A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY - PART I

PD ABL-077
94697

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: Trade and Investment Office	B. Was Evaluation Scheduled in Current FY annual Evaluation Plan?	C. Evaluation Timing
Mission or AID/W Office USAID/Dom. Rep. (ES# 2.07/B-LC)	Yes [] Slipped [X] Ad Hoc [] Evaluation Plan Submission date: FY 94 Q4	Interim [] Final [X] Ex Post [] Other []

D. Activity or Activities Evaluated (list the following for project(s) or program(s) evaluated; if not applicable, list title an 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)
2.07/B (Stand Alone Local Currency Proj.)	Integrated Pest Management Project (IPM)	FY 1990	12/94	DR$7.5M.	DR$7.5M.

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
Since this is the final evaluation and there are no additional funds expected to continue financing a second phase of this project, no action is required. However, a copy of both the summary and the full report will be provided to USDA/DR, which has an agreement with the GODR to continue fighting the white fly and similar agricultural pests.	Odalís Pérez, TIO	None

APPROVALS

F. Date Of Mission Or AID/W Office Review Of Evaluation:	(Month)	(Day)	(Year)
	September	23	1994

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)	Larry K. Laird, TIO		Luis C. González B., PDO	Marilyn A. Zak, DIR
Signature	Larry K. Laird		[signature]	[signature]
Date	5/3/95		5/4/95	5/5/95

ABSTRACT

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

The project is designed to find short and long-term solutions to the serious agricultural pest and pesticide use problems in the Dominican Republic. It is implemented by the Junta Agroempresarial Dominicana (JAD) and the Fundación de Desarrollo Agropecuario (FDA), in collaboration with the Secretaría de Estado de Agricultura (SEA) through a team of 14 crop protectionists distributed in four regional centers. This final evaluation was conducted by an MSI consultant over a 2.5 week period. The evaluation approach included visiting each of the main project sites and interviewing the project staff, beneficiary farmers, and private and public sector extensionists. The purpose of the evaluation was assess the project impact on local agricultural production and the degree of project achievements at the end of its four year. Major findings and conclusions are:

- This project compares very favorably with similar present and past projects in Latin America and can be considered a first rate and successful project. Working in an adverse and even hostile environment, it has accomplished much in a relatively short time, often exceeding its initial objectives. By providing answers to complex and -- from farmers' viewpoint -- often baffling crop protection problems and offering cost-effective and environmentally friendly IPM alternatives, it has won the respect and support from the agroindustry community and the public sector. Much of its success is due to the enthusiasm, energy, and dedication of its staff.

- This project has succeeded in introducing IPM approaches in target crop production systems, which have significantly altered the traditional dependence on pesticide use in favor of more cost-effective and environmentally-sound techniques.

The evaluator noted the following "lessons":

- To effectively promote IPM adoption, a project with limited resources must first capture the interest and support of target producers and devote most of its efforts to extension and training. In addition to the solutions offered, the success of such project will also depend on the motivation of its staff.

- A popular project, which is subject to changing crop protection conditions and pressures from influential farmers, whose priorities may not necessarily coincide with the project's, must periodically reexamine its objectives both to keep them in sharp focus, as well as to adjust them to changing conditions, as needed.

- Projects which must assist and work closely with farmers should not become involved in regulatory functions, such as crop destruction, which could directly affect some of these same beneficiary farmers.

COSTS

I. Evaluation Costs

1. Evaluation Team Name	Affiliation	Contract Number OR TDY Person Days	Contract Cost OR TDY Cost (U.S. $)	Source of Funds
Dr. Angel A. Chiri	MSI		$21,113	PD&S

2. Mission/Office Professional Staff Person-Days (Estimate)	3. Borrower/Grantee Professional Staff Person-Days (Estimate)

A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY - PART II

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

- Purpose of evaluation and methodology used
- Purpose of Activity(ies) evaluated
- Findings and conclusions (relate to question)
- Principal Recommendations
- Lessons learned

Mission or Office:	Date This Summary Prepared:	Title And Date Of Full Evaluation Report:
USAID/DR	September 23, 1994	Integrated Pest Mgt. Proj. Final Evaluation

Purpose of Evaluation and Methodology Used

The purpose of this final evaluation of the IPM Project in the Dominican Republic is to assess the project impact on agricultural production, the environment, and farmer income in the project target areas, as well as the degree of project achievements at the end of its fourth year of implementation. This evaluation further determines how well has the project met its objectives, as defined above and in the Project Paper, and identifies intervening impediments.

Purpose of Activity Evaluated

Since 1990, USAID/DR has supported the implementation of the Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Project in the Dominican Republic. It was designed with the main purpose of finding short and long-term solutions to the evolving pest and pesticide problems that have seriously affected this country's agriculture in recent years, including rejections of agroexport shipment in the U.S. due to unacceptable pesticide residues. One of the project's primary target pests have been whiteflies and a newly arrived thrips species. The project is implemented by the Junta Agroempresarial Dominicana (JAD) and the Fundación de Desarrollo Agropecuario (FDA) in collaboration with the Secretaría de Estado de Agricultura (SEA). Main project activities include farmer-responsive research, extension and training in four geographic regions. The training and extension components were designed to flow directly from research activities to assure prompt dissemination of IPM methodologies to farmers. At the field level, the IPM Project is implemented by a team of 14 crop protectionists.

Principal Findings and Conclusions

Research Objectives

Considering that it was not fully staffed until early 1991 and that it had to deal with unusually serious crop protection problems, the IPM project has been remarkably effective in finding short term solutions and initiating the search for long-term solutions for target pest problems, including two whitefly species, the sweet potato weevil, the potato tuberworm, the citrus weevil, the diamondback moth, and the avocado lacebug.

Training and Technology Transfer

Approximately 70% of project resources have been devoted to training and extension activities. Extension has been provided to beneficiary farmers through field days, demonstration plots, technical assistance activities, and through validation research carried out in farmers' fields. Training activities have included informal talks, seminars, and workshops. The extension and training activities have often blended into one another, as training sessions have tended to be designed to both heighten awareness of the IPM approach and adverse impacts of excessive pesticide use, as well as to transfer practical pest management options. These activities have been highly successful in encouraging farmer's understanding and adoption of IPM practices in target areas. Once the training and awareness program had reached substantial numbers of farmers and agronomists, many of these became enthusiastic project supporters and accepted the IPM approach to crop protection. Furthermore, many producer organizations, as well as individual farmers, found in the project an outlet for venting, discussing, and finally seeking rational solutions to what seemed to be, until then, unmanageable crop protection problems.

Support for Project in the Agribusiness Community

The agribusiness sector support for the IPM project is in general very high. During its relatively short life, the project has gained widespread acceptance, credibility, and respect in each of the four regions where it operates. Strong expressions of support come from both the organized tomato, citrus, and tobacco agroindustry, as well as from individual small and medium beneficiary producers of fresh market tomatoes, potatoes, sweet potatoes, cabbage and other vegetable crops, and avocadoes. The IPM project is openly credited by farmers with helping them save crop production costs through substantial pesticide reductions and offering hope for dealing with present and future pest problems in an organized and rational manner.

Project Impact on the Rural Poor and its Contribution to Poverty Alleviation

The project's remarkable gains in fostering IPM adoption benefits the poor in several ways. Small farmers and field workers benefit from the decreased emphasis on pesticide use and increase awareness of the health risks associated with inappropriate and excessive pesticide use, all of which has a hidden economic cost. The project's contribution to the adoption of more cost/effective crop protection techniques and to the reduction of potential pest damage benefits crop production and all those associated with its target commodities, including all those whose livelihood depend on or is related in some way to the production of such commodities.

Project Impact in the Environment in Target Areas

The project has created awareness of the consequences of excessive pesticide use introduced IPM techniques that emphasize the use of nonchemical pest control practices and the use of action thresholds to guide pesticide applications. In a country where there is a surprisingly wide selection of pesticides of all kinds available to farmers, with little or no guidance for their use, this project has introduced in its areas of influence a better understanding of the proper role of pesticides in agriculture. In many cases, the average number of pesticide applications in its target crops has been sharply reduced, and many of the conventional organosynthetic pesticides have been replaced by "softer" pesticides, such as oils, soaps, and microbials. One of the consequences of decreased pesticide use is that pests' natural enemies will have a better chance to survive and recolonize depopulated areas, thus contributing to the natural control of insect pests.

Principal Recommendations

- In spite of the significant achievements of this project, much remains to be done to expand the adoption of IPM practices and further minimize pesticide misuse. An effort should be made to extend the current amended PACD of 12/31/94 for at least four more years.

- Any future extension of this project should include provisions for continuing training of project staff in specialized IPM areas, such as: sampling and economic thresholds, biological control techniques, taxonomy of natural enemies, behavioral insect management techniques, and pesticide toxicology.

- The project must remain focused on previously selected research objectives. About 20% of project resources should be devoted to research efforts. The project should collaborate with institutions having research capabilities whenever undertaking medium or long-term research.

- This is the area where the project has had the greatest impact. In its present form, the project structure and team composition is highly suited to the very activities that have made this project successful. At least 70-75% of project resources should continue to be devoted to these activities.

- Project output of farmer and extension-oriented publications need to increase, based on perceived needs and target audiences. The project should have access to the services of a documentalist to facilitate this activity and should devote up to 10% of its efforts to this end.

4

- Any extension of the project should expand its outreach efforts in pest/pesticide management to women groups and audiences. Likewise, the project should design some of its planned pesticide management publications to women and their role in safe pesticide storage and use, both in the field as well as at home. JAD should also try to recruit female technical staff when replacing any extensionist who may choose to leave the project, or if project activities expand to other regions.

- The project should increase its pesticide management/safety training and awareness activities in the more contaminated areas, such as the Constanza valley. A pesticide management specialist should be recruited to carry out a nation-wide safe pesticide use program.

- The project should avoid becoming involved in the enforcement of crop-free period regulations. This role should be left to public sector authorities, such as SEA's regional director, who have the mandate and resources for such activities.
- Any second phase for this project should include a mid-term evaluation to assess project accomplishments and deal in a timely fashion with any significant implementation problems that may have arisen during its first two years.

- Current project management arrangements, which include close monitoring by AID, has allowed for a reasonably efficient project implementation. It is recommended that similar arrangements be maintained in any future extension of this project, including retaining a monitoring mechanism similar to AID's, as well as similar accountability requirements.

- If extended, the project should develop a workable sustainability strategy during its final year. The strategy could include plans for charging fees for services rendered, such as training, technical assistance, field diagnostic services, and -- on a selective basis -- pesticide testing.

Any extension of this project should consider mechanisms through which salary levels in the project can be adjusted to match those in the private sector. In addition, an evaluation system linked to annual increases and based on individual performance, professional skills, and motivation should be developed for the project staff.

Lessons Learned

- To effectively promote the adoption of IPM, a project with limited resources must first secure the interest and support of potential beneficiary farmers. It must also devote most of its efforts to extension and training activities. Furthermore, in addition to practical solutions offered, the success of such a project will depend largely on the dedication and motivation of its staff. In this particular case, it helped that many farmers, faced with a crisis for which there were no easy solutions, had become more amenable to IPM alternatives.

- A popular project, which is subject to changing crop protection conditions and pressures from influential farmers, whose priorities may not necessarily be the project's, must periodically reexamine its objectives, both to keep these in sharp focus, as well as to adjust them to evolving pest problems, as necessary.

- Projects which must assist and work closely with farmers should resist becoming involved in law enforcement activities, such as crop destruction, which could directly affect some of these same beneficiary farmers.

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.)

Full IPM Project Evaluation Report

COMMENTS

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

Mission is very pleased with the IPM evaluation. It shows that you can be effective even with limited resources (about $545,058, i.e. DR$7,500,000). Unfortunately, due to lack of resources Mission can no longer continue financing this type of activity.

Therefore, in regard to the recommendations stated in the final evaluation report of the project, it is not possible to extend the PACD or to have a second phase of this type of activity. However, a copy of both the full report and this summary will be handed over to USDA/DR which has now reached an agreement with the GODR to use some residual local currency for fighting the white fly and similar agricultural pests.