

CLASSIFICATION
PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

| | | | | |
|--|---|--------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| 1. PROJECT TITLE Surveys and Surveillance | | | 2. PROJECT NUMBER 931-1064 | 3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE ST/N |
| 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>22-7</u> 3/2/81 | |
| A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY <u>77</u> | B. Final Obligation Expected FY <u>87</u> | C. Final Input Delivery FY <u>87</u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION | |
| 6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING | | | 7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION | |
| A. Total \$ _____ | | | From (month/yr.) <u>10/78</u> | |
| B. U.S. \$ <u>2.475m</u> | | | To (month/yr.) <u>10/81</u> | |
| | | | Date of Evaluation Review <u>10/20/81</u> | |

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 |
|--|---|--------------------------------|
| A. The evaluation indicated that this is an essential ST/N project. It was decided that the project should be continued with a shift in emphasis from surveys to surveillance. | John McKigney | 2/82 - |
| B. It was decided that there should be a similar type of evaluation held at approximately the midpoint of the extension period. | John McKigney | 8/84 |

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Paper | <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____ |
| <input checked="" 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 | _____ |

10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT

A. Continue Project Without Change

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)

J. McKigney, Nutrition Advisor *m 1/2/84* H. Rice, ASIA/TR *VR*
 N. Luykx, Deputy Director *M. C. Luykx* J. Weissman, NE/TECH *inf*
 R. Brown, Program Officer *R. Brown* A. Silver, ST/PO *adv*
 L. Morse, LAC/DR *L. Morse* F. Campbell, ST/PO
 N. Kanno, AFR/DR *N. K. by J. McK.* A. Braunstein, NE/TECH *RWB*

12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval

Signature *Martin J. Forman*
 Typed Name Martin J. Forman
 Date 3/2/82

Surveys and Surveillance
Project Evaluation Summary Narrative

13. Summary

The Project Review Team considered this project to be an essential ST/N resource to backstop AID Regional Bureaus and Missions in their efforts to promote and enhance host governments' nutrition planning, programming and evaluation capabilities. It was felt that the recently established Cooperative Agreement with Cornell provides a number of heretofore missing elements in the project which will increase the ability of recipient countries to become self sufficient in nutritionally relevant data management and linking of information to decision making. While the project will focus primarily on surveillance methodology development in future years, it was felt that backstopping of nutrition surveys should be continued as a service function. Publication of detailed survey methodology manuals, now underway, was strongly endorsed as a means of documenting and disseminating the knowledge and experience gained through the project. Report circulation was considered to be adequate. More detailed documentation of non-ST/N inputs and post survey activities in host countries was suggested.

14. Evaluation Methodology

The purposes of the evaluation were to measure progress since the previous evaluation, assess adequacy of project leadership and response to clientele needs, verify appropriateness of host government and mission involvement and cost-sharing, and advise on the length of extension and approximate levels of funding for future years.

The scope of work for the evaluation, agenda of the review team meeting and list of participants are attached as Appendix I.

15. External Factors

External factors have not had a major impact on the project. Political developments have at times delayed host government follow-up, clearance of the survey reports, and on one occasion required cancellation of a survey at the last moment. While base funding of the project has in practice been substantially lower than projected and approved in the PAF, significant cost-sharing has been negotiated. The project design was based on the assumption that it would be possible to effectively collaborate with the U.N. Agencies in promoting surveillance and developing appropriate methodologies. This assumption has proved to be valid. On the other hand, the process of designing and establishing a nutritional surveillance system in developing countries has usually proved to be more complicated and, in some cases, more lengthy than anticipated. One external factor which could potentially have an adverse programmatic or funding effect would be that of further restrictions being placed by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) on international activities of the Nutrition Division of the Centers for Disease Control (CDC). This could result in the project not always being able to respond to requests for assistance or, alternatively, the need to contract these services with a private firm at considerably higher cost and probably not as satisfactory overall performance.

16. Inputs

The review team felt it desirable that there be more detailed documentation in project files of the cost-sharing which has been obtained from non-ST/N sources. This information is presented in Appendix 2.

Although not common, problems have been encountered in CDC backstopping of surveys and surveillance technical assistance visits. These were basically related to (a) poor communication on-site, (b) overbearing attitude, and (c) inflexibility regarding survey components, timetable, etc. The most likely basic causes have been: (a) absence of direct ST/N representation on exploratory and survey planning visits and negotiations with missions/host governments, (b) rapid turnover of CDC personnel, and (c) inflexibility and unresponsiveness of one individual to AID's suggestions. This person is leaving CDC in the near future. It was agreed that the forthcoming survey manuals will be helpful in conveying a clearer understanding of capabilities, limitations, procedures, resource requirements, etc. of the basic field survey methodology to host governments and missions. Also, present administrative arrangements between ST/N and CDC have permitted the problems to be minimized during the past year.

17. Outputs

Project Outputs are on schedule and, in some cases, have exceeded the targets. Some members of the review team indicated that they have seen the survey report for each country evolve over the course of the project's life to the point where it is now an extremely useful document.

On the other hand, Regional Bureaus and Missions would like to see more second stage analysis of survey data, which might produce critical information for programming purposes. It was explained that up until recently, contractual arrangements have restricted follow-on analysis to (a) validation of specific

measurements as predictors of morbidity/mortality and (b) cross-country comparisons to assess the sensitivity and specificity of anthropometric measurements. The Cooperative Agreement with Cornell provides a mechanism for follow-on analysis on an individual and cross-country basis and this operational research is already underway. The initial focus is on functional classification of the causes of malnutrition, which is the type of information that can most readily be utilized by host governments and donor agencies for decision making and programming purposes.

The team suggested that a formal listing be prepared of the impact each nutrition survey has had on the decision-making process and nutrition activities in the host countries. This information is presented in Appendix 3.

18. Purpose

"To develop in at least eight LDC's the capability and baseline information which will permit them to analyze and monitor the nature, magnitude and causes of their nutrition problems. To develop, refine and publish simplified methodologies for determining nutritional status, dietary intake patterns and nutrition surveillance systems".

The Project Review Team noted that the first purpose has been surpassed in that thirteen national nutrition surveys have been completed with substantial assistance from the project, while at least twelve additional countries have received technical assistance in development of nutrition surveillance systems. The second purpose has also been achieved. The set of End of Project Status conditions is considered to be still valid; project assistance is continuing as required to countries previously assisted and to countries desiring to initiate survey/surveillance activities and which meet project criteria.

19. Goal

"To achieve effective nutrition planning, programming and evaluation in the participating countries" "Goal achievement will be measured by the number of participating LDC's that adopt the methodologies made available through this project, train personnel to implement them, and the extent to which they are effectively utilized for improved planning and evaluation. The assumption is made that the LDC's will use the methods and information in developing nutrition programs".

Appendix 3 lists the post-survey activities in each country which have been relevant to goal achievement.

20. Beneficiaries

Pre-school children in the developing countries are the direct beneficiaries as the methodologies identify those who are malnourished or at risk of becoming so. The number of indirect beneficiaries in each country is infinitely larger as information which permits more effective prevention/intervention and more efficient use of resources addressed to reducing malnutrition is beneficial to each target family and all of society.

21. Unplanned Effects

Not pertinent at this time.

22. Lessons Learned

- A. Host governments should not be encouraged to undertake a national nutrition survey or establishment of a nutrition surveillance system unless it is seriously considered to be a high priority need;
- B. The probability of survey or surveillance system having a measurable and long-term impact on the decision-making and planning process is proportional to the host government sense of proprietorship;

- C. Host government officials and staff sense of proprietorship of the survey/ surveillance system requires a substantial commitment and degree of support on their part;
- D. While basic nutrition surveillance methods will be applicable to a number of situations, experience to date indicates that a nutrition surveillance system should be tailored to each country situation for it to be most useful and acceptable within that country.

23. Special Comments

In view of the fact that multisectoral nutrition surveillance systems are just getting underway in developing countries and that host governments requests for survey assistance is anticipated to continue indefinitely, the Project Review Team was of the opinion that a five-year project extension would be appropriate. It was felt that support from this project of the current level of activities of both the Centers for Disease Control and Cornell University should be sustained and that funding (allowing for inflation) should be sought accordingly. The Project Review Team's recommendations are being incorporated into a revised Project Paper and Budget proposal, which will also be reviewed by the same participants.

SCOPE OF WORK FOR A MANAGEMENT REVIEW OF THE S&T/N

NUTRITION: SURVEYS AND SURVEILLANCE PROJECT

A. Title and Number of Project

Nutrition: Surveys and Surveillance (931-1064)

B. Contractor and Cooperative Agreement

1. Contractor (RSSA)

Nutrition Division, Center for Health Promotion and Education
Centers for Disease Control (CDC)

2. Cooperative Agreement

Division of Nutritional Sciences
Cornell University (CNSP)

C. Purpose and Rationale for Management Review

This project serves as the Office of Nutrition's mechanism for developing appropriate methodologies and assisting selected developing countries in initial definition of the nature, magnitude and distribution of malnutrition in young children, and identification of associated factors (nutrition surveys) and obtaining ongoing information about the nutritional conditions of the population and factors that influence them (nutritional surveillance). The data from nutritional status surveys and surveillance systems are useful for long term food and nutrition planning, for establishing the need for early interventions to prevent deterioration of nutritional status, and for program evaluation. Project assistance in planning and implementation of nutritional status surveys and surveillance systems based solely on health/nutritional status data is provided through CDC. Assistance in nutritional surveillance based on the integration of data from several sectors of the economy is provided through CNSP. Periodic coordination meetings are held between CDC, CNSP and the project officer.

The purpose of this management review is to carefully assess the field support and methodology development activities carried out under the project since the last evaluation and determine the continuing need for these in the future. In view of the recent shift in project emphasis from surveys to nutritional surveillance methodology development, the recent establishment of CNSP, the greater than anticipated number of LDC requests for assistance in establishing surveillance systems, and AID Regional Bureau requests that S&T/N continue to backstop nutrition

surveys as a service function, a five year extension of the project is proposed.

D. Composition of Review Team

John McKigney, S&T/N, Nutrition Advisor and Project Officer
Julie Weissman, NE/TECH, Nutrition Advisor
Linda Morse, LAC/DR, Nutrition Advisor
Nellie Kano, AFR/DR, Nutrition Advisor
Harold Rice, ASIA/TECH, Nutrition Advisor

E. Other Participants in Review

Martin J. Forman, S&T/N, Director
Nicolaas Luykx, S&T/N, Deputy Director
Richard Brown, S&T/N, Program and Evaluation Officer
Garland Standrod, S&T/PO, Program Analyst
Frank Campbell, S&T/PO, Evaluation Officer
Fern Finley, S&T/PO, Evaluation Assistant

F. Dates and Place of Review

The review will be initiated on September 21, 1981 and should be completed by December 15, 1981. A final meeting of the review team will be held on October 20, 1981 to discuss the team's findings and to make recommendations for the future programming of this project. All evaluation activities will take place in Washington, D.C.

G. Estimated Cost of the Evaluation

Since all evaluation team members and other participants are AID direct hire employees, the review will cost only their salaries for the time they participate.

H. Project Background

1. Project Authorization and Funding History

This project stems from a commitment made by the U.S. Government at the 1974 World Food Conference to assist LDC's in defining the state of nutrition and to establish a global nutrition surveillance system. Since the conference assigned the lead role in promotion of nutritional surveillance to the U.N. Agencies, the project plan called for focussing primarily on developing and refining of nutrition survey methodologies during the initial years, then phasing into nutritional surveillance. This strategy permitted AID and U.N. Agency efforts and LDC assistance to be complementary rather than competitive.

Initial survey activities were funded under the Nutrition Planning and Analysis Project. The project paper was approved in FY 1977. Concurrently, a circular airgram (Attachment #1) advised all missions of the availability of assistance and the criteria for eligibility. The Committee on International Nutrition, NAS, reviewed the project in FY 1979. This led to approval of a two-year extension in FY 1980, with funding authorized to August 16, 1982.

2. Activities

The project is basically comprised of six interrelated activities, namely:

- a - assistance to LDC's in planning/implementation of nutrition surveys;
- b - assistance to LDC's in planning/implementation of nutritional surveillance systems;
- c - through a and b, develop and refine methodologies
- d - training of LDC personnel
- e - preparation of reports and manuals
- f - dissemination of results

a - Nutrition Surveys

The project has provided substantial assistance to the twelve countries listed on attachment #2 in conducting national nutritional status surveys. The level of support to individual countries from the project has varied considerably. A substantial degree of financial and manpower requirements were contributed from the project for each of the first five surveys, which provided an opportunity to test and refine the basic methodology under a variety of administrative and field situations. Since then, an effort has been made in every country to negotiate a cost-sharing arrangement. This stems from the experience that host governments and AID missions:

- (1) should not be encouraged to undertake a survey unless it is truly a high priority need,
- (2) will consider it to be their (as opposed to our) survey to the degree that they make a meaningful commitment and
- (3) the possibility of meaningful follow-up is usually proportional to the extent that they consider it to be their survey. In addition to these countries, the survey methodology, reference population data tapes, computer subroutines for data analysis/interpretation and,

in some cases consultation/training have been provided from the project for use in Indonesia, Mexico, Zaire, Mali, Kenya, Niger, Papua New Guinea, Senegal, Malaysia, Botswana, Kampuchea and in Food For Peace evaluations.

b - Nutrition Surveillance Systems

Since initiation of the project, CDC has provided assistance to El Salvador in developing a nutrition surveillance system. Indeed, the two national surveys in that country were largely stimulated by interest in validating the prevalence of malnutrition as reported by surveillance. At the conclusion of it's national survey, Sri Lanka decided to institute nutritional surveillance, which CDC together with the U.N. Agencies has continued to backstop. CDC is also providing ongoing short-term consultant services to Morocco, Swaziland and Egypt as these countries move toward establishment of surveillance systems.

CNSP initiated activities under the cooperative agreement on October 1, 1980. To date, Cornell has provided consultant services to the Philippines, Kenya, Costa Rica and Indonesia. Sri Lanka has very recently requested assistance from Cornell in phasing into multi-sectoral activities. Both the Philippines and Kenya have unofficially expressed intentions that CNSP provide comprehensive assistance; it appears that this has not as yet been proposed to the respective AID missions.

c - Methodology Development

Throughout the project, major attention has been placed on development of methodologies which are as simple as possible, permit objectives to be achieved at reasonable cost, and are likely to be incorporated into ongoing activities of the host government rather than discarded after the first use. In short, methodologies which are appropriate for developing countries. Throughout the series of nutritional status surveys, a large number of (mostly) subtle, yet important, changes have been made in the original methodology. During the past two years, a number of refinements have been made in data analysis and presentation, particularly a simplified program and graphic presentations. Also, precision analyses (sampling errors) have been incorporated into the analysis and reports to provide guidance regarding sampling requirements for any follow-on surveys. Perusal of the set of survey reports will demonstrate many of these refinements.

Since nutritional surveillance is a completely new field, all project efforts in this area have been addressed to methodology development. The project was formulated on the assumption that one (or at most a few) model surveillance methodologies would need to be developed and that these could then be applicable, with some variations, to most countries. It now appears that to be useful and acceptable to host

governments, the surveillance system will usually have to be tailored to the country situation. Thus, CDC activities in each country to date have first concentrated on this aspect. CDC has also done a sizeable amount of work on methodological development which will be useful in all countries - that of validating indicators of nutritional status.

The CNSP cooperative agreement (attachment #3) specifies that Cornell staff concentrate their efforts on development of methodology for multi-sectoral surveillance systems. This is being done initially by fairly intensive involvement in a limited number of selected countries which will provide natural laboratories for this purpose. Ongoing coordination of activities with the U.N. Agencies, joint sponsorship of international workshops/conferences, and preparation of state-of-the-art papers will also facilitate CNSP keeping up-to-date on developments in the field. For example, through preparation of the working document for the recent Cali workshop, CNSP staff have comprehensively reviewed the sum total of experience in nutritional surveillance to date, identified and analyzed those procedures which have and have not proved feasible. CNSP is also doing follow-on analysis of data from the nutrition surveys with a view toward functional classification on a country-by-country basis, then cross-country comparison. This has been done with the Haiti data. Analysis of the Sri Lanka data is now underway.

d - Training of Personnel

The very nature of the project implies a major training/institution building component. A high percentage of financial support from the project for each national survey has been for intensive training provided all host government staff associated with the survey, and supervision during the survey implementation, data analysis/interpretation and report preparation stages. Training methods have also been refined on an ongoing basis.

While most training has been carried out in-country, host government survey staff from some countries have received informal training in the U.S. (e.g. Cameroon, Sierra Leone, Egypt, Bolivia). CNSP is providing both formal and informal training at Cornell as required in order to develop the institutional base in each country for multisectoral data analysis and utilization.

e - Preparation of Reports and Manuals

The initial surveys each produced a report. Beginning with the Cameroon survey, an additional "summary report and recommendations" has been prepared for each country. This represents an effort to provide a document which is more likely to be read and understood

by busy administrators and officials in policy-making positions. It is believed that these summary reports have been of assistance in stimulating awareness of survey results and their being used in decision making.

The following manuals, which have evolved from refinement of nutritional status surveys, are in preparation for printing:

1. Overview of the Basic Survey Methodology
2. Planning a Survey
3. Training of Survey Personnel
4. Sampling Procedures
5. Analysis and Interpretation of the data

To date, CNSP work in report/manual preparation has included:

1. Nutrition Surveillance, Review of programs (being printed as a WHO Technical Report).
2. Heavy involvement in preparation of a NAS Position Paper on Nutrition Surveillance.
3. Heavy involvement in preparation of the Cali meeting report (being printed as an ACC/SCN report).
4. Heavy involvement in preparation of manuals 4 and 5 listed above.

f - Dissemination of Results

See attachments #2 and #4.

I. Measurement of Progress to Date:

1. Review of planned inputs and outputs.
2. Assessment of inputs utilized from FY 1979 through FY 1981:
 - (a) Technical competence of assistance provided
 - (b) Responsiveness of assistance to field needs
 - (c) Cost of assistance provided
 - (d) Efficiency of contracting mechanisms employed
 - (e) Participation and funding support provided by benefitted host governments and USAIDs.
 - (f) Comparison of the inputs provided under this project and those being provided under similar A.I.D. projects.
3. Assessment of actual outputs
4. Comparison of planned outputs with actual outputs
5. Assessment of benefits to beneficiaries
6. Assessment of actual outputs and their impact on achieving the projects purpose and goal.

J. Problems and Issues to be Addressed by the Team

1. Is the project design, as set forth in the Project Paper, still accurate and relevant? Are there alternative ways that might be more cost-effective and efficient for providing these field support services?
2. Have the S&T/N, Regional Bureau and USAID staff resources been adequate for the effective management of this project?
3. Have the resources provided been sufficient to meet field and Bureau needs? Have the developing countries, USAIDs and Regional Bureaus provided their "fair share" of the costs of these services?
4. Has the S&T/N, management of this project facilitated the utilization of the services by developing country institutions?
5. How effective have the reports been on services provided. How widely have these reports been circulated?
6. Have the technical assistance and support provided through this project been effective in meeting the needs of the developing countries? Of the USAIDs? Of the Regional Bureaus? Have the developing countries, USAIDs and Regional Bureaus collaborated fully in the design and preparation of scopes of work for the services provided?
7. Has the project influenced host government health, nutrition and food policies? Has it enhanced the institutional capacity of governments to make better decisions? What host government policies or institutional limitations have hindered project success?

K. Documents to be attached/available for team use

1. All attachments listed in scope of work
2. Project Paper and all amendments
3. All survey reports
4. Program Description of CNSP Cooperative Agreement
5. November 28, 1980 All Posts Memorandum
6. Cali working document
7. CNSP 1st year progress report

L. Management Review Agenda

- | | | |
|------------|---|---|
| 9/8-18/81 | - | Collection of Review Information |
| 9/21-25/81 | - | Organization of Information |
| 9/28-30/81 | - | Distribution of Documents to Review team members |
| 10/1-14/81 | - | Individual meetings with Regional Bureaus |
| 10/20/81 | - | Review team meeting to Assess Project Activities and Make recommendations for Future Project Directions |
| 11/4/81 | - | Completion and Distribution of Review Document |

Project Evaluation Summary - Surveys and Surveillance

Cost Sharing - National Nutrition Surveys

| | | |
|--------------------------------|--|------------------|
| I. <u>Nepal</u> | | |
| ST/N | - Technical Assistance | \$51,000 |
| USAID/Nepal | - Transport, personnel, supplies | 118,000 |
| Government of Nepal | - Personnel, facilities | 16,000 |
| | | <u>\$185,000</u> |
| II. <u>Sri Lanka</u> | | |
| ST/N | - Technical Assistance, Supplies | 101,000 |
| CARE | - Personnel, Transport, Per diem | 31,700 |
| UNICEF | - Personnel | 20,000 |
| Government of Sri Lanka | - Personnel, facilities | 24,500 |
| | | <u>\$177,200</u> |
| III. <u>Liberia</u> | | |
| ST/N | - Technical Assistance, Supplies | 61,000 |
| AFR | - In-country costs | 44,000 |
| Peace Corps | - Personnel, Vehicles, facilities | 13,000 |
| Government of Liberia | - Personnel, facilities | 24,000 |
| | | <u>\$142,000</u> |
| IV <u>Lesotho</u> | | |
| ST/N | - Technical Assistance, supplies, fuel, per diem | 116,000 |
| USAID | - Liaison | |
| National University of Lesotho | - Technical Assistance | 2,000 |
| Government of Lesotho | - Transport, Personnel, facilities | 24,000 |
| | | <u>\$142,000</u> |

Project Evaluation Summary - Surveys and Surveillance
Cost Sharing - National Nutrition Surveys

| | | |
|-------|---|----------------|
| V. | <u>Cameroon</u> | |
| | ST/N - Technical Assistance, fuel, supplies, per diem | 210,000 |
| | AFR/DR - Technical Assistance, fuel, supplies, per diem | 80,000 |
| | USAID - Liaison, Admin, support, translate report, fund nutrition planner | 40,000 |
| | GURC - Personnel, Transport, Facilities | <u>64,000</u> |
| | | \$394,000 |
| VI. | <u>Sierra Leone</u> | |
| | ST/N - Technical Assistance, fuel, supplies, per diem | 145,000 |
| | AFR/DR - Technical Assistance, fuel, supplies, per diem | 40,000 |
| | USAID - Liaison | |
| | GOSL - Personnel, Transport, facilities | <u>25,000</u> |
| | | \$210,000 |
| VII. | <u>Togo</u> | |
| | ST/N - Technical Assistance, Transport, fuel, supplies translation, per diem | 157,000 |
| | USAID - liaison | |
| | GOT - Personnel, facilities | <u>54,000</u> |
| | | \$211,000 |
| VIII. | <u>Indonesia</u> | |
| | ST/N - Technical Assistance, fuel, supplies, per diem | 74,000 |
| | USAID - Transport | 65,000 |
| | HKI - Technical Assistance | 40,000 |
| | WHO - laboratory equipment | 30,000 |
| | UNICEF - vitamin A capsules | 5,000 |
| | GOI - Personnel, fuel, facilities | <u>153,000</u> |
| | | \$367,000 |

Project Evaluation Summary - Surveys and Surveillance

Cost Sharing - National Nutrition Surveys

| | | | |
|------|---|--|-----------|
| IX. | <u>El Salvador</u> | | |
| | ST/N - Technical Assistance, per diem, fuel | | 20,000 |
| | INCAP - personnel | | 5,000 |
| | CDC - Vehicles, facilities | | 5,000 |
| | GOES - Personnel, facilities, | | 6,000 |
| | | | <hr/> |
| | | | \$36,000 |
| X. | <u>Egypt</u> | | |
| | ST/N - Technical Assistance, printing | | 21,000 |
| | USAID - Technical Assistance, supplies, per diem, transport | | 165,000 |
| | GOE - Personnel, transport | | 55,000 |
| | | | <hr/> |
| | | | \$241,000 |
| XI. | <u>Haiti</u> | | |
| | ST/N - Technical Assistance | | 26,000 |
| | USAID - Technical Assistance, supplies, per diem, transport, liaison | | 146,000 |
| | GOH - Personnel, facilities | | 12,000 |
| | | | <hr/> |
| | | | \$184,000 |
| XII. | <u>Yemen</u> | | |
| | ST/N - Technical Assistance, supplies, fuel, equipment, personnel | | 341,000 |
| | USAID - liaison | | |
| | UNICEF - vehicles | | 72,000 |
| | World Bank - per diem | | 130,000 |
| | YAR - personnel, facilities | | 70,000 |
| | | | <hr/> |
| | | | \$613,000 |

Project Evaluation Summary - Surveys and Surveillance

Cost Sharing - National Nutrition Surveys

XIII. Bolivia

| | |
|---|---------------|
| ST/N - Technical Assistance, supplies | 54,000 |
| USAID - Technical Assistance, Transport | 59,000 |
| GOB - Personnel, facilities | <u>26,000</u> |
| | \$139,000 |

Project Evaluation Summary - Surveys and Surveillance

National Nutrition Survey Follow-On Activities *

I. Nepal

1. Government planning emphasis on increased food production.
2. Ministry of Health assigned top priority to nutrition education.
3. Establishment of an intersectoral Nutrition Board.
4. Initiation of a nutrition surveillance system with UNICEF assistance.
5. Follow-on research to define causes of malnutrition, with assistance from Medical Research Council, United Kingdom.

II. Sri Lanka

1. Survey of all preschool children in low income areas of suburban Colombo.
2. Initiation of birth weight monitoring program.
3. Vitamin A capsule distribution in affected areas.
4. Phasing from capsule distribution to nutrition education in same areas.
5. Initiation of nutrition surveillance system with UNICEF assistance.
6. Ministry of Planning request to ST/N for assistance in multisectoral nutrition surveillance.

III. Liberia

1. Initiation of nutrition training program for health and agriculture extension workers.
2. National Food and Nutrition Committee promotion of interministerial coordination on nutrition-relevant matters.
3. Initiation of nutrition education messages on national radio.
4. National Nutrition Planning Workshop with ST/N assistance.

* listed in chronological order.

IV. Lesotho

1. Survey Report served as working document for National Food/Nutrition Workshop.
2. Food and Nutrition Planning institutionalized with Food and Nutrition Coordinating Office as implementing body.
3. National goals and strategies fixed.
4. Eighteen nutrition-related projects being coordinated among five ministries.
5. GOL planning an integrated growth surveillance system.

V. Cameroon

1. Follow-on analysis of survey data for planning purposes.
2. Survey Report used as working document for National Nutrition Workshop.
3. Follow-on family budget and food consumption surveys.
4. Follow-on socio-cultural determinants of malnutrition study.
5. Use of survey data by AID, World Bank and GURC in planning/evaluating rural development and agricultural production projects.
6. Follow-on research on seasonal patterns of malnutrition.

VI. Sierra Leone

1. GOSL Survey Director and statistician received advanced training in U.S.
2. Establishment of Food and Nutrition Commission (FNC) in Office of the Vice President.
3. Survey Director named Executive Secretary of FNC.
4. Survey Report served as working document for National Food and Nutrition Planning Conference.
5. Coordination of planning within Ministry of Economic Development and Planning.
6. Coordination of nutrition education within educational system.

7. Development of processed weaning food with U.N. assistance.

VII. Togo

1. Use of survey results in allocation of nutrition interventions.
2. Use of survey results in agriculture/rural development planning.
3. Use of survey results in designating new health care areas, with WHO assistance.

VIII. Indonesia (Survey under auspices of ST/N Vitamin A project)

1. Survey results served as data base for current Five year national development plan.
2. Expansion of integrated health/family planning/nutrition program targeted to priority areas identified by survey.
3. Major nutrition education effort addressed to problems identified by survey.
4. Major expansion of vitamin A program.
5. Establishment of multi-sectoral nutrition surveillance system.

IX El Salvador

1. provided data base for extension of analysis of multi-purpose and rural poor survey data.
2. provided data base for economic development planning.
3. provided baseline data for validation of nutrition surveillance system.

X. Egypt

1. Survey Report used as working document of National Nutrition Workshop.
2. developed capability in Institute of Nutrition to carry out Egypt Survey II and provide Technical Assistance to Yemen.
3. provided baseline data for oral rehydration and maternal/infant nutrition programs.

4. provided baseline data for More and Better Foods Program.
5. Led to current plans to initiate nutrition surveillance.

XI. Haiti

1. Report served as working document for National Nutrition Conference.
2. Provided data base for Food/Nutrition planning.
3. Provided data base for AID Nutrition Loan and Rural Health Project.
4. Enhanced Bureau of Nutrition Capability.
5. Provided baseline data for evaluating need for disaster relief.

XII. Yemen

1. World Bank is funding two nutrition advisors to host government.
2. Survey results are being used by USAID, U.N. Agencies and host government to define location and scope of development projects.
3. Nutritional Evaluations being incorporated into ongoing area development project.
4. Survey results provide baseline data for evaluating impact of intervention and development programs.

XIII. Bolivia

1. Survey data still being analyzed.