1-1 PD-ABB-564 APPENDIX B

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY

(Submit to MO/PAV after each project evaluation)

Mission or AID/W Office Name Office of Agriculture, DS/AGR/FCP	2. Project Number 931-0930.11

Project Title

Pest Management and Related Environmental Protection

Key project dates (fiscal years) Project Agreement Signed 1975	b. Final Obligation 1978	c. Final input delivered 1979	5. Total U.S. funding life of project $ 1,998.75
Evaluation number as listed in Eval. Schedule Special	7. Period covered by this evaluation FROM: 6/71 Month/year	TO: 5/78 Month/year	8. Date of this Evaluation Review 5/14/78 month/day/year

Action Decisions Reached at Evaluation Review, including items needing further study (Note--This list does not constitute an action request to AID/W. Use telegrams, airgram, SPARS, etc., for action)	10. Officer or Unit responsible for follow-up	11. Date action to be completed
Revise Project Paper to provide increased funding and expansion of project activities.	F. W. Whittemore	June 1, 1979

12. Signatures:

Project Officer	Mission or AID/W Office Dire
Signature: Frederick Whittemore	Signature

Typed

3. SUMMARY - Summarize in about 200 words the current project situation, mentioning progress in relation to design, prospects of achieving purpose, major problems encountered, etc.

Bearing in mind the limited funding which has been made available to this project and the magnitude of the problem to be solved, the progress of the project is satisfactory. High level personnel in a number of LDCs have been made aware of the environmental and human health problems associated with the use of pesticides and some limited progress has been made towards training field level personnel in appropriate solutions. These activities should now be expanded both in development of the technological basis of IPM and in training of LDC personnel in this field.

4. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY - Describe the methods used for this evaluation, i.e. was it a regular or special evaluation? was it in accordance with the Evaluation Plan in the PP with respect to timing, study design, scope, methodology and issues? What kinds of data were used and how were they collected and analyzed? Identify agencies and key individuals participating and contributing.

This was a special evaluation conducted at about 28 months into the current project by an external review team composed of 2 outside consultants, representatives of 3 Regional Bureaus and the Research Office, DSB. The team, accompanied by the Project Manager visited the project site and reviewed the headquarters facilities and received an extensive briefing by the Project Director of past activities and future plans. The Team was also furnished with copies of all relevant reports. Additionally, the Team received further briefing at the subproject site, to include detailed information on the scope of activities related to support in pesticide and pesticide residue analyses being provided to LDCs.

5. Documents to be revised to reflect decisions noted page 1 (other side:)

[X] Project Paper (PP) [X] Logical Framework [X] CPI Network [X] Financial Plan

[X] PIO/T [ ] PIO/C [ ] PIO/P [ ] Project Agreement [ ] Other

[ ] This evaluation brought out ideas for a new project --
a Project Identification Document (PID) will follow

Evaluation findings about EXTERNAL FACTORS - Identify and discuss major changes in project setting which have an impact on the project. Examine continuing validity of assumptions.

The AID policy on pesticide support, the ultimate formation of which was contributed to by the project through its assistance in the preparation of A.I.D.'s Environmental Impact Statement on its Pest Management Program has had an important impact on the project. It was instrumental in changing the thrust of the project toward the integration of pest control technologies away from heavy reliance on pesticidal chemicals. In addition, the policy has required the project to promulgate information on and assist LDCs in executing programs on the impact of pesticides on human health and the environment.

There is an increasing world-wide awareness of problems associated with chemically oriented pest management While the U.S., and especially project personnel, are recognized as leaders in the concept of reducing dependence on pesticides, the concept is developing internationally, Thus, AID and project personnel are also influenced by this increasing awareness. The temptation of LDCs to use what appears to be immediate solutions to long-term problems, i.e., dependence on pesticides for pest control, is great. This pressure for immediate solutions is lessened by training and technical assistance by project leadership.

The assumptions in relation to the anticipated end-of-project status continue to be valid - See pgs. 6.

Evaluation findings about GOAL/SUBGOAL - For the reader's convenience, quote the approved sector or other goal (and subgoal, where relevant) to which the project contributes. Then describe status by citing evidence available to date from specified indicators and by mentioning progress of other projects (whether or not U.S.) which contribute to same goal. Discuss causes--can progress toward goal be attributed to project, why shortfalls?

The project has two goals: to reduce crop losses caused by plant pests and diseases and to reduce environmental contamination caused by agricultural pesticides. Through a series of pesticide management workshops senior level LDC technicians have been alerted to necessity to implement pest and pesticide management programs in a number of countries and in a number of instances such programs are now under development. For example, the workshop in the Philippines resulted in the enactment of new pesticide legislation and eventually led to the establishment of a greatly expanded crop protection program with A.I.D. funding. In Egypt, an integrated pest management program on cotton now has been developed to the point where only small quantities of pesticides are used in some areas, particularly in the Fayoum. In Lesotho, consultant services furnished by the project resulted in the establishment of a list of more environmentall acceptable pesticides to be provided to small farmers, in proper size packages and elimination of a highly hazardous repackaging process. Numerous other examples could be cited but the overall problem is so great that progress for the foreseeable future will be painfully slow.

18. Evaluation findings about PURPOSE - Quote the approved project purpose. Cite progress toward each End-of-Project Status (EOPS) condition. When can achievement be expected? Discuss causes of progress or shortfalls.

The purpose of the project is to provide developing countries with assistance in devising and implementing ecologically sound and economically valid integrated pest management systems for the control of agricultural pests and diseases. However, the limited funding provided to the project has restricted such assistance to a relatively small number of countries, e.g., Indonesia, the Philippines, Colombia, Egypt and the Central American countries. Expansion of project activities will allow for additional assistance to be provided both to these and other countries. This however will have to be a continuing program for the foreseeable future because integrated pest management programs even after they are in place will have to be continually modified to deal with the ever-changing pest/parasite/predator/crop complex.

19. Evaluation findings about OUTPUTS and INPUTS - Note any particular success or difficulties. Comment on significant management experiences of host contractor, and donor organizations. Describe any necessary changes in schedule or in type and quantity of resources or outputs needed to achieve purpose.

The project approach of training the technical and administrative personnel in LDCs by seminars and assisting in developing implementation programs in workshops is a logical one. The enthusiasm demonstrated in such countries as Indonesia demonstrates this. Insofar as the contractor has input relative to selection of seminar and workshop participants from the LDCs, efforts should be made to get new, additional people involved. This will broaden the base of knowledge in the countries

The process of laying the ground-work for and implementing country-wide seminars and workshops should be strengthened and increased, carrying the process to more LDCs. Secondly, in those countries where the groundwork for pest and pesticide management programs has been established, the project should put technically trained pest management specialists in country to lead and assist in implementation at the production level. Such expansion, however is contingent upon a major revision of the project paper and the provision of significant additional funds.

Evaluation findings about UNPLANNED EFFECTS - Has project had any unexpected results or impact, such as changes in social structure, environment, technical or economic situation? Are these effects advantageous or not? Do they require any change in plans?

There have been no unexpected results or effects from the project. However, the agro-medical approach taken by the project in its seminar/workshops is somewhat unique. This involvement of officials of agriculture and health in developing pesticide management programs is logical and effective, and there are implications here that might improve the effectiveness of programs in more developed countries.

17. CHANGES in DESIGN or EXECUTION - Explain the rationale for any proposed modificat in project design or execution which now appear advisable as a result of the preceding findings (items 16 to 20 above) and which were reflected in one or more of the action decisions listed on page 1 or noted in Item 15 on page 2.

Relative to design and/or execution, project activities should provide in-country pest management specialists. This is a most significant mechanism to implement pest and pesticide management at the place where it must work, i.e., the producer levels.

The current level of funding ($365,098 for 9 months), with minimal funding built in for ad hoc response capabilities to bureaus and missions, is $486,972 per year.

The team recommends a 10 percent increase of this annual funding level to cover the need for employing a person experienced in international work as an understudy for the Project Director and to cover inflation ($50,000). The subcontract at the University of Miami needs a strengthened capacity ($40,000). The project needs improved funding for the seminar/workshops ($100,000) and for the short courses ($50,000). Further the project should employ six in-country/regional pest management specialists ($600,000). Based on previous experience and anticipated increased ad hoc assistance to bureaus and missions, funds should be put into the budget for this purpose ($175,000).

Thus, the recommendations for annual funding are as follows:

21. (Cont'd)

Item	Amount
Current level	$486,792
Increase for management	50,000
Increase for sub-contract	40,000
Increase for seminar/workshops	100,000
Increase for short courses	50,000
Pest management specialists	600,000
For ad hoc responses	175,000
TOTAL	$1,501,792

The AID policy on pesticides has put increased emphasis on providing information and strategies for implementing integrated pest management programs in the LDCs. This proposed budget will provide the contractor with the required resources for implementing a good program toward this objective. Therefore, the Project Paper should be revised to incorporate this improved budget.

LESSONS LEARNED - What advice can you give a colleague about development strategy--e.g., how to tackle a similar development problem or to manage a similar project in another country? What can be suggested for follow-on in this country? Similarly, do you have any suggestions about evaluation methodology?

Projects of this nature obviously have application in all LDCs and probably are best centrally funded for the most part. We deduce that there is a need and desire for greater involvement of bureaus and mi-sions in the development of broadly applicable projects. AID/W should devise some method of meeting this need in developing future projects.

There is a need for closer coordination of project activities with missions in recipient countries. In those cases where there has been close coordination and cooperation with the missions, such as with the seminars/workshops in Indonesia and the Philippines, the activities appear to have been more effective.

The proposed use of in-country/regional pest management specialists would be a good follow-on technique to utilize project activities in the LDCs. An ultimately shared funding responsibility with missions for such personnel might be desirable.

Appropriate team composition for evaluations is important. We think the participation of the project manager and bureau representatives is essential for outside consultants to adequately comprehend project operations and impacts. Perhaps a representative from a mission would be helpful on such evaluations. An additional dimension that could add to evaluation of project impact would be a short visit by some team members to one or two recipient countries.

SPECIAL COMMENTS OR REMARKS (For AID/W projects, assess likelihood that results of project will be utilized in LDC's).

There is no question but what the concepts put forward in the pesticide management workshops and the technique discussed in the pest management short courses will be reflected in national crop protection programs. How well these concepts and techniques will be implemented will, in many instances be dependent upon mission and country abilities to incorporate such approaches into appropriate agricultural development projects related to increasing food and cash crop productivity for small farmers.