

A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY PART I

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

PD-ABA-379

64472

IDENTIFICATION DATA

A. REPORTING A.I.D. UNIT: <u>S&T/RD/RRD</u> <small>(Mission or AID/W Office)</small> (ES# _____)	B. WAS EVALUATION SCHEDULED IN CURRENT FY ANNUAL EVALUATION PLAN? yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> skipped <input type="checkbox"/> ad hoc <input type="checkbox"/> Eval. Plan Submission Date: FY ___ 0 ___	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 (FY)	Most recent PACD (mo/yr)	Planned LOP Cost (000)	Amount Obligated to Date (000)
931-1135					
931-1135	Human Settlements and Resource System Analysis	7/1/84	9/30/90		\$6,254,672

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) Develop a concept paper building on the evaluation findings.	D. Dworkin	1/30/88
2) Set up a steering committee consisting of a representative of Clark University and of IDA and the SARSA project officer.	D. Dworkin	12/30/87
3) Develop plans for dissemination of the research results emanating from the project.	D. Dworkin	12/30/87
4) Restrict field work until first draft of synthesis papers are complete. Excepting only continuing work funded by Mission buy in..	D. Dworkin	12/30/87
5) Require Clark University and IDA submit plan for research cooperation and coordination.	D. Dworkin	12/30/87
6) Assuming the concept paper approval set up AID/W working group consisting of representatives of the regional and central bureaus to assist in the formulation of a follow on project.	D. Dworkin	3/1/88
7) Develop plans with AFR/DP to hold conference on African River Basins.	D. Dworkin	2/1/88

(Attach extra sheet if necessary)

APPROVALS

F. DATE OF MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE REVIEW OF EVALUATION: mo <u>2</u> day <u>1</u> yr <u>87</u>			
G. APPROVALS OF EVALUATION SUMMARY AND ACTION DECISIONS:			
Project/Program Officer Signature: <u>[Signature]</u> Typed Name: Daniel Dworkin Date: <u>1/25/88</u>	Representative of Borrower/Grantee Signature: <u>[Signature]</u> Avrom Bendavid-Val Date: <u>2/29/88</u>	Evaluation Officer Signature: <u>[Signature]</u> Daniel Dworkin Date: <u>1/26/88</u>	Mission or AID/W Office Director Signature: <u>[Signature]</u> Eric Chetwynd, Jr. Date: <u>2/29/88</u>

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

The SARSA goal is to increase the local capacity for effective management and preservation of the productive rural resource base; to increase agricultural productivity and rural income and to provide regional employment opportunities both rural and urban.

The purpose is to increase AID's ability to incorporate spatial and locational analysis and resource management perspectives into the design, implementation and evaluation activities of regional development projects.

The cooperative agreement focused the work into three broad subject areas all related to regional development. These are human settlement systems, the economic activity between rural and urban areas and the sustainability of natural resource systems.

The evaluation found that the SARSA performance was very good. SARSA research was of high quality and was useful to the AID/W, the Missions and the development community.

The project has increased the pool of knowledgeable researchers in both in the US and in the host country who are available to the Agency in the three theme areas, settlements, rural urban exchange and natural resource management.

The negative findings of the evaluation included the lack of anticipated integration of the geographic and anthropological perspectives and the, at times, uncoordinated and unrelated research carried out under the project.

ABSTRACT

L. EVALUATION COSTS

1. Evaluation Team Name	Affiliation	Contract Number OR TDY Person Days	Contract Cost OR TDY Cost (US\$)	Source of Funds
Daniel Dworkin,	ST/RD/RRD			
Pat Vondal,	AAAS Fellow	30	3600	AAAS Funds
Rowland Illick,	"TVT Associate	PDC - 0085-I-00-6108-05	20,000	S&T/RD
Steven Reyna	"			
David Van T. Jr.				

2. Mission/Office Professional Staff Person-Days (estimate) 30

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

COSTS

21

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 (relate to questions)
- Principal recommendations
- Lessons learned

Mission or Office: S&T/RD/RRD

Date this summary prepared: 1-15-88

Title and Date of Full Evaluation Report: Interim Evaluation - Human Settlements and Natural Resource System Analysis December 1987

The SARSA project goal is to increase the local capacity for effective management and preservation of the productive rural resource base; to increase agricultural productivity and rural income and to provide regional employment opportunities. Within this broad mandate it focused on three themes:

Issues relating to settlement and resettlement analysis, planning and implementation.

The development implications of the exchanges between rural and urban areas.

The issues related to the sustained use of natural resource systems and in particular the implications for sustainable development and the interaction between the resources and the resource user group.

Evaluation purpose and methodology:

The evaluation is an interim evaluation designed to suggest mid course corrections in the project and to determine if and in what form the project should be continued.

The evaluation posed four questions:

Quality of Research. What was the overall quality of the research?

Usefulness of Research. What has been learned from the research that is useful to AID policy formulation, programming and project operations?

Improving Resources Available to AID. Have the cooperating institutions enlarged and strengthened the base of expertise available to AID?

Strengthening Host Country Capabilities. Has the project involved host country professionals in the research so as to enhance their knowledge and skills?

The evaluation pursued these questions through five activities: field visits to Missions; queries by cable to Missions; a review of the literature produced by the project; interviews with relevant persons in AID/W and site visits to Clark University and the Institute for Development Anthropology.

The work was carried out by a team consisting of evaluation personnel provided by an IQC firm, an anthropologist working at S&T/RD under a fellowship from the American Academy for the advancement of Science and the current SARSA project manager. The methodology was consistent with the guidance in the AID Evaluation Handbook.

Findings:

Overall project performance was considered very good. SARSA research and researchers have been of high quality and have produced information of high utility to AID/W, the Missions and the larger development community.

The project has increased the pool of knowledgeable researchers in the US and in the host countries.

In some subject areas the research has been outstanding. The work on the Africa river basins has, for the first time, focused on the institutions and infrastructure providing the control of the water resource rather than the physical structures such as dams and barrages. The Panama research helped untangle and rationalize a complex project and made it possible to manage a complex urban project.

Balanced against the project achievements there were two deficiencies noted in the evaluation. First the intended integration of geographic and anthropological perspectives has not materialized to the degree anticipated. Second SARSA field research activities have been at times uncoordinated, and at times unrelated as a consequence of a less than fully formulated and integrated long term research strategy. The problem of integration has risen to a great extent as a result of the project's trying to be as responsive as possible to Mission requests.

Overall participants in the evaluation are unanimous in their belief that Clark University and IDA share the aspirations of AID for SARSA. They have concluded, therefore, that a strategy can be developed that will overcome the obstacles to fuller collaboration and integration, lead to achievement of the purposes of SARSA by the end of the cooperative agreement and address future needs in the areas covered by the present SARSA project.

The evaluation sets out the strategy for the balance of the project, much of which has been set in place by the AID project manager prior to the completion of the evaluation. These activities have been detailed in section E of this evaluation summary, ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR.

The evaluation concludes that SARSA has been and continues to be a valuable project and resource for AID. It is particularly well suited to addressing Agency concerns with raising incomes, especially rural incomes, in a way that can be sustained.

Recommendations:

- 1) AID project officer should play a more substantive role in defining the research agenda of the project.

- 2) SARSA should, when at all possible, use professionals from the staffs at Clark and IDA and their professional networks. Exceptions should be made only when the necessary expertise cannot be accessed from either institution, and only with the express approval of the AID SARSA Project Officer.
- 3) Scopes of work for Mission support activities should be fully detailed in writing and cleared in writing by the requesting Mission and the project steering committee. Any changes in scopes of work of field support activities and of field staff personnel should be carefully spelled out and cleared in a similar manner.
- 4) New field support assignments should not be accepted by SARSA until synthesis reports in its three theme areas and a synthesis report on the integration of its three theme areas have been completed in initial draft.
- 5) Field assignments should be justified in writing with attention to their consistency with and contributions to the research agenda.
- 6) Clark University and IDA should propose a plan to ensure the collaboration originally envisioned for the Cooperative Agreement for approval by S&T/RD.
- 7) For the remainder of the current cooperative agreement, steering committee meeting should be held bimonthly. These meetings should consist of the AID project manager and a person from Clark and IDA with the delegated authority to make decisions.
- 8) The synthesis reports being prepared as well as the other research activities undertaken should have express dissemination plans.
- 9) A follow on project incorporating recommendations from the evaluation should be developed.