

A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY - PART I

PD-AEA-720

1. BEFORE FILLING OUT THIS FORM, READ THE ATTACHED INSTRUCTIONS.  
2. USE LETTER QUALITY TYPE, NOT "DOT MATRIX" TYPE.

IDENTIFICATION DATA

A. Reporting A.I.D. Unit: Mission or AID/W Office (ES# ST/N)

B. Was Evaluation Scheduled in Current FY Annual Evaluation Plan? Yes  Skipped  Ad Hoc   
Evaluation Plan Submission Date: FY 90

C. Evaluation Timing Interim  Final   
Ex Post  Other

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 No.	Project /Program Title	First PROAG or Equivalent (FY)	Most Recent PACD (Mo/Yr)	Planned LOP Cost (000)	Amount Obligated to Date (000)
936-5114	Food Technology for Development		1/89	1,400	1,067
931-0831	Nutrition & Food Technical Services		12/86	11,158	10,431

ACTIONS

E. Action Decisions Approved By Mission or AID/W Office Director

Action(s) Required	Name of Officer Responsible for Action	Date Action to be Completed
1. Oversee an orderly close-out of the USDA food technology RSSA. Make sure that A.I.D. has single copies of all the significant reports produced by the project.	N. Luykx	by Feb. 1, 1990
2. Develop a new food technology project proposal built around private sector institutions that are most likely to contribute to economic recovery and growth.	N. Luykx, C. Coleman	by Feb. 1, 1990

(Attach extra sheet if necessary)

APPROVALS

F. Date Of Mission Or AID/W Office Review Of Evaluation: (Month) May (Day) 1 (Year) 1989

G. Approvals of Evaluation Summary And Action Decisions:

Name (Typed)	Project/Program Officer	Representative of Borrower/Grantee	Evaluation Officer	Mission or AID/W Office Director
Signature	Nicolas Luykx		Frank Alejandro	Norge W. Jerome
Date	<u>3-15-90</u>			<u>14/9/89</u>

**ABSTRACT**

H. Evaluation Abstract (Do not exceed the space provided)

The project aimed to help improve the nutritional status of people in developing countries through applications of food science and technology. In doing so A.I.D. made use of the technical skills of the U.S. Department of Agriculture through a RSSA arrangement.

The USDA Food Technology Branch in the Office of International Cooperation and Development (USDA/OICD/FTB) has developed cooperative agreements with universities and private companies to conduct R and D, and provide technical assistance overseas.

The FTB's biggest successes have been in the transfer of technologies for the preparation of low-cost nutritious weaning foods in developing countries. The case of the development and promotion of the weaning food, "Thriposha" in Sri Lanka is an illustration. Other countries are also adapting the technology and the marketing strategies successfully to their own situations. Other successes have been notable in the fortification of popular foods with vitamin A, and other nutrients.

The evaluators recommended strongly that A.I.D. continue to include food science and technology in its Nutrition program. The contractor has been slow in finalizing the evaluation report, causing difficulty in incorporating evaluation results in follow-on project activities.

**COSTS**

**I. Evaluation Costs**

1. Evaluation Team		Contract Number OR TDY Person Days	Contract Cost OR TDY Cost (U.S. \$)	Source of Funds Program
Name	Affiliation			
Malcolm C. Bourne	Sigma One Corp.	PDC-1406-I-00 7028	49,024	
John W. Erdman, Jr.				
Miriam H. Thomas				
2. Mission/Office Professional Staff Person-Days (Estimate) <u>0</u>		3. Borrower/Grantee Professional Staff Person-Days (Estimate) <u>0</u>		

7/

# A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY - PART II

## SUMMARY

J. Summary of Evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations (Try not to exceed the three (3) pages provided)  
Address the following items:

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

Mission or Office:

Date This Summary Prepared:

Title And Date Of Full Evaluation Report:

### I. Purpose of the Activity Being Evaluated:

This project activity, was implemented by the Food Technology Branch (FTB) of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Office of International Cooperation and Development (USDA/OICD) under a Resource Support Service Agreement (RSSA). The purpose of the project is to:

"... assist the developing countries in identifying, developing and introducing indigenous low-cost nutritious foods, and improving the feeding practices of children, and pregnant and lactating women ...."

The technical assistance effort has been designed to provide support to USAID missions and the developing countries in which they serve: by (1) identifying and advising on specific food science and technology problems; (2) identifying associated problems in consumption behavior; and (3) assisting in the design of the projects in these areas.

### II. Purpose of the Evaluation and Methodology Used:

This is a project termination evaluation, as well as a previous evaluation that has slipped on the schedule. The purpose of the evaluation was to make an assessment of the USDA/OICD/FTB compliance with the objectives established in the RSSA agreement, the results obtained, and the effectiveness of the technical assistance provided.

A three-person team was selected in May 1989 to evaluate the period FY 1983 - FY 1988 under the USDA/OICD/TAB RSSA. The team conducted interviews and examined project documents. They met with A.I.D. and USDA staff for this purpose and made field visits. The field visits took team members to project implementation sites in Indonesia and Sri Lanka; and to the location of cooperating universities in Colorado, Texas and Virginia.

### III. Findings and Conclusions:

A. Compliance with the Objectives of the RSSA: The FTB staff performance was evaluated as having complied actively with the four priorities identified in the RSSA documents: (1)

weaning foods, (2) processed fortified foods and appropriate food technology, (3) PVO programs support, and (4) private sector involvement in nutrition activities.

The evaluation team illustrated this judgement by citing FTB activities during the July -December period in 1988. During this period various types of technical assistance were being offered in seven countries. Further, private U.S. companies were cooperating in technological R and D in food fortification. Additional activities, exploring new technical areas included the development of special catch-up foods for young children whose growth progress had been interrupted by acute diarrhea, and exploration of the possible use of pro-biotic microorganisms in foods to help prevent diarrhea in children.

B Responsiveness: The evaluation team reported evidence of the responsiveness of the FTB to requests for technical assistance: "The OICD staff clearly placed priority on and took pride in rapid, clear and competent response ...."

C. Tangible and Intangible Results Achieved: The Thripasha weaning food activity illustrates successful assistance rendered by the FTB. Largely through the FTB's efforts, a high quality, low-cost and nutritious complimentary weaning food is now available to poor mothers in Sri Lanka. Technical assistance has also been provided to several other countries that have become interested in the local manufacture of weaning foods through the activities of the FTB.

Also, through FTB efforts, major technological advances have been achieved with a vitamin A product that is coated onto monosodium glutamate crystals.

D. Technical and Managerial Effectiveness: The technical effectiveness of the FTB is enhanced by their use of university and private company experts as consultants. The management style of the FTB is tied to that of the group's leader. The evaluation team judges the FTB to be "dogged," dedicated and quick to respond to identified needs within their purview. The unyielding single-mindedness of the FTB's leader was credited with encouraging others to continue in efforts to find solutions to complex food science and technology problems in developing countries.

#### IV. Principal Recommendations:

- (1) Food technology must continue to be an integral component of A.I.D.'s food, nutrition and health programs.
- (2) The Office of Nutrition should establish a bridging mechanism to hold on to the present food technology expertise in USDA/OICD/FTB until a permanent in-house A.I.D.

structure is established to provide for the long-term food technology needs of the Office of Nutrition and A.I.D. as a whole.

- (3) An Office of Food Technology should be established in the A.I.D. Bureau for Science and Technology ....
- (4) The food technology services for the Office of Nutrition should have an external review at regular intervals of about five years.
- (5) An advisory committee should be established to provide guidance for the food technology services provided to A.I.D.

V. Lessons Learned:

- (1) Food science and technology are very important to the success of food, agriculture, nutrition, health, rural development, and food aid programs. The field is largely ignored for reasons that are unclear.
- (2) One should not take consultants for granted. The final report of this evaluation is still awaiting revision and completion. No matter how good the past reputation of a contractor, no agreement should be signed without spelling out all expectations in sufficient detail so that a contractor's responsibilities are unmistakable.

## ATTACHMENTS

K. Attachments (List attachments submitted with this Evaluation Summary; always attach copy of full evaluation report, even if one was submitted earlier; attach studies, surveys, etc., from "on-going" evaluation, if relevant to the evaluation report.)

Bourne, Malcolm, John Erdman and Miriam Thomas, "Review of the Food Technology for Development RSSA," Sigma One Corporation, (Draft, August 1989). (The report is undergoing final review and editing by the contractor.)

## COMMENTS

L. Comments By Mission, AID/W Office and Borrower/Grantee On Full Report

The Office of Nutrition (S&T/N) is seriously dismayed at the length of time it has taken to complete the report of the evaluation, considering that the contract was signed in May 1989, and the draft report was completed by the contractor in August 1989.

S&T/N finds that the conclusions of the evaluation are a correct, positive interpretation of the USDA/OICD/FTB contribution to A.I.D. food and nutrition programs. However, the justifying evidence is not appropriately organized and presented in the report.

The recommendations call for continued reliance on food science and technology as part of A.I.D. efforts to improve nutrition in developing countries. This is being done, through the development of a new project taking account of changing conditions in developing countries.