

UNCLASSIFIED

**AGENCY FOR
INTERNATIONAL
DEVELOPMENT**



ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION

FY 83

OFFICE OF EVALUATION

BUREAU FOR

PROGRAM AND POLICY COORDINATION

JUNE 1981

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20523

FY 1983 ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1. Objectives: Office of Evaluation	1
2. Table I - Long Range Plan by Appropriation Account . . .	3
3. Table III - Project Obligations by Appropriation Account.	4
4. Table IV - Project Budget Data	5
5. Narrative for Program Ranking	7
6. Table V - FY 1983 Proposed Program Ranking	10

OBJECTIVES: OFFICE OF EVALUATION

The Office of Evaluation has been established to provide oversight for the Agency's evaluation system and to conduct and coordinate evaluation studies of Agency-wide significance. Thus, there are two objectives:

- To help shape an Agency evaluation system (consistent with the 1980 Administrator's Evaluation Task Force) which systematically produces information pertinent to management of and achievement in A.I.D. projects, programs, policies and related procedures. This objective serves the goal of providing measureable improvements in the efficiency, effectiveness and impact of A.I.D. and LDC development projects, programs, policies and related procedures.

- To undertake and coordinate studies on topics selected by A.I.D. executives which serve central policy, budget and program decisions, as well as serve the development community at large with clear lessons on what has worked and what has not in A.I.D.'s development experience.

Clearly, the latter objective (that which guides the PPC/E Studies Division) is a sub-set of the former objective (that which guides the PPC/E Program Evaluation Systems Division).

The first objective, above, states a linkage between A.I.D.'s evaluation work and the goal of improving LDC development activities. This is a critical working hypothesis. It implies that over time A.I.D. evaluation work will be moved to be more a part of normative LDC evaluation activities. Further, it sets the stage (as noted in previous budgets) for work directly on LDC evaluation capabilities. In short: A.I.D. has a responsibility, as a spender of public monies, to clean up its act. But, in the long run, evaluation as conducted by A.I.D. must be part of the assistance we furnish developing countries.

The second objective, above, indicates that responsibility for discharging part of the Agency's evaluation responsibilities has been given to PPC/E. These studies are unique in the Agency.

Both objectives have been established and are carried out after extensive consultation within the Agency and with the Hill. In 1980 an Administrator's Evaluation Task Force resulted in a large number of recommendations, all of which were accepted by the Administrator, which have been directly translated into (and constitute the great majority of) the work items in the PPC/E/PES workplan, much of which is reflected in this budget. Similarly, in what has now become an annual meeting, A.I.D.'s top executives have reviewed the workplan and objectives of PPC/E/S and set the stage for future impact evaluations and other studies. The general work of the impact evaluations was subsequently reviewed by A.I.D.'s

new Administrator, Peter McPherson, who sent a message to all principal A.I.D. officials on May 16, 1981, that:

"I want to continue the impact evaluation system which I believe can be particularly useful in identifying generalizable problems in particular kinds of projects. I think the impact evaluation concepts started by Doug Bennet have enduring importance. I believe it important to continue and, resources permitting, expand our efforts."

This budget reflects that decision, too.

Finally, it should be noted that the Associate Assistant Administrator for Evaluation chairs the OECD Development Assistance Committee's group on evaluation and, as such, has need for resources to support that important endeavor. The objective of that group, which the United States fully backs, is to enable sharing among the donors of lessons learned from development assistance and to carry out joint efforts to improve evaluation by donors and LDCs.

FY 1983 ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION

TABLE I - LONG RANGE PLAN BY APPROPRIATION ACCOUNT (\$ Thousands)

DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE	FY 1981 EST	FY 1982 EST	FY 1983 REQUEST			PLANNING PERIOD			
			MIN	CURR	AAPL	1984	1985	1986	1987
Country/Office _____									
Selected Development Activities									
Grants	700	900	990	990	1150	1200	1250	1300	1350
TOTAL PERSONNEL USDH (Workyears)	17.3	17.5	16	17.5	21				

TABLE III - PROJECT OBLIGATIONS BY APPROPRIATION ACCOUNT
FY 1981 to FY 1983
(\$ thousands)

Country/Office PPC/E

<u>APPROPRIATION ACCOUNT</u>	<u>FY 1981</u>	<u>FY 1982</u>	<u>FISCAL YEAR 1983</u>		
			<u>MINIMUM</u>	<u>CURRENT</u>	<u>AAPL</u>
Selected Development Activities Grants	700	900	990	990	1150
Integrated Studies & Systems 930-0085					

FY 1983 ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION

TABLE IV PROJECT BUDGET DATA

NUMBER	PROJECT TITLE	G/L	OBLIGATION DATE		LIFE OF PROJECT COST APTS PLAN	CIN PIPELINE AS OF 7/30/80	ESTIMATED U.S. DOLLAR COST (\$000)										ITEM #
			INITIAL	FINAL			FY 1981		FY 1982		FY OBLIGATIONS					FUTURE YEAR	
							OBL	EXP	OBL	EXP	1983 AACTL	1984	1985	1986	1987		
930-0095	Integrated Studies & Systems	G	80	C	-	144	700	818	900	1170	1150	1200	1250	1300	1350		

AND 1510A (4-81)

Country/Office
PFC/E

PROJECT NUMBER AND TITLE	ORIG	DATE	TOTAL CUST AUTH	PLAN	ESTIMATED U.S. DOLLAR CUST (000)															
					FY 80	FY 81	FY 82	FY 83	FY 84	FY 85	FY 86	FY 87	FY 88	FY 89						
AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEV. AND NUTRITION																				
CONCNS																				
INTEGRATED STUDIES AND SYSTEMS	6	80																		
																				50

APPROPRIATION	TOTAL	ESTIMATED U.S. DOLLAR CUST (000)																		
		FY 80	FY 81	FY 82	FY 83	FY 84	FY 85	FY 86	FY 87	FY 88	FY 89									
GRANT																				
LOAN																				

1
9
1

NARRATIVE FOR PROGRAM RANKING

The Office was not permitted much flexibility in establishing its AAPL level, hence the difference between the Minimum/Current and AAPL level is modest. It is worth noting that the basic use of Program funding for the office, per guidelines established by the Senate Appropriations Committee, is for activities which will involve and/or be of service to developing countries. Activities which are primarily of service to the Agency (e.g., reports not distributed outside of AID) will be funded from O.E. accounts).

a. Minimum/Current Level

At this level (and with appropriate O.E. and direct hire support), the total resources available to the Office will permit it to discharge its basic responsibilities of conducting and coordinating almost all aspects of assigned impact evaluation work and of undertaking some work to assist the development of evaluation among developing countries. The Minimum/Current package of \$990,000 is the same level submitted last year for the FY '82 program, thus it represents a shrinkage in real terms. The '83 package consists of the following elements:

- 1) AID/LDC Workshops to review the results of three different impact evaluation sectoral studies: agricultural credit, agricultural institutions, and Housing Investment Guaranty . A fourth subject, PL-480, Title I, is a possibility for a conference, but has not been budgeted for. These workshops are an essential part of translating studies into policy recommendations. A final report is produced and distributed. (\$180,000)
- 2) Support of 27 impact evaluations through local consultants and other appropriate program expenditures. Each study will result in a separate report sent widely throughout the development world. (\$270,000)
- 3) Feasibility, mapping and issues papers are an integral part of doing impact evaluations. They save a great deal of time and potential duplication by pinpointing studies on truly unresolved issues and by indicating how best to go about doing impact evaluations through mapping available evaluations. Almost all this work results in publications for the quite popular A.I.D. Program Evaluation Discussion Paper series, which has been distributed throughout the development world. We have budgeted for eight efforts. (\$160,000)

- 4) For FY '83 we plan three in-depth historical studies of AID programs to be done collaboratively with regional bureaus on a cost sharing basis. These also will be published widely. A few initial efforts in this direction have been conducted in FY '80-'81. This type of approach has long been desired by other bureaus and PPC/E. (\$90,000)
- 5) Direct publications support is necessary for the volume of work generated by and through the Office. In fact, PPC/E puts out a publications volume as great or greater than many academic publishers. This budget item will continue editorial and manuscript preparation services to enable a much faster publication of AID evaluation reports. The impact on direct hire needs will be clear as we can avoid staffing for peak production needs. (\$80,000)
- 6) An integral part of assuring that AID evaluation publications reach LDC audiences is to have the more important publications translated into major foreign languages. This is costly yet a valuable investment. (In a few cases wealthier LDCs have translated PPC/E reports themselves and where this takes place we will seize upon it.) (\$80,000)
- 7) PPC/E is innovating a number of approaches to enhance the role, linkages and substantive interchange between AID and LDC evaluation authorities. Among donors we hope to be a leader in this field. Conferences of LDC evaluation authorities, assistance to particularly countries (in concert with regional bureaus and as a first step to subsequent mission actions), publications for such people and circulation of special experts and reports for such authorities is seen as an integral part of moving the Agency evaluation system from an in-house function to an emphasis which increasingly relies on competent, independent evaluation authorities of the developing countries. AID has been promoting this approach both in-house and at the DAC group on evaluation. To back up missions, do conference work and finance other related activities we propose (\$130,000).

Total Minimum/Current (\$990,000)

b. AAPL Level

This level will allow for an expansion of two elements of the central evaluation program which are desirable to help better meet office objectives. If the proposed level is not met the office will not fold, but it will be more difficult to meet program objectives in a timely manner.

- 1) Item a. 3) limits us to only 8 feasibility, mapping and issues papers. Given the volume of executive requests given the Office, we anticipate that the real demand will be for 10 such reports. We note that this is a far more desirable level given the fact that for some issues a report of this nature may suffice to meet an Agency demand, i.e., we may have enough information in hand to compile a report without further field work. The cost of an additional 2 studies will be (\$40,000).
- 2) This item is an expansion of item a. 7) above. For the extra money we can support efforts by the Development Assistance Committee evaluation group (which AID chairs) to stimulate evaluation as a major activity of the core ministries of developing countries. AID can be a key help (along with other donors which have expressed interest: Canada, Netherlands, Sweden, IDRC) in helping to finance major LDC/donor conferences on evaluation. In addition, this funding would permit some work on joint LDC/AID evaluations beyond the project level. (\$120,000)

Total AAPL	<u>(\$ 160,000)</u>
Total Proposed Program	(\$1,150,000)

TABLE V - FY 1983 PROPOSED PROGRAM RANKING

RANK	DECISION PACKAGES/PROGRAM ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION	ONGOING/ NEW	LOAN/ GRANT	APPROP. ACCT.	Country/Office PPC/E		PROGRAM FUNDING (\$000)		WORKFORCE (Number of Workmonths)	
					INCR	CUM	INCR	CUM	INCR	CUM
	<u>Decision Package Minimum/Current</u>									
	<u>Pipeline</u>					(388)				
	<u>930-0085 Integrated Studies & Systems</u>									
1	AID/LDC Workshops					180				
2	Impact Evaluations					270				
3	Feasibility/Mapping/Issues Papers					160				
4	Historical Studies of AID Programs					90				
5	Publication Support					80				
6	Translation of Evaluation Findings					80				
7	LDC Evaluation Support					130				
8	Workforce Increment Minimum/Current							222		
	Total Minimum/Current Package and Related Workforce					990		222	222	
	<u>Decision Package AAPL</u>									
9	Feasibility/Mapping/Issues Papers					40				
10	LDC Evaluation Support					120				
11	Workforce Increment AAPL									42
	Total AAPL Package and Related Workforce					160				264