PD-ABN-206

Indefinite Quantity Contract LAG-4200-I-00-3059-00

Delivery Order No. 17

IMPACT EVALUATION OF THE NIS FARMER-TO-FARMER PROGRAM

Prepared for:

United States Agency for International Development
Bureau for Humanitarian Response

Prepared by:

Peter Askin
Malcolm Childress
Robert Delemarre
Valerie Estes
Mark Smith (USAID)
Gregory Sullivan

July 1996

AGRIDEC
AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT CONSULTANTS, INC.
8900 S.W. 117 AVENUE, SUITE C-207 •• MIAMI, FLORIDA 33186 •• PHONE: (305) 598-5777 / FAX: (305) 598-5885

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The NIS Evaluation Team would like to express its appreciation for the tremendous help and cooperation it received from the vast number of people and organizations contacted during the course of eight weeks of intensive activity.

The Team is deeply grateful to the staff of BHR/PVC for the excellent manner in which they organized the Evaluation and helped prepare the Team for its task. The degree of support and cooperation from beginning to end could not have been better.

The Team could not have begun to succeed in its task without the cooperation and assistance it received from all of the private voluntary agencies that implement the Farmer-to-Farmer Program in the NIS countries. Despite limited staff available, these Agencies at both the headquarters and field level did everything possible to see that the Team was supplied with all necessary materials and information, as well as doing an excellent job of making the logistical and other arrangements for the site visits. This was not an easy task, particularly when it involved arrangements for the entire Team, as was the case in Russia. In this respect, special mention must be made of the Land O'Lakes staff in Russia. Under the leadership of Nathaniel Carin and Will Bullock, they had to not only make the logistical and other arrangements for six Team Members traveling all over Russia for two weeks, but also to make all of the arrangements for onward transportation. The Team would also like to thank Winrock's Washington based staff, especially Brad Rutherford, for the logistical help and office space furnished the Team before and after its field work.

Busy USAID Mission staff members throughout the region were also very helpful to the Team in terms of facilitating its understanding of the linkage between the Farmer-to-Farmer Program and USAID Mission objectives. Special thanks is due the Mission Director of USAID/Russia for his excellent suggestions on developing an analytical framework within which to assess the impact of a program like Farmer-to-Farmer.

The Team was also grateful for the prompt and rich responses to the questionnaires sent to returned volunteers, and the telephone surveys done with US organizations and businesses. The information they furnished allowed the Team to develop valuable insights into the impact the FtF is having in the United States.

Above all, however, the Team wishes to express its gratitude and appreciation to the many hosts and host organizations who so freely and generously gave of their time and hospitality. From these visits with over 100 hosts and host organizations, the Team not only came to understand and appreciate the impact of the program at the grass roots, but also carried away a memorable appreciation of rural life and culture in these countries, and the innovative and even heroic efforts so many people are making in order to make the transition to a freer and more prosperous life.

ACRONYMS

ADB	Asian Development Bank
ACDI	Agricultural Cooperative Development International
AGRO	Association of Peasant Farms and Agricultural Cooperatives of Kazakhstan
AKKOR	Association of Peasant Farms and Agricultural Cooperatives of Russia (private farmers association)
BHR	Bureau for Humanitarian Response
CAAEF	Central Asia Enterprise Fund
CAR	Central Asia Republics (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan)
CAUC	Caucasus (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia)
CNAA	Citizens Network Agribusiness Alliance
CNFA	Citizens Network for Foreign Affairs
EBRD	European Bank for Reconstruction and Development
FSRP	Food Systems Restructuring Project
FtF	Farmer-to-Farmer Project
IFC	International Finance Corporation
JSC	Joint Stock Company
LOL	Land O'Lakes
NET	NIS Exchanges and Training Project
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NIS	New Independent States
Oblast	NIS equivalent of U.S. state or region
PCV	Peace Corps Volunteer
PFU	Private Farmer's Unions (Armenia)
PVO	Private Voluntary Organization
RAMISS	Penza Regional Public Foundation for Business Initiatives
RF	Russian Federation
Rayon	NIS equivalent of a U.S. county or district
RFA	Request for Agreement
RFP	Request for Proposal
RFtF	Reverse Farmer to Farmer Training
SOW	Scope of Work
TA	Technical Assistance
TACIS	Technical Assistance to the Confederation of Independent States (European Union)
TUSRIF	The U.S.-Russian Investment Fund
TVG	Tri Valley Growers
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USAID/ENI	United States Agency for International Development, Bureau for Eastern Europe and the NIS
USAID/W	United States Agency for International Development/Washington
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
USG	U.S. Government
VOCA	Volunteers in Overseas Cooperative Assistance
West NIS	West NIS (Belarus, Moldova, Ukraine)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments
Acronyms

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

I. INTRODUCTION . . . 1
A. Objectives of the Evaluation . . . 1
B. Methodology and Structure of the Report . . . 1
1. Evaluation Team . . . 1
2. Evaluation Techniques . . . 2
3. Structure of the Report . . . 2
C. Background . . . 2
1. Political and Economic Context . . . 2
2. Program Concepts and Evolution . . . 3

II. MAJOR FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS . . . 4
A. Program Results and Impact in the NIS . . . 4
1. Introduction . . . 4
2. Facilitating the Transition to a Free-Market Economy . . . 6
3. Increasing Food Availability and Resolving Food Distribution Problems 12
4. Promoting Good Will Toward The United States . . . 14
5. Sustainability of Impact . . . 15
6. Summary Conclusions . . . 18
B. Program Results and Impact in the United States . . . 21
1. Informing the American Public: FtF Volunteers . . . 21
2. Informing the American Public: U.S. Implementors . . . 24
3. Indicative Assessment of the Impact on U.S. Organizations and Businesses . . . 26
C. Program Management and Implementation Systems . . . 29
1. Relationship of Program Focus, Impact and Legislative Intent . . . 29
2. USAID Management, Coordination and Monitoring . . . 30
3. Program Linkages and Contributions to USAID Mission Objectives . . 31
4. Management and Cost Effectiveness of Implementation Systems . . . 32
5. Summary Conclusions . . . 35

III. LESSONS LEARNED - WHAT WORKS BEST . . . 36
A. Measuring and Demonstrating Impact . . . 36
1. Strategic Thinking and Planning . . . 36
2. Need for a Clear Protocol between Implementor and Host . . . 37
3. Other Factors . . . 37
B. Timely Communication Among all Parties . . . 38
1. Adequate Lead Time . . . 38

2. Seasonal Placement 38
C. A Full Complement of Inputs 38
D. Collaboration and Leveraging 38
E. When to Graduate the Host 39
F. Are Two To Three Week Visits Sufficiently Long To Be Effective? 39
G. Maintaining a Balanced Perspective on what Farmer-To-Farmer can and cannot do 39

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS 40
A. Continue Farmer-To-Farmer Program 40
B. Issue A New Request For Application 40
C. Adopt Three-Level Analytical Framework 41
D. Initiate Process To Achieve and Demonstrate More Impact 41
E. Restore Funding For Reverse Farmer-To-Farmer Training 42
F. Maximize Opportunities To Leverage Resources 43
G. Consider A Geographic Division of Labor In Larger Countries 43
H. Improve Coordination/Communications With and Among Implementors 44
I. Initiate Uniform Reporting from Implementors on Impact of FtF in the U.S. . . . 44

ANNEX A

I Scope of Work
II Persons Interviewed and Sites Visited
III Documents Reviewed
IV Profiles of Program Implementors
V Research Methodology
VI Returned Volunteer Questionnaire and Results
VII Other Research Instruments
VIII Methodology for Measuring and Demonstrating Impact
IX Reverse Farmer-to-Farmer
X Statistical Data on: 1) Funding and Volunteer Totals, and 2) Length of TA, Repeat Volunteers, and Repeat TA to Host Organizations

ANNEX B

Summary Findings of Cases Studies
Case Studies

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose of the Evaluation

Between May 28, 1996 and July 31, 1996, an Impact Evaluation of the Farmer-to-Farmer Program (FtF) in seven of the New Independent States (NIS) was carried out by a Team of five independent consultants and one USAID agricultural officer under the auspices of USAID's Office of Private Voluntary Cooperation, Bureau of Humanitarian Response (BHR/PVC/FtF).

The Farmer-to-Farmer Program is unique among programs administered by USAID in that it is authorized under current and previous Farm Bills, funded largely from ear-marked PL 480 Title II funds, managed by the USAID's Bureau For Humanitarian Response, and implemented by six U.S. private voluntary agencies. The Farmer-to-Farmer Program began as a pilot program in 1986. With the collapse of the Soviet Union in the early 1990's, and as part of a U.S. response to the technical assistance needs of the New Independent States, USAID mounted a Special Initiative to put FtF volunteers into NIS countries to assist in their transition to democracy and free market economies. Volunteers In Overseas Cooperative Assistance (VOCA) fielded the first volunteers to the region in 1992. Later the program was expanded to include six (recently reduced to five) U.S. NGO's implementing the program in twelve NIS countries.

In addition to research and interviews at the Washington level, Team members spent four weeks in seven countries (Russia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Ukraine, Moldova, Armenia, and Georgia) conducting over 100 interviews and visiting over 70 site locations. Most site visits are written up as Case Studies and are attached to this report as Annex B.

Within the context of the Scope Of Work (Annex A), the Team viewed the primary tasks and objectives as (1) assessing the type and extent of impact the program is having on assisting these countries in their transition to free market economies and the extent to which the FtF program is raising public awareness in the United States, (2) assessing program management and implementation systems, and (3) providing recommendations that can assist BHR in making decisions regarding the future direction of the program.

Major Findings, Conclusions And Recommendations

1. Measuring and Demonstrating Impact

Going beyond the merely anecdotal and generally positive impressions to more precisely measuring impact in meaningful and convincing ways became a major challenge. The FtF Program began in an atmosphere of political and programmatic urgency. Little attention was paid to the establishment of baseline data (probably impossible under the circumstances) and measurable indicators of progress and results. Success and impact in the early years tended to be quantified and measured mostly in terms of the number of volunteers fielded. The program content and implementation systems have matured since then, and some implementors now have well-developed impact assessment and tracking systems. But impact still tends to be viewed, measured and reported on the basis of one volunteer

assignment at a time. Uniform systems are not yet in place to look at impact on an aggregated basis. Based on discussions of this issue with field staff, the Team adopted an analytical framework which looks at impact on three levels:

a. Level One. Did the volunteer assistance have an impact on changing attitudes, thinking, knowledge and skills, production and income levels of the host farmer or host organization?

b. Level Two. To what extent have the changes and impact at the host level had a spread effect and helped influence others to adopt changes. What were the consequences of those changes?

c. Level Three. To what extent did the assistance rendered by the FtF volunteers contribute to systemic change, i.e., significant and positive changes in the underlying systems of production, marketing, finance and policy, legislation, etc. It was at this level that the Team looked for linkages and contributions to USAID's strategic objectives and program goals.

In applying this framework, the Team concluded that in the large majority of cases a significant degree of impact is and has been occurring at Level One. It certainly was true of most sites visited. While more difficult to determine in a limited amount of time, the Team also concluded that impact was also occurring at Level Two, but to a lesser extent and in fewer instances than at Level One. While this conclusion is based more on secondary than primary information, the majority of the case studies contained in Annex B seem to bear this out. Not surprisingly, the Team did not find much evidence that significant impact is occurring at the third, or systemic level. There were instances, however, where significant impact at this level may well be in the making through volunteer assistance in developing the institutional capacity of farmer associations and other organizations.

2. FtF is Succeeding and Achieving Impact in the NIS and in the U.S.

Thus a basic and unanimous conclusion of the Team is that the Farmer-to-Farmer Program, as it was observed operating in the seven NIS countries visited, is fully meeting the purpose and objectives of the legislation. It is achieving a degree of impact that goes well beyond creating good will and well-meaning people-to-people technical exchanges. From the results of questionnaires and surveys, it is also obvious that the Program is having a positive impact back home, in the United States, by raising US public awareness of programs like FtF, correcting misconceptions of life and attitudes in the NIS countries and helping to inform US businesses that sponsor volunteers of the environment and opportunities in NIS countries. Several sponsoring U.S. business organizations contacted during the survey pointed to this as a benefit in sending volunteers from their organizations.

The transition to a free market economy in most of the NIS countries will be a long-term process which must overcome a variety of problems and obstacles. Despite these obstacles, the Farmer-to-Farmer Program is helping to facilitate this process in several ways. Volunteers through their own experiences in market-oriented agriculture provide the NIS hosts with credible and experienced models. FtF volunteers and field staff fill a vacuum of needed, practical and usable technical expertise (Level One). FtF volunteers are providing training and advice in the various elements of running a

business (Level One and Two); and they are creating institutions such as farmer associations and other organizations that are beginning to develop the capacity to provide needed technical and business related services to farmers and new entrepreneurs. In these and other ways, FtF is helping to develop indigenous institutional capacity and new market-oriented private entrepreneurs and agribusiness enterprises (Level Two impact).

Recommendation # 1: Continue the FtF Program beyond the expiration of its current funding, preferably under a new RFA, but with some major changes in policy guidance and operating systems, most of which are summarized below and outlined in more detail under Part IV of the Report.

3. Focus, Targeting and Impact

The Team also gave a great deal of attention to program focus and targeting issues, particularly in the context of achieving and demonstrating impact. The trend has been to move away from production level activities and encourage implementors to focus more on post-harvest enterprises. The Team observed significant results and impact occurring at all levels and areas of agriculture. It concluded that while there definitely needs to be more focus within some of the programs, and less demand driven, it would be a mistake to second guess field implementors by prescribing certain areas for volunteer assistance and proscribing others. Rather, greater focus should come about through development and installation of systems that give priority to selection of projects that offer the greatest potential for first and second level, and where realistic, third level impact.

The analytical framework described and applied above is a valid approach, and worked well up to a point, but unless and until better and more uniform systems are in place that put more emphasis on strategic planning, pre-selection criteria, the use of project protocols, and uniform reporting of impact on a more aggregated basis, it will be difficult to make quantum jumps in the ability to demonstrate program impact.

Recommendation #2: The Team recommends that BHR and Implementors adopt the analytical approach outlined above as a framework within which to further develop uniform systems for achieving and demonstrating impact, along the lines of the section that follows.

Recommendation #3: BHR should initiate a process aimed at achieving more focus on impact at the point of project selection and in reporting systems. This recommendation envisions BHR establishing a process and guidelines by which:

a. Implementors are required to engage in more strategic thinking and planning about their program in terms of how and where it can have the greatest impact.

b. Uniform criteria are established for project selection that give priority to: i) potential for achieving impact beyond that of the host level, ii) opportunities to leverage other available resources, iii) sustainability of impact, and iv) projects in which results can be quantified.

8

c. As part of the selection process, implementors would be required to develop a "protocol" or plan of action with the host organization before volunteers arrive. The Team found several instances in which it appeared that it may be time to graduate the host. The problem was that there was no "plan" from the outset that anticipated a point at which volunteer assistance would accomplish its purpose and no longer be needed.

d. Reporting systems are made more uniform and designed to capture periodically aggregate impact data.

4. Reverse-Farmer-to-Farmer Training

It will come as no surprise to program managers and implementors that the use of some type of Farmer-to-Farmer training in the U.S. often spells the crucial difference in project success and sustainability. In almost every project observed, the inclusion of a reverse farmer-to-farmer training element was crucial to convincing the host and giving him/her the confidence to go ahead and implement the volunteers' recommendations.

Recommendation #4: Explore all possibilities to restore direct funding for Reverse Farmer-to-Farmer Training.

5. Leveraging Other Resources

The ability to leverage other resources emerged as an important element in increasing the effectiveness and sustainability of the impact of FtF programs. The Team was surprised to learn of the extent of other resources in-country and out of country that are sometimes available to FtF activities. It was impressed with the ability of some implementors and volunteers to access these resources. Not all implementors were aware of or inclined to use these resources. In the larger countries it may also be a matter of not being aware. This could be alleviated by better communication between USAID and implementors and between and among implementors. In any event, the ability to leverage some of these resources often permits the volunteer effort to help the host gain access to the resources needed beyond the TA provided under FtF. It can help break "second step" bottlenecks and relieve some of the frustration of hosts and volunteers when the volunteers' recommendations cannot be carried out for lack of other resources, usually credit.

See Recommendation # 8 below.

6. Program Management and Implementation Systems

The Team made several findings and recommendations with respect to program management and implementation systems.

a. It found a lack of a consistent, unified Agency-wide policy and attitude concerning the management, coordination and monitoring, and development worth, of the FtF Program. This has

caused, in some cases, misunderstandings and confusion among implementors at the Washington and field level. For example, lack of consistent reporting requirements between BHR and USAID/Moscow resulted in the CNFA Country Representative completely revamping the Office's reporting methodology. Reports are now generated to provide program information for BHR and quantitative information for USAID/Moscow to address impact on the Mission's Strategic Objectives.

Some implementors questioned whether USAID Missions in particular are really interested in FtF. The Team did get the impression that in some quarters of USAID, FtF tends to be undervalued and under-appreciated whether because of a lack of familiarity with FtF on the ground, or a tendency to expect too much in the way of development impact from an essentially grass roots program. On the other hand, several USAID officials expressed the opinion and belief that, in several NIS countries, FtF is likely to be around longer than a USAID Mission presence.

Recommendation #5: BHR should develop and issue policy guidelines aimed at: a) clarifying the role of the Farmer-to-Farmer Program and its relationship to the Bureau's and Agency's overall goals and objectives, b) establish clear parameters for the FtF Program , and c) establish uniform project selection criteria and uniform reporting systems. These initiatives could be part of a separate set of guidelines, or part of the issuance of a new Request For Application (RFA), or as main agenda items of the next implementors conference.

b. The Team believes USAID Washington may be missing an opportunity to take better advantage of what appears to be a golden public relations opportunity by giving the FtF Program more public recognition and support as an example of grass roots development that is building widespread support and good will for the U.S. within the former Soviet Union.

Recommendation #6: In the context of the previous recommendation, BHR should also take the initiative in examining ways in which the FtF Program could receive more public recognition. As part of this and the previous recommendation, implementors could also be requested to report on their public awareness efforts and the results of these efforts.

c. Concern was expressed in USAID/W and in the field as to the number of implementors currently active in the field. There is a general feeling that there are too many implementors operating in some of the larger countries. There was also a feeling among some that the FtF needed to be better focused on fewer target areas. The Team also felt that serious consideration should be given to a geographical division of labor among implementors in the larger countries, e.g., Russia and Ukraine. Such a division of labor by geographical region should result in several managerial, efficiency and cost-saving benefits.

Recommendation # 7:

Reduction in the number of implementors should be addressed in the issuance of a new Request For Applications (RFA). The Program focus issue should be addressed in the context of carrying out Recommendations 2, 3 and 5 above. With respect to implementing a geographical division of labor

among implementors in the larger countries, the Team recommends that BHR issue policy guidance to this effect, but let the implementors try to first work out a rational division among themselves. If that doesn't work, then BHR should take a more directive approach.

d. All Implementors seem to have good, effective implementation systems and approaches to the recruitment and delivery of technical assistance through their volunteers. Most Country FtF Program Managers voiced their satisfaction with the backstopping they receive from their headquarters, especially with respect to the timeliness and quality of volunteer selection and processing. Some volunteers interviewed, however, voiced a concern that the recruitment process was sometimes rushed.

e. Explicit linkages of FtF activities to USAID programs varied from none to actual inclusion of FtF into mission strategy statements and project descriptions. The Team observed that in four countries, FtF is being included as a resource in Mission program strategies or project descriptions now in the planning stage. In two countries, USAID Missions had put or were going to put a modest amount of their own funds into FtF activities. This is an encouraging development and perhaps the beginning of a trend.

It was more difficult to identify where FtF had made significant (Level Three) contributions to USAID program objectives. The Armenian case seems to be one clear exception, but unless there are explicit linkages drawn and tracked it is difficult to get beyond general observations. FtF activities in general are complementary and in small scale ways contribute to the overall goals of most USAID projects, but in what increments is almost impossible to determine under current systems.

Implementors and USAID Missions could benefit from increased linkages of the FtF Program to USAID Mission strategic objectives. The field Missions would gain access to an excellent and highly valuable source of technical assistance at minimal or no cost while the FtF volunteers would be associated with major impact activities (i.e., Level III) that directly address USAID's goals. In addition, this would facilitate USAID's taking advantage of the extensive area and grass roots information base possessed by most implementors. The Team found that the implementors are very knowledgeable about the areas and sub-sectors in which their programs operate; they have good contacts, and thus have much to offer in the way of insights and information. In addition, better and more frequent communication between all concerned parties might also lead to better and more timely sharing of information with respect to other resources that could be leveraged by FtF activities. This in turn could lead to achievement of more significant levels of impact. So efforts to increase contact, communications, and linkages would be in everyone's interest.

Recommendation # 8: BHR, Implementors and USAID Missions should strive for increased linkages of FtF to USAID programs and program objectives to the extent possible and realistic. Several actions may help facilitate this process. First, issuance of policy guidelines by BHR in which this objective is clearly stated. Second, implementation of Recommendations 2 and 5 should result in tighter program focus and ability to demonstrate significant impact at least at Levels One and Two of the Analytical Framework. Three, Missions should be encouraged to communicate and coordinate

11

more closely with FtF implementors, and where possible develop explicit program and program support linkages similar to what is planned in Russia, Ukraine and Moldova, and has already occurred in Armenia. In this context, BHR should encourage, facilitate and fund an annual workshop to be held in the NIS region to provide implementor in particular an opportunity to share information and experiences.

In summary, the Team formed a very positive impression of the Farmer-to-Farmer Program. While its continuance is probably assured by its legislative base, the Program, in terms of the contributions it is making to filling technical assistance needs in the NIS, can well stand on its own. But it has to be viewed with a balanced perspective. It is making a difference in the lives of thousands of people in the NIS; it touches and influences individuals and segments of societies at levels and in ways few U.S. programs can do; it is building good will for the United States; it is helping to build a U.S. public awareness of the problems of these countries and the role of U.S. assistance; and it does contribute to development objectives in numerous small-scale ways. While it can and probably should be more closely aligned with USAID program objectives, there is a limit as to how far that process should be carried without distorting the rather unique character of this Program and its basic reason for being--a people-to-people technical exchange program carried out at the grassroots.

FINAL REPORT

AN IMPACT EVALUATION OF THE NIS FARMER-TO-FARMER PROGRAM

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Objectives of the Evaluation

The objectives of the evaluation are: 1) to assess the impact of the FtF Program in the NIS, 2) to provide an initial assessment of program impact on U.S. organizations and communities from which FtF volunteers are fielded, and 3) to assess overall program design and management as it relates to future directions. The results of the evaluation will assist the BHR/PVC: 1) to measure the impact of the program, 2) to identify the types of projects and conditions that are best suited for a volunteer-based program and 3) to prepare a Request for Application (RFA) to re-compete a follow-on FtF program. The evaluation will also help BHR, ENI and USAID Missions assess the degree to which the FtF activities are addressing relevant strategic objectives.

In order to evaluate progress toward meeting these objectives the Team was asked to assess specific criteria and factors regarding program impact in the NIS and U.S. as well as program implementation systems. These criteria and factors are detailed in the Evaluation Scope of Work, included in Annex A of this report.

B. Methodology and Structure of the Report

1. Evaluation Team

This impact evaluation was carried out by Agricultural Development Consultants, Inc. (AGRIDEC) at the request of USAID's Bureau of Humanitarian Response, Office of Private Voluntary Cooperation (BHR/PVC/FtF). The Evaluation Team consisted of six members, five independent consultants and one USAID staff member: (1) Agricultural Project Design/Evaluation and Institutional Specialist/Team Leader (Peter W. Askin); (2) Food and Agricultural Economist (Gregory M. Sullivan, Ph.D.); (3) Agribusiness/Marketing Specialist (Robert Delemarre); (4) Agribusiness/Credit Systems Specialist (Malcolm Childress, Ph.D.); (5) Social Scientist (Valerie Estes, Ph.D.), and (6) USAID Agricultural Officer (Mark Smith, USAID/ENI/ED/AG).

Because FtF activities are widely dispersed throughout the NIS and for security reasons and travel difficulties, the Team concentrated on project sites in Russia and two countries in each of the three remaining NIS regions. These were Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan in the Central Asian Republics, Armenia and Georgia in the Caucasus, and Ukraine and Moldova in Western NIS.

2. Evaluation Techniques

Both quantitative and qualitative techniques and a range of data sources were used to assess impact in the NIS and the U.S.[1] NIS impact data included literature review; in-depth interviews with FtF host organizations, country directors of field implementor offices; interviews with USAID and other U.S. government representatives; and interviews with FtF volunteers working in the field. U.S. impact data included: (a) survey questionnaire sent to a randomly-selected sample of returned volunteers; (b) questionnaire sent to implementors; and (c) telephone interviews with selected sample of U.S. agricultural organizations and businesses.

The Team assessed 77 Host Organizations, interviewing over 100 individuals associated with these clients. The sites selected represent a cross-section of single and multiple FtF assignments and functional areas (e.g., farmers, farmers' groups, credit, processing, agribusiness, etc.). A table in the *Methodology* section of Annex A presents the detailed data and shows that the sites evaluated also parallel the percentages of volunteers fielded by region and implementor.

3. Structure of The Report

The report is divided into four main parts: Part I, Introduction; Part II, Major Findings and Conclusions; and Parts III and IV, Lessons Learned and Recommendations. The report also contains an extensive set of annexes. Annex A contains further discussion of several other aspects of the Evaluation such as Measuring and Demonstrating Impact, Profiles of each of the active PVO implementors, and discussion of the impact of the Reverse Farmer-To- Farmer Program. Annex B contains a collection of case studies, grouped by country, and developed from the Team's field interviews with FtF hosts. Frequent references are made to these cases studies throughout the main body of the report.

C. Background

1. Political and Economic Context

With the breakup of the USSR into 12 separate Republics in September 1991, there was a simultaneous breakdown of the traditional, Soviet state-run internal production, transportation and marketing system. The agricultural sector was particularly hard hit. These Republics faced a massive economic collapse and potential widespread hunger during the first years of independence. In an effort to address these problems as well as to help establish market economies and reinforce representative democracy in the Republics, the U.S. government mounted a program of immediate people-to-people technical assistance and training.

---

[1] More detailed information is given in the *Persons Interviewed* and *Methodology* sections of Annex A.

14

2. Program Concepts and Evolution

The FtF Program originated with Section 406 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. P.L. 89-808 in 1966 introduced the "Farmer-to-Farmer" terminology and Title V of the 1990 Farm Bill re-authorized the FtF program. In 1991, a three-year, $30 million Special Initiative of the FtF Program was authorized by the Assistant Administrator of the Bureau of Humanitarian Response, under the authorizing legislation of the FtF Program as one of the first USG assistance programs for the NIS countries and funded from PL 480 Title II resources. In FY 1995, the ENI Bureau provided $7.8 million to extend the program for FY 96. Additional funds from the 1996 Farm Bill have been provided to extend the program for FY 97.

The original FtF Program was designed to assist developing countries, middle-income countries and emerging democracies to increase farm production and farmer incomes as well as to assist agribusinesses involved in food processing and marketing. U.S. farmers, universities, agribusinesses, farm cooperatives as well as other appropriate organizations can be utilized on a volunteer basis to provide this assistance. From its inception, the FtF Program was intended to be primarily a grass-roots, people-to-people technical exchange program that also supports the democratic process.

Based on the quick response capabilities which the FtF program had demonstrated in Poland and other Eastern European countries in the early years of the collapse of the Soviet Block, it was determined that the FtF program would be an appropriate mechanism for initially dealing with similar problems in the former Soviet Republics. It offered the U.S. Government the opportunity to rapidly provide needed technical assistance in building market economies and encouraging democratization.

The objective of the U.S. Government's assistance to the NIS is to promote economic and political stability in the states of the former Soviet Union based on democratic and open market principles. The need to increase food availability, improve the effectiveness of farming and marketing operations, and accelerate agribusiness development is central to meeting this goal. The farmers of the U.S. can play a critical role in the achievement of these economic and political objectives through participation in the FtF program. USAID, as the arm of the U.S. government responsible for providing overseas development assistance, has been designated to manage the FtF program. The Bureau for Humanitarian Response/ Private and Voluntary Cooperation (BHR/PVC) is the office within USAID which is charged with this responsibility.

Six organizations have been involved in the implementation of the FtF program in the NIS. They are: 1) Agricultural Cooperatives Development International (ACDI); 2) Citizens Network for Foreign Affairs (CNFA); 3) Land O' Lakes (LOL); 4) Tri-Valley Growers (TVG); 5) Volunteers for Overseas Cooperative Assistance (VOCA); and 6) Winrock International.

As of May 1996, the total funding for all 12 republics in the NIS was $39,312,105, of which $34,877,955 had been expended. The total number of volunteer placements as of that date was 2,242. FtF volunteers have a broad range of technical skills and their assignments in the NIS include assistance to individual farm enterprises, cooperatives or other farmer associations, agribusinesses,

15

rural credit institutions and agricultural educational institutions. Increasingly NIS-FtF assignments are focusing on organizational, managerial and financial aspects of cooperatives, agribusinesses and rural financial institutions. In FY94, USAID implemented a pilot Reverse FtF (RFtF) program funded by the ENI Bureau ($1 million) which provided opportunities for NIS agriculturists to observe/study U.S. agricultural, cooperative and agribusiness operations firsthand.

The following table presents a summary of funding and number of volunteers by region and implementor. More detailed data are found in Annex A.I.

II. MAJOR FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

A. Program Results and Impact in the NIS

1. Introduction

a. The Measurement Challenge

Impact and recommendations for future program directions are the two main objectives of this evaluation. The first of these immediately raises the question of how can and should the results and impact of a program like Farmer-to-Farmer be measured? Against what set of benchmarks and indicators? Benchmarks and baseline for this program were not established as this program was launched amid the rush to respond to the opportunities and the political imperatives that accompanied the collapse and break-up of the former Soviet Union. Attempts were made later to establish some basic indicators for all implementors, but this process was never fully completed and installed on a program-wide basis. Since then, however, there have been serious attempts by some implementors to develop systems for tracking and measuring impact. This is not uniform and is generally done volunteer assignment by volunteer assignment. It also tends to focus more on inputs rather than concrete results. In other words, what the volunteer did and recommended, rather than on what the host did in response and the downstream impact of those actions. Absent also are systems and methodologies to aggregate the impact that is being tracked at the volunteer and/or assignment level. Impact, therefore, tends to be measured one volunteer at a time, and more often anecdotally and qualitatively rather than quantitatively.

The Team also found differing perceptions among USAID officials and implementors on what could or should be expected from a program like FtF. These perceptions range from views and expectations that do not go much beyond creating good will for the United States to making significant contributions to USAID sector development objectives. Building US and indigenous PVO capacities is also an important expectation of the program on the part of those responsible for its administration.

16

Table 1
Farmer-to-Farmer Funding and Volunteer Totals [2] [3]
By Region and Implementor

REGION	Funding to Date	% of Total Funding	No. of Volunteers	% of All Volunteers
CAR	$8,504,438	25%	503	22%
CAUC	$2,313,493	7%	119	5%
Russia	$19,176,694	57%	1,138	51%
WestNIS	$3,882,035	11%	482	21%
TOTAL	$33,876,660	100%	2,242	100%
IMPLEMENTOR	**Funding to Date**	**% of Total Funding**	**No. of Volunteers**	**% of All Volunteers**
ACDI	$6,423,690	16%	294	13%
CNFA	$5,043,558	13%	301	13%
LOL	$2,701,000	7%	177	8%
TVG	$1,999,747	5%	128	6%
VOCA	$15,530,052	40%	866	39%
Winrock	$7,614,058	19%	476	21%
TOTAL	$39,312,105	100%	2,242	100%

---

2 Source: USAID/BHR/FtF, *NIS-FtF Bridge Funding*, May 23, 1996.

3 Note that TVG completed implementation of its FtF program in December 1995.

17

b. The Analytical Framework

In the absence of an established baseline and uniformly-used indicator systems, the Team adopted the following analytical framework that emerged from its work in Russia, particularly from conversations with the USAID Director and his staff. In the Team's view it provides a realistic basis for looking at impact at three different levels:

(1) The First or Host Level

This involves the extent to which the volunteer assistance is having an impact on changing attitudes, thinking, knowledge and skills, production, income, employment increases, organizational and managerial development, etc. of the host farmer, host organization, association, or institution visited. This would also include the extent to which the visit helped create good will toward the US.

(2) The Second Level

This level of analysis involves looking at the extent to which the changes and impacts at the host level have had a spread effect and influenced others to adopt changes in attitudes and practices.

(3) The Third Level

This assesses the extent which the program is able to impact on and contribute to significant changes in the underlying systems of production, marketing, finance and policy. From a USAID point of view, emphasis at this level would also be placed on assessing the extent to which FtF programs contribute to USAID's strategic objectives and program goals.

In the following sections, the Team presents its major findings and recommendations, focusing on the main topical areas of the Evaluation Scope of Work: facilitating transition to a free market economy, increasing food availability and resolving food distribution problems, promoting good will towards the United States, and assessing the sustainability of the impact at all three levels.

While the Team believes these may be too generally and broadly stated for realistically judging impact of an essentially people-to-people program like the FtF, we have, nevertheless, made a serious attempt to measure impact against these broad objectives.

2. Facilitating the Transition to a Free-Market Economy

The Farmer-to-Farmer Program is playing a valuable, but limited role in facilitating the transition to a market-oriented economy in the NIS. In general, this role has been one of providing personal examples, technical support, training and institutional models of market-based agriculture and agribusiness for the segments of the agricultural sector which have embraced a market orientation.

18

The region-wide transition from a state-managed to a market-oriented economic system, however, is highly contingent on government policy which supports the latter orientation. Such policy is itself in a state of flux, and a number of policy barriers and social rigidities to the adoption of a free-market orientation in the agricultural sector remain. An important factor to remember is that the "institutional space" available to the Farmer-to-Farmer Program to facilitate change to a market-orientation within this environment is limited.

Many of the institutional bases which undergird a market-oriented agricultural system are either poorly developed, oriented away from a market-based system, or resource constrained in the NIS. The scarcity of private property rights in land, the weak legal structure for contract enforcement, excessive regulation and weak protection from criminal elements continue to inhibit vigorous, widespread market participation. Combined with tight monetary policies and resulting high real interest rates, these factors contribute to creating an institutional environment which is unfavorable to market-oriented agriculture. Social rigidities, i.e., distrust and fear of market activities and preferences by many for a state-oriented system also contribute to making the transition to a market orientation a complex process.

In spite of these institutional and social obstacles, which vary in intensity and scope across the NIS countries and locally within those countries, the Farmer-to-Farmer Program is functionally contributing to the transition process in four main ways.

- The FtF volunteers and staffs, through their own experiences, provide hosts with role models of market-oriented agricultural sector participation and explanation of market-oriented principles.

- FtF field staffs and volunteers give support to the private, market-oriented segments of the agricultural sector in technical and business aspects of their operations which fills a vacuum in local expertise.

- FtF activities provide explicit training in market principles such as accounting, profit maximization, marketing, business planning, loan application, bank management, etc.

- FtF activities are contributing to the creation and institutionalization of market-oriented models for providing services and conducting business transactions, such as farm associations, market-oriented cooperatives, commercial banking, forward contracting and grain storage receipts systems.

In these ways, FtF is making an impact, although it is primarily site-specific or local/regional. In some cases, bank training for example, FtF's impact is national in scope. Thematically, the impacts of FtF in facilitating the market transition can be aggregated into two primary categories, building indigenous institutional capacity and agribusiness development.

a. Building Indigenous Institutional Capacity

Implementors' efforts to build indigenous institutions that support the transition to a market economy fall into three strategic areas: top down, bottom up and service organizations for business. Each implementor has had various success with one or more of these strategic objectives. Though there are no certain successes at this time, viable institutions are appearing. This fact is partly due to the current period of uncertainty surrounding the political economy in the target countries visited.

Strategy One: Top Down Capacity Building

The opportunity exists for implementors to seek broader capacity building through a top down approach by working with local government authorities who support private sector development. This effort clearly is targeted at Level 3 impacts. A clear example is the unique and successful relationship developed by VOCA and the Small Business Development Office (SBDO) in the Samara Oblast, Russia. The relationship between the two entities is collaborative, and VOCA is assisting industries targeted by the SBDO with volunteers to help develop business plans. The assisted companies bring their plans to the Small Business Development Officer for possible credit. Funds from the oblast have been distributed to companies assisted by VOCA.

A second successful example, from the Sister Cities Program, is the work being done by the Des Moines Chamber of Commerce with Stavropol Krai Chambers of Commerce. The project is focused on building communication linkages directly between the governor of Iowa and the regional governor of Stavropol. Ten cities in Iowa are partnered with 10 cities in Stavropol Krai. The State of Iowa is even funding a similar FtF program. People on both ends have ownership in the projects, and direct communication (e-mail) links are being established. The project focuses on dairy, grain production and on-farm storage. CNFA is examining this "top down" model for replication in their own programs. This model clearly focuses on Level 2 diffusion of information to a broader audience to achieve a spread effect of information.

Another example of "top down" capacity building is that of the partnership between the Women's Committee of the American Farm Bureau and the Women's Committee of AKKOR (the primary national private farmers association), developed by CNFA. The potential membership of the AKKOR Women's Committee is 280,000 farm families. To date, this partnership has resulted in recognition of the Committee as a separate legal entity -- which gives it the potential for financial sustainability -- and seminars on agribusiness and association development at the national Russian Farmers Fair in St. Petersburg and in four other regions of Russia.[4]

Strategy Two: Bottom-up Capacity Building

Mobilization of individuals into proactive groups has been the objective in several projects among implementors. Association strengthening has been formed through formalized linkages, directed by

---

[4] Case Study # 49.

implementors and their U.S. collaborative partners, e.g. state farm bureaus. These formal institutional linkages have sought to provide nurturing and guidance from the embryonic stage to full fledged member supported organizations. While the Team was unable to visit the site, a lengthy phone interview was conducted with the executive director of the California Farm Bureau regarding their local institution capacity building in the Crimea. A series of California State Farm Bureau volunteers assisted in the development of the Crimean Farmers Association that has developed the confidence and the capacity to lobby the Crimean Assembly on policy changes and has actually drafted and presented to the Crimean legislative body proposed laws and implementation plans to carry out policy reforms that benefit private farmers.

Another type of institution building has been more *ad hoc*, usually with a dynamic individual who issues a "call to action". This person serves as a catalyst in organizing and motivating individuals in the greater cause of the group. The formation can be spontaneous like the goat breeders association[4]. Another example is a highly successful Eastern Ukraine farmer/leader. His leadership as president of the local oblast farmer's association resulted in quadrupling the association's membership (now 1250) and developing a capacity to represent that region before the National Association, Ukraine Ministry of Agriculture and legislative officials.[5] These examples of institutions may or may not be sustainable depending on the actions of the head to formalize the association. Management of the association can be loose with not much diffusion of responsibility which can be a weakness in the development of the organization.

The role of the American Farm Bureau and its assistance to similar organizations in Russia is important. The Future Farmers of America's work in Kaliningrad is an important example of how exchange programs can lead to association building in Russia.[6] It is expected that a similar U.S., style youth organization is planned in conjunction with the Polessk Vocational School in Kaliningrad.

Strategy Three: Supporting Service Organizations

Implementors are looking for support organizations for private agribusiness development. As these individual countries move to a free market economy, support organizations are the key to fill the void left after FtF. It is certainly evident that entrepreneurs are emerging and they need assistance in business planning, feasibility studies and market research and analysis. Technical support with relevant information is critical to problem solving.

The Team observed instances in which implementors have been instrumental in assisting in the development and establishment of private businesses and local NGOs and associations. These efforts

---

[4] Case Study #64

[5] Case Study #1

[6] Case Study #56.

21

have been in conjunction with other donors and local institutions. The role of volunteers in these efforts has varied between direct and indirect assistance.

Several examples are worth noting. An association of feed nutritionists similar to one in the U.S. is possible following the extensive training being conducted by the U.S. Feed Grains Council.[7] VOCA participates in this training. This association of practicing consultants could be a conduit for valuable information.

Volunteers from The Society for Farm Managers and Rural Appraisers have proposed certification courses for land appraisers. The Russian organizations want this type of program but not for the five-year training accreditation course being proposed, this issue is still under negotiation for a comprise solution. The creation of certified rural appraisers offer the opportunity to achieve Level 2 impacts and assist other institutions as they facilitate transition to private property and agricultural lending.

VOCA has also been innovative in identifying an emerging private company in Saratov to initiate into the consulting business. The idea is that this company will be able to sustain and provide services such as business planning. These private firms would facilitate the provision of business services to emerging companies. A similar example is the work by Winrock International to assist in the strengthening of the Business Center in Jambool[8]. The organization serves as a potential resource for agribusinesses needing to prepare business plans and do feasibility studies. VOCA/Moldova is engaged in developing similar capacities with local NGO's.

Another producer's association example is the Russian Mushroom Growers Association. Founded by private farmers in 1995, the Association works to transform traditional mushroom gathering into a mushroom cultivation industry throughout Russia. CNFA volunteers have trained more than 100 farmers on mushroom marketing, specialized production techniques, and small business management, in addition to strengthening the Association itself.[9]

o Impediments to Institution Building

There has certainly been less impact in institution building in the credit markets. The macroeconomic conditions have seen lending to small scale agriculture decline. Key banking institutions have failed leaving few alternatives to production agriculture for operating capital. Efforts are needed to support rural credit institutions to increase credit for the private sector development of agriculture. This is and has been a critical factor in terms of sustaining the impact the volunteer TA achieved. Access to credit is probably the major constraint in making it possible for FtF volunteers to take their "client"

---

[7] Case Study #60.

[8] Case Study #18.

[9] Case Study # 46.

to and through the "second step" in developing a private enterprise. It has led to considerable frustration for both volunteers and host organizations.

o Critical Mass to Affect Change

If the FtF program is to be judged on the merit of contributions to the three levels of impact outlined in Section II on *The Analytical Framework*, then institutions will be a key to reaching level 3 indicators. A critical mass of support is necessary to effect these kinds of system wide changes. Associations and producer groups serve as an important vehicle in this effort. In Russia, AKKOR[10] is a vehicle for communicating the interest of agriculture. AGRO II in Kazakhstan and the Farmers Union in Kaliningrad are examples of similar organizations mobilizing wider support.[11]

b. Agribusiness Development

The impact of FtF activities on agribusiness development has tended to be focused on small scale, locally-oriented enterprises. The most common activities are in the areas of meat and dairy processing, milling and baking and grain storage, which is expected because these are NIS staples and perishable.

Agribusiness development activities have received a growing percentage of FtF volunteer assignments since the inception of the program, increasing from 21.2 percent of assignments in 1993 to 28 percent of assignments in 1995.

Several factors appear to play prominent roles in hosts' agribusiness success:

- o Relatively high initial level of assets (finance, equipment, buildings).
- o Prior technical knowledge.
- o Preparatory work on the part of both host and implementor/volunteer for the volunteer assignment.
- o Repeat volunteer assignments.
- o Business scale appropriate to volunteer's background.

There are notable cases where individuals have been able to expand agribusiness ventures into diversified and profitable businesses on a scale with businesses in the U.S. For example, Mr. Evgenij Pavlovsky[12] in Kaliningrad Oblast has become a successful private farmer who is now involved in grain storage and flour milling. Borets Farm in Moscow Oblast has become a diversified joint stock

---

[10] Case Study #49.

[11] Case Study #12.

[12] Case Study #54.

company in dairy production and processing, and intensive vegetable production.[13] In Kyrgyzstan, Mr. Bulovek has grown from a private livestock producer to livestock trader to a successful businessman.[14] In Ukraine, Victor and Natalya Bogdanov's business grew from an agricultural enterprise with $ 18,000 in debt in 1987 to a large diversified farm with 50 employees farming 1,500 ha and over $ 1 million in machinery and equipment.[15] Western Foods in Ukraine has become a very viable company because of the efforts of volunteers.[16]

Employment and income impacts are important as fledgling companies have grown in their communities. In some cases these companies are the major source of employment in their area. For example, Abram and Irina Zigfrid in Samara Oblast have expanded from one small bakery to two bakeries employing 42 people in two rural communities. They estimate that within the year their salaried staff will increase to 70 employees.[17]

3. Increasing Food Availability and Resolving Food Distribution Problems

a. Increasing Food Availability

The broad legislative mandate of the FtF Program provides for volunteer assistance across the entire agricultural sector from increased crop production to development of agribusinesses. Over time USAID and implementors seem to have shifted the emphasis of the program from production assistance to post-harvest, value-added activities in the agribusiness sector. However, the Team has determined that many Program activities continue to be focused on increasing production and productivity (i.e., yield/unit of land, T/HA) of basic food crops (wheat, corn and potatoes) as well as dairy production.

The provision of assistance to the production sector makes sense for three fundamentally important reasons.

1. First, while the majority of republics of the former Soviet Union are capable of producing adequate amounts of basic food crops, at least two countries (Georgia and Armenia) are clearly not capable at this time. Under the Soviet system, these countries traditionally produced high valued crops (tea, wine, fruits and vegetables) for export, principally to Russia. In return, they received adequate supplies of basic food crops. However , with the collapse of the Soviet Union in the early

---

[13] Case Study #47.

[14] Case Study #26.

[15] Case Study #71.

[16] Case Study #70.

[17] USAID Ukraine

1990's, the market for Georgia's and Armenia's agricultural products essentially vanished and they were left on the verge of massive food shortages. Only the provision of humanitarian food aid from the international donor community saved the day. Both Georgia and Armenia are now putting major attention on the production of basic food crops.

2. Second, although there are countries in the NIS capable of producing large quantities of basic food crops, the efficiencies of these food production systems is very low. Ukraine represents a case in point. Its agricultural sector is producing only about 50% of what it did 5-6 years ago,[18] and is experiencing a partial drought in the summer of 1996. Under the Soviet system, inputs (i.e., fertilizer, herbicides and insecticides as well as equipment) were provided at no or minimal cost to state farms. Thus, these farms had no need or incentive to be efficient. That situation has now completely changed. Inputs are not provided by the government and state farms have been converted to private joint stock company farms. Therefore, there is a need for these farms to adopt new, efficient production technologies that are environmentally sound. U.S. private sector companies and public research institutions have been developing these technologies for years (e.g., zero tillage) and they are being widely used by U.S. farmers. They are now being introduced in Moldova as part of an FtF activity.

3. Third, FtF volunteers have already made solid progress in the area of increased crop and dairy production. For example, in Georgia ACDI has used FtF volunteers and an alliance with U.S. corn hybrid seed companies to increase corn production in the Western part of the country. An association of growers has been formed to grow the new hybrids and return a portion of the crop to the association for the purchase of needed inputs.[19] In Eastern Georgia, ACDI/FtF volunteers are working with the Plant Breeding Institute to test high yielding, disease resistant, well-adapted U.S. wheat varieties for release to Georgian farmers. With the help of FtF volunteers, a wheat growers' association has been formed to produce high quality seed of these varieties for which there already is a big demand.[20] In the Krasnodar/Rostov area of Southern Russia, FtF volunteers have made significant contributions to increased potato and potato seed production and improved dairy production.[21] FtF volunteers from the public and private sectors are particularly well equipped to continue this type of project with the potential for big payoffs that produce Level III type impacts.

b. Food Distribution

The Team saw some evidence of FtF volunteer assistance in the food distribution sector. Most of this assistance and impact was indirect and involved technical assistance in improving grain storage

---

[18] Data to be re-checked.

[19] Case Study #6.

[20] Case Study #5 and Case Study #7.

[21] Case Study #51.

facilities on and off farm to cut waste and losses, and the start up of many small private enterprises involved in the food processing chain. The most common examples observed were small meat and dairy processors, flour milling, and lots of mini-bakeries. One meat processor even named a new meat product after the volunteer that assisted the host. Other less common examples involved the start up of small canning operations and solar drying of fruits and vegetables. Assistance with packaging and marketing of these products was often a major contribution of the volunteers.

4. Promoting Good Will Toward The United States

The legislation creating Farmer-to-Farmer explicitly states that it is to be a transfer of the knowledge and expertise of U.S. agricultural producers and businesses on a people-to-people basis. Underlying this is the belief that volunteers working at the grass-roots level can provide moral and technical support to private farmers and entrepreneurs in the transition to a market economy, encouraging individual initiative and participation in political processes.

The NIS-FtF Program has effectively carried out not only its mandate of technology and information transfer but also its political charge of promoting good will toward the United States. Since 1992, volunteers have directly affected the lives of 120,970 women and men, working with more than 1,000 NIS organizations. In addition, personal ties between NIS citizens and volunteers often continue well past the assignment, further creating a web of economic and personal ties. In the evaluation of the Reverse Farmer-to-Farmer training program, for example, all NIS interviewees reported a desire to maintain contacts with their U.S. friends and associates. One result was more entrepreneurial activities, such as a joint venture to produce seed potatoes.[22]

Another effect of people-to-people ties is increased exchange of information. And a third is the unmeasurable value of new friendships. In the responses to the questionnaire sent to Returned U.S. Volunteers by this Evaluation Team (see section on *U.S. Impact*), 85% of volunteers have maintained some kind of contact with their associates in the NIS. Of those staying in touch multiple means were used, including letters (69% of all respondents), follow-on visiting in the U.S. and the NIS (42%), telephone calls (25%), e-mails (23%), and faxes (10%). 84% of these contacts had been maintained for the exchange of information, 52% strictly because of friendship, 14% for business purposes, and 9% because of equipment or funds.

A final result is the breaking down of the negative stereotypes that existed in the NIS toward the U.S. As one Returned Volunteer wrote:

> *I was very surprised to see how much almost all of the people I came across absolutely loved America and Americans, despite the fact that these people were*

---

[22] Source: Foti, John, *Evaluation of Training Program: Reverse Farmer-To-Farmer Project for the New Independent States.* Prepared for Agricultural Cooperative Development International, September 1995.

taught from an early age to hate our country, our system and - in a roundabout way - our people. We were the enemy.

Another example is the case of the two FtF volunteers who helped mountain villages in Armenia take a major step toward food security by helping the villagers develop a gravity feed irrigation system and a flour mill to mill the increased wheat production resulting from the irrigation system. The villagers were so grateful that they named the irrigation systems after the FtF irrigation volunteer.[23] This level of good will impact is not atypical. The Team saw many instances of this kind of appreciation and building of good will toward the program and the United States at almost every site visited.

In summary, the Farmer-to-Farmer Program is serving an important role as a vehicle for technology transfer and as a people-to-people program, providing usable technical assistance and strengthening bonds of friendship between the NIS and the U.S. Both have had an impact which has lasted well beyond the time of the technical assistance.[24]

5. Sustainability of Impact

The success of a FtF volunteer assignment can be measured by whether the intervention of technical knowledge results in sustained improvement in the business or association. The volunteer's impact does not diminish over time. Some indicators of successful sustainability can be measured in financial stability, product diversification, human capital development or marketing efficiencies. Three broad indicators that sustainability is likely to occur are:

- diversification of the company/organization into new ventures;
- diffusion of technical knowledge to a larger group of people; and
- attainment of a critical level of market share or support.

a. Financial Stability

There are clear examples where FtF volunteers have assisted firms and associations to reach financial stability. Borets Farm in the Moscow Oblast received a series of FtF volunteers in forage and dairy production and milk processing. The company has accumulated 700 million roubles ($14 million) in earnings and has reached a level of financial security.[25] A second example is Ferit Kazanow in Saratov Oblast who received FtF assistance in wheat production, soil conservation and grain storage.[26] He

---

[23] Case Study #1.

[24] The change in U.S. stereotypes toward the NIS is addressed in the Section II.B, Impact in the U.S.

[25] Case Study #47.

[26] Case Study #57.

27

also participated in the Reverse FtF Program. He has become a model farmer in his village and is financially secure with adequate capital. The Bogdanov Farm in Eastern Ukraine from all appearances has reached a point of financial stability and sustainability.[27] Many factors contributed to this result but two were of primary importance: vision and diversification of the activities of the enterprise.

b. Product Diversification

FtF volunteers have assisted agribusiness companies and associations to diversify their product lines and services. In Kaliningrad, several meat processing companies received volunteer assistance in product development. Meat companies owned by Izrapil Sochoyev[28] and Natasha Karpushova[29] received training. One meat item is named after the volunteer. One company developed a marketing contract with the merchant marine fleet based in Kaliningrad.

c. Human Capital Development

FtF volunteers have been successful in the transfer of new skills that ensure that host organizations can compete and prosper in the future. Ultimately, better business performance is achieved. In Kyrgyzstan, two FtF volunteers assisted Mr. Ao-adelet of J.S. Company[30] to design a 30 hectare orchard. This was a new venture. The volunteers designed a spacing that would allow efficient use of labor in pruning and harvesting of trees. Mr. Ao-adelet has implemented an innovative labor sharing scheme where workers receive 60% of fruit and are allowed to cultivate crops between the rows. This venture will likely sustain itself and be profitable because of labor participation. A good example of human capital development is the assistance to the Polessk Vocational School in Kaliningrad.[31] Teacher training and management training have strengthened the school and ensure that the curriculum remains effective. The school has signed a memorandum of understanding with a U.S. college for exchange of teachers, administrators and students.

d. Marketing Efficiency

FtF volunteers have assisted companies in improving their marketing plans and operations, especially in distribution, wholesaling, and retailing. On the advice of an FtF volunteer, a harness making

---

[27] Case Study #71.

[28] Case Study #55.

[29] Case Study #53.

[30] Case Study #29.

[31] Case Study #56.

company in Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan is improving the way it sells to the public.[32] The company is opening regional sales offices to sell directly to the public. Regional sales staff work on commission. Innovative marketing and sales activities will ensure the sustainability of the company. The company has re-engineered its operations to be more market-oriented. A second company in Bishkek received FtF assistance in farm machinery sales.[33] For the first time, the company will be taking-in used equipment on trade for new equipment. This new retailing strategy places the company in a unique competitive position and increases its chance for survival.

e. Company Diversification

A clear measure of sustainability of a company or association is whether it can grow and diversify its activities. Agro II Association in Taldykorgan is a dynamic association that continues to pursue activities in support of its members. Besides a nationally distributed newsletter with market prices, it operates a legal center for members to obtain legal title to their properties. Agro II is in the process of opening a marketing center for agricultural inputs and a sales outlet for producers commodities.[34]

f. Sufficient Capitalization

FtF volunteers have played successful roles in assisting companies and organizations to obtain operating capital and loan funds for infrastructure. Sustainability of these organizations is closely tied to capital assets. Volunteers have written business plans that have resulted in long-term loans. In Kyrgyzstan, Mr. Timmer-bek received $200,000 for completion of his meat processing facility.[35] In Kazakhstan, Salena Ltd. received a $15,000 loan from Mercy Corp. for improvements in their facility.[36] FtF volunteers helped to design a revolving credit program for the Kaskelen Farmers' Credit Fund which has loaned $420,000 for purchase of farm inputs.[37] The Russian Farm Community Project in Dimitrov has received over $ 1 million in monetized funds for providing loans to local farmers which will be significant in jump-starting production agriculture in the Dimitrov area.[38]

---

[32] Case Study #22.

[33] Case Study #21.

[34] Case Study #21.

[35] Case Study #25.

[36] Case Study #15.

[37] Case Study #11.

[38] Case Study #38.

g. Diffusion of Technical Information

Establishment of a critical mass of private sector firms is a key to overall sustainability of a volunteer efforts. This is why striving for Level 2 impact in all volunteer efforts is so important. Two irrigation projects in Khachik and Vardahovit Villages in Southern Armenia have had enormous impact on food availability and the economic welfare of the village inhabitants.[39] These impoverished areas have become more viable. Efforts by Mr. Alexander Bodorov, with assistance from several goat experts, has expanded a network of goat breeders. His efforts are leading to a critical mass of producers who can sustain their activities.[40] Efforts by the Solar-dried Fruit Association in Armenia have impacted a large group of growers who will continue to benefit from group processing and marketing.[41]

There is clear evidence that FtF projects are becoming more sustainable and will continue after the end of the FtF Program. Companies and organizations are becoming resilient and able to cope with market forces. This is achieved by diversification of activities, expansion of product lines, infusion of capital and dissemination of technical knowledge to other participants. Sustainability is a long-term proposition requiring continued attention to the economic and political environment confronting FtF projects.

6. Summary Conclusions

The Team's major conclusions based on the above findings can be summarized as follows:
Analytical Framework

a. Analytical Framework

The analytical framework adopted and utilized in this Evaluation, and described in Section II.A above, served the Team well.

b. FtF Is Achieving Its Basic Purposes

If promoting good will towards the United States is the minimum impact that justifies a program like FtF, then it is more than fulfilling that objective. But the FtF Program is achieving significant impact that goes well beyond good will and is producing significant impact at the first and second levels of the Team's analytical model, i.e. impact on the host and in many cases achieving a spread effect beyond the host. There may well be now or in the immediate future impact at the third level, but it will be very difficult to demonstrate this until better systems are in place to aggregate some of that first and second level impact. At the same time, the Team observed several instances where the

---

[39] Case Study #1.

[40] Case Study #64.

[41] Case Study #4.

sustainability of that impact was problematical because resources such as credit were not available to enable the host to move to that "second step" to implement volunteer recommendations.

c. FtF Is Not Broke

The Team concluded that The Farmer-to Farmer Program is not broke, so for the most part it does not need a major fix it. But with dwindling foreign assistance resources, and the prospect of greatly reduced USAID mission presence in many NIS countries, and the increased emphasis on getting maximum impact from every foreign assistance dollar, the Team believes that several policy and program adjustments should be undertaken. These are detailed in Lessons Learned and in Recommendations.

d. Need For Up-Dated Policy Guidance

There is a need for updated policy guidance to tighten program management, increase alignment with USAID objectives, and bring a more disciplined focus to achieving and measuring and demonstrating impact. All implementors are interested in and concerned about achieving and demonstrating impact. Some have a clearer notion than others as to what this entails. Now, however, impact tends to be observed and recorded one volunteer at a time. Adequate and uniform systems are not in place to discipline project selection, establish measurable objectives and capture impact data on a systematic and aggregated basis.

e. Targeting

While the Team concluded that the program needs to have more focus, it hesitates to recommend targeting on one functional area as opposed to another as it observed good impact being made in several areas, e.g. at the production levels as well as post harvest activities. Some institutional development projects, however, are not likely to demonstrate significant and measurable impact in the short run. The Team would also question continued focus on banking systems at the national level, especially since the impact being achieved is not likely to favorably impact the agricultural sector for some time. The Team, therefore believes that focus and greater impact should be a natural consequence of improved systems for strategic project planning and project selection and reporting.

f. Reverse Farmer-to-Farmer Training Programs

As a part of its interview format, the team collected data on the impact of U.S.-based training, not distinguishing among the various training programs. Of the more than 77 sites visited, approximately 40% had interviewees who had participated in some kind of U.S. training. The universal finding in all countries was that short-term training in the U.S. significantly increases the impact of FtF. Trainees and implementors reported very positive changes in both attitudes and technical knowledge as a result of the U.S.-based experience.

Examples of impact reported in the site visits include:

- A USDA advisor working with a Host Organization said:

  > *The participants came home with more positive attitudes about change. For example, they now don't believe that they need formal certification in order to do something (e.g., welding, accounting, farming). They have more guts, more of an independent attitude. They are willing to try new things and to see possibilities in the future. The training also destroyed some residual negative attitudes about the U.S.*

- A private farmer in Southern Russia reported that the training inspired him to try forming a cooperative himself. It also further solidified his belief in taking a scientific approach to farming and gave him a strong sense that the farmer must seek out the market.

- Another trainee, who is the Deputy Director of an Agribusiness Program, brought back a manual on business-plan development, which was translated into Russian. She uses the manual in her training programs.

And, again and again, trainees told us, "One picture is worth a thousand words. We saw for ourselves that the private market can work."[42]

The Team concluded that Reverse Farmer-to-Farmer Training, when carefully utilized, plays in almost all instances a critical role in inducing sustainable change in attitudes and practices at the host level and beyond.

g. Leveraging of Other Resources

The ability to leverage other resources emerged as an important element in increasing the effectiveness and sustainability of the impact of FtF programs. The Team was surprised to learn of the extent of other resources in-country and out of country that are sometimes available to FtF activities. It was impressed with the ability of some implementors and volunteers to access these resources. Not all implementors were aware of or inclined to use these resources.

---

[42] For more specific details on the positive impacts of U.S. training programs -- including such variables as multiplier effects -- see both the "Reverse Farmer-to-Farmer" evaluation cited above and the NET Evaluation (*The NIS Exchanges and Training [NET] Project: A Mid-term Evaluation of Process and Preliminary Impact*, Prepared by Aguirre International for USAID, 1995).

B. Program Results and Impact in the United States

1. Informing the American Public: FtF Volunteers

The evaluation SOW called for providing an "assessment of the impact of public outreach by the FtF volunteers and the implementing organizations to inform the public about their contributions to U.S. international assistance efforts." To do this, the team used two research tools: (1) a survey questionnaire sent to a sample of returned volunteers and (2) a questionnaire sent to all implementors. These questionnaires, as well as a more detailed presentation of the data collected, are found in the annexes.

o The Sample

A random sample of 5% of all returned volunteers (total of 110) was selected and a questionnaire sent to them by mail in early June 1996. A very impressive 45% of questionnaires had been returned at the time of this report, a number which indicates the degree of commitment that volunteers have to FtF. The sample was not intended to be a statistically significant representation of the universe of all volunteers and, as a mail survey, it is also skewed by being a self-selected response. However, we believe that it presents a good profile of outreach efforts by volunteers and attitudinal changes of themselves, their family and friends, and their professional colleagues toward the NIS and U.S. international assistance efforts.

The sample consists of 94% men and 6% women, 12% from Minnesota and Wisconsin, 6% from California, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and South Dakota, and the others distributed among 17 other states. Their educational background is relatively high, with 49% having masters or doctorates. The majority are self-employed (41%) and retired (27%). The distribution among implementors is: ACDI, 12%; CNFA, 10%; LOL, 14%; TVG, 2%; VOCA, 42%; and Winrock, 20%. The distribution among NIS regions is: Caucasus, 7%; Central Asian Republics, 13%; Russia, 60%; and West NIS, 20%.

o Public Outreach by Volunteers

All implementors encourage volunteers to carry out public outreach activities upon their return, but only one requires it.[43] Nevertheless, a significant number of volunteers, on their own initiative, educate their local communities and professional colleagues through presentations. Audiences

---

[43] CNFA requires returned volunteers to do 8 hours of speaking or interviews.

include service groups, marketing associations, and other business and social organizations, and audience size ranges from small local meetings to regional meetings.[44]

In the evaluation sample, data on size of audiences were not collected. However, **more than 75% of the sample had made presentations**: 36% were to community groups, 36% to professional organizations, and 27% to educational institutions. In addition, most volunteers had made more than one presentation; the average for the sample was **5 talks each**. This parallels the data from a survey carried out by an implementor in which **each volunteer had personally addressed 287 people** through presentations at cooperatives, church groups, farmers groups, professional associations, community associations, service clubs, and educational institutions.[45] Another implementor reported very similar findings, stating that more than 75% of their volunteers have done public outreach.[46]

If we combine the two data sources above (the team's survey and the implementors findings) and hypothesize that a modest 70% of the 2,242 returned volunteers to date have made presentations to 150 people each, at least 168,150 persons have become aware of the FtF through first-hand information from volunteers.

o Media Coverage of Volunteers

These numbers do not include the much larger number who receive information about FtF through the mass media. **63% of the evaluation sample had received some kind of media coverage**, most by more than one medium. 31% of the media hits were in newspapers, 24% in magazines and journals, 24% on the radio, and 21% on television. Size of audiences was not collected as a part of the evaluation survey; however, examples of circulation numbers of newspapers which have covered volunteers include the *Peoria Journal Star*, with a circulation of 102,296, and the *Arkansas Democrat Gazette* with 178,000 readers.

If we were to hypothesize very modestly that 25% of the 2,242 returned volunteers to date have been featured in a newspaper article with a circulation of 25,000, more than 14 million persons have read about FtF in the NIS. More information on the use of media to inform the public is found below in the section on implementors' outreach efforts.

---

[44] Implementors are not required by USAID to track these activities, but all do. Tracking systems range from a very formal one of using a clipping service to asking volunteers to send material on any outreach or media coverage. Implementors also track volunteer activities through follow-up calls by recruiters. CNFA, in fact, makes a call every 3 months to every volunteer who has been in the program over the last two years. In addition, most implementors provide background materials to volunteers to assist them in their outreach efforts, such as VOCA's *Share the Experience* materials.

[45] Source: ACDI memo to Evaluation Team, July 2, 1996.

[46] Source: CNFA memo to Evaluation Team, July 3, 1996.

o Change of Attitudes about the NIS and about U.S. International Assistance Efforts

The volunteer experience has affected attitudes of the volunteers themselves, their families and friends, and their professional colleagues about the NIS in general and U.S. international assistance efforts in particular. In the survey, volunteers were asked, "How much did your experiences in the NIS change the attitudes of" (a) yourself, (b) your family and friends, and (c) your professional colleagues toward the NIS and toward U.S. programs overseas? Responses are shaped by many variables, including previous knowledge of the NIS. However, **73% reported that their experiences had changed attitudes "very much" or "a moderate amount."** These data suggest that FtF is a very important people-to-people vehicle, not only for providing technical assistance to the NIS but also for educating the American public about the NIS and development activities of the U.S. government.

A Minnesota volunteer, who helped a food processing plant in the Ukraine develop a business plan, wrote in his questionnaire:

> *My volunteer experiences have had a profound effect on all of those around me, starting with my family. I got my parents involved on a volunteer assignment -- my father is a grocery store executive and the current Chair of the State Grocers Association and my step-mother is a small business owner -- and after their assignment, they gave lectures to colleges, trade associations, churches, and even individual companies, trying to get them to invest money in the NIS. I also convinced a food marketing professor at Michigan State to go on an assignment. As a result, the university has started the process of building some business and academic contacts in the NIS.*

The following table presents questionnaire responses in more detail.

o Impacts of Volunteer Outreach

Outreach activities by volunteers have had several positive effects. They include:

- Knowledge: Thousands of individuals know more about the efforts of the volunteers, the implementors, and USAID in the NIS. They are more aware of the problems facing the NIS and the usefulness of U.S. efforts in assisting the transition to a market economy and democracy.

- In-kind Contributions for the NIS: As detailed above, many volunteers maintain contact long after their return with the host organization and individuals they met in the NIS. Not only do they continue to send materials, but they also have been responsible for in-kind contributions for reverse training programs of NIS citizens and for in-kind and dollar contributions to Host Organizations in the NIS.

35

Table 2
Changing Attitudes Toward the NIS and Toward U.S. International Assistance Efforts

Changes in Attitudes Toward NIS		
	Very Much or Moderate Amount	Very Little or Not At All
Volunteer	70%	30%
Family & Friends	85%	15%
Colleagues	73%	27%
Average	**76%**	**24%**
Changes in Attitudes Toward U.S. International Assistance		
	Very Much or Moderate Amount	Very Little or Not At All
Volunteer	82%	18%
Family & Friends	73%	27%
Colleagues	53%	47%
Average	**69%**	**31%**
Overall Average	**73%**	**27%**

- Recruitment: Public outreach, particularly by returned volunteers, is also effective in recruiting new volunteers. Many individuals have volunteered as the result of a presentation by a former volunteer.

- Changes in Attitude: Such U.S. organizations as banks, agribusinesses, community groups, and universities, which volunteers address through public outreach and in which they work, have begun to view their institution in an international framework, resulting in a more global view of the world.

2. Informing the American Public: U.S. Implementors

Because implementors are not asked to report on their public outreach efforts in the U.S., no single source for this information exists. Consequently, the Team sent a questionnaire to all implementors which asked about the process and results of their public education activities. All responded with generosity, even though this type of information gathering is not a part of their agreement with USAID. The following summarizes the findings.

o Outreach Activities by Implementors

All implementors carry out public outreach activities. Primary methods include:

- Press releases to local, regional, and national newspapers, professional newsletters and journals, and in-house newsletters and magazines.
- Press releases to local , regional, and national television and radio outlets.
- World Wide Web Sites.
- Booth displays at such meetings and conventions as the *Annual Small Farm Today Trade Show and Seminar* in Columbia, MO, and the *Returned Peace Corps Volunteer Fair*.
- Voluntary visits with Congressional representatives.

Examples of these media sources and their coverage include:

Print Media

. ACDI assists volunteers in contacting their local newspaper or professional journal. It also uses cooperative newsletters to disseminate information, and it has direct access to the *Cooperative News International* and the *Cooperator*, each of which has a circulation of over 3,000. Other publications which have published articles about FtF include *The Champaign-Urbana News Gazette, Money and Credit*, and the *South-West Review*.

. CNFA's linkages to the American Farm Bureau also results in coverage of FtF through AFB journals and newsletters. For example, the CNFA Women's Canning Project in Ukraine, which received a $30,000 donation from the Women's Committee of AFB, received coverage in *Farm Bureau News* and *AFB Reno Review*, the special newsletter reporting on the annual meeting. (Each has circulation of 50,000 and each included photos.)

. LOL actively disseminates information about FtF both within the company and within the professional community. For example, articles on FtF appear in *Dairy Outlook*, and other professional journals and in-house publications such as *Land O'Lakes International Outlook Newsletter* (circulation of 1,500, primarily international business, agribusiness, and development specialists). In addition, LOL International Development sends out more than 100 packets a month of information regarding the international development programs which always includes a sheet on FtF.

. VOCA disseminates information to media ranging from the *International Edition of USA TODAY* to professional journals such as *Farm Journal* to VOCA's own publications, such as the *VOCA VIP* (Volunteers Inspiring Progress) (circulation of 6,000, primarily agribusinesses, members of Congress, and commodity groups) and *VOCA-GRAM* (sent to 5,000 former volunteers).

. Winrock publishes three FtF newsletters annually, which are distributed to more than 1,200 people, including partner organizations, returned volunteers, and others in the volunteer

database. In FY94, it produced 55 press releases based upon the assignment reports of 112 NIS volunteers, which were distributed to hometown media and publications of farm, commodity, and trade groups. In addition, the Winrock annual report profiles FtF, as does *SEEDS*, a quarterly newsletter sent to more than 12,000 readers. These activities have resulted in 120 published articles, radio interviews, and television reports over time on FtF in the NIS.

Electronic Media

As described above under volunteer outreach activities, FtF activities are also covered by the electronic media, including both television and radio. For example, volunteers reporting media coverage of their assignment said that 24% of it had been through the radio and 21% through television. Implementors also have their own electronic media contacts. CNFA's efforts have generated coverage through 34 radio and 17 television programs, and VOCA maintains a ongoing relationship with the *National Association of Farm Broadcasters*, which represents more than 2,000 radio stations and approximately 300 television stations. The listening audience is about 85% of all U.S. farmers, as well as many non-agriculture viewers and listeners.

World Wide Web

. ACDI and Winrock have created home pages, with a portion devoted exclusively to FtF and giving detailed information about the program and how to get involved. They have proved to be good vehicles for disseminating information about foreign assistance, USAID, FtF, and the NIS.

o Impacts of Implementor Outreach

The impacts of outreach activities by implementors are similar to those of volunteers, but often on a much larger scale because of the larger number of media outlets affected and the larger circulation or audience sizes. The most important effect is that documented above: Implementor outreach activities increase the knowledge and change the attitudes of the American public about the NIS and U.S. Government activities.

3. Indicative Assessment of the Impact on U.S. Organizations and Businesses

Telephone interviews were conducted with key individuals representing U.S. private businesses (12 people) and associations (10 association directors) out of a sample of 36 contacts. The purpose of the survey was an effort to determine the impact of participation in the FtF program on their operations. In all cases, U.S. interviewees were very positive about their personal experiences in working directly with their host business or organizations. In one case, a businessman said that he was forming a joint venture not just to make money "but to help people to understand democracy." This same individual put up the personal guarantee for a loan for a joint venture project in Uzbekistan.

The impacts on U.S. businesses are not as obvious though some business people were optimistic that their efforts would eventually bear financial payoffs. As for associations, solid progress was being achieved in this area with impacts even possible at Level 3 on national and regional policies.

a. U.S. Business Impacts

The impact of the FtF on U.S. businesses is difficult to measure in the actual numbers of joint ventures which have been signed and funded. There have been some sales of U.S. equipment to Russia and NIS countries which evolved out of a volunteers's assignments. A few joint ventures have been signed and others are awaiting final approval.

A wool scouring plant is under construction with a $ 475,000 loan from the Central Asian American Enterprise Fund (CAAEF). The Fund is even inquiring about a 30 percent equity share in the project. This project evolved out of a two week visit by two volunteers in March, 1996. The volunteer believes with more time he could implement several other "good" projects in textile production in Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan.

Another successful case is the selling of U.S. saw milling equipment to a firm in Siberia. The investment by the U.S. company was $ 40,000 while the return is estimated at $ 500,000.The project included bringing a Russian to the U.S. which helped to show how the machinery and the business could be run. This company has gotten good public relations in both the U.S. and Russia regarding this project. One businessman mentioned that a critical factor for success is finding the right person who will follow through with the venture. This same company did a smaller project selling flour milling equipment in Kazakhstan but the results were less impressive because people did not have the same commitment. Better sales representatives are also needed who have both a sales and technical background to market the equipment.

In Kazakhstan, a potential joint venture is evolving in the production of layers and broilers for the local market. The size of the investment is approximately $ 7 to 10 million and will use U.S. equipment and feedstuffs. The project will convert old state facilities into a Western standard business operation. More work needs to be done before this project can be phased in, but the U.S. businessman is optimistic.

Some companies have formed further linkages with other U.S. companies. In the case of production technologies, a company combined with another U.S. irrigation company to present a technical package for intensive vegetable production. There have been no major contracts yet but the outlook is positive from NIS governments and international donor agencies.

Projects which are smaller in scale are attractive to U.S. businesses rather than large scale agribusiness projects which are fraught with political, institutional, social and management problems. Large multinationals, e.g. ConAgra, take a long time to set up a project while smaller scale projects with less capital requirements start up quicker and generate impressive income and employment multiplier impacts. U.S. business people did state that the quality of Russian products, e.g. flour,

casein, are not up to their standards which certainly should be a signal to implementors to assist companies in the areas of technical production and quality control. The cost advantages of products from the NIS in most cases does not overcome the quality disadvantage.

There was the impression that if implementors could help on the joint venture aspects then more positive outputs would be forthcoming. It was felt that implementors were reluctant to take on this area of expertise because of a lack of experience in finding venture capital. In general, U.S. businesses interviewed said that implementors were very helpful in logistics but felt that implementors did not have the skill to move a project to financial completion and this is what their businesses needed.

A concern of U.S. businesses was how to better inform the NIS manager about world market conditions. There are clear opportunities as seen in wool processing, but the host business manager either does not know about world market opportunities or does not know how to get the information. There are also major hurdles to clear products for import or export which opens the opportunity for corruption.

b. U.S. Association Impacts

There has been significant involvement by U.S. associations assisting "sister organizations" in the NIS. The American Farm Bureau and a number of state farm bureaus, e.g. California, Kansas, Texas, and Wisconsin have developed long term relationships with Private Farmer Unions (PFU). Positive impacts are realized by the U.S. associations which introduces their members to overseas conditions and their host organization. U.S. associations increase international leadership, greater understanding about emerging democracies and good will from people-to-people exchanges. The increased awareness of globalization by an organization's staff, e.g. a bank, indirectly enhances their ability to better service their local clients.

The association linkage was found to strengthen the host association to organize and manage their operations (Level 1 impact). Membership numbers increase; leadership skills improve; and democratic principles are introduced to associations. The involvement of leaders in RFtF is especially beneficial to both the U.S. host and the participants.

It was found that more emphasis in the early period of involvement needs to be on leadership development and training because many associations were founded by a small core of motivated individuals. To get wider spread effects (Level 2), more democratic principles will need to be introduced into the host association training programs. Nevertheless, U.S. associations are increasing the critical mass within organizations to transfer knowledge about the U.S. and improved technologies.

There is clear evidence that association partnerships create the opportunities for Level 3 impacts at the national level in the NIS. U.S. associations have experience in lobbying the U.S. political establishment on agricultural issues. Excellent examples were found where women groups, PFU's and national associations have met in forums with parliament members to discuss agricultural issues. U.S.

associations have on occasion met with U.S. politicians and government officials on issues related to their NIS experiences. In fact the Secretary of Agriculture visited a FtF project to inaugurate a monetized fund for farmers in the Moscow Oblast.[47]

U.S. associations are pushing for better communication channels between themselves and their host organizations. Hopefully, these channels will increase marketing information about global markets so that both U.S. organizations and their farmers will better link with Russia and NIS market opportunities. State farm bureau associations through conventions and newsletters disseminate the work of the FtF volunteers to their membership and in doing so build greater global awareness about international markets.

C. Program Management and Implementation Systems

1. Relationship of Program Focus, Impact and Legislative Intent

The Evaluation Team clearly believes that the program focus has met and continues to meet the legislative intent and has been producing significant impact given the relatively limited amount of funds made available for the program.

The legislative intent of the Farmer-to-Farmer Program is contained in Title V of the 1990 Farm Bill. Section 41.(a) (2) reads "utilize United States farmers, etc. ... to facilitate the improvement of farm and agribusiness operations and agricultural systems in such countries, including animal health, field crop cultivation, fruit and vegetable growing, livestock operations, food processing and packaging, farm credit, marketing, inputs, agricultural extension, and the strengthening of cooperatives and other farm groups;" Section 41. (a) (3) calls for "...supporting private and public, agriculturally related organizations that request and support technical assistance activities through cash and in-kind services."

The RFA, dated March 6, 1992, which led to the current NIS FtF Program stated "The FtF Program in this Special Initiative will include, but will not be limited to, providing technical assistance and training to facilitate agribusiness development with emphasis on post-harvest activities. The focus will be on meat, dairy, vegetable oil, wheat, feed grains, and fruit and vegetable sectors."

With the exception of ACDI, the implementors have clearly focused on facilitating agribusiness development as called for in USAID's RFA. ACDI's focus, as outlined in their original proposal was mainly to develop rural credit delivery systems. While ACDI's focus was side-tracked for several years, causing ACDI to shift focus to the commercial banking sector, with the intent of extending its capabilities from government-directed credits to agriculture to legitimate bank credit, ACDI is, however, beginning to once again focus on rural credit delivery systems, as well as on agribusiness development. The Implementors, as a whole, appear to be shifting away from too much involvement in agricultural production due to signals from USAID/W and Missions and due to their belief that

---

[47] Case Study #38.

they can produce greater impact by assisting in the areas of agribusiness and strengthening of farmer organizations which provide crop inputs and technical advice to their members and also lobby for their members' interests with regional and national legislatures, and government ministries. However, the Team found many instances where there can be and has been substantial payback from assistance in the production of staple food crops.

Some implementors shy away from assisting public institutions, while others believe there can be great benefit by selectively supporting public institutions like wheat research stations and the Central Bank of the host country.

2. USAID Management, Coordination and Monitoring

The Team interviewed key personnel in the USAID/W BHR and ENI Bureaus that provide management, coordination and monitoring as well as policy guidance for the FtF Program. The Team also discussed FtF program management with USAID Missions visited throughout the NIS. Similarly, we discussed management of the Program with implementing organizations' headquarters and field personnel.

The responses from these interviews gave an impression of mixed perceptions and attitudes concerning the value and significance of the FtF Program to USAID's major priorities and objectives. This has influenced the Agency's approach to program management, coordination and monitoring. It is recognized that FtF has a broad legislative mandate and several audiences within the U.S. Executive Branch. Consequently, implementors are given a great deal of latitude in terms of implementation systems and selection of projects and project areas. Opinions at both USAID headquarters offices and in the field were mixed as to how much development impact could be achieved by a program like FtF. While some people indicated that FtF is not a program that USAID, given an option, would choose to fund, it was recognized by most, however, that some development impact occurs at a grass roots level, that it contributes to political development, and that there could probably be more integration of FtF activities and USAID program objectives.

The lack of a consistent, unified Agency-wide policy and attitude concerning the management, coordination and monitoring, and development worth of the FtF Program has caused, in some cases, misunderstandings and confusion among implementors at the Washington and field level. For example, lack of consistent reporting requirements between BHR and USAID/Moscow resulted in the CNFA Country Representative completely revamping the office's reporting methodology. Reports are now generated to provide program information, often in anecdotal form, for BHR and more quantitative information for USAID/Moscow to address impact on the Mission's Strategic Objectives. Some implementors question whether USAID missions in particular are really interested in FtF.

Concern was also expressed in USAID/W and in the field as to the number of implementors currently active in the field. There is a general feeling that there are too many implementors operating in some of the larger countries. There was also a feeling among some that FtF needed to be better focused

42

on fewer target areas. The Team shares both of these concerns, and believes both should be addressed in the issuance of a new RFA.

The Team recognizes that the FtF Program is not a typical USAID activity from several perspectives (e.g., funding source, focus, impacts), and therefore requires a different mode of management and monitoring. But the Team also feels that overall management and monitoring could be improved by:

a. Completing the results of the indicator exercise started several months ago with implementors in an effort to develop a more unified policy concerning program management, coordination and monitoring as well as a more proactive approach in the implementation of this policy. See Part III, LESSONS LEARNED and Part IV RECOMMENDATIONS.

b. Devoting a little more time at the field level to advising implementors concerning USAID mission programs and program objectives, as well as making implementors aware of the possible availability of other in-country resources which FtF could leverage its technical assistance. While the Team believes there is a need for more communication between USAID missions and the implementing agencies in the field, it is also sensitive to the fact that every mission visited is severely limited in terms of how much staff time can be devoted to programs like FtF. The Team found that the implementors are very knowledgeable about the areas and sub-sectors in which their programs operate, and thus have a lot to offer in the way of insights and information. Increased contact and communications would be in everyone's interest.

c. Taking better advantage of what appears to be a golden public relations opportunity by giving the FtF Program more public recognition and support as an example of grass roots development that is building widespread support and good will for the U.S. within the former Soviet Union.

3. Program Linkages and Contributions to USAID Mission Objectives

a. Program Linkages

The Team found a generally positive attitude on the part of USAID missions toward the Farmer-to Farmer Program in the countries visited. As indicated earlier, the degree of contact and familiarity with FtF, however, varied from almost none to some. There is some feeling, not widespread, that FtF, while a good program and accomplishing much in the area of good will for the U.S., is relatively marginal and insignificant in terms of making a significant impact on accomplishing USAID's overall program goals and objectives.

Explicit linkages of FtF activities to USAID programs, also varied from none to actual inclusion of FtF projects into mission strategy statements and project descriptions. This seems to be a fairly recent and encouraging trend, and a realization that in a period of diminished funding and staffing, USAID needs to try to take advantage of all in-country resources. Currently, FtF is being included as a resource in future program strategies or project descriptions in Russia, Ukraine, Moldova, and Armenia.

b. Contributions To USAID Objectives

It can be argued that most past and on-going FtF programs do contribute, albeit in small ways, to some aspects of USAID objectives. In the NIS, both are directed at accelerating the privatization process and the transition to more democratic and free enterprise systems. FtF tends to operate almost exclusively within the agricultural/agribusiness realm whereas USAID strategies are more focused on the privatization process *per se*. In terms of linkages and contributions of FtF to USAID priorities, this may be a distinction without a difference.

The biggest problem in demonstrating contributions of FtF programs to overall USAID program goals, is the lack of practical ways to aggregate the small scale outcomes of FtF activities into a larger whole in order to demonstrate more direct and dramatic impact and contributions. The Team, however, viewed some notable exceptions to this general observation.

For example, USAID/Armenia provided VOCA $300,000 to augment their Armenia program in FY 96 and plans to make a similar contribution in FY 97. Two-thirds of these funds supported the work of FtF volunteers by providing funds for "demonstration" activities. The remainder is used for purchase of a solar dryer for fruit and vegetables and other demonstration equipment. In USAID/Moscow, the Agricultural Development Officer in an effort to have the FtF Program have a more direct impact on the Mission's objectives, has asked three implementors, ACDI, LOL and VOCA, to provide volunteer assistance for the MOFSA Project from the FY 95 NIS bridge funding.

The USAID Mission for Ukraine and Moldova, under agricultural and technical assistance strategies currently being developed, plan to make greater use of the FtF Program. In the case of Ukraine, the mission is planning an integrated agricultural strategy over the next three years which projects the establishment of a series of agricultural service and processing centers in as many as fourteen oblasts. FtF volunteers would be used in support of funds ear-marked for assisting private farmers in marketing, input supplies and private farmer associations. A similar but smaller scale strategy is planned for Moldova. In addition, the Moldova USAID program is also projecting an involvement of both VOCA and CNFA in its new Small and Medium Enterprise Strategy, and may contribute up to $200,000 to support FtF activities.

4. Management and Cost Effectiveness of Implementation Systems

a. Program Design, Concentration, and Targeting

Each implementor has modified and refined its program design over the years as experience has been gained in the NIS, and as the realities of the situation have become known. In Russia, the greatest impact of volunteers, from a food availability and economic return perspective, appears to be in helping large farms, organized as private joint stock companies, significantly increase their productivity. The ability of the FtF Program to impact the agricultural sector of the NIS countries has been greatly compromised by the almost total lack of credit available to both farms and to food processors and distributors and the absence of legal title to private properties. Neither donors nor

implementors have been able to make a noticeable change in this situation, and no quick and easy solution to this problem is in the cards. The Evaluation Team did see numerous examples of successful interventions resulting from FtF volunteer visits. Unfortunately, implementor field program managers are basically uninformed as to successful interventions undertaken by their own organization and by other implementors in neighboring countries. Sharing of these experiences once a year would benefit each country program manager and might give each ideas to incorporate in their next FY country program designs.

The Evaluation Team believes that implementors in large countries, like Russia, would produce greater impact at less cost if they CONCENTRATED on one or two geographic areas, instead of implementing activities in several geographic regions. This may be an issue that could first be worked out among implementors, with BHR intervention only when needed.

Targeting can take many forms and should be a function of country needs, economic feasibility, and the ability of an implementor to best service a given segment of the agricultural/agribusiness sector. As an example, there is great potential in almost all, if not all, the host countries to improve the dairy industry. This is an area in which Land O'Lakes excels, and a logical sector where it could make a great impact by targeting its assistance. However, the Team agreed that targeting of a sector would likely not be suitable due to the divergent needs among the regions and countries in the NIS.

b. Implementation Systems and Approaches

All implementors seem to have good, effective implementation systems and approaches to the recruitment and delivery of technical assistance through their volunteers. Most Country FtF Program Managers voiced their satisfaction with the backstopping they receive from their headquarters, especially with respect to the timeliness and quality of volunteer selection and processing. Some volunteers interviewed, however, voiced a concern that the recruitment process was sometimes rushed.

Some implementors estimated that about 20-30% of their projects could be characterized as "stellar or outstanding" successes; and about 20-25% were either "failures or minimally successful," with the remainder falling into a generally successful category. Mismatches and misperceptions on the part of hosts and or volunteers were the main reasons given for the least successful. But it must be emphasized that the overwhelming majority of hosts and host organizations were very pleased with the selection of volunteers and felt that the assistance they provided was an enormous help to them. In most cases, the host wanted additional volunteers.

c. Minimum Cost-Effective Number of Volunteers Per Implementor Per Year

The Team spent a fair amount of time analyzing and exploring with implementors the issue of the minimum number of volunteers each should field per year to make it cost effective in terms of implementor overhead costs, etc. There is probably no hard and fast number that can be applied to

every situation, but it is interesting that there was almost unanimous agreement that the number under current costs and circumstances would be between 20 and 25 volunteers per year.

d. Optimum Number of Implementors

There are single implementor offices in the following countries: Armenia, Belarus, Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan. There are 2 implementor offices in Kazakhstan, 4 in Ukraine, and 5 in Moscow, Russia. VOCA maintains its main office in Saratov, Russia, with a branch office in Moscow. It is the Team's understanding that there will soon be an additional implementor in Moldova, making a total of 2 in that country. Consideration should be given to whether the number of implementors in Ukraine and in Russia could be reduced by one or more without effecting the quality of the FtF Program in those countries. The rationale for the additional implementor in Moldova was not clear to the Team, and perhaps this issue should be revisited (see Annex A).

e. Other Potential Cost-Savings Measures

There are a number of other ways in which potential savings could be achieved without sacrificing program effectiveness. Some of these include:

- Providing volunteers more detailed information about their host organization and more detailed Scopes of Work weeks before the volunteer departs for the host country. This could reduce down-time at the host organization and permit some shortening of the volunteer's time without lessening the impact of his/her efforts.

- Requiring the host organization to develop and have basic data available by the time of the volunteer's arrival. For example, if a volunteer is to advise on dairy herd health and nutrition, the dairy should have information prepared on items such as: calving rates, calf mortality, liters of milk production by cow, rations and amount of feed provided, incidence of diseases, use of supplemental feeds and micro-nutrients, etc.

- Elimination of routine home office debriefings by some grantees, as recommended in the 1994 mid-term evaluation.

- Elimination of home office briefings for repeat volunteers;

- Negotiation of a special rate with Delta Airlines for round-trip flights between the U.S. and Moscow; and

- Competing future NIS FtF Program grants with costs having a significant weight in the final selection. This would help instill increased competition in the procurement process. This could be coupled with a decision regarding reduction in the number of current implementors, in selected countries.

f. Host Organization Contributions

The Team also explored in some depth the issue of Host Organization contributions. Initially, the Team had the impression that most hosts supplied in-kind and other contributions for maintenance of the volunteer and that this usually comprises lodging and food, interpreter services, and local transportation.

The Team found, however, that rarely are all, or even some, of these supplied by the Host. There are many reasons for this, and valid in many instances. But the Team feels that where possible and realistic, implementors should press the issue a bit more with Hosts. Some type of Host contribution may be an important signal as to how valuable the volunteer TA is to the organization.

(Note to Readers: In Annex A.IV, the Team has compiled brief profiles of each of the five implementors active in the NIS. They describe some of the characteristics of the implementors, their philosophy and approach to FtF in general and implementation systems in particular.

5. Summary Conclusions

The Farmer-to-Farmer Program is more than adequately fulfilling its intended and legislatively mandated purpose and objectives. It has already created a tremendous amount of good will for the United States and beyond this has made a significant difference in the lives of many thousands of people in the NIS countries.

FtF may be more appreciated and valued outside as opposed to inside of USAID.

There are obviously definite limits to the extent to which FtF can and should be aligned and integrated with USAID programs. Nevertheless, a process is underway in several countries to increase this integration and alignment to the potential benefit of both programs.

For several reasons, there is an urgent need for BHR to issue updated policy and program guidance, either as part of a new RFA or separately, aimed at a tighter focus on impact, and capture and reporting of impact data.

USAID and implementors need to explore ways of reducing costs while at the same time increasing focus on impact. Number of implementors in the bigger countries and geographic divisions of labor are two areas that merit priority attention.

While there is probably a definite minimum number of volunteers placed in country per year per field office to be cost-effective in terms of overhead costs, the Team would urge caution in making decisions in this area. In the early part of the program, implementation was focused on numbers of

47

volunteers placed. Fund limitations and maturing implementation approaches have reduced the emphasis on numbers. If, as the Team suggests, BHR places increased emphasis on more strategic planning and pre-selection criteria in order to increase significant impact and the achievement and capture of impact data, then 20-30 volunteers a year could become as much of a ceiling as a floor.

III. LESSONS LEARNED - WHAT WORKS BEST

There are varying degrees of success in individual FtF projects. What allows certain projects to successfully take and others languish and even fail is a mixture of ingredients from both the implementor and the host. Following are the major ones observed by the Team, and outlined here as some "Lessons Learned."

A. Measuring and Demonstrating Impact

The budget outlook in which the FtF program will operate during the remainder of the decade will require greater efforts by implementors to measure and demonstrate the impact of their programs. Implementors will face declining numbers of volunteers for placement in the field. Each volunteer must be carefully placed to yield the greatest opportunity for success and impact as there is a high opportunity cost in misplacing a scarce volunteer in a project that does not produce impacts. The FtF program has reached a level of maturity that requires strategic thinking to achieve the greatest impact.

1. Strategic Thinking and Planning

Strategic planning on the part of implementors requires examining the potential of sectors of the economy and the institutional relationships which surround them in order to rank potential projects according to their overall impact. This will result in the selection of projects which have greater potential for synergy than projects in less critical areas.

Strategic thinking which identifies key subsectors or institutions on the part of implementors should be carried through to the project selection level to achieve maximum impact in terms of:

- spreading impact beyond host to other beneficiaries,
- leveraging of other available resources, and
- sustainability of the benefit stream from the intervention.

The possible impacts from leveraging of additional resources need to be considered from the perspective of host organizations, implementors, associations/groups of farmers, and USAID. Diffusion of the technology and institutional innovations by the host organization, implementors, association/groups and USAID will be considered.

2. Need For A Clear Protocol Between Implementor and Host

Another lesson is the need to develop a protocol for selecting and implementing projects. This should be based on a good reconnaissance of the need, then a mid to long-term plan with a set of objectives and establishment of some measures of impact success and when the activity should end. Objectives for demonstrable impact should guide the plans of work, and the design and implementation of the SOW of individual volunteers. A plan of work is a document between the implementor and the host that describes the objectives of their collaboration in terms of:

- demonstrable economic impact,
- diffusion of the technology,
- leverage of other available resources, and
- sustainability of the benefit stream beyond the framework of the volunteer assistance.

3. Other factors

Other factors that should be taken into consideration in the pre-selection process are :

- Multiple as opposed to single visits, especially when there is some kind of plan, but single visits are appropriate for specific technological interventions.
- Opportunities for a multiplier and spread effects, especially with multiple visits
- Need to establish good impact tracking systems.
- The use of in-kind contributions as an important signal of whether the TA is viewed by host as valuable and having impact.
- Opportunities for volunteer TA to be accompanied by a type of reverse FtF exchange.
- Picking a farmer/leader is one key to successful targeting. The selection of Pavlovsky in Kaliningrad, Bogdanov in Ukraine and Melkan in Moldova are key examples. The example and spread effect can be enormous. Implementors should be on the lookout for these models during their reconnaissance and selection process.[48]

Use of the above criteria and steps in establishing protocols would permit implementors to select among available project choices to determine which projects have the highest prospects for impact and spread effects.[49]

---

[48] Case Studies #54, #71, and #32.

[49] See *Methodology for Measuring and Demonstrating Impact* in Annex A for more detail on this topic.

49

B. Timely Communication Among all Parties

1. Adequate lead time

Field experience seems to indicate that there needs to be a minimum of six weeks lead time for adequate preparation of the volunteer and the host. In interviews with in-country volunteers, they reported that the information they received about their host organization and the problems and conditions was sometimes rushed and inadequate. Time and timing is necessary to prepare a good scope of work , do an adequate amount of pre-planning, and prepare the volunteer. Also, it is important that the host understands the SOW. It should contain measurable tasks with provision for tracking impact, spread effects and in-kind contributions.

2. Seasonal placement

Implementors have begun to see a pattern in the seasonal placement of volunteers to host organization. In some cases, the bulk of volunteers are in a certain period of the year, e.g. the spring and summer. The slow period of volunteer placements should allow for greater attention to next year's host clients. Closer working relationships to develop a work plan and then a SOW would allow for improved impacts from volunteers, even to Levels 2 and 3.

For example in Kyrgyzstan, volunteers are not placed during the winter period. In discussions with the country director for Winrock, he agreed that more in-depth preparation could occur than what is currently being done.

C. A Full Complement of Inputs

Technical assistance is most effective when it is part and parcel of a full complement of production, financial, management and marketing inputs. When one or more are missing, the project is likely to have a lower probability of success. The Russian Farm Community Project has not begun to reach its full potential until credit was made available through the USDA monetized funds.[50]

D. Collaboration and Leveraging

Leveraging can be a key factor in successful projects. Volunteers do a good job identifying key gaps in a host organization's operations. Sometimes the volunteer seeks to fill these gaps by leveraging resources in other programs. VOCA in Kazakhstan has sought joint ventures for promising clients even though this is extra effort on their part and beyond the scope of the FtF mandate. Also, collaborative efforts such as those of VOCA working with the Regional Small Business Administration in the Samara Region of Russia can assist in bringing the full complement of technology, human capital and credit to assist emerging businesses.

---

[50] Case Study #38.

E. When To Graduate The Host

The Team found several instances in which it appeared that it may be time to think about graduating the host. Part of the problem is that there was no "plan" from the outset that anticipated a point at which volunteer assistance would accomplish its purpose. It appeared to the Team that in many instances the marginal benefit of repeat volunteers seems to rise for early visits and then begins to fall. This means that it is important to know what is an appropriate point at which to stop providing volunteers to increasingly successful hosts. A good example is the success that Borets Farm has had, which makes it a candidate for graduation.[51] There is clear evidence of other hosts that have reached the point for graduation. A sampling of host organizations that have reached maturity are illustrated in Case Studies #41, #54, #60, #71.

Hence the need to know when a project is mature and the implementor can move to another project or pass the host to the next level -- possibly paid consultants, financial institutions or joint-venture capitalists. Implementors need to know when to reduce direct support. This implies the need for some type of protocol in the beginning, and fairly close monitoring against the protocol as a means of judging when to move on to other opportunities. Willingness or unwillingness to provide in-kind contributions by the host can be a gauge of when interest begins to wane.

F. Are Two To Three Week Visits Sufficiently Long To Be Effective?

Yes, in most instances, but in talking with implementors and volunteers in the field it became apparent that this often depends on several factors, most important of which are how well the volunteer is prepared beforehand and how well the host is prepared to utilize the volunteer's expertise.

G. Maintaining A Balanced Perspective On What Farmer-to-Farmer Can & Cannot Do

Finally, and while harder to articulate as a "Lesson Learned," the Evaluation Team believes that it is important to maintain a balanced perspective on the Farmer-to-Farmer Program in terms of the extent to which it can and should be viewed and evaluated as a development program. While it contributes to development objectives in numerous small scale ways, it is still basically a people-to-people technical exchange program carried out at the grass-roots level. As such , it touches and influences individuals and segments of societies at levels and in ways few other US programs can. And while it can probably be made more closely aligned with many USAID program objectives, there is a limit as to how far that process should or could be carried without distorting the program's basic reasons for being.

---

[51] Case Study #47.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

Following is a series of integrated recommendations that the Evaluation Team feels will help to 1) strengthen what is, has been and should continue to be an important part of US efforts to assist the New Independent States of the Former Soviet Union make the difficult transition to more open societies and market economies, 2) provide a basis for fine tuning the program to better fit the perceived needs and resource realities of the next 3-5 years, 3) suggest an analytical framework and methodology for not only achieving more program impact but also improving the means by which impact is captured, documented and demonstrated, and 4) bring the Farmer-to-Farmer Program into closer contact and communication within itself and with other US and donor programs,

A. Continue the Farmer-to-Farmer Program as an important U.S. program in assisting NIS countries successfully make the crucial transition to more democratic and liberalized economic systems.

1. The Team believes the findings and conclusions of the evaluation should leave no doubt that FtF is accomplishing its basic purposes and contributing in relatively small but important ways to US interests in this part of the world and to helping these countries with their difficult transition.

2. While no one can read the future, particularly in that part of the world, with any certainty, there appeared to be a developing consensus, among many USAID officials in the field, that FtF is likely to be around and should be around long after a USAID field presence ceases to exist in many of these countries.

3. That suggests not only a need to continue but also a need to strengthen and deepen programs such as Farmer-to-Farmer.

B. Continue the Farmer-to-Farmer Program through the issuance of a new Request For Application (RFA).

4. Current funding authority of the FtF expires at the end of FY 1997.

5. The Team feels strongly that it would be preferable to continue the program via a new RFA, as opposed to additional extensions, for a number of reasons, major of which are:

a. It would allow BHR/PVC to establish new program guidelines and parameters that take into account evolving country needs and assistance opportunities, as well as US and other donor programs.

b. More important, however, it offers an opportunity to orient and guide approaches to implementation and implementation systems to not only achieve more impact, but to capture that impact in a more orderly, uniform, and aggregated manner.

C. Implement a three-level analysis as the conceptual framework for viewing achieving, measuring, and evaluating impact under the Farmer-to-Farmer Program.

6. While the Team claims no credit for originating the basic analytical approach to assessing impact used in this evaluation, and discussed in some detail in the Introduction Section of Part II, Findings and Conclusions, it was quick to recognize its value as a practical and realistic means of assessing results and impact for a program like Farmer-to-Farmer.

7. The Team believes this model would provide a useful conceptual framework for all the actors in the Farmer-to-Farmer Program, one that allows policy makers, managers, implementors, former volunteers and even hosts, a common and easily understood way of looking at what a program like FtF is capable of achieving and what it is not. It also helps to understand program purpose and objectives at a grass-roots, people- to- people level. The framework may also satisfy some of the concerns of those who are skeptical about what FtF can and does achieve.

8. It also provides the conceptual framework for the recommendation that follows for establishing tighter and more uniform selection and reporting criteria aimed at achieving a more intense focus on measurable and demonstrable impact.

D. BHR should initiate a process aimed at achieving more focus on impact at the point of project selection and in reporting systems

9. The Team believes that it would be preferable to initiate this process within the framework of a new RFA, but certainly within the context of the analytical framework discussed under Recommendation C above.

10. This recommendation envisions BHR establishing a process and guidelines by which:

a. Implementors are required to engage in more strategic thinking and planning about their program in terms of how and where it can have the greatest impact. This implies a degree of forward planning that goes beyond numbers of volunteers or individual assignments, some analysis as to what kind of cumulative impact is desired and possible over an extended period and where the best opportunities lie for achieving that impact. It could also include as part of a new RFA or interim policy guidelines the need for implementors to engage in some triage regarding those active projects they consider weakest in terms of achieving sustainable impact.

b. Uniform criteria are established for project selection that gives priority to:

(1) potential for achieving impact beyond that of the host level, i.e. achieve a "spread effect";
(2) opportunities to leverage other available resources such as access to credit, reverse training, investment, etc. in order to get the host into and past the "second step";
(3) sustainability of impact and maintenance of a benefit stream; and
(4) projects in which results can be quantified.

c. As part of the selection process, implementors would be required to develop a "protocol" or plan of action before volunteers arrive in-country with a needs assessment and a plan of action drawn up that includes among others things: project objectives and planned outcomes, the kind and number of expertise required, timing, and assessment resources needed beyond volunteer assistance to achieve the desired outcomes.

d. Reporting systems are made more uniform and designed to capture periodically aggregate impact data.

E. Explore all possibilities for restoring funding for a Reverse Farmer-to-Farmer Program, and similar programs

11. It was unequivocally clear to all members of the Evaluation Team that the Reverse Farmer-to-Farmer Program, when used carefully and selectively, played a critical role in not only achieving but also increasing the impact of the volunteer assistance, and plays a crucial role in whether that impact is sustained.

12. Based on these very positive findings, we strongly recommend that BHR/FtF look for ways to reinstate a U.S.-based "Reverse Farmer-to-Farmer" program. In addition, USAID and USDA should continue to target FtF agriculturalists as participants for other U.S.-based training programs.

F. Encourage implementors to maximize opportunities to leverage FtF resources

13. The Team was impressed by the number of other donor programs (official and non-official) operating in the NIS, and while some implementors show great resourcefulness in trying to leverage these resources for the benefit of FtF host, others are less informed or inclined.

14. In the larger countries it may also be a matter of not being aware of all of these other programs (USAID and non-USAID donors). This could be alleviated by better communication between USAID and implementors and between and among implementors.

15. In any event, the ability to leverage some of these resources often permits the volunteer effort to help the host gain access to the resources needed beyond the TA provided under FtF. It can help break "second step" bottlenecks and relieve some of the frustration of hosts and volunteers when it is discovered that the volunteers' recommendations cannot be carried out for lack of other resources, usually credit.

16. Implementors need to be encouraged to seek closer integration of their projects in the plan of work stage so that limited resources and information sharing can be used effectively.

G Consider implementing a geographic division of labor among implementors in the larger countries

17. The Team believes there would be considerable merit to having individual implementors in the bigger countries, e.g., Russia and Ukraine, concentrate their efforts in different geographical areas. Such a division of labor by geographical region should result in the following benefits:

    a. Reduction of managerial time, simplifying logistics and reducing administrative costs.
    b. Reduction of competition among implementors for the same client base.

55

c. Improved ability of implementors to gain a detailed knowledge of the area, work towards developing a critical mass, albeit on a small scale, and do follow-up, and monitor and aggregate impact.

H. Improving coordination and communications between and among implementors and USAID Mission personnel

It is the opinion of the Team that both the implementors and USAID could benefit from the increased linkage of the FtF Program to USAID strategic objectives. The field missions would gain access to an excellent and highly variable source of TA at minimal or no cost while the FtF volunteers would be associated with major impact activities (i.e., Level III) that directly address USAID's priorities. In addition, this would facilitate USAID's taking advantage of the area and grass roots information base possessed by most implementors.

BHR and field missions in the NIS could take a lead role in the coordination of this effort. One way this could happen is through NIS-wide workshops of Country Directors, and BHR and USAID mission personnel in the NIS region for the purposes of sharing information and experience. A workshop approach could also be used to discuss selection criteria, reporting requirements, management, coordination and monitoring issues and develop specific recommendations in this regard.

Another topic of value to the implementor would be discussion by implementors and USAID of other donor host government programs and resources that could complement or be leveraged for FtF programs.

I. Uniform Reporting from Implementors on U.S. Impact of Public Outreach Activities

If impact of FtF in the U.S. is a project goal, BHR/FtF should request uniform information of all implementors on such issues as types of presentations made by volunteers and media coverage about them, including size of audience. In addition, implementors should be asked to report quarterly in a uniform and measurable way on the results of their own public outreach efforts.

ANNEX A

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ANNEX A.I	SCOPE OF WORK	1
ANNEX A.II	PERSONS INTERVIEWED AND SITES VISITED	8
ANNEX A.III	DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	14
ANNEX A.IV	PROGRAM IMPLEMENTORS	16
ANNEX A.V	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	32
ANNEX A.VI	RETURNED VOLUNTEER QUESTIONNAIRE AND RESULTS	35
ANNEX A.VII	OTHER RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS	47
ANNEX A.VIII	METHODOLOGY FOR MEASURING AND DEMONSTRATING IMPACT	50
ANNEX A.IX	REVERSE FARMER-TO-FARMER	55
ANNEX A.X	STATISTICAL DATA ON:	
	(1) FUNDING & VOLUNTEER TOTALS, AND	58
	(2) LENGTH OF TA, REPEAT VOLUNTEERS, AND REPEAT TA TO HOST ORGANIZATIONS	58

ANNEX A.I

SCOPE OF WORK

SCOPE OF WORK FOR AN IMPACT EVALUATION
OF THE
FARMER-TO-FARMER PROGRAM IN THE NEW INDEPENDENT STATES

MAY, 1996

I. BACKGROUND

In 1991, a three-year, $30 million Special Initiative of the Farmer-To-Farmer (FtF) Program was authorized as one of the first USG assistance programs for the New Independent States of the former Soviet Union (NIS) and funded from PL 480 Title II resources. Cooperative Agreements, specific to the NIS-FtF Program, were signed with Agricultural Cooperative Development International (ACDI), Citizens Network (CN), Land O'Lakes (LOL), Tri Valley Growers (TVG), Volunteers in Overseas Cooperative Assistance (VOCA), and Winrock International. The NIS-FtF Program is basically a people-to-people program organized to transfer the vast technology, knowledge, and skills of U.S. farmers organizations and agribusinesses to farmers, local organizations and agribusinesses in the NIS.

The overall objectives of the NIS-FtF Program are to increase food availability to the consumers in the near term, take steps to ensure against future food shortages and distribution problems, and facilitate an orderly transition to a free-market economy. As the NIS-FtF Program has grown, it has evolved to include a broader spectrum of agriculture-related activities. NIS-FtF volunteers have a broad range of technical skills and they provide assistance to a wide range of private businesses and grassroots organizations. An estimated 1,200 host country organizations and businesses in the NIS have received advice and assistance on a people-to-people basis through over 2,000 FtF volunteer assignments. More than 60 percent of these businesses and organizations have hosted more than one volunteer assignment. Organizations assisted include an estimated 300 farm enterprises, 250 cooperatives or other farmer associations, 350 agribusinesses, 120 rural credit organizations, 50 government entities, 120 educational institutions and 10 agricultural youth organizations. Increasingly, NIS-FtF assignments are focusing on organizational, managerial, and financial aspects of cooperatives, agribusinesses and rural financial institutions. Farmer-To-Farmer volunteers normally spend about 3 weeks in country.

The NIS-FtF Program has established an excellent record of performance. The program was very favorably evaluated in May, 1994 and strongly recommended for continuation. In 1995, the Bureau for Europe and the New Independent States (ENI) provided funds to extend the NIS-FtF Program for one year to September 30, 1996. Five of the above organizations have been extended for the additional year (Due to corporate restructuring, TVG withdrew from the program). More than 2,000 volunteer assignments have been completed to date in all 12 NIS countries. An additional 600 volunteer assignments will be completed by September, 1996.

The five FtF implementing organizations have established in-country field offices to manage the FtF program. Each organization has an extensive recruiting network, and volunteers have been fielded

from 49 of the 50 states. The average cost per volunteer assignment is about $15,000, which includes airfare, per diem and all implementor administrative costs.

The FtF Program represents the largest U.S. technical assistance initiative in the NIS. The program enjoys broad public support (illustrated by the caliber of volunteer recruits) as well as with Congress, USDA and the Department of State. BHR/PVC expects the program to be continued beyond September 30, 1996, under the new Farm Bill with PL 480 funding. Therefore, this impact evaluation is both timely and important.

II. OBJECTIVE

The objective of this evaluation is to assess the impact of the FtF Program in the NIS, to provide an initial assessment of program impact on U.S. organizations and communities from which FtF volunteers are fielded, and to assess overall program design and management as it relates to future directions. This evaluation will assist BHR/PVC: 1) to measure the results and impact of the program; 2) to identify the types of projects and conditions that are best suited for a volunteer-based program; and 3) to prepare a Request for Applications (RFA) to re-compete program implementation. The evaluation will also help BHR, the ENI Bureau and USAID Missions ensure that FtF activities are addressing relevant strategic objectives.

III. STATEMENT OF WORK

A. Specific Tasks

1) Program Impact:

a) In the NIS

- Assess the results and impact of the program in meeting the overall objectives:
  a) to increase food availability to consumers
  b) to take steps to ensure against future food shortages and distribution problems
  c) to facilitate an orderly transition to a free-market economy.

- Assess the impact of the FtF program in building sustainable agricultural systems, including farmers organizations, marketing mechanisms, value-added processing, alternative sources of credit, and access to information.

- Assess the effectiveness of the program in upgrading the credit policies and procedures of agriculturally-oriented commercial banks and other financial organizations.

- Assess the degree of success of implementing organizations and FtF volunteers in assisting host organizations to access capital and credit.

60

- Assess the impact of educational efforts of the program (the formal educational sector as well as on-the-job training of professionals) in terms of capacity-building, improved curricula, training methods and training materials.

- Assess the overall quality of FtF volunteers fielded in terms of expertise, cultural sensitivity, receptivity to host organizations and ability to transfer technical "know-how", and ability to share information about U.S. agricultural institutions and systems. Assess the impact and cost-effectiveness of FtF short-term technical assistance as a means of transferring U.S. agricultural "know-how", skills and technology to private farmers, local organizations and agribusinesses.

- Assess the impact and cost effectiveness of the Reverse FtF Program as a complement to the FtF program.

b) In the U.S.

- Provide an indicative assessment of the impact of public outreach by the FtF volunteers and the implementing organizations to inform the public about their contributions to U.S. international assistance efforts.

- Provide an indicative assessment of the impact of the FtF program on a sample of U.S. agricultural organizations and private businesses.

2) Program Implementation Systems

- Assess the effectiveness of management and implementation systems of the program implementors and BHR/PVC to support the achievement of program objectives. Identify areas of improvement.

- Assess how efficiently and effectively program funds are used to support achievement of program objectives and suggest areas of improvement as necessary.

- Assess effectiveness of overall program strategy and orientation, breadth of target organizations hosting FtF volunteer assignments, and breadth of volunteer assignments to achieve program objectives.

- Assess the FtF Program linkages and contribution to USAID Missions objectives and programs.

- Assess the relative effectiveness of one-time FtF assignments versus multiple volunteer assignments over time to host organizations. Assess the appropriate mix in the program of one-time and multiple assignments to host organizations.

61

B. Team Composition and Qualifications

The NIS/FtF impact evaluation will be carried out by a six-person team. Five members will be under a USAID Evaluation IQC Delivery Order, the sixth will be a USAID staff member assigned full-time as an integrated member of the team. The evaluation team will include an Agricultural Project Design/Evaluation and Institutional Specialist/Team Leader; a Food and Agricultural Economist; an Agribusiness/Marketing Specialist; an Agribusiness/Credit Systems Specialist; a Social Scientist; and a USAID ENI Bureau Agricultural Officer. The USAID Officer is not a facilitator but is seconded to the team for the duration of the evaluation. The FtF implementors will assist the team to arrange in-country travel, lodging and interpreters.

Each team member should possess an advanced degree (Masters or above) or relevant professional work in an academic discipline related to his/her specialty and have a minimum of 10 years relevant experience in the design, implementation and/or evaluation of broad economic assistance programs overseas. Strong writing and word processing skills are highly desirable. Previous overseas experience with volunteer-based programs, related experience in the NIS/Eastern Europe and Russian language capability is desirable. Evaluation team requirements and qualifications follow.

1) Agricultural Project Design/Evaluation and Institutional Specialist/Team Leader (Level 4). Responsible for coordinating and directing the overall evaluation effort, including preparation and submission of the draft and final evaluation reports to BHR/PVC, and for assessing the assistance provided to educational and training organizations. The incumbent should be either a regular staff member of the IQC firm selected to carry out the evaluation or a consultant frequently used by the IQC firm for evaluations. He/she should have extensive overseas agricultural program evaluation experience (including USAID related), and be thoroughly familiar with techniques of program impact appraisal. As evaluation team leader, the incumbent should possess good organization and team-building skills.

2) Food and Agricultural Economist (Level 4). The incumbent should have broad familiarity with the problems, needs and attitudes of farmers, farmer organizations and agribusinesses in an overseas environment.

3) Agribusiness/Marketing Specialist (Level 4). The incumbent should have broad experience with marketing mechanisms, farmers organizations and agribusinesses in an overseas environment.

4) Agribusiness/Credit Systems Specialist (Level 3). Primarily responsible for analyzing the impact of FtF efforts to upgrade selected agriculturally-oriented commercial banks and other financial organizations and to find alternative mechanisms of credit and financing to support agricultural production and local agribusinesses. The incumbent should have broad experience in banking, credit programs, agricultural finance, farmers organizations, agribusinesses and agricultural systems in an overseas environment.

5) Social Scientist (Level 3). Primarily responsible for analyzing the impact of the people-to-people aspect of the program. The incumbent should have broad experience in agriculture, PVO/volunteer-based programs, institutional development and local participation in an overseas environment.

62

6) USAID Agricultural Officer. The incumbent should have broad experience in agriculture production, the formation and operation of farmers groups, agribusiness and technology transfer in an overseas environment.

C. Suggested Methodology

The frame of reference for this evaluation is contained in the Action Memoranda outlining the objectives of the NIS/FtF Program, the Cooperative Agreements, and the BHR/PVC approved workplans of the implementors. Copies of these documents are found in BHR/PVC and will be made available to the evaluation team for review.

The NIS/FtF impact evaluation will be carried out on the basis of:

1) A literature review, including the NIS/FtF mid-term evaluation, evaluations prepared by implementors and the implementors' quarterly and annual reports. A review of secondary literature as determined by the evaluation team.

2) Interviews with FtF clients, returned Reverse FtF participants, program implementor U.S. and field personnel, FtF volunteers (returned and in-country), BHR/PVC FtF staff, U.S. organizations that sponsor volunteers, State and USDA officials, ENI Bureau staff, and Embassy and USAID field staff.

3) Site visits to a representative number of FtF projects in seven countries.

Farmer-to-Farmer Program activities are widely dispersed throughout the NIS, extending over thousands of miles. For security reasons and travel difficulty, it is not considered feasible to have the evaluation team visit all 12 NIS republics to which FtF volunteers have been assigned. Therefore, it is suggested that the evaluation team visit local organizations and project sites in Russia and two countries in each of the three remaining NIS regions.

It is suggested that the evaluation cover the following seven countries. FtF volunteer assignments to these seven countries comprise more than 90% of the program total.

Russia:	At least 2 areas
West NIS:	Ukraine, Moldova
Caucasus:	Armenia, Georgia
Central Asia:	Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan

The other countries have been excluded because of the limited number of assignments (Azerbaijan and Tajikistan), security concerns or difficulty of travel connections (Azerbaijan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan), and the presence of only one of the five program implementors in each of these countries.

For a valid and representative sample, the team should visit a minimum of 50 FtF host organizations selected from all six program implementors. Sites selected should provide a cross-section of single

63

and multiple FtF assignments including functional areas (i.e. farm management, credit, processing, marketing, storage, etc.) and beneficiary groups (i.e. farmers, farmers groups, agribusinesses, credit organizations, etc.). In carrying out this scope of work, the six-member evaluation team will address the following issues (which relate to BHR/PVC's principal concerns): 1) program results/impact, 2) capacity-building, 3) agribusiness development, 4) sustainability, 5) program management, and 6) lessons learned.

D. SCHEDULE OF WORK

A total of eight (8) weeks are programmed for this impact evaluation. The following work schedule is proposed, but may be modified by the contractor subject to BHR/PVC approval:

Week 1 - Washington. Review SOW and prepare schedule. Evaluation team carries out initial literature search. BHR/PVC/FtF will provide general background, program and other documents, supplemented by materials from FtF program implementors. Interviews held with USAID, State, USDA and other agency staff, headquarters personnel of NIS/FtF implementors, and organizations that sponsor volunteers. Begin assessment of U.S. impact by contacting a sample of returned FtF volunteers and sponsoring organizations via telephone.

Week 2-3- Russia. Interviews with FtF field staff, USAID and Embassy staff. Plan Russia field visits and select sample projects. Evaluation team spends 2-3 days visiting FtF projects in Moscow area to refine methodology. Split into three sub-teams (2 members each) and visit projects in at least two separate areas of Russia. Interview FtF clients, beneficiaries, returned Reverse FtF participants and FtF volunteers in country.

Week 4-5- Each evaluation sub-team travels to one NIS region and visits FtF activities in 2 countries, as follows;

Team A - Western NIS (Ukraine, Moldova)
Team B - Caucasus (Armenia, Georgia)
Team C - CARs (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan)

Interviews with FtF field staff, USAID and Embassy staff. Plan field visits and select sample projects. Interview FtF clients, beneficiaries, returned Reverse FtF participants and FtF volunteers in country.

Week 6 - Draft report of evaluation team's findings, conclusions, recommendations and other completed sections submitted to BHR/PVC/FtF for review and comment. USAID comments to be returned to the evaluation team within 5 working days.

Week 7 - Two IQC members and USAID Officer (if needed) continue assessment of U.S. impact and report preparation.

Week 8 - USAID comments returned to evaluation team leader for incorporation into the final report. Final evaluation report submitted not later than the end of week 8.

IV. REPORTS

In preparation for the award, the contractor will provide a technical proposal which includes a description of the proposed evaluation study design, work schedule, proposed team members and the number of days for each.

Upon arrival and before leaving each country, the evaluation team will brief USAID, Embassy and implementor field staff on their plans, major findings and preliminary conclusions. After returning from the field, the evaluation team will submit a draft evaluation report (10 copies) to BHR/PVC for review and comment by concerned USAID offices. The draft report will address each of the issues identified in the Statement of Work and any other factors the team believes have a bearing on the objectives of the impact evaluation. The team may also be requested to brief USAID, State and other agency representatives on their major findings, conclusions and recommendations following their return to Washington.

The final evaluation report (40 copies) will be submitted to BHR/PVC by the end of week 8. The format for the final evaluation report should conform to the following guidelines:

1. Cover page
2. Executive Summary (3-5 pages)
3. Main text (maximum 30 pages, single spaced)
4. Conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations that are mutually supporting.
5. Appendices:
   a. Case studies of impact on host organizations (15-20)
   b. Evaluation scope of work
   c. Description of the evaluation methodology used
   d. Bibliography of reference documents consulted
   e. List of persons contacted/consulted
   f. As appropriate

V. TECHNICAL DIRECTIONS

Technical directions during the performance of this delivery order will be provided by Mr. Larry Harms, BHR/PVC/FtF, Telephone No. 703-351-0218, Fax No. 703-351-0228.

ANNEX A.II
PERSONS INTERVIEWED AND SITES VISITED

WASHINGTON, D.C.

USAID

BHR
- Mr. Leonard Rogers, Deputy Assistant Administrator

BHR/PVC
- Mr. John Grant, Director

BHR/PVC/FtF
- Mr. Larry Harms, FtF Program Coordinator
- Mr. John Fasullo, Coordinator for Cooperative Development
- Mr. Charles Rheingan, FtF Technical Advisor
- Ms. Karen Nelson, FtF Program Assistant

ENI/ED/AG
- Mr. Charles Uphaus

USDA
FAS/ENI
- Mr. Michael B. Smith, Emerging Democracies Office

ACDI
- Mr. Michael Moran, Executive Director
- Mr. Jeffrey Singer, Project Coordinator
- Ms. Orli Almog, Project Assistant

CNFA
- Mr. William N. Witting, Director, Agribusiness Volunteer & Civic initiatives Programs
- Mr. Mark Freeman, Volunteer Coordinator, Agribusiness Volunteer Program
- Ms. Taryn Bussewitz, Assistant Volunteer Coordinator
- Ms. Megan Massan, Assistant Volunteer Coordinator

LOL
- Ms. Mary Hotchkiss, Manager, International Programs
- Ms. Milana Bergthold, FtF Director

VOCA
- Mr. Charles Cox, Acting President
- Ms. Madonna McGuire, Grants Administrator
- Ms. Alberta Ashbrook, Regional Program Officer, NIS
- Mr. Jim Cox, Regional Program Officer, NIS

WINROCK
- David Norman, Ph.D., NIS Program Director
- Mr. Brad Rutherford, Associate Program Manager, FtF

OTHERS
- Mr. Jonathan Sperling, Reverse FtF & ACDI Evaluator
- Mr. Ted Weihe, Executive Director, US Overseas Cooperative Development Council

CAR: (CENTRAL ASIAN REPUBLICS)

KAZAKHSTAN

USAID
- Mr. Gary Linden, Program Economist

ACDI
- Ms. Lauren Sroczynski, Program Director

HOST ORGANIZATIONS
- Kazkredsobank
  - Mr. Farid Khadiev, Head of Credit Operations
- Turanbank
  - Mr. Serik Amribaev, Deputy Chairman
  - Mr. Marat Tulenov, Director of Human Resources

FtF VOLUNTEER
- Mr. Bob Yoder

VOCA
- Mr. Ben Steinberg, Country Representative

HOST ORGANIZATIONS
Almaty
- Darkhan Company
  - Mr. Kairat Mustafin, Founder

Taldekorgan
- AGRO Association
  - Mr. Turabek Kudaibergenov, President
- Aripov Flour Mill
  - Mr. Serik Aripov

66

- Barsukov Private Farm
  - Mr. Alexander Barsukov, Owner
- Kakorlyk Private Farm
  - Mr. Serik Aripov, Owner

WINROCK

- Mr. Craig VanDeVelde, Regional Director
- Mr. Daulet I. Chunkunov, Project Manager

HOST ORGANIZATIONS

Burundai

- Salena Ltd.
  - Mr. Evgeny Moun, Director

Djambyl

- Djambyl Business Center
  - Ms. Irinia Dorozhkina, Co-Director
- Jagodka Private Farm
  - Mr. German Ilon, Director
- Ulan Meat Processing Facility
  - Mr. Segatain Makhambetov
- Yagoda Company
  - Ms. Ludmilla Tyan, Accountant

Talgar

- Talgar Agricultural College
  - Ms. Nailya Beiseubagevna, Director

OTHER

- Barents Group
  - Mr. Mike Lyons, Advisor to National Bank (USAID contract)
- Kaskelen Credit Fund
  - Mr. Alexander Uriev, Director

KYRGYZSTAN

USAID

- C.J. Rushin-Bell, Country Representative

ACDI

HOST ORGANIZATIONS

Bishkek

- Maksat Bank
  - Mr. Alexander Antipov, Vice President, Board of Directors
  - Mr. Arkady Arovnov, Vice President, Board of Directors
  - Mr. Andrey Iliaev, Head of Investment Department
- Mercury Bank
  - Mr. Bakhtiyar Abildaev, First Deputy of General Director

WINROCK

- Mr. George Bergman, Country Manager

HOST ORGANIZATIONS

Bishkek

- Agromash, Inc.
  - Mr. Alexander Shkumat, General Director
- Alfa and Kabar-Ata Companies
  - Mr. Ulubeck Jenclanev
- Bulgari Company
  - Mr. Vladimir Podkovitoff
- Goumira Akamatous Company
  - Ms. Goumira Akamatous

Kara-Balta

- Desert Company
  - Mr Abdulajan U. Tashmatov, Chairman
- J.S. Company
  - Mr. Ao-adelet
- Timmer Bek Company
  - Mr. Timmer Bek
  - Mr. Bek

Kochkor

- Bulovek Private Farm
  - Mr. Bulovek

Sarakormush

- Women's Cooperative
  - Ms. Svetalana Bekbolotova, President

CAUC (CAUCASUS)

ARMENIA

USAID

- Mr. Charles Johnson, General Development Officer

VOCA

- Mr. Paul Sommers, Country Representative
- Mr. Artashes Ghandilian, FtF Project Director

HOST ORGANIZATION

- Areni Winery
  - Raffael & Mikael, Owner/Managers
- Solar-Dried Fruits Association, Yeghegnadzor Region, Getap
  - Mr. Hazarapet Nazaryan, Manger
- Souther Armenia Irrigation Projects, Khachik and Vardahouvit
  - Mayor of Khachik
  - Mayor of Vardahouvit
- Veterinary Association of Yeghegnadzor Region

67

FtF VOLUNTEER

- Mr. Kit Carpenter, Irrigation Engineer

OTHERS

- Eurasia Foundation
  - Mr. Christopher Kibarian, Program Officer

GEORGIA

USAID

- Ms. Paula Feeney, Country Representative
- Ms. Ariel Ahart, Humanitarian Aid Coordinator

GOVERNMENT OF GEORGIA

- Ministry of Agriculture and Food
  - Mr. Roman Kakulia, EU Program Coordinator
- Parliament of Georgia
  - Mr. Kakha Nadiradze, Lead Specialist, Agrarian Issues Committee

ACDI

- William Furtick, Ph.D., Country Director
- Mr. Ernest Bethe, Credit Advisor
- Mr. Daniel Connoly, Input Supply Advisor
- Mr. Kurt Richter, FtF Program Manager
- Mr. David Bedoshvili, Organization Liaison, ASTECH Project
- Dr. Mathias Kolding, FtF Wheat Breeding Volunteer
- Mr. Rusty Schultz, FtF Credit Advisor
- Mr. Brent Peterson, ACDI/Monsanto/Eastmark Potato Production Advisor

HOST ORGANIZATIONS

- Alazani Growers Association, Tibaani
  - Mr. Jemal Khatiashvili, President
- Farmers Union of Kutaisai
  - Ms. Maia Babunashvili, President
- Farmers Union of Orzugetti
  - Mr. Tipo Mikatazde, Manager
- Mtskheta Plant Breeding Institute
  - Dr. Anton Iakobashvili, Vice Director

OTHER

- European Union
  - Mr. Peter Shaw, Senior Banker/Credit Advisor, TACIS Program
- World-Wide Sires
  - Mr. Todd Charnetzki, Area Director of Marketing

RUSSIA

USAID

- Mr. James Norris, Mission Director
- Mr. John Thomas, Agricultural Development Officer
- Ms. Catherine Norris, Agricultural Adviser
- Ms. Marina Abakumova, Program Assistant, Agriculture

ACDI

- Fred Smith, Ph.D., Program Director
- Ms. Yelena Savinova, Office Director

HOST ORGANIZATIONS

Krasnodar Krai

- ASSOY Inc. (VOCA has also had as client)
  - Mr. Alexander Podobedov, General Director
- Fasta Farm, Fastovetskaya
  - Mr. Vladimir Gavrilenko, General Director
- Krasnodar Bank, Krasnodar City
  - Mr. Sergei A. Kashin, Chairman of the Board & President
- Northern Caucasus Grain Marketing Association
  - Ms. Elena Kim, President
  - Ms. Julia Talagaeva, Vice President

Moscow City

- Academy of National Economy, Graduate School of Business
  - Ms. Elena Kosareva, Vice-President, Agribusiness Program
- Central Bank of Russian Federation
  - Mr. George V. Shuraev, Director, Division of Central Banking Studies & Personnel Training
- International Agroindustrial Fund (Interagrofund)
  - Mr. Eugeny V. Ulyanov, President
  - Mr. Alexander A. Lisov, Vice President
  - Mr. Denis G. Gerassimouk, Head, Capital Market Operations Department
  - Mr. Anatoli S. Totski, Ph.D., Head, External Relations Department
- International Finance and Banking School
  - Ms. Gelena Sergeyeva

CNFA

- Ms. Tracy Slaybaugh-Mitchell, Volunteer Coordinator, Agribusiness Volunteer Program
- Mr. Eduard Krjuchkov, Program Assistant
- Ms. Anna Shipkova, Program Assistant

HOST ORGANIZATIONS

Krasnodar Krai

- Belorechensk Farmers Association (AKKOR), Belorechensk
  - Mr. Alexander Kapustin, Director

68

- CONAGRA Farm
  - Mr. Mike Whitty, Project Manager
  - Dr. Dave Noetzl, Advisor

Moscow City & Oblast

- AKKOR Women's Council
  - Ms. Roza Mitrofanova, Deputy Director
- Inter-Regional Mushroom Growers Association
  - Mr. Alexander Khrenov, Executive Director
- Padderzhka Insurance Company
  - Mr. Jurij Volovik, President
- Russian Farms, Dmitrov
  - Mr. Valeri Kuznetsov, Executive Director

Rostov Krai

- AKKOR Rostov Regional Association of Farmers and Agricultural Cooperatives
  - Mr. Alexander Rodin, President
  - Mr. Victor I. Kolesnik, Vice President
- Mini-Bakery
  - Mr. Ivan

LOL

- Mr. Nathaniel Carin, Country Director
- Mr. Will Bullock, FtF Project Director

HOST ORGANIZATIONS

Kaliningrad

- AKKOR Regional Farmers Association
  - Mr. Yevgeniy Pavlovsky, Director
- Karpushova Meat Processing Plan
  - Ms. Natasha Karpushova, Owner
- Polessk Vocational School
  - Mr. Gregory Bakunovich, College Director
  - Mr. Aleksey Nechayev, Deputy Director
  - Ms. Rima Mikhailovna, English Teacher
  - Ms. Galina Orlova, Deputy Director
- Sochoyev Meat Processing Plant
  - Mr. Israpil Sochoyev

Ryazan Oblast

- Pavlov Private Farm
  - Mr. Yuriy Pavlov ,Owner

FtF VOLUNTEER

- John Carlson, Ph.D., Professor, Animal Science, Western Illinois University, Ryazan Oblast
- Mr. Hans Wanzenried, Flour Milling Volunteer, Chernyakhovsk Region

VOCA

- Mr. Jeff D. Ferry, Country Representative
- Ms. Irina Paisova, Office Manager ,Moscow
- Mr. Olga Sedykh, Supervisor, Project Development

HOST ORGANIZATIONS

Moscow

- AGROS (Puschino Mushroom Cooperative)
  - Mr. Irog Mazurin, Director
  - Mr. Alexander Borisov, Chief Technologist

Penza

- Graz Company
  - Mr. Yergenini Sharapov, Manager
  - Ms. Galina Tanasova, Manger
  - Ms. Maria Yasenich, Technician
- RAMICC - Penza Regional Public Foundation for Business Initiatives
  - Mr. Sergeenko Alexandrovich, General Director
  - Mr. Sergei Konnov, General Manger
  - Mr. Andrei Chub, Assistant Director

Samara

- Intensivny Korm
  - Mr. Boris Volkov, President
  - Ms. Anna Kuznetsova, Director of Feed Department
  - Mr. Alexei Nikitin, Manger of Meat Processing
- KaLeZhe Company
  - Mr. Abram Zigrid, Owner
- Kazanov Private Farm
  - Mr. Ferit Kazanov, Owner

Saratov

- *Bavis* Agricultural Cooperative
  - Mr. Ivan Baltayev, Co-Director

FtF VOLUNTEER

- Mr. Kenneth Baer, Co-op Management Specialist, Penza
- James Orf, Ph.D.

WINROCK

- Ms. Demetria Arvanitis, Regional Director
- Mr. Anatoly V. Tersi, Assistant Manager

HOST ORGANIZATIONS

Moscow

- Bodorov Private Farm
  - Mr. Alexander Bodorov
- EcoNiva
  - Dr. Yuri V. Vasyukov, General Director
  - Mr. Michael Vereshchak, Chief Consultant
- Radio Nadezhda
  - Irene S. Koroleva, Director General
  - Tatyana S. Zeleranskaya, Editor-in-Chief
- USDA Russian-American Farm Privatization Project
  - Mr. Philip Seltz, Director
  - Mr. Charles Edgemon, Advisor
  - Ms. Lyndell Edgemon, Advisor

OTHER

- Chemonics International
  - Ms. Susana Mudge, Project Supervisor for Europe and the NIS

WEST NIS

MOLDOVA

U.S. EMBASSY

- Mr. Sarge Cheever

USAID

- Mr. Paul Morris, Country Representative

ACDI

HOST ORGANIZATION

- Moldova Agroindbank, SA, Chisinau
  - Ms. Natalia Vrabii, President
  - Ms. Tatiana Groza, Chief, Crediting Division
  - Ms. Tatiana Samanovscaja, Chief, Credits, Pre-Division
  - Mr. Tudo Lupascu, Chief, Farm Crediting

VOCA

- Mr. Sean Carmody, Regional Representative for Belarus & Moldova
- Mr. Vasile Munteaunu, Country Director
- Mr. Sergei Miroshnikov, Assistant Country Director

HOST ORGANIZATIONS

Balti

- Scientific and Production Association (*Selectia*)
  - Mr. Magdaliuc
  - Mr. Vozian, Senior Plant Breeder

Chisinau

- Institute of Management & Advanced Training in Agriculture (*IMATA*)
  - Mr. Mihail Dumitrascu, Rector
- Moldova Agroindbank
  - Ms. Natalia Vrabii, President
  - Ms. Tatiana Groza, Chief, Crediting Division
  - Ms. Tatiana Samanovscaja, Chief, Credits, Pre-Division
  - Mr. Tudo Lupascu, Chief, Farm Crediting

Ialoveni

- Nimoreni Farmers Association
  - Mr. Stepan Melka, President

Sraseni

- *Terra* Farm Association, Cojusna Village, Sraseni District
  - Mr. Gheorghe Zheregi, Director

FtF VOLUNTEER

- Mr. Jeff Kratz, IMATA

UKRAINE

USAID

- Mr. Gregory F. Huger, Mission Director
- Mr. Harry Walters, Agriculture Advisor

CNFA

- Ms. Jenny Burback, Program Officer, Agribusiness Volunteer Program
- Mr. Anton Pasechnekov, Technical Assistant
- Dr. Ludmila Doudnik, Administrative Assistant

HOST ORGANIZATIONS

Kiev

- CIL/Western Foods, Inc.
  - Mr. Vicente Navarro, Vice President
- Ukrainian Private Farmers Association
  - Mr. Nikolai Shkarbonov, President

Uzhgorod

- Community Canning Project, Veleky Luchky
  - Ms. Liza Vasylivna Voloshyn
  - Ms. Maria Rega
  - Ms. Maria Rubesh

FtF VOLUNTEER

- Ms. Pat Sherard, Women's Initiative Project

LOL

- Mr. Wade Fauth, Sr. Project Officer, International Development (Minnesota)
- Ms. Maria Pasichnyk, Project Specialist, Moldova
- Mr. Peter Kishko, Country Coordinator

HOST ORGANIZATIONS

Uzhgorod

- Tremblita Company
  - Mr. and Mrs. Ivan Kerita, Proprietors

VOCA

- Mr. Ted Gashler, Country Representative
- Mr. Vadim Malishkevich, Country Director
- Mr. Alexandre Ilyenko, Administrative Assistant

HOST ORGANIZATIONS

Kiev

- CIL/Western Foods, Inc.
  - Mr. Vicente Navarro, Vice President

Lugansk

- Bogdanov Farms
  - Mr. and Mrs. Victor Bogdanov, President & Vice President

70

WINROCK

- Mr. Mickey Mullay, Project Director

HOST ORGANIZATIONS

Kiev

- Ukrainian Institute for Agrarian Economy
  - Mr. Mikail Krapivko, Director, Computer and Information Center

OTHERS

- Mr. John Cavanaugh, USDA Monetization contractor and former Nebraskan Congressman

71

ANNEX A.III
DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

AGRICULTURAL COOPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT INTERNATIONAL (ACDI)

- o Cooperative Agreements (Original - #5)
- o Annual Workplans: FY 97, FY 96 Supplemental, FY 96, FY 95, FY 94, and FY 93
- o Report on ACDI FtF activities in Central Asia (12/08/95)
- o Annual Reports: October, 1994-September, 1995; October, 1993-September, 1994; and October, 1992-September, 1993
- o Quarterly Reports: October-December, 1995, and April-June, 1995
- o Evaluation - internal (March 11, 1996)

CITIZENS NETWORK FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (CNFA)

- o Cooperative Agreements (Original - #5)
- o Annual Workplans: FY 97, FY 96, FY 95, FY 94, FY 93, and FY 93 Supplement
- o Annual Reports: October, 1994-September, 1995; October, 1993-September, 1994; and October, 1992-September, 1993
- o Quarterly Reports: January-March, 1996 and October-December, 1995

LAND O'LAKES (LOL)

- o Cooperative Agreements (Original - #4)
- o Annual Workplans: FY 97, FY 96, FY 95, FY 94, and FY 93
- o Annual Reports: October, 1994-September, 1995 and October, 1993-September, 1994
- o Quarterly Reports: January-March, 1996; October-December, 1995; and July-September, 1995

TRI VALLEY GROWERS (TVG)

- o Cooperative Agreements (Original - 2, unfunded extension)
- o Annual Workplans: extension, FY 95, and FY 94,
- o Annual Reports: Final technical progress report (9/30/92-12/31/95) and October, 1993-September, 1994
- o Quarterly Reports: April - June, 1995
- o Evaluations: Final Evaluation (12/15/95) and Internal Evaluation (March, 1994)

USAID/BHR/FtF

- o General Information
  - NIS-FtF contact list
  - Washington/USAID overseas
  - NIS field representatives
  - NIS-FtF Achievements and Success Stories: 1/31/92-9/30/94 and 1/31/92-9/30/95
  - Report of NIS-FtF Implementors Conference (9/22/95) and initial work on developing program indicators
  - NIS-FtF funds obligated and expended (by implementor and by country)
  - Map with states of origin of NIS-FtF volunteers
  - Chart with regional distribution of NIS-FtF volunteers and number of volunteers by state

Types of NIS-FtF volunteer assignments
NIS country profiles

- Program Documents
  - NIS-FtF concept paper (12/06/91)
  - NIS-FtF Phase-One proposal (1/09/92)
  - NIS-FtF Request for Proposals (3/06/92)
- Action Memos: funding
  - Special Initiative in the NIS (6/15/92)
  - FY 1994 FtF funding (5/17/94)
  - Authorization of FY 1995 funding (4/26/95)
  - Addendum authorizing FY 1995 funding (6/02/95)
  - Reprogramming of NIS-FtF funds (10/30/95)
  - Approval of FY 96 funding (3/04/96)
- Program Legislation
- Midterm Evaluation of the NIS-FtF Program (5/94)
- Reverse FtF Program (RFtF)
  - Action Memo (7/22/94), ACDI Concept Paper, Legislation
  - ACDI Cooperative Agreement (Original -#3)
  - Workplans: ACDI, CN, LOL, TVG, and VOCA
  - Final report (12/04/95)
  - Quarterly Reports: April-June, 1995 and July-September, 1995
  - RFtF Evaluation Report (9/21/95)

VOLUNTEERS IN OVERSEAS COOPERATIVE ASSISTANCE (VOCA)

- Cooperative Agreements (Original - #4)
- Annual Workplans: FY 97, FY 96 Supplement, FY 96, and FY 95
- Annual Reports: October, 1994 -September, 1995; October, 1993-September, 1994; and October, 1992-September, 1993
- "Quick Start": 1/92-1/94, 8/92-1/93
- Quarterly Reports: January-March, 1996; October-December, 1995; July-September, 1995; and April-June, 1995
- Evaluation of VOCA FtF Program in Eastern Europe

WINROCK INTERNATIONAL

- Cooperative Agreements (Original - #5)
- Annual Workplans: FY 97, FY 96, FY 95, FY 94, and FY 93
- Annual Reports: October, 1994-September, 1995; October, 1993-September, 1994; and October, 1992-September, 1993
- Quarterly Reports: January-March, 1996 and October-December, 1995

73

ANNEX A.IV
PROGRAM IMPLEMENTORS

A. Agricultural Cooperative Development International (ACDI)

1. Description

ACDI is a non-profit educational and consulting organization created by U.S. agricultural cooperatives and farmer associations in 1962. ACDI provides technical and management assistance to farmer cooperatives and related supply, marketing and credit organizations serving farmers overseas. Its membership includes approximately 28 dues-paying members and approximately 20 non-paying members. ACDI was one of six organizations selected in September 1992 to implement the NIS-FtF Program. Through 10 May 1996, ACDI has fielded 284 volunteers in 7 NIS countries, with 213 (75%) fielded in Russia.

2. Approach to Program Implementation

a. Program Objective

ACDI initially selected the development of rural credit institutions as its objective for the provision of credit to farmers and agribusinesses. Its program during the first year was focused on assistance to AKKOR (national farmer union)-affiliated banks and Serbank, and to six regional banks. In the second year, ACDI switched its focus to select commercial banks as it determined that assistance to the AKKOR affiliates was producing negligible impact. In year 3 and continuing to date, ACDI has further refined its focus to hone-in on banking and agribusiness programs which could have direct impact on the development of commercial agricultural.

b. Strategy to Achieve Program Objectives

Provision of a complete range of technical assistance from the development of business plans, lending policies, and training of bank personnel to permit banks to develop their agricultural and agribusiness lending programs.

c. Quality of Volunteers Fielded

- Relevance of Technical Skills to the Assignment: Excellent, with very few exceptions.
- Usefulness of Technical Assistance Provided: Overall, very good. There have been a few cases where some of the advice was not applicable, due to the host organization not having the financial resources to implement the recommendations. There were also comments by a few host organizations that more volunteers who had prior experience in their country would reduce the time required for them to understand the client's problems and needs.
- Cultural Sensitivity and Compatibility: Excellent, with very few exceptions.
- Encouragement and Support of Volunteer Public Outreach Efforts: ACDI encourages its returned volunteers to speak to churches, Granges, and cooperative and civic associations to relate their experiences under the FtF Program. ACDI will assist with the preparation of

24

"Press Releases" for insertion in local newspapers, farmer cooperative annual reports, professional journals, etc. ACDI also publicizes volunteer activities in its quarterly and annual reports, which are disseminated to over 1,500 addressees. A number of volunteers have spoken on local radio stations in the U.S. and many have been interviewed for radio and television programs in host countries.

3. Management and Implementation Systems

- Effectiveness: Very high both in the headquarters office and in the field offices visited. Field staff have stated that the support from ACDI/Washington has been excellent from both the operational side and from the recruitment of highly qualified and appropriate volunteers within required time-frames. Communications and relationships between field and headquarters personnel is excellent.
- Potential Areas of Improvement: ACDI and the other implementors each maintain separate volunteer data bases of 1,000 or more technical experts. Much time is spent on individually developing and maintaining these data bases using FtF monies that could be better spent on fielding volunteers. Many implementors, including ACDI, maintain separate databases for "volunteers" and for "consultants." It may be more efficient to integrate both databases, with resultant savings in operational costs.

4. Use of Program Funds to Achieve Program Objectives

- Effectiveness and Efficiency of Use: Overall, ACDI rates high in this area. As with all implementors coming into the NIS in the early stages of privatization, mistakes were made in providing support to organizations which later proved to be ineffective change agents or which were incapable of surviving as institutions. However, ACDI has cut its losses on such institutions, and has changed its focus to organizations and institutions in the banking and agribusiness sectors which have greater potential for development.

- Suggested Areas of Improvement: ACDI like most implementors, utilizes some type of "Protocol" at the onset of their working relationship with the volunteer and host. This is usually done by assignment. The team is suggesting, here and elsewhere in this report, that longer-range protocols be utilized that include a detailed plan of what type of volunteer assistance will be needed from the beginning to the end, to bring the project to a successful conclusion. Successful conclusion should entail achieving at least Level 1 impact and, preferably some impact at Level 2. The concept of a 'protocol" is discussed at length in the main section of this report.

5. Overall FtF Program Effectiveness in Terms of:

- Program Strategy and Orientation: As it has become more knowledgeable of the realities of the operations of government and private groups in the NIS, ACDI has made significant changes in program emphasis and focus. In Russia, for example, ACDI had as its initial strategy the provision of assistance to help develop a system of rural financial/credit institutions which would provide production credits and loans to private farms and farmers

75

and to agribusinesses. ACDI soon learned that private banks would not lend to either of these parties due to the lack of collateral or their inability to seize assets in case of loan default. ACDI therefore focused its attention to strengthening national banks through training of bank personnel in improved internal operations as well as training of trainers. The Central Bank of Russia now provides short-term staff training to approx. 5,000 employees annually, using its own personnel.

- Breadth of host organizations: ACDI has shifted it overall program of assistance to support of regional banks and agribusinesses.

6. Assessment of FtF Program Linkages and Contributions to USAID Missions' Strategic Objectives and Programs

Georgia

The USAID representative was to provide the evaluators with a draft copy of the USAID strategy objectives for Georgia. This was not provided. However, he did advise that the Mission is focusing on three main areas: i) Agricultural and rural development, including income generation; ii) Economic restructuring; and iii) Energy.

ACDI's FtF efforts have been and continue to focus on improving the production and productivity of Georgia's agricultural sector. This includes the development of farmer associations to serve as disseminators of improved seeds, fertilizer and other farm inputs, and technical advice on crop husbandry. It includes the development of three regional farm input wholesale distributorships which will be supported by Southern States Cooperative, headquartered in Richmond, VA. It also include assistance to develop banking and rural credit delivery systems to provide production credit and loans to Georgian farmers.

ACDI's focus on improving the productivity of private farmers is unique among the Implementors and among the NIS countries. Georgian farmers, using high-quality seeds provided by ACDI, have doubled their yields of corn and wheat; and a new seed potato project undertaken in conjunction with Monsanto, will provide seed potato that will provide farmers with 5 to 7 times the yield of their local varieties. The efforts of all parties involved have the potential to double the national production of corn, wheat and potatoes in Georgia over the next three years.

Russia

In Russia, the focus of the Mission's program is to support the transition from State to private farms. USAID stated they would like to see more support by the Implementors to assist farms which have gone through this transition. While ACDI is willing to assist the two contractors selected to implement the MOFSA Project (support to farmers in marketing, accessing credit and transferring social services to local government), it sees it greatest strength in helping Russia develop rural financial/credit institutions. In addition, the two MOFSA Projects are in Vologda and Saratov, two regions in which ACDI is not very active. Its activities in Russia, especially banking and rural credit, are unique to ACDI among the FtF Implementors.

B. Citizen's Network for Foreign Affairs (CNFA)

1. Introduction: Background and Approach of the CNFA Program

Volunteers and Funding To Date

CNFA carries out FtF[1] activities in two countries of the NIS, Russia and Ukraine. In Russia, it has fielded 181 volunteers as of May 1996 (16% of the Russian total) and received 16% of the Russian funding. In Ukraine, it has fielded 120 volunteers (36% of the Ukrainian total) and received 36% of the funding.[2]

The Russia program is carried out by one expatriate staff member and two Russian staff members, all based in Moscow. The Ukrainian program is coordinated by one expatriate staff member and three Ukrainian staff members, all based in Kiev. In both cases, the FtF program is just one part of CNFA activities in the country.

Host Organization Focus

CNFA's strategy for working with host organizations is a very focused one. It concentrates on a few selected organizations, working with these to develop a protocol of mutual understanding and a plan for sequential volunteer assistance. Primarily developing partnerships between NIS organizations and the American Farm Bureau and members of the Citizens Network Agribusiness Alliance (CNAA), the partnerships focus on private farmers associations, agribusinesses, and joint ventures.

Developing linkages between the American Farm Bureau and private farmers associations is an important part of this portfolio. For example, in Russia, CNFA created a partnership between the Women's Committee of the American Farm Bureau and the Women's Committee of AKKOR (the primary national private farmers association), which has a potential membership of 280,000 farm families. To date, this partnership has resulted in seminars on agribusiness and association development at the national Russian Farmers Fair in St. Petersburg and in four other regions of Russia.

CNFA sharpens its focus by "graduating" host organizations out of its portfolio. For example, in Russia, it will no longer work with AKKOR at a national level (other than the Women's Committee) and will focus on the oblast and rayon-level organizations. As explained in the FY97 proposal, CNFA "played a valuable role in assisting AKKOR in their initial efforts to organize AKKOR and make it self-sustaining. Today, it has grown into a large enterprise with substantial access to credit. It has graduated. [CNFA] will henceforth focus on aiding oblast and rayon-level units that are still in their

---

[1] CNFA uses the term "Agribusiness Volunteer Program" (AVP) to refer to its FtF activities.

[2] Source: USAID/BHR/FtF, *NIS-FtF Bridge Funding*, May 23, 1996.

77

formative stages." [3] Another focusing strategy was CNFA/Ukraine's decision to no longer work with host organizations in which the FtF technical assistance goes primarily to a joint venture, rather than directly to a Ukrainian beneficiary.

One result of the strategy is that CNFA has the highest percentage among all implementors of Repeat Technical Assistance (an average of 73%, in contrast to the lowest average of 24%).

2. Program Results and Impact

As described above, CNFA works in three primary areas ((1) Farm Bureau partnerships; (2) economic development partnerships; and (3) joint venture partnerships) with a total of 25 focal projects. Examples of impacts include:

Farm Bureau Partnerships

- Texas Farm Bureau & Krasnodar (Russia) Farmers Association (AKKOR)

  The Krasnodar AKKOR is one of the largest and strongest in Russia, with 21,000 members in 44 districts. Impacts include: AKKOR putting member services as top priority, using Texas Farm Bureau as model. Training Skaz Bank officials on ag-banking practices; 40% of bank's customers are now farmers.
- California Farm Bureau & Crimea Farms Association

  Following volunteer recommendations, the Crimea Farmers Association has submitted 6 resolutions to the Crimean Parliament on land reform, land payments, types of property ownership, and tax policy.

Economic Development Partnerships

- Russian Mushroom Growers Association

  Founded by private farmers in 1995, the Association works to transform traditional mushroom gathering into a mushroom cultivation industry throughout Russia. FtF volunteers have trained more than 100 farmers on mushroom marketing, specialized production techniques, and small business management, in addition to strengthening the Association itself. (See Case Studies for more details.)

Joint Venture Partnerships

- Giant Supermarkets, Russian Far East

  A Russian-American joint venture in Vladivostok and Nakhodka, the project is constructing two wholesale/retail supermarket operations, which, in turn, have created a self-sustaining privatized market supply system. Among other impacts, volunteers have helped create this supply system, identifying and establishing relations with private farmers in dairy, greenhouse, vegetable, bakery, meat, and animal feed production.

---

[3] Source: CNFA, *Proposal for Extension through FY97 of Cooperative Agreement o. FA 0-075-A-00-2094-00, USAID NIS Farmer-To-Farmer Program*, April 1996.

3. Relations with USAID and Other Programs

Reporting to USAID

Because the reporting requirements for USAID/Moscow and USAID/BHR/FtF are different, CNFA/Russia developed two kinds of reporting systems, one primarily focusing on quantitative impacts (for USAID/Moscow) and the other on qualitative impacts (BHR/FtF). Both were accurate and well done, but the process is labor-intensive and takes staff time away from other duties. It is suggested that, when possible, these kind of conflicting reporting requirements be eliminated.

CNFA in Moldova

Current plans are to expand CNFA operations into Moldova (3-5 volunteers). The evaluation team questions this decision for two reasons:

- Moldova is a small country in which VOCA is currently operating successfully in a range of institutions. If the number of FtF volunteers is to be increased, it is more efficient to add to VOCA's program -- which can absorb the increase -- rather than re-invent the wheel. FtF has had some prior experience with implementors stepping on each other's toes and, in small-scale Moldova, it would be difficult not to do so. For example, the proposal for FY97 shows CNFA working with IMATA in Moldova, an institution which is already a VOCA client. (It should be emphasized, however, that both implementors are comfortable with the current plan and able to work together.)

- FtF has found that an in-country director is necessary for the best management of a program, but the small number of volunteers planned for Moldova does not warrant an in-country office or director. This leaves management by the CNFA/Ukraine office, which already has a very large and dispersed territory to cover.

4. Management and Implementation Systems

CNFA has an extremely well-designed and well-executed system for planning and carrying out its activities with a host organization:

First, an initial "Protocol" between CNFA and the host organization is developed. The protocol sets out in writing, mutually-agreed-upon goals for the partnership, the financial contributions of each partner, and the types of sequential volunteer assignments which will help achieve the goals. (For an example, see the Case Study of the AKKOR Women's Committee in Russia.)

Next, a detailed "Assignment Statement" (SOW) is drawn up, based on the above. And, when the assignment is finished, a "Volunteer Impact Statement" is completed, linking the SOW goals and principal impacts from the assignment. In contrast to the files of some implementors, these documents were done on time and with specifics. All these activities are linked with CNFA/Washington through a computer tracking system which is available to all CNFA parties and shows "Recent Developments/Resolutions" and"Planning Next Step/Action."

It is strongly suggested that this process and these forms be considered for **all** implementors in the future.

C. Land O' Lakes (LOL)

1. Introduction: Background and Approach

LOL manages the smallest of the programs of the five active implementors, having fielded 141 volunteers since the program's inception in September 1992 through May 10, 1996. The LOL program is focused geographically in four regions of European Russian: Ivanova, Kaliningrad, Ryazan and Vologda. LOL also operates in Ukraine in four regions and has a field office there.

Originally, the LOL program's orientation was to work directly with AKKOR, assigning volunteers on the basis of requests generated by AKKOR. This approach has widened over the course of three years of implementation. While LOL still works directly with two local AKKOR organizations, it has now developed its own networking approach and word of mouth recommendations play a larger role in host organization selection. In the Russian program, there are currently 50 active "partners", as LOL calls host organizations, out of a total of 60 which have hosted volunteers. Forty project applications are in various states of review or preparation.

Thematically, LOL works with a variety of producers, both farmers and farm organizations, and takes a holistic approach in which it works with the host through the production system and with an emphasis on repeat volunteers.

2. Program Results and Impact

Land O'Lakes measures impact on a case by case basis. Baseline data on each host, focusing on assets and productivity, is recorded as part of the preparation for the initial volunteer visit. Follow-up evaluations by a staff member, approximately 6-9 months after the volunteer visit, then measure impact against this baseline.

The most comprehensive and aggregated impact statement by LOL is found in their fourth quarter report for Year Three, in which a sample of 42 hosts is measured along 12 dimensions of impact.

Progressive Management	90 %
Potential for Processing Business	70 %
Increase of assets	86 %
New products developed	60 %
Business plan developed	86 %
Development of production/processing technology	38 %
Production/processing cost reduction	33 %
Increase of customers	71 %
Increase of suppliers	50 %
Improvement of quality	45 %
Increase of production capacity	48 %

Quantitative examples of impact given in the Year Three Annual Report (some of which were confirmed by field visits) include the following:

- 44 tons of oats per hectare harvested on host farm vs. 25 tons per hectare on the adjoining collective farm.
- construction of a mini-feed mill at 100 percent cost savings over pre-assistance plan.
- increased dairy cow herd to 50 cows, based on savings obtained through business plan.
- increased pig herd, from 15 to 80 pigs, due to new light lot, pig barn construction.
- weight gains among dairy calves 1.5 times higher than previously recorded, based on access of calves to colostrum
- 1,500,000 R/year ($300) saving through installation of western-style barn ventilation system rather than traditional Russian system
- 50 percent cost reduction in installation of drainage and electrical lines due to revised location of barn and house
- 100 percent cost reduction in operation cost of mini-feed mill through use of efficient feed mill design
- 2,000,000 R/year ($400) cost savings in pig barn operations through use of western style construction and heating

These types of impacts are indicative of LOL's approach, which has tended to be fairly focused in on-farm production, especially in the early stages of volunteer assistance, and which would tend to fall into the Evaluation's "Level One" on-site category of impact, although, in several notable instances, LOL is also working with associations and regional groups. LOL's approach to diffusion is to help create leading or model farms or organizations which then attract local attention. The sustainability of the hosts' activities is a major concern, and LOL interviewees estimated that 40 percent of hosts are "weak," 40 percent are "struggling, but viable" and 20 percent are "sustainable."

From the LOL perspective, what works best for obtaining impact and sustainability is 1) careful selection and screening of potential hosts 2) a long-term relation with the host, 3) repeat volunteer visits, 4) Reverse Training and 5) attention to maintaining good relationships with local governments, which can help in leveraging local government support for hosts.

3. Relationship with USAID and Other Programs

Most of the relationship with USAID for LOL involves monitoring and reporting on impact, both to USAID/Moscow and to Washington. This monitoring has shifted from an earlier focus on monitoring the implementation of recommendations to the current focus on the 12 dimensions of impact listed above. Workplans are developed in collaboration with USAID/Moscow, but apart from this exercise, the interviewees felt that USAID gives LOL lots of freedom to implement the program as they see fit. LOL does plan to commit 12 volunteers to the USAID's MOFSA collective farms restructuring project in Vologda in FY 1997, which will comprise about a third of its overall volunteer effort and will represent the first time that LOL Farmer-to-Farmer has worked explicitly in support of USAID/Moscow strategic objectives.

81

LOL is also an advisor to the Joint Russian-America Commission for Agribusiness and Rural Development, which is a loan program funded from of the sale of US commodities provided by the USDA to Russia as humanitarian aid. This relationship has led to at least one project in which FtF assistance was followed by Joint Commission Financing (the creation of the Russian Community Fund in the Dmitrov Project). For smaller projects, LOL also refers clients to another monetization fund, the Russian Farmers Foundation.

4. Management and Implementation Systems.

LOL's Russian office in Moscow employs a full time staff of three -- a project manager, an applications and impact specialist and a secretary -- and draws on a pool of translators and drivers who are hired as independent contractors, according to need; it also relies on a pool of translators in the field. LOL rents office space in the AKKOR premises and has obtained favorable rent through this arrangement. In-kind contributions from hosts are documented in trip reports and reported through the home office, which is ultimately responsible for reporting. The staff feels thinly stretched at current funding levels and the ability of the project manager to visit sites is limited by the office workload.

82

D. Volunteers in Overseas Cooperative Assistance (VOCA)

1. Mandate and History

Volunteers in Overseas Cooperation Assistance (VOCA) is an international people-to-people volunteer organization committed to enhancing the development and economic opportunities of cooperatives and agriculturally-based enterprises. In addition, VOCA supports strengthening democratic institutions and promoting the sound management of the environment and natural resource base. VOCA has provided volunteer support to cooperatives and small and medium-sized agribusinesses in the developing world for 26 years.

VOCA began in 1970, when it was incorporated in the District of Columbia, as the Volunteer Development Corporation (VDC) and opened its offices with one staff member and its first cooperative assistance grant from USAID. In the same year, the first volunteers completed assignments to Jamaica and Chile. By 1976, 100 volunteers had completed assignments in 31 countries in Africa, Asia, the Near East and the Caribbean. In 1983, VDC changed its name to VOCA. In 1985, VOCA began a pilot FtF Program with funding from USAID and later that year Congress authorized more permanent FtF Program funds. In 1990, VOCA launched operations into emerging democracies of Central and Eastern Europe. With the fall of the Soviet Union, VOCA embarked on a quick-start FtF Program in the NIS. VOCA was the first USAID grantee to have a U.S. presence in the agricultural sectors of the Russian Federation, Ukraine, Kazakhstan and Armenia.

2. Program Implementation

VOCA, as an American private voluntary organization (PVO), focuses on providing technical assistance and training to developing world farmers, agribusinesses, cooperatives and policy makers by placing highly qualified U.S. volunteers on short-term assignments (2-4 weeks). VOCA follows a demand-driven approach with clients who have existing operations and who are making initiatives to improve their productivity and profitability. VOCA, through TA provided by FtF volunteers, also develops feasibility assessments and business plans that help budding entrepreneurs to initiate new businesses.

Typically, projects (i.e., a FtF volunteer assignment) are identified through an in-country staff member who visits rural areas and networks with other international organizations. Volunteers are recruited from a computerized data base with the assistance of the headquarters office in Washington, D.C. and the U.S. regional recruiting offices located in California, Wisconsin and Ohio. VOCA is reasonably well known in the NIS and regularly receives referrals for technical assistance and training. Clients, if possible, share some project costs by providing labor, interpretation, local transportation, as well as lodging and food costs when volunteers stay with client families. VOCA covers major expenses such as international travel, as well as housing and meal costs, when volunteers are not housed with client families.

VOCA has made special efforts to develop overall country or region-specific strategies. The strategies are in turn linked to work plans which outline specific tasks for the FtF volunteer. The

work plans have outcome implementation sheets which provide a systematic method to measure impact. For example, the Armenia VOCA office has an implementation sheet which measures 5 indicators of impact for each volunteer. A baseline is established at the beginning of the assignment and impact is measured upon completion of the assignment. Also, a debriefing sheet is prepared by the volunteer and the VOCA debriefer which outlines the accomplishments of the assignment as well as the inputs provided by the host client and the number of beneficiaries.

3. Use of Program Funds

During FY 1995, VOCA volunteers completed 783 assignments in 48 countries; 193 (25%) were in the NIS. Of the worldwide total, the most prevalent assignments focused on farm level assistance (20%) and agribusiness operations (22%). Worldwide, in 1988, VOCA completed 79 assignments. This number increased to a maximum of 1006 in 1994 and dropped to 783 in 1995. In FY 1995 funding totaled $23,214,432 (USAID - $13,703,048 and donated services - $9,341,309) and expenses were $23,174,275. Support of volunteer activities was the leading expense (54%), followed by overseas operations (23%), administration, fund raising (15%) and sub-grant management (8%).

From January 31, 1992, when VOCA initiated activities in the NIS, until March 31, 1996, 831 projects were completed. The number of projects per NIS country and the percentage of the total are: Russia - 369 (44.4%); Ukraine - 136 (16.3%); Kazakhstan - 94 (11.3%); Belarus - 82 (9.9%); Armenia - 81 (9.7%); Moldova - 65 (7.8%); Azerbaijan - 3 (.4%); and Georgia - 2 (.2%).

4. Program Effectiveness and Impact

In general, VOCA's FtF projects are well organized and effectively implemented. The team observed positive impacts of these projects in the NIS countries where VOCA has FtF activities. The case studies will provide details of the team's assessment of the TA provided and its impact. The following discussion is provided to contrast VOCA's FtF activities in a country where it is the sole FtF implementor, Armenia, and a country where VOCA is one of five FtF implementors, Russia.

Armenia is a country where VOCA has been particularly effective. It is also a country where VOCA is the only FtF implementor. The VOCA representative has developed a clear strategy that focuses on increased production and processing of high value annual crops. Rehabilitation of tree crops and irrigation systems also is receiving attention. The strategy has a cross-cutting theme of utilization of low energy input systems and renewable natural resources. VOCA has made significant and successful efforts to coordinate its activities with other donor organizations, including Save the Children, United Nations High Commission for Refugees, Fund for Armenian Relief, United Methodist Committee on Relief and USAID.

The team visited several project sites in southern Armenia designed to support the country strategy. With the input of multiple visits from one FtF volunteer, two villages constructed gravity feed irrigations systems which replaced old, energy inefficient systems; crop production in both villages greatly increased, wheat production tripled in one village. The team also visited a winery and solar fruit-drying installation in the same area. Both agribusinesses had received multiple visits from FtF volunteers and were well on their way to becoming sustainable private sector enterprises. The solar

dryer installation was using one of Armenia's most abundant natural resources. The impact of these projects is significant, quantifiable and directly addresses VOCA's strategy. In addition, these projects are highly leveraged because of VOCA's cooperation with other international donors. Importantly, the USAID Mission has provided $300,000 in FY 96 to support VOCA activities and plans to make a similar contribution in FY 97. These funds are used by VOCA for "demonstration" activities (e.g., construction of solar drying units).

In Russia, VOCA has used a very systematic approach to select regions (oblasts) in which to initiate FtF projects. After conducting a nationwide assessment of various regions, VOCA gave priority to Southeastern Russia as well as Northeastern Russia, particularly around Moscow. The Southeastern oblasts include some of the best agricultural areas in Russia and have a comparatively mild climate and excellent soils. VOCA opened an office in Saratov in 1993 to service this region. VOCA activities cover a wide range of the postharvest agribusinesses, including bakeries, milk production, meat processing and vegetable storage. Also, VOCA is cooperating with the IFC to assist in farm privatization efforts and the development of business plans for recently privatized farms. VOCA is working with AKKOR in the area of general agribusiness management as well as putting on seminars on cooperative development.

The Team was impressed with the quality of VOCA's projects and management in both Armenia and Russia. However, the impact of the FtF activities in Armenia seem to be more quantifiable and impressive. In the opinion of the Team, this may be a reflection of the one implementor/one country model more than superior program management. The multiple implementor/one country model does not provide the same clarity of purpose or of impact. Perhaps the phrase "too many cooks spoil the broth" might apply to the FtF Program in Russia.

5. Quality of VOCA Volunteers and Country Staff

The Team was consistently impressed with the quality of the VOCA volunteers as well as the VOCA staff members both in the field and Washington. The volunteers have excellent credentials and are very committed to the assigned task. The field offices have very motivated U.S. direct hire leadership and are supported by an excellent FSN staff.

6. Concluding Observations

The model that the FtF program is utilizing in Armenia may well serve as a model for future FtF activities. VOCA is the only FtF implementor in country and as such there is no confusion among clients or international donors concerning who is responsible for implementation of the FtF program. It is also comparatively easy to determine the success or failure of the program. Because of this clarity of purpose, VOCA has been able to easily identify clients and international donor cooperators. Thus, VOCA has developed a highly leveraged program that creates impact at Levels I and II and to some degree at Level III. While it may not be practical or desirable to have one implementor in Russia, it may be helpful for future FtF activities to consider one implementor per region or per agricultural sector (e.g., fruit and vegetable processing, dairy production) in order to obtain increased efficiency and impact.

85

E. Winrock International Farmer-to-Farmer Program Implementor Assessment

1. Introduction: Background and Approach of the Winrock International

Winrock has managed an extensive set of FtF volunteer projects in the NIS. Since the start of the project, 527 volunteers have been placed in seven countries. The major effort has been in three countries: Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Russia. Winrock has a field office in Moscow and a regional office in Almaty, which serves the Central Asian Republics. Country project officers are based in the other countries.

Since the mid-term evaluation of the NIS FtF program, major changes have occurred in the approach by WI. Winrock headquarters staff traveled throughout all the seven countries meeting with USAID and U.S. embassy staffs to better define the focus of the country programs. All countries have either a regional director or project director. There has been a complete turnover of field staff, and headquarters and the field staff are now closely linked together.

2. Program Results and Impact in the NIS

Winrock has developed an extensive impact data base which is linked to other tracking information on the project. A database is available for quick reference on all volunteers placed in the field. All SOWs prepared for a project, can be retrieved for quick reference.

The data indicates that Winrock has moved aggressively into the areas of agribusiness enterprises and business operations, in line with the direction of USAID. The percentage of volunteers working with farmers has remained fairly constant at around 25 percent, except in 1994, when the percentage of volunteers was approximately 40 percent.

In 1995, Winrock contracted with one of its subcontractors, Center for Agriculture and Rural Development (CARD) at Iowa State University, to conduct an impact analysis of volunteer assignments. The general impression by Winrock was that it was too theoretical an exercise, possibly because of the way the data has been collected for an impact assessment.

Winrock prepared "An Impact and Recommendation Report of FtF" in the NIS for the period of October, 1994 to March, 1996 in WI's Work Plans for September, 1996 to September, 1997. Impact is described in a general anecdotal nature. It is difficult to determine from the output the time dimension in which the impact occurred. The impact and recommendations are what is projected rather than what has actually occurred. In some cases, the impact statement said that the host applied for a loan but there was no follow-up to know if the loan was approved and money was received. Winrock and the other implementors need to examine their various impact analysis approaches and determine what is being achieved by this level of effort. Some implementors, like LOL, have done some aggregate analysis along impact indicator lines. These individual efforts need to be better integrated among implementors.

Since the inception of the project, Winrock has the following allocation of assignments by objective areas:

Table 1
Summary of Winrock FtF Assignments, 1993-1995

Objective Description	1993	1994	1995
Farmers	26.1	37.9	24.0
Farm Associations and Organization Development	6.5	12.1	9.4
Farm Association/Business Operations	6.5	17.2	11.5
Agriculture Enterprises - Organizational Development	15.2	1.7	10.4
Agribusiness Enterprises - Business Operations	10.9	15.5	30.2
Agricultural Credit and Financial Institutions	6.5	0.0	1.0
Government	8.7	3.4	3.1
Educational Institutions	15.2	12.1	10.4
Miscellaneous	4.3	0.0	0.0

Winrock prepared a list of possible indicators for different types of host organizations in a June, 1996 document entitled, "Potential Impact Indicators". The indicators narrowly look at ex post impacts, e.g. how many teachers/trainers using information in their courses were impacted by the FtF volunteer, rather than using indicators as a guide to directing the host to some particular end-point. Indicators need to have two purposes: selecting projects and monitoring projects. The indicators are especially important for fine-tuning or correcting an on-going project as well as knowing when a host organization has matured and needs to be graduated. Winrock and the other implementors need to strengthen this aspect of the impact assessment.

3. Relationship with USAID and Other Programs.

In discussions with USAID officers in Russia, Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan, positive reports were received on the efforts being made by WI. In general, USAID is satisfied with the field operations, and Winrock is responsive to the requests and needs of the country mission. In Russia, for example, USAID has a major initiative entitled MOSFA on restructuring collective farms. Winrock agreed to

87

allocate some of its volunteers to this project if the Mission so requested. Winrock is willing to work in line with USAID's strategic goals.

In the three countries visited, USAID's strategic plan either does not include agriculture or it is only a small percentage of effort in the overall Mission's portfolio. WI's FtF project does not command a high priority among the Mission personnel, though it is appreciated by the Mission for the projects it undertakes. For example, if the Ambassador wants to see successful rural and community development projects, the FtF country director gets the call to arrange a field visit.

In discussions with USAID mission personnel, there is the perception that Winrock and other implementors need to better network among themselves in designing and filling projects. Cursory levels of communication do flow among implementors in a country, but the level of integration among programs is not at the level that would allow synergy and networking to yield multiplicative benefits.

4. Management and Implementation Systems

Winrock has done an excellent job to turn its FtF program around since the mid-term evaluation. Management is effective in fielding volunteers to fill specific assignments. Each country office has local staff who are knowledgeable about the conditions and are in the front lines working with host organizations. In Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan, the local staffs have been in place since the inception of FtF operations in those countries. Winrock is able to provide both logistical support and interpreters for visiting volunteers.

Winrock and the host institution establish a work plan with a SOW for each volunteer. Winrock has been improving its protocols for insuring that each project is tracked and monitored. The key information-gathering tools are:

- A scope of work
- Post-assignment volunteer report and debriefing
- Post-assignment questionnaire
- Six to 12 month follow-up survey
- Compiled information in a Microsoft Access Databases:
  - Volunteer Database
  - Tracking Database
  - Quarterly and Annual Reports to USAID

Winrock is developing new questionnaire instruments to streamline the data collection from the volunteers and host organizations and to put more emphasis on impact analysis from the host organization. The post-project interviews with the volunteers are being converted into in-country data collection exercises before the volunteers leave the project. WI's efforts in this area are warranted because in the review of the written surveys, little valuable information could be gleaned on what worked best or how to refine the program.

Part of the SOW includes a memorandum of understanding (MOU) about the responsibilities of each party. In-kind contributions are not closely tracked and deserve greater attention by WI. This effort helps to send a message to the host that its participation is required and viewed as significant, even

if it is a small amount. The levels of in-kind contributions are also good for publicity, when describing to others how U.S. contributions are being leveraged by the host country recipients. Most important is that the in-kind contributions from host organizations are an indication of their commitment to a project, where a volunteer could otherwise be seen as a free asset and his services used in less productive ventures. Of course, in-kind contributions have to be designed along the lines of the "ability to pay", so that well-deserving projects are not avoided because of limited resources.

The perception gleaned from discussions with country directors is that a heavy emphasis is placed on carrying out the tedious logistical requirements of the FtF program, which can be time-consuming. On this point, Winrock has been effective.

There seems to be a lack of insight regarding the strategic goals for the host organizations, which provide the richness and sustaining impact of the FtF volunteer. Several examples, such as at the Talgar Agricultural College, the Djambool Business Center, and the USDA project in St. Petersburg, give the impression that more in-depth understanding of the immediate to long term impacts are not being assimilated into the projects. Part of this shortcoming seems to come from the ambiguous nature of the FtF program goals - whether the program is a goodwill program or an economic/social impact program. Winrock (and the other implementors) needs to reconcile this confusion by recognizing that goodwill is a necessary component of the program but it is not sufficient to constitute a successful FtF volunteer project. Only when the economic impact (and social impacts that lead to economic impact) is measurable and forthcoming, will a project be sustainable and will there be institutional capacity-building which leads to positive change.

This leads to the conclusion that as FtF numbers stabilize around break-even levels of volunteer placements for a country program, Winrock will need to conduct more in-depth quality assistance to the host organizations. For example, since volunteers are placed only during certain seasons of the year because of in-country living conditions, the in-country staff will need to undertake more long-term discussions with a client in order to produce detailed work plans and SOWs during the slack periods. The motto should be "Doing more with fewer numbers." This could have a measurable benefit on the success of FtF volunteers in having an impact on a host organization. Furthermore, Winrock could do more in-country capacity-building (see section in main report) so that momentum is maintained and long-term sustainability is preserve; the result could be more evidence of impacts at Levels 2 and 3.

ANNEX A.V
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. Team Members and Timing

This impact evaluation was carried out by Agricultural Development Consultants, Inc. (AGRIDEC) at the request of USAID's Bureau of Humanitarian Response, Office of Private Voluntary Cooperation (BHR/FtF). The evaluation team consisted of six members, five independent consultants and one USAID staff member: (1) Agricultural Project Design/Evaluation and Institutional Specialist/Team Leader (Peter W. Askin); (2) Food and Agricultural Economist (Gregory Sullivan, Ph.D.); (3) Agribusiness/Marketing Specialist (Robert Delemarre); (4) Agribusiness/Credit Systems Specialist (Malcolm Childress, Ph.D.); (5) Social Scientist (Valerie Estes, Ph.D.), and (6) USAID Agricultural Officer (Mark Smith, USAID/ENI/ED/AG).

Because FtF activities are widely dispersed throughout the NIS and for security reasons and travel difficulties, the team concentrated on project sites in Russia and two countries in each of the three remaining NIS regions. These were Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan in the Central Asian Republics, Armenia and Georgia in the Caucasus, and Ukraine and Moldova in West NIS.

From May 28-31, 1996, the team interviewed USAID, USDA, and implementor representatives in Washington. Between June 1 and June 15, all six team members worked in Russia, generally in groups of two. From June 17-28, three sub-teams carried out fieldwork in the other regions: Childress and Sullivan in the CAR; Delemarre and Smith in the CAUC; and Askin and Estes in West NIS. Debriefings with USAID Missions were held in all regions.

1. Evaluation Techniques

In accordance with the SOW, the evaluation was carried out using both quantitative and qualitative techniques and a range of data source to assess impact in the NIS and the U.S.

Research techniques regarding impact in the NIS included:

a. Literature Review

Numerous documents from both USAID and project implementors were reviewed. (See *Documents Reviewed* in the appendices for a complete list.)

b. Interviews with FtF Clients (host organizations) in the NIS

During the course of the NIS fieldwork, the team assessed 77 host organizations, interviewing over 100 individuals associated with these clients. The sites selected represent a cross-section of single and multiple FtF assignments and functional areas (e.g., farmers, farmers' groups, credit, processing, agribusiness, etc.). The following table presents the number of field sites visited, by region and by implementor. Note that Tri Valley Growers was not assessed specifically, since its contract ended in December 1995 and no implementor personnel were available to be interviewed. However, the

sites which had been taken over by ACDI, were included in the field sample. (See appendices for a complete list of names and titles of interviewees [*Persons Interviewed*], and for research instruments used.)

The table also compares the percentages of sites visited in the evaluation with the percentages of volunteers fielded in each region by each implementor. The differences range from oversampling one implementor (ACDI) by 6% and undersampling another (Winrock) by 4% and oversampling two regions (CAR and CAUC) by 7% and 5% and undersampling two regions (Russia and West NIS) by 6%. However, these differences are not great, and they also reflect such issues of fieldwork as the wide geographical dispersion of field sites in Russia and Ukraine.

Table 2
Site Visits to Host Organizations [4]

REGION	IMPLEMENTOR					TOTAL SITE VISITS	% of All NIS Sites Visited	% of All NIS Volunteers
	ACDI	CNFA	LOL	VOCA	Winrock			
CAR Visits	4	0	0	5	15	24	31%	24%
CAUC Visits	4	0	0	4	0	8	10%	5%
Russia Visits	8	8	5	7	4	32	42%	48%
West NIS Visits	1	3	1	7	1	13	17%	23%
TOTAL SITE VISITS	17	11	6	23	20	77		
% All NIS Sites Visited	20%	15%	8%	38%	19%			
% of All NIS Volunteers	14%	14%	8%	41%	23%			

c. Interviews with USAID, Other U.S. Government Representatives in the NIS, and FtF Implementors

Numerous interviews were carried out in the U.S. and NIS with representatives of USAID, U.S. Department of State, USDA, other U.S. Government-funded projects working in agriculture, and FtF Implementors. (See *Persons Interviewed*.)

---

[4] The percentages of volunteers by implementors and by region are slightly different than those shown in the table *Funding and Volunteer Totals* because Tri Valley Growers was not included in the basis for this analysis.

91

In addition to the in-depth interview with implementors, a follow-up request was sent to them asking for more details on host organizations and repeat technical assistance.

d. Interviews with FtF Volunteers

Eight volunteers, currently on their assignment, were interviewed in the field. (See *Persons Interviewed.*) Further data were collected through the *Returned Volunteer Questionnaire*. (See below.)

B. Impact in the U.S.

The team was asked not only to assess the impact of FtF in the NIS but also the impact of FtF in the U.S. Three types of impact were assessed: (i) Impact of Returned Volunteers; (ii) Impact of Implementors; and (iii) Impact of FtF on U.S. agricultural organizations and private business. (The results are reported in the section of the report entitled, *Impact in the United States*. Research instruments are in the appendices.)

a. Impact of Returned Volunteers

A questionnaire of primarily close-ended questions was sent to a randomly selected sample of 5% (112) of all returned volunteers. A very impressive 45% of the questionnaires were returned, a number which reflects the high commitment of volunteers to FtF.

b. Impact of Implementors

Implementors were sent a questionnaire asking about the methods and impacts of outreach they use to inform the American public about FtF. (See appendices for the questionnaire.)

c. Impact of FtF on U.S. Agricultural Organizations and Businesses

Implementors provided the team with a list of organizations and businesses which are a part of their FtF network. Telephone interviews were carried out with a randomly selected number.

ANNEX A.VI
RETURNED VOLUNTEER QUESTIONNAIRE AND RESULTS

A. SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO RETURNED VOLUNTEERS

7 June 1996

Dear Returned Farmer-to-Farmer Volunteer,

The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) has contracted AGRIDEC (Agricultural Development Consultants, Inc.) to evaluate the Farmer-to-Farmer Program in the NIS. One of the purposes of the evaluation is to assess the impact the program has had on farmers, agribusiness development, and agricultural institutions in the NIS. Another is to learn about the ways in which Volunteers have used the experiences and knowledge gained from the assignment since returning home.

We will be looking at the first issue through a four-week field evaluation in the NIS this month. To cover the second issue, we need your input. Consequently, we are sending out the attached questionnaire to a randomly-selected sample of Returned Volunteers which asks about your experiences in explaining Farmer-to-Farmer experiences to your workplace and in your community.

Please complete and return the questionnaire to us at:

AGRIDEC
8900 SW - 117th Avenue, Suite C-207
Miami, FL 33186
Fax: (305) 598.5885

Because we will begin writing our report to USAID on July 1, we would appreciate receiving your response by FRIDAY, JUNE 28.

Many thanks for your assistance. Your responses -- which will be held in complete confidence -- will form an important part of the report. If you believe there are additional issues that we have not covered, we welcome your written comments.

Sincerely,

Peter Askin
Evaluation Team Leader
AGRIDEC

93

EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE
FOR RETURNED NIS FARMER-TO-FARMER VOLUNTEERS

INSTRUCTIONS: Although we have asked for information which identifies you and the implementing organization, this material will be kept confidential.

When you have completed the questionnaire, please send it to:

AGRIDEC
8900 S.W. 117th Avenue, Suite C-207
Miami, FL 33186
E-mail: agridec@aol.com
Fax: (305) 598-5885
Tel: (305) 598-5777

1.NAME

_____

2. SEX _____ Female _____ Male

3. AGE _____ 20-29 _____ 40-49 _____ 60-69

_____ 30-39 _____ 50-59 _____ 70-79

4. STATE _____

Address (optional) _____

_____

Telephone (optional) _____

Fax (optional) _____

E-mail (optional) _____

5. OCCUPATION _____

6. EMPLOYER _____

_____ Self _____ Government _____ Non-Governmental or Non-Profit

_____ Private Business _____ Educational Institution _____ Retired

_____ Other (explain)

_____

7. HIGHEST EDUCATIONAL DEGREE

_____ High School _____ Some College/University _____ Masters

_____ Post-High School Technical _____ Bachelors _____ Doctorate

94

8. WAS THIS YOUR **FIRST** ASSIGNMENT WITH NIS FARMER-TO-FARMER?

_____ Yes _____ No

9. IF **NO**, WAS IT YOUR _____ 2nd? _____ 3rd? _____ 4th? _____ 5th?

_____ Other? (explain)

_____

10. IF YOU HAVE DONE **MORE THAN ONE ASSIGNMENT**, WERE YOUR OTHER ASSIGNMENTS WITH THE SAME **U.S.** ORGANIZATION?

_____ Yes _____ No

_____ Other (explain)

_____

11. IF YOU HAVE DONE **MORE THAN ONE ASSIGNMENT**, WERE YOUR OTHER ASSIGNMENTS WITH THE SAME **NIS** ORGANIZATION?

_____ Yes _____ No

_____ Other (explain) _

_____

IN REFERENCE TO YOUR **LAST** ASSIGNMENT:

12. **U.S.** ORGANIZATION WHICH SENT YOU ON FARMER-TO FARMER?

_____ ACDI _____ Land O' Lakes _____ VOCA

_____ Citizens Network _____ Tri Valley Growers _____ Winrock

13. LOCATION OF **LAST** ASSIGNMENT?

_____ Armenia _____ Georgia _____ Moldova _____ Turkmenistan

_____ Azerbaijan _____ Kazakhstan _____ Russia _____ Ukraine

_____ Belarus _____ Kyrgyzstan _____ Tajikistan _____ Uzbekistan

14. NAME OF **NIS** ORGANIZATION(S) WITH WHICH YOU **LAST** WORKED? (Host Organization)

_____

_____

95

15. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF **LAST** ASSIGNMENT

_____

_____

_____

_____

16. LENGTH OF **LAST** ASSIGNMENT?

_____ 5-9 days _____ 10-15 days _____ 16-20 days _____ 21-25 days

_____ 26-30 days _____ Longer (number of days _____)

17. YEAR OF **LAST** ASSIGNMENT?

_____ 1991 _____ 1992 _____ 1993 _____ 1994 _____ 1995 _____ 1996

18. **U.S.** MEDIA COVERAGE OF YOUR WORK IN THE NIS

Was there information about you and your assignment...

in a newspaper? _____ yes _____ how many times? _____ no

in a magazine or journal?_____ yes _____ how many times? _____ no

on TV? _____ yes _____ how many times? _____ no

on the radio? _____ yes _____ how many times? _____ no

_____ Other? (explain)

_____

If you responded **YES**, please give a brief description of the **U.S.** media coverage :

_____

_____

_____

_____

19. In the **U.S.**, did you give presentations, seminars, talks, or speeches about your assignment to...

a community group? _____ yes _____ how many times? _____ no

a professional organization? _____ yes _____ how many times? _____ no

an educational institution? _____ yes _____ how many times? _____ no

_____ Other? (explain)

_____

If you responded **YES**, please give a brief description of your **U.S.** presentation(s) :

_____

_____

_____

_____

20. a) How much did your experiences in the NIS change **your** attitudes about the **NIS**?

_____ very much _____ a moderate amount _____ very little _____ not at all

b) How much did your experiences in the NIS change the attitudes of your **family and friends** about the **NIS**?

_____ very much _____ a moderate amount _____ very little _____ not at all

c) How much did your experiences in the NIS change the attitudes of your **work colleagues** about the **NIS**?

_____ very much _____ a moderate amount _____ very little _____ not at all

We would appreciate any brief examples:

_____

_____

_____

_____

91

21. a) How much did your experiences in the NIS change **your** attitudes about **U.S. programs overseas**?

_____ very much _____ a moderate amount _____ very little _____ not at all

b) How much did your experiences in the NIS change the attitudes of your **family and friends** about **U.S. programs overseas**?

_____ very much _____ a moderate amount _____ very little _____ not at all

c) How much did your experiences in the NIS change the attitudes of your **work colleagues** about **U.S. programs overseas**?

_____ very much _____ a moderate amount _____ very little _____ not at all

We would appreciate any brief examples:

_____

_____

_____

_____

22. To what extent have you stayed in contact with people you met in the NIS during your assignment?

_____ to a great extent _____ to a medium extent _____ only to a slight extent _____ not at all

23. If you have stayed in contact, how have you stayed in contact?

_____ through letters _____ through faxes _____ through phone calls _____ through e-mail

_____ visits by them to the US _____ visits by you to the NIS

_____ Other (explain)

_____

_____

98

24. If you have stayed in contact, what has been the basis for the contact?

_____ you send them information _____ they send you information _____ business _____ you send them equipment or funds _____ strictly friendship _____ Other (explain the basis)

_____

_____

_____

Please give a brief description of the contacts you have had and the reasons for them:

_____

_____

_____

_____

25. Finally, we would appreciate any other information about how your experiences with Farmer-To-Farmer have affected your community, your workplace, or other people and organizations with which you associate. Many thanks for your generous and thoughtful assistance.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

C. RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE

Table 3
Returned Volunteer Questionnaire Responses
(N = 49)

Item	Subcategory	No. of Responses	% of Response
2. Sex	Female	46	94%
	Male	3	6%
3. Age	20-29	2	4%
	30-39	7	14%
	40-49	8	16%
	50-59	9	18%
	60-69	17	35%
	70-79	6	12%
4. State	MN, WI	2	12%
	CA, OH, PA, SD	4	6%
	CO, FL, ID, IA, KS, MA, MO, NB, NV, NY, ND, OR, TN, TX, VA, WA	16	4% or less
6. Employer	Self	20	41%
	Business	5	10%
	Government	2	4%
	Education	7	14%
	Non-profit	2	4%
	Retired	13	27%
7. Level of Education	High School	4	8%
	Technical	1	2%
	Some College/ University	4	8%
	Bachelors	16	33%

100

Item	Subcategory	No. of Responses	% of Response
	Masters	13	27%
	Doctorate	11	22%
8. First Assignment?	Yes	28	57%
	No	21	43%
9. If more than one,	2nd	7	33%
	3rd	5	24%
	4th	4	19%
	5th or more	5	24%
10. If more than one, with same implementor?	Yes	13	62%
	No	8	38%
11. If more than one, with same Host Organization?	Yes	13	65%
	No	7	35%
12. Implementor	ACDI	6	12%
	CNFA	5	10%
	LOL	7	14%
	TVG	1	2%
	VOCA	20	41%
	Winrock	10	20%
13. Country of Last Assignment	Armenia	3	7%
	Belarus	3	7%
	Georgia	0	9%
	Moldova	1	2%
	Russia	28	61%
	Turkmenistan	2	4%
	Ukraine	5	11%
16. Length of Last Assignment	5-9 days	2	4%
	10-15 days	1	2%

Item	Subcategory	No. of Responses	% of Response
	16-20 days	22	45%
	21-25 days	5	10%
	26-30 days	15	31%
	More than 30	4	8%
17. Year of Last Assignment	1992	2	4%
	1993	8	16%
	1994	15	29%
	1995	18	35%
	1996	8	16%
18. Media Coverage of Assignment [5]	Newspaper	22	16%
	Magazine/Journal	35	26%
	TV	40	29%
	Radio	40	29%
19. Volunteer Presentations [6]	Community Group	22	30%
	Professional Organization	30	41%
	Educational Institution	22	30%
20. Change of Attitudes about NIS			
a. Volunteer's	Very much	2	8%
	Moderate amount	16	62%
	Very little	7	27%
	Not at all	1	4%
b. Family & Friends'	Very much	16	35%
	Moderate amount	23	50%

[5] Most volunteers were covered by more than one type of medium. Number of times of media coverage (frequency) available.

[6] Most volunteers gave more than one type of presentation. Number of times of types of presentations (frequency) available.

102

Item	Subcategory	No. of Responses	% of Response
	Very little	6	13%
	Not at all	1	2%
c. Colleagues'	Very much	9	20%
	Moderate amount	24	53%
	Very little	9	20%
	Not at all	3	7%
21. Attitudes about U.S. Programs Overseas			
a. Volunteer's	Very much	14	29%
	Moderate amount	26	53%
	Very little	9	18%
	Not at all	0	0%
b. Family & Friends'	Very much	5	11%
	Moderate amount	29	62%
	Very little	10	21%
	Not at all	3	6%
c. Colleagues'	Very much	4	8%
	Moderate amount	22	45%
	Very little	19	39%
	Not at all	4	8%
22. Maintaining Contact	Great extent	4	8%
	Medium extent	15	31%
	Slight extent	22	46%
	Not at all	7	15%
23. Methods of Maintaining Contact [7]	Letters	33	69%
	Faxes	5	10%

[7] Many volunteers used more than one type of contact and had more than one reason for the contact. Frequencies for each are available.

103

Item	Subcategory	No. of Responses	% of Response
	Telephone	12	25%
	E-mail	11	23%
	Visits to U.S.	14	29%
	Visits to NIS	6	13%
24. Basis for Contact	Volunteer sends information	27	61%
	NIS contacts send information	10	23%
	Business	6	14%
	Equipment/Funds	4	9%
	Friendship	23	52%
	Other	1	2%

104

ANNEX A.VII
OTHER RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO IMPLEMENTORS ABOUT PUBLIC OUTREACH

19 June 1996

RE: IMPACT ON OF FARMER-TO-FARMER IN THE U.S.

Dear Farmer-To-Farmer Implementors,

In the Scope of Work for the Farmer-To-Farmer evaluation, we have been asked to concentrate on the impact of FtF in the NIS. However, another part of the scope also asks us to assess the impact of FtF in the U.S. The wording from the SOW is:
. Provide an indicative assessment of the impact of public outreach by the FtF volunteers and the implementing organizations to inform the public about their contributions to U.S. international assistance efforts.
. Provide an indicative assessment of the impact of the FtF program on a sample of U.S. agricultural organizations and private businesses.

We are using three sources to respond to these issues, which we hope will provide USAID with a systematic summary of the effects of FtF on American public opinion about the NIS and foreign assistance.

1. A survey questionnaire which was sent to a randomly-selected sample of returned volunteers (about 5% of the total). The emphasis in the questionnaire is on outreach or public information activities of volunteers after their return.

2. Information from you, the implementors, on results and impacts of media outreach and other means of communicating with the U.S. public that your organization carries out.

3. A brief telephone interview with a representative of the various organizations with which you work as "counterpart" organizations; for example, Farm Bureaus, FFA, business organizations, the VOCA regional network, etc.

To carry out the second and third, we would appreciate your responding to the following questions. We know that each implementor has different procedures and goals regarding outreach, so we have tried to keep questions as generic as possible. If they don't fit, please reshape to your program's activities. We would also appreciate any additional information on the topic, since we are sure that we didn't predict the multiplicity of ways in which you communicate with the American public.

1. Returned Volunteers and Public Outreach
   - a. Do you require returned volunteers to carry out some kind of public outreach upon their return?
   - b. If so, what are the requirements?
   - c. What kinds of activities do they carry out?
   - d. Who are their audiences?
   - e. What is the size of their audiences?
   - f. Are they required to report on their activities?
   - g. What have been the impacts of this public outreach?
   - h. What kind of tracking do you do regarding their efforts?
   - i. Do you keep any systematic records of this?
   - j. Other (What have we not asked that would be useful to know?)

2. Implementors & Public Outreach
   - a. What types of media outreach do you use in disseminating information about FtF? (e.g., newspapers, radio, TV, professional journals, newsletter from your organization)

105

i. Types
ii. Geographical coverage
iii. Size of audience
iv. Results

b. Do you track the results of your outreach in any systematic way? (e.g., clipping service, etc.)
c. Other (What have we not asked about that would be useful to know?)

3. Counterpart Organizations
a. Is there a network or group of U.S. organizations and/or businesses whom you see as "counterpart" organizations re FtF?
b. If so, please describe. (e.g., names of institutions in network, function of network, number of members, etc.)
c. What is the impact of FtF on these organizations?
d. What is the impact of these organizations on FtF?
e. Name, address, phone, fax, and e-mail (if available) of someone from each of the organizations whom we might re FtF.
f. Other (What have we not asked that would be useful to know?)

B. QUESTIONNAIRE FOR U.S. BUSINESSES AND ASSOCIATIONS

Five FtF implementors were asked to submit names of U.S. businesses and associations that have participated in FtF programs either directly or indirectly. A list of approximately 36 names. Twenty- people were interviewed: twelve business leaders and ten leaders of associations/organizations. The outline of the discussions was:

Date: Name of Business/Association:
Location and phone: Person Contacted:

1. Describe the nature of your business/service provided to your host partner in the NIS?

2. Describe the intensity of this relationships - number of trips, volunteers, NIS clients to US?

3. Have you signed a formal agreement with your host partner? What Type? MOU, partnership, joint venture, alliance. Describe?

4. Estimate the amount and type of investment (assets) that you have made in the NIS with your host partner.

5. Have you succeeded in influencing a critical mass of people in your host organization to sustain your efforts?

6. What tangible impacts (outputs) have been realized in your business or service venture? U.S.? NIS?

7. Have you been able to better network in the NIS to work with other NIS partners?

8. How have you been able to leverage your resources for working in the region?

9. Do you have a promotion/advertising budget for your project to promote your products or services in the NIS? Yes___No___What?

10. Has there been a positive public relations impact for your business/association from the FtF program? Yes___No___ How great?

11. What is your opinion on the near term outlook (1-2 years) for your NIS partnership?

12. Do you expect that there will be an increase in sales and/or investment in the next 12 to 24 months? Yes__ No___Percent?___

13. What problems or difficulties have you experienced in working in the NIS? And how would you conduct business differently in the NIS?

ANNEX A.VIII
METHODOLOGY FOR MEASURING AND DEMONSTRATING IMPACT

A. MEASURING AND DEMONSTRATING IMPACT

The budget outlook in which the FtF program will operate during the remainder of the decade will require greater efforts by implementors to measure and demonstrate the impact of their programs. Implementors will face declining numbers of volunteers for placement in the field. Each volunteer must be carefully placed to yield the greatest opportunity for success and impact as there is a high opportunity cost in misplacing a scarce volunteer in a project that does not produce impacts. The FtF program has reached a level of maturity that requires strategic thinking to achieve the greatest impact.

Strategic thinking on the part of implementors requires examining the potential of sectors of the economy and the institutional relationships which surround them in order to rank potential projects according to their overall impact. This will result in the selection of projects which have greater potential for synergy than projects in less critical areas.

Strategic thinking which identifies key subsectors or institutions on the part of implementors should be carried through to the project selection level to achieve maximum impact in terms of:

- diffusion of the knowledge base to other beneficiaries,
- leveraging of other available resources, and
- sustainability of the benefit stream from the intervention.

The possible impacts from leveraging of additional resources need to be considered from the perspective of host organizations, implementors, associations/groups of farmers, and USAID. Diffusion of the technology and institutional innovations by the host organization, implementors, association/groups and USAID will be considered.

Objectives for demonstrable impact should guide the plans of work, and the design and implementation of the SOW of individual volunteers. A plan of work is a document between the implementor and the host that describes the objectives of their collaboration in terms of:

a) demonstrable economic impact,

b) diffusion of the technology,

c) leverage of other available resources, and

d) sustainability of the benefit stream beyond the framework of the volunteer assistance.

A SOW will be prepared about the detail of how the volunteer's assistance will reach the overall pre-determined targets established before the start of the project. Progress toward these targets by the implementor and host will be monitored to determine if subsequent volunteer assistance is required. If targets are met, further volunteer assistance should be curtailed.

The marginal benefit of repeat volunteers seems to rise for early visits and then begins to fall. This means that it is important to know when is appropriate to stop providing volunteers to increasingly successful hosts. Single volunteer visits, if well timed and designed, can have significant and continuing impact.

Host organizations can cross the spectrum from independent businesses to providers of services to businesses. Each host organization needs to be measured against three levels for acceptable impact measurements for a proposed project.

Level 1. The host organization (firm, association, academy)

Level 2. Diffusion of knowledge to a broader audience

Level 3. Improvement in the underlying system of production, marketing, finance and policy

Level 1 Measurable and Demonstrable Impacts:

- production increases over pre-project levels
- cost reduction in production or services of output
- development of human capital leading to management efficiency and productivity gains
- quality improvements which lead to improved financial performance
- increased availability of inputs for production
- increased availability and wholesomeness for consumers
- new product development with consumer "bottom line" indicators
- marketing improvements that result in improved financial performance, contribution margins, cash flow, liquidity and product selection.
- balance sheet and financial ratios for businesses
- employment and income multipliers
- foreign exchange earnings
- savings mobilization to capture savings for productive investments

For both business and organizations providing services to business, the lowest common denominator of impact will be measurable and demonstrable impacts at Level 1.

Level 2 Measurable and Demonstrable Impacts

Impact is measured by: (1) what is the level and rate of diffusion and (2) the degree to which the receivers of the technical assistance achieve Level 1 indicators.

Types of diffusion considered will be both vertical and horizontal. Horizontal diffusion is the conveyance of the technical information/innovation to recipients with similar characteristics as the original hosts, flour millers diffusing to other millers. Vertical diffusion refers to the transmission of information to contributors or to recipients of the host's activity, e.g.,. flour millers spreading improved technical knowledge to wheat producers.

Level 3 Measurable and Demonstrable Impacts

Overall improvements in institutional and productive systems demonstrated by regulatory changes which contribute to achieving Level 1 impacts, reduction of transaction costs, widespread and rapid adaption of new technologies, and widespread and rapid changes in business procedures.

The protocol outlined guides the implementor in ranking and selecting from among potential projects and ultimately directing the projects to successful completion.

The FtF program has reached a level of maturity that requires the use of ex ante impact indicators. If quantifiable impacts cannot be clearly established, then a project should be ranked lower than projects which exhibit quantifiable indicators as outlined in Level 1 above. Projects which focus on qualitative impacts will need to insure that Level 1 indicators are being met or they will result in impacts. Projects without acceptable quantitative impacts or projects that can insure that qualitative impacts will result in quantitative results will be judged as second best to projects with measurable impact indicators.

All FtF projects are assumed to generate goodwill between the U.S. volunteers and their host organizations. This is considered to be a necessary output of the FtF project. However, good will by itself is not a sufficient justification for placement of a FtF volunteer. The protocol outlined above is recommended to insure maximum impact from the FtF program.

B. TAKING BETTER ADVANTAGE OF WHAT WORKS BEST

1. Program Design, Concentration and Targeting

Each Implementor has modified and refined its program design over the years as experience has been gained in the NIS, and as the realities of the situation have become known. Each Implementor has a concept of where its expertise best fits into the needs of host countries and where to apply its expertise to produce the greatest impact using its volunteers.

Program design should be and has been geared to the situation in each country, as there are wide differences between, say Russia and Armenia or Georgia. However, the evaluation team questions the emphasis placed on post-harvest activities in the RFA for the NIS FtF Program, i.e., "...with emphasis on post-harvest activities such as distribution, processing, marketing, and the promotion of agribusiness development." Few projects reviewed had interventions in marketing and none had any interventions in distribution. In Armenia and Georgia, the critical need in late 1992 (about the time NIS FtF Program grant agreements were signed with 5 Implementors) was to grow the staple food crops their people needed to survive.

In Russia, the greatest impact of volunteers, from a food availability and economic return perspective, appears to be in helping large farms significantly increase their productivity. The ability of the FtF Program to impact the agricultural sector of the NIS countries has been greatly compromised by the almost total lack of credit available to both farms and to food processors and distributors. Neither donors nor implementors have been able to make a noticeable change in this situation, and no quick and easy solution to this problem is in the cards.

The evaluation team did see numerous examples of successful interventions resulting from FtF volunteer visits. Unfortunately, implementor field program managers are basically uninformed as to successful interventions undertaken by their own organization and by other implementors in neighboring countries. Sharing of these experiences, once a year in Moscow, would benefit each country program manager and might give each ideas to incorporate in their next FY country program designs.

The evaluation team believes that implementors in large countries, like Russia, would produce greater impact at less cost if they concentrated on one or two geographic areas, within those countries.

Targeting can take many forms and should be a function of country needs, economic feasibility, and the ability of an Implementor to best service a given segment of the agricultural/agribusiness sector. As an example, there is great potential in almost all, if not all, the host countries to improve the dairy industry. This is an area in which Land O'Lakes excels, and a logical sector where it could make a great impact by targeting its assistance. However, the Team agreed that targeting of a sector would likely not be suitable due to the divergent needs among the regions and countries in the NIS.

Some Implementors have targeted the agribusiness/food processing sector in their host countries. In Armenia, VOCA has been focusing on assisting small food processors install capacity or improve and expand existing capacity to process a variety of foods and beverages. This has included: wheat milling; solar drying of fruits; soybean processing; wine making; orchard rehabilitation; potato processing; and seed potato production.

In Georgia, ACDI has focused on assisting farmers expand and increase their acreage and yields of the three main Georgian staple food crops - corn, potatoes and wheat. Using hybrid seed donated by Asgrow, Delta Pine and Microgen, ACDI has assisted farmers double their yields of corn and wheat. ACDI is now working with Monsanto to develop seed potato production in Georgia using genetically-engineered varieties resistant to the Colorado Potato Beetle and potato viruses. These potatoes, after replication next year, will be available for sale in Georgia and neighboring countries. Their use is likely to increase private farmer potato yields by three to four times, as they currently only obtain about 40 to 70 percent of their potential yield due to insect infestation and viruses (one kg of improved seed potato should result in 7 kg of new potatoes).

2. Implementation Systems and Approaches

All Implementors have good, effective implementation systems and approaches to providing technical assistance through their volunteers. While in a few cases, there appeared to be mismatches with the assistance requested by the host organization and the individuals provided, the overwhelming majority

of host organizations were very pleased with the selection of volunteers and the assistance they provided. Country FtF Program Managers voiced their satisfaction with the backstopping they receive from their headquarters, especially with respect to the timeliness and quality of volunteer selection and processing.

Overall, the evaluation team believes that the current implementation systems and approaches utilized by the Implementors are very effective. Under Section II.C. Program Management and Implementation Systems, several suggestions are presented to effect improvements in management and in cost-effectiveness of implementation systems.

ANNEX A.IX
REVERSE FARMER-TO-FARMER

A. Types of Programs

Although "Reverse Farmer to Farmer" can refer to a specific program which took place in 1994-95, in this report we are using the term to mean any U.S.-based training in agricultural subjects. In fact, NIS agriculturalists connected with FtF have participated in a variety of programs in addition to the 1994-95 program. The primary ones are:

- Reverse Farmer to Farmer

In August 1994, $1 million was provided to test the conclusion that a "Reverse Farmer-To-Farmer" training program would help accelerate the pace of modernizing the agricultural sectors of the NIS. Managed by ACDI, these funds were equally apportioned among the six implementors of the time, with each implementor responsible for selecting their allotment of participants. Between August 1994 and September 1995, 94 men and women were trained. An evaluation carried out in September 1995, found that: (1) the training was of high quality; (2) the program was cost effective; and (3) there was good potential for impact.[8]

- NET (NIS Exchanges & Training) Project

The NET Project was designed to provide NIS public- and private-sector leaders and professionals with the skills and attitudes necessary for guiding the transition to free-market economies and democratic governance through short-term training in the U.S. Begun in 1993, with funding of $120 million, it had trained 5,971 individuals from all 12 republics as of September 1995. Of these participants, approximately 50% came from Russia, 25% from West NIS, 20% from the CAR, and 5% from the Caucasus.

- Cochran Fellowships

Administered by the USDA, the Cochran Fellowship Program provides short-term training to agriculturalists from middle-income countries and emerging democracies. Focusing on senior- and mid-level specialists and administrators concerned with agricultural trade, agribusiness development, management, policy, and marketing from the public and private sectors, all training takes place in the U.S. The NIS program was begun in 1993, and between 1993 and 1995, 659 participants were trained from all 12 republics.

---

[8] Source: Foti, John, *Evaluation of Training Program: Reverse Farmer-To-Farmer Project for the New Independent States.* Prepared for Agricultural Cooperative Development International, September 1995.

113

B. FtF Participation in These Programs

To understand more clearly the kinds of programs in which FtF counterparts participate, information on specific numbers of trainees by program was obtained in Moldova. (See the following table.) Although not necessarily representative of all the NIS, it presents one example of distribution among the primary training programs. The largest percentage (51%) were trained through Cochran, the second (31%) through NET, and the third (12%) through "Reverse FtF".[9] The table also illustrates the efforts undertaken by FtF implementors in order to present their outstanding counterparts with additional opportunities to broaden, deepen, and reinforce the new techniques and attitudes introduced by FtF volunteers.

Table 4
Agriculturalists Sponsored by VOCA/Moldova for Short-Term Training (U.S. and European)

Type of Training Program	No. of Participants	% of Sub-Total	% of Grand Total
U.S. Government Programs			
"Reverse FtF" (ACDI Program)	5	12%	7%
NET Program	15	35%	22%
Cochran Fellowships	22	51%	32%
Fulbright Fellowships	1	2%	1%
	43	**100%**	
European Programs			
Training in Czech Republic (funded by Eurasia Foundation)	25	100%	37%
Sub-Total	**25**	**100%**	
GRAND TOTAL	**68**		**100%**

[9] It is most likely that the very high percentage of participation in Cochran is unique to Moldova. In other countries, the bulk of the training was probably done through NET and "Reverse FtF."

114

C. Findings

As a part of its interview format, the team collected data on the impact of U.S.-based training, not distinguishing among the various training programs. Of the more than 65 sites visited (see the Case Studies in the Appendices), approximately 40% had interviewees who had participated in some kind of U.S. training. The universal finding in all countries was that short-term training in the U.S. significantly increases the impact of FtF. Trainees and implementors reported very positive changes in both attitudes and technical knowledge as a result of the U.S.-based experience.

Examples of impact reported in the site visits include:

- A USDA advisor working with a host organization said:

  > The participants came home with more positive attitudes about change. For example, they now don't believe that they need formal certification in order to do something (e.g., welding, accounting, farming). They have more guts, more of an independent attitude. They are willing to try new things and to see possibilities in the future. The training also destroyed some residual negative attitudes about the U.S.

- A private farmer in Southern Russia reported that the training inspired him to try forming a cooperative himself. It also further solidified his belief in taking a scientific approach to farming and gave him a strong sense that the farmer must seek out the market.

- Another trainee, who is the Deputy Director of an Agribusiness Program, brought back a manual on business-plan development, which was translated into Russia. She uses the manual in her training programs.

And, again and again, trainees told us, "One picture is worth a thousand words. We saw for ourselves that the private market can work."[10]

D. Recommendations

Based on these very positive findings, we strongly recommend that BHR/FtF look for ways to reinstate a U.S.-based "Reverse Farmer-To-Farmer" program. In addition, USAID and USDA should continue to target FtF agriculturalists as participants for other U.S.-based training programs.

---

[10] For more specific details on the positive impacts of U.S. training programs -- including such variables as multiplier effects -- see both the "Reverse Farmer-To-Farmer" evaluation cited above and the NET Evaluation (*The NIS Exchanges and Training [NET] Project: A Mid-term Evaluation of Process and Preliminary Impact*, Prepared by Aguirre International for USAID, 1995).

ANNEX A.X
STATISTICAL DATA ON:
(1) FUNDING & VOLUNTEER TOTALS, AND (2) LENGTH OF TA, REPEAT VOLUNTEERS, AND REPEAT TA TO HOST ORGANIZATIONS

ENHANCING PROGRAM IMPACT: LENGTH OF ASSIGNMENT, REPEAT VOLUNTEERS, AND REPEAT TA TO HOST ORGANIZATIONS

A. Length of Volunteer TA

As the following table indicates, the average length of a volunteer assignment was 22 days, which is comparable to the 24 days reported in the 1994 midterm evaluation. No extraordinarily lengthy assignments were found, in contrast to 1994.

Given the positive impact reported in this evaluation, the current length of assignment appears to be satisfactory.

B. Repeat Volunteers

The team found that using volunteers who have had previous NIS FtF experience, "Repeat Volunteers," further increases impact. Although not absolutely essential, their use generally enhances project effectiveness since they are familiar with the technical, socioeconomic, and political situation and can "hit the ground running."

An analysis of the implementors' use of Repeat Volunteers shows that approximately 21% of volunteers were Repeat Volunteers. This is an increase of 11% over the 1994 average of 10% (for a summary of the data, see the following table).

The increased number of Repeat Volunteers is obviously affected by the fact that there is now a larger base of volunteers with experience in the NIS from which to draw. However, it also indicates that implementors are making use of previous volunteers, when they are available and when it is appropriate for the task at hand.

C. Repeat Technical Assistance (TA) to Host Organizations

The 1994 evaluation called for enhancing impact by giving follow-on TA to the same host organization, when appropriate. A re-analysis of repeat TA was done because it is one indicator of an implementor's focus on viable organizations; that is, concentrating on institutions where real impact can be achieved and supporting those organizations through a well-designed plan of sequential TA. The following tables show only Kazakhstan, Russia and Ukraine because these are the countries for which 1994 data were available.

The assessment of repeat TA shows a slight improvement (5%, from 37% to 42%) between 1994 and 1996. The 1994 average for host organizations receiving repeat TA was 37%, with a range of 0%

116

(LOL, Ukraine, and Winrock, Ukraine) to 100% (CNFA, Ukraine). The 1996 average is slightly higher, 42%. The range is from 8% (ACDI, Russia), 10% (LOL, Ukraine) and 12% (Winrock, Kazakhstan) to 45% (CNFA, Russia and LOL, Russia) and 100% (CNFA, Ukraine).

VOCA has the lowest percentage of repeat TA (24%) and CNFA the highest (73%). This reflects a difference in approach to selecting host organizations, VOCA collaborating with a variety of organizations across geographical and sectoral areas, and CNFA focusing on a few, the majority of which are paired with U.S. State Farm Bureaus. (For a summary of the data, see the following table.)

BHR/FtF should assess the benefits and weaknesses of a more narrow targeting of host organizations and a triage of those which are the weakest in regard to potential impact. This policy decision should be reflected in a new RFA or in updated FtF policy guidelines.

Table 5

PROJECT FOCUS
Length of TA, Repeat Volunteers, and Repeat TA to Host Organizations[11,12,13]

IMPLEMENTOR	ACDI	CNFA	LOL	TVG	VOCA	Winrock
CAR: KAZAKHSTAN						
1994						
Total Number of Volunteers	na	na	na	na	56	41
Number of Repeat Volunteers					9	2
% of Total Volunteers					16%	5%
Average Length of Volunteer TA (days)					19	24

[11] Source: Written responses of implementors to questionnaire distributed June 1996 and 1994 FtF Midterm Evaluation.

[12] Note: There is room for variation in these data, particularly in regard to number of host organizations. The questionnaire asked for "the number of organizations to which you are currently sending volunteers or may in the future." But implementors have different guidelines about counting host organizations. For example, some implementors list almost all host organizations as "active" or count all those which have filled out Technical Assistance applications. Others have much narrower definitions.

[13] na = not applicable because (1) the implementor does not operate in that country, (2) the implementor did not operate in that country in 1994, or (3) because the implementor was not operating in 1994, there is no basis for comparison between 1994 and 1996.

117

IMPLEMENTOR	ACDI	CNFA	LOL	TVG	VOCA	Winrock
Total Number of Host Organizations					27	25
Number of Host Organizations Receiving Repeat TA					6	4
% of Repeat TA to Host Organizations					22%	16%
1996						
Total Number of Volunteers	41	na	na	na	101	127
Number of Repeat Volunteers	12				13	35
% of Total Volunteers	29%				13%	28%
Average Length of Volunteer TA (days)	31				23	23
Total Number of Host Organizations	8				70	50
Number of Host Organizations Receiving Repeat TA	5				14	6
% of Repeat TA to Host Organizations	63%				20%	12%
Change Between 1994 & 1996						
% of Repeat Volunteers	na	na	na	na	-2%	-4%
Average Length of Volunteer TA					+4 days	-1 day
% of Repeat TA to Host Organizations					-2%	-4%

118

IMPLEMENTOR	ACDI	CNFA	LOL	TVG	VOCA	Winrock
RUSSIA						
1994						
Total Number of Volunteers	83	32	42	44	214	24
Number of Repeat Volunteers	6	2	1	2	35	1
% of Total Volunteers	7%	6%	2%	5%	16%	4%
Average Length of Volunteer TA (days) [14]	30	57	16	24	19	15
Total Number of Host Organizations	24	10	19	27	121	16
Number of Host Organizations Receiving Repeat TA	5	7	15	5	23	1
% of Repeat TA to Host Organizations	21%	70%	79%	19%	19%	16%
1996						
Total Number of Volunteers	214	181	145	na	379	105
Number of Repeat Volunteers	17	29	32		107	23
% of Total Volunteers	8%	16%	22%		28%	22%
Average Length of Volunteer TA (days)	28	24	18		23	21
Total Number of Host Organizations	10	22	38		70	48
Number of Host Organizations Receiving Repeat TA	9	10	17		14	9
% of Repeat TA to Host Organizations	90%	45%	45%		20%	19%
Change Between 1994 & 1996						
% of Repeat Volunteers	+1%	+10%	+20%	na	+12%	+18%
Average Length of Volunteer TA	-2 days	-33 days	+2 days		+4 days	+6 days
% of Repeat TA to Host Organizations	+69%	-25%	-44%		+1%	+3%

[14] The range of Citizen placements was 9-246 days.

119

IMPLEMENTOR	ACDI	CNFA	LOL	TVG	VOCA	Winrock
West NIS: UKRAINE						
1994						
Total Number of Volunteers	na	16	5	na	61	11
Number of Repeat Volunteers		2	1		7	1
% of Total Volunteers		13%	20%		11%	9%
Average Length of Volunteer TA (days)		18	18		22	23
Total Number of Host Organizations		10	8		36	11
Number of Host Organizations Receiving Repeat TA		3	0		20	0
% of Repeat TA to Host Organizations		100%	0%		56%	0%
1996						
Total Number of Volunteers	2	120	32		137	38
Number of Repeat Volunteers	2	38	6		49	2
% of Total Volunteers	100%	32%	19%		36%	5%
Average Length of Volunteer TA (days)	28	30	18		16	20
Total Number of Host Organizations	2	10	52		96	10
Number of Host Organizations Receiving Repeat TA	1	10	5		32	4
% of Repeat TA to Host Organizations	50%	100%	10.%		33%	40%
Change Between 1994 & 1996						
% of Repeat Volunteers	na	+19%	-1%	na	+25%	-4%
Average Length of Volunteer TA		+12 days	0		-6 days	-3 days
% of Repeat TA to Host Organizations		0	+10%		-23%	+40%

ANNEX B

List of Case Studies and Host Organizations

Summary Findings of Case Studies 1

Armenia:

Case 1. Southern Armenia Irrigation Projects (VOCA) 3
Case 2. Areni Winery (VOCA) 5
Case 3. Veterinary Association of Yeghegnadzor (VOCA) 7
Case 4. Solar Dried Fruit Association (VOCA) 9

Georgia:

Case 5. Mtskheta Plant Breeding Institute (ACDI) 11
Case 6. Farmers Union of Kutaisi (ACDI) 13
Case 7. Alazani Growers Association (ACDI) 17

Kazakhstan:

Case 8. Kazkredsotsbank (ACDI) 19
Case 9. Turanbank (ACDI) 20
Case 10. Kazakh Agricultural College (VOCA) 21
Case 11. Kaskelen Farmers Credit Union (VOCA) 23
Case 12. Taldykorgan AGRO II Association (VOCA) 24
Case 13. Mr. Serik Aripov (VOCA) 26
Case 14. Talgar Agricultural College (WI) 28
Case 15. Salena Ltd. (WI) 30
Case 16. Ulan Meat Processing Company (WI) 32
Case 17. Jagodka (WI) 34
Case 18. Jambool Business Center (WI) 36

Kyrgyzstan:

Case 19. Maksat Bank (ACDI) 37
Case 20. Mercury Bank (ACDI) 38
Case 21. Kormash (Agromash) (WI) 39
Case 22. Alfa and Kabar-Ata (WI) 41
Case 23. Goumira Akamatous (WI) 43
Case 24. Bulgari Company (WI) 44
Case 25. Timmer-Bek (WI) 46
Case 26. Mr. Bulovek (WI) 48
Case 27. Women's Cooperative (WI) 50
Case 28. Desert Company (WI) 52
Case 29. J. S. Company (WI) 53

Moldova:

Case 30. Moldovan Agroindbank, S.A. (ACDI) 55
Case 31. Selectia (VOCA) 57
Case 32. The Nimoreni Association of Farmers (VOCA) 59
Case 33. Terra Farm Association (VOCA) 61
Case 34. Institute of Management and Training in Agriculture-IMATA (VOCA) 63

Russia:

Case 35. FASTA Farm (ACDI) 66
Case 36. Northern Caucasus Grain Marketing Association (ACDI) 68
Case 37. Association of Soybean Processors (ASSOY) 70
Case 38. Russian Farm Community Project- RFCP (ACDI, LOL, VOCA, CNFA) 72
Case 39. Graduate School of International Business (ACDI) 75
Case 40. International Finance and Banking School (ACDI) 77
Case 41. Central Bank Training Institute - Moscow (ACDI) 78
Case 42. Interagro Fund (ACDI) 79
Case 43. Central Bank Training School - St. Petersburg (ACDI) 80
Case 44. Krasnodar Bank (ACDI) 82
Case 45. Padderzhka Insurance Company (CNFA) 84
Case 46. Russian Mushroom Growers Association (CNFA) 86
Case 47. Borets Collective Farm (CNFA) 88
Case 48. Belorechensk Farmers Association (CNFA, LOL, VOCA) 90
Case 49. Women's Committee - AKKOR (CNFA) 92
Case 50. AKKOR - Rostov (CNFA) 95
Case 51. ConAgra Farm (CNFA) 97
Case 52. Mr. Yury Pavlov (LOL) 99
Case 53. Mrs. Natasha Karpushova (LOL) 101
Case 54. Mr. Evgenij Pavlovsky (LOL) 103
Case 55. Izrapil Sochoyev (LOL) 105
Case 56. Polessk Vocational School LOL) 106
Case 57. Ferit Kazanov (VOCA) 108
Case 58. KaLeZhe (VOCA) 110
Case 59. AGROS, Puschino Mushroom Production (VOCA) 112
Case 60. Intensivny Korm (VOCA) 114
Case 61. Bavis Agricultural Cooperative (VOCA) 116
Case 62. Graz Company (VOCA) 118
Case 63. RAMICC - Penza Regional Public Foundation (VOCA) 119
Case 64. Alexander Bodorov (WI) 120
Case 65. EkoNiva AG (WI) 123
Case 66. Radio Nadezhda (WI) 125
Case 67. USDA Russian American Farm Privatization Project (WI) 127

Ukraine:

Case 68. Community Canning Project (CNFA) 129
Case 69. Trembita Company (LOL) 131
Case 70. Western Foods (VOCA and CNFA) 133
Case 71. Bogdanov Farm (VOCA) 135
Case 72. Institute of Agrarian Economy (WI) 138

Summary Findings of Case Studies

Seventy-two case studies were prepared on host organizations in seven NIS countries. In an effort to condense the case studies into summary findings, each project was assessed on the following indicators:

- improvement in quality of life
- demonstrated economic impact
- transfer of technical knowledge
- building institutional capacity
- leveraging of additional resources
- participation in RFtF or other exchange programs
- increasing sustainability
- establishment of US/NIS partnerships
- establish good will
- success in reaching Level 1 impacts
- success in reaching Level 2 impacts
- success in reaching Level 3 impacts

These indicators provide a comprehensive examination of the effect of a FtF volunteer on a host organization.

The summary findings with the number of host organizations meeting each stated criteria are compiled in the following table. An overall ranking of low, medium and high achievement is assigned to each indicator. A low assessment is assigned if the number of cases is less than 25; medium, if the number is between 25 to 50; and high, if above 50.

Summary Findings of Case Studies of Seventy-two Projects

Indicator	Number of Projects Meeting Indicators	Percent	Ranking of Projects
improvement in quality of life	18	25	Low
demonstrated economic impact	27	38	Medium
transfer of technical knowledge	64	89	High
building institutional capacity	44	61	Medium
leveraging of additional resources	20	28	Low
participation in RFtF or other exchange programs	35	49	Medium
increasing sustainability	38	53	Medium
establishment of US/NIS partnerships	12	17	Low
establish good will	71	98	High
success in reaching Level 1 impacts	65	90	High
success in reaching Level 2 impacts	34	47	Medium
success in reaching Level 3 impacts	4	6	Low

In the high achievement category, implementors were successful in transferring technical knowledge and in reaching Level 1 impacts, these two indicators are highly correlated to each other. These high scores are certainly a credit to the ability of the implementors to match qualified volunteers to willing and able host organizations capable of assimilating this knowledge. The FtF volunteers have been very successful in establishing good will towards the United States.

In the medium range of achievement, projects achieved demonstrated economic benefits, increased likelihood of sustainability, enhanced institutional capacity and a level of diffusion at Level 2. Fifty percent of the projects had participants who had engaged in a RFtF-type program.

Finally, in the low range of achievement, implementors had less success in improving the quality of life, leveraging additional resources, establishing US/NIS collaborative agreements and reaching Level 3 impacts.

In many of the host organizations, it was difficult to determine if the quality of life of participants had been measurably improved. In some cases, economic impact did not necessarily translate into broad improvements in the quality of life of participants. A clear example of where a FtF volunteer's efforts improved the broad base of quality of life is Case Study No. 1.

126

ARMENIA

Case Study No. 1

Date of Evaluation:	June 24-25, 1996
Implementor:	VOCA
Host Organization:	Southern Armenia Irrigation Projects
Location:	Khachik and Vardahouvit, Armenia
Name of Interviewee:	Kit Carpenter, FtF volunteer

Host Organization: The host organizations were the people of two villages, Khachik and Vardahouvit, where the irrigation projects were developed. Both villages are located in the mountains of southern Armenia near the Azerbaijan border. The population of Vardahouvit is made up of refugees. Khachik was the site of considerable fighting during the 1988 war between Armenia and Azerbijan and remains strategically important.

Assistance Provided: Assistance to these two villages has been provided via the input of 3 FtF volunteers, funding support from UNHCR and the cooperation and hard work of the villages leadership and general population particularly the young men. In 1993, the first VOCA FtF volunteer, Harold Love, University of Kentucky, prepared a general assessment and agricultural development plan for the villages. Based on this assessment, two VOCA volunteers came to the area in 1994. One volunteer, Kit Carpenter, did the technical design work for an irrigation system for the two villages. He returned on two additional assignments to provide hands on assistance in the construction of the irrigation systems. The other volunteer, George Lewis, provided technical assistance for the development of a flour mill. UNHCR provided grant funding for the purchase of equipment for both projects. The projects replaced irrigation systems installed during the Soviet era which required water to be pumped uphill over large distances and were very energy inefficient. The system devised by the VOCA volunteer for both villages is gravity fed using mountain spring water and thus provides the villages a reliable source of cheap irrigation water. The systems have had a major impact on increased crop production. Wheat yields have gone from an estimated 1.5 T/HA to 4 T/HA. Very significant yield increases were also obtained for vegetables (i.e., potatoes, tomatoes, onions), alfalfa and grapes. USAID provided U.S. wheat varieties which yielded above traditional varieties and had better disease resistance. These varieties have been distributed among farmers in the area.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: The village of Khachik and Vardahouvit are in the remote and arid mountains of southern Armenia. Water is the principal limiting factor in agricultural production and economic stability. These two small projects have made a major contribution to the quality of village life. The assistance of the FtF volunteers was essential in the development of these two irrigation

127

projects. In fact, the villagers were so grateful for the assistance provided that they named both irrigation systems after the FtF volunteer.

Reverse FtF Program: There was no participation in the RFtF program, however the Mayor of Khachik, a woman, had been to the U.S. in 1994 under the NET Program. The training focused on business management and women's rights issues. The Major indicated that she found the trip very useful and had utilized new administrative skills acquired during the training.

Concluding Observation: The approach used in the development of these projects can serve as a model for future projects. The initial volunteer did a careful overview analysis which provided a clear indication of the need for future volunteers. The follow-on volunteers had a clearly defined task which was supported by the villages as well as the international donor community. Thus, with the use of comparatively few funds, the projects managed to leverage funding and labor support.

128

Case Study No. 2

Date of Evaluation:	June 25, 1996
Implementor:	VOCA; Yerevan, Armenia
Host Organization:	Areni Winery
Location:	Areni Village Vayots Dzor Region Republic of Armenia
Name of Interviewees:	Raffael and Mikael

Host Organization: The Areni Winery, tel. (7-885-46)221-33, Raffael and Mikael, Owner/Managers. This group was formed by twelve members in 1993 (with registration in 1994) to develop commercial wine production using the Areni variety of grape which has been used for wine making in the region for over 1,000 years. The winery began with the making of the traditional red wine (stems pressed with the grapes). They have added a "Classic" red wine which is pressed without stems, have added a blush wine, and are experimenting with a white wine. They plan to add production of red and white wine vinegars. Their wines are sold in Armenia.

Assistance Provided: The winery approached VOCA in 1993 to seek assistance to improve the quality and marketing of their wine. In 1993, Charles Bauman, a VP for Dole Foods visited the winery and assisted them in preparing a five-year Business Plan. A second volunteer, Willis Brown, made two visits and provided assistance in the production and marketing of wines. He helped them in many ways including: a) providing a hand-operated corking machine; b) developing new, attractive labels meeting international standards for labeling; c) buying a new crusher with a grant from VOCA; d) assisting the winery in developing a marketing plan; e) arranging wine tasting gatherings at foreign embassies in Yerevan; and f) helping the winery in negotiations with six retail stores and one restaurant to sell Areni wines.

Impact of the FtF Volunteers: Development of a business plan which the winery is following and which led them to receive a $5,000 loan from the Fund for Armenian Relief (FAR). The loan has been primarily used to remodel the winery and complete the construction of a wine cellar. Additional uses include improving the corking of bottles, improving shelf-life and quality, lower corking costs, developing new products and improving market acceptance and sales. Results include reduced time and costs related to crushing of grapes, and increase in sales and profits of 150% and the development of wines and labels designed for an international market.

Reverse FtF Participation: None.

Conclusions: The assignment of these volunteers has been very instrumental in Areni Winery's ability to improve and expand its production, sales and profitability. Willis Brown's first visit provided him with a clear understanding of what additional assistance would be beneficial to the winery, and thus, he was able to provide invaluable assistance during his second visit. The winery will be able to continue its program of increased production and sales of quality wines due to the assistance received during three volunteer visits.

Case Study No. 3

Date of Evaluation:	June 25, 1996
Implementor:	VOCA; Yerevan
Host Organization:	Veterinary Association of Yeghegnadzor Region
Location:	Getap Village Yeghegnadzor Region, Armenia

Host Organization: The Veterinary Association of Yeghegnadzor Region was formed in 1993 by ten veterinarians and was registered with the GOA as a private association in 1994. The Association serves eight villages with 1,600 farmers and 15,000 head of cattle, sheep and goats. The vets provide diagnostic services, treat animals, and provide follow-up visits. The main disorders they treat include internal and external parasites, digestive problems, and worms. There is little mastitis, limited brucellosis, and no tuberculosis. Last year, there were a few cases of anthrax in a neighboring region. The GOA is responsible for treating epidemic diseases like anthrax.

The vets provide training to first-time livestock producers. They also hold workshops in the villages they serve. Last year they received 50 straws of Brown Swiss semen from which they experienced an 80% conception rate. They advised that the improvement of offspring born to cows administered the semen was obvious

Assistance Provided: VOCA staff in Armenia saw the need for a private veterinary service, as the GOA did not have the resources to provide the required services. Volunteers Ted Poelma and Richard Schmidt visited Armenia in 1994 and met with farmers, unemployed veterinarians and officials from various Armenian ministries. There was a conflict in the law which stated that the Government could not provide services to private farmers. The end result was approval by the GOA for the establishment of private veterinary associations. The two volunteers provided advice on the establishment of their association.

In 1966, Richard Schmidt returned to the association with Albert Lawrence. They reviewed the progress of the association and introduced the members to new drugs and new treatment methods, including topical application of one drug that the local vets were administering by injection.

The association discussed with Richard Schmidt the possibility of his returning to help them develop a long-range business plan and teach them to improve their operations and their technical proficiency.

Impact of the FtF Volunteers: Authorization by the GOA for the formation of private veterinary associations was obtained and the creation of a successful, private, for-profit veterinary association was established. Vet services are now being provided to farmers in eight villages and this number should expand as the association's resources permit. Based on the volunteers' assistance, VOCA was

able to help the association obtain a $4,000 grant from the United Nations High Commission for Refugees to assist in establishing their business and to contribute to the updating of professional skills of association members.

Reverse FtF Program: None. However, the French government paid for three association members to visit France to observe their system of providing veterinary services.

Concluding Observations: The visit of the first two volunteers was instrumental in obtaining the GOA's approval for the establishment of private veterinary services. The association is currently self-sustaining and approximately. 1,600 farmers now have available to them local veterinary services.

132

Case Study No. 4

Date of Evaluation:	June 26, 1996
Implementor:	VOCA; Yerevan
Host Organization:	Solar-dried Fruits Association
Location:	Getap Village Yeghegnadzor Region Armenia
Name of Interviewee:	Mr. Hazarapet Nazaryan, Manager

Host Organization: The Solar-dried Fruits Association, tel. (8-246) 2-54-69, currently operates three solar dryers, with a combined capacity of 2.7 MT per batch. Each batch takes approximately 2-3 days to dry, depending on weather conditions. They currently process apricots, peaches, pears, plums, and tomatoes. After drying, the fruits are placed in a smoke house where they are treated with sulphur using a smudgepot. This process reduces the potential for any fungus and helps maintain the color of the fruit. The dried fruits are sold locally and exported to Siberia where they bring a good price.

The limitation on increased processing is mainly a lack of capital to purchase additional fruit from area farmers who expect payment at the time they deliver the fruit to the association's three locations. A secondary limitation is that during the beginning of the season for fruits, e.g., apricots (June), the sale price is too high, at the same time the driers are idle awaiting the new harvests. Mr. Nazaryan indicated that a loan of U.S. $2,000 to $3,000 would greatly increase their ability to purchase and process additional volumes of fruit. This comment was passed on to VOCA's Armenian Farmer to Farmer Program Manager, Paul Sommers who stated he would discuss this with The Eurasian Foundation in Yerevan. The Eurasian Foundation works with local banks to provide loans to agricultural and manufacturing operations (See write-up on the foundation).

Assistance Provided: In 1993, VOCA was in the process of identifying potential projects in which it could be of assistance. During a visit to the Mega Region in the south of Armenia, villagers complained that they had fruits they could no longer sell to the defunct state canneries. They had experience with solar drying of fruits, on a household basis, but the quality was poor. VOCA suggested the installation of large solar dryers due to their large capacity, the ability to dry fruits in 2-3 days, and the ability to store these fruits until a market was found and/or the market price was attractive. The Fund for Armenian Relief (FAR) became interested in the project and assisted with the formation of the association.

VOCA had previously been approached by an Armenian engineer, Mr. Kalachian, about working together to develop solar drying in Armenia. Mr. Kalachian designed the solar dryers (length = 24

m and width = 5 m). The approx. cost was $5,000 for the Getap Village dryer (1 MT capacity/batch), with an additional $2,000 for the processing shed and the sulphur house. These funds were provided via a loan from FAR.

VOCA was requested to provide assistance in the production, processing and marketing of dried fruits. Mr. Kalachian, as noted above, provided the design and two VOCA volunteers, Mr. Hany Khalil and Mr. John Brekke provided recommendations on processing and marketing.

Impact of the FtF Volunteers: Before VOCA's involvement, only one of the three groups of the association was drying fruit. One had no dryer, the second has an incomplete dryer, and the third was not operating its dryer. Currently all three groups are drying fruit. The capacities of the three dryers are 500, 1,000 and 1,200 kg/batch respectively.

Last year, the three groups produced the following quantities of dried fruits: apricots = 2.5 MT; peaches = 90 kg; pears = 463 kg; plums = 75 kg; and tomatoes = 20 kg., and the combined sales were U.S. $5,142. Mr. Nazaryan estimates that the association could easily double their production and sales this year if they can obtain a loan to purchase additional fruit.

Reverse FtF Program: None.

Conclusions: VOCA's practice of working with other donor partners has resulted in a very viable, sustainable fruit-drying industry in the Mega Region. This operation is one that could be replicated in other areas of the country, as well as in other countries that produce quality fruits and have the solar capacity for fruit drying.

GEORGIA

Case Study No. 5

Date of Evaluation: June 17, 1996

Implementor: ACDI

Host Organization: Mtskheta Plant Breeding Institute

Location: Tbilisi, Georgia

Name of Interviewee: Anton Iakobashvili, Vice Director

Host Organization: The Mtskheta Plant Breeding Institute is located about 20 km. west of Tbilisi, Georgia. We visited with the Institute's Vice Director, Anton Iakobashvili. The Institute has not received government funding for the past two years and has survived on income earned from farming, selling hybrid seed corn and minimal funding (mostly in the form of inputs such as fertilizer) received from ACDI, which has provided significant technical assistance under the FtF program. The Director and staff have not received a salary in over two years.

Assistance Provided: With the assistance of ACDI and the FtF program, the Plant Breeding Institute has initiated an impressive wheat and barley improvement effort; 70% of the wheats being tested are local varieties and the remaining 30% are U.S. varieties and lines. Wheats being evaluated include hard red springs, hard red winters and soft white wheat. There are 700 lines of wheat and 700 lines of barley from the world collection. In addition, 13 U.S. varieties of wheat are in replicated yield trials. The best U.S. wheats in these trials will yield 6-7 MT/HA, as compared to the dominate local variety, Bezostaia, which yields 4-5 MT/HA under maximum yield conditions.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: As mentioned above, the wheat improvement effort would not have been possible without the assistance of ACDI. In addition, FtF volunteers have provided technical expertise related to proper wheat cultivation, pesticide and fertilizer use and scientific methodologies for wheat evaluation. A volunteer currently in country brought with him early generation lines as well as new high yielding varieties. These lines are particularly well adapted to Georgian conditions and have good disease resistance. If widely grown, these U.S. wheats could double wheat production in Georgia.

Reverse FtF Program: Host institute personnel have not participated in the RFtF program, however, one of the ACDI senior FSN staff will be provided funds from the U.S. Wheat Growers Association to attend Oregon State University for a Ph.D. program in wheat research.

Concluding Observations: In recent years, USAID has not focused on agriculture research and crop improvement as a development tool in individual countries. However, this small program

135

provides an important reminder of the tremendous sustainable benefits that can be derived from such efforts. In fact, this program can produce a kind of mini-green revolution in the wheat sector and put Georgia on the road to wheat self-sufficiency in the near future.

Case Study No. 6

Date of Evaluation:	June 18, 1996
Implementor:	ACDI, and formerly TVG
Host Organization:	Farmers Union of Kutaisi
Location:	10, Agmashenebeli Avenue Kutaisi, Georgia
Name of Interviewee:	Ms. Maia Babunashvili, President

Host Organization: The Farmers Union of Kutaisi, Tel. = 31628, was established on 26 August 1994 by 7 farmers who saw the need for a common organization to assist their farm community. They realized that the Ministry of Agriculture would not be providing any meaningful assistance, and that they would be responsible for obtaining their own assistance. Structurally, they are part of the National Private Farmers Union. However, they look to the national union mainly for lobbying the legislature to enact laws that protect the interests of the farming community. Maia estimates that nationally there are about 18,000 private farmer members of the regional unions. In the beginning it was difficult to get farmers to join the unions due to the mentality left over from the Soviet system and the farmers' lack of trust in organizations. Now, farmers are coming long distances to buy farm inputs from the various private farmer unions (PFUs) including the 21 in Maia's Western Georgia region. They are encouraged by the PFUs reputation in providing technical assistance and inputs of high quality.

Maia and the other unions in the Western Region sell to their members a range of farm input supplies including seeds, fertilizer and herbicides from the U.S., England, Germany and Russia. Ammonium Nitrate is available from a local plant. Last year, Maia sold some incubators, mini-tractors, and some bio-gas equipment which their members have installed in their homes. However, she has not yet begun to sell farming tools. She will likely do so after her union has more working capital. The union prefers to link buyers and sellers of agricultural commodities and receive a commission, rather than assemble corn, for example, and arrange the sale directly.

In 1994, 170 union members (Kutaisi) planted American hybrid maize. This year 300 members bought 9 MT of maize seed which will plant approx. 3,000. ha.

Maia stated that the biggest constraints to improved agricultural development and productivity in Georgia are first, the lack of credit for production inputs and farm equipment, and second, the laws related to land ownership and the country's legal structure which prevents the pledge of a farmer's land (or land rights) as collateral.

The Farmers Union of Kutaisi is now an association of 2,700 private farmers composed of 70% small, subsistence farmers (up to 2 ha. of land) and 30% large commercial growers (up to 100 ha.). Forty percent of the members are 30 years old or younger. About 20% of members are women.

Maia's daily activities at her union include, but are not limited to: a) obtaining and selling inputs to her members; b) providing technical information; c) creating a data base on her farmer members, their production practices and their capabilities (provision of a computer would be extremely valuable in this effort); d) develop strategic planning for her farmers; and e) encouraging farmers and researchers to publicize their activities.

Maia charges each member $5.00 per year as dues. For this they receive free technical advice, access to improved hybrid seeds and other inputs. She gets 10% of farmgate prices as a commission for linking farmers selling commodities to commercial buyers.

In the future, Maia hopes for assistance in the following areas: a) a Reverse Farmer to Farmer Program for Georgia; b) literature, videos, etc. on farming practices and farmer organizations; and c) a computer to keep track of her farmer surveys and data.

Assistance Provided: In 1995, Paul Heinzen, TVG's FtF Program Manager in Tbilisi, and local TVG staff presented a seminar to the union's members on maize growing. The local practices of maize growing were different from those taught at the seminar. Guidance was given on weed control including use of herbicides before planting, land preparation practices and how to obtain better yields through seeding rates, spacing between rows and between plants, fertilization practices, etc. This seminar was followed-up by a second seminar given by Paul Heinzen in February 1996 on maize production and harvesting.

TVG, and currently ACDI, have provided hybrid maize seed to Maia's and other farmers unions in 1995 (one variety) and in 1996 (three varieties). The seed was donated in 1995 by Asgrow, and in 1996 by Asgrow, Delta Pine and Microgen. This was arranged by the Brothers Brother Foundation in Philadelphia. ACDI has also provided ammonium nitrate fertilizer to Maia and other distributor/farmer unions on a ten-day payback plan. The monies received by Maia from the sale of hybrid maize seed, which was provided to her free of charge this year, are to be used as capital to sustain her union.

James Baarda provided a seminar on how farmer cooperatives in the U.S. are organized, managed and how they provide services to their members. Bill Maltby, a frequent volunteer under the FtF Program, presented a workshop on credit. From this seminar, according to Maia, it became clear that her farmer members do not trust banks and therefore there is a need to develop local credit institutions. Maia stated, that while farmer resources are limited, when combined they can be used to attract additional funds.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: Farmers have learned improved methods of crop husbandry. They now have visual proof and have accepted that American technologies, together with improved hybrid

seed, result in much greater yields and profitability. For instance, Georgian farmers were planting corn in rows 70 cm apart, and are now planting in rows 30 to 45 cm apart. They are using seed with a 90 + percent germination vs local varieties which have an average germination of 70% and they are using hybrid varieties which mature in 120 days vs 140 days; this allows them to plant a second crop of maize for a fodder crop.

Yields obtained with local maize varieties average 3 Mt ton/ha. Yields with American hybrids are now running between 6 to 7 MT/ha, and Maia estimated that maximum yields will reach close to 10 MT/ha. Maia is accomplished as an accountant and she has uses her skills to track the net profitability of her members maize production. She estimates that average net profitability per ha using local maize varieties to be $100 vs $500 for American hybrids. She mentioned the factors which account for such a large increase in profitability. These include: a) the higher germination rate of American seeds; b) the reduced spacing which about doubles plant population; c) the reduced costs of weeding (one vs 2 to 3 for local varieties); d) the reduced cost of fertilization due to the shorter maturity period; and e) the higher price received for maize grown with American hybrids.

James Baarda recommended that Maia further extend and develop her program of supplying farm inputs. She plans to do this with the capitalization fund developed from sale of maize seed this year. Mr. Baarda also provided recommendations related to the union's organization and management. Maia plans to incorporate a number of his recommendations in her revised Articles of Incorporation as part of re-registering her union this August, as required by the GOG.

Bill Maltby provided information, guidance and recommendations regarding the establishment of a credit cooperative or credit window within her farmers union. Maia plans to develop a credit union after her return from her training in the U.S. She said probably additional volunteers are needed to assist in this project.

Reverse FtF Program: No participation. However, Maia and one other regional PFU (Private Farmers Union) manager have been selected to travel to the U.S. this summer or fall under the Cochran Program. Maia stated that it was very important for her and others to view and understand U.S. farmer associations' organizational and management systems to permit Georgian managers to adopt and adapt what they learn to their own systems.

Concluding Observations: TVG and ACDI, as the successor FtF Program manager in Georgia, both understood that the impact of a FtF program is most often limited by the lack of numerous items we take for granted in the United States. For instance, there is little or no availability of farm inputs including improved seeds, fertilizer, herbicides, and animal health products including mirco-nutrients, vaccines, etc. And even when these products are available, there is usually no credit for the farmer to buy the products, nor a distribution system to get the products to the farm communities. Furthermore, there is no extension service to advise farmers on effective utilization of new inputs like hybrid maize seed. Through the provision of literature, training courses and both local and international consultants with the help of ACDI, the national Private Farmers Union, working through its local affiliates, has become the only active extension service in Georgia.

TVG and ACDI have marshaled inputs and services to overcome these constraints so that their combination with FtF volunteers has produced significant results. The Implementors have obtained high-quality hybrid seed, and have implemented a program to provide ammonium nitrate to farmer union distributors on credit. This year, ACDI provided 3,200 MT of ammonium nitrate on credit and believe that they could have had requests for another 800 to 1,000 MT if the delivery had not been delayed by a shut-down of the fertilizer plant for repairs during the middle of their production cycle.

ACDI will also request a $100,000 grant from the soybean monetization program to use to jump-start the agricultural input business they are helping to develop covering wholesale and retail distributors throughout Georgia.

This coordinated and integrated approach to improved agricultural production in Georgia not only provides a successful model for development, but also provides a means to maximize the value of Farmer to Farmer volunteers. It also provides an approach that USAID Missions might well consider as they plan their future support to economic development and private enterprise development in the NIS Region.

Case Study No. 7

Date of Evaluation: June 19, 1996

Implementor: ACDI

Host Organization: Alazani Growers Association

Location: Eastern Georgia

Name of Interviewee: Jemal Khatiashvili

Host Organization: The Alazani Growers Association (AGA) is located in Eastern Georgia, near the town of Tibaani and about a three hour drive east of Tbilisi. We met with the President of the AGA and of the recently formed Wheat Seed Cooperative, Mr Jemal Khatiashvili. This region of Georgia is the major wheat producing area and has a climate similar to Northern California. The AGA provides consultants, technical information and legal advise to member farmers.

Assistance Provided: The AGA has received assistance from approximately 10 FtF volunteers beginning in August 1994. Volunteers have made multiple visits, often as husband and wife teams. The average length of assignment is 2-3 weeks and in most cases food has been provided as well as lodging with farm families.

The volunteers helped organize and register the association, develop by-laws and initiate operations. According to Mr. Khatiashvili, this was the first organization of its type created in Georgia as a direct result of U.S. assistance. The organization currently has 164 members (approximately 10% of the farmers in the area) with new members joining regularly. The current membership farms some 2500 HA. As a result of assistance from one repeat volunteer, a wheat growers cooperative has been formed and now has 18 members. The FtF volunteer has also provided helpful technical assistance concerning soil testing, variety improvement, seeding rates and no tillage practices. Volunteers have also provided practical, field level advise on fertilizer and herbicide application methods and rates as well as proper use and maintenance of equipment.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: The assistance provided by FtF volunteers to AGA has produced significant impacts. For example, when farmers had difficulty with land ownership issues, one FtF volunteer advised them to represent themselves to the authorities as an association. This was done and the issue was favorably resolved. This same volunteer also helped farmers redraft the law concerning cooperatives and develop by-laws for the Wheat Seed Cooperative. A critical constraint to increased wheat production is lack of quality seed. The Wheat Seed Cooperative will help address this constraint. Farmer interest in the Cooperative is high and there is a large demand for the seed.

Reverse FtF Program: No participation. However, the son of the AGA President and a farmer as well as active association member, has been selected to participate in the Cochran program.

141

Concluding Observation: The assistance of the FtF program to AGA has focused on two of the most important issues confronting the Georgian agricultural sector, the organization of farmers associations to represent farmer interests and the provision of quality, high yielding, well adapted seed. Both are fundamentally important to the long range sustainable growth of the sector. The FtF effort has aptly demonstrated that it can make an effective contribution in these areas.

KAZAKHSTAN

Case Study No. 8

Date of Evaluation: June 18, 1996

Implementor: ACDI

Host Organization: Kazkredsotsbank

Location: Almaty, Kazakhstan

Name of Interviewee: Farit Khadiev, Director of Dept. of Credit Risks Management

Host Organization: Kazkredsotsbank is one of the ten largest banks in Kazakhstan. It has traditionally been involved in industrial lending and does no agricultural lending in any of its' 28 branches. A long-term consultant from the British Know-How Fund is working with the bank.

Assistance Provided: FtF volunteers have performed three assignments in the bank. In the first, volunteers assisted the bank's credit department to bring their loan portfolio assessment and monitoring up to international banking standards. The volunteers taught general concepts of credit policy and the development of credit instruments. The second and third sets of volunteers worked with the bank staff on converting their accounting procedures to international standards, a process which has been mandated for all banks by the National Bank of Kazakhstan (Central Bank).

Impact of FtF Volunteer: The credit policy activity has resulted in the bank's adoption of new methods of evaluating and monitoring loans, and the creation of a problem loan department which has increased repayment rates. The accounting activities have been primarily educational to date. Volunteer activities have resulted in improved credit procedures and greater awareness of international accounting principles by the bank's staff. In addition, the Bank is training its branch staffs in the new credit and accounting procedures, thus there is a spread effect from training in the head office. Given the size of the bank and the new National Bank requirements, the institution and the new procedures appear to be sustainable over the long term.

Reverse FtF Program: None

Concluding Observation: The volunteer activity in a bank which admittedly has no involvement with agriculture, and no interest in this area, raises the question of the appropriateness of providing it with volunteer assistance through FtF. Furthermore, the bank has a resident consultant from the Know-How Fund which makes the need for volunteer assistance seem less critical. It appears that because bank strengthening, and particularly account conversion, is a high priority of the USAID/Almaty mission, the ACDI volunteers have been channeled almost exclusively into this activity, which is only tangentially related to the goals of the FtF program.

Case Study No. 9

Date of Evaluation:	June 18, 1996
Implementor:	ACDI
Host Organization:	Turanbank
Location:	Almaty, Kazakhstan
Name of Interviewees:	Serik Amirbaev, Deputy Chairman, Marat Tulenov, Director of Staff and Human Resources

Host Organization: One of the ten largest banks in Kazakhstan with assets of approximately $266 million, Turanbank has 3,500 employees and branches in every oblast of Kazakhstan. In addition to volunteer assistance, two staff members have traveled to the US on Reverse FtF training.

Assistance Provided: The first pair of volunteers worked with bank staff and other consultants to develop a strategic plan for the bank which resulted in recommendations being implemented, such as the creation of a loan workout department. Volunteer Albert Barr provided training related to the use of letters of credit and his recommendations led the bank to a more economical working relationship with Republican National Bank. In the area of Human Resources, volunteers helped organize a salary structure based on results, created employee classifications, instituted performance evaluations and created an employment manual. Volunteers also helped implement a loan classification system, which was also partially based on insights from reverse training.

Impact of FtF Volunteer(s): There has been no agricultural impact from the FtF activities; Economic impact from better management may be forthcoming over the long term. However, the volunteer activities have had impact in strengthening the bank's operating procedures related to international transactions, liability management and human resources management. Furthermore, there is high potential for spread effects through the bank's branches.

Reverse FtF Program: U.S. training was highly praised by the interviewees and helped lead concretely to a new loan classification system.

Concluding Observation: Volunteer assistance to Turanbank again raises the question of the focus of work of FtF in the financial sector. As the bank has little involvement or interest in the agriculture sector, volunteers with financial expertise assigned to the bank are isolated from rest of the FtF program. While innovative approaches to rural lending are needed and the management challenges for agricultural lending are acute, the prioritization of large commercial banks for FtF assignments amounts to a choice to emphasize long- term, non-agricultural impact over short- term, agricultural sector impact.

Case Study No. 10

Date of Evaluation:	June 18, 1996
Implementor:	VOCA, Almaty, Kazakhstan
Host Organization:	Kazakh Agricultural College
Location:	Almaty, Kazakhstan
Name of Interviewee:	Dr. Kairat Mustafin

Host Organization: Dr. Kairat Mustafin is both Director of the Darkhan biotechnology company and Head of the Physiology and Biotechnology of Agricultural Plants Department at Kazakh Agricultural College. Dr. Mustafin specializes in propagating virus free potato seeds.

Assistance Provided: Assistance was provided to improve the quality of Dr. Mustafin's potato seeds. VOCA arranged for Dr. Peter Joyce, a leading expert in potato propagation research with patented biotechnological procedures for culture of potato seed, to visit in 1994. He shared his patent with Dr. Mustafin and introduced new methods for improving the growth of cell tissue in a liquid medium.

Impact of FtF Volunteer: The sharing of his patent by Dr. Joyce was instrumental for Dr. Mustafin's research; survival rates during production doubled, and productivity was increased 400 percent. Dr. Mustafin is perceived by the university and government as conducting quality research, and as such, strengthens the institution's capability to attract support from both domestic and international sources of funds. If Dr. Mustafin can successfully locate a joint venture partner or receive government support for establishing a commercial pilot project he will have enormous impact on the agricultural sector.

Reverse FtF Program: No participation

Concluding Observations: The impressive result of the FtF program is the close working relationship and communications that have endured from just one visit by Dr. Joyce. The partnership continues to look for ways to take the research to commercial production, and both parties have sought relationships to foster the program such as researchers from Israel. VOCA continues to have an interest in this project by looking for joint venture partners who can support the research project.

For the project to reap potential rewards and be sustainable, investment capital is needed. The technology is now tested but not on a commercial level. Lack of resources prevents the project from moving to the next stage. VOCA could benefit from having access to a resource network to which Dr. Mustafin could be transferred.

This volunteer assignment clearly illustrates that one visit can create a channel of communication that sustains itself because of the interest of the two parties. At some point a follow-up visit may be necessary after commercial production has started.

Case Study No. 11

Date of Evaluation: June 18, 1996

Implementor: VOCA

Host Organization: Kaskelen Farmers' Credit Fund

Location: Kaskelen, Kazakhstan

Name of Interviewee: Alexander Yuriev

Host Organization: The VOCA volunteers worked with Peace Corps volunteers to design a model for the establishment of revolving credit funds in Kazakhstan. Three programs have resulted from the assignment. The first is a $1 million crop loan program administered by the Peace Corps and by Mercy Corps. The second is a $450,000 TACIS (EU) and Mercy Corps peer group project in Kaskelen, visited by the evaluation team. The third is $1.2 million microlending program, developed by VOCA and Working Capital.

Assistance Provided: Volunteers assisted the Peace Corps in developing a plan for the revolving funds.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: The Kaskelen program originally issued $420,000 in interest free, long- term loans (3-10 years) under TACIS direction. After forming the Farmers Credit Fund, the fund has issued 73 loans (10-12 months) for fuel and fertilizer, at 10% annual interest. Repayment has been set at 82%. Because most of these farmers would have been credit constrained without the loans, impact in terms of increased area planted and increased farmer incomes have probably been achieved. Also, the development of the Fund fills a gap in the financial system, and is one of the only financing mechanisms available to farmers. However, sustainability is jeopardized by the low interest rate charged on loans, which does not cover the Fund's operating expenses. Unless revenues are increased through higher fees or interest rates, or additional funds are secured, the Fund will have to close its doors within a year.

Reverse FtF Program: No participation

Concluding Observations: Although the Fund was designed to charge enough interest to cover its operating expenses, it does not, and Fund management, although aware of the sustainability question, did not seem to want to raise interest rates or fees, but rather to look for additional sources of donor funds. The overall impact of this volunteer assignment seems to have been significant in the short term, however additional care must be taken to ensure that impact is sustained.

Case Study No. 12

Date of Evaluation:	June 20, 1996
Implementor:	VOCA
Host Organization:	Taldykorgan AGRO II Association
Location:	Taldykorgan, Kazakhstan
Name of Interviewee:	Turarbek Kudaibergenov

Host Organization: The Taldykorgan Association of Private Farmers, Small Enterprises and Rural Cooperatives (AGRO II) was organized in November 1993. The association has approximately 2,300 private farmer members; dues paying members are about half that number. The association has helped develop about 30, mostly informal, cooperatives in a variety of activities and has leveraged financing from USAID and other sources. Its other activities include a legal information center, a credit fund and insurance company, a wholesale and retail outlet due to start operation June 27 (pending a court decision), a newspaper and a farmer's school.

Assistance Provided: Volunteer Paul Willis worked with the Association to develop strategic plans, analyze the needs of its members and reach out to other assistance sources. Subsequently, additional volunteers have worked with subsets of the Association's membership on specific technical and business issues.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: At the urging of AGRO, the Taldykorgan governor set aside $20,000 worth of state seeds for private farmers in 1996, setting an important precedent. The association has also acquired a building adjacent to Taldykorgan's central market to be used as a wholesale/retail outlet for members' products and has introduced a farmer's market on Saturdays in a high-traffic pedestrian zone of the city. In addition to the creation of this robust association and the development of cooperatives, AGRO has persuaded the oblast governor to establish a committee to review the fairness of the land distribution process to private farmers. Lastly, AGRO publishes a Central Asia-wide newsletter on private farm issues (primarily legal and tax information) and provides legal consultations to private farmers.

The potential for both sustainability and spread effects in this case appears high. The association has attracted grants from the oblast government, USAID and USIS, while also taking measures to ensure a revenue stream for itself through renting out its building (although this is still clouded by legal issues), increasing the membership base, and selling its newspaper. The potential for spread effects can be national and international, as the association has begun to lobby the national government directly and is reaching out to farmers across Central Asia with its newspaper.

Reverse FtF Program: The association developed a partnership with the Indiana Farm Bureau and has vigorously promoted cooperative development among its members as a result of U.S. Training.

Concluding Observations: The association appears to be a robust organization which is moving beyond local level impacts to national ones. It is a good example of how a long- term relationship with a strategically chosen host organization can help to achieve widespread and lasting impact.

Case Study No. 13

Date of Evaluation: June 21, 1996

Implementor: VOCA, Almaty

Host Organization: Mr. Serik Aripov

Location: Taldykorgan, Kazakhstan

Name of Interviewee: Mr. Serik Aripov

Host Organization: Mr. Serik Aripov is the owner of the flour mill in Taldekorgan. In 1993, Mr. Aripov was able to purchase the necessary equipment for two mills by trading wool to China. He expanded his business to include the manufacture of macaroni. The mill operates at a current maximum level of 16 tons/day (16 hour shift) for flour and 850 kg/day of macaroni. Mr. Aripov also owns 17 ha of land producing wheat and sugar beets.

Assistance Provided: Mr. Aripov first made contact with VOCA in 1993. VOCA cautiously observed Mr. Aripov's actions to help build up other emerging groups in the region. In time the VOCA representative arranged for volunteer Terry Lee Johnson to visit the plant in January 1996 to develop a general strategic plan. She recommended that a second volunteer assist Mr. Aripov to install an accounting system. Volunteer Ron Atkinson visited in March 1996 for this purpose and in addition, developed a business plan.

Impact of FtF Volunteer: The volunteers had enormous impact on the development of Mr. Aripov's company. The installation of the bookkeeping systems has allowed the division of his company into profit centers and has revealed to him the importance of dividing his operations to better track profitability.

At one point, Mr. Aripov was considering the purchase or lease of a state meat processing facility. The volunteers suggested that he not expand at the time, but rather focus on his core interests; advice Mr. Aripov accepted and is pleased with. The business plan which Mr. Atkinson helped complete was submitted to CAAEF and viewed as a worthy proposal. As a result, the CAAEF has guaranteed funding for $ 200,000 and Mr. Aripov is currently negotiating with two local banks. He will purchase a third flour mill which will raise his production by another 2 mt/hour and improve his quality and he will also build a grain silo with 2 MT to store farmers' wheat.

Mr. Aripov has become an established figure and created a progressive business in his region. He has strong political connections which will insulate him from unnecessary and costly transactions and as such, his company should provide economic stability in the community. Mr. Aripov offers horizontal and vertical multiplier effects which are positive developments for the project. The horizontal linkage will be to other emerging flour millers and pasta makers whom he seems willing to provide advice.

The vertical linkages will be with wheat growers in the area who will avail themselves of his processing and storage facilities.

Reverse FtF Program: Mr. Aripov has visited Italy and Germany in the course of purchasing equipment for his macaroni plant, but has not visited the U.S..

Concluding Observations: The assistance of the volunteers will contribute to the long term sustainability of the company. Mr. Aripov has not only implemented the volunteers' recommendations but exceeded them by purchasing additional computers for his business operations.

He is contributing to the community by increasing labor from 3 to 27 people, a significant number in this locality, and by building grain storage on his property he will assist local farmers in storing their grain and processing their wheat into flour. He is very concerned with trying to assist others in the community to improve themselves. Furthermore, Mr. Aripov seems willing to diffuse the knowledge he has gained related to his business. Increased competition does not worry him as he believes he can stay ahead of the game. The day the team met with him, he was meeting with a person interested in opening a macaroni plant and supplying them with suggestions.

Finally, Mr. Aripov's situation is an excellent example of the conditions that allow businesses to prosper. First, Mr. Aripov was willing to enter into private business early, being the first to produce products and establish procurement and marketing agreements; conditions were more favorable to private businesses in the first years of privatization. Mr. Aripov also had the good will of his mother's position in the government to insure that excessive bureaucratic meddling did not occur as it does for other companies without the Kazak "umbrella". Certainly, these are conditions worth noting for which projects succeed.

Case Study No. 14

Date of Evaluation: June 19, 1996

Implementor: Winrock International, Almaty

Host Organization: Talgar Agricultural College

Location: Almaty, Kazakhstan

Name of Interviewee: Mrs. Nailya Beiseubagevna, Director

Host Organization: Mrs. Nailya Beiseubagevna is the director of Talgar Agricultural College, which was founded in 1918. There are 1500 students, 60 teachers and 100 support staff. The goal of the college's administration is to be a center of technical expertise for guiding agriculture toward a market economy. The college struggles to balance its academic mandate within the realities of financial constraints (salaries have not been paid since March).

Assistance Provided: Two teams of volunteers have been placed at the College. The purpose of the teams was to train the staff in marketing and financial principles related to market economy transition issues.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: The impact of the volunteers was viewed as positive by the director. Direct teacher training was provided on subjects of great interest to the staff. An average of twenty teachers were in attendance at each workshop. The volunteers reported a high level of competency by the faculty in attendance. Bell and Johnson have asked to return in September to conduct a second course in the use of microcomputers in financial management in agriculture. The director indicated that there have been changes in the teaching curriculum resulting from the visits of the volunteers, but it was unclear exactly what changes have been made. However, because the training was focused on training teachers, the spread effect is present and changes should be taking place and on-going. Appropriate technology will need to be available to continue the efforts of the volunteers.

Reverse FtF Program: No participation

Concluding Observations: The director mentioned a great need for reference materials for the teachers. The evaluation team suggested organizations in the U.S. that may be of assistance, e.g. The Asian Foundation in San Francisco. A Winrock representative mentioned he would assist the college.

Greater assistance in resource networking would be of great benefit to them. The team recommended that when there are future volunteer visits that the seminars be video-taped and the Director agreed. There seems to be adequate diffusion in focusing the training on current staff of the College. However, sustainability of the impact is dependent on institutionalizing the teaching seminars.

Though the second set of volunteers and the Director are keen on a follow-on visit, the evaluation team was concerned that the early return seems pre-mature, especially given that the computer lab is not functioning at the level required by the volunteers. Several strategies were discussed with the director. First, the director suggested buying eight new computers for the lab to be ready for the seminar. The funds would be borrowed from a local collective in exchange for student labor on collectives farm. This proactive strategy was encouraged because the college was taking the initiative and making a contribution to the overall sustainability of the volunteers' efforts. The Winrock representative also suggested exploring ways to find donor assistance to help with the procurement of the computers. This presents a fall back to getting the computers for this workshop.

A question of appropriate technology being proposed by the volunteers comes into question. The volunteers propose they use Microsoft Windows with Excel in its next workshop, however, the evaluation team is concerned about the level of sophistication being proposed for the next workshop, which exceeds the available computer hardware at the college. It is recommended that a simpler and more user-friendly software, e.g. Supercalc or Lotus, be considered for initiating the basic approaches to designing computer farm spreadsheets for teachers.

Case Study No. 15

Date of Evaluation:	June 19, 1996
Implementor:	Winrock International, Almaty, Kazakhstan
Host Organization:	Salena Ltd.
Location:	Burundai near Almaty, Kazakhstan
Name of Interviewee:	Evgeny Moun, Director

Host Organization: Mr. Moun is the owner of a small meat-processing company specializing in smoked sausages. In September 1992, the company was privatized by those currently in management and has since reduced its staff from 12 to 10 people. Production level is currently at 150 kg/day; Mr. Moun hopes to expand to 500 kg/day with proposed improvements. One such improvement includes the addition of a small slaughter plant to the existing facility. The plant has received a loan of $15,500 from Mercy Corp for the purchase of equipment, and it is paying the loan in-kind with 3,800 kg of meat to the local hospital.

Assistance provided: Mr. Moun first made contact with Winrock in 1994. As a result, assigned meat processing specialists helped to improve the plant's production system. In addition, a volunteer visited the plant for five days in 1995 and prepared a business plan, which was submitted to CAAEF for consideration. No decision has been made on the loan request thus far.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: The volunteer assisted the plant manager by improving the overall organizational structure of the plant. Emphasis was placed on the preparation of the business plan for the loan from CAAEF. The volunteer also helped to identify material and equipment needs and demonstrated how to obtain increased profit from the operation by improving the product mix. The owner feels the recommendations are positive and will be beneficial to his business if the loan is approved; in the meantime the plant faces constraints from government legislation that requires each new product to carry a license (these licenses can cost as much as $100 to $150 per product every three months). Currently, the business is well-established and provides regular employment. Furthermore, if the plant expands, it will be able to solidify its economic base.

Reverse FtF Program: No participation.

Concluding Observations: Aside from the contribution of a business plan, little volunteer impact was detected. The manager of the plant is careful about not exceeding his financial means, however credit is tight, with the bank requiring 120 percent of the loan request in collateral. The Winrock representative stated that he would look into credit alternatives for Mr. Moun. Another issue is management's lack of marketing acumen. Targeted markets tend to be local and no consideration has been given to ways to expand sales as quality and quantity improve. There is concern about the

availability of meat for processing, the replacement of equipment to improve the quality of the product, the lack of staff training, and cash flow issues. It is viewed that unless there is a significant change in business practices, the company will not meet its growth objectives.

Case Study No. 16

Date of Evaluation:	June 21, 1996
Implementor:	Winrock International, Almaty, Kazakhstan
Host Organization:	Ulan Meat Processing Facility
Location:	Kamenka Village, Djambyl Region
Name of Interviewee:	Segatain Makhambetov

Host Organization: Mr. Makhambetov is the owner of Ulan Company, a meat processing plant in Kamenka, which is 150 km. from the town of Djambyl in Djambyl Region. Mr. Makhambetov took possession of the plant after privatization from the local collective, Karl Marx, of which he was a member. He obtained a loan from Agroprom Bank for $72,000 for the purchase of 1,700 sheep and 100 steers. These animals serve as a source of meat for his canning plant. The animals are presently grazing in the mountains and will be available for slaughter in November. Furthermore, Mr. Makhambetov has constructed a second building on his 3 ha parcel of land, which will be used for processing and storage of fruits and vegetables. He confided that he is unable to pay the loan from the Agroprom and is hoping to rollover the note in a larger loan approved by CAAEF for $ 200,000. However, the banks in Djambyl have been slow to process his loan and are requesting he shift his banking to one of these banks.

Assistance Provided: The first meeting between the Winrock representative and Mr. Makhambetov took place in June 1995 and the scope of work was written in September of that year. At that time the plant had its equipment in place and was operational. Based on these conditions Winrock arranged for the services of two volunteers, Michael Eickman and Timothy Braun, who provided services for 8 days in March 1996. The SOW prepared suggests the development of a business plan containing a cash flow analysis and financial statements.

FtF Volunteer Impact: In examining the SOW and the final business plan, there seems to be a lack of valuable information to guide Mr. Makhambetov in the development of his plant. The business plan does not include marketing forecasts or standard financial projections and cash flow analyses. Although the business plan was approved by CAAEF, there is doubt whether it is sustainable. The business plan does include sanitation suggestions which seem to have been implemented, as the plant was in clean condition during the interview. It is important to note that Mr. Makhambetov said he can not operate his plant during the summer months because of flies in the plant. This was not noted in the business plan as a condition of concern. Overall, there are minimal institutional impacts provided by this project and minimal to no spread multiplier effects.

Reverse FtF Program: No participation.

Concluding Observations: Mr. Makhambetov was appreciative of the time provided by the two volunteers. Nevertheless, the impression is that he has little background in the management of a meat processing business. The plant is fattening steers destined for the canning line. Normally, cull cows and the lower quality cuts from the carcass are canned. His canning operation is not following standard industry guidelines. In a tour of the plant, it was found that most of the by-products are not being captured and processed for additional revenues. These processing activities are an important revenue generator, if labor to process the raw material is inexpensive and a market can be found for the bone meal and other products.

Finally, the plant is facing a problem of repaying the loan from Agroprom Bank. Rolling over the loan to a larger loan will not alleviate the problem and allow for the successful operation of this business. This is particularly relevant since the plant does not operate for several months out of the year. Therefore, the sustainability of this project is in question because of inefficiencies in the operation. Furthermore, the business plan did not address these issues of low capacity and did not consider alternative procurement and marketing strategies to allow the company to repay its existing loan.

157

Case Study No. 17

Date of Evaluation: June 21, 1996

Implementor: Winrock International, Almaty

Host Organization: Jagodka, a private farm

Location: Djambyl City

Name of Interviewee: German Hon, Director

Host Organization: A fruit and juice company was visited in the city of Djambyl in Djambyl Region. The company owns and operates orchards. Mr. Hon is the director of the company but was overseas during the visit. Therefore, Mrs. Ludmilla Tyan, the Deputy Director, conducted the interview. The company was established in 1992 and took over the plant from the state collective. It has approximately 75 staff members. They raise vegetables and fruit, primarily blackberries and strawberries, on its 116 ha property, as well as purchase produce from local farmers. Currently the plant is not producing juice but hopes to obtain a loan to operate its juice equipment. The plant buildings have been repaired and they are getting ready to expand into juice packaging. It is currently selling raw products in the local market.

Assistance Provided: Mr. Jack Harris, a financial management expert, has participated in several FtF assignments and has a good reputation for developing business plans. He was able to prepare a thorough business plan for the plant, which included projections of cash flow and balance sheets. In addition, Mr. Harris was able to work with the accounting department to compile balance sheets for the last several years so that the owner could better understand the operations of his business. The owner was very satisfied with Mr. Harris's contribution.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: The business plan was completed and it was submitted to the CAAEF for consideration for funding. The volunteer was able to have an impact on improving accounting procedures for the company. No multiplier effects at this time. Could be present if company works with other orchard producers in transfer of improved orchard management.

Reverse FtF Program: No participation.

Concluding Observations: It is difficult to determine the sustainability of the company due to the volunteer's effort. If the business plan serves as the measure of impact then there is no result yet from the volunteer's work and it seems that not much further impact is likely to be forthcoming in the near future. It is certainly worthy to note that there is the Business Center in Djambyl which could be included in further business plan developments by Winrock volunteers. This would increase the ability of local institutions to provide this service. To increase the diffusion of Mr. Harris' efforts,

the program should consider the possibility of a joint assignment where Mr. Harris is able to train and supervise local staff in preparing business plans and conducting feasibility studies.

Case Study No. 18

Date of Evaluation: June 21, 1996

Implementor: Winrock International

Host Organization: Business Center

Location: Jambool, Kazakhstan

Name of Interviewee: Irina Dorozhkina, Director

Host Organization: Founded in 1993 with the assistance of Peace Corps volunteers, the Center conducts seminars and provides business plan assistance and legal consultation for small businesses and farmers in the city of Jambool and surrounding districts. It is financed partially by Mercy Corps' sale of U.S. butter and, principally, by fees from services.

Assistance Provided: The first volunteer conducted a seminar on sheep management focusing on issues related to equipment, veterinary techniques and shearing practices. The second volunteer conducted a small business seminar for approximately 700 participants, which was characterized by the host as basically a description of Winrock's development activities. It was not possible to evaluate the first volunteer's impact because the host was not present at the first seminar and follow-up impact evaluations were not available. The second seminar does not appear to have had any direct economic impact. Also, the volunteers did not seem to have any significant impact on the institution itself, although the second seminar apparently helped channel a number of interested farmers to Winrock to seek specific assistance. The Business Center appears to be in a strong position to provide sustainability and multiplication of the volunteers' efforts through its district-wide role as a training and consulting service. Attention needs to be paid, however, to institutionalizing the technical knowledge provided by volunteers into a format which can be widely and easily disseminated.

Reverse FtF Impact: No participation.

Concluding Observations: There seemed to be a problem with lack of follow-up by the implementor in this case, perhaps due to the changeover of the country representative soon after the second volunteer visit. The Center's approach and mission seems to provide a good model of a host which can have significant multiplier effects if care is taken in providing the right volunteers and their message institutionalized into practices or teaching materials.

160

KYRGYZSTAN

Case Study No. 19

Date of Evaluation:	June 24, 1996
Implementor:	ACDI
Host Organization:	Maksat Bank
Location:	Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan
Name of Interviewees:	Arkady Aronov, Vice-President of board, Andrey Iliaev, Head of Investment Department, Alexander Antipov, Vice-President of Board

Host Organization: Maksat Bank was founded in late 1991 in a joint-stock partnership with British investors. It has $3 million in share capital and 150 employees based in two branches and a main office. It is the bank for a number of foreign companies in Kyrgyzstan and was selected by the US-Kyrgyz Joint Commission to manage some of the Commission's funds. In addition to the joint commission activity, the bank provides some limited lending in the agricultural sector, specifically for cotton and tobacco purchases and one milk-processing joint venture.

Assistance Provided: Volunteers assisted bank management personnel in developing plans related to marketing, credit risk reduction, and long-term lending, a new activity for the bank.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: The volunteer's assistance is too recent to have had any agricultural or economic impact, but it may lead to the improved credit analysis of agricultural projects in the short- term. The volunteer's assistance appears to have strengthened the bank's operations, clarified a number of procedures and helped to open up long- term lending as a new activity for the bank. Furthermore, the potential for sustainability appears to be high given the bank's institutional strength.

Reverse FtF Program: No participation.

Concluding Observation: This bank has at least some agricultural sector involvement, which means that a direct link between FtF volunteer assistance and the agricultural sector can be established. However, the question of why well-capitalized, profitable banks (the bank also draws technical assistance on a fee basis from professional consultants) need volunteer assistance is raised by this host.

Case Study No. 20

Date of Evaluation: June 24, 1996

Implementor: ACDI

Host Organization: Mercury Bank

Location: Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan

Name of Interviewee: Bakhtiyar Abildaev, First Deputy of General Director

Host Organization: Mercury Bank was founded in 1992 as one of Kyrgyzstan's first commercial banks. It is a "universal" bank, providing a wide variety of services to its clients. The bank has about $8.9 million in total assets and $1.3 in paid-up share capital. It employs a total of 30 individuals based in a main office in Bishkek and two branch offices. The bank's loan portfolio emphasizes industrial and energy sectors. It is currently charging 45-65% annual interest on loans of 3-6 months; inflation is approximately 2% per month.

Assistance Provided: Volunteers assisted in the development of a strategic plan for the bank's activities which emphasizes both sectors for lending and bank operations. The volunteers also consulted on various other bank operation activities.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: There has been no agricultural impact from this activity. The interviewee asserted that it would be in neither the interest of agricultural producers nor the bank for the bank to lend to agricultural interests at the present time. The assignment was too recent to determine any other type of economic impact, although a strategic shift into real estate lending suggested by the volunteers, which is being implemented by the bank, may provide some short-term impact. However, the volunteer activities appear to have had a significant institutional impact on the bank, helping them to define and clarify their strategic goals and operations and instilling additional confidence in their top managers. Furthermore, the sustainability of the bank appears strong given its relatively healthy capital/asset ratio and recent growth.

Reverse FtF Program: No participation

Concluding Observations: This host represents one of numerous examples of how ACDI's program, while providing high-quality, valuable and appreciated technical assistance, results in negligible impact in the agricultural sector.

162

Case Study No. 21

Date of Evaluation: June 24, 1996

Implementor: Winrock International, Bishkek

Host Organization: Kormash - new name is Agromash

Location: Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan

Name of Interviewee: Alexander A. Shkumat, General Director

Host Organization: The company, which produces farm machinery, was formed from a state corporation in 1993 and has evolved into a joint stock company. Sixty-two percent is owned by a private registered business and the remaining stock is held by individuals. Its main product line is forage harvesting equipment. The company is beginning to diversify into smaller equipment for tillage and food processing companies. Its primary challenge is lack of working capital to expand into new product lines and the lack of buying power in the farm sector. Currently, the plant has 172 employees, down from 330 in 1994.

Assistance Provided: After some initial apprehension, the volunteer was able to transfer new concepts related to marketing and management to plant management staff.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: The volunteer made the following recommendations, some of which have been instituted: 1) sell equipment on credit; 2) open a dealership; 3) rehabilitate old equipment taken on trade-in, and 4) improve the look of equipment by applying higher quality paint and attaching a decal. According to the Winrock representative, the volunteer's largest contribution was in persuading management to improve their marketing skills. The plant now has a mobile display on a trailer to be utilized by prospective clients and the management staff has participated in a tour of the local Mercedes dealership, to observe upscale marketing firsthand. More of the volunteer's recommendations would have been implemented if revenues were higher.

Reverse FtF Program: No participation

Concluding Observations: This company benefitted directly from the involvement of the volunteers. It would be difficult to determine an exact dollar amount due to the nature of the assignment, however management seems more open to being proactive in merchandising their products and identifying new markets. If the plant can secure working capital and the situation in the farm sector improves, then this plant could fill the market with appropriate products. The staff at the plant is technically sound, combining both design as well as manufacturing skills. It has increased production 140 % since 1994, while at the same time cutting labor approximately 50%. This company has all the ingredients to develop into an important company in the agribusiness sector. Repeat volunteers could be of service if a clear project design and SOWs are drafted. Further

involvement of volunteers should require the plant to increase its in-kind contribution for the volunteers.

Case Study No. 22

Date of Evaluation: June 25, 1996

Implementor: Winrock International, Bishkek

Host Organization: Alfa and Kabar-Ata

Location: Bishkek

Name of Interviewee: Ulubeck Jenelanev

Host Background: Ulubeck Jenelanev is the owner of two companies: Alfa, which produces farm machinery and Kabar-Ata, which produces harnesses and saddles. The company was state-owned and then privatized. It is located in the town of Bishkek and produces mainly for the domestic market. There is a demand for horse drawn equipment and leather accessories for horses; the company has a unique niche in the market and is trying to expand its position. In 1995 they employed 17 people and they have 83 staff members (35 in leather, 45 in machinery and 2 in administration). The company has developed an innovative idea of establishing dealerships.

Assistance Provided: The plant received information related to farm equipment engineering and the manufacturing of saddles and bridles. A business plan was prepared by an FtF volunteer. The agricultural engineer had less impact on the farm machinery end of the business because of Mr. Jenelanev's interest in the profit potential for horse livery equipment.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: The agricultural engineer made several recommendations which have been or will be implemented. For instance, the assembly room was moved from a dark room on the first floor to an airy room on the second; it was enlarged to include the whole process in one room. Saddle designs were considered and may be adapted if cost effective. The volunteers' assistance helped energize Mr. Jenelanev to consider adapting other areas of his operation, particularly his marketing methods. Marketing is an area in which he feels he needs more assistance. On his own initiative he is opening farm equipment dealerships in two areas where he transports items for sale to local farmers and he is also preparing a catalog to advertise his equipment. He credits the volunteers with motivating him to be more proactive in his business. It is likely that the volunteer efforts in this assignment will prove to be significant in establishing the sustainability of the company

Reverse FtF Program: No participation. However, Mr. Jenelanev has traveled extensively to Europe and Britain and has been influenced by methods used in other countries.

Concluding Observations: This company benefitted directly from the involvement of the volunteers, particularly Mr. Schmucher, the agricultural engineer. The relationship between the two men was so positive that impact was most likely established during the first meeting. They communicated effectively due to common interests and a genuine respect for one another. At

165

present, they continue to communicate and Mr. Schmucher hopes to directly assist Mr. Jenelanev with a container of equipment.

The western saddle popular in the U.S. was brought to Mr. Jenelanev by the volunteer to demonstrate good saddle construction. The plant has the capacity to build the saddle but it is too costly ($ 600 compared to the local saddle of $ 80). Mr. Jenelanev's goal is to export saddles to Kazakhstan and he wants to improve the quality of his saddles, which has not been the case thus far. This case demonstrates how impact can be immediate if the right chemistry is present between the volunteer and plant manager. The long term sustainability of this company looks good, and the volunteer will be remembered for sometime to come.

Case Study No. 23

Date of Evaluation:	June 25, 1996
Implementor:	Winrock International; Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan
Host Organization and Interviewee:	Goumira Akamatous
Location:	Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan

Host Organization: Goumira Akamatous is the owner of a small specialized textile business. She sought assistance from Winrock after seeing the effect that volunteers had working with her father on his sheep farm. She decided to expand her business by using wool from his flock for textile crafts. She is a teacher by training but prefers this occupation. Her loom is currently in her house while she finishes the construction of a two room building in her compound. The new building will house the loom and the cleaning equipment. The clean wool is spun into yarn in her father's village. Goumira is testing new designs with a return to traditional patterns, which sell well to the tourist market. She is responding to advice provided by the owner of the art shop where her textiles are sold.

Assistance Provided: Volunteers conducted a workshop and training program for Goumira and eight employees in June 1994.

Impact of FtF Volunteer: The volunteers were very concerned about the level of equipment, even for such a simple loom. Goumira shared that she had not made changes because she was unsure of what needed to be done. It seems that she is reluctant to experiment with technological innovations. However, it is evident that Goumira has adopted other recommendations that have proven successful. She has developed hang tags and a logo for the promotion of her products, which the volunteers suggested, and has developed an exclusive arrangement with an upscale crafts shop. The owner of the craft shop is pleased with their exclusive arrangement, and Goumira's products sell very well. Gourmira is currently well-established in her business and is very appreciative of the Winrock's assistance.

Reverse FtF Program: No participation

Concluding Observations: This small-scale company benefitted directly from the involvement of FtF volunteers. Goumira's company is running successfully due in part to significant changes in her marketing program suggested by the volunteers. She seems content not to move into mass production and takes pride in the high quality of her products. As a successful business owner, she provides employment opportunities to women and she has been asked to display her products at trade fairs in Bishkek. The company should continue to sustain itself in the future.

Case Study No. 24

Date of Evaluation: June 25, 1996

Implementor: Winrock International, Bishkek

Host Organization: Bulgari Company

Location: City of Bishkek

Name of Interviewee: Vladimir Podkovitoff

Host Organization: Vladimir Podkovitoff is the general manager of Bulgari, a tanning and leather goods manufacturer. The company was privatized and the majority owner is Raphael Dressing of New York. Other owners are locals and the government owns 10% of the company. The company continues to struggle because of a lack of working capital, however money is reinvested in equipment, so equity is being built. The manager feels the leather industry is changing and cheap goods are less attractive than in the past, however the company has had difficulty upgrading the quality of its products because of a lack of improved dyes and chemicals. The plant had large stocks of finished hides in inventory, which are sold in the semi-finished stage or processed into leather products.

Assistance Provided: Two volunteers, a tanning specialist and a marketing advisor, visited the plant for 6 days in October 1995. The marketing specialist proposed a joint venture for the plant during his stay and developed a procedure toward the assembly of paint rollers, however, the deal never materialized after he left the country.

Impact of FtF Volunteer: The tanning specialist suggested introducing a cost reducing procedure of using cold water instead of hot water when processing the hides. The recommendation was implemented. No direct impact provided by the marketing advisor was evident, however market development is a major deficit for the company, and it will be difficult to progress without improved market access, which will require upgrading the quality of the products to international standards.

Reverse FtF Program: No participation. The U.S. owner who owns 50 percent of the company is not involving himself directly in company operations.

Concluding Observations: The company is in a unique position, as it is partly owned by a U.S. business. As such, future volunteers should not be assigned to this plant as it can afford its own consultants and diffusion of volunteer technical knowledge to other businesses is unlikely.

In 1991 the company had 70 employees and now it has 170. Furthermore, the employment and income multipliers are good. The plant continues to experience difficulty due to lack of working capital to purchase the necessary dyes and chemicals that would allow it to significantly improve the

quality of its products. The existing line of equipment is sufficient to meet higher quality standards if other inputs are made available.

A significant problem is the lack of marketing expertise on behalf of current management. The lack of information related to product design make it hard to compete in the world market. Marketing is a common constraint to emerging businesses and for this reason the company is not likely to have significant growth until management is able and willing to invest in a marketing program. At the same time limited quality products dampens its ability to respond to large orders if they were available. In short, there are smaller leather goods companies in Bishkek, and it is recommended that Winrock look at assisting these companies.

It is worth noting that the current manager may be leaving his position in the near future and will be replaced by one of the larger stockholders. The manager seems confident in his abilities to undertake a new business if he can get the required capital; the entrepreneurial "bug" seems to be in his bonnet.

Case Study No. 25

Date of Evaluation:	June 26, 1996
Implementor:	Winrock International, Bishkek
Host Organization:	Timmer-Bek
Location:	Bishkek and Kochkor
Name of Interviewee:	Timmer Bek in Bishkek and his brother in Kochkor

Host Organization: Timmer-Bek Company in Kochkor, Narrin District is the site of fruit- and meat-processing activities; the two facilities are on the same compound. The building for the meat plant was bought and improvements are currently in motion. A loan from EBRD for $150,000 has been granted for 5 years at 15%. A semi-processed puree of apples and apricots was observed which will likely be further processed into jam and sold. The shelf life of the product after processing is five years and the market for this product is local or in Siberia. Timmer-Bek is a joint venture with Siberian partners and its main products are vodka, meat and fruits. The plant employs eight people in jam making, and when the meat plant goes on-line, over 150 people will be directly impacted by its operation from cattle owners who will sell cattle on contract, to processing labor. The plant will make a large contribution to the local economy.

Assistance Provided: A volunteer completed a business plan for the meat company which served as the basis for the loan to the CAAEF. A second volunteer prepared marketing materials, a logo for new products, and marketing strategies for the company.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: According to the host, the volunteers' greatest accomplishment was in helping to "open his eyes" to the possibilities for his company. He now realizes that marketing will be a key issue in the success of the company. A loan obtained from EBRD for this company is another proud accomplishment of the two volunteers. The suggestion and creation of a logo for corporate and product advertising allowed the host an opportunity to experience the benefits proactive marketing. Also, the loan obtained from CAAEF is an important step in the consolidation of activities in Kochkor.

Reverse FtF Program: No participation.

Concluding Observations: Even though the meat plant was not operating yet, the loan had been granted and the host felt the completion of the plant would occur in the near future. The plant will have important economic multiplier effects in the area and it will likely be one of the largest employers in the area. Furthermore, it should have a diffusion impact as the plant establishes buying contracts with local livestock owners.

170

For this assignment, the FtF program identified two important specialties in a team of volunteers that allowed for maximum impact. The inclusion of a graphic designer with a flair for marketing certainly enhanced the ability of the team to take a broad and comprehensive approach to the feasibility of the meat plant. Overall, the company's outlook is positive due to the quality of upper management and its joint venture with its Siberian partner. At issue is whether the plant can be utilized to full capacity during the major slaughter period from September through November for cattle and March through May for sheep. This project is an excellent example of a productive FtF volunteer assignment.

Case Study No. 26

Date of Evaluation: June 26, 1996

Implementor: Winrock International, Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan

Host Organization: Mr. Bulovek, private farmer

Location: Kochkor, Kyrgyzstan

Name of Interviewee: Mr. Bulovek

Host Organization: Mr. Bulovek is an entrepreneur who has worked with several volunteer teams. He began in the livestock business as a livestock buyer and raiser. He started with 20 sheep in 1993 and now has over 1,500 sheep, plus an assortment of other livestock. In addition to these activities, he farms 60 HA of wheat and 6 HA of potatoes and has retail shops in Bishkek and Kochkor, as well as a gas station in Kochkor. Mr. Bulovek is trained as an engineer and works in construction. He has started and failed in previous businesses, e.g. bricks, but continues to learn and expand his businesses. He continues to operate his livestock enterprises, which now include dairy production. To fulfill his grant from Mercy Corp, he contributes the milk from the dairy to the local hospital. Mr. Bulovek is highly motivated and believes with hard work he will succeed; he is assisted by 11 brothers.

Assistance Provided: Mr. Bulovek has received three teams of volunteers since the start of the FtF program. The first team in 1994 provided assistance in sheep management with successful results. He found the volunteers' advice pertinent to his business development.

A tannery specialist and a meat processing specialist visited the farm in April 1995 and conducted a feasibility study. Mr. Bulovek was interested in pursuing the project and requested volunteers to return in October 1995. These volunteer worked on accounting principles and on the meat-processing component. However, Mr. Bulovek decided not to pursue the meat processing plant, possibly due to Timmer-Bek's involvement in the area. Mr. Bulovek has chosen to concentrate on a small dairy-processing facility instead, which is currently under construction.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: Mr. Bulovek praises the volunteers primarily for their impact on his outlook related to his business. He is very appreciative that the FtF program facilitated his interaction with successful business people from the U.S.

Because the meat plant was not initiated it is difficult to determine any concrete impact of the later two teams. The first team of four consultants seems to have helped Mr. Bulovek become a better sheep raiser. Thus far, Mr. Bulovek has been very successful and it appears that he will continue to grow and diversify his business. At this point in time, he is not interested in participating in an

association with other business people, particularly farmers, because they do not have the same level of resources and in his opinion are just looking for money.

Reverse FtF Program: No participation

Concluding Observations: Mr. Bulovek seems to mirror the pattern of other successful hosts who have excelled in their business. The common trend is that these entrepreneurs were early entrants into the privatization process. They were able, either through their prior positions or through early access to affordable credit, to accumulate capital, land and/or equipment. Certainly this was not the overriding factor, since they were risk takers and are being rewarded as such. However, later entrants found themselves with fewer incentive packages and have probably struggled to survive or exited the industry. Certainly Mr. Bulovek benefited from the series of FtF volunteers who provided technical knowledge as well as encouragement.

It was observed during the field visit that Mr. Bulovek has an interest in additional volunteers from Winrock for his dairy operation. The host represents the type of client who certainly has matured in his business. Future volunteers need to be scrutinized as to their appropriateness and their impact. By his account, Mr. Bulovek certainly can afford to enlist and pay for consultants to help him further expand his business. It seems to be easier to place volunteers with established hosts rather than seek out emerging entrepreneurs who need greater assistance and do not have the resources to procure consultants. This fact is not unique to either this host or this implementor, but seems to be a common occurrence in the FtF program requiring necessary protocol adjustments.

Mr. Bulovek has reached a level where his business is now sustainable. He and his brothers present a formidable business that will only continue to expand thanks to the assistance of the FtF program. FtF and Winrock should be proud of their accomplishment and look for a new Bulovek.

Case Study No. 27

Date of Evaluation:	June 26, 1996
Implementor:	Winrock International
Host Organization:	Women's Cooperative
Location:	Sarakormush, Kyrgyzstan
Name of Interviewee:	Svetalana Bekbolotova, President

Host Organization: The village of Sarakormush was deindustrialized when the Soviet Geological Institute withdrew in 1992. Since that time, many men in the village have emigrated and/or abandoned their families and the school has closed. A women's association (500 nominal members, 30 active) has formed to undertake economic and social activities. After receiving some humanitarian aid from an Adventist relief group, the association was put in touch with Winrock. In March 1996, the Association obtained the use for five years of a greenhouse, rent free with an option to buy for $4700 after five years. The greenhouse has no heating system or ventilation, other than the manipulation of glass panes. Furthermore, the women have no technical experience in greenhouse production. The group hopes that the greenhouse will be operational in September. A Winrock volunteer team was on-site when the evaluation team visited. In addition to the greenhouse, the association operates a workshop for handicrafts production - rugs, pillows and wallhangings with indigenous patterns and materials - which is in the process of building up its inventory to sell to tourists in Bishkek.

Assistance Provided: FtF volunteers are helping these women create production and management plans for the greenhouse, and teaching the association members about greenhouse production techniques, as well as helping to design heating and ventilation systems for four season operation.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: Impact of FtF activities in the productive and economic spheres has not occurred yet, as volunteer activities are ongoing. However, the volunteers' presence appears to be catalyzing the association, at least for the moment. Work crews are actively working in the greenhouse and crafts workshop and morale appears to be high. The potential for sustainability is still questionable because key questions about the association's technical capabilities in greenhouse management and vegetable and flower marketing, as well as questions about the financing and technical adequacy of various heating systems which have been proposed, have not been answered at this point.

Reverse FtF Program: No participation.

Concluding Observations: Volunteers pointed out that much of the technical information they had received about the greenhouse was incorrect. To cope with the potential inadequacy of the heating system proposed by the association president's brother, the volunteers are drawing up two sets of

174

recommendations, one for four season use and one for three season operation. The volunteers were enthusiastic, appeared well-qualified and were clearly appreciated by the hosts.

175

Case Study No. 28

Date of the Evaluation: June 27, 1996

Implementor: Winrock International, Bishkek

Host Organization: Desert Company

Location: Karabota, 100 km west of Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan

Name of Interviewee: Mr. Abdulajan U. Tashmatov, Chairman

Host Organization: The company was state owned and part of the collective in the area. It is now a joint stock company with 170 shareholders and 300 workers. The company owns two plants plus orchards in the region. There are fifty workers at the Korabota location.

Assistance Provided: The volunteers will arrive in July and will assist the company in improving their fruit-processing systems, business plans and marketing/promotion strategies.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: Volunteers were arriving during the field visit so there was no impact to be measured. It is too early to tell whether this plant will be able to sustain itself. Capital is limited, though fortunately they are not in debt according to the director. Their product line looks outdated, except possibly for markets in Siberia. Spread effects for this project are possible if the plant can establish marketing links to the orchard producers in the area.

Reverse FtF Program: No participation.

Concluding Observations: This visit was unplanned as we were in the town and knew that the project manager was visiting the next day. It was interesting to observe the relationship between the host and the Winrock representatives. All logistics were in order for the arrival of the volunteers in the next few days.

In probing the chairman, he seems less definitive on exactly what he expects the volunteers to accomplish. He is pleased they will be in the plant and he has assigned key staff to each volunteer. He wanted to the technical volunteer to help him decide on types and sizes of equipment that should be ordered from overseas. However, he was unclear as to what he expected the marketing volunteer to accomplish. It would be valuable if written task orders and outputs were developed on what he would like the volunteers to accomplish during their two week stay. This should be done the first day of the volunteer's visit.

Case Study No. 29

Date of the Evaluation:	June 27, 1996
Implementor:	Winrock International, Bishkek
Host Organization:	J. S. Company
Location:	Karabota (100 km west of Bishkek)
Name of Interviewee:	Mr. Ao-adelet

Host Organization: Mr. Ao-adelet purchased or received free from the local collective 700 ha. Some of the land was of very poor quality with many rocks. He currently has 500 ha in production of onions, oats, alfalfa, sugar beets and fruit orchards. The site visited was the fruit orchard because that is where the volunteers had the greatest impact.

Assistance Provided: In the fruit orchard, rows were layed out and the system was planned along California standards with one exception, trees would be kept pruned to a height of 1.6 meters; this would allow for hand picking. The orchard design is based on the volunteers' recommendations. Without their recommendations, Mr. Ao-adelet would not have established the orchard or designed the present system, with which he is very pleased. A business plan was also prepared by the volunteers.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: Mr. Ao-adelet is an interesting individual with a keen sense of balancing his profit motive with the desire to care for his staff. The laborers in the orchard receive 60% of the harvest and are allowed to grow crops between the rows of trees. There are a total of 10 laborers on the farm.

This project is significant for the FtF program, as a clear impact can be observed after just three years. It is estimated that 20% percent of the trees will bear fruit this year. The plan calls for processing the fruit into jams and selling the higher quality in the fresh market. Mr. Ao-adelet will likely purchase a cold storage to retain longer shelf life. He plans to offer other orchard owners in the area use of the storage facility.

Mr. Ao-adelet has been approached by the local Farmers Union. However, at the present time he is not interested in participating because they have no money and they have nothing to offer him. When Mr. Ao-adelet purchased the 30,000 tree seedlings for the orchard he offered other farmers in the area some of the seedling for their own homes, but most refused. Now the neighbors are stealing his young trees and he has hired a watchman. He attributes this to the fact that in the beginning the neighbors could not see the opportunity until it was shown to them. This is an important reality for achieving effective diffusion. Currently the government does not operate experimental farms to introduce farmers to new agricultural production systems.

Reverse FtF Program: No participation

Concluding Observations: Mr. Ao-adelet's business serves as an exemplary case of long-term impact. The volunteer team came in 1993 and for only one visit, yet their impact was immense. Multiple visits were not needed because Mr. Ao-adelet was able to provide the necessary components of on-site management, finance and technology and he and his family members are already preparing feasibility studies on processing and marketing of the fruit.

178

MOLDOVA

Case Study No. 30

Date of Evaluation:	June 26, 1996
Implementor:	ACDI & VOCA
Host Organization:	Moldovan Agroindbank, SA
Location:	Chisinau, Moldova
Names of Interviewee(s):	Ms. Natalia Vrabii, President, Ms. Tatiana Groza, Chief, Crediting Division, Ms. Tatiana Samanovscaja, Chief, Credits, Pre-Division Mr. Tudo Lupascu, Chief, Farm Crediting

Host Organization: Agroindbank, a private bank with what is said to be the best quality loan portfolio in the Republic, was established in 1991 as a branch of the former USSR Agroprombank; Ms. Vrabii, its President, came from the former state national bank, as did many of its employees. As a sign of its stability and institutional maturity, the EBRD Credit Committee approved an investment line of credit for US$20 million in 1994. As of now, the bulk of its portfolio is not in agricultural loans, but it is slowly moving toward including this sector.

Assistance Provided: ACDI's team visited from March 24-April 8 in 1994. The team worked with bank leadership, headquarters personnel, and grassroots personnel focusing on overall management and finance issues, mechanisms and technology of mortgage operations (elaborating the necessary forms), and elaborating a business-plan outline that includes recommendations in credit committee rights and responsibilities, bank interest policy, risk control, and relations between central bank and its branches.

Another volunteer visited in August 1993. He helped design a grassroots-oriented farm credit system and assisted in bank restructuring to serve needs in market economy. He conducted banking seminars for bank employees concerning basic principles of farm credit systems in U.S. and provided insights into a potential farm credit system in Moldova.

A farm credit systems banker/specialist visited from March 11-23 in 1996. He worked with the bank on crediting systems for farmers and farmers' associations, focusing on the following issues: collateral usage, procedures of collateral value evaluation, specifically land, appreciation of interest rates, attracting clients, and the role of the State in supporting farmers with credits. Furthermore, he conducted a seminar and met with government officials to talk about farm credit. No follow-on report was available during the FtF evaluation.

179

Impact of FtF Volunteer: Both the interviewees and a lengthy oral questionnaire administered by ACDI to the President in February 1996 as a part of its follow-on activities, were extremely positive about the impacts of FtF volunteers (both ACDI and VOCA) on bank activities. For example, in the ACDI questionnaire, volunteers were ranked as 5 (top grade) and workplan as 4.5, and the President stated that "50% of the improvements in the lending policy of the bank may be regarded as a direct result" of the work of volunteers and that many recommendations have been implemented.

As with all banking and credit issues, sustainability multiplier and impact effects are limited by current political, economic, and legal policies. Despite these constraints, the bank is doing very well as a private entity.

Reverse FtF Program: Ms. Vrabii and Mr. Lupascu, who at the time was director of a collective farm, participated in U.S. training in 1993. Both were highly positive about the training and its usefulness. The two women from the credit division had also received two weeks of training in Germany in 1995 on risk analysis, paid for by the bank.

Concluding Observations: The issue here, as we discussed with the country representative of VOCA/Moldova, is not the potential for positive impact, nor sustainability. It is whether this institution, which has a relatively significant profit, should be receiving volunteer TA through FtF. The country representative is very aware of the problem and, particularly with reduced resources, is seriously assessing the pros and cons of additional TA. The evaluator assumes that ACDI will not be fielding any further volunteers in Moldova, so the issue for them may be moot.

Case Study No. 31

Date Evaluated:	June 24, 1996
Implementing Agency:	VOCA
Host Organization:	Selectia
Location:	Beltsi, Moldova
Names of Interviewees:	Mr. Vozian Mr. Magdaliuc

Host Organization: SELECTIA is an agricultural research center, based in Beltsi, Moldova, with 450 employees, 100 of them scientists. It has 350 hectares of land for research with another 1700 hectares for crop production. Much cropland in Moldova was abused by the Soviet system with the overuse of chemicals for fertilizer and pesticides, and deforestation of some parts of the country. Selectia is interested in promoting the cause of sustainable agriculture and has asked VOCA for technical assistance in this area. SELECTIA has information to help the farmers keep yield high without chemicals, but is lacking funds to operate. To continue the research, pay salaries of the staff and provide extension service they need technical and financial support.

SELECTIA and the NGO they created work with the USAID environmental program EPT, the SOROS Foundation, the University of Nebraska, USIA and the World Bank, to name a few. SELECTIA also has very close working relationships with the local Universities and agricultural institutes in the northern region of Moldova.

Assistance Provided: Selectia has had 4 VOCA volunteers over the past two years. Dr. Boichan, the Deputy General Director, met in his travels Walter Goldstein, a US. expert in sustainable agriculture. Dr. Goldstein was induced to come to Selectia in 1994 as a VOCA volunteer. This was followed by the visit of Roger Bloaum who assisted the Center on the policy and legal aspects of sustainable agriculture. This was followed by volunteer Daamon Schamansky, who demonstrated the use of "no till" agricultural machinery which had been acquired from another source. He was assisted by Jim Holderbaum, who was working on a separate Environmental Protection Project (EPT). The most recent volunteer was Paul Olson who came primarily to work on curriculum development at the Merculesti school which is associated with the Selectia Center.

Impact of The FtF Volunteer: This succession of volunteers has had a varied and cumulative impact on introducing and demonstrating the advantages of using sustainable agriculture techniques, and in overcoming a great deal of skepticism among the scientists at the Selectia Center. As a result of the efforts of one volunteer's recommendations on some of the policy/legal aspects of sustainable agriculture, a few laws have actually been passed to aid in the protection of agricultural lands. The cumulative effect of this series of volunteers has been to overcome the skepticism of over half the

scientists at the center regarding the merits of sustainable agricultural techniques. For some crops, the volunteers have also been able to demonstrate that equivalent yields can be obtained by using sustainable agriculture techniques, which discourages the use of chemicals for fertilizer and pesticides.

The real payoff according to those in charge will be in the next generation of farmers who will be schooled in the principles of sustainable agriculture.

Reverse FtF Program: Mr. Voizian was the beneficiary of a training program similar to the Reverse FtF. With a group sponsored by USDA, he studied the entire processing and marketing chain for several agricultural crops in California. He returned favorably impressed with U.S. agriculture, how government assists the private sector and the entire processing and cold storage chain. He also realized that most of it would too expensive for Moldova at this stage of it's current development.

Concluding Observations: Like so many former state-supported institutions, SELECTIA is struggling financially with only 25% of its budget now coming from the national budget, with the remaining amount coming from various sources including sales of seeds and other products and from other donor assistance.

The main discernible, but difficult to quantify, impact has occurred at the first level of impact. In other words, it has changed attitudes and it has introduced and demonstrated new more environmentally friendly agricultural techniques at the school and research center level. It remains to be seen how much "spread effect" will occur and over time.

Case Study No. 32

Date Evaluated: June 25, 1996

Implementing Agency: VOCA

Host Organization: The Nimoreni Association of Farmers

Location: Moldova

Names of Interviewees: Stephan Melkan, President

Host Organization: Nimoreni Farm has a very complicated structure. Mr. Stephan Melkan manages the NIMORENI Association of Farmers in Nimoreni village, 20 kilometers west of Chisinau. He is also the manager of the LIVADAROL Cooperative. This is one of the eight cooperatives in the NIMORENI farm. There are seven service cooperatives serving one production cooperative. This system seems to have met with some success and is receiving some attention.

The size of the agricultural land in Nimoreni has changed. The land was turned back to the borders of 1950, giving some of the land back to the neighboring villages. Now the village has in total 700 hectares from which 209 are vineyards, 111 orchards and 380 are arable land. This cooperative shifts production based on past profits and future projections. The arable land is planted with corn, wheat and sunflower. On the household plots the villagers are growing beans, potatoes, corn.

Assistance Provided: Nimoreni has hosted several VOCA specialists over the last 3 years, and several more have visited Nimoreni and assisted for short periods. Volunteers advised on a range of farm topics including assisting with the review of cooperative laws and cooperative credit systems. Mr. Melkan has worked with the following VOCA volunteers:

- June 1993, Szymanski, Damon
- August 1993, Young, George
- November 1993, Fleischmann, Josef
- October 1994, Hass, Marvin
- October 1994, Hiatt, Robert
- January 1995, Evans, Cooper

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: In 1995 the harvests in Nimoreni were excellent. They harvested 10 metric tons (MT) of grapes this year. The best harvest year under the state structure was approximately 4 MT's. Also, according to Stephan, in 1995 the yield results of Nimoreni farm were the best in the district and very good in the Republic. 10 MT of grapes per hectare, 7.5 MT of corn grains per hectare, 30 MT of fruit per hectare.

Other crops saw a similar increase in yields. The actual labor for the harvest used to take several weeks under the old system. They brought students in from Chisinau and even enlisted soldiers. Under the current system only the members of the association do the harvesting and it takes less than one week. Also theft of crops has been wiped out. Each individual can identify his/her land and the crops are produced and marketed cooperatively so there is no incentive, nor opportunity, for theft. The vice-chairman of Ialoveni District held a meeting with all the local authorities, collective farm managers, JSC groups, Association members and representatives of NIMORENI in the fall of 1995. The question: what system should we try to use in Ialoveni District? The answer - Nimoreni's. Only one collective manager dissented; this is significant. The District Authorities have committed to assisting Melkan in legalizing the service coop in the district as a model. He now has the local support needed.

Mr. Melkan is active and he is trying to realize his idea of crediting a community based system. This year he borrowed from Moldova's Agroindbank 110 thousand lei (4.5 lei=$1), 100 thousand at 34% a year, and 10,000 at 37%. As usual the credits are given in the form of supplies to the borrowers.

Also, Mr. Melkan was hired by TACIS in the fall of 1995 as a consultant on VOCA's recommendations. The service cooperative Mr. Melkan has developed, with the assistance of VOCA, has been very successful in assisting in the training of other collective farm groups to implement his ideas. The World Bank is also interested in Mr. Melkan's structure and will assist in making this model available country wide. He will be a prime candidate for the planned IFAD credits available this spring.

Reverse FtF Program: Mr. Melkan went to Britain in the spring of 1995 with the IMATA/Plunkett Foundation and is part of the Foundations' farm management project. VOCA also recommended Mr. Melkan for the Reverse FtF Program and a training trip was arranged through ACDI in 1993. He observed an LOL cooperative farm in Wisconsin and claims that after this experience he came back convinced that he could do the same thing on Nimoreni Farm. He adapted what he had learned and put together this cooperative structure.

Concluding Observations: This organization serves as another example of the impact that can be achieved by working with a farmer leader that is committed to change but not quite sure how to go about it. Sustainability of the cooperative structure could be an issue since it has no permanent legal status under Moldovan law. On the other hand, it is viewed by many as a model way to go about privatizing but maintaining the production structure of relatively large farms. With Mr. Melkan's status in the country and his persistence, it may also serve as a major catalyst for changing the law.

Case Study No. 33

Date of Evaluation: June 25, 1996

Implementor: VOCA

Host Organization: Terra Farm Association

Location: Cojusna Village, Sraseni District

Name of Interviewee: Mr. Gheorghe Zheregi, Director

Host Organization: The Terra Farmers Association was formed in April 1993 when it broke away from a collective farm led by the Association Director. It still has the 417 members and 6 managers it started with, each owning .6 hectares of land. The Association itself has 140 ha. of field crops, mainly corn, 80 ha. of orchards, mainly apples, and 35 ha. of vineyards. The land ownership is certified and members will receive titles when legally possible. It is the only truly privatized group in this District of 35 collective farms. The primary income crop is apples, which are currently only sold in bulk to markets in Moldova, Ukraine, and Southern Russia.

Assistance Provided: In 1994, an agriculture processing advisor, specializing in apples and fruit, conducted the following tasks: gathered data concerning apple/fruit output to determine the feasibility of the processing plant, studied the organization of the Association to consider the viability of a joint venture in the district, assessed the market (national and international) for apple products, prepared a feasibility study which could be used in applications to funding organizations, such as TACIS, and provided information concerning processing and equipment.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: Most of the volunteer's recommendations have not yet been put into effect because they require capital, even though minimal, which the Association does not have. However, he did set in place new thinking about the necessity for changes in packaging and marketing and the high-energy Director is attempting to use these in setting a new path for the Association.

The Association continues to maintain itself and its membership, despite the constraints of lack of credit to improve processing facilities and to upgrade its orchards. The trees need to be replaced within the next two years. In 1995, it sold 50% of its crop as an Association to a canning factory and was eventually paid in April 1996 in cash. It also was able to obtain 6 months of credit of Lei 20,000 ($400) at 28% annual interest from Agroindbank - using equipment as the collateral - for buying inputs, which it will not have problems repaying. The Director is energetically exploring numerous non-agriculture means for increasing cash income, including such ideas as manufacturing and selling portable display stands for kiosks.

185

The Director disseminates information through the Association's General Assemblies, which are held about every two months and which approximately 200 people attend. In addition, members of the other state farms in the District are eyeing the Association as a possible model for their futures.

Reverse FtF Program: The interviewee had been on reverse training in fruit and vegetable processing from March 1-28 of 1995 in Oregon, Ohio, and Washington State; he also visited the volunteer during this time. He was extremely positive about its benefits. He was convinced before the training about the private market, "but in the U.S. I was convinced by a thousand times that I was right. We can go back and tell our members that the privatized system works." He also saw the entire agricultural process, from pruning to marketing, and realized how the importance of issues such as packaging and marketing.

Concluding Observations: This project serves as a good example of choosing a host organization that is innovative and ready to change and, if successful, will have spread effect, as well as how a volunteer's presence can help encourage the process of attitudinal change, even if technical change can not yet be put into effect. As the Director said, "We can change everything, including the equipment, but, unless there is also change in attitudes, nothing is going to work."

Case Study No. 34

Date of Interview: June 26, 1996

Implementor: VOCA

Host Organization: Institute of Management and Training in Agriculture (IMATA)

Location: Chisinau, Moldova

Names of Interviewee: Dr. Mihail Dumitrashko

Host Organization: IMATA is a partially government- supported training organization under the leadership of a dynamic, energetic and well-connected individual. IMATA has 7 permanent teaching consultants, 150 part-time consultants, one is a member of Parliament, and 70 additional employees. The dean, or rector, is Professor Mihail Dumitrashko.

VOCA feels that Dr. Dumitrashko and IMATA's staff are progressive and in a position to lead many privatization activities in Moldova. The Institute is currently a training ground for select Moldovan managers/students in various fields. Dr. Dumitrashko is trying to inject western ideas and up-to-date information into the program by using VOCA volunteers. The Institute is in a position to be a point of contact, not only for VOCA, but any foreign or Moldovan organization that is actively pursuing privatization in agriculture.

For example, the Eurasia proposal for IMATA of $75,000 was awarded in April 1995 and is moving full steam ahead. VOCA assisted in writing the proposal and is named as key supporter. IMATA has purchased computers, a printer, a modem and materials for study, books, publications, etc. The training trip to Czech and Hungary for 25 advanced agricultural managers, included in the Eurasia grant, finished in October. The length of the grant is two full years from April 1995. This is a huge boon to privatization in Moldova and has the possibility of impacting thousands, as IMATA is one of the biggest educators in market economy agriculture and privatization in Moldova.

Also, 6 students from the 1994/5 class traveled to the U.S. on Cochran Fellowship Programs last fall. IMATA will submit Cochran applicants from this current body of students again this year. Through NET, IMATA and VOCA they submitted a proposal to send 12 agribusiness managers to the U.S. Another VOCA client, Boris Boinchan of SELECTIA Crop Research Institute put 3 candidates forward. VOCA/Moldova assisted both Professor Dumitrashko and Mr. Boinchan in writing the proposal/applications. This proposal was accepted and CSU Fresno won the tender. The 15 Moldovans left for the U.S. on September 6th of 1995 and returned in mid-October.

Professor Dumitrashko is involved in many activities. He is the British Know-How Fund manager in Moldova, UNFAO manager, works with EC TACIS, the World Bank, and others. VOCA works very intensively with the Professor and recommended IMATA to most of these donor organizations.

He is our primary counterpart in Moldova. Most recently, IMATA was approached by Brian Berman of the World Bank to submit a proposal for training, funded by a Japanese grant of $300,000. This proposal has been awarded, but at a (unknown) lesser figure than the $300,000 initially discussed.

Assistance Provided: Eleven VOCA volunteers have participated in IMATA's intensive training programs since 1993, teaching groups, for 2-3 week periods, during the 10 month intensive courses. The rector requested this assistance primarily to help him reorient his curriculum to effectively train current and future farm managers and policy makers of Moldova in the principles of operating within a market economy, particularly in the field of agriculture. The assistance provided has tended to be focused on revising curriculum and training material, and actually teaching or co-teaching several groups of students, some of whom are now in farm and other management careers, and others who are preparing for careers in agriculture. Some attention has also been paid to the orientation of some of the school's permanent and temporary staff. The normal stays of the volunteers have been between one to two weeks. Ideally, the rector would like them for no less than three weeks.

This is one of VOCA Moldova's favorite clients for a variety of reasons. The rector is well-respected and well-connected within official and unofficial circles in Moldova. He has a vision for his country and his institution, and is hungry for assistance in reforming policy and practices in Moldova, but he is also discriminating about the assistance he accepts.

With non-FtF VOCA assistance, the rector of IMATA and others have been able to establish a small indigenous NGO called ADISTO. The purpose of this organization is to develop a capability to render technical assistance in agriculture, and interfaces and networks between western and Moldovan commercial and non-commercial interests, and also provide needed assistance and information to foreign donors.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: For both the implementor and the evaluator, this is the type of activity that is very difficult to assess and measure impact in very specific terms. It has changed the mentality, according to the Rector, of some of his faculty and certainly many of his students. Probably the biggest impact has been the fact that volunteers have been able to successfully introduce market principles, practices and training methods into the schools curriculum, These have included marketing, management in general and farm management in particular, and some agricultural technology, as well as the teaching of the English language.

The real impact of this type of assistance to this type of institution will not be known, as the rector stated, until a generation of future policy and agricultural managers can be trained in western methods.

Reverse FtF Program: The Rector is well know in international training circles and has been the beneficiary of many grants and lecture visits to the West. As near as could be determined he was not a participant in the Reverse Farmer to Farmer Program per se.

Concluding Observations: It is easy to see why IMATA has become a preferred VOCA client. It is a worthwhile target for institution building, although its current and projected financial situation is shaky and highly dependent on donor grant assistance. On the other hand, it is an institution with a vision and purpose that fits U.S., USAID and FtF objectives very well.

Besides the question of institutional sustainability, there is also the issue of achieving measurable impact with some spread effect. This has probably been achieved in terms of curriculum development and reorientation, but not too much in terms of training trainers because the permanent faculty is small. So the focus has been on teaching students, which in terms of impact is a long-term and open-ended proposition. In this sense it is difficult for implementor and host to determine and agree on a point when assistance should end. As the above discussion under host organization implies, IMATA is well-served by and connected to other donor sources. It may be time to assess continued FtF assistance to IMATA against the needs of other potential Moldovan hosts.

RUSSIA

Case Study No. 35

Date of Evaluation:	June 12, 1996
Implementor:	ACDI; Moscow
Host Organization:	FASTA Farm
Location:	Fastovetskaya, Krasnodar Krai, Russia
Name of Interviewee:	Vladimir Gavrilenko

Host Organization: The FASTA Farm is a former collective farm of 13,800 tillable hectares that was reorganized as a joint stock company in 1992. The farm has 1,383 shareholders, a large majority of whom are employees of FASTA Farm. For the 1995 crop year, FASTA's hectarage under cultivation of major crops included: a) winter wheat = 7,000; b) grain and silage corn = 2,000; c) sugar beets = 1,900; d) sunflower = 1,400; e) alfalfa = 1,000; and f) barley = 550. The farm also has a dairy herd of 1,500 cows, 600 sows, 3,000 piglets and 3,000 feeder pigs.

FASTA owns 155 tractors, over 1,000 pieces of cultivation equipment, 29 DON-1500 combines, 88 trucks, 3 truck cranes, 6 bulldozers, 9 buses, and several pieces of special machinery. FASTA has completed about 60% of the construction of a 9,000 MT grain and oilseed storage silo complex and has purchased equipment for a flour mill. It was at a stage where it needed additional funding to complete the complex. FASTA has already paid for about 42% of the total estimated cost (15,500,000,000 Rubles or $3.1 ml) and needs a loan of about $1.8 ml to complete the complex.

Assistance Provided: In August of 1995, ACDI fielded a two-volunteer team consisting of an agricultural economist and a business planning advisor. The two volunteers worked directly with FASTA management for three weeks, assisting them in preparing a business plan with a loan application to obtain financing to complete construction of the 9,000 MT grain and oilseed storage silo (18 - 500 MT silos interconnected) and to construct a 25 MT/per 8-hour shift flour mill. The farm already has purchased in cash 90% of the equipment and fixtures needed to equip the mill and has paid for all the construction on the silo to-date.

Mr. Gavrilenko, the General Director of FASTA, stated that he might need future help from ACDI or another implementor to assist FASTA develop a corn milling operation. They will not attempt this until their silo and flour mill are operational. Their desire to develop corn milling is due to several factors, including but not limited to, their large production of corn, milling costs for corn being less than for wheat and the lack of current competition for corn meal and flour in their market area..

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: Upon departure, the volunteers left a complete business plan/loan application based on the loan application information required by the Russian American Enterprise Fund. From discussions with top officials of the Interagrofund Bank in Moscow, a loan guarantee operation, and with the Krasnodar Bank in the city of Krasnodar, it appears highly likely that either a loan will be made to FASTA Farm for their grain silo and flour mill, or there is a chance that Krasnodar Bank will take an equity position in the combined silo/mill component of FASTA's farming operation .

The second impact is that FASTA management now believe they have learned how to prepare business plans and loan applications in the format and detail required for consideration by lending institutions. They have learned the process and the terminology of cash flow analysis, break-even points, profit and loss statements, etc. In addition, the two translators provided by FASTA have also become familiar with the process and the terminology.

Reverse FtF Program: No participation. However, the General Director of FASTA visited the annual farm machinery show in California early in 1996 at FASTA's expense. He is very interested in farm machinery and implements the U.S. manufacturers offer. Julia Talagaeva of the Northern Caucasus Grain Marketing Association stated that Vladimir is a very talented leader of a major agricultural enterprise, and he would greatly benefit from a visit to a U.S. farmers' cooperative like Harvest States in Minneapolis.

Concluding Observations: Several observations regarding this project are worth mentioning. For example, there is a 95 % probability that the grain storage silo and flour milling complex will receive funding due to the assistance provided by the two volunteers, and a FASTA employee who received his diploma in grain milling technology at a State Polytechnical College is available and qualified to manage the wheat milling operation; no additional volunteers will be required for this purpose. Furthermore, it is felt that single visits can be extremely valuable under certain circumstances such as FASTA's. Finally, the estimated return on investment in this organization appears very attractive.

Case Study No. 36

Date of Evaluation:	June 11, 1996
Implementor:	ACDI, Moscow
Host Organization:	Northern Caucasus Grain Marketing Association Tel. 55-88-37
Location:	1 Elevatorny per., Krasnodar 350046, Russia
Name of Interviewee:	Helena Kim

Host Organization: The Northern Caucasus Grain Marketing Association (NCGMA) was founded five years ago by Helena Kim. The purpose of the association is to modernize agriculture in the Krasnodar region of Russia by linking a number of groups with similar interests in the agricultural/agribusiness sector. Current members of NCGMA include: a) FASTA Farm, a 13,800 ha grain and livestock farm two hours northeast of Krasnodar; b) Krasnodar Bank; c) Agrotech Services; d) Pamyt Lenin Farm; e) Stock Elevator in Novorossisk; f) Guichevechi Farmers Association (an AKKOR affiliate); g) the Plant Breeding Research Institute; and h) one new member, Rodina, a joint stock company with 17,000 acres of farm land. Five additional groups have applied for membership to the Association. Each member pays dues of $2,000 per year to NCGMA.

As part of its own business operations, NCGMA, with its staff of ten persons, focuses on the import, export and domestic sale of grains and oilseeds. In 1995, they sold about 15,000 MT of grains. At the same time, it is working with it's members to explore a variety of investment potentials including a farm machinery leasing business and fruit juice processing.

Assistance Provided: In 1995, NCGMA and its members received assistance from 13 volunteers. In total, NCGMA and its members received 15 volunteers on 7 assignments, including one repeat volunteer. Several of these members were visited by the evaluation team and their use of volunteers will be discussed in their respective reports.

ACDI volunteers Aaron Glanzer and Myron recently assisted the NCGMA develop its structure, vision and plans for development during September 1995. During June of 1995, three volunteers presented a three-hour, introductory business planning seminar to NCGMA members and other invited guests. Volunteer Ken Eubanks presented a 3-day seminar on this same topic May 1996. ACDI volunteers also assisted NCGMA in the implementation of forward contracts for grain in which NCGMA provided up to 20% of funds for a given tonnage of wheat before planting season. At harvest, the farm is committed to sell/deliver to the association x tons to pay back the advance and the rest to honor its contract to market grain through the association.

192

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: NCGMA was organized as a non-profit organization. In 1997 it plans to convert to for-profit status. The assistance provided by Mr. Glanzer and Mr. Just related to the improvement of internal documents, instruments and articles of incorporation will be of material value in re-registering the company as a for-profit corporation.

Volunteers have also introduced NCGMA to the concepts of forward contracting and warehouse receipts as effective grain marketing tools. Furthermore, NCGMA and several of its members have learned how to prepare professional quality Business Plans.

Reverse FtF Program: Helena Kim attended a Land O'Lakes agribusiness seminar in Minneapolis under the Reverse FtF Program at the recommendation of Fred Smith of ACDI.

In addition to the Reverse FtF trip, Ms. Kim and 10 members of the association visited the U.S. on other-sponsored or paid orientation tours. Of these, six paid their own way, four went to Land O'Lakes under the NET Program and one visited under the COMEX Program. Of these, four visited an exhibit of food processing equipment, two observed financing of agricultural lending and general banking operations, two studied agricultural management, and Ms. Kim participated in a grain marketing seminar conducted by the Chicago Board of Trade and the University of Illinois. Ms. Kim stated about her visit that "When I returned to Krasnodar, I was enthused with all the potential to develop the grain marketing business in the Krasnodar Region. There is a great need to produce, process and market grain products in Russia. The investment in small processing plants in areas of production holds great merit business-wise."

Concluding Observations: The comment has been often stated by USAID officials in Washington and in the Missions that volunteer visits should impact on multiple beneficiaries. In the case of the NCGMA, the association has been instrumental in identifying opportunities for its members to benefit from the assistance provided by U.S. volunteers. It has functioned as a coordinating body to ensure that the assistance provided by the FtF Program has been well thought-out and effective. This has eased the burden on ACDI staff in Moscow. ACDI volunteers have presented seminars to the association and its members, and have assisted with the development of business plans. The association was thus enabled to assist its members with the completion of seven business plans including the development of loan applications. The association has also taken the lead in assisting its members in the presentation of their loan applications and conducting continuous follow-up with lenders to ensure favorable consideration of the loan requests. The size of loans requested has ranged from $100,000 to $300,000.

Case Study No. 37

Date of Evaluation:	June 12, 1996
Implementor:	ACDI & VOCA, Moscow
Host Organization:	Association of Soybean Processors (ASSOY), Tel. 52-56-14
Location:	ul. Mira, 28 Krasnodar 350063 Russia
Name of Interviewee:	Alexander Podobedov, General Director

Host Organization: ASSOY is a private, for-profit soybean and sunflower processing and marketing company. Alexander Podobedov is the firm's General Director and major shareholder. The firm was organized about 4 years ago and began operations through gaining control of five old government-owned sunflower oil mills. Since that time, the firm has added 8 new oilseed mills which it designed, built and equipped with its own staff. Those who constructed and installed the equipment were retained to operate and maintain their respective oil mills.

Two years ago, ASSOY began producing soy milk on a small scale at its headquarters office using SoyCow-20 machines from Canada. The soy milk and the by-product (Okara) were initially sold from its headquarters facility and are now sold from three or more outlets in Krasnodar. In 1995, ASSOY purchased six commercial roasters from a firm that was bankrupt. ASSOY is now producing roasted soy nuts which are packaged and sold as snack items. Several months ago, the firm began production of powdered soy milk and soy flour using SoyCow-2,000 (liters) machines. The soy powder and flour have been used commercially in baked goods, especially bread and rolls, sausage, and candy.

With the Ministry of Agriculture and Food of the Russian Federation, ASSOY has developed a "Federal Target Program" for the development of soybean production and value-added processing in the Krasnodar Region during 1996-1998. This program has among its goals an annual production of 600,000 MT of soybeans which they are processing into food and feed products.

Assistance Provided: Mr. Podobedov stated that the first volunteers were provided about two years ago, but that he could not recall just who or what they did. To date, ASSOY has hosted about eight volunteers as we calculate from ACDI records and the current VOCA volunteer.

Volunteers helped train ASSOY personnel and oriented them as to how they could develop the soybean industry in the Krasnodar Region. Volunteers also trained ASSOY staff in business plan development, including how to develop questionnaires and conduct personal interviews to obtain information on market potentials for soy products. Volunteers helped to make a good analysis of packaging options and different systems of soybean processing. Nevertheless, Mr. Podobedov stated

that he has not received enough assistance on soybean growing; however Dr. Orf, a soybean specialist, had recently arrived at the time of the evaluation interview and was scheduled to spend three weeks with ASSOY as a FtF volunteer for VOCA.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: The firm has adopted recommended financial planning and budgeting formats. Volunteers trained ASSOY staff in business planning development and market assessment methodologies. This resulted in the development of a large soy milk powder plant with the capability of producing condensed soy milk, soy flour, yogurt, margarine, and frozen yogurt. The plant began operations about three months ago. ASSOY's acquired ability to produce good business plans has been instrumental in obtaining direct investments in their operations by German and Russian investors.

Mr. Podobedov stated that if USAID started a real FtF Program, by this we feel that he means using actual farmers, ASSOY would pay for their accommodations in Russia. Mr. Podobedov is trying to encourage additional farmers to grow soybeans in the Krasnodar Region and he would like American farmers to teach Russian farmers improved techniques of soybean production.

Reverse FtF Program: No participation. ASSOY would like to send 5 persons per quarter to the U.S. for training and they would be prepared to pay for lodging costs.

Concluding Observations: ASSOY has clearly benefitted from the FtF Program and would like to see the Reverse FtF Program reinstated. Mr. Podobedov stated that the quality of the volunteers was "very good". The assistance provided in business planning has resulted in financing of the aforementioned soy milk processing plant. The key question now is whether ASSOY should be graduated from the FtF Program. The evaluators' opinion is that ASSOY has reached the position where it has the in-house expertise to continue to expand its activities and the financial resources to engage any further technical assistance that it may require.

Case Study No. 38

Date of Evaluation:	June 6, 1996
Implementors:	ACDI, LOL, VOCA, & CNFA
Host Organization:	Russian Farm Community Project (RFCP)
Location:	Dimitrov Raion, Moscow Oblast
Name of Interviewee:	Staff of RFCP

Host Organization: The Russian Farm Community Project (RFCP), located in the Dimitrov Raion, Moscow Oblast, is a joint U.S./Russian effort. The purpose of the project is to assist Dimitrov Raion residents to establish private farms and agribusinesses and to convert former state/collective farms into private entities. The Project works with 3 joint stock companies (former state farms) comprised of 8,550 people (2000 farm families), 18 villages and 7,000 hectares of land, as well as over 40 private farmers in the area. RFCP takes a very general approach to the development of the agricultural sector of Dimitrov through the provision of training, extension and social services as well as financial assistance (Attachment 1 - organizational chart). Following a request from the Russian Parliament, the RFCP was organized as a subsidiary of the Churches United in Global Mission (CUGM) in 1992 by Ralph Hofstad, former President of LOL.

Assistance Provided: FtF volunteers have provided a wide range of technical expertise to farm families participating in the project. From the fall of 1993 to date, 15 volunteers have participated in 31 assignments. Technical expertise has been provided in farm privatization, cooperative development, financial management, agricultural production credit, farm management, meat processing and marketing, potato and vegetable marketing and agricultural extension.

The project has established a trust fund to manage a revolving credit program for project farmers and agribusinesses. The credit monies come from a soybean monetization program agreement between USDA and RFCP. Soybeans are donated by USDA and sold by RFCP for rubles. These rubles then become the credit monies which can be lent to RFCP participants. RFCP sale of soybeans under the current agreement with USDA will generate $1,500,000. RFCP will provide $250,000 to finance shipping cost of the commodity. Through the end of 1995, one million dollars had been deposited to the trust fund. RFCP plans to request additional funds from the USDA under this commodity monetization program. An annual audit of monetized funds is required under this USDA program.

Nearly $600,000 has been lent to farmers for the current year for purchase of production inputs - seed, fertilizer, pesticides, herbicides, fuel, etc. No credits have been provided for equipment and machinery purchases nor for livestock purchases. The trust fund plans to gain some initial experience and assess how well borrowers repay loans. Loans were made to 13 private farmers; another 3 declined loans due to the burden of completing the loan applications. Three additional loans were

made to three joint stock company farms. Loans ranged from $3,000 to $50,000 and were made for a maximum of one year at an annual interest rate of 57%. Those farmers, including those from the JSCs, were required to attend training sessions at the project's Training and Consulting Center as a condition to their eligibility for loan consideration.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: As stated above, RFCP has received substantial volunteer input under the FtF Program. Since 1993, the 4 implementors have provided 15 volunteers on 31 assignments. RFCP staff indicated that the primary goal of the activity is to "assist private farmers to make their enterprises profitable." In support of this goal, the FtF program assigns volunteers to support the development of activities in areas such as, credit, marketing, extension, demonstration plots, and business plans. Listed below are specific examples pointed out by RFCP representatives of activities involving FtF volunteers.

Dr. Yuri Izilov from the Timiryazev Agricultural Academy is heading a team which is providing technical assistance to the project's farmers under a contract with the trust fund. The team, which involved FtF volunteers, has been assisting with research trials on three main crops: 1) potatoes (nine varieties), 2) corn (3 varieties), and 3) winter wheat (26 varieties).

One of the borrowers visited by the team is a woman, who with her husband has about 20 milking cows and approximately 6 calves. She borrowed $3000 from the trust fund and has already paid a considerable amount back. She practices close to zero grazing and has received advice from FtF volunteers concerning silage handling and grass seed. She stated that she now has no debt and is decidedly better off than before she became involved with the program.

The RFCP made a loan to a sawmill which is the only small agribusiness operating within the project. The initial general manager mismanaged the operation, kept poor records and receipts and may have appropriated some of the operations funds. The sawmill has new management now, but has yet to make a profit.

The second FtF project participant the team visited is a farmer who is the local head of AKKOR. This farmer has a large cold storage facility for potatoes and would like to construct another one for other vegetables including carrots. He received a loan of $50,000 from the project which he has used to buy seed potatoes, fertilizer, herbicides, pesticides, and fuel for his tractors. He has received advice from FtF volunteers concerning seed certification. The average yield in the Raion is 18 kg/ha, but with the improved varieties the farmer is expecting a yield of 25-30 kg/ha.

Reverse FtF Program: No participation.

Concluding Observations: The RFCP begs the question "what is enough" FtF assistance. To date 31 assignments have supported RFCP activities and yet clear impacts are difficult to document. USAID/Moscow has questioned the need for this level of assistance to one activity. It would seem that an overall strategy statement as well as a clear, focused SOW for each volunteer would help reduce significantly this area of concern.

It is important to note that the project now comprises a full complement of inputs for the farmer (i.e., credit, farm management and marketing). The project is posed to finally deliver expected outputs. In this regard, the project needs to establish a baseline to evaluate the impact of the inputs.

Case Study No. 39

Date of Evaluation:	June 7, 1996
Implementor:	ACDI; Moscow, Russia
Host Organization:	Graduate School of International Business, Academy of National Economy, Government of Russia
Location:	Moscow
Name of Interviewee:	Ms. Elena Kosareva, Agribusiness Program Vice-Director

Host Organization: The Graduate School of International Business was founded in 1991 to assist in the transition to a market economy. The school focuses on retraining of business executives.

Assistance Provided: The Graduate School has received twenty volunteers since the inception of its relationship with ACDI in 1993. The complexity of the workshop materials increased, culminating in mortgage finance, which was a popular topic for the participants. The large number of volunteers indicates a close relationship between ACDI and school. It was interesting that even after the assistance of 20 volunteers, the Graduate School was not fully participating with in-kind contributions of lodging, food, interpreters, and transportation.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: The volunteers conducted workshops in business planning. An example of a participant who benefitted from the training included Vladamir Tropin, who diversified his operation into bakeries, grain mill operations and a fox breeding operation. In 1995 he sold his fox furs in France.

There has not been a systematic method for assessing the impact of the volunteer's assistance. The project has received qualified volunteers, which were appropriate for the type of assistance requested. However, the long-term impact does not seem to be significant because the graduate school was not receptive to broadening and deepening the scope of the project. Furthermore, institutional capacity building was limited by the lack of resources and vision on the part of the host institution. The graduate school apparently used the volunteers as free lecturers instead of utilizing them to institutionalize the subject matter which they were teaching. ACDI stopped its support of further volunteers after it realized that the organization was not going to institutionalize the type of training programs that it was offering.

Reverse FtF Program: Ms.. Kosareva spent three weeks in the U.S. attending Iowa State University. She had an excellent experience with an intensive course that included visits to banks lending to farmers and providing mortgage financing. Ms. Kosareva brought back a manual on business plan development, which was translated into Russian. She continues to use this manual in her training programs.

Concluding Observations: ACDI decided last year not to continue with additional volunteers after the last set of volunteers in May of 1995, although the seminars were viewed positively. ACDI had several meetings with the host institution and, based on a lack of response to expanding the project, decided that it would not continue with future volunteers until the school was prepared to commit more resources and expressed interest in institutionalizing the information provided by the volunteers.

The Graduate School has limited resources and it has been difficult for ACDI to move the school toward institutionalizing the agribusiness training program. Ms. Kosareva recommended the need for additional teaching materials to assist in this effort. In the future, ACDI will need to consider ways to enhance the ability of the host institution to video-tape the courses and to translate the materials in order to improve the outreach of the program. Also, the opportunity to enhance the school's curriculum not of particular interest to the Graduate School. Overall, it seems that an appropriate decision was made to curtail further involvement with the Graduate School until a more comprehensive approach can be implemented.

The lesson learned is that a vehicle is necessary to institutionalize consultant's contributions in assisting agribusiness companies in business plan development and financial management. Certainly on paper, and in theory, the Graduate School of International Business would offer the hope of building indigenous capacity for training senior and middle management of agribusiness companies.

Finally, this case study clearly points to the evident need that a protocol be established which identifies goals for the host institution. It is very possible that the twenty volunteers were more than would have been necessary if ex ante benchmarks had been established between ACDI and the Graduate School. It would have been reasonable to expect a simple policy for in-kind contributions, after the large number of volunteers that had been assigned, but this was not the case.

Case Study No. 40

Date of Evaluation: June 7, 1996

Implementor: ACDI

Host Organization: International Finance and Banking School

Location: Moscow, Russia

Name of Interviewee: Gelena Sergeyeva

Host Organization: The IFBS is a non-profit institute which presents seminars and training programs to financial sector professionals. The school was established in 1994 with a $8 million grant from the Eurasia Foundation and operates out of a renovated building in Moscow. It offers its program all over the country.

Assistance Provided: Volunteers assisted in the preparation of three different seminars and a module of materials for the presentation, in collaboration with school faculty. The first seminar treated the topic of bank valuation. The second seminar concerned the analysis of investment projects and the third seminar illustrated internal audit procedures for banks. Two school employees visited the U.S. on Reverse FtF training in October of 1995.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: There are no measurable agricultural or economic impacts from the training program. The potential for long-term impacts from a more efficient and market-oriented financial sector is significant, although heavily contingent on a host of other factors.

The three seminars, designed with volunteer assistance, were each conducted three times in 1996 to an average class of approximately 18 students. In this regard, there is potential impact in terms of human resources development in the financial sector over the long-term. The institutionalization of the seminar programs as discreet teaching modules by the school and the school's wide geographic coverage creates a significant potential for spread effects with similar impact.

Reverse FtF Program: Reverse training was cited by the interviewee as crucial in deepening her understanding of credit techniques, loan evaluation and work with agricultural clients.

Concluding Observations: The school appears to be providing a service for which there is demand. The impact on agriculture is indirect, will take place over the long- term and diffuse. This case again raises the question of how much volunteer assistance should go to institutions that can apparently pay for similar services.

Case Study No. 41

Date of Evaluation: June 7, 1996

Implementor: ACDI

Host Organization: Central Bank Training Institute

Location: Moscow, Russia

Name of Interviewee: Mr. Surayev, Director of Training Programs

Host Organization: The Central Bank Training Institute is one of the main bank management training facilities in Russia, operating a network of thirteen facilities throughout the country. Its student population is made up of approximately 60 percent commercial bank personnel and 40 percent Central Bank and government employees.

Assistance Provided: FtF volunteers contributed significantly to the design of curriculum and teaching modules, training trainers at the Institute's thirteen training centers. They have assisted in developing a system of five modules on the topics of internal auditing, securities operations, bank management, economic analysis and currency trading. This curriculum and methodology has been adopted as standard by the CBTI.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: No measurable impact could be determined; however, the potential indirect economic gains from a well-trained and efficient banking sector, may be significant in the long-term. In the last two years, 148 trainers and 5,000 banking students have been trained through the CBTI using materials developed with FtF volunteers. Furthermore, the spread effects of continued training using the materials developed in collaboration with FtF volunteers should include the training of approximately 2,500 students per year and increased effectiveness of these personnel in the private and public banking sector.

Reverse FtF Program: No participation

Concluding Observations: The CBTI collaboration is a case of a successful training intervention whose impact is widely diffused and will only be realized over the long-term. While the quality of curriculum materials and usefulness of the intervention to the host organization is clear, the intervention raises questions three important questions: 1) how much should FtF focus on long-term, evolutionary activities, as opposed to interventions whose impact is more direct and realized in the short term, 2) how much FtF volunteer assistance should go to large, well-funded institutions, which are conceivably able to pay for their own assistance, and 3) when should institutions with these resources be graduated from FtF volunteer assistance?

Case Study No. 42

Date of Evaluation:	June 7, 1996
Implementor:	ACDI
Host Organization:	Interagro Fund
Location:	Moscow, Russia
Name of Interviewees:	Evgeny V. Ulyanov, President, Alexander A. Lisov, Denis G. Gerassimouk, Head of Capital Market Operations.

Host Organization: This joint stock company was established in 1994 to encourage investment in agribusiness and finance rural projects. Stockholders include the RF government, banks and several agroindustries. The fund is capitalized with 250 billion rubles.

Assistance Provided: FtF volunteers assisted the fund in creating a business plan and strategy for the institution and they trained fund management and its staff in project evaluation techniques which have been adopted and are being applied to their appraisal of potential investments.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: The fund has thus far guaranteed only one project, so the volunteers' impact to date is limited. Another 15 projects have been approved but are pending. The eventual impact of the fund could be significant in lowering lenders' risk and therefore helping to attract sizeable investments to agribusiness and agricultural activity. The fund is a unique institution in Russia and is an important developing institution, whose progress will monitored by the financial sector. If the fund is successful it may play an important role in helping to reduce risk in agribusiness and agricultural lending and contribute to the creation of similar funds and a broadening of financial intermediation in the agricultural sector.

Reverse FtF Program: The impact of three U.S. training trips appears to have been very general in terms of acquainting beneficiaries with financial systems and operations in the U.S.

Concluding Observations: The establishment and fledgling operation of the fund signals a preliminary interest in agribusiness projects by Russia's largest banks, and are therefore important steps toward the widening of financial intermediation in agriculture. The significant capitalization, income and backing of the fund raises the question, should volunteer assistance be denied to apparently viable institutions?

Case Study No. 43

Date Evaluated: June 10, 1996

Implementing Agency: ACDI

Host Organization: Central Bank Training School

Location: St. Petersburg, Russia

Names of Interviewee: Madame MaKeeva, Deputy Director

Host Organization: The Central Bank Training School is part of a network of 13 schools or training centers for Central Bank employees throughout the country. The St. Petersburg School is one of the largest and one of three equipped to train most levels of bank employees.

Assistance Provided: The School has been assigned a total of five volunteers over the last two years. The last volunteer, Jeff Young, is a repeat volunteer to the School. He came two years ago to help the Bank and School lay out a major training program He and one other volunteer have conducted at least three seminars, the last of which ended on June 7. The purpose of the training was to train trainers of the Bank's 13 schools to handle several complicated aspects of domestic and international banking such as investments, securities, certificates of deposits , etc. They began with small seminars to test the material and response of the school trainers, as well as of bank officials. The assistance to date culminated on June 7, 1996 in a week -long seminar for trainers from all 13 schools, to enable them to train prospective and current bank employees at three levels of skill and knowledge. As a result, the school is very anxious to have the most recent volunteer assistance repeated at least once more. Madame McKeeva appeared quite disappointed that this may not be possible.

The Deputy Director informed me that volunteers were provided with an apartment in St. Petersburg, a food allowance and interpreter services. ACDI, however, stands the cost of translating the voluminous training materials and modules into Russian.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: According to ACDI, volunteer assistance in developing and implementing training modules has been enthusiastically adopted by the school and has already led to the training of over 1000 bank employees. It was obvious from talking to Madame McKeeva that the school's officials and trainers from this and other schools are enthusiastic about the training modules. The most appreciated aspect of the assistance provided is that it has opened their eyes to more practical and useful interactive training methods through the use of practical demonstrations, case studies, and video and computer-assisted learning.

Reverse FtF Program: The Director of the St. Petersburg school , who was not available on the day of the interview, participated with four other school directors in the Reverse FtF program in the U.S.

According to the Deputy Director, he returned highly enthused about what he saw and even more committed to the training and methodology initiated by the volunteers.

Concluding Observations: It appears that the volunteer assistance to the school was of the highest quality and had a strong influence on their methodology for bank training. It would also appear that the methodology has been widely accepted by the trainers who are very anxious for more exposure and are already changing the ways they teach and train. In general, it can be concluded that the volunteer assistance has been institutionalized at the Central Bank and its 13 training centers and shows strong indication that it will be sustained. This type of assistance, however, raises the issue of relevance to the core objectives of the FtF program, and how long will it be before this type of assistance begins to impact more directly on these objectives. Lastly, because translation is an expensive proposition in Russia, there is the question of whether this is a cost that the Central Bank might be able to afford.

205

Case Study No. 44

Date of Evaluation: June 13, 1996

Implementor: ACDI

Host Organization: Krasnodar Bank

Location: Krasnodar Krey

Name of Interviewee: Sergei A. Kashin, Chairman of the Board

Host Organization: The Krasnodar Bank is located in the city of Krasnodar, extreme Southeast Russia, near the Black Sea. The Bank was founded in the 1880s and became a joint stock company in 1990. Mr. Kashin described the bank as a universal bank providing not only banking services but also functioning as a financial company. He indicated that the bank had no debt and very few non-performing loans. The bank currently has several branch offices including one in Moscow. Approximately 50% of bank funds are invested in short term loans (e.g., construction, communication, transportation), 25% in State securities and 25% in road construction and agriculture, principally agribusiness activities.

Assistance Provided: Krasnodar Bank has been working with ACDI to gain an increased understanding of the U.S. banking system and where appropriate, incorporate components of the U.S. system. The Krasnodar Bank initially received 3 FtF volunteers for 20-day assignments. The volunteers spent the first week familiarizing themselves with the Russian banking system - Mr. Kashin made the point that in the future it would be helpful if volunteers had previous experience with the Russian system to make more efficient use of their time. During the remaining period the volunteers worked with all departments of the bank and then concluded with a seminar for bank employees. Subsequently 2 bank employees went to Michigan and Minnesota to visit banks. Mr. Kashin felt that the initial visit of FtF volunteers to Russia was very good but that the RFtF visits to the U.S. were preferable, in that a clear understanding of the U.S. banking system was obtained particularly regarding the U.S. legal system, land ownership and risk management.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: Mr. Kashin indicated that the FtF program helped his bank gain a clear understanding of how U.S. bankers viewed the Krasnodar bank (i.e., both the strengths and weaknesses) as well as ways to improve management and services. Specifically, as a result of the FtF volunteer visits, the Krasnodar Bank joined an association of grain producers. Also volunteers recommended that the work force be reduced by 30%. Although this recommendation was not implemented, efforts were made to improve employee efficiency and expand work responsibilities. Mr. Kashin indicated that as a result of the initial FtF volunteers' work, he planned to request additional volunteers to assist on, inter alia, bank policy reform and formation of long-term leasing companies. Perhaps one of the potential biggest impacts of the FtF program is the impending approval of a $1 million loan to the FASTA farm, a joint stock company, for the completion of a

grain silo and construction of a small milling facility. The loan will not be approved until after the presidential elections.

The bank generally provided interpretation services and transportation for volunteers.

Reverse FtF Program: As indicated above, Mr. Kashin was particularly supportive of the RFtF Program. The RFtF program seems to provide a "reality check" on information provided by FtF volunteers and an opportunity to, in this case, observe the U.S. banking system in operation.

Concluding Observations: Our discussions concerning the RFtF program are showing a recurrent and consistent theme. All hosts strongly support the RFtF program and see a strong synergistic benefit to be derived by visits to the U.S., particularly with FtF volunteers that had previously visited the host organization. Also, a successful placement of the FASTA farm loan would seem to provide a strong justification for ACDI's effort in the banking system.

Case Study No. 45

Date of Evaluation:	June 6, 1996
Implementor:	CNFA
Host Organization:	Padderzhka Insurance Company
Location:	Moscow, Russia
Name of Interviewee:	Jurij S. Volovik, President.

Host Organization: Padderzhka operates 14 regional offices offering crop and other insurance services to approximately 28,000 farmers. Padderzhka was created as one of AKKOR's service enterprises in October of 1991 with the goals of creating a competitive rural insurance network and developing a system of insuring private farmers. A closed, joint-stock company, Padderzhka was established with $20 million in charter capital from AKKOR and private shareholders. It was designed as a decentralized network of regional offices which were to operate parallel to AKKOR regional offices. The regional insurance companies began operation in 1992, and by 1994, forty were in operation across Russia. In 1993, a new insurance law was passed whose new licensing and minimal capital requirements made it clear that many of Padderzhka's regional offices would not be able to be licensed. By 1995, an agreement with the government was worked out for adding an additional 20 billion rubles to Padderzhka's network, and 14 regional offices were selected to continue operation. Padderzhka's portfolio is approximate one-third property insurance, one-third livestock and crop insurance and one-third various other types. As a new insurance company, 99 percent of its employees are inexperienced in the insurance industry.

Assistance Provided: FtF volunteers assisted in the design of the company's operating structure, the relationship between the central administration and subsidiaries, agent-company and agent-client relationships, management of departments, policy formulation, financial management, design of computer systems and they assisted in setting up bookkeeping and accounting systems.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: Padderzhka offers insurance services, including crop insurance, to approximately 28,000 private farmers. This is the only crop insurance available to private farmers, and therefore is a unique mechanism for reducing risk and promoting investment in private agriculture.

Padderzhka is a new institution which fills a gap in rural services. Changeable legislative and economic circumstances have already forced downsizing and reliance on infusions of government capital, which have reduced the companies institutional impact. Its potential for sustainability is contingent on the financial success of Padderzka's primary client base of private farmers. Although Padderzhka originally operated 40 regional subsidiaries, in 1995, 26 of these were closed due to financial reasons and the remaining 14 were fortified by a 20 billion ruble government loan.

Reverse FtF Program: Two U.S. training trips were cited by the interviewee as critical to his overall understanding of the functioning of insurance companies. His contacts with Nationwide Insurance were cited as particularly useful in clarifying his vision of rural insurance operations.

Concluding Observations: Padderzhka fills an important need in terms of financial services to private farmers and other rural inhabitants. Its long-term financial viability is still in question, as it depends on the prosperity of its client base. FtF assistance appears to have played a major role in the establishment of effective operating and management procedures for the company.

Case Study No. 46

Date of Evaluation: June 6, 1996

Implementor: CNFA

Host Organization: Russian Mushroom Growers Association

Location: Moscow, Russia

Name of Interviewee: Mr. Alexander Krhenov, Director

Host Organization: The Russian Mushroom Growers Association was founded by private farmers in 1995 to transform traditional mushroom gathering into a mushroom cultivation industry; it was formed from the Moscow Mushroom Growing School, which CNFA began working with in 1994. The Association seeks to introduce new mushroom varieties and cultivation techniques, improve business management and marketing activities, create private labs for spore germination, make Western technology available to members, disseminate technical literature, and represent growers' interests. There are 60 founding members who operate button and oyster mushroom farms throughout Russia, which provide jobs to 360 families.

Assistance Provided: The first volunteer provided farmers with information on the marketing of mushrooms and conducted three seminars for association members on the marketing of agricultural produce. Another volunteer assisted mushroom growers in improving their compost and production techniques and advised on ways to enhance their mushroom industry, individual business, and educational activities. Work was also conducted with researchers and scientists at a fungus lab or Moscow State University, which was directed by Professor Laddie Garibova and approximately three mushroom growing areas in the Moscow Region were visited, which resulted in the presentation of a seminar entitled, "Growing Button Mushrooms in Russia and Abroad".

The most recent volunteers helped improve button and shiitake mushroom production; assisted in creating effective marketing plans, including reaching niche markets and highlighting options such as packaging, labeling, and advertising; and increased awareness of how the U.S. mushroom industry operates.

The host organization provided lodging, food, and transportation at site for all volunteers.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: Significant impact. For example, the second volunteers assistance resulted in improved composing techniques among 40 members. Because compost quality is 70% of mushroom productivity, making these improvements are critical to farm profitability. Furthermore, modern production techniques were reinforced, which growers were familiar with, but were not confident enough in their source of information or level of understanding to try to apply what they

210

had learned. As a result of the FtF volunteer's assistance, they were confident in applying these new techniques. In addition, CNFA providing the association with subscription to a U.S. publication which will provide more in-depth information.

Another accomplishment involves improved research on mycelium genetics with Moscow State university scientists and better understanding of the usefulness of developing closer research/industry ties to further develop the Russian mushroom industry.

Finally, FtF volunteers helped the association provide member services more effectively and identified new potential services. The Director now understands how marketing boards work and will be getting new publications and training videos for their members. In addition, 3 growers are being assisted with business planning and financing options.

In summary, TA has assisted in (a) increasing profits by 50%; (b) encouraging growers toward more independent thinking and problem-solving; and (c) increasing the number of commercial mushroom growers through information and marketing conferences. Long-term impacts are that Russian mushroom growers are better able to compete with European producers in Russia and more employment opportunities exist in mushroom production on former collective farms. The "spread effect" of this assistance may be significant, as this producers' association has direct links with 40 members of the association, 18 women and 22 men, and indirectly with the 5,200 employees of the 26 farms belonging to the association.

Reverse FtF Program: Four association members have participated in U.S. short-term training. Each returned with a new entrepreneurial perspective, as well as technical ideas and information not available in Russia.

Concluding Observations: The association is an excellent example of a project which has a mutually-agreed-upon development plan for sequential volunteers, as laid out in the *Technical Assistance Protocol* between the association and CNFA. Its impact has been excellent, both economically and institutionally and it has very good prospects for economic and institutional sustainability and growth.

Case Study No. 47

Date of Evaluation:	June 8, 1996
Implementor:	CNFA; Moscow
Host Organization:	Borets Collective Farm, Tel. 546-0042 or 503-4355
Location:	Rybolovo Village, Ramenski Raion, Moscow Oblast, Russia
Name of Interviewee:	Nicolai Mikhailovich Sabetov, Chief Engineer

Host Organization: Borets Farm was founded in 1931 and is the largest joint stock company in the Moscow Region. It covers 6,000 hectares, of which 4,000 are arable. The farm has 1,373 workers and its 4,000 residents live in 8 villages. The farm's activities cover three main areas:

1. Dairy Operation - Borets has 1,730 dairy cows, culled from about 2,000 due to a Blackleg incidence six months ago. Last year, the farms produced 7,180 MT of milk, with average yield of 4,760 liters per cow. Borets sells unpasteurized milk to the State Milk Plant at 900 - 1,100 rubles per liter, pasteurized milk to middlemen at 1,600 - 1,700 rubles per liter, and pasteurized, packaged milk in six of their retail outlets for 3,000 rubles. Ten percent of the milk is given to employees and their families - one-half liter per person per day. The packaging line cost $112,000 in 1994 and Borets paid for it within 20 months. The farm would like to construct and equip a milk products manufacturing facility; they have already determined their needs and estimate the facility would cost approximately $1 million. This plan is on hold until they determine how and where they might get financing for the facility. Borets claims that their profit on milk production is 30%.

2. Vegetable Production - Borets grows vegetables, mainly tomatoes and cucumbers, in heated greenhouses on 6 hectares. Of this amount, 2.5 hectares were equipped this spring with drip irrigation supplied from Israel. Normal production has been 12 kg per square meter without irrigation. This year, Borets expects to obtain 18 kg per square meter and 28 kg in two years, as their experience and knowledge of growing under drip irrigation increases. The have experienced a 25% reduction in labor required by the drip irrigation practice, and they believe that they will be able to amortize the cost of the equipment in 2 years. They use a combination of peat and sawdust for their growing medium. Borets also grows carrots and cabbage outdoors. Their vegetable production in 1995 was about 3,000 MT. They claim that their level of profit on their vegetable production is 75%.

Borets also grew 200 hectares of potatoes and obtained 3,500 MT. A small amount of these are used for seed, most are sold at the retail level, and about 10% goes for making potato starch. They plan to build a potato storage facility, make french fries, and buy machinery for cleaning and packaging potatoes for sale at the retail level.

212

3. Field Crop Production - In 1995, Borets produced more that 2,000 MT of grains on 800 hectares. This year, they have 1,300 hectares in grain - all of which is grown for seed, with the seconds fed to their dairy cows.

Borets has 150 trucks, 120 tractors, 8 combines, plus all the implements needed for tillage and harvesting. All equipment repairs are done on the farm.

Assistance Provided: In 1993, Don Hutchins provided assistance in farm management and recommended that Borets pasteurize and bottle milk. This led to Borets purchasing the Tetra Rex packaging line mentioned above. In 1994, a second Volunteer visited Borets to review their soil disease problems in their greenhouse operations. He recommended that they install a drip irrigation system, which they did this spring; they had to wait until they had the funds to buy the system. In 1995, Joe Ferris visited Borets and made recommendations related to the housing of dairy calves, and improved cow handling, including ventilation of the dairy barns to release some of the ammonia built up due to confinement feeding. Mr. Ferris has visited Borets a number of times during his eleven volunteer assignments under the FtF Program in Russia.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: A number of improvements in Borets operations have been implemented by management. In addition to those mentioned under "Assistance Provided," Borets was shown how to sterilize their growing medium from the bottom up, whereas Borets has been sterilizing from the top down and the steam did not penetrate all the way through the growing medium, thereby failing to kill many of the disease organisms.

In the next month or two, Borets will host a bakery advisor who will be working with about three different host organizations.

Reverse FtF Program: Borets' chief engineer was offered the opportunity to participate last year, but was unable to participate due to pressing duties at the farm.

Concluding Observations: Borets stated that VOCA has provided them with valuable assistance and their confidence in the volunteers' recommendations has lead them to make many improvements in their operations, as previously mentioned. The improvements made in milk processing and packaging and greenhouse production have and/or will result in significant increased earnings for Borets, which is already a profitable operation. The farm is at the point where it should be able to pay for future technical assistance on its own. At the very least, if it receives any future volunteers, it should be required to pay all local costs associated with these visits.

Case Study No. 48

Date of Evaluation:	June 10, 1996
Implementor:	CNFA, LOL, & VOCA
Host Organization:	Belorechensk Farmers Association
Location:	Belorechensk, Krasnodar Krai, Russia
Name of Interviewee:	Alexander Kapustin, Director

Host Organization: The Belorechensk Farmers Association was organized in 1989, by government decision, as a local branch of AKKOR. In 1992, the association became private/independent. However, in 1993, it was still tied to the State structure as it had its offices in the Ministry of Agriculture building. When the association would act in defiance of the Ministry, it would cut off their phone service. The association solved this interference by buying the two offices it was occupying. The association is made up of 380 farmer members who control 30 percent of the land in their area. The ownership of members' lands ranges from one hectare to 500 hectares, with the average being about 40. Members each pay 2,000 rubles per hectare per year as dues. Primary crops produced include corn, barley, wheat, soya beans and wheat

The association provides member services in the following areas: a) lobbying for protective legislation, tax laws, etc.; b) accounting services to farmers for preparing their tax returns and developing farm budgets; c) legal services; d) market information; e) public relations/member communications; f) technical assistance on crop production; and g) training seminars and workshops.

Assistance Provided: CNFA provided 5 volunteers who made 7 visits to the association. LOL and VOCA volunteers worked with individuals or small groups, i.e., a mini bakery, while CNFA worked directly with the Association.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: An example of a volunteer's assistance is the work of Steve Cochrane from the Texas Farm Bureau, which is teamed with CNFA for services in the Krasnodar Krai. During his first visit, Steve provided theoretical knowledge related to the organization and administration of a farmers' association, by describing how an American Farm Bureau works.

Volunteers also provided assistance in the methods farmers use to communicate with one another, how Farm Bureaus provide information and services to their members, and how American farmers and cooperatives market their production.

Reverse FtF Program: Three persons from the association traveled to the U.S. This includes the current Director, the past Director who is now on the Board of Directors, and the Chief of the land committee. Their three-week visit afforded them the opportunity to see in operation the theoretical information they received in Russia from the volunteers. This included: a) the structure and

214

organization of the Texas Farm Bureau; b) the establishment of a credit association and an insurance association; c) the operation of farmer-owned processing cooperatives operate; and d) the realization that cooperatives can be small, medium and huge. The knowledge gained was also instrumental in the association's preparation of a model for agro-industrial development in the region, in association with the Agricultural Research Institute.

Concluding Observations: It was difficult to obtain a direct statement from the Director as to what impact he felt the volunteers had on his organization, in the sense of where he felt the association would be without their assistance. However, it is clear that the association is functioning with a salaried director, that it is providing services to its members, and it is proceeding to increase and expand its member services, especially in market information and marketing. The Director provided us with statistics that show that the association's farmers are more successful/profitable than the collective farms in his area. The assistance provided by CNFA Overall, the volunteers were viewed as invaluable to the success of the Association.

Case Study No. 49

Date of Evaluation: 14 June 1996

Implementor: CNFA

Host Organization: Women's Committee, AKKOR Farmers Association

Location: Moscow, Russia

Name of Interviewee: Ms. Roza Mitrofanova, Deputy Director

Host Organization: The project is based on a protocol between The American Farm Bureau Women's Committee, The Women's Committee of the Russian Private Farmers Association (AKKOR), and CNFA, which was signed in March 1995 for a duration of five years. Its purpose is to support the emergence of private farming in Russia and to establish a long-lasting working relationship between the women's committees of both national farmers' associations. The partnership -- which involves a two-way flow of people between the U.S. and Russia -- consists of sharing of information, building institutions, establishing relationships, and working on joint projects.

The types of activities agreed upon at the time of the protocol signing were: joint seminars, workshops, and conferences, and business plan training. At the time of the evaluation, two major activities had been carried out:

1. St. Petersburg, August 1995 - a seminar which was held during the 1995 Russian Farmers Fair in St. Petersburg, three women representing the AFB Women's Committee came to Russia to conduct three workshops for an audience of more than 100 Russian Women's AKKOR members and their husbands. The workshops focuses on the structure and operations of women's committees, the marketing of agricultural commodities, lobbying by women and women's committees and the structure and operation of young farmers' committees.

2. Planning Workshops in Moscow and Southern Russia, March to April 1996 - Two representatives of the AFB Women's Committee and AFB Young Farmers Committee presented workshops on business planning, leadership development, young farmers' committees, and agricultural education systems.

Assistance Provided: Two women representing the Farm Bureau Women's Committee and accompanied by Tracy Slaybaugh-Mitchell, the CNFA FtF Coordinator in Russia, presented seminars in Krasnodar, Voronezh, Novgorod, and Moscow to audiences of women farmers, their husbands, and other leading farmers and government representatives.
One volunteer conduced business plan development seminars, helped farmers understand how to customize business plans to cover loan repayment, lead case studies of business plans provided by participants, and provide recommendations for future activities of Women's Committee. The second

volunteer conducted presentations on the Young Farmers Movement and leadership and assist with business plan development seminars.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: AFB/CNFA/AKKOR Women's Committee partnership has been of exceptional importance in strengthening this organization, which potentially can affect 280,000 Russian farm families. Its position as a national institution has been further enhanced by its acquiring legal status this year as an institution separate from AKKOR. This status gives it the right, among others, to give and receive legally recognized benefits, including foundation funds.

In the 1996 business plan seminars carried out in four areas of Russia, 182 farmers and rural leaders learned to write business plans and were introduced to how Americans farm within their market economy. These leaders will not only use the information to improve their own agribusinesses but will also pass on the information through local Women's AKKOR organizations. The volunteers also passed on information about U.S. farmers' experience with taxes and informed local politicians about possible strategies. In addition, the seminars raised the status of women as farm leaders in the eyes of government officials.

The volunteer representing the FFA explained agricultural youth education programs to 165 rural students, young farmers, and teachers, showing how these programs help prepare young people for careers in farming. Among other impacts, the Tver Young Farmer Association decided to start activities similar to FFA, and CNFA is now planning to bring a FFA specialist to mentor the Tver Association. This volunteer also conducted a seminar with 35 professors and students at the University of Krasnodar's "Private Farmer Program," which was started in 1992 and will graduate its first class of 20 students this year. Most students already have their own private land, and the University also has an agricultural extension division that provides consultations to farmers. The division may seek a linkage with FFA in Washington in the future. Finally, this volunteer met with the former governor of Krasnodar and current Chairperson of the Krasnodar Krai Legislative Assembly Economics and Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. Vasily Diakonov, to discuss his support of private farming and lobbying efforts for the future.

This project has excellent possibilities for both sustainability and multiplier effects. First, its new legal status as a legally-recognized entity gives it the possibility of both applying for funding from international organizations; for instance, the Swedish Women's Committee is interested in providing them with support. Second, as an entity separate from the national AKKOR, it can consider a plan for internal funding from membership dues.

Multiplier effects are already at work. The 1995 St. Petersburg workshop at the national Russian Farmers Fair directly affected 100 leading Russian women farmers and their husbands, who would return to their respective regions and pass on the acquired information. The 1996 regional workshops also have good potential for spread effect, since they targeted leading farmers and local politicians concerned with agricultural issues.

Reverse FtF Program: In September 1995, three women, including the interviewee, visited local farms and farm bureau offices in New Mexico, Indiana, and New Jersey, in order to learn more about the structure of farm bureaus, with a special emphasis on women's committee activities. They also met in Washington with USAID officials and Congress members from New Mexico and New Jersey to brief them on the agricultural situation in Russia and findings in these three U.S. states. The interviewee was exceptionally positive about the usefulness of the visit and about continuing possibilities for others in the future.

Concluding Observations: This project is exceptionally well-designed, with strong possibilities for building an institution which can potentially affect 280,000 Russian farm families and give them information ranging from business planning to lobbying skills to developing a national FFA organization. It should be noted that of the almost 300,000 households in private farming, 20% are headed by women, a not insignificant number of 60,000. In addition, in households where there is a couple, women's responsibilities are equal to men's.

Like almost all CNFA projects, a well-designed protocol was in place which had a development plan for the host organization and addressed volunteer needs over time. The SOW's were clear and detailed, and the implementor had invested considerable time in working with the host organization to arrive at a mutual understanding of need. In addition, the follow-up assessments were completed on schedule, with very good quantitative and qualitative details provided.

This protocol, SOW, and follow-up procedure would serve as a very useful model for all FtF projects.

Case Study No. 50

Date of Evaluation: June 14, 1996

Implementor: CNFA

Host Organization: AKKOR

Location: Rostov

Name of Interviewees: Alexandar Rodin, President and Victor I. Kolesnik, Vice President

Host Organization: AKKOR is a national organization representing private farmers. It maintains offices at the Oblast and Raion level. We visited the Rostov Regional Association of Farmers (Peasants) and agricultural cooperatives located in the city of Rostov, Rostov Oblast in Southeast Russia. Rostov Oblast, along with the Krasnodar Oblast, comprise one of the major crop - wheat, corn, barley, sunflower - producing regions of Russia. The association produces a weekly newsletter which is sold at a very nominal cost and has a distribution of 130,000 copies. The association obtains funds through commercial activities (e.g., bakery equipment, bread additives). Also, the association attempts to develop marketing information, but it is very difficult to obtain reliable information from farmers according to Mr. Rodin.

Assistance Provided: AKKOR/Rostov has developed a long-term working relationship with the Kansas Farm Bureau (KFB). In the spring of 1993, four KFB staff came to AKKOR/Rostov under the FtF program. In March 1994, under the RFtF program, AKKOR/Rostov staff members including the President visited the KFB. Also in 1995, two additional delegation visited AKKOR/Rostov from the KFB. Recently, three Russian bankers visited the KFB under the RFtF program. The purpose of these visits was to gain an understanding of the workings of the Bureau and where appropriate, to adopt and to utilize its organizational structure and methods. According to Mr. Rodin, this purpose has been accomplished, at least in part. AKKOR would like to continue to work with the FtF program and has requested a volunteer in the area of cooperative credit associations. Mr. Rodin also stressed that the quality of volunteers has been very good. He mentioned that the last volunteer was particularly good at providing practical information in establishing a profitable mini-bakery.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: As pointed out above, Mr. Rodin was pleased with the relationship the FtF program helped AKKOR/Rostov develop with KFB. That said, his discussion was short on specifics. It does seem axiomatic however, that as the Russian agricultural sector moves more toward a free market economy, AKKOR in Rostov and elsewhere in Russia will find knowledge and relationships with U.S. Farm Bureaus more and more useful in shaping their organizations.

Reverse FtF Program: As summarized above, the RFtF component of FtF was utilized to gain a first hand understanding of the workings of the KFB. As with all host organization representatives interviewed during the course of this evaluation, both Mr. Rodin and Mr. Kolesnik were effusive in

their support of the RFtF program. Both felt that the opportunity to see the KFB in operation provided more convincing evidence of its worth than visits from to Rostov by KFB personnel.

Concluding Observations: Two important lessons learned may be concluded from the AKKOR/Rostov visit. First, the RFtF program, from the viewpoint of the host organization, is of great value. This support goes much further than just getting a free trip to the U.S. One gets the impression that one picture really is worth at least a thousand words. Also, for organizational change to be truly effective one must be committed for the long haul. In Russia this is particularly true, combined with changes in the attitudes an customs of the population and the laws of the country.

Case Study No. 51

Date of Interview: June 13, 1996

Implementor: CNFA

Host Organization: CONAGRA FARM

Name of Interviewees: Mike Whitty and Dave Noetzel

Host Organization: The CONAGRA Farm is located approximately halfway between Krasnodar and Rostov, two of the largest cities in the Southeast region of Russia. CONAGRA is a major U.S. diversified agribusiness firm its headquarters in Omaha, Nebraska. CONAGRA's activities at the site focused on the production of seed potatoes. A dairy operation was also being developed at the site and supported by U.S. financier James Watkins. We met with Mike Whitty, a U.S. dairy expert, who is project manager of the dairy activities, and Dr. Dave Noetzel, a retired University of Minnesota, extension agronomist and potato production and certification expert.

CONAGRA's initial interest in potato production in the region was to raise commercial quality potatoes for sale to MacDonald's fast food restaurant chain in Moscow. However, it soon became apparent that commercial production of high quality potatoes was not practical in the region due to disease and insect problems, principally viruses. Thus, CONAGRA is now focusing on the production of seed potatoes and providing assistance to village households to improve the production and quality of "kitchen garden" potatoes for local consumption. CONAGRA has received support for the activity under a USAID subgrant from CNFA; CNFA was awarded a $30 million cooperative agreement under USAID's Food System Restructuring Program for the purpose of supporting agricultural/agribusiness development in the NIS. CONAGRA is providing $3 per $1 of USAID funding. The project is currently working with five growers in the area, plus raising seed potatoes on 200 hectares of leased land. A joint stock company named Privolnaya has been formed to support this effort.

As stated above, the dairy operation was started with the support of U.S. financier, James Watkins, a retired senior CONAGRA executive. Start-up operations began in early 1995 and milking operations commenced in November 1995. Currently 187 cows are being milked, with a total herd size of 890 head.

Assistance Provided: Potato and dairy activities have received the services of 15 FtF volunteers, divided evenly among the two projects. As a result, a number of initiatives have been started to improve potato seed and "kitchen garden" production as well as dairy production. Potato fields are regularly rogued for off types, thus, control of insects and diseases has been much improved. Dr. Noetzel indicated that the whole process of proper potato production is being institutionalized and that the yields of "kitchen garden" potatoes in the target area should double or triple in the next three years. Among cooperating farmers, commercial potato production has doubled. Eventually,

production of commercial potatoes from virus-free stock should increase 10 fold. Under the dairy activity, production is averaging 18 liters/day/cow as compared to 5 liters/day/cow on collective farms. Mr. Whitty indicated production should jump to 25 liters/day/cow from cows currently dry, when brought back in production. These increases are due to improved feed and feeding patterns, improved cow comfort, better milking machines and elimination of abusive treatment. Long-term increases will be obtained through the use of genetically superior semen. Neither the potato nor dairy operations will require further assistance under the FtF program.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: While the FtF program can not claim full credit for the improvements in the potato and dairy sectors described above, clearly their efforts have had an impact. Both Dr. Noetzel and Mr. Whitty eluded to the productive efforts of the FtF volunteers. In July 1995, FtF volunteer services ended for the potato improvement effort while FtF volunteer services for the dairy improvement effort were completed in 1994.

Reverse FtF Program: Both dairy and potato farmers and experts have participated actively in the RFtF program. A total of 4 people, 2 men and 2 women, were selected to travel to the U.S. The group brought back improved skills in basic business management, milking systems maintenance, artificial insemination and pregnancy testing. They visited the University of Minnesota's Crookston campus. The people selected for training in potato production under the RFtF program visited the St. Paul campus and received instruction in potato seed production and certification.

Concluding Observations: The utilization of volunteers to service activities such as those described above raises an interesting question of appropriateness, i.e., should FtF volunteers be used to support activities funded by a major U.S. corporation and USAID? One could argue that these funds should be targeted to support indigenous host-country organizations only. On the other hand, linkage with activities supported by U.S. companies and USAID provides the opportunity to leverage significant amounts of both money and expertise.

Case Study No. 52

Date of the Evaluation: June 4, 1996

Implementor: Land of Lakes; Moscow, Russia

Host Organization: Mr. Yury Pavlov

Location: P. O. Box Ilyich, Ryazan Region; Russia, 391752.

Name of Interviewee: Mr. Yury Pavlov

Host Organization: Mr. Pavlov is a 38 year old, veterinary technician and a member of AKKOR. He currently has 500 hectares in cultivation, of which 300 are owned and the rest he leases. He produces winter and spring wheat, barley and oats. He also owns fifteen dairy cows and twelve sows.

Assistance Provided: Mr. Pavlov received his first volunteer, a grain production specialist, in 1993. The volunteer visited Mr. Pavlov for two days, while traveling for the Russian organization, AKKOR. Mr. Pavlov became interested in the FtF program from this visit and requested a second volunteer for a longer period, who focused on swine production. Mr. Pavlov is expecting the return of the second volunteer in August of 1996, who will continue the work in swine production and concentrate on feeding systems and setting up feeding trials.

The first volunteer stay was so short, that nothing of significance was forthcoming. It was the introduction to the FtF program by this volunteer that was of most importance to Mr. Pavlov. The second volunteer's assistance in swine production was much more productive. Mr. Pavlov had the opportunity to learn about improved practices to better manage his operation.

Mr. Pavlov provided in-kind services by providing lodging and food and covering the cost of the interpreter; furthermore, he is willing to pay for these services if volunteers are assigned in the future.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: The FtF volunteer was instrumental in improving the swine operation by increasing the productivity of his operation. Animals are able to reach slaughter weight in a shorter period of time with less illness and lower cost. According to the host, the FtF program can be improved by accurately determining farmer needs and providing appropriate volunteer assistance. Mr. Pavlov provides an example of how the project can generate assistance through one farmer to other hog producers in the area. Through his association with AKKOR, Mr. Pavlov has met and discussed the techniques and opportunities of improved agriculture with other farmers in the area.

Reverse FtF Program: Mr. Pavlov went to the U.S. in 1995 on a tour of 12 cooperatives. He met with the leaders of these cooperatives over a period of twelve days. The trip helped provide him with the vision of how cooperatives can offer the opportunity to overcome problems in the input supply and product marketing systems. Mr. Pavlov said that the visit to the U.S. was like the old saying, "A

picture is worth a thousand words." The visit was able to crystallize his understanding of what the volunteers were trying to express. Mr. Pavlov believes that to improve the program only serious candidates should be selected for the RFtF program.

Concluding Observations: Mr. Pavlov stated that his transition to a market economy has been difficult. His prior position with the state farm provided a secure income, regular days off, and all with less responsibilities and expenses. His current economic position is such that he now has less income, which is more volatile, and he has to work harder; however, he would not want to go back to the old system because he had "no control over his operation" and did not have the freedom to produce and market the products of his choice.

In summary, it should be noted that Mr. Pavlov has made significant investments in buildings and equipment and he appears very serious about improving the commercial size and operation of his farm. He is even building a store next to the road to sell food and supplies. Mr. Pavlov demonstrates individual drive necessary to overcome adversity, inherit in the market economy.

Unfortunately, Mr. Pavlov sorely lacks the technical assistance and sources of information necessary to keep him abreast of new advances and to help him solve applied problems on his farm. He would like assistance from the government to help him stay in business. The government could help to correct the inequities in the marketing system by requiring that purchasers of livestock (livestock buyers, meat processors) remit payment for livestock within five business days of purchase (exchange of the live animals). It is recommended that the Packers and Stockyards Act in the U.S. be considered as a model for implementation.

Case Study No. 53

Date of Evaluation:	June 12, 1996
Implementor:	Land of Lakes, Moscow Oblast
Host Organization:	Mrs. Natasha Karpushova
Location:	Novostroiva Reion, Kaliningrad Oblast
Name of Interviewee:	Mrs. Natasha Karpushova

Host Organization: Natasha is a veterinarian by trade and worked at the local collective farm before starting her own meat processing plant. Natasha is a colleague of Mr. Pavlovsky, leading farmer in the area and mentor to Natasha. Her goal is to establish a meat processing plant in her village. She has obtained a loan of Ruble 25 million from the oblast administration for repairs of the building. She also received a Ruble 12 million for equipment from AKKOR. Natasha owns 6 hectares of land, far from her house and of poor quality. She grows grains to feed her hogs.

The challenge faced by Natasha is that, although the building is completed and the machinery has been purchased and tested, the raion administration is creating a roadblock to the opening of the plant by charging an enormous amount to turn on the electrical service. Currently, the plant is not producing Natasha is not sure when production will begin. She states the problem is political and illegal.

Natasha has trained three people from her village to work in the meat processing plant. The plant is the only private business in the area and will have an important impact if and when it opens. Also, she has plans to open other businesses, like a retail shop, in the future.

Assistance Provided: The first volunteer was assigned in 1993 and helped Natasha develop a business plan. The volunteer worked for a few days, but did provide much assistance in helping Natasha open her business or in obtaining a loan. A second set of volunteers came in November of 1994 and stayed only a few days. A third volunteer came one day and did not accomplish much.

In November 1995 and April 1996 Peter Basset, a meat processing specialist, spent a more significant amount of time at her operation. Basset provided the greatest assistance; Natasha described him as a real expert. He is familiar with how to cut up the carcass to get finished end products. He provided advice on each cut, as well as on suitable recipes. A fifth volunteer stopped for a short time at the plant and talked about smoking meats and provided some recipes. This stay was very short and not very productive.

The volunteers helped in many aspects related to establishing the small meat processing facility. The work was comprehensive and the host is ready to proceed, after resolving problems with the raion administration.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: With the exception of Peter Basset, the volunteers had minimal impact on Natasha's meat business. According to Natasha, the information they provided was too theoretical in their approach. Basset provided concrete, hands-on assistance and even developed meat product that has become very popular in the area and carries his name, "Peter's Meat".

Overall, the volunteers provided important technical advice to Natasha which should be beneficial. It will be important that the plant open in a timely manner or this impact could be diminished.

Reverse FtF Program: Natasha visited the U.S. for 21 days. She participated in seminars and visited a meat processing facilities and other businesses. Her most memorable experience was a visit to a meat processing plant in Pine Falls, Wisconsin. She wishes she could have spent her entire visit at the processing plant.

Concluding Observations: The likelihood of the success of the meat processing plant is still in doubt, due to difficulties with the local administration, that does not want her to open. She will have to be patient, but at the same time the lack of revenue from not opening the plant is a strain on her and her family. AKKOR is being helpful by negotiating on her behalf.

Natasha symbolizes the risk inherent in starting a private business. She has exposed her family to the possibility of failure; an even greater risk is her status as a political outcast. If the government should return to communism, she will be at a disadvantage in protecting her property and her family. She is paying a high price for exercising her freedom to conduct private business in Russia.

Fortunately, Natasha has developed a cadre of other small meat processing operators who joined the AKKOR loan program at the same time she did. This group is guided by Pavlovsky and presents a core of small businesses who can draw upon each other for assistance.

Case Study No. 54

Date of Evaluation:	June 13, 1996
Implementor:	Land of Lakes, Moscow Oblast
Host Organization:	Mr. Evgenij Pavlovsky
Location:	Kaliningrad Oblast, Russia
Name of Interviewee:	Mr. Evgenij Pavlovsky

Host Organization: Mr. Evgenij Pavlovsky is president of the Regional Farmer-Association of the Kaliningrad Area. He owns a 500 hectare farm, which he acquired in 1988. He produces wheat, barley, rapeseed and rye. Mr. Pavlovsky has been involved in bringing the LOL-sponsored FtF Program to the Academy of Agricultural Sciences and individual lead farmers in the oblast.

Assistance Provided: Mr. Pavlovsky has received up to 50 volunteers. The first volunteers were provided by VOCA in 1992. Volunteers spent various amounts of time at his farm. They provided advice related to livestock, land cultivation, grain production, storage, building, process feeding, flour production, pig production and meat processing.

At the time of the interview, a volunteer was at Mr. Pavlovsky's farm providing assistance in flour milling. Mr. Hans Wanzenried spent two weeks at the farm advising on the operation of the flour mill.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: Mr. Pavlovsky has clearly benefitted from the large number of volunteers who have visited his farm and is demonstrated by the continuous development and expansion of his operations.

In the case of the current volunteer at the farm, Mr. Wanzenried commented that his visit could have been more productive if he had been provided with more comprehensive information on his assignment. The flour mill was not complete with a flour testing lab, which kept him from provided the assistance he had intended. Therefore, the recommendations he provided were consequently of a theoretical nature. Mr. Pavlovsky has since ordered the necessary equipment.

Mr. Pavlovsky is the leader in the local farmers' union in the oblast. He is dynamic and works for the betterment of all farmers in the region. He has become an institution and is recognized for his generous efforts and support of other farmers striving to become private business people. Furthermore, Mr. Pavlovsky is cognizant of the need to diffuse information to other private sector farmers. As such, his operation serves as vehicle for demonstrating the positive impact of FtF.

Reverse FtF Program: Mr. Pavlovsky went to the U.S. to obtain a better understanding of cooperative grain marketing. He has not been able to establish the cooperative yet; however, he does have four to five farmers storing grain in his storage facility.

Concluding Observations: Mr. Pavlovsky is an example of a host organization that has progressed under the auspices of the FtF and the RFtF program. His farm is recognized in the oblast as being on the cutting edge of technology. He has shared this technology with other like-minded individuals. It appears that his efforts will be sustained because his operation is profitable.

The frustrated efforts of the current flour milling specialist demonstrate the need for increased communication between the volunteer and the host organization prior to the assignment. The volunteer was given only two weeks notice and therefore arrived unprepared for his assignment. More advanced notice and appropriate communication would have made the volunteer's visit much more productive.

Mr. Pavlovsky's son is attending the Academy of Agricultural Sciences and is currently in the U.S. on the FFA exchange program. It is evident that the efforts of FtF will successfully contribute to the establishment and continued success of a farm family that will encourage attitudinal change towards farming in the area.

Case Study No. 55

Date of Evaluation: June 13, 1996

Implementor: Land of Lakes, Moscow Oblast

Host Organization: Izrapil Sochoyev

Location: Kaliningrad Oblast

Name of Interviewee: Izrapil Sochoyev

Host Organization: Mr. Sochoyev is an immigrant from Southern Russia. He is the owner of a meat processing plant in Kaliningrad. He opened his plant in an old dairy processing facility operated by the Germans before the war. Improvements have been made in the facility. Mr. Sochoyev has developed marketing contracts for his meat with the Baltic navy and other outlets in the Kaliningrad area.

Assistance Provided: Mr. Sochoyev received FtF assistance in training at his plant, at the Academy and at other locations in the oblast. He is the one of the leading agribusiness developers in the network of the Regional Farmer Association of the Kaliningrad Area. Volunteers have visited him on a short-term basis and provided assistance in the areas of business planning and management.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: Mr. Sochoyev praised the efforts of volunteer Peter Basset toward the development of a new product, "Peter's Meat". Mr. Sochoyev prepared the product for the evaluation team and it was very tasty. Other new meat products will be tested and sold by the plant.

The meat processing company is part of a network of emerging meat plants that LOL is helping to establish. It is a viable operation and is an asset to the community. The owner is part of an entrepreneurial group that is emerging in the oblast. The spread effect is certainly taking place among their group and will likely spread as the plant expands the marketing of its products.

Reverse FtF Program: Mr. Sochoyev participated in an excellent management course in the U.S.

Concluding Observations: Mr. Sochoyev has been successful in establishing himself and his family in the village. He has been harassed by some in the area who see him as a threat to the old way of conducting business. Mr. Sochoyev has a close relationship with Mr. Pavlovsky, the dynamic leader who works with the Academy and key private sector farmers and agribusiness operators. He complained that the VAT tax policy favors the state collectives and puts him at a disadvantage. He would like to see some of these larger policy issues corrected so that he can expand his business.

In summary, Mr. Sochoyev stated that the improvement to his livelihood from the success of his meat business, due in part to FtF assistance, allows him the freedom to make choices regarding his future.

Case Study No. 56

Date of Evaluation:	June 13, 1996
Implementor:	Land O'Lakes, Moscow Oblast
Host Organization:	Polessk Vocational School
Location:	Kaliningrad Oblast, Russia
Name of Interviewee:	Grigoriy V. Bakunovich, Director

Host Organization: The Polessk Vocational School enrolls approximately 500 students and trains them in the agricultural sciences. They have forged a close linkage with AKKOR and rely heavily on its support, as only 15 percent of its funding comes from the federal government. The school has been in operation for three years and gives preference to children of AKKOR families.

AKKOR has assisted the school, and four private meat operations in the oblast, in the procurement of meat processing equipment. The school provides seminars and training courses to these meat operations, as well as to other farm families, and they are viewed positively as a farmer training center. Also, they have developed a collaborative relationship with Future Farmers of America (FFA) and there has been an exchange of students, which has been useful. Currently, there are students in the U.S. who are due to return home this month; another group of students is set to go in the fall.

Assistance Provided: Fifteen volunteers have assisted the school. The first set of volunteers focused on curriculum development. They made recommendations on changes in curriculum and teaching methods; however, improvement in these areas has been minimal according to Gregoriy, the Director.

Larry Propp, Director of Morgan Community College, provided assistance with testing procedures and helped develop business plans. Propp forged a Memorandum of Understanding between his college, the school and AKKOR. He is looking for private funds to assist in joint teacher and student exchanges between the two institutions.

The school has been forthcoming in its in-kind contributions. They have paid for all food, lodging, and local transportation, and they have provided an interpreter. This demonstrates a keen interest on the part of the host organization.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: A volunteer provided teaching materials which are being translated into Russian by one of the teachers and a translator in Kaliningrad. Also, one of the volunteers was able to assist the college in getting a large supply of seed from Burpee Seed Co. in the U.S.

The director commented that the volunteers have been of significant help in curriculum development, which strengthens its programs. The program has gained media attention in the oblast, which has

resulted in families trying to send their children to the school. It is hoped this will solidify the survival of the institution.

Reverse FtF Program: Gregoriy and Remi, the English teacher, have both traveled to the U.S. and the impact has been significant to the overall mission of the program. Gregoriy studied agribusiness and management at Arden House at Land O'Lakes and has in turn, taught a course on what he learned. This is a direct impact of his visit to the U.S. After the FFA visits, the school and AKKOR would like to develop a similar organization in Kaliningrad Oblast.

Concluding Observations: A significant number of volunteers have been assigned to the school; however, it seems necessary to better define the work procedures in the scopes of work. The college is presently concerned with future financing and its survival is closely linked to that of AKKOR. It is felt that the school needs to diversify its funding activities, but at the same time it should not minimize the impact of AKKOR and its ability to assist the college. If the institution can improve its financial uncertainty, it certainly seems to be developing the necessary ingredients to become a sustainable teaching institution with the long-term capability of meeting the needs of the agricultural community in Kaliningrad.

In summary, the Director and Mr. Pavlovsky of AKKOR are very supportive of the linkages that LOL has helped create through the FtF program and feel that the assistance provided by the volunteers was beneficial to their institutions.

Case Study No. 57

Date of Evaluation: June 11, 1996

Implementor: VOCA

Host Organization: Ferit Kazanov, Private Farmer

Location: Sukhony Karabulak, Saratov

Name of Interviewee: Ferit Kazanov

Host Organization: Ferit Kazanov is a graduate of the Saratov Agricultural Institute in agronomy, who worked for twelve 12 years as an agronomist on a collective farm. In 1992 he applied for, and was granted, approximately 70 hectares of arable land to farm privately. He also acquired a variety of farm implements including a tractor, a combine, a harvester, and planters. This spring he is farming 6 hectares of alfalfa, 12 of spring wheat, and 20 of winter wheat with 15 hectares in fallow. He has also developed a partnership with a neighbor to farm 12 hectares of sunflower and buckwheat. Kazanov installed four 40-ton grain storage bins in 1993 and made them operational with German-manufactured driers and a home-made roof in 1995. He is the leader of a small cooperative for the storage and sale of grains and sunflower.

Assistance Provided: Assistance in general farm management helped Kazanov design a 7-year rotation and fine-tune his system of mapping and fertilizing his fields, which led to crop yield increases. One volunteer focused on erosion control, which resulted in Kazanov adopting a new technique for controlling run-off by creating a soil trap strip across one hillside. Another volunteer focused on the formulation of by-laws for a small cooperative.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: Kazanov attributed yield increases to the volunteer's recommendations, as well as the solution to his erosion problem; as a result, he should experience higher soil fertility. In addition, the formation by Kazanov of a small cooperative built on market principles, is a new institutional form in his village. Although it is just beginning, it could serve as a positive model for achieving economies of scale.

Kazanov is a leading farmer and trained agronomist who is an effective communicator of technical farming information. His partnerships with neighboring private farmers indicate that his technical knowledge has already spread in his small community. He is apparently not linked formally with other producers, nor does he have much documentation on his techniques; therefore, potential spread effects appear to be limited to his small village for the time being.

Reverse FtF Program: Kazanov's U.S. training clearly influenced and inspired him to attempt forming a cooperative himself. Furthermore, it solidified his belief in applying a scientific approach to farming and provided him with strong sense that the farmer must seek out the market.

Concluding Observations: This site is an example of a successful private farmer who has benefitted from volunteer assistance and training. Further development will need to focus on the business and marketing side of his operation. He was one of the few farmers to note that pays a tax (10% of profits) to the local mafia. Lastly, Kazanov is perhaps a little underutilized in terms of his capacity to teach and disseminate information in the area; further volunteer assignments might extend their impact by trying to utilize his acquired skills.

Case Study No. 58

Date of Evaluation:	June 6, 1996
Implementor:	VOCA, Samara Oblast
Host Organization:	KaLeZhe Company, Tel. (8462) 56-39-13
Location:	near Samara
Name of Interviewees:	Abram and Irina Zigfrid

Host Organization: Abram Zigfrid became a farmer one year ago. He owns 25 hectares of plowed land and he grows wheat. Two years ago, Abram installed small-scale bakery equipment in the 400 sq.m. building. He started his bakery business and it became a success. After that success, he began a meat processing operation to produce smoked meat products. He installed very simple equipment to smoke meat in the same building where the bakery is located. At present, the Zigfrids market their bread and meat products through the small retail store which is located at the bakery. They have leased a second bakery in a nearby village and have begun operations.

Assistance Provided: Four volunteers were assigned to the Zigfrids in a short period of time. In some cases the volunteer only spent a few days, as they were traveling to other host organizations. Art Fisher was the first initial volunteer. He helped improve the quality of the bread and the production system, which led to achieving 20-27 batches (90 loaves per batch) of loaves per 24 hour period. The Zigfrids credit Mr. Fisher with placing their business on a sound footing.

Leonard Knoblock visited next and focused on continued business planning, formulations and breakeven analysis. Volunteer Tom Oburn visited in the spring; however, his trip was less productive. He focused on horticultural activities for the farm, but it was too early in the year to be effective. This endeavor is now on hold by the Zigfrids. Norman Eggen came in 1996 and introduced 17 grades of sausage recipes in four days spent with the Zigfrids. Unfortunately, his recommendations are currently on hold, as the bakery occupies most of the Zigfrid's time. Maurice Kalisky visited the bakery for several days and advised on diversification to meet increasing demand. In response, the Zigfrids have leased a second bakery and need direction for their expansion.

Regarding in-kind contributions, the Zigfrids provided lodging, food and local transportation to the volunteers.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: The volunteers can be credited with helping the Zigfrids to successfully launch their bakery business. Technical knowledge as well as business acumen were evident in the operation. Based on the success of the first bakery and the input of the volunteers, the Zigfrids have leased, with the option to buy, a second bakery. All this has developed within a period of three years. The Zigfrids have become model entrepreneurs in their towns.

234

The Zigfrids and VOCA have gained credibility in the local area because of the presence of the five short term volunteers in a period of only six months. The bakery has improved the quality of its bread according to the consumers in the town. Employment and income multipliers to the local economy are important. The Zigfrids have gone from employing 5 people, to their current payroll of 42, and anticipate growing to 70 employees by the end of the year. Their salary scale is $180 per month, well above the average wage of $100.

Reverse FtF Program: No participation, however, they would be excellent candidates.

Concluding Observations: The volunteers spent concentrated periods of time with the Zigfrids. Some, such as the horticultural specialist, were less productive due to inappropriate timing. However, many recommendations provided by volunteers were invaluable and the Zigfrids have been very receptive to their suggestions. The bakery operation, with the help of the volunteers, is established and should be sustainable as a family run business. Furthermore, their children have expressed an interest in continuing the business.

According to the regional administration officer, there are a sufficient number of bakeries in the area, but they need to be upgraded in product quality and operations. Further volunteers should reach out to a larger group using the Zigfrids as a model. Because the Zigfrids are seen as lone eagles, they certainly need the support of a group of other emerging entrepreneurs. If VOCA can insure this support system it would prevent the Zigfrids from burning out too soon.

Case Study No. 59

Date of Evaluation:	8 June 1996
Implementor:	VOCA
Host Organization:	AGROS, Puschino Mushroom Production, Puschino, Moscow Oblast
Name of Interviewees:	Igor Mazurin, Director and Alexander Borisov, Chief Technical Specialist

Host Organization: The Puschino Research Center was part of a regional center in the Russian Academy of Sciences. It is located in the small city of Puschino, population 20,500, a former "closed" city. It was comprised of eight research institutes, one of which, the Branch of the Institute of Bio-organic Chemistry, linked itself with AGROS. AGROS was founded in 1988 as a cooperative, with 6 worker-members and 2-3 seasonally hired. It was initially headed by Mr. Pavel Milonov, a young, dynamic, former scientist at the Institute, who is currently growing mushrooms in the U.S. The coop produces and markets approximately twelve tons of mushrooms annually, in addition to producing approximately one ton of oyster mushroom mycelium per month. This is done in the old bomb shelter of the Institute, which they rent.

The center's action plan includes: producing new mushroom varieties, including Shiitake and flomulina; developing a system for processing and packaging mushrooms; creating specialized publications on mushroom cultivation; and designing and implementing refresher courses for farmers.

Assistance Provided: A volunteer assisted the cooperative by assisting them in becoming members of the International Association of Mushroom Growers, as well as several other national and international groups of mushroom growers. This allows them additional sources of technical information and materials on business and marketing. This volunteer wrote in his final report, "Any technical support provided to the coop gets amplified to a much larger user group and larger geographic area, through its role in serving the mushroom farming community in ways that are similar to U.S. extension services."

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: With increasing production and profits, odds are good that the business will continue to grow. Since the visit of the volunteer, and following his recommendations, AGROS has experienced a five-fold increase in the overall mushroom harvest in 1995, including production of close to 1.5 tons in August 1995. In addition, to an increase in production, the coop has changed its method of preparing the substrate, substituting sawdust for sunflower shells (also recommended), which reduced the cost of production and has also helped the coop produce mushrooms on more regular basis. All this has assisted AGROS in having a profit in excess of 20 million Rubles in 1995.

Reverse FtF Program: Former director went to U.S. (not sure on what program) and is currently working there, through auspices of an FtF volunteer.

Concluding Observations: This is a sound project. The economic and institutional impacts are clear. Recommendations provided by the FtF volunteer were followed and contact is maintained with volunteer. Additional technical assistance is planned for Summer 1996, which will focus on the production of new varieties of mushrooms, processing and packaging, and further technical seminars. The only question is whether geographical location - north of Moscow - is part of VOCA's territorial focus and if it can/should be maintained in future.

Notes regarding Russian Mushroom Culture: Mushrooms are important both nutritionally and ideologically, as a food source and as a traditional link with nature for Russians. Mushrooms are often used as a meat substitute during fasting periods, such as Lent. Meals includes such dishes as rice and mushrooms and potatoes and mushrooms. They are traditionally gathered by women in forest; urban dwellers gather near *dachas*. They are fresh, pickled, and occasionally dried. In these modern times, with more people moving to urban centers, mushrooms are increasingly purchased in the cash market. Also, the market is increasing because of the growing numbers of private restaurants and expatriate residents. For these reasons, mushroom cultivation can be a profitable endeavor.

Case Study No. 60

Date of Evaluation:	June 10, 1996
Implementor:	VOCA
Host Organization:	Intensivny Korm
Location:	Samara
Name of Interviewee(s):	Boris Volkov, President, Anna Kuznetsova, Director of Feed Department, and Alexei Nikitin, Manager of Meat Processing.

Host Organization: Intensivny Korm, a privately-owned firm, was established in 1988 as a holding company. It consists of several production units including a feed factory, a dairy farm, a hog farm, a training center operating in conjunction with the U.S. Feed Grains Council, a grain mill and a research laboratory. The company is involved in joint ventures with Dutch and German partners as well.

Assistance Provided: A mycology specialist provided technical assistance in the processing, packaging, and marketing of mushrooms and information on the cultivation of mushrooms in small and medium-scale enterprises in U.S. He helped establish connections for purchasing mycelium of new varieties of mushrooms, specifically Shiitake and Flomulina, and assisted the cooperative in becoming a member of the International Association of Mushroom Growers. Additional volunteers provided assistance in cattle operations, business planning training, sausage production and poultry management.

The impact of these visits seems to be diffuse in such a large operation, which carries out its own research program and regularly hosts paid foreign consultants. In sausage production, for example, volunteer usefulness appears to have been minimal, because the sausage operation is larger in scale than the volunteer had anticipated. Meat and poultry recommendations were described as useful, but apparently led to no significant changes in production systems. The business specialists' visit resulted in the preparation of materials for the teaching of business planning and loan application techniques, but is a small part of the company's training center's overall activities.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: The impact of the volunteer assistance was marginal. The operation was successful, apparently sustainable, and seeking capital expansion. The volunteers' contribution will probably not spread beyond the company, with the exception of the business planning materials, which may be diffused through the training center.

Reverse FtF Program: No participation.

Concluding Observations: The case raises the question of the rationale for volunteer assistance to a well-functioning private firm. Even in-kind contributions could not be viewed as an incentive, as volunteers paid for their lodging in the firm's training center. Furthermore, personnel reported that volunteers were less useful than paid consultants, as consultant's were better prepared.

Case Study No. 61

Date of Evaluation:	June 12, 1996
Implementor:	VOCA
Host Organization:	"Bavis" Agricultural Cooperative
Location:	Dukhovnitskiy Raion, Saratov Oblast
Name of Interviewee:	Ivan Baltayev

Host Organization: Ivan Baltayev is a private farmer who owns 208 hectares of land, which he primarily plants for sunflower seeds. Needing an outlet for his production, he and another grower, along with two other partners, founded a processing "cooperative" in September of 1995 with 20 million rubles in capital, 14 million of which came from a bank loan (5 years, 52 percent interest) and the rest from the partners. The firm occupies two buildings rented from a local firm and operates a machine for drying prepared seed, two oil presses (one currently not operational), three, three meter by 1.5 meter tanks for oil storage, and a tanker truck. Output currently is about 1,500kg/day of oil, sold for 4,000R/kg. Oil is sold off the truck in a variety of locations where the partners have contacts. The market has apparently becoming saturated; therefore, further expansion of the business will call for improved marketing to more remote areas. By spring of 1996, the two operating partners were running the business profitably and were seeking a way to buy out the other two partners. Volunteer Ken Baer, in his most recent visit, assisted the two in designing a limited partnership to achieve this end.

Assistance Provided: The first volunteer, a specialist in farm management, simple "got acquainted" with the organization. The assistance provided by the sunflower seed oil extraction specialist was critical to the organization; he demonstrated to the partners exactly how to run the production process of oil extraction. The cooperative development specialist focused on getting them to clarify the form of business they wanted and on writing by-laws to create their chosen corporate form.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: The volunteer who provided assistance in sunflower seed oil extraction, directly contributed to an increase in production. The company's output increased from zero to 1,500 kg/day of oil production. The assistance arrived at just the right time. As the only private agribusiness in their community, the company is a potential model for subsequent local businesses. Their potential for sustainability looks good, given that the company is paying back its loan and the operating partners are buying out the silent partners. Possible spread effects could emerge subsequently from the observation by others of the company as a successful private agribusiness.

Reverse FtF Program: No participation.

Concluding Observations: The site appears to be an example of a successful local agribusiness operation. The technical assistance in sunflower oil production appears to have been the assistance with the most impact and the partners appear close to full self-sufficiency.

Case Study No. 62

Date of Evaluation:	June 13, 1996
Implementor:	VOCA
Host Organization:	Graz Company
Location:	Grabova, Penza Region, Russia
Name of Interviewee(s):	Yergeini Sharopov, manager, Maria Yasenich, technician, and Galina Tanasova, manager.

Host Organization: Graz Company is a 1,200 employee organization, which produces specialized tanks for trucks, such as airport fueling trucks. Because some of their customers pay by bartering meat, the company has set up a small sausage production facility to manufacture sausage for the company cafeteria and for local sale. The plant has four employees and manufactures 30 kg. of sausage per shift, currently running one shift per day.

Assistance Provided: Norman Eggan demonstrated the production process of sausage with plant employees and offered them recipes, which were not used, as they could not be licensed by the local health authorities.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: The impact which resulted from the volunteer's assistance was minimal in economic terms. The staff was composed of trained sausage producers and the operation is small and self-contained.

The sausage plant is the only department of the Graz Company which is experiencing financial difficulties and is in search of foreign partners. The success and sustainability of the sausage plant will depend directly on the fortunes of the parent company. There have been no spread or multiplier effects from the visit, nor are there any plans for wider diffusion.

Reverse FtF Program: No participation.

Concluding Observations: The utility of volunteer assistance to this site appears minimal. The assignment raises the question of whether some hosts are requesting marginally needed assistance in order to make contacts with U.S. organizations, with the hope that these might lead to investment deals in the future.

Case Study No. 63

Date of Evaluation:	June 14-15, 1996
Implementor:	VOCA
Host Organization:	RAMICC-Penza Regional Public Foundation for Business Initiatives
Location:	Penza and Penza Region, Russia
Name of Interviewees:	Sergeenko Alexandrovich, General Director, Sergei Konnov, General Manager, and Andrei Chub, Assistant Director

Host Organization: The Penza Retired Officers Association helped found the foundation, which conducts activities in six different areas, including agribusiness and agribusiness training. With over 3,000 members, the foundation provides assistance to 37 private farmers in the Penza Region. It has attracted grants from the Eurasia Foundation. In addition, it has its own farm and its own building project.

Assistance Provided: Technical assistance was provided in multiple forms.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: A variety of specific impacts were observed. RAMICC initially receives the volunteer and then channels him/her to members according to their needs, thereby effectively diffusing these impacts. This group of volunteers has been a factor in the building of a strong and dynamic organization, which is successfully leveraging other resources through the Peace Corps and local government.

Reverse FtF Program: No participation.

Concluding Observations: This organization may serve as a possible model for further FtF involvement. RAMICC effectively utilizes FtF volunteer technical assistance in conjunction with marketing strategies, to achieve its organizational goals.

Case Study No. 64

Date of Evaluation:	June 5, 1996
Implementor:	Winrock International; Moscow, Russia
Host Organization:	Mr. Alexandra Bodorov
Location:	Tver District, Torzhokskyi Region, P. O. Stzasherichi Tsapshevo, Russia
Name of Interviewee:	Mr. Alexandra Bodorov

Host Organization: Mr. Bodorov is 46 years old and holds advanced degrees in engineering and physics. He has 280 hectares in cultivation, of which 20 are owned by him and the rest are leased. He produces oats and hay from pasture grass and clover. The sale of hay is his major cash crop. In addition, he has 15 breeding does and a total herd of 70 Saanem dairy goats. Mr. Bodorov is committed to the advancement of the goat industry and a Russian Goat Association. He is currently a member of the American Goat Association.

Mr. Bodorov provides in-kind contributions such as lodging and food, and he serves as an interpreter. He also provides the cost of local transportation for any domestic travel undertaken by the volunteer while in Russia.

Assistance Provided: Mr. Bodorov learned of the FtF program through the paper and then contacted VOCA, but eventually was supplied a volunteer by Winrock. He received his first volunteer in November of 1994. Ms. Pixie Day visited for two weeks and focused on general goat management practices. She recommended that Frances Forman visit the farm and provide information on product testing and development. Mr. Bodorov is expecting his third volunteer in June, 1996, who will concentrate on animal breeding, scoring of live animals and judging techniques. Mr. Constantine, the volunteer, is also experienced in the production of cheese products and will advise on processing techniques.

The goat project at Mr. Bodorov's farm holds great promise as an opportunity for multiple benefits. Mr. Bodorov is a unique individual who has a strong interest in assisting the development of the goat industry in his region. He strives at his own initiative to gather information on goat production and shares the information with other Russian farmers. Mr. Bodorov has presented seminars in Moscow and St. Petersburg and has had as many as 20 persons in attendance. A seminar is planned later this year where 50 people are expected to attend.

Mr. Bodorov's operation has benefitted from the volunteers as demonstrated by improved productivity with better milking practices. The first volunteer, Ms. Pixie Day, even brought an improved buck for Mr. Bodorov which will enhance the genetic base of his operation in the years to

come. His milking parlor is simple yet clean and he has provided rooms for veterinary activities and storage of products. His goat barn shows the evidence of hard work and research conducted by he and his wife.

Overall, Mr. Bodorov has received multiple volunteers which have contributed to his increased understanding of the goat business and his business operations. Each volunteer has added to the success of his business and the complexity of the assignments has increased with each visit.

Impact of FtF Volunteer: The FtF volunteer was instrumental in improving the goat operation by increasing the productivity of this operation. The health and maintenance of the goats are excellent and milk yields are good. Mr. Bodorov is planning the introduction of processing at his operation and has sought advice from the volunteers. When he is ready to process cheese and other products, he will be prepared.

The major suggestion for improvement is that the volunteer should come to one farm, like his, and other farms should be invited during the volunteer's period. It would be helpful if the volunteer could bring more materials and possibly even a video. More detailed information needs to be provided to volunteers to prepare them for the assignment. Nevertheless, Mr. Bodorov commented on the level of professionalism of the volunteers being excellent.

Mr. Bodorov stands as the key figure as to whether the Russian goat association develops and becomes sustainable. Spread effects could take place if this is accomplished. Unfortunately, results are dependent on the ability of one person.

Reverse FtF Program: Mr. Bodorov went to the U.S. and felt his tour was comprehensive. He attended fairs and seminars, and visited farms in an effort to learn as much as possible on the management of goats. The trip opened up a network of contacts which will be beneficial to him as he develops a goat association in Russia. There were no suggestions on improvements of the tour; it was a very valuable experience for him.

Concluding Observations: Mr. Bodorov has succeeded in generating multiple benefits from the FtF investment. He has single-handedly produced a video tape on goat production, which he has made available to others interested in entering the business and he has sold breeding stock to other farmers. His efforts will build an institutional capacity that will continue long after the end of FtF in Russia. Furthermore, Mr. Bodorov has contributed to the dissemination of information by making his farm available for site visits and documentaries by the Russian news media.

The FtF program has matured in its delivery of services to Mr. Bodorov. It is now time to think about ways to utilize Mr. Bodorov newly-enhanced skills and increase the multiplier effect in the dispersion of information by utilizing distance learning technologies. Mr. Bodorov has in effect started the process on his own initiative with the development of videos and other teaching tools. The Winrock representative has several creative ideas which need to be explored in an effort to obtain greater coverage and impact.

An interesting aside is that, in an effort to be creative in using available resources, Mr. Byodorov has procured old rocket launcher covers from the Cold War period which he will utilize in the development of his goat farm.

Case Study No. 65

Date of Evaluation:	June 5, 1996
Implementor:	Winrock International
Host Organization:	EkoNiva AG
Location:	Moscow
Name of Interviewees:	Dr. Yuri V. Vasyukov, General Director and Michael Vereshchak, Chief Consultant

Host Organization: EkoNiva was established in 1993 by agricultural specialists from Russia, Germany and the U.S. It functions as a multipurpose company assisting in the development of organic food production. It holds educational forums throughout the country, provides technical assistance to farmers and helps them market their products. It is also the only organic certifying agency in the country. EkoNiva has 12 employees and operates out of a small office located at an agricultural research institute just outside of Moscow. It is composed of two entities, a private joint stock company which provides consultant services and a NGO which conducts educational programs.

Assistance Provided: EkoNiva has received a series of FtF volunteers since the Spring of 1995. A summary of their activities is provided below.

1. Dr. David Milholland, was requested in 1995 to provide advice to EkoNiva concerning organic food certification and marketing, as well as to assess EkoNiva's business approach. The volunteer reviewed the company's objectives and its portfolio of projects. He also helped it develop an appropriate business plan and strategy to target its products to the domestic Russian market. Dr. Milholland advised EkoNiva that it become a for profit company, as well as an NGO.

2. John Kiefer and Kitty Murphy-Kiefer were asked to provide technical assistance and training in organic beef and milk production. They provided a hands-on approach to various issues included soil testing, assistance in calf production and the development of an organic farm association. As a result of their visit, the Kiefer's arranged for the visit of two Russian organic farming experts to the U.S. under the RFtF program.

3. Bert Olson originally intended to assist an EkoNiva farm client with buckwheat production and processing. However, due to differences in philosophies, the volunteer was reassigned to work with Sergiev Posad Agricultural College and Shestakovsky Joint Stock Association in the Moscow Region. The volunteer shared experiences regarding organic production and provided positive reinforcement to college staff and farmers in the area concerning virtues of organic farming.

4. Dr. Yitzac Goldstein and Dr. David West were assigned to assess the current status of hemp and flax production in two oblasts, Kursk and Nishny Novgorad, and to work with producers and processors to ascertain the interest and possibility of producing organic hemp for the export market - hemp is currently being used in the manufacturing of organically produced shirts, jackets and other garments. It was determined that in several localities organic production was of interest and the infrastructure exists to support such production for the export market. The volunteers worked intensively with farm directors, agronomists, scientists and mill directors.

5. Lena Heron assisted farmers in several different locations in understanding the principles of organic farming, with particular reference to fruit and berry production. Special emphasis was placed on organic pest and weed control. The volunteer also helped farmers develop market strategies for their organic products. All of the farms and institutions visited had prior interaction with EkoNiva. Also, the volunteer assisted EkoNiva on certification requirements and the development of educational materials on organic farming.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: According to EkoNiva representatives, the volunteer visits stimulated a greater understanding and interest in organic food production. As a direct result of the FtF volunteer visits, information related to organic food production has been widely distributed through television, radio and print media. Also, expertise is now available in Russia to certify organic food production in accordance with European and U.S. standards. EkoNiva representatives indicated that generally, the host organization provided housing, food, local transportation, and in some cases interpretation services to the volunteers.

Reverse FtF Program: Two organic farmers participated in the program. The principal results were increased knowledge, improved certification capabilities and increased contacts with U.S. experts.

Concluding Observations: Development of organic food production in Russia and other countries in the CIS will, in all likelihood, be a long-term endeavor. The EkoNiva initiative by Winrock seems to be good start. However, the question again arises concerning when has adequate assistance been provided. A comprehensive strategy and clear, task oriented SOWs would help address this question in the future. The quality of the volunteers and their reports were generally very good.

Case Study No. 66

Date of Evaluation:	June 5 1996
Implementor:	Winrock
Host Organization:	Radio Nadezhda (RN)
Location:	Moscow
Name of Interviewee(s):	Ms. Irene S. Koroleva, Director General and Ms. Tatyana S. Zeleranskaya, Editor-in-Chief

Host Organization: Radio Nadezhda (RN) is a "non-governmental, women's radio station" which was founded in July 1992 by the interviewees, well-known female journalists, as an outgrowth of the state radio station. Radio Nadezhda is a closed-stock company with the two women among the shareholders. The station ranks sixth in listeners among Moscow's 19 radio stations, and fourth among female listeners. Their programming is varied with a focus on family topics. Since the station emphasizes family, health, agriculture, the economy and science and culture, many men also listen to the station. The interviewees said that they have not been able to afford a sophisticated demographic survey of their audience, but they estimate that it is potentially 20 million, between the ages of 25 and 50, split equally between men and women.

The station's *With the Roosters* program, a farm/rural household program was developed with volunteer technical assistance. It was broadcast between 6 and 7 AM, and was an innovative program in Russia providing information related to a variety of topics including: weather reports, crop husbandry, fruit and vegetable production, farm commodity prices and home economics. However, the program was been dropped due to lack of funds and/or sponsorship. The advertising sales manual prepared by Ms. Bailey and her training of the sales staff were very helpful. However, the spending of advertising dollars in Russia is controlled by a few large advertising agencies, and they are not directing their client funds to RN.

Assistance Provided: Radio Nadezhda met Winrock staff at a Russian-American Seminar in Moscow hosted by the U.S. Embassy and learned of the FtF Program at that time. It has been the recipient of 3 volunteer assignments carried out by four volunteers. These include:

1. Janet Macy and Richard Kuska, a sister and brother team, assisted RN in developing a series of pilot, ten-minute radio spots directed to farm women, in training RN staff in the development of radio extension materials directed toward rural and farm women in developing an underwriting package for international and Russian agribusinesses to sponsor radio extension programs focused on women, and creating a prospectus for a longer 12-month, weekly program directed toward farm and rural women.

2. Janet Macy assisted RN staff in writing and producing a radio show directed toward women and the urban food consumer and trained RN staff in the development of radio materials focused on agriculture, food safety, and home economics. She also assisted with the production and broadcast of the first farm home/consumer radio show in Russia, created a prospectus for 12 months of scripts and adapted American radio materials to the program.

3. Sharon Bailey assisted RN staff in designing a program for attracting potential advertisers, assessed the current sales training program, revised or developed a new training program and train staff in advertising sales. Furthermore, she developed advertising packets for prospective clients and sponsors, developed an underwriting package for international and Russian agribusinesses to sponsor and wrote a grant proposal for RN to receive funding from the Eurasian Foundation.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: Comments provided at a volunteer debriefing in March of 1995 illustrates the dilemmas faced by an organization which has a good informational base, but which has not yet learned how to adapt to the private market. One volunteer stated, "The radio station is in the midst of serious financial crisis stemming from inadequate and uninformed fiscal management and lack of a well-organized program with trained staff, that would enable it to continue broadcasting. Top management had recently borrowed more money to keep the station operating; however, in terms of programming, the station is well managed. The two top managers are well-known journalists who continue to keep RN in the public eye."

The station has high spread effect potential for agricultural-related information to 20 million men and women. However, sustainability is a moot issue at the moment since the program is off the air. The interviewees stated that they would very much like to reintroduce *Rooster* because of its potential impact but cannot without sponsorship and/or foundation funding. Later, the Winrock Country Director reported that Winrock will supply the station with a marketing specialist this fall through the Russian-American Fund, instead of through FtF. Continuation of the project will depend largely on the recommendations of that specialist.

Reverse FtF Program: Both interviewees participated in short-term visits to the U.S. and Canada, sponsored by the Russian-American Fund which is part of the NIS-US Women's Consortium, in which Winrock is involved.

Concluding Observations: This project has some interesting prospects; however, its sustainability is obviously questionable.

Case Study No. 67

Date of Evaluation:	June 13, 1996
Implementor:	Winrock
Host Organization:	USDA Russian-American Farm Privatization Project
Location:	Volkhov Rayon, Leningrad Oblast (100 km. east of St. Petersburg)
Name of Interviewee(s):	Mr. Philip Seltz, Director, Mr. Charles Edgemon, advisor, and Ms. Lyndell Edgemon, advisor

Host Organization: In January 1992, an agreement was signed between the St. Petersburg Mayor's office, the Leningrad Oblast, and the USDA for a Congressionally-funded short term project worth $2.8 million. Russia provided the land, farmers, and most of the infrastructure; USDA provided technical assistance in the form of two couples - former farmers from Texas - living at the project site and acting as advisors to the Model Farm Project. Additional technical assistance was provided through USDA, as well as linkages with other USG projects in rayon and the oblast. The project will be ending December 1996.

In 1992, 800 acres taken from Chaplinksy State Farm was divided among 22 farm families, with the Americans arriving late that year, initially living at the State Farm. Twenty-two farmers still remain (5 have been replaced), only three of whom had a farming background initially (the majority of the others were down-sized military). Of the 22, 25% were "only in it initially for the money." Of the remaining families, 50% have turned a profit and the other 50% "are having a hard time but will probably make it."

Assistance Provided: Volunteers helped design co-op by-laws and an organizational structure for the development of the agricultural cooperative. One volunteer provided technical assistance related to welding, machinery repair and parts fabrication and another focused on road building, providing a hands-on demonstration and workshops.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: The interviewees felt that volunteer activities had helped project; e.g., roads in better shape and farmers now do their own welding, rather than coming and asking advisors to do it. However, it is very difficult to observe any significant impact provided by the volunteers. That is, the percentage of farmers making a profit, which is considerable, are doing so because of American advisors on site, not because of FtF Volunteers. In addition, the one-shot technical assistance assignment related to road-building and welding, were not part of any overall development plan for the efficient use of FtF volunteers.

USDA advisors will be leaving this December and plans are to continue the sustainability of the project in two ways: a) by maintaining the farm as a demonstration/research center, with a representative of the Volkhov Rayon Department of Agriculture living on site and acting as manager and b) by establishing an information/consulting service through the Oblast Ministry of Agriculture.

Regarding this project, the evaluator is very skeptical about: a) the ability of the new farm advisor to act as a catalyst and/or leader, b) the continued investment in a project with many governmental linkages, and c) the project only affecting about 22 families; the local population receives no benefits and therefore spread effects are nonexistent.

Reverse FtF Program: Thanks to the recommendations of the U.S. advisors, of the 22 families, 20 were able to send at least one of their farmers to the U.S. for training. Trainees were sent to the University of Wisconsin, River Falls, for "family farm" training. The training program was mediocre, but participants had a very good informal experience in staying with farm families over the Thanksgiving break. There, was a great deal of local U.S. media coverage.

Participants came home with a more positive attitude. For example, they now don't believe that they need formal certification in order to do something (e.g., welding, accounting, farming); they have more initiative and more of an independent attitude. Furthermore, they are willing to try new things and to envision future possibilities. The training also assisted in eliminating some residual negative attitudes about the U.S. There were also some splits among informal partnerships after the training between those who went and those who didn't. Trainees wanted to try new things; others didn't.

Concluding Observations: It is suggested that Winrock assess the value of keeping this project in its portfolio. Aside from the short-term, "shotgun" style of technical assistance provided to this project, Winrock should consider how this project contributes to the Winrock portfolio? What does it represent in terms of sectoral focus? With the U.S. advisors leaving and the project being turned over to the regional government, should FtF continue to support a state-affiliated project? Are there better uses of FtF resources?

The project is set to be re-evaluated in early 1997.

252

UKRAINE

Case Study No. 68

Date of Evaluation:	June 21, 1996
Implementor:	CNFA
Host Organization:	Community Canning Project
Location:	Veleky Luchky, Ukraine (40 km. east of Uzhgorod)
Name of Interviewee(s):	Ms. Liza Vasylivna Voloshyn, Ms. Maria Rega, and Ms. Maria Rubesh

Host Organization: The project was begun by six women, former state-farm employees, who formed a private enterprise and acquired a building to set up a local cannery. The protocol for this project, signed in 1995, cites four objectives: (1) to provide a model for farmers in the surrounding area, for farmers attempting to make the transition from collective to private enterprise, (2) to give a boost to women-directed enterprises, (3) to introduce western business planning and marketing practices to the area, and (4) to improve nutrition and reduce waste in food consumption.

The project follows the CNFA model of linking a Host Organization with an American Farm Bureau branch, in this case the Women's Committee of the American Farm Bureau. Ten representatives of the Women's Committee made a tour of Ukraine in 1994, and this was one of their field sites. In fact the Women's Committee raised $30,000 to support the purchase of canning equipment for the project by selling Ukrainian-American lapel pins through local and state functions at $5 a pin.

The protocol also calls for (a) a good business plan and (b) a realistic cash flow plan before the equipment will be shipped and installed. The project is now in the phase of just completing its cash flow plan, thanks in part to a computer purchased with some of the $30,000, and the technical advice of a CNFA/Kiev employee. (The women directors are computer savvy, and there is also a local resident in this collective-farm town of 30,000 with computer expertise who is giving them free advice.)

Assistance Provided: Mr. Robert Jones assisted the project in writing a business plan to assess long-term sustainability and establish a time-line for project operations. He assessed staff training requirements and determine supplies for jars. Also, he ensured that all legal and other necessary licenses were complete before the equipment's arrival.

A part of the project is being supported by monies from the Project Development Fund of CNFA. For example, it supported the work of the computer consultant in June 1996.The protocol calls for the cannery donating 10% of any net profit, up to a cumulative value of 50% of the dollar value of

U.S. contributions, to a Ukrainian charity, preferably one helping women. Ms. Voloshyn, the Project Director, provided food and lodging in her home for the volunteer and the CNFA employee.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: It is not possible to measure economic impact at this point because the cannery is not yet in operation. However, following CNFA's usual procedure, a mutually-agreed-upon protocol has been established with an action plan, and this plan is being followed, although it has required some "tough love" on the part of CNFA (e.g. The interviewees were not totally happy that they do not yet have the equipment because their financial plan is not yet completed).

The current time-line is for the equipment to arrive is Fall 1996, and operations to being in 1997.

This project has generated considerable interest in the U.S., about the NIS in general and Ukraine in particular. Witness the thousands of small contributions -- across all 50 states -- to make up the $30,000 equipment donation. A giant symbolic check was presented to CNFA on behalf of the project at the Annual AFB meeting by the Chair of the Women's Committee, a major supporter of the project. The presentation got top billing in *Farm Bureau News*.

If the project works, it not only will provide employment opportunities for former workers of the large state farm of the area, but will also create a market for local products. In addition, CNFA plans to use the project as a model for the establishment of community-based canneries in other Ukrainian regions.

Reverse FtF Program: Eight women from the project were trained by LOL in the U.S. in food processing and agribusiness management. The training received high marks from the participants who were interviewed - this group was selected after competition with three other sites, and a part of their agreement is to serve as a training site in the future.

Concluding Observations: A slightly risky project, but one which will have significant impact if it is even moderately successful. The planning on the part of CNFA has been thoughtful, and the Ukrainian host organization leaders are intelligent and motivated.

Case Study No. 69

Date of Evaluation: June 20, 1996

Implementor: LOL

Host Organization: Trembita Company

Location: Khustski District, Uzhgorod, Ukraine

Name of Interviewee(s): Mr. and Mrs. Ivan Kerita, Proprietors

Host Organization: The Trembita Company was established in 1991 by the Kerita's as a private company specializing in dried mushroom processing. The "farm" itself is only 1.5 hectares, but the mushroom operation sells 40-45 tons annually, primarily to an Italian company, "Agricolsemi,", which provided them with the drying equipment, which he is paying for with the product. The quality of the product meets international standards, making it competitive with European processors. The mushrooms are bought from local gatherers during two intense months of the year. The various activities employ 35 permanent and 120 part-time women and men. Plans are to expand into sunflower seed oil production, a flour mill and bakery, dairy production, and a small shop in the local market.

Assistance Provided: Mr. Laverne Palmberg assessed and provided recommendations on company operations, analyzed possibilities for other enterprises, consulted on product marketing and advertising and advised on business plan preparation. Ms. Jenny Burback assisted with ideas related to the packaging and marketing of products for the dairy processing plant.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: The final reports of both volunteers indicated that Trembita's activities and needs were not along the lines of their scope of work. For example, Ms. Burback -- whose SOW centered on dairy -- wrote, I "found that this business wants financial assistance to expand and begin new areas of business activity [but] dairy is not a primary interest." And she concluded, "I don't feel I was as productive as I would have liked to have been."

This lack of a development plan, or protocol, between the host organization and LOL, and the lack of a clear understanding of what technical assistance would be most appropriate, resulted in the volunteers' skills not being used as efficiently as possible.

This host organization is an example of one highly motivated entrepreneur who is achieving success in the private market and whose operation will most likely be financially sustainable. His success also means that he is providing much-needed employment to the local population. What is not clear is whether there are other spread or multiplier effects.

Reverse FtF Program: No participation.

Concluding Observations: This assignment raises another issue, the reality of placing volunteers in individual private farms with no demonstrable multiplier effects, other than providing local employment. The host is an individual who would be succeeding with or without FtF. However, one also wonders about the sustainability of the mushroom enterprise, if 45 tons are being gathered annually from local forests.

Case Study No. 70

Date of Evaluation:	June 18, 1996
Implementor:	VOCA & CNFA (though this is no longer an active host organization for CNFA; see below)
Host Organization:	CIL (Commodities International, Inc)./ Western Foods
Location:	Kiev, Ukraine
Name of Interviewees:	Mr. Vicente Navarro, Vice President (Spaniard, and part of a sub-joint venture to CIL) and Mr. Gour Jaraff, President (out of country at time of evaluation visit.)

Host Organization: CIL is a privately-owned meat processing plant that opened in 1993 as a U.S.-Ukrainian joint-venture. It was constructed to meet EEC and USDA standards and it produces for the foreign and upper-class urban market of Ukraine. It is successful enough so that owners are hoping to expand the operation to include a delicatessen section in stores that market Western Foods. They have processing facilities in Kiev and in Khmelnystki, six hours west of Kiev.

Business is certainly a growing concern. The interviewee stated that all volunteers have had an impact resulting in increased sales and improved technology. The real question is whether FtF should be placing in a joint venture, whose owners are primarily foreigners. Because of this issue, CNFA is no longer working with CIL. The Washington Director of CNFA's FtF program wrote the president in March 1996 that CNFA would appreciate an alternate proposal from CIL in which volunteers would work with a group of Ukrainian packing/processing plants. No response has been received to date.

VOCA continues to keep this Host Organization as an "active" client.

Assistance Provided: CNFA (4 volunteers)
Mr. Michael Pullen and Mr. Pete Nelson resolved technical problems concerning fresh meat cuts in the Khmelnystki processing plant and they developed five western-style sausage/ham products. They assisted CIL in locating a useable sausage manufacturing facility and worked with Mr. Navarro on producing a western-style hot dog. They also provide food safety guidelines.

Mr. Rudy Stoysich reviewed all work done to date on the sausage project. He discussed results of the pilot test in the Khmelnystki meat processing plant and provide advice regarding the practical implementation of earlier volunteers' recommendation concerning sausage production.

Dr. Gary Frank provided CIL with the financial component of its business plan. He developed the feasibility of performance income and expense statements, and he produced a document to attract investors.

Mr. Ellis Clark conducted an in-depth study to determine the market needs of delicatessen sections in currency stores and developed a business plan and cash flow statement for the proposed delicatessen and gift pack divisions. He also helped identify prospective markets, provided information on equipment needs, taught principles of advertising, packaging, and other marketing concepts and taught members how to insure quality.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: As noted above, the interviewee stated that all volunteers have helped improve and increase production. But, as also noted, the question should be, whether this a suitable host organization for FtF?

The company will most likely continue to be successful economically, but, as a joint-venture, it raises the other issue concerning direct multiplier effects and sustainability for Ukrainian concerns.

Reverse FtF Program: No participation.

Concluding Observations: VOCA/Ukraine should assess its policy regarding working with joint ventures and they should revise their procedures for developing protocols or development plans with hosts, for writing SOW's, and for assessing follow-on impacts. Although only three VOCA/Ukraine projects were examined in detail, all three processes were found to be very weak in these areas.

Case Study No. 71

Date Evaluated: June 18, 1996

Implementing Agency: VOCA

Host Organization: Bogdanov Farm

Location: Lugansk, Ukraine

Names of Interviewee(s): Victor and Natalya Bogdanov

Host Organization: Bogdanov Farms, wholly or principally owned by the hosts, is a complex of on and off farm enterprises that has evolved over the past 8-9 years from a couple starting out in debt ($18,000), trying to succeed raising chickens. Today it consists of a large farm, with fifty employees, farming 1500 hectares of leased land (mostly sunflowers) and using $1 million dollars in heavy machinery, which is rented to neighbors throughout the year.

Mr. Bogdanov is now a representative for several farm machinery and agricultural companies. His enterprise also consists of some hog production, breeding bulls whose services are sold, and a small retail outlet in the main village. The host has built with local labor several new buildings, making his own brick and cinder block and scrounging for local materials. He is also putting together his own machine and carpentry shop and is in the process of building a 10 unit hotel/apartment building on his property for the purpose of renting or to offer accommodations to business guests.

His appetite for expansion and supply of new ideas for making money seem endless. He was reluctant to discuss his financial condition but seems to have no trouble getting access to credit, or self-financing his various expansions. They are not hurting for any of the necessities and some of the luxuries. Mr. Bogdanov was President of the Oblast's Farmer's Association for almost three years. He knows he is a success and is very proud of it. He does not intend to slow down until he has the largest agricultural enterprise in Eastern Ukraine. His success has attracted much attention from the local and national media, and as a result, he has participated in two television videos and a broadcast on local and national TV regarding the evolution of his farm. His success story has also been brought to the attention of local and national politicians. He is reported to be one of the most successful farmers in the Ukraine.

Assistance Provided: The Bogdanov farm has been the beneficiary of four volunteer visits to date and has requested one more this year, to advise on grain storage. It was Mrs. Bogdanov that first heard about the FtF Program. She was attending an agricultural meeting in Kiev in 1993, seeking technical information, when someone from the U.S. Embassy mentioned the VOCA program. As a result, two volunteers came in early 1994, separately, for the purpose of advising the Bogdanov's and some neighboring farmers on swine production and meat processing. Another volunteer came

in 1994 to advise on farm management, while the fourth concentrated on grain storage and formulating a business plan around the renting and leasing of agricultural equipment.

The host organization in all cases provided the required in-kind contributions for this assistance consisting of lodging, food, transportation and interpreter services. This was not a strain for this particular host.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: The Bogdanov farm operation is a tremendous success measured against almost any standard. Unquestionably, the FtF volunteer assistance provided has played an important, and in some cases significant, part in that success. But it is difficult to separate the significance of that assistance from the initiative, drive and momentum the Bogdanov's had already established when they first requested the technical assistance. As the hosts themselves put it, " we would have gotten to where we are today even without the VOCA volunteers, but it would have taken longer, and we would have made a lot more mistakes getting there". The assistance furnished on hog production was thorough and appropriate, but the host really did not implement much of it as hog production, for a variety of reasons did not prove profitable, for them.

It would appear that the business plan assistance for acquiring agricultural equipment and becoming an equipment dealer, as well as the initial recommendations for grain storage, have had the greatest impact on the Bogdanov's success. The technical assistance showed them how to calculate costs, access credit including supplier credits, the options between owning and renting, and the concepts of sub-leasing, cash flow, income streams, accounting, etc. He is now an equipment and input dealer for some European equipment firms, and Cargill. He also wants to be a John Deere dealer.

A draft of his business plan showed a gross income of almost $1 million and a surplus after costs of almost half of that. He has come a long way from 1987, when he and his wife were $18,000 in debt to get into the poultry business, which proved, with a lot of hard work, very profitable for them and created the capital to begin to branch out.

Some of the keys to their success seem to include: 1) they had a vision of what they wanted from the start, 2) they were willing to work very hard, 3) they had a voracious appetite for knowledge and technical information, and the ability to process it and adapt it to their realities, and 4) they were risk takers. Consequently, they were able to get the most out of the FtF technical assistance that fit their vision and their realities.

In terms of impact at the three levels the evaluation is using as yardsticks, there is no doubt that a major impact has been achieved here at the first, (the host level. While a little harder to document, it is clear that significant impact has been achieved at the second level - spread effect - as well. The Bogdanov's were the envy of the region if not the country. They received letters from all over the former USSR inquiring how they did it. People showed up at their gate, unannounced, wanting advice and to see their operation. Mr. Bogdanov has lectured at the local agricultural school and was President for three years of the fledgling Farmers Association of the Lugansk region, during which

time membership grew from 300 hundred to 1250. He represented the Association to the National Association and elected and appointed national and regional authorities.

Some of this also represents contributions, actual but more likely potential, in terms of changing some of the systems currently inhibiting agriculture, agribusiness and privatization in general in the Ukraine.

The impact that has been achieved at the first level is definitely sustainable and is likely to expand. At the second level, Bogdanov farms will continue to exert a model and example effect on the surrounding country-side if not the country. Mr. Bogdanov apparently of late, has backed off a bit on his outreach activities, as he needs more time to manage his operations. One senses however, he is a little disappointed in some of his neighbors who have tried and failed to emulate his success, but have failed for various reasons , among which is a lack of family unity and support. But it is the consensus of many who know this operation that Mr. Bogdanov will be increasingly in a position to exert influence on needed change and reform in the agriculture systems of Ukraine.

Reverse FtF Program: Mr. Bogdanov has been to the U.S. on an exchange program. It was not, however, FtF but more likely one of the Embassy programs, e.g. OPIC. He spent 10 days visiting agricultural equipment dealerships around the U.S. and got a lot out of it, but was frustrated because one of his aims was to arrange to be a John Deere dealer for his region, which did not result. However, he is still hopeful that this will happen. The trip gave him more ideas and helped solidify his thinking about being an equipment dealer.

Concluding Observations: This is an impressive activity to say the least, and it is clear why this is VOCA's stellar activity. It is a good example of the success that can be achieved in the FtF program by identifying and assisting a "farmer leader." The benefit stream appears completely sustainable at this point and no further FtF assistance should be required. VOCA should, however, continue to press the Bogdanov's to continue and expand their influence and example within the Ukraine.

Case Study No. 72

Date Evaluated:	June 22, 1996
Implementing Agency:	Winrock International
Host Organization:	Institute for Agrarian Economy
Location:	Kiev, Ukraine
Name of Interviewee(s):	Mikail F. Krapivko, Director of Computer Center, Vasily Schlapak, And Vitaly Sablook

Host Organization: The host organization is charged with the collection, processing and distribution of agricultural information for the nation. It has had very little experience in Western methods of processing agricultural information of use to producers and distributors of agricultural products. The director, being quite progressive -minded from the beginning, wanted to transform his institution in three important ways, in order to help the agriculture sector operate within a market economy. First, to establish a market information system. Second, to establish a consultancy (extension) capacity to advise farmers and third, to understand, collect and distribute information on the world market for agricultural products. For these purposes, he requested VOCA assistance.

Assistance Provided: Four volunteers have visited the organization over the past two years. Each has focused on a different part of the host's requirements. The first volunteer advised on establishing a consultancy service. The second advised on establishing a market information system. Third volunteer focused on improving the organization's current data processing capability and the fourth volunteer was a macroeconomist and advised on methods to process Western statistics using the current data base.

Impact of the FtF Volunteer: The Director stated that he had completely changed his style and method of thinking. In other words, under the old system, agricultural information was a one way street. The farms supplied the top with production and yield information and that was the last they heard of it, except what to plant and when. Under a Western system, it is more of a two-way street with the farmer both receiving and furnishing valuable information. He is now trying to create a system in which information also flows to the producer. He has also worked with two groups of USDA officials that have come here. The market information system that he developed, with the help and insight of volunteers, and his trip to the U.S. , has been approved and are being implemented slowly. The volunteer that advised on computerization was successful in helping the institute to think through the methods of establishing a computer network linking research and extension sites in Ukraine. The volunteer also was successful in helping the Institute obtain a link to the Internet through a UN project. The director is now in discussions with the World Bank on financial assistance. "The Volunteers opened our eyes", he said, "not only mine here but several others in the

ministry who were visited by volunteers. As a result, they have bought into the concept." The Director of the Institute director wants and needs further assistance.

Reverse FtF Program: Mr. Krapivko went on a type of reverse farmer to farmer program sponsored by the USDA. He visited various parts of USDA, including field branches of ERS, agricultural marketing, extension services and agricultural statistics offices, as well as a couple of land grant universities. The trip convinced him to put into practice his ideas and the recommendations volunteers had made thus far.

Concluding Observations: The head of this organization is well- respected within the Ministry and is in a position to influence those above him. It appears he has been able to convince a few skeptics of the positive results of his FtF and Reverse FtF assistance. He now knows what he wants and has a vision. It is a little problematic, however, as to how far he might be able to take this in the current environment. But one thing is clear, FtF has created a small nucleus of new ideas and new ways of looking at how western agricultural information systems can aid the private and non-private farmers of the Ukraine. One further observation would be that this activity, like many, contained a small but potentially significant element of leveraging, i.e. an instance in which the volunteer was resourceful and instrumental in obtaining resources from another donor source.