

# A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY PART I

(BEFORE FILLING OUT THIS FORM, READ THE ATTACHED INSTRUCTIONS) D.H.A.2-289

**REPORTING A.I.D. UNIT:**

S&T/AGR/AP

Mission or AID/W Office)

ES

**B. WAS EVALUATION SCHEDULED IN CURRENT FY ANNUAL EVALUATION PLAN?**

yes  slipped  ad hoc

Eval. Plan Submission Date: FY   0  

**C. EVALUATION TIMING** 61314

Interim  final  ex post  other

**ACTIVITY OR ACTIVITIES EVALUATED** (List the following information for project(s) or program(s) evaluated; If not applicable, list title and date of the evaluation report)

IDENTIFICATION DATA

Project #	Project/Program Title (or title & date of evaluation report)	First PROAG or equivalent (FY)	Most recent PACD (mo/yr)	Planned LOP Cost ('000)	Amount Obligated to Date ('000)
931-0203	Seed Program and Industry Development	1958	6/86	4,134	4,134
936-4143	Improved Seed Production and Utilization				
plus					
2,166					
(buy-in)					

**E. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR**

Action(s) Required

- Amend the PP and Cooperative Agreement to provide limited follow-up consultation to successfully completed mission projects, funded out of core projects to guarantee their sustainability.
- Obligate an additional \$15,000 for 936-4143.

Name of officer responsible for Action

S&T/AGR,  
F. Mertens

S&T/AGR,  
M. Blakeney

Date Action to be Completed

March 31, 1988

March 31, 1988

ACTIONS

(Attach extra sheet if necessary)

**F. DATE OF MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE REVIEW OF EVALUATION:** mo   1   day   5   yr   88  

**G. APPROVALS OF EVALUATION SUMMARY AND ACTION DECISIONS:**

APPROVALS

	Project/Program Officer	Representative of Borrower/Grantee	Evaluation Officer	Mission or AID/W Office Director
Signature				
Typed Name	F. Mertens	J.C. Delouche	E. Roche	D. Bathrick
Date:	<u>4/20/88</u>	<u>1/6/89</u>	<u>11/16/88</u>	<u>11/18/88</u>

**H. EVALUATION ABSTRACT** (do not exceed the space provided)

The project was initiated to assist developing countries with the development of storage, processing and handling of seeds. Since 1986, the project has concentrated on research and technical assistance which has been provided only if requested and funded by missions through the Basic Ordering Agreement. The project has been implemented by Mississippi State University (MSU) as a centrally funded project with the Bureau for Science and Technology in Washington, D.C. since 1958. Because the project is 30 years old, this evaluation was undertaken to determine the impact the project has had on the development of the seed industry in less developed countries (LDCs). The major findings were:

ABSTRACT

- The impact of the project's assistance and training at the Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical (CIAT) and the four countries of Niger, Honduras, Brazil and Thailand, has been notable. In each of the last three countries, an effective, profitable and growing private seed industry has been established.
- Training has strongly influenced the initiation of seed programs in the LDCs.
- MSU's research has made a substantial contribution to drying and storing seed in the humid tropics.
- A private seed industry was developed in all of the seed projects when profitable opportunities were available.
- The project's cost of services to LDCs has been low when compared to other projects and greater amounts of total funding have been allocated to technical assistance.
- Technical assistance provided by MSU is of the highest quality.

The evaluation team reached the following conclusions:

- Seed programs must consider the role of private enterprise and public service. Both will be needed to assure a well-rounded program.
- Trained staff is essential to project success.
- An on-going research program dedicated to providing improved crop varieties is necessary for project success in the LDCs.
- Missions must properly sequence proposed assistance efforts to assure conditions favorable for project success.

**I. EVALUATION COSTS**

COSTS

1. Evaluation Team		Contract Number <input type="checkbox"/>	Contract Cost <input type="checkbox"/>	Source of Funds
Name	Affiliation			
Dr. E. Hogan	Contractor	108	81,554	936-4109
Dr. R. Jackson	Contractor			
Dr. S. West	Contractor			

2. Mission/Office Professional Staff Person-Days (estimate) 37

3. Borrower/Grantee Professional Staff Person-Days (estimate) 65

21

# A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY PART II

## I. SUMMARY OF EVALUATION FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS (Try not to exceed the 3 pages provided)

Address the following items:

- Purpose of activity(ies) evaluated
- Purpose of evaluation and Methodology used
- Findings and conclusions (relate to questions)
- Principal recommendations
- Lessons learned

Mission or Office: S&T/AGR/AP

Date this summary prepared: 4/19/88

Title and Date of Full Evaluation Report: Seed Program and Industry Development & Improved Seed Production & Utilization

1. PURPOSE: The purpose of this activity is to improve capabilities in LDCs for the efficient production, conditioning, distribution and utilization of seeds of improved food and feed crop varieties. The goal of this activity is to increase the quality and quantity of food and feed crop production in LDCs.

2. PURPOSE OF EVALUATION AND METHODOLOGY: The purpose of the evaluation was to carry out a comprehensive examination of the operations and implementation of A.I.D. projects: Seed Program and Industry (931-0203) and Improved Seed Production and Utilization (936-4143) under cooperative agreements and contracts with Mississippi State University (MSU) since 1958. The evaluation was to determine the responsiveness of the projects to assist seed specialists in LDCs through the provision of technical assistance.

METHODOLOGY USED: 1) The team reviewed background information which included reviewing the cooperative agreement scope of work, trip reports and the project output documents such as workshop proceedings, publications, presented papers and inputs to PIDs, PPs and evaluation reports; 2) The team reviewed the project papers, cooperative agreements, program descriptions, STL final project report, midterm evaluation and other project documents as deemed relevant; 3) Team visited MSU and interviewed project staff; 4) Team visited 4 countries and discussed the project with country officials.

### 3. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:

FINDINGS: 1) The impact of the project's assistance and training at the Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical (CIAT) and the four countries of Niger, Honduras, Brazil and Thailand, has been notable. In each of the last three countries, an effective, profitable and growing private seed industry has been established; 2) Training has strongly influenced the initiation of seed programs in the LDCs; 3) MSU's research has made a substantial contribution to drying and storing seed in the humid tropics; 4) A private seed industry was developed in all of the seed projects when profitable opportunities were available; 5) The project's cost of services to LDCs has been low when compared to other projects and greater amounts of total funding have been allocated to technical assistance; and 6) Technical assistance provided by MSU is of the highest quality.

CONCLUSIONS: 1) seed programs must consider the role of private enterprise and public service; both will be utilized to assure a well-rounded program for an LDC; 2) Trained staff in the LDC is essential to project success; 3) An on-going research program dedicated to providing improved crop varieties is necessary for project success in the LDCs; and 4) Missions must properly sequence proposed assistance efforts to assure conditions favorable for project success.

4. RECOMMENDATION: The team recommended that AID should provide a minimum amount of funding to the project to provide increased cooperative research and a minimum of technical assistance to successfully completed mission projects to assure complete institutionalization of programs.

LESSONS LEARNED:

1. Seed programs need to consider the role of private enterprise and public service; both are needed to assure a well-rounded program.
2. Trained staff is essential to project success.
3. An on-going agricultural research program dedicated to providing improved crop varieties is necessary for project success.
4. Continuity and integration into on-going institution research programs significantly improves the quality of services provided to A.I.D. by outside organizations and so does the use of permanent tenured staff.
5. Wide support by the LDC government is helpful to the establishment of a viable seed program.
6. IARCs can be excellent locations for regional training.
7. Missions must properly sequence proposed assistance efforts to assure conditions favorable to project success.
8. Follow-on activities after project completion can be important to successful institutionalization programs.

K. ATTACHMENTS (List attachments submitted with this Evaluation Summary; always attach copy of full evaluation report, even if one was submitted earlier)

ATTACHMENTS

One evaluation report.

L. COMMENTS BY MISSION, AID/W OFFICE AND BORROWER/GRANTEE

L. The evaluation report has been reviewed by the Office of Agriculture of the Bureau for Science and Technology (S&T/AGR). It is agreed that the evaluation was fair and concurred with the general impression of the subject project by S&T/AGR. The evaluation followed the Scope of Work (SOW) and answered all questions. S&T/AGR agreed with the team that a greater variety of countries could have been visited by splitting the team more frequently. Future SOWs for similar projects will take this recommendation into consideration. The evaluation team confirmed S&T/AGR's long held belief that the major factors for a successful seed project are:

- 1. Locally improved varieties which must be continually developed; 2) well trained staff and an appropriate balance between the private seed sector and the public seed sector. The latter factor is often being omitted in recent years with A.I.D.'s trend towards the private sector.

The second most frequent mistake in seed industry development, especially in Africa, is the lack of an on-going research program dedicated to continuously improving crop varieties.

Of special interest was the team's recommendation to provide a minimum amount of funding in the project to provide increased cooperative research and a minimum of technical assistance to successfully completed projects to assure complete institutionalization of programs. These funds were originally provided for the project but were eliminated during a project revision in 1984.

The Grantee concurs with the findings and recommendations of the evaluation report, and the comments and suggestions made here.

MISSION COMMENTS ON FULL REPORT