

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/SRI LANKA</u> (ES# _____)		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 ___ Q ___		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)
383-0083	Agriculture Planning & Analysis Project	1986	8/92	6,600	6,600

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.	Extend PACD by one year to August, 1993.	USAID/GSL	6/90
2.	Develop a plan for GSL funding to replace AID Project funding for specific operational costs for latter years of the project.	USAID/GSL	6/90
3.	Incorporate an expanded degree training program as part of the project implementation plan.	USAID/GSL	6/90
4.	Provide project funding for training and office equipment to support provincial agricultural planning capabilities	USAID/GSL	6/90
5.	Provide short-term consultants to work with Ministries of Lands, Irrigation and Mahaweli Development and Plantation Industries as early as possible	TA/Contractor	9/90

(Attach extra sheet if necessary)

APPROVALS

F. Date Of Mission Or AID/W Office Review Of Evaluation:				
	(Month)	(Day)	(Year)	
	5	17	1990	
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
	Gary E. Alex Project Officer	C.H.de A.Jayasinghe Project Manager	Randall H. Casey Evaluation Officer	George Jones Acting Director
Signature				
Date	5/25/90	06-13-90	6/8/90	6/14/90

**ABSTRACT**

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

The Agriculture Planning & Analysis Project No.383-0083 is a six year institution building project designed to develop an integrated national level agricultural planning system. Project outputs include trained and adequately supported staff in ministerial planning units, an inter-ministerial Agricultural Planning Group, a minimum of 15 agricultural policy program studies, and a revised National Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Strategy. Total project costs are estimated at US\$9.3 million of which AID will provide \$6.6 million and the Government of Sri Lanka (GSL) \$2.7 million.

This Evaluation is the planned mid-term evaluation. Although project activities have been slow to start (both by design and due to implementation delays), they are now picking up with the arrival of the technical assistance team. The evaluation is intended to assess the validity of the project approach in light of changes in the GSL organization and to provide input into pending decisions on revision of input plans.

The evaluation found that the value of agricultural planning is well accepted by the GSL, that the project has a reasonable chance of accomplishing objectives, and that the project carries the potential for providing a high return on investment. However, project activities are delayed and more time will be necessary to realize project objectives.

The evaluation recommended: (a) a one-year project extension; (b) developing benchmarks for replacing project funding with GSL resources; (c) consolidation of ministerial planning units; (d) increasing training activities and providing support to provincial planning units; (e) utilizing task forces for studies; and (f) providing technical assistance to Ministries of Plantation Industries and Land, Irrigation and Mahaweli Development.

**COSTS**

I. Evaluation Costs				
1. Evaluation Team				
Name	Affiliation	Contract Number OR TDY Person Days	Contract Cost OR TDY Cost (U.S. \$)	Source of Funds
Dr. Fred Mangum	Devres	383-0083-0-00- 0018-00	\$20,500	Project
2. Mission/Office Professional Staff Person-Days (Estimate) <u>20</u>		3. Borrower/Grantee Professional Staff Person-Days (Estimate) <u>15</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:

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purpose of evaluation and methodology used</li> <li>• Purpose of activity(ies) evaluated</li> <li>• Findings and conclusions (relate to questions)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Principal recommendations</li> <li>• Lessons learned</li> </ul> |
|--|--|

Mission or Office: USAID/Sri Lanka	Date This Summary Prepared: April 12, 1990	Title And Date Of Full Evaluation Report: Mid-Term Evaluation of the Sri Lanka Agriculture Planning and Analysis Project
---------------------------------------	---	--

#### A. Background

##### 1. Title

"Evaluation of the Sri Lankan Agriculture Planning and Analysis Project" (No 383-0083) April 12, 1990. The midterm evaluation was initiated by USAID-Colombo and was contracted with Devres, Inc., Bethesda, Maryland.

##### 2. Purpose

The Sri Lankan Agriculture Planning and Analysis Project began in August 1986 with an expected completion date of August 1992. The purpose of the six-year project was to develop an integrated, national-level agricultural planning system which can provide a rational basis for policy formulation and decision making in the agricultural sector. The project contributes directly to USAID-Colombo's broader goal of enhancing the contribution of the agricultural sector to overall national economic development through increased production, expanded employment and higher incomes.

The project had its genesis with the development of the first integrated National Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Strategy (NAFNS). This exercise identified several major constraints to agricultural planning in Sri Lanka: (1) limited capacity of planning unit staffs, (2) over-emphasis on projects without adequate consideration of policy impacts and priorities, (3) inadequate linkages between planners and decision makers, (4) institutional fragmentation and (5) a fragmented and inadequate data base.

Project outputs were designed to remedy these problems and result in a strengthened, integrated agricultural planning system in the context of the Sri Lankan setting. Project outputs included: (1) trained and adequately supported professional staff in planning units of participating ministries with special emphasis on the Ministry of Agricultural Development and Research (MADR) and the National Planning Division (NPD) of the Ministry of Finance and Planning, (2) a functioning inter-ministerial Agricultural Planning Group, (3) completion of a minimum of 15 agricultural policy program studies and (4) a revised and expanded NAFNS.

Total project cost is estimated at US\$ 9.3 million of which AID will provide \$ 6.6 million (71 percent) and the GSL the rupee equivalent of \$ 2.7 million (29 percent). These funds provide inputs directly related to identified problems: training, technical assistance, operational expenses, facilities and commodities.

B. Evaluation Purpose, Procedures and Scope

The mid-term evaluation of the project has the purpose of providing management information on project implementation, use of resources and progress to date and to recommend any modifications needed to achieve the project purpose. A detailed scope of work guided the evaluation throughout. Specific questions to be answered included: is the project design valid in light of governmental reorganization, are modifications needed with the institutional change and is an extension of the project needed.

Answers to these questions were sought by reviewing project documents on file at USAID-Colombo and in the project office and by interviewing key personnel with knowledge of project activities and/or the planning environment in Sri Lanka. Based on this evidence, quantitative and qualitative findings were presented and conclusions drawn regarding project implementation and progress toward stated objectives. From this analysis recommendations were derived for the remainder of project life.

C. Findings and Conclusions

The evaluation found project implementation to be delayed, partly as a result of the design which combined a host country contract with planned delayed arrival of long-term technical assistance and partly as a result of governmental reorganization and security disruptions in the country. Only 17 percent of AID expenditures had been made at the time of evaluation compared with a planned 49 percent. Total GSL expenditures, were also somewhat behind the planned rate, with 27 percent of budget expended compared to a planned 40 percent.

The arrival of a skilled, long-term policy advisor with previous working experience in Sri Lanka and excellent rapport with host government officials has moved the project activities to a higher level. This event combined with the beginning flow of returning trained planning unit staff and the enthusiasm of key GSL planners and administrators has significantly improved project performance in recent months.

Project implementation was found to be uneven across the five participating ministries with planning unit development in the Ministries of Lands, Irrigation and Mahaweli Development (MLIMD) and Plantation Industries (MPI) lagging the other three. Evidence for this conclusion was: (1) these two Ministries had the lowest rate of actual vs planned, long-term training completed (21 and 18 percent), (2) the smallest number of months of short-term training completed (2.5 and 0) and (3) no analytical policy studies completed by MLIMD and two by MPI. A major reason for these shortcomings was lower use/availability of project inputs including technical assistance, training and operational funds. A conclusion of the evaluation was that these two ministries would benefit from additional specialized short-term technical assistance. It concluded that this input would overcome present implementation problems and contribute to project institutionalization.

It was also found that recent governmental reorganization had shifted the focus of some agricultural planning from the national level to provincial levels. In light of this and ongoing changes, it was concluded that the project should broaden its target audience to include strengthening these planning organizations as part of the overall national effort.

#### D. Recommendations for the Agriculture Planning and Analysis Project

Two general recommendations are made for achieving project objectives and institutionalizing the planning activity. First, the project should be extended one year because of changes in governmental organization since its design and because activities now with the arrival of long term technical assistance are much more focused. Second, that for the remaining life of the project, specific benchmarks be agreed on for replacing project funding with GSL resources.

A number of specific recommendations were made for the purpose of improving probability of achieving project objectives in a reorganized ministerial setting. These include:

- \* giving consideration to further consolidation of planning entities to arrive at an integrated, cohesive planning system,
- \* increased training and extending both training and commodity procurement to planning units at the provincial level,
- \* completing policy studies on a task force basis focused on those with a quick turn around response to policy makers requests and longer term, forward looking studies largely initiated within the planning units and,
- \* utilizing additional technical assistance to strengthen the planning units in the MPI and the MLIMD.

#### E. Lessons Learned

The evaluation suggests that agricultural planning and policy activities are by nature integrative and long term in maturing. Project design must take this into consideration and establish realistic time frames for expecting positive results. This lengthy learning curve is evident in the present project which appears now to have crossed a major implementation threshold toward attaining its objectives.

A second clear lesson for project design is that the combination of a host country contract and delayed technical assistance is to be avoided. Either may have valid reasons to be used alone but the combination in a single project virtually assures unwarranted complexity and implementation delay.

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.)

A copy of Full Evaluation Report - "Mid-Term Evaluation of the Sri Lanka Agricultural Planning & Analysis Project No.383-0083"

COMMENTS

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

The Mission found the evaluation report to be very useful in planning future implementation actions and assessing adequacy of the proposed project work plan. The approach of doing a quick overview of the project as a mid-term evaluation was very useful and cost effective.