

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

1. PROJECT TITLE Appraisal of Health Mangement Systems 931-1016			2. PROJECT NUMBER 931-1016	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE DS/RAD
5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES			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) <u>81-19</u> <u>3/12/81</u>	
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY <u>77</u>	B. Final Obligation Expected FY <u>81</u>	C. Final Input Delivery FY <u>81</u>	6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING DS/RAD A. Total \$ <u>943,386</u> Missions \$ <u>68,000</u> B. U.S.	
			7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION From (month/yr.) <u>September, 1977</u> To (month/yr.) <u>January, 1981</u> Date of Evaluation Review	

B. 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
A. Document outputs: Emphasize analysis of technical assistance rendered by project in order to build literature which will assist AID mission's planning and to provide a base for the discipline's further analytical work. Monitor to ensure timely submission of these documents and their formal and informal review.	DS/RAD Project Officer Ex. Director - AUPHA	
B. Technical Assistance. Continue TA to Jordan and Ecuador. No additional unless document development (A) proceeds at a pace to allow staff time.	DS/RAD Project Officer	Specified dates prior to Sept. 8: Most before June 81.
C. De-emphasize papers which have not had successful field use.	DS/RAD Project Manager AUPHA	

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS	10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) Interpretation or amendment to contract <input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T <input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) <input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P	A. <input type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change <input type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change Implementation Plan C. <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinue Project

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)	12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval
Jeanne F. North DS/RAD <i>Jeanne F. North</i>	Signature: <i>[Signature]</i> Typed Name: Jerome French, Director DS/RAD Date: <u>3/12/81</u>

Summary of Evaluation of Appraisal of Health Management Systems
Project #931-1016
February 12, 1981

This project evaluation summary is written with the benefit of the following:

- 1) the Evaluation Team' (TEAM) report submitted July, 1980, (which extended the project for one year)
- 2) the contract amendment of September, 1980 (and which was responsive to many of the TEAM's recommendations),
- 3) the response of AUPHA to the evaluation in two letters of January, 1981 and
- 4) the recommendations of the Project Technical Coordinating Committee at its meeting of January, 1981. This summary is written by DS/RAD project officer, new to the project as of October, 1980. (The project has had two previous project officers).

This summary notes 1) areas of divergence of view, 2) recommendations for modifications of project design which have been put into effect and 3) project decisions pending.

1. The evaluation team asserted that the original design of the project by AID was unrealistic; that the project was designed to meet a need current at the time, namely to provide better technology for exhaustive health sector assessments and to render them more useful for planning. Even after the modification of the 1978 amendment, (largely needed because there was sharply reduced use of such comprehensive sector analyses), the altered design, in the team's view, evidenced a "misunderstanding of ministries' needs and interests; of Mission interest, knowledge and reward systems". This opinion seemed to have been ratified by members of the project Technical Coordinating Committee. Moreover, the team considered the intended project outputs to be so over-ambitious that no contractor would be able produce them. The team faulted the project's aim for tools of universal application. It was the team's view that there are few "right answers", rather, that there are "several reasonable paths."

It is not clear to what extent AUPHA disagrees with this assessment of earlier project design. In his letter of response, Dr. Brown speaks of the development of an overall methodology and the importance of emphasis on the relationship of any of the project document outputs to the overall project methodology. He seems to support an iterative process in methodology development, emanating from theory. On the other hand, Dr. Brown, Dr. Emrey and team are all agreed that a creative response to actual problems is what is sought; the team suggests that this can be developed only from host country experience. Dr. Emrey's letter suggests a demurrer to the contention that the earlier design did not address Mission needs, in his reference to the Brooking Workshop, yet he, too, refers to materials of field origin.

Conclusion: It will be useful to see what light is shed on these questions by Agency and peer review of the guidelines for self assessment and of the analyses of field experiences. The project manager should ensure that, in spite of two changes in project design, a congruence of purpose is maintained between AID and contractor.

All concerned, AUPHA, DS/RAD, the Project Coordinatin Committee, are agreed, without qualification, that AUPHA consultants are highly skilled and that field consultations and materials are valuable. The differences of opinion regarding the academic, vs. operationally accessible nature of drafts of guidelines produced by the project reflect the strains common to projects which seek operational benefit from needed academic expertise. All are agreed that the final form of these drafts is to be practical, self-appraisal tools.

Differences of opinion regarding alleged inadequacy of compensation for consultants is an issue in the evaluation only if present practice inhibits timely production of project documents and availability of consultants when needed. The comparatively small size of the pool of consultants (who are part time) is perhaps largely due to the lack of demand for consultants under the earlier design, and the wish to maintain continuity in the consultant roster in the later field consultations.

2. A decision to extend the contract for a year followed the Team report of 7/80. The majority of Team recommendations were accepted and incorporated in the project amendment of 9/80. Prior to the evaluation some of these changes had begun with consultations to USAID Missions regarding USAID projects. The amendment called for analysis of process and training needs and testing of guidelines to accompany these field consultations. The "users' manual" was shelved; the extended work in Jordan was endorsed. The team recommended a reduction in the number of guideline papers to be produced, but, the contract amendment did not reflect this, nor the call for fewer planned consultancies in order to aim for a more realistic implementation strategy. A reduced consultation plan was recommended by the Project Committee in 1/81.

3. Still to be agreed upon are the number and nature of a variety of reports, analysis and training materials called for in the 9/80 amendment, and the number of field consultancies which can be offered. DS/RAD has been fortunate to have the unusually competent assistance of Dr. Ron O'Connor and Dr. Charles DeBose in the writing of the evaluation report, and the care and thought of Dr. Gordon Brown and Dr. Robert Emrey as well as the Project Technical Coordinating Committee in its review.

(The evaluation team's report, letters referred to above and memorandum about Project Technical Coordinating Committee meeting may be seen at DS/RAD).