

PD - MINN-025
 ISN - 30835
 3860467/15

UNCLASSIFIED
 CLASSIFICATION
 PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

ADD 5H, Ch 5, HB 3
 (TM 3:26) 8-3-78

Report Symbol U-44

1. PROJECT TITLE Rajasthan Medium Irrigation (AID Loan No. 386-T-228)			2. PROJECT NUMBER 386-0467	3. MISSION/REGIONAL OFFICE India
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) 83-3			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION	
5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES			6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING	
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY 80	B. Final Obligation Expected FY 80	C. Final Input Delivery FY 85	A. Total: \$58,000,000	7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION
			B. U.S. \$35,500,000	From (month/yr.) 7/80
				To (month/yr.) 3/83
				Date of Evaluation Review 4/83

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., Memo, SPAR, PIO, which will present details req. req. req.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
1. Attached is the Mid-Term Project Review Report dated April, 1983, highlighting project implementation status and action points requiring attention of GOR for accelerating project progress. 2. A disbursement of \$4.2 million has been made with another about \$5.0 million expected to be disbursed shortly, accounting for the expenditure incurred up to March 1983 on seven approved subprojects. 3. Inadequate financial allocations and placement of field staff continues to be a major bottleneck to project progress. Efforts are underway to effect improvements in financial allocation. 4. It appears that reimbursement percentage would need to be enhanced from the present 67 percent to 75 percent (overall) on the eligible expenditures to accelerate disbursements and help improve GOR financial allocation and suitably reschedule project implementation on a realistic basis.	N.A. Dimick	October, 1983

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS None

<input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper	<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., GPI Network	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify)
<input type="checkbox"/> Feasibility 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 (Name and Title)

Niel A. Dimick, Agricultural Engineering Advisor
 Kailash Roop Rai, Chief Engineer, GOR Irrigation Dept.
 John R. Westley, Chief, Program Office

12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval

Signature: *Princilla M. Boughton*

Typed Name: Princilla M. Boughton

Date: Director 6/1/83

RAJASTHAN MEDIUM IRRIGATION PROJECT
(386-0467)

Mid-Term Project Report

April, 1983

1. Purpose and Schedule

The Rajasthan Medium Irrigation Project is a five-year irrigation sector support project. The project agreement was signed on June 30, 1980 and has a Project Assistance Completion Date (PACD) of June 30, 1985.

The implementation schedule outlined in the project paper requires conduct of a mid-project special review in February 1983 of project performance, detailed analysis of implementation problems and recommendations for resolution and/or modifications in order to improve project performance.

The mid-term project review was conducted between April 4-9, 1983 in collaboration with the concerned Government of Rajasthan officials (see Attachment A for the list of officials) and on the basis of the "Annual Implementation Review Report - August 1982" of the Central Water Commission (CWC). Mr. K.T. Sukhani, Executive Engineer and Technical Assistant to Chief Engineer (Irrigation) participated in the review as representative of the Government of Rajasthan (GOR).

2. Project Commitments

The project was designed to provide financial support to about 15 Medium Irrigation Projects (MIPs) having a mix of new, ongoing and modernization projects for developing an additional irrigation potential of approximately 65,000 hectares. A project agreement between AID and the Government of India provides \$35.0 million as loan to finance construction of MIPs and \$0.5 million as grant financing for specialized training and studies. The total cost of the project including Government of Rajasthan was estimated to be \$58.0 million.

The project at its completion envisions the following achievements as outlined in the project paper:

- a. Loan:
 - i. Implementing about fifteen (new, ongoing and modernized) MIPs covering approximately 65,000 hectares of irrigated land.
 - ii. Government of Rajasthan to double expenditure rates on MIPs during the life of the project.
 - iii. Irrigation intensity increased by 20 percent.

- b. Grant:
 - i. Government of Rajasthan/Government of India Irrigation Department Engineers responsible for design, construction, operation and water management in MIPs; Govt. of Rajasthan/ Agriculture Department and Govt. of India officials specializing in economic and project feasibility analysis provided with in-country training and training in the United States.
 - ii. Baseline socio-economic surveys of representative MIPs completed.
 - iii. Water management studies below the outlet level (40 ha) conducted.
 - iv. Local level management organizations studied and evaluated.

3. Follow-up on Annual Implementation Review - November 1981

The recommendations of the Annual Implementation Review conducted in November 1981 are given in Attachment B. These recommendations and other points brought out in the Annual Review of the project by the CWC requiring urgent attention were transmitted to the Government of India and the Government of Rajasthan on December 17, 1981. The status of action taken on the five recommendations is summarized below:

- a. Sanction and placement of field staff on the irrigation projects is linked with the availability of funds. Inadequate provision of budgets in the participating MIPs due to reasons explained in 3(b) below, continues to result in the placement of field staff being one of the major constraints to project progress.

b. Four successive years of drought in Rajasthan and consequent diversion of sizeable financial resources towards famine relief operations have resulted in the impediment of all developmental activities. In addition, adjustment of overdrafts in the annual budget allocations have further resulted in the curtailment of anticipated annual and planned allocations. Efforts of AID at different forums within the Government of India and the Government of Rajasthan have not succeeded in augmenting financial allocations to the participating MIPs. As a result, the pace of implementation is very slow. With the present rate of budget allocations and no improvement in sight during the remaining period of the project, achievement of the project objectives by PACD is unlikely.

c. Waterloss measurement studies in the three representative MIPs (Gudha, Jaisamand and Chhaparwada) have been initiated, the results and methodology of which will be reviewed. It is proposed to continue these studies during the remaining life of the project and analyze data to formulate recommendations.

Contract for the conduct of socio-economic baseline studies for six representative MIPs (Meja, Meja Feeder, Panchana, Bhimsagar, Chhapi and Bilas) has been awarded to the National Council of Applied Economic Research (NCAER) and the studies are under progress. Report on these studies will be available in about six months' time.

d. With the improved efforts of the Irrigation Department, seven MIPs (Bhimsagar, Bassi, Kothari, Panchana, Chhapi, Bilas and Sawan-Bhadon) have been appraised and approved by the CWC Appraisal Committee. Appraisal Summary Reports for an additional two MIPs are under preparation. The concerned Additional Chief Engineers were advised to have a couple of extra projects ready so that those could be appraised in the event of the proposed projects not being approved by the CWC Appraisal Committee.

e. A project monitoring cell has been established in the office of the Chief Engineer (Irrigation) headed by an Executive Engineer to monitor project progress, to coordinate/expedite approval of projects and to accelerate the process of reimbursement claims. This cell will work under the direct control of the Chief Engineer (Irrigation) and apprise him of the status of implementation and identify issues requiring immediate attention.

4. Project Status

a. Physical: The project has realized the following achievements against the commitments outlined in Section 2:

i. Project Approvals: Seven MIPs have been approved by the CWC Appraisal Committee which will provide an additional irrigation potential of about 40,000 hectares when completed. Preparations for the approval of two more MIPs are underway.

As against the initial target of proposed 15 MIPs having an ultimate irrigation potential of about 65,000 hectares, the GOR Irrigation Department now proposes to pose nine MIPs (see Attachment D for proposed MIPs and their ultimate irrigation potential) for assistance. These nine MIPs will create an additional irrigation potential of about 60,000 hectares which is close to the committed achievement. In the event that either of the present two MIPs being processed for approval are not approved by CWC Appraisal Committee, other MIPs (shelf projects) will be processed by the GOR/Irrigation Department. However, a clear position with regard to approval of these projects will take another three to four months.

ii. Construction: The Project Agreement specifies that adequate finances shall be provided by the host government including qualified and experienced supervisory and management staff for executing the projects in conformity with sound technical practices. In addition, it was agreed that specific design specifications would be followed and that the construction of the MIPs (new and ongoing) would be completed within five years from their initiation or from the date of signing the agreement. However, modernization projects may take up to eight years.

Though the construction in all the nine MIPs (seven approved and two proposed for appraisal) is in progress, it is unlikely that any of the MIPs will be completed by the PACD. Inadequate provision of funds and lack of field supervisory staff from the beginning of the project for the reasons enunciated in Section 3(a) and (b) have led to slow implementation of the project. These still continue to be the major constraints.

Attachments C and D present the status of field supervisory staff in position against the requisite strength for completing the projects on time and the development of irrigation potential, respectively. As against the requirement of 68 field subdivisions, only 25 are in place. Since the placement of field supervisory staff is linked with the budget provisions (one subdivision for every Rs 3.0 million, there does not seem to be any possibility for augmenting the field staff unless funding situation improves. However, if the available budgets could be reallocated to the projects which have entered advance stages of construction or have the potential of spending more budget than their present allocation, there could be a possibility of completing some of these projects on time and by PACD. Such projects include Bhimsagar, Nassi, Kothari and possibly Chhapi (all approved by CWC Appraisal Committee). During the review, the project officers of the above mentioned MIPs indicated that they will be able to spend up to double the allocated funds on these projects during the current GOR financial year 1983-84 (see Attachment E) provided the reallocation was made now and not at the end of the financial year.

Completion of at least these four MIPs by the PACD (June 1985) will create an irrigation potential of about 19,000 hectares (Attachment D). With the present proposed rate, the entire potential of about 60,000 hectares will not be created by March 1989.

iii. Training, Workshops and Field Studies: Program for the conduct of training for the officials of Irrigation and Agriculture Departments, workshops and field studies (socio-economic baseline and waterloss measurement in watercourses) as outlined in the project paper has progressed satisfactorily. Achievements in this regard are summarized below:

- Training in the United States of 20 field officials from Irrigation and Agriculture Departments in the disciplines of economic analysis, irrigation projects planning and operation including study/observation tours to irrigation projects completed. There has, however, been little effort made to utilize the trained staff in the projects so far.
- Two workshops, one each on Diagnostic Analysis of Irrigation Projects and Irrigation Water Measurements in the completed systems. These workshops also had participants from other states (Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, etc.). AID is involved in supporting irrigation development in these states.

- Contract for the conduct of socio-economic baseline studies awarded to National Council of Applied Economic Research (NCAER) and the reports will be available in another six months.
- Waterloss measurement studies are under progress.

A follow-up action group on the recommendations of the diagnostic analysis workshop has been constituted to develop and test solutions for the improvement of the Gambhiri irrigation system and for similar old systems in the state of Rajasthan.

It has been observed during the course of project implementation that the majority of officials who received training and attended workshops have been transferred outside the project areas where they cannot utilize the expertise attained during the training. This significantly offsets the objectives of training and transfer of technology. GOR should ensure that the trained officials are not transferred for at least three years. This would result in achieving better project designs and efficiency of projects.

During the course of project implementation and consequent discussions with the field supervisory staff directly responsible for implementing project activities, a number of additional areas for training (in-country), development of field manuals/guides/handbooks and use of improved construction/data processing equipment have been identified. The additional training will supplement the limited training originally envisioned under this project to further strengthen the institutional infrastructure within the Rajasthan Irrigation/Agriculture Departments, and for improving design and construction standards of the MIPs. A proposal for the authorization of additional grant of \$750,000 is being processed to accommodate the above requirements.

b. Financial: Details in Attachment E present the status of the total estimated cost of the nine MIPs considered for AID credit assistance (includes seven MIPs already approved for assistance), expenditures incurred up to March 1983, expenditures eligible for reimbursement, budget provisions available through March 1985 (end of Fifth Plan period) and possible reimbursements by that date.

Ending March 1983 (about mid-point), the project has incurred approximately 25 percent (Rs. 209 million) of the total estimated cost (Rs. 820 million) on the appraised and approved MIPs and 36 percent (Rs. 431.5 million) of the total estimated cost (Rs. 1,189 million) on all nine proposed MIPs. This low financial performance is attributed to the provision of inadequate budgets.

Considering that about 60 percent of the eligible expenditure will qualify for reimbursement ending March 1983 (July 80-March 83), a sum of \$9.6 million (0.6 x Rs 161 million) will be disburseable on the appraised and approved projects and an additional \$6.8 million (0.6 x Rs 114 million) if the other two projects are approved. This total of \$16.4 million represents 47 percent of the project loan. Keeping in view the budget allocations available during the remaining two years of the Fifth Plan, i.e. GOI 1983-84 and 1984-85, a total disbursement of Rs. 332.50 million (\$33.0 million) is expected on the nine MIPs against the available credit of \$35.0 and that the remaining \$2.0 million credit could be utilized by the PACD of June 30, 1985. However, with the possible utilization of credit, the project objectives (completion of participating MIPs and creating additional irrigation for an area of 65,000 hectares) will not be fulfilled. Fulfillment of project objectives depends on completion of the participating MIPs within the agreed to time schedule which require augmentation of the current budget significantly. With the existing budget provisions, none of the MIPs receiving credit assistance is likely to be completed.

c. Disbursement: According to the disbursement schedule presented in the project paper, the project would have disbursed about \$14 million by March 1983. Against this projection, the eligible disbursement for the seven approved MIPs is of the order of \$9.6 million. A sum of \$4.2 million has actually been disbursed by March 1983 with another claim of about \$0.3 million under process. The lag in the submission of claims is expected to be reduced after recent assistance from AID staff in streamlining the GOR claiming procedures. In addition, with the approval of the other two MIPs, the disbursement is expected to pick up and if budget allocations are appropriately adjusted within the State at this point, considerable progress could be achieved.

5. Recommended Actions

a. Government of Rajasthan/ID

- i. Budget allocations during the current GOR fiscal year 1983-84 on Bassi, Kothari, Chhapi and Bilas should be increased. Although these projects have potential to spend double the current allocations even without additional staff, their current budget allocation is either lower or the same as the preceding years. This situation needs an urgent review by the GOR for re-allocation of funds within the overall funds available for Medium Irrigation Projects during the current financial year. An early review and decision will help enable the project officials to schedule implementation accordingly.

- ii. The Government of Rajasthan should consider modifying the present scope of the project by integrating on-farm development activities (construction of field channels, land leveling/shaping, field drainage, etc.) with the remaining construction activities. This action would improve the utilization of the projects and increase the return on investment. To achieve the above, the project implementation schedule will require revision on a realistic basis and with added involvement of Agriculture Department and CAD authorities.
- iii. Two network planning cells (for planning and design of distribution network at chak level) need to be established, one each under the direct control of Superintending Engineers Bhilwara and Kota Irrigation Circles where the majority of participating MIPs are located. These cells, after appropriate training, could provide sound uniform network planning for all the MIPs.
- iv. Efforts need to be stepped up to ensure an early appraisal/approval of the remaining projects by the CWC prior to September 30, 1983.
- v. Submission of the reimbursement claims to the USAID should be expedited.
- vi. Request for the additional grant funds for training, technical assistance, and demonstration equipment and justification thereof, should be submitted to the Central Ministry of Irrigation on a priority basis for obligation of available US FY 83 funds.
- vii. Field officials trained in specialized disciplines should not be transferred for at least three years in the interest of project implementation and deriving benefits from their expertise gained during the training.

b. USAID

Work with Government of Rajasthan in the preparation of a modified implementation schedule, project scope integrating on-farm development activities, additional grant fund requirements, arrangement of TA, and organizing additional training workshops.

Attachment A

List of GOR-Irrigation Department Officials Contacted

- | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. Kailash Roop Rai - | Chief Engineer |
| 2. Mr. D.M. Singhvi - | Addl. Chief Eng. (Jaipur Region) |
| 3. Mr. G.C. Kanjolia - | Addl. Chief Eng. (Udaipur Region) |
| 4. Mr. B.K.S. Mathur - | Addl. Chief Eng. (Kota Region) |
| 5. Mr. D.N. Dhandra - | Sptd. Eng. (Jaipur Circle) |
| 6. Mr. K.S. Kang - | Sptd. Eng. (Bhilwara Circle) |
| 7. Mr. K.L. Nyati - | Sptd. Eng. (Udaipur Circle) |
| 8. Mr. Jagdish Gehlot - | Sptd. Eng. (Kota Circle) |
| 9. Mr. D.S. Mathur - | Exec. Eng. (Som Kagdar) |
| 10. Mr. P.D. Mahanandani - | Exec. Eng. (Som Kagdar) |
| 11. Mr. W. Paerera - | Exec. Eng. (Bausi) |
| 12. Mr. P.S. Sirohi - | Exec. Eng. (Kothari) |
| 13. Mr. P.M. Rai - | Exec. Eng. (Meja Feeder) |
| 14. Mr. A.S. Kandhawa - | Exec. Eng. (Meja) |
| 15. Mr. G.S. Chowdhary - | Exec. Eng. (Sawan-Bhadon) |
| 16. Mr. H.K. Kala - | Exec. Eng. (Chhapi) |
| 17. Mr. C.B. Lokwani - | Exec. Eng. (Bhawanagar) |
| 18. Mr. Sawai Singh Rathod - | Exec. Eng. (Bilas) |

RECOMMENDATIONS

ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW

(November, 1981)

Action by Government of Rajasthan

- a. There is a significant shortfall in the staff placement. GOR needs to take immediate steps for sanctioning the required subdivisions and staffing them on a priority basis.
- b. Existing budget allocations of the GOR for the subprojects which need to be completed by project closing date (June 1985) are inadequate. These need to be substantially increased during the remaining period of the project in order to achieve the targetted project construction completion.
- c. The water loss measurement studies and award of contract for the socio-economic baseline studies needs to be expedited.
- d. GJR/ID efforts need improvement to ensure GWC Appraisal Committee's approval of the ongoing projects by March 1982.
- e. To further expedite project design and approval process, it is recommended that GOR establish a design unit at the state level.

RAJASTHAN MEDIUM IRRIGATION PROJECTStatus of Field Staff in Approved/Proposed
Subprojects

(March 1983)

No.	Subproject	As recommended in CIC Appraisal		Sanctioned by GOR		Actual in Position	
		D	SD	D	SD	D	SD
<u>Approved</u>							
1.	Bhim Sagar ^{1/}	2	10	1	5	1	5
2.	Bassi	2	6	1	3	1	3
3.	Kothari	2	6	1	2	1	2
4.	Chhapri	2	8	1	1	1*	1
5.	Bilas	2	6	1	1	1*	1
6.	Sawan-Bhadon	2	6	1	1	1*	1
7.	Panchana	2	8	1	4	1	4
	Sub-Total	14	50	7	17	7	17
<u>Proposed for Appraisal</u>							
8.	Meja & Meja Feeder	3	10	2	4	2	4
9.	Soni-Kagdar	2	8	2	4	2	4
	Sub-Total	5	18	4	8	4	8
	Total	19	63	11	25	11	25

D - Division (headed by an Exec. Eng. to supervise working of subdivisions)
SD - Subdivision (a field unit) headed by an Asst. Eng.
1/- Another division (3 subdivisions) - proposed to be added soon.
* - Part-time allocation. Exec. Engineers have other additional responsibilities.

RAJASTHAN MEDIUM IRRIGATION PROJECT

Schedule of Creation of Irrigation Potential
(March 1983)

No.	Subproject	Ultimate Irrigation Potential	Schedule of Creation of Potential (Cumulative) - (Hectares)						
			82-83	83-84	84-85	85-86	86-87	87-88	88-89
<u>Approved</u>									
1.	Bhimsagar	9,986	-	2,200	4,860	8,060	9,986	9,986	9,986
2.	Bassi	3,250	-	-	325	810	1,625	2,440	3,250
3.	Kothari	3,415	-	-	1,360	1,700	2,560	3,415	3,415
4.	Chhapri	7,000	-	-	1,000	3,500	7,000	7,000	7,000
	Bilas	2,700	-	-	1,000	2,700	2,700	2,700	2,700
	Sawan-Bhadon	3,200	-	-	320	960	1,600	2,400	3,200
	Fanchana	9,985	250	1,000	3,000	6,000	9,985	9,985	9,985
	Sub-Total	39,536	250	3,200	11,865	23,730	35,456	37,926	39,536
<u>Proposed for Appraisal</u>									
8.	Meja & Meja ^{1/} Feeder	15,424	-	2,000	6,000	10,000	15,424	15,424	15,424
9.	Soo-Kagdar	4,864	-	650	900	3,400	4,864	4,864	4,864
	Sub-Total	20,288	-	2,650	6,900	13,400	20,288	20,288	20,288
	Total	59,824	250	5,850	18,765	37,130	55,744	58,214	59,824

1/ - Modernization Project - the potential shown is the additional potential that will be created as a result of modernization.

- Year during which ultimate potential will be created.

RAJASTHAN MEDIUM IRRIGATION PROJECT

Subproject Costs, Expenditure Incurred and Budget Allocations

(March 1983)^{1/}

Attachment E

(Million Rupees)

No.	Subproject	Cost (2)	Expend. up to 6/80 (3)	Expend. 7/80 to 3/83 (4)	Total up to 3/83 (5)	---Allocations during Fifth Plan---				Expend. up to 3/85 (10)	Expend. eligible f. relob. up to 3/85 (11)	Anticip. reimburs. up to 3/85 (12)	Balance budget allocations (13)
						81-82 (6)	82-83 (7)	83-84 (8)	84-85 (9)				
Approved													
1.	Bhim Sagar	141.8	27.39	38.09	65.39	15.90	14.00	20.00	15.90	101.29	73.99	41.40	40.51
2.	Bassi	67.8	0.49	9.53	10.02	3.50	5.27	9.00	15.00	35.02	34.53	20.70	25.78
3.	Kothari	74.4	4.47	25.10	29.57	8.00	10.45	4.00	20.00	53.57	49.10	32.90	20.83
	Chhapri	142.2	-	6.99	6.99	2.55	4.00	5.00	20.00	37.93	37.99	25.40	14.21
	Hiles	63.0	-	5.69	5.69	2.04	2.94	4.00	9.00	18.69	18.69	12.50	43.31
	Sawan-Bhadan	85.9	-	3.03	3.03	1.10	1.95	2.50	6.00	11.53	11.53	7.72	74.37
	Panchana	210.3	14.4	39.00	53.40	15.00	11.80	25.00	30.00	108.40	94.03	63.00	101.90
	Sub-Total	819.4	46.66	161.23	208.89	48.09	50.41	69.50	116.90	366.66	319.80	206.62	451.91
												52	
Proposed for Appraisal													
8.	Mela & Niche Feeder	215.0	63.80	79.30	143.10	23.80	18.70	14.00	20.00	177.19	113.30	76.90	37.90
9.	Son-Kejda ^{2/}	155.0	45.16	34.71	79.47	11.17	14.60	19.00	20.00	118.47	73.31	49.00	36.53
	Sub-Total	370.0	108.96	114.01	222.57	34.97	33.30	33.00	40.00	295.67	186.61	125.90	74.43
	Total	1,189.4	155.62	275.24	431.46	83.06	83.71	102.50	156.90	662.33	506.41	332.52	526.34

1/ - Information collected from the project officers and Annual Implementation Review Report (1982-83) on the project prepared by OIC in August, 1982.

2/ - Subject to approval by OIC Appraisal Committee, these subprojects will become eligible for assistance failing which other ongoing PPPs will be appraised.

EVALUATION COST DATA

1. No. and Title of Project/Activity: Rajasthan Medium Irrigation
2. Purpose of Evaluation: Mid-Term Evaluation
3. Mission Staff Person Days involved in Evaluation (estimated):
 - Professional Staff 20 Person Days
 - Support Staff 5 Person Days

4. AID/W Direct-Hire or IPA TDY support funded by Mission:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Period of TDY (Person-Days)</u>	<u>Dollar Cost (Travel, Per Diem etc.)</u>	<u>* Source of Funds</u>
a.			
b.			
c.	none		
d.			

5. Contractor Support, if any:

<u>Name of Contractor[@]</u>	<u>Contract No.</u>	<u>Amount of Contract</u>	<u>* Source of Funds</u>
		none	

* Whether FDS, Mission O.E., Project Budget or Central/Regional Bureau funds.
 @ IQC, BSSA, PASA, PSC's, Institutional Contract, Cooperative Agreement, etc.