of protection; — No
or (d) by any direct or indirect means significantly degrade national parks or similar protected areas or introduce exotic plants or animals into such areas? — No

14. FAA 121(d). If a Sahel project, has a determination been made that the host government has an adequate system for accounting for and controlling receipt and expenditure of project funds (either dollars or local currency generated therefrom)? Yes

15. FY 1988 Continuing Resolution. If assistance is to be made to a United States PVO (other than a cooperative development organization), does it obtain at least 20 percent of its total annual funding for international activities from sources other than the United States Government? N/A

16. FY Continuing Resolution Sec. 541. If assistance is being made available to a PVO, has that organization provided upon timely request any document, file, or record necessary to the auditing requirements of A.I.D., and is the PVO registered with A.I.D.? N/A

17. FY 1988 Continuing Resolution Sec. 514. If funds are being obligated under an appropriation account to which they were not appropriated, has prior approval of the Appropriations Committees of Congress been obtained? N/A

18. FY Continuing Resolution Sec. 515. If deob/reob authority is sought to be exercised in the provision of assistance, are the funds being obligated for the same general purpose, and for countries within the same general region as originally obligated, and have the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress been properly notified? N/A

19. State Authorization Sec. 139 (as interpreted by conference report). Has confirmation of the date of signing of the project agreement, including the amount involved, been cabled to State L/T and A.I.D. LEG within 60 days of the agreement's entry into force with respect to the United States, and has the full text of the agreement been pouched to those same offices? (See Handbook 3, Appendix 6G for agreements covered by this provision). N/A

B. FUNDING CRITERIA FOR PROJECT

1. Development Assistance Project Criteria

a. FY 1988 Continuing Resolution Sec. 552 (as interpreted by conference report). If assistance is for agricultural development activities (specifically, any testing or breeding feasibility study, variety improvement or introduction, consultancy, publication, conference, or training), are such activities (a) specifically and principally designed to increase agricultural exports by the host country to a country other than the United States, where the export would lead to direct competition in that third country with exports of a similar commodity grown or produced in the United States, and can the activities reasonably be expected to cause substantial injury to U.S. exporters of a similar agricultural commodity; or (b) in support of research that is intended primarily to benefit U.S. producers?

No

No

b. FAA Secs. 102(b), 111, 113, 281(a). Describe extent to which activity will (a) effectively involve the poor in development by extending access to economy at local level, increasing labor-intensive production and the use of appropriate technology, dispersing investment from cities to small towns and rural areas, and

(a) Project is designed to assist small farmers to us appropriate technologies.

insuring wide participation of the poor in the benefits of development on a sustained basis, using appropriate U.S. institutions; (b) help develop cooperatives, especially by technical assistance, to assist rural and urban poor to help themselves toward a better life, and otherwise encourage democratic private and local governmental institutions; (c) support the self-help efforts of developing countries; (d) promote the participation of women in the national economies of developing countries and the improvement of women's status; and (e) utilize and encourage regional cooperation by developing countries.

(b) project will encourage rural farmers to organize & cooperate in research efforts.
(c) through educational efforts of Project.
(d) project will promote the role of women in agricultural research and training.
(e) project will encourage regional research efforts.

c. FAA Secs. 103, 103A, 104, 105, 106, 120-21. Does the project fit the criteria for the source of funds (functional account) being used?

Yes. Development Fund for Africa funds

d. FAA Sec. 107. Is emphasis placed on use of appropriate technology (relatively smaller, cost-saving, labor-using technologies that are generally most appropriate for the small farms, small businesses, and small incomes of the poor)?

Yes, a primary go. of project is to make available appropriate technologies to farmers.

e. FAA Secs. 110, 124(d). Will the recipient country provide at least 25 percent of the costs of the program, project, or activity with respect to which the assistance is to be furnished (or is the latter cost-sharing requirement being waived for a "relatively least developed" country)?

N/A

f. FAA Sec. 128(b). If the activity attempts to increase the institutional capabilities of private organizations or the government of the country, or if it attempts to stimulate scientific and technological research, has it been designed and will it be monitored to ensure that the ultimate beneficiaries are the poor majority?

Yes

g.	FAA Sec. 281(b). Describe extent to which program recognizes the particular needs, desires, and capacities of the people of the country; utilizes the country's intellectual resources to encourage institutional development; and supports civil education and training in skills required for effective participation in governmental processes essential to self-government.	Project has extensive trainin component both U. degree training & In-country training.
h.	FY 1988 Continuing Resolution Sec. 538. Are any of the funds to be used for the performance of abortions as a method of family planning or to motivate or coerce any person to practice abortions?	No
	Are any of the funds to be used to pay for the performance of involuntary sterilization as a method of family planning or to coerce or provide any financial incentive to any person to undergo sterilizations?	No
	Are any of the funds to be used to pay for any biomedical research which relates, in whole or in part, to methods of, or the performance of, abortions or involuntary sterilization as a means of family planning?	No
i.	FY 1988 Continuing Resolution. Is the assistance being made available to any organization or program which has been determined to support or participate in the management of a program of coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization?	No
	If assistance is from the population functional account, are any of the funds to be made available to voluntary family planning projects which do not offer, either directly or through referral to or information about access to, a broad range of family planning methods and services?	N/A

j.	FAA Sec. 601(e). Will the project utilize competitive selection procedures for the awarding of contracts, except where applicable procurement rules allow otherwise?	Yes
k.	FY 1988 Continuing Resolution. What portion of the funds will be available only for activities of economically and socially disadvantaged enterprises, historically black colleges and universities, colleges and universities having a student body in which more than 20 percent of the students are Hispanic Americans, and private and voluntary organizations which are controlled by individuals who are black Americans, Hispanic Americans, or Native Americans, or who are economically or socially disadvantaged (including women)?	Note; ANNEX I.G.
l.	FAA Sec. 118(c). Does the assistance comply with the environmental procedures set forth in A.I.D. Regulation 16?	Yes
	Does the assistance place a high priority on conservation and sustainable management of tropical forests?	Yes
	Specifically, does the assistance, to the fullest extent feasible: (a) stress the importance of conserving and sustainably managing forest resources;	Yes
	(b) support activities which offer employment and income alternatives to those who otherwise would cause destruction and loss of forests, and help countries identify and implement alternatives to colonizing forested areas;	Yes
	(c) support training programs, educational efforts, and the establishment or strengthening of institutions to improve forest management;	Yes
	(d) help end destructive slash-and-burn agriculture by supporting stable and productive farming practices;	Yes
	(e) help conserve forests which have not yet been degraded by helping to increase production on lands already cleared	Yes

or degraded; (f) conserve forested watersheds and rehabilitate those which have been deforested;	Yes
(g) support training, research, and other actions which lead to sustainable and more environmentally sound practices for timber harvesting, removal, and processing;	Yes
(h) support research to expand knowledge of tropical forests and identify alternatives which will prevent forest destruction, loss, or degradation;	Yes
(i) conserve biological diversity in forest areas by supporting efforts to identify, establish, and maintain a representative network of protected tropical forest ecosystems on a worldwide basis, by making the establishment of protected areas a condition of support for activities involving forest clearance or degradation, and by helping to identify tropical forest ecosystems and species in need of protection and establish and maintain appropriate protected areas;	Yes
(j) seek to increase the awareness of U.S. government agencies and other donors of the immediate and long-term value of tropical forests;	Yes
and (k)/utilize the resources and abilities of all relevant U.S. government agencies?	Yes
m. <u>FAA Sec. 118(c)(13)</u>. If the assistance will support a program or project significantly affecting tropical forests (including projects involving the planting of exotic plant species), will the program or project (a) be based upon careful analysis of the alternatives available to achieve the best sustainable use of the land, and (b)/take full account of the environmental impacts of the proposed activities on biological diversity?	N/A

n. FAA Sec. 118(c)(14). Will assistance be used for (a) the procurement or use of logging equipment, unless an environmental assessment indicates that all timber harvesting operations involved will be conducted in an environmentally sound manner and that the proposed activity will produce positive economic benefits and sustainable forest management systems; or (b) actions which will significantly degrade national parks or similar protected areas which contain tropical forests, or introduce exotic plants or animals into such areas?

No

No

o. FAA Sec. 118(c)(15). Will assistance be used for (a) activities which would result in the conversion of forest lands to the rearing of livestock; (b) the construction, upgrading, or maintenance of roads (including temporary haul roads for logging or other extractive industries) which pass through relatively undegraded forest lands; (c) the colonization of forest lands; or (d) the construction of dams or other water control structures which flood relatively undegraded forest lands, unless with respect to each such activity an environmental assessment indicates that the activity will contribute significantly and directly to improving the livelihood of the rural poor and will be conducted in an environmentally sound manner which supports sustainable development?

No

No

No

No

p. FY 1988 Continuing Resolution If assistance will come from the Sub-Saharan Africa DA account, is it (a) to be used to help the poor majority in Sub-Saharan Africa through a process of long-term development and economic growth that is equitable, participatory, environmentally sustainable, and self-reliant; (b) being provided in

Beneficiaries are small farmers using improved technologies.

PROJECT AUTHORIZATION

Country: Burkina Faso

Project Name: Agricultural Research and Training Project

Project Number:

1. Pursuant to Section 121 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, I hereby authorize the Agricultural Research and Training Project for Burkina Faso, involving planned obligations of not to exceed $4,850,000 in grant funds over a five-year period from date of authorization, subject to the availability of funds in accordance with the A.I.D. OYB/allotment process, to help in financing foreign exchange and local currency costs for the project. Except as A.I.D. may otherwise agree in writing, the planned life of the project is five years from the date of initial obligation.

2. The project will improve the performance of the adaptive research program of INERA (Institut National des Etudes et Recherche Agricole), the national agricultural research institute, in developing farmer-oriented technologies and practices leading to improved farming systems.

3. The Project Agreement which may be negotiated and executed by the officers to whom such authority is delegated in accordance with A.I.D. regulations and Delegations of Authority, shall be subject to the following essential terms and covenants and major conditions, together with such other terms and conditions as A.I.D. may deem appropriate:

a. Source and Origin of Commodities, Nationality of Services.

Except as A.I.D. may otherwise agree in writing:

(1) Commodities financed by A.I.D. under the project shall have their source and, except for motor vehicles, their origin in the Cooperating Country or in countries included in A.I.D. Geographic Code 941.

(2) Motor vehicles financed by A.I.D. under the project shall have their origin in the United States.

(3) The suppliers of commodities or services financed by A.I.D. under the project shall have the Cooperating Country or countries included in A.I.D. Geographic Code 941 as their place of nationality.

b. Conditions Precedent

(1) Prior to any disbursement, or the issuance of any commitment documents under the Project Agreement, the Grantee shall, except as the parties may otherwise agree in writing, furnish to A.I.D., in form and substance satisfactory to A.I.D.:

(a) A statement of the names and titles of the persons who will act as the representatives of the Grantee, together with a specimen signature of each person specified in such statement;

(b) Appoint and furnish to USAID/Ouagadougou the name of an individual Director of the RSP Program at INERA who has the sole responsibility for RSP Program direction.

c. Covenants

(1) The Grantee shall covenant that it will assign and integrate returned participants into INERA's National Agricultural Research Program.

(2) The Grantee shall covenant that it will assign no less than two female participants to the long-term degree training program financed by this project.

Date: _____

_____
Herbert N. Miller
Mission Director

OPR: IKoussoube
OAG: DMcCarthy
RLA: AVance draft

61

accordance with the policies contained in section 102 of the FAA;	Yes
(c) being provided, when conistent with the objectives of such assistance, through African, United States and other PVOs that have demonstrated effectiveness in the promotion of local grassroots activities on behalf of long-term development in Sub-Saharan Africa;	The project is being implemented by GB agencies.
(d) being used to help overcome shorter-term constraints to long-term development, to promote reform of sectoral economic policies, to support the critical sector priorities of agricultural production and natural resources, health, voluntary family planning services, education, and income generating opportunities, to bring about appropriate sectoral restructuring of the Sub-Saharan African economies, to support reform in public administration and finances and to establish a favorable environment for individual enterprise and self-sustaining development, and to take into account, in assisted policy reforms, the need to protect vulnerable groups;	Yes
(e) being used to increase agricultural production in ways that protect and restore the natural resource base, especially food production, to maintain and improve basic transportation and communication networks, to maintain and restore the natural resource base in ways that increase agricultural production, to improve health conditions with special emphasis on meeting the health needs of mothers and children, including the establishment of self-sustaining primary health care systems that give priority to preventive care, to provide increased access to voluntary family planning services, to improve basic literacy and mathematics especially to those outside the formal educational system and to improve primary education, and to develop income-generating opportunities for the unemployed and underemployed in urban and rural areas?	Yes

65

2. Development Assistance Project Criteria (Loans Only)

a.	FAA Sec. 122(b). Information and conclusion on capacity of the country to repay the loan at a reasonable rate of interest.	N/A
b.	FAA Sec. 620(d). If assistance is for any productive enterprise which will compete with U.S. enterprises, is there an agreement by the recipient country to prevent export to the U.S. of more than 20 percent of the enterprise's annual production during the life of the loan, or has the requirement to enter into such an agreement been waived by the President because of a national security interest?	N/A
c.	FY 1988 Continuing Resolution. If for a loan to a private sector institution from funds made available to carry out the provisions of FAA Sections 103 through 106, will loan be provided, to the maximum extent practicable, at or near the prevailing interest rate paid on Treasury obligations of similar maturity at the time of obligating such funds?	N/A
d.	FAA Sec. 122(b). Does the activity give reasonable promise of assisting long-range plans and programs designed to develop economic resources and increase productive capacities?	N/A

3. Economic Support Fund Project Criteria

a. FAA Sec. 531(a). Will this assistance promote economic and political stability? To the maximum extent feasible, is this assistance consistent with the policy directions, purposes, and programs of Part I of the FAA?	N/A
b. FAA Sec. 531(e). Will this assistance be used for military or paramilitary purposes?	N/A
c. FAA Sec. 609. If commodities are to be granted so that sale proceeds will accrue to the recipient country, have Special Account (counterpart) arrangements been made?	N/A

5C(3) - STANDARD ITEM CHECKLIST

Listed below are the statutory items which normally will be covered routinely in those provisions of an assistance agreement dealing with its implementation, or covered in the agreement by imposing limits on certain uses of funds.

These items are arranged under the general headings of (A) Procurement, (B) Construction, and (C) Other Restrictions.

A. PROCUREMENT

1.	FAA Sec. 602(a). Are there arrangements to permit U.S. small business to participate equitably in the furnishing of commodities and services financed?	Note; Annex I.G.
2.	FAA Sec. 604(a). Will all procurement be from the U.S. except as otherwise determined by the President or under delegation from him?	Procurement will be from countries in A.I.D. Geographi Code 941.
3.	FAA Sec. 604(d). If the cooperating country discriminates against marine insurance companies authorized to do business in the U.S., will commodities be insured in the United States against marine risk with such a company?	N/A
4.	FAA Sec. 604(e); ISDCA of 1980 Sec. 705(a). If non-U.S. procurement of agricultural commodity or product thereof is to be financed, is there provision against such procurement when the domestic price of such commodity is less than parity? (Exception where commodity financed could not reasonably be procured in U.S.)	N/A
5.	FAA Sec. 604(g). Will construction or engineering services be procured from firms of advanced developing countries which are otherwise eligible under Code 941 and which have attained a competitive capability in international markets in one of these areas? (Exception for those	N/A

countries which receive direct economic assistance under the FAA and permit United States firms to compete for construction or engineering services financed from assistance programs of these countries.)

6.	FAA Sec. 603. Is the shipping excluded from compliance with the requirement in section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, that at least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of commodities (computed separately for dry bulk carriers, dry cargo liners, and tankers) financed shall be transported on privately owned U.S. flag commercial vessels to the extent such vessels are available at fair and reasonable rates?	No
7.	FAA Sec. 621(a). If technical assistance is financed, will such assistance be furnished by private enterprise on a contract basis to the fullest extent practicable?	Yes
	Will the facilities and resources of other Federal agencies be utilized, when they are particularly suitable, not competitive with private enterprise, and made available without undue interference with domestic programs?	No need is anticipated.
8.	International Air Transportation Fair Competitive Practices Act, 1974. If air transportation of persons or property is financed on grant basis, will U.S. carriers be used to the extent such service is available?	Yes
9.	FY 1988 Continuing Resolution Sec. 504. If the U.S. Government is a party to a contract for procurement, does the contract contain a provision authorizing termination of such contract for the convenience of the United States?	Yes
10.	FY 1988 Continuing Resolution Sec. 524. If assistance is for consulting service through procurement contract pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3109, are contract expenditures a matter of public record and available for public inspection (unless otherwise provided by law or Executive order)?	Yes

B. CONSTRUCTION

1. FAA Sec. 601(d). If capital (e.g., construction) project, will U.S. engineering and professional services be used? N/A

2. FAA Sec. 611(c). If contracts for construction are to be financed, will they be let on a competitive basis to maximum extent practicable? N/A

3. FAA Sec. 620(k). If for construction of productive enterprise, will aggregate value of assistance to be furnished by the U.S. not exceed $100 million (except for productive enterprises in Egypt that were described in the CP), or does assistance have the express approval of Congress? N/A

C. OTHER RESTRICTIONS

1. FAA Sec. 122(b). If development loan repayable in dollars, is interest rate at least 2 percent per annum during a grace period which is not to exceed ten years, and at least 3 percent per annum thereafter? N/A

2. FAA Sec. 301(d). If fund is established solely by U.S. contributions and administered by an international organization, does Comptroller General have audit rights? N/A

3. FAA Sec. 620(h). Do arrangements exist to insure that United States foreign aid is not used in a manner which, contrary to the best interests of the United States, promotes or assists the foreign aid projects or activities of the Communist-bloc countries? Yes

4. Will arrangements preclude use of financing:

a. FAA Sec. 104(f); FY 1987 Continuing Resolution Secs. 525, 538. (1) To pay for performance of abortions as a method of family planning or to motivate or coerce persons to practice abortions; (2) to pay for performance of involuntary sterilization as method of family planning, or to coerce or provide financial incentive to any person to undergo sterilization; (3) to pay for any biomedical research which relates, in whole or part, to methods or the performance of abortions or involuntary sterilizations as a means of family planning; or (4) to lobby for abortion?

Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes

b. FAA Sec. 483. To make reimbursements, in the form of cash payments, to persons whose illicit drug crops are eradicated?

Yes

c. FAA Sec. 620(q). To compensate owners for expropriated or nationalized property, except to compensate foreign nationals in accordance with a land reform program certified by the President?

Yes

d. FAA Sec. 660. To provide training, advice, or any financial support for police, prisons, or other law enforcement forces, except for narcotics programs?

Yes

e. FAA Sec. 662. For CIA activities?

Yes

f. FAA Sec. 636(i). For purchase, sale, long-term lease, exchange or guaranty of the sale of motor vehicles manufactured outside U.S., unless a waiver is obtained?

Yes

g. FY 1988 Continuing Resolution Sec. 503. To pay pensions, annuities, retirement pay, or adjusted service compensation for prior or current military personnel? Yes

h. FY 1988 Continuing Resolution Sec. 505. To pay U.N. assessments, arrearages or dues? Yes

i. FY 1988 Continuing Resolution Sec. 506. To carry out provisions of FAA section 209(d) (transfer of FAA funds to multilateral organizations for lending)? Yes

j. FY 1988 Continuing Resolution Sec. 510. To finance the export of nuclear equipment, fuel, or technology? Yes

k. FY 1988 Continuing Resolution Sec. 511. For the purpose of aiding the efforts of the government of such country to repress the legitimate rights of the population of such country contrary to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights? Yes

l. FY 1988 Continuing Resolution Sec. 516; State Authorization Sec. 109. To be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress, to influence in any way the outcome of a political election in the United States, or for any publicity or propaganda purposes not authorized by Congress? Yes

BURKINA FASO

MINISTERE DE
L'ENSEIGNEMENT SUPERIEUR ET
DE LA RECHERCHE SCIENTIFIQUE

N° AN V ...../FP/ESRS/CNRST

Réf. :

Ouagadougou, le 30 MAI 1988

Le Ministre de l'Enseignement Supérieur et de la Recherche Scientifique

à

Monsieur le Directeur
de l'US/AID

Objet : Requête pour une participation de l'US/AID au financement du Programme National de Recherche Agricole (P.N.R.A.)

LETTER # 0403

USAID / BURKINA FASO
Rec'd 5/31
ACTION : OAG
DUE DATE : 6/10
DISTRIBUTION : DIR OPR CHRON
NAN :
REMARKS :

Monsieur le Directeur,

En septembre 1983, le Gouvernement a initié des réflexions visant à rendre opérationnel le système national de recherche agricole.

Ainsi, le séminaire national de février 1985 qui est l'aboutissement de ces réflexions, a identifié des priorités constituant en quelque sorte une première phase du Programme National de Recherche Agricole. Par la suite, nous avons pris contact avec nos différents partenaires pour étudier les modalités de mise en oeuvre du P.N.R.A. C'est ainsi que lors des premiers contacts, l'US/AID, dans le cadre de son effort continu pour le soutien du secteur agricole au Burkina Faso, avait manifesté un intérêt pour les Recherches sur les Systèmes de Production Agricole.

./.-

A cet effet, un document de travail définissant les stratégies à long terme de l'IN.E.R.A. a été élaboré en matière de recherche système. Ce document a servi de référence à la mission d'évaluation de l'US/AID qui a séjourné au Burkina de Janvier à Mars 1988. Cette mission, en liaison avec les chercheurs de l'IN.E.R.A., a pu faire des propositions qui rencontrent notre agrément.

Aussi, c'est avec plaisir que par la présente, je sollicite auprès de votre institution le financement du programme R.F.P. tel que défini par la mission.

En vous remerciant par avance pour votre aide, je vous saurai gré des dispositions qu'il vous plaira de réserver à ma requête.

Veuillez agréer, Monsieur le Directeur, mes salutations distinguées.

LA PATRIE OU LA MORT, NOUS VAINCRONS !

Pour le Ministre et par délégation
Le Secrétaire Général,

Youssoufou M I L L O G O.

INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EXAMINATIONS
or
CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION

Project Country: Burkina Faso

Project Title: Agricultural Research and Training Support Project (686-0270)

Funding: FY(s): 1988-1992 US$: 3.500 million

IEE Prepared By: Jeffrey W. Goodson
Regional Environmental Officer
REDSO/WCA

DATE: 28 July 1987

Environmental Action Recommended:

Positive Determination _____

Negative Determination X

Categorical Exclusion X

The Farming Systems Research and research-extension linkages components of this project are eligible and recommended for categorical exclusion pursuant to the provisions of 22 CFR 216.2(c)(1)(iii) and 216.2(c)(2)(ii) and (iii). The technical assistance and training inputs are eligible and recommended for categorical exclusion pursuant to the provisions of 22 CFR 216.2(c)(2)(i). The acquisition of commodities other than pesticides, the provision of funds for operational support of the technical assistance team, and the provision of funds for project evaluation and auditing are recommended for negative determination since they will not result in significant adverse environmental impact. Pesticide acquisition and use activities are exceptable under the provisions of 22 CFR 216.3(b)(2)(iii), contingent upon USAID and Grantee commitments to abide by the provisions, conditions and restrictions of that section as described in Section 3.0 of this IEE.

Concurrence: (Bureau Environmental Officer)

APPROVED _____

DISAPPROVED _____

DATE _____

Clearance: (General Counsel/Africa) NAME _____

DATE _____

Statutory Concern: Gray Amendment

Whatever its composition and size, the technical assistance team will be contracted through BIFAD using the Title XII contracting mechanism. This will permit the participation of land grant members of the Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) included under the Title XII umbrella. While a case can be made that private firms, including those with minority and women ownership, can provide the technical assistance required, USAID/Burkina's and INERA's intention is to use the Title XII mode to create/foster longer term institutional linkages both during and post project between INERA and the selected university or universities. This has been the case with the AgHRD project where links between the University of Ouagadougou and the University of Georgia (and other members of the SECID consortium including Tuskeegee Institute) continue to grow and pay significant dividends.

In addition, USAID/Burkina will continue its active policy of making use of Gray amendment entities for both evaluations and procurement. Minority firms on the IQC/PSC lists will receive priority attention for both activities. While training will be handled by the Mission, the selection universe of U.S. universities for long-term participant training will include HBCU entities, albeit the design team should also consider the value of linkages between the Title XII contractor and training sites for participants as an additional selection criterion. The positive experience of former Burkinabe participants with specific both HBCU's and U.S. land-grant universities including post-degree support will also be taken into account.

Burkina Faso: Agricultural Research and Training Support Project.

Certification Pursuant to Section 611(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act, as amended:

I, Herbert N. Miller, Director for the Agency for International Development, do hereby certify that, in my judgement, the Government of Burkina Faso (GOB) will have the financial and human resource capability to implement, maintain and utilize the assistance provided under this Project. This certification takes into consideration the requirements placed on the GOB to maintain and utilize other projects previously financed or assisted by the United States.

Herbert N. Miller
Director
USAID/Burkina.

6/15/88
Date.

(3) ACTION: REDSO INFO: WAAC ECON

VZCZCAB0465
OO RUEEAB
DE RUEFC #2832/01 3360131
ZNR UUUUU ZZH
O R 021128Z DEC 87
FM SECSTATE WASHDC
TO RUFROC/AMEMBASSY OUAGADOUGOU IMMEDIATE 1613
IN. RUEEAB/AMEMBASSY ABIDJAN 9412
BT
UNCLAS STATE 372832

AIDAC, ABIDJAN FOR REDSO WAYNE KING

E.O. 12356: N/A

SUBJECT: BURKINA FASO - AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH TRAINING AND SUPPORT PROJECT 686-0270

1. SUMMARY: THE AFRICA BUREAU EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR PROJECT REVIEW (ECPR) MET ON NOVEMBER 20, 1987 TO REVIEW SUBJECT PROJECT PID. THE ECPR WAS CHAIRED BY AFR/PD DIRECTOR CAROL PEASLEY. PARTICIPANTS INCLUDED REPRESENTATIVES FROM AFR/PD, AFR/SWA, GC/AFR, AFR/TR, AFR/DP, BIFAD, S AND T/AGR, AND USAID/BURKINA FASO.

2. THE ECPR APPROVED THE PID AT DOLS 3.5 MILLION, SUBJECT TO THE GUIDANCE OUTLINED HEREIN, AND RECOMMENDED THAT THE PP DESIGN PROCEED, ALTHOUGH IN CONTEXT OF ISSUES CONCERNING BROADER PROGRAMMING WHICH ARE DISCUSSED PARA 11 BELOW. IN VIEW OF THE BROADER MISSION PROGRAM REVIEW CONTEMPLATED FOR MARCH 1988, AND QUESTIONS REGARDING THE RELATIONSHIP OF THIS PROJECT TO THE BROADER PROGRAM, THE PROJECT PAPER SHOULD BE RETURNED TO AID/W FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL. PDO/MCKENZIE WAS CONGRATULATED FOR HIS EXCELLENT SUMMARY ON MISSION'S PORTFOLIO AND ON THE QUALITY OF THE PID.

3. ROLE OF PROJECT IN BROADER MULTI-DONOR AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH PROGRAM: THE ECPR QUESTIONED WHETHER THE PROPOSED PROJECT WAS REALLY NEEDED GIVEN THE SIGNIFICANT LEVELS OF TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE CONTEMPLATED BY OTHER DONORS FOR BURKINA FASO'S AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ACTIVITIES. OF PARTICULAR CONCERN WAS THE WORLD BANK'S COMPREHENSIVE NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH (NAR) PROGRAM, CURRENTLY BEING DESIGNED, WHICH IS FOCUSED ON DEVELOPING INERA'S RESEARCH MANAGEMENT CAPACITY IN SEVERAL AREAS, INCLUDING FARMING SYSTEMS RESEARCH (FSR). THE MISSION REPRESENTATIVE STRESSED, INTER-ALIA: PREDOMINANT CAPABILITY OF U.S. IN FARMING SYSTEM'S RESEARCH, INCLUDING THE TRAINING OPPORTUNITIE OFFERED BY THE U.S. LAND-GRANT COLLEGES; THE SPECIFIC REQUEST FOR U.S. ASSISTANCE IN THIS AREA BY KEY GOBF OFFICIALS, INCLUDING THE MINISTER OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH; THE SIGNIFICANT INFLUENCE THE U.S. WOULD SECURE OVER THE DIRECTION OF BURKINA'S

IOC: 236
02 DEC 87 01
CN: 46345
CHRG: AID
DIST: AIDL

Action: RDO
Info:
Due Date: 12/4
Action Taken
NAW

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH PROGRAM GIVEN THE PROMINENT ROLE OF FARMING SYSTEMS RESEARCH VIS-A-VIS ALL OTHER AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH PROGRAMS; AND THE NEED FOR CONSOLIDATING SOME 1300 PERSON-MONTHS OF RESEARCH ACTIVITY UNDER THE SAFGRAD PROJECT INTO APPROPRIATE TECHNICAL PACKAGES FOR DISSEMINATION TO FARMERS.

THE ECPR CONCLUDED THAT A.I.D. COULD PLAY A CRITICALLY IMPORTANT ROLE IN FSR AND REQUESTS MISSION TO DISCUSS THIS ROLE FURTHER WITH THE GOBF AND THE OTHER DONORS PARTICIPATING IN THE NAR PROGRAM, PARTICULARLY THE WORLD BANK. THE PROJECT PAPER SHOULD PRESENT A CLEAR PICTURE OF A.I.D.'S RESEARCH INTERVENTION WITHIN THE BROADER MULTI-DONOR AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH PROGRAM.

4. INSTITUTIONAL ANALYSIS: GIVEN THE PROJECT'S PURPOSE OF STRENGTHENING INERA'S INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY, CONCERN WAS EXPRESSED OVER THE PID'S LACK OF INFORMATION REGARDING INERA'S CURRENT CAPABILITIES AND NEEDS. THE MISSION REPRESENTATIVE ACKNOWLEDGED THIS SHORTCOMING BUT FELT THAT AID/W HAD ACCESS TO THE WORLD BANK'S ASSESSMENT OF INERA.

IT WAS AGREED THAT A THOROUGH INSTITUTIONAL ANALYSIS WOULD BE UNDERTAKEN BY A.I.D. DURING THE INTENSIVE REVIEW. THE RESULTS OF THIS ANALYSIS, INCLUDING THE INSTITUTIONAL IMPLICATIONS FOR EXECUTING ALL ESSENTIAL FACETS OF THE PROPOSED FSR PROGRAM, SHOULD BE SPELLED OUT TO INDICATE THE NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE INSTITUTIONAL CONSTRAINTS REQUIRING ATTENTION UNDER THE PROJECT. MISSION SHOULD REVIEW CURRENT PP TEAM

WORKSCOPES TO DETERMINE APPROPRIATENESS OF ALTERING THEM TO ADDRESS THIS INSTITUTIONAL ANALYSIS REQUIREMENT.

5. SUSTAINABILITY OF INERA'S TOTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM: THE ECPR NOTED WITH SOME CONCERN THE BROAD BUILD-UP OF RESEARCH ACTIVITIES CONTEMPLATED BY INERA, INVOLVING SOME EIGHT DISTRICT RESEARCH PROGRAMS, A DOUBLING OF RESEARCH STATIONS (FROM 3 TO 6), AND THE TRAINING AND PLACEMENT OF THIRTY-TWO PROFESSIONALS OVER THE NEAR TERM. GIVEN INERA'S SHORT INSTITUTIONAL LIFE AND LIMITED BUDGETARY RESOURCES, IS IT REASONABLE TO UNDERTAKE A RESEARCH PROGRAM OF THE SCOPE AND COMPLEXITY OUTLINED IN THE PID? THE PROJECT'S FINANCIAL ANALYSIS SHOULD EXAMINE PROJECTED COSTS AND REVENUE SOURCES ASSOCIATED WITH INERA'S BROADER RESEARCH PROGRAM, AS WELL AS THE FSR PROGRAM CONTEMPLATED FOR A.I.D. ASSISTANCE. THERE MAY WELL BE A NEED FOR PRIORITIZING THE RESEARCH PROGRAMS CONTEMPLATED TO ENSURE THAT THOSE MOST CRITICAL TO THE RATIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE AGRICULTURAL SECTOR ARE SUSTAINABLE OVER TIME. THIS

82

WOULD APPEAR PARTICULARLY RELEVANT GIVEN OBJECTIVE OF PROJECT TO IMPROVE BURKINA'S RESEARCH POLICY AND RESOURCE ALLOCATIONS MORE GENERALLY.

6. INVOLVEMENT OF TITLE XII INSTITUTION: WITH A VIEW TO AVOIDING A PROTRACTED HIATUS BETWEEN THE PROJECT'S DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION STAGES, MISSION SHOULD ELICIT EXPRESSIONS OF INTEREST FROM TITLE XII SCHOOLS IN A TIMELY MANNER. HOWEVER, THIS ACTION SHOULD AWAIT THE RESULTS OF THE BROADER AID/W PROGRAM REVIEW CURRENTLY PLANNED FOR MARCH 1988. (SEE PARA 11, BELOW.)

7. PROJECT'S RELATIONSHIP TO PREVIOUS AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH IN BURKINA FASO: THE PID PROVIDED ONLY LIMITED INFORMATION ON THE LESSONS LEARNED FROM PREVIOUS RESEARCH, PARTICULARLY RESEARCH UNDERTAKEN BY ICRISAT, IITA, AND SAFGRAD, AS WELL AS FARMING SYSTEMS RESEARCH CARRIED OUT BY PURDUE UNIVERSITY. THE PP SHOULD INCLUDE A DISCUSSION OF THE PRINCIPAL RESEARCH FINDINGS FROM THE SAFGRAD PROJECT AND OTHER RESEARCH EFFORTS IN BURKINA FASO AND INDICATE HOW THE PROJECT WILL BUILD UPON SUCH RESEARCH.

8. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RESEARCH AND EXTENSION: WHILE THE PID ASSERTS THAT A RESEARCH ENDEAVOR OF THIS NATURE CAN ASSURE HIGHER ADOPTION RATES OF IMPROVED TECHNIQUES AND FARMING SYSTEMS, AN EFFECTIVE EXTENSION NETWORK OR ACTIVE PRIVATE SECTOR OUTREACH WOULD SEEM ESSENTIAL TO REALIZING THIS OBJECTIVE. HOWEVER, THERE WAS LITTLE DISCUSSION OF AGRICULTURAL TECHNOLOGY DISSEMINATION IN THE PID. THE MISSION REPRESENTATIVE INDICATED THAT THERE ARE A NUMBER OF LOCALLY-BASED GROUPS AS WELL AS RURAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATIONS WHICH COULD SERVE AS EFFECTIVE VEHICLES FOR TRANSMITTING SIGNIFICANT RESEARCH FINDINGS. THE ECPR CONCLUDED THAT THE PP SHOULD ELABORATE ON THE VARIOUS POTENTIAL OUTREACH MECHANISMS AND THEIR PROSPECTIVE ROLES IN COMMUNICATING RESEARCH FINDINGS TO THE FARMING COMMUNITY. MISSION SHOULD ACTIVELY EXPLORE PRIVATE SECTOR ALTERNATIVE. MOREOVER, S AND T AGRICULTURE AGREED TO PROVIDE THE MISSION WITH INFORMATION ON THIS TOPIC. IT WAS ALSO OBSERVED THAT FIFTH YEAR UNIVERSITY STUDENTS MIGHT BE HELPFUL IN CONDUCTING ON-FARM RESEARCH TRIALS.

9. REINTEGRATION OF PARTICIPANTS: GIVEN THE PROJECT'S FOCUS ON TRAINING AND INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTHENING OVERALL, IT IS IMPORTANT THAT PARTICIPANTS WHO HAVE SATISFACTORILY COMPLETED THEIR TRAINING PROGRAMS BE GIVEN APPROPRIATE POSITIONS WITHIN INERA. A COVENANT ADDRESSING THIS CONCERN SHOULD BE NEGOTIATED WITH THE GOBF AND INCLUDED IN THE GRANT AGREEMENT.

10. MONITORING/EVALUATION (M AND E) PLAN: AS MISSION KNOWS, THE AGENCY IS PLACING INCREASING EMPHASIS ON THE NEED FOR ESTABLISHING AND MONITORING PERFORMANCE INDICATORS. GIVEN THE RESEARCH DATA ALREADY GENERATED, AS BRIEFLY OUTLINED IN THE PID'S BACKGROUND SECTION, THE

MISSION SHOULD HAVE LITTLE DIFFICULTY ESTABLISHING THE BASELINE DATA FOR MEASURING FUTURE RESEARCH ACCOMPLISHMENTS, SUCH AS THE NUMBER OF TECHNICAL PACKAGES DEVELOPED AND DISSEMINATED; THE NUMBER OF FARMERS ADOPTING NEW PACKAGES; YIELD INCREASES (BOTH ON-STATION AND ON-FARM) ASSOCIATED WITH THE NEW PACKAGES; THE NUMBER OF LOCALLY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS ACTIVELY PARTICIPATING IN THE DISSEMINATION OF RESEARCH FINDINGS; THE NUMBER OF AGRICULTURAL SPECIALISTS ON BOARD AT OUTSET OF PROJECT AND THE NUMBER TRAINED AND POSITIONED AFTER COMPLETION OF THEIR TRAINING; AND SO FORTH. THE PP SHOULD SET FORTH A DETAILED M AND E PLAN WHICH INDICATES THE VARIABLES TO BE TRACKED; QUANTIFIES THE PROJECTED ACCOMPLISHMENTS FOR EACH OF THE VARIABLES IN QUESTION; STIPULATES THE BENCHMARKS FOR MEASURING PROGRESS AGAINST THESE STATED OBJECTIVES; AND INDICATES THE SCOPE AND TIMING OF PROJECT EVALUATIONS.

11. PROJECT'S RELATIONSHIP TO BROADER PROGRAM: AS CURRENTLY ENVISIONED, AN AGRICULTURAL SECTOR TEAM WILL BE MOBILIZED IN JANUARY 1988 TO UNDERTAKE A STUDY OF GROWTH NEEDS AND OPPORTUNITIES IN THAT SECTOR. WHILE AID/W BELIEVES THAT A RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THIS PROJECT AND A BROADER GROWTH STRATEGY FOR THE AGRICULTURAL SECTOR WILL LIKELY BE DEMONSTRATED, THE DETAILS OF THIS RELATIONSHIP AND THE IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS ARE STILL TO BE DETERMINED. DEPENDING UPON RESULTS OF THAT SECTOR REVIEW, WE COULD ENVISION PROPOSED FSR ACTIVITIES AS ONE COMPONENT OF A BROADER AG SECTOR GRANT WHICH DEALT WITH POLICY, AS WELL AS INSTITUTIONAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL, CONSTRAINTS TO ECONOMIC GROWTH. ALTERNATIVELY, PROPOSED FSR ACTIVITIES COULD BE FREESTANDING PROJECT, COMPLEMENTED BY MORE GROWTH ORIENTED PROGRAM ASSISTANCE RELATED TO POLICY REFORMS. GIVEN UNCERTAINTIES, AID/W REQUESTS THAT THE PP REVIEW BE CONDUCTED IN AID/W FOLLOWING THE BROADER PROGRAM REVIEW, CURRENTLY SCHEDULED FOR MARCH 1988. DETAILS ON THIS PROGRAM REVIEW WILL BE TRANSMITTED BY SEPTEL.
SHULTZ
BT
#2832

NNNN

84

UNCLASSIFIED

Department of State

OUTGOING TELEGRAM

PAGE 01 STATE 331819 0573 053024 AID7345
ORIGIN AID-00

ORIGIN OFFICE AFPD-04
INFO AAAF-02 AFCO-02 AFEV-04 AFDP-06 AFTR-05 AMAD-01 GC-01
GCAF-01 MS-01 FM-01 SMC-02 BIFA-01 STAG-02 SAST-01
PELO-01 AFMG-03 /042 AD

INFO LOG-00 /020 R

DRAFTED BY: AID/AFR/PD/SWAP:MBROWN:EDL:4345M
APPROVED BY: AID/AFR/PD:JGRAHAM
AID/AFR/SWA:FDICHTER
AID/GC/AFR:PJOHNSON (INFO)
AID/AFR/SWA:LLEWIS (DRAFT)
AID/AFR/PD/SWAP:BBURNETT (DRAFT)
AID/AFR/DP/PAB:TBETHUNE (DRAFT)
AID/AFR/TR:CMARTIN (DRAFT)
AID/AFR/TR/AFD:ABURCETT (DRAFT)
AID/AFR/SWA:RDANIELS (DRAFT)
AID/BIFAD:RHEFFERNAN (PHONE)
AID/AFR/TR/PFC:EBOYD (INFO)
AID/AFR/TR/EHR:MSHAW (INFO)

----------070231 240511Z /38

O 240500Z OCT 87
FM SECSTATE WASHDC
TO AMEMBASSY OUAGADOUGOU IMMEDIATE

UNCLAS STATE 331819

AIDAC

E.O. 12356: N/A

SUBJECT: BURKINA FASO AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH TRAINING SUPPORT PROJECT/PID (686-0.70)

1. SUMMARY: AID/W PROJECT COMMITTEE (PC) MET ON OCTOBER 14, 1987 TO REVIEW SUBJECT PID. OFFICES REPRESENTED WERE AFR/PD/SWAP, AFR/SWA, AFR/TR/AFD AFR/TR/EHR, GC/AFR, AND BIFAD. THE COMMITTEE COMMENDS THE MISSION FOR A WELL-PREPARED PID. HOWEVER, THE COMMITTEE FEELS THAT THE DOCUMENT, AS WRITTEN, REQUIRES ADDITIONAL SUPPORTIVE INFORMATION AND/OR CLARIFICATION. LISTED BELOW ARE SPECIFIC ISSUES RAISED AT THE PID REVIEW.

2. ISSUE NO. 1. LESSONS LEARNED. (A) TECHNICAL: OF SOME CONCERN TO THE PROJECT COMMITTEE IS THE LIMITED INFORMATION PROVIDED ON LESSONS LEARNED FROM PREVIOUS RESEARCH; PARTICULARLY RESEARCH UNDERTAKEN BY ICRISAT, IITA, AND SAFGRAD, AS WELL AS THE FARMING SYSTEMS RESEARCH WORK EXECUTED BY PURDUE UNIVERSITY. THE DOCUMENT IS WEAK IN ITS DISCUSSION OF GAINS MADE IN THE PAST AND HOW BURKINA FASO'S AGRICULTURAL SECTOR HAS BEEN AFFECTED, ADVANCES MADE BY INERA IN CROP YIELDS, INCENTIVES TO FARMERS, SOIL AND WATER CONTROL MEASURES,

AND SO FORTH. (B) INSTITUTIONAL: BECAUSE THE DEVELOPMENT OF RESEARCH INSTITUTION TAKES TIME, IT IS CRITICAL THAT SPECIAL ATTENTION BE PAID TO STRENGTHENING AND REORIENTATING NATIONAL RESEARCH SYSTEMS, AS WELL AS ESTABLISHING SUPPORTIVE LINKAGES WITH APPROPRIATE REGIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS. THE COMMITEE RECOMMENDS MISSION INCLUDE A SHORT SUMMARY REFLECTING SOME OF THE LESSONS LEARNED FROM PAST FSR AND OTHER AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH PROGRAMS (SEE, FOR EXAMPLE, PPC/CDIE EXAMINATION OF A.I.D.'S EXPERIENCE WORLDWIDE IN THIS DOMAIN).

ISSUE NO. 2 COORDINATION. THE PID DESCRIBES THE PROPOSED PROJECT AS PART OF A MULTI-DONOR EFFORT LED BY THE WORLD BANK. YET, IN REVIEWING THE PID, THE COMMITTEE WAS UNABLE TO DETERMINE WITH SUFFICIENT CLARITY ANY LINKAGES BETWEEN THE WORLD BANK'S EFFORTS

STATE 331819 0573 053024 AID7345

AND THOSE OF USAID AND THE OTHER DONORS. HOW WILL THIS SMALL ACTIVITY FIT INTO THE TOTAL AG. RESEARCH INSTITUTION BUILDING EFFORT?

4. ISSUE NO. 3 COLLABORATIVE ASSISTANCE MODE. GIVEN THE FACT THAT INSTITUTIONALIZING FARMING SYSTEMS RESEARCH (FSR) IN BURKINA FASO IS THE PRIMARY OBJECTIVE TO BE ACHIEVED UNDER THIS PROJECT, THE COMMITTEE WONDERS WHY THE DOCUMENT DOES NOT DISCUSS USING THE COLLABORATIVE ASSISTANCE MODE FOR THE PP DESIGN AND PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION. PLEASE ADVISE.

5. FYI, PD/SWAP ON OCTOBER 14, 1987, FORWARDED TO USAID A COPY OF WORLD BANK STAFF APPRAISAL REPORT FOR BURKINA FASO'S AG RESEARCH PROJECT. END FYI.

6. FYI, AS MISSION IS AWARE, BUREAU IS REVIEWING VARIOUS OPTIONS FOR REDUCING MISSION'S OPERATING EXPENSES. SINCE THE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SUBJECT PROJECT HAS OBVIOUS IMPLICATIONS, THE BUREAU MUST WEIGH THIS FACTOR IN ITS DELIBERATIONS. HOWEVER, NO FINAL DETERMINATIONS WOULD BE MADE WITHOUT CONSULTING THE MISSION. END FYI.
WHITEHEAD

UNCLASSIFIED

85

PAGE 01 OF 02 OUAGAD 06691 00 OF 03 271537Z 3835 055074 AID9497
ACTION AID-00

ACTION OFFICE AFPD-04
INFO AAAF-03 AFFW-04 AFCW-03 AFDP-06 AFTR-05 GC-01 GCAF-01
BIFA-01 STAG-02 SAST-01 AGRI-01 RELO-01 /033 A4 327

INFO LOG-00 COPY-01 AF-00 CIAE-00 EB-00 DODE-00 /001 W
246044 271539Z /44/38

O 261726Z OCT 87
FM AMEMBASSY OUAGADOUGOU
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 4845
INFO AMEMBASSY ABIDJAN

UNCLAS OUAGADOUGOU 06691

A.I.AC

ABIDJAN FOR REDSO PDRI (BAKER)

E.O. 12356: N/A
SUBJECT: BURKINA FASO AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING SUPPORT PROJECT PID (686-0278)

REF: STATE 331819

1. ISSUE NO. 1(A): REFTEL REFLECTS A MISUNDERSTANDING OF THE SAFGRAD PROJECT AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO BURKINA. WHILE RECOGNIZING THAT THE PID DID NOT ELABORATE EXTENSIVELY ON THE POINT IN THE INTEREST OF RESPECTING PID LENGTH GUIDELINES, THE BASIC ASSUMPTION DURING THE DRAFTING PROCESS, PERHAPS NAIVELY SO, WAS THAT A GREATER BODY OF KNOWLEDGE EXISTED AMONG AID/W REVIEWERS WHICH WOULD HAVE FIELDED AND RESPONDED TO SUCH QUESTIONS DURING THE PROJECT COMMITTEE REVIEW PROCESS. CONTRARY TO IMPLICATIONS OF PARA 2, REFTEL, SAFGRAD HAS NOT UNDERTAKEN INDEPENDENT RESEARCH AS A FOURTH AND SEPARATE ENTITY. RATHER, ICRISAT AND IITA, UNDER THE AEGIS OF SAFGRAD, HAVE UNDERTAKEN BASIC CROP SPECIFIC, VARIETY TESTING RESEARCH RELATIVE TO MAIZE, SORGHUM, MILLET AND COWPEAS. WHILE THIS RESEARCH WAS CONDUCTED IN BURKINA, IT WAS DONE AS A REGIONAL ACTIVITY INDEPENDENT OF INERA WHICH IS ONLY ONE OF THE 26 NATIONAL RESEARCH MEMBER INSTITUTIONS OF THE SAFGRAD PROGRAM. DESPITE INERA'S NON-INVOLVEMENT IN THIS RESEARCH, INERA HAS NEVERTHELESS HAD A PRIVILEDGED ASSOCIATION SINCE THE RESEARCH WAS CONDUCTED AT INERA STATIONS AND THE INSTITUTION THEREFORE HAS READY ACCESS TO RESULTS THROUGH ASSOCIATION. LIKEWISE, THE FSR RESEARCH CONDUCTED BY PURDUE UNIVERSITY UNDER THE SAFGRAD PROJECT, WHILE CONDUCTED IN BURKINA AND HEADQUARTERED AT THE INERA STATION AT KAMBOINSE, WAS NEVERTHELESS INDEPENDENT OF INERA. IT IS THEREFORE ERRONEOUS TO IMPUTE A UNIQUE BURKINA SPECIFIC RELATIONSHIP TO THE SAFGRAD PROJECT, ANY MORE THAN THE OTHER 26 MEMBER COUNTRIES, FROM WHICH SPECIFIC LESSONS LEARNED OR AGRICULTURAL SECTOR IMPROVEMENT INDICATORS CAN BE DETAILED. THE POINT WHICH THE PID ATTEMPTED TO MAKE WAS THAT THE FACT OF THE SAFGRA PROJECT BEING HEADQUARTERED IN OUAGADOUGOU DID INDEED PROVIDE A DISTINCT ADVANTAGE TO INERA DUE TO ITS CLOSE PROXIMITY ASSOCIATION, ITS READY ACCESS TO RESEARCH TRIAL AND FINDINGS, AND THE BURKINA SPECIFIC ECOLOGICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL ORIENTATION OF BOTH CROP AND FSR RESEARCH WHICH INERA CAN NOW ACCESS AND BUILD UPON WITHOUT HAVING TO START FROM GROUND ZERO. IT IS REMEMBERED THAT THE OBJECTIVE OF THE AFRICA-WIDE REGIONAL SAFGRAD PROJECT IS TO INSTITUTIONALIZE NETWORKING BETWEEN THE MEMBER COUNTRY NATIONAL RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS WHOSE MAIN WORK IS SUPPORTED BY BILATERAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS AND THE HOST-COUNTRIES. IT WAS NOT AND IS NOT A PROJECT TO STRENGTHEN AND DEVELOP INERA. ISSUE NO. 1(A), WHILE INTERESTING AND PERTINENT IN EVALUATING SAFGRAD, IS

OUAGAD 06691 00 OF 03 271537Z 3835 055074 AID

THEREFORE UNFAIR AS RELATED TO BURKINA AND SHOULD NOT BE RAISED IN REVIEW OF A FIRST-TIME, BURKINA BILATERAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH INITIATIVE ANY MORE THAN IT SHOULD BE RAISED IN REVIEW OF BILATERAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH PROJECT PROPOSALS FOR NIGER, SENEGAL, MALI, TOGO, ZAIRE, KENYA, BOTSWANA, CAMEROON OR ANY OTHER OF THE 26 MEMBER COUNTRIES OF SAFGRAD.

2. ISSUE NO. 1(B): THE MISSION AGREES COMPLETELY WITH THE PROJECT COMMITTEE CONCERNS AS REFLECTED REFTEL. THIS IS THE BASIC PREMISE OF THE PROJECT PROPOSAL. ALTHOUGH THE POINT WAS NOT UNDERLINED IN THE PID, USAID/BURKINA HAD THOUGHT IT SUFFICIENTLY CLEAR THAT THE OBJECTIVE OF THE TOTAL MULTI-DONOR EFFORT WAS TO "STRENGTHEN AND REORIENT" THE NATIONAL RESEARCH SYSTEM. (SEE FOR EXAMPLE, INTER ALIA, PARTS II.A.2, II.B AND III.D.3(B) AND ANNEX C OF THE PID "WORLD BANK NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH PROJECT BRIEF".) WITH REGARD TO LESSONS LEARNED THE FOLLOWING POINTS ARE OFFERED:

--(A) SAFGRAD/PURDUE FSR: THE FINAL REPORT STATED "ON-FARM TESTING DONE AND FINANCED BY IARC'S (IITA, ICRISAT ETC.) TENDS TO CONCENTRATE ON VARIETAL EFFECTS SINCE CROP BREEDING IS THEIR MANDATE" AND SUGGESTS THAT INSTITUTIONS OTHER THAN IARC'S NEED TO DO THE ON-FARM TESTING UNDER TRUE FSR PROGRAMS. THE MISSION SEES THE STRENGTHENING OF INERA AS A WAY OF BALANCING THE RESEARCH PROCESS TO INCLUDE A MORE MULTI-FACETED SMALL-FARMER ORIENTED APPROACH.

--(B) WITHOUT THE DEVELOPMENT OF INDIGENOUS INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY, THERE WILL BE NO SUSTAINABILITY OF FSR EFFORTS. WITH THE DEPARTURE OF THE PURDUE TEAM, NO INSTITUTIONALIZED FSR CAPABILITY REMAINED. THE INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF INERA AND ITS FSR CAPACITY ARE THEREFORE THE PRIMARY PURPOSES OF THE MULTI-DONOR PROGRAM.

--(C) SAFGRAD: IF SAFGRAD HAD NOT CONTINUED INTO A SECOND PHASE TO EMPHASIZE THE INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE SCO (THE OAU/STRC'S SAFGRAD COORDINATION OFFICE) AND RESEARCH NETWORKING, THERE ALSO WOULD HAVE BEEN LITTLE TO SHOW FOR THE MILLIONS OF AID INVESTMENT. ONE OF THE MISSION'S AND THE SAFGRAD PROJECT'S SHORT-TERM GOALS IS TO TAKE ALL THE RESEARCH DATA AND COME FORTH WITH SOME CONCRETE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FARMERS THROUGH NATIONAL RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS INSTEAD OF CONTINUING TO IMPROVE VARIETIES AS AN END IN ITSELF. THE INSTITUTIONAL STRNGTHENING OF INERA, THROUGH THE PROPOSED PROJECT, WILL ASSIST IT IN DEVELOPING ITS CAPACITY TO TAP INTO AND CAPITALIZE UPON ITS LINKAGES WITH OTHER COUNTRY INSTITUTIONS THROUGH THE SAFGRAD NETWORK.

3. ISSUE NO. 2: UPON PID RE-REVIEW AFTER RECEIPT OF REFTEL, MISSION ACKNOWLEDGES WEAKNESS IN DESCRIPTION OF MULTI-DONOR CHARACTER OF TOTAL PROGRAM ACTIVITIES. THE BASIC DOCUMENTS UPON WHICH THE PID IS BASED ARE THE JOINT GOB/IBRD AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SECTOR REORIENTATION AND STRENGTHENING STUDY, THE IBRD'S INITIAL FIELD APPRAISAL OF 3/86, THE IBRD'S FINAL STAFF APPRAISAL VISIT OF 12/86 AND CLOSE DISCUSSION WITH INERA, IBRD COUNTRY REPRESENTATIVES AND TECHNICAL MISSIONS, LOCAL REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NETHERLANDS DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM AND FAC. THE PRESENT USAID/BURKINA PID REFLECTS ONE SPECIFIC COMPONENT OF THE FINAL IBRD/GOB PROGRAM PROPOSAL. THE DUTCH ARE PRESENTLY LOOKING AT THREE (3) OF THE OTHER COMPONENTS, TO WIT: AGRICULTURE MACHINERY, LIVESTOCK, AND POST HARVEST TECHNOLOGY. THEY HAVE SET ASIDE A PRELIMINARY PLANNING FIGURE OF EIGHT MILLION GUILDERS (4 MILLION) FOR THEIR PARTICIPATION IN THE OVERALL PROGRAM. FRANCE (FAC) HAS PROMISED A MINIMUM OF THREE (3) LONG-TERM TECHNICAL

ASSISTANCE PERSONNEL AND HAS EXPRESSED A POSSIBLE INTEREST IN THE SOIL-WATER-PLANT RELATIONSHIP COMPONENT. FINAL DETERMINATION ON THE EXTENT OF FAC PARTICIPATION WILL BE MADE FOLLOWING A PLANNED VISIT TO BURKINA BY THE FRENCH MINISTER OF COOPERATION IN JANUARY. ALL DONORS INCLUDING USAID, ARE WORKING FROM THE SAME BASIC DOCUMENTS. THE IBRD WILL BE PROVIDING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO THE RESEARCH POLICY, COORDINATION AND INSTITUTIONAL ADMINISTRATION COMPONENT OF THE TOTAL PROGRAM. USAID/BURKINA'S PID PROPOSAL OF CONCENTRATING ON THE FSR COMPONENT PROVIDES USAID WITH THE UNIQUE POSITION OF INVOLVEMENT WITH AND EXERCISING INFLUENCE OVER ALL OTHER COMPONENTS, INCLUDING THE POLICY AND COORDINATION COMPONENT, GIVEN FSR'S RELEVANCE TO ALL SUB-SECTORS OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH. FYI: RE PARA 5 OF REFTEL, USAID/BURKINA HAS BEEN IN POSSESSION OF THE IBRD'S DRAFT STAFF APPRAISAL REPORT SINCE THE APPRAISAL TEAM LEFT IN DECEMBER 1986 AND SUBSEQUENTLY USED THAT AND PERIODIC UPDATES IN PREPARATION OF THE PID. END FYI.

4. ISSUE NO. 3: USAID/BURKINA HAD CONSIDERED USING THE COLLABORATIVE ASSISTANCE MODE FOR PP DESIGN BUT HAD REJECTED IT FOR SEVERAL REASONS: THE COLLABORATIVE ASSISTANCE MODE IMPLYS COMPETITIVE ADVERTISEMENT, EXPRESSION OF INTEREST RESPONSES, REVIEW, SELECTION, AWARD, PROLONGED DISCUSSION ON ULTIMATE DESIGN TEAM MEMBERS, MOBILIZATION, ETC., ETC. THE NECESSITY TO ASSURE AN FY 88 OBLIGATION WITHOUT HAVING TO ACCEPT AN UNSATISFACTORY FOURTH QUARTER DESIGN PRODUCT IN ORDER TO MEET SUCH OBLIGATION PRESSURES WAS COMPELLING AND MITIGATED AGAINST A PROTRACTED PRE-DESIGN PROCESS. SECONDLY, THE PROJECT IS NOT COMPLEX AND REQUIRES NO UNIQUE INSTITUTIONAL IMPRINT IN ITS DESIGN. THIRDLY, THE MISSION WISHES TO CONTROL THE DESIGN BASED ON ITS OWN EXPERIENCE, INSTITUTIONAL MEMORY AND INTIMATE KNOWLEDGE OF ALL ACTORS - BOTH HOST-COUNTRY AND MULTI-DONOR PARTNERS. FOURTH AND FINALLY, THE MISSION INTENDS TO ACHIEVE THE ULTIMATE OBJECTIVE OF TITLE XII INVOLVEMENT (ONE OF THE RATIONALE BEHIND THE COLLABORATIVE MODE) THROUGH ITS STATED INTENTION (SECTION III.F.2 OF THE PID) TO UTILIZE A TITLE XII INSTITUTION IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROJECT. SUCH TITLE XII INVOLVEMENT WILL BE COMPETITIVELY SOUGHT AFTER FINAL APPROVAL AND PROAG EXECUTION OF THE PROJECT.

5. RE PARA 6 OF REFTEL, USAID/BURKINA TAKES SERIOUS EXCEPTION TO THE FACTORING IN OF OE CONCERNS IN THE PID REVIEWS. WHILE THE OE CONCERNS ARE A TOPICAL ISSUE TO THE BUREAU AND THE MISSION THEY SHOULD BE HELD EXTRANEOUS TO COMMITTEE REVIEW OF THE PID. THE MISSION INSISTS THAT THE PID BE REVIEWED ON ITS MERITS AS A DEVELOPMENTAL PROJECT AND THAT SUCH REVIEW BE NEITHER COLORED NOR BIASED BY FACTORS EXTERNAL TO SUCH MERITS. THE ISSUE OF WHETHER THE PROJECT WILL ULTIMATELY BE AUTHORIZED FOR IMPLEMENTATION WILL BE DECIDED SUBSEQUENT TO AND APART FROM APPROVAL OR DISAPPROVAL OF THE PROJECT PROPOSAL. FYI: THE SUBJECT PROJECT DOES NOT RPT NOT HAVE OE IMPLICATIONS AS PRESENTLY BEING DEBATED BY AID/W (AS UNDERSTOOD BY THE MISSION RELATIVE TO THE SPECIFIC POSITIONS BEING LOOKED AT IN AID/W). IN 1988 THE PRESENT MISSION DIRECTOR WAS MANDATED WITH SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCING AND CONSOLIDATING THE EXISTING PORTFOLIO. THIS HAS BEEN DONE. THE AGRICULTURAL PORTFOLIO HAS BEEN REDUCED BY FIVE PROJECTS OVER THE PAST TWO YEARS AND THE AGRICULTURAL DIVISION STAFFING REDUCED FROM FIVE USDH AND THREE FSN (1984) TO ONE USDH AND ONE FSN. IT IS INCONCEIVABLE THAT A USAID SAHELIAN DEVELOPMENT MISSION COULD BE REDUCED FURTHER IN ITS AGRICULTURAL RELATED STAFF. THE SUBJECT PROJECT AS REPRESENTED BY THE PRESENT PID CAN BE EASILY ABSORBED WITHIN THE PORTFOLIO WORKLOAD OF THE MISSION'S PRESENT AND MINIMAL AGRICULTURAL STAFF. AS, IN A WORST-CASE SCENARIO, WE WOULD EXPECT NO

REDUCTION IN THIS STAFF WE SEE NO RELEVANCE BETWEEN THE OE DEBATE AND THE PID REVIEW. END FYI.

6. MISSION DIRECTOR MILLER URGES THAT AN ECPR BE SCHEDULED SOONEST FOR THE SUBJECT PID AND THAT THE MISSION DIRECTOR BE AUTHORIZED TO ATTEND THE ECPR TO ELABORATE FURTHER ON ISSUES RAISED BY PROJECT COMMITTEE ISSUES MEETING (PER REFTEL) AND AS BRIEFLY RESPONDED TO BY THIS MESSAGE. MISSION DIRECTOR CONSULTATIONS IN AID/W ARE CRITICAL AT THIS TIME AND WILL PROVIDE OPPORTUNITY FOR PROPER AND ESSENTIAL MISSION PARTICIPATION IN MAJOR DECISIONS AFFECTING LONG-TERM FUTURE OF THE BURKINA PROGRAM. FYI: FINE LINE PENCILING OF FY 88 OE BUDGET IS PRESENTLY 28.7 PERCENT BELOW THAT PROJECTED IN FY 89 ABS AND 9.1 PERCENT BELOW ACTUAL FY 87 OE. PROJECTED FY 88 FAAS COSTS HAVE BEEN REDUCED 49 PERCENT FROM ESTIMATED FY 87 COSTS AND 56 PERCENT FROM ACTUAL FY 86 COSTS. MISSION AND COMBINED USDH AND FSN STAFF ARE PREPARED TO TIGHTEN BELTS EVEN FURTHER IN DEFENSE OF PRESENT PROGRAM DIRECTION AND STAFFING LEVELS. END FYI.

7. GIVEN ABIDJAN REDSO PERSONNEL INVOLVEMENT IN THE DESIGN SCHEDULE OF THE PROJECT, REQUEST REDSO/WCA BE INFO'D ON ALL TRAFFIC RELEVANT TO THIS PROJECT.

8. FOR ABIDJAN REDSO: REFTEL BEING REPEATED FYI.
TWINING

91