

*Wub**1*

U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT  
USAID/Philippines  
APO San Francisco 96528

June 8, 1982

TO : ASIA/DP/E: Maureen Norton  
FROM : USAID/PO : Richard Rhoda *RR*  
SUBJECT : Evaluation of Economic and Social Impact Analysis/  
Women in Development (ESIA/WID) Project (492-0295)

The enclosed evaluation of the ESIA/WID Project consists of three parts.

1. Evaluation Team Report

The report presents the findings of a four week effort by external evaluators Bruce Koppel, Bituin Gonzales, and Augustin Kintanar, Jr.

2. MEC Report

This report is the result of three days of deliberations by the internal ESIA/WID Project Monitoring and Evaluation Committee (MEC). The MEC report is based on an analysis and discussion of the findings of the Evaluation Team Report.

3. USAID Memo

This memo from Richard Rhoda, USAID Evaluation Officer, to the files provides a very brief overview of the ESIA/WID Project, an executive summary of the Evaluation Team Report, and comments on the relevancy to the Mission Evaluation Plan of the ESIA/WID Project.

The ESIA/WID Project and its evaluation are significant in a couple of ways. First, the central project activity is evaluation. A total of thirty-nine impact evaluations were conducted under the project. These studies and other project activities have contributed considerable information on the impact of development projects in the Philippines and on appropriate and inappropriate techniques for conducting impact evaluations. Second, the GOP essentially took full responsibility for the evaluation of the ESIA/WID project.

The evaluation as submitted does not conform closely to the Bureau's standard evaluation format because the GOP was primarily responsible for the evaluation and selected a format which met their needs. This points to a more general problem of trying to maximize host country

involvement while attempting to use the same evaluation approach and format for all Missions. In an attempt to comply with Bureau requirements, we have added a Project Data Sheet to both the Evaluation Team and MEC Reports. My memo to the files can serve as an executive summary.

We are still trying to finalize the Bicol Integrated Area Development III (492-0289) and Rural Service Centers (492-0304) evaluations. I hope these can be submitted in the near future.

Enclosure

cc: OD/PE:GDy-Liaco  
PPC/E/PES:MHageboeck  
ASIA/PTB/P:CPenndorf

31

**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL IMPACT ANALYSIS/  
WOMEN IN DEVELOPMENT (ESIA/WID) PROJECT**

**Report of the ESIA/WID Project Monitoring and  
Evaluation Committee**

**March 1982**

- 4 -  
BASIC PROGRAM IDENTIFICATION DATA

1. Country: Philippines
2. Bilateral project title: "Economic and Social Impact Analysis/Women in Development Project"
3. Bilateral project numbers: 492-0295
4. Program Implementation
  - a. First project agreement: FY 78
  - b. Final obligation: FY 81
  - c. Final input delivery: FY 82
5. Program funding:
  - a. A.I.D. bilateral funding \$2,500,000 (grant FY 78-81)
  - b. Host country counterpart funds \$2,325,250
6. Mode of implementation:
  - a. Project grant agreement between USAID/Manila and the Philippine National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA)
  - b. Agreement between NEDA and the Philippine Institute for Development Studies (PIDS)
  - c. Agreement between PIDS and
    - 1) Philippine Center for Economic Development (PCED) for the MICRO Component
    - 2) Statistical Coordination Office (SCO) of NEDA for the MACRO Component;
    - 3) Regional Development Council of Region VI (RDC VI) for the Region VI Component;
    - 4) Institute of Philippine Culture for the WID Component; and
    - 5) Programs and Projects Office (PPO) of NEDA for the RESEARCH UTILIZATION Component.
7. Previous evaluation:
  - a. First Internal Technical Review, May 1979
8. Responsible Mission Officials:
  - a. Mission Directors: Peter Cody, 1976-1979; Anthony Schwarzwald, 1979-present
  - b. Responsible project officers: Donald Dembowski, 1975-1979; C. Stuart Callison, 1979-present.
9. Host Country exchange rates
  - a. Name of currency: Peso (P)
  - b. Exchange rate at time of project: P7.50=\$1.00

GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS

- CC - Consultative Council
- CPI - Consumer Pulse, Incorporated
- EPRS - Economic Planning and Research Staff
- FFUEW - First Follow-up Evaluation Workshop
- IAD - Integrated Area Development
- IPC - Institute of Philippine Culture
- IRIS - Integrated Regional Information System
- JPAC - Joint Project Advisory Committee
- MAG - Micro Advisory Group
- MES - Monitoring and Evaluation System
- MJB - Ministry of the Budget
- NCRFW - National Commission on the Role of Filipino Women
- NCSO - National Census and Statistics Office
- NEDA - National Economic and Development Authority
- NRO - NEDA Regional Office
- NSS - National Sample Survey
- PBSP - Philippine Business for Social Progress
- PCED - Philippine Center for Economic Development
- PDS - Provincial Development Staff
- PICRAD - Panay Island Consortium for Rural & Agricultural Development
- PMO - Project Management Office
- PPO - Programs and Projects Office
- PS - Pilot Survey
- RDC - Regional Development Council
- RPMS - Regional Project Monitoring System
- RUC - Research Utilization Component
- SAS - Social Accounts Staff
- SCO - Statistical Coordination Office
- UPV - University of the Philippines at Visayas

- 1 -

**ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL IMPACT ANALYSIS/  
WOMEN IN DEVELOPMENT (ESIA/WID) PROJECT**

**Report of the ESIA/WID Project Monitoring and  
Evaluation Committee**

**March 1982**

**Background**

This Report presents the results of the second evaluation conducted by the Monitoring and Evaluation Committee (MEC) on the implementation and accomplishments of the ESIA/WID Project as of December 31, 1981.

The MEC was created pursuant to the Monitoring and Evaluation Program of the ESIA/WID Project as approved by the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA) and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). It is composed of representatives from NEDA, USAID, the Project Management Office at the Philippine Institute for Development Studies (PIDS) and the Component Coordinators of the Project.

The MEC conducted the first evaluation of the Project through a series of internal technical review workshops from April 19 to May 22, 1979. The objective was to assess the substantive progress that the Project had made (as of 31 March 1979) relative to the objectives and

outputs expected as stated in the currently valid Implementation Plan. The findings and recommendations of the MEC during the first evaluation are contained in the Report of the ESIA/WID Monitoring and Evaluation Committee dated May 1979.

The second evaluation of the ESIA/WID Project was conducted from January 25 to March 4, 1982. The objectives of the second evaluation are twofold: first, an assessment of the substantive outputs that the Project has produced as of December 31, 1981 vis-a-vis its expected outputs and objectives as stated in the currently valid Implementation Plan with the end in view of identifying measures that would most effectively utilize and institutionalize within the government the final outputs of the Macro, Micro, Region VI and WID Components; and second, an assessment of the substantive progress that the Research Utilization Component has made to date with a view to recommending measures that would make the Component more effective in utilizing and possibly institutionalizing the use of the outputs of the Project.

The second evaluation focused on:

- (a) the actual accomplishments and performance of the Project and its five Components;
- (b) an assessment as to whether or not such accomplishments are on schedule and in line with stated objectives;
- (c) an analysis of problems encountered and constraints inhibiting the achievement of Project objectives as stated in the currently valid Implementation Plan;

- (d) recommended measures or courses of action to be taken to solve such problems and overcome constraints; and
- (e) other pertinent recommendations to permit maximum utilization and institutionalization of Project outputs and activities.

In contrast to the self evaluation undertaken previously, the second evaluation was conducted with the assistance of a team of consultants who undertook an independent evaluation of the Project. (For the detailed scope of work of the consultants please see Annex A). The team spent four weeks to conduct an independent evaluation and prepare a Special Evaluation Report. The Special Evaluation Report served as the basic document that inputted to the MEC's deliberations and forms part of this Report (Annex B). The MEC convened on February 24 and 25 in Iloilo City to consider the Consultants' Special Evaluation Report, and on March 4 in Manila to consider and adopt this Report.

The findings, conclusions and recommendations contained in the succeeding pages of this Report are the results of the MEC's deliberations during the above-mentioned evaluation sessions.

OVER-ALL PROJECT

Summary Findings and Conclusions

1. The Committee concluded that, over-all, the ESIA/WID Project is making good progress towards meeting its major objectives as set forth in the June, 1981 Implementation Plan. It was noted that, under the Project, the whole Philippine statistical and administrative reporting system has come under inspection from the perspective of the role the system needs to play in policy, program and project development.
2. The Committee noted that that Implementation Plan of the Project assumes that: (a) the general shift in Philippine planning orientation away from a narrower emphasis on production goals and toward broader development concerns such as equity, social justice, etc. would continue and (b) the evolving rationalization of linkages among the planning process, the project development process and resource allocation, particularly public financial resources, would continue at the national, sectoral and regional levels. The Committee observed, however, that while these assumptions remain essentially correct, the pace and scope of shifts anticipated therein have not been proceeding at even speeds nor have the shifts in orientation and improved linkages been equally characteristic of the entire GOP system.

In light of this, the demand for ESIA/WID outputs may be considerably less than anticipated. In this regard, it was agreed that it would be desirable to take steps towards an administrative action at the highest level which would promote or require the use of impact analysis as a means of improving the project development process. Such action, however, would be taken only if the results of the Research Utilization Component should warrant it. It would also entail the conduct of adequate training of government personnel on project impact analyses to enable them to respond to such administrative action. These training activities may be addressed explicitly in the preparation of the appropriate legal instrument for the aforesaid purpose.

3. The Committee noted that the evaluation is the first external "third party" evaluation of the ESIA/WID Project. The absence of a prior systematic external evaluation was viewed with concern since many of the problems which emerged during the evaluation would have at least been confronted if an evaluation had been conducted at the Project's mid-point. The Committee was informed of efforts undertaken by Project Management to permit such an evaluation in mid-1981 but a number of administrative factors prevented its actual conduct.

**RECOMMENDATION**

1. The Project should establish a more strategic view. Specifically, the PMO should take steps to establish more clearly the Project's post-project goals and to specify the strategies and actions which must be taken from this point on to reach those goals.

MACRO COMPONENT

Summary Findings and Conclusions

1. The Committee noted the substantial outputs and accomplishments of the Component. In particular, it stressed that apart from the outputs, the process involved in achieving them represented a significant accomplishment in itself. This includes the initial conceptualization and identification of relevant economic and social indicators to measure the stated objectives of the COP's Five Year Plan, as well as efforts made to set up the data bases for a continuing plan monitoring and evaluation system. Another benefit is the opportunity it provided to the staff to engage in the conceptualization of the indicators themselves --- which opportunity is seldom provided to government statistical workers who are largely limited to the mechanical aspects of statistical work. Such exposure would contribute to a better understanding of the nature of planning processes and could lead to closer collaborative efforts among statisticians, economists and other social scientists.
2. The Committee found a few serious gaps in the system of indicators, as published in the 1990 "Economic and Social Indicators" which should be filled as much as possible before the termination of the research project. These gaps are in the following areas:

- a) **Poverty and Income Distribution.** The Committee noted the inadequacy of the indicators in the area of poverty and income distribution, notwithstanding the priority assigned to it in the 5 Year Development Plan. In particular, the Committee felt that the indicators on income distribution were not available on a timely basis. It was clarified, however, that the lack of timely data from the National Census and Statistics Office (NCSO), in particular, posed severe constraints to the measurement of the indicators. With respect to indicators on poverty, it was pointed out that indicators have been identified. These indicators are not based on the usual threshold measures but consist mainly of a presentation of an economic and social profile of the bottom 30% of families on the income scale. The Committee also noted the absence of any actual nominal and real wage rate indicators.
- b) **Underemployment.** The existing indicators on underemployment were viewed as inadequate and weak. It was noted that while a concept paper prepared by the staff discusses various methods and techniques for measuring underemployment, the existing publication does not contain these suggested measures since the data required for their measurement have not been released by the NCSO.

c) Health and Nutrition. The Committee noted the absence of statistical indicators for incidence and degree of malnutrition. Considering the prevalence of malnutrition, the Committee felt that the Component can not afford to be silent on this fundamental area of concern. The Committee observed, however, that the second round of the National Health, Nutrition, and Social Services Survey is on-going and that this Survey seeks to gather data on malnutrition.

With respect to all these gaps, the Committee indicated that the absence of solid data required for the indicators can not be taken as an excuse for the non-measurement since the Macro Component is tasked with the improvement of the data bases for the ESIA Indicators System.

3. The Committee observed the lack of a unifying framework for the ESIA Indicator System to link the various areas of concern and goal areas. The Committee recognized that such a framework will draw heavily from the 5-Year Development Plan and suggested that assistance of the Economic Planning and Research Staff (EPRS) of the NEDA may be required in preparing the framework. At the same time, the Committee encouraged the finalization of the concept papers which will serve to clarify the issues involved in the choice of goals/areas of concern and in the selection of the corresponding indicators.
4. The Committee noted that the EPRS of the NEDA participated in the initial stages of the ESIA/WID and such participation augurs well for the ready

utilization of the output into the on-going planning process, especially in the preparation of the new 5-Year Development Plan. The utility of the ESIA Indicator System has likewise been demonstrated in the preparation of the Social Development Report (jointly by the Macro Component Staff and EPRS), which Report serves to document social development of the country in the last decade. With respect to the finding of the Evaluation Team on the lack of knowledge of Project activities by other staffs of the NEDA (which may constrain fuller utilization of the outputs), the Committee noted that several fora (e.g. Macro Component Executive Committee, inter-agency committees, etc.) have been established for such purpose.

5. The Committee viewed the development of the economic and social indicators as a natural and necessary step in the improvement of the planning process in the Philippines in that it provides feedback mechanism to measure progress and accomplishments towards achieving goals. In this regard, the Committee endorsed the efforts undertaken to institutionalize the maintenance of the ESIA Indicator System.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the above findings, the Committee put forward the following recommendations:

1. Adequate indicators should be developed and measured in the areas of poverty and income distribution, wage rates, employment and malnutrition. Additionally, this issue should be elevated to the Joint Project Advisory Committee (JPAC) for it to reiterate the Component's mandate to come up by May 1982 with adequate measures for these key areas of concern.
2. The Component should set up in collaboration with EPRS a unifying framework which would link up the various goal areas and areas of concern of the ESIA Indicator System. In addition, the concept papers which describe the process through which areas of concern were chosen and indicators identified should be finalized.

WOMEN IN DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT

Summary Findings and Conclusions

1. The Committee noted that the activities completed by the WID Component, namely the Pilot Survey and the seven (7) Special Studies, generated substantial information on issues regarding women's participation and that they could be considered as a major contribution to the state of women's studies in the country.
2. The Committee observed, however, that these studies did not generate, in the light of ESIA/WID Project expectations, explicit suggestions as to the type of data to be pursued in order to come up with measures of status of women's participation, its determinants, and the effects of such participation on selected ESIA areas of concern.
3. It was pointed out that both studies involved significant indicator development components which include: (a) an analysis of the social processes and relationship relating to women's participation in development so that the technical validity of proposed indicators may be established; and (b) a look into the cost-effectiveness and other issues relating to measurement feasibility. The Committee noted that while the studies looked into mechanisms and relationships of women's participation, they drew weak conclusions as to

the technical validity of the indicators as well as on the measurement feasibility issues. It was clarified that while these studies did propose indicators, most were considered infeasible.

4. The Committee felt that the redesign of the Three Region Survey (as mandated by the JPAC) represented a major step in bringing WID closer to a special goal area to be included in the indicator system. It noted, however, that the implementation of the Component is delayed by three months largely due to operational and field problems. The completion of the Three Region Survey will require an additional period of six months beyond 31 December 1981 and an additional cost of about \$70,000.00.
5. The Committee noted that considering the revised objectives of the Three Region Survey and the commitment of the Component to pursue these objectives and undertake the necessary analyses, the Three Region Survey and its analyses should be completed. Additionally, it was felt that substantial investments have been made and that the marginal cost involved in completing the study would yield major benefits.
6. The Committee noted that the implementation of the Component had proceeded largely without establishing linkages with institutions and organizations pertinent to women in development. In view of the substantial research findings on women in development issues

and possible implications for policy thereof, it was felt that adequate fora be identified to ensure the utilization of the research results, particularly upon completion of the Three Region Survey.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the above findings, the Committee made the following recommendations:

1. The Three Region Survey and its analyses should be completed by 30 June 1982. This recommendation is made on the assurance by the Component Coordinator that the analysis will be undertaken following the scheme approved by the JPAC.
2. The Committee also endorsed the recommendation of the Evaluation Team that linkages between WID and appropriate women's groups, such as the National Commission on the Role of Filipino Women (NCRFW), be established to sensitize them with appropriate issues on women in development. In this regard, it was suggested that appropriate forum for establishing these linkages be identified such as the conduct of a policy perspectives seminar on women in development issues with the NCRFW and other women's groups.

## MICRO COMPONENT

### Summary Findings and Conclusions

1. The Committee noted that the implementation of activities falling under Phases I-IV (I-development of framework for 8 intensively-studied projects, II-development of framework for 10 extensively-studied projects, III-Survey/data generation for intensive studies, IV-data collection for extensive studies), was essentially on schedule. However, Data Analysis I which includes tabulation and coding of data, was significantly delayed. This consequently delayed all subsequent activities. Data Analysis I, originally scheduled for completion by June, 1981 is now expected to be completed in April, 1982. Hence, the Micro Component research is 10 months behind the schedule stipulated in the currently valid Implementation Plan.
2. The Committee observed that at present, 15 (out of originally 18) projects are still under study. Based on the presentations in the 13th and 14th Micro Workshops, the Committee felt that the final number of research projects which will be completed will likely be less than 15. Moreover, the Committee noticed the unevenness in the quality of analyses so far documented by the Component and thus felt that there would be an even lesser number of candidates out of those most likely to be completed for possible application by govern-

ment practitioners. In view of this finding, the Committee agreed that there is a need for an external review process to be able to determine which research methods should or should not be tested in the Research Utilization Component (RUC).

The Micro Component Manager, however, while in full agreement with this finding, expressed some concern over the feasibility of the external review. In this light, the Committee requested the Micro Component Management to identify which of the 15 projects currently under study will not likely contain serious methodological flaws to provide guidance to RUC as to which studies it should test.

3. The Committee noted that the Component essentially involves basic research as distinguished from applied research. It was observed in this regard, however, that several steps have already been taken by Micro Component Management to establish some transition from basic to applied research. These include: a) conduct of dialogue between project investigators and government personnel through the PCED-PIDS-NEDA seminar series; b) hiring of a consultant to examine the existing monitoring and evaluation systems of agencies participating in the Micro Component with a view to understanding how those agencies could focus attention to a broader set of concerns; and c) participation in the Micro Component of research coordinators from line agencies to facilitate the completion of the research and to serve as the link in absorbing the methods used into their

agencias. The Committee observed that with respect to a) above, the seminar series was generally not as successful as expected, partly because of the preliminary nature of the project reports (which previously dealt with literature survey and research design), and partly because of the extreme formality of the series (wherein government technical staff formally react to papers presented in the limited time period of a seminar), in spite of the fact that this improved the understanding on the part of the practitioners. As regards b), the consultants' efforts, in general, did not provide enough information about how existing monitoring systems should function to constitute an especially meaningful input to the Project. With respect to c), the role that the research coordinators actually played was very limited. In view thereof, the Committee concluded that since the above steps taken by the Component have met with limited success, the transition process from basic to applied research remains inadequate.

4. The Committee found that the role of foreign consultants in the Micro Component had not been as relevant and useful as expected in view of several factors. These were: (a) the Consultants entered the project late for the role they were assigned; (b) some consultants were slow in becoming adequately familiar with the development projects being studied; and (c) some of the consultants lacked prior experience in the Philippines.

5. The Committee took note of the efforts of the Component in the conceptualization of Data Analysis II. However, the Committee expressed concern that Data Analysis II would be very difficult to complete because of a number of factors, foremost of which are the diversity of methods of analysis and the way the data were generated (which does not lend itself to appropriate analyses anticipated in Data Analysis II). In this regard, the Committee endorsed an integrative report which Micro Management plans to write as the final product of Data Analysis I. This report would be in addition to the Micro Component's final report and would cover the relative contribution of various projects across different areas of concern. In the event that Data Analysis II proves to be not feasible, then the integrative report may be considered as a substitute. In view thereof, the Committee agreed that it would be useful to extend (at no additional cost) the duration of the Component by three months after May 1982 to permit the completion of the integrative report.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the foregoing analyses and findings, the Committee recommended the following:

1. The remaining extensive and intensive studies should be subjected to an external review process upon their completion. The review should be able to determine the following:

- a) whether or not the design, methods and analysis of each study are adequate in that they do not contain serious methodological flaws. The results of this review should be provided to the RUC for its consideration.
  - b) the contribution the study makes or will make to the understanding of the mechanisms, processes, and relationships through which development projects achieve their impact on various development goals; and
  - c) in view of (a) and (b) above, whether or not the papers are of quality suitable for publication.
2. Under the joint sponsorship of the Micro Component and the Research Utilization Component, the remaining studies which will not likely contain serious methodological flaws should be presented to an appropriate policy audience to determine whether the results are acceptable to practitioners. Those reports which are found to be not acceptable should remain candidates for publication but not for testing by the Research Utilization Component.

**REGION VI COMPONENT**

**Summary Findings and Conclusions**

1. The Committee found that the Component had essentially achieved its three major objectives as presented in its implementation plan, viz: (a) identification and development of ~~ways~~ to facilitate the adoption and use of project progress and impact indicators; (b) formulation and pilot-testing of low-cost progress and impact measurement systems for selected projects; and (c) documentation of the actual experience and the administrative and other operational feasibility issues involved in the course of achieving (a) and (b) above.
2. The Committee noted that the component's implementation strategy of using training cum agency self-assessment has successfully facilitated the adoption and actual use of project progress and impact indicators for project development at the regional level.
3. As expected in the implementation plan, about 73 persons from the NEEA, the participating regional line agencies and the local governments in the region were trained in the actual design and operation of project progress and impact measurement systems. Fifteen (out of 23) participating agencies were able to develop fully operational Monitoring and Evaluation (M and E) Systems. The Committee noted in this regard, however, that the major difficulty encountered in the course of operating the M and E

Systems was the generation of the baseline data set and a second data set at some later period of time, for purposes of analyzing and measuring project progress and impact. It was found that capabilities in this aspect were very limited, and regional personnel involved needed more rigorous training. Moreover, it was also noted that the component faced chronic problems of personnel transfers or change in employment which either delayed the implementation of the M & E Systems of the concerned agency or necessitated the dropping of the project under study by the Region VI Component.

4. The Component had adequately documented their experiences in the formulation and pilot-testing of the M and E Systems and a number of administrative and other operational feasibility issues that emerged throughout the implementation period. It was observed that the Component encountered specific experiences that help shed more light into the kinds of feasibility questions that arise in promoting the extensive use of project progress and impact measurement systems at the regional level. For instance, it was found that the use of the Consultative Council meetings as the forum through which agency-level problems relating to the operation of the M and E Systems were addressed did not prove to be as productive as expected. It was felt that individual agency consultations would have been more effective in resolving agency-level problems.

In noting the activities undertaken by the Component, the Committee expressed some concern over the extensive use of private consultants, to the extent that it may have stifled some initiatives on the part of both the Component's management and the agency participants in implementing their various activities. In addition, the Committee expressed concern as to whether or not the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms established by the Component would remain operative if a new set of indicators such as those developed by the Micro Component were to be used instead.

The role and extent of interest of the Regional Development Council was felt to be crucial, especially with respect to the mobilization of regional agencies, in the joint effort of operating progress and impact measurement and analysis systems in the region. The seriousness of interest of the RDC in this case was manifested in its passing of several resolutions aimed at maintaining the established mechanisms to run the said systems beyond the life of the Component.

The linking of the NEDA and PDS Staffs for the implementation of the Component proved to be organizationally effective, serving as the monitoring channel in relation to line agency activities at the regional and provincial levels.

Finally, while the exposure on monitoring project progress and analyzing and measuring project impact has placed in context the use

of indicators (as a management tool in relating projects to regional goals), it was, however, concluded that the effective use of this tool depended largely on the extent to which its value was appreciated by the staff or personnel operating the system.

5. In view of the foregoing, the Committee concluded that the promotion of the extensive use of project progress and impact measurement systems in Region VI was administratively feasible, and that its promotion in other regions can similarly be undertaken to the extent that the same set of administrative feasibility issues are obtaining and are not insurmountable. The key issues in this regard are: (a) the role and level of interest of the RDC; (b) close collaboration between the regional and provincial planning staffs; (c) adequate technical and managerial capabilities; (d) provision of continuous training in specialized skills; and (e) full appreciation of the value of project progress and impact measurement and analysis systems as a management tool.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

Based upon the above findings and conclusions, the Committee recommended that in the interest of continuing the promotion and eventual institutionalization of the extensive use of project progress and impact measurement and analysis systems which has been successfully initiated in Region VI, a follow-up plan aimed at the maintenance and

operation of the M and E Systems over the next 3 to 5 years should be prepared by the Component as soon as possible. This plan should be implementable using the region's own resources. Specifically, the plan should cover the following areas:

- (a) reinforcement of technical and managerial skills in the formulation of M and E System designs, generation of baseline and other requisite data, and analysis of impact; and
- (b) improvement in the application of method as required in (a) above.

RESEARCH UTILIZATION COMPONENT

Summary Findings and Conclusions

The Committee noted the progress of the RUC to date relative to their work program, and observed that the principal inputs, i.e. the methods of analysis being developed by the Micro Component, have not been made available as scheduled. The RUC nevertheless proceeded to initiate the testing of selected methods of analysis of the Micro Component, using whatever materials on these methods were available to the RUC (which were mostly pre-analysis discussion papers).

The Committee, thus, noted that even while efforts were being exerted by the Component to undertake its scheduled activities per the work program, the Component is not making substantial progress because of the absence of the principal inputs from Micro Component. The possibility of the non-completion of the RUC by December 1982 was, therefore, deemed to be unacceptably high.

In view of this fundamental problem faced by the RUC, the Committee considered possible alternative actions that the RUC should pursue between now and December 31, 1982. It generally concluded that the RUC design as described in its implementation plan should be revised accordingly.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee's recommendations are in terms of revisions in the work program and schedule of the RUC, as follows:

1. RUC should defer its on-going testing of the intensive and extensive studies until such time as the Micro Component can identify the projects which will not likely contain serious methodological flaws.
2. On those projects which are unlikely to have methodological flaws, the RUC should engage the services of a statistical consultant and/or the Micro investigators in an effort to scale down the data collection activities for the RUC and to reduce the number of areas of concern to be addressed in the analyses.
3. The RUC should: (a) coordinate with the NEDA-Regional Development Staff and NRO-VI to develop an operational plan for the replication of those portions of the Region VI Component experiences considered valuable to other regions; and (b) render technical assistance to the Region VI Component in the course of preparing its follow-up plan in areas where RUC Staff have meaningful knowledge to contribute.
4. In preparation for the resumption of practical testing of the Micro Component methods of analysis, the selection of projects upon which said methods will be tried should be reviewed based on a set of criteria that will satisfy the design considerations for ex-ante and ex-post applications, without the ex-ante necessarily having to follow ex-post.

5. The number of ex-post and ex-ante applications should be significantly reduced from the planned 14 each.
6. Per the currently-valid implementation plan of RUC, one of its objectives is to identify the steps that should be taken to improve government's capacity for monitoring of progress of output delivery and measuring the socio economic impact of a project and the current approach to project prioritization and selection, after it has tested the methods of analysis of Micro Component. In this regard, the Committee felt that an effort to build and maintain the aforesaid capacity and approach to project selection/prioritization is not a one-shot question, but rather a question requiring a longer range capacity-building strategy. Accordingly, the Committee recommended that: (a) the Component should take the lead in identifying specific 3- and 5-year goals for the status of impact assessment capabilities and utilization, in the broader national context of developing project M and E systems in the country; and (b) the Component should identify the detailed training strategy that would be appropriate by 1983. The design of such a training program/strategy should draw, as necessary, on the relevant experiences of the Micro and Region VI Components and other related project development training recently conducted.