

ED-ABD-461
12/27/91

APPENDIX D
A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY - PART I

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 <u>OAR/Burkina</u> (ES# _____)		B. Was Evaluation Scheduled in Current FY Annual Evaluation Plan? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Skipped <input type="checkbox"/> Ad Hoc <input type="checkbox"/> Evaluation Plan Submission Date: FY <u>9</u>		C. Evaluation Timing Interim <input type="checkbox"/> Final <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ex Post <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/>	
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 (Yr)	Most Recent PACD (Mo/Yr)	Planned LOP Cost (000)	Amount Obligated to Date (000)
698-0452	Semi Arid Food Grains Research and Development Phase II	1986	Dec. 31, 1991	\$11,250	\$11,250

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
Request extension of project to provide funding for approximately 18 months (thru June 1993) to allow project (1) to complete selected number of network technology impact assessment studies by national researchers which will assist in the development of the Africa Bureau Agriculture Research Strategy and efforts under the SPAAR initiative which will spell out over the next ten years, programs and financial assistance for agriculture research in Africa and (2) to continue the work of the networks and a minimum program of country based research.	TBork, AFR/SWA OAR/Burkina	Nov. 22, 1991

APPROVALS

F. Date Of Mission Or AID/W Office Review Of Evaluation:			(Month)	(Day)	(Year)
			August	15	1991
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	
	Sally R. Sharp	Dennis McCarthy	Sally R. Sharp	Wilbur G. Thomas	
Signature	<i>Sally R. Sharp</i>	<i>Dennis McCarthy</i>	<i>Sally R. Sharp</i>	<i>Wilbur G. Thomas</i>	
Date	9/10/91		9/10/91		

ABSTRACT

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

The objective of SAFGRAD II is to develop a regional collaborative crop network system for a major semi arid food grains research in sub-saharan Africa. SAFGRAD was an outcome of the worsening drought situation in Africa in the 1970 when the African Heads of State created it in 1977 under the auspices of OAU. Twenty six member countries participate-East, South, West, Central, Anglo-Franco and Lusophone to accelerate the development of a productive and sustainable research system which will be compatible with the needs and conditions of small farmers. Phase I which was operational in 26 African member states included crops research by IITA, ICRISAT, farming systems research and a program for establishing close links between national agricultural research and extension services. SAFGRAD Phase II provided financial and technical assistance for a regional coordination office (SCO) in Ouagadougou and four crop networks: 1) the West & Central Africa Maize network (WECAMAN); 2) the West & Central Africa Cowpea Research network (RENACO); 3) the West & Central Africa Sorghum Research network (WCASRN); 4) the East Africa Regional Sorghum and Millet Network (EARSAM).

The final evaluation was conducted by an external evaluation team on the basis of a review of project documents, site visits to networks in West & East Africa, interviews with project personnel, & AID staff. The purpose of the final evaluation is to determine if project met its objectives as stated in PP and its amendments and if there is a need for a follow on phase III project. The evaluation was also aimed at responding to a continuing international interest in revitalizing agricultural research in Africa and efforts to forge and encourage more truly Africa-centered modes of collaboration. The major findings and conclusions are:

- 1) The project as designed has been successful.
- 2) Come 12/31/91 (PACD) AID will end over 20 continuous years of financial and technical assistance for major Semi-Arid Food Grains Research in sub-saharan Africa which has represented a significant and singular commitment to an Africa-centered organization for agricultural research and development and which has put the Agency in the forefront, leadership role in promoting the professional development of African agricultural scientists.
- 3) Agricultural research networks in sub-saharan Africa are seen as ready mechanisms to improve communication among scientists who are trying to tackle priority problems and constraints on agricultural production. As these problems are shared across agro-ecological zones, networks like SAFGRAD have been seen as key vehicles for organizing a critical mass of scientific expertise across previously inconvenient political and language barriers.
- 4) Continued investment in regional efforts offers opportunities for national scientists to draw upon basic strategic and applied research information and offers a significant means for breaking down professional isolation and for advancing the development of an African community of researchers. 5) SAFGRAD has made significant progress in moving toward active research networks that are driven by national program concerns and which operates in close scientific collaboration with the international research centers. 6) OAU is an appropriate organization and political framework within which to manage agricultural research networks.

COSTS

I. Evaluation Costs

1. Evaluation Team

Name	Affiliation	Contract Number OR TDY Person Days	Contract Cost OR TDY Cost (U.S. \$)	Source of Funds
R. James Bingen Team Leader	Institute In'l Agriculture Michigan State Univ.	PSC	25,000	Project
Timothy Schilling (Breeder/Agronomist)	Assoc. Program Director, INTSORMIL Univ. of Nebraska	April - PSC June 28, 1991	44,000	
William Judy (Research Management Specialist)	Consultant	PSC	25,000	

2. Mission/Office Professional Staff

Person-Days (Estimate) _____

3. Borrower/Grantee Professional

Staff Person-Days (Estimate) _____

21

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:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose of evaluation and methodology used • Purpose of activity(ies) evaluated • Findings and conclusions (relate to questions) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principal recommendations • Lessons learned |
|--|--|

Mission or Office: OAR/Burkina	Date This Summary Prepared: September 9, 1991	Title And Date Of Full Evaluation Report: Semi-Arid Food Grain Research & Development (698-0452) Final Report - July 1991
-----------------------------------	--	---

Final evaluation to determine if objectives as stated in PP plus Amendments had been attained, to determine if there should be a follow on project and if so, what the objectives of new project should be. External evaluation team consisting of a plant Breeder/Agronomist, Research Management Specialist and a Team Leader all with considerable experience in Africa and Agriculture Research carried out evaluation through review of project documents, site visits to networks in West, East Africa, interviews with project personnel (SCO of OAU/STRC in Ouagadougou, OAU/STRC in Lagos, network coordinators, NARS Scientists) AID staff, IITA (International Institute of Tropical Agriculture), ICRISAT (International Center for Research in Semi-Arid tropics), CIRAD (Center for Crop, in Agric. Research) IRAT network steering Committee, Oversight Committee.

Project Purpose: To increase the efficiency and effectiveness of agricultural research on identified staple food crops in the SAFGRAD region by 1) strengthening commodity to plan, broader their base of support and make productive use of resources; and 2) strengthening the service capacity of the OAU/STRC/SCO to facilitate the NARS (National Agricultural Research System) participation in networking and obtain internal and external support for national research programs to accomplish this purpose.

Conclusions and Lessons Learned:

- 1) Project as designed has been successful,
- 2) All project inputs were supplied,
- 3) Project outputs fully achieved: (1) SAFGRAD oversight Committee makes annually, (2) future research activities:
 - Future research activities identified, planned and allocated among participants
 - Network priorities are reflected in NARS decision-making
 - Opportunities for the future donor support at regional and national levels clarified.
 - Research for networks reviewed and evaluated annually, but results need to be interpreted and evaluated
 - In-country research implemented by NARS, but results are frequently not reported or returned to the coordinators
 - Varieties released and cultural practices recommended, except for the latter
 - Responsive technical backstopping by IITA and ICRISAT has been partial
- (4) other project outputs attained with following qualification: (1) an effectively functioning african;

Network Research

National program scientists have participated fully in setting the research priorities generally emphasize major, common biological constraints found in semi-arid Africa. Network trials basically address production constraints on semi-arid agriculture through varietal improvement.

The Office of the Director of Research in the SCO has played an important role in assuring that network research programs respond to national program interests and concerns.

The SAFGRAD networks effectively implement regional variety performance trials, fund regionally oriented research by national programs and provide national scientists with a forum for scientific communication and exchange.

The SAFGRAD networks are an effective means for linking national researchers with the international centers.

In collaboration with the international centers, the SAFGRAD networks are an effective mechanism for pooling the research resources of both stronger and weaker national programs in order to address region-wide constraints on agricultural production.

The quality of genetic and other technical material available to national programs through the networks could be increased through relations with a broader range of sources including the USAID-funded CRSPs, Non-Governmental Organizations, etc.

The national programs value the technologies diffused by the networks and use them in both on-station and on-farm trials. There is some evidence that network diffused technology has been released and adopted by some farmers. There has been no attempt by the networks, however, to monitor and evaluate the progression of technologies after they enter a national program. As a result, it is difficult to assess the farm-level impact of network research.

There is strong evidence that the number and proportion of technologies developed by national programs have increased in the networks' regional trials. This indicates that some programs have developed technologies which merit regional testing and that the networks offer a vehicle for this "spillover" effect to be captured by other national programs.

The research agendas of the international centers (IITA and ICRISAT) have shifted during the period of the project and parallel the research emphases of the networks. It is difficult to assess whether the IARC shift was in response to network demand of activity.

Network Management

The SAFGRAD Coordination Office, in association with national scientists and administrators, has developed a strategy for the institutional structure, management and operation of regional commodity research networks. Over the period of the project, the SCO has been able to clarify its contribution to network management.

External donor support will be required in order for the SAFGRAD Coordination Office to continue its effective support for the research networks.

Network coordinators work closely with national program scientists and with their IARC in program implementation.

Fostering the professional growth and development of national scientists may be among one of the networks' most significant and lasting accomplishments.

The professional enhancement of almost 700 agricultural scientists and technicians has been achieved at a very low cost per participant.

An assessment of the effectiveness and efficiency of the networks would be improved if the significance and real-world implications of network research objectives and short term targets were clearly identified.

National programs benefit directly from their participation in SAFGRAD network activities. Over the life of the project, and largely at the prompting of USAID and the SCO, the flow of network research resources to national programs has increased.

The positions held by national scientists and administrators in the SAFGRAD research management system permit national programs to exercise leadership and to influence the direction of the SAFGRAD networks.

The concept of "lead center" research and regional trials is an effective and efficient means for generating and diffusing research of benefit to all participating countries.

SAFGRAD is actively pursuing an appropriate way to "harmonize" relations between the SAFGRAD and CORAF maize networks.

LESSONS

This results of this evaluation indicate the following lessons that should be especially useful in planning and designing projects for continued support to SAFGRAD or other agricultural research networks in sub-Saharan Africa.

Agricultural research networking sub-Saharan Africa can effectively generate and diffuse improved technology, but it is also an important means for promoting the growth and development of an African scientific community. Exchange visits among scientists, or monitoring tours, are especially effective.

Investments in agricultural research networks help to strengthen national programs directly by giving access to new technology, supporting the development of improved technology in collaboration with other national programs, and providing a regular and open means for professional communication among national scientists and research administrators.

Both strong and weak national programs can benefit from membership in a research network.

Regional research networks can be an effective mechanism for funding national research activities, but ways are needed to assure the adequate allocation of available financial resources to national programs.

The Organization of African Unity is an appropriate organization and political framework within which to manage agricultural research networks. It may offer the most effective auspices under which to continue truly regional networking that successfully cuts across political boundaries and (crumbling) language barriers, thereby enhancing the capacity of African scientists to confront common research challenges within far-ranging agro-ecological zones.

The successful organization and operation of effective agricultural research networks in sub-Saharan Africa does depend at least upon:

- an identified, shared and common problem by network members
- technical leadership from national scientists collaborating with programs in the international research centers
- interest by scientists and research administrators that fosters collaboration among participants and generates national support for regional research,
- a continuing regional coordinating body operating with accepted regional political and diplomatic status, a standing advisory committee and, with national
- effective scientific supervision.

It will take a concerted effort to move beyond the "varietal improvement approach" to overcoming constraints on agricultural production in sub-Saharan Africa. The incorporation of broader agronomic and management considerations, such as integrated pest management or cropping systems research, into a solid, field-level, region-wide program may require special attention to the effective use and comparison of more site-specific results.

The effective transfer of full responsibility of regional networks will require individuals who can exercise several types of leadership:

Principal Recommendations: (Continued)

The evaluation team had strong backgrounds in agriculture research and West Africa experience and were up to the task of carrying out this important evaluation. The terms of reference of the evaluation were carried out fully and provided answers to specific questions raised by the OAU and various offices in AID/W.

The team spent more than 50% of their time in the field in East, West Africa interfacing with project personnel, scientists in NARS/IITA, ICRISAT with the SCO in Ouagadougou and OAU in Ethiopia and OAU/STRC in Lagos. All three team members have worked on agric. research activities and were knowledgeable about SAFGRAD. This is evident in their thorough analyses. As a result of the evaluation, the team has suggested that AID carry out impact assessment studies at farmer level to determine the impact of agriculture research which may lead to a methodology that AID can use in future agriculture research activities to determine impact. Mission and SCO concurs in the content of the evaluation and think it has given a thorough, comprehensive, objective assessment of the SAFGRAD project.

memorandum

DATE: 9/9/91

REPLY TO
ATTN OF: Dennis B. McCarthy, ADO



SUBJECT: Project Evaluation Summary SAFGRAD II 698-0452

TO: Sally Sharp OPR/Evaluation Officer

SAFGRAD PROJECT MISSION COMMENTS ON EVALUATION SUMMARY

In general the evaluation report is consistent and gives a well balanced appraisal of the projects progress towards the stated objectives in the Project Paper. Taking into account the evaluation results and reflecting on it's experiences managing the Project in the field since its inception, OAR/Burkina supports the following recommendations;

1. Aid should make at least an additional 10-year commitment of financial and technical assistance to the established SAFGRAD networks in order to continue the real progress made to date in building NARS scientist's professionalism on a regional basis. To abandon the SAFGRAD Networks at this point would be wanton to relinquishment of all progress made over the past eight years of solid productive SAFGRAD network development.
2. The use of three separate Grant Agreements to fund the SAFGRAD project has been unnecessarily management intensive. It has greatly complicated the development of harmonious project management actions concerning the three individual Grantees and the implementation of critical cooperative actions in the execution of necessary concerted project efforts. It has also been the source of misunderstandings on the part of SAFGRAD project entities (SCO, the Oversight Committee, the Council of NARD) concerning the role and responsibilities of the IARCS, NARS, OAU/STRC/SCO, and USAID.

OPTIONAL FORM NO. 10
(REV. 1-80)
GSA FPMR (41 CFR) 101-11.6
5010-114

A single unifying grant mechanism should be developed in order to allow USAID project management to effectively compel critical concerted planning and implementation actions of participating grantees in such complex projects. In addition, the extensive, diffuse project management requirements consequent of such complex projects dictates the need for explicit project management resources and responsibilities to be specifically dedicated and consigned to direct hire field management requirements in order to effectively coordinate regional initiatives of this type. Such regional field based initiatives, by definition, cannot be effectively orchestrated from AID/W or by a single participating bilateral USAID field Mission. The most appropriate USAID management entity would be those USAID Missions already directly charged with regional responsibilities i.e. REDSO/WCA, REDSO/ECA, etc. working in close collaboration with the specific USAID bilateral Missions participating in the particular regional initiative.

3. An SCO like secretariat organization will be necessary in any type of a SAFGRAD Project Phase III activity for the success of Network operations in the future. NARS scientists clearly need some measure of administrative backstopping and political support which transcends national boundaries if they are to achieve the full potential of networking activities.

The primary responsibility of a secretariat, and unfortunately the most neglected by the present secretariat structure (SCO) in the SAFGRAD Phase II Project, should be taking the initiative to synthesize the results of Network research, to promote a clearly defined vision of regional research and to champion a greater appreciation of the contribution of agricultural research to development among regional and international policymakers. This mandate must be clearly defined, early on, as a primary responsibility of whatever type of secretariat institution is developed in the follow-on phase to network support. Equally important, and management intensive, are the development of plans and follow-up for assessing the impact of network research on farm-level production, productivity and incomes.

If thoroughly addressed, these mandates will require the undivided attention of the network secretariat and it clearly follows that, premature, ambitious expectations for significant expansion of the secretariat institution into other Networks and projects is not only unrealistic, but will be seriously detrimental to efforts to continue, document and consolidate the solid professional accomplishments of the existing networks in the region. Two separate regional i.e. East/Southern Africa, and West/Central Africa, lean secretariats may be an option to distribute the work and promote more effective and efficient addressing of these important mandates in the regional context.

4. OAU diplomatic status has given the SAFGRAD International Coordinator of the SCO secretariat many opportunities to keep network research on the political agenda of many national ministerial level officials. The facility provided by the SCO to the Networks through the political influence of the OAU is well documented.

Secretariat assistance to the networks, and consequently the NARS, should not be confined to political regional organizations but ~~through~~ scientific bodies with broader representation. Various sub-regional organizations i.e. INSAH, SADCC etc, while structurally sound, possess sub-regional political ties which may omit some countries and/or research institutions. Research collaboration and planning among those NARS participating in the networks must not be held hostage to political boundaries but rather be targeted to scientific endeavors which networks and scientific organizations offer. The Organization of African Unity (OAU) and its institutions represent Africa-wide interests and this office should be promoted to provide continuity of effort among all its member states Africa-wide.

August 14, 1991

SOME COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGES OF SAFGRAD

- I. The SCO is in the unique institutional setting to provide feed back to OAU headquarters with regard to agricultural research and development issues that could emanate from national structures.

Evidence:

The deliberations of the National Agricultural Directors and the Oversight Committee and the overall SAFGRAD activities are reported to the Council of Ministers of the OAU.

The recent resolution of the Council regarding SAFGRAD has been to consider its institutionalization as permanent agency, the main agenda for forthcoming internal OAU/SCO meeting (September 1991) in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

- II. The OAU umbrella provides smooth and unimpeded movement of scientists, equipment and germplasm across national frontiers of Member States of SAFGRAD. This has enabled SCO to forge cooperative relationships among NARS and with other regional organizations and agricultural research centres.

efforts in areas of food grain research and development among national systems and between IARCS and NARS.

IV. SAFGRAD as an OAU project received good ambiance of collaboration, and in kind-contribution by beneficiary member countries.

Evidence:

- 1) Greater cooperation in the technical implementation the activities of the food grains networks. Acceptance of regional research responsibilities of the relatively strong NARS as "Lead Centres" as well as, sharing of research facilities and results.
- 2) Allocation of research land, research time of NARS staff, office space, as well as laboratories, at no cost, to SAFGRAD (i.e. for example, in Burkina Faso, Nigeria, Ghana, Cameroon, Kenya, Sudan, Mali etc.). This in-kind contribution is estimated to about \$5 millions during SAFGRAD II.
- 3) Unquestioned willingness to allow scientists from one national programme to offer technical expertise to another member country through the networks (for example: Among several examples, the Cameroon NARS scientist were able to provide research assistance

to neighboring NARS such as Chad and Central African Republic).

V. OAU/SAFGRAD in general and its coordination Office in particular, has comparative advantage in consolidating research efforts and expanding the benefits of collaborative networks beyond political boundaries and across linguistic barriers.

Evidence:

- 1) In West and Central Africa 17 countries (Francophone, Anglophone and Lusophone) ~~participate in each of OAU/SAFGRAD's food grain collaborative research networks.~~ Under OAU umbrella, National programme scientists and research managers have addressed common problems and issues of agricultural research and development from African perspectives with minimum external influence.
- 2) In Eastern Africa 8 countries participate in sorghum and millet collaborative research networks. OAU's offices provide research facilities, diplomatic privileges and tax and legal immunities in Kenya. This makes the ICRIAT/SAFGRAD collaborative research network more effective

3) Furthermore, the end of SAFGRAD II evaluation also determined that "The Organization of African Unity is an appropriate organization and political framework within which to manage agricultural research networks. It may offer the most effective auspices under which to continue truly regional networking that successfully cuts across political boundaries and (crumbling) language barriers, thereby enhancing the capacity of African scientists to confront common research challenges within far-ranging agro-ecological zones".

The SCO as an OAU agency has effectively mobilized "pool of scientific manpower, research infrastructure etc. of participating countries. Consequently, NARS were categorized according to their level of research development (Lead Centres, Associate Centres and Technology Adapting NARS). The relatively few stronger NARS not only assumed regional research responsibility in the area of their research comparative advantage, but also provided direct research assistance to minimize research weaknesses in the small national systems.

VI. Among the indigenous regional agencies, the SCO has relatively long experience for research coordination, sound financial management systems and administrative capabilities to implement regional research projects. This includes the

disbursement of funds to NARS for different research and on-farm verification trials under SCO-financial control systems.

Evidence:

The political entity of OAU/STRC/SAFGRAD that SCO embodies, is desired by other networks. Those networks already accepted (by the Oversight Committee) to operate under SAFGRAD umbrella include the West African Farming Systems Research and the semi-arid lowlands agroforestry networks for Sahelian countries.

11. The SCO continuous interactions with national agricultural institutions and with their respective governments and international research centres facilitated the emergence and development of scientific and research management leadership.

1) Research Management

- 52 research managers from 22 countries actively participated and provided policy guidance and operational framework for network activities.
- 7 eminent senior researchers research managers and university professors as member of the Oversight

Committee served as Management Board for SAFGRAD.

40 technical scientists actively participated in the management of the four collaborative food grain networks.

- 2) Scientific Leadership was provided particularly by Lead Centres to implement 25-30 collaborative projects to alleviate constraints to the production of food grains (i.e. drought, Striga, diseases and pests, soil fertility, yield and utilization etc.). For example 35, 40 and 37 senior scientists conduct research at Lead Centres for sorghum, maize and cowpea networks respectively in West and Central Africa. And 45 scientists have collaborative research activities (in the five Lead Centres) for sorghum and millet improvement in Eastern Africa.