

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/Islamabad</u> (ES# <u>88-5</u>)		B. Was Evaluation Scheduled in Current FY Annual Evaluation Plan? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Slipped <input type="checkbox"/> Ad Hoc <input type="checkbox"/> Evaluation Plan Submission Date: FY <u>9</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)
391-0467	Irrigation Systems Management	June 4, 1983	Feb 15, 1991	\$90,000	\$67,000

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
1. USAID to work with Federal and Provincial officials to design and authorize a follow-on ISM-II project based in part on lessons learned from the evaluation. All recommendations have been considered and most areas of emphasis (monitoring and evaluation; training needs; equipment acquisition, management and utilization; operation and maintenance; provincial level technical assistance; and adoption by PIDs of the new design methods) will be incorporated in the final design. This action responds to the first fifteen recommendations listed in Part II of this evaluation summary.	GRAndersen, PDM	Dec, 1988
2. USAID and Provincial Irrigation Departments review progress on the fulfillment of the project covenant on improving cost recovery through adequate collection of water charges.	A. Newman, ARD	Mar.1990 <u>1/</u> Mar.1991 <u>1/</u> Mar.1992 <u>1/</u> Mar.1993 <u>1/</u>
3. USAID to work with PIDs and FCC to develop, install and use an improved evaluation and monitoring system. Reports generated as a result of this activity are to be distributed to USAID and appropriate government agencies.	A. Newman, ARD	Apr.1989 <u>2/</u> May 1989 <u>2/</u>
4. PIDs to initiate implementation of the annual maintenance review of the rehabilitated works.	PIDs	June 1989

*1/ After review of a nation-wide study for improving assessment and collection of water charges which is scheduled for completion in Dec. 1989, USAID and the World Bank will suggest this schedule to review with the PIDs the progress on the fulfillment of the project covenant.
 2/ By these dates, it is expected that necessary agreements would have been reached by the FCC with ACOP and the Provincial Departments of Planning and Development for monitoring and evaluation.*

(Attach extra sheet if necessary)

APPROVALS

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

G. Approvals of Evaluation Summary And Action Decisions:

Name (Typed)	Project/Program Officer	Representative of Borrower/Grantee	Evaluation Officer	Mission or AID/W Office Director
	Alvin Newman, ARD	Asif H. Kazi	Jonathan S. Addleton	James A. Norris
Signature	<i>Alvin Newman</i>	<i>Asif H. Kazi</i>	<i>Jonathan S. Addleton</i>	<i>James A. Norris</i>
Date	14 Dec 88			14 Dec 1988

ABSTRACT

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

The Irrigation Systems Management Project, aims to deliver reliable and equitable water supplies to farmers by rehabilitating Pakistan's Irrigation and drainage system and by improving institutions to enable them to sustain those improvements. This project is being implemented by the four Provincial Irrigation Departments (PIDs) and the GOP's Federal Coordination Cell. This mid-term evaluation (1983-1991) was conducted by a team from the Irrigation Support Project for Asia and Neareast (ISPAN) based on a review of data reports and other records and activities carried out under the ISM Project, interviews with USAID, contractor, GOP and GOP Provincial personnel involved in the project, and visits to provincial irrigation district offices and rehabilitation sites.

The team found that physical improvements have been easier to undertake than institutional improvements. Even though the project emphasized a systems approach to institutional development, the evaluation team remarked that the project seems to have adopted a "band-aid" approach to patch up most of the vulnerable parts of the system. They indicate however, that this implementation approach was justified and the effort successful.

The team noted that much of the project management focus has been on establishing "yardsticks" to identify and respond to various management problems, and a lack of viable mechanisms to sustain improvements. The team concludes that, as a result activities to-date have primarily set in place a foundation for future initiatives.

The team found that limited institutional impact results from management deficiencies; that implementation lacked a guiding force to synchronize inputs and outputs to obtain project objectives; and that given the quality of the project TA and lack of understanding of the PIDs as institutions the overall outcome has been positive.

First, a common ground has been established as a basis to address future institutional development and second, PIDs and USAID are in a better position to identify specific areas in which assistance is needed.

In sum, the evaluation team indicated that it is unrealistic to expect the promises of ISM to have been fulfilled at this stage as they were exaggerated, overstated, and did not represent a common agenda at the outset. Nonetheless, some movement is evident and the overall results are consistent with the broad objectives. Most importantly, the team confirms the basic wisdom of project objectives and the appropriateness of AID's decision to pursue them in a more focused manner.

The team indicates that the project strategy is sound and urges AID to signal such a commitment, develop a time-table, in conjunction with World Bank and the GOP to fit the time and resources available, and identify reciprocal responsibilities and commitments. A number of recommendations regarding redesign of a follow on project emphasize short term and long term sustainability objectives in both operation and maintenance as well as rehabilitation.

COSTS

I. Evaluation Costs

1. Evaluation Team		Contract Number OR TDY Person Days	Contract Cost OR TDY Cost (U.S. \$)	Source of Funds
Name	Affiliation			
Jack Cave, Equipment and Workshop Specialist	Irrigation Support Project for Asia and Neareast (ISPAN)	192	\$116,500	Project Funds
W. A. Garvey, Water Resource Engr, and Chief of Party				
Ken Nobe, Economist & Institutional Specialist				
Ted Schuurmans, P.E., Public Works Engineer				
Larry Swarner, P.E., Operation and Maintenance Specialist				
Clay Wescott, Management & Computerization Specialist				
2. Mission/Office Professional Staff		3. Borrower/Grantee Professional		
Person-Days (Estimate) _____ 20		Staff Person-Days (Estimate) _____ 10		

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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li style="width: 50%;">• Purpose of evaluation and methodology used <li style="width: 50%;">• Principal recommendations <li style="width: 50%;">• Purpose of activity(ies) evaluated <li style="width: 50%;">• Lessons learned <li style="width: 50%;">• Findings and conclusions (relate to questions) 		
<p>Mission or Office: USAID/Islamabad</p>	<p>Date This Summary Prepared: September, 1988</p>	<p>Title And Date Of Full Evaluation Report: Evaluation of the Rehabilitation and Institutional Strengthening Components</p>
<p>The Irrigation Systems Management Project aims primarily at equitable and reliable water delivery through four discrete but inter-related components 1) rehabilitation works 2) institutional strengthening 3) research and policy implementation and 4) command water management. Only the first two components are covered under this evaluation. While the project was initiated in 1983 the third and fourth components did not begin until 1985 and 1986 respectively.</p> <p>The mid-term evaluation was called to evaluate progress from the initial project agreement signing on June 5, 1983 to date. Recommendations were also requested to serve as a guide for the design of the follow on project, ISM-II. The team was requested to provide specific recommendations regarding the need to continue selected elements of the original ISM project. Primary information sources included visits to GOP Federal and GOP Provincial PID offices and interviews with USAID contractor and technically oriented project teams. In addition, a series of background reports were provided.</p> <p>The team found that the implementation of the project was hampered by the complex institutional arrangements involving the Federal Coordination Cell, Provincial Coordinators, several federal agencies, six technical assistance teams, a supervisory consultant and a variety of USAID staff. While the implementation called for rehabilitation works to be completed within three years of the date of the project agreement and for other activities to be completed within five years of the project agreement date, difficulties in finding a common base to proceed and the over ambitious goals and schedule of the original project design served to hinder and delay the implementation.</p> <p>Despite the long and difficult start up period, it is evident that ISM has had beneficial impact on construction and rehabilitation practices, primarily due to the enforcement of specifications. While civil works on canals and drains was carried out with a broad degree of success, institutional improvements designed to improve the ongoing operation and maintenance capabilities of the provincial irrigation districts have had little measurable and sustainable impact.</p> <p>Further, the equipment chosen for use in canal and drain rehabilitation was often of the wrong size and capability for the work required. Moreover, the absence of effective communication between USAID, the PIDs, consulting firms and the technical assistance consultants has probably been the greatest problem in implementing the over all rehabilitation program. The consultants found a lack of direction throughout the program caused it to move more slowly than was originally anticipated. Specific problems, such as lack of agreement on the use of hydraulic design criteria were major obstacles to making progress in rehabilitation.</p>		

3

S U M M A R Y (Continued)

The team noted that while one of the main objectives of the project was to increase the operation and maintenance capability of the PIDs, it was difficult to measure, quantitatively, the degree of success in meeting any of the envisioned institutional improvement goals. The evaluation team found that monitoring and evaluation was not taken seriously. Thus, it was not possible to substantiate some of the impressions and judgments as firmly as needed. Even though the original goals envisioned in ISM were overly optimistic, the team found that the ISM project has contributed to institutional improvement generally and provides a good foundation for continuing institutional improvement during any follow on project.

While the evaluation team endorses the continuation of the combined ISM/ISR project, a number of recommendations were made to be incorporated in the design of any follow on project.

Recommendations from the evaluation are summarized below:

- Further rehabilitation work should follow a system concept and should include a construction and equipment use plan.
- Both construction and maintenance of civil works should be closely monitored.
- ISM-II TA should consist of a long term advisor based in each province to work an "advise and assist" basis. Additionally, the Chief of Party should be assigned to the Federal Coordinating Cell.
- A monitoring and evaluation program should be implemented as a continuous, simple and clearly designed system under the review of a U.S. direct contract PSC.
- USAID and IBRD should view ISM and ISR as a single integrated project.
- The ISM-II follow on project should provide a broad strategic framework, realistic expectations, and sufficient flexibility to adapt the approach and resources within the project time frame.
- The USAID assigned direct hire project officer should concentrate on guidance of the conceptual work plan, allocation of resources, policy dialogue and monitoring and evaluation.
- USAID and PIDs should come to agreement on the use of Hydraulic Design Criteria.
- The follow on project should provide for the collection and evaluation of data.
- Trial sets of equipment should be procured for use at division and subdivision levels before further large scale equipment procurement.
- Equipment, other than trial equipment should not be procured, repaired or rehabilitated until adequate inventory and utilization plans are prepared.
- USAID should improve its ability to take timely remedial action by assigning clear responsibility for corrective action.

S U M M A R Y (Continued)

- Training efforts should focus primarily on in-country in-service training. Skill training should be coordinated with equipment installation, construction, renovation of facilities or institutional adjustments.
- Institutionalization of training in the PIDs should be continued by developing the training and management cells.
- Efforts should be focused on training Provincial Irrigation Department field staff in planning and carrying out maintenance activities directly related to yardsticks and budgets which should be the basis for monitoring maintenance performance and benefits.
- PIDs should, if necessary, amend maintenance yardsticks to reflect realistic operation and maintenance costs.
- An annual maintenance review of rehabilitated works should be implemented to assist in preparation of maintenance plans, budgets and monitoring of maintenance cost and effectiveness.

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.)

IRRIGATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT (391-0467)

"EVALUATION OF THE REHABILITATION AND INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTHENING COMPONENTS"

COMMENTS

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

The Irrigation Systems Management evaluation was conducted in early January-February, 1988 after an earlier ISM draft project amendment paper was found unacceptable. At that time the certainty of a follow on project was doubtful especially after a series of negative audit reports questioning the overall efficacy of the project implementation. While the evaluation of the rehabilitation and institutional strengthening components carried out by ISPAN points out major weaknesses in the project implementation, it also endorses the project concept and indicates a good foundation has been established for continuing institutional improvement.

Specific findings and recommendations drawn from the evaluation are being used in the development of the ISM-II follow on project paper. Most recommendations and specific findings noted in the evaluation are being incorporated into the follow on document.