

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

Report Symbol U-44

1. PROJECT TITLE Weed Control Systems (AID/ta/c/1295) (Research) Oregon State University International Plant Protection Center			2. PROJECT NUMBER 931-0463	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE S&T/AGR/AP
5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY <u>66</u> B. Final Obligation Expected FY <u>80</u> C. Final Input Delivery FY <u>82</u>			6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING A. Total \$ <u>4,289,000</u> B. U.S. \$ <u>4,289,000</u>	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) <u>81-39</u> <u>8-4-81</u> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION
7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION From (month/yr.) <u>9/79</u> To (month/yr.) <u>4/81</u> Date of Evaluation Review <u>April 6-14, 1981</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
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			10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT	
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper	<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network	<input type="checkbox"/> None	A. <input type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change	
<input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____	B. <input type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or	
<input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PIO/C	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Change Implementation Plan	
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P		C. <input checked="" 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	
S&T/AGR/AP:R.J. Niec <u>RJ Niec</u> Date: <u>5/20/81</u>			Signature <u>[Signature]</u>	
S&T/AGR/AP:J.M. Yohe <u>JM Yohe</u> Date: <u>4/12/81</u>			Typed Name <u>Ken McDermott, Acting</u>	
S&T/AGR:Mozynski <u>Mozynski</u> Date: <u>7/29/81</u>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> S&T/AGR Director	
S&T/AGR:JWalker <u>J Walker</u> Date: <u>28 JULY 81</u>			Date _____	
S&T/PO:ASilver <u>ASilver</u> Date: <u>5/10/81</u>				
S&T/PO:MRehcigl <u>MRehcigl</u> Date: <u>5/11/81</u>				

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.