

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

388-0008 (6) 0003001503

# 2-Way Memo

PD-AAJ-927-E1  
Call Eval Office  
Lanny - 28526

29064

BILL ERDAHL

INSTRUCTIONS	
Use routing symbols whenever possible.	
SENDER: Use brief, informal language. Conserve space. Forward original and one copy.	
RECEIVER: Reply below the message, keep one copy, return one copy.	

Subject : Project Evaluation Summary for Project Studies Grant (388-0008)

From : MO/PAV  
Room #B930  
Department of State  
AID/Washington

DATE OF MESSAGE	Routing Symbol
June 12, 1978	PRO
SIGNATURE OF ORIGINATOR	
<i>Bill Erdahl</i>	
TITLE OF ORIGINATOR	
Assistant Program Officer	

FOLD

INITIAL MESSAGE

5p.

Enclosed for your reproduction and distribution is the mat for the Project Evaluation Summary of the Project Studies Grant.

Please acknowledge receipt.

Encl: a/s

REPLY MESSAGE

FOR SHARLOCK  
255-8450

To : Michael Sullivan, PRO  
USAID/Dacca  
Bangladesh

DATE OF REPLY	Routing Symbol
SIGNATURE OF REPLIER	
TITLE OF REPLIER	

13. SUMMARY - Summarize in about 200 words the current project situation, mentioning progress in relation to design, prospects of achieving purpose, major problems encountered, etc.

The project has been effectively completed. Six studies were conducted under the project and one of these led to a full-scale AID-supported project (Rural Electrification). When the PP was written it was expected that each of the studies would provide the basis for a larger project. [Although this has not happened, the studies have nevertheless been useful to the BDG and USAID, many of them by indicating that a project, or an additional project, was not needed in a particular sector.]

[According to the PP, the BDG was supposed to develop the scopes of work and contract with the organizations that would conduct the studies. The BDG was incapable or unwilling to perform these tasks and the project stagnated until USAID took over its operation. As a result, BDG personnel did not receive the project development experience that was planned in the project.]

14. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY - Describe the methods used for this evaluation, i. e. was it a regular or special evaluation? Was it in accordance with the Evaluation Plan in the PP with respect to timing, study design, scope, methodology and issues? What kinds of data were used and how were they collected and analyzed? Identify agencies and key individuals participating and contributing.

This was an ex post facto evaluation of the project and concentrated on purpose-level achievements. Each of the studies funded under the project was analyzed in relation to its contribution to project purpose and the project as a whole was analyzed for lessons that might be applied to other projects.

As it turned out to be essentially a Mission project, only Mission personnel were involved in the evaluation.

15. Documents to be revised to reflect decisions noted page 1

Project Paper (PP)  Logical Framework  CPI Network  
 Financial Plan  PIO/T  PIO/C  PIO/P  Project Agreement  
 Other  This evaluation brought out ideas for a new project--a Project Identification Document (PID) will follow.

None

16. Evaluation findings about EXTERNAL FACTORS - Identify and discuss major changes in project setting which have an impact on the project. Examine continuing validity of assumptions.

The BDG was not able to provide the support to this project which was envisioned in the Project Paper, and the BDG First Five Year Plan, which was to provide direction for the studies, was not implemented as planned. Therefore, the actual situation was completely different from what was assumed, and USAID had to step in and take over implementation of the project. With the reduced effectiveness of the Five Year Plan, the studies undertaken under this project were not clearly directed toward a defined and understood goal, and the studies which resulted were not as useful as expected.

---

17. Evaluation findings about GOAL/SUBGOAL - For the reader's convenience, quote the approved sector goal, (and subgoal, where relevant) to which the project contributes. Then describe status by citing evidence available to date from specified indicators and by mentioning progress of other projects (whether or not U.S.) which contribute to same goal. Discuss causes -- can progress toward goal be attributed to project, why shortfalls?

"Support achievement of Five Year Plan targets in the agriculture and rural development sectors."

The results of this project did not really contribute to the attainment of goal level targets because the Five Year Plan was not implemented fully by the BDG. Actually, the sector goal was unrealistic (as was the Five Year Plan). There was not a clearly defined statement in the goal of the objectives of the Five Year Plan. Therefore it is impossible to measure progress toward the stated goal.

---

18. Evaluation findings about PURPOSE - Quote the approved project purpose. Cite progress toward each End-of-Project Status (EOPS) condition. When can achievement be expected? Discuss causes of progress or shortfalls.

"Supplementing the BDG's capacity to identify, analyze and prepare for implementation high priority development activities in agriculture, rural development and closely related areas."

As the project developed, the purpose of supplementing the BDG's capacity to develop projects was only peripherally addressed, in that USAID and consultants had the most direct involvement. The BDG did not provide support for the project as planned. It did gain some experience in (1) contracting procedures and monitoring through host country contracts; and (2) planned and incidental counterpart roles that consultants built into studies.

---

19. Evaluation findings about OUTPUTS and INPUTS- Note any particular success or difficulties. Comment on significant management experiences of host contractor, and donor organizations. Describe any necessary changes in schedule or in type and quantity of resources or outputs needed to achieve project purpose.

AID inputs were provided more or less as planned while the BDG did not provide the expected support for developing scopes of work and contracting. After the project stagnated for some time, USAID picked up the slack in these areas.

The logframe predicted that six to twelve studies would be completed under this project; six have actually been conducted.

---

20. Evaluation findings about UNPLANNED EFFECTS - Has project had any unexpected results or impact, such as changes in social structure, environment, technical or economic situation? Are these effects advantageous or not? Do they require any change in plans?

None

---

21. CHANGES in DESIGN or EXECUTION - Explain the rationale for any proposed modification in project design or execution which now appear advisable as a result of the preceding findings (items 16 to 20 above) and which were reflected in one or more of the action decisions listed on page 1 or noted in Item 15 on page 2.

None

---

22. LESSONS LEARNED - What advice can you give a colleague about development strategy--e. g., how to tackle a similar development problem or to manage a similar project in another country? What can be suggested for follow-on in this country? Similarly, do you have any suggestions about evaluation methodology?

The Mission learned that the BDG was not yet prepared to take over full responsibility for a project of this kind. It did not yet have the technical skills necessary to develop scopes of work for the proposed studies, nor did it have full command of the required skills for host country contracting. In future projects we should be more careful in the types of activities we expect the BDG to perform. However, the BDG now has more capability in these areas than it did two or three years ago. Also, in order to provide BDG personnel with the opportunity to gain experience in project development, future projects of this kind should include more clearly defined roles for counterparts to work closely with the expatriate consultants. BDG personnel also should be consulted more closely by USAID technicians while they are preparing scopes of work.