

A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY PART 1

PD-AA3-761

43574

(BEFORE FILLING OUT THIS FORM, READ THE ATTACHED INSTRUCTIONS)

A. REPORTING A.I.D. UNIT (Mission or AID/W Office) USAID/Sri Lanka (ES # 86-1)

B. WAS EVALUATION SCHEDULED IN CURRENT FY ANNUAL EVALUATION PLAN? yes slipped ad hoc

C. EVALUATION TIMING interim final ex post other

D. ACTIVITY OR ACTIVITIES EVALUATED (List the following information for project(s) or program (s) evaluated; if not applicable, list title and date of the evaluation report)

Project #	Project/Program Title (or title & date of evaluation report)	First PRGAG or equivalent (FY)	Most recent FAD (mo/yr)	Planned LOP Cost ('000)	Amount Obligated to Date ('000)
383-0075	Mahaweli Environment	FY82	9/87	\$5000(G)	\$5000(G)

E. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR

Action(s) Required	Name of officer responsible for Action	Date Action to be Completed
1. Review and agree on revised project management structure and implementation plan	USAID/GSL	January 1986
2. Appoint senior project staff per revised MEP management structure (see 1 above)	DWLC/MASL	January 1986
3. Transfer responsibility for project construction activities	DWLC/MASL	January 1986
4. Contract long-term project expatriate technical advisor	AID/MEP	February 1986
5. Contract protected areas inventory and research program development study (Long-term TA advisor arrives in Sri Lanka and initiates System Planning process)	MEP/DWLC	March 1986
6. Appoint staff for Wildlife Management Unit-MEP and new senior DWLC technical positions	USNPS/AID	(March 1986)
7. Send key personnel to India and Malaysia to review protected area barrier technology for inclusion in Park Systems Plan.	DWLC	April 1986
8. Conduct workshops on Staff Development and In-Service Training producing a draft training plan	USAID/MEP	April 1986
9. Conduct workshop on Conservation Education and Park Interpretation producing and initiating comprehensive Public Awareness and Education Plan	USNPS/MEP	May 1986
	USNPS/MEP (Attachments)	May 1986 if necessary

F. DATE OF MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE REVIEW OF EVALUATION no 12 day 30 year 85

G. APPROVALS OF EVALUATION SUMMARY AND ACTION DECISIONS:

Signature Typed Name Date	Project/Program Officer <i>ELK</i> Eric Loken	Representative of Beneficiary <i>Shelton Atapattu</i> Dr. Shelton Atapattu	Evaluation Officer <i>Anna Dammarell</i> Anna Dammarell	Mission or AID/W Office Director <i>F Correl</i> Frank Correl
---------------------------------	---	--	---	---

Action(s) Required	Name of officer responsible for Action	Date Action to be completed
10. Conduct comprehensive workshop for MEP Park System Plan	MEP/DWLC/MASL	June 1986
11. Conduct workshops for each MEP protected area and complete final draft management plans (in accordance with MEP System Plan)	MEP/USNPS	July 1986
12. Approve final site plan for all project construction and initiate construction tendering process	MECA/MEP/DWLC/USAID	July 1986
13. Conduct second Academic Seminar	USNPS/MEP	August 1986
14. Finalize plans for In-Service Training program	MEP/DWLC	September 1986
15. MEP construction contract(s) awarded and construction work initiated	MECA/MEP	October 1986
16. Complete draft local participation plan for MEP areas	MEP/DWLC	October 1986
17. Initiate wildlife monitoring program for MEP areas	MEP/DWLC	October 1986
18. Conduct external evaluation of 1986 project implementation status	USAID/MEP	December 1986

(Decision Point: Extension of MEP Project Assistance Completion Date)

The project aims to strengthen the institutional capacity of the GSL Department for Wildlife Conservation (DWLC) to manage wildland resources in the Accelerated Mahaweli Program (AMP) area to conserve wildlife, protect investments in irrigation and human settlements and bring the benefits of nature conservation to the local people. The project is being implemented by the DWLC in conjunction with the Mahaweli Authority of Sri Lanka (MASL) with short-term technical assistance provided by the US National Park Services (USNPS). This mid-term evaluation (11/08/85-12/07/85) was conducted by a joint team of GSL, AID/W and USAID/Sri Lanka officials and consultants from the International Science and Technology Institute. The team reviewed documents, interviewed project personnel and visited three national park sites within the project area.

The major findings and conclusions are: (1) while there has been significant progress in legally establishing the Mahaweli protected areas, little or no progress has been made on the development of buffer zones, habitat enrichment and construction of park physical infrastructure. Responsibility for development of park infrastructure should be transferred to MASL and all future park development activities should be guided by an overall AMP Park Systems Plan developed specifically for this purpose; (2) conservation of wildlife in the AMP is being inadequately addressed. Increased emphasis needs to be placed upon this aspect of the project; (3) the technical assistance and training component of the project has worked relatively well and could be improved by providing a long-term Technical Advisor to facilitate implementation of USNPS contributions; (4) local participation in the project has been far less than originally envisioned. Greater cooperation among DWLC, other GSL agencies, PVOs and academic interests would enhance this element of the project; (5) project administration has been a major source of implementation difficulties. Key elements for improving project administration include augmenting project staff, clarifying authority and responsibility in Colombo and decentralizing authority to the field/project area; and (6) the national security situation in Sri Lanka has had a major impact on the project. This situation presents both a dilemma and an opportunity to redirect project resources to cover the costs of priority actions recommended in this mid-term evaluation of the project.

Because of the project's strategic local, regional, national and international importance, the project should continue with major efforts by the GSL and USAID to correct implementation problems as identified and recommended above. If substantial progress is evident by the end of 1986, USAID and the GSL should extend the project by two years to make up for the initial slow pace of implementation in 1982-85.

The evaluators noted the following "lessons learned": (1) a long-term technical assistance advisor in the initial years of the project would have prevented/lessened many of the implementation problems documented in the evaluation; (2) projects calling for substantial construction of physical facilities require implementing agencies that have proven expertise in this field; and (3) extra effort must be devoted to ensuring effective administrative arrangements for any project that has implementing agency(s) with unproven administrative capability.

I. EVALUATION COSTS

1. Evaluation Team

Name	Affiliation	Contract Number OR TDY Person Days	Contract Cost OR TDY Cost (US\$)	Source of Funds
Mike Phillee	AID/W/ANE/PD	28 days TDY	\$ 3,500	USAID/Sri Lanka Project 383-0075
Jeffrey McNeely	IUCN)	ISTI IQC No. PDC- 0000-1-42-3083-00	\$ 28,552	
John Seidensticker	Smithsonian) Institution)			
Gamini Wickremasinghe	ARTI)			
Ranjit Wijewansa	GSL	21 days TDY	\$ 125	GSL
Malvila Dissanayake	USAID/SL/PDSP	21 days TDY	\$ 410	USAID/Sri Lanka

2. Mission/Office Professional
Staff Person Days (estimate) 6 days

3. Borrower/Grantee Professional
Staff Person-Days (estimate) 15 days

A. I. D. EVALUATION SUMMARY PART II

J. SUMMARY OF EVALUATION FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

1. PROBLEM AND OVERVIEW

The Accelerated Mahaweli Program (AMP) is Sri Lanka's highest priority development activity. More than \$2 billion of multidonor financing is assisting the Government of Sri Lanka (GSL) to bring 117,000 hectares of dry-zone land under permanent irrigation. Approximately one-half million people will be resettled on small farms in the area, leading to increases in agricultural production. Through the completion of four new dams in upper catchments of the Mahaweli River, the country's total electric generating capacity will be more than doubled. The development of infrastructure and service industries accompanying resettlement will create new opportunities for off-farm employment, helping to bring a major portion of the previously underdeveloped dry-zone into the mainstream of Sri Lanka's economy.

A river basin development scheme of this massive scale is certain to generate significant environmental impacts. Major changes in land-use and human settlement will create pressures to utilize natural resources more intensively, natural landscapes will be altered permanently, and a certain amount of environmental degradation will be inevitable.

2. U.S. ASSISTANCE

USAID was the first foreign donor to provide assistance to the GSL in addressing the environmental impacts of Mahaweli development. USAID funded an Environmental Assessment of the AMP in 1979-80 and helped the GSL develop an Environmental Plan of Action in 1981. Through its Mahaweli Basin I Loan, USAID provided \$400,000 to the GSL for carrying out activities in the AMP region to monitor and control the movements of problem elephants displaced by agricultural development.

USAID and the GSL approved a five-year Mahaweli Environment Project in September 1982 to respond to the specific recommendations on wildlife conservation and management contained in the AMP Environmental Assessment and Plan of Action. The project was designed specifically to be part of the overall development effort in the Mahaweli. Its purpose was to "ensure the stability of irrigated agricultural development and human settlements in the AMP area by providing alternative protected habitats for displaced wildlife in a manner that is ecologically sound and socially acceptable."

The project was designed to improve the institutional capacity of the Department of Wildlife Conservation (DWLC) to continue managing Mahaweli protected areas beyond the life of the project. The total project budget was \$6.9 million, of which \$5 million was a grant by USAID.

Date this summary prepared: December 5, 1985.

3. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

This mid-term evaluation is the first of two planned evaluations of the Mahaweli Environment Project (383-0075). The objective of the evaluation is to review the progress made toward attaining planned outputs and end-of-project status conditions, and to recommend changes in project implementation if warranted and practicable.

4. FINDINGS

While there has been significant progress in legally establishing the Mahaweli protected areas, little or no progress can be reported on the development of buffer zones, habitat enrichment, and construction of physical infrastructure (buildings, roads). Only 6 percent of AID funds have been disbursed after three years of project implementation. The delays have been caused by problems in project administration, changes in both GSL and USAID management personnel, difficulties in tendering and contracting for local procurement, and the lack of a planning framework for site development. Because the construction component is beyond the present capacity of DWLC to implement, development of physical infrastructure should be transferred to the Mahaweli Authority of Sri Lanka, which has proven expertise in this area.

Conservation of wildlife in the AMP area is being inadequately addressed, due to the lack of trained personnel in the DWLC and slow implementation of the Wildlife Conservation Unit as planned in the PP. Although technical expertise and resources are available from Sri Lankan universities and the private sector, the DWLC has not encouraged cooperation with these groups.

The technical assistance and training component has worked relatively well, but could be improved. In-country workshops implemented through a PASA arrangement with the U.S. National Park Service (USNPS) have demonstrated great potential for developing DWLC personnel, but results have been less than satisfactory because of poor coordination, participation and follow-through in-country. This element of the project could be greatly improved by providing a long-term Technical Advisor to facilitate preparation for and application of USNPS contributions.

Local participation of AMP people in the project has been far less than envisaged in the PP, largely due to inappropriate DWLC policies, lack of a rural sociologist in DWLC, and delays in implementing the capital investment portions of the project. Greater cooperation among DWLC, other GSL agencies, and PVOs would enhance this element of the project.

Administration of the project has been a source of major difficulties, with no clear authority established, sporadic support from DWLC, and poor coordination among DWLC, Mahaweli Authority of Sri Lanka, and other involved institutions. Key elements of

improving project administration include clarifying authority and responsibility in Colombo and decentralizing authority for field level decisions to field personnel.

The internal security situation in Sri Lanka has had a major impact on the project. Northern and eastern portions of the AMP area have become vulnerable to insurgent activity, affecting the establishment and development of Somawathiya Sanctuary as a national park. DWLC personnel no longer go to Somawathiya; however, most of the remaining protected areas in the AMP region are reasonably secure. This situation presents both a dilemma for DWLC and an opportunity to redirect project resources planned for development of Somawathiya to cover the costs of recommended actions indicated in this mid-term evaluation.

5. PROJECT DESIGN IMPLICATIONS

The evaluation has identified critical areas for improvement that entail adjustments in project design, administration and implementation. The project purpose as stated in the PP is unrealistic; the purpose and end-of-project status conditions (EOPS) should be modified to place greater emphasis on developing a strong interagency mechanism to support the DWLC in planning and managing protected areas within the AMP land-use system (revised EOPS are indicated in Part II of the evaluation report). The project implementing mechanism requires strengthening, which will call for changes in GSL administrative arrangements. Progress in constructing park infrastructure will require MASL to take the lead in coordinating and supervising this project component. The internal security situation warrants a redirection of project resources planned for development of Somawathiya to cover the costs of the recommendations outlined in the evaluation.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

The project should continue, with a major effort by the GSL and USAID in 1986 to correct implementation problems. A full-time Project Director in Colombo and a DWLC Deputy Director for the Mahaweli region should be appointed by the Ministry of State as soon as possible to overcome shortcomings in project administration. A long-term Technical Advisor is required to help coordinate technical assistance and training contributions in-country; this should be facilitated through an amendment of the existing PASA with the U.S. National Park Service. The project's construction component should be transferred as a package to MASL, with major progress expected by the end of 1986. Inputs planned for development of Somawathiya should be redirected to other priority uses identified in the evaluation.

If substantial progress is indicated by the end of 1986, USAID should extend the project by two years -- to September 1989 -- to make up for the initial slow pace of implementation in 1982-1985.

ATTACHMENTS (List attachments submitted with this Evaluation Summary; always attach copy of full evaluation report, even if one was submitted earlier)

Mahaweli Environment Project (Project No. 383-0075) Mid-Term
Evaluation prepared for USAID / Colombo, Sri Lanka; December 1985.

ATTACHMENTS

COMMENTS BY MISSION, AID/W OFFICE AND BORROWER/GRANTEE

In general, the evaluation results were judged to be realistic, timely and useful and in agreement with Mission and GSL expectations. The reported findings, conclusions and recommendations were complete and comprehensive with respect to both the requirements of the evaluation scope of work and in addressing all of the various aspects of ongoing project implementation. In addition, the final report was clear, concise and professional and completed/presented in accordance with a tight schedule. All concerned parties feel that the teams' good prior familiarity with the project, strong commitment to and support of project objectives and excellent rapport developed with key GSL and Mission staff all contributed greatly to the success of the evaluation. The evaluation team is to be commended for successfully completing such a complex task in so relatively short a period of time (i.e. 3 weeks in-country).

MISSION COMMENTS ON FULL REPORT