

A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY - PART I

PD-ABB-363

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 USAID/Jakarta (ES# _____)

B. Was Evaluation Scheduled In Current FY Annual Evaluation Plan? Yes Slipped Ad Hoc
Evaluation Plan Submission Date: FY 89 Q 4

C. Evaluation Timing Interim Final Ex Post Other

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)
497-0347	Small Scale Irrigation Management Project	85	9/93	50,000	33,035

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
SEE ATTACHED		

(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
	Herbert G. Blank	Ir. Matono	E. Greeley	Peter Cajewski
Signature	<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>[Signature]</i>
Date	7/2/90	5/12/90		

E. Action Decisions Approved by Mission or AID/W Officer
Action(s) Required

- | | | |
|--|---|-------|
| 1. Mission will organize a senior management review (DIR - Director's Implementation Review) of project implementation and evaluation recommendations. | JHradsky
USAID | 12/89 |
| 2. Mission will write a Strategy Statement which reassesses end of project status in light of present implementation and redirect project activities to emphasize the new ANE Bureau's guidelines regarding open societies and open market goals. | HBlank/
GKerr/
SSiskel
USAID | 2/90 |
| 3. DGWRD and USAID will hold an implementation workshop to review and ratify actions and decisions resulting from the evaluation and the DIR. This will include: developing a new management structure to increase the planning, coordination and implementation capacity of DGWRD and to reorient USAID's role away from detailed involvement in project implementation toward overall project monitoring and management; to develop an improved implementation plan and procedures (including special studies agenda, concurrent rather than serial implementation of groundwater components and provision for O&M units in provincial irrigation offices); and to develop improved budgeting procedures (including collaboration in the DUP/DIP process and maximizing the use of umbrella PILs). | HBlank
USAID
DGWRD | 2/90 |
| 4. The Technical Assistance Contract will be amended to cover the entire design phase through 9/91, increased attention to training and project planning, monitoring and implementation, and to include a sub-team to support expanded groundwater activities in all three provinces. | HBlank
USAID | 5/90 |
| 5. The contract with LP3ES for the Water User Association Organizer Program will be signed by DGWRD and LP3ES and approved by USAID as soon as possible so that the WUAOs can participate in final design of projects currently being designed. | HBlank
PScott
USAID
DGWRD
LP3ES | 5/90 |
| 6. The GOI and USAID will adopt key changes outlined in the Strategy Statement and consider an extension of the PACD to allow construction and initial O&M of the viable surface schemes and full development of a sustainable groundwater program. | USAID
DGWRD | 12/90 |

A B S T R A C T

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

The project is to design and apply irrigation technologies and management systems in support of diversified cropping patterns in three eastern provinces in Indonesia. The project is being implemented by the Directorate General of Water Resources Development of the Ministry of Public Works and the provinces of SulSel, NTT and NTB. The midterm evaluation (7/89-8/89) was conducted by a team from the Irrigation Support Project for Asia and the Near East (ISPAN) which visited all the project sites and interviewed GOI project staff, consultants, and USAID staff. The evaluation identified implementation problems and recommended strategies for overcoming them. The major findings and conclusions are:

- The project is two years behind schedule. However, much has been accomplished, and it is poised to move forward and achieve its objectives if time permits. Given the policy relevance of these objectives and their importance for future irrigation activities in Indonesia, the project deserves continued support and should be carried to completion. To do this, some important changes are needed.
- Two major management problems impede implementation of the SSIMP. Unless they are resolved, it is unlikely that the project can be implemented successfully, even if it is extended. The two problems are:
 - the lack of an effective management structure; and
 - the lack of effective management planning and monitoring systems.
- The Project Paper proposed ten surface water subprojects. Two probably are not technically feasible. Only three others can be completed before the current PACD, and none would have a full year's operation after completion. A two-year extension would allow all of these subprojects to be completed and provide at least a year of operations--something that is essential if the WUAs are to be consolidated.
- Groundwater activities are just beginning, and provincial groundwater project plans are urgently needed. The Project Paper called for sequential exploration, pilot test activities and expansion. Enough is now known about the aquifers and farmer organization so that these activities can and should be conducted concurrently. As a result, project progress will be expedited and better information will be gained on the water resources available.

Japan is participating in the project through its Overseas Economic Cooperation Fund, which will provide needed finance, but, more importantly, may help ensure that the project's institutional aspects will be carried forward in future OECF irrigation activities. Similar participation by other donors should be encouraged.

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			
William R. Thomas	ISTI/ISPAN	ANE 0289-C-00	90,876	PIO/T 497- 0347-3-5-197
Jack Keller	Utah State/ISPAN	7044-0		
E. Walter Coward	Cornell/ISPAN			
Sjofjan Asnawi	Andalas Univ./ ISPAN			
2. Mission/Office Professional Staff Person-Days (Estimate) _____ 60		3. Borrower/Grantee Professional Staff Person-Days (Estimate) _____ 160		

A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY - PART II

.. S U M M A R Y

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"> • 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:

Jakarta

Date This Summary Prepared:

May 14, 1990

Title And Date Of Full Evaluation Report:

Mid-Term Evaluation Small Scale Irrigation Management Project, Indonesia, Nov., 1989

SSIMP was evaluated in two stages. The first was an evaluation of the project by ISPAN consultants in July/August, 1989. The second stage was the Director's Implementation Review (DIR) held in December, 1989. The DIR was an intensive field review of the project and of the ISPAN evaluation by senior Mission management. The ISPAN evaluation is summarized in detail below, followed by a summary of the findings of the DIR and the revisions of SSIMP that were made as a result of this review.

ISPAN EVALUATION

This report presents the results of the mid-term evaluation of USAID/Jakarta's Small Scale irrigation Management Project (SSIMP), Project No. 497-0347. The Project Agreement was signed on August 30, 1985, and its completion date (PACD) is September 30, 1993. The total cost is estimated at \$89.7 million. Of this, USAID will provide \$50 million (\$32.4 grant and \$17.6 loan), and the Government of Indonesia will provide \$39.7 million in cash and in kind.

Purpose of the Evaluation

- To assess current implementation status;
- to identify administrative and technical problems with project implementation and recommend strategies for overcoming them;
- determine whether the project is likely to achieve the objectives and verifiable indicators specified in the Project Paper and whether these remain appropriate;
- assess the performance of the TA team and recommend whether their contract should be extended for the life of the project and how the contract should be structured;
- recommend ways to improve the effectiveness and reliability of monitoring systems being developed.

Methodology

The evaluation team visited project sites; interviewed central and provincial GOI officials and project staff, consultants, and USAID staff; and reviewed all principal project documentation. Briefing and final debriefing meetings were held at AID and at the Directorate General of Water Resources Development (DGWRD) in Jakarta.

Purpose of Activity Evaluated

The purpose of the Small Scale Irrigation Management Project (SSIMP) is to design, test, and apply irrigation technologies and management systems that support diversified food crop production in three eastern island provinces, Nusa Tenggara Barat (NTB), Nusa Tenggara Timur (NTT), and Sulawesi Selatan (SulSel). Irrigation systems financed under the project are being designed and will be managed to the maximum extent feasible for diversified cropping. This measure is especially appropriate in the three project provinces where water scarcity may significantly limit the command areas if only rice production is encouraged.

Findings and Conclusions

The SSIMP is a complicated project. It is based on four irrigation technologies: weirs, reservoirs, groundwater and lift irrigation. Reservoirs and groundwater are relatively new to the three eastern provinces where the project is operating--South Sulawesi, Nusa Tenggara Barat and Nusa Tenggara Timur-- but the technologies are relatively straightforward. The complexity of the project stems from the fact that, despite its name, it is concerned with intermediate scale, rather than small scale irrigation systems. This difference in scale further complicates the two major institution building themes that are at the heart of the project and give it its importance. They are:

Decentralization of authority for small and mid-size irrigation projects to the provinces. This is in keeping with the official overall decentralization policy of the Government. The project provides an opportunity to help the Government find ways to make decentralization of local government planning and management a reality.

Involvement of farmer beneficiaries in the subprojects from design through operations and maintenance. This also supports the Government policies of forming strong water user associations (WUAs) and the collection of user fees. This is the first time in Indonesia that WUA organizers will be used in mid-size irrigation projects, and that farmer involvement in the design stage of such projects has been tried anywhere in the world.

There are also important training and special studies elements in the project. Participant training has been well done. Twenty-seven participants in long-term (MS) overseas training programs are now returning and will provide an infusion of talent. In-country training needs to be better planned and executed. Special studies are intended to support other project activities. A new mechanism for planning and managing them is needed.

Japan is participating in the project through its Overseas Economic Cooperation Fund. The OECF will finance the Tiu Kulit dam project in NTB and support for groundwater activities in NTT. This is a very positive development. It provides needed finance; but, more importantly, it will help insure that the project's institutional aspects will be carried forward in future OECF irrigation activities. Similar participation by other donors should be encouraged.

Current Status

The project is behind schedule by as much as two years. However, much has been accomplished, and it is poised to move forward and achieve its objectives if PACD can be extended by two years. Given the policy relevance of these objectives and their importance for future irrigation activities in Indonesia, the project deserves continued support and should be carried to completion. To do this, some important changes are needed.

Two major management problems impede implementation of the SSIMP. Unless they are resolved, it is unlikely that the project can be implemented successfully, even if it is extended. The two problems are:

- the lack of an effective management structure; and
- the lack of effective management planning and monitoring of project activities and progress both for the project as a whole and for its component elements.

Ten surface water subprojects are proposed in the PP. Two probably are not technically feasible. Only three others can be completed before the current PACD, and none would have a full year's operation after completion. A two-year extension would allow all of these subprojects to be completed and provide at least a year of operations--something that is essential if the WUAs are to be consolidated.

Groundwater activities are just beginning, and provincial groundwater project plans are urgently needed. The Project Paper called for sequential exploration, pilot test activities and expansion. Enough is now known about the aquifers and farmer organization so that these activities can and should be conducted concurrently. As a result, project progress will be expedited and better information will be gained on the water resources available.

Recommendations

Chapter 6 of the report presents 20 specific recommendations of the evaluation team. Key recommendations are the following:

- That a no-cost two-year extension of the PACD be made, and that the current TA contract be extended to September 1991, with a follow-on contract let for construction services and O&M support.
- That a project management structure with clear assignment of responsibilities be created in the Government's Directorate General of Water Resources Development, and that the role of the TA Team Leader in Jakarta be redefined to include responsibility for overall project planning, monitoring, implementation, and providing advice and assistance to the DGWRD.
- That every effort be made to reduce the detailed management activities of USAID by such actions as the use of umbrella PILs for the groundwater activities.
- That implementation plans be developed for the project and its components, and that progress be monitored against those plans.
- That all surface subprojects be constructed, except Raja Telaga and perhaps the Surabaya lift schemes, and that additional foreign funding sources be explored.
- That the project carry out the groundwater exploration, pilot study and expansion program concurrently, rather than in sequence, with the use of site profiles and careful monitoring of the physical and socioeconomic consequences.

- That, in keeping with the overall recommendation on project planning, groundwater programs be planned for each province as soon as possible; and that a TA sub-team be put in place to support the planning and execution of expanded groundwater activities in all three provinces.
- That arrangements be made to provide water user association organizers to support the groundwater programs in all three provinces.

Director's Implementation Review (DIR)

The first DIR of SSIMP was held four months after the ISPAN evaluation. It consisted of a briefing for DIR participants at the Mission followed by a 3 day trip to Nusa Tenggara Barat. DIR participants were briefed on arrival by the heads of the Provincial Public Works office and Irrigation Service as well as by local TA and GOI project staff. They traveled to the site of the Kalimantan II weir system; visited a private sector river pumping site; talked with village leaders, farmers and local Public Works staff; and held a final briefing with kabupaten government officials.

The principal outcome of the DIR is the Strategy Statement which incorporates findings of the DIR and the evaluation into the implementation of the project. This Statement was a guide for the implementation workshop (2/90).

The Statement outlines the following recommended changes in the project:

- 1) intensification and expansion of policy development components based on Mission and GOI concerns with issues such as: reduced government subsidization of services, expanded role of users, decentralized irrigation services, improved irrigation performance, broadened scope of water resource planning and management, strengthened institutional capabilities within GOI to generate and implement national water policies and improved contracting practices;
- 2) reduction of the scope of both the ground and surface water components of the project;
- 3) budget reallocations to ensure the availability of adequate funds to institute a sustainable O&M program;
- 4) development of a new project management structure to reduce the Mission management burden and place greater responsibility for planning, coordination and implementation with DGWRD and the TA;
- 5) improvement of contracting procedures through measures such as GOI prefinancing of all contracts and minimizing the number of contracts per site.

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.)

Midterm Evaluation Small Scale Irrigation Management Project, Indonesia.

SSIMP Strategy Statement.

COMMENTS

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

Mission, GOI and Consultant comments on the draft midterm evaluation report were provided (Memos from Blank/Siskel to Reiss dated September 19, 1989 and September 25, 1989) and were incorporated in the final document.

The evaluation provided a good, candid overall assessment of the project. The team identified the major problems with management, organization, and implementation and made useful general suggestions for their resolution. The evaluation team was a good representative mix of highly experienced management, engineering, and socio-economic experts who had no difficulty grasping the scope and constraints of the project. They followed the scope of work and methodology specified for this activity and were not hindered by the difficult logistics involved in reaching all project sites and meeting appropriate personnel in the three project provinces. From the perspective of the Mission, the report is useful as a general summary of the principal issues effecting the implementation and potential impact of SSIMP; however, it would have been more effective had it provided more specific or detailed guidelines on how to implement its recommendations.