XD-ABJ-667-A
91271

AGRICULTURE MANAGEMENT AND PLANNING
PROJECT NO. 631-0008

EVALUATION REPORT

FEBRUARY-MARCH 1987

Prepared By
John Fliginger (Team Leader)
Lyle Calvin
Larry Herman
Murl Baker.

3/19/87

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

GRC	Government of Cameroon
MINAGRI	Ministry of Agriculture
DEP	Direction of Studies and Projects
DE	Division of Studies
CP	Planning Section
CE	Studies Section
CPP	Project Preparation Section
CD	Documentation Section
DS	Division of Statistics
DP	Division of Projects
USAID	U.S. Agency for Internation Development
PP	Project Paper
ProAg	Project Agreement
PACD	Project Assistance Completion Date
TA	Technical Assistance
TDY	Short Term tour of Duty
PIO/C	Project Implementation Order/Commodities
PIO/T	Project Implementation Order/Participant
USDA	U.S. Department of Agriculture
OICD	Office of International Cooperation and Development
PASA	Participating Agency Service Agreement
AMP	Agriculture Management and Planning Project
COP	Chief of Party
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organisation
IBRD	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

AGRICULTURAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT PROJECT (631-0008)

EVALUATION REPORT

I Executive Summary 01
Major Conclusions 01
Major Recommendations 01

II Description of the Evaluation 03
A. Brief History of the Project 03
B. Purpose and Scope of the Evaluation 04
C. Evaluation Methodologies 04
D. Composition of the Evaluation Team 05

III Project Goal and Purpose 06

IV Project Inputs 07
A. USAID 07
1. Technical Assistance 07
2. Training 10
3. Commodities 11
B. Government of Cameroon 13
1. Personnel 13
2. Office Space 15
C. Financial Analysis 15
1. USAID 15
2. Government of Cameroon 16

V Project Outputs 19

VI Economic Analysis and Sector Planning 20
A. Organization and Functions of the Division of Studies 20
B. Staffing of the Division of Studies 22
C. Programming of Division of Studies and AMP Project Activities 23
D. Technical Assistance in Economics 25
E. Sub-Sector Studies and Special Studies 25
F. Managing Outside Studies 27
G. Agricultural Sector Review 27
H. Sectoral Planning and Other Activies 28
I. Links Within DEP 29
J. Links Outside of DEP 30
K. Training for Economic Analysis and Sectoral Planning 31
L. Other Issues 32
M. Recommendations 33

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Page

VII Improved Agricultural Statistics 36
A. Organization of the Division of Statistics 36
B. Area Sampling Frame 37
C. Sample Design 37
D. Survey Methodology 38
E. Objective Field Procedures 39
F. Publication and Dissemination of Reports 39
G. Data Management 40
H. Data Processing for the 1984 Agricultural Census 41
I. Data Processing for the Annual Surveys 41
J. Management of the Data Processing Unit 42
K. Facilities 42
L. Staff Development 43
M. Technical Assistance 44
N. Recommendations 46

VIII Extension Planning and Project Development 48

IX. Project Management 49

A. Management Responsibilities 49
B. Management Tools 49
C. Host Country Management 50
D. USAID Project Monitoring 51
E. Conclusions 51
F. Recommendations 52

X Principal Conclusions and Recommendations 54
A. Principal Conclusions 54
B. Principal Recommendations 55
General 55
Economics 55
Statistics 56

XI Recommendations for Follow-on Activities 58

Annexes:
1. Evaluation Scope of Work
2. List of Persons Contacted
3. List of Documents Consulted
4. A. Listing of Long-Term Participant Training
B. Listing of Short-Term Participant Training
5. Listing of PIO/Cs
6. 1986/87 Project Budget
7. Summary of Economic Activities

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

5

EVALUATION REPORT
AGRICULTURAL MANAGEMENT AND PLANNING PROJECT

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Major Conclusions:

Progress since the last evaluation in the statistics component has been very significant: the 1984 Census was completed, tabulated, and a limited number of preliminary copies have been published in English and French; the annual surveys were conducted during 1985, 1986, and are underway for 1987; data from the surveys are in the process of being tabulated. An in-house data processing capability is being developed as are computer systems and programs. All of this has been a major accomplishment and the Division of Statistics directors and staff are to be complimented.

More limited progress was noted in the economics component of the project, as some studies were carried out in collaboration with other donors and agencies. However, efforts in the project-specific outputs are just now getting underway. To some degree the more limited accomplishments are the result of a lack of priority within DEP and the Division of Studies to actually conduct analysis and studies.

Management issues emerge in almost all elements of the project. Priorities within the project documentation do not seem to be the same as priorities conceptualized by the various implementing elements, i.e., USAID, DEP, Division of Studies, Division of Statistics, and the technical assistance team. Management difficulties have most seriously hampered progress in achieving the economics objectives.

Major Recommendations:

1. Strengthen project management; more coordination and interaction among the DEP directorate, division heads, the TA team, and USAID is necessary. The director of the project should be more active in project management and planning. A project implementation committee to facilitate management and planning is recommended. Project priorities and objectives should be regularly and explicitly reviewed, discussed, and amended if necessary.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

2 Increase emphasis on accomplishing the economic analysis objectives. Clear evidence of DEP's committment to these goals would be manifested by the statement of a clear priority for and directing resources toward conducting an agricultural sector review and in-house studies. The management and planning implementation steps that need to be taken include freeing up Division of Studies' staff to devote substantially more time on these activities, allocating necessary budget amounts, careful monitoring of progress and willingness to remedy problems.

3. Extend the current project until December 1988 in order to provide assistance to both Divisions of DEP to achieve the stated project goals. Additional time will enable DEP to manifest its committment to economic analysis through the completion of an agricultural sector review and selected other studies by the Division of Studies. Even though significant progress has been made in statistics, much remains to be done, such as: tabulation of the 1985, 1986, and 1987 annual surveys, objective yield research, and development of a data processing management system.

4. In the event that USAID decides to continue to support data collection, economic analysis, and agricultural sector planning in DEP following the 1988 PACD, it is recommended that a new project be designed rather than extending the current one. This will permit a restatement of project and DEP priorities, a restructuring of project management, and a respecification of investment issues.

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION

A. Brief History of the Project

The Agricultural Management and Planning Project (AMP) was designed to "institutionalize a sector planning and statistical capacity within the Ministry of Agriculture's (MINAGRI) Directorate of Studies and Projects" (DEP). USAID's assistance in Agricultural statistics and sector analysis was coupled with IBRD assistance in project planning and implementation. The combined AID/IBRD investments were intended to create a linked set of functions within the Directorate of Studies and Projects (DEP).

Since the inception of the project in 1979 USAID has invested approximately $9 million, while the Government of the Republic of Cameroon (GRC) has invested an equal amount. AID's investment concentrated mainly on building capacity to generate agricultural statistics and, to a lesser extent, on sector analysis and planning capacities. An estimated 90 percent of USAID and GRC counterpart investment has been devoted toward improving statistics operations.

The first project evaluation (January 1982) found that progress had been made in statistics, but that development in economics was slower for three reasons: 1) the greater priority and support given to the statistics; 2) organizational difficulties and lack of trained personnel made it difficult to direct major economic studies; and 3) reliable agricultural sector data on which to base economic analysis did not exist. That evaluation recommended delaying the agricultural sector review until after the national agricultural census was completed. A project paper (PP) amendment was authorized on June 2, 1981 to increase the authorized life of project funding to $4.2 million.

The second project evaluation (Jan-Feb 1984) found that substantial progress had been achieved, especially in the statistics component. The basic elements for conducting the 1984 agricultural census and the subsequent annual surveys were considered to be proceeding well despite some problems and delays in recruiting for the senior U. S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) statistician, staff vacancies within the Division of Statistics (DS), and decisions concerning the 1984 Agricultural Census. The evaluation recommended strengthening data processing capabilities to ensure tabulation and presentation of census data on a timely basis. The evaluation noted that several useful economic studies had been completed and progress had been made in staffing the Division of Studies (DE). The evaluation supported delaying the sector review until agricultural census data was available and recommended that the project be extended to June 30, 1987 so that data collection/processing could be completed, the annual survey program initiated, a series of subsector and special studies conducted, and the sector review readied for use in the preparation of the GRC's Sixth Five-year Plan.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

The project was amended on August 21, 1984 extending the Project Assistance Completion Date (PACD) to June 30, 1987, and adding funding of $4.6 million making the authorized life of project funding $8.8 million. The mission prepared a PP amendment which revised the project description and respecified some project outputs. The PP Amendment stressed the importance of improving the sector analysis/planning capacity within DEP, but did not substantially change the project's investment patterns. Additional funds were provided for long-term participant training and an agricultural extension planner was added to the USDA team to assist in preparation for the design of a national extension project.

B. Purpose and Scope of the Evaluation

The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the continuing validity and relevance of the project, to determine whether project amendments have brought about the desired results, to suggest modifications or future actions for achieving project goals, and to make recommendations regarding a second phase of the project. This evaluation was called for in the Project Paper Amendment and Project Agreement (ProAg) Amendment No. 5.

— The evaluation focusses on those DEP divisions and activities where AID has provided Technical Assistance (TA). The evaluation does not cover the "project" functions of DEP; neither project preparation within the Division of Studies (DE) nor project evaluation and monitoring within the Division of Project Management (DP) were closely examined. The scope of the evaluation also includes management issues which relate to directing and supervising the divisions examined. Improving the management of DEP was not an explicit objective of the project as originally designed or as modified. Specific scopes of work as prepared by USAID/Cameroon are set forth in Annex 1.

C. Evaluation Methodologies

The evaluation team reviewed project documents, conducted interviews, and made on-site visits, covering the period February 15 to March 20, 1987. (See Annex 2: Persons Contacted; and Annex 3: Documents Consulted) Intensive reviews were made of project files and published reports. The team held meetings with officials from DEP, USAID, FAO, and other agencies. The Project Paper Ammendment and Project Agreement Amendment No. 5 were used to set parameters regarding objectives, purposes, outputs, work priorities, and timeframes.

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

The draft evaluation report was prepared by the contract and REDSO evaluators. It was then reviewed by the entire evaluation team, PASA team members, DEP, and USAID officials. Meetings were then held to review the draft report with USAID and DEP officials. Their responses were considered in preparing the final draft of the evaluation report which was submitted directly to the ARDO in USAID/Cameroon.

Three members of the evaluation team were provided by Abt Associates Inc., under AID contract number DAN-4084-C-00-3087-99. These members are individually identified in the following section.

D. Composition of the Evaluation Team

The following individuals composed the evaluation team:

Mr. C. John Pliginger	Agricultural Economist/Statistician and Team Leader (Abt Contractor)
Dr. Lyle Calvin	Senior Statistician; Dean of Graduate School and Professor of Statistics, Oregon State University (Abt Contractor).
Mr. Pierre Nkoulou	Associate Director, Projects and Programs, MINPI
Dr. Larry Herman	Planning Economist; MacArthur Ass't Professor of Political Economy, Kenyon College (Abt Contractor)
Mr. Murl Baker	Chief PDO, REDSO/WCA
Mr. Marcel Ngue	Assistant Project Officer, USAID

Serving primarily as resurce persons were the following:

Mr. Pierre Kouang,	Chief of the Division of Statistics, DEP, MINAGRI.
Dr. Ngenge Wawa Anthony,	Chief of the Division of Studies, DEP, MINAGRI.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

III. PROJECT GOAL AND PURPOSE.

The original project goal and purpose were unchanged in the PP and ProAg amendments and remain as follows:

> The goal of the project is to improve Cameroon's ability to execute agricultural and rural development projects which benefit the poor.
>
> The purpose of the project is to strengthen the capability of the agricultural economics and planning unit within the Ministry of Agriculture to plan, design, implement, and evaluate agricultural and rural development projects.

The amendments also included the following statement following purpose:

> A basic objective of the project is to strengthen the economic planning capacitiy of the Department of Studies and Projects (DEP) within the Ministry of Agriculture.

Current project activities are primarily directed towards this basic objective and are still considered to be valid.

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

IV. PROJECT INPUTS.

A. USAID.

1. Technical Assistance

The USAID/USDA Participating Agency Service Agreement (PASA) provides technical assistance advisors to the project through the Office of International Cooperation and Development (OICD). The project amendment calls for a Senior Agricultural Economist, a Senior Statistician (sampling), a Survey Statistician/Agricultural Economist, a Data Processing Specialist, and an Agricultural Extension and Training Specialist. (See Table 1 for summary of Technical Assistance utilized.)

Timely staffing of the positions of Senior Economist, Survey Statistician/Economist and Extension Specialist provided continuity to the program. However, the data processing position was vacant for almost a year and a half (until Feburary 1986) and the position of senior statistician has been vacant for nearly two years (since May 1985). These staffing delays have had a significant impact on the project. One effect was the delayed development of the data base system for handling the census and annual surveys. A second effect was the necessity for the Survey Statistician/Economist to absorb statistical duties while carrying on his own responsibilities, thereby limiting the time he could devote to economic analysis and hampering his ability to interact with the senior economist. Technical assistance for data processing was primarily absorbed by the COP and statistician/economist during this period thereby reducing time for their economic responsibilities.

In general, TA provided to the Division of Statistics (DS) has been effectively used in transferring desired technologies and achieving project objectives. This may be attributed to the fact that DS has very clear unit priorities which are reflected in the division's management plans. As a result, the workplans, priorities, and responsibilities were fairly clear for the statisticians and data processing specialist. This was also generally true for the extension specialist. Such was not the case, however, for the agricultural economist working in the Division of Studies where clearer organizational plans and priorities would increase his effectiveness toward achieving the sector analysis and planning objectives of the project.

The more obscure responsibilities and priorities set for the Chief-of-Party (COP) renders his function especially difficult. As defined by the PASA Agreement, his responsibilities to other team members are administrative and non-supervisory. Yet the COP is viewed by both USAID and DEP management, as being responsible for overall project management, though these responsibilities are not commonly agreed upon. This illustrates how overall project management responsibilities need clarification.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

The project added an administrative officer in 1984. The intent of this addition was to reduce the amount of time devoted to administrative duties by the COP. This has resulted in about a 15% reduction in the amount of time devoted to administration by the COP. Approximately 50% of his time is still going to administrative duties. The evaluation team considers 10 to 15 percent to be the maximum time which should be devoted to team administration in view of the importance of his technical duties.

The project can make greater effectiveness of the substantial investment in technical assistance. At the overall project level, improved management and better defined work priorities are needed. Also, DEP institutional priorities, especially in regrards to the economic activities, should be more clearly articulated. These actions would provide more guidance and support to the individual team members in preparing workplans and implementing their activities.

While all the long term advisors fielded by USDA/OICD have the required qualifications, there has been little use of USDA/OICD's technical backstopping support for its team. Greater use of short-term technical assistance would have been useful in easing exceptionally heavy workloads, management training, implementation planning as well as supporting various technical operations of the project (ie. data processing and economic analysis and planning skills). As an institution, USDA/OICD is supposed to be unique in being able to access the range of statistical,economic and sector analysis and planning, training and developmnet management expertise which the project obviously needs especially on a short-term basis. The short-term assistance which has supported the data processing function was obtained on a Personal Services Contract rather than through OICD/USDA. To be effective, OICD backstopping must be more familiar with and active in the project, in order to develop linkages between the project and the institutional capabilities within USDA.

The evaluation team became cognizant of dissention within the team. Since this has not affected the professional performance of team members, the evaluation team did not deal with these problems. We believe however that USDA/OICD does have responsibility for being aware of and dealing with such issues.

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

13

TABLE 1: Summary of Resident Technical Assistance
(Person Months)

	Position	PP	ProAg	ProAg Am #5	Actual 1-31-87	Projected**
1.	Ag Economist/Planning	60	60	-	71	76
2.	Ag Economist/Marketing	60	48	-	42	42
3.	Senior Statistician	36	60	-	27	27
4.	Survey Statistician	60	48	-	75	80
5.	Data Processing	-	-	*	12	17
6.	Ag Extension	-	-	*	22	25
	Total Resident	216	216	+155	249	267

* Total Person-months of long term technical assistance was increased by 155 person-months in the fifth ProAg amendment which added the services of an agricultural extension specialist and a data processing specialist. This makes a total of 371 pm for the project.
** Projected to current PACD 6/30/87.

RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE:

a) That a senior statistician be recruited and assigned as rapidly as possible.

b) That USAID, DEP, USDA, and the COP jointly develop overall project management work plans.

c) That USAID, DEP, and the COP define the role of the COP for both administrative and economic duties.

d) That more use be made of short-term specialists to aid in sector analysis, planning, management, and in short courses and other training efforts.

e) That OICD have a more direct involvement in the project in order to better support the activities and technicians.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

14

2. Training

Long-Term Training- The original Project Agreement provided for 8 training positions. Subsequent amendments have increased that to a total of 13 graduate, 4 B.S. level, and 2 non-degree positions. Nineteen long term participants have departed Cameroon for training in the U.S.: two have completed non-degree programs and eight have completed M.S. programs. Four of the returned participants are currently assigned to the Division of Statistics, two to the Division of Studies, one is a representative of MINAGRI to FAO, and one to Semry. One participant is continuing a Ph.D. program under university sponsorship. The rest are in the U.S. continuing their programs and are scheduled to complete their degrees and return during 1987 and 1988. (See Annex 4 for listing of participants, programs, dates etc.)

All of the long term participants have been placed into U.S. universities by OICD/USDA. Project and DEP officials have expressed concern over placement of some of the participants. The technical assistance team does not feel that its recommendations are taken into account by OICD in placing participants. Another problem is that neither project advisors nor DEP staff receive participant progress reports on a regular and timely basis.

Short-Term Training--Nineteen participants have attended short courses and study observation tours in the U.S. These programs have also been arranged by OICD/USDA and have apparently been well organized. (See Annex 4 for a listing of short term participants.)

In-Country Training--A number of in-country training courses were held by the DEP staff, the advisors and outside specialists. Eleven six-day training schools were held for field enumenators, and thirty six seminars were held for supervisory level field staff.

A seminar was presented in October 1985 for directors of regional colleges and technical schools of agriculture. This seminar treated alternatives for improving the educational activities of these institutions. A seminar was held in May 1985 for the DEP staff on agricultural census results. A national seminar on extension has been held and another national seminar on Improvement of Agricultural Cooperatives is currently being planned.

The importance of on-the-job types of training was clearly noted in project documents. Within the project itself, the Survey and Data Collection section unquestionalbly shows the effectiveness of regular in-service training. There is a continuing need for greater amounts of this type of training to develop the skills of DEP personnel in data processing, statistical analysis, economic and sector analysis, and planning.

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING TRAINING:

a) Recognizing the difficulty placing foriegn students in U.S. Universities, we suggest that OICD make a better effort to place students in the best possible programs, and that more consideration be given to TA team recommendations.

b) Progress reports are important to both project personnel and host country officials and should be submitted on a regular and timely basis.

c) Greater USDA/OICD involvement is assessing training needs and in the planning and preparation of training programs would increase the effectiveness of the training component.

d Place more emphasis on economic training than has been given under this project.

3. Commodities

USAID retains responsibility for all project commodity procurement with the exception of a petty cash advance given to the USDA chief-of-party. This rolling advance is limited to $2,300 and essentially is intended to cover replenishing expendible office supplies and vehicle operating costs. (See PIO/C Status Report contained in Annex 5.)

Generally all commodities are appropriate and USAID is to be commended for shifting from the procurement of US manufactured vehicles to foreign made vehicles which can be maintained and repaired in country by commercial garages. No specific data for comparison exist, but the evaluation team was told by project staff, that down time and maintenance costs have been reduced by as much as 50% or more.

The project agreement contains a covenant whereby DEP agreed to provide quarterly vehicle use and condition reports for AID-financed vehicles. The evaluation team has reviewed the files and finds very inconsistent reporting. The reports are apparently submitted on a random basis with a variation of from as few as 3-4 cars to as many as 105 per report. Most are condition reports of down vehicles and do not include those which are running or how they are being used. In general there is no regular, coherent nor complete reporting of use and condition.

A second covenant requires the Host Country to make AID financed vehicles fully available for annual agricultural surveys. Although no specific information exists on this condition, everyone seems to be in agreement that this covenant is being met.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Two problem areas were noted by the evaluation team regarding project procurement. First is the problem of lags between procurement requests and deliveries. These lags varied from one and a half months t two years, with the bulk falling between 6 and 10 months. The second problem is disagreement over commodity lists, specifications, and the frequency of procurement requests.

On occasion, procurement delays affected implementation. Vehicles have not always been available and in good operational condition when needed for survey and census field work. Software and French user's manuals have not been available when needed for training. Data processing operations have been carried out for more than a year without the security of an adequate uninteruptable power supply.

Waiver authority has been used judiciously. The major use of waiver authority has been in relation to the procurement of non-U.S. manufactured vehicles and computer equipment, justified on the basis of lack of maintenance and repair facilities for U.S. source/origin commodities. The evaluation team fully supports the use of this waiver authority for vehicles but suggests that further investigation for computers be conducted. Local procurement does not seem to solve maintenance problems and local costs run three to four times U.S. costs for comparable computer equipment.

Given the unavoidable lead times associated with procurement, it is evident that the procurement planning process is not giving USAID adequate advance notice of upcoming needs. An annual budget is prepared for the project and submitted by DEP to USAID (see Annex 6 for the December 1986 Budget). This budget serves as Host Country approval on purchases, but memos are required from project officials requesting the initiation of procurement actions (PIOs). These requests tend to be identified during the preparation of quarterly work plans or on an irregular basis. Shifting commodity procurement responsibilities to USDA also would probably not substantially reduce the required lead time because a) USDA follows similar procurement regulations and guidelines and b) USDA has no specialized procurement expertise available in-country. Shifting to a greater use of host-country procurement theoretically could reduce some of the required procurement lead time but a substantial investment in upgrading the HC procurement capacity would be required.

In the short term, procurement delays can be mitigated by a) longer term implementation planning and earlier identification of procurement needs by the USDA team and host-country project officials; and b) increasing the staff carrying out procurement responsibilities within USAID.

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING COMMODITIES:

a) Realizing the difficulty in speeding up the procurement procedures, it is recommended that every avenue be explored for quicker delivery of items requested

b) That a means of purchasing small items be devised so that technicians can make purchases of limited items directly.

c) Earlier and more comprehensive long-term planning for needed commodities would assist the process.

d) The number of commodity requests should be limited to as few as possible so that small lots do not clutter the procurement system.

e) Simplify and standardize the vehicle use and condition reporting system and to making reports every six months rather than quarterly.

B. Government of Cameroon

1. Personnel:

Levels of staffing have been increased in both divisions since the 1984 evaluation, the overall level of trained personnel has increased as a result of appointing higher trained staff and the returning of participants from training in the U.S. (Table 2)

The Division of Statistics seems to be adequately staffed to carry out most of its current functions and in fact the total number of employees seems to be stabilizing at current levels. Additional training and staff will be needed to compensate for attrition and the addition of new functions, as well as for general upgrading of staff.

The Division of Studies appears to be understaffed in relation to its duties. The large amount of "firefighting", (speechwriting, attending meetings, responding to letters etc.) seems to preclude time for economic analysis.

RECOMMENDATION REGARDING LOCAL PERSONNEL:

That efforts to increase, upgrade, and train staff continue in both Divisions.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Table 2: DEP STAFF 1984, 1987
(DIVISION OF STUDIES & DIVISION OF STATISTICS)

	1984	1987
1. Division of Statistics		
a. Central Office		
Statisticians	2	3
Data Processing specialist	1	1
Ingenieur Agronome	4	3
Ing. des Travaux Agri.	4	4
Licence in Economy	-	3
Ag. Technician	2	3
Bachelor in Agriculture	-	1
Others		
- Data entry agents	6	5
- Coders	8	7
- Secretaries	4	4
- Drivers	3	3
- Others	5	5
b. Field		
Provincial Chiefs	7	10
Assistant Prov. Chief	7	20
Dept. Chiefs of Section	44	49
Dept. Chiefs of Depts	15	49
Enumerators permanent	155	170
Enumerators Temp.	108	
2. Division of Studies		
Ingenieur Agronome	6	15
Economists	1	5
Food Technicians	2	2
Soil Scientist	1	1
Other	1	4

Source: DE and DS

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

2. Office Space:

Division of Studies: Space provided for the Division of Studies has been upgraded considerably since the last evaluation. It appears to be both ample and adequate for the existing staffing levels. However, location of the office isolates techicians from the other Divisions of DEP, and the lack of telephones hamper communication even more.

Division of Statistics: Space provided for the Division of Statistics is neither ample nor appropriate. Offices are generally cramped and dirty, and in some cases without air conditioning. Storage for questionnaires, computer printouts, publications, etc. is inadequate and contributes to loss of documents and lack of security for basic forms. This will become more critical as surveys continue to generate more records. The environment is harmful both to the operation of the computers and to staff performance.

A recent addtion of office space, temporarily financed by USAID, helps to some degree but does not adequately satisfy the requirements of the Division. Recent acquisition of a telephone helps overcome some of the communication problems, but does not completely overcome the problems of also being separated from other Divisions of DEP.

RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING OFFICE SPACE:

a. That offices be obtained for the Statistics Division which offer a) adequate secure storage space for records, (b) a dust free environment for computers, and (c) sufficient facilities for staff.

b For the longer term, efforts should be made to house all DEP divisions in one location to promote staff interaction, ease access to documents and data, and facilitate management.

C. Financial Analysis

This section contains a general overview of the financial status of the project and is not intended to portray a line by line fiscal audit.

1. USAID

A total of $8,800,000 has been obligated to the project by USAID as of February 26, 1986, through project agreement amendments. Allocations and status of these funds are as shown in Table 3.

An approved budget (Annex 6) indicates that adequate funds remain to carry the project to the current PACD. The evaluation team understands that USAID is in the process of extending the PACD to December 1988 and

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

adding $900,000 to the project and is in full agreement with this decision. This funding appears to be adequate to cover project costs for that period.

In general no difficulties were identified by the evaluation concerning either adequacy or timeliness of USAID contributions.

Table 3
SUMMARY STATUS REPORT
PROJECT NO. 631-0008
AGRICULTURAL MANAGEMENT AND PLANNING
AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 1986
($ 000)

	BUDGET	COMMITTED	DISBURSED	ACCRUALS	PIPELINE
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	4,482	3,866	2,640	-	1,226
TRAINING	1,194	1,072	785	-	287
COMMODITIES	2,144	1,787	1,607	-	180
OTHER COSTS	487	286	234	-	52
CONTINGENCY	264	-	-	11	(11)
INFLATION	229	-	-	-	-
SUBTOTAL	8,800	7,011	5,266	11	1,734
EARMARKED		5	-	-	5
UNEARMARKED		1,784	-		1,784
PROJECT TOTAL	8,800	8,800	5,266	11	3,523

Source: USAID Cameroon

2. Government of Cameroon

The evaluation team was unable to obtain GRC budget figures for either personnel or space. Therefore the only financial information covered by this evaluation are the operational budgets for the Divisions of Statistics and Studies.

The combined budgets of the divisions of Studies and Statistics, shown in Table 4, amount to a total of FCFA 3,167,000, compared to the FCFA 3,082,400 commitment in the ProAg No. 5. However, these figures do not accurately reflect the level of the GRC contribution to the project or its allocation among divisions. First, these lines do not include salaries, office space, or utilities. Second, some activities in one division may be financed out of the budget of another division. Third, because the Division of Studies includes sections that are not directly involved in the project (Project Preparation) and supports studies outside of economics (get example from Rod), it is difficult to determine how much of its budget should be considered part of GRC's contribution to the project.

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

21

During the 1979/80 to 1986/87 period a total of FCFA 900,000,000 was contributed to the Division of Statistics through the "counterpart" budget, an additional FCFA 1,056,000 was contributed for the 1984 ~~Agricultural Census~~. Census funding helped finance the building of the sampling frame, sample design materials as well as, cost of conducting the census. The statistics "counterpart" budget was increased after the census in order to maintain the annual surveys and the costs for data processing and publishing. Although still called the "counterpart" budget, it can be anticipated that funding will continue even after the project itself terminates.

The Division of Statistics has purchased or is in the process of purchasing 20 all-terrain field vehicles, the exact quantity called for in Amendment. Two additional vehicles were purchased for central office use. Additional purchases of copiers, office equipment, survey materials, etc have also been made. The Division has generally provided for office equipment and supplies. Shortages of shelf and filing space for storing questionnaires, computer print-outs etc. were noted by the evaluation team for the Division of Statistics.

The Division of Studies budget which is not considered "counterpart" and is related primarily to specific projects rather than to in-house studies, has more fluctuation and for the 1986/87 year is zero. Even considering the caveats noted above, we believe that this reflects the lower priority given to economic analysis. The division appears to have less budget for equipment and supplies than does the Division of Statistics but seems to be minimally equipped to carry out its functions.

The ability to absorb recurrent costs seem to be adequate at present. In all probability the willingness to absorb these costs in the future will depend on the success of the project and the divisions in generating adequate and reliable statistics and sound economic analysis.

RECOMMENDATION REGARDING HOST-COUNTRY BUDGET:

That DEP budget allocations for activities identified by the project be explicitly identified in the budgets of the divisions of Statistics and Studies.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

TABLE 4

GRC CONTRIBUTION (79/80 - 98/87)

(MILLION FCFA)

1. Budget	79/80	80/81	81/82	82/83	83/84	84/85	85/86	86/87	Total
Division of Studies*	50	30	50	110	82	300	490	0	1112
Division of Statistics (Counterpart)	50	50	50	60	86	104	297	300	997
2. Census of Agriculture Division of Statistics					415	419	124	100	1058
	100	80	100	170	583	823	911	400	3167

Source:DEP Directorate

*The evaluation team was unable to determine which portion of the budget was in fact used for AMP activities.

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

V PROJECT OUTPUTS

The project documentation specified benchmark accomplishments which were expected to demonstrate that the purpose of the project was being achieved. These benchmarks or outputs were expected to be consistent with long-term projected institutional outputs of the divisions of Statistics and Studies (Annual Agricultural Surveys, Agricultural Sector Review, etc). The expected project outputs have been grouped according to the division that has primary responsibility for its production. The outputs of the project were modified by the Project Paper Amendment authorized in August 1985 and the Project Agreement Amendment #5. These changes identified rather specific outputs for both elements of the project, and especially on statistics. The economic analysis outputs were less specific although the project activities sections identified certain studies to be undertaken during the life of the project.

The sections which follow examine the institutional context for producing the desired outputs and the progress being made in respect to those outputs; review whether the specified outputs continue to be valid indicators of the project purpose or objective; and, review the quantity and quality of inputs used by the project to produce those outputs. A final section examines the management process that was used to guide the project, allocate resources, and monitor progress toward developing the analytical, planning, and statistical capacities which were identified as the project's ultimate objective, and toward achieving the specific outputs which were identified as more proximate goals.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

VI. ECONOMIC ANALYSIS AND SECTOR PLANNING

The economic objectives of the project are to develop the capacity in the Division of Studies (DE) to undertake economic analysis and planning for the agricultural sector. This capacity was to be evidenced by 1) subsector studies, 2) special studies, 3) an agricultural sector review, and 4) trained staff. No specific planning or project preparation activities (with the particular exception of the extension project) were were explicitly called for in project documents, though DE is responsible for both.

A. Organization and Functions of The Division of Studies

The three main responsibilities assigned to DE are:

- To conduct technical and economic studies of the agricultural sector.
- Planning of the agricultural sector.
- To prepare investment projects for the agricultural sector.

The division is divided into four sections (cellules) which carry out the identified functional responsibilities of the DE: Planning (CP), Studies (CE), Project Preparation (CPP), and Documentation (CD). This organization is intended to facilitate an effective division of responsibility, specialization, and expertise. However, this internal structure has no legal status, sections do not have separate budgets, and staffers are not permanantly assigned to sections. Each section works under the supervision of a chief who reports to the director of DE.

The intended operation of the division is explained in "Note de Presentation de la Division des Etudes", an unofficial document of the DE. That document recognizes the integrated and interactive nature of the following tasks undertaken by the DE:

	Activity	Responsible Section
I.	Sectoral and Analytical (Special) Studies	Studies Section
II.	Review of Existing Studies	Planning Section
III.	Agricultural Policy Formulation	
	1. Preparation of the Five-Year Plan	Planning Section
	2. Identification of Specific Interventions	Studies Section
IV.	Post-Planning Activities	
	1. Annual Programming of the Plan	Planning Section
	2. Monitoring of Plan execution	Planning Section
	3. Review of Plan performance	Planning Section
	4. New project preparation	Project Preparation Section

In principle the planning section uses information provided by the studies section as well as by the other divisions within DEP (DS and DP). Identification of sub-sectoral and special studies takes place through the collaboration of the planning and studies sections. Less

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

interaction is expected from the project preparation section, whose role is more narrowly defined to include project identification, feasibility studies, evaluation studies, and pre-implementation studies.

In addition to these analytical and planning functions, division staff have many other responsibilities including monitoring official dossiers (relationships with donors, international organizations), responding to correspondence for the ministry, attending meetings and writing up reports on those meetings, summarizing reports received, and other administrative activities. Interviews with the staffs of the CE and CP suggest that at least fifty percent of their time is devoted to administrative tasks. No personnel in the studies or planning sections are exempt from these responsibilities. In fact, some personnel may attract even more of this burden because of their effectiveness.

The AMP project has most direct impact on the activities of the Studies Section. Technical assistance has also been directed toward the preparation of the Sixth Five-Year Plan, which, though a planning section activity, involved the participation of most DE personnel. The studies section is given the responsibility of producing basic sector analysis with the goals of better understanding the functioning of the sector; identifying constraints to sectoral development and proposing solutions; and forcasting future trends and needs. To this end the section produces terms of reference for studies that are to be carried out in house or contracted out, participates in evaluation meetings for studies carried out elsewhere, and evaluates other studies that are relevant to the agricultural sector.

While the planning section has direct responsibility for contributing the agricultural sector component to the five-year plans and for monitoring annual progress in meeting plan targets, it also has responsibility for producing "etudes de synthese". These reviews are supposed to be syntheses of existing information about sub-sectors or particular issues, providing original analysis of the information which goes into them. They are similar to what is intended for sub-sector and special studies under the AMP. This suggests that studies carried out by the Studies Section have a more focussed, or at least different, intention. For the moment any confusion of responsibility that this might cause is strictly conjectural since no etudes de sythese have been produced yet.

The role of the Planning section in preparing the agricultural sector component of the five-year plan is quite well defined, and includes 1) evaluating the accomplishments during the previous plan, 2) reviewing the needs of the sector, 3) defining future sector strategies, 4) establishing quantifiable objectives, 5) reconciling the regional components of the plan with the national objectives, 6) computing financing needs, and 7) submitting the plan to the Ministry of Plan for approval. Less well defined is the role in evaluating and proposing agricultural policy. A wide range of policy instruments are recognized (pricing policy, credit and interest rate policy, input subsidies, etc.) but so too is the fact that some of these are not directly controled by

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

the Ministry of Agriculture. And though staff members may be given policy-oriented portfolios to monitor, there is no clearly established mechanism for effectively formulating and transmitting specific policy recommendations.

The planning section's technical activities following the presentation of the a five-year plan involve programming and monitoring. The annual programs of parastatals and operational projects are reviewed and summarized. In principle, these aggregates are compared to those projected in the five-year plan and to resource availability. Similarly, annual reports from parastatals and projects (with assistance from the Division of Project Management), and data from the statistics division are supposed to be used to measure actual performance of the agricultural sector against the plan's forecast. Finally, at the same time that a new plan is being formulated the overall performance of the previous plan is evaluated. As currently designed, the AMP project should support these planning functions through the studies and sector review which are to be produced. However, project documents do not identify these specific "planning" activities (preparation, programming, monitoring, and evaluating) as project outputs or activities.

B. Staffing of the Division of Studies

There are currently 27 permanent staff members in the division. Table 5 shows the staffing pattern by section and level of education. The project preparation section is the largest with 10 staff members, followed by studies and planning with 6 each, and the documentation center with 4.

Only the director of DE is trained at the Ph.D. level, though the chiefs of the studies and planning sections each have M.S. degrees in agricultural economics. Two members of the planning section have advanced degrees in economics (Maitrise). Other staff members have technical training in agricultural fields, most holding degrees as Ingenieur Agronome, though few have specialized training in agricultural economics.

Only four staff members have had supplemental training specific to their assignments in DE. Two members of the CPP have training in project preparation and evaluation (ISTA, Libreville), another in financial analysis, and one member of the planning section has attended a USDA six-week program in agricultural credit.

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

Table 5
Staffing: Division of Studies

Highest Degree	Studies	Planning	Project Preparation	Documentation
Ph.D., Ag. Econ.			Director	
M.S. Ag. Econ	1	1	-	-
Maitrise, Econ.	-	2	-	-
M.S. Soil Science	-	-	1	-
B.S.(food science)	2	-	-	-
Ingenieur Agronome	3	1	8	2
Ing. Trav. Agric.	-	2	-	1
Other Ingenieur	-	-	1	1
Total	6	6	10	4
Supplemental Training	0	1	3	0

C. Programming of Division of Studies and AMP Project Activities

The Division of Studies does not have a documented comprehensive plan of work that guides its long- and short-term activities. The explanation that was given was that written work plans tend to be disregarded because of the emphasis placed on responding to sudden requests, or "firefighting". It is acknowledged that projects form the priorities except when the sectoral plan is in preparation. In principle the division is supposed to have monthly meetings to set short-term and long-term priorities and assignments. The individual sections are also supposed to meet regularly for the same purpose. However, such meetings occur infrequently. New staffers who arrived in the fall claim that they have never attended division-wide programming meetings. The lack of a concrete work plans and schedules for the entire division greatly hampers progress in accomplishing the project objectives of increasing the amount of economic analysis conducted and used by DEP.

Within the Studies Section activities are better planned and organized, though there is little doubt that they could be better managed. Study agendas appear throughout the Progress Reports that have been submitted by the chief-of-party. A "Programme d'Action 1985/1986" was prepared and included a list of nine studies that were to serve as inputs into the Sixth Five-Year Plan. The studies section was also to initiate a limited series of commodity (crop) situation reports. In an effort to accomplish these long- and medium-range objectives the team working out of CE instituted a tracking system for studies and other activities of the section. This system assigns a priority level to the activity (studies underway, programmed for immediate initiation,

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

28

programmed for the following year, and not yet programmed), indicates the executing agency and section personnel responsible, and charts the progress of the activity with annotations. This system tends to be "backward looking", providing details on what has been done and few specifics about future activities.

Both long- and short-run programming of project activities could be dramatically improved. First, a comprehensive strategy toward accomplishing a sectoral review, a major project output, must be articulated. A written program for accomplishing this task should be prepared by DE. Staffers in the studies and planning sections should be made aware that a comprehensive sector review will be undertaken and they must understand the role the various studies will play in that review.

Second, the sub-sector and special studies that are planned should be part of a systematic treatment of the Cameroonian agricultural sector. The studies that have been done and which are planned appear to be a rather ad hoc collection, some essential to the sector review and others more marginal. Many of the implemented and proposed studies are ambitious though narrowly focussed. Given DE staffing and resources, and the lack of a comprehensive sectoral picture, a series of broad though modest studies that would make use of data generated by the 1984 agricultural sector census and subsequent annual surveys is much preferable. Some of the current studies appear to be more oriented toward identifying specific project ideas than toward providing a broad understanding of the sector, identifying major constraints to agricultural development, and establishing priorities for policy and planning. What is missing is the systematic element that ought to guide the sector review and its component parts.

Short-term programming of activities can also be strengthened. Though the tracking system for studies indicates what work has been done, it fails to define and schedule future action in specific terms. In most cases section personnel could not use these to plan their own contributions to specific studies except under intense supervision. More direction needs to be given to indicate the immediate steps that need to be taken, the resources that are needed, data requirements, the analytical methodologies that are to be used, the schedule to be followed, and how the output (terms of reference, final report) is to be used.

A better effort is required to allocate staff resources to accomplish the objectives of the project. Despite the increased staff size in the division, little effort has been made to free even a small number of staffers from their time-consuming administrative tasks. Even the Technical Assistant is greatly constrained by both the administrative burdens of being COP and those imposed upon him by DEP management. The project economist should be able to serve as a role model for DE personnel by spending the vast majority of his time on economic analysis and planning activities that use his technical skills and enable him to transfer those skills to local staff. Unfortunately, the present situation conveys the impression that priority is given to administrative tasks.

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

D. Technical Assistance in Economics

The actual amount of technical assistance that has been directed toward accomplishing the economic objectives of the project has been les than needed. There are five main reasons for this. First, only one tea member, the agricultural economist/sector planner, has direct responsibility for pursuing the economic objectives. Second, his COP responsibilities diminish the attention he can devote to his main technical functions. Third, the agricultural economist tends to be give administrative responsibilities within the Division of Studies which dilutes his ability to advise and guide other staff members in technical or substantive matters. Fourth, the role envisioned for the statisticia in collaborating with Division of Studies personnel to produce the sub-sector and special studies has not been realized. This is because the technical assistance team working on statistics has always been incomplete and because of the physical separation of the two divisions. Fift. the short-term TA available under the project to be used for carry ng out the sector review and its component studies has not be utili ed.

Despite these constraints the technical assistance to the Division of Studies has had an overall positive impact. As described below, a numbe of project objectives have been achieved under the guidance of the agricultural economist. Both he and the extension specialist have developed good rapport with DE personnel. The simple physical presence of two project advisors at DE and in the Studies Section underscores the importance USAID and the team attach to economic analysis. In sum, the technical assistance rendered in DE up to now has gone a long way toward establishing the foundations for accomplishing solid economic analysis with the goal of improving sectoral planning.

E. Sub-Sector Studies and Special Studies

Though the ultimate economic goals of the AMP project are to build institutional capacity to do economic analysis, the proximate indicators were the set of studies leading to a sectoral review. The progress made toward accomplishing those objectives is summarized in Annex 7.

A series of sub-sector and special studies were supposed to have been conducted in 1985 in order to provide inputs into the sector review in early 1986. Suggested studies included: 1) the structure of traditional agriculture in Cameroon; 2) the structure of commercial agriculture in Cameroon; 3) an evaluation of the impact of different input factors such as fertilizer, labor, planting methods, on total and average crop production levels; 4)an analysis of farm prices received over time; 5) the development of producer level price indexes; 6) analyses of gross farm incomes received over time; and possibly 7) analyses of costs of production.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Though a number of studies on the Cameroonian agricultural sector have been produced, neither the distinction between sub-sector and special studies nor the level of DEP participation in these studies have always been made clear. Project Progress Reports list the following as "sector studies": Coffee, cocoa, Food sector, livestock, and "other crops". Of these, only the livestock report has been completed though it has not been published. (In fact, the livestock study was an analysis of census data produced by the statistician/ag. economist without any DE collaboration). The 1985-1986 "Programme d'Action" for the Studies Section lists nine "major" studies, which are presumed to be special studies.

Three special studies have been completed by outside experts: the National Food Marketing Study prepared by GFS-MIDAS for the Ministry of Commerce; the Coffee/Cocoa Regeneration Study prepared by SEDA for DEP; and the Rural Finance Study prepared by GTZ for the IBRD. All three were initiated by terms of reference produced by DE personnel and should be quite useful as inputs into sub-sector studies and the sector review.

Three other studies are either underway or beyond the initiating stage: terms of reference have been prepared for a set of studies on cooperatives is planned for the National Seminar on Cooperatives later this year; the post-harvest protection study should be financed soon; and DEP has requested 55 million CFA to fund the agricultural labor study. A variety of other studies are at relatively early stages.

Clearly the DE has made progress in producing information that will ultimately be useful in comprehensive sectoral planning. Still, there are several areas in which improvement can be expected immediately. First, the DE should collaborate with the DS to conduct baseline analyses of the major sub-sectors, a task that should be possible using census and annual survey data. Relatively brief and generally descriptive first-efforts would be worthwhile exercises for the staff and provide useful information for the sector review. Second, the division needs an overall plan of how special studies will fit into the sub-sector studies or sector review. The absence of an explicit strategy has made it difficult to set priorities for the component studies.

Thirdly, the special studies should have broad analytical focus so as to identify more specific issues which can later be analyzed in more detail. The project preparation section can then translate into specific project ideas. The national food marketing study and the agricultural labor studies are good examples of broadly focussed studies which should generate much good information for use in sector reviews, many good ideas for further research, and investment projects.

Fourthly, the DE needs to begin to utilize the data being generated by the DS. These data should lend themselves to both descriptive and economic analysis that would be useful and also serve as a valuable training exercise in quantitative and analytical methods for DE

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

personnel. Finally, DE should begin to conduct studies in-house. Both the division chief and team economist support this, but they have yet to undertake even a modest effort. The staff would benefit greatly from participation in a "model" study, conducted as a training exercise. Though the division currently has limited capacity to undertake large-scale studies, the on-the-job training, managerial discipline, and institutional sense of accomplishment that would result would indicate that even a modest research project of this nature should be attempted soon.

F. Managing Outside Studies

Currently most of DE's study-related efforts have been directed toward managing studies conducted by outside agencies. The process of identifying and specifying studies is embodied in the writing of Terms of Reference (TORs). This orientation toward the "contracting out" of studies was never explicitly recognized in project documents which, by their vagueness on the subject, tended to imply that most of DE's studies would be conducted by the division itself.

The evaluation team believes that as currently constituted, DE will undoubtedly have to continue to "manage" a portion of its studies portfolio as by engaging contractors to conduct them. If effectively monitored, this approach will make efficient use of DE's and DEP's scarce resources, most notably trained staff. Still, three caveats must be raised: First, to be better able to write TORs and to effectively manage outside studies, division staff must understand what constitutes good economic and sectoral analysis. This underscores the importance of DE staff undertaking some studies themselves, as noted above. Second, wherever possible, DE personnel should be actively involved in all aspects of studies conducted outside. Currently, some DE personnel participate in fieldwork for outside studies, though even then other responsibilities at DE tend to limit the amount of their participation. Third, the writing of TORs should be seen as a means to an end and not an end in itself, developing the capacity to effectively manage outside studies, including specification, participation, and review, should be incorporated as a project objective. Finally and intrinsic in the three points already raised, DE should explicitly establish the goal of conducting as many of the studies themselves as possible. Developing this capacity should remain the ultimate goal of the AMP project on the economics side.

G. Agricultural Sector Review

It was intended that the sector review be conducted prior to the preparation of the Sixth Plan, using data collected and processed by the statistics division. It was to incorporate the results of sub-sector and special studies and be carried out by the staff of DEP with assistance from the TA team (Chief-of-Party and statistician/agricultural economist) and several short-term consultants. The results were to be used to

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

identify the major constraints to agricultural development and to establish priorities, in other words, as a major instrument for systematic sectoral planning. The PP Amendment suggested that the review cover the following: a) geographic and natural resource profile; b) evaluation of the agricultural sector in relation to other sectors; c) production information by farm size, crops, livestock, and factors of production; d) evaluation of the agricultural marketing system; and e) an evaluation of the historical performance of the public sector in agricultural development. There was no indication that the sector review would require any external funding (beyond the AMP Project) nor that it would require the participation of other Cameroonian or international agencies.

The sector review has yet to be done. Neither has DEP prepared a formal proposition for producing one. Nonetheless, both the PASA and evaluation teams continue to believe that this activity would be a useful, if not essential exercise for DE personnel to participate in. It is understood that the division of studies will be involved in the preparation of a comprehensive sectoral review this year. Some field work for this review has been completed and additional field work is planned for FY 87, with draft and final reports to be prepared by mid 1988. The review will draw on some of the studies mentioned below for a background section, supplemented by additional, though limited, field work. The main focus of the review will be smaller scale commercially oriented farmers. It will address questions of farmer responsiveness, input use and productivity, and the appropriateness of technological innovations. The review will also look at existing policies and strategies, concentrating on pricing, investments, input supply, and marketing, concluding with an analysis of Cameroonian agricultural sector policy.

There can be no question that DEP personnel will benefit immensely from this activity. Every effort should be made to free up selected staff members for full-time participation and to include all members of the planning and studies sections in some part of the review. The failure to produce a sector review in time to be used for the preparation of the Sixth Plan in no way diminishes usefulness of this exercise, both for its direct use in policy and planning, and for the training experience it could provide for DE personnel. Since one of the goals of the project is for DEP to ultimately have the capacity to produce its own sector reviews on a regular basis, it is imperative to involve DE personnel in every phase of the activity, including the synthesizing analysis and final report writing, in the event that outside consultants or institutions are involved.

H. Sectoral Planning and Other Activities

Within the Division of Studies the majority of non-study activity which is directly or indirectly supported by the AMP project involved the preparation of the Sixth Five-Year Plan and "downstream" plan responsibilities. Some of these are included in Annex 7. Though DEP

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

places much emphasis on such activities (programming, monitoring, and evaluation of the plan) there is little evidence that much progress is being made to accomplish these tasks in a systematic and comprehensive fashion. Much of what passes as "programming" and "monitoring" seems to be little more than compilation of information appearing elsewhere, while "evaluation" measures performance against promises with little analytical effort. The IBRD currently has a project which provides technical assistance in these areas. It is recommended that the AMP project continue to focus its efforts on studies.

The Studies Section's proposal to begin a quarterly publication called the Cameroon Agricultural Review is an excellent one and deserves support. This publication will serve two important functions. First, it will be an effective way to disseminate information and analyses produced by DEP and to keep decision makers in the government, the private sector, and the international community abreast of current DEP activities. Second, the inclusion of original articles will be an incentive for the staff of the divisions of Studies and Statistics to produce short and medium-length analytical treatments of the agricultural sector. This could also stimulate more policy focus in the CE's work.

I. Links Within DEP

The Division of Studies is both a producer and consumer of information which is used within DEP. Functionally, the primary flow of information should be characterized as follows:

Generation of Data (DS)	Sector Analysis/Planning (DE)	Project Design/Monitoring (DE and DP)

Secondary flows (feedback, design input) are also important and suggest an interactive and dynamic relationship among the units responsible for these three main functions. Unfortunately, this model is imperfectly followed because existing links are weak and because the relationship between sectoral analysis/planning and project analysis/planning is clouded.

DE should be using data which are produced by the Division of Statistics and at the same time be providing input as to what data are needed. But links between DE and DS are weak. Almost no data from the census is being analyzed by DE. (Census data was used in preparing the Sixth Plan). Because the two divisions are physically separated there is little interaction between the staffs. High priority should be given to promoting greater contact, especially between DE personnel and the TA working out of DS. Specifically, the statistician/ag. economist should work with DE personnel to produce the required sub-sector studies.

In principle, DE should be conducting broad analyses of sub-sectors and special issues without specific project orientation, in order to identify problem areas. This information should then contribute to a formulation of a sectoral strategy (by the planning section) and to the

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

generation of specific project ideas (by the project preparation section). The fact of subsequent feedback (projects to be included in the plan, specific studies requested) should not overwhelm the independent sector analysis and planning functions of DE, which, if done well, will generate good project and policy ideas. The inclusion of the project preparation section in DE tends to tilt division activities toward projects and obscure the importance of broad sectoral analysis.

- In principle, the Division of Project Management (DP) takes over the monitoring of projects once DE (specifically the project preparation section) finishes its tasks and a project is implemented. DP should also provide information to DE and possibly to DS. Additionally, DP can ask DE to conduct specific studies. These links do not seem to be well established yet. Currently the AMP project has little direct activity in either CPP or DP. Except for participant training no direct activity is recommended until the project successfully strengthens DE's capacity to do broad sectoral analyses.

J. Links Outside of DEP

Currently, DEP's mandate excludes analysis of livestock issues. Given the increasing importance of mixed farming and the tendancy toward farming systems research, the separation of crop and livestock analysis will render planning and policy formulation less effective. Efforts should be taken to coordinate studies and the sector review with the livestock ministry.

DEP recognizes the need to establish links with the Institute for Agricultural Research (IRA), specific research projects such as NCRE, and other institutions which can be tapped for their research capabilities such as Dschang and the University of Yaounde. The Division of Studies has established a relationship with National Agricultural School whereby some students work out of DE while researching and writing thesis ("memoires"). Relationships with researchers (faculty, staff) at universities and other institutions could be strengthened by inviting these professionals to present and attend seminars at DE. Their expertise could also be used in specialized training courses or through collaboration on research projects and studies.

Specifically, DEP needs to 1) be aware of what research and information is available elsewhere; 2) determine how to best collect and use that information, (through DS or DE); 3) provide input to other research projects when there is a coincidence of focus; 4) avoid duplication of data collection and analysis; and 5) pursue collaborative efforts like the one with students from Dschang. However, as important as these links are, efforts to build institutional relationships should not take precedence over the main analytical and planning functions of DE.

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

K. Training for Economic Analysis and Sectoral Planning

As designed and amended the project was to provide nine scholarships for long-term training which could logically have been intended to strengthen analytical and planning capacity within the Division of Studies. The original project paper called for four scholarships for M.S. training in agricultural economics, with the fields specified as marketing, farm management/production economics, quantitative methods, and planning. Two other scholarships were to be offered in rural sociology and agronomy with a planning emphasis. The project extension added three more scholarships in agricultural economics, though the fields were not specified.

Two of the Cameroonians sent on long-term training under the AMP project are currently working in DE. Both earned M.S. degrees in agricultural economics. One heads up the CE and the other is head of the CP. Another project trainee also earned an M.S. in ag econ and currently works in the DP. Two others are scheduled to return to DE in 1988. Thus, by the PACD 4 of the 19 long-term training participants should be available for economic analysis and sectoral planning activities in the studies division.

At this point it is difficult to evaluate the appropriateness of the training in economics. The participants who have returned have not yet had much opportunity to make use of the analytical skills they learned. One of the returnees reports that he was sent (by USDA) to a university which did not offer a specialization in quantitative methods, the field he was supposed to have worked in. This points out one of the difficulties with the USDA placement of training-program participants. However, while it is certainly true that quantitative methods would be an desirable specialization for participants trained under the project, it is equally true that DE should be able to make good use of participants who receive solid analytical training in almost any field of agricultural or planning economics.

Off-shore short-term training has not been extensively utilized for DE personnel. Two current DE staff members have received such training; one attended a program on data systems for developing countries and the other participated in a USDA course on small farmer credit policy. The project has sponsored short-term training in other subjects that would be very useful for DE personnel (development management, agricultural/rural development planning, strategies for developing agricultural sector) but these other participants are either no longer at DEP or have been assigned to other divisions.

In-country training to support economic activities was to include: a) eight seminars to make public the results of recently completed studies--presumably the sub-sector and special studies--and involving staff from the ministries of Agriculture, Plan, and Livestock; b) semi-annual coordination seminars for staff of all divisions of DEP;

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

36

c) A technical review committee which was to meet every six months to review project progress and address problems; and d) two training sessions on statistical methods, presumably including material of use in doing quantitative economic analysis.

Local formal training in technical subjects has yet to be done, though team members have provided informal training (computer use, writing terms of reference, selected quantitative methods) to some DE personnel. The most effective type of on-the-job training, learning by doing, has been hampered by the lack of analysis taking place in DE.

There have yet to be any seminars presented by DE personnel on completed or on-going studies, though some are currently planned. DE staff members have participated in several presentations of study results conducted by executing agencies. Obviously, it remains valid that regular seminars, both in-house before studies are completed and for a wider audience once they are concluded, would be very useful training mechanisms and would also promote interaction within DE and with other divisions.

L. Other Issues

Office facilities for the Division of Studies are good, both in terms of space and arrangement. The location, near the university, presents several drawbacks, most notably the separation from the other divisions. As mentioned above, this is most detrimental with regard to establishing working relationships with DS. The location of the main DEP documentation center at DEP's direction has led to the creation of another documentation center at DE. The team has not been able to evaluate whether this arrangement is inefficient, but it would seem to be problematical. Clearly, to effectively conduct sectoral studies and manage planning, the division of studies needs access to both a comprehensive documentation center and reference library.

DE currently has four working micro-computers. For the moment these are adequate though needs will increase dramatically once DE begins to do more economic analysis and conducts more studies.

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

M. RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES:

1. Plan and execute a sector review. If done entirely by DE personnel, this exercise shouldn't be overly elaborate but rather, be constructed as a model for how such reviews will be done in the future. If done as part of a collaborative effort with other agencies, DE personnel must be intensively involved in every aspect of the exercise, from design to field work, and from analysis to writing the report.

2. Establish and articulate clear priorities with regard to sub-sector and special studies. This should include an explicit definition of sub-sectors and specification of special studies emphasizing simple, broad-based analysis. These studies should avoid project orientation. A written program should be produced, explaining how each study contributes to the comprehensive sectoral analysis, i.e., sector review. Specific and realistic scheduling is an essential aspect of the setting of priorities. Since this process is a dynamic one, this program should be updated annually.

3. Enhance the monitoring and tracking system currently being used by including more specific direction to DE personnel, so that it will clearly articulate short-term objectives, the immediate steps to be taken, the resources that are needed, data requirements, the analystical methodologies that are to be used, the schedule to be followed, and how the output is to be used.

4. Conduct some in-house studies. Even if done as a model excercise, this will greatly enhance the division's capacity to specify and manage future studies. The first studies undertaken would make use of the agricultural census data and would not involve extensive fieldwork. Good choices would include sub--sector studies conducted in collaboration with the statistician/ag. economist from the Division of Studies. The main objective of early studies conducted by DE staff should be becoming familiar with the data and gaining experience in applying simple economic analysis to broad sectoral issues.

5. Strengthen the working links between the Division of Studies and the Division of Statistics. Explicit collaboration between the two staffs should be encouraged. In the short-term, DS could offer one or a series of brief seminars for DE personnel to familiarize them with the agricultural data base and to explain possible output forms and statistical analyses. Similarly, DE could include DS personnel in seminars that cover study design (and later results).

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

6. Cognizant of the fact that good sectoral analysis will identify potentials and constraints which others can use to design specific interventions, the Division of Studies should strive to include discussions of broad sectoral strategy and policy in their studies. The proposed publication, "Cameroon Agricultural Review" is an good format for encouraging such pieces and for disseminating them.

7. Consideration should be given to relieving selected personnel from "administrative responsibilities", or to having more of these tasks done by a specialized group (e.g., the documentation section or the establishment a Representation and Information Division); any effective means of limiting the time trained staff members spend on routine correspondence, attending meetings, writing memos, and summarizing reports will enhance productivity in economic analysis. A distinction should be made between routine monitoring of dossiers and doing economic analysis.

8. Conduct regular seminars led by DE personnel, and not just after studies have been completed. Both in-house and open exchanges focussing on study design, methodology, preliminary results, and final reports would provide opportunities for staff to interact and encourage the meeting of deadlines.

9. Organize a series of formal in-house training sessions by the technical assistant working in the Division of Studies. Some of these he could conduct himself, but he should also consider using local (university) or TDY consultants. One such course ought to be on basic micro-computer literacy, including familiarity with basic word processing, data base, and statistical program capabilities. This should be followed by a course on applied statistical techniques and computer applications for economic analysis, perhaps conducted in conjunction with a "model" study.

10. Extend and augment the technical assistance in the Division of Studies. Even under the best of circumstances under the current project, one agricultural economist is not likely to be able to help the division develop the capacity to manage, let alone conduct the range of studies and analyses that are needed for effective sectoral management and which will be possible as the Division of Statistics begins to process and publish annual survey data. Specific fields that should be considered in a follow-up project include: production economics; marketing/rural institutions; sectoral planning and modeling.

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

11. Long-term training should be continued at the M.S. level and begun at the Ph.D. level. Training participants should be encouraged to utilize the data available from the Division of Statistics for thesis or dissertation research, and to conduct this research as part of the division's program of studies.

12. Further consideration needs to be given to the relationship between broad-based sectoral studies, sectoral planning, and project preparation. The project should focus on institutionalizing appropriate links while at the same time emphasizing the distinct and essential qualities of these three functions. The advantages of an alternative organizational structure, with project preparation operating out of the Division of Project Management for example, should not be overlooked.

13 Efforts should be taken to coordinate studies and the sector review with the livestock ministry.

14 Strengthen links with researchers in other institutions and projects. In the short run this can be done by inviting these professionals to present and attend seminars at DEP, arranging for them to offer specialized training courses to DEP personnel, or through collaboration on research projects and studies.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

VII. Improved Agricultural Statistics

A. Organization of the Division of Statistics

Within the Division of Statistics the objective of the project is to provide the assistance necessary to enable the Division to develop the capability to design surveys, collect and process data, analyze and interpret data, and to publish and disseminate the results of surveys for the Ministry of Agriculture in Cameroon.

To carry out these functions the Division is divided into two sections - the Agricultural Surveys Service and the Agricultural Statistics Service. The Surveys Service is responsible for the sampling frame; survey design; training of ensumerators; forms, questionnaires and survey methods; data collection; editing of data; and quality control of data and methods used in the data collection process. The Statistics Service is responsible for the computer processing of the data, from data entry through to the final tabulations for reports as specified by the appropriate chiefs within DEP. This responsibility specifically includes data entry, computer editing and correction, processing to provide appropriate files for analysis, tabulation of summary results and statistical estimates, development of software to accomplish these tasks efficiently within reasonable time limits, and training of technical personnel to meet these objectives. This assumes that the computer equipment is adequate for the assigned tasks and that personnel of the service have basic training in data processing.

The role of the Division in specifying the data to be collected, in analyzing and interpreting data and in publishing and disseminating results is less clear. Output tables for the 1984 Agricultural Census and for the annual surveys were fairly clearly specified; however, the responsibility for further analysis of the data or for baseline studies has not been identified. This is not surprising since the initial efforts were to develop an area sampling frame and to demonstrate a data collection capability in the 1984 census and the 1985-86 surveys. A limited amount of statistical analysis has been carried out, primarily by John Litschauer, but the responsibility for such analyses does not appear to be assigned to either of the services. To develop this capability, it may be necessary to create a new section, say an Analysis, or Estimates service. This activity will be increasingly important in the future and there should be an assigned Cameroonian responsibility for it.

The section needs a minimum of two statisticians who would be responsible for specifying the data to be collected, developing output tables, specifying the calculation of sampling errors, carrying out special treatments of the data for specified statistical summaries, establish certain baseline series, and conduct studies on estimation procedures.

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

B. Area Sampling Frame

The construction of an area sampling frame was complete at the time of the 1984 evaluation, in time to be used for the 1984 Agricultural Census. It proved to be an effective frame and no serious deficiencies were noted. The intention in 1984 was to supplement the area frame with a list frame of farms greater than 50 hectares in size. This was not done although the provincial chiefs did identify a list of large farms but whose definition varied from province to province. Consequently, the dual frame approach was not used in any estimates for the 1984 Census or for the 1985-86 annual surveys.

Starting with the 1987 annual survey, a rotation of sample segments will be started, with 20% of the sample segments rotated off each year and an equivalent number added. New maps will be obtained for the new segments, in keeping with the plan to replace maps on a five-year cycle.

The area sampling frame is a stable frame, requiring few changes from year to year. One change that might be made is to reduce the size of the segments in the north and extreme north where the segments are much larger than in the rest of the country. Subsampling of these large segments is being done at present but is not as efficient as having smaller segments providing boundaries can be established satisfactorily. This may not be possible with available maps and may be possible only with aerial photography.

C. Sample Design

In both the 1984 Agricultural Census and in the 1985-86 Annual Surveys, segments were selected with probability proportional to size in most rural areas and with probability proportional to the number of dwelling units in the 1976 Population Census in urban areas and the remaining rural segments. Five to seven dwelling units were selected systematically in each of the sample segments. A total of 954 segments (778 rural segments and 176 urban segments) were selected for the 1984 census. The numbers of sample segments was reduced to 650 for the 1985 and 1986 Annual Surveys. The coefficient of variation (as a measure of sampling error) of the number of total farms in the 1984 Census was 3.5% and should be about 4.4% in the Annual Surveys. Coefficients of variation for areas planted and total production for major crops in 1984 ran from 7 to 15%. Provincial estimates had coefficients of variation considerably higher, often at 20% or higher.

Five to seven dwelling units seems to be a reasonable number to sample in each segment but no analysis has been made to verify the optimum subsample size. This could and should be done using the 1984 Census data.

In general, both the area sampling frame and the sample design appear to have been carried out satisfactorily and are working well.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

D. Survey Methodology

In this context, survey methodology is intended to include all aspects of the data collection process from questionnaire design through submission of data forms to the data processing center. It is the heart of the activities of the Division of Statistics upon which the basic quality of all other activities depend. It is an area of work which requires sound management skills and careful attention to details to ensure that the data sent are collected are meaningful and not subject to a host of non-sampling errors. A variety of methods must be used to keep these errors within reasonable bounds, recognizing that they can never be completely eliminated. The recent report by John Litschauer reported on a number of non-sampling errors encountered in the field by the enumerators and the other field staff.

The reduction of non-sampling errors is accomplished in several different ways. These may be categorized as quality assurance, data quality control and process control. They are all often commonly referred to as quality control. The most common techniques for quality assurance involve procedures such as pilot tests of questionnaires and forms, training schools and workshops for group leaders and enumerators, practice sessions of all aspects of the data collection process, editing and checking procedures to detect data errors or inconsistencies, and providing assistance to answer questions as they arise.

Procedures for data quality control involve sampling a portion (say, 10%) of the original sample segments and dwelling units to determine if the data were collected accurately and if edit checks were successfully detecting data errors.

Procedures for process control of methods involve visits to the field by department, provincial, service and division chiefs to determine if the proper methods are being used in the identification and selection of segments and dwelling units, if interviewing and measurement techniques are being carried out properly and if data forms are adequately protected and submitted to the next level on schedule.

The quality assurance procedures used for the 1984 Census and for the annual surveys appear to have carried out reasonably well. The questionnaires and data forms were reviewed and tested. The training schools were well conceived and manuals were available to the trainees. Not all trainees showed up or participated in all activities but the majority received effective training. Editing procedures worked fairly well in most departments and provinces although it is clear that some improvements are still needed. Controllers and department chiefs were available to answer most questions. Overall the procedures worked as well as should have been expected the first year and perhaps even better in some respects than might have been expected. Both the Cameroon survey staff and the statistical advisors deserve credit for the quality of the work carried out in the past three years.

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

43

Although some efforts have been made in data quality control and process control in the field, these efforts have been minimal and have served more to demonstrate the nature and extent of the problems than to resolve them. The recent visit by Director Kamga and Paul Pierre Pouansi to the three northern provinces to meet with Provincial and Department Statistics Chiefs to discuss field procedures used in the data collection for the annual surveys should help considerably in obtaining the cooperation of the field staff. Because of the organizational structure within the MOA, direct authority and control are not fully hierachical. Provincial and department chiefs have an independence of the Division of Statistics that requires cooperation and coordination rather than control of their procedures. This should not be a serious problem, however, but does require that negotiation take place to reach agreement as to who does what and what information is reported to whom. The lead in this must come from the Division of Statistics with assistance fromthe statistical advisor or TDY specialists. This also means that DS must train Provincial and Department Chiefs on how to manage and supervise statistics collection operations.

E. Objective Field Procedures

Because of problems inherent in the estimation of yield and production based upon farmer estimates, consideration was given to the use of measured yield from small sample plots to estimate yield and production of many of the major crops. The 1984 evaluation team recommended that this approach (objective yield measurements) not be used as a general procedure but that the method be tried, on an experimental basis, on one or two crops to work out details of the method and to resolve problems unique to each crop. This recommendation was difficult to carry out in practice because the common practice of mixed planting does not permit the isolation of individual crops. It may be useful, however, to limit a study of objective yield procedures to a limited number of crops and to work out measurement techniques for determining the nature and size of errors that occur.

Objective yield methods are appealing because of their seemingly quantitative objectivity, but they also tend to have high cost, high sampling error, and often are subject to various non-sampling errors. Still, the methods have been used successfully on a number of crops and should be tried here. It is expected that one of the sessions for the in-country training program will be on objective yield procedures.

F. Publication and Dissemination of Reports

Preliminary census data were available in December 1985 and used in preparation of the Sixth Plan. Final reports on the 1984 Agricultural Census were completed in December 1986 (English version) and in January 1987 (French version). It is anticipated that 3,000 copies of each version will be printed and available for distribution by June 1987.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Although a fairly wide distribution of these reports is planned, no list has yet been generated. To ensure dissemination to agencies and individuals for whom it will be most useful, a list of recipients should be developed. Such lists should also be developed for annual reports and other reports generated by the Statistics Division. Original plans called for the Census Tabulation to be completed on July 1, 1985. Delays were primarily caused by difficulties in data processing.

In addition to the annual reports, the Statistics Division should be generating reports on baseline studies and analyses of data of interest to subsector populations. As the Statistics Division matures in its basic function of data collection and reporting of general statistics, the opportunity to provide statistical analyses for special uses will grow. The Division of Studies will presumably assume the responsibility for economic studies whereas the Division of Statistics should assume the responsibility for basic statistical information. John Litschauer has generated several unpublished reports of this type and more should be generated within the Statistics Division. Since the Surveys Service and the Statistics Service have fairly definitive roles which do not include this responsibility, it is recommended that a new section within the Statistics Division be created to carry out this function.

G. Data Management

The data collected in 1984 were processed with separate programs for data entry, editing and correction, and tabulation of output tables. These programs have succeeded in accomplishing the task but are not efficient and must have constant attention to ensure that the outputs of one process fit the input requirements of subsequent programs. An overall system is needed which will permit data to be entered into a common data base which can be used for editing, correction, analysis, and generation of reports. Separate programs can be designed for separate objectives but, except for special analyses, they should use a common data base.

Progress has clearly been made since the last evaluation but too much time of the data processing advisor is being spent on assisting data processing clerical and technical staff, formatting tables, checking outputs, and providing management of everyday operations. A good data management system should enable the work to proceed smoothly and with a minimum of delay and questions requiring special attention. Such a system should be completed as soon as possible. It is recognized that outside help will be needed to accomplish this task since the time needed is far in excess of that available to the resident data processing advisor.

Even with the development of such a system, it should be recognized that it will have a limited life time of 3-4 years at best. Advances in equipment and software are so rapid that the system will be obsolete within that time, not because it won't do the job any longer but because a better job can be done at lower cost with new equipment and/or new

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

software. One need only look back to the last evaluation to recognize the degree of the change to be expected. If it is not done now, however, it will be even more difficult to update at a later stage.

H. Data Processing for the 1984 Agricultural Census

The 1984 census proved to be a good test of the ability of the Statistics Service to process a large set of data. The task was carried out step by step with the data being entered on the North Star computers in the Statistics Division. diskettes sent to Oregon State University for the tabulation and the generation of reports, and final tabulation for the publication of the Census Report carried out in the Statistics Division. The English version was completed in December 1986 and the French version in January 1987. The publication of both versions is expected by June 1987.

The original schedule called for completion of all work at least a year earlier. Part of the delay was caused by the delay in receiving data from the field but the major cause was the inability to process the data as rapidly as had been anticipated. In view of the changes in computing equipment, in the delay in the arrival of the data processing advisor, and the fact that this was a first-time effort on a large scale, a delay is hardly surprising. Although it is discouraging to see delays occurring, no one should probably have realistically expected the final publication before June 1986 at the earliest. Even with this delay, the accomplishment of getting out the 1984 Agricultural Census in its final form should be considered a success.
Of perhaps even greater importance than the timeliness of the report is the accuracy and the quality and completeness of the report. The accuracy is addressed elsewhere in this evaluation and will not be repeated here. The report provides a great deal of information in a form that should be very useful to the MOA, the GRC, and to others. Thought and consideration have clearly been given to the content and format of the tables; resulting in information which should be of considerable value to users.

I. Data Processing for the Annual Surveys

The data from the 1985 annual survey have been entered and are being edited. Further processing is expected to be completed by September. Data from the 1986 annual survey have been received but entry has not yet begun. If the analysis of three year period 1984-86 is to proceed as planned, entry of the 1986 data should be started immediately. It would have been started earlier but was put aside to give top priority to the completion of the French version of the Census report.

BEST AVAILABLE

J. Management of the Data Processing Unit

At the time of the last evaluation the data processing unit was in its infancy. The equipment and the software system ordered to process the data appeared to have been reasonible even though both were subsequently found to have serious flaws. The chief of the data processing unit had received data processing training but had little or no experience in managing a computing center. Furthermore no technical assistance had been provided by the project. This deficiency was noted and the project supplement provided for a data processing advisor to be added to the project. Unfortunately this position was not filled until February 1986 when Bob Aston arrived. Some assistance had been given by Bill Kelly but he left in 1985. Joe Snyder visited the project on a TDY basis several times in 1984-85 to assist in the acquisition of new equipment and the development of appropriate software. The chief of the data processing center was not present or available to work with Snyder during most of these visits.

To provide effective management, it is essential that the chief of the center be present most of the time, that he be fully familiar with the programs and work progress in the center, that he provide the leadership and support of the employees of the center, that he maintain a close relationship with the survey section and plan for the assignment of work as data forms are received, and generally that he manage the center so as to carry out the functions of the center in an efficient and timely manner. These responsibilities have not been carried out very well and improvement is needed. A manager is needed who has the skills and ability to provide effective management when a technical advisor is no longer present. Admittedly, computing is a fast moving field and the chief must be one who can learn as well as manage. It will not be an easy task but is required if the Division of Statistics is to develop its full capabilities.

K. Facilities

Equipment for the data collection activities of the Surveys Service has enabled most activities to be carried out satisfactorily. Some problems have occurred because of lack of vehicles or because vehicles were inoperable. The project has purchased additional 4-wheel drive vehicles and motorcycles and DEP has purchase 4-wheel drive vehicles to bring the Division to reasonable levels for the 1987 season. Maps, compasses and planimeters are at acceptable levels.

Computer maintenance continues to be a problem. In addition to the normal problems that can occur under any conditions, most of the computers are located in a room that has a heavy dust infiltration and in which the air conditioning is not always operable. Dust is a serious problem with electronics in general and particularly with computers. A relatively dust free space, with good air conditioning, is needed to

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

reduce the maintenance problems to a normal level. This is particularly true for the data processing center but is basically true for all rooms in which computers are located.

Maintenance service for the computing equipment has been a continuing problem which has not yet been solved. Local service had been provided for the North Star computers but no service has been available for the IBM computers now in use. Preliminary discussions with possible service contractors have indicated that annual costs for service would approach the cost of new equipment. Alternative solutions, such as limited service contracts, project purchase of parts and maintenance by project staff, or service by outside contractors, need to be considered. A study of these and other alternatives should be made with the possible assistance of a TDY consultant.

With the increasing need to move from manual record keeping to an automated system, most of the central staff who are involved with data manipulation or processing would benefit from microcomputers. To be most effective, each staff member should have access to a computer. This does not mean exclusive use for each person and certainly does not mean that machines should not ordinarily be assigned exclusively to offices or individuals where they are not used an appreciable portion of the time. Additional computers are recommended for the Surveys Service, for the data processing unit, and for the proposed Statistical Analysis Section.

Space is severely limited in the Statistics Division both in terms of quantity and quality. It is completely inadequate for storing maps, questionnaires, manuals and other necessary material and supplies. Completed forms are stacked in any available space, without reasonable security or order. File cabinets and shelves would help immensely to relieve this problem. This would also relieve crowding of offices where workers must work around stacks of paper, and in dirty, undersirable conditions.

Additional space has been rented by the project through June 1987, at which time the MOA is committed to continue it. This has helped only marginally and is not suitable space for computers. Besides working space for staff, additional space is needed for large volumes of data forms, for supplies, for files and computer output, and for a library of manuals, reference materials and training supplies. An increase of 30-50% in space for the Statistics Division would help considerably.

L. Staff Development

Master's level training in agricultural statistics was provided for eight Cameroonians within the past three years, with one trainee returning in 1986. He has been placed in the Surveys Service but has been given no duties which utilize his statistical training. Some on-the-job training should be expected but those returning should be given responsibilities consistent with their training and experience as soon as possible.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Two trainees in computer science are scheduled to return in 1988 or earlier from B.S. training in the U.S. No others are in long-term training in data processing. Additional long-term training is highly desirable and training is recommended for additional B.S. and M.S. as soon as possible. The PIC/P specifies that all degree participants, whether in data processing, economics, or statistics, receive training in micro computer applications.

The only Short-term training abroad that has occurred since the last evaluation was provided to two statistics staff by USDA and a computer short course at Stanford University attended by Pierre Kouang. Four Cameroonians also visited Oregon State University in 1985 to work with Joe Snyder on the analysis of the 1984 Agricultural Census.

In-country seminars were to have been held on statistical methods for central and provincial personnel of the Division of Statistics and on basic statistics for Division personnel. None of these was held because of the almost total involvement of staff with the data collection and processing of the 1984 Census and the 1985-86 annual surveys. It is true that the census and the annual surveys had to have high priority but it is unfortunate that seminars were not carried out as planned. This type of training is recognized as important to the continued improvement of staff at all levels. The Division of Statistics is in the process of Developing a series of in-service statistics and data processing programs which will begin in June 1987.

At present there are six data processing technicians and six data entry staff in addition to the chief of the data processing unit and the technical advisor. The data entry staff have been trained to enter data but not to handle other problems or to handle special situations that arise. The technicians have had some basic one-on-one training with the technical advisor on the use of spreadsheets but on no other software packages. All of them should receive additional training to improve their data processing skills. Some of this could be provided by Bob Acton but additional training could also be given by Cameroon data processing specialists.

The data collection training schools have been held as scheduled and have contributed greatly to the success of the survey phase of the project. They must continue, to train new staff and to review and refine methodology in the field. Future plans call for additional in-service training. Activities are underway to develop topics and procedures for carrying this out.

- Technical Assistance

For nearly two years, John Litschauer has been the only statistical advisor to the Statistics Division. The position of senior statistician has been vacant since the departure of Bill Kelly in May 1985. John Litschauer has assumed some of the functions that would normally have

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

been carried out by the senior statistician and Kelly has been back on TDY to prepare reports on sample rotation and other aspects of sample design. Work to improve methodology or to provide further in-country training has been held in obeyance. Without assistance of this type, additional progress will be difficult.

John Litschauer has provided direct assistance in all aspects of survey methodology. He and Paul Pierre Pouasi have worked well together to provide the necessary training and management to develop a well-organized data collection system.

The project agreement following the last evaluation added a long-term data processing specialist to the project to further develop the data processing unit within the Statistics Division and to establish training programs for operation and maintenance of equipment. There was over a year's delay in filling this position. Bob Acton arrived in February 1986 for a two-year assignment. To date, most of his time has been spent on development of a system for data entry and editing. Additional time was spent on systems for handling the 1985 data and preparation of the French version of the tables for the 1984 Census Report. No training program or courses have been offered although some individualized training has been given to staff of the data processing unit. He has been able to provide limited maintenance to the machines but cannot provide full service required of the unit.

With the work on the census now essentially completed, Acton's attention will be turned to the development of the data processing system for the entry of the 1986 data, processing of the 1985 data, processing of data for the three-year 1984-86 report and, hopefully, a limited training program for local staff. Help will be needed in the development of a data base system and for further in-country training in data processing and the use of computer packages.

OICD/USDA has been the backstop agency for the project. Unfortunately the USDA's NASS (National Agricultural Statistics Service) has not been involved in backstopping the project since its early inception. This has precluded access to high level, experienced statistical specialists which could have provided valuable assistance to the project. It is suggested that any continuation of the project include access to an institution which would provide state-of-the-art backstopping in both statistical methods and in data processing. This is especially important for maintaining consistency when one or more resident advisor positions are unfilled for a period of time.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

N. RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING STATISTICS:

1. A solution to the problem of management of the data processing unit should be addressed in any continuation of the project.

2. Fill the position of senior statistician as soon as possible. This is needed for the period of the extension of the project and for Phase II if it materializes.

3. Create a new section within the Statistics Division with responsibility for base-line studies, specialized statistical analyses, improvement of estimation procedures, and shared responsibility for the description of the type and nature of data to be collected and the output tables needed for annual reports. A senior statistician will be needed for several years to support this section.

4. Special attention must be given to quality control of the annual surveys. The problem appears to be appreciated by the Statistics Division, by the MOA, and increasingly by field staff. Specifications should be developed cooperatively by the Statistics Division and the Provincial and Department Chiefs as to what procedures will be carried out and what information will be reported to whom.

5. Objective yield procedures should be developed for a limited number of crops but should not be used operationally until satisfactory procedures have been worked out and tested.

6. Establish distribution lists for dissemination of reports of the census, annual surveys and special reports.

7. Establish and maintain a relatively dust free, air-conditioned, space to house the computers in the data processing unit. All computers should be kept as dust free as possible and air-conditioned for optimum operation.

8. The maintenance problems of the data processing unit must be resolved. Without more study, it is not clear whether this can best be done with an in-country service contract, by an outside contractor, or if replacement of parts and equipment by the technical advisor would be satisfactory. Further study of alternative solutions is recommended with the possible assistance of a TDY consultant.

9. A data base system for the processing of annual surveys should be completed and put in place. Outside assistance is needed for this because of the time required for development of the software. TDY help has been requested.

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

10. Technical assistance in data processing should be continued for several years. No Cameroon staff have the training, experience and management capability at present to assume responsibility for the proper functioning of the data processing unit.

11. Additional microcomputers are needed for the Surveys Service. Each should include built in hard disc, a printer (dot-matrix or better) and an uninterruptable power supply. The data processing unit needs at least three additional back-up computers and an additional letter-quality printer. The new Analysis section will need enough microcomputers to provide one to each technically trained staff member.

12. A small library of manuals (both French and English versions where available), books, and other reference materials should be established for use by staff of the Statistics Division. It should have relatively unrestricted availability and staff should be encouraged to use it.

13. Continue the development of a series of seminars for in-country training in basic statistics, data processing, special topics in statistical methods, objective yield procedures, and other topics as determined by the project team. Some of these may be given by the technical advisors; TDY's will be needed for others.

14. Long-term training should be continued for B.S. and M.S. level training in data processing and M.S. and Ph.D level training in statistics. Ph.D level training is needed for staff in the proposed Analysis section. Numbers are difficult to specify because of attrition to other programs and to the private sector but several should be sent in each category.

15. An institution with experience and expertise in both statistics and data processing should be included in any extension of the project so that consistent and competent backstopping for the resident advisors and the Division of Statistics is readily available and accessable.

16. Consideration should be given to the establishment of an advisory committee to the project if Phase II is approved. The purpose of the committee would be to provide continuing advice on technical aspects of the project as well as overall project direction.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

VIII. Extension Planning and Project Development.

An Extension Advisor was added to the project in Amendment #5. It was placed under this project so that the advisor could work with the Division of Studies in DEP, which has responsibilities for the design of an Agricultural Extension Project. This seems a valid placement since the project recognizes project development and in view of the fact that the Division of Studies has primary responsibility for project design.

The Advisor has worked very closely with a number of staff in conducting analysis of the Extension Service as well as an analysis of the education and manpower development facilities. Division staff with the help of the advisor organized, planned and implemented a National Seminar on Agricultural Extension. A number of international specialists presented papers as did host country officials. A working group approach was used and several significant recommendations emerged from the Seminar. A second major seminar is currently being prepared by the Extension Advisor and Division of Studies staff. It will be a national seminar on the improvement of agricultural cooperatives. The Rural Sector finance study which was completed in July 1988 by GTZ, under the direction of the Division of Studies, will be a major document of the seminar.

Studies on communication, and progressive replacement of monitors by assistant technicians were also carried out. A major study of "Future Demand for Qualified Personnel in the Ag Sector" was completed by the Division of Studies in collaboration with the Association for the Training for Administrative and Industrial Personnel (AFCA). This study anticipates agricultural personnel needs to the year 2000 and makes recommendations for achieving the needed level. These studies and documents will be of great assistance in the design of an Agricultural Extension Project.

It was apparent during interviews in the Ministry of Agriculture, USAID/Cameroon, FAO and IBRD that all elements are agreed to proceed in a pre-design phase for an extension project. It was not so apparent that all interested parties were on board as far as extension and organizational concepts of the project are concerned. The evaluation team neither received nor reviewed an implementation plan for the design of the extension project.

It must be noted that the extension advisor has established an excellent rapport with his colleques in the Division of Studies and other agencies, that he has maintained effective communications with other members of the technical assistance team as well as other technicians, and that he has been an effective trainer of the DE staff with which he has worked. He has also served as acting project chief in the absence of the Chief of Party, and as the project training officer.

RECOMMENDATION REGARDING EXTENSION PROJECT:

We have no major recommendations for the extension activity except to suggest that the extension advisor be involved with the project design teams as they proceed toward final project design, which we understand is already being considered by USAID/Yaounde.

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

IX. Project Management

Management and implementation planning issues have been discussed in relation to various input (TA, training, commodities) and output (statistics, economic analysis) catagories throughout this report. The purpose of this section is to consolidate some of these observations, to evaluate the techniques that have been used, and to focus specifically on the role of the major project actors (DEP, the TA team, USAID) in the management process.

A. Management Responsibilities

Project management is the process by which ultimate project objectives (Purpose) are respecified in more concrete and proximate terms and by which project resources are allocated so as to accomplish those objectives. As is often the case, the outputs defined for this project are largely indicators of the institutional capabilities which the project seeks to develop. Outputs may need to be modified or redefined if agreement is reached that a redefinition of the output would better describe the desired organizational capacity.

Project implementation planning specifies the incremental steps or tasks necessary to achieve project objectives, assigns responsibility for the execution of these tasks, and schedules their execution sequentially over time. Part of implementation planning is determining the financial or physical resources required to carrying out the various tasks and produce the desired outputs. The overall division of responsibilities related to project management and implementation is that (a) the DEP directorate is responsible for project management--the DEP director is the project director; (b) implementation responsibilities are vested in the divisions of Statistics and Studies--host-country personnel with the assistance of the USDA technical assistance team; and (c) USAID is responsible for project procurement and for monitoring project implementation.

B. Management Tools

Annual Workplans: Until this year formalized annual workplans were not submitted to USAID although they are required by the PASA and have been requested by USAID on several occassions. Annual workplans for the project are essentially a summary and compilation of work plans for individual technical assistance team members rather than a comprehensive treatment of project-level activities. At times, the technical advisors' work plans reflect the workload of individual sections of divisions (i.e. Litschauer and possibly Acton and partially Kite). In other cases the workplans reflect the major tasks of the individual and do not correspond to the workload of an organizational unit of DEP (Prawl).

Quarterly Progress Reports are submitted by the technical assistance team to USAID, the director of DEP, and the USDA/OICD backstop officer. These reports tend to focus on activities carried out during the past three-month interval but progressively have also included upcoming actions as well. Reports are reviewed by USAID and are a major input into AID's project monitoring activities. We have no indication of how GRC uses these reports.

Annual Project Budgets are prepared by the USDA TA team in collaboration with DEP's division chiefs and are formally submitted by the project director (director of DEP) to USAID for approval. USAID has requested that this annual budget submission be made in accordance with the U.S. government's fiscal year (i.e., October through September). DEP prepares submissions for its normal operating budget and separate project "counterpart" budget in accordance with GRC's fiscal calendar which runs from July 1 to June 30. There does not appear to be an overall consolidated budget that combines these three sources of financing. USAID's controller and the Ministry of Agricultural both have reports covering disbursements made in accordance with respective budgets, although these reports normally only circulate within their respective institutions.

C. Host-Country Management

The quality of host country management is variable. Overall DEP management of the AMP project is not clearly evident. The Statistics Division, and in particular the Surveys and Data Collection section clearly evidences sound management and planning. The Division of Studies has been much less successful at managing and planning with respect to AMP project activities and outputs. The evaluation team believes that building institutional capacity in DEP has and will continue to develop most rapidly where management and planning is strongest.

The Director of the Department of Studies and Projects is named as Project Director for the AMP and is responsible for overall project management and for planning the implementation activities. As a result of the priority that has been given to development of the statistics component of the project, the Director of the Division of Statistics has been delegated the major share of responsibility for day to day management of the project. This accounts for the high degree of progress made in developing the agricultural statistics system.

The Director of Statistics and his staff deserve a special note of credit on their management of the Division in conducting the 1984 Census. This took a great deal of organizational and management skill. The task was immense and they are to be congratulated on their accomplishments.

The placement of a lower priority for the economics component of the project has resulted in less delegation to the Chief of the Studies

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

Division, less support of project activities and objectives within the Division of Studies, and slower progress toward achieving project objectives.

Host country management and monitoring mechanisms are largely informal. Overall project level workplans do not exist other than a single page annual budget proposal. With respect to some project activities, most notably economics, priorities within DEP are vague and performance specifications rarely established or monitored. Good performance receives little recognization and poor performance is tolerated.

D. USAID Project Monitoring.

USAID monitors project management and implementation to see whether stated project objectives are met within the agreed upon timeframe and budget. Monitoring activities include: (a) weekly meetings between the project officer and the USDA Chief-of-Party; (b) monthly meetings with the entire USDA team; (c) occasional meetings with host country officials and USDA team members; (d) review of reports and publications largely from USDA team; and (e) review of controller reports and commodity procurement status reports (when these latter are actually used). The USAID project officer is responsible for preparing semi-annual implementation reports which are reviewed within the mission and then submitted to AID/W. USAID's monitoring functions tend to focus heavily on input delivery and have not been very effective in dealing with problems on output and project management issues.

E. Conclusions Regarding Management

In assessing the adequacy of existing project management systems and their performance, several general conclusions emerge. First, there appear to be inconsistencies between USAID priorities for the project and those of the Host Government and DEP. USAID consistently stress the importance sector analysis and planning functions of DEP, with statistics as a means to those ends: DEP itself gives greater priority to statistic functions without the same explicit tie-in to analysis. These priorities are far from being mutually exclusive objectives. Yet none of the managment mechanisms being used by the project allow for an honest give and take on institutional and project priorities, so that both USAID and DEP understand each others' expectations.

Second, the management tools used to guide implementation planning are inadequate. Technical Assistance workplans (as presently prepared), quarterly progress reports from the TA team, and annual project budgets do not state project objectives in an operational context; they neither adequately indicate resource needs nor do they direct resources where needed in order to achieve these objectives. The existing mechanisms fall short of providing the management and implementation functions described in the beginning of this section. Specifically, priorities for

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

the project are not clearly specified and project resource allocation patterns do not reflect changing relative needs within the project and DEP. Management tools being used do not translate into a management system that tracks the development of division-specific capacities, engenders divisional coordination, or even monitors project accomplishments or outputs.

Third, problem-solving responsibilities of project management are not effectively performed. This is true both in terms of a) resolving internal problems (e.g., data processing management problems) and b) redefining project outputs in order to either enhance achievement of the project's purpose or to respond to specific needs expressed by USAID or by the Host Country.

Fourth, management roles and responsibilities are not clearly specified. It is clear that the Project Director (director of DEP), the USDA Chief-of-Party, and the USAID Project Officer have certain responsibilities in the overall management of the project. It is equally clear that no one individual has assumed or been delegated the responsibility and authority for the routine management of the project. Both USAID and DEP look toward the COP to provide a large part of the project management, though given his technical functions as agricultural economist, he does not have the time available to properly execute those responsibilities. We feel that USAID and DEP are placing unrealistic expectations on this individual.

RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING MANAGEMENT:

1. That the DEP director become more involved in the management, planning, and monitoring of the AMP project, or that he delegate that authority and responsibility

2. That USAID, DEP, and the COP articulate and establish priorities for the economic activities of both the project and the Division of Studies, so that improved long- and short-term planning can take place to accomplish the economic analysis objectives.

3. Overall project workplans should be jointly developed by USAID, DEP, and the COP.

4. Project documents (ProAg and PP with amendments and annexes) should be explicitly used and referred to. Where project objectives conflict with DEP priorities or are otherwise unlikely to be achieved, the conflict should be acknowleded and explicitly reconciled.

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

5. The evaluation team recommends that DEP, the USDA team and USAID establish a project implementation committee to facilitate the management and implementation for the project. (It should be noted that a similar recommendation appeared in the 1984 evaluation and was not acted upon.) Meetings should be scheduled regularly and frequently (monthly or quarterly) and specific agendas established. The effective project director should chair the committee. We would suggest that the major functions of the committee be as follows:

   a. Ensure agreement between the parties as to the operational objectives of the project and review benchmark indicators for achieving those objectives.

   b. Review and seek agreement on implementation planning. These planning functions include defining what needs to be done, establishing realistic schedules, specifying resource requirements, and assigning staff-level responsibilities.

   c. Resolve problems as they arise.

   d. Monitor progress and, if necessary, adjust schedules, resource allocation, and, in some cases, even objectives.

   e. Disseminate reports of these meetings to project participants, including staff, in order to keep them informed of project direction and objectives.

6. Have USDA participate in the annual review of project workplans in order to enhance its backstopping functions in providing technical services in accordance with those workplans, especially short-term TA. Since reviewing annual workplans would logically become a responsibility of the proposed project implementation committee, it is recommended that the USDA/OICD backstop officer participate in this meeting.

7. In recognization of the importance of developing management skills as well as technical skills, the evaluation team recommends that at least ten percent of the resources being added to the project be devoted to improving management skills at the directorate and divisional levels of DEP. This could take the form of technical assistance, long- or short-term off-shore training, salaries for staff working on project management or administration, or materials.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

X. PRINCIPAL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

A. Principal Conclusions

Progress in the statistics component has been significant, the 1984 Census was completed, tabulated and published (to a limited degree) in both English and French, the annual surveys were carried out in 1985, 1986 and are underway for 1987. Processing of the data for the annual surveys is underway. Although tabulation and publication of the data is later than projected, a major accomplishment was achieved by conducting the census and publishing results.

The hands-on experience of having completed these activities is extremely important and valuable for the development of the staff and gives confidence in being able to continue to refine and implement the system.

Progress has been much less dramatic in the economics component of the project. Some studies were carried out with collaboration of other donors or agencies, some terms of references were developed but very little in-house analysis was carried out. There is no hard evidence of concrete plans for carrying out the agricultural assessment, nor other management planning which identifies specific in-house studies and a time frame in which they will be completed.

This reflects a rather distinct and opposite set of priorities from project management, than was obviously given to the statistics component of the project. In fact the overall division of responsibilities related to project management and implementation appears to be that (a) the Direction of Studies and Projects is responsible for overal project direction, (b) implementation responsibilities are vested in the Divisions of Statistics with the assistance of the USDA technical assistance team; and (c) USAID is responsible for project procurement.

Management and monitoring mechanisms for the economics component are largely informal within DEP and priorities are vague, and performance specifications are rarely established and monitored. Overal project level work plans do not exist other than a budget proposal. Some basic project management functions are not being performed. There appears to be a lack of clarity of how the project fits into the operations and structures of the Division of Studies and there seems to be a lack of agreement on priorities for project objectives and output. In general the project lacks overall project management focus which is watching divisional capacities develop, insuring divisional coordination/cooperation and the bringing together of project and DE objectives and priorities.

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

B. Principal Recommendations

GENERAL:

1. Project management needs to be strengthened. More coordination and interaction among the DEP directorate, division heads, the TA team, and USAID is necessary. The director of the project should be more active in project management and planning.

2. More emphasis needs to be given to accomplishing the economic analysis objectives. Clear evidence of DEP's committment to these goals would be manifested by the statement of a clear priority for and directing resources toward accomplishing the economic outputs of the project.

3. Establish and articulate priorities and overall management workplans, especially for economic analysis in both the project and the Division of Studies.

4. That USAID, DEP, OICD, and the COP define the roll of the Chief-of-Party so as to maximize his effectiveness in economic analysis and plannning.

5. Extend the current project until December 1988. This will allow assistance to continue for the on-going statistical activities and the amplification of in-house economic analysis and planning functions.

6. In the event that USAID decides to continue to support data collection, economic analysis, and agricultural sector planning in DEP following the 1988 PACD, it is recommended that a new project be designed rather than extending the current one. This should assure a greater degree of emphasis on economic analysis and planning than the current project evidently offers.

ECONOMICS:

1. Plan and execute a sector review. If done entirely by DE personnel, this exercise shouldn't be overly elaborate but rather, be constructed as a model for how such reviews will be done in the future. If done as part of a collaborative effort with other agencies, DE personnel must be intensively involved in every aspect of the excercise, from design to field work, and from analysis to writing the report.

2. Establish and articulate clear priorities with regard to sub-sector and special studies. This should include an explicit definition of sub-sectors and specification of special studies emphasizing simple, broad-based analysis

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

3. Enhance the monitoring and tracking system currently being used by including more specific direction to DE personnel, so that it will clearly articulate short-term objectives, the immediate steps to be taken, the resources that are needed, data requirements, the analytical methodologies that are to be used, the schedule to be followed, and how the output is to be used.

4. Conduct some in-house studies. Good choices would include sub--sector studies conducted in collaboration with the statistician/ag. economist from the Division of Studies.

5. Strengthen the working links between the Division of Studies and the Division of Statistics.

6. Relieve selected personnel from "administrative responsibilities", or to have more of these tasks done by a specialized group; any effective means of limiting the time trained staff members spend on routine correspondence, attending meetings, writing memos, and summarizing reports will enhance productivity in economic analysis.

7. Extend and augment the technical assistance in the Division of Studies. Specific fields that should be considered in a follow-up project include: production economics; marketing/rural institutions; sectoral planning and modeling.

8. Long-term training should be continued at the M.S. level and begun at the Ph.D. level.

STATISTICS:

1. A solution to the problem of management of the data processing unit should be addressed in any continuation of the project.

2. Fill the position of senior statistician as soon as possible. This is needed for the period of the extension of the project and for Phase II if it materializes.

3. Create a new section within the Statistics Division with responsibility for base-line studies, specialized statistical analyses, improvement of estimation procedures, and shared responsibility for the description of the type and nature of data to be collected and the output tables needed for annual reports. A senior statistician will be needed for several years to support this section.

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

4. Special attention must be given to quality control of the annual surveys. The problem appears to be appreciated by the Statistics Division, by the ICA, and increasingly by field staff. Specifications should be developed cooperatively by the Statistics Division and the Provincial and Department Chiefs as to what procedures will be carried out and what information will be reported to whom.

5. Objective yield procedures should be developed for a limited number of crops but should not be used operationally until satisfactory procedures have been worked out and tested.

6. Establish and maintain a relatively dust free, air-conditioned, space to house the computers in the data processing unit. All computers should be kept as dust free as possible and air-conditioned for optimum operation.

7. The maintenance problems of the data processing unit must be resolved. Without more study, it is not clear whether this can best be done with an in-country service contract, by an outside contractor, or if replacement of parts and equipment by the technical advisor would be satisfactory. Further study of alternative solutions is recommended with the possible assistance of a TDY consultant.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

XI. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FOLLOW-ON ACTIVITIES

USAID/Yaounde was considering two major actions on extending the project upon arrival of the evaluation team; first an extension of the existing project to December 1988 and second the development of a Phase II of the project.

In view of the current activities of the project the team is in full agreement on the extension to December 1988. There appears to be adequate funding, with the addition of $900,000, to carry the project to that date. It will allow for TA throughout four cycles of annual data collection, two of which are completed, and one of which is currently being carrried out. The extension will also support tabulation and publication of the results of at least three survey cycles. This should strengthen the data collection system, the data processing center management, management of the data itself, and permit sample and frame refinements.

The extension should also allow time for completion of a sector review as well as other studies called for in the economic component of the project. It should allow DEP the time to articulate priorities for the Division of Studies in regards to the management and conduct of the economic analysis called for in the project documentation.

The previous evaluation and project amendments attempted to induce DEP to place a higher priority on economic studies than it had previously. Since no in-house studies have been completed in the Division of Studies as of this date and since there exists no systematic articulation of specific priorities nor manifestation of effective plans for doing studies, it is fairly apparent that this priority was raised only slightly if at all. Therefore an extension will give USAID the opportunity to assess the seriousness of DEP on conducting economic analysis in the future.

The evaluation team has considered three options relative to the longer term involvement in the project: first to terminate the project at the December 1988 PACD, second to amend the current project to achieve currently stated project goals, and third to develop a new project or Phase II.

Termination of the project on the December 1983 PACD, would be too early to institutionalize much of the progress achieved to date. Progress on the statistics side has been significant. The fact that certain activities were completed later than programmed does not detract from that fact that goals are being achieved. But the Statistics Division will need additional help in improving and refining the system for some time to come (data processing and data management, objective yield, sampling efficiency, etc.). On the economic side, activities are just beginning and in all probability progress will be limited to rather elementary analysis by the December 1988 PACD. Therefore, the evaluation team rejected the first option of terminating the project on that date.

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

Continuation of the project by an amendment would probably fail to place a greater priority on economic analysis; this was attempted by the last evaluation and amendment number 5. Since the project is thought of as primarily a statistics project by DEP, statistics would probably continue to dominate activities and funding. Although assistance in statisitics need to be continued, it should not be the overwhelmingly dominant element of the project that it has been up until now.

The evaluation team therefore, recommends a complete redesign of the project, or a Phase II. The project should be designed to focus more on economic analysis but still allow for continued activities in statisitics. The linkage between statistics and economics should be strengthened in a new project as should the use of economic analysis for support of sector planning and policy decision making.

On the basis of this evaluation, the team recommends that the following issues be addressed during the design of a Phase II project:

1. Consideration should be given to selecting a single institution, for implementation of the project, that can provide a technical assistance team who already have established working relationships and linkages between disciplines.

2. Continue assistance to statistics, probably one senior statistician and one data processor.

3. Strengthen assistance in economic analysis, probably three senior analysts (Ag. production economics, marketing/institutions, sector planning) and additional economists/TDY specialists.

4. Strengthen the studies budget of the Division of Studies so that more in-house analysis can be conducted.

5. Phase out commodity support for statistics during the life of the project so that recurrent costs are placed into the regular GRC budgeting process.

6. Establish, articulate, and achieve mutual agreement on management procedures, project priorities as well as expectations for the divisions, technical assistance and leadership.

7. Introduce management assistance to address overall management issues as well as specific problems such as research management, data management, data center management, etc.

8. Strengthen overall technical and management training at graduate levels, as well as formal and informal in-country programs.

9. Place greater emphasis on economic analysis than is currently done.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

10. Strengthen linkages between Division of Studies and Division of Statistics.

11. Attempt to get DSP under one roof so that linkages between Divisions can be strengthened and so that a single Documentation Center and Library can be better utilized.

12. Focus on the studies-planning relationship, de-emphasize "projects"

13. Consider various options on procurement.

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

ANNEX I

SCOPES OF WORK FOR EVALUATION

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

IV. Scopes of Work

A. Agricultural Economist/Team Leader

1. Provide leadership and direction for the team in conducting the evaluation and follow-on recommendations as outlined above and preparing the reports.

2. Review project file documents and conduct interviews with USAID, USDA, Project and Ministry of Agriculture officials

3. Assess the timeliness, adequacy and appropriateness of the following inputs and/or management elements necessary for achieving project purpose and major objectives and make positive recommendations to improve over current condition if appropriate.

a. Project general management:

USDA project personnel including long and short term technical assistance (qualifications and effectiveness of work and adequacy of appropriate mix of professionalism to achieve progress)

- Management of USAID's project officer, Controller, Contracts Office, Procurement Office to monitor and respond to project requests.

- Backstopping effectiveness of USDA/Washington, including institutional response (ERS, NASS, OICD) to provide appropriate and timely assistance

b. Work Plans and Progress Reports:

- Timeliness and adequacy of annual and semi-annual progress reports with special emphasis on Work Plans.

c. Roles and relationships among the three major divisions in the Department of Studies and Projects (DEP)

- Evaluation of the present system - Technical Review Committee

- Recommendations to strengthen the linkages between the Statistics, Planning, and Economic Studies Service.

d. Contribution (funding levels) of AID and the Host Government institution to adequately provide necessary resources to meet project purpose and objectives.

e. Office Space

Quality and quantity of present occupancy of project personnel

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

- Recommendations for improving (expanding) including implementing local area networking of computer system.

f. Training
- Participant training: long and short term.

  In country training with recommendations to expand into more innovative types of more effective seminars or activity specific training modules.

g. Conduct an economic and financial analysis of the project and analyze returns to AID and GRC investments if Phase II follow-on is recommended.

4. Review the following Extension/Training activities:

   a. Identify and assess technical training and analytical activities which would lead to the design of an extension project.

   b. Identify and assess administration activities leading to the design of an extension project.

   c. Determine status of progress toward extension project design

   d. Assess contribution to Division of Studies in terms of improving quality of design, conduct and analysis of studies

   e. Assess contribution to staff development (on-the-job training) of Division of Studies colleagues

   f. Assess progress toward improving instructional programs in the technical agricultural schools operated by MINAGRI.

5. Determine whether assumptions and objectives of the project and its logical framework continue o be valid, and whether or not the project activities will lead to achieving project objectives.

6. With the assistance of the PDO and other team members prepare an evaluation report summarizing the team findings and recommendations. The Team Leader will have responsibility for the overall report writing but will have specific responsibility for the above inputs and economic section.

7. With the assistance of the PDO and other team members prepare a specific chapter in the report (see above III C. 2) that will assist the Mission in its forward planning of a Phase II follow-on if deemed appropriate given a positive evaluation finding.

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

B. Senior Agricultural Economist/Policy Analyst

1. Evaluate status of subsector studies to serve as basis for sector review

2. Evaluate status, plans and priorities for special studies.

3. Evaluate adequacy of staff to perform the terms of reference and analyses of the studies.

4. Assess the progress in achieving project outputs identified in the Project Paper and Project Agreement as related to the special studies and sector review.

5. Address other issues affecting achievement of the project with emphasis on recommendations and strategy of improving the planning, economic and policy analysis of the department. The following areas should be addressed at a minimum.

   a. Organization, planning and management of DEP and technical assistance team. Describe in detail ways to improve management and planning.

   b. Impact on project planning and economic analysis and policy formulation for the agricultural sector including interministerial relationship with other planning ministries involving agricultural initiatives.

   c. Institutionalization of project activities and ways to improve in house capability to perform economic and policy analyses.

   d. Recommendations for increased technical assistance levels with specific emphasis on proper mix of disciplines, long and/or short term assistance and appropriate studies to be undertaken.

   e. Recommendations for training in Areas of Agricultural Economics/policy after a complete assessment of the DEP supply and demand of current staff is undertaken. Training schedule should be developed.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

C. Agricultural Statistician/Data Processor

As Agricultural Statistician the evaluator will:

a. Review project file documents and conduct interviews with AID, Project, and Ministry of Agriculture officials. He will, in collaboration with the team leader, have primary responsibility for preparation of the statistics and data processing sections of the evaluation report.

b. Assist the team leader in assessing the timeliness, adequacy and/or appropriateness of inputs and management elements necessary for achieving project goals and preparing the final report. Some inputs and management and planning elements to be addressed are as follows:

1. Management systems for data collection and data processing

2. Staff development (formal and informal)

3. Planning for long term goals

4. Funding levels

5. Technical assistance

6. Equipment procurement

7. Interaction between statistics and data processing

8. Interaction between statistics and economic studies

9. Technical Review Committee

c. Assess progress and appropriateness in achieving project outputs identified in the project paper and project agreement. These shall include the following:

1. Area sampling frame

2. Agriculture sample for;
   a. census
   b. annual surveys

3. Annual Agricultural Surveys (1985 & 1986)

4. National Agricultural Census

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

5. Publication of crop: livestock, price and other agricultural data

6. Annual statistical summary

7. Trained staff

d. Address other issues affecting achievement of project goals. These, include but are not limited to the following:

1. Refinement of sample based on results of Census Data, (sample efficiency, allocation etc.)

2. Development of a system for identifying and systematically addressing non-sampling error (quality of data, enumeration supervision, questionnaire design etc.

3. Objective yield or production measurement systems

2. As Data Processor the evaluator will:

a. Assess the data processing inputs and management issues including those listed below:

1. Role of data processing within DEP and within the Division of Statistics

2. Management of the data processing facility (center)

3. Preparation and training of staff

4. Long term planning and follow through

5. Access, adequacy and timeliness of technical assistance

b. The evaluator will assess the degree of achievement toward the following project outputs:

1. Development of a computer "facility"

2. Processing of the 1984 agricultural census

3. Processing of 1985, 1986 annual survey data

4. A trained staff

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

c. Address other activities and issues affecting achievement of project goals. These include but are not limited to the following:

1. Adequacy of equipment installed

2. Adequacy of software developed

3. Adequacy and quality of office space

4. Ability to maintain and repair equipment

d. Recommend equipment purchase, T.A. and training required for a Phase II follow-on project, if deemed appropriate from a positive evaluation finding.

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

D. Project Design Officer, REDSO/West Africa
The Project Design Officer will be primarily responsible for assuring proper packaging of the evaluation report and preparing guidance, recommendations, and outline for the documentation (for an extension of the PACD) and possible PID and PP or PP amendment for a Phase II follow on. He is responsible to assure that the Evaluation Summary and PES of the project evaluation is complete.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ANNEX 2

LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Annex 2

~~List of p~~ersons contacted during the course of the Evaluation

Direction of Studies and Planning

Joseph Kamga,	Director
Elizabeth Balepa (Mrs),	Deputy Director

Division of Statistics

Pierre Kouang,	Division Chief
Paul-Pierre Pouansi,	Chief, Surveys and Data Collection Section
John Litshauer,	Survey Statistician/Ag. Economist, USDA
Anabel Agoum,	Chief, Data Processing Section
Robert Acton,	Data Processing Specialist, USDA

Division of Studies,

Wawa Ngenge,	Division Chief
Rod Kite,	Agricultural Economist, USDA
Warren Prawl,	Extension/Training Specialist, USDA

Division of Projects

Clobert Tchatat,	Division Chief
	Project Monitoring System Design, Louis Berger Int'l

USAID

Jay P. Johnson,	Mission Director
Mosina Jordan,	Deputy Mission Director
John Balis,	Agricultural Development Officer (ADO)
John Dorman,	Project Officer, Ag. Management and Planning Project and Deputy ADO
Marcel Ngue,	Assistant Project Officer, Ag. Management and Planning Project
Martin Napper,	Regional Contracting Officer
Johnson Ntuba,	Commodity Procurement Specialist

FAO

Christin Chaperon,	Program Officer

OTHER

Ken McDermot,	Evaluation Team Leader, NCRE.
Essama Nsah ,	Economist and Vice Doyen, University of Yaounde

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

ANNEX 3

LIST OF DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Annex 3

DOCUMENTS CONSULTED DURING THE EVALUATION

A. Major Project Documents Consulted.

1. USAID, Agricultural Management and Planning Project Paper Supplement. Dated [illegible] Justification [illegible] and Amended Project Authorization.
2. USAID/Gov't of Cameroon, Project Grant Agreement Amendment Number 5, with Revised ANNEX 1 (Project Desruption). Dated September 27, 1984.
3. USAID, Project Implementation Reports. Reports dated
   09/30/86
   10/31/85
   03/31/85
   09/30/84
   03/31/84
   09/30/83
   06/30/83
   03/31/83
   12/31/82
   09/30/82
   06/30/82
4. USAID, Project Implementation Letters 1-10.
5. USDA, PASA Team Progress Report. Report dated:
   Oct-Dec. 1986 (including Plan of Work for Oct. 1987 to March 1988)
   July-Sept. 1986
   Jan. - June 1986
   Oct. 1985 - Jan 1986
   May - Sept. 1985
   Jan. - April 1985
   June - Dec. 1984
6. USAID, Second Evaluation Report dated Feb. 1984 and prepared by John Flinginger, Lyle Calvin and Joe Snyder.

B. USDA, TEAM MEMBER'S REPORTS (Management and Administrative)

1. Litschauer, John; Progress Report Oct.-Dec. 1986. Not dated.
2. Litschauer, John; Progress Report July-Oct. 1986 Dated 10/21/86
3. Acton, Robert, a Computer Plan for the Agricultural Management and Planning Project. Dated 10/03/86

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

4. Acton, Robert, TRIP REPORT to Cameroon for AMP Project, dated 10/03/86

5. Kelly, William, END-OF-TOUR Report, dated 05/18/85

6. Kite, Rod, AMP Project training plan, dated 11/06/84

7. Snyder, Joe, Trip Report to Cameroon for AMP Project, dated 06/06/84

C. Project Related Technical Reports

1. GTZ, Cameroon Rural Finance Sector Study, July 1986.

2. Rep. du Cameroun, Division des Etudes, Direction des Etudes et Projects, Min. of Ag.; "Revue et Analyse des programmes et des equipements des colleges Regionaux et des Ecoles Technique d'Agriculture"; en date d'Octobre 1985. Report prepared by Warren Prawl.

3. Rep. du Cameroun, Division des Etudes, Direction des Etudes et Projets (DEP), Min. of Ag.; "A Study on the Progressive Replacement of Monitors by Assistant Technicians and Technicians of Agriculture". Report not dated. Report prepared by Warren Prawl.

4. McLellan, Iain and Fraser, Colin, "Communication for Agricultural and Rural Development in Cameroon"; Dated November 1985. Study carried out under FAO financing.

5. Rep. du Cameroun, Division des Etudes, DEP, Min.Ag.; "Rapport Final du Seminaire National sur la Vulgarisation en milieu Rural"; en date du Decembre 1985.

6. Rep. du Cameroun, Division des Etudes, DEP, Min.Ag.; "Previsions de la Demande Quantitive en Personnel Qualifie du Secteur Agricole Periode 1985-200" en date du decembre 1985. Report prepared by Debouvry, Pierre (DEP); Hamrouni, Ridha (AFCA/Cameroon) and Bouscharain, Gerard (AFCA/Yaounde).

7. Rep. du Cameroun, Division des Etudes, DEP, Min.Ag.; "VIe Plan, Secteur Agricole (Document de Synthese); en date du Mars 1986.

8. Rep. du Cameroun, Division des Etudes, DEP, Min. Ag.; "Problematique et Perspectives de Developpement du Secteur Agricole au Cours du Ve Plan (Document Provisoire) en date du Novembre 1985.

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

9. Rep. du Cameroun, Division des Etudes, DEP, Min. Ag.; "Bilan de l'Operation Regeneration Cafe/Cacao au Cameroun"; en date du fevrier 1986. Etude effectue par la Societe d'Etudes pour le Developpement de l'Afrique (SEDA).

10. Rep. du Cameroun, Division des Etudes, DEP, Min. Ag. et BCEOM; "Termes de Reference pour une etude sur la liaison recherche/Vulgarisation"; en date du juillet 1985.

11. Rep. du Cameroun, Division of Studies, DEP, Min. Ag.; "Terms of Reference for a Study on Cost Effectiveness of Extension Services Operated by MIDENO (North-West Development Authority)"; document not dated.

12. Rep. du Cameroun, Division of Statistics, DEP, Min. Ag.; "1984 Agricultural Census in Cameroon: Sampling Procedures". Report not dated.

13. Rep. du Cameroun, Division of Statistics, DEP, Min. Ag.; "Towards the Development of a System for Dealing with Nonsampling Errors Under the Annual Agricultural Surveys (Position Paper)"; paper dated December 1986. Paper authored by Dr. John G. Litschauer.

14. Rep. du Cameroun, Direction du Commerce Interieur, Ministere du Commerce et de l'Industrie; "Rapport definitif de l'Etude de la Commercialisation des Produits Vivrier"; en date de juillet 1986. L'etude etait conduit par G.F.S.- MIDAS, (RFA).Report includes a principle report in one volumn and Annexes bound seperately.

15. Rep. du Cameroun, Division of Studies, DEP, Min. Ag.; "Coffee in the Sixth Five-Year Development Plan: Objectives and Constraints." Report not dated. Report presented by W.A. Ngenge at the 26th Assembly of the Inter-African Coffee Organization which took place in Bujumbura, Burundi on 18-23 November 1986.

16. Rep. du Cameroun, Division des Etudes, DEP, Min. Ag.; "Projet des Exploitations Agricoles de Moyenne Importance: Manuel d'Evaluation" en date d'octobre 1986.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

D. Other Technical Reports

1. Rep. of Cameroon, Ministry of Plan; Sixth Five Year Plan for Economic and Social Development; dated August 1986.

E. Other Works Consulted.

1. USAID, IG, Audit of AID's Evaluation Program, Audit Report # 9-000-86-5; dated 08/27/86
2. JAEGER, William, "Managing Agricultural Development in Africa: USAID to Cameroon; Its impact on agricultural and rural development"; (Draft) September 1986.
3. USAID, Country Development Strategy Statement Update: Cameroon; dated December 1986. Includes seperately bound annexes.

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

ANNEX 4

A. LISTING OF LONG-TERM PARTICIPANTS

B. LISTING OF SHORT-TERM PARTICIPANTS

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANT TRAINING LONG-TEM
Agricultural Management and Planning Project (631-0008)
1980 - 1985

NAME	DEPARTURE	RETURN	DEGREE EARNED	FIELD AND INSTITUTION	COMMENTS INCLUDING PRESENT ASSI
CHRISTIAN	1/1980	6/1982	-	Statistics, George Washington University	Pro. Chief of Statistics, S.W.
BA THOMAS	1/1980	6/1982	M.S.	-"- -"- -"-	Representative of MINAGRI to F Rome, Italy.
ANABEL	5/1981	6/1983	M.S.	Computer Science	Statistics Div. Computer DEP
I Paul-Pierre	5/1981	6/1983	M.S.	Agricultural Statistics	Statistical survey chief, M
IGANGA	1/1982	12/1983	-	Rural economy-Uni. of Florida	Non-degree program. Semry Pr
SIMON	3/1983	9/1985	M.S.	Ag. Economics- Uni. of Ken.	Division of Studies, DEP
DIUEDONNE	3/1983	9/1985	M.S.	Ag. -"- Uni. of Georgia	Division of Studies, DEP
Samual	3/1983	9/1985	M.S.	Ag. Economics-West Texas	Division of Projects, Min. F
DOMINIQUE	3/1983	-	M.S.	Statistics-Southern Illinois	Continuing for Ph.D on U.S. Scho ship
VINCENT	3/1983	4/1985	M.S.	Ag. Economics-Oregon Univer.	Division of Statistics -DEP
TIMOTHEE	8/1985	12/1987	-	Statistics, Oklahoma State	M.S. proposed
CALVIN	8/1985	" "	-	Data Processing, Oregon St.	S.S. proposed
	8/1985	" "	-	Ag. Economics, New Mexico St	M.S. proposed
PASCAL	8/1985	" "	-	-"- -"- New Mexico St.	M.S. proposed
Pierre	8/1985	" "	-	Data processing, Michigan St	B.S. proposed
ANTOINE	12/1985	6/1988	-	Statistics, Oregon University	M.S. proposed
JULES	12/1985	6/1988	-	Ag. Economics, Oklahoma Univer	M.S. proposed
Boniface	6/1985	12/1988	-	University of Pennsylvania	M.B.A. proposed
	6/1986	12/1988	-	Ag. Economics and Statistics	M.S. proposed

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Annex 4B

SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANT TRAINING SHORT-TERM
Agricultural Management and Planning Project (631-0008)
1980 - 1986

	NAME	DEPARTURE	RETURN	TRAINING SUBJECT	LOCATION	COMMENT
1.	KOUANG Pierre	6/1980 7/1982 7/1985 8/1986	8/1980 8/1982 8/1985 8/1986	Statistics Microcomputer Data tablulation Microcomputers in Development	U.S. Bureau of Commerce U.S.D.A. -S.R.S. Oregon State Univer. Stanford U.	Head, Statistics Division, DEP
2.	KENGNE Samuel	6/1980	8/1980	Statistics	U.S. Bureau of Census	Provincial Stat.
3.	KETCHAPA Jean	5/1981	8/1981	Agric. Statistics	New Mexico State Uni.	Min. of Public M
4.	OLE Zacherie	5/1981	8/1981	Development Mgnt.	University of Pitts-burgh	ZAPI-EST, Gen.Man
5.	PENDIA, Joseph	5/1981	8/1981	Agric. Statistics	New Mexico State Uni.	Deceased Provinci Chief of State. M
6.	TOZE Emmanuel	5/1981	8/1981	Agric. Statistics	-"- -"-	Provincial Chief of Statistics NW.
7.	NGUENKENG Joseph	9/1982	11/1982	Ag. Project Planning	U. S. D. A.	National Office for Development
8.	KAMGA Joseph	10/1983 7/1985	11/1983 8/1985	VIP visit,Consultant	TVA-USAID Uni.of Oregon,USDA	Director, DEP
9.	TCHATAT Clobert	3/1985	5/1985	Ag. Rural Dev. Planning	U.S.D.A.	Head,Project Div.DEP
10.	TENTCHOU Jean	6/1985	7/1985	Strategies for developing agri-cultural Sector	U. S. D. A	Transferred to INA 6/1986
11.	NGENGE WAWA, Anthony	6/1985	7/1985	Data Systems for developing countries	Uni. of Wisconsin	Head, Studies, DEP Division.
12.	NJEJOU Jonatta	6/1985	7/1985	Basic Ag. survey statistics and methods	U.S.D.A - S.R.S.	Statistics Divisi DEP
13.	MEZAZEM Edouard	9/1985	10/1985	Organization and Operation of Extension Services	Univer. of Illinois	Chief, Ext.Service DIRAGRI
14.	NLEND Valentin	9/1985	10/1985	" " "	" -"- "	Prov. Chief-Littor

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANT TRAINING - SHORT TERM 1980 - 1986

NAME	DEPARTURE	RETURN	TRAINING SUBJECT	LOCATION	COMMENTS
15. MEKA-ENGAMBA, Andre	3/1986	4/1986	Study tour of agricultural education and Extension Programs	U.S.D.A., State Universities of Florida, Pennsylvania and Kansas	Director, Department of Agric. Training
16. BALEPA, Elizabeth Mme	4/1986	5/1986	Study tour of agirucltural education and research institutions	U.S.D.A., Virginia Florida and Lovisiana.	Deputy Director, DEP **
17. BINDOUA, Jean-Roger	5/1986	10/1986	Management of Government Organizations	U.S.D.A.	Personal Assistant to Director, DEP
18. HAOUA, Rebecca (Mlle)	9/1986	10/1986	Small Farmer Credity Policy	U.S.D.A.	Div. of Studies, DEP
19. KOUAM, Augustine	9/1986	10/1986	Basic Agricultural Survey Statistics and Methods	U.S.D.A.	Prov. Statistical Officer-Center

* Accompanied by Prawl, Agricultural Education and Extension Advisor.

** Accompanied by Kite, Chief of Party.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ANNEX 5

LISTING OF PIO/C'S

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Annex 5

Agricultural Management and Planning Project
MINAGRI/USAID
Yaounde - Cameroon

PIO/Cs Report - 1985/86-87

N°	PIO/C N°.	Description	Date Issued	Value of PIO/C	Date Items Received	Estimated Balance PIO/C
				$		$
1	10117	Maps	6-17-85	3,000.00	1985-86	-o-
2	40068	Cherokee Spare Parts	7-10-85	9,000.00	-- --	9,000.00
3	50067	4Motive Vehicles	11-20-85	320,000.00	5/2/86 - 7/7/86	40,000.00
4	10099	Journals, Periodicals	11-17-83	10,000.00	12/7/85	--
5	10116	Vehicles	4-12-85	30,000.00	7/2/85 - 8/9/85	-o-
6	50071	Office Furniture	12-2-85	27,569.71	1/13/86	-o-
7	40038	Home Furniture	3-18-85	107,000.00	12/17/85	-o-
8	10119	Calculators and Batteries	6-26-85	8,500.00	4/23/86	-o-
9	50062	Motorcycles and Spare Parts	10-08-85	31,000.00	11/7/85 - 1/13/86	-o-
10	50059	Computer hardware and software	8-29-85	190,000.00	1/20/85 - 6/13/86	-o-
11	10118	Compasses, Tape Measures, Planimeter, Miscellaneous Office Supplies	7-18-85	9,900.00	10/22/86 - 11/24/86	-o-
12	60020	Photocopy Machines	6-26-86	21,000.00	10/15/86	-o-
13	P.O.90143-F	Cherokee tires	6-16-85	P.O. 2,200.00	4/8/86	--
14	10109	Tool Sets	4-10-84	8,500.00	4/23/85 - 6/21/85	3,180.00
		--				

N.B. PIO/C value is -o- if balance is less than $100.00

Agricultural Management and Planning Project
January 21, 1987

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

ANNEX 6

1986/87 PROJECT BUDGET

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

OPERATING ACTIVITY	ITEM	SUBTOTALS	TOTALS
1.00 TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE			$586,340
1.10 Long-term technical advisors		901,340	
1.11 Salaries and allowances	440,000		
1.12 Support costs and housing	172,000		
1.13 Travel	72,000		
1.14 Transport/storage HHS/travel to post	50,000		
1.15 Other costs	17,340		
1.16. PASA overhead	150,000		
1.20 TDY Advisors		25,000	
1.30 Evaluation		60,000	
2.00 TRAINING			286,060
2.10 Long-term 9 participants		161,000	
2.20 Short-term		50,000	
2.30 In-country seminar (Statistics)		50,000	
2.40 Inflation + other		25,060	
3.00 COMMODITIES			394,600
3.10 Vehicles		220,000	
3.11 GRC Statistics vehicles (12)	180,000		
3.12 GRC Statistics motorcycles (10)	20,000		
3.13 TA vehicle (fifth person)	20,000		
3.20 Computer equipment and supplies		86,500	
3.21 Computers and equipment	30,000		
3.22 UPS(power system)+transformers	23,000		
3.23 Printers (4 letter quality)	4,000		
3.24 Computer software	2,000		
3.25 Local Area Network (2)	27,500		
(7,500 travel+10,000*2 network)			
3.30 Calculators, compass, etc.		20,000	
3.40 Planimeters 3x$500		1,500	
3.50 Office equipment		3,000	
3.51 Office rental (9 months @ 300,000/mo.)		8,200	
3.60 Baseball caps (500)		6,000	
3.70 Document center equipment		20,000	
3.80 Books and training materials		10,000	
3.90 Inflation etc.		19,400	
4.00 OTHER COSTS			168,000
4.10 Publication expense		20,000	
4.20 Computer services and maintenance		20,000	
4.30 Administrative officer		24,000	
4.40 Translator		5,000	
4.50 Language training		7,000	
4.51 French	4,000		
4.52 English	3,000		
4.60 Other support costs		72,000	
4.61 Vehicle operation and maintenance	40,000		
4.62 Office supplies and equipment	8,000		
4.63 Local employees salaries and support	24,000		
4.70 Inflation etc.		20,000	
5.0 TOTAL			$1,035,000

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

ANNEX 7

SUMMARY OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ANNEX 7: SUMMARY OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES

Sub-sector Studies

Activity:	Food Sector Study
Status:	Early stages
Prepared by:	DE and DS
Funded by:	DEP
DEP Participation:	Outline has been prepared. Statistical Analysis of traditional crop sector under work. Population/Land Use paper planned.

Activity:	Livestock sub-sector
Status:	Completed
Prepared by:	DS, Litschauer
Funded by:	DEP
DEP Participation:	exclusive

Activity:	Cash Crop
Status:	proposed for Feb 1987
Prepared by:	DS, Litschauer
Funded by:	DEP
DEP Participation:	exclusive

Activity:	Modern Sector
Status:	proposed for June
Prepared by:	No info
Funded by:	No info
DEP Participation:	No info

Activity:	Crops Structure
Status:	proposed for January 1988
Prepared by:	No info
Funded by:	No info
DEP Participation:	

Special Studies

Activity:	National Food Marketing Study
Status:	Completed
Prepared by:	GFS-MIDAS for Ministry of Commerce
Funded by:	FED
DEP Participation:	Wrote TOR in 1980 Served on technical advisory committee. Seminar planned

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

Activity:	Coffee/Cocoa Regeneration Study
Status:	Completed
Prepared by:	SEDA
Funded by:	DEP
DEP Participation:	Terms of Reference, Aug. 1985 Summary report prepared by Ngite Seminar planned for March, 1987 Used census data? Two DE staffers worked on it

Activity:	Rural Sector Finance Study
Status:	Completed
Prepared by:	GTZ for IBRD
Funded by:	PNUD
DEP Participation:	Terms of ReferenceNo info Mann and Bomda participated in field studies. Summary and Seminar planned

Activity:	Studies for National Seminar on Cooperatives
Status:	Planning
Prepared by:	DEP staff in collaboration with outside experts
Funded by:	UNDP, ILO
DEP Participation:	Terms of Reference for studies written with ILO expert Write special studies (March-May) Seminar for mid-1987

Activity:	Post-Harvest Crop Protection
Status:	FAO to finance Phase II project
Prepared by:	Anticipate team of three consultants (ag econ, crop storage expert, and agronomist.
Funded by:	No info
DEP Participation:	Terms of Reference, "Pertes Post-Recoltes", March 1985

Activity:	Agricultural Labor
Status:	Planned for July 1987-March 1988
Prepared by:	DEP personnel in cooperation with staff at extension service, at least two outside consultants.
Funded by:	DEP funding requested
DEP Participation:	Terms of Reference, "Work-Time Study of Cameroonian Agriculture", March 1985

Other Activities

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Activity:	Cameroon Agricultural Review
Status:	Proposal and mock up
Prepared by:	Kite
Funded by:	DEP funding requested
DEP Participation:	Will be major instrument for disseminating information regularly.