PD-AAS-789

AIRGRAM

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

UNCLASSIFIED
CLASSIFICATION

For each address check one ACTION | INFO

DATE REC'D.

TO - AID/W TCAID A- 163

DATE SENT 9/6/78

DISTRIBUTION
ACTION
INFO.

FROM · USAID/Islamabad

SUBJECT · Project Evaluation Summary (PES) 391-78-6 for Village Level Food Processing Project 391-0417

REFERENCE ·

1. The scheduled date for the Village Level Food Processing PES was 2/79, but the scheduled mid-phase I and II evaluation review in July 1978 was broadened into a special evaluation.

2. The prime contractor, Denver Research Institute (DRI), did not provide necessary guidance and supervision to the subcontractors in-country and its first reports require improvement. The GOP's Appropriate Technology Development Organization (ATDC) notified DRI of its deficiencies and the level of guidance provided by DRI's Program Supervisor. DRI has been requested to put its final reports into a form consistent with the terms of the contract and to fill the position of program leader to improve in-country coordination.

3. Worthwhile research has been done in-country and the GOP maintains a high degree of interest in the project. It is premature to discuss progress towards achieving project purpose at this early stage of project implementation.

4. If project monitoring reveals no improvement in contractor performance then a decision will be made concerning contract termination.

Encl: PES 391-78-6 — sent mail Room 10/3/78

HUMMEL

OTHER AGENCY

PAGE 1 OF 1 PAGES

DRAFTED BY	OFFICE	PHONE NO.	DATE	APPROVED BY:
AHWirtz:ms	Program	225	8/31/78	Director (A):WAWolffer

AID AND OTHER CLEARANCES

AGR:ADLundberg
FC(A):ASLezin
DD(A):AMHandly

UNCLASSIFIED
CLASSIFICATION

AID:5:39 (9-62)

(Do not type below this line)

PRINTED 3-63

CLASSIFICATION

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) — PART I

Report Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE	2. PROJECT NUMBER	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE
Village Level Food Processing	391-0417	USAID/Pakistan

4. EVALUATION NUMBER (Enter the number maintained by the reporting unit e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No. beginning with No. 1 each FY) 391-78-6

☐ REGULAR EVALUATION ☒ SPECIAL EVALUATION

5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES			6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING	7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY 76	B. Final Obligation Expected FY 79	C. Final Input Delivery FY 79	A. Total $ 800,000 B. U.S. $ 565,000	From (month/yr.) 11/77 To (month/yr.) 7/78 Date of Evaluation Review 7/11/78

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

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., airgram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
- The role of Denver Research Institute (DRI) versus the sub-contractors in implementation of the project will be sorted out to resolve implementation problems.	ATDO & DRI	September 78
- The position of Program Leader, under terms of the DRI contract, will be filled to provide the needed guidance and assistance to the sub-contractors.	ATDO & DRI	September 78
- Denver Research Institute (DRI) will put draft reports in a form that would more closely follow terms of the prime contract.	DRI	October 78
- The socio-economic situation at the village level as explained in the DRI final report on Phase I will be closely scrutinized and action taken, thru additional research to fill any gaps.	ATDO & USAID	October 78

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS

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

10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT

- A. ☒ Continue Project With improved implementation
- B. ☐ Change Project Design and/or ☐ Change Implementation Plan
- C. ☐ Discontinue Project

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

Evaluation Team

Dr. M.M. Qureshi, D.G., ATDO
Mr. Abdul Razaq Sheikh, Plan. Div.
Prof. Thomas Degregori, AID/W
Mr. David Lundberg, USAID

Also assiting were Messrs. Erickson, Aslam and Qayyum of DRI, PCSIR and IACP.

12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval

Signature: [signature]

Typed Name: William A. Wolffer

Date: 9/3/78

AID 1330-15 (3-78)

13. Summary

The project is just beginning, only seven months into a 42 months planned implementation period. The prime contractor, Denver Research Institute (DRI) and two local sub-contractors, the Pakistan Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (PCSIR) and the Investment Advisory Centre of Pakistan (IACP), are responsible for execution of the initial two phases of the project. PCSIR works with the technical aspects of village level technology and IACP with the socio-economic aspects.

Although implementation is proceeding according to project design there are problems concerning the guidance and supervision being provided to the sub-contractors by DRI. Recommendations to resolve this problem are being made and acted upon. The GOP's Appropriate Technology Development Organization (ATDO) notified DRI of its deficiencies, especially in the coordination of its sub-contractors and the level of guidance provided by DRI's Program Supervisor. DRI has been requested to fill the position of program leader to improve in-country coordination and to put its reports into a form consistent with the terms of the contract.

Interest and enthusiasm on the part of the Government of Pakistan is high, particularly in the area of village level sugar processing. Sugar processing appears to offer considerable potential with rice bran and oilseed processing at the village level questionable, however final decision must await additional work by the contractor to complete phases I and II.

14. Evaluation Methodology

A four day mid-phase review was held to determine progress of Phase I, an evaluation of the potential for developing appropriate improved food processing technology for village level processing of sugar, oil seeds and rice bran, and phase II, a world search for improved technology useful to Pakistan.

Participants in the review were the Dirctor General of ATDO, experts from the private sector concerned with each of the three technical areas discussed, a senior representative from the GOP Planning Division and USAID personnel. Representatives of DRI, PCSIR and IACP were also available to assist the review team.

The team reviewed the sub-contractor draft reports, recommended modifications, and provided guidance for ATDO and USAID to consider in future project activities. As scheduled in the Project Paper this was the mid-phase I and II evaluation review, which ordinarily would not require a P.E.S. since it was conducted early in the project implementation, but it was decided to broaden the review into a special evaluation to examine the questionable performance of DRI.

15. External Factors

All important assumptions remain valid. It was encouraging to note the high degree of interest the GOP Planning Division has in the project, particularly the sugar processing element. They are relying on the project for guidance on whether to expand the large sugar mill concept or decentralize in the future to village level or some intermediate location.

16. Inputs

The primary problem in this area is in the provision of technical services. It was apparent that the sub-contractors were not receiving the type of guidance and direction necessary to assure quality information and reports needed for deciding the course of the project. This was discussed, recommendations made, and action is being taken as described in the summary.

17. Outputs

It is premature at this stage to comment on the outputs. With the implementation of the decisions taken during this review the initial outputs will be on target.

18. Purpose

The purpose of the project is that -- "feasible method of improving small scale, sugar cane, oilseed and rice bran processing identified, developed, tested and the potential for commercialization of improved technology demonstrated."

It is premature to discuss progress toward achieving EOPS targets at this early stage of the project however preliminary findings indicate that rice bran oil extraction at the villagel level may not be feasible and perhaps will be dropped.

19. Goal/Sub-Goal

The goal is to -- "increase employment, raise incomes of small farmers and village food processors and increase the supply of village produced sugar and edible oil". No progress has been made toward achieving the goal at this early stage of the project.

20. Beneficiaries

The target population is the rural villager in the sugar, oil seed, and rice producing areas of Pakistan.

Due to the target population and the nature of the food processing activities upon which this project focuses, social feasibility issues may be of special import in this project. Consequently Phase I research plans include explicit provision for socio-economic analysis intended to:

A. Describe and analyze the social milieu in which village food processing activities occur.

B. Identify constraints, including social factors, that may limit the target population's access to or acceptance of innovations that may be developed in the course of project implementation.

This initial review of draft reports indicated a weakness in the analysis of these crucial areas. Recommendations were made to further analyze the data and pending the contents of the final research reports, follow-up work in these areas may be necessary.

21. Unplanned Effects

This topic is not pertinent at this early stage of project implementation.

22. Lesson Learned

This topic is not pertinent at this early stage of project implementation.

23. Special Comments or Remarks

Initial project implementation by DRI has not been satisfactory but DRI's contribution can be fully adequate if the recommendations of the review team are followed. If project monitoring reveals no improvement in contractor performance then a decision will be made concerning contract termination.