

Georgia - Agribusiness Development

Report generated on: November 10, 2015

Visit our data catalog at: <https://data.mcc.gov/evaluations/index.php>

Overview

Identification

COUNTRY

Georgia

EVALUATION TITLE

Agribusiness Development

EVALUATION TYPE

Independent Evaluation

ID NUMBER

DDI-MCC-GEO-AG-2014-v1.1

Version

VERSION DESCRIPTION

Anonymized dataset for public distribution

Overview

ABSTRACT

The evaluation considers a range of outcomes of the ADA program, including production and profitability, investment and technology adoption, employment and wages, and access to credit and markets. Though it was originally designed as a rigorous impact evaluation that incorporated a randomized design, the evaluation was not able to undertake a rigorous statistical

analysis of the program on these outcomes for a number of reasons, including the small overall size of the program, changes during implementation that compromised the original evaluation design, and the timing of the evaluation. Instead, the evaluation uses a mixed methods approach combining qualitative data with descriptive quantitative analysis to assess the impact of the project.

Qualitative data collection included focus group discussions and in-depth interviews that collected detailed information from a total of 69 respondents. Respondents were recruited from among those who responded to the ADA survey and were grouped together by type of grantee (PP, VA/VCI, and FSC as separate groups) and by characteristics of interest based on responses to the ADA survey (those that reported an increase in income, those that didn't respond to income questions, those that closed their businesses, exporters, and machinery ring grantees). These interviews and focus groups were transcribed and analyzed using the specialized software package NVivo to systematically categorize responses and identify commonalities. Themes of interest to the evaluation were identified and then coded in all of the transcriptions. Summaries of responses by code and respondent type were completed and interesting cases were highlighted, providing some concrete examples of project results and/or feedback that also served in helping interpret the quantitative data.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

Other (Performance Evaluation)

UNITS OF ANALYSIS

Small, medium and large agribusinesses (MCG grantees and non-grantees)

KIND OF DATA

Sample survey data [ssd]

KEYWORDS

Georgia, performance evaluation, agriculture, ADA

Coverage

GEOGRAPHIC COVERAGE

The program was implemented nationally.

UNIVERSE

Applicants to the ADA program from all application rounds (9 in total) in Georgia.

Producers and Sponsors

PRIMARY INVESTIGATOR(S)

Name	Affiliation
NORC at the University of Chicago	Independent evaluator

FUNDING

Name	Abbreviation	Role
Millennium Challenge Corporation	MCC	Funded evaluation and Round 3 data collection
Millennium Challenge Georgia	MCG	Funded Round 1 and Round 2 data collection

Metadata Production

METADATA PRODUCED BY

Name	Abbreviation	Affiliation	Role
Millennium Challenge Corporation	MCC		Review of Metadata
NORC at the University of Chicago	NORC		Compiled original metadata files, additions to MCC-compiled metadata file
Institute for Polling and Marketing	IPM		Produced original metadata for Rounds 1 and 2
Analysis and Consulting Team	ACT		Produced original metadata for Round 3

DATE OF METADATA PRODUCTION

2014-06

DDI DOCUMENT VERSION

Version 1.1 (August 2014) Added missing fields and edited content.

DDI DOCUMENT ID

DDI-MCC-GEO-AG-2014-v1.1

MCC Compact and Program

COMPACT OR THRESHOLD

Georgia Compact I

PROGRAM

In 2005, the Millennium Challenge Corporation and the Republic of Georgia signed a \$395 million Compact that included a range of activities to support the agriculture and infrastructure sectors. The Compact included the Agribusiness Development Activity (ADA), an agricultural grants program. This \$20 million program targeted a range of beneficiaries in the sector, with separate grants facilities for small producers, larger enterprises, and input suppliers. The ADA program was implemented between 2006 and 2011, disbursing a total of 283 grants in amounts ranging from \$5,000 to \$300,000. Grants were awarded on the basis of a competitive application process, and required matching contributions from beneficiaries. Grantees were engaged in a wide range of agricultural activities in various parts of the country. In 2006, NORC at the University of Chicago was contracted to conduct an evaluation of the ADA activity. The evaluation covered two out of the three sub-activities of ADA: Enterprise Initiative: This initiative involved modest-sized grants of between USD 5,000 and 50,000 mainly for producers and for entrepreneurs in rural production and marketing infrastructure, with emphasis on value-added activities. A key element of this component was the creation of a network of farm service centers throughout the country to supply production inputs and technical advice to groups of local producers. Value Chain Initiative: This portion

of the ADA program involved making larger grants in the range of USD 50,000 to 300,000 to commercial operators for projects that strengthen important value chains. In addition to providing grants focused on enterprise and value chain development, the program also later responded to a request from the Georgian Ministry of Agriculture to support the introduction of new agricultural machinery into the country. In early 2009, an additional component was added called the ADA Machinery Ring program. This program provided grants to existing Farm Service Centers for the purpose of purchasing agricultural equipment that would be rented to farmers to facilitate improved technology adoption.

MCC SECTOR

Agriculture and Irrigation (Ag & Irr)

PROGRAM LOGIC

The \$20 million ADA component of the MCC Georgia Compact was designed to target key areas of agro-economic development in Georgia that would lead to sustainable poverty reduction in rural areas. The aim was to improve the competitiveness of the Georgian agriculture sector and accelerate its transformation from subsistence production to profitable farms and rural enterprises directly participating in commercial value-chains that would result in new jobs and increased firm and household incomes. To reach these goals, the ADA program components were designed to stimulate the rural economy through agricultural enterprise development that would expand production, improve quality, and add value. The program was originally designed to employ a “value chain approach” that included strengthening commercial linkages among agricultural service providers, producers, processors, wholesalers/distributors, and markets. Program activities focused on the provision of matching grants to farmers and agribusinesses in critical value chains that supply agricultural products to the domestic market. The use of matching grants was believed to increase a farmer’s sense of responsibility towards provision of inputs, mitigate investment risk for Georgian agribusinesses, help mobilize capital for the sector (which accounted for less than 2% of commercial lending), introduce new technologies, and achieve commercial scale viability at an accelerated pace. Activities were grouped into three main components: - Enterprise Initiative: This initiative involved modest-sized grants of between USD 5,000 and 50,000 mainly for producers and for entrepreneurs in rural production and marketing infrastructure, with emphasis on value-added activities. A key element of this component was the creation of a network of farm service centers throughout the country to supply production inputs and technical advice to groups of local producers. - Value Chain Initiative: This portion of the ADA program involved making larger grants in the range of USD 50,000 to 300,000 to commercial operators for projects that strengthen important value chains. - Market Information: This part of the program included a series of activities to disseminate information on agricultural best practices and pricing mechanisms, as well as promoting the other components of ADA; however it was subsequently cancelled. The logic of the program was that grants and technical assistance to farm service centers, primary producers, and value-adders lead to increased volumes and values of production through the use of higher quality agricultural inputs, including more modern agricultural equipment. Higher quality and volume of primary products lead to increases in volumes and values of sales, with additional help from improved access to markets. Higher sales revenues translate into increases in net revenues, allowing investment and expansion of the agribusinesses, including hiring employees at possibly higher wages. Greater levels of employment and compensation and more profitable businesses increase household net incomes and reduce poverty levels.

PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

Grants under the ADA program were awarded to four categories of beneficiaries- three under the Enterprise Initiative and a single Value Chain Initiative grantee group. Below is a description of each category: i. Primary Producers (PP): Targeted PPs were farmers and farming operations linked with existing Farm Service Centers and Value Adding operations and potential ADA clients. Agricultural activities considered included: - Fruits and Vegetables: vegetable, fruit, and “environmentally friendly” production - Animal Husbandry: Dairy products; beef, pork and lamb production; poultry and egg production; bee-keeping; and fish farms and hatchery support. ii. Value Adding Enterprises (VA): VAs were expected to increase production volume and quality in addition to introducing new and improved technologies and expanding market access. Targeted projects generally fell into two categories: - Collection, Storage, and Distribution: milk collection stations, small-scale vegetable/fruit packing houses, and conventional cold storage - Processing and Packaging for the Retail Market: small-scale dairy processing, fruit and vegetable canning, dried fruits and vegetables, slaughterhouses and meat-cutting operations, enterprises adding value to walnuts and hazelnuts, tea processing, and honey processing or packaging. iii. Farm Service Centers (FSC): FSCs are profit-oriented, privately-owned legal enterprises designed to meet the needs of Georgian farmers through the supply of inputs; provision of machinery; veterinary, breeding, and agricultural extension services; marketing of farmers’ products; provision of market and technical information; and links to credit providers. Assistance provided to each approved FSC project included: building renovation, agricultural and processing machinery, veterinary facilities and equipment, proper storage and shelving, a cash register, computer and accounting system installation, and training. iv. Value Chain Initiative Enterprises (VCI): VCI grants focused on key enterprises in “nationally important” value chains. These included input suppliers, service providers, processors, distributors and other off-farm enterprises that were to build the foundation for a stronger agricultural sector. They were to strengthen the rural economy as a whole, providing increased opportunities for job creation and income generation. Examples include nursery and seed production enterprises, fruit and vegetable processing and packinghouses (including cold storage), dairy processing, slaughterhouses, meat processing, broiler facilities, and nut processing. The initial approach to beneficiary selection was based on a set of criteria of eligibility developed jointly by MCC, MCG, and CNFA program developers to insure high impact and sustainability. These criteria included commercial viability; adherence to ethical business standards; location in rural areas; access to cash or a

matching contribution; minimum relevant experience; engagement in production, sales, and/or distribution of agricultural inputs, services, or output marketing and consulting leading to increased incomes and employment; legal registration; good financial standing to implement the project; and compliance with environmental requirements.

Sampling

Study Population

Applicants to the ADA program from all application rounds (9 in total) in Georgia.

Sampling Procedure

Round 1:

The frame for the survey is the list of all applicants. It was supplied by CNFA, the program implementer, along with the scores from the initial evaluation, various statuses assigned by CNFA, and various items of information taken from the applications.

Each of the four applicant types were considered as separate strata, that is, primary producers (PPs), farm service centers (FSCs), value adders (VAs) and value chain enterprises (VCHs).

For PPs, one comparison case was selected for each new treatment case. A propensity score matching (PSM) methodology was used to select the comparison cases, using binary logistic regression. The dependent variable was the event of being a treatment case. The independent variables, all available from data supplied by CNFA on the frame, were:

- * the amount of matching contribution the applicant proposed to make
- * the current turnover of the business when it made its application
- * the number of employees of the business when it made its application
- * whether the business was able to secure credit
- * the year in which the business was established
- * whether the business was located in a village or larger town
- * the type of activity the business was proposing to be engaged in
- * the round in which the applicant applied

For each PP treatment case, the comparison case with the closest PSM score was selected for inclusion in the survey sample, as long as it had not been selected for interview previously.

For the other applicant types (FSCs, VAs and VCHs), stratified random sampling was used to select comparison cases. Because the populations were relatively small, two comparison cases were selected for each treatment case. Selection of comparison cases was to be made within the same strata in which the treatment cases occurred. The strata were defined in terms of the current turnover of the business when it made its application and the year in which the business was established. Type of activity was also used to define the strata for VAs and VCHs.

Round 2:

The following sampling rules were applied:

1. Include all businesses that had been interviewed in Round 1 from ADA application waves 1 to 7.
 - a) Interviewees from ADA application waves 8 and 9 were excluded because those interviews had been conducted too recently to expect significant change to have taken place in the meantime.
 - b) Selections were made in terms of "businesses" rather than "applications" because some businesses had applied several times. Where a selected business had made multiple applications, the most recent application was nominally selected for inclusion in the survey, regardless of whether that application or an earlier one was the basis of interview in ADA application waves 1 to 7. The most recent one was chosen because it would have the most up-to-date contact information.
 - c) 199 applications were selected on this basis.
2. Include treatments from any ADA application wave that had not yet been interviewed in Round 1. Some of these were previously non-response and some appeared to have wrongly claimed to have been previously interviewed on the basis of another application. 29 applications were selected on this basis.
3. Include applicants that scored 70+ (passing score) in ADA application waves 1-7, that have not yet been interviewed, but that are not previous nonresponse. Most appear to have wrongly claimed to have been previously interviewed on the basis of another application. 8 applications were selected on this basis.
4. PPs and VAs were not fully enumerated in Round 1, and the process used to randomly select applicants with a score less than 70 has not enabled the probability of selection to be derived. Therefore, for Round 2, select a random sample of 100 PPs and 25 VAs applications, where (i) neither they nor any related application was interviewed in ADA application waves 8 or 9, and (ii) neither they nor any related application received a score of 70+. If the selected application has not already been selected under condition 1 above, include in the Round 2 Survey.

- a) 78 PP applications were selected on this basis, that is, 22 of the 100 were already selected under condition 1 above.
 b) 18 VA applications were initially selected on this basis, that is, 7 of the 25 were already selected under condition 1 above.

However, as there were only 20 eligible VAs to be chosen under this condition, all 20 were included and so the VAs became fully enumerated.

In total there were 334 applications selected for inclusion in the survey.

The frame and summary information about the selections are included in the external resource "Followup frame and selections.xlsx".

Round 3:

The sample frame was created by NORC and included all cases that were part of the sample in Round 1 and all the cases that were part of the sample in Round 2. The sample comprised of treatment and control groups with three main types of businesses in each group. Overall 600 face-to-face interviews were planned to be conducted for Round 3. This sample frame was then put through a re-listing exercise to update it since the list of business status and contact information included many incorrect telephone numbers and addresses, there was turnover in owners/managers of agribusinesses, and some had shut down.

For the relisting exercise, ACT first tried calling the phone numbers, then conducted field visits to the listed addresses. If still unable to locate the business, ACT regional coordinators contacted local authorities/representatives. Upon contacting the business, updated information about the business status, location, and contact information was collected for use during the main data collection. This updated list was the sample used for data collection.

Deviations from Sample Design

Round 1

It should be noted that the model for PPs was re-estimated many times and some comparison cases were selected on the basis of the PSM scores generated in each of those runs. First of all, it had to be re-estimated for each wave of the survey, as new applicants appeared in the frame and new treatment cases were chosen by CNFA. Secondly, many applicants did not have values for all the independent variables, and therefore the model was re-estimated a number of times with varying reduced sets of independent variables.

In practice, the strata were defined with too much detail and comparison cases often could not be found in the same strata as treatment cases. Therefore strata had to be combined. This was done in an ad hoc way, with the result that the probability of selection is not available and corresponding sampling weights cannot be calculated.

By wave 4, it was also found that the pool of comparison cases was so small for FSCs and VCHs that all cases had to be included in the sample, that is, these categories are fully enumerated. This then applies to wave 5 also.

Selection of comparison cases was on a quota basis, that is, there was substitution for non-responding selections and for selections that no longer existed as separate entities.

This occurred because some green-field proposals never commenced operations, because some businesses ceased operations, and because some businesses merged with or had always operated jointly with other applicants that had already been interviewed.

Round 2

During the course of the survey, two notable changes were made to the frame. First, it was discovered that one applicant had not been included in the CNFA Masterlist. This was a VCI applicant and it was therefore added to the survey. Second, it was discovered during interview (and subsequently confirmed) that applicant #318 should have been classified as a PP and not as a VA.

Round 3

None

Response Rate

Round 1:

The details of response rates (for each variable separately) are provided in the external resources.

Round 2:

Case response rates are included in the data file as a separate variable. It was calculated by counting all answered codes in each case, also counting every answered code (except refuse -1 and don't know -2) and then dividing the second number by the first. The detailed information about the variable response rates (for each variable separately) you can find in external resources -"Variable Response Rates_Follow-Up.xlsx".

In total, 335 applicants were selected for interview. Of these, 217 (65%) were interviewed face to face. A further 51 (15%) had ceased business or were merged with other businesses but were interviewed briefly by telephone. There were 33 noncontacts (including 2 businesses that are known to have been sold to new owners) and 32 refusals (including one ceased or merged business). Details are available in the external resource "Selection and field disposition summary.xlsx".

Round 3:

The response rate was calculated based on the number of complete cases out of the number of eligible cases in the sample. A case was considered complete using the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) standard where 80% of the questions that were supposed to be answered have a valid answer (non-valid answers consisted of "don't know", refusals, or interviewer errors that skipped the question), taking into consideration the skip patterns.

The overall response rate was 68.3% (397 complete cases out of 593 eligible cases). The response rates for each group are as follows:

Primary producer treatment: 75% (114 out of 151)
 Primary producer comparison: 43% (155 out of 362)
 Value Adders/Value Chain initiative treatment: 71% (34 out of 48)
 Value Adders/Value Chain initiative comparison: 34% (56 out of 163)
 Farm Service Center treatment: 71% (24 out of 34)
 Farm Service Center comparison: 21% (14 out of 68)

Weighting

Round 1: Not calculated.

Round 2: A census was conducted of FSCs, VAs VCI. While there is a random selection of additional PPs in the sample, not all selections were chosen through the random process, and so no weights have been derived for Round 2.

Round 3: Not calculated.

Questionnaires

Overview

The ADA evaluation uses data collected using a farm- and business-level survey, the ADA Survey, designed specifically for the evaluation of the program. The ADA Survey is a longitudinal panel survey comprised of three different surveys and three different rounds. The three different surveys are:

- Primary Producer Survey: enterprise descriptives; production inputs, volumes, and values; marketing distribution channels; number of employees and salaries; enterprise assets; transportation accessibility; utilities; business growth potential; sources of finance; impact of natural disasters.

- Farm Service Center Survey: enterprise descriptives; geographic catchment area; value of products and services provided; machinery and equipment; number of employees and salaries; enterprise assets; transportation accessibility; utilities; business growth potential; sources of finance; impact of natural disasters.

- Value Adder and Value Chain Initiative Grantee Survey: enterprise descriptives; production inputs, volumes, and values; marketing distribution channels; number of employees and salaries; enterprise assets; transportation accessibility; utilities; business growth potential; sources of finance; impact of natural disasters.

Questionnaires were designed in English and then translated, tested through cognitive interviews (for Round 3 only), piloted prior to every round, and fielded in Georgian. Questionnaires in English and Georgian are provided in the external resources.

Data Collection

Data Collection Dates

Start	End	Cycle
2008-05-22	2008-06-23	Round 1, wave 1 (application rounds 1-5)
2008-08-01	2008-09	Round 1, wave 2 (application round 6)
2009-01	2009-02	Round 1, wave 3 (applicaiton round 7)
2009-07-25	2009-09-30	Round 1, wave 4 (application round 8)
2010-01-10	2010-03-26	Round 1, wave 5 (application round 9)
2010-09	2010-10	Round 2
2012-09-26	2012-10-16	Round 3

Data Collection Notes

IPM collected the Round 1 and Round 2 ADA Survey under contract to Millennium Challenge Georgia (MCG). ACT collected Round 3 under a subcontract to NORC, who was contracted by MCC.

Round 1: The fieldwork implementation schedule was elaborated by regional supervisors in advance, but due to the difficulties related to the recruiting respondents the fieldwork plan was frequently changing. The sampled respondents were telephoned in advance and approximately 80% of them agreed on the interview. The delays/refuses were caused by the fact that respondents were very busy (treatment) or had negative attitude (Control, Comparison) towards the ADA project:

Every of Treatment Group members preliminary agreed on an interview, though many of them expressed burden to provide the information referring to the fact that they have already done lot's of reporting to the CNFA and are bothered;

Few of the Control Group members agreed on an interview and those who refused (4 cases) expressed critics and irritation towards the project and didn't agree on cooperation;

Recruiting of the respondents from the Comparison Group had been very difficult: a) 21% of respondents were not reachable - as the phone numbers from CNFA master list were invalid; b) around 15% of respondents had stopped the operations; c) 20 of them had no interest to attend interviews, however the wider pool of sampling frame gave flexibility to substitute the above mentioned respondents with the new ones.

Format of Questionnaires:

The size of the questionnaires appeared to be very long and tiresome for the respondents. The interviews lasted 2 hours or even more in some cases and such specificity of the required information used to cause irritation of respondents in some cases. Approximately in 20% of interviews with FSC, VA/VCI, interviewers had to visit respondents second time in order to obtain valid information based on financial recording of the respondent activity. In some cases visit was not necessary and respondents (or their accountants) used to provide the missing information by telephone. Such cases occurred in approximately 20-25 interviews. Among those Treatment group composes about 50% and rest is distributed among Control-30% and Comparison-20%.

The general part of questionnaire, which is common for all 3 types of projects (PP, FSC, VA /VCI), was completed without any problems and in a short period of time, what we can not say for the particular modules of the questionnaires, which varies by project type. Especially in the cases where the specific financial information had been required (for e.g.: history of sales for each marketed goods), what had been a cumbersome for all targets groups.

In general format of questions included in the questionnaire had been consistent with the available information.

Round 2:

Pilot surveys:

The Baseline Survey experienced a number of difficulties with the questionnaire. Therefore there was some redesign of the questionnaires and two pilot surveys were conducted.

The aim of the first pilot of 10 respondents was to test improvements in the following areas:

Questions that were difficult to comprehend for the respondents;

Questions that were left without answer

Questions, which have additional answers unforeseen in the questionnaire

Questions that were ambiguously understood by the respondents

Questions that were irritating respondents

Other difficulties revealed during the pre-test

A second pilot of 30 respondents was then conducted to test further changes made to the questionnaire, to test a new block of summary questions that were added, and to test the effectiveness of using incentives.

Further detail on the pilot tests is available from external resources: "MCG_ADA_Results of pilot testing_23.09.09.doc " and "MCG_ADA_Results of pilot testing_22.01.10.doc"

Before the fieldwork the training of the interviewers was conducted, explaining the survey instrument, introducing before the interview and the ways of conducting the it. Farther data on training is available from external resource "MCG_ADA_Training Manual_Follow-Up.doc";

The fieldwork implementation schedule was elaborated by regional supervisors in advance, but due to the difficulties related to the recruiting respondents the fieldwork plan was frequently changing. The sampled respondents were telephoned in advance and approximately 65% of them agreed on the interview. The delays/refuses were caused by the fact that respondents were very busy (treatment) or had negative attitude (Control, Comparison) towards the ADA project:

Even some Treatment Group members were unable to reach or were not agreed to cooperate, but most of them agreed on the interview, though many of them expressed burden to provide the information referring to the fact that they have already done lot's of reporting to the CNFA and are bothered; For those unreachable and/or refused grantees the most helpful assistance was provided from MCG and CNFA field monitors and eventually they were found and interviewed (except few cases that had considerable reasons for not participating in the Surevy).

Few of the Control Group members agreed on an interview and those who refused expressed critics and irritation towards the project and didn't agree on cooperation;

Recruiting of the respondents from the Comparison and Control Groups had been very difficult: almost 36% of respondents were not reachable - as the phone numbers from CNFA master list were invalid and in these cases even the field monitors of CNFA were unable to help (provide the correct number or settlement), as it was done for Treatment cases.

Considering that the most part of the contact information was incorrect, the field visits were implemented in order to find the non-contact respondents. If the respondent could not be recruited by IPM's recruitment stuff (the phone was turned off, wrong number, no phone number at all and etc.) the contact information of such respondent was given to the relevant regional supervisor. Then the regional interviewers were arriving in the settlement and try to find the non-contact respondent by asking villagers. If the interviewer had another interview planned in the same village which was already recruited he/she also was asked after the interview about the non-contact. Some of our interviewers have acquaintances in the local administrations and/or in the local bodies and in some cases they also were involved in searching the non-contact respondents, some interviewers remembered the places where the respondents from the waves of the baseline survey were interviewed. Approximatly 40 respondents were identified and interviewed during such visits.

Format of Questionnaires:

The size of the questionnaires appeared to be very long and tiresome for the respondents. The interviews lasted 2 hours or even more in some cases and such specificity of the required information used to cause irritation of respondents in some cases. In some cases interviewers had to visit respondents second time in order to obtain valid information based on financial recording of the respondent activity. In some cases visit was not necessary and respondents (or their accountants) used to provide the missing information by telephone. But the frequency of such cases was law comparing it to the Baseline Survey.

The general part of questionnaire, which is common for all 3 types of projects (PP, FSC, VA /VCI), was completed without any problems and in a short period of time, what we can not say for the particular modules of the questionnaires, which varies by project type. Especially in the cases where the specific financial information had been required (for e.g.: history of sales for each marketed goods), what had been a cumbersome for all targets groups.

In general format of questions included in the questionnaire had been consistent with the available information.

Further detail on data collection is available from external resource:
"Fieldwork_FollowUp.xls";

Round 3: Several stages of questionnaire testing were completed: Cognitive interviews, pre-test study and pilot study. To keep the questionnaire comparable to previous rounds, no major changes were made to the questionnaire.

Questionnaires

The ADA evaluation uses data collected using a farm- and business-level survey, the ADA Survey, designed specifically for the evaluation of the program. The ADA Survey is a longitudinal panel survey comprised of three different surveys and three different rounds. The three different surveys are:

- Primary Producer Survey: enterprise descriptives; production inputs, volumes, and values; marketing distribution channels; number of employees and salaries; enterprise assets; transportation accessibility; utilities; business growth potential; sources of finance; impact of natural disasters.
- Farm Service Center Survey: enterprise descriptives; geographic catchment area; value of products and services provided; machinery and equipment; number of employees and salaries; enterprise assets; transportation accessibility; utilities; business growth potential; sources of finance; impact of natural disasters.
- Value Adder and Value Chain Initiative Grantee Survey: enterprise descriptives; production inputs, volumes, and values; marketing distribution channels; number of employees and salaries; enterprise assets; transportation accessibility; utilities; business growth potential; sources of finance; impact of natural disasters.

Questionnaires were designed in English and then translated, tested through cognitive interviews (for Round 3 only), piloted prior to every round, and fielded in Georgian. Questionnaires in English and Georgian are provided in the external resources.

Data Collectors

Name	Abbreviation	Affiliation
Institute for Polling and Marketing	IPM	Millennium Challenge Georgia contractor
Analysis and Consulting Team	ACT	NORC subcontractor

Supervision

Round 1 and 2:

The fieldwork activities were implemented by 33 interviewers of IPM. 9 regional supervisors coordinated the interviewers. The role of the supervisors was to control the processes, to improve those mistakes that were made at the beginning of the fieldworks and to oversee the rest of the fieldwork process. Also the supervisors were controlling interviewers in the field in order to observe how well they have acknowledged the specifics of the survey, how well they cope with their duties, how appropriately do they proceed the relations with respondents in each target group and whether they are sending the correct messages to respondents, avoiding misinterpretation of the survey objective and false expectations regarding the project.

Round 3:

Interviews were conducted by individual interviewers and submitted to regional coordinators. ACT used a team of 9 regional coordinators and 35 interviewers. There was one regional coordinator for each region who worked with teams of 3-7 people, depending on the size of the sample in that region. Completed questionnaires were submitted to Tbilisi office for further revision. Control group based on Tbilisi office randomly selected 25% of the completed questionnaires per interviewer for control activities. 15% of the interviews were controlled via telephone while 10% of the respondents were visited and asked fixed set of questions to check data validity. The revision specialist was responsible for reviewing each questionnaire, checking for missed questions, skip errors, fields incorrectly completed, and checking for inconsistencies in the data.

Data Processing

Data Editing

Round 1 and Round 2:

Data editing took place at a number of stages throughout the processing, including:

a) Primary logical control of the questionnaire:

At the end of each week the interviewers submitted the completed questionnaire to the regional supervisors. In the presence of the interviewers the supervisors checked the accuracy of filling the questionnaires and logical skip patterns. Where mistakes were discovered, a question without a response or ambiguous information, they called the respondents and checked the data.

b) Secondary logical control of the questionnaire:

From the beginning of the field period, at the end of each week and in some cases after two weeks, the regional supervisors sent the questionnaires checked by them to Tbilisi. The secondary logical control of these questionnaires and coding was conducted in the IPM office.

Round 3:

Data editing took place at number of stages throughout the processing, including:

a) Primary revision of the completed questionnaires by regional coordinators

b) Comprehensive checking of the questionnaire by revision specialist

c) Coding of the questionnaire

d) Structural checking of SPSS data files

Other Processing

100% double data entry was completed with the exception of the first waves of Round 1. From the ADA application wave 8 (Round 1, wave 4 of data collection), based on DQR recommendations, the decision was made to do 100% double data entry. Detailed information is provided in the external resources.

Data Appraisal

No content available