

PD-AMZ-291
PART 1.0316

A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY

(BEFORE FILLING OUT THIS FORM, READ THE ATTACHED INSTRUCTIONS)

A. REPORTING A.I.D. UNIT:
S&T/AGR
 (Mission or AID/W Office)

B. WAS EVALUATION SCHEDULED IN CURRENT FY ANNUAL EVALUATION PLAN?
 yes slipped ad hoc

C. EVALUATION TIMING
 Interim final ex post other

(ES#) Eval. Plan Submission Date: FY Q

IDENTIFICATION DATA

D. 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)

Project #	Project/Program Title (for title & date of evaluation report)	First PROAG or equivalent (FY)	Most recent PACD (mo/yr)	Planned LOP Cost ('000)	Amount Obligated to Date ('000)
931-0786	Improvement of Post-harvest Grain Systems	09/30/80	02/15/86		
931-4144	Post-harvest Grain Systems R&D	09/30/85	02/15/81	1,226	3,245

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

Action(s) Required
 Work with Post-harvest Grain Systems R&D contractor to incorporate relevant recommendations into Annual Work Plan.

Name of officer responsible for Action
 S&T/AGR
 F. Mertens

Date Action to be Completed
 06/30/88

(Attach extra sheet if necessary)

ACTIONS

F. DATE OF MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE REVIEW OF EVALUATION: mo 3 day 3 yr 88

G. APPROVALS OF EVALUATION SUMMARY AND ACTION DECISIONS:

Signature Typed Name	Project/Program Officer	Representative of Borrower/Grantee	Evaluation Officer	Mission or AID/W Office Director
	F. Mertens <i>F. Mertens</i> Date: <u>4/28/88</u>	<i>C. Deyoe</i> C. Deyoe Date: <u>11/29/88</u>	<i>E. Roche</i> E. Roche Date: <u>11/16/88</u>	<i>D. Bathrick</i> D. Bathrick Date: <u>10/15/88</u>

APPROVALS

11-105

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

The project supports USAID field missions and host country efforts in reducing losses of harvested grain and in improving the efficiency of post-harvest systems through such activities as research, technical assistance, training, operation of a post-harvest documentation service, and networking with other post-harvest professionals and operatives. The project is implemented under a cooperative agreement with the Food and Feed Grain Institute (FFGI) of Kansas State University (KSU).

This evaluation (February 8-27, 1988) combined the final evaluation of the Project 931-0786 (Cooperative Agreement AID/DSAN-CA-0256) which was effective from November 1, 1980 through February 15, 1986 and a mid-term evaluation of Project 931-4144 (the second Cooperative Agreement DAN-4144-00-A-5095-00) which was initiated September 30, 1985 and is scheduled to terminate February 15, 1991.

This external evaluation was conducted by a team of two external post-harvest specialists and an Agency management specialist to assess the project's achievements in relation to project goals. The team reviewed: (a) project documents, reports, studies; (b) interviewed A.I.D. staff and host country nationals who used project services; (c) interviewed KSU staff, and; (d) visited KSU facilities and two countries where services were utilized.

The evaluation team found the project to be on schedule in its progress toward the goals which were reduced because of budget cuts. Specific findings and conclusions are:

1. The project provided a highly qualified professional staff in spite of three mid-project budget cuts and they were commended for their recent work in Costa Rica and Belize. The project made valuable contributions in the privatization of marketing boards.
2. The contractor should place more emphasis on the reporting and publication of their success stories and research results.
3. Any further cuts in core funding would create extremely serious problems in preserving a critical mass of technical expertise. Mission buy-ins, a substitute for core funding, are extremely variable, uncertain and creates a problem for the project to support a long-term core staff of experts.
4. The project should conduct further loss assessment studies to establish the size, location, and timing of post-harvest losses to guide further research aimed at their prevention.

I. EVALUATION COSTS

1. Evaluation Team Name	Affiliation	Contract Number Of TDY Person Days	Contract Cost Of TDY Cost (US\$)	Source of Funds
Elizabeth Roche	S&T/AGR	20	1,000	OE
Dale Anderson	Consultant	22	} 22,500	Program
Elvis Heinrich	Consultant	20		

2. Mission/Office Professional
Staff Person-Days (estimate) 45

3. Borrower/Grantee Professional
Staff Person-Days (estimate) 10

ABSTRACT

COSTS

21

A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY PART II

J. 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 Date this summary prepared: April 1988

Title and Date of Full Evaluation Report: Global: Post-Harvest Grain Systems Evaluation April 1988

Project Purpose:

This project continues a program initiated in 1967 to improve the capability of small farmers, agribusiness, and government agencies in LDCs in the design, implementation, studies and research of improved systems for cereal grains and legumes, in order to reduce losses and increase the efficiency of the marketing system. The project is implemented by Kansas State University.

Evaluation Purpose and Methodology used:

The external evaluation was conducted to provide a comprehensive examination of the performance and implementation in accordance with the initial and modified Scope of Work in the grant agreements and logframes of A.I.D. projects 931-0786 and 936-4144 with Kansas State University (K.S.U.) since 1980. The evaluation determined the capability of the project to aid missions and LDCs in the field of grain storage, grain processing, and marketing through the provision of technical assistance.

The external evaluation was conducted by a team who: (a) reviewed project documents, reports, and studies, (b) interviewed contractor staff and A.I.D. staff and host country officials who used project services; and (c) visited project sites to determine project impact.

Findings and conclusions:

- 1.) The Food and Feed Grains Institute's (P.F.G.I.) excellent reputation has been reinforced by the long-term continuity of its activities. Continuity of A.I.D. funding has provided the basis for the retention of a highly qualified professional staff which forms the basis for the Institute's outreach activities. However, the erosion of core support occasioned by recent budget reductions, threatens to undermine the source of this continuity (p. 3, 11, & 24).
- 2.) Examples of success abound in narrative form, but they tend not to be well-documented either quantitatively or qualitatively. The project has given minimal attention to publicizing its success stories (p. 11, 16).
- 3.) Efforts toward addressing recommendations of the 1984 evaluation team have been commendable, especially in light of subsequent budget reductions which had to be absorbed (p. 3, 4, & 5).
- 4.) Mission buy-ins appear likely to become a major source of project funding. However, this funding volume is highly variable, making it of limited value in substituting for more consistent core funding

SUMMARY

5.) Recent work in Costa Rica and Belize is commendable in its depth of outreach, such assistance is more likely to achieve permanent results than more fragmented efforts (p. 11, 12).

6.) The lack of reliable data describing harvesting and in-storage losses in many countries makes it difficult to determine the cost-effectiveness of preventing such losses (p. 2, 5 & 10).

7.) Initiatives in guiding the privatization portions of the marketing board's operations in Belize and Costa Rica are commendable examples of assistance to the private sector (p. 26).

8.) Networking activities are important, not only to the enhancement of project staff professional capabilities, but to the capabilities of those with whom the project collaborates. These activities complement the more central activities of technical assistance, training, and research.

Principal Recommendations:

The external evaluation made the following recommendations with regard to completion of the project:

--Further loss assessment studies are needed to establish the size, location, and timing of losses and to guide further research aimed at their prevention (p. 4, 5 & 10).

--The project should give further attention to the reporting of its output. Successes in case-study examples should be highlighted in the project's annual reports. Wider publication of research results should be sought and more publications produced. The project should also publish a newsletter for distribution to former students and other postharvest professionals and practitioners around the world. An ongoing system of internal program evaluation should be initiated (p. 16, 4).

--Further attention should be given to the institutionalization of outreach activities. In this connection, the team supports the involvement of the project and the Government of Honduras in the proposed international seed and grain center at Zamorano. Such a center might significantly reinforce and expand the research, training, and technology transfer capabilities of the project (p. 3, 15).

--Efforts should be made to form stronger cooperative links with the international agricultural research centers. Such links should aim especially at the strengthening of postharvest considerations in the CGIAR crop breeding programs (p. 16).

--The Postharvest Documentation Service is encouraged to continue expansion of its files and extension of its outreach. Means for cooperation rather than competition with the proposed Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) documentation system should be explored (p. 12, 13).

--Increased funding, especially of core-supported activities, is essential to the implementation of recommendations of both the present and 1984 evaluations (p. 3, 11, 24 & 25).

Lessons Learned:

An expansion of core funding by A.I.D./W is critical to the future success of project programs. Any further cuts would create extremely serious problems in preservation of a critical mass of technical expertise; and networking would probably have to be eliminated. Beyond that, the viability of the entire program would be called into question.

SUMMARY (continued)

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

ATTACHMENTS

Global: Post Harvest Grain Systems Evaluation Report - April 1988

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

AID/S&T/AGR COMMENTS:

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.

The AID-project manager will incorporate the following evaluation recommendations into the annual work plan of the project:

- A) KSU will increase research publications and will highlight its success in case studies of its annual report.
- B) KSU will seek mission buy-ins.
- C) Efforts will be made for stronger cooperative links with international agricultural research centers.
- D) An outreach mechanism will be developed to maintain contacts with former students.

KSU/FFGI COMMENTS:

MISSION COMMENTS ON FULL REPORT

1. FFGI staff will increase publication of research output and promote a wider distribution of such publications.
2. An outreach device will be implemented to establish and maintain contacts with former students as well as other postharvest professionals around the world.
3. In order to develop cooperative linkages with international research centers, a scheduled distribution of research reports will be initiated. A letter concerning collaboration in postharvest research will be sent to these research centers in order to determine the extent of interest of such institutions in postharvest research issues.
4. Closer collaboration with other S&T-sponsored projects will require specific plans and actions on the part of S&T project officers. Without such plans and actions, it is improbable that FFGI can collaborate to any greater extent than it is currently performing.

Many of the other issues raised in the evaluation report, such as the production of videotapes and slide sets, the continued expansion of PHDS, and increased collaborative activities, cannot be directly addressed because of funding constraints. These constraints were noted and acknowledged by the project evaluation team.

A point of clarification is required concerning paragraph 2 on page 22 of the report. The budgeted time of 91.0 person-months is as approved by S&T/AGR on 02/06/87. It should be noted that an organization cannot reduce original person-month targets in direct proportion to budget reductions without requiring a reduction in the technical core staff. Therefore, reductions were made in such categories as graduate students and clerical support so as to maintain the core technical staff. This results in a person-month reduction of greater percentage than the budget reduction. This is shown in the tabular format on page 22.