ISN-527

UNCLASSIFIED
CLASSIFICATION

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) — PART I

Report Symbol U-441

1. PROJECT TITLE	2. PROJECT NUMBER	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE
Weed Control Utilization (AID/ta/c/1303)(Tech. Ass't) Oregon State University International Plant Protection Center	931-0206	S&T/AGR/AP

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) 81-38

8/4/81

☒ REGULAR EVALUATION ☐ SPECIAL EVALUATION

5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES			6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING		7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION	
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent	B. Final Obligation Expected	C. Final Input Delivery	A. Total	$ 2,398,000	From (month/yr.)	9/79
FY 76	FY 80	FY 82	B. U.S.	$ 2,398,000	To (month/yr.)	4/81
					Date of Evaluation Review	April 6-14, 1981

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

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., airgram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
1. Develop a project paper to continue the Weed Control Utilization Project activities for five (5) years under a new Cooperative Agreement, including on-going socio-economic studies and the use of weed control technologies developed under the Weed Control Systems Project.	OSU/IPPC: S. Miller S&T/AGR/AP J.M. Yohe	December 1981
2. Increase technical staff in new project extension.	OSU/IPPC: S. Miller S&T/AGR/AP J.M. Yohe	December 1981
3. Renegotiate University of Florida subagreement to insure continued coverage of aquatic weed problems.	OSU/IPPC: S. Miller	June 1982
4. Investigate availability of GOP counterpart funds which were earmarked for Philippine Regional Crop Protection Center's research activities under Crop Protection Project (492-0288).	AID/Philippines	September 1981
Attachment: Report of the In-depth Team Review of April 6-14,	1981	

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS (None)

☐ Project Paper ☐ Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network ☐ Other (Specify)
☐ Financial Plan ☐ PIO/T
☐ Logical Framework ☐ PIO/C ☐ Other (Specify)
☐ Project Agreement ☐ PIO/P

10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT

A. ☐ Continue Project Without Change
B. ☒ Change Project Design and/or ☐ Change Implementation Plan
C. ☐ Discontinue Project

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

S&T /AGR/AP: R.J. Niec Date: 5/20/81
S&T /AGR/AP: J.M. Yohe Date:
S&T /AGR: MMozynski Date: 7/28/81
S&T/PO: ASilver Date: 8/10

12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval

Signature
Typed Name Ken McDermott, Acting Director, S&T/AGR
Date 8/4/81

13. SUMMARY: The evaluation team finished the review with a good deal of respect for the OSU/IPPC staff and their accomplishments. There were no suprises or major problems determined. Progress has been highly commendable. The recommendations described in Part I of the PES were agreed upon unanimously. The report of the evaluation team is attached as part of this PES. Both this PES and the team evaluation report makes reference to the three ring binder (AID/OSU-1981 Weed Control Systems Project Review) which was prepared by OSU/IPPC for the review. It is available in S&T/AGR/AP.

14. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY: This was the scheduled eighteen (18) month team evaluation as described in the project paper evaluation plan. Details of the proposed methodology can be found in the evaluation scope of work, approved February 23, 1981. Further information is in the attached team evaluation report.

15. EXTERNAL FACTORS: The assumptions continue to be valid. No major changes have occurred in project settings.

16. INPUTS: Recruiting a new chief of party for the Philippine site has not been successful. This is due in part to the short time remaining until the contract expires.

17. OUTPUTS: Project results are excellent. The activities are well managed and timely. The professional expertise and organization of OSU/IPPC in fulfilling the contract are highly commendable.

18. PURPOSE: Progress toward project purpose exceeds expectations. End of project status conditions are in process.

19. GOAL/SUBGOAL: Not pertinent at this time.

20. BENEFICIARIES: Results of the project have not only benefited developing country farmers through trained extension agents, but weed researchers and technicians around the world have benefited from the information exchange nurtured by IPPC.

21. UNPLANNED EFFECTS: Not pertinent at this time.

22. LESSONS LEARNED: Not pertinent at this time.

23. SPECIAL COMMENTS OR REMARKS: OSU/IPPC prepared an excellent three-ring binder of pertinent information for this project review which is available in S&T/AGR/AP (AID/OSU - 1981 Weed Control Systems Project Review). The evaluation team report is attached to insure completeness, as the Project Manager could only travel to OSU, Corvallis, Oregon due to shortage of travel funds.

UNCLASSIFIED

CLASSIFICATION

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) — PART I

Report Symbol U-44

1. PROJECT TITLE	2. PROJECT NUMBER	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE
Weed Control Systems (AID/ta/c/1295) (Research) Oregon State University International Plant Protection Center	931-0463	S&T/AGR/AP

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) 81-39 8-4-21

☒ REGULAR EVALUATION ☐ SPECIAL EVALUATION

5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES			6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING		7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION	
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent	B. Final Obligation Expected	C. Final Input Delivery	A. Total	$ 4,289,000	From (month/yr.)	9/79
FY 66	FY 80	FY 82	B. U.S.	$ 4,289,000	To (month/yr.)	4/81

Date of Evaluation Review: April 6 -14, 1981

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

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., airgram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
1. Allow present contract to terminate upon expiration, May 31, 1982.	S&T/AGR/AP J. Yohe	NAN
2. Significant research results from this project will be put to use in a five (5) year extension of the Weed Control Utilization Project (931-0206) which will be implemented under a cooperative agreement with Oregon State University.	S&T/AGR/AP:JYohe OSU/IPPC:S.Miller	Continuing
Attachment: Report of the In-depth Team Review of April 6-14, 1981		

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS

☐ Project Paper ☐ Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network ☐ None / Other (Specify)

☐ Financial Plan ☐ PIO/T

☐ Logical Framework ☐ PIO/C ☐ Other (Specify)

☐ Project Agreement ☐ PIO/P

10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT

A. ☐ Continue Project Without Change

B. ☐ Change Project Design and/or ☐ Change Implementation Plan

C. ☒ Discontinue Project

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

S&T/AGR/AP:R.J. Niec Date: 7/20/81

S&T/AGR/AP:J.M. Yohe Date:

S&T/AGR:MMozynski Date: 7/28/81

S&T/AGR:JWalker Date: 28July81

S&T/PO:ASilver Date: 8/10/81

S&T/PO:MRechcigl Date: 8/11/81

12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval

Signature

Typed Name: Ken McDermott, Acting S&T/AGR Director

Date

13. SUMMARY: The evaluation team finished the review with a good deal of respect for the OSU/IPPC staff and their accomplishments. There were no surprises or major problems determined. Progress has been highly commendable. The recommendations described in Part I of this PES were agreed upon unanimously. The report of the evaluation team is attached as a part of this PES. Both this PES and the team evaluation report make reference to the three ring binder (AID/OSU - 1981 Weed Control Systems Project Review) which was prepared by OSU/IPPC for the review. It is available in S&T/AGR/AP.

14. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY: This was the scheduled eighteen (18) month team evaluation as described in the project paper evaluation plan. Details of the proposed methodology can be found in the evaluation scope of work, approved February 23, 1981. Further information is in the attached team evaluation report.

15. EXTERNAL FACTORS: The assumptions continue to be valid. No major changes have occurred in project settings.

16. INPUTS: Recruiting a new chief of party for the Philippine site has not been successful. This is due in part to the short time remaining until the contract expires.

17. OUTPUTS: Project results are excellent. The activities are well managed and timely. The professional expertise and organization of OSU/IPPC in fulfilling the contract are highly commendable.

18. PURPOSE: Progress toward project purposes exceeds expectations. End of project status conditions are in process.

19. GOAL/SUBGOAL: Not pertinent at this time.

20. BENEFICIARIES: Results of the project have not only benefitted developing country farmers through trained extension agents, but weed researchers and technicians around the world have benefited from the information exchange nurtured by IPPC.

21. UNPLANNED EFFECTS: Not pertinent at this time.

22. LESSONS LEARNED: Not pertinent at this time.

23. SPECIAL COMMENTS OR REMARKS: OSU/IPPC prepared an excellent three-ring binder of pertinent information for this project review which is available in S&T/AGR/AP (AID/OSU-1981 Weed Control Systems Project Review). The evaluation team report is attached to insure completeness, as the project manager could only travel to OSU, Corvallis, Oregon due to shortage of funds.

TEAM REVIEW OF

WEED CONTROL SYSTEMS (931-0463)

AND

WEED CONTROL UTILIZATION (931-0206)

PROJECTS OF OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

INTERNATIONAL PLANT PROTECTION CENTER

CORVALLIS, OREGON

APRIL 6-14, 1981

Los Baños, Philippines and Corvallis, Oregon

For this review, personnel of the International Plant Protection Center (IPPC) prepared a project summary entitled "AID/OSU-1981 Weed Control Systems Project Review". The Table of Contents of this summary is included (as an appendix) herein. This document, in the form of a three-ring-binder, and IPPC's "Weed Control Systems Annual Report, 1979-1980" were used by the team throughout the review. Reference to these documents will be made in this report. Within AID, copies of these documents are in the possession of **Mark Smith, S&T/AGR/AP.** Washington, D.C., Phone (703) 235-8877. Additional copies are available from the International Plant Protection Center, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR 97331.

INTRODUCTION

At the request of US/A.I.D., a four-member team reviewed Oregon State University's handling of the A.I.D. contract being carried out by the International Plant Protection Center (IPPC).

Team members were:

Dr. Robert Andersen, Weed Scientist, USDA/SEA/AR, Department of Agronomy and Plant Genetics, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, MN -- Team Leader.

Dr. David E. Bayer, Weed Scientist, Department of Botany, University of California, Davis, CA.

Dr. L. M. Eisgruber, Associate Dean, Office of International Agriculture, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR.

Dr. Edward Rice, Agricultural Officer, US/A.I.D., Manila, the Philippines.

All members of the team took part in the review at Los Baños in the Philippines, and Eisgruber, Bayer, and Andersen were joined by Rebecca Niec (A.I.D., DS/AGR/AP) as an observer for a continuation of the review at IPPC headquarters in Corvallis, Oregon.

IPPC staff taking part in the review in the Phillippines were: Larry Burrill, Weed Research Specialist (Corvallis); Alan Cooper, Weed Research Specialist (Los Baños), Dale Habeck, Aquatic Weed Specialist (University of Florida), Stanley Miller, Director of IPPC (Corvallis); Cliff Munroe, Weed Research Specialist (Los Baños); Dennis O'Brian, Agricultural Economist (Los Banõs). Cooper was just reporting for duty in Los Baños and Habeck and Miller came to Los Banõs following IPPC activity in Thailand.

In Corvallis, Allan Deutsch, IPPC Information Specialist (Corvallis), joined in the review.

A brief itinerary follows:

April 6 (Monday)

Visited Bureau of Plant Industry in Manila.

Met with Jess Sumangil, Chief, Crop Protection Division.

Traveled to Los Banõs.

Visited National Crop Protection Center (NCPC) University of the Philippines, Los Banõs.

Met with Dr. Fernando Sanchez, NCPC Director.

Met with Dr. Eduvigis Pantastico, Director of Crop Research. Philippine Council for Agriculture and Resources Research (PCARR).

Met with Dr. Beatriz Mercado and Dr. Enrique Paller, Weed Scientists, University of the Phillipines, Los Baños.

April 7 (Tuesday)

In Los Baños--reviewed IPPC activities.

April 8 (Wednesday)

Field trip to Mindanao.

Observed Rottboellia exaltata problems in maize.

Visited a Regional Crop Protection Center at Maylaybalay, Mindanao.

April 9 (Thursday)

Visited International Rice Research Institute (IRRI) at Los Baños.

Met Dr. DeDatta, Agronomist
Dr. Keith Moody, Weed Scientist.

April 10 (Friday)

At Los Baños, continued review of IPPC activities.

Departed for Manila.

April 11 (Saturday)

Departed the Philippines.

April 12 (Sunday)

Arrived Corvallis, Oregon.

April 13 (Monday)

Continued review of IPPC activities.

Met with various members of the Oregon State University staff and administration.

April 14 (Tuesday)

Concluded review in Corvallis.

The team found the IPPC group to be very cooperative and helpful throughout the course of this review. Their presentations were well organized and supported with a rather thorough and professionally done document of their activities. This document (referred to on the title page of this review report) should be available to anyone making use of this report. For this reason, much of that documentation will not be repeated in this report, but will be referred to from time to time.

In the remainder of this report we will discuss IPPC's operations under the major headings of "The Headquarters Operation", "Costa Rica", "The Philippines", "Aquatic Program, University of Florida", and "Other Technical Assistance Activities". Because the activities of the Weed Control Systems (931-0463) and Weed Control Utilization (931-0206) often involve the same personnel and are often closely related to one another, we will make no attempt to discuss them separately.

Following these major headings, we will attempt to answer questions a-m as requested in the "Scope of Work" given our team. Finally we will give some specific recommendations, with reasons for those recommendations.

IPPC has been diligently fulfilling the obligations of its contracts with A.I.D. IPPC has over the years gained a favorable reputation with those knowledgeable in weed science throughout the world. IPPC's activities should be maintained and strengthened by the negotiation of a new contract, as will be discussed in our specific recommendations.

The Headquarters Operation

IPPC headquarters continues to be recognized throughout the world as a focal point for weed control information, particularly that applicable to farmers with small land holdings. The Infoletter serves as a cohesive force for weed scientists and others interested in weeds throughout the world. The varied activites of the IPPC headquarters in developing application equipment for small farms, supplying information, and more recently in supplying technical assistant through consultants, have made important contributions to weed control throughout the world. The reputation of IPPC was not made overnight and can only be maintained with the continued service of dedicated personnel. Further details of the headquarters operation are given in the three-ring-binder report (sections 10 and 11).

Costa Rica

The team was intrigued by the approach being followed in Costa Rica. Here a weed control technology--chemical mulch--has been developed and tested. Currently the adoption by farmers with small land holdings is being studied in a systematic manner (details given in three-ring-binder, Section 4). Here, as in the Philippines, the combination of economics and weed science is a commendable and unique approach.

Project personnel expressed their desire to continue their studies on the adoption of new weed control technology and the economic consequences of such technology under various environmental and economic conditions. The team concurs with this approach, but recognizes that time will not permit such studies in the current contract. Therefore, the team recommended against expanding into a second ecologically different area, and recommended maintaining emphasis on existing studies, including economic aspects and grower acceptance, for the remainder of the present contract.

The Philippines

It was obvious that representatives of the Philippine government and the University appreciated the cooperation of the IPPC staff. The progress in the Philippines has been hampered somewhat by changes in IPPC personnel and by lack of adequate support at Regional Crop Protection Centers. Three enthusiastic IPPC staff are currently on the job in Los Baños and appear to be making good progress under what at times must be frustrating circumstances. Here the effort has been directed primarily toward weed control in upland rice and toward control of an extremely difficult to control annual grass weed, Rottboellia exaltata, in maize. IPPC personnel conduct research in cooperation with Filipino counterparts at Los Baños and at various Regional Crop Protection Centers.

Weed control in upland unbunded rice is not receiving attention from researchers at IRRI or University researchers. Thus IPPC personnel believed that they could make a valuable contribution by working in this aspect of rice culture, and have chosen it with the concurrence of IRRI and University personnel. Economic analysis of the benefits of improved weed control technology in upland rice by IPPC personnel have thus far failed to show a consistent advantage over the farmers standard methods. These studies are being continued, but as yet, no method suitable for adoption studies such as those being conducted in Costa Rica has been developed. IPPC personnel working on weed control in upland rice should not be dismayed if new technology does not prove better than the farmers' current practice. If this is the case, so be it. That is what they need to know.

On the Rottboellia problem in maize, no method of control has yet been found that warrants detailed adaptation studies. The problem is difficult as long as farmers are following a maize-maize rotation. The major maize producing area (and the major Rottboellia problem) is on Mindanao. This presents a severe logistic problem for IPPC personnel stationed in Los Baños. The Regional Crop Protection Research Center that we visited on Mindanao is presently not equipped to function effectively. Transportation for getting personnel and equipment to field plots is non-existent. Funds for seed, fertilizer, and so forth, are not available. Of all the research underway at the RCPC on Mindanao, about 66% was that being conducted in cooperation with IPPC personnel with IPPC supplying most of the effort. The weed control counterpart at this RCPC had received training by IPPC personnel at Los Baños and appeared eager to put his training to good use if he had something to work with. The situation at other RCPC's around the country where IPPC has cooperative efforts is similar to that on Mindanao according to our Manila-based team member, Ed Rice.

Ideally IPPC should be making real progress in research and the training of counterparts stationed at these RCPC's through formal training in short courses and workshops at Los Baños (which they are doing) and through follow up cooperative research at the RCPC's locations (which they are attempting to do). However, current conditions at the RCPC's make the latter extremely difficult. Our specific recommendation No. 5 addresses this problem.

The team suggest that the effort on Rottboellia on Mindanao be kept to a minimum unless more suitable arrangements can be made for cooperative efforts with the RCPC or the University on Mindanao.

Aquatic Program, University of Florida

The aquatic program's information retrieval center is operational and requests for information have been increasing, particularly recently in response to the distribution of a circular explaining the center's information service. The technical consulting aspect has been hampered by loss of personnel originally involved in the project. The program is now administratively attached to the Department of Entomology, whose new Head questions the appropriateness of such a project in a department of entomology when an aquatic research center is present on the campus.

Other Technical Assistance

IPPC's technical assistance has taken many forms, as can be seen in the three-ring-binder sections 8-13. Project personnel have given training sessions, provided information and literature, and responded to requests for consulting services. Project personnel expressed a desire to do more in the area of consulting on weed problems. They foresee an increasing demand for such services by lesser developed countries through local AID missions. The team agrees that the need for such services is likely to increase. As far as the team can determine, AID has no weed research component other than IPPC built into its system. The need for increased technical assistance in weed control is addressed in our specific recommendations No. 1.

Responses to Questions a-m in Scope of Work

a. The progress of the projects toward objectives. What progress has been made in relation to the intended design of the activities? Will the projects' objectives be attained by the end of present contracts in May 1982? What major problems have been encountered?

Substantial progress has been made toward all objectives. The projects' objectives will for the most part be attained by May 1982. However, the nature and scope of the problem is such that the ultimate can never be reached for some of the stated objectives. Some of the problems have been mentioned previously.

b. The continuing validity of project assumptions as stated in the Logical Frameworks (last page of project papers). Are these assumptions still valid?

The assumptions appear to remain valid.

c. The actual vs. planned results of the projects. What impact have the projects had on national research activity priorities; government policies; agricultural extension services; farmers? What effect have the projects had on production; income; employment? What problems have hindered further impact? How can these problems be circumvented? What alternatives are available to increase the use of results of this program?

It is too early to answer many of these questions. Measurable changes in factors such as these are sometimes not rapid and are difficult to quantify even in developed countries. As yet, it would be impossible to detect changes in production, government policies, income, or employment. Economic studies underway in Costa Rica should shed light on some of these questions. National research activities have been influenced by greater awareness of the importance of weeds in limiting crop production. Agricultural extension services have been aided by training sessions and information provided.

d. The future of the OSU weed control research and technical assistance program after May 1982. Should the contract be terminated or extended as it is or with changes/improvements in the design or emphasis? Should these activities be incorporated into a Title XII project? Should the IPPC contracts become a part of the Integrated Crop Protection (Consortium for International Crop Protection-CICP) contract?

OSU program should be continued. It should not be put under Title XII or CICP. These questions are addressed more fully under our specific recommendation No. 6.

e. The involvement and roles of host country counterparts at the project sites. What involvement have counterparts had at the project sites? What are their feelings about the impact of the projects?

Counterparts have been involved to a great extent in the project in Costa Rica and this involvement is developing in the Philippines. Counterparts appear to be enthusiastic about their involvement.

f. The progress made in training. How many research and extension people have been trained in short-term in-country weed control research/extension courses? How many administrators have been exposed to seminars? How many international students have participated in training at Corvallis?

Numerous research and extension people have received training in one form or another ranging from seminars to a 3-week short course. Good documentation of training activities was provided in the three-ring-support material sections 5 and 7. Some administrators have been exposed to seminars and workshops, and have been contacted personally. Eleven students (7 foreign, 4 domestic) participated in training at Corvallis over the last 5 years with some financial support from IPPC.

g. The technical assistance and consultation services provided. How many requests for technical assistance have been received? What is the disposition of these requests?

This is covered in projects' annual report and three-ring-document (see especially sections 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 12).

h. The extent of involvement with weed science organizations. How have these linkages been expanded or improved during the period under evaluation?

Project personnel have been active in presenting papers at scientific meetings. Larry Burrill has just completed service as President of the Western Weed Science Society and continues to serve as Secretary of the International Weed Science Society. IPPC personnel maintain contacts with the FAO weed officer and others involved with weed science organizations throughout the world.

i. The volume and quality of information and publications prepared and distributed, including papers prepared for professional, scientific and general audience meetings. To what extent have "how to" manuals been generated for use by farmers and extension agents as opposed to technical publications and information targeted for weed scientists? What impact has this literature had on the intended audience?

Details on this are well documented in the three-ring binder (sections 10 and 11) and the annual report of this program. Short course and other material has been generated for extension personnel and a simple general publication on weed control for extension personnel is in preparation. The Costa Rica work on economics and adoption of weed control technology should be written up when completed for a scientific journal. Thus far, the project has not produced "how to" manuals

suitable for farmers (many of whom are illiterate). IPPC personnel are thinking of how to do this--stick-figure drawings were mentioned as a possibility. Probably concentrating on "how-to" manuals for extension personnel is a more realistic approach than working on material for direct use by the farmers in those situations where farmers may not be able to read the material but could benefit from personal contact with extension personnel.

j. The progress in development of appropriate weed control technologies for small and medium-sized farms in Central America and South East Asia involving traditional and/or modern technologies, or a combination. What technologies have been identified for introduction to small farmers? How successful has farmer adoption been? What are reasons for the different degrees of acceptability to farmers?

The chemical mulch system has been developed for Central America and introduction to small farmers has been started. How successful farmer adoption will be is not yet known. In the Philippines, no technology for control of Rottboellia in maize or for general weed control in upland rice has yet been developed to the point of studying farmer adoption. Economic modeling studies in the Philippines suggest various reasons why there would be different degrees of acceptability to farmers. Lack of credit to purchase needed inputs for improved technology appeared to be a major constraint on acceptance of a new weed control technology, in the event a suitable technology were developed.

k. The degree of success in analyzing the appropriate weed control technologies in terms of their effect on both economic and social conditions and goals such as economic efficiency, unemployment, income distribution, etc. How have cost/benefit evaluation methods been established for alternative weed control methods for both terresterial and aquatic weeds?

Procedures and models for determining many of these aspects have been arrived at for terresterial weed problems. More testing of the models with experimental data is needed and is underway. On aquatic weeds, the cost/benefit evaluations are thus far only at the qualitative stage.

l. The need for final technical reports on weed control recommendations for specific production situations, including analyses of the socio-economic implications of alternative weed control methods. Would such reports be useful? Who should they be targeted for? Should the final project report include recommendations/suggestions for future weed control research or technical assistance needs? Should it identify those areas which might have high payoff in terms of employment or income?

This item will be dealt with as specific recommendation No. 7.

m. The actions/reactions of developing country people and governments who have had contact with the project. What are the feelings of government officials, extension agents, and farmers about the benefits of the project?

As best the team could determine, all such feelings were positive.

Specific Recommendations

1. The US A.I.D./International Plant Protection Center's weed control activities should be maintained and strengthened by additional technical staff and funds for hiring consultants to respond to requests for technical assistance, even at the cost of reducing other programs within A.I.D.

   Reason: If U.S. policy continues to be that of providing technical assistance to lesser developed countries (LDC's) through A.I.D. programs, the need for weed control expertise will become greater and greater. Whereas much emphasis has been given to other agricultural disciplines, and much progress has been made, weed science has been neglected in LDC's. Government officials in LDC's are becoming more aware that, in many instances, weeds are now the major constraint on crop production after other improved practices have been adopted. The demand for weed science expertise by the governments of LDC's through US A.I.D. missions can only be expected to increase. If effective A.I.D. programs in agricultural production are to be conducted, it is essential that an available adequate supply of such expertise be maintained. IPPC would be the logical organization in which A.I.D should maintain such expertise.

2. The IPPC program should be funded for a five-year period.

   Reason: IPPC's procedure of developing and testing appropriate weed control technology and determining the economic consequences of such technology, then working with small farmers to utilize the technology, and finally monitoring the acceptance of such technology, is excellent and unique. However, such efforts must be long-term and continuing to be effective. Understandably, the IPPC program is strongest and most effective in those phases where individuals have been at the job over an extended period of time. The program is less effective in phases where personnel turn-over has been greatest. The uncertainty associated with short-term funding makes recruiting of full-time permanent professional staff difficult. IPPC's program, which obviously must be on-going if it is to be effective, would be enhanced if funding uncertainty was reduced.

3. The research component (weed control research and economic research) and the technical assistance component of the IPPC program should be combined into one project.

   Reason: Because the research being done is adaptive research and is an integral part of the technical assistance program, having two project results in unnecessary administrative duplication.

4. IPPC's sub-contract on aquatic weeds with the University of Florida should be thoroughly reconsidered in further contract negotiations so that IPPC can continue providing technical assistance on aquatic weed problems and can increase its ability to provide technical assistance.

   Reason: Aquatic weeds are a major world problem and requests for technical assistance on this problem can be expected to increase. Organizational and personnel changes at the University of Florida since the sub-contract was initiated make essential a reconsideration of the project.

5. A.I.D. mission in Maila should investigate whether Government of the Philippines' counterpart peso funds earmarked for the Regional Crop Protection Centers (RCPC's) are in fact being made available for research being conducted at those Centers.

   Reason: IPPC personnel have an excellent opportunity to train RCPC personnel in research techniques and to accomplish meaningful cooperative research. However this training and research is hampered by the severe lack of support available at the RCPC's.

6. The activities of the IPPC program should not become a part of Title XII or CICP.

   Reason: IPPC has established itself as an effective, competent, and productive entity. In its present status, it is able to respond quickly to A.I.D. missions' requests for technical assistance and to respond to the changing needs of LDC's and A.I.D. There is nothing to be gained (except additional administrative burden) by appending or subjugating IPPC to another organization. Further such an arrangement could remove decisions concerning weed control matters from the hands of weed scientists.

7. The final report for the current contracts should involve only that effort required to satisfy A.I.D. requirements. But IPPC personnel should respond to the other items suggested in question "1" (see page 8 of this report) by making available all possible technical information that is complete enough to be meaningful in forms that are useful to extension personnel in LDC's for use by small farmers or to the scientific community through appropriate publications. The part referring to future needs should be covered in a new grant proposal.

   Reason: The effort spent on a report to be filed is better spent on materials of wider distribution.

AID/OSU – 1981
Weed Control Systems
PROJECT REVIEW

CONTENTS

section	item
9.	Aquatic program
10.	Information / publications: - Chronological listing of publications - AID/OSU-IPPC project major publications and distribution - Technical papers, presentations, and articles - INFOLETTER - IPPC Papers - Publications planned
11.	Equipment: - Development: wick wipers, spray shield - Familiarization: knapsack sprayers - Pesticide application equipment (PAEQ) file
12.	Consulting / linkages: - Consulting - Linkages
13.	Feedback: - Requests - Letters