

A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY - PART I

1. BEFORE FILLING OUT THIS FORM, READ THE ATTACHED INSTRUCTIONS
 2. USE LETTER QUALITY TYPE, NOT DOT MATRIX TYPE

IDENTIFICATION DATA

A. Reporting A.I.D. Unit: Mission or AID/W Office <u>USAID/BOLIVIA/DP</u> (ES# _____)		B. Was Evaluation Scheduled in Current FY Annual Evaluation Plan? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Slipped <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ad Hoc <input type="checkbox"/> Evaluation Plan Submission Date: FY <u>87</u> <u>04th</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 No.	Project /Program Title	First PROAG or Equivalent (FY)	Most Recent PACD (Mo/Yr)	Planned LOP Cost (000)	Amount Obligated to Date (000)
511-0412	Special Development Activities (SDA)		Contin.	\$300,000/ Yr.	N/A

ACTIONS

E. Action Decisions Approved By Mission or AID/W Office Director	Name of Officer Responsible for Action	Date Action to be Completed
Action(s) Required 1. Issue new Mission Local Order for SDA activities 2. Refine selection criteria 3. Reorganize project committee 4. Identify group of secondary support organizations	Marcos Arce " " A.A. Funicello Marcos Arce	05/89 05/89 08/89 Ongoing

(Attach extra sheet if necessary)

APPROVALS

F. Date Of Mission Or AID/W Office Review Of Evaluation: (Month) 03 (Day) 11 (Year) 89

G. Approvals of Evaluation Summary And Action Decisions:

	Project/Program Officer	Representative of Borrower/Grantee	Evaluation Officer	Mission or AID/W Office Director
Name (Typed)	AAFunicello		Lance Downing Liza Valenzuela	GRvan Raalte
Signature				
Date	<u>2/17/89</u>			

ABSTRACT

H. Evaluation Abstract (Do not exceed the space provided)

The Special Development Activities (SDA) Project of USAID/Bolivia is a grant funded activity which provides direct assistance in the form of materials and grants to small rural communities and peasant organizations who wish to undertake community level projects that address their self-felt socio-economic needs and development opportunities. The primary target group is that segment of the rural population which tends to have very serious problems in gaining access to, and thus is seldom reached by, the typically structured development projects.

This evaluation was undertaken at the request of the Mission to augment its data relative to the effectiveness of the project, and to utilize this information in the planning of a possible expansion. Inherent in the minimal allocation of Mission staff resources to the implementation and monitoring of this project has been the generation and collection of only a very limited amount of data on the results of the individual subprojects carried out by the recipient communities.

On the basis of questionnaires and interviews, field level investigations of a representative sample of 15 completed subprojects indicated that two-thirds (67%) had either successfully achieved an income generating status or could reasonably be expected to do so within an appropriate time frame. The remaining one-third (33%) were either already abandoned as failures or diagnosed as having no reasonable prognosis for success. Comparatively speaking, this is a very satisfactory success rate for the subprojects in an undertaking of this nature.

C O S T S

I. Evaluation Costs

1. Evaluation Team		Contract Number OR TDY Person Days	Contract Cost OR TDY Cost (U.S. \$)	Source of Funds
Name	Affiliation			
Jesse Robert Moffet	Checchi and Company	8 weeks	\$35,779.00	Mission PD&S
Murray Simon	" " "			
2. Mission/Office Professional Staff Person-Days (Estimate) <u>2 weeks</u>		3. Borrower/Grantee Professional Staff Person-Days (Estimate) <u>None</u>		

21

A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY - PART II

SUMMARY				
<p>J. Summary of Evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations (Try not to exceed the three (3) pages provided) Address the following items:</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 60%; border: none;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose of evaluation and methodology used • Purpose of activity(ies) evaluated • Findings and conclusions (relate to questions) </td> <td style="width: 40%; border: none;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principal recommendations • Lessons learned </td> </tr> </table>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose of evaluation and methodology used • Purpose of activity(ies) evaluated • Findings and conclusions (relate to questions) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principal recommendations • Lessons learned
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose of evaluation and methodology used • Purpose of activity(ies) evaluated • Findings and conclusions (relate to questions) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principal recommendations • Lessons learned 			
Mission or Office:	Date This Summary Prepared:	Title And Date Of Full Evaluation Report:		
<p>A. <u>The Project Purpose</u></p> <p>The Special Development Activities (SDA) Project of USAID/Bolivia is a grant funded activity which provides direct assistance in the form of materials and grants to small rural communities and peasant organizations who wish to undertake community level projects that address their self-felt socio-economic needs and development opportunities. The primary target group is that segment of the rural population which tends to have very serious problems in gaining access to, and thus is seldom reached by, the typically structured development projects. For reasons peculiar to Bolivia, this segment of the population is proportionately larger than its counterpart in most Latin American countries. The project represents an opportunity for the Mission, not only to extend a portion of its resources to this marginal subsector, but to experiment and probe the possibilities of more effectively incorporating this population as both contributors to and beneficiaries of the country's development.</p> <p>While the project relies very heavily on the felt-need and self-help methodologies, the focus of the Mission's recent assistance has been in support of those proposals which directly address income generating opportunities. During the past five years, an average of about 18 subprojects per year have been approved with an average grant of approximately \$5,000. The project is readily acknowledged as a high risk endeavor, experimental in nature, and a Mission activity to which only a bare minimum of staff resources may be allocated.</p> <p>B. <u>Purpose of the Evaluation</u></p> <p>This evaluation was undertaken at the request of the Mission to augment its data relative to the effectiveness of the project, and to utilize this information in the planning of a possible expansion. Inherent in the minimal allocation of Mission staff resources to the implementation and monitoring of this project has been the generation and collection of only a very limited amount of data on the results of the individual subprojects carried out by the recipient communities. Equally lacking, due to the same staffing constraint, has been the opportunity to periodically and systematically analyze the criteria and procedures being used for the selection and implementation of the subprojects. In fact, this second function is dependent upon the prior gathering of data on the results of the subproject activities.</p> <p>Briefly stated, the following tasks were to be covered by the evaluation team:</p> <p>(a) Review criteria and procedures used to select and implement SDA activities to assess appropriateness and conformance with A.I.D. and Mission regulations.</p>				

4

- (b) Evaluate at least 15 completed projects in various regions of Bolivia to measure socio-economic impact and related effects such as attitudinal changes and improvements.
- (c) Provide a report on findings and recommendations to modify, expand, or continue future project activities.

An IQC contract team of two technicians spent almost four weeks in Bolivia during the period of April 19 to May 14, 1988. Approximately two-thirds of this time was devoted to the on-site investigation and collection of data at the subproject level. This data base encompassed 15 completed subprojects, four more subprojects which were at various stages of implementation, and two which were at the initial proposal/investigation stage. A subproject investigation questionnaire was developed by the team shortly after arrival in Bolivia and used in the collection of new data on each completed subproject investigated at the field level. The focus of this field investigation was to gain additional insight into the intermediate objective¹ of each subproject; assess socio-economic impact; appropriateness to the local conditions, capabilities, and needs of the participating group; identify the problems and constraints associated with the local implementation; and to uncover any other factors which might appear to be reasonably correlated with subproject success or failure.

C. Major Findings and Conclusions

1. Field level investigations of a representative sample of 15 completed subprojects² indicated that two-thirds (67%) had either successfully achieved an income generating status or could reasonably be expected to do so within an appropriate time frame. The remaining one-third (33%) were either already abandoned as failures or diagnosed as having no reasonable prognosis for success. Comparatively speaking, this is a very satisfactory success rate for the subprojects in an undertaking of this nature.

2. Subproject success appears to be highly correlated to type of subproject and participation of a secondary organization capable of providing appropriate TA and implementation guidance. Three basic types of income generating subprojects were identified - economic infrastructure, product diversification, and processing and marketing. In turn, the highest probability for successful implementation among these three types also tends to quite consistently occur in this same order.

¹ The intermediate objective being the specific community undertaking - an irrigation system, a coffee processing plant, etc. - which was to be the means for income generation.

² Within its current context under the SDA Project, a completed subproject is one in which the community has made its initial inputs and the USAID contribution has been delivered and made ready for use, or accounted for. The term bears no relationship as to whether the subproject has become income generating or not.

3. The effort to assess the socio-economic impact of the project revealed that the social benefits are very extensive and homogeneous from site to site, that they appear to arise largely from the community's experience with the undertaking and that they bear only a lesser relationship to the actual outcome of the subproject. Three villages had achieved impressive economic gains. However, the lack of record keeping at the subproject level, the diversity of subprojects and the incomplete maturation periods for almost half of the active subprojects precluded a meaningful economic assessment of the income generating effects on the target group of communities.

4. The criteria and procedures currently being used in the selection and implementation of SDA activities were found to be in general conformance with related Mission regulations. However, no corresponding set of Agency regulations could be identified and any substantive judgment on conformance with Agency regulations is currently precluded.

5. The criteria and procedures currently established for the selection and implementation of the SDA subprojects are considered quite thorough and appropriate for normal SDA activities. There are, however, some recent modifications to these guidelines which need to be formally incorporated into a revision of the Mission's principal controlling regulation, Local Order No. 2-2 of August 24, 1983. To further strengthen its application to income generation goals, the Mission might also wish to include therein selected recommendations from this evaluation report.

6. The current project staff is sorely pressed for the time to provide a minimally satisfactory level of administration for this project. Clearly, it could not provide adequate administration of an expanded project.

D. Principal Recommendations

1. Issue new Mission Local Order covering administration of SDA Project to consolidate all pertinent current guidelines plus those modifications which Mission accepts from this evaluation report.

2. The highest priority among subproject proposals should be assigned to those of vital economic infrastructure and those involving participation of a capable secondary support organization.

3. Consistent with the project's new developmental thrust, the Project Committee should be reorganized without the traditional Embassy and USIS participation.

4. A special effort should be made to identify and develop a selected group of secondary support organizations interested in and capable of assisting the SDA target groups as appropriate.

5. Any expansion of the project must include the provision of additional staff support.

ATTACHMENTS

K. Attachments (List attachments submitted with this Evaluation Summary; always attach copy of full evaluation report, even if one was submitted earlier; attach studies, surveys, etc., from "on-going" evaluation, if relevant to the evaluation report.)

Letter from USAID to Checchi and Company DP-382/83-L dated 08/22/88.

PIO/T No. 511-0000.04-3-80011

COMMENTS

L. Comments By Mission, AID/W Office and Borrower/Grantee On Full Report

1. Despite a request for copies of the questionnaires for 15 evaluated subprojects and/or a statistical analysis of the findings, the final report did not provide this.
2. The report also lacked an analysis of the forms and procedures used for selecting SDA subprojects.
3. In general, the report was helpful and well done.