

**APPENDIX D
A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY - PART I**

PD-ABG-193
ISN 92057

1. BEFORE FILLING OUT THIS FORM, READ THE ATTACHED INSTRUCTIONS.
2. USE LETTER QUALITY TYPE, NOT "DOT MATRIX" TYPE.

IDENTIFICATION DATA

A. Reporting A.I.D. Unit: Mission or AID/W Office <u>USAID/Rwanda</u> (ES# _____)	B. Was Evaluation Scheduled In Current FY Annual Evaluation Plan? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Skipped <input type="checkbox"/> Ad Hoc <input type="checkbox"/> Evaluation Plan Submission Date: FY <u>92 Q 3</u>	C. Evaluation Timing Interim <input type="checkbox"/> Final <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ex Post <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/>
--	---	--

D. Activity or Activities Evaluated (List the following information for project(s) or program(s) evaluated; if not applicable, list title and date of the evaluation report.)

Project No.	Project /Program Title	First PROAG or Equivalent (FY)	Most Recent PACD (Mo/Yr)	Planned LOP Cost (000)	Amount Obligated to Date (000)
696-0110	Farming Systems Research Project (FSRP)	9/26/84	3/30/93	\$15.7	\$15.7

ACTIONS

E. Action Decisions Approved By Mission or AID/W Office Director Action(s) Required	Name of Officer Responsible for Action	Date Action to be Completed
(1) Ensure participants still in U.S. for long term training complete their program and return to Rwanda.	ADO:KFuller	2/15/93
(2) Perform Project Closeout.	ADO:KFuller	3/30/93

(Attach extra sheet if necessary)

APPROVALS

F. Date Of Mission Or AID/W Office Review Of Evaluation: _____ (Month) _____ (Day) _____ (Year)

G. Approvals of Evaluation Summary And Action Decisions:

	Project/Program Officer	Representative of Borrower/Grantee	Evaluation Officer	Mission or AID/W Office Director
Name (Typed)	Kurt Fuller	Egide Nizeyimana	Claudia Cantell	Gary Nelson
Signature				
Date		3/12/93	2/11/93	4/23/93

ABSTRACT

H. Evaluation Abstract (Do not exceed the space provided)

Project: Final evaluation: Farming Systems Research Program
 Contract no.: PDC-1406-I-00-0073, D.O.# 14
Period: 9/92-11/92
Project officer: Claudia Cantell **Budget:** \$56,905

Description: Tropical Research & Development, Inc. provided an agronomist and an agricultural economist to determine the extent to which the project had assisted the host-country government in developing a farming-systems approach for research and extension, including effective links between research and extension institutions. The evaluation team assessed economic impacts and sustainability of the project, as well as appropriateness of agricultural technologies developed to aid Rwandan farmers. And the team assessed the impact to the project from a civil war, including the 1990 evacuation of the project's long-term staff.

The final-evaluation team found the project's training efforts, improvements to infrastructure and work with women farmers were beneficial. A total of 22 Rwandans earned Ph.D., M.S. and B.S. degrees from U.S. universities, and more than half of these graduates were reemployed by Institut des Sciences Agronomiques du Rwanda (ISAR). AFRICARE, for a modest sum of \$750,000, repaired roads, installed potable-water systems, built training centers and constructed storage hangars in the project area. These improvements will be of continuing value to the rural community. The FSRP team worked with women farmers, who composed an estimated 40 percent of total farmers; women were recruited as extension agents, and women were represented among Rwandan counterparts for long-term training.

However, the project suffered as a result of poor management and due to a lack of farming-systems expertise among the project-implementation team. Because farming-systems methodology was not implemented, few of the developed or proposed technologies were subjected to requisite socioeconomic analysis. As a result, sustainability of technologies tested among farmers was not fully assured. Although the higher-yielding varieties of beans, wheat and potatoes continued to be used by farmers, the value of the much preferred bean variety, G2333, was compromised by the onset of a fungal root disease. Other technologies, such as the Lime plus NPK treatment and the agroforestry species, *Sesbania*, were either abandoned or recognized as inappropriate.

Success of the project was also limited because recommendations from previous project evaluations were not followed. The 1986 evaluation led to the fourth project amendment, in which USAID unilaterally eliminated the extension component and the extension advisor's position, compromising the project's relevance to farming-systems research and extension. In 1988, the inspector general recommended an evaluation to determine the significance of extension for continued project implementation. The 1989 project evaluation that followed led to a fifth amendment, in which the extension component was reinstated and continued until the project agreement completion date.

COSTS

I. Evaluation Costs

1. Evaluation Team		Contract Number OR TDY Person Days	Contract Cost OR TDY Cost (U.S. \$)	Source of Funds
Name	Affiliation			
Dr. Alex C. Cunard	TR&D	PDC-1406-1-00- 0073-00, D014	\$56,905	Project
Dr. Millie Gabdois	TR&D			
Ms. Claudia Cantell	USAID/PDO			
Mr. Kurt Fuller	USAID/ADO			
Dr. Paul Bartholomew	USAID/ADO			
Mr. Emmanuel Twagirumukiza	USAID/ADO			
Dr. Egide Nizeyimana	GOR/ISAR			
2. Mission/Office Professional Staff		3. Borrower/Grantee Professional		
Person-Days (Estimate) <u>10 days</u>		Staff Person-Days (Estimate) <u>10 days</u>		

21

A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY - PART II

SUMMARY

J. Summary of Evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations (Try not to exceed the three (3) pages provided)
Address the following items:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose of evaluation and methodology used • Purpose of activity(ies) evaluated • Findings and conclusions (relate to questions) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principal recommendations • Lessons learned |
|--|--|

Mission or Office:
USAID/Rwanda

Date This Summary Prepared:
12/7/92

Title And Date Of Full Evaluation Report:
Final Evaluation - FSRP 12/7/92

The Farming Systems Research Program (FSRP), USAID Contract # 696-0110-C-00-5016-00, began in 1984 with the launching of preliminary diagnostic survey during the project's design phase. The survey was implemented in four communes, Nyamugali, Nyarutovu, Cyeru and Butarø in the Ruhengeri Prefecture.

The final evaluation team found the project's training efforts, improvements to infrastructure and work with women farmers were beneficial. However, the project suffered as a result of poor management, the implementation team's lack of expertise in farming-systems research and because recommendations from previous project evaluations were not followed.

Positive aspects of the project were the training program and AFRICARE's construction of infrastructure. A total of 22 Rwandans earned Ph.D., M.S. and B.S. degrees from U.S. universities, and more than half of these graduates were reemployed by Institut des Sciences Agronomiques du Rwanda (ISAR). However, because of GOR policy constraints, their future in ISAR is uncertain.

AFRICARE, for a modest sum of \$750,000, repaired roads, installed potable water systems, built training centers and constructed storage hangars in the project area. These improvements will be of continuing value to the rural community.

The project had a significant impact upon women although women were not specifically targeted. The rapid reconnaissance survey (RRS) of the 1992 evaluation team revealed no difference between men and women's access to project personnel, resources or information. Unfortunately, FSRP's failure to collect data on the number of women participants rendered impossible any disaggregation of project impacts comparatively between women and men.

However, FSRP worked with women farmers, who composed an estimated 40 percent of total farmers; women were recruited as extension agents, and women were represented among Rwandan counterparts for long-term training.

One constraint to project success was that the FSR/Extension team that was to implement the project had no experienced leadership, nor were they adequately qualified to practice farming-systems research. They conducted no complementary diagnostic or verification surveys to explore further findings of the preliminary survey and, thus, failed to characterize recommendation domains or to identify and prioritize real constraints and problems of farmers. Since farming-systems methodology was not implemented, practically none of the developed or proposed technology were subjected to requisite socioeconomic analysis. Consequently, those technologies, such as the Lime and NPK treatment and the agroforestry species, *Sesbania*, were found to be unacceptable to farmers. Much on-station testing and even some on-farm trials conducted could be classified under upstream research; only a few on-farm trials fell under the category of down-stream research or research oriented towards solving problems and constraints of farmers.

A series of evaluations, internal and external, took place although most recommendations of the evaluating teams were not followed. The 1986 evaluation led to the fourth project amendment, in which, unfortunately, USAID unilaterally eliminated the extension component and the extension advisor's position, compromising the project's relevance to farming-systems research and extension. In 1988, the inspector general found the changes in the fourth amendment unacceptable and recommended an evaluation to determine the significance of extension for continued project implementation.

3

The 1989 project evaluation that followed led to a fifth amendment, in which the extension component was reinstated and continued until the project agreement completion date (PACD).

Project management by the University of Arkansas (UOA), USAID and ISAR was unsatisfactory throughout the project. With a few exceptions, the UOA was not able to provide a technical-assistance team that was adequately trained and experienced in farming-systems research and extension or with multidisciplinary capabilities. Nor were the TA teams representative of required disciplines, including agricultural economics. The team was unable to integrate itself fully with ISAR. Administrative and financial management problems plagued the UOA.

USAID management was poor throughout the project. Some salient management errors were use of project funds for USAID management costs that were not budgeted and for revision of the 1986 mid-term evaluation, with subsequent elimination of the extension component.

Effective implementation of the project was rendered extremely difficult by the advent of armed hostilities in October 1990. The hostilities led to the evacuation of the expatriate staff from the Rwerere Experiment Station in November 1990. Subsequent to that date, the expatriate staff made monthly or bimonthly visits to the stations from Kigali, which led to a commiserate reduction in levels of effort by research-station staff.

The station was directly attacked in June 1992 and activity at the station had ceased at the time of this final evaluation.

ISAR was unable to provide counterparts to the expatriate team. Those counterparts who were assigned were continually replaced, resulting in a lack of continuity and commitment to sustained research.

Because of the absence of an experienced farming-systems economist, the socioeconomic program was seriously compromised. The sociologist who was appointed as a socioeconomic was unable to fulfill the task of adequate economic analysis or even partial budgeting. This problem was likely the reason that the economic analysis contained in the final report for the FSRP was prepared without his knowledge and/or participation.

Because technologies tested among farmers did not undergo rigorous scrutiny of farming-systems methodology, their sustainability was not fully assured. Although the higher yielding varieties of beans, wheat and potatoes continued to be used by farmers, the value of the much preferred bean variety G2333 was compromised by the onset of a fungal root disease. Other technologies, such as the Lime + NPK treatment and the agroforestry species, *Sesbania*, were either abandoned or recognized as inappropriate.

ATTACHMENTS

K. Attachments (List attachments submitted with this Evaluation Summary: always attach copy of full evaluation report, even if one was submitted earlier; attach studies, surveys, etc., from "on-going" evaluation, if relevant to the evaluation report.)

Final Evaluation, 12/7/92

COMMENTS

L. Comments By Mission, AID/W Office and Borrower/Grantee On Full Report

1. The Mission generally concurs with the findings of the evaluation which was conducted in accordance with the scope of work and in a thorough and satisfactory manner.
2. The Mission notes that many aspects of project implementation and impact were unsatisfactory. In particular the prime contractor failed to provide staff who had farming systems research experience, while ISAR did not provide adequate counterpart staff. Contractor and grantee shortcomings were compounded by inappropriate action taken by USAID in response to the 1986 evaluation, following which the extension component of the project was eliminated. Problems created by lack of continuity of personnel, lack of appropriate expertise and knowledge of farming systems research methodologies and the inadequate research-extension linkage were major factors contributing to the failure of the research program to impact on the farming population in the project area.
3. The Mission believes that it is important to acknowledge that the failure of the project to generate impact did not result from a shortcoming of Farming Systems Research methodology, *per se*, but from an inadequate application of research practice.
4. Rural infrastructure development was probably the component most appreciated by the population. However, this component did not directly contribute to the achievement of project purpose, i.e., strengthening of ISAR capacity to carry out agricultural research using an FSR/E approach.
5. Training is widely viewed as the major lasting contribution of the project although participants were not trained in FSR/E methodology. However, the Mission is concerned that ISAR pay and employment policies do not provide incentive for returning trainees to remain with the institution, and that this will compromise the effectiveness of USAID investment in overseas training. The Mission and GOR need to address this issue as well as the equivalency between the US university degrees and those issued by Rwandan or third country institutions.
6. In view of the revised orientation of Mission strategy, which emphasizes private sector development, no further direct bilateral USAID investment for agricultural research is proposed. Other bilateral and multilateral donors are continuing to support agricultural research in Rwanda and it is appropriate that A.I.D. concentrate on other areas of development and avoid duplication of effort within the agricultural research sector. The Some USAID support for research into primary industries in Rwanda is continuing through centrally-funded projects.

ATTACHMENTS

K. Attachments (List attachments submitted with this Evaluation Summary; always attach copy of full evaluation report, even if one was submitted earlier; attach studies, surveys, etc., from "on-going" evaluation, if relevant to the evaluation report.)

Final Evaluation, 12/7/92

COMMENTS

L. Comments By Mission, AID/W Office and Borrower/Grantee On Full Report