

A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY - PART I

PL 442-906

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

IDENTIFICATION DATA

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
| <b>A. Reporting A.I.D. Unit:</b><br>Mission or AID/W Office <u>S&amp;T/FENR</u><br>(ES# _____)   |  | <b>B. Was Evaluation Scheduled In Current FY Annual Evaluation Plan?</b><br>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Skipped <input type="checkbox"/> Ad Hoc <input type="checkbox"/><br>Evaluation Plan Submission Date: FY ____ Q ____ | <b>C. Evaluation Timing</b><br>Interim <input type="checkbox"/> Final <input checked="" type="checkbox"/><br>Ex Post <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <b>D. Activity or Activities Evaluated</b> (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) |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 936-5519    | Forest Resources Management (FRM) | 1980                           | 9/90                     | \$19,820               | \$14,196                       |

ACTIONS

| <b>E. Action Decisions Approved By Mission or AID/W Office Director</b><br>Action(s) Required   |  | Name of Officer Responsible for Action                                | Date Action to be Completed                          |
|---|--|---|--|
| <b>A. Follow-on Project Planning and Preparation</b><br>1. Based on the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the final evaluation, design and implement the follow-on project. This involves the following action:<br>- finalization of the PID/Concept Paper.<br>- preparation and approval of PP<br>- develop PAF/CN<br>- implement follow-on project<br>2. Develop mode of contracting for the follow-on project.<br>3. Negotiate structure and components of the follow-on project.<br>4. Determine the amount and type of contribution from U.S. Forest Service to the follow-on project. |  | S&T/FENR<br>"<br>"<br>"<br>S&T/FENR-OICD<br>S&T/FENR-USFS-IF<br>" " " | 1/90<br>6/90<br>6/90<br>7/90<br>2/90<br>2/90<br>2/90 |
| <b>B. Project Management and Finances</b><br>1. Obligate the available resources to initiate selected components of the follow-on project.<br>2. Determine when other components of the project can be phased-in as resources become available.   |  | AID/W<br>S&T/FENR-USFS-IF   | 2/90<br>6/90   |

APPROVALS

**F. Date Of Mission Or AID/W Office Review Of Evaluation:**  
 (Month) (Day) (Year)  
 November 17, 1989

**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 |
|--------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
|              | Carl M. Gallegos        | Arlene Mitchell                    | Frank Z. Alejandro               | Twig Johnson (Actg.)             |
| Signature    | <i>Carl M. Gallegos</i> | <i>Arlene Mitchell</i>             | <i>Frank Z. Alejandro 2/9/90</i> | <i>Twig Johnson 1/31/89</i>      |
| Date         | 25 Jan. 1990            | 2/5/90                             |                                  |                                  |

**ABSTRACT**

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

The project aims at providing technical backstopping, expert referral services, research and training, agriculture/forestry program demonstrations and support for private enterprise initiatives to assist the less-developed countries (LDCs) in the design and implementation of effective forestry-related development activity. This project is being implemented under a RSSA with the U.S. Forest Service and OICD and a PASA with Peace Corps. This final evaluation (8/80-9/90), which focussed on activities done under the RSSA, was conducted by an AID/S&T team on the basis of a review of project documents (including the 8/83 mid-term evaluation and FY 83 project amendment), visits to seven USAID Missions, questionnaires sent to 25 USAID Missions, and interviews with AID/W personnel and interested parties in the Washington, D.C. forestry community. The major findings and conclusions are:

- FSP has successfully delivered its intended products, directly or indirectly, influencing AID operations in the forestry sector.
- Both within and apart from AID, professionals knowledgeable about FSP expressed a favorable attitude towards its professional staff, USFS institutional relationship, and delivery of services.
- FSP has been a major source of continuity and institutional memory on matters regarding AID natural resource/forestry issues, practices, and lessons.
- Project management is credited with a high degree of professional competence, is greatly respected for the establishment and continuation of the FSP effort, and is given much credit for the correct balance between independence and direction. Management of the program by FSP staff was adroit and of high quality.
- AID Missions and Bureaus expressed a "virtually unqualified 'yes'" for the continuation of FSP services. Technical support needs in forestry and renewable natural resources in AID are increasing, and a diversifying agenda of assistance in forestry is creating additional support needs, e.g., agroforestry, social forestry, legal and policy aspects, etc.
- Ideas for additional services or functions of the follow-on project included:
  - In addition to satisfying Missions' requests, FSP should assume a more proactive role;
  - The scope of programmatic studies that explore new initiatives could be expanded to include all renewable natural resources that involve forested lands;
  - There is a need for studies of global and regional scope that address different themes and approaches to the topic of "advances in development assistance in renewable natural resources management."

**C O S T S**

**I. Evaluation Costs**

| 1. Evaluation Team                          |  | Contract Number OR<br>TDY Person Days   | Contract Cost OR<br>TDY Cost (U.S. \$) | Source of Funds                       |
|---|--|---|--|---------------------------------------|
| Name  | Affiliation  |   |  |                                       |
| William R. Burch<br>(Team Leader)           | Tropical Research & Develop.<br>(TRD)<br>(Yale University School of<br>Forestry) | 33                                      | \$15,190.56                            | Project<br>Evaluation<br>Funds<br>and |
| Peter H. Freeman                            | TRD Contract (Freeman, Inc.)   | 45                                      | \$20,336.40                            | Small                                 |
| Gerold Grosenick                            | TRD Contract (Consultant)  | 28                                      | \$11,289.60                            | Activities                            |
| Michael Hardin                              | TRD Employee   | 3                                       | \$ 1,009.26                            | Funds                                 |
| Other Direct Costs                          |  | --                                      | \$32,049.62                            |                                       |
|   |  |   | \$87,000                               |                                       |
| <b>2. Mission/Office Professional Staff</b> |  | <b>3. Borrower/Grantee Professional</b> |  |                                       |
| Person-Days (Estimate) <u>45</u>            |  | Staff Person-Days (Estimate) <u>45</u>  |  |                                       |

## A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY - PART II

### SUMMARY

J. Summary of Evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations (Try not to exceed the three (3) pages provided)

Address the following items:

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

Mission or Office:

S&T/FENR

Date This Summary Prepared:

January 25, 1990

Title And Date Of Full Evaluation Report:

The Greening of A.I.D. 1980-1990  
October, 1989 (December, 1989 final version)

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Forestry Support Program (FSP) is a ten-year (1980-1990) support program implemented through a Resources Support Service Agreement (RSSA), with the USDA/Office of International Cooperation and Development supplying the technical resources of the Forest Services. The program's main product is technical backing to the Regional Bureaus, USAID missions, the Peace Corps, and various private volunteer organizations (PVO). This support is provided directly or arranged by a core staff whose offices have been located in Rosslyn, Virginia. The core staff has also established a computerized roster of forestry experts and related referral services, and pursued various thematic or programmatic initiatives including food aid support for forestry, agroforestry, social forestry, and training.

A final project evaluation of the FSP component of the USAID Forest Resources Management Project (FRMP) was performed during July to September 1989. The evaluation was conducted under independent contract to Tropical Research & Development, Inc (TR&D), and was performed by a three-member team that initially conducted joint interviews of A.I.D. staff in Washington D.C., followed by individual field trips to each of the three regions of major interest. To supplement the information obtained through direct interview, a questionnaire was dispatched to those missions not visited by the Team. Team members were Dr. William Burch, Mr. Peter Freeman, and Mr. Gerry Grosenick.

The program activities during the 1983-1989 period were emphasized during the evaluation, though future directions and initiatives were also explored on the basis of five thematic papers prepared by USDA scientists and technicians.

Preliminary results were delivered during oral presentations to A.I.D. staff in Washington D.C., followed by the preparation of two drafts and this final report.

## 2.0 EVALUATION RESULTS

### Technical Performance

FSP has successfully delivered its intended products, directly or indirectly influencing A.I.D. operations in the forestry sector. Numerous discrete tasks that contributed in some measure to FRM's goals have also been completed, such as the Forest Private Enterprise Initiative (FPEI) in Ecuador; financial support to the University of Michigan's Forest Administration and Management Seminar during its first two years; and sponsorship of various conferences, training events, seminars, and publications. However, the impact of these activities on the FRM project purposes and goals (e.g., halt deforestation, cure rural poverty) are difficult to determine and are probably not measurable.

Technical Support

Both within and apart from A.I.D., those professionals who have first- and second-hand knowledge about FSP universally expressed a favorable attitude towards its professional staff, USFS institutional relationship and delivery of services. The field (i.e., mission and field regional) clients had mid to high levels of satisfaction with the performance of the project, expressing particularly high regard for the referral service, the information contained in the monthly and quarterly reports, and the special reports, such as "Profiles of USA Forestry Schools," or "The Job Seekers Guide to Opportunities in Natural Resources Management in the Developing World."

Personnel in the regional bureaus expressed overall satisfaction with FSP technical backstopping, though some experts in the Regional Bureaus thought that FSP responded to a good many small needs or demands while lacking a larger vision that could provide coherence to these multiple small actions.

FSP has been a major source of continuity and institutional memory on matters regarding A.I.D. natural resource/forestry issues, practices, and lessons.

FSP Consultancies

FSP staff consultancies are provided as a free or subsidized service to the USAID missions, which accounts for much of their attractiveness. Additionally, many clients expressed more confidence in their working relationships with this USFS-based program than those maintained with private consultants. This can be taken as an indirect measure of the high quality of FSP core staff people with whom the missions and bureaus have interacted.

On the other hand, few USFS personnel outside of the core staff have actually been used for consultancies (Table 1). Furthermore many people believe that career foresters are too limited in their abilities, or that the forestry profession itself is too narrowly focused. Some clients felt that FSP, by hiring consultants and or sending its own staff members on consultancies, competes with the private sector.

Referral Service

The referral service is widely appreciated, and the FSP computerized roster is generally regarded as one of the better such devices in existence. Although it was impossible to draw broad conclusions regarding the quality of specific services performed, those clients whose recruiting efforts were aided by the roster were pleased with the service received.

The requirement for such a service is evolving. Many of the missions and even some NGOs now have their own rosters. Further, the expanding agenda of natural resource management needs in the various countries, missions and bureaus requires a wide array of technical expertise (e.g., ecologists, economic botanists, rural sociologists, soil scientists,

anthropologists, etc.) which currently has poor representation in the roster. The FSP has carried out special outreach efforts to address these deficiencies (Annex 14).

A few individuals expressed doubts regarding the roster's overall utility, suggesting that the selection criteria may be applied in too restrictive a manner, or that FSP may not have succeeded in attracting sufficient numbers of professionals from certain fields.

### Core Technical Staff (Coordinators)

In general, USAID missions and bureau staff expressed satisfaction with the caliber and contributions of the FSP regional and specialized coordinators, with the following minor exceptions:

The Training Coordinator is the only staff member with a Bureau-vetted, annual work plan (12 months). However, judging from evaluations of this activity, the work of the Training Coordinator and the training program proper have both been very effective. The overall performance of the Agriculture/Forestry Coordinator, the Social Forestry Coordinator, and the coordinator concerned with Food for Peace and PVOs could not be evaluated for several reasons: lack of documentation of the impact of specific activities pursued by these coordinators, objectively verifiable indicators of sub-program goals, or work plans for use by these coordinators. However, there were notable cases where the Food and Voluntary Assistance Coordinator has catalyzed support for PVO actions from mission food aid resources (e.g., the case of CARE in Peru).

### Networking and Information Outreach

FSP has performed well in the promotion of information exchange among professionals. FSP's open-door policy is an important ingredient in its networking capacity.

At Peace Corps/Ecuador there was high satisfaction with the training and technical support for forestry volunteers provided through Peace Corps' Office of Training and Program Support (whose forestry-specific support work is largely funded by FRM).

### FPEI in Ecuador

Performance of the Forestry Private Enterprise Initiative (FPEI) in Ecuador was exceptional in the judgment of the private sector institutions that benefitted from this two-year activity, namely AIMA and CORMADERA. The high impact and effectiveness of this demonstration portion of FPEI was attributed in large part to the excellent performance of the technical advisor posted there. However, the sustainability of the FPEI work in Ecuador has been jeopardized by inflation and a transition in government that have resulted in less support for the private sector in general.

## FSP Management

The Evaluation Team found that the management of the program by FSP staff was adroit and of high quality. The S&T/FENR role in the creation and direction of FSP is nearly invisible, which merits an effort towards increased visibility.

Members of the regional bureau staff said that the FSP regional coordinators should spend more time physically present in the bureau offices, in order to become part of their bureau's "culture" and to enhance communication, efficiency, and effectiveness of performance.

The fact that the FSP is executed through an RSSA (which is normally the vehicle for obtaining supplementary staff support) without either physical presence in the A.I.D. offices or continuous supervision creates the need for (1) extra A.I.D. management effort to ensure effective actions consistent with A.I.D. needs and FRM goals, (2) short (three-month) and medium (six-month to 12-month) work plans that ensure actions consistent with a defined goal or set of goals, or (3) continuous measurement and assessment of the impacts (results) of actions and events.

Additional A.I.D. management in the form of weekly meetings among FSP, FRM, and Office of International Cooperation and Development (OICD) managers with the S&T/FENR director of the Office of Forestry, Environment and Natural Resources was instituted in the mid-1980s. Only one coordinator had a work plan (Training Coordinator) which was organized around a "strategic goal." For other coordinators, actions proper have been partly documented, but not their impacts.

## Mission Awareness of FSP and FSP Relationships with Other S&T and Bureau Support Projects

Individual personalities can have greater impact in A.I.D. than the overall program of which they are a part. Hence, the work of individual FSP professionals may overshadow the overall FSP program, and relationships between projects, programs, and missions will change as a consequence when these key interpersonal connections change. In one sense, the parts are greater than the sum of the whole in A.I.D. programs and projects.

FSP had an operational link to F/FRED project through the Social Forester, who was funded from that project. FSP staff have worked frequently with broad support projects such as the NRMS and DESFIL projects, but less frequently or not at all with other more narrowly focussed support projects which are operationally compatible, such as SMSS.

Many field mission personnel are unaware of the services available to them through FSP. Some field mission personnel feel that an awareness of and contact with FSP is not necessary since they can resort to the Regional Forestry Advisors or Regional Bureaus, who in turn can contact FSP.

FSP as an entity and a source of specific services is not part of the culture of most missions because of the regular and rapid turnover of professional personnel in the USAID offices. Larger projects tend to crowd out smaller projects in the awareness and memory of A.I.D. officers, hence FSP may simply be overlooked. Furthermore, forestry is often a part of large, multiple resource projects such as MANRES in Thailand; hence, the primary interest may be in ecology rather than traditional forestry.

### Design

A considerable amount of useful flexibility was built into the project design which allowed latitude to change directions or initiate new actions. The disadvantage of this flexibility has been a somewhat "free-floating" work program characterized by many diverse actions whose accumulated impact has not been measured. Even if measured, such measurement would suffer from the lack of strategic goals against which to assess impacts. The design of the project did not specify such evaluations or the need to monitor the impacts of individual activities.

Except for evaluations of individual training events and of the FPEI initiative in Ecuador (INFORDE), there has been no monitoring or periodic evaluation of the impact of FSP activities, costs of the services, means of delivery, and managerial efficiency.

### Should FSP be Continued?

Missions and bureaus desire the continuation of many FSP services. The requirement for support in forestry and renewable natural resources by the A.I.D./Washington Bureau is increasing. The need for general support in production and research forestry at the mission level is declining, but a diversifying agenda of assistance in forestry is creating additional requirements for support in areas such as agroforestry, social forestry, and legal/policy aspects.

Regionally-based foresters and some bureau foresters noted the importance of agroforestry, social forestry, private enterprise considerations, and NGO actions in forestry (particularly agroforestry). However, comments on these themes did not suggest a need for "special initiatives" or full-time staff support. These aspects of forestry are no longer entirely new. They are being integrated into development projects in a wide variety of contexts, with an associated accumulation of documented experience. On the other hand, agroforestry, social forestry, and entrepreneurial forestry are not thoroughly integrated into either the forestry or the agricultural sector and their usefulness, development benefits, and means of promotion are still being worked out. It is concluded that some level of programmatic and technical advisory support is needed to assist bureaus and missions to carry work forward along these lines or other into other promising themes. The required level and nature of program support and promotion cannot be defined, but it would at least entail access to expertise, information, training, and overview studies.

A separate review paper commissioned by the FRM project manager has examined in the needs and responses to possible technical themes in greater depth, including those listed above ("Initiatives in Forestry Support" by Mr. Peter H. Freeman, September 1989 [draft]).

### **3.0 CONTINUATION OF SPECIFIC FSP SERVICES**

There was a virtual consensus with regard to the desired continuation of the following services: referral services, technical backstopping to missions and regional bureaus, information services and outreach through periodic technical memos and reports, networking functions (e.g., brown bag seminars in Washington, D.C., mailings of job announcements to roster entrants), and training. The regional bureaus and missions suggested modification and improvements for all of these services.

### **4.0 NEEDS FOR ADDITIONAL SERVICES AND FUNCTIONS**

Ideas for additional services or functions emerged from the various interviews as well as from the Evaluation Team's internal collaboration. These ideas are:

- The technical continuity ("institutional memory" and "repository of agency experience in forestry") function should be made a more explicit and systematic function.
- Many clients believed that FSP should, in addition to satisfying mission requests, assume a more pro-active role.
- When considering new technical initiatives, a variety of administrative formulations should be considered before selecting the one most appropriate.
- The scope of programmatic studies that explore new initiatives could be expanded to include all renewable natural resources that involve forested lands and all rural land uses where trees are important or indispensable elements to sustainable development. To facilitate this, an S&T inter-office coordination committee charged with program studies could be established to advise on the themes and scope of investigations to be undertaken.
- There is a need for studies of global and regional scope that address different themes and approaches to the topic of "advances in development assistance in renewable natural resources management."
- Follow-up studies on the lessons from two decades of social/community forestry activities are also needed.

## 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.)

1. "The Greening of AID 1980-1990. An Evaluation of the Science and Technology Forest Resources Management Project and Forestry Support Program in Partnership with USDA and USFS" by William R. Burch, Jr., Peter H. Freeman, and Gerold Grosenick.
2. "Initiatives in Forestry Support. Synthesis of Commentary and Critiques of Five Initiatives." Paper by Peter H. Freeman.

## COMMENTS

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

1. The overall evaluation activity and the final report faithfully followed the scope of work. Answers were provided to all questions. However, the issue of measuring long-term impacts of this and other AID projects surfaced, and recommendations were provided about how best to address this issue in the follow-on project.
2. The overall evaluation was performed during July to September, 1989, and seven Missions were visited by the team, questionnaires were sent to 25 Missions, and numerous interviews were held inside and outside AID/Washington during this time. In addition, files containing all FSP and Peace Corps publications and reports were made available. However, the evaluation team noted that much more than three months was needed to adequately address the various aspects of this complex project.
3. No biases were demonstrated by the evaluators and the report reflects the team's objectivity.
4. The evaluation was facilitated by a detailed questionnaire compiled by specialists on the evaluation team and the contractor's staff (TRD) to query the Missions about this project. This was either panafaxed or cabled to Missions, and a more thorough evaluation was achieved as a result.
5. Findings and lessons learned generally concur with those reached by AID staff and host-country officials. In addition, the evaluation team provided many valuable insights and suggestions for designing the follow-on project.
6. A third paper entitled, "Forestry Support Program for Sustainable Development, PID Concept Paper" was produced by Peter H. Freeman. This document, as well as valuable suggestions provided by Mr. Freeman, is being revised to prepare the final PID Concept Paper.