

PA 158

64459
~~Redacted~~
~~Redacted~~



EVALUATION SCOPES OF WORK
FOR
FOOD PRODUCTION PROJECTS



Devres, Inc.

2426 Ontario Road, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20009
(202) 797-9610
Cable: DEVRES
Telex: 440184



Devres

2426 Ontario Road, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20009
(202) 797-9610
Cable: DEVRES
Telex: 440184

October 21, 1982

Ms. Nena Vreeland
PPC/E/PES
Room 3435 NS
Agency for International Development
Department of State
21st & Virginia Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20523

RE: Evaluation Scopes of Work -- Food Production Projects

Dear Nena:

Devres is pleased to submit herewith Interim Report I in partial fulfillment of the terms of Contract No. PDC-1406-1-03-1137-00 Work Order No. (03) on the topic cited above.

Devres has classified the projects included in the DIU universe of food production projects by "type" (according to function), proposed a typology for such projects and a tentative selection of four types for preparation of Generic Scopes of Work. We have identified projects for in-depth review and prepared generic logical frameworks for the four selected types to be used as a basis for work at the next stage.

We look forward to your comments and suggestions. We are prepared to meet at any time convenient to you to discuss this Report and the processes for further work. Please contact me or Mr. Turner regarding your wishes on getting together for discussion.

Warm personal regards.

Sincerely,

John H. Kean,
Senior Associate

JHK:jch

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
List of Tables	iii
I. DESCRIPTION OF METHODOLOGY FOR DEVELOPING THE TYPOLOGY	1
II. DESCRIPTION OF TYPOLOGY	5
A. Tentative Selection of Types and Projects for In-depth Review	5
B. Description of Project Types Selected for In-Depth Review	7
1. Research/Extension Projects	7
2. Irrigation Projects	22
3. Storage and Marketing Projects	22
4. Small-Scale Local Projects	23
III. WORK PLAN PREPARATORY TO INTERIM REPORT II	34
A. Review of Interim Report I with PPC/E/PES	34
B. Final Selection of Project Types and Projects for In-Depth Review	34
C. Interview AID and Other Development Agency Personnel	35
D. Literature Review of Evaluation Studies	35
E. Outline of Interim Report II (due 11/24/82)	37
1. Summary statement of conclusions from:	37
a. Documentation review	37
b. Interviews with personnel	38

	<u>Page</u>
2. Develop Preliminary Generic Evaluation Scopes of Work for Projects of Two Selected Types	38
IV. DRAFT FINAL REPORT (December 23, 1982)	40
V. FINAL REPORT (January 1983)	42

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table Number</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Project Type by Frequency and by Funding Level	6
2	Food Production Projects Listed by Type	8
3	Generic Logical Framework: Integrated Research/Extension Project	24
4	Generic Logical Framework: Irrigation Projects	27
5	Generic Logical Framework: Storage and Marketing Projects	30
6	Generic Logical Framework: Small-Scale Local Projects	32
7	Proposed Interviewees for Food Production Evaluation	36

EVALUATION SCOPES OF WORK
FOR
FOOD PRODUCTION PROJECTS

I. DESCRIPTION OF METHODOLOGY FOR DEVELOPING THE TYPOLOGY

The following typology has been developed to provide a coherent framework for the evaluation of AID's food production projects. Even for similar projects, evaluations have frequently not dealt with similar issues or questions nor collected and analyzed similar kinds of data. Devres has been asked to prepare a set of "generic" scopes of work for several "types" of food production projects to help ensure that future evaluations will be based on the most relevant hypotheses and will address the most critical issues or questions. The preliminary typology which follows separates a universe of projects into categories identified by function. This functional categorization provides the most suitable set of "types" distinguishing projects in ways which permit an analysis of the factors common to each type and most influential in determining their impact on increasing food production, the primary focus of this effort to formulate a common framework for future evaluations.

Devres has based its typology on a sample of 141 projects prepared by the Development Information Utilization Service (S&T/DIU) under the direction of the Office of Evaluation of the Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination (PPC/E). The sample was part of a larger universe of projects which had been entered into the DIU computer, perhaps half of all AID's projects. The sample was restricted, by means of a selected field of key words, to those projects dealing specifically

with some aspect of food production. Devres further narrowed the sample by eliminating those whose impact was too diffuse or indirect to contribute significantly to the evaluation system development effort, e.g. projects supporting worldwide research on particular agricultural problems, or supporting the International Agricultural Research Centers. Devres believes that many food-production related projects do not appear in the sample provided by DIU. This seems to indicate either that DIU's information is quite incomplete or that the key words used have not triggered the inclusion of a considerable array of AID projects which had as much focus on food production as many that are included. The sample which remains is believed to be large enough, however, to be representative of the full universe of AID-supported projects focused primarily on food production.

The typology proposed has been developed as much as possible on key project attributes identified at the purpose level in AID's logical framework. A fairly large proportion of projects selected, however, had purpose statements which were not sufficiently detailed to determine a project type. This was especially the case where purpose statements had been devised for entry into the DIU system on projects which had not been designed following the logical framework format. For these projects, and for cross-checking those projects with more expressive and focused purpose statements, the outputs statement and sometimes the strategy and summary statements were referred to. These statements were first quickly reviewed, in order to identify distinguishing attributes of the projects in the sample.

A number of elements basic to the projects in the sample were identified and tabulated as noted:

- o function performed (type of goods or services provided)
- o length of project
- o presence or absence of an institution-building component
- o type of institution implementing the project
- o primary and secondary beneficiaries
- o presence or absence of a manpower training component
- o nature of involvement of the beneficiaries in the project
- o the degree of integration among the project components

PPC/E had also asked Devres to note possibilities for private sector roles in any of the projects. This was not directly apparent from the project descriptions, and thus, had to be inferred. This will be more fully explored for those projects selected for in-depth review.

After the preliminary review, a number of project type categories were hypothesized. The function performed and the type of goods or services provided by the project most sharply distinguished the sample into discrete clusters of projects. The resultant categories were adjusted several times but eventually resulted in a rather conventional typology which could also have resulted from a deductive approach, rather than the inductive method Devres relied on.

Devres believes that this typology based largely on the function performed (credit, irrigation, marketing, etc.) is in fact the most rational basis for classification of food-production oriented activities in order to facilitate the development of "generic" scopes of work. This is believed to hold even though few projects are pure or single function activities. Most include more than one function. Some

are predominantly characterized by one or another of these and can be said to belong to a "type" identifiable by the particular function. Others are characterized by more than one function each of which is very significant to the purpose of the project and must be identified as of a type with dual character (e.g. research/extension). Still others must be identified as multi-functional or multi-component activities where no one or two of the services performed is clearly predominant and yet they are not "integrated." One type which is multi-functional and integrated is, however, not primarily characterized by those function-based characteristics but by the manner in which the activities are organized, namely: small-scale local projects. These are distinctive because they address the problem of low-level or low-yield food output by organizing a variety of functions through local government or local voluntary associations. This is the single exception to our function-based typology. It has not, largely by its nature, been a category to which large amounts of money have been committed. Devres believes, however, that due to its experimental nature and the deliberate intensity of beneficiary involvement it should be included as a separate "typ

II. DESCRIPTION OF TYPOLOGY

A. Tentative Selection of Types and Projects for In-depth Review

The type categories developed are listed in Table 1. As developing evaluation scopes of work for all of the project types will not be possible given the level of effort asked of Devres, only four of these, and a number of projects for each of the four types, have been selected for in-depth review. The four project types have been chosen not only on the basis of their importance, based on their frequency or funding level, but also to permit the corresponding scopes of work to serve as models for as many project types as possible. The Research/Extension Project scope of work, for example, will contain many, if not all, of the elements necessary for preparing an evaluation scope of work for the Research Project type. Devres did not select Input Distribution Projects for in-depth review. Although many and funded heavily, over half of them and over two-thirds of the funding were more directly resource transfers, rather than food production projects. These include three projects for Bangladesh, as well as two responding to Hurricane Allen in the Caribbean. The Small-Scale Local Project type was selected on the basis of its frequency and its rather unique configuration of project elements which they presented. The Irrigation Type was selected both as representing particular elements not elsewhere found and as generally containing a mix of elements similar to the Multi-Component Project type. Many of the individual elements of the latter fall into other project types, and it was felt

Table 1 : Project Type by Frequency and by Funding Level

<u>Project Type</u>	<u>Number of Projects</u>	<u>Number of Projects as Percent of Total</u>	<u>Funding Level</u>	<u>Funding Level as Total Percent</u>
Research/Extension	16	18.4	53.5	11.6
Research	11	12.6	31.7	6.9
Extension	2	2.3	3.3	0.7
Irrigation and Extension	1	1.1	1.9	0.4
Irrigation	7	8.0	50.6	10.9
Soil and Water Management	2	2.3	5.4	1.2
Input Distribution	11	12.6	138.2	29.9
Seed Production & Distribution	4	4.6	11.3	2.4
Fertilizer Production	1	1.1	19.7	4.3
Credit	2	2.3	21.0	4.5
Storage and Marketing	7	8.0	20.2	4.4
Multi-Component	14	16.1	99.4	21.5
Small-Scale Local	9	10.3	6.4	1.4
Total	87	99.7	462.6	100.1

that between the Small-Scale Local Project and the generally larger-scale Irrigation Project types, the issue of how to evaluate the interaction of diverse elements could be adequately addressed. The Grain Storage and Marketing Project type was considered for in-depth examination because it has the unique capacity to influence production through "demand pull."

Particular projects have been tentatively selected for in-depth review within each of the four types. For each type, these projects have been selected to cover as fully as possible the different possible issues and problems of each type in a variety of geographical, cultural, and ecological areas. Each of the projects selected is marked by an asterisk in Table 2.

B. Description of Project Types Selected for In-Depth Review

1. Research/Extension Projects

The Research/Extension Project type includes projects with varying degrees of collaboration between the research and extension components. More recent projects have emphasized much stronger collaboration between the research and extension systems. Research/extension projects generally focus on applied and/or "adaptive" research and often on developing "technological packages" designed explicitly to encourage adoption by producers. Plant breeding, the development of high-yielding varieties, particularly of basic cereals and legumes, receives some emphasis in these projects, although not as much as in

Table 2 : Food Production Projects Listed by Type

<u>Country/Bureau</u>	<u>Project Number</u>	<u>Project Title</u>	<u>Beginning and Ending Year</u>	<u>Funding Level (thousands of dollars)</u>	<u>Evaluations Available</u>
<u>Research/Extension Projects</u>					
Jordan	2780140	Vegetable Res. and Prod.	70-74	\$ 28	_____
Nepal	3670114	Integrated Cereals	75-84	7,970	PES(2)
India	3860366	Ag. Prod.	66-72	2,016	EOT
Korea	4890705	Ag. Res. Project	74-80	4,968	SPE, PRO
El Salvador	5190174	Intensive Small Farm Mgmt.	77-81	1,035	_____
Guatemala	5200232	Food Prod. Nutritional Improve.	75-81	1,662	PES
Guatemala	5200255	Small Farm Diversif. Systems	81-87	6,196	_____
Honduras	5220139	Ag. Res.	78-83	1,300	PES
Peru	5270149	Soy and Corn Prod. on Small Farms	79-81	2,297	PES
E. Caribb. Reg.	538007	Integrated Ag. Dev.	72-82	10,685	PES, SPE
Morocco	6080131	Dryland Farming	76-81	226	PES
Nigeria	6200798	Food Crop Prod.	71-79	2,119	SPE
C. & W. Afr. Reg.	6250616	OMVS Agron. Res. Proj.	75-80	1,260	_____
Somalia	6490038	Agric Services	62-75	5,587	SPE, PRO(2)
Mauritania	6820204	Vegetable Prod.	78-81	1,470	_____
Senegal	6850201	Senegal Cereals Prod.	75-79	4,668	SPE
Total Funding				\$53,487	

Table 2: Food Production Projects Listed by Type (cont.)

<u>Country/Bureau</u>	<u>Project Number</u>	<u>Project Title</u>	<u>Beginning and Ending Year</u>	<u>Funding Level (thousands of dollars)</u>	<u>Evaluations Available</u>
<u>Research Projects</u>					
India	3860379	Rice Res. Improve.	67-73	\$ 578	PRO(2)
Philippines	4920280	Ag. Res. improve.	75-81	4,841	PES, PRO
Guyana	5040039	Diversify and Develop Agric.	67-76	1,957	PRO
Uruguay	5280041	Ag. Prod. and Marketing	65-79	2,807	SPE, FIN
Kenya	6150180	Drylands Cropping Systems Res.	79-84	3,000	SPE
E. Afr. Reg.	6180652	Major Cereals and Legume Improve.	70-74	1,068	PES, SPE(2), EOT, PRO
E. Afr. Reg.	6180657	E. Afr. Food Crop Res.	72-81	2,984	SPE
Tanzania	6210107	Ag. Res.	70-83	8,495	PES(4), (SPE(5))
Botswana ²	6330056	Botswana Crop Prod.	76-82	1,742	PES(2)
Zaire	6600064	INERA Support	77-83	3,850	_____
Afr. Reg.	6980176	Major Cereals Develop.	64-73	337	_____
Total Funding				\$31,659	

Table 2 : Food Production Projects Listed by Type (cont.)

<u>Country/Bureau</u>	<u>Project Number</u>	<u>Project Title</u>	<u>Beginning and Ending Year</u>	<u>Funding Level (thousands of dollars)</u>	<u>Evaluations Available</u>
<u>Extension³ Projects</u>					
Chad	6670002	Ag. Institutional Develop.	78-83	\$ 373	_____
Nicaragua	5240057	Ag. Institutional Develop.	58-72	2,963	_____
Total Funding				\$3,336	

Table 2 : Food Production Projects Listed by Type (cont.d)

<u>Country/Bureau</u>	<u>Project Number</u>	<u>Project Title</u>	<u>Beginning and Ending Year</u>	<u>Funding Level (thousands of dollars)</u>	<u>Evaluations Available</u>
<u>Irrigation and Extension Project</u>					
Guinea-Bissau	6570009	Rice Prod. II	80-85	\$1,900	—
				<u>Total Funding</u>	<u>\$1,900</u>

Table 2 : Food Production Projects Listed by Type (cont'd)

<u>Country/Bureau</u>	<u>Project Number</u>	<u>Project Title</u>	<u>Beginning and Ending Year</u>	<u>Funding Level (thousands of dollars)</u>	<u>Evaluations Available</u>
<u>Irrigation³ Projects</u>					
* Philippines	4920289-01	Bicol Int. Area Dev. III	79-85	\$ 3,000 ⁴	_____
Philippines	4920289-02	Bicol Int. Area Dev. III			
Indonesia	4970242	Sederhana Irrig. and Land	75-82	22,547	PES, SPE(3),
* Indonesia	4970245	Citanduy Basin Dev.	76-82	12,500	PRO PES, PRO (37)
Mauritania ⁵	6820203	Rural Land Reclamation	81-86	2,122	_____
* Senegal ⁵	6850208	Small Irrigated Perimeters	77-82	6,559	FIN
Mali ⁵	6880206	Action Riz Sorgho	76-82	3,878	_____
Total Funding				<u>\$50,606</u>	

Table 2: Food Production Projects Listed by Type

<u>Country/Bureau</u>	<u>Project Number</u>	<u>Project Title</u>	<u>Beginning and Ending Year</u>	<u>Funding Level (thousands of dollars)</u>	<u>Evaluations Available</u>
<u>Soil and Water Management Projects</u>					
Philippines	4920289-04	Bicol Int. Area Devel. III	79-85	\$ 1,000 ⁴	_____
Cape Verde	6550001	Food for Work and Distrib.	75-81	4,430	PRO

Table 2 : Food Production Projects Listed by Type

<u>Country/Bureau</u>	<u>Project Number</u>	<u>Project Title</u>	<u>Beginning and Ending Year</u>	<u>Funding Level (thousands of dollars)</u>	<u>Evaluations Available</u>
<u>Input Distribution Projects</u>					
Afghanistan	3060129	Fertilizer Distribution	72-76	\$ 19,441	SPE(3)
Afghanistan	3060143	AFC Management Support	75-80	1,241	SPE(2)
Sri Lanka	3830039	Agricultural Inputs	75-76	7,217	—
India	3860367	Agric. Inputs Develop.	66-76	434	EOT(4), FIN (4)
Bangladesh	3880014	Agric. Assistance	74-77	24,999	—
Bangladesh	3880015	Agric. Inputs II	75-78	29,743	—
Bangladesh	3880035	Agric. Inputs	77-81	27,500	PES(1)
Brazil	5120247	Food Production-Fertilizers	-73	14,504	SPE(4), PRO, EOT, FIN
Haiti	5210150	Food Production	80-82	769	—
Nicaragua	5240079	Basic Crop Production	68-74	9,160	—
E. Caribb. Reg.	5380058	E.Caribb. Econ. Recovery	80-82	3,150	—
Total Funding				\$ 138,158	

Table 2 : Food Production Projects Listed by Type

<u>Country/Bureau</u>	<u>Project Number</u>	<u>Project Title</u>	<u>Beginning and Ending Year</u>	<u>Funding Level (thousands of dollars)</u>	<u>Evaluations Available</u>
<u>Seed Production and Distribution Projects</u>					
Pakistan	3910327	Seed Potato Multiplication	68-77	\$ 27	_____
Tanzania	6210092	Seed Mult. and Dist.	70-82	6,854	PES(3) SPE(5) ANN
Central Afr. Reg.	6760001	C.A.R. Seed Prod. Center	76-80	272	SPE(1)
Burundi	6950101	Basic Food Crops	80-85	4,120	_____
Total Funding				<u>\$ 11,273</u>	

Table 2: Food Production Projects Listed by Type

<u>Country/Bureau</u>	<u>Project Number</u>	<u>Project Title</u>	<u>Beginning and Ending Year</u>	<u>Funding Level (thousands of dollars)</u>	<u>Evaluations Available</u>
India	3860416	Indian Farmer Fertilizer Coop	71-75	\$19,675	SPE

Table 2 : Food Production Projects Listed by Type

<u>Country/Bureau</u>	<u>Project Number</u>	<u>Project Title</u>	<u>Beginning and Ending Year</u>	<u>Funding Level (thousands of dollars)</u>	<u>Evaluations Available</u>
<u>Credit Projects</u>					
Korea	4890688	Ag. Credit	71-75	\$ 14,000	PRO
Peru	5270155	Ag. Coop. Federations	76-82	7,000	PES
Total Funding				\$ 21,000	

Table 2: Food Production Projects Listed by Type

<u>Country/Bureau</u>	<u>Project Number</u>	<u>Project Title</u>	<u>Beginning and Ending Year</u>	<u>Funding Level (thousands of dollars)</u>	<u>Evaluations Available</u>
<u>Storage and Marketing Projects</u>					
Guatemala	5200238	Small Farmer Mktng.	78-81	\$ 4,200	_____
* Honduras	5220104	BNF-Basic Grain Devel.	73-76	1,977	PES
C.&W. Afr. Reg.	6250600	Grain Stabilization	72-76	120	_____
Zaire	6600026	Ag. Marketing Devel.	79-82	5,000	_____
Zaire	6600069	Grain Marketing	78-80	1,600	_____
* Senegal	6850209	Grain Storage	77-82	4,900	_____
Upper Volta	6860243	Grain Marketing Devel.	80-84	2,381	_____
Total Funding				\$ 20,178	

Table 2 : Food Production Projects Listed by Type

<u>Country/Bureau</u>	<u>Project Number</u>	<u>Project Title</u>	<u>Beginning and Ending Year</u>	<u>Funding Level (thousands of dollars)</u>	<u>Evaluations Available</u>
<u>Multi-Component Projects</u>					
Korea	4890594	Rural Policy Planning & Survey	63-74	\$ 6,000	PRO, EOT(42), FIN
Indonesia	4970189	Assistance to Ag.	73-81	2,683	---
El Salvador	5190012	Ag. Develop.	63-79	462	PRO
Guatemala	5200204	Rural Dev.	70-76	22,846	PES(2), SPE(4)
Haiti	5210069	Ag. Dev. Support I	73-78	1,727	PES, PRO(21)
Paraguay	5260118	Minifundia Crop Intensification	79-84	2,250	---
Tanzania	6210133	Agriculture	75-76	12,000	---
Niger	6830201	Niger Cereals Production	74-81	16,104	PES, SPE(4), PRO(3)
Niger	6830240	Niamey Dept. Develop. II	81-84	5,704	---
Mali	6880202	Mali Crop Production	76-83	12,309	PES, SPE
Mali	6880213	Action Ble	78-82	2,301	---
Mali	6880215	First Region Pilot Devel.	79-79	1,000	---
Upper Volta	6860201	I.R.D.	74-81	4,649	PRO(3)
Upper Volta	6860231	AFRICARE - Rural Devel.	78-83	4,356	---
Total Funding				<u>\$ 99,391</u>	

Table 2 : Food Production Projects Listed by Type

<u>Country/Bureau</u>	<u>Project Number</u>	<u>Project Title</u>	<u>Beginning and Ending Year</u>	<u>Funding Level (thousands of dollars)</u>	<u>Evaluations Available</u>
<u>Small-Scale Local Projects</u>					
Bangladesh	3880045	PVO Co-Financing II	80-84	\$ 2,588	---
Chile	5130314	School-Family Garden Coop.	79-80	150	ANN,PRO
El Salvador	5190197	Small Enterprise Devel.	78-82	800	PES(2), SPE, PRO
* Peru	5270184	Community Food Prod.	79-82	300	PES,SPE
Tanzania	6210160	Village Environ. Improv.	80-84	499	---
Zaire	6600082	Imelko IRD	78-81	410	---
* Chad	6770008	CARE Acacia/bida Expans.	78-79	1,110	PES
Chad	6770009	SAWS Irrigated Ag.	76-80	392	---
*Latin American Reg.	5980577	Operational Program Grants	78-82	230	---
				Total Funding	\$ 6,479

FOOTNOTES

1

Type of evaluation acronyms are as follows: PES=Projection Evaluation Summary, SPE=Special Evaluation, ANN=Annual Report, PRO=Progress/Interim Report, EOT=End of Tour Report, FIN=Final Report

2

Includes minor storage component

3

See also Irrigation and Extension

4

Exact breakdown not available; figure derived arbitrarily, but based on \$5 million allocated for total project

5

Small-Scale and/or with distinctive features

research projects lacking explicit extension components. Recent projects sometimes focus on particular ecological areas, e.g. areas of marginal rainfall. The projects often bring in a long-term technical assistance team. Equipment, machinery, and library facilities are generally supported, and there is generally an element, often quite strong, of institutional development and of manpower training. A generic logical framework is presented in Table 3.

2. Irrigation Projects

The Irrigation Project type displays quite diverse characteristics among individual projects. Nonetheless, they all focus on bringing about an increased area or increased intensity of land cultivation through the provision of an increased and better controlled water supply. They are represented in the project sample by two areas, each of which presents unique problems and project approaches. Projects in Indonesia and the Philippines rely on larger infrastructure, e.g. dams, to control and store water for dry season use in high rainfall areas whereas the projects in the countries of the Sahel use pumps to distribute river water in areas of low annual rainfall. No projects of this type from Latin America were identified in the sample. A generic logical framework is presented in Table 4.

3. Storage and Marketing Projects

The Storage and Marketing Project type is the only category which is designed to increase food production through interventions on the demand side. Invariably, such projects place considerable

importance on institution building and often on manpower training. There is usually about equal emphasis placed in most projects on two major elements: the needed physical infrastructure such as storage facilities and roads, and the policy environment needed for stable prices. Most of these projects focus on a few basic food grains and most are in Africa. No projects of this type were identified in Asia. A generic logical framework is presented in Table 5.

4. Small-Scale Local Projects

As noted above, the Small-Scale Local Project type is based not on the function performed so much as on the type of involvement it requires of project beneficiaries. The projects are a very diverse group, and include some (e.g. the SAWS Irrigated Agriculture Project in Chad) that might also be included under another type. The Operational Program Grants to Latin America (Project No. 5920577) is a special case consisting of numerous distinct projects, not all of which relate to food production and each of which would need to be examined separately. Although small in scale and perhaps of minor direct impact, this type of project includes many of interest for the potential they offer as innovative experiments in food production intervention. They are most often carried out by Private Voluntary Organizations (PVO's). A generic logical framework for this project type is presented in Table 6.

Table 3: Generic Logical Framework: Integrated Research/Extension Project

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
<p><u>Goal:</u> To achieve a sustainable rate of growth of food crop production exceeding the rate of population growth.</p>	<p><u>Measures of Goal Achievement:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Major food crop production data show growth rising to meet and exceed population growth rates by the end of the decade. o Food crops marketed through commercial channels grow at rate equal to or exceeding growth of urban population. o Prices received by farmers cover costs and provide reasonable return on capital. o Prices paid by consumers of domestically produced food remain stable or decline in real terms. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o National farm production statistics o National food marketing data o National and/or regional producer and consumer price data 	<p><u>Assumptions for achieving goal targets:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o World economic conditions permit continuing flow of investment resources and export trade on favorable terms. o World and internal economic conditions will permit allocation of sufficient domestic resources to agricultural sector to support growth. o Government will place priority on agriculture sector in allocating capital and/or manpower and other resources to support growth. o Climatic conditions will remain favorable.
<p><u>Purpose:</u> Strengthen and/or expand an integrated research/extension system capable of evolving and disseminating improved production systems and technology suited to particular ecological zones and existing small farm conditions.</p>	<p><u>Conditions that will indicate purpose has been achieved: End of project status.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Extension system effectively communicating new ideas to farmers and reflecting their problems to researchers. o Research programs concentrate on farming systems issues which are closely related to real world needs and constraints of small farmer food producers. o Extension programs move new varieties and systems to farmers through process of test and demonstration on or near farmers' fields. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Research Community has system of national and international peer review which reports regularly on progress. o Government and donors hold annual evaluations which report on program progress and revise programs as needed to enhance impact and achieve desired results. o Research system prepares detailed, relevant reports on program content, objectives, results. o Extension system prepares detailed relevant reports on program content, objectives, results. 	<p><u>Assumptions for achieving purpose:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o National leadership strongly dedicated to maximum growth of food output as means to accelerate development, improve nutritional status of nation and increase rural incomes and employment. o Sector leaders strongly support integrated extension/research system with prime focus on food production by small farmer. o Sector leaders encourage interactive collaborative work between extension and research.

Outputs:

- o High-yielding, nutritious, disease and insect resistant varieties of specified crops and well-defined technological and management practices developed, tested, and demonstrated to be suited to existing small farm conditions.
- o Close collaboration between research and extension staffs in planning, administering, and evaluating the research and extension program.
- o Adequately trained and equipped inter-disciplinary extension and research staffs, with access to latest methods and techniques for developing and spreading appropriate interventions.
- o Effective linkages developed for dissemination and feedback between farmers, research and extension staff, and outside institutions.
- o Increased adoption of interventions by small farmers, with resulting raised yields, nutritional status of family, family income and marketable surplus.
- o Identification of and effective use of specific existing resources, including soil, water, traditional farming knowledge systems, labor and power sources, and personnel.
- o Identification of an increased capacity to deal with specific existing constraints.

Magnitude of Outputs:

- o New crop varieties and intervention packages tested and proven each year over life of project.
- o ___ extension agents trained for programs involving close research/extension interaction.
- o ___ research personnel trained of whom ___ to Ph.D. level and ___ to MSc level.
- o Research system actively using ___ field trial sites for local adaptability and demonstration/training programs.
- o ___ farmers collaborate in field trials by testing new varieties on own fields.
- o ___ percent of farmers using one or more new varieties and ___ newly developed or adapted production systems by end of project.
- o Inventory completed and base line data analyzed.

- o Research and extension system reports
- o Government and donor evaluation reports
- o Government statistics and data
- o Technical assistance contractor reports

Assumptions for achieving outputs:

- o Linkage to regional research institutions and worldwide network of research centers permits access to information and plant materials from abroad.
- o Collaboration between research/extension systems and universities as well as other training institutions results in availability of recruits appropriately trained for effective participation.
- o Price relationships are remunerative and provide incentives to increased food production.
- o Input and food distribution and marketing system are efficient enough to support actions by farmers made possible through research and advocated through extension.
- o Infrastructure exists or is developed rapidly enough to avoid imposing constraints to rising production.

Inputs:

- o Technical Assistance
- o Training
- o Equipment
- o Materials

Implementation Target (Type and Quantity):

- o Person-months of technical assistance
 - o Items of equipment
 - o Quantity of materials
- o USAID records
 - o Project evaluations and audits
 - o Host country records

Table 4: Generic Logical Framework: Irrigation Projects

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
<p><u>Goal:</u> To achieve a sustainable rate of growth of food crop production exceeding the rate of population growth.</p>	<p><u>Measures of Goal Achievement:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Major food crop production data show growth rising to meet and exceed population growth rates by the end of the decade. o Food crops marketed through commercial channels grow at rate equal to or exceeding growth of urban population. o Prices received by farmers cover costs and provide reasonable return on capital. o Prices paid by consumers of domestically produced food remain stable or decline in real terms. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o National farm production statistics o National food marketing data o National and/or regional producer and consumer price data 	<p><u>Assumptions for achieving goal targets:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o World economic conditions permit continuing flow of investment resources and export trade on favorable terms. o World and internal economic conditions will permit allocation of sufficient domestic resources to agricultural sector to support growth. o Government will place priority on agriculture sector in allocating capital and/or manpower and other resources to support growth. o Climatic conditions will remain favorable.
<p><u>Purpose:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Develop indigenous institutional capacity to operate and maintain new and improved water control, distribution and drainage systems. o Develop indigenous institutional capacity to plan, organize, and implement irrigation and land development programs. o Acquaint farmers with new technologies relevant to irrigated crop production. o Develop improved health and sanitation programs for water-borne diseases. 	<p><u>Conditions that will indicate purpose has been achieved: End of project status.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Land in project in successful irrigated cultivation. o Indigenously developed irrigation projects underway. o Health program staffed and funded. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Government records and statistics o Aerial photographs o Evaluations 	<p><u>Assumptions for achieving purpose:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Government accords high priority to agriculture/food production in developing its investment plans and budgets. o Good coordination exists among several ministries responsible for various related elements of programs essential to the success of irrigation program (forestry, public works, agriculture, communication, health, social affairs, etc.) o Strong team for management and administration is assembled and maintained to provide effective and stable direction to a complex, long term program.

Outputs:

- o Irrigation and water control infrastructure, e.g. canals, dams, flumes, headworks, terraces, levees, etc.
- o New land area brought under irrigation.
- o Watershed protection program developed, resulting in reforestation, agro-forestry, plantings, etc.
- o Training seminars
- o Infrastructure and equipment operated and maintained properly.
- o Feasibility and design studies.
- o Farmers familiarized with new technologies.
- o Health delivery systems

Magnitude of Outputs:

- o Number and size of each structure
- o Number of hectares
- o Number and level of persons trained
- o Equipment and infrastructure in proper operating order.
- o Number of studies
- o Number of farmers using irrigation
- o Increase in average annual production.
- o Low incidence of water-borne diseases.

- o Government records
- o Evaluations
- o Aerial photographs
- o Technical assistance contractor reports
- o Periodic reviews by external donor and/or government teams

Assumptions for achieving outputs:

- o Manpower policies of government provide reasonable incentives for management and technical personnel to join and remain committed to the success of the irrigation program.
- o Farmers are assisted and encouraged to form water users associations for effective local water control and management and sound on-farm water management practices.
- o Appropriate user fees are charged for water to ensure adequate funds for O & M and to discourage excessive water use within a rational overall project water management regime.
- o Input distribution and output marketing systems function efficiently to permit farmers to make optimal use of high output potential and realize satisfactory income levels.
- o Short and medium term credit is available to permit farmers to finance equipment and production expenses of an intensive cropping system.
- o Farm size, land purchase terms and labor availability at peak demand periods permit use of balanced farming systems and capital/labor input ratios.
- o Design criteria used and drainage investments made combined with effective water control and management ensure long term productivity of the land.

Inputs:

- o Technical Assistance
- o Equipment
- o Training
- o Material costs
- o Studies

Implementation Target (Type and Quantity):

- o Person-months of technical assistance and training
- o Items of equipment
- o Quantity of materials
- o Number of studies

- o USAID records
- o Projection evaluations and audits
- o Host government records

Table 5: Generic Logical Framework: Storage and Marketing Projects

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Achievement	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
<p><u>Goal:</u> To achieve a sustainable rate of growth of food crop production exceeding the rate of population growth.</p>	<p><u>Measures of Goal Achievement:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Major food crop production data show growth rising to meet and exceed population growth rates by end of decade. o Food crops marketed through commercial channels grow at rate equal to or exceeding growth of urban population. o Prices received by farmers cover costs and provide reasonable return on capital and labor. o Prices paid by consumers of domestically produced food remain stable or decline in real terms. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o National farm production statistics o National food marketing data o National and/or regional producer and consumer price data 	<p><u>Assumptions for achieving goal targets:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o World economic conditions permit continuing flow of investment resources and export trade on favorable terms. o World and internal economic conditions will permit allocation of sufficient domestic resources to agricultural sector to support growth. o Government will place priority on agriculture sector in allocating capital and/or manpower and other resources to support growth. o Climatic conditions will remain favorable.
<p><u>Purpose:</u> Develop, strengthen and/or expand a national or regional system(s) and/or institution(s) for providing incentives to increased food production through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o managing specific food supplies o stabilizing specific food commodity prices o marketing/evaluating small farmer crops 	<p><u>Conditions that will indicate purpose has been achieved: End of project status.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Marketing and storage institution(s) and/or associations functioning. o Seasonal and/or annual fluctuations of food commodity prices dampened. o Increased flow of food crops marketed and increased availability to consumer at more reasonable and/or stable prices. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o National food crop marketing data o National and regional producer and consumer price data o Reports by implementing agencies, associations, etc. o Evaluations 	<p><u>Assumptions for achieving purpose:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Government provides as rational and stable a set of macro-economic policies as possible. o Government accords high priority in investment programs to provision of essential public infrastructure facilities for efficient marketing. o Public and/or private credit institutions operate under policies which will facilitate short and long term financing for orderly marketing systems. o International trade policies and external assistance programs support rational prices fair to farmers and consumers.

Outputs:

- o Creation or development of viable institutions, e.g. agricultural development banks and cooperative marketing associations.
- o Improved storage and marketing infrastructure, including
 - storage facilities
 - receiving stations
 - transportation
- o Improved policy-making, including improved research and data collection support.
- o Improved pest control and quality control in commodities stored and marketed.
- o Trained personnel for all of above and related operations.

Inputs:

- o Technical assistance
- o Equipment
- o Material costs
- o Training

Magnitude of Outputs:

- o Central institution involved with ___ local institutions/associations, representing ___ farm families.
- o Central institutions handling a flow of ___ dollars and/or ___ MT of food commodities each year.
- o Storage, receiving and/or transport.
- o Facilities for handling ___ MT of food crops in operation.
- o Seasonal/annual fluctuations of specific food commodities no greater than ___ per cent.
- o Food crop losses in storage reduced by ___ per cent.
- o ___ person-months of training provided.

Implementation Target (Type and Quantity):

- o Person-months
- o Items
- o Quantity

- o National food crop marketing data
- o National and regional producer and consumer price data
- o Reports by implementing agencies, associations, etc.
- o Evaluations

Assumptions for achieving outputs:

- o Government collects price and other market data regularly at the producer, wholesale, and consumer levels in all key market locations.
- o Government and private institutions facilitate the flow of needed market information uniformly to all segments of the economy and areas of the country
- o A sufficiently open and competitive marketing system is provided under the general economic policies of government to ensure that markets are responsive to price signals and incentives.
- o Producer and consumer subsidy, price support and other systems (e.g. marketing quotas, etc.) are operated in ways which interfere only minimally with orderly and efficient marketing of all or most food crops.

- o USAID records
- o Project evaluations and audits
- o Host country (local and/or national) records

Table 6 : Generic Logical Framework: Small-Scale Local Projects

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
<p><u>Goal:</u> To achieve a sustainable rate of growth of food crop production exceeding the rate of population growth.</p>	<p><u>Measures of Goal Achievement:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Major food crop production data show growth rising to meet and exceed population growth rates by the end of the decade. o Food crops marketed through commercial channels grow at rate equal to or exceeding growth of urban population. o Prices received by farmers cover costs and provide reasonable return on capital. o Prices paid by consumers of domestically produced food remain stable or decline in real terms. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o National farm production statistics o National food marketing data o National and/or regional producer and consumer price data 	<p><u>Assumptions for achieving goal targets:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o World economic conditions permit continuing flow of investment resources and export trade on favorable terms. o World and internal economic conditions will permit allocation of sufficient domestic resources to agricultural sector to support growth. o Government will place priority on agriculture sector in allocating capital and/or manpower and other resources to support growth. o Climatic conditions will remain favorable.
<p><u>Purpose:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Establish, test, and/or expand innovative food crop production interventions with potential for replication, mutually funded by AID and local community or private voluntary organizations o Foster self-reliance and organization among local communities. o Provide necessary training 	<p><u>Conditions that will indicate purpose has been achieved: End of project status.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Projects underway o Communities involved o Funding shared by community o Training centers functioning o Community organizations functioning o Local authorities receive shared revenues from central ministry 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Base-line studies executed before project initiated. o Reports by implementor(s) (grantees, contractors, local agencies, communities, etc.) o Community budgets and expenditure reports and reports to donors, government, etc. on program. o Internal evaluation reports o Data collected as integral part of project. o Central ministry (with oversight recognizance) provides summary reports to parliament, donor groups, etc. o External evaluation contractor reports. o Training institution reports o Special studies designed to provide insight for project replication. 	<p><u>Assumptions for achieving purpose:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Government policy at central level supports and encourages local initiative/action, revenue collection, etc. as required for community support and involvement o Government revenues made available by central authorities to support local action. o Central and/or regional governments with or without external assistance establish and support training institutions and programs for local officials and non-government local leadership people. o Arrangements made for local programs to have access to centrally-operated supply and maintenance services for economies of scale. o Technical personnel from central authorities seconded to support local programs.

Outputs:

- o Increased indigenous institutional capacity
- o Increased community level expertise
- o Families and/or communities aided in establishing interventions (e.g. school gardens, small pumps, etc.)
- o Training facilities and centers established
- o Increased community level organization
- o Increased family and community level participation in innovation and interventions.

Inputs:

- o Central authorities second personnel and share revenues.
- o External donors provide planners, technician grants to PVO's, local groups, farmers' associations HMO's, other voluntary associations.
- o Central authorities provide access to training and maintenance facilities.
- o Local communities commit taxes and personnel.

Magnitude of Outputs:

- o Number and extent of projects undertaken by community.
- o Degree of community participation in projects.
- o Number of families participating in organizations and
- o Number of new project ideas initiated by community.
- o Number of communities with training centers.
- o degree of staffing for project from local communities.
- o Number and proportion of families participating in community organizations.

Implementation Target (Type and Quantity):

- o Central facilities open and accessible.
- o Local communities make plans, commit people and revenues.
- o Donor organizations on hand and resources available.
- o Personnel in training according to schedule.
- o Physical resources planned arrive on project sites as required.

- o Base-line studies executed before project initiated.
- o Reports by implementor(s) (grantees, contractors, local agencies, communities, etc.)
- o Community budgets and expenditure reports and reports to donors, government, etc. on program.
- o Internal evaluation reports
- o Data collected as integral part of project.
- o Central ministry (with oversight recognizance) provides summary reports to parliament, donor groups, etc.
- o External evaluation contractor reports.
- o Training institution reports
- o Special studies designed to provide insight for project replication.

Assumptions for achieving outputs:

- o Local people appointed/elected to make policy or provide policy advice for local programs.
- o Individual projects reflect locally developed ideas/felt needs in community rather than outsiders' judgments on needs and priorities.
- o Both governmental and voluntary organizations at the local level play significant roles in the planning and execution of projects.
- o Local people of all ages and both sexes will be assisted/encouraged to participate.
- o Technology appropriate to local context will be applied (e.g. labor intensive approaches will be used as appropriate).
- o Projects will be executed in ways to strengthen sense of local proprietorship of completed projects.

- o USAID records
- o Project evaluations and audits
- o Host country (local and/or national) records

III. WORK PLAN PREPARATORY TO INTERIM REPORT II

A. Review of Interim Report I with PPC/E/PES

Devres will hold discussions with PPC/E/PES regarding the selection of Food Production Project Types and specific projects within those types for intensive review. The tentative selection proposed by Devres will be considered both in light of our criteria and in light of any findings from the Utah State University "meta-analysis" process. If that process has moved far enough it may be the basis for modification of the selection based less on frequency and funding committed than on indicated probability of success in encouraging/assisting the achievement of increased food production. PPC may also have suggestions for modification of the selection based on other criteria.

In addition, the tentative generic logical frameworks and the characterization of the selected emphasis project Types will be reviewed. Any suggestions developed in the course of discussions will be incorporated in further Devres work toward the development of generic evaluation Scopes of Work briefly elaborated below.

B. Final Selection of Project Types and Projects for In-Depth Review

On the basis of the foregoing, Devres will initiate work to develop Generic Scopes of Work and will, among other things, use a selected set of projects for in-depth review as "case studies" to help formulate a set of hypotheses/problem statements as a starting point for the development of the evaluation models. These will be continuously tested and revised as necessary in the course of interviews and review of evaluation

literature. Similarly, issues or questions will be formulated on the basis of the in-depth review and will also be further tested and refined as work progresses through additional stages.

Documentation for the in-depth review projects will be obtained from the DIU files and/or from the offices which have had oversight responsibility for the projects.

C. Interview AID and Other Development Agency Personnel

Devres will undertake a series of in-depth interviews, especially of AID personnel who have particular insight into the evaluation process and especially for food production-oriented projects. These interviews will include both central and regional bureau personnel whose experience has included formulation of evaluation guidelines and/or has involved the management of systems/programs/projects in the food production sector. In short, we will seek feedback concerning our preliminary concepts, hypotheses, and issues from a variety of perspectives -- those of substantive specialists in agriculture, of various regional specialists, and of evaluation specialists who have sought common frameworks for comparing diverse projects. See Table 7 for proposed interviewees.

D. Literature Review of Evaluation Studies

Along with the above interviews and in-depth analysis of selected projects, Devres will undertake a study of recent literature on evaluation methodology and project-level research and data collection related to base line and progress indicators. This literature review

Table 7: Proposed Interviewees for Food Production Evaluation

<u>Specialist</u> Org.	Evaluation Officers	Agriculture Specialists	Others
<u>AID</u>			
PPC	Josette Murphy PPC/E/S Twig Johnson PPC/E/S	Douglas Caton PPC/PDPR	James O'Connor PPC/EA
S & T	Dr. John Robbins S & T/FA	Dr. Anson Bertrand (and Staff) S & T/AGR Bernard Chapnick S & T/PO	
ASIA	Maureen Norton ASIA/DP/E	Allen Hankins ASIA/TR	
36			Various persons cognizant of projects selected for in-depth review. These may include Desk or Project Officers or contract person- nel who served on technical assistance of evaluation teams.
AFRICA	John Wilhelm AFR/DP/PEEA	David Shaer AFR/DR/AGR	
NE	Richard Johnson NE/DP/PE	Kenneth Sherper NE/TECH Richard Cobb NE/TECH	
LAC	Bernice Goldstein LAC/DP/E	Albert "Scaff" Brown LAC/DR/RD	
<u>OTHER</u>	Dudley Sears (Thru D.A.I.) Sam Danes, Cie Taylor (U.S.U.)	John Rothberg BIFAD	Edgar Harrell PRE Robert Werge USDA

will serve as a foundation for developing specific cost-effective methods for evaluating relevant types of food production projects. In particular, Devres will seek to identify and define suitable "leading indicators" of progress, which both define progress on significant elements of purpose achievement and are achievable within a time and funds expenditure appropriate to the scale and schedule of the project. Devres will then seek to go beyond the point of the present state of the art as indicated in this literature to refine and/or more precisely define how project evaluation planners can build suitable and even more "target sensitive" indicators into their designs.

In its literature review, Devres will examine AID's past manuals for project evaluations as well as the World Bank's Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation of Agriculture and Rural Development Projects. Devres will also examine evaluation reports which shed light on the particular project types selected for in-depth review. In addition, Devres will look at sources suggested by persons contacted for interviews.

E. Outline of Interim Report II (due 11/24/82)

1. Summary statement of conclusions from:

a. Documentation review

- o Publications of AID, IBRD, FAO, etc. re: problems, issues, research methods, data collection, indicators, etc.
- o In depth review of projects of Types selected for Generic Scopes of Work

- b. Interviews with personnel of:
 - o AID
 - o IBRD
 - o IDB
 - o FAO
 - o Other development institutions

2. Develop Preliminary Generic Evaluation Scopes of Work for Projects of Two Selected Types

- a. Define a process for formation of an overall evaluation hypothesis (or hypotheses) for projects of the selected type.
- b. Formulate a tentative set (or sets) of issues and problems relevant to projects of the selected type (at the formative and/or end-of-project stage).
- c. Test these issues sets against the following:
 - o project experience demonstrated by in-depth review of selected projects within type
 - o knowledge of experienced project designers, implementors and evaluators in AID and other development agencies
- d. Formulate a well-defined step-by-step process to assess availability and relevance of existing data for assessment of project progress. Identify gaps in data.
- e. Formulate a set of leading indicators for the type of project from which evaluation designers can select those most relevant to particular cases. Define research approaches and cost-effective, quick-feedback data collection systems which can be implemented in the course of an evaluation.

f. Define areas of impact, benefits, or unfavorable developments which need to be measured and assessed to fully appreciate project progress and success.

g. Formulate budgets, skill requirements, and duration of activity for 2 or 3 levels of evaluation effort depending on:

- o size of project
- o intensity of evaluation called for
- o purpose of evaluation
 - primarily for project reformulation
 - end-of-project as an element of overall country program effectiveness assessment
 - provision of concepts important to formulation of similar projects in other settings

Devres proposes that Scopes of Work according to the above process be formulated for two project "types" in the Interim Report II. These would serve as prototypes for the full set to be prepared for the final report. The scopes would be prepared for one formative and one ex post evaluation so that both would be reviewed. Tentatively, Devres proposes that the prototype be of the Research/Extension and Irrigation types. Both are concerned with direct impact on farmer/food producers but the irrigation type will illustrate a more complex multi-component case. PPC/E comments and criticism will help shape Scopes for the larger group in the final report.

IV. DRAFT FINAL REPORT (December 23, 1982)

Prepare report along following tentative lines:

- A. Introduction (User's Guide)
- B. Generic Logical Framework (for each selected Food Production Project Type)
- C. Generic Scopes of Work for Evaluation
 - 1. For Research/Extension Type Projects
 - a. Interim (Formative) Evaluations:
 - i. Problem/Hypothesis (Presented and Elaborated)
 - ii. Evaluation Issues/Questions Identified
 - iii. Alternative Research Methods Defined
 - (a) Data Collection Options Specified
 - o Criteria for selection
 - o Cost/effectiveness assessment
 - o Standards
 - (b) Identification of Relevant "Leading" Indicators
 - (c) Data Analysis Procedures
 - iv. Generic Evaluation Scope of Work: Summary
(including budget, level of effort and specialist personnel needs)
 - b. End-of-Project (Ex Post) Evaluations
(Same as for a. above)
 - 2. Irrigation Type Projects
(Same as for 1. above)

3. Storage and Marketing Type Projects

(Same as for 1. above)

4. Small Scale Local Type Projects

(Same as for 1. above)

D. Annex I

Methodology employed for the development of the typology, research and data collection systems, selection of type-relevant "leading" indicators, evaluation hypotheses and issues on problems to be examined.

E. Annex II

Index of terms

F. Annex III

Acronyms and abbreviations

V. FINAL REPORT (January 1983)

Devres will review and finalize the Draft report presented to AID/PPC/E/PES in December in light of the comments received on the Draft. The final report will be constructed in a way to permit ease of access as a manual or reference document and will seek to point out how the concepts devised for relevance to projects directed toward food production can be generalized to other project purposes.