PD-ABB-563
67823

CLASSIFICATION

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) – PART I

Report Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE	2. PROJECT NUMBER	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE
IPFE OPG - Rural Campesino Training	527-0179	USAID/Peru

4. EVALUATION NUMBER (Enter the number maintained by the reporting unit e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No. beginning with No. 1 each FY)

☒ REGULAR EVALUATION ☐ SPECIAL EVALUATION

5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES			6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING	7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY 78	B. Final Obligation Expected FY 80	C. Final Input Delivery FY 80	A. Total $ 269,000 B. U.S. $ 210,000	From (month/yr.) 2/78 To (month/yr.) 7/79 Date of Evaluation Review

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

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., airgram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
(See attached Memo)		

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS

- ☐ Project Paper
- ☐ Financial Plan
- ☐ Logical Framework
- ☐ Project Agreement
- ☐ Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network
- ☐ PIO/T
- ☐ PIO/C
- ☐ PIO/P
- ☐ Other (Specify)
- ☐ Other (Specify)

10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT

- A. ☐ Continue Project Without Change
- B. ☐ Change Project Design and/or
- ☒ Change Implementation Plan
- C. ☐ Discontinue Project

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)

Francisco Espinoza, Administrative Assistant
Howard R. Kramer, Assistant Program Officer

12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval

Signature: R. Villalobos

Typed Name: Ricardo Villalobos

Date: July 9, 1979

AID 1330-15 (3-78)

Messrs. O'Donnell, Smucker, Espinoza

July 3, 1979

H.Robert Kramer
Assistant Program Officer

Evaluation of IPFE OPG 527-0179, Rural Campesino Training

This OPG is designed to assist IPFE conduct training in basic agricultural production techniques for independent, small farmers in selected areas of the sierra and ceja de selva. This is a pilot program in which IPFE is developing, demonstrating and testing the effectiveness of an audio-visual training methodology.

A recent visit (June 25-26) was made to Huancayo, IPFE's first training area, to meet with IPFE project personnel, measure achievements to date, discuss implementation problems, and determine additional funding requirements, following a recent IPFE request for additional funding beyond the $210,000 originally contemplated. Meetings were also held with the Director of the Agrarian Regional Office, Ing. Bravo Mejia, and with the head of the CENCIRA zonal office, to discuss the efficacy of coordination arrangements and elicit their perceptions regarding the relative utility of IPFE's activities. Informal conversations were held with a number of campesinos who received training during the past few months. Since an IPFE training course I was to visit was unavoidably postponed, I was unable to assess the effectiveness of both the content and delivery of the program. However, I expect to attend the next course, to be held in San Pedro de Cajas within the next few weeks.

Although the brief visit only permitted a short, perfunctory examination of the project, I believe that it is safe to conclude that activities are being implemented according to initial design by a capable and dedicated group of project personnel. Trainers and technical advisors have been selected and trained, geographic areas have been identified, course requirements have been selected and two courses has been produced. Sixteen course have been given to date with a total of 309 participants In the Mantaro Valley all participants with whom I spoke expressed their satisfaction with the course, although all stated that it was too limited in scope.

By mid-1980, five courses will have been produced, including Improvement of Potato and Tarwi Seed, Rice Irrigation, (both already completed), Cuy Production and Pig Raising. The present project sites of Huancayo

and Moyobamba (San Martín), will be extended to provinces in Ancash, Cajamarca and Loreto. There is little question that the project will be able to meet its goal of 200 classes for a total participation of 2,000 farmers. In all the IPFE operation is working efficiently.

The important questions remaining then, in light of similar training being carried out by CENCIRA (discussed below), are: (1) why was this project ever designed by IPFE and approved by USAID? and (2) what actions can be recommended to insure that IPFE and CENCIRA programs become complementary, rather than have the efforts of one institution duplicated by the other?

When the project was initially designed and approved in 1977, CENCIRA, while responsible for coordinating all training in the rural sector, was directing its training efforts exclusively at Agrarian Reform cooperative or associative enterprise sector. Since the majority of campesinos were outside the jurisdiction of the public training effort, IPFE would direct its training at the small, independent farmer. Any possibility of duplication of efforts was expected to be avoided through the close collaboration between IPFE and CENCIRA in the selection of project sites. An agreement signed between IPFE and CENCIRA in April, 1978, would insure a joint training effort aimed at the independent farmer, since CENCIRA was to provide IPFE with technical assistance and logistical support, both in course design and in audio-visual techniques. Nevertheless, no project design document makes reference to CENCIRA's project, financed by the UNDP and FAO, to implement precisely the same type of training project utilizing the same audio-visual methodology. For this reason, the possibility of duplication in the production of training courses was never contemplated.

Unfortunately, there has been little significant collaboration between IPFE and CENCIRA, and none between IPFE and the Agrarian Region in which the initial project activities are being implemented. CENCIRA has produced over 34 taped courses in conjunction with its UNDP-FAO project, including one on Potato Production which duplicates the information contained in IPFE's Potato Seed Improvement course. CENCIRA has provided IPFE with some logistical support, e.g. mobility, but has not informed IPFE of the content of the audio-visual courses it has been developing, nor is it providing information regarding where the courses are being held. In addition, there has been no CENCIRA input in the courses designed by IPFE. A certain amount of mistrust is evident between the two organizations, as if both were in direct competition. The Director of the Huancayo Agrarian Region was quite frank in his opinions of the IPFE project; he was not impressed with the one course developed so far, and felt that he was being ignored by IPFE. Yet if IPFE is to be successful in gaining initial access to the communities in which it intends to work, both permission and active support of the agrarian zonal offices is required. Again, it is difficult to discern whether the Director's attitude is the result of

resentment at being slighted by IPFE or an honest belief that the IPFE course is poorly conceived. While IPFE has responded to MinAg criticism with a meeting to coordinate its activities with the Regional Office, the Director was unable to attend that meeting. A recommendation was made to immediately call a meeting with IPFE, CENCIRA and the MinAg to coordinate training activities, identify course content, and to exchange ideas on future training needs.

Recommendations

1. Since CENCIRA has now made the decision to direct its audio-visual training beyond the cooperatives to groups of independent farmers and campesino communities, coordination between the two projects is imperative. A meeting will be held on July 2 at CENCIRA with IPFE and USAID participation for the purpose of facilitating dialogue between IPFE and CENCIRA, and to assure future coordination in the selection of project sites and course content. In addition, some mechanism will have to be established whereby videotapes of courses produced by one organization can be used by the other. For example, IPFE should be able to follow up its Potato Seed Improvement course with CENCIRA's Potato Production tape. Instead of rival course on the Raising of Cuyes, one group can concentrate on home raising, another provide more sophisticated information on the establishment of granjas. Depending on the needs of the farmer participants, either course may be utilized.

2. This project cannot be justified as a training project per se due to its limited number of beneficiaries. Nor can USAID financing be justified in support of a pilot project to prove the effectiveness of the audio-visual training methodology, since CENCIRA has been testing the technique on a considerably larger scale with far greater resources and probability of success. Yet, if the close collaboration between the two entities can be achieved, I recommend that we obligate $110,000 to continue project activities.

3. IPFE courses can be used for the DALPRA project, as well as for training efforts associated with Small Farmer Organization, Sierra Production, Ceja de Selva efforts. If they are used in these projects (especially DALPRA), we would have them direct their training courses to the needs of comunidades campesinas and independent farmer groups selected for that project.

4. As another alternative, we may suggest to IPFE that they terminate course production entirely since its limited resources do not permit a significant effort and since CENCIRA continues to produce a better product. IPFE's role would be reduced to that of a mechanism for the dissemination of CENCIRA-produced courses in areas where CENCIRA cannot enter. The feasibility of this arrangement will be discussed in the July 2 meeting.

5. It is recommended that USAID respond favorably to CENCIRA's request for funds to continue dissemination of training courses in the field, since FAO-UNDP financing of training project has been limited to course production and field testing. The Mission appeared to be favorably impressed with a FAO-CENCIRA presentation last month on the training activities undertaken to date. A request for USAID funding was made to continue activities.