PD/SWAP File Copy
PD-ABP-201
94297

UNCLASSIFIED
CLASSIFICATION

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) – PART I

Report Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE	2. PROJECT NUMBER	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE
Food Crop Research	655-0011	USAID/Praia

4. EVALUATION NUMBER (Enter the number maintained by the reporting unit e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No. beginning with No. 1 each FY) 655-87-01

[X] REGULAR EVALUATION [ ] SPECIAL EVALUATION

5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES			6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING	7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY 82	B. Final Obligation Expected FY 87	C. Final Input Delivery FY 90	A. Total $ 6,709 B. U.S. $ 4,688	From (month/yr.) 10/82 To (month/yr.) 10/86 Date of Evaluation Review

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

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., airgram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
1. Technical justification for the development of a viable National Agricultural Research Institute in Cape Verde is especially sound and must continue to receive USAID support. As such, the Food Crop Research Project will be extended to 6/30/90 and be provided with additional funding of $1,000,000.	A. Hartman	6/87
2. An updated Plan of Work will be developed.	A. Hartman	12/87
3. (unresolved issue) That a standard, internationally recognized classification system such as Dewey Decimal or LC should be implemented at the INIA Library, instead of the present system developed by the Librarian.		na
4. (item needing further study) That future projects consider a Food Crop Research, and Watershed Development combined into a single project.	T. Luche	open

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS

- [X] Project Paper *
- [X] Financial Plan *
- [X] Logical Framework *
- [X] Project Agreement *
- [ ] Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network
- [X] PIO/T *
- [ ] PIO/C
- [ ] PIO/P
- [X] Other (Specify) Work Plan
- [X] Other (Specify) * Arizona Contract

*Actions completed

10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT

- A. [ ] Continue Project Without Change
- B. [ ] Change Project Design and/or
- [X] Change Implementation Plan
- C. [ ] Discontinue Project

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

Eng. Horacio Soares, President, INIA
Jose Luis Rocha, Head of Bilateral Division
Ministry of Cooperation and Plan
A. Hartman, ADO, USAID/Praia

12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval

Signature: Thomas C. Luche
Typed Name: Thomas C. Luche
Date: November 6, 1987

AID 1330-15 (3-78)

Part II

13. SUMMARY: The Food Crop Research Project was authorized on September 30, 1982, at a LOP funding level of $3.688 million for the purpose of assisting the Government of Cape Verde to develop an adaptive research capacity at its Center for Agrarian Studies (now the National Institute for Agricultural Research - INIA). Progress to date involves the return of five M.S. participants from the U.S., with two still in training; two PhD candidates are also in training. Consulting services for management and fiscal administration provided by the Title XII contractor have assisted in establishing the effective administrative framework now in place. A research library has been established and formally dedicated. Researcher housing consisting of a triplex and a detached unit is completed and occupied. INIA's objectives and organizational structure have received GOCV legislative approval and validity. A Research Strategy with Priorities has been developed by INIA. Phase I Rural Economic Survey has been completed and published for Santiago, Santo Antao, and Sao Nicolau Islands. Phase II studies are in progress. Horticultural and field crop Production Cost Studies have been published for irrigated agriculture on Santiago and Santo Antao Islands. The Project has been extended through June 1990, and provided with a funding increase of $1.0 million, to new total of $4.688 million. The TA contract with the University of Arizona has also been extended through March 30, 1990. Major justifications for extending the Project and increasing funding, involve requirement for commodity inputs not included in the original design, and extension of TA input to more adequately overlap with returning participants.

14. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY: The evaluation under discussion was a Mid-Term Evaluation designed to document progress to date in relation to anticipated outputs. A very important additional aspect was to determine whether the Project should be considered for extension past its PACD of 9/30/87, and, if so, should additional funding be provided or the implementation plan modified. The PP states that at the end of two and a half years, the Food Crop Research Project should be evaluated to determine the degree to which: a) progress has been made towards training Cape Verdean researchers; b) the institution has begun to manifest a research orientation; c) a comprehensive rural survey has been carried out; d) a National Agricultural Strategy has been formulated; e) progress has been made in organizing a library; f) B.S. level staff has gained skills in setting up research plots; g) the provision of personnel and equipment has been provided in a timely fashion; and h) the relationship of the technical assistance to Cape Verdean personnel has been productive.

The Evaluation Team arrived in Cape Verde on August 25, 1986, and completed its in-country work on September 18, 1986. The Team consisted of the Team Leader (Dr. Roger G. Hanson), the Agronomist (Dr. Kenneth G. Cassman), and the Agricultural Economist (Dr. John V. D. Saunders). Contracting was done through AID IQC PDC-1406-I-00-4093 with Resources Development Associates, Inc., of Placerville, CA. Final total cost of the evaluation was U.S. $60,652.12. The Final payment due under the contract of $4,054.98 was withheld until July 1987 pending final acceptance of the Evaluation by USAID/Praia and the GOCV.

A technical Review of the FCR Project was done in July 1985 by Dr. E. C. Tigchelaar, Department of Horticulture, Purdue University.

15. EXTERNAL FACTORS: A major external event which had very significant impact on the Project and on agricultural research in Cape Verde, was passage of GOCV Decree DL 101/85 establishing a semi-autonomous agricultural research institute in Cape Verde with direct funding from the national treasury. The predecessor organization known as the Center for Agrarian Studies was within the organigram of the Ministry of Rural Development and Fisheries, and as such, subject to its financial and organizational control. With the new status as semi-autonomous institute, INIA has financial independence from MDRP, and, even more importantly, has legal responsibility for all agricultural research undertaken in Cape Verde. Eight hundred hectares encompassing stable and unstable hillsides, terraces, etc., have become part of the INIA research area at Sao Jorge. This site is where genetic materials are maintained and the research and production demonstrations are centralized. Five other sub-stations have been selected from various climatic regions in Cape Verde to serve as research and farmer demonstration centers.

The creation in 1985 of the beginnings of a National Extension Service, provides INIA with an organized outlet for research recommendations and a partner for on-farm research trials. Since extension agents are cycled through the Training Center operated by INIA, it offers an excellent opportunity for them to become acquainted with the research program and the researchers themselves, who act as instructors

16. INPUTS: Based on the results of the evaluation, the Project was extended from 9/30/87 to 6/30/90. In order to compensate for insufficient commodity support programmed under the original Project, the commodity element under the Project extension was increased by $772,000 to a new total of $1,176,000. In order also to sustain the momentum of the technical assistance element, and provide important overlap between all returned participants and the TA personnel, the TA contract with the University of Arizona (UA) was extended from a terminal date of 9/30/87 to a new date of 3/30/90. Additional funding of $425,148 was put into the contract, bringing it to a new total of $2,749,369. Noted in the evaluation was a deficiency of production cost data particularly for irrigated agriculture in Cape Verde; as such, the contract with UA now includes provision for a Production Cost Analysis, which has already been initiated. Additional training up to $150,000 has also been provided under the Project extension.

17. OUTPUTS: The outputs stated in the Logical Framework of the Project Paper (revised) are as follows:

A. Trained Participants
B. Equipped Research Station
C. Initial INIA Research Strategy Developed

Objectively Verifiable Indicator	Status as of 10/87
Participants	
1. Eight M.S. level	1. Six completed, one in trng, one predeparture.
2. Four PhD level	2. Two in training, two predepart
Facilities	
1. Information/Communication Center	1. In operation
2. Management/Administrative Center	2. In operation
3. Soils Laboratory	3. In operation, but with added equipment to purchase
4. Applied Plant Physiology Laboratory	4. Being developed
5. Plant Protection/Nematology Laboratory	5. In operation
6. Agronomy Field Laboratory	6. To be developed
7. Housing (triplex plus detached house)	7. Completed and occupied
Rural Economic Survey	
1. Phase I for Santiago, Santo Antao, and Sao Nicolau	1. Completed
2. Phase II for Santiago and Santo Antao	2. In progress
Production Economics Cost Analysis	
1. Initial Survey, with four-month TDY follow-on	1. Initial survey complete
Research Strategy	
1. Research Strategy Developed	1. The INIA Research Strategy was approved in early 1986 by the Scientific Council, and published as part of the Second Five Year Plan for INIA. It includes research projects in soils, crop production, soil and water conservation, integrated pest mgt., and maintenance of genetic diversity. Objective to increase ag production and incomes in rainfed and irrigated production systems.

18. PURPOSE: The approved Project Purpose as stated in the amended Project Data Sheet of the PP is "to assist the GOCV to develop an adaptive research capacity at the National Institute for Agricultural Research (INIA)." No difficulty is anticipated in meeting the EOPS indicators as specified in the Log Frame in the amended Project Paper. The newly extended project has included the inputs and resources suggested to attain the projected EOPS.

19. GOAL: The approved goal to which the Project contributes is "to support GOCV development goals in food self-sufficiency, rural employment, rural income, and nutrition." In a very practical sense, the Project is contributing to the Goal. Improved varieties of subsistence crops have been selected with enhanced yield potential under Cape Verdean conditions, and, with pest resistance, augmenting the IPM approach adopted by the GOCV. The research priorities and strategies developed, based as they are on the results of actual rural surveys conducted by INIA, are relevant to the realities of the rural sector, including actual production constraints and the farming decision process.

20. BENEFICIARIES: The main direct beneficiary of agricultural research in Cape Verde is, of course, the farm family. In Cape Verde the typical farm family is a small, labor intensive unit. On the main agricultural island of Santiago, the typical farm unit involves 1.3 ha of arable, rainfed land, with some 29 percent of farm families also having access to about 0.1 ha of irrigated land. These are generally very consistent averages with limited range into higher or lower values. The recently created (1985) National Extension Service is another beneficiary of the agricultural research generated by this Project. The cooperation required of these two organizations is greatly facilitated by the existence at INIA of a Training Center at which INIA scientists, among other trainers, provide theoretical and practical training in agriculture and agriculturally related areas (i.e. nutrition) to extension agents, trainee agents, farmers, and others. There is very little planning that can be developed for the agricultural and rural area without recourse to inputs required of INIA and its agricultural research role.

21. UNPLANNED EFFECTS: No specific comment.

22. LESSONS LEARNED: Past AID development projects in Cape Verde have focused on environmental rehabilitation and agricultural research institution building. These programs need to continue. Continued improvements of research facilities at INIA's central research station at Sao Jorge and at the outlying substations will be required to develop those improved crop production technologies that will be most acceptable to Cape Verdean farmers. The value of the Rural Survey in helping to define research areas and priority crops is such that its preliminary completion and input into the Project should have been programmed for earlier in the project, or, even before the FCR Project began.

23. REMARKS: Attachments to this PES are as follows:

(A) Summary of Evaluation Recommendations
(B) PRAIA 03105
(C) Technical Evaluation by Dr. Tigchelaar, Purdue University

Attachment A
Evaluation 655-87-01

Summary of Evaluation Recommendations

ADMINISTRATIVE

1. That technical justification for the development of a viable National Agricultural Research Institute in Cape Verde is especially sound and must continue to receive USAID support. Accepted.

2. That an updated Plan of Work with more focus on integrated adaptive research be developed. Consideration must be given to EOPS indicators as stated in the PP. (see p 37, section 5.1.2.B.) Accepted.

3. That the rural surveys be completed, and the data made available for and utilized in planning the Farming Systems Research Program. (see p 4, section 1.6.3.A.) Accepted, assuming that FSRP refers to the general INIA research program.

4. That short-term planning concentrate on the building of multi-disciplinary teams of 8 to 12 scientists who will develop the research programs on two to four staple crops. (see p 4, section 1.6.3.C.)
Not Accepted: This concept of multi-disciplinary teams was developed in the 1985 AID Strategy entitled "Plan for Supporting Agricultural Research and Faculties of Agriculture in Africa." In the case of Cape Verde, this specific approach is not required, since each Directorate of Services within the INIA Organization is composed of departments subdivided into divisions, with achievement of interdisciplinary or pluridisciplinary work being carried out by a Scientific Council. The unit is responsible for coordinating the execution of INIA'S program.

5. That future projects consider a Food Crop Research, and Watershed Development combined into a single project. (see p 5, section 1.6.3.F.) Unresolved.

TECHNICAL

1. That the original PP should have emphasized research more for the area under rainfed and less in the area for irrigated crop production. (see p 35, section 5.1.2.A. and 5.1.2.B(5).)
Not Accepted: The Project does not exclude support to rainfed research, but rather gives precedence to irrigated crop research. As is stated on p 27 of the Evaluation, irrigated land represents only 5 percent of cultivated area in Cape Verde, but contributes 40 percent of total gross crop value. Low input technology predominates. In years of severe drought, the gross value of rainfed crops is well below that of irrigated crops. Given the high potential for return from irrigated agriculture, its greater independence from the variabilities of rainfall, and its important contribution to gross crop value, it will continue to receive relative priority by the GOCV in its agricultural research program. INIA is well aware of the requirement to stabilize the upland cropping area, and a focus on irrigated agriculture does not diminish its research efforts in stabilization.

2. That the FCRP should work to develop a logical framework and the baseline data required to identify specific crops for expanded research activities. Thus far, the rural survey studies have not provided basic information on costs of labor, inputs, water, actual yield, and farmgate prices received. (see p 37, section 5.1.2.B.) Accepted. (Note: An initial study has been conducted, and the results submitted in report form. Additional studies are planned.)

3. That before serious work on irrigation management and water use efficiency can begin, INIA must have access to research sites with year-round availability of irrigation water and the ability to measure the quantity of water applied. It is recommended that improved irrigation systems and field leveling be established at Sao Jorge, Tarrafal, Mt. Genebra on Fogo, and at one research site on Santo Antao. (see pp 37-38, section 5.1.2.B(2).) Accepted.

4. Data from field experiments must be analyzed and interpreted before follow-up experiments are initiated. (see p 38, section 5.1.2.B(3).) Accepted.

5. Field experiments on management of soil salinity or crop/cultivar salt tolerance should not be undertaken. The only pragmatic solution for salinity in coastal areas will be to regulate pumping such that salt water intrusion is stopped. (see p 38, section 5.1.2.B(4).) Not Accepted, since limited research in varietal trails and management practices for the saline areas is programmed.

6. The Social Science Department at INIA, and the rural survey require additional resources, i.e. transportation, office space, office equipment, and supplies. (see p 38, section 5.1.3.1.A.) Accepted. It should be mentioned, however, that previous logistic problems in the Social Science Department have been resolved, and the Department restructured.

7. Training should be provided at the M.S. level in agricultural economics focusing on farm economics. Consideration should also be given to training in rural sociology. (see p 39, section 5.1.3.1.B.) Accepted. (Note: an M.S. candidate presently at the University of Arizona, has been identified.)

8. That the primary focus of farming systems research should be increased stability of the fragile, steeply sloping uplands cropped under rainfed agriculture. (see p 4, section 1.6.3.D.) Note: The Food Crop Research Project is not a farming systems research project; however, current on-farm research in rainfed agriculture is focusing on water harvesting, and minimizing soil erosion, building on traditional methods.

9. The FCRP is at the point that it should receive some technical assistance from the Small Ruminants and Sorghum-Pearl Millet CRSPS. (see p.5, section 1.6.3.E.) Accepted. It should be noted that sorghum and millet varieties from INTSORMIL institutions are being evaluated by INIA.

10. The role of women in agricultural production should not be overlooked. (see p 39, section 1.6.3.I.) Accepted. The Rural Surveys conducted under FCRP incorporate observations specific to the role of women in Cape Verdean agriculture.

11. That a standard, internationally recognized classification system such as Dewey Decimal or LC should be implemented at the INIA Library, instead of the present system developed by the librarian. Unresolved.

Attachment B

UNCLASSIFIED PRAIA 3105

VZCZCPRI *
RR RUEHC RUEHAB
DE RUFHPR #3105/01 365 **
ZNR UUUUU ZZH
R 311725Z DEC 86
FM AMEMBASSY PRAIA
TO RUEHC / SECSTATE WASHDC 1461
INFO RUEHAB / AMEMBASSY ABIDJAN 5022
BT
UNCLAS PRAIA 03105

CLASS: UNCLASSIFIED
CHRGE: AID 12-29-86
APPRV: AIDREP:THBALL
DRFTD: AID:ADO:AHARTMA
CLEAR: NONE
DISTR: AID CHRON

ADM AID DIRECT RELAY

E. O. 12356: N/A
SUBJECT: CAPE VERDE FOOD CROP RESEARCH PROJECT 655-0011;
- MID-TERM EVALUATION

TO: KEITH SIMMONS
- RDA INTERNATIONAL, INC.
- 801 MOREY DRIVE
- PLACERVILLE, CA 95667
- TEL: (916) 622-8800
- TELEX: 383656 RDA

REF: PDC- 1406-I-00-4093-00, W.O. NO. 5
- EVALUATION COMMENTS

1. WITH THE RETURN OF HORACIO SOARES TO CAPE VERDE ON 11/28, THE GOCV AND USAID/PRAIA PREPARED THE FOLLOWING COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT MID-TERM EVALUATION REPORT OF THE FOOD CROP RESEARCH PROJECT IN CAPE VERDE AS SUBMITTED BY RDA INTERNATIONAL, INC., IN OCTOBER, 1986, UMDER IOC CONTRACT NO. PDC-1406-I-00-4093-00. REFERENCES TO PAGE NUMBERS AND SECTIONS GIVEN BELOW REFER TO THE ORIGINAL DRAFT AS SUBMITTED BY RDA, AND NOT THE REEDITED DRAFT VERSION RECEIVED IN DECEMBER.

2. FIRST, THE GOCV AND USAID/PRAIA WISH TO THANK RDA AND THE EVALUATION TEAM MEMBERS FOR THE LONG HOURS THEY DEVOTED TO THE EVALUATION. THEIR CONFIRMATION OF THE IMPORTANCE OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH IN CAPE VERDE, AND OF THE ADVISABILITY FOR CONTINUED USAID SUPPORT WERE ESPECIALLY GRATIFYING TO THOSE DAILY INVOLVED IN THE WORKINGS OF ITS DEVELOPMENT.

3. A. THE EVALUATION PROPOSES A MAJOR SHIFT IN EMPHASIS OF THE PROJECT BY RECOMMENDING A SHIFT FROM IRRIGATED TO RAINFED AGRICULTURE. THERE IS, HOWEVER, NO SUPPORT FROM EITHER THE GOCV OR USAID/PRAIA FOR THIS RECOMMENDATION. THE PROJECT DOES NOT EXCLUDE SUPPORT TO RAINFED RESEARCH, BUT RATHER GIVES PRECEDENCE TO IRRIGATED CROP RESEARCH. AS IS STATED ON P 27 OF THE EVALUATION, IRRIGATED LAND REPRESENTS ONLY 5 PERCENT OF CULTIVATED AREA IN CAPE VERDE, BUT CONTRIBUTES 40 PERCENT OF TOTAL GROSS CROP VALUE. LOW INPUT TECHNOLOGY PREDOMINATES. IN YEARS OF SEVERE DROUGHT, THE GROSS VALUE OF RAINFED CROPS IS WELL BELOW THAT OF IRRIGATED CROPS. GIVEN THE HIGH POTENTIAL FOR RETURN FROM

IRRIGATED AGRICULTURE, ITS GREATER INDEPENDENCE FROM THE VARIABILITIES OF RAINFALL, AND ITS IMPORTANT CONTRIBUTION TO GROSS CROP VALUE, IT WILL CONTINUE TO RECEIVE RELATIVE PRIORITY BY THE GOCV IN ITS AG RESEARCH PROGRAM. INIA IS WELL AWARE OF THE REQUIREMENT TO STABILIZE THE UPLAND CROPPING AREA, AND A FOCUS ON IRRIGATED AGRICULTURE DOES NOT DIMINISH ITS RESEARCH EFFORTS IN STABILIZATION.

B. ANOTHER MAJOR RECOMMENDATION OF THE EVALUATION (P 54) IS FOR A SHORT-TERM RESEARCH EFFORT FOCUSED ON SORGHUM, WITH ONE M.S. CANDIDATE SENT IN RAINFED SORGHUM PRODUCTION. SORGHUM AND MILLET HAVE OFTEN BEEN PROPOSED AS SOLUTIONS TO RAINFED AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT IN CAPE VERDE BUT WITHOUT REGARD FOR THE RAMIFICATIONS OF SUCH A RECOMMENDATION, NOT THE LEAST OF WHICH IS CONSUMER ACCEPTANCE OF A NEW STAPLE GRAIN. THE GOCV RECOGNIZES THAT THERE MAY BE A PLACE FOR SORGHUM IN CAPE VERDE, ESPECIALLY ON THE MOST MARGINAL OF CULTIVATED LANDS. RESEARCH TRIALS ARE BEING CONDUCTED. HOWEVER, TO SUGGEST THAT THE ENTIRE RESEARCH EFFORT SHOULD BE FOCUSED IN THE SHORT-TERM TO SORGUM, MAY NOT BE REALISTIC. THE LIMITED ONGOING RESEARCH TRIALS ARE SUFFICIENT AT PRESENT TO DETERMINE ADAPTABILITY AND POTENTIAL AREAS FOR PRODUCTION. THERE ARE ALSO NUTRITIONAL ASPECTS RELATED TO THE CAPE VERDE CONTEXT WHICH MUST BE STUDIED BEFORE ANY RESEARCH FOCUS IS CONSIDERED. FIVE HUNDRED YEARS AGO WHEN CAPE VERDE WAS BEING SETTLED, SORGHUM AND MILLET WERE THE MAJOR CROPS;THESE, HOWEVER, WERE SUBSTITUTED BY CORN AND BEANS - BEFORE LEAPING BACK TO SORGHUM AND MILLET, IT MUST BE UNDERSTOOD WHY THIS SHIFT TOOK PLACE.

C. ALSO, THERE APPEARS INSUFFICIENT RECOGNITION GIVEN IN THE EVALUATION TO THE PROGRESS MADE IN THE PROJECT [ØN[E<LING THE INSTITUTIUNAL DEVELØPMENT TU DATE OF INIA, ITS PROGRESSION FROM THE CENTER FOR AGRARIAN STUDIES TO ITS OFFICIAL LEGAL RECOGNITION AS THE CAPE VERDEAN INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND THE PROJECT'S ROLE IN THIS PROGRESSION. THE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PERSONNEL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA ARE DIRECTLY INVOLVED IN THE PLANNING AND THOUGHT THAT GO IN TO THE

DOCUMENTATION DEFINING THE LEGAL AND TECHNICAL FUNCTIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF INIA. THE FCR PROJECT IS NOT INDEPENDENT OF INIA'S ACTIVITIES, BUT RATHER THE PROJECT AND ITS PERSONNEL ARE INVOLVED DAILY IN THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS AND PLANNING OF THE INIA OPERATION.

4. FOLLOWING ARE COMMENTS ON SPECIFIC SECTIONS OF THE EVALUATION REPORT:

A. (P 1, SECT 1.2) THE WORD QUOTE LIMITED UNQUOTE USED IN THE SECOND LINE OF THIS SECTION WAS OBTAINED FROM THE PROJECT PAPER, BUT IT WAS NOT USED IN THAT DOCUMENT IN QUITE THAT SAME WAY AS USED HERE. SUGGEST THAT THE WORD QUOTE LIMITED UNQUOTE BE OMITTED.
B. (P 2, SECT 1.3.5.) ALL HOUSES ARE COMPLETED.
C. (P 3 PARA C.) IT WAS NEVER INTENDED THAT M.S. CANDIDATES COMPLETE THESIS WORK IN CAPE VERDE; THE ONLY CONSIDERATION FOR THIS IN-COUNTRY RESEARCH WAS FOR THE PHD CANDIDATES. SUGGEST CHANGING THE UNDERLINED TITLE OF THIS PARA SINCE SOME AG RESEARCH EXISTED BEFORE FCR; IT COULD PERHAPS BE CALLED QUOTE IN-COUNTRY PARTICIPANT RESEARCH UNQUOTE.
D. (P 4, SECT 1.6.) IN LAST LINE OF FIRST PARAGRAPH QUOTE AFRICA UNQUOTE SHOULD BE PRECEDED BY QUOTE CONTINENTAL UNQUOTE.
E. (P 4, SECT 1.6.) IN SECOND PARAGRAPH, OMIT LINE QUOTE IT IS NOT TOO SOON...AS THESE TWO PROJECTS PHASE DOWN UNQUOTE.
F. (P 12) THE LAST PARAGRAPH MAY REFLECT CONTINUING CONFUSION ON THE PART OF THE EVALUATION BETWEEN THE RESEARCH STRATEGY/PRIORITIES AND THE QUOTE REGULAMENTO INTERNO UNQUOTE. THE REGULAMENTO SPECIFIES THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF INIA IN AN ADMINISTRATIVE AND ORGANIZATIONAL SENSE AND WAS APPROVED AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL. THE RESEARCH STRATEGY OF INIA IS A SEPARATE DOCUMENT WHICH DETAILS THE RESEARCH PLAN OF WORK, AND WAS GIVEN TO THE EVALUATION TEAM, BUT FOR WHICH NO REFERENCE SEEMS TO EXIST IN THE EVALUATION. THE DOCUMENT REFERRED TO IN THE FIRST PARAGRAPH OF P 14 IS A SUMMARY OF THE RESEARCH STRATEGY, BUT IS NOT THE STRATEGY ITSELF. REFERENCE ON P 34, LINE 16, IN THE REEDITED COPY OF THE EVALUATION MENTIONS LACK OF A QUOTE WELL-DEFINED RESEARCH PLAN OF WORK UNQUOTE, BUT THIS SIMPLY IS NOT TRUE.
G. (P 13) IN LINE 24, THE CORRECT SPELLING IS QUOTE OPUNTIA UNQUOTE.
H. (P 16, SECT 2.4.3.) IN THE FIRST ENTRY, DELETE LIVESTOCK AS AN INIA OBJECTIVE AND SUBSTITUTE ANIMAL PATHOLOGY.
I. (P18) IN LINE 7 REFERENCE IS MADE TO A BUDGET IN THE PROJECT PAPER AS DIFFERING FROM THE FINAL BUDGET. THE FINAL AND AUTHORITATIVE BUDGET IS ONLY THAT AS APPEARS IN THE PROJECT AGREEMENT AND THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA CONTRACT. NO UNJUSTIFIED OR UNDOCUMENTED CHANGES HAVE BEEN MADE FROM THESE BUDGETS.
J. (P 18) THE USE OF THE TERM EOPS IN LINE 25 MAY BE CONFUSING, BUT THE CHANGE IN THE REEDITED VERSION IS

UNACCEPTABLE. SUGGEST THAT THE WORDING AS USED IN THE ORIGINAL DRAFT BE MAINTAINED THROUGH QUOTE FOCUSED ON MAXIMIZING FOOD PRODUCTION UNQUOTE; AND DELETE THE REST OF THE SENTENCE: THE PHRASE IN THE REEDITED VERSION STATING QUOTE IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT THIS WAS TO BE A PRIMARY OUTPUT OF THIS PROJECT UNQUOTE IS NOT TRUE.
K. (P 19) THE SECOND PARAGRAPH IS UNACCEPTABLE. IN THE TA REPORT OF DR. MATLOCK, SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS WERE MADE FOR INFRASTRUCTURAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE IRRIGATION SYSTEM OF INIA. GUIDANCE IS GIVEN FOR DEVELOPMENT OF THE IRRIGATION INFRASTRUCTURE ON THE RETURN OF THE PROJECT FUNDED PARTICIPANT IN IRRIGATION.
L. (P 22) IN LINE FOUR INSERT THE WORDS QUOTE BILATERAL AGRICULTURAL UNQUOTE IMMEDIATELY IN FRONT OF QUOTE USAID PROJECTS PRESENTLY IN CAPE VERDE UNQUOTE.
M. (P 35) IN THE LAST PARAGRAPH MENTION IS MADE OF THE IPM EFFORT AT INIA INVOLVING BOTH USAID AND GTZ FUNDING. WHILE GTZ FUNDING IS ASSURED THROUGH 1989, USAID FUNDING IS ONLY ASSURED THROUGH 3/87 AND LEAVES THE FUTURE OF THOSE FUNDING ELEMENTS UNCERTAIN
N. (P 37) IN LINE 22 TWO REFERENCES ARE CITED (5,17) WHICH SUPPOSEDLY STATE THAT THE ROOT CAUSE OF THE SALINITY PROBLEM IN COASTAL AREAS OF RIBEIRA MOUTHS IS OVERPUMPING OF COASTAL WELLS WHICH LEADS TO SALT WATER INTRUSION. THE PRESIDENT OF INIA HAS TAKEN EXCEPTION TO THIS INTERPRETATION. THE STUDIES CITED WARN AGAINST OVERPUMPING, BUT ARE NOT SAYING THAT

OVERPUMPING IS ACTUALLY TAKING PLACE. THE PRESIDENT OF INIA STATES THAT HE HAS ELEVEN YEARS EXPERIENCE IN CAPE VERDE, INCLUDING PART OF THAT TIME AS HEAD OF THE DEPARTMENT CONCERNED WITH SOIL AND WATER;HE KNOWS OF NO CONFIRMATION TO SUSTAINED OVERPUMPING. THERE IS CONTINUOUS MONITORING OF THE DEEP WELLS BY THE GOCV.
O. (P 38, PARA 4) IN LINE 25 REFERENCE IS MADE TO A STATE FARM WHICH COULD BE INTERPRETED AS REFERRING TO SAO JORGE;NO PART OF THE RESEARCH CENTER AT SAO JORGE IS A STATE FARM.
P. (P 52) THE SECTION ENTITLED OPERATIONAL LESSONS LEARNED DOES LITTLE MORE THAN RAISE ISSUES WITHOUT ADEQUATE SPECIFITY OR SUGGESTED COURSES OF ACTION. THIS IS ESPECIALLY EVIDENT UNDER THE LEADERSHIP SECTION WHERE THE READER IS LEFT WONDERING WHO, WHAT, AND WHY. GIVEN ITS LACK OF PRACTICAL SIGNIFICANCE, THIS SECTION WOULD BEST BE DELETED.
Q. (P 73) DELETE SECTION 5.2.5. IN ITS ENTIRETY; FUNDING AT THE LEVELS PROPOSED IS NOT FEASIBLE.

5. FOLLOWING ARE COMMENTS RESULTING FROM AN AID/W PROJECT COMMITTEE REVIEW OF THE DRAFT EVALUATION:

A. PROJECT COMMITTEE (PC) FOUND THAT DOCUMENT WAS NOT SUFFICIENTLY ORGANIZED AND REQUESTS USAID TO ASK EVALUATION TEAM TO MORE CLEARLY FLAG KEY RECOMMENDATIONS AND GIVE AID MANAGEMENT (PERHAPS IN EXECUTIVE SUMMARY) A CLEAR SENSE OF PRIORITY IN IMPLEMENTING THEM.
B. PC SUGGESTS THE EVALUATION TEAM CLEARLY STATE THE PROJECT PURPOSE AND GOAL ON P 1.
C. RE P 51, 5.0 CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE RECOMMENDATIONS, 5.1.1 PROJECT GOALS, OPERATIONAL LESSONS LEARNED, PLAN OF WORK. PC AGREES THAT AN UPDATED PLAN NEEDS TO BE PREPARED AND THAT IT SHOULD BE FLEXIBLE. THE WORK PLAN SHOULD APPROPRIATELY INTEGRATE THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EVALUATION.
D. P 53, SHIFTING FROM MAIZE TO SORGHUM RESEARCH IS A PROVOCATIVE IDEA. PC QUESTIONS, HOWEVER, WHETHER IT WILL BE DIFFICULT TO MARKET THE SORGHUM SINCE THE CAPE VERDEANS ARE A MAIZE-CONSUMING POPULATION.
E. PC ALSO NOTED THAT MANY SENTENCES AND PARAGRAPHS THROUGHOUT THE REPORT WERE CONFØSING, UNCLEAR AND NOT WELL WRITTEN. THE REPORT COULD BE IMPROVED UPON BY SOME CAREFULL EDITING AND REWRITING BY THE CONTRACTOR.
PENNER
BT
#3105

NNNN