

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
 WASHINGTON, D. C. 20523
BIBLIOGRAPHIC INPUT SHEET

FOR AID USE ONLY

1. SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION	A. PRIMARY Social Sciences
	B. SECONDARY Development Planning

2. TITLE AND SUBTITLE
 Projects of integrated rural development

3. AUTHOR(S)
 Mosher, A. T.

4. DOCUMENT DATE 1970	5. NUMBER OF PAGES 27 p.	6. ARC NUMBER ARC
--------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------

7. REFERENCE ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS
 The Agricultural Development Council, Inc., 630 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10020

8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES (*Sponsoring Organization, Publishers, Availability*)
 (Presented at Seminar on Small Farmer Development Strategies, Columbus, Ohio, 1970)

9. ABSTRACT
 This paper analyzes and classifies various types of integrated rural development projects and their needs, and presents the author's conclusions concerning the Symposium on Agricultural Institutions for Integrated Rural Development, conducted in Rome in June, 1971, by the FAO and the Swedish International Development Administration. Sections of the paper deal with such questions as the distinction between agricultural and rural development, whether an agricultural development project can best be considered a system or a sub-system, and whether it is more important for development activities to be integrated as opposed to simultaneously available. Next presented are a classification system and a discussion of six major types of integrated development projects, each containing a different combination of elements, but all possessing two common characteristics: limitation to a specific land area, and limitation to elements not already present but potentially effective in the project area. Next follows a discussion of the importance of adjusting types of projects to local needs. The last section discusses seven problems common to all projects of integrated agricultural or rural development that were discussed in the Symposium: the size of individual projects, their location, meeting the needs of small farmers, the role of the private sector, relating projects to the government structure, project financing and national planning, and "popular participation" in integrated projects. The author's major impression of the Symposium is that integrated projects have matured enormously in the past twenty years.

10. CONTROL NUMBER PN-AAB-904	11. PRICE OF DOCUMENT
12. DESCRIPTORS Community development Project planning Rural sociology	13. PROJECT NUMBER
	14. CONTRACT NUMBER CSD-2813 GTS
	15. TYPE OF DOCUMENT

CSO-2813 GTS
PN-AAB-904

SEMINAR ON SMALL FARMER DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES

**Projects of Integrated Rural
Development**

by

**A. T. Mosher
President**

**Agricultural Development Council
New York, New York**

**The Agricultural Development Council
and
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio**

September 13-15, 1970

PROJECTS OF INTEGRATED RURAL DEVELOPMENT *

A. T. Mosher

President
Agricultural Development Council
New York

During the past twenty years, particularly, a large number of projects have been undertaken, in many countries, that may be described as projects of "integrated rural development." Consequently, the Symposium on Agricultural Institutions for Integrated Rural Development recently convened by FAO and the Swedish International Development Administration was well-timed.¹ It provided an opportunity for comparing different projects and for examining possible reasons for their varying degrees of apparent success or failure.

As so frequently happens in such discussions, it soon became clear that different persons have quite different concepts of what constitutes an integrated rural development project. The projects on which various participants reported are quite different in both objectives and content. That fact could have led to much fruitless discussion; instead, it became a valuable opportunity for sorting out the reasons

¹ Symposium on Agricultural Institutions for Integrated Rural Development, Rome, June 21-28, 1971.

* Article submitted to the Editor of CERES for consideration, July 1971.

The Agricultural Development Council is a private non-profit agency supporting teaching and research related to the economic and human problems of agricultural development, primarily in Asia.

for differences. This paper is not a report of the Symposium but one participant's conclusions about its implications.¹

I. Preliminary Questions

Agricultural or Rural Development?

One distinction that is crucial in comparing different projects or programs is related to their basic objective. Is that objective to increase agricultural production, or is it to increase the satisfactions, economic and noneconomic, of rural² living? Each of these objectives is legitimate.

Programs designed to serve one of these objectives almost always contain elements relevant to the other. Obviously, increasing agricultural productivity is an important part of increasing the satisfactions of rural living, since without it most rural family incomes cannot rise. But the extent to which increased agricultural productivity will in fact increase the satisfactions of rural living depends on how the rewards of the increased production are divided among land owners, tenants, farm laborers and urban consumers. Moreover, not all rural dwellers are farmers or farm laborers; some of them are employed in various service activities or are currently under-employed or unemployed. For them, family incomes must arise from some other source than farming. And some aspects of satisfaction in rural living are largely independent of

¹ The writer's experience of such projects has been largely in Asia. That fact may color his conclusions but is not explicitly referred to in various parts of the paper.

² The term rural is used in this paper to cover both the open countryside and villages or towns that do not include much production of nonagricultural products for sale predominantly in large cities, and very few of whose inhabitants, if any, commute to jobs in larger cities.

family incomes. These depend more on the availability of public services -- education, agencies of law and order, public health and family planning services -- and on opportunities for social participation whether in recreation, government, or the management of group activities.

It is to be expected, therefore, that different projects will include different combinations of activities, depending on whether the major objective is agricultural or rural development.

Systems or Sub-Systems?

It is fashionable these days to think in terms of "systems" of activities. We recognize that agricultural development involves a large number of disparate activities that must be orchestrated in one way or another if agricultural production is to rise. Similarly, rural development involves the interaction of a large number of different activities that constitute another system. Some elements are common to both systems (such as provision of adequate agri-support activities) while others are an integral part of one system but not of the other.

Most actual projects of the types discussed in the Symposium, however, can more accurately be described as constituting sub-systems. That is, each is composed of fewer elements than the total number that comprise the system of which it is a part. The chosen elements are the ones thought to be especially crucial, or they comprise a group of elements among which the complementarities are thought to be particularly strong, or they are the ones on which it is possible for a particular administering agency to work.¹

¹ Thus, many agricultural projects do not include adaptive research or price subsidies because these are beyond the resources or authority of persons within the limited territory covered by the project.

Simultaneous or Integrated Activities?

Another distinction it is important to make is between the need for a certain group of activities to be administratively integrated, and the need for them to be simultaneously available but not necessarily integrated. For example, rapid adoption of a new higher-yielding crop variety requires that the necessary inputs be locally available; it is expedited by the availability of production credit; and it may be accelerated by the activities of a competent extension service. The major requirement is that such services be simultaneously available and it is frequently possible for that to be achieved without administrative integration. Farm inputs can be made available by private merchants, by cooperatives, by farmers' associations or by government agencies. Credit can be supplied by any one of these types of agencies. Extension normally is a public activity although salesmen for farm inputs can also provide aspects of it. Different combinations of administrative arrangements can provide simultaneity; administrative integration is only one way of achieving it.

II. A System of Classification

Table 1 presents a schematic form for classifying most of the actual types of integrated agricultural or rural development projects now being carried on.

Column A in the table presents a list of the elements of the system of overall agricultural development. It groups the various activities that are involved into six categories:

- I Research -- to develop new technology that can allow agricultural production to rise;
- II The manufacture or importation of farm inputs that will allow the results of research to be utilized by farmers;
- III A set of rural agri-support activities that provide the rural "circulatory system" for goods, ideas and financing that makes it possible for farmers to participate in raising agricultural production;
- IV Provision of adequate production incentives -- price and tenure relationships -- that make it profitable for farmers to increase production;
- V Land development activities, such as irrigation and drainage; and
- VI Provision for training scientists, technicians, and administrators to man all agricultural development activities.

Column B lists the kinds of activities included in one or another of most integrated agricultural or rural development projects and shows the relationship of these to the elements of the overall agricultural development system depicted in Column A. Items B 1-6 are the various activities that, taken together, comprise the rural agri-support activities (AIII) listed in Column A. It will be noted that it is these activities (or selections from among them) that make up most integrated agricultural development projects.

Table 1
Elements in Various Integrated Projects
of Agricultural or Rural Development

<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>
<u>Overall Agric. Development</u>	<u>Project Activities</u>	<u>Types of Integrated Projects</u>
I Research		
II Producing or Importing Farm Inputs		
	<u>Agricultural</u>	
III Rural Agri-Support Activities	{ <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Markets for Farm Products 2. Retail Outlets for Farm Inputs 3. Production Credit 4. Extension Education 5. Local Verification Trials 6. Farm-to-Market Roads 	1. <u>Agricultural</u> development projects
IV Production Incentives		2. <u>Rural</u> development <u>projects with an</u> <u>agricultural</u> component (Selec- tions from among B 1-13)
V Land Development		
VI Training Agricultural Technicians		
	<u>Non-Agricultural</u>	
	{ <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Rural Industries 8. Rural Public Works 9. Community Development Construction Projects 10. Group Activities--Recreational --Cultural 11. Home Life Improvement Extension Services 12. Health Facilities 13. Family Planning Programs 	3. <u>Rural</u> development <u>projects without</u> <u>an agricultural</u> component (Selec- tions from among B 7-13)
	{ <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 14. Schools 15. Local Government 16. Religious Activities 	

Items B 7-16 represent activities that do not contribute directly to increasing agricultural production but that help to increase the satisfactions of rural living in other ways. However, integrated projects seldom include schools, local government or religious activities. Thus, integrated rural development projects normally include any combination of items B 1-13, depending on which ones are considered to be needed locally and feasible for the project to undertake.

Types of Integrated Projects

Based on the considerations presented above, it is possible to identify six major types of integrated projects. Each type consists of a different combination of the elements listed in Columns A and B of Table 1.

All of them have two characteristics in common.

First, each such project is limited to a specific land area; it is not a nationwide program, at least in the beginning.

Second, each such project is (or should be) limited to elements not already present and reasonably effective in the project area. Local markets for farm products are essential, but if they already exist in a particular area they may not appear in an integrated project developed there. The same can be said about health facilities, production credit, or any other element. The emphasis in designing an integrated project for a particular area should be, and usually is, on providing the missing elements of a particular sub-system, not duplicating activities that are already proceeding with reasonable effectiveness.

Three of the types of integrated projects combine elements of Column B with one of the elements in Column A.

Type_I consists of projects like that reported from Iran of which one element is a change in the land tenure system (A IV). Such a project usually needs to include all agri-support activities (B 1-6) that are not already present and functioning in the area. It may also include one or more nonagricultural rural development activities (B 7-13).

Type_II consists of projects like the one in Egypt of which one element is the introduction of a new irrigation system (A V). The other elements are selected from within the same range as Type I.

Type_III consists of projects like those of the Federal Land Development Authority in Malaysia of which one element is the opening of new agricultural lands to settlement (A V). The other elements of such projects, again, are selected as in Types I and II.

While in each of the above cases an element from Column A has been listed as one element in the integrated project, it should be emphasized that the important consideration is simultaneity. The actual administration of land reform, construction of irrigation facilities, or clearing new lands and getting them into cultivation involves intricate technologies and may, therefore, be most effective when separately organized. The important thing is that where land reform, or irrigation, or settlement is undertaken it is most likely to bear full fruit if an integrated agricultural development program embodying appropriate activities from Column B is launched simultaneously in the same area.

The other three types of integrated projects do not include any elements from Column A.¹ Instead, they are limited to selected elements from Column B, and the selection in each case is determined by the objective of the program.

Type_IV consists of projects that concentrate on agricultural development, such as the Intensive Agricultural Districts Program in India. They normally consist of items B 1-4 only. Few of them include local verification trials (B 5) but all of them should. Few include attention to farm-to-market roads (B 6) although the adequacy of economical farm-to-market transport is essential to their full success.

Type_V consists of projects having the objective of rural development, but giving substantial attention to agricultural development in recognition of the importance of raising farm family incomes. Such projects contain elements selected from among items B 1-13. Various projects in which the Israeli technical assistance agency cooperates appear to be of this type.

Type_VI consists of projects that concentrate on nonagricultural rural development and therefore include elements from among items B 7-13 only. Their pertinence arises in two cases. One is where the agricultural program elements are satisfactorily being cared for by other programs. The other is in rural areas where agricultural growth is not a near-future possibility (given existing technology or foreseeable advances in it) but where substantial numbers of people now live, many of whom may be engaged in largely subsistence agriculture.

¹ Except selections from among those that are rural agri-support activities (A III) and appear as items B 1-6.

Delineating these six types of projects seems to the writer to have two advantages. First, it facilitates the comparison of different projects and helps to avoid making the false judgment that all integrated projects should contain the same elements. At the same time, since different conditions prevail in different parts of each country, this typology can be useful in deciding what kind of integrated project should be introduced in a particular place.

III. Adjusting Types of Projects to Local Needs

Selecting an Area vs. Selecting a Type of Project

Persons who launch integrated projects do not all approach it in the same manner. Some begin with an interest in a particular type of project and then set about trying to identify the most suitable place to locate it. Others start with concern about a particular area or type of area and then consider what type of program would be most appropriate for it.

Since most countries have different areas requiring different types of projects or programs, and both humanitarian and political considerations dictate an appropriate concern for all parts of each country, the second approach -- identifying types of areas and then trying to devise appropriate types of projects for each of them -- appears to be primary. At the same time, advantage should be taken of the interest and competence of certain domestic or foreign organizations in particular kinds of programs since there are areas in almost every country where each type of project is appropriate.

In other words, those responsible for the agricultural and rural development of their country should get a good grasp of the variations in local potential that exist in different parts of the country and then select appropriate types of projects for each of them. Meanwhile, they should be alert to the special interest of particular persons or organizations, domestic or foreign, in particular types of programs, and try to expedite their activities in those parts of the country to which their special interests are pertinent.

Delineating Types of Areas

A classification of parts of each country proposed by the writer in another context¹ would appear to be useful in locating integrated projects of Types IV, V and VI.² That classification is based on the potential for agricultural growth of each part of the country and on the immediacy of that potential.

I. Immediate (Agricultural) Growth Potential Most countries have lands on which it would be possible to increase agricultural production substantially within the next two to five years, given appropriate public programs and stimulation of private activities. These are areas that have good soils, appropriate temperatures, adequate rainfall or installed irrigation, and for which pertinent new technology to support higher production is already available.

It is in such areas that integrated projects of Types IV and V can be highly productive, because what is usually impeding full

1 A. T. Mosher, Creating a Progressive Rural Structure, Agricultural Development Council, New York, 1969.

2 The location of projects of Types I, II and III is determined by where projects of land reform, irrigation, or land settlement are being undertaken.

exploitation of the potential in such areas is adequate agri-support activities: markets for farm products, local outlets for farm inputs, production credit, a competent extension service, local verification trials, and farm-to-market roads.

II. Low (Agricultural) Growth Potential At the other extreme, most countries have lands for which the foreseeable agricultural growth potential is very low, even though many people may now be engaged in largely subsistence agriculture there. Since the agricultural growth outlook for such areas is bleak, integrated agricultural projects would show very meager returns and would be uneconomic. However, the people living there do deserve appropriate help in increasing the satisfactions of rural living in those places as much as may be possible, plus greater mobility to move elsewhere as employment opportunities in other places become available.

Consequently, areas of low agricultural growth potential are appropriate places for nonagricultural integrated projects of Type VI.

III. Future (Agricultural) Growth Potential In between the two types of areas described above, most countries have substantial land areas that have a possible growth potential beginning five or more years from now, but not sooner. These are areas where soils and climate are good but where one or the other of two elements essential to an immediate growth potential is now lacking. It may be that irrigation is needed before the area can move forward, and it will take several years, and substantial financing, to provide it. Or it may be that new technology to make higher production of crops that can be grown

in the area possible is not now available. To provide it will require adaptive research that, again, will require time as well as money and competent research workers and organization.

For the time being, then, an emphasis on integrated agricultural development projects would be uneconomic in areas of future agricultural growth potential. Instead, resources available for application in such areas should be concentrated on research and/or irrigation, as may be needed.¹ But integrated nonagricultural rural development projects (Type VI) can be helpful in such regions, partly to get on with the nonagricultural phases of rural development and partly because every step in the direction of making rural communities more dynamic and participatory will help to accelerate agricultural growth once the technological base for it has been laid.

When the research or irrigation or transportation access that is the immediate need has been completed, then the content of projects in such areas can be expanded to include appropriate elements related to agricultural development.

Scope for Multiplication

The term "pilot project" is frequently applied to integrated projects, reflecting the hope that one project, begun on a modest scale, will encourage multiplication of it at a later date over a much broader part of the country. It is argued that such pilot projects can serve

¹ A third lack that can hold an area back from having an immediate growth potential is lack of transportation access to the wider national (and international) economy. In such cases, the immediate priority should be given to providing such access.

three functions: they can prove the effectiveness of a certain kind of program, they can furnish experience in learning about its problems, and they can serve as training grounds for personnel to duplicate that program elsewhere.

This argument is sound, but care must be taken not to assume a wider applicability of a particular type of integrated project than is justified. A pilot project in one area of immediate growth potential might prove its applicability in other areas of immediate growth potential, provided the same new technology is profitable there, but it would be much less effective, and hence uneconomic, if reproduced in an area of future or low agricultural growth potential. Similarly, a Type VI pilot project that shows satisfactory results in an area of low agricultural growth potential might be appropriate for other similar areas but would miss the opportunity for rapid growth if reproduced in areas of immediate agricultural growth potential without incorporating agri-support activities in it.

Thus, the scope for multiplication of pilot projects is not unlimited. It can be substantial, but it is limited to other areas of the same type in each country.

IV. Common Problems

The remainder of this paper is devoted to a brief discussion of seven common problems of all projects of integrated agricultural or rural development that were discussed in the recent Symposium.

1. Size of Individual Projects

I shall argue that the optimum size for each integrated project is what may be called the farming district.¹

We begin with the fact that the virtue of any integrated project is that it makes a set of complementary services conveniently available to rural families and that it facilitates intimate interaction in matters related to the satisfactions of rural living. These considerations define the importance of the farming locality, which is the land area that can be conveniently served by one "service center": one place (usually a small market town) at which there are an established market for farm products, local outlets for farm inputs and production credit, and the services of an extension agent. Where people walk or travel by cart such a locality center can conveniently serve rural people within a radius of three to five miles from the center.

Some integrated projects have been established for a single farming locality (as here defined) or even for a single village that

may serve an even smaller area. But experience of the past twenty years has demonstrated that such projects are either not viable technically or are inordinately expensive. One reason is that two factors conflict in establishing the optimum size for a farming locality: on the one hand, convenience to farmers dictates having each locality as small as possible; on the other, economy in providing each service is increased by having each locality as big as possible. For example, farmers like to have fertilizer and credit available as close as possible but dealer's costs of operation (whether private, cooperative, or public) decrease rapidly with the number of farmers served by each local outlet.

The other reason why integrated projects servicing only a single village or a single farming locality are too small is that locality facilities must themselves be serviced by wholesale facilities, supervision, and (in the case of production credit) by re-discounting banking facilities. The farming district is the smallest land area that can provide the farming localities within it with these wholesaling, supervisory and re-discounting facilities and is, therefore, the "natural" optimum size for an integrated agricultural development project.¹

The actual optimum size for a farming district will vary widely from place to place. Normally it will need to be large enough to include at least ten farming localities and to include at least twenty to twenty-five extension workers (since that is the minimum number for

¹ It will be noted that this discussion of factors affecting the optimum size for integrated projects is in terms of agricultural projects. Similar considerations can be drafted for nonagricultural projects of Type VI and those may indicate that projects of that type can be somewhat smaller and still be effective at not too great a cost.

effective and continuous in-service training). The upper limit is set by convenience in supervision and servicing from the district headquarters. In general terms, this means that the optimum size will normally lie somewhere between 1000 and 3000 square miles.¹ At that size, an integrated project can take advantage of most of the economies of scale of large projects, and is of a size that is appropriate for multiplication in additional units of similar size in other areas of the type to which it is suited.

2. Location of Individual Projects

The major criterion for the location of integrated projects were discussed earlier. If agricultural development is a main objective, projects must be located in areas of immediate growth potential where profitable new technology for crops or livestock products for which an adequate market for substantially increased production is readily available.

An additional criterion should be added in the case of pilot projects that it is hoped will be extended later to other areas. It is that the pilot project be located somewhere within, and preferably near the middle of a much larger area of roughly comparable potential. It should not be located either in an area of unique characteristics or in one that, although typical of a larger suitable area, is isolated from it.

¹ The various criteria to be taken into account in deciding on the size of farming districts, and hence of integrated projects, are described more fully in Creating a Progressive Rural Structure, op. cit.

3. Meeting the Needs of Small Farmers

Discussions of how best to meet the needs of small farmers are frequently confused by failure to distinguish between three different situations.

One case is where "small" means small in absolute terms: farmers having so little land that they can scarcely be expected to gain a reasonable family income from farming. In such cases, the only solutions (short of combining several small farms and finding full-time nonfarm employment for those farmers who are displaced) are either to develop new technology appropriate for intensive types of farm production that require very little land (including vegetable, poultry and some types of livestock production) or to develop part-time off-farm employment opportunities. Both of these approaches need to be pursued wherever the number of small farmers, in this sense, is large.

The second case is where "small" means small in comparison with the land holdings of other farmers in the same region. Here, again, one solution lies in developing profitable types of labor-intensive production. Another consists of making arrangements that give small farmers as effective access to farm inputs, credit, and extension services as big farmers have. The simplest way to achieve the latter, as well as that which is economically most defensible, is (instead of setting up special programs for small farmers) to design the operation of all activities within all integrated projects primarily to serve the small farmers within the project area. If that is done, larger farmers will still share in utilizing them. It is when services are designed without the small farmers primarily in mind that large farmers tend to monopolize them.

The third case is where the term "small farmers" is used as a synonym for "subsistence" farmers -- those who do not produce for the market. Here the fact must be faced that full-time subsistence farmers rarely if ever do, or can be induced to, increase production while remaining subsistence farmers. Increasing production almost always requires the use of new inputs -- purchased inputs. Inputs will be purchased only for use on products that are sold, bringing in cash. The one exception to this, and it is important, is that where some part-time off-farm employment is available, subsistence farmers frequently do buy purchased inputs to increase the production of crops grown for home consumption. So the two remedies for the plight of subsistence farmers are (1) to shift to production for the market, and/or (2) to get some part-time off-farm employment both for what it will add to family income and to finance the purchase of inputs to increase farm production for home consumption.

4. The Role of the Private Sector

Integrated projects are almost always public projects; they are seldom private-for-profit organizations. Some of their elements must be public, particularly education, both formal and "extension." Community health facilities are firmly established as a public responsibility in most developing countries. The provision of roads and postal services is a public function. But many agri-support activities that are so important in most rural development programs can be either governmental, cooperative or private-for-profit. Should they all be undertaken as public activities and thus made an integral part of "integrated projects"?

No issue led to more widespread disagreement in the Symposium than this one. From the discussion one would conclude that most participants fell into one of two camps. One group felt strongly that the only "right" way to organize agri-support services for which farmers pay as they are used is through member-controlled and government-free cooperative societies. The other group did not so much contest that view as argue that in the initial stages it is better for commercial agri-support services to be provided by governmental agencies, until such time as rural people may have learned how to operate cooperative societies effectively. Only a few participants suggested that private operation of these activities is not always bad, and that many privately-operated agri-support activities are not as rapacious as they are widely believed to be. The writer was among this small minority group.

From the individual farmer's standpoint, two considerations are primary: first, are the needed agri-support services readily available nearby (by whomever operated); second, does he have a choice among two or more merchants or lenders (whether private, cooperative, or governmental) or is he practically forced to deal with a particular one because no other is easily available to him? Farmers tend to distrust all middlemen, whether private, cooperative, or governmental, and particularly if they have no choice among them. Yet it must be recognized that there is a natural tendency toward monopoly wherever the size of functioning farming localities is small due to rudimentary transportation and communication facilities. Where such monopoly exists and it would be uneconomic to overcome it, public regulation is the only partial solution.

The writer would argue that the growth of cooperative societies should be promoted but that to give them a monopoly position with respect to any given agri-support service has many of the same ill-effects that arise when any other type of enterprise is allowed to monopolize the distribution of farm inputs, the marketing of farm products, or extending production credit. There are cases where governmental agencies to provide these services should be encouraged, pending the demonstrated ability of cooperative societies to handle them effectively. Private operation of such services should certainly be allowed and encouraged by appropriate extension education programs to help merchants and lenders develop methods of operation in line with the needs of a modernizing agriculture. To the extent that agri-support activities can be privately managed it simplifies the public administrative burden, private savings may be drawn into productive investments in merchandizing and credit facilities, and there is considerable evidence that in many places in the developing world the farmer is at least as efficiently served by private agri-support activities as by public or cooperative agencies.

5. Relating Integrated Projects to the

General Government Structure

Some integrated projects are undertaken in the first instance by one or another ministry of established agency of a government. Even there, a problem arises from the fact that the different elements of such a project lie in fields that are normally the province of different governmental agencies so jealousies or conflicts of jurisdiction are likely to arise. In addition, the administrative integration

of different elements of a project must be accomplished at the level of the land area covered by the project itself and this is in conflict with each element of the project having a line relationship to regional and national units of the same type of activity. The majority opinion in the Symposium was that the land area covered by the project should coincide with that of an established administrative unit of government¹ so that both project integration and a connection with general administration can be made at that point.

Even when the project area and that of an administrative unit of government are identical, the problem of local integration and national coordination remains. Several countries have established separate regional and national administrative units particularly for integrated projects. In most cases this has been abandoned after a few years because of the substantial overlapping of interests and responsibilities with governmental agencies that have a single subject-matter focus. Moreover, since different parts of each country are appropriate for different types of integrated projects having one set of regional and national units of administration for all integrated projects would be ambiguous, and having a separate set for each type of project would result in a proliferation of agencies.

¹ There may be a conflict between this criterion and the writer's judgment, previously expressed, that the land area to be covered by one project should be that of a functional "farming district." Both criteria are important and need to be honored insofar as they can be reconciled. It would be justifiable to reduce the land area dictated by the "farming district" concept slightly in order to achieve boundaries coinciding with those of an existing administrative unit, but very much reduction would lead to reduced cost efficiency.

There is no clear-cut solution to the problem. The least undesirable semi-solution would appear to be to have the regular field staffs of all government agencies for types of activity included in each integrated project administratively responsible to the unit of governmental administration most nearly coinciding with the land area of the project, and then have a small advisory staff at the regional level for each specific type of integrated project. The purpose of this regional (or national) advisory staff would not be to exercise administrative control but to counsel with the staffs of each integrated project about ways in which the project might be improved.

A special form of administrative problem is met whenever a pilot integrated project is launched completely independent from any connection with the regular administrative structure of the government. Such a form may be adopted on the grounds that complete independence is needed for innovative freedom and that, if the project is successful, it can later be "adopted" by the government and the problem of administrative relationships faced then. Experience has shown that this seldom works. Governmental officers typically look upon any independent project as an implicit criticism of their own established activities and are therefore more eager to see it fail than succeed. They are less likely to want to learn from it than to discredit it. Consequently, it is worth taking considerable initial pains to have the initial pilot project not only approved by, but administratively related to, an established unit of governmental administration from the beginning.

6. Integrated Projects and National Planning

Integrated projects must be financed. Sooner or later they must get increasing financial support domestically. To accomplish that, their support must be integrated into national procedures of budgeting and planning. At this point they are at a serious disadvantage because they fit neither into established ministry budgets nor into a particular "sector" of the economy.

A member of the Symposium from Pakistan correctly pointed out that the best approach to this problem is to try to get the planning process -- at least insofar as agricultural and rural planning are concerned -- changed so that planning is disaggregated by regions rather than on the basis of specific kinds of activity¹ or sectors of the economy. Different parts of the country need different kinds of agricultural and rural development programs. It is not only integrated projects of which this is true. Different regions require different kinds of research, different kinds and quantities of farm inputs, different types and amounts of land development, etc. The amount of resources that should be allocated to these various activities should rest on a summation of the varying needs of different rural regions.

If such a change could be made in procedures for planning and budgeting, integrated projects would no longer be a unique and special pleader for financial support. Instead, they could appear in specific regional proposals along with other major elements of development, and find their way from there into national plans and budgets.

¹ This topic is discussed much more fully in the writer's To Create a Modern Agriculture, to be published shortly.

7. "Popular Participation" in Integrated Projects

Are integrated projects for rural people by someone else or are the projects by rural people for their own development. Ideally, we might prefer that they should be the latter. In practice, integrated projects almost never arise primarily in that way. Almost universally they are designed and launched by some outside group. The group usually is a national or regional government, or an external technical assistance agency, either governmental or private. In some cases, it is a domestic nongovernmental agency.

In practice, then, almost all integrated projects are initially designed for rural people. Those that endure and thrive, however, are almost invariably those which have the benefit of considerable participation by rural people in modifying the program over time and even in administering it.

The need for popular participation should be recognized from the beginning. Those who it is hoped will be beneficiaries should be made fully and continuously aware of what is planned. For some parts of a project popular approval is necessary from the beginning; for other parts approval cannot be expected until after some concrete results are achieved. Formal planning and administrative participation is likely to come slowly, but it is unlikely to come at all unless it is vigorously promoted from the beginning.

Conclusions

The overwhelming impression this participant took away from the Symposium was that integrated projects have matured enormously in the past twenty years and can make major contributions in the years ahead. They are of many types. Each type needs to be seen against the background from which it emerged and in the light of the particular objective set for it. The form of many projects has changed dramatically over time as experience has been gained and as the nature of current needs has changed. They still face major problems as do all dynamic programs.

Integrated projects are not a panacea. Each is a sub-system within one or the other of two broader systems: agricultural development, or rural development with or without agricultural components.