

A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY PART I

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

60-00000-101
12/28/87

IDENTIFICATION DATA

A. REPORTING A.I.D. UNIT: <u>USAID/Islamabad</u> <small>(Mission or AID/W Office)</small> (ES# <u>87-3</u>)	B. WAS EVALUATION SCHEDULED IN CURRENT FY ANNUAL EVALUATION PLAN? yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> elipped <input type="checkbox"/> ad hoc <input type="checkbox"/> Eval. Plan Submission Date: FY <u>87</u> Q <u>3</u>	C. EVALUATION TIMING Interim <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> final <input type="checkbox"/> ex post <input type="checkbox"/> other <input type="checkbox"/>			
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 <small>(or title & date of evaluation report)</small>	First PROAG or equivalent <small>(FY)</small>	Most recent PACD <small>(mo/yr)</small>	Planned LOP Cost <small>('000)</small>	Amount Obligated to Date <small>('000)</small>
Northwest Frontier Area Development Project (391-0485)	Evaluation of USAID/Pakistan Northwest Frontier Area Development Project (25 September 1987)	FY1983	12/90	31,000	31,000

ACTIONS

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
USAID to work with provincial officials to design and authorize five-year extension of the project (including inclusion of Khala Daka area), based in part on "lessons learned" from the evaluation. All recommendations will be considered and most areas of emphasis (training needs, animal husbandry activities, critical view of land leveling schemes, etc.) are being incorporated into the final design.	RNachtrieb, PDM	Feb. 1988
USAID to work with PCU in developing improved monitoring system, including provision of training and supervision as appropriate. Reports generated as a result of this activity are to be distributed to USAID and appropriate government agencies.	NHussain, TDurrani, MMcGovern, RAO/P	Ongoing
USAID and PCU to reach understanding on annual work plan to ensure that planned project activities stay within overall project resources.	" "	Dec. 1987
(Attach extra sheet if necessary)		

APPROVALS

F. DATE OF MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE REVIEW OF EVALUATION: mo <u>11</u> day <u>29</u> yr <u>87</u>			
G. APPROVALS OF EVALUATION SUMMARY AND ACTION DECISIONS:			
	Project/Program Officer	Representative of Borrower/Grantee	Mission or AID/W Office Director
Signature	<i>Nisar A. Husain</i>	<i>Adnan Bashir Khan</i>	<i>E. Staples</i>
Typed Name	Nisar A. Husain	Adnan Bashir Khan	E. Staples
Date:	<u>12/22/87</u>	<u>26/12/87</u>	<u>12/28/87</u>
		Evaluation Officer	
		<i>J. Addleton</i>	
		Date: <u>12/13/87</u>	

H. EVALUATION ABSTRACT (do not exceed the space provided)

The Northwest Frontier Area Development Project (NWFADP) represents the first USAID narcotics-related development intervention in Pakistan. This approach includes infrastructure, agriculture, education, non-formal education, vocational training, and health facilities in support of government-imposed bans on poppy production. Implementing agencies include the Project Coordination Unit (PCU) in Topi and various line agencies such as WAPDA and provincial departments of Agriculture and Communications and Works (C&W). The first interim evaluation was conducted by Development Associates, Inc. and took place during June/July 1987.

The team noted that after a long and difficult start-up period, the project was able to demonstrate commendable energy and accomplishments during the most recent eighteen months. The evaluation team also noted that the project now seems positioned to meet most of its objectives. The quality of construction of infrastructure sub-projects was considered good, particularly given the ruggedness and remoteness of the project area. Among the agricultural activities, demonstration plots have had high visibility and there is considerable popular demand for more.

The team noted several concerns about project management and monitoring and made recommendations concerning improved data collection. The cost of future activities planned by PCU was more than provided for within the project. With regard to the line agencies, the team observed that the agricultural sector agencies had been most supportive and interested, while a number of problems had been encountered in infrastructure activities undertaken by WAPDA and C&W.

In sum, the evaluation team indicated that the project, despite all the difficulties, was succeeding and having a beneficial impact. Several observations on related activities in Dir implemented by UNFDAC but funded in part by USAID were made in the evaluation. A number of recommendations--including the expansion of the project to adjacent regions--were also made in the context of a planned NWFADP II activity.

I. EVALUATION COSTS

1. Evaluation Team Name	Affiliation	Contract Number OR TDY Person Days	Contract Cost OR TDY Cost (US\$)	Source of Funds
Earl Jones, Development Associates				
James Ginter, Development Associates		PDC-1096-I-00-	\$76,925	PIO/T-391-0485-3-60620
Dale Smith, Development Associates		4163-00, WO#4		
Ghulam Dastgir Akhtar, NWFP P&D				
Lynn Carter, PSC Contractor				

2. Mission/Office Professional
Staff Person-Days (estimate) 15

3. Borrower/Grantee Professional
Staff Person-Days (estimate) 10

A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY PART II

J. SUMMARY OF EVALUATION FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS (Try not to exceed the 3 pages provided)

Address the following items:

- Purpose of activity(ies) evaluated
- Purpose of evaluation and Methodology used
- Findings and conclusions (relative to questions)
- Principal recommendations
- Lessons learned

Mission or Office: USAID/Islamabad Date this summary prepared: December 1987
 Title and Date of Full Evaluation Report: Evaluation of the USAID/Pakistan North West Frontier Area Development Project (September 1987)

The Northwest Frontier Area Development Project (NWFADP) aims primarily at changing the economy of Gadoon-Amazai from one based substantially on poppy cultivation to a diversified agricultural and non-agricultural system with strong ties to the national economy.

The interim evaluation was called to evaluate progress from the initial project agreement signing on August 28, 1983 to date. Recommendations were also requested on planned phase two activities. Main sources include field visits and interviews with USAID and GOP officials concerned. In addition, a formal survey was conducted by graduate students from the University of Peshawar and the guidance of the evaluation team. Nearly 200 beneficiaries in all seven union councils covered by the project area were interviewed in this survey.

Despite a long and difficult start period, the project showed considerable energy and accomplishments during the most recent eighteen months. It now seems positioned to fulfill most of its objectives. About 356 infrastructure subprojects are completed, under construction, or planned. Some of these have to be postponed to a project extension due to budgetary constraints. The quality of construction has been high, particularly in view of the ruggedness and remoteness of the region. Popular appreciation of and demand for roads, schools, water supply and irrigation systems, and health units is strong.

Among the agricultural activities, demonstration plots have had high visibility and there is considerable popular demand for them. Extension services, afforestation, orchard plantings, improved seed and fertilizer distribution, and animal husbandry efforts have had a positive impact on the farming sector and offer some alternatives to poppy cultivation. However, project targets related to off-farm employment training and placement are not being met.

Although project implementation should ideally be through line agencies, some problems had been encountered, especially in relation to WAPDA and C&W. The Project Coordinating Unit (PCU) in Topi also required more inputs from USAID than anticipated, particularly in terms of engineering design and supervision.

The evaluation noted several concerns about project management and monitoring. Activities planned by the PCU could not be completed within existing project resources (although they could be accommodated under an extension). The need for an improved monitoring system was also noted.

SUMMARY

The evaluation team stated that further work was needed in order to inhibit poppy cultivation. Many agricultural activities have not yet reached an income generating stage. More infrastructure is also needed. With poppy cultivation shifting to Kala Dhaka, similar development activities are needed there in support of government enforcement efforts.

Recommendations stemming from the evaluation are summarized below:

- Design and authorization of phase two of not less than five years to ensure continuity;
- Second phase should emphasize agriculture, forestry, animal husbandry, and off-farm employment;
- PCU and USAID to reach agreement on final work plan;
- PCU and USAID to monitor cost estimates and startups to ensure planned activities don't exceed project resources, seeking additional funding where essential;
- More frequent inspections of ongoing work required, if necessary involving hiring of more staff;
- Strengthening of PCU engineering section as well as line agencies involved;
- Provision of additional vehicles for project staff;
- More training for field staff, expanded animal husbandry activities, expanded irrigation activities, and utilization of integrated model farm approach;
- Provision of appropriate storage facilities for equipment, seed, fertilizer, and other supplies now in Topi;
- Land levelling schemes to be critically reviewed to assure costs are commensurate with benefits;
- Need for improved monitoring and reporting system, involving additional training and supervision, to address needs of USAID, PCU, and SDU;
- Consideration of expansion of activities to Khala Daka under phase two and establishment of project office there;
- Examination of costly infrastructure requirements, some of which could receive financial support from GOP/NWFP or other donors.

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

ATTACHMENTS

Evaluation Report
"Change in Gadoon-Amazai" Brochure

L. COMMENTS BY MISSION, AID/W' OFFICE AND BORROWER/GRANTEE

The NWFADP evaluation took place at an appropriate time in the project life cycle--just prior to the arrival of the design team for phase II of the project. Although the evaluation was delayed for one year (due to enforcement difficulties in spring 1986), this delay meant there were many more on-ground activities for the evaluation team to review and assess. The overall tone of the report, while generally favorable, passes perhaps too lightly over the real difficulties entailed in working in an area as difficult as Gadoon-Amazai. USAID is not itself involved on the enforcement side. Nevertheless, these enforcement activities directly affect project activities and certainly figure into local perceptions about the project itself.

The main utility of the evaluation is in the context of the proposed add-on and extension of project activities into adjacent areas. Most recommendations and "lessons learned" noted in the evaluation are being incorporated into this follow-on document. In at least one instance--the issue of further engineering supervision--the Project Committee felt that the recommendation made directly contradicted findings elsewhere in the evaluation report, which had described the quality of construction as "high." Several other recommendations were considered either too general or too self-evident to be included in the final list of "action decisions."

MISSION COMMENTS ON FULL REPORT