

|   |                         |
|---|-------------------------|
| AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT<br>WASHINGTON, D. C. 20523<br><b>BIBLIOGRAPHIC INPUT SHEET</b> | <b>FOR AID USE ONLY</b> |
|---|-------------------------|

|                           |                                      |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION | A. PRIMARY<br>Social Science         |
|                           | B. SECONDARY<br>Development Planning |

2. TITLE AND SUBTITLE  
 Implementing the U.S. AID-McNamara Mandate: What Big Foreign Donors can do about getting the Benefits of Rural Development to the Small Farmer

3. AUTHOR(S)  
 Morss, Elliott R.; Mickelwait, Donald R.; and Sweet Charles F.

|                               |                            |                                  |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 4. DOCUMENT DATE<br>June 1974 | 5. NUMBER OF PAGES<br>90p. | 6. ARC NUMBER<br>ARC 301.35-MR86 |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------------|

7. REFERENCE ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS  
 Development Alternatives Inc.  
 1823 Jefferson Place, N.W.  
 Washington, D.C. 20036

8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES (Sponsoring Organization, Publishers, Availability)

9. ABSTRACT  
 The purpose of this research is to provide U.S. AID with information on what can be done to help the small farmer in the Third World. Particular emphasis is being placed on specifying the level and type of small farmer involvement so as to maximize small-farmer benefits; it is assumed that for this to have a long-term effect, projects must ultimately carry themselves, and this has led us to look for mechanisms to make projects self-sustaining.

The research approach is primarily inductive: it is based on a detailed examination of the various activities and design of more than 40 rural development projects operating in the Third World (for list of projects, see Attachment A.)

The report summarizes the author's work to:

- specify the determinants of effective local action in rural development projects;
- identify cost-effective methods of data collection; and
- provide field support to rural development projects for the design and implementation of information systems.

|   |  |
|---|--|
| 10. CONTROL NUMBER<br>PN-AAB-212  | 11. PRICE OF DOCUMENT                    |
| 12. DESCRIPTORS<br>Self Sustaining Projects, LDCs, Rural Development Projects, Data Collection, Cost Effective Methods, Information Systems | 13. PROJECT NUMBER<br>931-11-720-986     |
|   | 14. CONTRACT NUMBER<br>AID/CM-ta-C-73-41 |
|   | 15. TYPE OF DOCUMENT<br>Research Study   |

**IMPLEMENTING THE U.S. AID-McNAMARA MANDATE:  
WHAT BIG FOREIGN DONORS CAN DO ABOUT GETTING THE  
BENEFITS OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT TO THE SMALL FARMER**

by

**Elliott R. Morss, Donald R. Mickelwait  
and Charles F. Sweet**

**Development Alternatives, Inc.  
1823 Jefferson Place, NW  
Washington, DC 20036**

**This is a revised and expanded version of a paper presented  
at the East-West Center Conference on the Role of Rural  
Institutions in Technology Transfer for the Small Farmer  
Sector in Asia, June 1974.**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   | Page       |
|---|------------|
| <b>Part I: Research on the Determinants of Effective Local Action</b>   | <b>1</b>   |
| Introduction  | 1          |
| Small Farmer Research - An Overview   | 2          |
| A Specification of the Small Farmer Research Objectives   | 8          |
| Details of Part I of the Small Farmer Research - Success Model  | 9          |
| Details of Part II of the Small Farmer Research - Behavior Model  | 11         |
| Reflections on Methodology  | 14         |
| Anticipated Research Results  | 16         |
| <br>  |            |
| <b>Part II: Research on Information Systems Concerning Small Farmers and Rural Development</b>  | <b>23</b>  |
| Introduction  | 23         |
| What Data Are Needed?   | 23         |
| An Analysis of Past and Current Information Systems   | 26         |
| A. Past "Evaluation" Systems  |            |
| B. Some Major Attempts to Collect Data on Small Farmer Attitudes and Behavior   |            |
| C. Project-Specific Information Systems   |            |
| Steps Towards the Design of New Information Systems   | 29         |
| A. A Rural Survey in Paraguay to Determine Why People Join or Do Not Join Cooperatives  |            |
| B. Predicting Repayment Potential for Cooperative Infrastructure Loans in Ecuador   |            |
| C. Indicators of Development in Bolivia   |            |
| Future Research   | 35         |
| <br>  |            |
| <b>Attachment A</b>   | <b>A-1</b> |
| A summary listing of the projects and subprojects which will be used to test the research models  |            |
| <br>  |            |
| <b>Attachment B</b>   | <b>B-1</b> |
| A specification of the research models  |            |
| <br>  |            |
| <b>Attachment C</b>   | <b>C-1</b> |
| The local action questionnaire, a structured interview guide used by the four field researchers to insure data collection standardization |            |

Implementing the U.S. AID-McNamara Mandate:  
What Big Foreign Donors Can Do About Getting the  
Benefits of Rural Development to the Small Farmer

by

Elliott R. Morss, Donald R. Mickelwait  
and Charles F. Sweet\*

Part I

Research on the Determinants of Effective Local Action

I. Introduction

Until the late 'sixties, foreign donors placed priority on helping to maximize the rate of increase in aggregate output and income of individual Third World countries. More recently, primary attention has turned towards what can be done to improve the lot of the rural poor.<sup>1</sup> In part, the concern for the plight of the small farmer grew out of equity considerations, as disparities in income distribution increased when larger farmers took advantage of the advances of the Green Revolution. This concern was first articulated by academic researchers; it was first acted upon by church groups and voluntary agencies; this was followed by changes in U.S. AID's priorities and eventually those of the World Bank. With this change has come the recognition that we need to know much more about the small farmer, his priorities and capabilities.

---

\* The views expressed in this paper are those of one or more of the authors.

1 For an explicit statement of this concern, see Robert S. McNamara's Address to the Board of Governors of the World Bank, Nairobi, Kenya, September, 24, 1973

## II. Small Farmer Research - An Overview

The purpose of this research is to provide U.S. AID with information on what can be done to help the small farmer in the Third World. Particular emphasis is being placed on specifying the level and type of small farmer involvement so as to maximize small-farmer benefits; it is assumed that for this to have a long-term effect, projects must ultimately carry themselves, and this has led us to look for mechanisms to make projects self-sustaining.

Our research approach is primarily inductive: it is based on a detailed examination of the various activities and design of more than 40 rural development projects operating in the Third World (for list of projects, see Attachment A.) Every effort is being made to be scientific in our research work. That is, we attempt to grade our cases on various success dimensions and then use cross-project analysis in a effort to uncover the key determinants for success and failure. We are also attempting to use cross-project analysis to determine the most effective mechanisms to use for creating the appropriate type and level of small farmer project involvement. It is an understatement to say that the subject matter does not readily lend itself to detailed scientific scrutiny. This was apparent before starting, but an attempt at rigorous analysis offered the potential for useful (if unforeseen) results.

At the outset, we planned to draw heavily on written project reports, both published and unpublished, for our data base. This has not proven possible because of data gaps and the tremendous disparity of viewpoints and conclusions expressed in the reports available to us. We conclude that to collect accurate and comparable data on projects, site visits are a necessity. During these visits, data based on a lengthy, prestructured questionnaire are collected. The questionnaire is now in its third formulation and because of data deficiencies, calls for the collection of ideal, second-best, and third-best data sets (a copy of the latest version of the questionnaire is included as Attachment C). Every effort is made to collect comparable qualitative and quantitative data on the site visits. This has proven difficult even with the prestructured questionnaire and even though only four experienced staff members are involved in the data collection effort.<sup>1</sup>

With the work more than half-completed, it is possible to specify in considerable detail what it is we are trying to document and the methodology being used for documentation. And further, while our conclusions have not yet been finalized and will not be until the data are analyzed in detail, it is possible to assemble a tentative list of conclusions (which for the time being should be viewed as hypotheses to be tested) that will give the reader at least a rough idea of the direction in which we are moving.

---

1 In addition to the authors of this paper, Dr. John K. Hatch has been collecting data. He was on a field trip when this paper was written.

Before getting into the details of our methodology, we offer several general observations based on our experience to date. At the beginning of our work, we were aware that certain conditions had to be met if projects were to be successful. These included:

- the existence of a technological package which, in light of existing prices and market structures, would offer small farmers significant incentives to adopt it; and
- an administrative network which delivers needed external resources when and where required.

Our contract did not call for us to focus primary attention on these areas; instead, it called for us to focus on various political, economic and social conditions in the project area and the components of project design that relate to the involvement of the small farmer. Very early in our work, however, we found that the two assumed conditions mentioned above so rarely held that some attention would have to be given to them in our project research.

A second general conclusion is that while the desirability of creating programs to involve small farmers in the development process is now acknowledged and recognized, few projects in the past have been developed with the interests of this group specifically in mind. Rather, the objective has been to increase aggregate farm output. When projects are not specifically designed

for small farmers, most appear to be of little use to them. We hasten to add that the "designed for" terminology is somewhat misleading, since it implies that some external agent can develop good project designs. We are finding small farmers have played an important role on the "design teams" of nearly all projects that have provided significant benefits to small farmers.<sup>1</sup>

Our third general finding is that getting the benefits of development to the small farmer in a way that will become self-sustaining will be more difficult, administratively more costly, more time consuming and will involve more political problems than achieving the earlier development objective of increasing aggregate agricultural output. In part, this stems from the newness of the objective. However, it is also due to diseconomies of scale and the absence of sound intermediary organizations. Perhaps more importantly, it is due to problems related to the particular characteristics of the rural poor.

Our final general conclusion, and indeed the one to which our research is addressed, is that getting the benefits of development to the small rural producer in a manner which can become self-sustaining will require fundamental changes in the project identification, design, and implementation procedures of U.S. AID and other external assistance agencies. Projects have failed frequently in the past because of mistaken conceptions or inadequate

---

1 In this regard, the most valuable service an external agent can provide is to initiate a process directly involving small farmers that will generate good project design.

information on the small farmer's priorities and the alternative mechanisms by which they might be realized. Regrettably, these are not things an outsider can uncover in the short time frame during which external assistance projects are usually generated. It calls for a detailed knowledge of the thinking processes and behavior of the small farmer and it requires the small farmer's trust; these things take time to develop. Consequently, we advocate the "tree approach" to project design. For this approach, the key is to start with something simple which there is every reason to believe the small farmer desires (e.g., a system that gets fertilizer to him when needed). The first year or two of the project (during implementation of the initial project objective) would be used to determine what might further be done to involve and benefit the small farmer. This approach is particularly necessary in situations where technological packages have not been positively identified and demonstrated to be profitable for small farmers. Although the approach calls for individualized attention to the needs of each local area (to insure that relevant local constraints to the adoption of new technology are overcome), it does not prevent national or regional programs from being developed and implemented. For example, there is no a priori reason why the tree approach could not be attempted simultaneously in a number of separate geographic locations in a country. It is the complexity, speed and design of project activities at the local level which are critical to the "tree approach," not the number of

?

localities being assisted by a small farmer development program.

From this brief description it should be apparent that the "tree approach" differs substantially from the current procedures used by most major external donors to identify and process potential projects. Gone should be the initial ten-day, ten-man expert team that flies in, around, and out of a country to identify projects costing more than 10 million dollars. Gone should be the amazingly detailed 150 page reports which specify exactly the procedures and steps to be taken when the project is implemented. Gone should be the extremely long and detailed outside evaluation of projects based upon the inputs, construction completed, and money spent. In its place should be a healthy appreciation for the perceptions, interests and risk considerations of small farmers.

### III. A Specification of the Small Farmer Research Objectives<sup>1</sup>

After considerable thought, we have concluded that the question we are addressing can be most easily handled if it is broken into two subordinated questions. The first involves specifying the circumstances, both in terms of environmental conditions and project design, that are most likely to lead to project success, where success is defined as getting the benefits of development to small rural producers in a manner that will become self-sustaining.

It is probable that project success will depend importantly on the level, timing and nature of the target population's involvement in the project. For analytical purposes four types of involvement have been distinguished: dialogue, technical inputs, decision responsibility, and a resource commitment. The called-for involvement will require certain behavioral changes. Consequently, our second task entails specifying what steps should be taken, under different sets of circumstances, to effect the desired behavioral changes.

In short, we are saying that project success depends on environmental conditions and project design -- where it is probable that involvement of the target population is an important component of project design. The first part of our research will indicate the types of local involvement needed. The second part will indicate how to get the desired type of local involvement. A

---

<sup>1</sup> A more detailed statement of our models is given in Attachment B.

more detailed elaboration of our conceptual framework is given in the following section.

However, before getting into the details of our research design, one qualification should be made. There are a number of local circumstances that are tremendously important in project design that are not generalizable across projects. Clearly, all of these special circumstances that should be accounted for cannot be specified. Instead, we will list the major areas that should be investigated in our final report, and make some procedural suggestions as to how these investigations might be undertaken.

#### IV. Details of Part I of the Small Farmer Research

Our general hypothesis is that Success in getting the benefits of development to small poor rural producers in a manner which will become self-sustaining, is determined by the Local and National Conditions, the Project Design Components, and the Interaction of the Two.

##### Success

Success is getting benefits to the small rural producer in a manner which can become self-sustaining.

Benefits are disaggregated for the subproject and project activity as follows:

*Low benefits: Increase in small producers' income (but no increase in output or productivity) by market price changes, elimination of the middle-man, transfers, etc.*

*Medium benefits: Output increases which increase income.*

*High benefits: Medium benefits accompanied by evidence of the process becoming self-sustaining e.g., that the subproject is able to operate on commercially-viable terms*

*Highest benefits: High benefits accompanied by a decision process controlled by small farmers.*

### Local and National Conditions

*Local and National Conditions refer to:*

*Stages of development as measured by level of rural education, real income, and market involvement;*

*Political and economic power structure;*

*Available local physical resources and production possibilities;*

*Structure and accessibility of markets for local output;*

*Administrative capacity;*

*Other relevant, physical, economic, and socio/cultural conditions.*

### Project Design Components

*Project Design Components refer to:*

*Project Structure: Type of Project  
Intermediary  
Sponsorship*

*Project Dynamics during each of four stages of a project's life-cycle: identification, design, implementation, and withdrawal of externally subsidized resources (self-sufficiency):*

- a. Timing, level and kind of non-local resource inputs.*
- b. Timing, level and kind of local resources inputs (local involvement).*

### The Interaction of the Two<sup>1</sup>

The Interaction of the Two refers to the impact of stages of development on Project Design Components, national and local power structures on Project Design Components, etc., as well as interaction between elements of each set.

### V. Details of Part II of the Small Farmer Research

The primary assumption on which the second major part of our research is based is that the timing, level, and nature of the local involvement of the small rural producer is an important element in project success. Granting this (which will, of course, be tested in the first part of our research), and granting further that the type of involvement needed will require behavioral change on the part of the small farmer, the second part of our research entails developing a behavioral model that will illuminate the alternative methods that could be used to achieve the desired behavioral changes.

It is probable that the various project stages outlined above will call for differing types and mixes of target population involvement. However, as mentioned above, it is possible to reduce the types of involvement to four basic ones. These are:

---

1 Some of the most interesting of the interactions occur within the Project Design Components set. These will be examined in some detail in the second stage of the model, the search for the determinants of behavioral changes necessary for local involvement and commitment of resources.

1. *dialogue*
2. *technical inputs*
3. *decision responsibility*
4. *resources commitment*

Having specified in the earlier part of our research the type or types of population involvement desired, our task here will be to specify the level and nature of the efforts required for policymakers to obtain the desired responses.

Our general hypothesis is that Local Involvement by the target population in development projects is determined by the Local and National Conditions, Past Experience with development projects, the Level of Local Involvement in a prior stage of the project, Policy Variables, and Interactions among the different variable sets.

### Local Involvement

We feel that the level and nature of local involvement should depend on the project stage. For analytical purposes, we have broken out four stages: identification, design, implementation, and movement to self-sufficiency. We then look at local involvement at each stage--the four types noted earlier:

*Dialogue: where the target population furnishes insights and information to the project research and administrative staff.*

*Technical Inputs: where the target population furnishes technical services (extension, research, evaluation) to the project.*

*Decision Responsibility: where the target population undertakes the basic responsibilities of project direction.*

*Resource Commitment: where the target population furnishes labor, capital, land or managerial skills to the project.*

## Local and National Conditions

*Local and National Conditions refer to:*

*Stages of development as measured by level of rural education, real income, and market involvement;*

*Political and economic power structure;*

*Available local physical resources and production possibilities;*

*Structure and accessibility of markets for local output;*

*Administrative capacity;*

*Other relevant, physical, economic, and socio/cultural conditions.*

## Past Experience

The small farmer's past experience with development projects will affect his willingness to become involved with current projects.

## Level of Local Involvement in Previous Stage

Level of Local Involvement in a previous stage is probably an important predictor of the level and type of involvement one might expect in the current stage.

## Policy Variables

Policy Variables are those variables which can be directly manipulated in attempts to increase local involvement. These include:

- *social services (health, housing, food, clothing);*
- *extension communications (contact, training, demonstration farms);*
- *organizations (cooperatives, farmers associations, community groups);*
- *the cost of goods purchased and the price received for goods sold;*
- *input service availability (credit, fertilizer, water, seeds, insurance, etc.).*

### Interactions

Interactions among the different variable sets includes all interaction among sets, as well as interactions of variables within a set.

### VI. Reflections on Methodology

To those with a background in quantitative analysis, it should be apparent that for both our success and behavior models<sup>1</sup>, we would run into serious "degrees of freedom" problems, given our number of observations, if we were to test simultaneously for the significance of all the independent variables we have listed. However, it is expected that our field experience, the availability of data, and some eclectic attempts at analysis will permit us to bring the number of variables down into a more manageable range.

At this stage, it is clear that our research activities will lead us to a number of important conclusions. As to how useful our data collection and analysis effort will be in permitting us to document these conclusions remains to be seen. In a sense, we share Polly Hill's feeling that by the time you have adequately field-tested a survey document, you know all the answers you initially designed the survey document to uncover.

In a more positive vein, it is fair to say we will end up with a large and rich data base on the benefits and involvement

---

1 See Attachment B for our models', specifications.

of small farmers in rural development. This data base will allow us to document our findings more thoroughly than has been done by others who have written on this subject to date.

## VII. Anticipated Research Results

Earlier on in this paper, some of what we anticipate will be our more general findings were put forth. In the following paragraphs, some of our yet-to-be documented, more specific conclusions are presented.

### A. Concerning the Farmer's Willingness to Accept Technological Innovation

#### A-1 THE ONLY RELIABLE TESTOR OF TECHNOLOGICAL PACKAGE DESIGNED FOR THE SMALL FARMER IS THE SMALL FARMER.

Our site visits are making it abundantly clear that there is nothing mysterious about why small farmers have not adopted new technologies. In many cases, it is simply not in their interest to do so. The problem is that often the new technology is developed on the basis of erroneous assumptions concerning small farmer objectives and constraints. Now, one could undertake detailed studies to uncover these objectives and constraints. But frequently, it will be more cost-effective to uncover this by offering small farmers a technological package and to learn the correct assumptions from their reaction. Be that as it may, the main point is that one should not accept the assertion that it is in the interest of small farmers to do something differently until it has been shown to be the case by their actions.

#### A-2 THE RISK (i.e., PROBABILITY OF FAILURE) ASSOCIATED WITH ANY TECHNOLOGICAL PACKAGE IS OF GREATER CONCERN (AND HENCE CONSTITUTES A GREATER IMPEDIMENT TO ADOPTION) FOR THE SMALL FARMER THAN FOR THE LARGE FARMER:

For expositional purposes, the benefits from the adoption of a new technology might be defined as the mean expected increase in net income. Risk might then be defined as the probability of a loss in net income resulting from adoption of a new technology. In a real sense therefore, a given risk is of greater concern to a farmer producing at only subsistence than one producing at above subsistence. The latter can afford some loss in income whereas the former cannot. Consequently, it is natural to expect the small farmer will be more reluctant to adopt a new technology

than the larger farmer. We believe inadequate attention has been given to this "differential risk cost" in project design, and this is one of the major reasons small farmers have lagged behind larger farmers in the adoption of new technologies. There are several things that might be done to reduce this differential. One is to define the plot of land to utilize the new technology small enough so that small farmers might try it without having to cut into the land they need for subsistence. Various insurance schemes might also be introduced.

A-3 THE SMALL FARMER IS NOT ALL-KNOWING; HIS PERSPECTIVES ARE LIMITED; HIS THINKING PROCESS IS DIFFERENT FROM THAT OF EXTERNAL AGENTS; AND HIS MODE OF COMMUNICATION IS PRIMARILY ORAL. FOR ALL THESE REASONS HIS INVOLVEMENT FROM THE VERY OUTSET IS CALLED FOR WHEN CONSIDERATION IS BEING GIVEN TO A TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGE INTENDED TO BENEFIT HIM.

As the earlier discussion suggests, the small farmer's reaction to a new technology cannot be anticipated without a detailed understanding of his objectives and the constraints he works under. The most direct way to obtain knowledge on these points is to engage in a direct dialogue with the small farmer. This would seem to be a self-evident preposition, but we have found few instances of meaningful, two-way dialogues.

A-4 FORMAL OR INFORMAL GROUPS ARE A VALUABLE, IF NOT NECESSARY, MECHANISM FOR CONVINCING SMALL FARMERS TO TAKE RISKS.

In the projects and subprojects examined to date, groups perform four major functions. First, they tend to serve as a reinforcement mechanism for the required behavioral changes, particularly if the land of the farmers is contiguous. Second, groups are effective mechanisms for providing feedback information to project workers; the use of this vehicle is most clearly seen in large commercial ventures which involve smallholders. Third, the delivery of external assistance and agricultural inputs is administratively more feasible to groups. And fourth, the carrying out of larger endeavors which require communal labor and investment is facilitated. One, or a combination of these elements either contribute to the farmer's willingness to take risks, or increase the certainty of a return from taking the risk, or both.

**B. Concerning the Design of a Project to Benefit the Small farmer.**

**B-1 IN MOST PUBLICLY-SPONSORED SMALL FARMER CREDIT PROGRAMS, THE LOAN CHARGES AND SAVINGS RATES ARE BOTH TOO LOW;**

Higher (positive real) interest rates could provide small farmers with a protection against a loss in asset value resulting from inflation. Without such an opportunity available, farmers will either make consumption purchases or buy nonproductive assets as a hedge against inflation. Increasing borrowing charges will reduce the attractiveness of the loanable funds to larger farmers (who have alternative credit sources) and increase the incentive for the lending organization to administer the credit program to small farmers. In many instances, higher lending rates will not significantly effect the small farmers' willingness to borrow since risk considerations play a far more important role. If the small farmer's willingness to borrow is substantially curtailed, there is reason to suspect whether the farmer has high enough rate of return prospect to warrant additional investments. In many Third World countries, capital is underpriced with the result that labor is underutilized.

**B-2 A LARGE AMOUNT OF SOCIAL SERVICE ASSISTANCE IN THE EARLY STAGE OF A PROJECT CAN WORK AGAINST THE LONG RUN CHANCES OF PROJECT SUCCESS.**

From a purely objective standpoint it is clear that the rural poor frequently have miserable housing, health, nutrition, and educational services. It is therefore tempting to attempt to build an improvement in these services into a rural development program. Our experiences suggest that there are two dangers in doing this. The first is that offering such social services can lead the rural poor into believing that their needs will be then taken care of by an outside agent rather than by their own efforts. This we refer to as a "dependency effect". The second negative feature in providing social services is that most aid comes in the form of capital; the locality is then left with the financial burden of having to cover current expenditures.

**B-3 NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS ARE MORE LIKELY TO BE SUCCESSFUL IN REACHING SMALL FARMERS THAN GOVERNMENT PROJECTS.**

We are finding a high success rate among small farmers projects administered by certain types of non-governmental organizations. Some of the church-supported projects, in particular, appear successful. While our analysis is not yet complete, it appears that a key reason for success is the amount of time spent by the churchmen interacting with the rural poor before attempting to launch any sort of project. Another probable reason for success stems from the limited resources of the church; because of this fact a project will not get started unless it is appealing enough to small farmers to convince them to make an early commitment of resources. From our analysis, we will arrive at some conclusions as to the replicability of these projects on a larger scale.

**B-4 A PRIMARY OBJECTIVE IN ANY PROJECT DESIGNED TO BENEFIT SMALL FARMERS SHOULD BE TO GET THE DECISION-MAKING IN THE HANDS OF SMALL FARMERS.**

Time and again we have found that when the decision-making is not in the hands of the small farmer, the programs' objectives will turn away from involving the small farmers in the rural development process. Also, there is little prospect for the project to become self-sustaining before the small farmer gets involved in the decision making process. Moreover, increasing farmer participation in decision making helps build local organizational and managerial skills. In several of the projects, it has been feasible and cost-effective for farmers to replace government officials in low-level managerial/design roles.

**B-5 SMALL FARMER PROJECTS ARE LESS LIKELY TO BE SUCCESSFUL IF LAND IS CULTIVATED COMMUNALLY AND THE OUTPUT SHARED.**

Several site visits have shown that yields per acre are substantially lower on communally worked land (where the output is shared) than from private holdings. Moreover, local conflicts develop over questions of level of effort by individual farmers. In projects where a small portion of the land is worked communally to pay off larger investments, it is common to find that this approach is usually abandoned after a year or two.

- B-6 GOVERNMENT PROVIDED EXTENSION SERVICES ARE FREQUENTLY INEFFECTIVE BECAUSE OF THE LOW RATIOS OF EXTENSION WORKERS TO FARM UNITS AND BECAUSE EFFORTS ARE NOT DIRECTED TOWARDS THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A FEW WELL-DEVELOPED TECHNOLOGICAL PACKAGES.**

In contrast to most commercial operations, government extension services are diffuse and understaffed. An effort to introduce a few good technological packages using locally-trained paraprofessionals will produce more benefits to the small farmers than general technical assistance provided by trained agriculturalists. As to the number of extension workers, we are finding that a minimum of 1 per 200 farm units is required during the initial stages of a project, even with a well-developed technological package. One further observation has been that the quality of information held by local project officers (agricultural officers and paraprofessionals) about the costs and benefits to small farmers adopting a technological package correlates with the degree of success of the project.

- B-7 SMALL FARMERS SHOULD BE OFFERED SUBSIDIZED INPUTS AS AN INDUCEMENT TO ADOPT NEW TECHNOLOGIES ONLY AS A LAST RESORT;**

There is considerable evidence that providing subsidized inputs is not a key factor in determining whether small farmers adopt new technologies. More important factors are whether the new technology is explained properly to the small farmer, whether he can obtain the inputs needed to introduce the new technology at the time the inputs are required, and other considerations of risk. In many cases, the provision of subsidized inputs draws attention away from the more fundamental impediments to behavior change and, to the extent they are successful in effecting behavior change, results in a long-term misallocation of resources.

- B-8 SMALL FARMER PROJECTS SHOULD HAVE BUILT-IN EVALUATION SYSTEMS, AND FROM THE STANDPOINT OF GETTING DESIRED BEHAVIOR CHANGES ADOPTED AND COST-EFFECTIVENESS CONSIDERATIONS, THE SMALL FARMER SHOULD BE INVOLVED IN THE DATA COLLECTION EFFORT.**

We are finding that it is cost effective to use small farmers as data collectors on their own activities. Also, there is some evidence to suggest that when the small farmer is collecting these data, he becomes more aware of the adequacy of his own performance relative to others.

C. Concerning Macro Economic and Political Factors.

C-1 SMALL FARMERS WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF NEW TECHNOLOGY ARE ABLE TO ACHIEVE SIGNIFICANTLY HIGHER YIELDS PER ACRE THAN LARGER FARMERS.

Comparing small farmer yields with larger farmers' in the areas where the projects and subprojects are located, the small farmers consistently produce higher yields per acre of both cash and food crops because of intensive cultivation (once they adopt the new technology).

C-2 IN COUNTRIES WHERE LAND IS NOT IN SHORT SUPPLY, REAL CONFLICTS CAN EXIST BETWEEN MAXIMIZING GROWTH IN AGGREGATE OUTPUT AND THE SEPARATE OBJECTIVES OF MAXIMIZING EMPLOYMENT GROWTH AND REDUCING INCOME INEQUALITIES;

The fact must be faced that there are often very real trade-offs between maximizing the growth in output and other objectives. This is particularly true in countries where land is not a scarce factor. In these countries, the investment with the highest return might be tractors that can only be used by the large farmers (or groups of small farmers with contiguous land).

C-3 PROJECTS TO ASSIST SMALL FARMERS ARE LIKELY TO FAIL IF THEY ARE NOT CONSISTENT WITH THE POLITICAL OBJECTIVES OF THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT.

Attention must be given to the practical objectives of the national government when one is attempting to assess the prospects for project success. An important positive sign is that the central government depends (or might in the future) on the small farmer for political support. This phenomenon exists in many of the countries with a military leadership.

C-4 DISPERSION OF WEALTH/INCOME/POWER IN LOCAL AREAS DICTATES WHETHER A "TUNNEL" PROJECT (RESTRICTED TO SMALL FARMERS) OR A GENERAL AREA IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM IS MORE LIKELY TO SUCCEED.

Where there is a high degree of disparity in income and land holdings in a local area, it is necessary to design a project with strict requirements for participation in order to

reach the smallholders. Where there is a reasonably equitable distribution of income and power, general area development programs (roads or community development projects) may be appropriate. The same consideration applies when structuring the organizational vehicle. If there is great disparity, the organizational unit has to be small enough and structured in a way to screen out the larger farmers who may exploit the poorer.

**C-5 GROUPS/ASSOCIATIONS CAN HELP THE SMALL FARMER COMPETE WITH LARGER FARMERS FOR POLITICALLY-DETERMINED EXTENSION/MARKETING SERVICES.**

The creation of local organizations increases the political bargaining power of small farmers. Through these organizations, small farmers will have a better chance of convincing government officials to provide the needed technical assistance and inputs. This is particularly true in countries where popular elections occur, or where the ruling elements do not have a natural political constituency. Also, increasing local organizational capabilities facilitates for the government the delivery of services.

## Part II

### Research on Information Systems Concerning Small Farmers and Rural Development

#### I. Introduction

As mentioned earlier, our contract calls for research on information systems concerning small farmers and rural development. More specifically, U.S. AID is interested in doing more to get small farmers involved in and benefiting from rural development. As pointed out in Part I, this will entail making changes in existing programs and developing new project designs. Our second job is therefore to specify the data needed to design, monitor, and evaluate efforts towards these objectives, and to determine the most cost-effective ways to obtain these data.

#### II. What Data Are Needed?

From the work we have done so far, it is clear that many projects have failed because of inadequate information on small farmer's attitudes and behavior, particularly as they relate to agricultural production. It is the lack of this sort of information that is largely responsible for the technological package shortcomings mentioned earlier. More information is also needed on what steps might be taken to change these attitudes and behavior to better serve the small farmer's interests. To service these requirements, micro data, (i.e., data on individual small farmers) are needed.

If small farmers are to be offered programs that will in fact benefit them if adopted, it is essential to know about small farmers attitudes and behavior both as producers and consumers. In the field of production, detailed and accurate data on small farmer production processes are needed. This presents a serious (although frequently overlooked) problem. The only person who has direct access to the needed data is the small farmer, and because he does not as a rule keep detailed records, one cannot obtain accurate data from him by asking him a set of questions once a year. Only rarely will he keep written accounts, and he does not have an accurate picture in his mind of how much fertilizer he used on each crop (often he does not know the size of his holding in standard measurements); he has an even less clear picture of the labor input, particularly if he draws heavily on family labor. To obtain accurate information on these subjects, data must be collected on a continual basis during the production cycle. Several approaches offer potential here. One, which Winch has used in Ghana, is to interview the farmer once-a-week. Another, used by Hatch in Peru, is to live with small farmers and record the data directly. The third is to provide the farmer (or the farmers' association) with a journal, and ask him to record the needed data. Depending on local conditions, one or another of these approaches could be the cost-effective collection mechanism.

For some production-related questions, data on small farmer attitudes, as distinct from behavior, would appear to be the most relevant data to collect. For example, in Paraguay, we were involved in structuring a study in which a substantial number of small farmers, cooperative and non-cooperative members, were interviewed to determine their reasons for joining or not joining. Hopefully the results of this study, which is still under way, will provide useful insights on how to design a cooperative to maximize its appeal to small farmers.

Collecting data on the small farmer as a consumer presents another set of problems. Here, key questions are frequently whether a farmer will change his eating or purchasing habits, or shift from less to more leisure time if his income changes. We have not done detailed research on this subject, but it is clearly questionable whether what a farmer says he will do can be trusted. The real test would again appear to be whether the desired behavior change occurs when the alternative is presented and if not, what can be done to bring it about.

Finally, mention should be made of the critical area of attitudes and behavior as they relate to family formation (some view this as a production activity; other view it as a consumption activity). Again, this is an area we have not focused upon, but it is clear that a detailed understanding of attitudes and behavior is needed for successful family planning projects.

### III. An Analysis of Past and Current Information Systems

#### A. Past "Evaluation" Systems

After looking in depth at rural development efforts in ten Latin American and African countries, it is clear that comprehensive information systems--systems which allow continual monitoring and evaluation of project interaction with small farmers--are rare indeed. Generally some static cost/benefit appraisal is undertaken before the project is approved. After the project has been initiated, the external lending agency usually supports a one-time look at performance. This is often useful as a "go-no-go" evaluation for future funding of this or similar projects, but generally offers little to project managers in improving their program's performance. In the event there is an interest in ongoing evaluation it generally takes the form of counting completed structures, training courses, agricultural extension contacts and other "activity" measures. Few efforts attempt to assess the project's "societal effects."

If an evaluation is demanded by the external agency, and if funds are available, rural surveys have generally been the technique used. That these are slow, expensive, static and often misleading is well documented. However, in the absence of a funding or a professional staff constraint, this method of evaluation can offer insights into attitudes and behavior patterns which result from development inputs. The emphasis has often been on attitudes, however, and these are often poor

predictors of behavior change. A further shortcoming of past survey work has been the failure to generate recommendations for improvements in ongoing projects. The analytical work involved is frequently too complex for most project managers to comprehend, and the all-too-frequent result has been that the survey work has not been directed to answering policy-relevant questions. This point is discussed further under IV. C. below.

B. Some Major Attempts to Collect Data on Small Farmer Attitudes and Behavior

U.S. AID has direct access to a number of surveys that have collected data on small farmer attitudes and behavior. Among others, these include the Daines work in Colombia, the Winch work in Northern Ghana, the Hatch work in Peru, the AIR work in Thailand, and the works of Mook and Weisel for the Vihiga Special Rural Development Program in Kenya. We have concluded that efforts such as these warrant further study since:

- . there has been a wide range in costs and techniques employed in these efforts, and a comparative review of them should offer interesting insights into the most cost-effective collection design; and
- . shockingly, little analysis has been done with the data bases that have been generated.

In light of these considerations, we are in the process of accumulating information on these data collection methods, and intend to complete a comparative cost study.

We are also obtaining copies of the computer tapes on the results of these surveys and will examine the tapes with the objective of doing further analytical work on them.

### C. Project-Specific Information Systems

For all of the projects we are studying for the first part of our research assignment, we are also focusing attention on their information systems. In addition to the points made above, certain conclusions stand out from this work. The first is that in few of the projects was baseline data collected at the time of project initiation. Such data are needed to draw conclusions later on about project impact. It is difficult enough to separate out program effects from other factors through time; it is an impossible assignment when no data exist on the situation at the time of project initiation.

A second observation mentioned earlier in the paper should be repeated here. Little data on the distribution of project benefits have been collected for ongoing projects. This is understandable since distributional benefit information was not a requirement of project design in an era when maximizing aggregate output was the primary objective. Such data are obviously critical if one is interested in a particular group such as small farmers. From our standpoint, this is unfortunate, for it makes it difficult to distinguish those projects that were successful in getting benefits to small farmers from those that were not.

#### IV. Steps Towards the Design of New Information Systems

Our research into the determinants of effective local action has led us into attempting to specify the types of benefits from development projects which actually get to the poor rural producers. While attempting to determine how to develop this information, we became directly involved in examining the information systems in use that were intended to "evaluate" and "correct" specific development projects. From this effort, we have moved to assisting project managers with the design and implementation of information systems which will deliver the data needed to improve the performance particularly with respect to the benefits accruing to small farmers.

Our experience has suggested that rural development project managers can become enthusiastic about information systems based on impact and output measures, rather than activity or input measures, if the system can offer realistic recommendations for project improvement. These are the kinds of ongoing or continuous evaluation systems we have been designing in Latin America. Some examples are offered below.

##### A. A Rural Survey in Paraguay to Determine Why People Join or Do Not Join Cooperatives

A 1,300 sample including large and small farmers with a great amount of data on economic production, farm size, use of modern inputs, socio-economic characteristics, and subjective perception.

The survey should offer far better data than have been previously available on the rural sector in Paraguay. However, it is a look at rural Paraguay at only one point in time. What is needed is a continuing collection and analysis program building on the rural survey. We have recommended the use of farm journals, maintained by individual farmers, to record cost-of-production and yield data in a manner which would make it comparable to the survey data. This is now under consideration by U.S. AID.

B. Predicting Repayment Potential for Cooperative Infrastructure Loans in Ecuador.

U.S. AID has supported loans to small farmers to establish rice cooperatives in Guayaquil, Ecuador. This program involved short-term crop loans, medium-term equipment loans (pumps/tractors) and long-term infrastructure loans (dikes/canals/roads). The technological package was estimated to increase yields at predicted future prices of inputs and outputs, to allow repayment of all three kinds of loans. A standard accounting system was established and computerized which produce monthly profit and loss statements and balance sheets. Such a system can produce absolute proof of failure after the program has collapsed but has little predictive value.

We designed an accounting manual which allows detailed records to be kept of cash costs and labor inputs for special land plots, as well as the collective expenses attributable to the cooperative as a whole. The cooperative managers were able to see how detailed records of inputs on special land plots and yields could help them improve their input allocations to maximize income from various plots of land owned by cooperative members. This cost-of-production and yield data allows a direct comparison with the engineer-designed technological package, and would allow the improvement of new cooperative technical design in the future. Once net income increases are known, the next step is to add a set of impact indicators for the cooperatives which would begin to measure the changes over time, that will occur with additional income.

C. Indicators of Development in Bolivia 3

In poor countries with no potential for rural survey methods, our "indicator" systems offer one option to evaluate success in development projects. An impact assessment of the Accelerated Rural Development program in Thailand has been ongoing for the past three years. While the conceptual framework developed to explain change in rural Thailand, as well as the computer-assisted analysis scheme, is unnecessarily complex, the basic idea (i.e., to measure behavioral change) can be extracted and used in any country.

In Bolivia we are providing assistance to the National Community Development Service (NCDS) which is the major government agency in the rural areas. NCDS has gained the confidence of the rural population; local communities place cash in state banks as their share (about 50 percent) of the entire cost of projects they desire. This includes schools, potable water systems, sheep and cattle dips, potato storage, health stations, women's organizations for health and nutrition, agricultural irrigation systems, veterinarian assistance and agricultural extension. In the past, all evaluation was given in terms of construction schedules, i.e., "how many x's have been built?" Our recommendations have stressed three different levels:

i) Aggregate indicators. Activity measures as well as repeat requests for assistance and projects. If this latter information is collected by project type, it will be possible to trace the movement of a community's requests from the "original" project, often a school to income-generating projects.

ii) Project-level indicators. These call for a definition of "success" within a particular project type (schools for example). This "success" measure is defined by a dialogue with the lowest level professional staff and the community leaders and farmers themselves, asking for the results of an optimum project in their community. These generally could

be grouped under the following indices:

- a. Use-rates of the completed project compared to maximum potential use rates;
- b. Contribution-rates by the target population in support, maintenance, cooperating investment, etc., to the completed projects.
- c. Costs of the project to the government.

When combined, it has been possible to obtain a ranking of projects, from the most successful to the least successful. At the same time, data were collected on those variables which were thought to explain "success." Correctly done, this allows a very simple visual examination of the success rankings and potential explanatory variables. Data for this analysis can be collected after the project has been completed.

This is only one part of the system, however, because the project-specific evaluation system does not allow a comparison between (for example) schools and agricultural irrigation systems. Thus, it cannot be used to allocate funds among projects in different functional areas. The question of the impact of development resources calls for a complementary set of indicators at the community level.

iii) Community-level indicators of development.

Within different social/economic/political environments, projects will have different impacts on behavior change and development. It may be that a project with only moderate "success" ratings when compared to other similar projects, will have a very large impact on an entire community "Success" measures for development can differ

widely, but might include:

- a. increased agricultural and livestock production,
- b. increased income;
- c. increased use of modern agricultural techniques;
- d. increased local organizational ability to solve local problems;
- e. increased ability to make local voices heard in a larger political arena;
- f. increased ability to make critical economic decisions by local area residents;
- g. increased educational investment for the children.

The problem is to define indicators which serve as proxies for the success measures on questionnaires which do not have obviously "correct" answers, and which can be collected from local leaders and villagers by the lowest level of the professional field staff. The answers will require coding and aggregation, with a series of simple manipulations to make the scores comparable. Just as in the case of the project-specific analysis, data collection must include those variables which could be used to "explain" the impact of one or several development projects. This should permit recommendations on improving the impact and performance of programs.

Our experience has been that impact evaluation programs are relatively complex systems to design and can only be created in the field, in direct conjunction with those who have first-hand knowledge of local behavior patterns and responses.

## VI. Future Research

Obviously, we will attempt to refine the project-specific and community-impact information systems. The first experimental system using quantitative impact indicators, as well as more subjective evaluation systems, will be included in the ORDEZA program in Peru. The research for the design of this system was initiated in June 1974, and includes eight weeks of field work in cooperation with the research staff of the ORDEZA project. A completed system should be in place by December, 1974. In addition, we would hope to move forward on two other fronts:

A. The benefits to be derived from direct involvement by small farmers in the evaluation and information system. Besides the obvious benefits of low cost or free collection of basic data not otherwise obtainable, the collection of cost and yield data by small farmers may (we suspect "will") affect the resistance of the small farmers to technical innovations and lead directly to behavior change. This system can be tested relatively simply wherever farm journals are used.

B. Research into the use of "optimum" systems we have designed. There are reasons why managers may resist the use of information systems. These could include:

- i) poor systems;
- ii) systems which provide "warnings" of trouble but no recommendations for solution;
- iii) costly systems;
- iv) evaluation systems not directly linked to the management of the project; and
- v) political restrictions on the ability of managers to revise existing programs.

This research would aim at improving the utility of information systems promoting project change and improvements.

Revised List of Projects and SubprojectsLATIN AMERICAMexico

- 1) Puebla, as a project and subprojects (Rockefeller supported).
- 2) Puebla-copy, in the State of Mexico (GOM-supported).

Colombia

- 1) (ICA) Agricultural Science Institute rural development pilot program designed as an improved copy of Puebla (IRDC and AID-supported).
- 2) ICA rural development pilot program near Cali.
- 3) Radio \_\_\_\_\_, a popular Catholic radio program directed, at least in part, at innovations in rural agricultural practices.
- 4) Futures for Children (Futuro), a private sector, urban and rural community development program.

Ecuador

- 1) Land Guarantee Program (Fondos Financieros in Guayaquil), with two specific cooperatives as sub-projects (AID-supported).
- 2) FEEOAC, a directed agricultural credit program connected with COLAC, with two cooperatives as subprojects (AID-supported).
- 3) CESA, a private development organization which has concentrated on farmer organizations, with two cooperatives as subprojects.

Peru

- 1) VICOS, a Cornell University experiment in change and modernization (as yet not visited).
- 2) ORDEZA, an earthquake rehabilitation project with three communities as subprojects (AID-supported).
- 3) A GOP cooperative farm project (as yet not visited).

Bolivia

- 1) DESEC, a private development organization supported by foundations and grants to organize and assist small farmers.
- 2) Under DESEC, a potato production project, supported by ASAR with two communities as subprojects.
- 3) National Community Development Service (NCDS), with three communities serving as subprojects.

Paraguay

- 1) Associations of Agricultural Credit Users (AUCAs): a specialized crop credit program financed by the Paraguayan Agricultural Credit Bank (CAH), with two specific AUCAs as subprojects.
- 2) Agricultural Marketing Central (UNIPACO): An AID supported agricultural cooperative marketing program, with two cooperatives as subprojects.
- 3) Directed agricultural credit program of Paraguay's Savings and Loan Credit Cooperative Movement (CUNA and COLAC assisted) AID-supported, with two cooperatives as subprojects.

## Revised List of Projects and Subprojects

### AFRICA

#### Gambia

- 1) Chinese Rice Production Project (Basse Substation). Taiwanese effort to introduce irrigated rice. Two subprojects: Kuoba Kunda Scheme and Alohungari Scheme.
- 2) Gambian Government/IBRD Agricultural Production Project. Smallholder rice production project in McCarthy Division. One subproject: Kerewan Scheme.
- 3) Gambian Government Mixed Farming Centers. Introduction of ox-plowing and improved farming techniques. Two subprojects: Jenoi Mixed Farming Center and the Sare N'gai Mixed Farming Center.
- 4) Freedom from Hunger/Gambian Government Mixed Vegetable Scheme. Introduction of onion growing through village women's associations. Two subprojects: Busumbala Scheme and Kembujie Scheme.
- 5) Gambian Government/Gambia Cooperative Union Confectionary Groundnut Package Deal. Introduction of new variety of groundnuts through the Gambia Cooperative Union. Two subprojects: Faraba Banta Cooperative and N'Demban Cooperative.

#### Ghana

- 1) Christian Service Committee's Agriculture Program in Northern and Upper Regions. Effort of religious groups to reach small farmers through Agricultural Stations. Subprojects: Garu Agriculture Substation, Yendi Agriculture Substation (broken out by two more subprojects--work with the Dagomba and Komkomba villages).
- 2) Ghanaian Government/German Agricultural Project in Northern and Upper Regions. Agriculture program which started with fertilizer distribution and expanded into integrated package for smallholders. (The CSC work can be considered a subproject of this project.)

- 3) UNDP/FAO Fertilizer Use Project, Volta Region. Formation of cooperatives to introduce improved agricultural techniques for maize production. Two subprojects: Tsibu Gudui Food Cooperative Society, and Vovoli Food Marketing Cooperative Society.
- 4) Biriwa Project (Ghanaian Government/German). Development of fishing village through commercial and community development activities. Commercial and community development activities broken out as subprojects because of differences in approach and beneficiaries.
- 5) Denu Shallots Project. Locally evolved scientific method of growing shallots, complicated by loan from the Agricultural Development Bank.

#### Nigeria

- 1) Abeokuta Rice and Maize Development Project. Introduction of improved production techniques and inputs through group (communal) farms, grouped (combined though cultivated privately), and farm settlements. Each approach will be written up as subproject.
- 2) Nigerian Tobacco Company. Smallholder tobacco producing and curing through cooperatives and family units. Each approach will be written up as subproject.
- 3) Zaria Tomato Production Project. Production of tomatoes for processing plant, supported by Cadbury (a British firm), FAO, and the Ministry of Agriculture. Two group schemes will be written up as subprojects.
- 4) Tiv Bam Program. Indigenous credit program, locally organized and supported, to provide small farmers with funds for subsistence and production. Two Bams will be written up as subprojects.
- 5) Obomo Project in East Central State. Shell Oil-sponsored project to improve oil palm and cassava production of small farmers as part of an overall community development effort.

Kenya

- 1) Vihiga Special Rural Development Program: AID-financed rural development program at Division level.
- 2) Tetu Special Rural Development Program: Government of Kenya and University of Nairobi-supported rural development program.
- 3) Lehrembe Project: Multiservice center directed at a confined target area, initiated by the local MP and funded by a Dutch private agency.
- 4) Kenya Tea Authority: Government-controlled commercial effort to expand production of tea by smallholders, with financial assistance from IDA and the Commonwealth Development Corporation.

Lesotho

- 1) Thaba Bosio Rural Development Project: AID/IDA-financed project.
- 2) Leribe Rural Development Project: UNDP-financed and FAO-administered project.

## Attachment B

## Determinants of Effective Local Action

Model Specification for the Project  
and Subproject Levels

Our work on the Determinants of Effective Local Action has suggested that separating the research into two models is useful. The first is a SUCCESS model, which attempts to explain various levels of success in getting the benefits of development projects to small farmers in terms of Local and National Conditions, Project Design Components, and the Interaction of the two.

For expository reasons, we show SUCCESS as a dependent variable (Y), and the explanatory variables as independent variables (Xi). It is not clear at this time that the data will allow rigorous testing in the form as specified.

The second is a BEHAVIOR model, which attempts to explain various levels of local involvement in development projects terms of Local and National Conditions, Past Experience in Development Projects, Previous Local Involvement, Policy Variables, and the Interactions of Different Variable Sets. As in the SUCCESS model above, for expository reasons, we have used the dependent and independent variable specification although the data may not be adequate for rigorous testing.

These models were derived as a compromise between that data needed for an optimal and rigorous test, and the data which may, after arduous field collection, be available in comparable form.

Similar data have been (and will continue to be) obtained for "Project" as well as "Subproject" levels. This is necessary since the distinction between a small project, operating in one geographic location, and a large subproject, operating in one geographic location, is arbitrary.

**Model One: Success**

**Dependent Variable (Y)**

- |            |                               |   |
|------------|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>i</b>   | <b>Low Benefits:</b>          | Increase in small producers' income (but no increase in output or productivity) by market price changes, elimination of the middle-man, transfers, etc.   |
| <b>ii</b>  | <b>Medium Benefits:</b>       | Output increases which increase income.   |
| <b>iii</b> | <b>High Benefits:</b>         | Medium benefits accompanied by evidence of the process becoming self-sustaining e.g. that the subproject is able to operate on commercially-viable terms. |
| <b>iv</b>  | <b>Highest Benefits:</b>      | High benefits accompanied by a decision process controlled by small farmers.  |
|            | <b>Demonstration Benefits</b> | Where new techniques introduced in the project are adopted by non-project small farmers.  |

## Independent Variables (X<sub>i</sub>)

### Local and National Conditions

---

X<sub>1</sub>

X<sub>2</sub>

Stages of Development,  
as shown by:

- i education levels
- ii income levels
- iii market integration levels

Political and Economic Power  
Structure, as shown by:

- i extension workers
- ii land tenure status
- iii size of land holdings
- iv land reform efforts
- v income distribution

**Local and National Conditions**

---

**X<sub>3</sub>**

**Available Local Resources and  
Production Possibilities, as  
shown by:**

- i demonstrated technological  
package**
- ii successful agricultural  
innovation by size of land  
holding**

**X<sub>4</sub>**

**Structure and Accessibility  
of Markets for local Output,  
as shown by:**

- i relative prices of  
inputs and outputs**
- ii access to markets**

**Local and National Conditions**

---

**x<sub>5</sub>**

**Administrative Capacity,  
as shown by:**

- i delivery of necessary  
external resources**
- ii inability to deliver  
resources by administra-  
tive level**

**x<sub>6</sub>**

**Other Relevant Physical,  
Economic or Socio-Cultural  
Conditions, as shown by:**

- i land**
- ii water**
- iii weather**
- iv labor**
- v modern inputs**
- vi market**
- vii political environment**
- viii socio-cultural factors**

## Project Design Components

---

$X_7$

**Project Structure and Services, as shown by:**

- i project originator
- ii external sponsor
- iii intermediary
- iv sequence of activities

**at each stage in the Project's:**

Identification

Design

Implementation

Movement toward  
Self-Sufficiency

$X_8$

**Non-Local Resource Inputs, as shown by:**

- i funding
- ii staffing
- iii staff interactions with the local population
- iv communication methods between staff and local population

**at each stage in the Project's**

Identification

Design

Implementation

Movement toward  
Self-Sufficiency

Project Design Components

---

$x_9$

Local Resource Inputs,  
as shown by:

- i dialogue
- ii technical inputs
- iii decision responsibility
- vi resources committed

at each stage in the Project's

Identification

Design

Implementation

Movement toward  
Self-Sufficiency

$x_{10}$

The Interaction of Local  
and National Conditions  
and Project Design Com-  
ponents.

**MODEL TWO: BEHAVIOR**

**Dependent Variable (Y)**

**Local Involvement by the target population in successful development projects, as shown by:**

- i Dialogue:** where the target population furnishes insights and information to the project research and administrative staff;
- ii Technical Inputs:** where the target population furnishes technical services (extension, research, evaluation) to the project;
- iii Decision Responsibility:** where the target population undertakes the basic responsibilities of direction; and
- iv Resource Commitment:** where the target population furnishes labor, capital, land or managerial skills to the project.

**at each stage in the Project's**

**Identification**

**Design**

**Implementation**

**Movement Toward Self-Sufficiency**

## Independent Variable (Xi)

National Conditions

---

 $X_1$ 

Stages of Development,  
as shown by:

- i education levels
- ii income levels
- iii market integration levels

 $X_2$ 

Political and Economic  
Power Structure, as  
shown by:

- i extension workers
- ii land tenure status
- iii size of land holdings
- iv land reform efforts
- v income distribution

**Local and National Conditions**Xi

---

**X<sub>3</sub>**

**Available Local Resources  
and Production Possibilities,  
as shown by:**

- i** demonstrated technological package
- ii** successful agricultural innovation by size of land holding

**X<sub>4</sub>**

**Structure and Accessibility  
of Markets for Local Output  
as shown by:**

- i** relative prices of inputs and outputs
- ii** access to markets

**Local and National Conditions**

---

**x<sub>5</sub>****Administrative Capacity,  
as shown by:**

- i delivery of necessary external resources
- ii inability to deliver resources by administrative level

**x<sub>6</sub>****Other Relevant Physical,  
Economic or Socio-Cultural  
Conditions, as shown by:**

- i land
- ii water
- iii weather
- iv labor
- v modern inputs
- vi market
- vii political environment
- viii socio-cultural factors

Past Experience $X_{11}$ 

Past Experience with  
Development Projects, as  
shown by:

- i past experience with  
similar development  
projects
- ii past experience  
with related  
government agencies
- iii past experience  
with local com-  
munity organizations
- iv past experience with  
other local organiza-  
tions

Previous Local Involvement $X_{12}$ 

Level of Local Involvement in  
a Previous Stage, as shown by:

- i dialogue
- ii technical inputs
- iii decision responsibility
- iv resource commitment

at each stage in the  
project's

Design

Implementation

Movement towards  
self-sufficiency

Policy Variables

---

X<sub>13</sub>X<sub>14</sub>

Provision of Social  
Services, as shown by:

Type and Frequency of  
Extension Communications

- i services in health,  
housing, food, cloth-  
ing, electricity,  
potable water, other
- ii whether provided by  
the project
- iii whether available to  
the target population
- iv before or after  
project initiation
- v tied to output  
increases

Policy Variables

---

X<sub>15</sub>

Intermediary Organizations,  
as shown by:

- i organizational history
- ii membership restrictions
- iii membership resource commitments
- iv leadership positions

X<sub>16</sub>

Relative Price Variables,  
as shown by:

- i market manipulations for inputs or outputs
- ii marketing assistance
- iii storage provision

Policy Variables

Interaction

X<sub>17</sub>

X<sub>18</sub>

Input Services Availability,  
as shown by:

- i credit
- ii fertilizer
- iii water
- iv seeds

Interactions among the  
different variable sets.

Date Completed \_\_\_\_\_

**LOCAL ACTION QUESTIONNAIRE**

(Use for subproject, project, and national data collection. For use in subproject, read "subproject" each time "project" occurs.)

**A. ABSTRACT COVER SHEET**

**I. Subproject Abstract**

1. Name/Title \_\_\_\_\_
2. Location \_\_\_\_\_  
Community                      District/Dept.                      Region                      Country
3. Subproject Type \_\_\_\_\_
4. External Assistance Agency \_\_\_\_\_
5. When initiated \_\_\_\_\_

**II. Project Abstract**

1. Name/Title \_\_\_\_\_
2. Location \_\_\_\_\_  
District/Dept.                      Region                      Country
3. Project Type \_\_\_\_\_
4. External Assistance Agency \_\_\_\_\_
5. When initiated \_\_\_\_\_

**III. Target Populations**

1. Local Area Land Holdings Distribution (profile).
2. Local Area Target Population \_\_\_\_\_ has.
3. Project Participants Land Holding Distribution (profile).
4. Project Target Group Criteria:

Income

Land Holding

B. SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

THE PURPOSE OF THIS SECTION IS TO DETERMINE THE EXISTING LEVEL AND RATES OF CHANGE OF RURAL EDUCATION, REAL INCOME AND INTEGRATION INTO THE MARKET OF TWO DISTINCT POPULATIONS.

EDUCATION

|  | <u>Local Area<br/>Average</u> | <u>Project<br/>Participants</u> |
|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Percent functional literacy (read farm instructions) | _____                         | _____                           |
| Percent with basic primary schooling (1-3 years)     | _____                         | _____                           |
| Percent who completed primary school                 | _____                         | _____                           |
| Percent with secondary education                     | _____                         | _____                           |
| Average years of school of children                  | _____                         | _____                           |

MARKET INTEGRATION

|  |       |       |
|--|-------|-------|
| Percent of output in cash crops  | _____ | _____ |
| Change in % output marketed over the last few years.   | _____ | _____ |
| Off-farm employment (as a percent of total net income, or use "none, little, some, significant" if percentage figures are not available) | _____ | _____ |

INCOME

|  |       |       |
|--|-------|-------|
| Level of farm family real income (specify currency and conversion)   | _____ | _____ |
| # of people in a farm family _____<br>Subsistence income   | _____ | _____ |
| Changes in income level in last few years (if percentage figures are not available, use "none, little, some, significant") | _____ | _____ |

MIGRATION

Is there migration to or from the local area?

C. POWER STRUCTURE

THE PURPOSE OF THIS SECTION IS TO DETERMINE WHETHER THE POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC CONDITIONS AT THE LOCAL, PROJECT, AND NATIONAL LEVEL AFFECT THE SUCCESS OF THE PROJECT.

EXTENSION WORKERS

Average number of extension workers to farm units at the:

Subproject level \_\_\_\_\_  
Project level \_\_\_\_\_  
National level \_\_\_\_\_

LAND TENURE STATUS

|            | <u>Local Area Target Population</u> | <u>Project Participants</u> | <u>In Land Availability:</u>                     |
|------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| Subproject | _____<br>_____                      | _____<br>_____              | % with land titles<br>% with reasonable security |
| Project    | _____<br>_____                      | _____<br>_____              | % with land titles<br>% with reasonable security |
| National   | _____<br>_____                      | _____<br>_____              | % with land titles<br>% with reasonable security |

In the project, give the:

- \_\_\_\_\_ % who own their land
- \_\_\_\_\_ % who own some land
- \_\_\_\_\_ % who rent or are sharecroppers
- \_\_\_\_\_ % who are squatters

Which categories of the above classifications can be reasonably assured to capturing the rewards of investments they might make on the land they farm?

- \_\_\_\_\_ owners
- \_\_\_\_\_ renters/sharecroppers
- \_\_\_\_\_ squatters

FARM SIZE

In the project, give the

largest holdings of participants \_\_\_\_\_ Has.  
smallest holdings of participants \_\_\_\_\_ Has.  
average holdings of participants \_\_\_\_\_ Has.

Number of farmers cultivating less than average holding \_\_\_\_\_  
Total number of farmers \_\_\_\_\_  
Total has. of all farmers \_\_\_\_\_

C. POWER STRUCTURE (Con't)

NATIONAL LAND DISTRIBUTION PATTERN

Percent of all Farms

Size

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

LAND REFORM

Give the nature and effects of land reform efforts.

|                           | <u>Subproject</u> | <u>Project</u> | <u>National</u> |
|---------------------------|-------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Land Reform Objective:    |                   |                |                 |
| Colonization              |                   |                |                 |
| Legalization              |                   |                |                 |
| Redistribution            |                   |                |                 |
| Has. redistributed        |                   |                |                 |
| # of Receiving Farm Units |                   |                |                 |

INCOME DISTRIBUTION

Significant changes in income distribution over the last few years:

Changes

Reasons

D. PAST EXPERIENCE

THE PURPOSE OF THIS SECTION IS TO DETERMINE WHETHER PAST EXPERIENCE HAS A DIRECT EFFECT ON THE ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOR OF POTENTIAL PROJECT PARTICIPANTS.

PAST EXPERIENCE WITH SIMILAR DEVELOPMENT PROJECTSRelevant ExperienceBrief Effect on Local Area Target PopulationPAST EXPERIENCE WITH RELATED OR ASSOCIATED GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATIONS OR AGENCIESRelevant ExperienceBrief Effect on Local Area Target PopulationPAST EXPERIENCE WITH LOCAL COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONSRelevant ExperienceBrief Effect on Local Area Target PopulationPAST EXPERIENCE WITH OTHER LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS (FARMERS ASSOCIATIONS, ETC.)Relevant ExperienceBrief Effect on Local Area Target Population

E. SOCIAL SERVICES

THE PURPOSE OF THIS SECTION IS TO DETERMINE THE IMPACT OF SOCIAL SERVICES CONCENTRATED IN THE AREA OF THE PROJECT.

| <u>Social Services</u> | <u>Provided by the Project</u> |    | <u>Not a Project Service, but Provided to Complement Project</u> |    | <u>Available to Project Members</u> |    | <u>When Initiated</u> | <u>Tied to Output Increases</u> |    |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|----|--|----|-------------------------------------|----|-----------------------|---------------------------------|----|
|                        | Yes                            | No | Yes  | No | Yes                                 | No |                       | Yes                             | No |
| Health                 | Yes                            | No | Yes  | No | Yes                                 | No | _____                 | Yes                             | No |
| Housing                | Yes                            | No | Yes  | No | Yes                                 | No | _____                 | Yes                             | No |
| Food                   | Yes                            | No | Yes  | No | Yes                                 | No | _____                 | Yes                             | No |
| Clothing               | Yes                            | No | Yes  | No | Yes                                 | No | _____                 | Yes                             | No |
| Electricity            | Yes                            | No | Yes  | No | Yes                                 | No | _____                 | Yes                             | No |
| Potable Water          | Yes                            | No | Yes  | No | Yes                                 | No | _____                 | Yes                             | No |
| Other                  | Yes                            | No | Yes  | No | Yes                                 | No | _____                 | Yes                             | No |

**F. TECHNICAL PACKAGE ADEQUACY**

THE PURPOSE OF THIS SECTION IS TO DETERMINE WHETHER A WEAK RESOURCE BASE, OR THE ABSENCE OF A DEMONSTRATED SUCCESSFUL TECHNOLOGICAL PACKAGE HAS PREVENTED BENEFITS FROM REACHING THE TARGET POPULATION.

Was the project focused on an output increase?      YES      NO

If YES, what were the components of the technological package at the base of the project?

Was the technological package convincingly tested/demonstrated under local small farmer conditions?      YES      NO

If YES, what percentage of the small farmers witnessed the demonstration?

\_\_\_\_\_

Has the package proven to be successful for:

|   |     |    |
|---|-----|----|
| Large farmers (commercial)              | YES | NO |
| Medium farmers (commercial)             | YES | NO |
| Average local area small holdings       | YES | NO |
| Below average local area small holdings | YES | NO |

F. TECHNICAL PACKAGE ADEQUACY (Con't)

THE PURPOSE OF THIS SECTION IS TO DETERMINE WHETHER THE MARKET PRICES OF INPUTS AND OUTPUTS PROVIDED A POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE INCENTIVE FOR THE PRODUCTION OF CERTAIN CROPS. IN ADDITION, IT IS TO DETERMINE THE ACCESS TO MARKETS OF THE TARGET POPULATION.

PRICES, OUTPUT

| <u>Cash Crops</u> | <u>1969</u> | <u>G</u> | <u>1970</u> | <u>G</u> | <u>1971</u> | <u>G</u> | <u>1972</u> | <u>G</u> | <u>1973</u> | (G=grade, where applicable)  |
|-------------------|-------------|----------|-------------|----------|-------------|----------|-------------|----------|-------------|------------------------------|
| _____             | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | major market prices, harvest |
| _____             | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | local prices at harvest      |
| _____             | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | maximum price during year    |
| _____             | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | international price          |
| _____             | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | major market prices, harvest |
| _____             | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | local prices at harvest      |
| _____             | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | maximum price during year    |
| _____             | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | international price          |
| _____             | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | major market prices, harvest |
| _____             | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | local prices at harvest      |
| _____             | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | maximum price during year    |
| _____             | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | international price          |

PRICES, INPUTS

|                | <u>1969</u> | <u>G</u> | <u>1970</u> | <u>G</u> | <u>1971</u> | <u>G</u> | <u>1972</u> | <u>G</u> | <u>1973</u> | (G=grade where applicable) |
|----------------|-------------|----------|-------------|----------|-------------|----------|-------------|----------|-------------|----------------------------|
| Fertilizer     | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | (prices at peak demand)    |
|                | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | local price, if available  |
|                | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | regional market price      |
| Insecticide    | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | local price, if available  |
|                | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | regional market price      |
| Improved Seeds | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | local price, if available  |
|                | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | regional market price      |
| Water          | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | local price, if available  |
| Labor          | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | -        | ---         | local price                |

ACCESS TO MARKETS

Average distance of subproject participants to all-weather road: \_\_\_\_\_ kilometers.  
 Subproject distance to nearest all-weather road: \_\_\_\_\_ kilometers.  
 (Project all-weather transportation system: \_\_\_\_\_ communities within 5 kilometers of an all-weather road.)  
 Cost of transportation as a percent of market price \_\_\_\_\_ %.  
 Distance to the nearest regional center: \_\_\_\_\_ kilometers.

F. TECHNICAL PACKAGE ADEQUACY (Con't)

THE PURPOSE OF THIS SECTION IS TO DETERMINE IF A LACK OF ADMINISTRATIVE CAPABILITY HAS BEEN RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPEDING BENEFITS TO THE TARGET POPULATION.

LOCAL DELIVERY OF NECESSARY EXTERNAL RESOURCES

| <u>Necessary Deliveries</u> | <u>Delivered When Needed</u> |    | <u>Delivered as Appropriate</u> |    |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|----|---------------------------------|----|
|                             | Yes                          | No | Yes                             | No |
| Technology                  |                              |    |                                 |    |
| Credit                      |                              |    |                                 |    |
| Agricultural Inputs         |                              |    |                                 |    |
| Other (Specify)             |                              |    |                                 |    |

CAUSE OF DELAYS OR INAPPROPRIATE DELIVERIES

- \_\_\_\_\_ Project administrative complexities at the local level.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Project administrative complexities at the project level.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Project administrative complexities at the national or regional level.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Local, regional or national disputes over lines of authority and control of funds and manpower.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Low national priority on delivery of inputs to the project.

F. TECHNICAL PACKAGE ADEQUACY (Con't)

THE PURPOSE OF THIS SECTION IS TO DETERMINE WHETHER THERE WERE UNIQUE LOCAL CONSTRAINTS WHICH IMPEDED THE SUCCESS OF THE PROJECT.

Mark each applicable constraint with L = Low, M = Medium, H = High.  
Explain very briefly each HIGH marking.

**LAND**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Farm size too small
- \_\_\_\_\_ Area cultivated too small
- \_\_\_\_\_ Insecure land tenure
- \_\_\_\_\_ Soil eroded
- \_\_\_\_\_ Soil fertility poor
- \_\_\_\_\_ Soil toxified (salt deposits, etc.)

**WATER**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Irrigation supply inadequate
- \_\_\_\_\_ Irrigation supply undependable

**WEATHER**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Frequent flooding
- \_\_\_\_\_ Frequent drought
- \_\_\_\_\_ Frequent windstorms
- \_\_\_\_\_ Frequent frost/hail storms
- \_\_\_\_\_ Frequent insect blight

**LABOR**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Family labor supply inadequate
- \_\_\_\_\_ Hired labor supply scarce and high priced

F. TECHNICAL PACKAGE ADEQUACY (Con't)

|               | PUBLIC | COMMERCIAL | TRADITIONAL |
|---------------|--------|------------|-------------|
| Inadequate    |        |            |             |
| Too Expensive |        |            |             |
| Undependable  |        |            |             |

11

**MODERN INPUTS**

\_\_\_\_\_ Not available

\_\_\_\_\_ Too expensive

\_\_\_\_\_ Technicological package inappropriate

\_\_\_\_\_ Inadequate technical assistance or supervision

**MARKET**

\_\_\_\_\_ Product prices very unstable

\_\_\_\_\_ Product prices declining relative to input prices

\_\_\_\_\_ Market transportation scarce and expensive

\_\_\_\_\_ Marketing margins of intermediaries are exorbitant

**POLITICAL ENVIRONMENT**

\_\_\_\_\_ Regime instability (national government)

\_\_\_\_\_ High level of local political unrest

\_\_\_\_\_ Uncertainty due to government policy

\_\_\_\_\_ Heavy government sanctions against political organization/protest

**SOCIO-CULTURAL FACTORS**

\_\_\_\_\_ Local sanctions against innovation

\_\_\_\_\_ Local sanctions against personal accumulation

\_\_\_\_\_ Religious obligations

\_\_\_\_\_ Social obligations

\_\_\_\_\_ Extended family obligations

\_\_\_\_\_ Strong leisure preference

\_\_\_\_\_ Income-leveling mechanisms

\_\_\_\_\_ Rifts/schisms among membership

\_\_\_\_\_ Dishonesty/corruption of project leadership

Dishonesty/corruption of external agents

CREDIT SERVICES

| TYPE OF CREDIT<br>(Purpose/Use) | DATE  | FUNDING<br>SOURCE | AMOUNT | INTEREST<br>RATE | COMMERCIAL<br>RATE | REPAYMENT<br>RATE |
|---------------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| 1. <u>Long-Term</u> ( __ yrs)   |       |                   |        |                  |                    |                   |
| _____                           | _____ | _____             | _____  | _____            | _____              | _____             |
| _____                           | _____ | _____             | _____  | _____            | _____              | _____             |
| _____                           | _____ | _____             | _____  | _____            | _____              | _____             |
| 2. <u>Medium-Term</u> ( __ yrs) |       |                   |        |                  |                    |                   |
| _____                           | _____ | _____             | _____  | _____            | _____              | _____             |
| _____                           | _____ | _____             | _____  | _____            | _____              | _____             |
| _____                           | _____ | _____             | _____  | _____            | _____              | _____             |

Obligations are distributed among project recipients:  
 Equally \_\_\_ On per hectare basis \_\_\_ Other method (describe) \_\_\_\_\_

Short-Term credit to project participants

Since the project's inception, how many crop cycles have been financed with short-term credit? \_\_\_\_\_

Are loans extended for 1 \_\_\_ or 2 \_\_\_ consecutive crop cycles?

For the most recently completed crop cycle financed, indicate the following:

Period: \_\_\_\_\_

| CROPS<br>FINANCED | HECTARES | VALUE/<br>HECTARE | NUMBER OF<br>SUB-LOANS | INTEREST<br>RATE | COMMERCIAL<br>RATE | REPAYMENT<br>RATE |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|------------------------|------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| _____             | _____    | _____             | _____                  | _____            | _____              | _____             |
| _____             | _____    | _____             | _____                  | _____            | _____              | _____             |
| _____             | _____    | _____             | _____                  | _____            | _____              | _____             |
| _____             | _____    | _____             | _____                  | _____            | _____              | _____             |

Are short-term loans based on a detailed production plan? NO \_\_\_ YES \_\_\_

If YES, indicate to what extent the credit recipient is involved in plan design. \_\_\_\_\_

Is compliance with loan plan supervised? NO \_\_\_ YES \_\_\_.

If YES, by whom and with what frequency? \_\_\_\_\_

What percent of total production costs financed by credit? \_\_\_\_\_

Was the credit delivered on time (on or before planting date(s) )? \_\_\_\_\_

YES \_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

F. TECHNICAL PACKAGE ADEQUACY (Con't)

Distribution of credit services

Of the loans made to project recipients, indicate number and value of loans granted by farm size of recipients:

| <u>FARM SIZE</u>          | <u>NUMBER OF LOANS</u> | <u>VALUE</u> |
|---------------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| LARGE ( ___ has. or more) | _____                  | _____        |
| MEDIUM ( ___ to ___ has.) | _____                  | _____        |
| SMALL ( 0 to ___ has.)    | _____                  | _____        |

What collateral requirement, if any, to receive credit? \_\_\_\_\_

What sanctions against credit delinquency exist (foreclosure, loss of credit, withdrawal from project, etc.)? Have they ever been enforced? By whom?

| <u>SANCTIONS</u> | <u>NUMBER OF CASES OF ENFORCEMENT</u> | <u>ENFORCED BY</u> |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------|
| _____            | _____                                 | _____              |
| _____            | _____                                 | _____              |
| _____            | _____                                 | _____              |
| _____            | _____                                 | _____              |

PROJECT LEVEL ONLY

Regarding all small farmer lending of project for period \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_.

Aggregate value of all loans as of \_\_\_\_\_ (date) is \_\_\_\_\_.

Total number of loans \_\_\_\_\_.

Total number credit recipients \_\_\_\_\_.

Cost of administration and supervision of above \_\_\_\_\_.

Cost of administration/supervision as a percentage of aggregate value of all loans. \_\_\_\_\_

G. PROJECT DYNAMICS

14

1. Identification Stage

a. Structure and Services

THE PURPOSE OF THIS SECTION IS TO OBTAIN DETAILS ON THE STRUCTURE AND SERVICES OF THE PROJECT DURING THE INITIAL ACTIVITY (IDENTIFICATION) PHASE.

THE PRIME SOURCE OR ORIGINATOR OF THE PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

Was the idea of the project originated by:

- \_\_\_\_\_ A member of the rural poor
- \_\_\_\_\_ A member of the organization which now conducts the project
- \_\_\_\_\_ A research team from an external assistance agency
- \_\_\_\_\_ A search for suitable projects for this particular area
- \_\_\_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_

Significant aspects: \_\_\_\_\_

THE EXTERNAL ORGANIZATION INVOLVED IN THE IDENTIFICATION PROCESS

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Organizational structure (circle those which apply):

|                    |                  |             |
|--------------------|------------------|-------------|
| External aid donor | Regional staff   | Local staff |
| National staff     | Provincial staff |             |

THE ACTIVITIES, BRIEFLY, IN SEQUENCE, WHICH LED TO THE IDENTIFICATION OF THE PROJECT.

Activities

Conducted by

Dates

G. PROJECT DYNAMICS

- 1. Identification Stage
  - b. Non-Local Agent Involvement

THE PURPOSE OF THIS SECTION IS TO IDENTIFY THE NON-LOCAL (EXTERNAL AGENT) RESOURCES AND THE MANNER OF INTERACTION WITH THE LOCAL POPULATION DURING THE INITIAL ACTIVITY (IDENTIFICATION) PHASE

PROJECT FUNDS CONSUMED DURING THE IDENTIFICATION PHASE

|              |            |                |
|--------------|------------|----------------|
| <u>Funds</u> | <u>Use</u> | <u>Sponsor</u> |
|--------------|------------|----------------|

PROJECT STAFF DURING THE IDENTIFICATION PHASE (in man-years)

|                                   |                     |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|
|                                   | <u>Professional</u> |
| External donor                    | _____               |
| Expatriate                        | _____               |
| Host Government, national level   | _____               |
| Host government, regional level   | _____               |
| Host government, provincial level | _____               |
| Host government, local level      | _____               |
| Other _____                       | _____               |

PROJECT PROFESSIONAL STAFF WHO HAD INTERACTION WITH THE LOCAL POPULATION

|                               |                           |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| <u>Professional Specialty</u> | <u>Time in Local Area</u> |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|

THE COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN EXTERNAL AGENTS AND THE LOCAL POPULATION

|   |                |                  |                |
|---|----------------|------------------|----------------|
| <u>Each Different Communications Method</u> | <u>Purpose</u> | <u>Frequency</u> | <u>Success</u> |
| (Survey, Radio, Extension, Etc.)            |                |                  |                |

Significant Aspects:

G. PROJECT DYNAMICS

1. Identification Stage (Con't)

c. Local Involvement

THE PURPOSE OF THIS SECTION IS TO SPECIFY THE LOCAL INVOLVEMENT AND CONTRIBUTION TO THE PROJECT OF THE TARGET POPULATION DURING THE INITIAL ACTIVITY (IDENTIFICATION) PHASE.

DIALOGUE

Contacted elements in the target population:

Frequency/Total Man-Years

Purpose

Vehicle

How were the elements chosen for the dialogue?

TECHNICAL INPUTS (Specific contributions by selected members of the target population)

Functions Performed

Frequency/Total Man-Years  
Vol. Paid Obligated

Success

How were the local technical inputs selected?

If training was involved, specify:

Each Functional Activity

# Trained

Length of Time

Subjects Covered

DECISION RESPONSIBILITY

Options Presented to the Target Population (Level of Significance)

Organization Structure Used for the Presentation

Which Representatives Are Deciding Who Was In The Decision-Making Group)

Were any procedures suggested or discussed which would call for the local population to take over the direction and management of the project? YES NO

If YES, explain briefly:

Does the project funding depend upon an external agent placed within the project structure? YES NO

If YES, explain briefly:

**G. PROJECT DYNAMICS**

17

- 2. Design
  - a. Structure and Services

**THE PURPOSE OF THIS SECTION IS TO OBTAIN DETAILS ON THE STRUCTURE AND SERVICES OF THE PROJECT DURING THE DESIGN PHASE.**

**PROJECT DESIGN**

**Was the project designed by:**

- \_\_\_\_\_ A member of the rural poor
- \_\_\_\_\_ A member of the organization which now conducts the project
- \_\_\_\_\_ A research team from an external assistance agency
- \_\_\_\_\_ A design originally used in some other location
- \_\_\_\_\_ In conjunction with the project target population

**Significant Aspects:** \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**EXTERNAL ORGANIZATION INVOLVED IN THE DESIGN PROCESS**

**Name** \_\_\_\_\_

**Organizational structure (circle those which apply):**

|                    |                  |             |
|--------------------|------------------|-------------|
| External aid donor | Regional staff   | Local staff |
| National staff     | Provincial staff |             |

**THE ACTIVITIES, BRIEFLY, IN SEQUENCE, WHICH LED TO THE DESIGN OF THE PROJECT**

**G. PROJECT DYNAMICS**

2. Design

b. Non-local Agent Involvement

THE PURPOSE OF THIS SECTION IS TO IDENTIFY THE NON-LOCAL (EXTERNAL AGENT) RESOURCES AND THE MANNER OF INTERACTION WITH THE LOCAL POPULATION DURING THE DESIGN PHASE

**PROJECT FUNDS CONSUMED DURING THE DESIGN PHASE**

Funds

Use

Sponsor

**PROJECT STAFF DURING THE DESIGN PHASE (Man-Years)**

External donor  
Expatriate  
Host Government, national level  
Host government, regional level  
Host government, provincial level  
Host government, local level  
Other \_\_\_\_\_

Professional

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**PROFESSIONAL STAFF WHO HAD INTERACTION WITH THE LOCAL POPULATION**

Professional Specialty

Time in Local Area

**COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN EXTERNAL AGENTS AND THE LOCAL POPULATION**

Each Different:

Communications Method

Purpose

Frequency

Success

(Survey, Radio, Extension, Etc.)

Significant Aspects:

G. PROJECT DYNAMICS

2. Design

c. Local Involvement

19

THE PURPOSE OF THIS SECTION IS TO SPECIFY THE LOCAL INVOLVEMENT  
AND CONTRIBUTION TO THE PROJECT BY THE TARGET POPULATION  
DURING THE DESIGN PHASE

DIALOGUE

Contacted Elements in the  
Target Population

Frequency/Man-Years

Purpose

Vehicle

How were the elements chosen for the dialogue?

TECHNICAL INPUTS

Functions Performed

Frequency/Man-Years

Vol. Paid Obligated

Success

How were the local technical inputs selected?

If training was involved, specify:

Each Functional Activity

# Trained

Length of Time

Subject Covered

DECISION RESPONSIBILITY

Options Presented to the  
Target Population

Organizational Structure  
Used for the Presentation

Which Representatives  
Were Deciding

Were any procedures suggested or discussed which would call for the local population  
to take over the direction and management of the project? YES NO

If YES, explain briefly:

Does the project funding depend upon an external agent placed within the project  
structure? YES NO

If YES, explain briefly:

**G. PROJECT DYNAMICS**

**3. Implementation**

**a. Structure and Services**

THE PURPOSE OF THIS SECTION IS TO SPECIFY THE STRUCTURE AND SERVICES OF THE PROJECT DURING THE IMPLEMENTATION PHASE.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES, GENERAL

PROJECT OBJECTIVES, SPECIFIC

EXTERNAL ORGANIZATION INVOLVED IN THE IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Organizational structure (circle those which apply).

External aid donor    national staff    regional staff    provincial staff    local staff

ACTIVITIES, IN SEQUENCE, WHICH LED TO THE IMPLEMENTATION AND CONTINUATION OF THE PROJECT

Activities

Conducted By

Dates

PROJECT SERVICES, GENERAL

- \_\_\_\_\_ Credit
- \_\_\_\_\_ Inputs provision
- \_\_\_\_\_ Marketing Assistance
- \_\_\_\_\_ Other

PROJECT ORGANIZATION, GENERAL

- \_\_\_\_\_ No intermediary (government project)
- \_\_\_\_\_ Cooperative
- \_\_\_\_\_ Farmers association
- \_\_\_\_\_ Pre-cooperative
- \_\_\_\_\_ Community
- \_\_\_\_\_ One crop government board
- \_\_\_\_\_ Private commercial
- \_\_\_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_

**G. PROJECT DYNAMICS**

**3. Implementation**

**a. Structure and Services (Con't)**

INTERMEDIARY/PROJECT ORGANIZATION

Type of organization: \_\_\_\_\_

How organized? \_\_\_\_\_

By whom? \_\_\_\_\_

Purpose \_\_\_\_\_

When Organized \_\_\_\_\_

Participants since organization. 19\_\_...1968\_\_, 1969\_\_, 1970\_\_, 1971\_\_, 1972\_\_, 1973\_\_, 1974\_\_.

**Membership Restrictions:**

|                    | <u>Description</u> | <u>Enforcement</u> |    |
|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----|
| Location/residence | _____              | Yes                | No |
| Occupation         | _____              | Yes                | No |
| Age/sex            | _____              | Yes                | No |
| Religion           | _____              | Yes                | No |
| Political          | _____              | Yes                | No |
| Land Tenure        | _____              | Yes                | No |
| Farm Size          | _____              | Yes                | No |
| _____              | _____              | Yes                | No |

**Membership Resource Requirements:**

|                      |       |     |    |
|----------------------|-------|-----|----|
| Entrance Fees        | _____ | Yes | No |
| Subscribed capital   | _____ | Yes | No |
| Savings              | _____ | Yes | No |
| Miscellaneous quotas | _____ | Yes | No |
| Labor                | _____ | Yes | No |
| Land                 | _____ | Yes | No |
| Materials            | _____ | Yes | No |
| _____                | _____ | Yes | No |

LEADERSHIP POSITIONS

| <u>Voluntary</u> | <u>Salaried</u> | <u>Elected</u> | <u>Appointed</u> | Local<br>Area<br>Target<br>Pop. | Traditional<br>(List if yes) |
|------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|
|------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|

G. PROJECT DYNAMICS

- J. Implementation  
 a. Structure and Services (Con't)

MARKETING ASSISTANCECrops/Product MarketedLocal Market PriceProject Price

Who arranged the marketing contract?    project leaders    external agent    Other

Was delivery compulsory under the project?    YES    NO

Was marketing assistance restricted to project "members?"    YES    NO

What percent of total output (cash) was marketed through this system? \_\_\_\_\_<sup>b</sup>

Storage FacilitiesCrops Stored<sup>b</sup> Price Differential Over Harvest Prices (See Benefits)Other Project Services:

**G. PROJECT DYNAMICS**

**1. Implementation**

**b. Non-Local Involvement**

THE PURPOSE OF THIS SECTION IS TO IDENTIFY THE NON-LOCAL (EXTERNAL AGENT) RESOURCES AND THEIR MANNER OF INTERACTION WITH THE LOCAL POPULATION DURING THE IMPLEMENTATION PHASE.

**PROJECT FUNDS CONSUMED DURING THE IMPLEMENTATION AND CONTINUATION PHASE**

| <u>Funds</u> | <u>Use</u> | <u>Sponsor</u> |
|--------------|------------|----------------|
|--------------|------------|----------------|

**PROJECT STAFF DURING THE IMPLEMENTATION PHASE (Man-Years)**

|                                   | <u>Professional</u> |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|
| External donor                    |                     |
| External donor                    |                     |
| Expatriate                        | _____               |
| Host government, national level   | _____               |
| Host government, regional level   | _____               |
| Host government, provincial level | _____               |
| Host government, local level      | _____               |
| Other _____                       | _____               |

**PROFESSIONAL STAFF WHO HAD INTERACTION WITH THE LOCAL POPULATION**

| <u>Professional Specialty</u> | <u>Time in the Local Area</u> |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|

**COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN EXTERNAL AGENTS AND THE LOCAL POPULATION**

| <u>Each Different Communications Method</u><br>(Survey, Radio, Extension, Etc.) | <u>Purpose</u> | <u>Frequency</u> | <u>Success</u> |
|---|----------------|------------------|----------------|
|---|----------------|------------------|----------------|

**Significant Aspects:**

G. PROJECT DYNAMICS

3. Implementation

c. Local Involvement

THE PURPOSE OF THIS SECTION IS TO SPECIFY THE LOCAL INVOLVEMENT AND CONTRIBUTION TO THE PROJECT OF THE TARGET POPULATION DURING THE INITIAL ACTIVITY (IDENTIFICATION) PHASE.

DIALOGUE

Contacted elements in the target population:

Frequency/Total Man-Years      Purpose      Vehicle

How were the elements chosen for the dialogue?

TECHNICAL INPUTS (Specific contributions by selected members of the target population)

Functions Performed      Frequency/Total Man-Years  
Vol.      Paid      Obligated      Success

How were the local technical inputs selected?

If training was involved, specify:

Each Functional Activity      # Trained      Length of Time      Subjects Covered

G. PROJECT DYNAMICS

3. Implementation

c. Local Involvement (Con't)

DECISION RESPONSIBILITY

Options Presented To The  
Target Population

Organizational Structure  
Used for the Presentation

Which Representa-  
tives are Deciding

Were any procedures suggested or discussed which would call for the local population to take over the direction and management of the project? YES NO  
If YES, explain briefly:

Does the project funding depend upon an external agent placed within the project structure? YES NO  
If YES, explain briefly:

RESOURCES COMMITTED

Infrastructure Creation: (Construction of irrigation systems, cow-dips, roads, etc.)

|                  | <u>Man-Days</u> | <u>Value</u> |
|------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Voluntary labor: |                 |              |
| Unskilled        | _____           | _____        |
| Skilled          | _____           | _____        |
| Managerial       | _____           | _____        |
| Cash             | _____           | _____        |
| Materials        | _____           | _____        |
| Machinery        | _____           | _____        |
| _____            | _____           | _____        |
| _____            | _____           | _____        |
| _____            | _____           | _____        |

G. PROJECT DYNAMICS

- 3. Implementation
  - c. Local Involvement (Con't)

ONGOING (COMPLEMENTARY) PRIVATE CONTRIBUTIONS: (DIRECTED CREDIT, ETC.)

|   | <u>Man-Days</u> | <u>Value</u> |
|---|-----------------|--------------|
| Labor, Farm<br>(All own-family labor under project<br>not financed by credit) | _____           | _____        |
| Labor, Management<br>(Voluntary meetings, committees,<br>Co-op Boards, etc.)  | _____           | _____        |
| Input purchases not covered by credit or subsidies                            | _____           | _____        |
| Land withheld from alternative production                                     | _____           | _____        |
| Investments required to complement the project:                               |                 |              |
| Machinery   | _____           | _____        |
| Animals   | _____           | _____        |
| Medicines   | _____           | _____        |
| Other _____   | _____           | _____        |
| Cash Contribution, capital requirements, etc.                                 | _____           | _____        |
| _____   | _____           | _____        |
| _____   | _____           | _____        |
| _____   | _____           | _____        |

H. PROJECT SUCCESS/BENEFITSAGGREGATE BENEFITS

1. Percent physical output has increased due to the project.

| <u>CROP</u> | <u>PERCENT INCREASE</u> |
|-------------|-------------------------|
| _____       | _____ %                 |
| _____       | _____ %                 |
| _____       | _____ %                 |
| _____       | _____ %                 |

2. Percent increase in net income as a result of the project \_\_\_\_\_ %.  
(i.e. new net income minus income lost from alternative production forgone.)

3. Increased income from project sufficient to:

\_\_\_\_\_ Pay all operating expenses of the project.

\_\_\_\_\_ Pay back the initial capital outlay for the project.

4. Increased economic decision responsibility: (circle one)

None

Little

Some

Significant

5. Other benefits: (Quantitative or qualitative, demonstration effect, increased political voice).

H. PROJECT SUCCESS/BENEFITS (Con't)

Increased physical output and output prices

PRE-PROJECT (One agricultural year)

| CROP YEAR YIELD<br>TREND PER<br>HECTARE | (GRADE)<br>LOCAL PRICE PER —<br>AT HARVEST | (GRADE)<br>MAJOR MARKET PRICE<br>AT HARVEST | (GRADE)<br>MAX. PRICE<br>DURING YEAR | TREND |
|---|--|---|--------------------------------------|-------|
|   |  |   |                                      |       |

POST-PROJECT (Same agricultural year)

| CROP YEAR YIELD<br>TREND PER<br>HECTARE | (GRADE)<br>LOCAL PRICE PER —<br>AT HARVEST | (GRADE)<br>MAJOR MARKET PRICE<br>AT HARVEST | (GRADE)<br>MAX. PRICE<br>DURING YEAR | TREND |
|---|--|---|--------------------------------------|-------|
|   |  |   |                                      |       |

How much of the change attributable to:

Weather, input available, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_.

Trend: Steady → , Variable  , Up ↑ , Down ↓ .

H. PROJECT SUCCESS/BENEFITS (Con't)Increased cash expenses as a result of the project

Aggregate estimate of increased cash expenses over  
pre-project production \_\_\_\_\_.

CASH EXPENSES (own family labor not included) PRE-PROJECT.

CROP: \_\_\_\_\_

| INPUT          | YEAR | VOLUME<br>(UNITS) | TREND<br>(Volume) | TREND<br>(Prices) | (GRADE)                             | (GRADE)          |
|----------------|------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|
|                |      |                   |                   |                   | LOCAL PRICE<br>(No, if unavailable) | MAJ.MARKET PRICE |
| Fertilizer     |      |                   |                   |                   |                                     |                  |
| Seeds          |      |                   |                   |                   |                                     |                  |
| Insecticides   |      |                   |                   |                   |                                     |                  |
| Water          |      |                   |                   |                   |                                     |                  |
| Labor          |      |                   |                   |                   |                                     |                  |
| Machinery      |      |                   |                   |                   |                                     |                  |
| Transportation |      |                   |                   |                   |                                     |                  |
| _____          |      |                   |                   |                   |                                     |                  |
| _____          |      |                   |                   |                   |                                     |                  |

CASH EXPENSES -- POST-PROJECT.

CROP: \_\_\_\_\_

| INPUT        | YEAR | VOLUME<br>(UNITS) | TREND<br>(Volume) | TREND<br>(Price) | (GRADE)                             | (GRADE)          |
|--------------|------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|
|              |      |                   |                   |                  | LOCAL PRICE<br>(No, if unavailable) | MAJ.MARKET PRICE |
| Fertilizer   |      |                   |                   |                  |                                     |                  |
| Seeds        |      |                   |                   |                  |                                     |                  |
| Insecticides |      |                   |                   |                  |                                     |                  |
| Water        |      |                   |                   |                  |                                     |                  |
| Labor        |      |                   |                   |                  |                                     |                  |
| Machinery    |      |                   |                   |                  |                                     |                  |

H. PROJECT SUCCESS/BENEFITS (Con't)

|  | PRE-PROJECT | POST-PROJECT | DATA  | QUALITATIVE ESTIMATE |
|--|-------------|--------------|-------|----------------------|
| <u>LOCAL AREA TARGET</u>   |             |              |       |                      |
| <u>POPULATION</u>  |             |              |       |                      |
| Population/Farm Families   | _____       | _____        | _____ | _____                |
| Average Hectares   | _____       | _____        | _____ | _____                |
| Total Family Income (AU)   | _____       | _____        | _____ | _____                |
| Subsistence Income   | _____       | _____        | _____ | _____                |
| Average Maximum Cash Income (Hectares X maximum net income per hectare from cash crop) | _____       | _____        | _____ | _____                |
| <br><u>PROJECT PARTICIPANTS</u>  |             |              |       |                      |
| Population/Farm Families   | _____       | _____        | _____ | _____                |
| Average Hectares   | _____       | _____        | _____ | _____                |
| Total Family Income  | _____       | _____        | _____ | _____                |
| Subsistence Income   | _____       | _____        | _____ | _____                |
| Average Maximum Cash Income  | _____       | _____        | _____ | _____                |

Average increase in net income as a result of the project per crop per hectare. (from input/output prices).

| <u>CROP</u> | <u>NET INCOME</u> | <u>HAS PLANTED BY PROJECT PARTICIPANT</u> |
|-------------|-------------------|---|
|-------------|-------------------|---|

Average increase in net income per capita as a result of the project.

$$\frac{\text{Crop net income X Has planted}}{\text{population}} = \underline{\hspace{2cm}}$$

H. PROJECT SUCCESS/BENEFITS (Con't)

What production is forgone as a result of the project (what did the land, now used for cash crops assisted by the project, previously produce).

All Subsistence \_\_\_\_\_

All Cash \_\_\_\_\_

Mixed with \_\_\_ % cash \_\_\_\_\_

What increase in own-family labor accompany<sup>ed</sup> the project (man-days) \_\_\_\_\_.

Do farm families sell services off-farm? YES NO If YES, what % of total farm income? \_\_\_\_\_%

What cash off-farm employment opportunities are now available or foregone for the agricultural year used for project benefits \_\_\_\_\_.

\$ Loss or Gain

Give the market prices for the direct services which support the project, per agricultural year.

|     |                     |                      |       |
|-----|---------------------|----------------------|-------|
| Per | Project Participant | Technical Assistance | _____ |
| Per | "                   | Transportation       | _____ |
| Per | "                   | Credit Subsidy       | _____ |
| Per | "                   | Input Subsidy        | _____ |
| Per | "                   | Marketing Subsidy    | _____ |
| Per | "                   | -Other Services      | _____ |

What project design components, or what project considerations, have been made to making the project:

1. Self-sufficient in continuation, after the initial resource input. (None, planning, process being implemented, now self-sufficient, other) \_\_\_\_\_
2. Self-sufficient in the entire project, with income sufficient to pay off the initial resource contribution and the continuing expenses. (None, planning, process being implemented, now self-sufficient, other) \_\_\_\_\_

H. PROJECT SUCCESS/BENEFITS (Con't)DECISION MAKING BENEFITS

Increase in decision-making responsibility within the project (over economic assets) as a result of the project, by

1. \_\_\_\_\_ all project participants
2. \_\_\_\_\_ all participants with \_\_\_\_\_ or below  
(local area farm parcel average)

\_\_\_\_\_ None

\_\_\_\_\_ Some, but of limited significance

\_\_\_\_\_ Some of significance

\_\_\_\_\_ Control over the operations of the project

OTHER BENEFITS

Demonstration effects, where non-project participants adopt new techniques and increase output or gain income as a result of innovations in the project.

Increase political voice and weight to protect participants opinions.

Other \_\_\_\_\_

I. OPEN-ENDED "LESSON" QUESTIONS

(To be asked of Project or Sub-Project Manager)

In retrospect, what do you know now that should have been known during the project identification and design stage?

If you look back at the original project design, was adequate time allowed to get the specified objectives accomplished?

Do you think involvement of the local populations was important in terms of success? If so, are you satisfied with the mechanisms you have used to achieve local involvement?