

PDAAA-654-A1

5140203-100-000

5140203 (3)

CLASSIFICATION
PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

Report Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE SMALL FARMER DEVELOPMENT LOAN 514-T-080	2. PROJECT NUMBER 514-0203-100-000	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE USAID/Colombia 160.
	4. EVALUATION NUMBER (Enter the number maintained by the reporting unit e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No. beginning with No. 1 each FY) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION	

5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES	6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING	7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY <u>76</u>	A. Total \$ <u>3.4 million</u>	From (month/yr.) <u>October 1976</u>
B. Final Obligation Expected FY <u>80</u>	B. U.S. \$ <u>1.284 "</u>	To (month/yr.) <u>May 1979</u>
C. Final Input Delivery FY <u>80</u>		Date of Evaluation Review <u>June 1979</u>

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

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., airgram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
Amend Implementation Plan to include evaluation recommendations with emphasis on farm management element. Satisfactory completion of the above action depends upon ICA's enthusiastic acceptance and implementation of the action recommended above. Mission uncertain at this time if ICA will accept this proposed major change.	D. Schaer ARDO	September 1979

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS	10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P _____	A. <input type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change B. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or <input type="checkbox"/> Change Implementation Plan C. <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinue Project

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)	12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval
DHSchaer/ARDO <u>DHS</u> NBillig/Evaluation Officer <u>NB</u> JBMartin/Associate Director <u>JM</u>	Signature <u>James Megellas</u> Typed Name <u>James Megellas</u> Date <u>June 13, 1979</u>

13. SUMMARY

Progress has been made on each item listed in the project design, perhaps more in the letter than in the spirit. Critical inputs of technical assistance and technical interchange with other countries were not made for 28 months and then only in a peripheral area. Technical input to the project has been inadequate. Because of internal resistance to contracting technical assistance ICA has relied upon its own devices in designing and testing new methodologies, which often conflict with its own tradition. In view of this ICA has done a creditable job.

Project design was both comprehensive and specific on certain critical issues, although the project implementation plan did not treat some critical issues adequately. USAID managers were not specifically skilled in the technical areas covered by the project, and responsibilities were shared by four USAID officers in the first 14 months of the project.

No plans exist for Technical Assistance in the critical area of viewing and examining the small farmer as a farm system rather than focusing upon a single crop. Plans for technical interchange have bogged down. A principal technique currently being used to know and understand farmers is costly and cumbersome, and the information it presents is often inaccurate in regard to the average small farmer.

There has been progress in collecting and utilizing objective data on geographic areas of a global or macro area, and this technology is being used by ICA outside the project areas. There has also been notable progress in knowing something of the agriculture of ICA areas and in identifying certain types of problems.

Prospects for fully achieving the Goal and Purpose of the project are limited if the current project trajectory is projected, although ICA will be able to make significant if modest improvements in developing some improved techniques for the small farmer and will have a better understanding of small farmer requirements.

In the project paper, the goal and purpose embody virtually the same concepts with different wording. There is no hierarchical relationship. Goal indicators are not realistic in a three-year project of this complexity.

The purpose statement is adequate, and the end of project status indicators are good. Five "subsystems" are listed, but they vary in importance, difficulty, and nature. Progress of some nature is being made in all

five. There is no single sub-system evaluating and monitoring the project, although ad hoc evaluating and monitoring is being done. The Ficha Técnica was intended to serve a monitoring function, along with other functions, but has not been made functional.

Some components of the system are being diffused throughout ICA, but we don't know with what effect.

The major problems have been incongruence of project design and project implementation, lack of technical assistance and technical interchange in key areas, and weak GOC administrative support to ICA which has made it difficult to provide inputs.

14. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

This was a regularly scheduled evaluation with the specific objectives of improving Mission knowledge of the project and of determining mid-course corrections needed. This evaluation was accomplished with the technical input of a specialist in technology innovation. His technique was to describe the operation of the project. Information was gathered by interviews and analysis of documents produced by the project. Following description, an analysis of the quality of achievements measured against project documents, and a projection of accomplishments by end of project were made.

ICA and USAID were the entities involved. Persons included AID project managers, the ICA project coordinator, his superiors in the ICA organization responsible for the project, district directors of two districts in which the project has field operations, and technicians at both national and district level who are working on the project.

Cost of the evaluation included five weeks time of an AID/W officer, plus per diem and travel. He spent three weeks in the evaluation in February 1978 and updated it in May 1979, for two weeks.

15. EXTERNAL FACTORS

There has been little change in external factors affecting the project. ICA does not enjoy good financial support and has been losing personnel. This situation existed at the beginning of the project. There are pro-

blems in arranging foreign travel for ICA personnel to achieve the technical interchange designed in the project. No foreign travel has been done, but it is not clear that there has been a vigorous effort by ICA to arrange the travel. External factors have inhibited the providing of inputs.

Assumptions are as valid now as they ever were. However, many of the assumptions for Purpose and Output seem to be either (1) a condition to be provided by management or a project output, or (2) the assuming away of a significant constraint.

It is assumed for example that inputs will be available. One project output is a sub-system for organizing farmers to provide inputs along with other services. To the extent inputs cannot be provided with reasonable security then input scarcity becomes a constraint, and technology compatible with that constraint must be generated. That is the definition of "appropriate technology."

Price structure cannot be assumed away, nor can lack of market infrastructure. These are constraints within which technology innovation must occur and with which ICA program management must deal.

All the assumptions for outputs are either the responsibility of project management or an output of the project.

16. INPUTS

The only input supplied by AID resources for the first two years of the project has been local costs. There had been no technical assistance, no technical interchange, and little if any commodity input.

At about the 28th month of a 36-month project, one technician arrived to provide technical assistance in marketing and evaluation, neither of which is seriously limiting project success.

This lack of technical assistance and technical interchange has been serious and to a great extent based upon ICA's reluctance to employ non-Colombian technicians. There is much useful experience in the world and no need for ICA to undertake a project in innovation in such complete isolation.

If this project cannot get some technical assistance soon in farm management, including record keeping and farm management surveys, it is going to be severely limited in its impact. A proposal or recommendation has been prepared suggesting a way to make this input.

Technical assistance is most needed in work on sub-systems A and B, because they are more important than the other subsystems, because the task is more difficult, and the success of others depend on them.

17. OUTPUTS

SUMMARY :

This project has made creditable progress in achieving output having to do with description of areas in which field activities are sited, including methodologies for using secondary data supplemented by visual surveys and limited farmer interviews. These methodologies can be easily transferred to other ICA areas. Progress has also been made in adaptive research. The above has given ICA considerably improved knowledge of its clientele, and can be considered a significant achievement.

Much less progress has been made in developing methodologies for data collection and analysis that would lead to a better understanding of the farmer as a means of identifying and evaluating constraints that could be used for developing a technology strategy. Some ad hoc achievements have been made by individuals.

A methodology for collecting information has been developed but is not satisfactory and needs urgent attention.

Work has been done with groups and in the delivery of critical services, but no significant innovative methodologies have been identified at this stage.

17. OUTPUTS (detailed)

Log Frame : " A process by which the constraints to small farmer development can be identified and overcome" To this end the project will develop the following :

(i) "A cost effective methodology for describing and analyzing the small farmer." (Subsystem A in MPP).

Implementation Plan

5/1/79 Status

(a) Desk Analysis

(a) Analyses have been made of three pilot areas and used to select specific work sites.

Methodology Guide has been prepared tested by field personnel of non - AID districts, and revised to facilitate field implementation.

Evaluation : A positive and satisfactory achievement.

(b) Field Analyses

(1) Determine importance of major crops and major livestock activities in area, related to ecological characteristics.

1. A methodology has been developed and tested involving national, regional, and local ICA personnel in a reconnaissance of the area.

(2) Identify technologies being used for each crop and livestock activity. (ICA calls this "sistemas de producción "

2. A simplified methodology of farmer interviews has been developed, supplemented by knowledge and experience of local ICA personnel.

(3) Technology Inventory (of ICA institutional technology)

3. A methodology has been developed of seminars and conferences of ICA researchers and field personnel to determine what it is that ICA knows that could probably help local farmers. This methodology results in tentative recommendations called "first approximations".

(Note : ICA implementation plan lists this under "desk analysis", but it occurs in "field analysis.")

(4) Detailed analysis involving factor-factor comparisons, factor-product relationships, and efficiency of production on a statistical sample representing the universe.

4. Methodologies have been developed. One is the "Ficha Técnica", a schedule of form intended to collect all data needed for farm analysis, plus that needed for social analysis. A follow up form, called "Hoja de Seguimiento", was also developed.

An analytic methodology, called Heads and Tails analysis was devised to identify best local practices for use in extension. This methodology has been revised with considerable improvement.

Various other methodologies, such as partial budgetting, have been used, perhaps with adaptations.

(5) Describe marketing systems.

5. Descriptions have been made, but methodology used was conventional.

Evaluation of Field Analysis :

1. Real progress has been made in points 1, 2, and 3, i. e. learning what the farmer produces and what technology he uses in producing it. This has enabled ICA to improve its programming significantly, within its commodity constraint.

2. The Ficha Técnica as a data gathering device has been a virtual failure. It is applied to all ICA usuarios. This causes the handling of much more data than is needed and yet is not representative of the universe of small farmers. It is the universe of ICA "usuarios", and that may have been the universe ICA intended in its implementation plan. The Ficha Técnica takes too much time and resources, does not present accurate data, does not present data in the form needed, and does not collect some significant data.

3. Inadequate progress has been made on identifying farmer constraints in a methodological sense, although individual field workers, in the experimental spirit of the project, have identified constraints and reacted to them, and a systematic methodology may emerge.

4. This is the critical point in the project and needs immediate and energetic attention. All other sub-systems are affected by it.

(ii) "A system for conducting research on small farms to determine what technology needs ought to be the subject of research and what technology is ready for diffusion." (Subsystem B MPP),

Implementation Plan

5/1/79 Status

(a) Agricultural Research

(a) A Methodology has been developed by which field or extension personnel do ecology-specific testing and adaptation. Central and Regional personnel provide technical counsel. This research results in "adjusted technology",

i. e., modifications in the "first approximation" recommendations made by ICA upon identifying local technology.

(b) Communications Research
(Note : This is more relevant to Subsystem C than to B)

(b) Communication research has been carried out on specific communications methodologies. Some new information has been gained, but it has not been put into methodologies.

(c) Mechanization and Processing Research

(c) Project funds have been used to continue a line of research initiated well before the project. Need for and design of this research was established before the project. It has not been effectively delivered to the farmer.

Evaluation : There have been useful results from on-farm research. There has been little progress in tested, systematic methodologies. In general ICA took its experiment station methodology to the field. Some individual field workers have adjusted the methodologies, but these have not been adequately tested, codified, and put in a form that is teachable and transferable throughout the ICA system. On-farm adaptive research by field workers used to modify standard recommendations may turn out to be a significant project achievement. It is too soon to project its institutionalization. Impact will be reduced by ICA's rigid commodity orientation.

(iii) "A methodology for identification of cost effective delivery services to supply small farmers with critical goods and services." (Sub-system C in PP).

Implementation Plan

Status 5/1/79

(a) Transfer of technology. (Plan indicated nothing beyond conventional extension).

(a) Some cases have been reported in which technology improvement under this project have been extended successfully.

(b) Production Plan
(This is the terminology used for an extension campaign involving inputs of other agencies)

(b) Some field teams have devised and implemented production plans. However, there are no guidelines that have been tested for field use in designing such plans. Such a methodology will be presented for field test in mid-1979.

(See item B under Subsystem B)

(c) Marketing
(To be accomplished by groups, similar to cooperatives, organized around production plans).

(c) Some ad hoc work with groups has been done. One group has organized a "Botiquín Veredal" to provide drugs for livestock. Reports are that panela producers of Huila are being organized to market increased panela production. Consideration is being given to organizing Yuca producers in the Guajira to process yuca into starch as a means of marketing production. No new methodologies exist.

(d) The implementation plan discussed risk as a major problem, but presented no plan to deal with it. However, a plan called "risk sharing" has been used. It is simply that a farmer does not have to pay back his loan for inputs unless his production surpasses a certain level. In practice, this is not risk sharing. It is simply a transfer of risk to ICA. Given the problem of measuring production, ICA has assumed more risk than the farmer incurred.

Evaluation : While there has been considerable activity in this area, it is difficult to identify activities that are innovative or lead to new methodology. No methodologies of any consequence have been developed, tested, and published. There have been academic type publications and conventional research.

The ICA implementation plan did not reflect the full range of activities anticipated in the project design.

(IV) " A method for encouraging the participation of existing small farmer organizations in the delivery of critical goods and services and the design and adaptation of technology to small farmer conditions "
(Subsystem D in PP)

Implementation Plan

Status 5/1/79

(a) Socio-economic research from Ficha Técnica and additional information on usuario and his family.

(a) Characterizations have been done on basis of usuario universe from Ficha Técnica data. It follow up studies have been done on families, it has been limited.

(b) Motivate usuarios to participate in Groups

(c) Support organization of new groups, and improvement of existing groups.

d) Use groups for technical assistance and for project decisions.

(b, c, d,) There has been considerable activity in working with groups, and some experimenting with special interest vs. general interest groups and with ad hoc vs permanent groups. Use has been made of chartered groups, such as Acción Comunal, but more for the legal status involved than for the membership involved.

ICA groups consist mainly of its usuarios, a small and privileged Group.

Evaluation : (1) There is not enough distinction between subsystems C and D in either the implementation plan or the implementation to consider them as two systems. In fact in design the distinction may have been too precise.

(2) ICA has implemented the plan, which was neither imaginative nor innovative and did not fully reflect project design. The plan did not include adaptation of such standard techniques as those dealing with group dynamics and identification of leaders.

(3) An important obstacle to progress in this area of work is the ICA tradition of working with usuarios, often on a one-on-one basis. This factor was not addressed, either in the project paper or the ICA implementation plan. The usuario often receives credit and always some special

attention. This puts him in a privileged class that does not quite represent the small farmer. Yet in practice, if not in theory, ICA tends to consider this group its client universe.

(4) No technical assistance input nor technical interchange was provided to help ICA see and develop alternatives to its own tradition.

(5) If there were more time left in the project, these combined subsystems would warrant attention, with emphasis on groups. Pay off possibilities throughout the project are limited by the inadequacies of sub-system A, which must receive first attention.

(V) "An evaluation/information system to provide corrective guidance to the project as well as to measure and ascribe success to project components." (Subsystem E in PP)

Implementation Plans

Status 5/1/79

(a) Final evaluation and Analysis

(a) Not due until end of project

(B) Partial Evaluations

The plan is vague and difficult to follow. It mentions "the need for a Unit of Evaluation" but assigns responsibility throughout the system, to the Planning Evaluation Units in each district and to two divisions of the Central Office.

It also places evaluation in the ICA format of Problem Identification, Program Development, Execution, and Evaluation.

(b) While there is no visible evaluation and monitoring unit, there are many activities in these areas, from the evaluation of an idea by a single field technician to seminars of several days by district, regional, and national personnel.

The Ficha Técnica was an idealized monitoring device. It has not been successful, ICA realizes it and knows what is wrong with it, but it does not know how to correct the problems.

Evaluation : 1 To a considerable extent, evaluation and monitoring, although not systematized, has been better than the plan accepted by AID. Project accomplishment has not been impeded directly by inadequacies in this sub-system.

2. In the sense of having a formal information system to provide a formal, continual monitoring, efforts have produced nothing of value, have been very costly, and offer no chance of being used throughout the ICA system.

General Evaluation :

1. AID accepted an implementation plan submitted by ICA that was deficient. This is hindsight considering the evaluation. However, the deficiencies were recognized in a memo by Dwight Steen, principal design officer, in August 1976. My "hindsight" is that he predicted many of the most serious problems that I have identified.

2. ICA operates under some severe constraints imposed by its own traditions that the project did not explicitly address. One of these is its strict commodity approach which limits the alternatives it has at its disposal. The other is its concentration on a small group of usuarios which receive services simply not available to small farmers as a class. This two-dimensional constraining, of its felt responsibility and of its range of alternatives, has contributed to the lack of understanding of small farmer constraints and the failure to make an adequate address of them. For example, capital is recognized as a constraint, and correctly. For its small group of usuarios ICA can arrange credit at subsidized interest rates and thus relax this constraint. Relaxing this constraint ICA can deal in technology that requires more capital than most small farmers have. ICA's responsibility, which it does not fully realize, is to generate technology that can operate within this constraint. This is made more difficult than it needs to be by ICA's dealing in individual commodities. The project design aimed at this problem syndrome, although it was not explicitly identified.

3. ICA has worked in this project up until now completely isolated. For various reasons, ICA has not taken advantage of experience elsewhere in the world that would have helped it break through its own constraints. There has been no technical assistance and no technical interchange. Technical assistance is just now beginning in marketing and evaluation, areas which are not seriously limiting the achievement of the project.

4. Given the above constraints ICA has done a good job, and some of its personnel have performed admirably. Given the current project trajectory, real if modest achievements can be expected.

5. If ICA-USAID can provide significant, if not massive, technical assistance quickly and continuously, the chances of improving the project are great enough to justify project extension and the inconvenience to AID of managing it as a regional or central project.

18. PURPOSE

"The purpose of the project is to develop a system for helping to solve small farmer problems. This will be accomplished through the identification, design, development of appropriate improved technology and other critical services. The system will be transferable among areas and will have component sub-systems."

The end of project status is given in terms of the "component subsystems" referred to in the Purpose Statement. These sub-systems are reflected almost perfectly in the five outputs discussed in "17" above.

In summary the first subsystem component of describing the farmer is progressing well up to a point, and will likely be transferred to non-pilot districts. The component of analyzing or understanding the farmer is not making adequate progress, and this has implications throughout the system.

The sub-system of non-farm adaptive research has made progress up to a point. Its real value is limited by the lack of analysis and understanding of the farmer and ICA's commodity orientation.

The sub-system dealing with group activity and delivery of services cannot be distinguished in the field. Progress here is limited by the lack of analysis and understanding of the farmer, and ICA's lack of skill and appreciation of groups.

The sub-system of Monitoring and Evaluation has not emerged as a separate and visible entity. There has been evaluation, although ad hoc, and the project is not suffering from inadequacy here.

All shortfalls are due to lack of technical assistance in critical areas where ICA needed the advantage of experience from outside.

EOPS conditions are adequate, although sub-systems iii and iv could be combined for simplification.

19. GOAL/SUBGOAL

"The Goal of the Project is to identify and test methods which will lead to a net increase in small farmer income and welfare on a basis that will become self-sustaining."

There has not been time enough to measure this project against goal indicators. While this project aims to improve technology available to the small farmer, it seeks this end through helping improve the technology (methodology) of the entity responsible for generating and diffusing the improved small farm technology. Thus it is one step removed from small farm technology.

Further, the project involves activities both in sequence and in interaction, which depend on cropping cycles of one year.

20. BENEFICIARIES

This project will benefit the small farmer and his family. Its greatest impact will be on increasing farm income, but it will have an impact also on family nutrition and health.

Some 2,000 farm families are in direct contact with the project in three test sites. They will be the first to benefit. But in the organization of the project they are to be considered more as experimentors than as beneficiaries.

There is no meaningful way to anticipate the number of beneficiaries and the extent to which they will benefit. If ICA can succeed in developing a full interaction with the small farmer, the number of direct beneficiaries could number in the hundreds of thousands. Incomes could double, and part of the income could be invested in education of the youth which in turn would bear dividends. The extra production would also result in increased farm employment in the rural areas and a more dependable and lower cost supply of food in urban areas. Such was the power of the original design, with the single exception that three years was not adequate time. Now that more than two of those years have been used up, any statement on beneficiaries would be highly tentative.

If the project is extended and if the farm management technical assistance input can be provided in the time, quality, and quantity needed, there is perhaps a 50 percent chance that ICA can modify its orientation from commodity to farm. This liberation could have important impact, but prediction is hazardous.

21. UNPLANNED EFFECTS

There have been no unplanned effects detected.

22. LESSONS LEARNED

A. That a project aimed at helping a national institution develop improved methods of operation requires adequate technical assistance. This is not the first AID experience that indicates that financial resources are not the most important limiting factor in development, that the U. S. dollar alone will not solve many problems in most LDC's.

B. That when a Mission enters into a project with a design that in some ways is both subtle and sophisticated, although realistic, it must provide itself with the technical competence to manage the project. If such competence cannot be provided in-house, it probably can be provided by TDY. In this case a few weeks per year of the designer's time could have improved significantly this project's chances of success.

C. That the project design should be thoroughly understood and supported by the power structure within the implementing agency prior to signing the loan agreement. In this case the reluctance of ICA to contract technical assistance and the lack of congruence between the implementation plan and the sophisticated project design set forth in the project paper stems directly from the extremely limited participation of ICA personnel in project preparation. Again, as with other projects prepared during the same period within the Mission, project development was rushed in order to meet an AID/W deadline for obligation of funds.

23. SPECIAL COMMENTS OR REMARKS

1. The Mission should not support ICA's proposal for revision of the ficha técnica without technical counsel from persons experienced in data needs, data collection, and analysis in situations similar to what ICA faces. Suggested are Jim McGrann, Peter Hildebrand, Don Winkleman and/or colleagues.

2. Mission needs to work with ICA to develop a handbook type format for the presentation of methodologies it has developed. Current publications are of an academic nature rather than a simple straight forward how-to-do-it manual. The format should be standardized to the extent subject matter allows.

This will require an inventory of the methodologies that have been developed and will represent the output of the project.

3. Attached is a proposal for helping ICA understand adequately the farmer. This proposal is based on a specific hypothesis regarding the factor most seriously limiting ICA's performance in the spirit of the project. The proposal assumes that at this late date in the project a comprehensive address of all project problems would be less effective than a concentrated address on a single limiting factor. The proposal reflects a judgement that the field of farm management offers the best chance of an effective concentrated address on a serious limiting factor.

The Mission should contemplate the use of additional judgements, even though such action would use up valuable time.

If consultation on the Ficha Técnica can be arranged at once, these consultants could be used to react to the proposal. Another alternative is to arrange a consultant (McGrann, Hildebrand, or someone from CIM-MYT) to review the two McDermott reports, make spot checks in ICA to the extent time allows, prepare an analysis of the proposal and its chance for success, and suggest revisions.

At any rate, special expertise is needed to develop the farm management component.