

PD-AAS-403
42767

Analysis and Evaluation Plan

FY 1981 - FY 1983

USAID/India
October 1980

Analysis and Evaluation Plan

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction	1
II. Planned Analysis and Evaluation Activities	
A. Macro-Level Analysis	4
B. Food Supply and Rural Employment	5
1. Agricultural Research Education and Extension	7
2. Surface Irrigation	7
3. Rural Electrification	10
4. Rural Works	12
5. Rural Credit	13
6. Fertilizer	16
7. Cooperative Development	18
C. Fertility and Mortality Reduction	19
1. Rural Health/Family Planning Systems	20
2. Maternal and Child Health/Nutrition	22
D. Special AID Concerns	
1. Women in Development	24
2. Energy, Environment and Forestry	24
3. Primary Education	26
III. Analysis and Evaluation Summary	26
 Annex A: Analysis and Evaluation Team Recommendations and Planned USAID Actions	
 Annex B: Existing and Proposed India Assistance Program FY 1978 - FY 1986	
 Annex C: Long-Range Evaluation Schedules and Logical Frame- works: Existing Projects.	

I. Introduction

In August 1979 USAID/India requested that AID/W assemble a team of consultants who could assist USAID in the development of an "analysis and evaluation plan". The consultant team arrived in late November and was in India for most of December. The Analysis and Evaluation Team was led by Dr. Thomas Timberg, a political scientist with long experience in India; it included Dr. Russell Olson, a recently retired AID agricultural economist who had worked in India in the 1950s as a contractor and returned subsequently as USAID/India Food and Agriculture chief in the late 1960s and early 1970s, and Dr. Allan Hoben, a Boston University social anthropologist, formerly with PPC in AID/W. The team was joined for part of its stay by Dr. Richard Blue, Chief of the Studies Division of PPC/E and former India scholar, and Dr. Hugh Plunkett, USAID/Bangladesh social anthropologist, and was assisted in New Delhi by two Indian graduate students in sociology.

USAID requested the team visit for several reasons. First, it was clear that India had a wealth of information and resources to offer in analysis and evaluation of the programs likely to be of interest to AID, but that USAID would need both a "road map" and a "plan of attack" in order to be able to take full advantage of available resources.

This presented difficulties for the USAID staff, all of whom were new to India. Second, USAID recognized that many of the issues of "impact" and "access" of particular concern to AID were common to most projects in each of the two major sectors of interest to AID (agriculture and health/family planning/nutrition). USAID wanted expert advice in devising an analysis and evaluation approach which would take advantage of common elements at the project "purpose" and "goal" levels in obtaining adequate information on program impact and access for the AID "target group". Finally, USAID felt that a "crash course" in the literature on program impact in India would be useful in preparation of the Country Development Strategy Statement (CDSS) for FY 1982 - FY 1986.

The Analysis and Evaluation Team was generally successful in meeting the objectives set for the team by USAID. The team members were extremely helpful in putting USAID staff in touch with relevant individuals and institutions in India, and the report has served as a very useful catalogue of contacts. Their suggestions concerning the capabilities of various institutions, possible ways of keeping abreast of the vast Indian literature, and the principles which should guide USAID evaluation efforts were invaluable, as were the team's observations on various "impact" issues. The team's recommendations and the actions planned by USAID are listed in Annex A. USAID's only major

disagreement with the team concerned the recommendations on in-depth micro-studies. Although USAID would like to support such studies, it has subsequently concluded that AID-financed studies of this type are simply not feasible in India in the 1980s.

In discussing USAID analysis and evaluation plans for various sectors, sub-sectors and programs, this paper follows the organization of the "program areas" listed on page 58 of the FY 1982-1986 India CDSS. Among other things, this has precluded an integrated discussion of Title II evaluation since, Title II programs are considered in the relevant sub-sector rather than lumped together. However, it should be kept in mind that the evaluation plans for various Title II programs are a response to the concern that all Title II programs be assessed for their impact and effectiveness, and have developed from the "qualitative" Title II evaluation undertaken by a team of consultants in early 1979.

To provide the program context for the discussion below, Annex B lists existing and planned projects for FY 1978 through FY 1982 and the proposed levels for various program areas for FY 1983 through FY 1986 (based on the Approved Assistance Planning level of \$750 million for FY 1986). Annex C provides the logical frameworks and the USAID evaluation planning worksheets for each of USAID's existing projects.

II. Proposed Analysis and Evaluation Activities

A. Macro-Level Analysis

Unless there is a major change in AID policies and practices, USAID does not anticipate a requirement for major analytical studies at the macro level. Given the quality and timeliness of the general economic analysis produced by the Government of India, the Economic Section of the U.S. Embassy in New Delhi, World Bank and International Monetary Fund, it should be possible for the existing USAID staff (particularly the U.S. Deputy Program Officer/Economist, the FSN Economic Specialist, and FSN Agricultural Economist) to deal adequately with any macroeconomic issues which might arise in the context of the Indicative Planning Allocation (IPA) exercise, the CDSS, or the Annual Budget Submission (e.g. balance of payments analysis for PL 480 Title I requests).

One macro-level analysis which will be considered in an assessment of India's overall development performance, using the results of the 1981 Census and other available data to review trends in poverty, employment and income distribution. Depending upon the rate at which Census data are compiled and released, it might be possible to undertake such a study in the latter half of CY 1982 (i. e. in time for the CDSS for FY 1985 - FY 1989). The study would be largely an in-house effort, with assistance on special topics from Indian and U.S. consultants. USAID will reach a decision on the utility and feasibility of a "development

performance assessment" in late FY 1981 to permit budgeting of FY 1982 Program Development and Support (PDS) funds, as appropriate.

B. Food Supply and Rural Employment

The major portion of USAID's proposed program for India is allocated to the expansion of food supplies and rural employment. The latter includes off-farm employment, although emphasis has been given thus far to programs which simultaneously expand both food supply and rural employment through agricultural intensification. The "Food Supply and Rural Employment" program category should account for the bulk of USAID's analysis and evaluation efforts. Over the longer run, as noted above, a large amount of high-quality impact data should be available from AID-supported programs and projects. In the period covered by this Analysis and Evaluation Plan, however, most of the impact data will have to come from other sources. This Plan is designed to take maximum advantage of these other sources pending the availability of similar information from AID-assisted activities.

The key activity in this respect will be an ongoing analysis of the impact of India's agricultural and rural development strategy. This effort was begun in the Analysis and Evaluation Team Report and the CDSS for FY 1982 - FY 1986, and will be updated annually and summarized in each successive CDSS. The analysis will assess the development

pattern of the overall rural economy, concentrating on the impact on poverty, employment and income distribution of the agricultural intensification. The studies will be based primarily on data from the states of northern and western India (Punjab, Haryana, Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan, Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra), but will include data from eastern and southern India for comparative purposes. The first update will be undertaken in November and December 1980, preferably with assistance from knowledgeable U.S. or Indian consultants.

Within the Food Supply and Rural Employment category nearly half of projected allocations are for surface or groundwater irrigation (including rural electrification). Although USAID has prepared analyses of particular irrigation activities for four Project Papers, it has not yet been possible to undertake a comprehensive assessment of long-term AID assistance priorities within India's irrigation sector. USAID plans to undertake such an assessment during CY 1981 for the FY 1984 - FY 1988 CDSS. The scope of the assessment and the extent of assistance required from Indian and U.S. consultants will be determined following the report of the Asia Regional Irrigation Review Team (scheduled to visit India during November 1980) and the issuance of the new Sixth Five Year Plan for 1980 - 1985 (VI FYP) in early CY 1981.

Other analysis and evaluation activities in the Food Supply and Rural Employment category will be closely related to particular projects or groups of projects. These are discussed below, using the headings from the FY 1982 - FY 1986 CDSS.

1. Agricultural Research Education and Extension

Priority areas for AID assistance for agricultural research, education and extension were agreed upon recently at the initial meetings of the Indo-U.S. Joint Subcommittee on Agriculture (September 23-25, 1980). A Project Paper will be prepared during FY 1981. USAID has not yet had an opportunity to review fully the analysis and evaluation requirements for activities in this field. Our preliminary assessment is that no analyses will be required beyond those which are included in the Project Paper. Material on research, education and extension will be included in the annual impact analysis on India's agricultural and rural development strategy, but it will probably receive less emphasis than such topics as irrigation, credit, fertilizer and rural electrification.

2. Surface Irrigation

AID is already financing Medium Irrigation Projects (MIPs) in Gujarat and Rajasthan, and is considering FY 82 funding for a third MIP in Maharashtra. The scheduled completion dates for the Gujarat

and Rajasthan MIPs are FY 1983 and FY 1985 respectively, although completion dates for individual medium irrigation schemes financed under the MIPs will vary. In general, a project appraisal is carried out for each scheme and socio-economic baseline surveys are undertaken for at least one-half of the schemes, so impact data for selected schemes should begin to be available from about FY 1983 onwards. Similar socio-economic economic baseline studies are being carried out on all irrigation projects recently financed by the World Bank. These studies will eventually provide an additional source of extremely useful impact information.

Several members of the Analysis and Evaluation Team reviewed copies of the socio-economic baseline studies prepared for the AID/World Bank financed Gujarat Medium Irrigation Project. They concluded that the studies were generally adequate in providing a basis for measurement of overall impact on production, employment and incomes of farm households, but were weak in providing a basis for assessing project impact on particular groups, such as women, tribals, landless laborers, and artisans. While it is too late to modify the scopes of work for the Gujarat socio-economic baseline studies. USAID will seek the assistance of the economist and sociologist on the Asia Bureau Irrigation Review Team in reviewing the scopes of work

now being prepared by the Irrigation Department of the Government of Rajasthan (GOR) for the Rajasthan MIP. The GOR and USAID have already agreed that the socio-economic baseline studies should be expanded to include landless households and also extended to reflect secondary impact at the market town level. USAID will engage Indian consultants if further assistance is required in developing suitable scopes of work. It is conceivable that some impact data could be available by early CY 1983, when a PID for an FY 1985 Rajasthan MIP II would be submitted.

USAID has also had discussions with the GOI Ministry of Irrigation concerning possible AID support for "command area development" in both Gujarat and Rajasthan. This involves provision for on farm development, market infrastructure and input access designed to improve water management and increase the agricultural production impact of surface irrigation schemes. Analytical requirements for these types of activities will be identified during PID preparation.

Analytical requirements for the irrigation sub-sector will be further defined during CY 1981 in conjunction with several other efforts, including the Asia Bureau Irrigation Review; the joint training workshops in Gujarat on on-farm water management; and the results of studies of water distribution to farms collaboratively designed with USAID and now being initiated by the Irrigation Department of the Government of Rajasthan.

3. Rural Electrification

As in the case of the Rajasthan MIP project, reliable impact data will not be available for 5-10 years. In order to assure that high-quality data is eventually available, USAID has been working with the evaluation unit of the Rural Electrification Corporation (REC) to develop a plan for impact assessment of selected schemes. USAID will request that a U.S. consultant be made available to assist REC and USAID in the preparation of a scope of work for appropriate socio-economic baseline studies. This work will be guided by REC studies already underway on schemes similar to those being financed under the AID loan one of which is nearing completion.

With respect to the overall impact of past rural electrification programs, Resources for the Future (RfF) is undertaking a DS/EY-financed longitudinal study using baseline data collected in 1966 in Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra and Punjab. The survey work in India will be carried out by the Operations Research Group (ORG) and the Administrative Staff College, Hyderabad (ASCI). In addition to assessing the impact of rural electrification on agricultural and non-agricultural incomes and employment, the study will also review the economic feasibility of alternative forms of rural energy supply and the appropriateness of the present rate structure for rural electricity supply. The RfF study should

be the most comprehensive assessment ever attempted on the impact of rural electrification in India. It is scheduled for completion in draft by April or May 1981.

The REC has also sponsored a number of impact studies, as well as separate studies on pricing issues. Under contracts with ORG, ASCI and the Indian Institute of Management/Bangalore, rate structures in 12 states will be examined in terms of their financial and economic impact. The final reports are due in September 1981, although draft reports may be available earlier. REC itself is undertaking a study of the effect of rate changes on load development in two states (report due March 1981) and a comparative study on the impact of alternative metering systems (report due December 1981).

AID has had a particular interest in the role of cooperatives in rural electrification. REC expects that the new Sixth Five Year Plan (1980-1985) will call for a substantial expansion of cooperative organization for rural electrification (which at present is confined to 16 schemes). REC has contracted for a major study of the Sircilla rural electric cooperative in Andhra Pradesh and expects the report to be available in draft by December 1980. USAID has also initiated a review of the role of cooperatives in rural electrification in India and expects to complete a report by January 1981.

USAID plans to prepare a PID for an FY 1983 Rural Electrification II project. Based on the above, there should be ample information on issues of impact, rate structure, and cooperatives for a PID to be submitted in May 1981.

4. Rural Works

Although there is a major "rural works" component in both surface irrigation and rural electrification, this heading refers to the Title II Food for Works programs (\$23.2 million in FY 1980) operated by Catholic Relief Services (CRS) and Church World Services/Lutheran World Relief (CWS/LWR), and to possible future AID support for the rural works program of the Government of India (GOI).

USAID will be assisted by U. S. consultants in preparing an evaluation plan for the Title II Food for Work program. USAID's present thinking is that this will involve development of an evaluation system for use by CRS and CWS/LWR, and will include preparation of a series of Food for Work case studies by USAID/Voluntary Agency teams as well as establishment of a training program for volag program and evaluation staff. Preliminary evaluation results should be available by early CY 1982.

Fairly large-scale rural works programs have been operated by the GOI and various state governments for several years. The largest and

best established are the GOI's Food for Work Program (modelled on the earlier programs run by CARE using Title II commodities) and the Employment Guarantee Scheme (EGS) run by the state of Maharashtra. According to the recently approved Plan Framework for the new Sixth Five Year Plan for 1980-1985 (VI FYP) the best features of the GOI FFW program and the EGS will be combined in a National Rural Employment Program (NREP) to be initiated in India's FY 1982 (April 1981 - March 1982). There are a number of academic studies available of both FFW and EGS, and the Planning Commission's Programme Evaluation Organization (PEO) has just completed "quick evaluations" of both programs. A preliminary assessment of the possible role of AID assistance for the NREP is included in the Rural Employment Situation and Prospects paper prepared by Peter Thormann (ASLA/TR/RD) for USAID in October 1980. USAID will explore assistance prospects further following completion of the VI FYP, and will submit an FY 1983 PID in May 1981 if assistance appears warranted.

5. Rural Credit

USAID's present rural credit program consists of Agricultural Development Credit project, which provides a line of credit to the Agricultural Refinance and Development Corporation (ARDC); \$100 million was authorized for this project in FY 1980. Although ARDC refinances a broad range of agricultural credit activities, the present AID project is limited to minor irrigation (i. e., credit to construct wells, purchase pumps and motors for

new and already constructed wells). The final obligation under the present project is expected to take place in FY 1982. Consequently USAID is planning to submit an FY 1983 PID in May 1981 for a follow-on rural credit project.

Information on minor irrigation programs of the type supported under the AID Agricultural Development Credit project will be available from ARDC evaluation studies in Bihar, Rajasthan, West Bengal and Orissa, ^{be} all of which are to/completed by April 1981. Minor irrigation programs will also be studied by the Asia Bureau Irrigation Review Team and reviewed in the USAID / Irrigation Sector Review. Recommendations for additional analyses may arise from these reviews, but no special AID-supported studies are anticipated for the Agricultural Development Credit project.

As noted in the FY 1982 - FY 1986 CDSS, USAID views rural credit as a potentially appropriate vehicle for assistance to ancillary agricultural activities (e. g. animal husbandry, horticulture, fisheries), and to rural small-scale enterprises. Ancillary agricultural activities and rural enterprises are two of the three major sources of "off-farm" employment reviewed in the Thormann rural employment paper. (The other is rural works.) Based on Thormann's findings and the strong positive recommendations of the Analysis and Evaluation Team, USAID expects to give serious consideration to expansion of the Rural Credit II project to include ancillary agricultural activities. This will be a largely in-house USAID

exercise, although some U.S. or Indian consultant assistance will be required. The USAID PID review will be able to draw on a large number of recent studies, including several completed for the ARDC and several carried out by the PEO.

Rural enterprises raise more difficult issues and there is less available guidance from recent evaluation studies. Also, ARDC is not currently refinancing the credit needs of rural enterprises, except on a minor scale. Credit for rural enterprises would be a component of the new integrated rural credit system (encompassing ARDC and several other institutions); the new system is expected to be operational within the next year. Following a thorough review of the Thormann report and discussions with the Planning Commission and Department of Economic Affairs (DEA), Ministry of Finance, USAID will decide whether to proceed to pursue assistance possibilities for rural enterprises (including forms of assistance other than rural credit). If the decision is favorable, substantial U.S. and Indian consultant assistance will be required prior to preparation of an FY 1983 PID.

Even if rural enterprises are not selected as an appropriate area for AID assistance, the performance of rural enterprises will be assessed in general terms in the USAID Agricultural and Rural Development Impact Analysis.

6. Fertilizer

AID authorized a \$150 million India Fertilizer Promotion loan in FY 1979. Thus far \$66 million has been obligated, and an additional \$30 million should be obligated in FY, 1981. It is not certain when it will be possible to obligate the balance, but current indications are that it is not likely that the balance could be obligated in FY 1982. USAID nevertheless plans to submit an FY 1983 PID in the event that a new authorization might be sought in FY 1983.

Although there is abundant data and an extensive literature on fertilizer distribution and consumption in India, USAID had anticipated that it might be useful to undertake some additional studies on fertilizer distribution to remote areas and fertilizer promotion activities. However, after a thorough review of a range of potential studies by a highly-qualified US consultant (Carl Gotsch of the Stanford Food Research Institute), USAID has concluded that further special studies of this nature are probably not justified. Based on the consultant's recommendations, USAID has already completed an in-house review of the literature on the relationship between agricultural production credit and fertilizer use.

Evidence on the role of fertilizer and its "equity impact" will also be summarized in the upcoming USAID review of agricultural and rural development in India. In addition, USAID will prepare a more comprehensive

assessment of the fertilizer sector by February or March 1981. This sector paper would be the basis for the FY 1983 PID to be submitted in March or April 1981.

At the initial meetings of the Indo-U.S. Joint Sub-Commission on Agriculture, several fertilizer related topics were endorsed as priority areas for U.S. technical collaboration. These include efficiency in fertilizer use, fertilizer storage and distribution with emphasis on bulk handling production technologies, phosphate rock exploration and development of organic fertilizers. USAID will propose to the GOI that initial work in some or all of these areas proceed with funds from the Fertilizer Promotion loan. If this is not acceptable to the GOI, other funding possibilities will be explored. In any case, some or all of these areas might be included in a possible FY 1983 PID for a follow-on Fertilizer Promotion project. Given the general adequacy of the data on the "equity impact" of fertilizer use in India, USAID's present assessment is that additional analysis and evaluation efforts could be most productive if related more directly to areas in which there is potential for technical collaboration, such as those suggested by the Subcommission. However, USAID will remain alert to any future analytical requirements related to the general "equity impact" issues.

7. Cooperative Development

AID is supporting cooperative development in India through a series of small Operational Program Grants to the Cooperative League of the USA (CLUSA) and through Title II soybean oil (\$26.6 million in FY 1980) used to generate rupee resources for the Oilseed Growers Cooperative Project of the National Dairy Development Board (NDDB). CLUSA provides technical support to the NDDB for the Oilseed Growers Cooperative Project, as well as technical assistance to the National Cooperative Development Corporation (NCDC) for Cooperative Oilseed Processing Management.

An evaluation of the latter project has just been completed by a CLUSA consultant. The same consultant is scheduled to return to India in January 1981 as part of a CLUSA/AID team to review the CLUSA and Title II support to the NDDB Oilseed Growers Cooperative Project. The team will have two major tasks, in addition to evaluating the effectiveness of CLUSA's technical support and overall project progress to date. These will be to assist USAID in reaching agreement with CLUSA and NDDB on a schedule and procedure for preparation of a revised Operational Plan reflecting actual plans at present; and to assist CLUSA and NDDB in the preparation of a monitoring and evaluation plan which will assure that base-line data is available for an eventual assessment of project impact

on employment and incomes for various groups (medium, small and marginal farmers, landless laborers, women workers engaged in traditional groundnut processing, etc.). The NDDE has been involved in comprehensive impact assessments of its highly successful dairy cooperative program (Operation Flood I), and has indicated a strong interest in carrying out a similar impact assessment for the Oilseed Growers Cooperative Project.

Following completion of the evaluation of the CLUSA/NDDB project USAID will consider whether assistance for cooperative development should be expanded using either Development Assistance funding or Title II resources. USAID plans to complete this analysis by April 1981 to permit the conclusions of the review to be reflected in the FY 1983 Annual Budget Submission (ABS), and possibly in an FY 1983 PID.

C. Fertility and Mortality Reduction

This program category includes health, family planning and nutrition activities with the common goals of fertility reduction and mortality reduction. As in the case of the programs under the Food Supply and Rural Employment category, USAID plans to assess GOI progress toward goal-level objectives through an annual review of data and literature relating to all of the program category headings (in this case health/population and maternal and child health/nutrition).

Because the programs in this category are generally new or under design and because USAID's Health/Nutrition/Population office is not yet fully started, the strategy statements FY 82 CDSS will not be elaborated further for the CDSS for FY 1983 - FY 1987. A fuller review will be prepared in late 1981 for the CDSS for FY 1984 - FY 1988, primarily as a by-product of the preparation of health, population and nutrition strategy papers planned for CY 1981 (discussed below). Subsequent reviews would be essentially updates of the 1981 review, and would be summarized in successive CDSSs.

1. Rural Health/Family Planning Systems

The major activity under this heading is the Integrated Rural Health/Population Project recently authorized for \$40 million in grant funding. In addition to the \$23.7 million obligated in FY 1980 it is anticipated that \$9.4 million and \$6.9 million be obligated in FY 1981 and FY 1982, respectively. USAID plans to submit an FY 1983 PID for funding of a follow-on project. The other project planned under this is a Private Health Institutions Project funded by U.S. owned rupees (FY 1981). There will also be a number of centrally-funded health and population activities which are not reflected in USAID's budget requests but which should contribute to USAID's understanding of health and family planning programs in India.

USAID prepared a preliminary health strategy statement in late CY 1979. A summary was included in the FY 1982-1986 CDSS. USAID subsequently commissioned a review of rural health system experience by a U.S. health anthropologist who had just completed two years in southern India, and contracted for a limited literature search by an Indian consultant on health system impact and access. USAID plans to complete an updated health strategy statement drawn on the studies noted above; on a more extensive literature review focused on constraints to utilization of key family planning and health services by the rural and urban poor (to be initiated in CY 1981); and on the population and nutrition reviews described below. The updated strategy statement will review GOI plans for the health sector as reflected in the VI FYP. USAID will consider including a review of AID assistance possibilities in water supply and sanitation.

USAID also plans to prepare a separate Multi Year Population Strategy Statement (MYPSS). This is particularly important in view of the AID policies affecting family planning activities specifically, as well as the fact that centrally-funded projects are likely to play an important role in USAID's overall approach to population/family planning. USAID plans to complete the MYPSS in CY 1981. A separate but related activity in CY 1981

will be a review of the Indian literature on "non-family planning" determinants of fertility (104 (d)). A 104 (d) issues paper based on this review will be completed during CY 1981 with U.S. contractor assistance.

Although the planned USAID strategy papers will rely initially on existing data and literature, subsequent versions will be able to draw on evaluation data generated by the AID-assisted Integrated Rural Health/Population Project, which will be operating in the states of Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Punjab, Gujarat and Maharashtra. In late CY 1980, and early CY 1981. USAID staff will be participating with GOI and state health officials in the design of the monitoring and evaluation systems for the Integrated Rural Health/Population Project. Baseline data will be collected beginning in CY 1981, and some initial impact and access data may be available by early CY 1982. USAID also plans to design the rupee funded Rural Health Institutions Project with a view toward generation of impact and access data.

2. Maternal and Child Health/Nutrition

The only activities under this heading at present are the Title II Maternal Child Health (MCH), Other Child Feeding (OCF) and Individual Health Cases (IHC) programs, which totalled \$45.8 million in FY 1980 (excluding ocean freight). However, a Maternal/Child Nutrition Project using Development Assistance funds to upgrade the Title II MCH

program is now being designed for an FY 1981 authorization.

USAID included a general analysis of appropriate objectives and priorities for AID nutrition assistance in India in the CDSS for FY 1982 - FY 1986. An updated nutrition strategy statement will be completed prior to submission of the FY 1984 - FY 1988 CDSS, i. e. by late CY 1981.

USAID plans to request U.S. consultant assistance in early CY 1981 to design an appropriate impact assessment study for the Title II MCH programs run by CARE and CRS. USAID and the consultants will be guided in these efforts by a literature review on targeted feeding programs in India which was prepared for USAID recently by a U.S. consultant (David Sahn of the Community Systems Foundation), and by two recent evaluations of Title II MCH programs (CRS evaluation their Nutrition Education Program, and a CARE evaluation of their Composite Program for Women and Preschool Children in Kerala). USAID expects to be able to have preliminary evaluation information on existing Title II MCH programs by mid-CY 1982.

D. Special AID Concerns

1. Women in Development

USAID has no plans for any special analyses of Women in Development (WID) issues in general, partially because the GOI has advised USAID that it is not interested in AID financing for projects identified specifically as WID projects. However, USAID will continue to select and design projects with a view to maximizing net benefits for women, taking account of the value of women as a resource. Also, all project evaluation plans will provide specifically for assessment of project impact on women as appropriate.

2. Energy, Environment and Forestry

The only existing activity under this heading is the Technologies for the Rural Poor Project authorized in FY 78. About \$1 million has been committed under this grant for three renewable energy projects, and the GOI is considering requesting funding under the grant for a National Academy of Sciences (NAS) effort to identify collaborative projects in biomass production and conversion (including "energy forestry"). However, a number of other major activities under this heading are in the planning stages. These include a "social forestry" project for the state of Madhya Pradesh (deferred from FY 1981 to FY 1982 for authorization) and similar project for Maharashtra (now deferred to FY 1983), a soil and water conservation project (FY 1982), and a follow-on project to the Technologies for the Rural Poor grant covering alternative energy resource development (FY 1982).

USAID prepared a background paper on Energy, Environment and Forestry in November 1979 for the Asia Bureau Conference of the same title. More recently USAID commissioned a paper by a U.S. consultant on biogas development in India. It will probably not be necessary to undertake additional analytical efforts on energy in general due to the relatively limited opportunities for U.S. assistance in the areas of interest to AID. It should be possible to resolve all relevant issues during PP preparation. The situation is somewhat different with respect to "environment" and "forestry" since there appear to be a large number of assistance opportunities which could absorb substantial amounts of AID funding. USAID plans to prepare a forestry sector strategy statement during CY 1981. This will be largely an in-house effort, although some U.S. or Indian consultant assistance will probably be required. USAID has not yet determined how to approach the analysis of objectives and priorities for AID assistance in the area of "environment" or conservation. Since many of the issues in this area overlap with irrigation and forestry, USAID will review the need for a soil and water conservation sector paper during preparation of the sector strategies for irrigation and forestry discussed above.

Evaluation plans for the various projects under this heading will be developed during project design. USAID assigns very high priority to the development of appropriate monitoring and evaluation systems for projects

in this area since their success is so heavily dependent of socio-cultural and organizational factors. It is important to note in this respect that the Ford Foundation has been involved in the development of both the Madhya Pradesh Social Forestry and Soil and Water Conservation projects, and is expected to have a continuing interest in analysis of factors affecting project success.

3. Primary Education

The only activity under this heading is Title II School Feeding (\$37.9 million in FY 1980, excluding ocean freight). Previous school feeding evaluations were reviewed in July 1980 by Richard Shortlidge, DS/Bureau education economist. He concluded that none of the previous evaluations provided an adequate basis for assessment of the impact of Title II school feeding programs on school attendance and enrollment. He outlined possibilities for several new studies, which are now under review by the GOI Ministry of Education. The timing of evaluation results depends on the course of action decided upon by the GOI.

III. Analysis and Evaluation Summary

USAID analysis and evaluation plans are presented in summary form in the following four tables. No attempt has been made to summarize the staff and financial requirements involved, since these are likely to change considerably over time. The financial requirements over the next year are reflected in USAID's FY 1981 PDS submission.

Analysis and Evaluation Summary

Acronyms and Symbols

ABS	Annual Budget Submission
ARD Impact	Agricultural and Rural Development Impact Analysis Report
CDSS	Country Development Statement
CG	IBRD Consultative Group for India
CP	Congressional Presentation
DESIGN	Design of evaluation system for a project
MYPSS	Multi-Year Population Strategy Statement
PACD	Project Assistance Completion Date
PES (F)	Project Evaluation Summary (Final)
PES (M)	Project Evaluation Summary (Mid-Project or Interim)
PID	Project Identification Document
PP	Project Paper
VI FYP	Indian Sixth Five Year Plan for 1980-81 to 1984-85
	Earliest date at which impact and access data are likely to be available from evaluations

ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION SUMMARY

<u>PROGRAM AREA/PROJECT</u>	Fiscal Year 1981			Fiscal Year 1982			Fiscal Year 1983															
	O	N	D	J	F	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S
	CY 1980			CY 1981			CY 1982			CY 1983			CY 1984			CY 1985						
	FY 83	FY 83	FY 83	FY 84	FY 84	FY 84	FY 85	FY 85	FY 85	FY 85	FY 85	FY 85	FY 85	FY 85	FY 85	FY 85	FY 85	FY 85	FY 85	FY 85	FY 85	
CDSS	ABS CG	CP	CDSS	ABS CG	CP	CDSS	ABS CG	CP	CDSS	ABS CG	CP	CDSS	ABS CG	CP	CDSS	ABS CG	CP	CDSS	ABS CG	CP		
<u>Macro-Level Analysis</u>																						
Routine Analyses <u>1/</u>																						
Special Analyses																						
<u>Food Supply & Rural Employment</u>																						
Sectoral Analyses																						
AG. RESEARCH, EDUCATION EXTENSION																						
Ag. Research (0470)																						
Ag. Education																						
SURFACE IRRIGATION																						
Gujarat MIP (0464)																						
Rajasthan MIP (0481)																						
Rajasthan CAD																						
Rajasthan MIP II																						

28

PROJECT AREA/PROJECT	Fiscal Year 1981					Fiscal Year 1982					Fiscal Year 1983				
	O	N	D	J	F	O	N	D	J	F	O	N	D	J	F
	CY 1980					CY 1981					CY 1982				
RURAL ELECTRIFICATION															
General	* RFF Impact Study														
Rural Electrification (0462)	Coop Study Design PES(M)										PACD 6/30 PES (F)				
Rural Electrification II	PID					PP									
RURAL WORKS															
Title II (Food For Work)	Design										*				
Rural Works	PID					PP					PES(M)				
RURAL CREDIT															
Ag. Development Credit (0466)	*					PES(M)					PACD 6/30 PES(F)				
Ag. Credit II	PID 2/					PP					PES (M)				
Ag. Credit III															
FERTILIZER															
Fertilizer Promotion (0471)	Sub-Sector Review					PACD 12/31 PES(F)					PID				
Fertilizer Promotion	PID										PID				
COOPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT															
Title II (CLUSA/NDDB Oilseeds Project)	CLUSA/AID Evaluation					PID 3/					*				

29

<u>PROJECT AREA/PROJECT</u>	<u>Fiscal Year 1981</u>					<u>Fiscal Year 1982</u>					<u>Fiscal Year 1983</u>				
	O	N	D	J	F	O	N	D	J	F	O	N	D	J	F
	CY 1980					CY 1981					CY 1982				

Fertility and Mortality Reduction

Sectoral Analyses

Health Strategy Update

HPN Strategy Update

MPYSS
104(d) Review

Nutrition Strategy

RURAL HEALTH/FAMILY PLANNING SYSTEMS

Integrated Rural Health/and
Population (0468)

Design

PES(M)

*

PES (M)

Integrated Rural Health and
Population II

PID

PP

Population Project

PID

PP

Private Health Institutions

PP

*

Maternal and Child Health/
Nutrition Title II (MCH)

Design

*

Integrated Maternal and
Child Nutrition (0476)

PP

Design

Malaria Control

PES(M)

PACD
12/31 PES(F)

20

PROGRAM AREA/PROJECT

<u>PROGRAM AREA/PROJECT</u>	Fiscal Year 1981								Fiscal Year 1982								Fiscal Year 1983																			
	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S
	CY 1980								CY 1981								CY 1982																			

Special AID Concerns

WOMEN IN DEVELOPMENT

Sectoral Analyses

ENERGY, ENVIRONMENT & FORESTRY

Forestry Strategy

Alternative Energy Resource Development (0474)

PP

PP

Madhya Pradesh Social Forestry (0475)

PP

*

Maharashtra Social Forestry

PP

Land and Water Conservation (Small Tanks) (0479)

PP

*

PRIMARY EDUCATION

Title II (School Feeding)

Design

*

31

Footnotes

- 1/ Each CDSS update will include a brief analysis of the current status of the Plan, indicators of Plan performance, and budget and balance of payments problems and prospects. USAID will prepare a brief analysis of the Sixth Five Year Plan (1980-1985) after it is issued (probably in March or April 1981).
- 2/ PID analysis for Ag. Credit II will probably include an assessment of the appropriateness of assistance for credit to allied agricultural activities (animal husbandry, horticulture, fisheries, forestry) and possibly rural enterprises. "Rural enterprises" has not been included as a separate "program area" because USAID assumes that assistance, if appropriate, would be primarily in the form of credit.
- 3/ PIDs are not used for PL-480 programming. However, USAID will in effect be preparing a "PID" for the FY 1983 ABS as a basis for recommendations concerning the Transfer Authorization for the CLUSA/NDDDB Oilseed Growers Cooperative Project, and other possible CLUSA/NDDDB cooperative activities. This "PID" will be based on the CLUSA/AID evaluation scheduled for January 1981.

24

Analysis and Evaluation Team Recommendations
and Planned USAID Actions

I. USAID Actions Requiring Funding

1. Local hire, part-time staff to monitor and keep current bibliography.

USAID has hired a Foreign Service National (FSN) economist and has submitted a position description to Washington for an FSN social analyst (anthropologist or rural sociologist). Both will work in the Analysis and Evaluation Division of the Program Office under the supervision of the U.S. Direct Hire Deputy Program Officer/Economist. The Analysis and Evaluation Division will also have an FSN Program Assistant (Information), who will operate the USAID Documentation Center institutions which are potential sources of relevant analytical materials. One of the principal duties of the Analysis and Evaluation Division will be to maintain monitor current literature and bibliographies, as recommended by the Analysis and Evaluation Team.

2. Survey statistics and statistical sources in Gujarat, Rajasthan,

Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, and Haryana, using purchase orders.

USAID does not plan to survey state-level statistical sources using Purchase Orders, since this can be done by USAID staff and consultants in the course of preparation of various sector or project analyses. In particular USAID plans to survey statistical sources in preparing the

33

Agricultural and Rural Development Impact Analysis, which will concentrate on data available from India's northern, central and western states (Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Punjab, Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh). USAID also plans to provide somewhat more comprehensive state-level data in the future in Project Papers for projects which will be implemented in a particular state.

3. Subscribe to the Center for Monitoring the Indian Economy.

Done

4. Survey administrative infrastructure for development in Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh, probably using local contractor, or temporary hire.

USAID does not plan to survey administrative infrastructure in Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh in general. However, analyses for projects to be implemented by "weaker" state governments such as those of Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh will consider administratively feasibility issues particularly thoroughly.

5. Inventory rural consumption data with ORG and other marketing surveys, for use in monitoring state and change in rural consumption by classes, probably use local contractor or temporary hire.

This will be considered after USAID has had an opportunity to assess the adequacy of existing rural consumption data for USAID purposes.

6. Do baseline study for Health and Population Project.

The Integrated Rural Health/Population project includes plans for the collection of baseline data beginning in early CY 1981.

7. Survey the social science literature on health and illness, probably using short term assignment personnel.

Much of the social science literature on health and illness in India was reviewed in a series of reports prepared for USAID in early CY 1980 by Dr. Mark Nichter, a health anthropologist who had recently completed a two-year study of rural health services in southern India. The utility of further literature reviews in this area will be assessed in conjunction with USAID preparation of Health/Population/Nutrition strategy papers in CY 1981.

8. Commission two to three brief studies of the social organization of health services at the local delivery levels, using local contractor or temporary hire.

The social organization of health services at the local delivery levels was analyzed for rural Karnataka by Nichter. USAID will consider the utility of additional studies following review of the Government of India (GOI) and state plans for evaluation of the Integrated Rural Health/Population Project.

9. Check out remaining unsurveyed highly recommended institutions, using short term assignment personnel.

Liaison with Indian academic and research institutions will be a routine responsibility of the Analysis and Evaluation Division of the USAID Program Office, once it is fully established. To accelerate the development of appropriate contacts, consultants familiar with the work of various institutions will be requested as part of their consulting assignments, to assist USAID in establishing liaison and assessing the institution's capabilities.

10. Survey experience with resettlement of those displaced by medium irrigation projects, using temporarily assigned personnel.

Information on this subject will be included in the socio economic studies for AID-funded medium irrigation projects.

11. Survey impact of some completed medium irrigation projects using local contractors.

This will be considered in conjunction with USAID participation in the Asia Bureau Irrigation Review and subsequent preparation of an irrigation strategy paper.

12. Study the differential regional patterns of development in the different regions of India and how it governs the differential impact of the various elements of the GOI's rural development programs on different socio-economic classes.

The USAID policy of program concentration in the poorer northern, central and western states (Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra,

Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh) is based partially on a preliminary assessment that the impact of agricultural and rural development programs in these states is likely to be more equitable than in eastern India (Bihar, Orissa, West Bengal). Southern India (Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Kerala, Tamil Nadu) would be an alternative possibility for program concentration, but is far less accessible from New Delhi. USAID would undertake a separate study of different regional patterns of development if a major shift in USAID's regional concentration were considered. In the meantime, USAID will include data on rural development patterns in eastern and southern India for comparison purposes in the Agricultural and Rural Development Impact Analysis.

13. Survey institutional alternatives in agricultural credit and extension fields.

USAID may assess institutional alternatives for agricultural credit in carrying the analysis for an FY 1983 Agricultural Development Credit II project. Institutional alternatives in extension will be assessed if USAID is requested to provide general support for extension programs.

II. USAID Actions Not Requiring Funding

1. Maintain contact with contact list and PVO projects list.

This will be a routine responsibility of the Program Office Analysis and Evaluation Division. Other USAID offices (e.g. Agriculture and Rural

Development, Health/Population/Nutrition) will also maintain contact with individuals, institutions and private and voluntary organizations (PVOs) working in their fields.

2. Permit Village Study Leave

USAID believes that this suggestion has merit, and is considering ways in which it might be done.

III. Recommendations on Evaluation

1. Do through Indian institutions.

USAID anticipates that any evaluation studies requiring collection of primary data will be carried out by Indian institutions. However, it is likely that a substantial input will be required from USAID (with AID/W and consultant support) to assure that studies carried out by Indian institutions are methodologically adequate.

2. Should serve research purposes as well as pure evaluation purposes.

USAID agrees that evaluations should contribute to a better understanding of sectoral development while meeting project-specific evaluation requirements. This will generally be the case if evaluations have been designed so as to assure adequate assessment of progress toward goal-level and purpose-level objectives including assessment of the mechanisms involved.

3. Should contain data that can assess impact of funded programs on power and equality.

Evaluations of USAID activities will generally include data on equality of access (e.g. to credit, water, health services, etc.) and equality in terms of outcome (e.g., income distribution, mortality reduction by social class etc.). While some of this data will illuminate trends in power relationships, USAID will not attempt to measure trends in power relationships directly, because of the sensitivities involved. However, trends in power relationships and their correlation with trends in other socio-economic variables will be a major focus of USAID's effort to monitor relevant social science literature in India.

4. Test hypotheses of program strategy -- especially of immiseration negative hypothesis.

This is the principal purpose of the Agricultural and Rural Development Impact Analysis. Data on the impact of AID-supported programs and projects will also contribute eventually to the testing of the "equitable growth" hypothesis.

5. Specifically, do so for fertilizer, agricultural credit, medium irrigation, minor irrigation, and rural electrification.

These topics will all be included in the Agricultural and Rural Development Impact Analysis.

6. Coordinate with in-depth micro-studies using socio-anthropological techniques.

Although USAID has concluded that in-depth micro studies supported by AID are not politically feasible at this time, USAID anticipates that it will be possible to achieve most of the same purposes through monitoring current Indian social science literature.

USAID/NEW DELHI
CURRENT AND PROPOSED PROGRAM (\$ MILLION)

	<u>FY 78</u> <u>Actual</u>	<u>FY 79</u> <u>Actual</u>	<u>FY 80</u> <u>Actual</u>	<u>FY 81</u> <u>CP/Adjusted</u>	<u>FY 82</u> <u>Proposed</u>
<u>Food Supply & Rural Employment</u>					
0462 Rural Electrification (L)	-	58.0	-	-	-
0464 Gujarat Medium Irrigation (L)	30.0	-	-	-	-
0466 Ag. Development Credit (L)	-	-	20.0	35.6	44.4
0467 Rajasthan Medium Irrigation (L/G)	-	-	15.5	20.0	-
0470 Ag. Research (G)	-	-	-	-	7.0
0471 Fertilizer Promotion (L)	-	22.0	44.0	35.0	33.0
0481 Maharashtra Medium Irrigation (L/G)	-	-	-	-	35.5
<u>Fertility & Mortality Reduction</u>					
0455 Malaria Control (L)	28.0	10.0	-	-	-
0468 Integrated Rural Health/Pop. (G)	-	-	23.7	9.4	6.9
0476 Integrated Maternal/Child Nutrition (G)	-	-	-	4.0	8.0
<u>Special AID Concerns</u>					
0465 Technologies for Rural Poor (G)	2.0	-	-	-	-
0474 Alternative Energy Res. Dev. (G)	-	-	-	-	5.2
0475 Madhya Pradesh Social Forestry (L/G)	-	-	-	-	25.0
0479 Land & Water Conservation (Small Tanks)(G)	-	-	-	-	5.0
TOTAL DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE	<u>60.0</u>	<u>90.0</u>	<u>103.2</u>	<u>104.0</u>	<u>170.0</u>
Grants:	(2.0)	(--)	(24.2)	(13.4)	(33.6)
Loans:	(58.0)	(90.0)	(79.0)	(90.6)	(136.4)
<hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/>					
<u>PL - 480 Title II</u>					
- Food for Cooperatives (Oilseeds)	-	21.1	26.6	24.5	22.7
- Food for Rural Works	25.1	23.7	23.2	27.9	29.2
- Food for MCH and OCF	44.4	45.7	43.8	57.8	58.4
- Food for Individual Health Cases	2.1	2.1	2.0	2.6	2.7
- Food for Primary Education	35.8	36.6	37.9	47.7	49.6
TOTAL TITLE II: (w/o. Freight)	<u>107.4</u>	<u>129.2</u>	<u>133.5</u>	<u>160.5</u>	<u>162.6</u>
(with Freight)	<u>(150.4)</u>	<u>(175.6)</u>	<u>(180.3)</u>	<u>(219.8)</u>	<u>(223.1)</u>

41

USAID/NEW DELHI
APPROVED ASSISTANCE PLANNING LEVEL

(\$ Million)

<u>Program Area</u>	FY 82 Proposed	Planning Levels					Total (FY 83-86)
		FY 83	FY 84	FY 85	FY 86		
<u>Food Supply and Rural Employment</u>							
Ag. Research, Education & Extension	7.0	10	10	15	20	55	
Surface Irrigation	35.5	40	60	90	90	280	
Rural Electrification	-	50	60	30	80	270	
Rural Works	-	10	25	50	60	145	
Food for Rural Works, Title II (Non-add) ^{a/}	(40.9)	(45)	(50)	(60)	(70)	(225)	
Rural Credit	44.4	70	110	140	180	500	
Fertilizer	33.0	70	100	100	100	370	
Food for Cooperatives, Title II ^{a/}	(27.2)	(30)	(30)	(35)	(40)	(135)	
<u>Fertility and Mortality Reduction</u>							
Rural Health/Family Planning/ Nutrition Systems	14.9	55	75	90	115	335	
Food for Maternal/Child Health, and Other Programs, Title II ^{a/}	(85.5)	(85)	(90)	(95)	(110)	(380)	
<u>Special AID Concerns</u>							
Women in Development	-	5	10	10	15	40	
Energy, Environment & Forestry	35.2	40	50	75	90	255	
Food for Primary Education, Title II ^{a/}	(69.4)	(70)	(80)	(100)	(110)	(360)	
Total (DA):	170	350	500	650	750	2,250	
PL 480 Title I	-	-	-	-	-	-	
PL 480 Title II	(223)	(230)	(250)	(290)	(330)	(1,100)	

^{a/} Title II amounts shown under planning levels are non-additive; amounts include estimated ocean freight.

Long-Range Evaluation Schedules and
Logical Frameworks: Existing Projects

This Annex is comprised of USAID Long Range Evaluation Schedules for the projects listed below. The Long Range Evaluation Schedules set forth the dates of mid-project and final Project Evaluation Summaries (PES). Since comprehensive data on achievement of goal-level and purpose-level objectives will often not be available until after the Project Assistance Completion Date (PACD) and the submission of the final PES, each schedule also notes briefly the present plans for project impact assessment (i.e. evaluation of the project's effects on such things as employment, income distribution, poverty, fertility and mortality reduction and access to infrastructure, inputs and services). The project logical frameworks are included for reference.

The projects included are:

1. Gujarat Medium Irrigation Project (0464)
2. Rajasthan Medium Irrigation Project (0467)
3. Rural Electrification (0462)
4. Agricultural Development Credit (0466)
5. Fertilizer Promotion (0471)
6. Integrated Rural Health & Population (0468)
7. Malaria Control (0465)

USAID/NEW DELHI
LONG RANGE EVALUATION SCHEDULE

Date Prepared October 24, 1980
Project Manager Edwin D. Stains

- 1) Project/Activity No. 386-0464 2) Project/Activity Title: GUJARAT MEDIUM IRRIGATION
 3) Date of Initial Obligation: 8/26/78 4) Date of Final Obligation: FY 78 5) Proj. Asst. Completion Date: 6/30/83
 6) Life-of-Project Cost to AID: \$30,000,000 (L)

7) Dates of Evaluations Proposed through Life-of-Project

<u>Submittal Date</u>	<u>Period Covered</u>	<u>Character</u>	<u>Purpose and Nature of Proposed Evaluation</u>	<u>Start-up Date</u>	<u>Completion Date</u>
12/80	8/78-10/80	Routine PES	Project mid-term joint field review by USAID and IDA at Output level to assess progress, identify constraints and estimate expected expenditures to end of project.	11/80	11/80
12/81	11/80-10/81	Routine PES	Field review at Output level to evaluate progress and determine extent to which constraints identified by previous evaluation have been removed.	11/81	11/81
9/83	8/78-6/83	Final PES	Project Completion Report.	7/83	8/83

- 8) Plans for Project Impact Assessment: The project's impact on output, employment, incomes and income distribution will be evaluated through socioeconomic studies to be undertaken on all schemes financed under the project. Baseline surveys have already been completed by various institutes for six schemes. Follow-on surveys to gather impact data should begin in 1983 or 1984.

PROJECT DESIGN SUMMARY
LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Life of Project: R3
From FY 74 to FY 78
Total U.S. Funding: 171478
Date Prepared: 11/11/78
Team: S/W/11/11/78

Project Title & Number: Gujarat Medium Irrigation - Indig

NARRATIVE SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	IMPORTANT ASSUMPTIONS																																																																								
<p>Program or Sector Goal: The broader objective to which this project contributes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Increase level & security of Small Farmer Income. Expand rural employment opportunities. Increase availability of food to rural & urban poor. 	<p>Measures of Goal Achievement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Income increased 5 to 6 times over present levels. Increased employment: New MIPs Improved MIPs a. Farm 4,000 Jobs 4,000 Jobs b. Non- 11,000 " 4,000 " Food grain & oilseed use in Gujarat & other Indian states. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Farms & rural area baseline and follow-on surveys done as part of eval. plan. Government statistics on food consumption and prices. 	<p>Assumptions for achieving goal targets:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> GOI/GOG maintains agricultural price policies which are favorable to small farmers. Changed production practices are labor demanding and not labor displacing. Construction activities of MIPs continue to use labor intensive methods. Present land ceilings are maintained. New ag processing facilities to handle increased ag production are located in rural area. Market & transport network available adequate for increased production. 																																																																								
<p>Project Purpose:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Increase food production in Gujarat. Decrease the risk of drought. 	<p>Conditions that will indicate purpose has been achieved: End of project status.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Food grain production increased by approx.: a. 102,000 tons - new MIPs b. 40,000 tons - Improved MIPs TOTAL: 142,000 tons Increased oilseed production... 32,000 tons. Reduced variability of food production. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Farm surveys done as part of eval. plan. Gujarat crop statistics by district. 	<p>Assumptions for achieving purpose:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Credit available at reasonable rates. Technological inputs remain accessible and at reasonable prices. Ag extension system strengthened thru separate World Bank loan. Ag & Irrigation Depts. coordinate activities well. Reservoir releases managed to minimize the kharif planting risks. 																																																																								
<p>Outputs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Increased acreage under irrigation in the state of Gujarat. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> New MIPs constructed. Improvement/modernization of existing MIPs. Network of automatic discharging measuring stations. Agricultural plans for each MIP completed. 	<p>Magnitude of Outputs: (Estimated) Acres</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a+b) #Projects Irrigated Ha. - New MIPs: 13 80,000 (200,000) - Improved: 20 29,000 (113,000) Measuring stations established. Agricultural plan completed for each MIP. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Irrigation Dept. records. Review of baseline agr-crop surveys and ag. plans for each MIP area. Gujarat irrigated acreage statistics by district. 	<p>Assumptions for achieving outputs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> GOG engineering & contract mgmt capability adequate. Adequate number of feasible projects can be identified. Private contracting capability is adequate. 																																																																								
<p>Inputs:</p> <p>* Financing: AID & IDA reimburse GOI for local currency costs; IDA for certain FX costs) - as below:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="491 1212 633 1306"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>AID</th> <th>GOI</th> <th>IDA</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1) Construction of MIPs</td> <td>X</td> <td>X</td> <td>X</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2) Modernization of MIPs</td> <td>X</td> <td>X</td> <td>X</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3) River Gauging Network</td> <td></td> <td>X</td> <td>X</td> </tr> <tr> <td>- Short-Term Consultants (FX)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>- Vehicles</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>- Equipment (FX)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>4) Monitoring & Evaluation Studies</td> <td></td> <td>Y</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		AID	GOI	IDA	1) Construction of MIPs	X	X	X	2) Modernization of MIPs	X	X	X	3) River Gauging Network		X	X	- Short-Term Consultants (FX)				- Vehicles				- Equipment (FX)				4) Monitoring & Evaluation Studies		Y		<p>Implementation Target (Type and Quantity)</p> <p>Disbursements (Million US\$)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="666 1204 1070 1409"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>AID</th> <th>GOI</th> <th>IDA</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>FY79</td> <td>6</td> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>13</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FY80</td> <td>6</td> <td>15</td> <td>13</td> <td>34</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FY81</td> <td>7</td> <td>20</td> <td>17</td> <td>44</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FY82</td> <td>7</td> <td>23</td> <td>19.5</td> <td>49.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FY83</td> <td>4</td> <td>24</td> <td>20</td> <td>48</td> </tr> <tr> <td>FY84</td> <td>0</td> <td>14</td> <td>12.5</td> <td>26.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL:</td> <td>30</td> <td>100</td> <td>82.0</td> <td>212.0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	AID	GOI	IDA	TOTAL	FY79	6	4	3	13	FY80	6	15	13	34	FY81	7	20	17	44	FY82	7	23	19.5	49.5	FY83	4	24	20	48	FY84	0	14	12.5	26.5	TOTAL:	30	100	82.0	212.0	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> IDA/AID monitoring. Sub-project accounts. GOG/GOI audit reports. GOG/GOI vouchers. 	<p>Assumptions for providing inputs:</p> <p>GOI/GOG provide sufficient funds on timely basis.</p>
	AID	GOI	IDA																																																																								
1) Construction of MIPs	X	X	X																																																																								
2) Modernization of MIPs	X	X	X																																																																								
3) River Gauging Network		X	X																																																																								
- Short-Term Consultants (FX)																																																																											
- Vehicles																																																																											
- Equipment (FX)																																																																											
4) Monitoring & Evaluation Studies		Y																																																																									
Year	AID	GOI	IDA	TOTAL																																																																							
FY79	6	4	3	13																																																																							
FY80	6	15	13	34																																																																							
FY81	7	20	17	44																																																																							
FY82	7	23	19.5	49.5																																																																							
FY83	4	24	20	48																																																																							
FY84	0	14	12.5	26.5																																																																							
TOTAL:	30	100	82.0	212.0																																																																							

USAID/NEW DELHI
LONG RANGE EVALUATION SCHEDULE

Date Prepared October 24, 1980
Project Manager Edwin D. Steiner

- 1) Project/Activity No. 386-0467 2) Project/Activity Title: RAJASTHAN MEDIUM IRRIGATION
3) Date of Initial Obligation: 6/30/80 4) Date of Final Obligation: FY 81 5) Proj. Asst. Completion Date: 6/30/85
6) Life-of-Project Cost to AID: \$35,500,000 (L/G)

7) Dates of Evaluations Proposed through Life-of-Project

<u>Submittal Date</u>	<u>Period Covered</u>	<u>Character</u>	<u>Purpose and Nature of Proposed Evaluation</u>	<u>Start-up Date</u>	<u>Completion Date</u>
10/81	7/80 - 9/81	Routine PES	Combined Input and Output level assessment to evaluate progress based on project managers' field inspection and GOR and GOI/CWC regular reports.	10/81	10/81
3/83	7/80 -12/82	Special	Purpose level assessment prior to preparation of FY 1985 ABS and possible Rajasthan II PID.	1/83	2/83
3/84	12/82-12/83	Routine PES	Output level assessment to evaluate progress based on USAID field inspections and GOR and GOI/CWC regular reports	2/84	2/84
9/85	7/80 - 6/85	Final PES	Purpose level evaluation after completion of project.	7/85	8/85

8) Plans for Project Impact Assessment:

The project's impact on access to supplies of controlled water and on output, employment, incomes, and income distribution will be evaluated through socio-economic studies to be undertaken on approximately ten medium irrigation schemes. Baseline data collection for the socio-economic studies will begin in CY 1981. Given the construction time involved, impact data would be collected beginning in about 1986. The terms of reference for baseline data collection will be prepared by the Irrigation Department of the Government of Rajasthan (GOR) with assistance from USAID.

2/9

**PROJECT DESIGN SUMMARY
LOGICAL FRAMEWORK**

Project Title & Number: Rajasthan Medium Irrigation - India 396-0467

Life of Project:
From FY 80 to FY 85
Total U.S. Funding: \$35.5 million
Date Prepared: 4/10/80
Loan: \$35 million

NARRATIVE SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	IMPORTANT ASSUMPTIONS																																								
<p>Program or Sector Goal: The broader objective to which this project contributes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Increase level & security of small farmer income. Expand rural employment opportunities. Increase availability of food to rural and urban poor. 	<p>Measures of Goal Achievement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Net farm income increased by 125 million rupees/yr. Added employment in construction of 50,000 person years. Added annual agricultural employment of 26,000 person years. 	<p>Data:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline studies made under the project. Production statistics from Revenue and Agricultural Depts. Government statistics on food consumption and prices. Evaluation studies. 	<p>Assumptions for achieving goal targets:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> GOI/COR maintains agricultural price policies which are favorable to small farmers. Construction activities of NIPs continue to use labor intensive methods. Market and storage network remains adequate for increased production. 																																								
<p>Project Purpose:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Increase small farmer output. Decrease the impact of drought. 	<p>Conditions that will indicate purpose has been achieved. End of project status.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Food grain production to increase by 65,000 MT. 32,000 or more families directly benefitted; 50% or more with farms of 4 ha. or less. Increase modernized irrigated area 38,000 ha and improve water management on 27,000 additional ha. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Farm surveys done as part of NIP feasibility studies and evaluation studies. Rajasthan crop statistics by blocks. Water management studies. CWC, COR/ID reports. 	<p>Assumptions for achieving purpose:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Credit available at reasonable rates. Technological inputs remain accessible and at reasonable prices. Ag. extension system strengthened in NIP areas. Ag. & Irrigation Depts. coordinate activities well. Reservoir releases managed to minimize planting risks and optimize production. 																																								
<p>Outputs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Increased acreage under irrigation in the project area. Improved reliability and improved distribution of water to farmers. Improved efficiency of water use. 	<p>Magnitude of Outputs</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> COR doubles expenditures on NIPs during LOP. New or modernized irrigation on 65,000 hectares of add'l land. Irrigation intensity increased by 20 percent. Training of ten COR/ID engineers. Training of six COR/DOA economists. Ten socio-economic baseline studies. Intensive water mgmt. studies in each sub-project. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> COR/ID and AD records and COR and CWC Project reports. Revenue and Agricultural Dept. cropping reports. Review of baseline socio-economic and water management study reports. 	<p>Assumptions for achieving outputs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> GOI/COR budget sufficient resources. COR engineering & contract mgts. capacity adequate. Adequate number of feasible projects can be identified. COR staff available for training 																																								
<p>Inputs:</p> <p>Financing 67% of construction costs of NIPs by loan. Grant financing of training and studies. USAID participation in evaluations.</p>	<p>Implementation Target (Type & Quantity)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="4">Disbursement (\$ million)</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>FY</th> <th>LC</th> <th>GOI/COR</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1981</td> <td>.1</td> <td>4</td> <td>2.9</td> <td>7.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1982</td> <td>.2</td> <td>8</td> <td>5.8</td> <td>14.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1983</td> <td>.1</td> <td>10</td> <td>6.4</td> <td>16.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1984</td> <td>.1</td> <td>8</td> <td>4.9</td> <td>13.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1985</td> <td></td> <td>5</td> <td>2.5</td> <td>7.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>.5</td> <td>35</td> <td>22.5</td> <td>58.0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Disbursement (\$ million)					FY	LC	GOI/COR	Total	1981	.1	4	2.9	7.0	1982	.2	8	5.8	14.0	1983	.1	10	6.4	16.5	1984	.1	8	4.9	13.0	1985		5	2.5	7.5	Total	.5	35	22.5	58.0	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> COR/CWC/AID monitoring. CWC/AC reports Sub-project accounts COR/GOI audit reports COR/GOI vouchers. 	
	Disbursement (\$ million)																																										
	FY	LC	GOI/COR	Total																																							
1981	.1	4	2.9	7.0																																							
1982	.2	8	5.8	14.0																																							
1983	.1	10	6.4	16.5																																							
1984	.1	8	4.9	13.0																																							
1985		5	2.5	7.5																																							
Total	.5	35	22.5	58.0																																							

USAID/NEW DELHI
LONG RANGE EVALUATION SCHEDULE

Date Prepared October 24, 1980
Project Manager Jeffery A. Mallick

1) Project Activity No. 386-0462 RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

3) Date of Initial Obligation: 6/30/79 4) Date of Final Obligation: 6/30/79 5) Proj. Asst. Completion Date: 6/30/83

6) Life-of-Project Cost to AID: \$58,000,000 (L)

7) Dates of Evaluations Proposed through Life-of-Project

<u>Submittal Date</u>	<u>Period Covered</u>	<u>Character</u>	<u>Purpose and Nature of Proposed Evaluation</u>	<u>Start-up Date</u>	<u>Completion Date</u>
7/81	7/79 - 4/81	Routine PES	Input and output level assessment	4/81	5/81
6/81	N.A.	Special	Socio-economic impact-purpose and goal levels		
7/83	7/81 - 6/83	Final PES	Project Completion Report	6/83	7/83

8) Plans for Project Impact Assessment:

The project's impact on agricultural and industrial production and on employment, incomes and income distribution will be evaluated through socio-economic studies of a sample of Rural Electrification schemes. The studies will be undertaken by the Rural Electrification Corporation (REC), probably using Indian consulting firms. The studies will be designed by REC in early CY 1981 with assistance from USAID. Baseline data collection should begin in 1981, and impact data from follow-on surveys should begin to be available from 1985 onwards.

The special Evaluation listed for submission in 1981 refers to the Resources for the Future (RFF) study of the impact of rural electrification in India. It is being undertaken in cooperation with the Operations Research Group (Baroda) and the Administrative Staff College (Hyderabad) Field work began in October 1980.

Best Available Document

PROJECT DESIGN SUMMARY

LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Life of Project:
From FY 79 to FY 83
Total U.S. funding \$58 million
Date prepared May 8, 1979

Project Title & Number: Rural Electrification 386-0462

Narrative Summary	Objectively verifiable indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions										
<p>Program or Sector Goal: The broader objective to which this project contributes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Increase production/income Expand employment opportunities in rural areas. 	<p>Measures of Goal Achievement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Accelerated increase in ag. prod. over normal growth in these areas by 30%. Accelerated income growth somewhat higher than growth in ag. prod. because of increased non-crop agricultural activity. Accelerated increases in employment opportunities from irrigated agriculture and development of small-scale rural industry. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> REC evaluation studies. 	<p>Assumptions for achieving goal targets:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> GOI maintains price policies favorable to farmers. Changed production practices are labor demanding rather than labor displacing. Agricultural inputs remain at reasonable rates. 										
<p>Project Purpose: Provide electrical energy for productive and social services to "backward" areas.</p>	<p>Conditions that will indicate purpose has been achieved: End of project status</p> <p>46,000 pumps energized 6,000 commercial connections 225,000 domestic connections 3,000 industrial connections 24,000 street lights Total : 308,500</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> RFC and SER records. 	<p>Assumptions for achieving purpose:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Credit available at affordable rates for agricultural inputs such as electric pumps. Farmers deem irrigated agriculture economically viable. Farmers willing to use electrical energy for irrigation. Pumps priced at reasonable rates. Consumer energy rates affordable. Connection charges affordable. 										
<p>Outputs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Electrification infrastructure in place for HNP and SU project areas. 	<p>Magnitude of Outputs:</p> <p>112 HNP projects 22 SU projects</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> REC records SER records 	<p>Assumptions for achieving outputs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate number of feasible sub-projects can be identified. SER technical, organizational and management capability adequate for implementing sub-projects. 										
<p>Inputs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> AID Loan: \$58 million GOI : \$58 million equivalent <p>Total : \$116 million</p>	<p>Implementation Target (Type and Quantity): Disbursements (Millions US\$)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="613 1115 1022 1164"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FY 80</th> <th>FY 81</th> <th>FY 82</th> <th>FY 83</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>AID</td> <td>1</td> <td>16</td> <td>31</td> <td>10</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		FY 80	FY 81	FY 82	FY 83	AID	1	16	31	10	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> AID monitoring Sub-project accounts GOI vouchers 	<p>Assumptions for providing inputs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> GOI provides sufficient funds on timely basis.
	FY 80	FY 81	FY 82	FY 83									
AID	1	16	31	10									

26

LONG RANGE EVALUATION SCHEDULE

1) Project/Activity No. 386-0466 2) Project/Activity Title: AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT CREDIT
 3) Date of Initial Obligation: 6/30/80 4) Date of Final Obligation: 12/81 5) Proj. Asst. Completion Date: 6/30/82
 6) Life-of-Project Cost to AID: \$100,000,000 (L)

7) Dates of Evaluations Proposed through Life-of-Project

<u>Submittal Date</u>	<u>Period Covered</u>	<u>Character:</u>	<u>Purpose and Nature of Proposed Evaluation</u>	<u>Start-up Date</u>	<u>Completion Date</u>
10/81	7/80 - 8/81	Routine PES	Output level assessment	9/81	9/81
1/82	7/80 - 8/81	Special	Purpose and goal level assessment	12/81	12/81
7/82	9/81 - 6/82	Final PES	Project Completion Report	6/82	7/82

8) Plans for Project Impact Assessment:

The Agricultural Refinance and Development Corporation (ARDC) has an extensive program for evaluation on a sample basis of various types of schemes. Of the 50 evaluations scheduled for the next two years, approximately 16 will be on minor irrigation schemes such as those being financed under the AID Agricultural Development Credit Project. Past ARDC minor irrigation evaluations have contained adequate information concerning access to credit and project impact on output, employment, and incomes. Unless there is a marked deterioration in coverage and quality, USAID will not propose additional impact assessment studies. Impact data from minor irrigation evaluations already under way will be available beginning in early CY 1981.

**PROJECT DESIGN SUMMARY
LOGICAL FRAMEWORK**

Project Title & Number: Agricultural Development Credit - 186-0466

Life of Project: \$1.2 billion
From FY 80 to FY 82
Total U.S. Funding: \$100 million
Date Prepared: May 19, 1980

<u>Narrative Summary</u>	<u>Objectively Verifiable Indicators</u>	<u>Means of Verification</u>	<u>Important Assumptions</u>																										
<p>Program Sector Goal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Increased level of small farmer income. Expanded rural employment opportunities. 	<p>Measure of Goal Achievement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Annual income increased by 20% per farm household for approx. 880,000 households. Approx. 1.4 million person/yr. of on-farm employment generated. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> ARDC Evaluation Studies. Planning Commission Evaluation Studies. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> GOI maintains input/output price relationships favorable to small farmers. Construction and production practices are labor intensive. 																										
<p>Project Purpose:</p> <p>Increased agricultural production.</p>	<p>Conditions that will indicate purpose achieved: End of project status.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Average Prod. increased by 74% from .67 tons/ha. to 1.17 due to irrigation. Average Prod. increased by 30% from .67 tons/ha. to .8 due to land development and soil conservation. Total Prod. increased by 647,000 tons in project areas. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> ARDC Evaluation Studies. Planning Commission Evaluation Studies. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Ag. inputs available and accessible. Adequate extension services provided. Farmers deem credit affordable. 																										
<p>Outputs:</p> <p>Increased area under efficient groundwater irrigation.</p>	<p>Magnitude of Outputs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.6 million ha. benefited of which: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 million ha. irrigated. .5 million ha. improved from land development, soil conservation and refore. Approx. 361,000 minor irrigation units financed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 106,500 Wells 2' 33,000 Well Improvements 221,000 Pumps (Diesel & Electric) 500, Lift Schemes <p>a/Appendix 1 attached has detailed breakdown.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> ARDC & AID records 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> IDBs and CBs identify sufficient number of profitable investments. ARDC and participating banks remain financially viable. Pumps and other investment items available. farmers regard investments profitable. 																										
<p>Inputs: (in \$ million)</p> <p>A. Current</p> <table border="0"> <tr><td>AID</td><td>: 100</td></tr> <tr><td>IDA</td><td>: 100</td></tr> <tr><td>Other BI-lateral</td><td>: 443</td></tr> <tr><td>GOI</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>SI'D-TOTAL</td><td>57,000</td></tr> </table> <p>B. Estimated</p> <table border="0"> <tr><td>IDA</td><td>: 75</td></tr> <tr><td>Other BI-lateral</td><td>: 122</td></tr> <tr><td>GOI</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>TOTAL</td><td>\$1,750</td></tr> </table>	AID	: 100	IDA	: 100	Other BI-lateral	: 443	GOI	1	SI'D-TOTAL	57,000	IDA	: 75	Other BI-lateral	: 122	GOI	1	TOTAL	\$1,750	<p>Implementation for ARDC:</p> <p>Disbursements:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td></td> <td><u>FY 80</u></td> <td><u>FY 81</u></td> <td><u>FY 82</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>AID</td> <td>0</td> <td>60</td> <td>60</td> </tr> </table>		<u>FY 80</u>	<u>FY 81</u>	<u>FY 82</u>	AID	0	60	60	<p>AID and GOI records.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> GOI provides sufficient funds for credit program.
AID	: 100																												
IDA	: 100																												
Other BI-lateral	: 443																												
GOI	1																												
SI'D-TOTAL	57,000																												
IDA	: 75																												
Other BI-lateral	: 122																												
GOI	1																												
TOTAL	\$1,750																												
	<u>FY 80</u>	<u>FY 81</u>	<u>FY 82</u>																										
AID	0	60	60																										

5/

USAID/NEW DELHI
LONG RANGE EVALUATION SCHEDULE

Date Prepared October 24, 1980
Project Manager Fletcher E. Riggs

- 1) Project/Activity No. 386-0471 2) Project/Activity Title: FERTILIZER PROMOTION
- 3) Date of Initial Obligation: 9/28/79 4) Date of Final Obligation: FY 82 5) Proj. Asst. Completion Date: 12/31/81*
- 6) Life-of-Project Cost to AID: \$150,000,000 (L)

7) Dates of Evaluations Proposed through Life-of-Project

<u>Submittal Date</u>	<u>Period Covered</u>	<u>Character</u>	<u>Purpose and Nature of Proposed Evaluation</u>	<u>Start-up Date</u>	<u>Completion Date</u>
3/81	9/79 - 1/81	Routine PES	Input level assessment of procurement procedures and purpose level assessment of achievements prior to preparing PID for FY 83 follow-on project.	2/81	2/81
12/81	9/79 - 9/81	Routine PES	Input level assessment of procurement procedures and purpose level assessment of achievements prior to preparing PP for FY 83 follow-on project.	11/81	12/81
2/83	9/79 - 12/82	Final PES	Project Completion Report	1/83	1/83

8) Plans for Project Impact Assessment:

There is ample data available on fertilizer use by farm size and by region, and on the impact of fertilizer use on output, employment and incomes. USAID will prepare a comprehensive in-house survey of available information on fertilizer impact and access in early CY 1981. Subsequent impact assessment activities would depend on the prospective role of Fertilizer Promotion follow-on projects in the India program.

52

Fertilizer Promotion Logical Framework

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
<p>Sector Goals Increase agricultural output over 1979-83 period. Increase small farmer incomes</p>	<p>Measures of goal achievement: Annual average growth rate of crop output of Four percent Continued participation of small farmers in adoption of HYV package.</p>	<p>Data: GOI statistics on agricultural production. Review and synthesize relevant evaluation reports of ARDC, SFDA/MFAI, Program Evaluation Organization, RFC etc.</p>	<p>Assumptions: "Normal" weather over '79-'82 period. "Normal" plant disease and plant infection. Implementation of projected levels of investment in irrigation and other complementary inputs.</p>
<p>Project Purpose: Maintain current momentum of fertilizer consumption on an equitable basis.</p>	<p>EOPS: Increase national fertilizer consumption at an average rate of 10%/annum. Increase growth rate of "lagging" areas relative to State averages. Continued participation of small farmers in increased fertilizer consumption.</p>	<p>Data prepared by Fertilizer Section, MOA. Using NCAER study as a bench mark may be necessary to fund sample survey to evaluate progress.</p>	<p>Current crop/fertilizer price relationships will be maintained. Planned increase in rural credit will be attained. Investment plans for complementing inputs will be achieved. Planned extension activities in lagging areas will be implemented.</p>
<p>Outputs: Adequate supply of fertilizer at local level. Expanded base of consumption.</p>	<p>Magnitude of Output Consumption of approximately 25 million N.T. of fertilizers. Additional supply points will be established in the "lagging" areas.</p>	<p>Data prepared by Fertilizer Section, MOA. Data prepared by Fertilizer Sections, State DOA. Jointly agreed upon GOI/AID evaluation studies of distribution and promotion activities</p>	<p>Transportation and storage will not be a constraint. Current foreign exchange picture will not change dramatically Production capacity, will develop on schedule.</p>
<p>Inputs: GOI: Government budget to cover fertilizer imports, transportation costs, promotional activities, personnel salaries and general operating expenses. AID: \$ 150 million for fertilizer imports.</p>	<p>Implementation targets: GOI: Continuous import program sufficient to maintain necessary buffer stocks. AID: Fertilizer imports according to following schedule: FY 1979 \$22 mil* FY 1980 \$49 mil* FY 1981 \$79 mil* *landed cost</p>	<p>GOI Reports and instructions. AID Procurement and disbursement records.</p>	

Best Available Document

5

USAID/NEW DELHI
LONG RANGE EVALUATION SCHEDULE

Date Prepared October 24, 1980
Project Manager John W. LaSar

- 1) Project/~~Activity~~ No. 386-0468 2) Project/Activity Title: INTEGRATED RURAL HEALTH AND POPULATION
3) Date of Initial Obligation: 8/80 4) Date of Final Obligation: FY 82 5) Proj. Asst. Completion Date: 9/30/85
6) Life-of-Project Cost to AID: \$40,000,000 (G)

7) Dates of Evaluations Proposed through Life-of-Project

<u>Submittal Date</u>	<u>Period Covered</u>	<u>Character</u>	<u>Purpose and Nature of Proposed Evaluation</u>	<u>Start-up Date</u>	<u>Completion Date</u>
a. 1/82	9/80 - 10/81	Routine PES	Output level assessment	11/81	12/81
b. 2/83	9/80 - 10/82	Special	Mid-project review including selected Purpose Indicators	10/82	2/83
c. 1/84	11/82 - 10/83	Routine PES	Output level assessment	11/83	12/83
d. 1/85	11/83 - 10/84	Routine PES	Output level assessment	11/84	12/84
e. 1/86	9/80 - 9/85	Final PES	Project Completion Report	10/85	12/85

8) Plans for Project Impact Assessment:

The project's impact on access to health and family planning services and on fertility and mortality rates will be assessed through baseline and follow-on surveys administered by the GOI in conjunction with the Indian Institute for Population Studies (Bombay).

The surveys will be designed in late CY 1980 and early CY 1981 with assistance from USAID. Baseline surveys should begin in early to mid-CY 1981, and initial impact data should become available in CY 1983, after mid-project, second round survey.

5

PROJECT DESIGN SUMMARY
LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Life of Project: From FY 80 to FY 85
Total U.S. Funding \$40
Date Prepared: May 1980

Project Title & Number: Integrated Rural Health and Population 386-0468

NARRATIVE SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	IMPORTANT ASSUMPTIONS
<p>Program or Sector Goal: The broader objective to which this project contributes: (A-1)</p> <p>To reduce fertility in the population and mortality in the 0-4 age group.</p>	<p>Measures of Goal Achievement: (A-2)</p> <p>1.A significant decline in the Crude Birth Rate. 2.A 15% decline in the Infant Mortality Rate. 3.A 20% decline in the 1-4 mortality rate.</p>	<p>(A-3)</p> <p>Baseline and end-of-project survey on a sampling basis with selected control groups</p>	<p>Assumptions for achieving goal targets: (A-4)</p> <p>Increased access to improved and expanded services will lead to increased utilization of village-level and government services and hence to decreased fertility and mortality.</p>
<p>Project Purpose: (B-1)</p> <p>To improve access to health and family planning services that promote fertility and mortality reduction and to improve and expand the services and support systems of the Model Plan</p>	<p>Conditions that will indicate purpose has been achieved: End-of-Project status: (B-2)</p> <p>See purpose boxes, Part II: B of PP, pages 8-20.</p>	<p>(B-3)</p> <p>Baseline and end-of-project survey</p>	<p>Assumptions for achieving purpose: (B-4)</p> <p>The facilities will be constructed and the trained workers deployed so that the Model Plan organizational pattern is achieved and access is improved.</p>
<p>Project Purpose: (C-1)</p> <p>1.Additional trained workers, 2.Additional service facilities and quarters constructed, 3.Additional person-years of work, 4. Improved and expanded services, 5.Improved and expanded training support, 6.Improved and expanded communications support, 7. Improved and expanded existing service facilities, 8.Improved and expanded management support.</p>	<p>Magnitude of Outputs: (C-2)</p> <p>See pages 17-20 of Project Paper</p>	<p>(C-3)</p> <p>Baseline survey, quarterly reports, end-of-project survey.</p>	<p>Assumptions for achieving outputs: (C-4)</p> <p>There are enough skilled project management staff to manage the project and the policies of the GOI and states about the Model Plan don't change significantly.</p>
<p>Project Inputs: (D-1)</p> <p>Technical and managerial skills of project staff and financial input of \$64.7 million of which AID will contribute not more than \$40 million.</p>	<p>Implementation Target (Type and Quantity): (D-2)</p> <p>Local costs only</p>	<p>(D-3)</p> <p>Not applicable.</p>	<p>Assumptions for providing inputs: (D-4)</p> <p>The Project Agreement between the Government of India and the United States government is signed and followed.</p>

5

LONG RANGE EVALUATION SCHEDULE

Project Manager John W. LeSar

1) Project/~~Activity~~ No. 386-0455 2) Project/Activity Title: MALARIA CONTROL
 3) Date of Initial Obligation: 8/26/78 4) Date of Final Obligation: FY 1979 5) Proj. Asst. Completion Date: 12/31/81
 6) Life-of-Project Cost to AID: \$38,000,000 (L)

7) Dates of Evaluations Proposed through Life-of-Project

<u>Submittal Date</u>	<u>Period Covered</u>	<u>Character</u>	<u>Purpose and Nature of Proposed Evaluation</u>	<u>Start-up Date</u>	<u>Completion Date</u>
a. 6/20/80	8/78 - 4/80	Routine PES	Review of GOI annual evaluation	5/15/80	6/20/80
b. 2/81	5/80 - 12/80	Routine PES	Review of joint GOI/WHO Annual Independent Appraisal	1/81	2/81
c. 4/82	8/78 - 12/81	Final PES	Project Completion Report	1/82	3/82

8) Plans for Project Impact Assessment: None

PROJECT DESIGN SUMMARY
LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Life of Project:
From FY 78 to FY 82
Total U.S. Funding: 38,000,000
Date Prepared: 3/30/78

Project Title & Number: INDIA - Malaria Control

NARRATIVE SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	IMPORTANT ASSUMPTIONS
<p>Program or Sector Goal: The broader objective to which this project contributes: To reduce morbidity and mortality from endemic diseases through the establishment of a responsive, effective and efficient nationwide health services.</p>	<p>Measures of Goal Achievement: 1. Measurable significant reductions in mortality and morbidity directly attributable to interventions of the health service.</p>	<p>Evaluation of statistics from the National and State Ministries of Health and other health organizations both - public and private.</p>	<p>Assumptions for achieving goal targets: 1. Sustained economic growth to support national health services. 2. Continued Government commitment to supporting its health services.</p>
<p>Project Purpose: To bring malaria under control.</p>	<p>Conditions that will indicate purpose to be achieved: End of project status 1. Reduction of the annual incidence of malaria to less than 2.0 per 1000 API. 2. Control of P.falciparum</p>	<p>NMEP report and health institution records with validation by NMEP.</p>	<p>Assumptions for achieving purpose: 1. Resistance to malathion does not develop until year 6. 2. Resistance to drug does not develop. 3. Alternative control methods implemented.</p>
<p>Outputs: 1. Modified Plan of Operation 2. Trained Personnel 3. Community support programs implemented. 4. Spraying operations effectively executed. 5. Laboratories effectively operating. 6. Drug distribution centers and fever treatment depots operating. 7. Required equipment available and operating. 8. Research schemes executed. 9. Alternative control methods executed.</p>	<p>Magnitude of Outputs: The GOI has set forth specific targets/requirements in the Modified Plan of Operation on a state and district/zone basis.</p>	<p>1. Annual Evaluations. 2. Progress monitoring and reporting.</p>	<p>Assumptions for achieving outputs: 1. GOI support for NMEP. 2. States follow modified plan. 3. State support. 4. Other donor/AID support. 5. Required drugs and insecticides available on timely basis.</p>
<p>Inputs: Insecticides Drugs Spray and laboratory equipment NMEP/State Personnel Personnel for training Vehicles</p>	<p>Implementation Target (Type and Quantity) • See detailed budget Part III.A</p>	<p>Program and financial reports and evaluation</p>	<p>Assumptions for providing inputs: Malaria is epidemic in most of India. 1977 about 6 million positive cases reported and an estimated 40,000 deaths.</p>

Best Available Document

57