

PD-ABB-9976
68762

REVISED DRAFT WORK PLAN

JSAID Contract No. 538-0119-C-00-6027

MONITORING, EVALUATION, AND DESIGN OF THE PROGRAM AND PROJECTS
OF RDO/C'S PRIVATE SECTOR OFFICE

September 3, 1986

Louis Berger International, Inc.
1819 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I	PRINCIPAL WORK REQUIREMENTS	2
	A. CONTRACTOR OUTPUTS REQUIRED BY SCOPE OF WORK	2
	B. OTHER DOCUMENTS RELATED TO THE SCOPE OF THIS ASSIGNMENT	4
	C. OUTPUT ISSUE AND RECOMMENDATIONS	3
II.	GENERIC SCOPE OF WORK	16
	A. PURPOSE	16
	B. STRUCTURE AND CONTENT	17
	C. USE OF GENERIC SCOPE OF WORK	22
III.	DATA BASE DEVELOPMENT	24
	A. PURPOSE	24
	B. ASSESSMENT OF EXISTING PROJECT DATA BASE	24
	C. DATABASE DEVELOPMENT PLAN	27
IV.	WORK PROGRAM	32
	ASSIGNMENT 1	32
	ASSIGNMENT 2	33
	ASSIGNMENT 3	35
	ASSIGNMENT 4	36
	ASSIGNMENT 5	37
	ASSIGNMENT 6	38
V.	SCHEDULE AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION	39
	A. OVERVIEW	39
	B. SCHEDULE STRATEGY	40
	C. THE SCHEDULE AND STAFFING THROUGH FEBRUARY 28	40
	D. COST IMPLICATIONS OF WORK PROGRAM	42

LIST OF EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT I	COMPARISON OF THREE SPECIAL PURPOSE LISTS OF PRIVATE SECTOR OFFICE PROJECTS	43
EXHIBIT II	ADDITIONAL PROJECTS IDENTIFIED BY RDO/C AS HAVING A PRIVATE SECTOR FOCUS OR ELEMENT	44
EXHIBIT III	OUTLINE OF "GENERIC SCOPE OF WORK"	45
	A. PROGRAM GOALS	45
	B. PROJECT PURPOSE ELEMENTS	45
	C. PROJECT OUTPUTS	46
	D. PROJECT INPUTS	47
	E. CHANGES IN EXTERNAL FACTORS	47
EXHIBIT IV	COMPARISON OF PROJECT GOALS	48
EXHIBIT V	COMPARISON OF PROJECT PURPOSES	51
EXHIBIT VI	SCHEDULE BY ASSIGNMENT, POSITION AND STAFF CATEGORY	54
EXHIBIT VII	SCHEDULE BY TASK	56

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A	GENERIC SCOPE OF WORK: CONTRACT OUTLINE	57
------------	---	----

REVISED DRAFT OF WORK PLAN

USAID Contract No. 538-0119-C-00-6027

MONITORING, EVALUATION, AND DESIGN OF THE PROGRAM AND PROJECTS
OF RDO/C'S PRIVATE SECTOR OFFICE

This Work Plan is submitted in accordance with Section C-I-D-1 of Contract No. 538-0119-C-00-6027 (Design, Monitoring, and Evaluation of RDO/C's Private Sector Program and Projects) between the United States Agency for International Development and Louis Berger International, Inc.

The Contract Scope of Work provides that, for a period of two years, LBII will be responsible for evaluating projects managed by the Private Sector Office, establishing a system for monitoring private sector office projects, and assisting the Private Sector Office in the design or redesign of projects. LBII is to evaluate fourteen PSO projects in a consistent format, assess each of these project within the context of the overall program, and to prepare two reports on the overall program. These program reports are to determine the types of business activity resulting from the projects, their economic impacts, and their job relocation effects, as well as whether the results justify the costs. LBII also will be responsible for designing a project monitoring system intended to track how well borrowers and grantees comply with AID requirements and how well the goals and purposes of AID projects are being achieved. Finally, LBII will assist in the design or redesign of up to three projects during the course of the two-year contract.

The Contract Scope of Work is intricately and firmly structured, and lays out the Contractor's assignments in considerable detail. It includes international and local consultant time estimates for six principal specified assignments. These six assignments are:

1. Development of a Work Plan and Schedule
2. Development of Baseline Data
3. Project Evaluations
4. Project Monitoring
5. Project Design
6. Reporting

This Work Plan, like LBII's Technical Proposal, conforms closely to the structure of the Contract Scope of Work. Readers wishing additional perspectives, are referred to the Scope of Work and to LBII's Technical Proposal.

The Contract Scope of Work is very explicit concerning the contents of the present document. The Work Plan is to evaluate the quality of project-derived data, provide a plan to develop a comprehensive data base, and draft a "generic scope of work." The purpose of the generic scope of work is to introduce more uniformity into individual project evaluations, to help fit parts of the program into a logical whole and to shape individual evaluations to serve the needs of overall program assessments. The present document has been organized to accommodate these mandated requirements.

This Work Plan is composed of five sections. The first section analyzes LBII's principal work requirements and related issues. The second section presents a "generic scope of work" to be used in evaluations carried out by the Contractor. The third section discusses baseline analysis. The fourth section presents LBII's work program. The final section presents a project schedule and person-month allocations. Seven exhibits referred to in the text are located at the end of the report. The outline of a "generic scope of work" contained in the Contract Scope of Work is reproduced in Appendix A.

I. PRINCIPAL WORK REQUIREMENTS

This section of LBII's Work Plan has three subsections. In Subsection I-A, the Work Statement contained in the contract is analyzed, with particular emphasis on the tangible Contractor outputs which the Contract Work Statement requires. In Subsection I-B, other documents pertinent to LBII's assignment are reviewed, including the 1983 GAO Report, the 1984 IPED Project Paper, and the evaluation section of RDO/C's Annual Action Plan for FY 1987-1988. Subsection I-C discusses and makes recommendations on key issues concerning work requirements which arise from an analysis of these documents.

A. CONTRACTOR OUTPUTS REQUIRED BY CONTRACT SCOPE OF WORK

There are ten principal types of Contractor outputs, two of which may be classified under the headings of "program evaluation", three under "project evaluation," two under "monitoring," one under "project design;" and two of which represent general reporting requirements. Topics to be covered in this Work Plan are set forth in Output (9) below.

The Semi-Annual and Final Reports (Output 10) are, inter alia, to report on progress against quantitative indicators established in this Work Plan.

Outputs required of the Contractor, in connection with program evaluations, are as follows:

1. Evaluate the overall program to measure:

- (1-1) the types of business activity resulting from RDO/C Private Sector Office projects, their impact on the local economy and the persons benefitted;
- (1-2) if private investment caused jobs to be "created/sustained/relocated" (c.f. Background Statement, p. 13 of Contract); and
- (1-3) if the results achieved justify the costs.

2. Prepare program reports on:

- (2-1) Aggregate results of evaluations conducted in FY 1986, due by February 28, 1987.
- (2-2) Comprehensive assessment of all evaluations, due February 28, 1988

Outputs required of the Contractor, in connection with project evaluations, are as follows:

3. Evaluate each individual Private Sector Office project:

- (3-1) in a consistent format, by means of a "generic scope of work," which would be roughly applicable across the entire Private Sector Office Portfolio.
- (3-2) within the context of the Private Sector Program.
- (3-3) as an individual project.

4. For each specific project evaluation:

- (a) prepare a specific scope of work and evaluation plan.
- (b) familiarize host governments and implementing organizations with the evaluation plan.
- (c) conduct field evaluation.
- (d) prepare project report.

5. Develop baseline data for new projects, and, as applicable, for evaluating older projects (c.f. Background Statement, p. 14 of Contract, referring to project monitoring).

Outputs required of the Contractor, in connection with monitoring, are as follows:

6. Design a continuing project monitoring system that will track compliance aspects of the Private Sector portfolio: how well Borrowers and Grantees comply with AID conditions, covenants, regulations, requirements, policies, procedures, and practices.
7. Design a continuing project monitoring system that will track achievement aspects of the Private Sector portfolio:

Outputs required of the Contractor, in connection with project design are as follows:

8. Assist in the design or reprogramming of up to three private sector projects.

The following reports, covering the entire scope of LBII's activities, are required under the Contract:

9. Work Plan (Section I-D-1, page 22)
 - (10-1) Evaluate quality of project-derived data
 - (10-2) Develop plan to develop comprehensive baseline data base
 - (10-3) Draft "generic scope of work"
 - (10-4) Develop Draft Work Plan for review by AID
 - (10-5) Finalize Work Plan after AID Approval
 - (10-6) Establish progress indicators (see 10.2 below)
10. Semi-Annual and Final Reports (Section I-D-6, page 23)
 - (11-1) Prepare three half-yearly reports summarizing progress against quantifiable indicators identified in Work Plan.
 - (11-2) Prepare final report summarizing achievements against quantifiable indicators in the Work Plan.

of quantifiable indicators

B. OTHER DOCUMENTS RELATED TO THE SCOPE OF THIS ASSIGNMENT

This subsection (I-B) of LBII's Work Plan reviews three documents (other than the Contract Scope of Work) which provide insights into outputs which may be expected from LBII's assignment. These three documents are:

- (1) GAO, AID Assistance to the Eastern Caribbean: Program Changes and Possible Consequences (July 22, 1983);
- (2) RDO/C, Project Paper: Investment Promotion and Export Development (August, 1984);
- (3) RDO/C: Annual Action Plan, FY 87-88, February 23, 1986.

1. The GAO Report

In July of 1983, the General Accounting Office submitted a Report to Administrator of AID on AID Assistance to the Eastern Caribbean. The report focussed on the management consequences of the rapid growth of AID's program in the Eastern Caribbean, its initiation of bilateral and private sector programs, and the limited capacities of Eastern Caribbean countries to implement projects without extensive external assistance.

The GAO concluded that, in view of the substantial resources being devoted to AID's private sector programs, better information on program impact was required. It manifested concern with the question of whether jobs were being relocated from the United States or redistributed within the region; whether AID projects flowing through well-established business concerns, chambers of commerce, and affluent private businessmen could benefit the poor majority, and whether the cost of AID's private sector program was too high.

The GAO report recommended that AID should undertake a comprehensive evaluation of its private sector program in the Eastern Caribbean to measure:

- (1) the types of business activity resulting from AID projects;
- (2) if private investment caused jobs to be relocated from elsewhere; and
- (3) if the results achieved justify the costs.

This formulation is almost identical to the objective which the Contract Scope of Work (Section II-A-1) establishes for evaluation activities, with the following differences:

- (a) The Evaluation Objective Statement in the Contract is limited to projects which are the responsibility of the Private Sector Office;
- (b) The Evaluation Objectives statement specifically calls for the measurement of the impact of AID's projects "on the local economy and the persons benefitted, including secondary beneficiaries." (p. 14), a more technical and sophisticated formulation than that articulated by GAO.

2. The Evaluation Description in the IESP Project Paper

In August of 1984, RDO/C issued a Project Paper on the Investment Promotion and Export Development Project. That paper included a description of a "Private Sector Strategy Evaluation" covering the overall private sector strategy of RDO/C including EIP, PDAP, CAIC, BIMAP, CFSC, IPIP, IFED, and other RDO/C projects falling within this strategy. It also indicated the Private Sector Strategy Evaluation would address the social and cultural implications and effects of the strategy.

Again, the formulation is similar to that contained in the Contract Scope of Work with two differences:

- (c). The Project Paper envisions the Contractor will evaluate training projects carried out by Barbados Institute of Management (BIMAP), projects not currently within the responsibility of the Private Sector Office.
- (d). The Project Paper anticipates that the evaluation will investigate the social and cultural effects of, incentives for, and impediments to, the transition from agriculture to industry which is at an early stage in many of the islands of the Eastern Caribbean. The Contract Scope of Work does not explicitly call for such an investigation.

3. Evaluation Section of RDO/C's Annual Action Plan

RDO/C's Action Plan for FY 87-88 is organized into two parts. The first deals with Strategy and Policy. The second is concerned with Implementation. The Evaluation Plan in the Implementation section lists planned evaluations under four categories:

- (1) Private Sector-led Productive Investment in Manufacturing and Tourism Development;
- (2) High Impact Agricultural Development;
- (3) Infrastructure Expansion and Maintenance Systems Development; and
- (4) Public Management and Institutional Development.

The narrative indicates that program type evaluations will be emphasized in these four categories in order to assess progress toward attainment of program goals and objectives, enhance management of the Mission's portfolio, assist in designing and programming future assistance, and:

"provide feedback as to whether or not the Mission's program is meeting AID's major objectives of private sector growth, policy dialogue strengthening, institution building and technology transfer." (page 106)

Private sector
policy dialog,
inst. build,
tech transfer

The Evaluation Plan states that EDO/O's private sector program is the pivot around which Mission strategy is designed and that the evaluation will encompass both projects which have direct impacts on the private sector and those which have indirect impacts. The Plan calls for final evaluations of Employment Investment Promotion II, Dominica Small Enterprise and Credit Union Development projects. The Plan also calls for evaluations of PSIAP, CFSC, IPIP, and IPED. The Regional Development II project will be evaluated "to determine progress toward improved management training for private sector participants" (p. 106).

The Agriculture section of the Evaluation Plan provides for evaluation of single-country projects on St. Vincent, St. Kitts, and St. Lucia in FY 1987, and for evaluation of the regional SFRD, CAEP, and CATCO projects in FY 1988. No cross-reference to the private sector program is apparent in the document. By contrast, the Infrastructure section states that the productive aspects of projects such as road rehabilitation, construction of hydroelectric plants, and rehabilitation of water projects will be analyzed under the private sector program evaluation, although individual project performance will be measured in separate final evaluations.

The evaluation of Productive Infrastructure Rehabilitation (4th Quarter of FY 1987) is to examine the effectiveness of road maintenance planning and implementation capabilities on the governments of St. Lucia and St. Vincent and the impact of rehabilitated roads on agricultural production, marketing, and employment. However, the descriptions of the evaluations of the Cumberland Hydroelectric Project (2nd Quarter, 1988) the Antigua Water Supply (1st Quarter, 1987), the Grenada Infrastructure Revitalization, and the Grenada Productive Infrastructure Rehabilitation Projects (no dates given) do not explicitly identify investigation of the productive aspects of these projects in individual evaluations.

For the Public Management and Institutional Category, a final evaluation of the Population and Development Project will take place in the first quarter of 1987. A final evaluation of the Regional Development Training II project (LAC Training Initiatives I and II) is scheduled for the third and fourth quarters of 1988 to determine the impact which these initiatives have made on the development of manpower resources to assist development activities.

The formulation contained in the Evaluation section of the Action Plan compares with the Contract Scope of Work in the following ways:

e. There is no reference in the Scope of Work to evaluating the indirect or productive impacts of projects outside the responsibility of the Private Sector Office. However, the Background Section of the Description/Specifications/Work Statement does say, "It will also be the task of the contractor to coordinate with other Mission evaluation activity related to projects with a private sector focus or element to assure maximum possible consistency." (page 14.)

f. The Regional Development Training II Project (538-0087) is not a Private Sector Office project to be evaluated by the Contractor under the present Scope of Work. (but see recommendation in the following section)

C. OUTPUT ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This Subsection identifies and suggests resolutions for the principal output-related issues identified by LBII during the course of its preparation of this Work Plan.

1. For which project evaluations-is LBII responsible?

DISCUSSION:

The Scope of Work states on page 14, "...the Contractor will be responsible for evaluating the Projects managed by the Private Sector Office." The description of the AID projects contained in the Background Section says on page 13: "Since 1980, approximately 29 projects have been authorized with a direct or an indirect impact on the private sector...Only 14 of these 29 projects are within the responsibility of the Private Sector Office. See Attachment L-4."

Although the Contract does not in fact contain an Attachment L-4, such an Attachment was contained in the Request for Proposal. Exhibit on the following page compares the projects listed on the RFP Attachment L-4 (technically 15 projects because two formally separate EIP II projects were combined in L-4) with a list of projects contained on the Mission's Project Status Report covering the period October 1, 1985- March 31, 1986 and with the list of private sector project evaluations contained in the text and tables of the Mission's most recent Annual Action Plan.

Although the project responsibilities of the Private Sector Office have decreased from 15 in Attachment L-4 to 13 in the Project Status Report list, this is a net change, resulting from the transfer/dropping of five projects and the adding of three new ones.

The text and tables in the evaluation section of the Annual Action Plan show nine projects up for evaluation in the next two years, but the scope of this list presumably was not intended to be as inclusive as the L-4 and Status Report Lists.

The projects which appear to present problems or deserve special comment are designated by letters in the notes column of Exhibit 1. Each of the projects so designated is discussed below.

a. Regional Agribusiness Development, 338-T-007

This project was on the original L-4 Private Sector list, but was subsequently transferred to the Agriculture Office. It was authorized in March of 1978, but apparently never has been evaluated. The Mission has asked LBII to include this project on its list for evaluation early in the first quarter of calendar year 1987. LBII has agreed.

b. Agribusiness Expansion Project (LAAD), 538-0057

Attachment L-4 called this project "The Latin American Business Development Corporation." Subsequent documents have used the title, "Agribusiness Expansion Project." The project is shown neither on the Project Status Report for the period October 1, 1985 - March 31, 1986, nor on the Evaluation Plan contained in the Annual Action Plan. However, Mr. Holtaway's memorandum of March 10, 1986 identifying RDO/C Project/Backstop Officers shows the project, as does a Mission document entitled "U.S.A.I.D. Program for the Eastern Caribbean" dated April 24, 1986. That document describes the Agribusiness Expansion Project as follows on page 3:

Project began in 1980 with a completion date of 1986. This project provides technical assistance to locate fundable agribusiness ventures and to make equity investments therein in the Caribbean, including Jamaica, Haiti, Guyana, Dominican Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Barbados, and the English-speaking LDCs. To date, LAAD has committed US\$3,455,000 in AID loan funds for 18 projects in 7 English speaking Caribbean LDCs.

The Project Paper, dated 1980, contains an evaluation plan based principally on the use of a monitoring device, "\$2.0 million reviews. The evaluation section of the paper is very precise concerning the techniques to be used in evaluating the project during the reviews:

....the best method mechanism to be used for evaluating the degree to which sub-projects are actually producing the benefits intended is the review of completed and revised Project Assessment Forms on each subproject together with additional data included on these subprojects in Quarterly reports received by LAAD from their clients. The evaluation will collate and examine the data from these sources to determine achievement of project." (For a fuller extract, see Attachment A to this Work Plan).

Two "two million dollar reviews" were in fact conducted, but it is by no means clear that the evaluation (impact) issues were addressed in any kind of integrated way. It is our understanding that the AID/Washington has been exercising leadership of this project on a de facto basis.

c. Caribbean Project Development Facility, 538-0060

The Caribbean Project Development Facility appears neither in the most recent Status Report, nor in Evaluation Plan nor on the March 15 list of Project and Evaluation Officers. However, the Mission document entitled U.S.A.I.D. Program for the Eastern Caribbean" dated April 24, 1986 states the following under the heading "Accelerated Private Sector Assistance" on page 2:

Project began in 1981, with completion date extended to 1987. The Caribbean Project Development Facility (CPDF) assists twenty-one Caribbean states in identifying, appraising, and promoting suitable private and public sector projects to be submitted for financing by existing financial institutions. In its first four years, CPDF has completed some 38 project proposals in 18 different Caribbean states, having an aggregate investment cost of approximately US\$78 million. CPDF was instrumental in raising both long-term finance and equity for these in an aggregate amount of US\$28.3 million.

The Grant Agreement does not provide for evaluation, nor indeed any form of report other than a financial report. The file does contain a copy of a progress report to the UNDP for the period August 1984 - January 1985.

d. Barbados Private Initiatives in Housing, 538-HG-002 and 538-0081

This project has a training and credit union linkage. It was started in September of 1982 and is set to expire in August of 1986. This project is the only one on the list which does not include a one or more Eastern Caribbean LDC's. The project was originally initiated by PRE. PRE was to prepare a detailed plan visits for monitoring purposes. Annual evaluations were to be carried out. The Office of Housing Evaluation and Monitoring Guidelines was to be utilized to conduct these evaluations. It appears that one evaluation was carried out, covering the period from July, 1982 to February, 1985.

e. Regional Development Training, 538-0087

This project appears on the "Private Sector Program" list in the RDO/C Annual Action Program, but not on the L-4 or Project Status Report Lists. The project paper distinguishes between a private sector component and a participant training component for evaluation/monitoring purposes.

For the private sector component, the project paper provides for a "running evaluation and monitoring process" supplemented by

- (1) a progress evaluation after 18 months and
- (2) a final evaluation at the end of 48 months.

An internal assessment is currently being conducted in lieu of the mid-term evaluation.

An evaluation of the participant training component is to be conducted at the end of the second year of the project.

f. Small Enterprise Assistance Project, 538-0113

The SEA Project is receiving technical assistance from Robert Nathan under its worldwide microenterprise umbrella contract. LBII will develop monitoring requirements from AID's standpoint. Nathan will provide assistance to CAIC in setting up SEA to meet these requirements. LBII will have responsibility for project evaluations.

g. Caribbean Credit Union Development II, 538-0135

The Grant Agreement for the Caribbean Credit Union II, project signed on February 20, 1985 provides:

An evaluation will be performed in July 1986 which will include the AID financed contractor and representatives of the Grantee, CIDA and CDF to assess the effectiveness of the project. The scope of the evaluation will be agreed upon by AID prior to its initiation.

The evaluation was subsequently rescheduled for October, 1986. Attachment L-4 shows Caribbean Credit Union Development I, (538-0035) as a Private Sector Office project and this project is included on the evaluation list in the RDO/C Annual Evaluation Plan.

h. National Development Housing Assistance, 538-HG-002 and 538-0081

The Grant Agreement to the Pan American Development Foundation provides for quarterly progress reports which shall contain:

- a. A schedule of loans showing cumulative approvals, cumulative disbursements, classification of loans by activity, and number of jobs created. (emphasis added)
- b. A description of technical assistance provided to specific projects."

The Grant Agreement does not contain a provision for evaluation.

RECOMMENDATION:

LBII's responsibility should be defined to include evaluation of all projects on the L-4 list, with the exception of the SEA project with which LBII would be involved only from a monitoring viewpoint (or conceivably a redesign viewpoint later in the project). A final or summary-to-date impact evaluation for the Agribusiness Expansion (LAAD) project (538-0057) should be carried out in the first quarter of CY 1987, at the same time as the evaluation of the Regional Agribusiness Project (538-T-007) is undertaken. In addition, LBII should undertake either evaluation of the private sector component of the Regional Training II project (538-0087) or the Barbados Housing Initiatives Project. From a program evaluation viewpoint,--the case for Regional Development Training II appears stronger because the Barbados project includes no LDC's whereas several projects which are the responsibility of the Private Sector Office contain training components. If it is desired that LBII undertake both projects not on the L-4 list, some adjustment in the planned use of resources for evaluation will be required. The lack of clarity resulting from the omission of Attachment L-4 from the contract should be resolved through a contract amendment.

2. What other Mission projects have "a private sector focus or element" involving LBII coordination in preparation for their evaluation?

DISCUSSION:

The list of 29 Mission projects with a private sector focus or element, referred to in the Contract Work Statement, has not been located.

Clearly, Regional Development Training II and Private Initiatives in Housing fit this description if one is not included on the list of LBII evaluations. Three other training projects appear to have such elements: Regional Development Training I, Basic Skills Development, and Management Training, a new project presently being prepared.

Most infrastructure projects (water, roads, ports, airports, electric power production and supply, telecommunications, waste disposal, industrial real estate development) have a potentially favorable impact on private sector, even where infrastructure is owned and maintained by government.

From a rigorously analytical point of view, any project that contributes to employment, exports, or investment, and affects-- or operates in whole or in part through-- the medium of private sector establishments or their personnel, has "a private sector element" for purposes of examining the impact of Mission programs and the achievement of Mission objectives. From such a rigorous point of view, it is difficult to identify any Mission project that does not arguably have such an impact.

For example, the Epidemiological Surveillance and Training Project (538-0027) arguably contributes to employment and exports by reducing absenteeism and increasing the productivity of the labor force employed by private sector establishments. Since labor force reliability and productivity is a significant factor in attracting certain kinds of investment, such a project presumably could have a indirect impact on investment. Presumably, such concepts are involved in the designation of the benchmarks included in the Mission's Annual Action Plan.

From the practical point of view of identifying projects outside the Private Sector Office where Contractor is to coordinate with other Mission evaluation activities, the list presented in the April 14, 1986 Mission publication, U.S.A.I.D. Private Sector Program for the Eastern Caribbean would appear to represent a reasonable starting point. That document presents thirteen projects not shown on Exhibit I attached. Those thirteen additional projects are shown on Exhibit II in this Work Plan. When the doubling of related grant and loan projects for the housing and employment investment promotion projects is eliminated from Exhibit I, the Exhibit I total becomes 17. Exhibits I and II together produce a total of 30 projects. This may or may not include all 29 projects on the lost list, but it seems good enough for the practical purpose of identifying the kinds and numbers of projects with which LBII will be coordinating.

RECOMMENDATION:

The projects listed on Exhibit II plus any projects on Exhibit I for which LBII is not assigned primary evaluation responsibilities should represent the portfolio of projects for which LBII has coordination responsibilities for evaluation purposes.

3. What are LBII's coordination responsibilities with respect to evaluations by others of projects with a private sector element or focus?

DISCUSSION:

The purpose of LBII coordination with other Mission evaluation activity, as described in the Background Section of the Work Plan, is "to assure maximum possible consistency." It will advise on how the Generic Scope of Work which it uses in the evaluations on the primary list (recommended to be selected from Exhibit I) can be used in evaluations of projects on the secondary list (recommended as projects on Exhibit II plus those not selected for primary evaluation on List I). It will also advise on how project or program evaluations conducted by others can make maximum contributions to the private sector program evaluation for which it is responsible.

However, this Work Plan does not envision that LBII will undertake to determine the primary or secondary impacts of the productive aspects of projects for which it does not have primary project evaluation responsibility, either (1) as a participant in other evaluations or (2) as part of its own evaluation of the private sector program. It is possible that LBII may make some global estimates of the impact of everything that AID does which is outside of the scope of the primary projects which it is investigating. We urge that assessment of the productive impacts of AID projects be included within both the monitoring arrangements and the evaluations of such projects. LBII would be happy to participate in such activities, but would see that as an extension of its present work.

RECOMMENDATION:

AID's Scopes of Work for evaluations of projects on the secondary list (project evaluations not LBII's primary responsibility, but which have private sector focus or element) should explicitly include a requirement for evaluation of the productive aspects of the projects.

As a practical matter, pressures on available staff time will be such that LBII "coordination" will usually be limited to reviewing, or making suggestions concerning, the Scope of Work for the evaluation. It is anticipated that available evaluation resources often will be tight, and would normally be directed toward the operational concerns of individual offices. Private sector program evaluation concerns, particularly those involving the search for secondary impacts or benefits, could represent a competitive demand on resources. Realistically, it is doubtful that much that is integratable in a program evaluation will emerge from these "coordinated" evaluations unless (a) the supervising office judges the interests of private sector program evaluation to be important; (b) specific requirements for pertinent evaluation findings are incorporated into the Scope of Work for its evaluation; (c) sufficient resources are allocated to these requirements; and (d) evaluators with appropriate skills are assigned to meeting these requirements.

4. Will LBII's program evaluation include the results of formal social and cultural investigations?

DISCUSSION:

The IPED Project Paper states at page 29:

"Considering that the transition from agriculture to industry is at an early stage in these islands, and the social and cultural incentives for, obstacles to, and effects of such change are not well known, the Private Sector Strategy Evaluation will also address the social and cultural implications and effects of the strategy."

It appears entirely relevant for both project and program evaluations to examine the social, cultural, and generational characteristics of the business communities involved in the execution of AID private sector projects, and to inquire into the needs, attitudes and motivations of these communities. However, no formal cultural or sociological studies are presently anticipated, and it is conceivable that such subjects will be treated almost entirely on an impressionistic basis. As far as project evaluations are concerned, the Scope of Work states that the Contractor should not anticipate spending more than six person weeks of international consultant time on any one project evaluation (p. 19). "Socio-economic conditions of the target group" are listed under "changes in external factors," and as one of some 25 variables to be evaluated in a "generic scope of work" outlined in the Contract Work Statement. Given the complexity of most of RDO/C's private sector projects and the importance of other considerations bearing on program impact, it is doubtful that much time can be dedicated to systematic socio-cultural investigations in project evaluations.

As far as the program evaluation is concerned, beyond gathering appropriate baseline data, it appears premature to schedule resources for social and cultural studies. Should subsequent investigations indicate that poorly understood socio-cultural factors are critical to assessment of the program, scheduling of resources for this purpose may be in order.

RECOMMENDATION:

Commitment of effort to formal socio-cultural investigations is a conceivable but not highly probable outcome of initial project and program evaluations. No such commitments should be made at this time, but the question should be left open.

II. GENERIC SCOPE OF WORK

A careful analysis of the Contract Scope of Work indicates that the intended purpose of the generic scope of work is a relatively modest one. It is meant to serve as a means of encouraging a greater degree of uniformity in project evaluations, and of giving them a program-oriented dimension. It is a starting point for two parallel processes that will be carried on throughout the course of our work and the work of others:

- (1) the definition of the scopes of work for specific project and program evaluations and
- (2) a functional restatement of the contents of the Private Sector Office portfolio in program-pertinent terms.

The generic scope of work is one of a number of tools to be applied in carrying out these two continuing activities. It marks the beginning, not the end, of their paths.

This Section is composed of three parts. Subsection II-A discusses the purpose the Generic Scope of Work. Subsection II-B outlines its structure and content. Subsection II-C discusses the use and modifications of the generic scope of work in project evaluations.

A. PURPOSE

The "Evaluation Framework" section of the Scope of Work in the Contract (Subsection A-2) provides that the Contractor is to draw up a "generic scope of work" which will be roughly applicable across the entire Private Sector Office portfolio. It then lists some twenty-five types of variables to be evaluated in such a scope of work. These variables are organized in the format of AID's Logical Framework. Inputs and outputs are shown on the project level alone. A set of project purposes and a set of program purposes are shown separately. Goals and subgoals are shown only at the program level. Changes in external factors are shown without distinction as to project and program levels.

Subsection A-2 then goes on to list thirteen evaluation tasks, including those which concern project contribution to program goals; types and numbers of project activities which assist the region's private sector to increase production and productivity; measurement of planned and unplanned project impacts; linkages with other donors and agencies; effectiveness of particular techniques; program institutionalization; assessing performance of project management structure; internal and external project staff administrative relationships; compliance with work plans and implementation schedules; assessing impact of external factors on attainment of project objectives; and changes for increasing project efficiency and impact.

The Contract Scope of Work circumscribes the generic scope of work and its application in four important ways. First, it makes clear that evaluation of each project will take place against the objectives and indicators established in the Logical Framework prepared during the course of project design, and against other documented updates developed as the project proceeds. Second, it provides that RDO/C will review and approve the specific scope of work for each evaluation. Third, it makes clear that LBII should not anticipate utilizing more than six weeks of international consultant time on any one project evaluation, including familiarization with contract documentation, familiarizing Governments and implementing organizations with the process to be conducted, field evaluation, and preparation of project reports. Finally, it states its expectations with respect to standardization:

"Given the number of evaluations and internal variables involved, full standardization of evaluation methodology will not be possible. However, the Contractor will strive for maximum feasible standardization to facilitate comparability across projects and for overall program evaluation."

The generic scope laid out in the Scope of Work does not, in itself, purport to define the scope, structure, and detail the private sector projects and program themselves, nor does it define the strategic relationship of each individual project to the entire program.

B. STRUCTURE AND CONTENT

Exhibit III presents an outline of a Generic Scope of Work recommended by LBII for use in preparing Scopes of Work for individual evaluations. The recommended outline represents a modification of the outline contained in the Contract Scope of Work (which is reproduced in Appendix A and is referred to below as the "Contract Outline". These changes have been made both on the basis of suggestions contained in LBII's Technical Proposal and on the basis of the work carried out in the preparation of this Work Plan. The major change is at the purpose level, discussed in Subsection 2-c below.

a. Order of Elements

We have reversed the order of the elements shown in the Contract outline to conform to the conventional Logframe order. Goals come first, purpose second, outputs third, inputs fourth and "Changes in external factors" last. We see "program" as being particularly pertinent at the project goal level. Putting goal first helps to communicate the central idea that a program dimension is being added to the traditionally "purpose" oriented project evaluations.

We recognise that order put forth in the Contract Outline as designed to emphasize the idea of measurement of variables, from cause to effect. Nevertheless the first question for most persons working on these evaluations is, "What program ends or objectives am I supposed to be relating this evaluation to?" We place the answer to that question up front.

b. Program Goal

Two-Fold Goal Statement

The Contract Outline contains three items under the heading "Program Goals/Subgoals:"

- (1) Investment climate measurably improved.
- (2) The productive sector is being measurably expanded, thereby creating export earnings
- (3) Standard of living of Caribbean poor is being measurably improved.

We propose to replace these items with a statement of two goals for RDO/C's Private Sector Program:

- employ.
 - prod.
 - expts
 - productivity
 - Standard of living
1. To increase measurably the contributions of private sector enterprises and institutions to employment, production, exports, productivity, and/or improved standards of living in six Eastern Caribbean LDC's
 2. To improve measurably the investment climate in these six countries.

The first goal as formulated by LBII subsumes the second and third Contract Outline goals, but is somewhat broader and, in some ways, more precise. A situation in which the private portion of the productive sector is measurably while publicly owned productive enterprises are measurably contracting with a net expansion of zero could signal a favorable outcome under our formulation.

Exhibit IV contains a list of the goals and subgoals presently contained in LogFrames and existing documentation of the projects on the primary project list (Exhibit I). Employment is mentioned in a number of these statements. Putting people to work is a fundamental objective shared by donors and recipients in the Eastern Caribbean. We believe that employment belongs at the goal level in the private sector program formulation.

The second goal, improvement of investment climate, is normally considered a means to the achievement of the first goal. However, at a given point in time, the investment climate could have measurably improved (laws passed, government policies and procedures changed, investors correspondingly impressed) without tangible economic impacts having yet followed.

The program goal statements can be changed to "End of Program Status" descriptions simply by grammatical inversion, e.g. the second goal as proposed by LBII simply goes back to "investment climate measurably improved," the format used in the Contract Outline.

Specification of Geographic Scope

Given the fact that the projects in the Private Sector Office cover differing sets of countries, it is very important to delineate the specific countries to which the program goal (and hence the program assessment emphasis) applies. We are recommend that RDO/C's primary area of concern, the six English Speaking Eastern Caribbean LDC's, should be used for this purpose. In the discussion which follows, we call these six countries the "primary program impact area."

There are several Private Sector Office Projects which operate in Barbados, Montserrat and/or Belize, and a few (such as those involving CAIC, CUNA and LAAD) which are directed at several other countries as well. It should be understood that defining a limited geographic scope for program evaluation purposes is not intended to limit the geographic scope of project evaluations, though it doubtless will affect allocation of resources in a given evaluation. Thus, for program evaluation purposes, an evaluation of a project that serves Barbados, Montserrat, and Guyana as well as the six Eastern Caribbean countries will devote special attention to program issues in the primary program impact area which will not be not be required in the three countries not in this area. It should be understood as well that defining the intended primary impact area of the program does not preclude identifying intended or unintended effects of the program outside this primary area of intended impact. Thus, if a firm had pretty much decided on locating an assembly operation in Malaysia, but was persuaded by project personnel to consider Eastern Caribbean as an alternative-- and ended up locating the operation in the Dominican Republic, that could be considered as a pertinent project impact.

Conceivably the definition of the primary program impact area could be widened to include Montserrat, Belize, and/or Barbados, or, for that matter, any country in which any RDO/C-managed project money is spent or services delivered. The wider the focus, the more costly the analysis and/or the thinner its results.

What is most important is that a primary impact area should be defined decisively and clearly, and that, once made, the definition should be adhered to. The geographic scope decision has direct effect on the impact monitoring, cost analysis, job relocation analyses, and data base development activities which are described elsewhere in this Work Plan.

Specification of Time Period

The nominal period for the first program report (due February 28, 1987) will be 1980-1986. The nominal period for the second program report (due February 28, 1988) will be 1980-1987, giving special attention to any changes noted since the submission of the first program report. These nominal designations will establish the time parameters for sought-after information for the program-related portions of project evaluations. However, because of anticipated differences in the respective coverages of project and country data, time period boundaries for specific program analyses will not be rigidly established in advance. Data for recently completed calendar or fiscal years may or may not be generally available, and it is best to look at the entire data picture before setting firm limits for any given program report or analysis. Some projects (such as the Regional Agribusiness Development Project) started before 1980. If significant impacts occurred during, or lessons can be learned from, the period prior to 1980, they certainly will be included in the program reports.

c. Program and Project Purpose

The Contract Outline describes project and program purposes under two separate categories, "project level" and "program level" as follows:

(1) Project Level

- (a) Employment
- (b) Institutions established or strengthened
- (c) Firm-level productivity
- (d) Foreign investment
- (e) Foreign exchange earnings or savings (net)

(2) Program Level

- (a) Private investment results in measurable increases in export oriented business.
- (b) Construction of physical infrastructure for production results in measurable increases in jobs
- (c) Upgrading managerial and technical skills results in measurable increases in firm-level productivity.
- (d) Creation of a private development finance institution results in a measurable flow of financial resources to targeted businesses, resulting in turn in their measurable growth.

Exhibit V lists the purposes of the projects on the primary list as shown in their Logical Framework and other documents.

A comparison of the approach suggested in the Contract Outline with the project purposes shown in Exhibit V. indicates the likelihood of some confusion in relating the existing Logframe purposes with purposes or purpose variables shown in the Contract Outline. We are concerned that evaluators and project people could become mired in, and confused by, what are, in effect, three different ways of stating purpose, all of them on about the same conceptual level. Our analysis of the content of the projects on the primary evaluation list (Exhibit I) indicates that there are more structural elements in these projects than are reflected in the Contract Outline or indeed in the Purpose statements of these projects themselves. (Exhibit V).

We therefore have adopted a somewhat different approach to "purpose" than the one presented in the Contract Outline. We have renamed the section, "Project Purpose Elements," a shorthand phrase for its intended use in a program-related analysis of elements (or subcategories) of project purposes.

We have provided a single long list of purpose elements by means of which the project can be related to the purpose elements of other projects and the goal of the program without directly reworking or replacing the existing statements of project purposes.

What is involved here is the Cartesian process of breaking projects into basic elements for purposes of understanding, measurement and rationalization. One could argue that what we are really doing is creating "subpurposes," or "classifying outputs," or requiring the rewriting of project purposes on a much more detailed, standardized basis. What is really crucial here is to break the projects down into pieces that reflect the reality of what they are (or should be) doing, and then to fit these pieces back into the rubric of the program goal.

We have identified nearly forty purpose elements. We well may specify others as our analysis proceeds and we would encourage others to suggest additions. Obviously, no single project contains all of these elements, but many Private Sector Office projects are in fact multifaceted and quite complex. This complexity, which may not be readily apparent on conventional project logframes, is a feature of the project of the program that deserves analysis. The list of purpose elements will also be used in developing an impact monitoring system.

d. Project Outputs

We have substantially expanded the list of project outputs in the Contract Outline in order to make it commensurable with the elements of project purpose.

e. Project Inputs

We have made only a few changes in the Project Outline on this level. The main addition is to make clear that, for a given project, each type of input can be provided by AID, another donor, and/or a recipient institution or recipient in a host country.

f. Changes in External Factors

The Contract Outline lists three external factors:

- (1) Macro-economic conditions.
- (2) Socio-economic conditions of target group
- (3) Government policy

Our outline makes clear that the macroeconomic conditions referred to as those in both the host countries and those in countries which constitute their principal export markets.

We have added an item on market conditions and technological trends in key industries abroad because, even with good macroeconomic conditions prevailing a shift in style or a new production technology can affect orders for goods which are very important to key establishments in island economies.

We have modified the item, "Government policies" in the Contract Outline to make clear that where changing government policies is an intended purpose of a project or program, the failure of a government to make the intended policy change cannot be regarded as an "external" condition.

Finally, we have added an item concerned with the realism of the explicit and implicit assumptions concerning external factors made in the project design. One important question that should be addressed on a program wide basis is whether the private sector portfolio is sufficiently diversified to accommodate a reasonably wide range of economic conditions that could exist in an uncertain future.

C. USE OF GENERIC SCOPE OF WORK

The generic scope of work will be used both in evaluations and in the developing a project monitoring system. Its use as an input in connection with monitoring is briefly described in Section IV of this Work Plan under Task 31.

For project evaluations, the use of the generic scope of work will proceed along the following lines. After review of the project files, discussions with the RDO/C Project Officer, and other key persons involved in the project, the evaluator will identify items on the list of project purpose elements which ostensibly contribute to program goals.

He or she will then briefly sketch out the causal path which leads from these purpose elements to the program goals-- and from the purpose elements back through outputs to inputs. Bearing in mind limitations on project evaluation resources, the evaluator will then propose a few of the more promising paths for exploration in a given evaluation. For these selected paths, methods of gathering data concerning chains of causation will be specified. These methods could consist of case studies, systematic surveys, analyses of data bases, macroeconomic indicators, or other quantitative information, and/or simply gathering convincing anecdotal evidence. In the early stages of applying the generic scope of work, it is anticipated that there will pressures to expand the number of purpose elements-- because project personnel may feel some important aspect of a given project has been left out. But as the pressures to select and substantiate items exert themselves within budget limitations, a relatively few items are likely to emerge as representing the fundamental functional profile of RDO/C's Private Sector Program.

The generic scope of work will help link individual evaluations to program assessments in several ways. It will enable the program assessment to present a well-conceived analysis of the principal elements of the projects covered by the assessment. With such an analysis as background, the program assessment can compare the ways in which, and the effectiveness with which, like elements of different projects have been carried out. It can also compare the ways and extent to which such elements may have contributed to program goals, the casual paths, leading from project to program goals, and the presence or absence of synergistic effects within and between project elements. Within individual project evaluations, the generic scope of work will help to maintain a proper balance between emphasis on more immediate operational concerns focus and on longer term issues of impact and lessons for the future. By encouraging a longer and wider view, use of the generic scope of work could conceivably contribute to sounder and more objectively based practical recommendations.

III. DATA BASE DEVELOPMENT

A. PURPOSE

In describing the contents of this Work Plan, the Contract Scope of Work indicates that the Contractor should evaluate the quality of project-derived data and to provide a plan "to develop a comprehensive baseline data base." Section B contains an assessment of the existing project data base. Section C provides a plan for database development.

B. ASSESSMENT OF EXISTING PROJECT DATA BASE

We have conducted a brief review of the files of the nineteen "primary" projects listed in Exhibit I. Our assessment of the project data base was conducted from three perspectives: its adequacy from the viewpoint of program assessment, its adequacy from the viewpoint of impact monitoring, and its adequacy from the viewpoint of project evaluation employing quasi-experimental project evaluation design.

1. Costs

The most fundamental question raised by the 1983 GAO audit and by the Contract Scope of Work definition of the objective of evaluating the private sector program is, "Do the results justify the costs?" Costs are a very important ingredient of this question. The kinds of costs that can be captured from the RDO/C's records and the extent to which these costs can be tied, through project output data to impact indicators, will significantly affect the quality of the program and project analysis. There is a considerable amount of information on costs in RDO/C's accounting system and in its project files, but a substantial effort will be required in order to turn this information into a form in which it is commensurable with information on impact and benefits.

The question of whether the results justify the cost ideally should be addressed on a project-by-project, country-by-country, function-by-function basis. To provide a convincing and useful work product, in the end, we would like to be able to report and analyze information along the following lines:

"Table A shows the annual cash outflows from RDO/C's Private Sector Portfolio for the benefit of Country X for the period 1980-1986. These cash outflows are broken down by

- (a) portions of loans and grants provided by intermediaries to end-users (project beneficiaries) which have their origin in AID financing,
- (b) AID payments for technical assistance rendered to business establishments in the productive sector in Country X, (c) AID payments for technical assistance rendered to governments, associations, and intermediate institutions on Country X,

- (d) AID payments made for training, wherever given, of persons in business establishments in the productive sector
- (e) AID payments for project identification, feasibility and appraisal studies for the country and
- (f) other AID private sector portfolio expenditures for the benefit of Country X.

Table B shows the same information for funds provided through the same channels and for the same end use purposes by collaborating international agencies, host governments, intermediaries, and associations, and by end users themselves (from savings, personal loans, commercial loans, etc). Table C shows cash inflows representing repayments by end-users (beneficiaries) to intermediaries of the portfolio-related borrowed funds shown in Tables A and B."

Our impression from a rapid review of the files is that while there is no subject covered on the above-described Tables A, B, and C on which one set of project files or another does not contain some information. Yet there is no single set of project files that contains anything like the full picture for that project required to fill in its lines on three tables. It certainly is not realistic to expect that a comprehensive financial profile for all projects in the portfolio can quickly be extracted from the project files and/or from the Mission's accounting system.

The creation of a fairly good picture of the magnitudes and uses of cash flows is critically important in developing a sound data base strategy. Looking backward in time, a financial profile should reveal a good deal about the relationship of project and program components to the measurement of impacts. Looking forward, such a profile will help to identify the kinds of impacts which are likely to prove the most critical and the kinds of relationships between costs and impact, which are important to examine.

The size of the program budget in relationship to the country's size provides some notion of the order of magnitude of expected results. This relationship also yields some insights concerning the potential policy leverage which the program may have.

Clearly the pattern of the end-use of funds is only a partial predictor of anticipated results of a project or a program, and certainly a project can have significant impact even if it provides no funds or services directly to end users. For example, on the basis of its most recent evaluation report, the Credit Union II project appears to have had a catalytic role in mobilizing local savings-- without itself providing substantial funds for relending. Apparently, significant amounts of funds were lent to business people for productive purposes without any assistance in their small enterprises being extended to these people.

Nevertheless, if one were to find a country in which virtually no AID funds reached productive enterprises, and no technical assistance or training was delivered to persons in such enterprises, one would not normally expect to find a measurable impact on macroeconomic indicators. A financial profile is a skeleton on which should be hung a program evaluation- and, to a lesser extent- project evaluations and baseline creation. Given the structure of the accounting system and the information in the files, preparing such a financial profile will be a significant task.] D

2. Impact Reporting

Only a few projects contain periodic reports on project impact. Other than establishing a schedule for evaluations and tying these evaluations to project Logframes, project papers are generally silent on the subject of how AID is to receive regular information on project impact for monitoring purposes. The LAAD Agribusiness Expansion Project Paper (Project No. 538-0057) contained a particularly interesting device called the "Two Million Dollar Review" in which was to include analysis of information on impact reported on subproject forms. This subproject impact data was to be combined with information on business conditions and other subjects to create a form of integrated project impact assessment. Two "Two Million Dollar Reviews" were held, but we have found no evidence in the files of any integrated impact analysis for this project. The device still merits consideration.

3. Reliability and Objectivity of Impact Estimates

Except for highly visible and important projects, estimates of project impact (e.g. employment created, production and exports stimulated, membership increased, new businesses started, and the like) in the project files do not appear to have been subjected to a great deal of cross-checking and independent substantiation. Such estimates sometimes have been made in what may be termed a "viewing with pride" mode-- in proposals, in reviews shortly before refunding decisions are made, or on other occasions when high side estimates may have been in vogue. In the brief time available for our review of the files, it has not been possible to form a judgement as to the extent of this phenomenon. At this time we are not able to assess the accuracy of the data reported, or the extent to which needed caveats may have been omitted. Pressures to report good news are hardly unique to the RDO/C program, and account needs to be taken of the effects of these pressures. We suggest below a pattern in which data developed for impact monitoring purposes can be cross-checked be re-examined in evaluations, and both can be validated in baseline studies.

4. Baseline for Quasi-experimental Evaluation Design

We have found no instance in which the information contained in the project files is by itself suitable in its nature, quality, and quantity to serve as a baseline for a longitudinal or cross-sectional quasi-experimental evaluation design.

5. Overall Assessment

Given the extent of the project files and the time available to review them, our assessment is, of necessity, impressionistic. There is a great deal of information in the files, but little that can be utilized for the purposes of the work to be performed by LBII without considerable cross-checking, disaggregation, re-aggregation and analysis. The Mission's accounting system was not set up to track the costs of regional projects on a nation-by-nation basis. The projects themselves were not designed within a uniform framework; they have not been integrated into a single management information system; the organizations responsible for project execution are very different in their capabilities and operating styles. It is not surprising that the information in the files requires digestion and enhancement.

C. DATABASE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

LBII proposes to inter-relate four activities in the process of data base development

- (1) creation of a suitable program cost data base;
- (2) creation of an impact monitoring system;
- (3) creation of a multiproject baseline; and
- (4) impact assessment in individual project evaluations.

We see the first two tasks, which can be carried out in parallel as being steps on a critical path leading to the multiproject baseline. We view the conduct of project evaluations as a function which can contribute to the data base development process whenever they are conducted, but which are likely to contribute most if they are conducted following the creation of a multiproject baseline. Because of the importance attached by the Scope of Work to the creation of a multi-project baseline, this subject is discussed first.

1. Background

The Contract Scope of Work states on pages 18-19:

"A principal focus of the contractor will be on developing baseline data for new or recently implemented projects. Some of this data will be usable for older projects as well... The Contractor will be expected to collect baseline information for projects in their early stages in such a manner as to allow for quasi-experimental evaluation design where this seems justified... It is assumed that in most cases experimental designs for measurement of either project or program-level indicators will not prove justified either on the basis of cost or utility. In most cases, it can safely be assumed that some form of quasi-experimental design or case study will be utilized to measure indicators."

The Contract Scope of Work was developed at a time when IPIP and CFSC were still new, when it seemed if several new Mission projects might soon appear on the scene, along with the Evaluation Contractor. As the present Work Plan is prepared, IPIP redesign is about to get under way and the CFSC project has matured to the point where it already has had both an evaluation and a performance audit. Of the projects on the primary list in Exhibit I, only Small Enterprise Assistance (Project No. 538-0133) appears to fall into the category of "new or recently implemented projects."

A second consideration in the formulation of an approach to a multiproject database is the likelihood that a quasi-experimental design will be used to study SEA or other projects which may be developed before the multi-project baseline analysis is implemented. Significant reservations have been raised about the cost effectiveness of quasi-experimental design studies (as contrasted with case studies) in AID/W's Center for Development Information and Evaluation, and rightly so, in our judgment. We would certainly not rule out the quasi-experimental design at this point, but we would express three cautions.

The first caution is that the Scope of Work provides for only one baseline study. Since this baseline qua will be directed principally at new projects, it could only mark the beginning of an experimental period for a longitudinal (as distinguished from a cross-sectional) survey design. The Scope of Work does not provide for a second field survey at the end of the experimental period. The second caution is that, in a quasi-experimental design, project evaluations directed to the kinds of issues listed in the Evaluation Framework portion of the Scope of Work should not be used at the same time as a substitute for a second field survey. The limited amount of staffing allocated to individual project evaluations and their multiple concerns do not jibe well with the special requirements of large scale sample surveys and experimental designs.

The final caution is that, even with the most well conceived survey design and most carefully managed sample surveys, there is no guarantee that analysis of the data will produce correlations that meet standard tests of statistical significance. Too frequently, the conclusions of experimental designs studies conducted in developing countries have been that the data gathered is not reliable enough to affirm or negate study hypotheses.

2. Proposed Approach

We propose to create a multi-project baseline, within the six-country program area for each project on the primary list whether or not that project has been completed or gone through its final evaluation by the time of the field survey. We propose to carry out a six-country sample survey in April of 1987, after work has been completed on the design of the impact position an impact monitoring system (January 31) and the first report on the Private Sector Program (February 28). The sample survey would have five basic purposes. First, it would serve as a catalyst to the start-up an impact monitoring system which would apply to all on-going Private Sector Office projects. Second, it would be designed to answer questions about project impact raised, but not fully answered, in the first Private Sector Program Report (due February 28, 1987). Third, it would provide a range of program benchmarks. Fourth, it would test the validity of data on program impact presently in RDO/C files. Fifth, it would provide a sample of project beneficiaries and of persons/establishments not ostensibly directly affected by the designated projects which could be used for case studies and a variety of purposes in subsequent evaluations. Sixth, it may serve as the baseline for a quasi-experimental design for the SEA project, if that is decided upon. The design of the sample survey will take place during the month of March, 1987.

Work on a Program Cost Data Base would be carried out in the Fall of 1986. This should produce a reasonable approximation of Tables A, B, and C described in Subsection B-1 above. It would provide insights both for project impact monitoring system and for sample survey design. An important issue will be how the sample should be weighted as between projects. Among the considerations that should be taken into account in sample design on a country by country basis are:

Magnitude of use of AID funds on a given project

Magnitude of all funds associated with the project

Relationship of planned cash flows to actual cash flows

Importance, in terms of of resource use, of grants, credit, technical assistance, training, feasibility studies, and other means of assistance.

Relative magnitudes of AID resources expended by intermediaries as compared with AID resources expended by beneficiaries/end users.

The Program Cost Data Base will provide this kind of information.

The sample survey design also will benefit from the work on the development of an impact monitoring system. This system will bring together on a regular basis, data from secondary sources such as CBD, IBRD and CAIC and combine it with primary impact information to be gathered and reported regularly on a project-by-project basis. One dimension of the impact monitoring effort will look periodically at project and program results in their broadest terms, asking questions such as:

What kinds of lasting changes have these projects, taken separately and together, produced in the private sector and the institutions that affect it?

Is the program producing changes in policies or outlook which can have a sustained effect in the future?

In particular, is the program changing any public or private sector attitudes about risk-taking, incentives, and self-reliance?

A second dimension, will be very specific. It will compile a reasonably complete list of beneficiaries of Private Sector Office projects, with the exception of the very large numbers of members of credit unions in the six countries. It will also produce a well conceived regime of detailed information on outputs and impact, specifying a reasonable number of periodic reporting requirements which focus on key indicators relating to the business activity resulting from AID's projects and effects of this activity.

Both of these dimensions will contribute to sample survey design. The first will contribute to the development of some psychometric questions designed to elicit respondents' perceptions of changes in attitude on their own part and on the part of others in the context of their cultural environments. The second dimension will focus on the function of the sample survey as a catalyst to the installation of the project impact monitoring system. Some of the information sought subsequently will be updated on a regular basis by this system.

The impact monitoring system also will contribute to the design of the survey sample by providing information, by project and by country, on:

Number of establishments affected

Number of beneficiaries affected

Names and addresses of beneficiaries and intermediaries

Projects with the most impressive ostensible track records

Projects with the least impressive ostensible track records

It is not intended that the sample survey will deal with compliance monitoring issues. However, interviews will be conducted with intermediary and delivery institutions as well as with ultimate beneficiaries. It is anticipated that questions may be asked concerning the effects of AID regulations on participation in the program and on its administration.

Information provided by the both the baseline survey (which will establish conditions at a single point in time) and the impact monitoring system (which will gather periodic information on key indicators) will somewhat lighten the routine information gathering load of persons involved in evaluations and permit them to focus more attention on substantive issues. However, it is intended that re-interviewing and double checking of information will be carried out on a selected basis during evaluations.

For this reason, both the baseline survey and the impact monitoring reports should leave "audit trails" which permit evaluators to get back to primary informants with ease. The baseline survey will identify a "non-target" or "non-treatment" sample which will be matched as well as is reasonable to the sample of persons and organizations directly affected by the AID Private Sector portfolio. It is intended that evaluators will draw on this matched list in order to provide "control sample" type perspectives during the course of their evaluations.

IV. WORK PROGRAM

This Section of our Work Plan presents our Work Program. LBII's plan to carry out this project consists of six distinct assignments and 41 principal tasks. These assignments and tasks are set forth in the remainder of this section. Assignment outputs are summarized at the end of each Assignment for purposes of monitoring LBII's performance of its responsibilities.

ASSIGNMENT I Initiation of Assignment

Assignment I consists of four tasks, which are described in greater detail below.

Task 1 Make Administrative Arrangements

The purpose of this task was for the Project Manager to assemble personnel and equipment and make other administrative arrangements needed to initiate the assignment. Subtask have included:

- a. Select computer equipment and supplies
- b. Engage in Post and Mission Orientation
- c. Make ad hoc and standby arrangements for space
- d. Hire Secretary
- e. Prepare security forms
- f. Make arrangements for local supplies, logistic arrangements, and billings

Task 2 Participate in RAF Review

The purpose of this Task was for the Project Manager to review Records of Audit Findings concerning three Private Sector Office Projects, participate in RAF review meetings, and undertake certain short assignments in connection with these meetings.

- a. Review RAFs
- b. Attend RAF Review Meetings
- c. Extract materials from selected files

Task 3 Develop Work Plan and Schedule

The Purpose of this task was for the Project Manager to:

- a. Review Mission and Program goal statements
- b. Evaluate available project data

- c. Reach key decisions with RDO/C management on the scope of the effort
- d. Define purposes of baseline data development
- e. Draft "generic scope of work"
- f. Develop Work Plan for submission to RDO/C
- g. Define special issues for particular attention
- h. Set up logistical arrangements for project execution
- i. Set up organization, coordination, and monitoring of work progress

Task 4 Visit Selected Project Sites

The purpose of this task is for the Project Manager to familiarize himself with conditions, implementation issues, and resource organizations in six countries.

- a. Visit Antigua
- b. Visit St. Kitts
- c. Visit Grenada
- d. Visit Dominica
- e. Visit St. Lucia
- f. Visit St. Vincent

PRINCIPAL OUTPUTS OF ASSIGNMENT I

The principal outputs of Assignment I of these tasks are as follows:

- Task 1: Administrative arrangements completed as specified
- Task 2: Staff memorandum completed
- Task 3: Work Plan completed
- Task 4: Trip Report completed

ASSIGNMENT II Development of Baseline Data

Assignment II consists of four tasks, which are described in detail below.

Task 5 Develop Program Cost Data Base

The purpose of this task is to establish the historical cash outflows of the Private Sector Office projects on a project-by-project, function-by-function basis for the six LDC Eastern Caribbean Countries.

Task 8

Data Analysis

The purpose of this task is to prepare and analyze standardized tables containing data pertinent to the individual projects and the program as a whole.

- a. Develop standardized tables for individual projects and program as a whole.
- b. Analyze contribution of survey data to understanding of project progress, efficiency, effectiveness, and impact.
- c. Analyze contribution of survey to understanding of program progress, efficiency, effectiveness, and impact.
- d. Perform assessment of data consistency, reliability, and replicability.
- e. Make corrections and provide proxy variable to remedy data deficiencies, as appropriate.
- f. Make recommendations for continued data development through impact monitoring, evaluations, and other means.
- g. Prepare report on survey results.

PRINCIPAL OUTPUTS OF ASSIGNMENT II

The principal outputs of Assignment II are as follows:

- | | |
|---------------|---|
| <u>Task 5</u> | Tables A, B, and C as described in text of Section III of this Work Plan and appropriate explanatory materials. |
| <u>Task 6</u> | Survey Research Design and Forms |
| <u>Task 7</u> | Survey Data Encoded on Diskettes/Hard Disk |
| <u>Task 8</u> | Report on Results of Analysis of Results of Sample Survey |

ASSIGNMENT III

Project Evaluations

Assignment III consists of 11 tasks, which are described below.

- | | |
|----------------|---|
| <u>Task 9</u> | Define common issues, approaches, timeframe, stages of evaluation common to Private Sector Office Projects. |
| <u>Task 10</u> | Apply up-dated AID Evaluation Guidance to project-specific evaluation designs. |
| <u>Task 11</u> | Recommend extent of evaluation effort for each project (mid-term, ongoing, final evaluation, etc.) |

- Task 12 Review other ongoing or previous evaluation activity carried out by RDO/C to relate it to the consistency and compatability.
- Task 13 Check the feasibility, organization, and procedures for each project evaluation, and prepare scope of work utilizing about six weeks of international consultant time.
- Task 14 Prepare quasi-experimental and/or case study design for SEA and other new projects.
- Task 15 Proceed to implementation following AID approval of each proposed scope of work for a project evaluation.
- Task 16 Project Manager conducts review to discuss problems encountered, and evaluate preliminary findings, conclusions, and recommendations.
- Task 17 Compare cost-effectiveness of various projects.
- Task 18 Conduct seminars with evaluation specialists and RDO/C management to interpret evaluation results in terms of program goals and achievements. Prepare draft report.
- Task 19 Complete project evaluation reports for each evaluation after receipt of comments from RDO/C in accordance with procedures described in the Contract Scope of Work.

PRINCIPAL OUTPUTS OF ASSIGNMENT III

The principal outputs of Assignment III are scopes of work for 14 project evaluations, participation in these evaluations, and preparation of evaluation reports for those evaluations for which LBII has full responsibility.

ASSIGNMENT IV Program Performance Reports

Assignment IV consists of nine tasks, which are listed below.

- Task 20 Prepare synthesis of results and lessons of experience for private sector projects contained in evaluation studies conducted to date for AID, and, to the extent they are readily available, for other development institutions.
- Task 21 Prepare Synthesis of information from Program Cost Data Base and Impact Monitoring Design, and data available from secondary sources, focussing on cost patterns and macroeconomic evidence, and pre-survey indicators of anticpataed results.

- Task_22 Conduct Team Review of project evaluations conducted in Fall/Winter 1986/87
- Task_23 Prepare recommendations concerning data to be gathered during large scale sample survey.
- Task_24 Prepare first Program Performance Report
- Task_25 Review results of sample survey
- Task_26 Conduct Team Review of evaluations conducted in preceeding twelve months.
- Task_27 Review results of impact monitoring.
- Task_28 Prepare second Program Performance Report.

PRINCIPAL OUTPUTS OF ASSIGNMENT IV

The principal outputs of Assignment IV are two program performance reports.

ASSIGNMENT V

Project Monitoring

Assignment V consists of eleven tasks, which are listed below.

- Task_29 Review updated AID Guidance on Project Monitoring.
- Task_30 Evaluate existing monitoring system and its potential for improvement.
- Task_31 Starting with list of Purpose Elements contained in the "generic scope of work" (Task 3-c) and the cost categories developed for inclusion in Task 5, subdivide the portfolio into its major physical, financial, insitutional, and social components and stages.
- Task_32 Identify in detail the sequence of project operations indicating the logical relationships between various project activities and budgetary, procurement, and disbursement schedules.
- Task_33 Design project monitoring system around the principal categories of management information requirements.
- Task_34 Propose allocation of information generation and reporting responsibilities among implementing institutions and contractors.
- Task_35 Develop computer-based tables for presenting information to various levels of managment.

- Task_36 Determine feasibility of microcomputer network linked by modems for use in monitoring
- Task_37 Test monitoring reliability on system component by component.
- Task_38 Design indicators and other information that will highlight the health of the portfolio, in terms of trends, problem areas, and issues that require replanning and modifications; and in terms of behavior of variables that affect attainment of project purposes and program goals across the board.
- Task_39 Develop guidelines for using monitoring information in future project and program planning.

PRINCIPAL OUTPUTS OF ASSIGNMENT V

The principal outputs of Assignment V are:

1. Project Monitoring System
2. Standard Tables and Reports Format
3. Monthly and Quarterly Reports Format
4. Project Portfolio Management Reports
5. Project Completion Reports

ASSIGNMENT VI

Project Design

- Task_40 Contribute to redesign of IPIP Project.
- Task_41 Define LBII contribution to design or redesign of one or two other projects.

PRINCIPAL OUTPUTS OF ASSIGNMENT VI

The outputs of Assignment VI will consist of contributions to the design or redesign of two or three projects. Specific outputs will be agreed upon in advance of each assignment.

V. SCHEDULE AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION

This final section of our Work Plan consists of four subsections. The first, Subsection V-A, provides an overview of our planned schedule and use of personnel. Subsection V-B contains a discussion of the study strategy reflected in the Work Schedule. Subsection V-C provides details on planned activities and use of personnel through February 28, 1987. The final subsection, V-D, discusses the cost implications of our proposed schedule of work.

A. OVERVIEW

Exhibit VI shows the project schedule by principal assignment, position, and staff category. The Project Manager's field orientation visits, originally scheduled in LBII's Technical Proposal as part of Assignment III (Evaluation), have been included in Assignment I (Initiation). The preponderance of the evaluation work now takes place nearly a year after these initiation visits.

Assignment II (Data Base Development) is carried out in two parts, the first in the Fall of 1986 and the second in the Spring of 1987. Assignment III (Evaluation) has three clusters, the first in the Fall of 1986 and early Winter of 1987, the second in the Summer and Fall of 1987, an evaluation of PDAP or PDAP replacement in the Spring of 1988. The 1987 clustering poses a particular scheduling challenge. Assignment IV (Program Performance Reports) is organized around the February due dates for the two program reports. Assignment V carried out in three clusters. The final assignment (Assignment VI, Project Design) has been spread out over most of the project period. It is difficult at this time to predict the scheduling of any project other than the IPIP redesign.

Exhibit VII shows our planned schedule for carrying out the tasks identified in Section IV of this Work Plan. Exhibit VII also shows the distribution of the work load among LBII's Project Manager (Mr. Lerner), other specialists from the United States to be provided by LBII and its U.S. subcontractors (International Phoenix Corporation and Analysis Group Inc.) and personnel to be provided by our local subcontractor (Coopers and Lybrand).

The bottom line totals, 23 person months for the Project Manager, 20 person months for other U.S. specialists, and 40 person months for the local subcontract, reflect the estimates contained in the Contract Scope of Work and are identical to those shown in LBII's Technical Proposal. As noted previously the person-month allocations, by assignment generally conform to the Contract Scope of Work, with some minor modifications.

B. SCHEDULE STRATEGY

The underlying strategy of the schedule is to carry out the Scope of Work in the most orderly and efficient way, while at the same time accommodating major contract deadlines and Mission special requirements. In purely linear analytical terms, it would be ideal for the development of a program cost data base (Task 5, the initial task in the data base development assignment and the provision of the Project Monitoring system to come first. The development of the rest of the data base should come second. Project evaluations should come third. A single program evaluation next, and project design/redesign last. However, given a requirement for two program reports with a year's interval between them, it seems sensible to base the first report principally on a thorough analysis of information in RDO/C files, data from contractors and recipient institutions, and from evaluations to be carried out in the next six months. The synthesis of such information in the first program report will provide an excellent background for the sample survey, which can supplement, test, confirm or disaffirm the key portions of available data. With the benefit of survey data, the results of information from subsequent evaluations, and a year's additional experience, the second report can move well beyond from the base established in the first report.

Given a requirement for two evaluations in the fall of 1986, a contribution to IPIP redesign during the remainder of the calendar year, and at least one evaluation early in 1987, it seems desirable to defer the development of a portion of the monitoring system. Since the baseline survey should not be delayed until late in the study, it is desirable to have lessons learned in carrying out other assignments feed the final development of the monitoring system towards the end of the two-year period. Introducing a certain amount of iteration and interweaving principal assignments provides a way to respond to real world pressures and requirements, and at the same time provide a reasonably efficient study design.

C. THE SCHEDULE AND STAFFING THROUGH FEBRUARY 28

This two-year contract is presently funded through February 28, 1987, on which date the first program report is due. The schedule envisions orientation visits by the Project Manager to the Eastern Caribbean LDC's an evaluation of the Credit Union II project starting in early October, evaluation of the Private Sector Investment Assistance Project (PSIAP) (CAIC) starting in late October or early November, early attention to the PDAP monitoring system, a contribution to IPIP redesign before the end of the calendar year, and at least one evaluation (Regional Agribusiness Development) early in 1987. We think it would be useful and cost-effective to combine this evaluation with an evaluation of the Agribusiness Expansion Project (LAAD).

The Project Manager is going to be very busy, and he will need help. We envision that this help will be as follows:

<u>Position Title</u>	<u>Task Number</u>	<u>Description of Work to be Performed</u>	<u>Assignment Length</u>	<u>Months, Year</u>
Financial Analyst	5	Prepare and analyze key cash flow tables	8 weeks	10-11/86
Chief, Baseline Data	6	Overview of baseline data requirements	1 week	10/86
Evaluation Specialist	15	Conduct interviews and participate in Credit Union Evaluation	3 weeks	10/86
Senior Evaluation Specialist	15	Interview CAIC Board Members and participate in PSIAP evaluation	2 weeks	11/86
Evaluation Specialist	15 18	Analyze project data Assist in draft report preparation	3 weeks	10-11/86
Senior Evaluation Specialist	15 18	Head Evaluation Team for 2 Agricultural Project Evaluations	5 weeks	1-2/87
Evaluation Specialist	15 18	Team Member, two Agricultural Project Evaluations	5 weeks	1-2/87

The Project Manager, with the assistance of the Chief of Baseline Data, will provide guidance for the financial analyst, during October and November on this task. He will participate in both the Credit Union and PSIAP evaluations. In the case of the Credit Union evaluation, LBII will provide two participants in an evaluation for which the manager and several other participants have already been selected from other organizations by agreement with AID. The designated evaluation manager will be responsible for preparing the final evaluation report. In the case of the remaining three evaluations, LBII will take full responsibility. For the two agricultural evaluations, which will be carried out together, the LBII's Resident Project Manager will prepare the scope of work and review the final work product. In other respects a Senior Evaluation Specialist, to be brought on short term assignment from the United States, will provide leadership for the effort. Mr. Lerner will oversee the PSIAP evaluation in late October or early November, but day-to-day leadership will be supplied by a Senior Evaluation Specialist.

D. COST IMPLICATIONS OF WORK PROGRAM

The proposed Work Program poses no problems for the total contract budget, which provide for an average monthly expenditure of \$36,257 per month over a period of 24 months. However, the obligated funds for the nine month period from, June 1, 1986 through February 28, 1987 average \$27,940 per month. Under the projected work program, obligated funds may not last through February 28. However, they would last at least through December 31, 1986, involving a average monthly expenditure of no more than \$35,922 for the first seven months of the contract. We understand that the services of personnel for the Credit Union II evaluation (other than those supplied by LBII) will be project funded, but that LBII personnel costs will be charged to the present contract.

EXHIBIT I

COMPARISON OF THREE SPECIAL-PURPOSE LISTS OF
PRIVATE ENTERPRISE OFFICE PROJECTS

PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT NAME	LIST NAME*			NOTES**
		L-4	PSR	AAP	
538-T-007	Regional Agribusiness Development	X	0	0	a
538-W-012	Employment Investment Promotion II	X	X	X	Combined in L-4
538-0018	Employment Investment Promotion II	X	X	X	
538-0035	Caribbean Credit Union Devel I	X	0	X	
538-0042	Project Development Assist Prog	X	0	0	Now IPED
538-0043	Private Sector Investment Assist	X	X	X	
538-0057	LAAD (Agribus Expansion Project)	X	0	0	b
538-0060	Caribbean Project Develop Facil	X	0	0	c
538-0079	Dominica Small Enterprise Devel	X	X	X	
538-HG-002	Barbados Private Iniat in Housing	0	X	0	Combined d
538-0081	Barbados Private Iniat in Housing	0	X	0	
538-0084	Caribbean Financial Services Corp	X	X	X	
538-0087	Regional Development Training II	0	0	X	e
538-0088	Infrastructure for Product Invest	X	X	X	
538-0102	Caribbean Marketing Assistance	X	X	X	
538-0119	Investment Promotion & Export Dev	X	X	X	
538-0133	Small Enterprise Assistance	X	X	0	f
538-0135	Caribbean Credit Union Devel II	0	X	0	g
538-0136	National Devel Foundation Assist	X	X	0	h
TOTALS		15	13	9	

* List Names are as follows:

L-4 = Attachment L-4 to RFP Scope of Work

PSR = RDO/C Project Status Report for Period 10/1/85-3/31/86.

AAP = RDO/C Annual Action Plan 1987-1988, text and tables on evaluation.

**Notes a-h are discussed in Section I-C-1 of the text.

EXHIBIT II

ADDITIONAL PROJECTS IDENTIFIED BY RDO/C AS HAVING A PRIVATE
SECTOR FOCUS OR ELEMENT

538-0073	Regional Non-Formal Skills Training
538-0140	High Impact Agricultural, Marketing and Production
538-0080	Caribbean Agriculture Trading Company
538-0138	Infrastructure Expansion and Maintenance Systems
538-0076	Dominica Road Rehabilitation
538-0098	Antigua Water Supply
543-0008	Grenada Infrastructure Revitalization I
538-0129	Grenada Infrastructure Revitalization II
543-0076	Point Saline Airport, Grenada
538-0137	St. Lucia Geothermal Development
538-0076	Dominica Rural Electrification
538-0091	St. Vincent Cumberland Hydroelectric Development
539-0092	Productive Infrastructure Rehabilitation

SOURCES: RDO/C, U.S.A.I.D. Private Sector Program in the Eastern
Caribbean, April 24, 1986 and RDO/C Project Status Report,
May 15, 1986

EXHIBIT III

OUTLINE OF "GENERIC SCOPE OF WORK"

A. PROGRAM GOALS

1. To increase measurably the contributions of private sector enterprises and institutions to employment, production, exports, productivity, and/or improved standards of living in six Eastern Caribbean LDC's
2. To improve measurably the investment climate in these six countries.

B. PROJECT PURPOSE ELEMENTS

(Intended project outcomes which contribute to program goal with the project area)

1. To attract foreign investment
2. To encourage local investment
3. To develop land for industrial and commercial uses
4. To provide factory buildings
5. To provide long term financing for businesses
6. To provide short term financing for businesses
7. To provide financing for housing
8. To provide financing for consumer durables
9. To provide other consumer credit
10. To create financial institutions to serve unmet needs
11. To improve business management skills
12. To improve record keeping and accounting skills
13. To improve labor skills
14. To develop investment promotion skills
15. To develop investment promotion institutions
16. To improve production methods
17. To introduce new technology
18. To identify and tap new markets
19. To improve service or reduce costs of public infrastructure utilized by productive activities.
20. To encourage risk-taking and entrepreneurship
21. To encourage reliance competition and market mechanisms of resource allocation.
22. To divest state-owned enterprises.
23. To replace government force account activities with government contracting.
24. To establish ground-rules under which enterprises and cooperatives can compete with government parastatals and force account activities on the basis of efficiency.
25. To adopt tax structures which encourage private initiative

26. To reduce the burdens of import and export controls and other forms of regulation of the business community
27. To improve labor-management relations.
28. To reduce distortions of market forces in international trade
29. To develop infant industries
30. To foster regional economic integration (increase market size and access)
31. To create and strengthen support institutions for small and medium-sized industry
32. To integrate the efforts of members of the business community to improve conditions of doing business
33. To create and strengthen business associations
34. To encourage dialogue between government and business on matters of mutual interest
35. To convey to policy makers an understanding of the decision-criteria of foreign investors
36. To create or change government policies
37. To create or change legislation.
38. To create or change government procedures and practices

C. PROJECT OUTPUTS

(Outputs to be related to individual purposes)

1. Technical Assistance Tasks Completed (characterize and quantify tasks)
2. Promotional materials distributed
3. Trade shows attended
4. Prospects followed up
5. Visits made
6. Financing Drawn Down by End Users
7. Persons Trained
8. Manuals Prepared
9. Institutions in Place and Providing Outputs (characterize and quantify outputs)
10. License agreements made
11. Public Infrastructure Projects Services provided
12. New ventures undertaken
13. Representations made to government officials and legislators
14. Divestiture plans prepared
15. Contracting procedures written
16. Policy studies completed
16. Labor-management conferences held
17. Relationships with decision-makers established
18. Memberships on policy-making bodies and advisory committees held
19. Recommendations on legislation, regulations, and procedures made
20. Media message circulation achieved

D. PROJECT INPUTS

(AID inputs, Other Donor inputs, and inputs provided by recipient institutions and individuals to be shown separately)

1. Funding
2. In-kind contributions
3. Policies
4. Planning
5. Project Management
6. Recruitment
7. Client interaction
8. Consultant support

E. CHANGES IN EXTERNAL FACTORS

1. Macro-economic conditions in host countries and in countries which constitute their principal export markets
2. Market conditions and technological trends in specific key industries and industry segments such as clothing and electronics prevailing worldwide or in particular export markets
3. Socio-economic conditions of target group
4. Government-policies external to those which are the subject of the program
5. Realism of explicit or implicit assumptions concerning external factors.

EXHIBIT IV
COMPARISON OF PROJECT GOALS

REGIONAL AGRIBUSINESS DEVELOPMENT
Project No. 538-0010

Goal

Increase the incomes of the small farmer and the rural poor.

EMPLOYMENT INVESTMENT PROMOTION II
Project No. 538-0018

Goal

To increase employment and output of the industrial and informal sectors of the MDC's and LDC's of the English-speaking Caribbean (the Region)

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE
Project No. 538-0042

Goal

Improve socio-economic conditions of the lower income groups of Eastern Caribbean LDCs and Barbados.

PRIVATE SECTOR INVESTMENT ASSISTANCE
Project No. 538-0043

Goal

To mobilize the indigenous private sector for increased production and productivity to improve the economic base of the region.

AGRIBUSINESS EXPANSION
Project No. 538-0057

Goal

To improve the standard of living of the Caribbean poor.

Sub-goal

To stimulate economic and agricultural growth and create employment.

BARBADOS PRIVATE INITIATIVES IN HOUSING
Project No. 538-0081

Goal

To help alleviate the overall shortage of housing for low-income people, to significantly improve the existing housing stock, particularly deteriorating timber houses; to shift the initiative from production to the private sector.

CARIBBEAN FINANCIAL SERVICES CORPORATION
Project No. 538-0084

Goal

The goal of this Project is to stimulate expansion of the productive sector in the Eastern Caribbean, thereby creating employment, income and balance of payments support.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT TRAINING II
Project No. 538-0087

Goal

To increase the viability of private enterprise and performance of public sector services.

INFRASTRUCTURE FOR PRODUCTIVE INVESTMENT
Project No. 538-0088

Goal

To increase private, productive employment in the Region.

CARIBBEAN MARKETING ASSISTANCE
Project No. 538-0102

Goal

No goal found.

INVESTMENT-PROMOTION AND EXPORT DEVELOPMENT
Project No. 538-0119

Goal

Increase private sector productive employment in the Eastern Caribbean LDCs, Barbados and Belize.

SMALL ENTERPRISE ASSISTANCE
Project No. 538 0133

Goal

To increase levels of employment income, productivity and economic growth in the Eastern Caribbean countries by assisting in the development of privately owned productive enterprises.

CARIBBEAN CREDIT UNION DEVELOPMENT II
Project No. 538-0135

Goal

The goal of this Phase II to the Caribbean Credit Union Development Project is to improve the quality of life for the peoples of the region.

NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATIONS ASSISTANCE
Project No. 538-0136

Goal:

To strengthen indigenous private sector organizations whose programs will have an immediate impact on small enterprise development and employment.

EXHIBIT V
COMPARISON OF PROJECT PURPOSES

REGIONAL AGRIBUSINESS DEVELOPMENT
Project No. 538-0010

Purpose

Increase the capacity of the MDC and LDC institutions to develop finance and implement agribusiness and labor intensive enterprises which are based on the local projection and participation of small farmers and the rural poor.

EMPLOYMENT INVESTMENT PROMOTION II
Project No. 538-0018

Purpose

To stimulate the investment in small and medium businesses necessary to increase production and employment in the region.

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE
Project No. 538-0042

Purpose

To assist the governments and private sector of the Eastern Caribbean to identify, design and implement development projects which promote productive employment.

PRIVATE SECTOR INVESTMENT ASSISTANCE
Project No. 538-0043

Purpose

To strengthen the capacity of CAIC to promote investment and stimulate productive employment in the English-speaking Caribbean.

AGRIBUSINESS EXPANSION
Project No. 538-0057

Purpose

To initiate and expand private agribusiness investments in the Caribbean.

BARBADOS PRIVATE INITIATIVES IN HOUSING
Project No. 538-0081

Purpose

To help private individuals and businesses and financial institutions provide new houses and home improvement loans to low-income families; reduce the direct production role of government; provide a means to carry out the Tenantry Freehold Purchase Act.

CARIBBEAN FINANCIAL SERVICES CORPORATION
Project No. 538-0084

Purpose

To establish a private development finance institution to provide long-term financing and the provision of non-traditional financial services to private enterprises in the English speaking Caribbean.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT TRAINING II
Project No. 538-0087

Purpose

- (1) to upgrade the managerial and technical skills of public sector employees through short or long-term training,
- (2) to improve the output and performance capabilities of private enterprises and public agencies through organization development diagnostic and problem solving methods, and
- (3) to expand the institutional capacity of BIMAP to extend its training and consulting assistance to private enterprises.

INFRASTRUCTURE FOR PRODUCTIVE INVESTMENT
Project No. 538-0088

Purpose

To provide physical infrastructure required for expanded private production which would result in increased employment.

CARIBBEAN MARKETING ASSISTANCE
Project No. 538-0102

Purpose

To provide comprehensive marketing assistance to Caribbean manufacturers improving the competitive position and increasing the sales of their products and services in the U.S. market.

INVESTMENT-PROMOTION AND EXPORT DEVELOPMENT
Project No. 538-0119

Purpose

To identify and promote private investment in productive, export-oriented businesses.

SMALL ENTERPRISE ASSISTANCE PROJECT
Project No. 538 0133

Purpose

To increase the ability of local entrepreneurs to establish, expand or increase the efficiency of their micro, small and medium-scale enterprises to produce and sell their goods and services in the local, regional and extra-regional markets.

CARIBBEAN CREDIT UNION DEVELOPMENT II
Project No. 538-0135

Purpose

The purpose of this Project is to increase the system's mobilization of savings and channeling of these funds into loans for productive and provident purposes at the community level, particularly in the smaller and lesser developed territories.

NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATIONS ASSISTANCE
Project No. 538-0136

Purpose

The purpose of the grant is to provide support for a program to stimulate income and employment generation and broaden the entrepreneurial base in participating countries by promoting the development of small/micro businesses in these countries.

EXHIBIT VI - SCHEDULE BY ASSIGNMENT, POSITION AND STAFF CATEGORY

	1986						1987						1988					TOTAL STAFF MONTHS		U.S. STAFF MONTHS																																		
	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	U.S.	LOCAL	PM	TS																										
ASSIGNMENT I																																																						
Initiation																																																						
Project Manager																												2.5	2.5																									
ASSIGNMENT II																																																						
Develop Baseline Data																																																						
Project Manager																												1.0	1.0																									
Chief Baseline Data																												4.0	4.0																									
Financial Analyst																												2.0	2.0																									
Local Enumerators/ Supervisors																												30.0																										
ASSIGNMENT III																																																						
Field Evaluations																																																						
Project Manager																												8.0	8.0																									
Specialists																												4.0	4.0																									
Specialists																												3.0	3.0																									
Specialists																												2.0	2.0																									
Specialists																												1.0	1.0																									
Local Staff																												7.0																										
ASSIGNMENT IV																																																						
Program Perf. Reports																																																						
Project Manager																												4.0	4.0																									
Reporting and Administration																												1.0	1.0																									
ASSIGNMENT V																																																						
Project Monitoring System																																																						
Project Manager																												5.0	5.0																									
Specialists																												1.0	1.0																									
Specialists																												1.0	1.0																									
Local Staff																												3.0																										
ASSIGNMENT VI																																																						
Project Design																																																						
Project Manager																												1.5	1.5																									
Specialists																												2.0	2.0																									
TOTAL																																																						
U.S. STAFF MONTHS																																																			43.0	23.0	20.0	
LOCAL STAFF MONTHS																																																					40.0	

LEGEND
 X = 1/3 PERSON MONTH
 . = 1 WEEK OR LESS
 ○ = EVALUATION REPORT NO.
 ◊ = ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT
 ■ = ADMINISTRATION

NOTE:

DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL STAFF MONTHS: US & (LOCAL)

PRE-EVALUATION	BASELINE DATA	EVALUATIONS & PROGRAM REPORTING	MONITORING	DESIGN	ADMINISTRATION AND REPORTS	TOTAL
2.5	7(30)	22(7)	7(3)	3.5		43(40)
Of which = Project Manager						
2.5	1	12	5	1.5	1	23
Of which = other U.S. Specialists						
0	6	10	2	2	0	20

54-

EXHIBIT VII
SCHEDULE AND WORKLOAD DISTRIBUTION

	Project Manager	Other U.S.	Local Sub	Total
<u>Assignment I</u>				
<u>Initiation of Assignment</u>				
Task 1	PM, 6-8/86	.5		.5
Task 2	PM, 7-8/86	.1		.1
Task 3	PM, 6-8/86	1.4		1.4
Task 4	PM, 9/86	.5		.5
	Subtotal	2.5		2.5
<u>Assignment II</u>				
<u>Development of Baseline Data</u>				
Task 5	PM, FA 11-12/86	.2	2.0	2.2
Task 6	PM, CB, 9/86, 2-3/87	.3	2.5	2.8
Task 7	PM, CB 4/87		.5	27.0
Task 8	PM, CB 5-6/87	.5	1.0	3.0
	Subtotal	1.0	6.0	30.0
<u>Assignment III</u>				
<u>Project Evaluations</u>				
Tasks 9-19	PM, S 8-11/86, 1-2/87, then 6-12/87 and 3-4/88	8.0	10.0	7.0
				25.0
<u>Assignment IV</u>				
<u>Program Performance Reports</u>				
Task 20	PM 12/86	.2		.2
Task 21	PM 11/87	.8		.8
Task 22	PM 1/87	.2		.2
Task 23	PM 2/87	.3		.3
Task 24	PM 2/87	.5		.5
Task 25	PM 1/88	.1		.1
Task 26	PM 1/88	.3		.3
Task 27	PM 1/88	.2		.2
Task 28	PM 1-2/88	1.4		1.4
	<u>Other Reports and Administration</u>	1.0		1.0
	Subtotal	5.0		5.0
<u>Assignment V</u>				
<u>Project Monitoring</u>				
Task 29	PM 9/86	.25		.25
Task 30	PM 10/86	.25		.25
Task 31	PM 11/86	.25		.25
Task 32	LS 12/86	.75		1.5
Task 33	PM 4-5/87	.75		1.5
Task 34	PM 5-12/87	.75	1.00	1.75
Task 35	S 4/88		.33	.33
Task 36	S 4-5/88		.33	.33
Task 37	PM, S 4-5/88	.50	.33	.83
Task 38	PM 4-5/88	.75		.75
Task 39	PM 5/88	.75		.75

Assignment VID

Project Design

Task 40	PM	8-12/87	.5			.5
Task 41	PM	4/87-6/88	1.0	2.0		3.0
	Subtotal		1.5	2.0		3.5

TOTALS			23.0	20.0	40.0	83.0
--------	--	--	------	------	------	------

PM = Project Manager

ES = Evaluation Specialist

L = Local Subcontractor

FA = Financial Analyst

S = Specialist

CD = Chief, Baseline Data

*Local Sub Contractor

APPENDIX A

GENERIC SCOPE OF WORK: CONTRACT OUTLINE

Extracted from Contract No. 538-0119-C-00-6027. Page 15-16:

"Evaluation of each project will take place against the objectives and indicators established in the Logical Framework (LogFrame) prepared during project design, and against other documented upgrades developed as the project proceeds. In the case of Operational Program Grants (OPG) the objectives and indicators will be specified although not necessarily in a Logframe. The Contractor will draw up a "generic scope of work" which would be roughly applicable across the entire portfolio.

Examples of the types of variables to be evaluated in a "generic scope of work" include the following:

a. Changes in external factors

- (1) Macro-economic conditions
- (2) Socio-economic conditions of target group
- (3) Government policy

b. Project inputs

- (1) AID resources and local counterpart
- (2) Project management
- (3) Planning
- (4) Policies
- (5) Client interaction
- (6) Consultant support

c. Project outputs

- (1) People trained
- (2) Loans given
- (3) Factory space constructed
- (4) Businesses assisted

d. Project and Program Purpose

(1) Project Level

- (a) Employment
- (b) Institution(s) established or strengthened
- (c) Firm-level productivity
- (d) Foreign investment
- (e) Foreign exchange earnings or savings (net)

(2) Program Level

- (a) Private investment promotion results in measurable increases in export-oriented businesses.
- (b) Construction of physical infrastructure for production results in measurable increases in jobs.

- (c) Upgrading managerial and technical skills resulting in measurable increases in firm-level productivity.
- (d) Creation of a private development finance institution results in a measurable flow of financial resources to targeted businesses, resulting in turn in their measurable growth.

e. Program Goals/Subgoals

- (1) Investment climate measurably improved.
- (2) The productive sector is being measurably expanded, thereby creating export earnings.
- (3) Standard of living of Caribbean poor is being measurably improved."