

A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY PART I

(BEFORE FILLING OUT THIS FORM, READ THE ATTACHED INSTRUCTIONS)

A. REPORTING A.I.D. UNIT:

USAID/INDONESIA

(Mission or AID/W Office)

(ES#)

B. WAS EVALUATION SCHEDULED IN CURRENT FY ANNUAL EVALUATION PLAN?

yes slipped ad hoc

Eval. Plan Submission Date: FY 87 Q

C. EVALUATION TIMING

Interim final ex post other

D. ACTIVITY OR ACTIVITIES EVALUATED (List the following information for project(s) or program(s) evaluated; If not applicable, list title and date of the evaluation report)

Project #	Project/Program Title (or title & date of evaluation report)	First PROAG or equivalent (FY)	Most recent PACD (mo/yr)	Planned LOP Cost ('000)	Amount Obligated to Date ('000)
Grant No. 1064	CRS East Timor Agricultural Development Project	81	9/30/88	6,000	6,000

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

Action(s) Required

Name of officer
responsible for
Action

Date Action
to be
Completed

1. Completion of procedures to register Yayasan ETADEP with USAID as pro eligible to receive USG funds.

Nelson/
Stevenson

NLT
Dec. 31, 1987
Completed
Dec. 31, 1987

2. Completion of a tripartite agreement to transfer responsibility for Grant No. *1064 to Yayasan ETADEP.

Nelson/
Stevenson

NLT
Dec. 31, 1987
Completed
Dec. 31, 1987

3. Assisting Yayasan ETADEP in locating and hiring consultant staff to: (a) review the actionability of recommendations contained in this report; (b) plan a course of actions to address those recommendations deemed actionable; (c) develop a follow on grant proposal (if deemed appropriate) and obligate it NLT July 30, 1988.

Nelson

NLT
July 31, 1988

(Attach extra sheet if necessary)

F. DATE OF MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE REVIEW OF EVALUATION: mo 2 day 4 yr 88

G. APPROVALS OF EVALUATION SUMMARY AND ACTION DECISIONS:

	Project/Program Officer	Representative of Borrower/Grantee	Evaluation Officer	Mission or AID/W Office Director
Signature				
Typed Name	David Nelson	Michael Wiest	Tim Mahoney	David Merrill
Date:	<u>11/21/88</u>	<u>11/21/88</u>	<u>11/21/88</u>	<u>11/21/88</u>

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

H. EVALUATION ABSTRACT (do not exceed the space provided)

An agriculturalist, a sociologist/anthropologist, a Catholic Relief Services (CRS) program officer, and a legal officer conducted this review of the East Timor Agricultural Development Project (ETADEP). The goal of the project was to reestablish a viable agroecosystem and to improve the social and economic position of Timorese farmers.

The evaluation team found that the project has made considerable progress towards its objective of controlling wild grass and enabling farmers to return to trampling, their traditional method of land preparation. If enough cattle continue to be brought into project sites and rice is cultivated at least once a year, trampling will again be a realistic method of controlling this grass. Over the next five years, subsidies for land preparation will be reduced, as will the need for tractors to control the grasses. Farmers are now growing secondary crops during the dry season, but improved inputs and irrigation are still needed to make this venture successful. The project has been successful in directly benefiting about 10,000 people, nearly a quarter of the project area's population. However, farmers with dry land fields and women have not been made a part of project activities. There remains a need to improve water users' associations and farmers' groups, and to resolve land registration issues. Project management is now being turned over to the local ETADEP Foundation, whose staff are committed and competent, but need further training in project implementation and design. In addition, the Foundation will be dependent on USAID for financial support until they establish a network of other donors to fund them.

In the area of agriculture, the team recommends improved water control and inputs, the encouragement of secondary crops and agroforestry, the introduction of sound agricultural practices in lowland dry fields, and an integrated, diversified agricultural strategy. In community development, they encourage extending project coverage for farmers' groups and women, and exploring the possibilities for moving into health and nutrition. They also recommended the assistance of consultants and the introduction of training for members of the ETADEP Foundation, assistance from CRS during the transition to ETADEP takeover, and assistance from USAID after the transition is complete. Last, USAID should continue its funding for the Foundation so that it can achieve the project's aims.

I. EVALUATION COSTS

1. Evaluation Team Name	Affiliation	Contract Number OR TDY Person Days	Contract Cost OR TDY Cost (US\$)	Source of Funds
Ms. Barbara Martin-Schiller	USAID/I	AID 497-0336-0-00-7135-00	\$ 8,700	PVO Co-Financing
Ms. Joanne Hale	USAID/I	USAID/Jkt T.A.	\$ 563	OE
Ms. Pauline Wilson	CRS/NY	CRS/N.Y. T.A.	\$ 972	Grant No. 1064

2. Mission/Office Professional
Staff Person-Days (estimate) 45

3. Borrower/Grantee Professional
Staff Person-Days (estimate) 15

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY PART II

J. SUMMARY OF EVALUATION FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS (Try not to exceed the 3 pages provided) Address the following items:

- Purpose of activity(ies) evaluated
- Purpose of evaluation and Methodology used
- Findings and conclusions (relate to questions)

- Principal recommendations
- Lessons learned

Mission or Office: USAID/Indonesia

Date this summary prepared: January 8, 1988

Title and Date of Full Evaluation Report: Review of the East Timor Agricultural Development Project (ETADEP), November 1987

Purpose of Activity Evaluated

After East Timor was incorporated into Indonesia in 1975, the province experienced massive physical and social disruptions for several years. The subsistence and commercial agricultural bases of the economy were destroyed and by 1977 East Timor, an area of marginal subsistence at the best of times, had become a famine area. Catholic Relief Services (CRS) came to East Timor in 1979 as part of the famine relief effort. By 1981, famine had been alleviated and CRS and USAID established the East Timor Agricultural Development Project (ETADEP) in 1981. Its goal was to reestablish a viable agroecosystem and to improve the social and economic position of Timorese farmers.

Purpose of the Evaluation and Methodology Used

This evaluation was conducted to: 1) record and assess the status of ETADEP activities, 2) determine the specific actions that need to be taken by CRS and USAID during the transition period (October to December 1987, prior to turning the project over to an East Timorese foundation, the ETADEP Foundation), and 3) make recommendations relating to the ETADEP Foundation and activities that should be continued or initiated in the short and long terms. The team was also to examine the implications of CRS's withdrawal from the project and make recommendations on which CRS functions will need to be fulfilled by USAID or by foreign consultants.

The review team was composed of an agriculturalist, a sociologist/anthropologist, a CRS program officer and a legal officer. They each spent up to twelve days in East Timor in September 1987. Data were collected by interviewing project staff, beneficiaries, ETADEP Foundation Board members, by empirical observation, and by studying project records.

Findings and Conclusions

Agriculture. When the project began, the Sare plain (the project region) was overgrown with a tall, wild sugar cane-like grass (*Saccharum spontaneum*), which had previously been kept under control by annual cultivation and grazing. This grass had grown so tall and developed such a mass of tuber-like roots that its control by limited available labor and animal power proved ineffective. Tractors were introduced as a temporary measure to bring the grass under control while water buffalo and Balinese cattle were distributed to farmers under a revolving credit program with the aim of increasing livestock numbers to levels adequate for animal traction and/or trampling, the traditional form of land preparation.

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

3

1. Progress towards objectives. The project has made considerable progress towards its objectives of controlling wild grass and enabling farmers to return to trampling as a method of land preparation. However, because it took longer than anticipated to accomplish these objectives, the project could not expand to other areas, but instead concentrated on the Sare plain. Thus far, about 1650 ha of wet rice fields and 400 ha of dry fields have been cleared and plowed by tractor one or (in most cases) more times during the life of the project; tractor use has been phased out entirely or for certain operations on approximately two thirds of the cultivated lowland area; and about 1400 Balinese cattle and water buffalo have been distributed under a successful revolving credit program.

2. Trampling as a land preparation method. If cattle continue to be brought in at the rate of at least 400 head per year, the plan to return to trampling to control grass is realistic. Because animal traction has not been accepted by farmers, the project has discontinued its efforts to introduce plows. An alternative to be tested should there not be enough cattle by the time tractors wear out is the short-term use of systemic herbicides.

3. Grass control. In the project area, 750 ha of riceland are not currently cultivated. To control the grass on this land, tractors would have to be phased out of the other fields as grass is controlled and livestock levels become adequate; a herbicide could also be tried as an additional option.

4. Subsidies. Over the next five years it is anticipated that tractors will have been phased out and replaced by cattle and water buffalo. The charges for land preparation were being raised in 1987 and it is anticipated that this will be continued, thus allowing the subsidy to be reduced. Increased fees are also expected to encourage farmers to use their animals.

5. Crop diversification. Few farmers now grow secondary crops on their rice fields during the dry season because of inadequate water supplies and control, competing upland activities in the dry season (particularly coffee harvesting), and lack of marketing opportunities coupled with low prices. With improved irrigation and preferably also with improved inputs, secondary crops are viable, particularly for farmers with little or no coffee. The focus should be on crops with good marketing potential or subsistence crops.

6. Upland dry fields and soil conservation. Farmers grow a wide variety of crops on upland dry fields. However, pressure on the land has resulted in too short a fallow period on slash-and-burn fields, thus severely degrading the land base. The project has had limited success with encouraging sustained soil conservation measures such as terracing and the planting of *Leucaena* trees because farmers fail to see the benefits.

7. Preference for upland residence. Provincial authorities encourage or pressure people to move from their traditional upland villages to the lowlands. The problems with permanent lowland residence include lack of water in the dry season, malaria, and the attachment people have to their land of origin and burial sites.

Community Development and Farmers' Participation. In 1987 the population directly served by the project (1804 households belonging to farmers' groups) was about 10,000. These beneficiaries comprise about 23% of the 1980 Census' total population of the four project subdistricts. An indeterminate number of people benefit indirectly from the project.

1. Beneficiaries. Only a small percentage of farmers in the project area belong to farmers' groups. Farmers' group members own lowland rice fields; farmers with dry fields or coffee gardens and dry fields do not benefit, or benefit only indirectly. It is problematic to have a project that focuses on only part of a community, and not necessarily the poorest part. This has given rise to some ill feelings in the project command area.
2. Women. So far, women have not been involved in project activities, despite their extensive activity in agriculture.
3. Farmers' groups. These groups are largely a channel for tractor organizations and cattle distribution. Most have yet to develop autonomy and initiative.
4. New initiatives. Farmers have shown considerable interest in fishponds, although there have been some problems with water supply. They have also responded well to the introduction of certain secondary crops, vegetables in particular. There is a good market for these. Most recently, farmers have been requesting teak seedlings for hillside land.
5. Water users' associations. Options need to be explored here because there is almost no organization of irrigation water or channel maintenance.
6. Land registration. No land titles have yet been issued to farmers, but the Governor has agreed to take action on this.

ETADEP Foundation Capacity Issues

1. Staff and management. The new East Timorese project management is committed and competent, and aware of their weaknesses and training needs. Several key management staff assumed their positions only in July 1987 and need management training and a consultant's assistance. The agricultural extension staff need training and follow-up support in community development and group dynamics skills.
2. The Foundation. The new ETADEP Foundation has not had time to become fully functioning, although board members seem committed to its success.
3. New directions. Once the Foundation is well established, management staff hope to expand into such new activities, such as health, to change emphases (e.g., more emphasis on household water supply systems), and expand to other areas.

CRS Withdrawal Issues

1. Funding. The Foundation will be dependent on USAID for financial support while it attempts to develop a network of other donors. The Foundation was established with USAID's support and the understanding that USAID would continue its funding. Delays in setting up the Foundation have meant there may not be time to seek other donors before funds are needed at the end of FY 88.

Recommendations

In agriculture, the recommendations are: 1) To achieve higher rice yields and better control of the grass, improved water control is needed along with improved cultivation practices and inputs. Techniques should be sought which are less labor-intensive and which are acceptable to farmers. 2) Encouraging secondary crops on rice fields would

control the pressure on upland dry fields, and irrigation and water control need to be extended and marketing opportunities explored. 3) Agro-forestry should be encouraged on upland dry fields. 4) To ensure that land does not deteriorate, sound agricultural practices should be introduced in permanent lowland dry fields. 5) There should be an integration of wet rice, dryland, and coffee cultivation into an overall diversified agricultural strategy. Such an approach should start with the traditional agricultural system and build on its strong points while overcoming its weaknesses. 6) Compromise solutions are needed that satisfy government and farmers, protect watersheds, and ensure that a wide variety of crops continue to be grown. This would ensure good rice yields and grass control. 7) The appropriate timing for the progression to a fee structure for services which reflects costs should be determined as soon after the next harvest as possible.

In the area of community development and farmers' participation, the following recommendations are made: 1) Examine whether and how it is possible to include farmers who are not currently group members. The coverage and benefits of farmers' groups begun by the government should also be examined. 2) Women should be involved in project activities, ideally through the formation of women's groups. 3) The possibilities for moving into health and nutrition activities should be explored by the Foundation when appropriate. 4) Farmers' groups should receive increased attention with a view toward improving their capacity to initiate, plan and implement activities.

For issues regarding the capacity of the ETADEP Foundation, it is recommended that one or more consultants, including a long-term foreign consultant, be hired by the Foundation. Also, training, either at the project site or outside the province, should focus initially on management, planning, financial and record-keeping skills for management staff, and community organization and group dynamics for extension workers.

Regarding CRS's withdrawal and the transfer of responsibilities to the Foundation, it is recommended that 1) until December 31, 1987, CRS should ensure that ETADEP staff are competent in the procedures previously carried out by CRS/Jakarta and complete all preparation necessary for the transfer. 2) For the Foundation to have continuing access to project funds, it is essential that the registration process with USAID be completed by December 31.

Regarding support for the Foundation, USAID has the opportunity to contribute to developing and strengthening a young NGO in a province where there are very few self-help organizations and only one other local foundation. It is hoped that with continuing USAID assistance, the Foundation will be able to achieve the aims of the project.

K. ATTACHMENTS (List attachments submitted with this Evaluation Summary; always attach copy of full evaluation report, even if one was submitted earlier)

ATTACHMENTS

Review of the East Timor Agricultural Development Project (ETADEP), September - October 1987, by Dr. Barbara Martin-Schiller, Joanne Hale and Pauline Wilson, USAID/Indonesia - Catholic Relief Services, November 1987.

L. COMMENTS BY MISSION, AID/W OFFICE AND BORROWER/GRANTEE

MISSION COMMENTS ON FULL REPORT

7