

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

1. PROJECT TITLE PL-480 Title II Feeding Programs			2. PROJECT NUMBER	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE TUNIS
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)			<input type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION	
5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES		6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING		7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION
A. First PRC-AG or Equivalent FY _____	B. Final Obligation Expected FY _____	C. Final Input Delivery FY _____	A. Total \$ _____	From (month/yr.) <u>October 1977</u>
			B. U.S. \$ _____	To (month/yr.) <u>October 1978</u>
			Date of Evaluation Review <u>5-3-79</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., airmgram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
<p>1. Review committee felt that A.I.D. should keep open mind concerning possible continuation of Title II program following termination concessional economic assistance, but that we do not yet have adequate basis to determine extent to which program as a whole, or any of its individual feeding components, may warrant continuation beyond FY 1981. Committee also of view that each feeding category should be considered separately and on its own merits in developing a phaseover or phasedown plan since the objectives, priority and effectiveness of each are different. committee feels that report's suggested phasedown schedule through FY-86 is unwarranted. Any Title II phaseover should be based on shorter time frame. Also wish to reiterate that Title I cannot be wedded to any Title II phaseover. Of most immediate concern is question of present effectiveness of feeding programs and their potential for continued and increased effectiveness. Evaluation report itself discusses a number of important shortcomings and deficiencies. Ofequal concern is apparent need: (A) to amplify GOT nutrition/health development strategy as related to specific objectives of supplemental feeding interventions; (B) to clarify role and purpose of Title II food resources related to GOT's own commitment to carry out supplemental feeding interventions; and (C) on basis of (A) and (B), to design multi-year food aid program strategy and assistance plan, including GOT multi-year resource allocation schedule. (cont'd)</p>	USAID/FFPO	CDSS October 1979

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS

<input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper	<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) <u>Strategy Paper</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> PIC/T	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C	
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P	

10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT

A. <input type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change
B. <input type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or Change Implementation Plan
C. <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinue Project

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Name and Titles)

Typed Name Peggy A. Sheehan	
AID/PDC/FFP/II	Date 7/20/79

12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval:

Signature
Typed Name
Date

8. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR (cont'd from Page 1):

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
<p>2. National nutrition survey 1975 identified children 0-2 years as age group most affected by food deficits and growth retardation. Report quotes Min. of Plan official as saying priority feeding target is age group 0-3. Mortality rate is highest in this group. Yet GOT and volag effort to reach this high risk group did not commence until FY-79 and proportionately this most vulnerable group receives least amount food resources. Report indicates that actual recipient count fell short of modest program level of 17,500 mothers and children. On positive side collaboration of Min. Health and volagencies in PMI laudable and worthy of encouragement and support. What constraints are preventing broader coverage of all rural PMIs? Could the volagencies extend their MCH outreach through further project inputs under OPGs? Can the CTRD assist in this outreach? Can the Title II food be used as incentive for rural women to avail themselves of PMI health and medical services? Does Title II program offer a practical or realistic means of influencing GOT to accord greater policy priority to development of programs aimed at this age group?</p> <p>USAID Health/Nutrition Office and FFP Office should collaborate with the cooperating sponsors in resolving these problems of design and implementation.</p>	<p>USAID/MSO USAID/FFPO</p>	<p>ABS June 1980</p>
<p>3. Report notes that NCSS in process of reorganizing and restructuring Pre-School program to include additional services. These new services should include Health and Nutrition inputs since food aid in isolation does not impact on nutritional status. NCSS seems to have the outreach capability in the Pre-School Feeding and the Health Min. has the Health/Medical inputs for MCH program. Some coordination or even integration of both programs would seem to be in best interest of target groups being served.</p>	<p>USAID/FFP CARE CRS</p>	<p>ABS June 1980</p>
<p>4. The evaluation team observed a "total absence of any community support or grass roots participation in the implementation of the feeding programs."</p> <p>If one accepts the notion of development as "people learning to solve their own problem", one cannot dismiss the importance of community involvement. This is an important use of food as an entré, inducement, leverage to involve the community and the recipient families into contributing in some way to the solution of their problems. (Continued on next page.)</p>		

8: ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR (cont'd from Page 3):

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
7. Report notes that school canteens are located in rural and semi-rural areas, and that only neediest children participate. However, only 45 percent of rural children attend primary school. Are special efforts being made to use school canteen as incentive for these unschooled rural children to attend class?	USAID/FFP	June 1980
8. Committee endorses recommendation of report that (1) Nutritional/Health curriculum should be developed for all classes, (2) that regional nutritionists for Min. Ed. should be supported and encouraged, and (3) that canteen personnel need in-service training to sensitize them to objectives of the program.	Education Ministry	---