FOOD FOR THE HUNGRY INTERNATIONAL

P.L. 480 TITLE II
INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Award #: FAO-A-00-98-00032-00

"*IMPROVING FOOD SECURITY PROGRAMMING AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT*"

SCOPE OF WORK FOR FINAL EVALUATION

Submitted to USAID/DCHA/FFP/CTO on 7 June 2002

FHI Headquarters Office Contact:
Buck Deines
ISA Team Leader
7807 E. Greenway Rd. Suite 3
Scottsdale AZ 85260
Tel: (480) 609-7791 Fax: (480) 951-9035
Email: bdeines@fhi.net

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	BACKGROUND	1
2.	PURPOSE OF THE REVIEW	2
3.	EXISTING PERFORMANCE INFORMATION SOURCES	3
4.	REVIEW QUESTIONS	4
5.	REVIEW METHODOLOGY	5
6.	REVIEW TEAM COMPOSITION	6
7.	TIMEFRAME	7
8.	REPORTING	8
9.	BUDGET	9

Addendums:

Addendum A: Proposed Consultant CV

Addendum B: Consultant Bio-data Form

1. BACKGROUND

Food for the Hungry International (FHI) has been implementing Title II food security programs in Africa and Latin America since 1985. Despite that long history and contrary to many other cooperating sponsors who have been receiving ISG/As since the beginning, FHI received its first institutional support grant in 1997. The grant period for that ISG was 20 months with the goal being to achieve significant impact in food security via the establishment of a robust monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system in FHI's Title II programs. The focus of the ISG activities was to design and develop methodologies and systems, and train and provide technical assistance to FHI Title II-related field staff in the following components of the food security M&E continuum: 1) macro-targeting, 2) micro-targeting, 3) indicator development, 4) baseline data collection and analysis, 5) monitoring, and 6) evaluation. FHI met all and surpassed many of its targets that it set for the ISG outputs and activities.

As a follow-on to the ISG, FHI is currently implementing a five-year ISA program that began in September 1998 and is scheduled to end in August 2003. The program is addressing six major headquarters' and field priority areas:

1. program design and implementation of development programs,
2. emergency and transition programs,
3. new country program initiation,
4. commodity management,
5. collaborative efforts in M&E, monetization and local partner facilitation, and
6. information systems.

The goal of the ISA activities is to increase the impact of FHI's Title II food security programs via the improvement of its technical, programmatic and managerial capability. This is being accomplished by way of the following objectives:

A. Select, promote and train staff in the use of standard, high-quality tools for Title II program design and implementation as a follow up to the accomplishments achieved under the former ISG program in M&E system standardization;
B. Improve FHI's capacity to respond to emergencies and facilitate a rapid transition to development activities in Sub-Saharan Africa;
C. Conduct needs assessments in Mali/Burkina Faso and Haiti to determine rationale for and feasibility of initiating activities in those countries;
D. Improve FHI's capacity to efficiently and effectively manage commodities;
E. Collectively improve a) program monitoring and evaluation, b) monetization activities and Bellmon analyses, and c) local capacity building via substantive collaborative efforts with other Title II cooperating sponsors; and

F. Via a mentoring agreement, contribute toward the improvement of FAM knowledge of and proficiency in using information technology to enhance communication and information flow between the PVO members of FAM.

FHI's ISA program is targeted to impact three distinct sets of beneficiaries in the following order of importance: 1) current FHI Title II programs in Bolivia, Ethiopia, Kenya and Mozambique, 2) potential future FHI Title II programs, and 3) other FAM-member Title II Cooperating Sponsors. The program is implemented by a five-member, multi-disciplinary team composed of 1) a team leader (who also serve as the technical assistant in agriculture and training facilitator), 2) a technical assistant and trainer in maternal-child health and nutrition, 3) a technical assistant and trainer in commodity management, 4) a technical assistant and trainer in information systems, and 5) a technical assistant and trainer in emergency response programming. In addition, FAM staff and other Title II Cooperating Sponsors provide indirect support to the program via the collaborative efforts described above in objective E.

FHI is now completing the fourth year of its ISA program having accomplished the great majority of its activity and output objectives to date. USAID/FFP's comments on FHI's Mid-Term Evaluation included the following:

- With two minor exceptions, all the planned activities and outputs have occurred. Achievement of targets has been very strong.
- Trainings are high quality and have resulted in improved field capacity and tools, including the adaptation of tools from other PVOs.
- While it is difficult at this stage to link improvements in food security directly to the ISA, field staff do perceive the ISA to be having a positive impact on food security through higher quality programs, more efficient use of resources, and improved techniques learned from ISA training.

As FHI is completing implementation of this ISA program we will now conduct the planned external review to assess achievement of planned objectives in activities and outputs as well as effects and impact.

2. PURPOSE OF THE REVIEW

The purpose of this final evaluation will be to provide an assessment of the results achieved, reasons for levels of achievement or non-achievement, and lessons learned from the ISA program. An emphasis of the evaluation will be an external review of impact-level results on the ISA's contribution to impacts on food security achievements through FHI Title II programs.

Other considerations for the final evaluation:

- Need for statistically valid quantitative data collection
- Externally oriented assessment

- Indicator Performance Tracking Table will be updated for all indicators
- Recommendations can suggest where the need may or may not exist for further institutional strengthening activities.

3. EXISTING PERFORMANCE INFORMATION SOURCES

In order for the review team to successfully conduct the mid-term review, they will need to conduct a thorough review of existing ISG/ISA documentation. The following list of documents is comprehensive, but not necessarily exhaustive. All of these documents can be obtained through FHI's ISA team leader and on FHI's Food Security Extranet at: http://www.fhi.net/gme/fse/isapr/index.htm#isadocumentreview

- FHI's corporate identity (including Vision of Community);
- 1997-98 ISG final proposal;
- Quarterly and final reports for the ISG;
- 1999-2003 ISA final proposal;
- ISA program performance M&E plan;
- 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003 ISA annual work plans;
- 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002 annual results reports;
- FHI Food Security Extranet website;
- ISA team orientation notes;
- Mali/Burkina Faso and Haiti food security needs assessments;
- FHI Title II commodity management procedures manual;
- Educational messages and methods assessment report;
- Workshop notes and handouts for the following ISA workshops:
    - M&E remedial;
    - Food security problem analysis and program design;
    - Epi-Info
    - HEARTH methodology (positive deviance)
    - Food security education messages and methods;
    - Barrier Analysis (Factor Analysis)
    - Emergency program preparation;
    - Rapid disaster assessments;
    - Emergency program design;
    - Emergency program monitoring and evaluation; and
    - Commodity management procedures – part 1 and 2.
- Pre/post test scores for the workshops above;
- Participant evaluation summaries of the workshops above;
- Quality improvement checklist scores from Title II fields;
- Food Aid Management (FAM) website
- FAM annual evaluations of FAM mentoring activities; and
- FHI ISA Mid-Term Evaluation

4. REVIEW QUESTIONS

Several key questions need to be answered in order to fully review FHI's ISA performance. The questions below should form the bulk of the review. However, it is likely that additional questions will arise as a result of going through the review process. The review team should include these additional questions—and their answers—in the review report.

1. To what extent were the planned objectives achieved for the program? Specifically, were the annual monitoring indicators (activities and outputs) and final impact indicators (effects and impacts) successfully reached?

2. In what ways and to what extent has the ISA program made a positive impact on FHI's ability to increase food security at the field level?

3. Which ISA program components where the most effective in strengthening FHI's food security program capacity? Why? Which program components were the least effective in strengthening FHI's food security program capacity? Why?

4. To what extent were the recommendations from the Mid-Term evaluation implemented?

5. What were the most significant constraints and/or difficulties in implementing the program and, where appropriate, how did FHI overcome them? What lessons learned does the review team identify that have implications for future capacity building programs?

6. Given that a large part of FHI's ISA focuses on capacity building of Title II staff, what has been the change in the related knowledge, skills and practices of those staff?

7. Are the ISA training materials appropriate- tailored to the user and, accurate, state of the art? Which materials need strengthening, if any, and how?

8. What is the perspective of FHI Title II field staff with regards to the services provided under the ISA?

9. How did the best practices identified in the CS collaborative efforts in M&E, monetization and local capacity building effect FHI's ISA program?

10. What are lessons learned from this program? What implications for future institutional support activities can be extracted from those lessons learned?

11. What specific future needs can the review team recommend be prioritized for future institutional support activities? Of activities in the current ISA, which areas would benefit from further support in the future?

5. REVIEW METHODOLOGY

The final evaluation will determine the effects and impact that the ISA grant activities and outputs have had on FHI's Title II programs. The evaluation will be both quantitative and qualitative and will be implemented during the first quarter of the last program year (October-December 2002).

The evaluation will rely primarily on qualitative methods including, but not limited to, semi-structured interviews, direct observation, focus groups, and secondary data review. Additional sources of information for the evaluation will include monitoring project data and recommendations made in the mid-term review.

Through participatory methods a multi-disciplinary team composed of an external consultant (team leader) and FHI headquarters staff will examine FHI's ISA program results. A visit to three Title II fields will allow field staff and beneficiaries to provide their inputs to the review process. The final evaluation will be conducted in three stages:

Stage 1: *Review of Existing Documentation*
Time Frame: 01 – 15 October 2002

The review team will conduct a thorough review of existing data and information from the documents cited above in Section 3. In addition, the team leader (external consultant) may decide to consult additional documentation from the headquarters office, Title II field offices, or other sources. He/she will also evaluate the FAM mentoring activities and results during this stage. Finally, the team leader will outline preliminary field visit plans.

Stage 2: *Refinement of Review Methods*
Time Frame: 15 – 31 October 2002

FHI's ISA activities are heavily weighted toward building the capacity of field staff in order to increase their effectiveness in improving food security. In order to determine whether capacity has been built and, more importantly, that this increased capacity is being used on a routine basis by the trained staff and impacting FHI Title II programs, the team will need to combine both quantitative and qualitative approaches to data collection. Rather than stating the exact mix in this scope of work, we feel that it is crucial for the team leader to be instrumental in the method selection process. For some performance indicators, we will attempt to gather statistically valid quantitative data. For other indicators, qualitative methods will be a better way to gather more

useful information. At a minimum the following data collection methods will be utilized: focus group interviews, key informant interviews, document review, observation, random spot checks (visits to field offices and target population homes/fields), and surveys. In addition, decisions will need to be made on choosing a sample of staff and target population to be interviewed/surveyed. Thus, during this stage, the team leader will decide on final selection of the methods and instruments to be used during the field visit and prepare for the data collection exercise in the field.

Stage 3: *Field Data Collection*
Time Frame: 01 – 19 November 2002

The team leader will plan and coordinate all the necessary logistics for the qualitative and quantitative collection of data at the field level. The FHI evaluation team members will assist the team leader as requested in this stage. FHI proposes conducting the field review in three of its four Title II fields— Bolivia, Kenya and Mozambique. The reasons for selecting these fields are: Bolivia and Kenya were not visited in the Mid-Term Evaluation. Ethiopia is phasing out its Title II activities in FY2002 and as a result will not be a focus of this Final Evaluation as program activities have been re-focused in the other three fields during the last two years of the ISA. The team will spend a maximum of four days in each of these three fields collecting data.

Stage 4: *Write Evaluation Report*
Time Frame: 20 November – 15 December 2002

Upon completion of the field data collection, the team leader will draft the evaluation report with conclusions and recommendations. The team leader will hold a meeting (in person or virtual) with FHI ISA staff to present findings, lessons learned, and recommendations. The final report will be submitted to USAID/DCHA/FFP no later than 31 December 2002.

6. REVIEW TEAM COMPOSITION

The final evaluation team will include an external technical consultant who will serve as the evaluation team leader and two selected FHI ISA team members. The final evaluation will be conducted over a ten-week period at an estimated cost of $28,159.

The final evaluation team will be composed of:

1. Team Leader

The team leader will be an external technical consultant who will be responsible for structuring and designing all review activities and methodologies, assigning

evaluation tasks among the other team members, conducting interviews, meeting the specified objectives, collaborating with USAID and/or FANTA, and writing the report according to the defined timeline.

2. Two FHI ISA team members (from headquarters)

Two members of FHI's ISA team will assist the external consultant in providing requested background and organizational (HQ and field) information, arranging evaluation logistics for field data collection, and generally facilitating requested information to the team leader. The presence of these FHI ISA team members will be beneficial by enabling FHI to experience greater insight into the lessons learned of the program. One member will be the ISA Team Leader. The other member will be the trainer in information systems.

7. TIMEFRAME

The following time frame and deliverables reflect the management plan for this evaluation and, as such, each set of dates is the expected time of completion for each evaluation component and set of deliverables.

Stage 1: Review of Existing Documentation -- Time Frame: 1-15 October 2002
Total Person/Days = 9 (3 days x 3 team members)
Deliverables: None.

Stage 2: Refinement of Review Methods --Time Frame:15-31 October 2002
Total Person/Days = 12 (8 days x 1 team leader + 2 days x 2 team members)
Deliverables: Field visit schedule and itinerary, respondent selection, and data collection tools.

Stage 3: Field Data Collection -- Time Frame: 1 – 19 November 2002
Total Person/Days = 57 (19 days x 3 team members)
Deliverables: Completed survey tools, data.

Stage 4: Write Report -- Time Frame: 20 November – 15 December 2002
Total Person/Days = 13 (8 days x 1 team member + 2.5 days x 2 team members)
Deliverables: Draft to FHI by 6 December 2002 for comment; 16 December 2002 final report to FHI; Final Report submitted by 31 December 2002 by FHI to USAID/DCHA/FFP.

Total Time Frame: 1 October – 31 December 2002
Total Person/Days = 90 (38 days for team leader (external consultant), 26 days for two ISA team members)

8. REPORTING

The final report must be submitted to USAID/DCHA/COTR on or before 31 December 2002. The report must contain at least the following sections. Additional sections may be recommended by the review team.

1. Executive Summary

2. Introduction

    a. Objective of SOW
    b. Brief description of project

3. Methodology

4. Updated Indicator Performance Tracking Table

5. Discussion of Performance Results

    a. Brief description of interventions
    b. Achievement of results
        i. Meeting targets (annual and impact indicators)
        ii. Other achievements
    c. Discussion of general evaluation questions

6. Cross-Cutting Issues

7. Lessons Learned

8. Recommendations for further institutional strengthening activities

9. Annexes

    a. Evaluation SOW
    b. Composition of the team
    c. Methods
    d. List of sites visited
    e. List of key informants
    f. References
    g. Indicator Performance Tracking Tables (IPTT)

h. Survey tools
i. List of acronyms

9. BUDGET

The costs for the two ISA team members will be absorbed as part of the normal costs of the ISA and fields. It is estimated that these costs amount to approximately $10,700, these costs will be covered by FHI matching funds. In addition, the following costs below relate to the hiring of an external consultant and are listed in the ISA budget for FY 2003 as "evaluation" expenses.

Consultant Fee = $10,450

Fee for external consultant/team leader to participate in the ISA mid-term review. It is estimated that the consultant will work approximately 38 days. (38 days x $275/day = $10,450).

Per Diem = $1,900

Per diems paid to the consultant while traveling. (19 days x $100/day = $1,900).

Travel = $5,200

One RT ticket (quote for coach fare) to Bolivia (Quito – La Paz)

One RT ticket to Mozambique and Kenya at $ (La Paz - Beira – Nairobi - Marsabit – La Paz).

Evaluation Supplies = $159

Paper, copies, etc.

TOTAL costs for external consultant = $17,709

Addendums

Addendum A: Proposed Consultant CV

Addendum B: Proposed Consultant Bio-data Form

Addendum A: Proposed Consultant CV

Curriculum Vitae

PERSONAL PARTICULARS

Name: [redacted]
Address: [redacted]
Tel/Fax: ++ 593 (0) 99 0202 339

Postal address: [redacted]

E-Mail: [redacted]

Birthdate: [redacted]
Nationality: South African/Dutch

EXPERIENCE

1993-2002 ***CONSULTANCY WORK***

My consultancy work focuses on the monitoring and evaluation of development projects. During the past eight years I assisted a diversity of clients with a variety of monitoring and evaluation related tasks (detailed list of publications follows on page 4). Most of these organizations are International NGO's, working in Mozambique, Kenya, Angola, Peru and Ecuador in the food security and rural development sectors. Services rendered include:

- Design of Monitoring and Evaluation Implementation systems for Adra, Dole and World Vision.
- Questionnaire and sample design for baseline, mid-term and final household surveys, data analysis and report writing. Clients included: Adra, Africare, Aid to Artisans, Care, Dole, FHI, GTZ and World Vision.
- Evaluation team leader for the Final Evaluation of a USAID/World Vision implemented development project.
- Analysis, integration and interpretation of health database for final project evaluation. Africare Health, Water and Sanitation project.
- Literature Review on the socio-economic conditions in the Zambezi valley. World Conservation Union (IUCN).
- Training of World Vision, CRS and ADRA staff members in the manipulation of databases and analysis of data using the statistical programs SPSS and EPINFO.
- Developed and presented a training course on the Rapid Rural Appraisal and Participatory Rural Appraisal Research Methods for Directorate of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture, Pretoria.

1986-1993 ***AGRICOR, Mafikeng, South Africa***

Rural Development Researcher

Key Performance Areas

- Conduct client needs analysis and determine most appropriate research methodology and data collection tools.
- Organise and or do the collection of data where appropriate.
- Design and manage procedures for the capturing, storage and processing of data where appropriate.
- Interpret and analyze data using the SAS statistical analysis package and recommends action where needed.
- Compile Research Reports.
- Maintain State of art through reading and networking; collect and supply secondary information to other sections within the corporation.
- Manage the performance of subordinate.

1984-1985 ***SOUTH AFRICAN INSTITUTE FOR MEDICAL RESEARCH,*** under supervision of Dr. A.R.P. Walker, Johannesburg and based in Potchefstroom.

Responsibilities included:

- Statistical planning and design of epidemiological research studies.
- Organization of fieldwork where necessary.
- Statistical analysis of data using the BMDP statistical package.

EDUCATION

1980 : Matric. Subjects: Mathematics, Science, Biology (distinction), Afrikaans, English, German.

1981-1983 : B.Sc. Majors: Mathematical Statistics and Human Physiology.
Other subjects: Mathematics 1&2, Computer Science1, Physics1.
Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education.

1984-1985 : B.Sc (Honores) in Human Physiology with specialization in nutrition; Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education.

1991- 2001 : BA degree in Anthropology and Development Administration. UNISA, Pretoria.

1993-1995: MSc (Cum Laude), Potchefstroom University for Higher Education, Potchefstroom. Thesis title: The effect of community vegetable gardens on the nutritional status of the participants.

ADDITIONAL TRAINING AND COURSES

1995: Computer based training for the statistical packages: SPSS and EPI Info version 6.02 .

1993 : Participatory Rural Appraisals, James Mascarenhas from Outreach Bangalore India, Bulver Natal.

1992 : Qualitative Research Methods, Free attitude & depth interviewing, Human Sciences Research Council , Pretoria.

Introduction to Wordperfect, Agricor, Mmabatho.

1991 : Creativity course, Dr. Neetling, SARTORI, Potchefstroom.
Agricor Communication Campaign to Optimize Rural Development, Agricor, Mmabatho.
Communication in Setswana, Agricor, Mmabatho.
Interaction Management Training, Agricor Mmabatho.

1990 : Research methods for the Social Sciences, Human Sciences Research Council, Pretoria.
Introduction to Novell networks, Agricor, Mmabatho.
Multimate advantage 4, Beginners & Advance, Todata, Mmabatho.
Assertiveness training, Manpower Development Center, Pretoria.

1989 : Team oriented problem solving, Agricor, Mmabatho.

1988 : SAS training course, DSS, Johannesburg.
Programming in Dbase 3+, Damelin, Johannesburg.

LANGUAGES

Afrikaans : Mother tongue
English : Second language, fluent
Portuguese : Good speaking and reading
Spanish : Good speaking and reading
Dutch : Good speaking and reading
German : Good reading

REFERENCES

1. Dorothy Scheffel, Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, WVUS (Consultancy client). E-mail**:** dcheffe@worldvision.org ; ** 1 202-608-1806

2. Scott Clark, Director for Development, Food for the Hungry International, Maputo, Mozambique (Consultancy client). E-mail: sclark@fhi.net; Tel: ** 258 (1) 306154

3. ***Sheldon Rankin, World Vision Australia, (former boss at AGRICOR). E-mail: rankins@wva.org.au***

COMPLETED RESEARCH

54. Organic banana exportation program for small farmers. Baseline survey. Copdeban/Dole, Piura, Peru, 2002

53. Community Increased Agricultural Production Program. Baseline survey. World Vision/USAID Luanda, Angola, 2001

52. Socio-economic Monitoring and Evaluation System. Copdeban/Dole, Piura, Peru, 2001

51. Final evaluation of the Morrulem Irrigation Scheme. World Vision/USAID Kenya, Nairobi, 2001.

50. Situation analysis at household level. Morrulem Irrigation Scheme Final Evaluation. World Vision/USAID, Kenya, Nairobi, 2001.

49. Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Program Mid-term Survey, World Vision/USAID, World Vision Mozambique, Maputo, 1999.

48. Cashew rehabilitation program. Mid-term survey. ADRA/USAID Development Program, ADRA Mozambique, Maputo, 1999.

47. Artisan sector in Mozambique, Qualitative and Quantitative Baseline Survey, Aid to Artisans, Maputo Mozambique, 1999.

46. Gorongosa Mountain Project, Baseline Survey, Food for the Hungry International/ USAID, Beira, 1998.

45. Monitoring and Evaluation implementation system, ADRA/USAID Development Program, ADRA Mozambique, Maputo, 1998.

44. AFRICARE/USAID Manica Oil Seed Food Security Initiative, Agricultural baseline survey, AFRICARE Mozambique, Maputo, 1997.

43. AFRICARE/USAID Manica Oil Seed Food Security Initiative, Nutrition baseline survey, AFRICARE Mozambique, Maputo, 1997.

42. Cashew Rehabilitation program, Baseline survey. ADRA/USAID Mozambique, Maputo, 1997.

41. DAP Monitoring and Evaluation implementation system. I. Schmidt. World Vision Mozambique, Maputo, 1997.

40. The Zambezi delta: A socio-economic overview. I. Schmidt. IUCN (World Conservation Union) Mozambique: Beira 1996.

39. Gorongosa agricultural baseline survey. I. Schmidt. GTZ-PRRS: Beira, 1996.

38. Food security baseline survey. Gorongosa and Cheringoma. I. Schmidt. GTZ-PRRS : Beira 1996.

37. Agricultural Recovery and Development Baseline Survey: Nampula, I. Schmidt. World Vision Mozambique: Nampula, 1996.

36. Impact Indicator Survey: Water and Sanitation Project, I. Schmidt. Care International: Maputo.

35. Health Information System: A final analysis, I. Schmidt. Africare: Beira 1996.

34. General Analysis: Food Security Survey. I. Schmidt. World Vision Mozambique: Maputo, 1995.

33. An evaluation of the Farmer Support Programme in Bophuthatswana. I. Schmidt, Agricor: Mmabatho, 1993.

32. A quick assessment of the implementation of some aspects of the Community Development Approach, Agricor: Mmabatho, 1993.

31. Mankwe/Bafokeng Rural Industries Training Programme: A Short and simple assessment of its costs and benefits, Agricor: Mmabatho, 1993.

30. Some of the economic aspects of food gardens, I.Schmidt & W. Mmutle, Agricor: Mmabatho, 1993.

29. Mechanization and small scale crop producers in the central region: present practices, constraints and opportunities, I.Schmidt, Agricor: Mmabatho, 1992.

28. A summary of the publication: Agricultural mechanization and the evolution of farming systems in Sub-Saharan Africa, I.Schmidt, Agricor: Mmabatho, 1992.

27. The effect of vegetable gardens on the nutritional status of the participants: A case study done in Slough, Bophuthatswana, I.Schmidt, Agricor: Mmabatho, 1992.

26. Animal Health Services: Customer needs and perceptions. Report 1, National Overview, I.Schmidt, Agricor: Mmabatho, 1992.

25. Animal Health Services: Customer needs and perceptions. Reports 2-8, District specific reports, I.Schmidt, Agricor: Mmabatho, 1992.

24. Factors that create the conditions for viable rural business, I.Schmidt, Agricor: Mmabatho, 1992.

23. Resources for research on small rural industries, I.Schmidt , Agricor: Mmabatho, 1992.

22. An evaluation of Agricor's rural Service Centers, Bosman, A. Perkins D.,

Rankin S., Schmidt I. , Agricor: Mmabatho, 1991.

21. Literature review: Factors Constraining Livestock Development in Africa and Group ranches in selected Sub-Saharan countries, I.Schmidt, Agricor: Mmabatho, 1991.
20. Dryharts tribal ranch: Introduction to the factors at play when considering the proposed development intervention, I.Schmidt, Agricor: Mmabatho, 1990.

19. Dryharts tribal ranch: Group categorization according to livestock keeping practices, I.Schmidt, Agricor: Mmabatho, 1990.

18. Dryharts tribal ranch: The historical context within which this development is taking place, with special reference to land, I.Schmidt, Agricor: Mmabatho, 1990.

17. Dryharts Tribal ranch: Evaluation of the Resimolotse dairy and its links to the proposed project, I.Schmidt, Agricor: Mmabatho, 1990.

16. The relationship between cattle and savings, I.Schmidt, Agricor: Mmabatho, 1990.

15. An evaluation of farmer participation at the Tsholofelo irrigation scheme, I.Schmidt & J. Kgasoe, Agricor: Mmabatho, 1990.

14. Sheep improvement programme: monitoring and evaluation indicators, I. Schmidt, Agricor: Mmabatho, 1990.

13. A literature review on People Participation with special reference to groups, I.Schmidt, Agricor: Mmabatho, 1990.

12. Village Development Committee Evaluation: General overview for Bophuthatswana, I.Schmidt & J. Motebe, Agricor: Mmabatho, 1990.

11. Village Development Committee Evaluation: District specific reports, Reports 3A-3J, I.Schmidt & J. Motebe, Agricor: Mmabatho, 1990.

10. Boo Ratshidi Tribal Development: an evaluation of basic needs, I.Schmidt, Agricor: Mmabatho, 1989

9. The satisfaction of basic needs: ideas generated by extension and community development staff: Molopo district, I. Schmidt, Agricor: Mmabatho, 1989.

8. Multi-disciplinary survey report, Disaneng, I.Schmidt, Agricor: Mmabatho, 1988.

7. Multi-disciplinary survey report Thaba'nchu: Rietfontein Service Center area: Report A-D, I.Schmidt & P. Maloka, Agricor: Mmabatho, 1988.

6. Multi-disciplinary survey report, Marapjane, I.Schmidt, Agricor: Mmabatho, 1988.

5. Multi-disciplinary survey report, Makgobistad, I.Schmidt, Agricor: Mmabatho, 1987.

4. Multi-disciplinary survey report, Heuningvlei, I.Schmidt, Agricor: Mmabatho, 1987.

3. Multi-disciplinary survey report, Makouspan, I.Schmidt, Agricor: Mmabatho, 1987.

2. Tshidilamolomo Rapid Rural Appraisal. I.Schmidt & F. Wellian, Agricor: Mmabatho,1987.

1. 'n Kritiese evaluering van die glukemiese indeks. I. Odendaal, 1984.

PAPERS PRESENTED AT CONFERENCES AND WORKSHOPS

8. Agricultural Recovery and Development Programme, Monitoring and Evaluation Implementation system, I.Schmidt, 1997. Delivered at USAID/Food Aid Management Monitoring and Evaluation Workshop, Harrisonburg, Virginia (USA), June 1997.
7. Some considerations in the design of the Mozambique Monitoring and Evaluation Implementation system, I.Schmidt, 1997. Delivered at a World Vision International Workshop in ACCRA, Ghana, April 1997.
6. The removal of input constraints as an element of Farmer Support Programmes, I.Schmidt, 1993. Delivered at a workshop at the DBSA, Johannesburg, April 1993.
5. The implementation of Farmer Support Programme in Bophuthatswana: a process of growth and evolution, I.Schmidt & L. Fisser. Delivered at a workshop organized by Agriven, Thoyandou, March 1993.
4. A comparison between the general health profile of under fives in a rural and peri-urban village, I.Schmidt. Paper presented at the Anthropological conference (AASA), September 1991.
3. Grazing Management in the Tribal areas of Bophuthatswana: the application of the Tribal Ranch concept, Perkins, D.W., Khabele T. Illeman E., Schmidt I., Tshenkeng S. Paper presented at the Grassland society of Southern Africa conference, May 1991.
2. The risk factors associated with cancer, A.R.P. Walker & I. Odendaal, Presented at an International Cancer Workshop, Washington D.C., 1984.
1. The glucose tolerance curve and the feasibility of using it to predict the suitability of specific kinds of food in a diabetic diet, I. Odendaal, presented at the National Physiology and Pharmacology Congress, Potchefstroom, 1984.

PAPERS PUBLISHED OR IN PRINT

4. Vegetable gardens: the solution to nutritional problems in developing areas?,M.I. Schmidt & H.H. Vorster. Development Southern Africa, Vol 12. (5), October 1995.
3. The relationship between cattle and savings: a cattle owner perspective, M.I. Schmidt. Development Southern Africa, Vol 9 (4), November 1992.
2. Hypocholesterolaemic effects of an oats fiber tablet and wheat bran in healthy volunteers. H.H. Vorster, A.P. Lotter & I. Odendaal. SA Medical Journal, 69:435-438.
1. Cancer Patterns in Different Ethnic Groups in South Africa. A.R.P. Walker, M.I. Odendaal & I. Segal. Dietary Fiber. Edited by George V. Vahouny and D. Kritchevsky. Plenum Publishing Corporation, 1985.

Addendum B: Proposed Consultant Bio-data Form