

PDABE-445  
ISN 7872

A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY - PART I

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

| IDENTIFICATION DATA   |  |   |                          |   |                                |
|---|--|---|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| A. Reporting A.I.D. Unit:<br><br>Mission or AID/W Office (ES# _____) <u>USAID/INDIA</u>   |  | B. Was Evaluation Scheduled In Current FY Annual Evaluation Plan?<br>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Slipped <input type="checkbox"/> Ad Hoc <input type="checkbox"/><br>Evaluation Plan Submission Date: FY <u>90</u> Q <u>3</u> |                          | C. Evaluation Timing<br>Interim <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Final <input type="checkbox"/><br>Ex Post <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/> |                                |
| D. Activity or Activities Evaluated (List the following information for project(s) or program(s) evaluated; if not applicable, list title and date of the evaluation report.) |  |   |                          |   |                                |
| Project No.   | Project /Program Title                               | First PROAG or Equivalent (FY)  | Most Recent PACD (Mo/Yr) | Planned LOP Cost (000)  | Amount Obligated to Date (000) |
| 386-0500  | Contraceptive Development and Research in Immunology | 1985  | 05/93                    | \$6,600   | \$6,600                        |

| ACTIONS  |  |                             |
|--|--|-----------------------------|
| E. Action Decisions Approved By Mission or AID/W Office Director<br>Action(s) Required   | Name of Officer Responsible for Action | Date Action to be Completed |
| 1. Offer an extension of PACD from 05/31/93 to 09/30/93 and if required consider further extension upto 12/31/93 to ensure resolution of management issues and completion of researches initiated.   | D, HPN / BRT, PDPS                     | March 30, 1992              |
| 2. Develop a brief paper to suggest possible ways in which DBT and Indian Research Institutes can develop a direct relationship with centrally funded projects in AID/W's R&D Bureau for future support of researches initiated under the project. | HPN/BRT                                | December 15, 1991           |
| (Attach extra sheet if necessary)  |  |                             |

| APPROVALS  |                         |                                    |                                  |
|--|-------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| F. Date Of Mission Or AID/W Office Review Of Evaluation: |                         | (Month)<br>November                | (Day)<br>25                      |
|  |                         | (Year)<br>1991                     |                                  |
| G. Approvals of Evaluation Summary And Action Decisions: |                         |                                    |                                  |
| Name (Typed)   | Project/Program Officer | Representative of Borrower/Grantee | Mission or AID/W Office Director |
|  | Rekha Masilamani        |                                    | Walter G. Bollinger              |
| Signature  | <i>R Masilamani</i>     | <i>B.R. Patil</i>                  | <i>W.G. Bollinger</i>            |
| Date   | 4/14/92                 | 4/14/92                            | 5/7/92                           |

**ABSTRACT**

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

1. Project Purpose: The Contraceptive Development and Research in Immunology Project (CD&RI) was authorized in 1988 and designed to support Indo-U.S. collaborative research project in contraceptive development and disease-related immunology.

2. Evaluation Purpose and Methodology: The three-week midterm evaluation was conducted in June/July 1991 to assess the current status of the project and to explore implications for the future. The four-person team reviewed pertinent documents, interviewed researchers and administrators as well as USAID and Government of India (GOI) personnel, and visited three of the four participating Indian institutions.

3. Findings: The evaluation found that (1) 6 of the 11 collaborative research proposals submitted by investigators from the 4 participating institutes had been jointly approved and funded, (2) 7 new collaborative research relationships had been established, (3) 8 research fellowships had been awarded and three fellows had traveled to the U.S., (4) one participating institute, National Institute of Immunology (NII), had procured scientific equipment, and (5) several scientific publications had been prepared.

The evaluation noted that (1) the collaborative research projects submitted for funding were conceptually very good and scientifically significant, (2) the researchers involved in the CD&RI Project were qualified and motivated and were carrying out the proposed research, and (3) the four participating Indian research institutes had good infrastructure and research capabilities.

The project has had major implementation problems. A number of activities took a long time to complete: (1) defining the structure for managing the day-to-day activities of the project; (2) submitting center plans and grants; (3) peer reviewing the collaborative research proposals, especially in immunology, and (4) executing the Participating Agency Services Agreement (PASA) with the Office of International Health/National Institute of Allergies and Infectious Diseases (OIH/NIAID). Others remain obstacles to implementation: (1) the definition of intellectual property rights (IPR); (2) the procurement of U.S. scientific equipment; (3) the transfer of funds to the GOI by USAID/India. These difficulties have significantly delayed the initiation and completion of the activities proposed under the project.

4. Lessons Learned: (1) a program design that has dual scientific foci (in CD&RI, contraception and disease-related immunology) complicates the management structure, divides scarce resources and reduces the prospects for achieving significant results in either area; and (2) when multiple agencies are involved, the roles and responsibilities of each must be clearly defined and systems for communicating information and coordinating activities must be fully elaborated and closely followed.

**COSTS**

**I. Evaluation Costs**

**1. Evaluation Team**

| Name                  | Affiliation    | Contract Number OR<br>TDY Person Days | Contract Cost OR<br>TDY Cost (U.S. \$) | Source of Funds |
|-----------------------|----------------|---------------------------------------|--|-----------------|
| Mr. John B. Tomaro    | POPTech Buy-in | DPE-3024-2-00-8078-00                 | 50,280                                 | Project         |
| Mr. Laneta Dorflinger | POPTech Buy-in | -- do --                              | 50,280                                 | - do -          |
| Ms. Laxmi Kumari      | Purchase Order | 386-0500-0-00-1175                    | 1,950                                  | - do -          |
| Mr. Somnath Roy       | Purchase Order | 386-0500-0-00-1176                    | 2,900                                  | - do -          |

**2. Mission/Office Professional Staff**

Person-Days (Estimate) \_\_\_\_\_

**3. Borrower/Grantee Professional**

Staff Person-Days (Estimate) \_\_\_\_\_

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

### SUMMARY

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

Address the following items:

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

Mission or Office:  
USAID/INDIA

Date This Summary Prepared:  
March 1992

Title And Date Of Full Evaluation Report:  
Mid-term Evaluation of Contraceptive  
Development & Research In Immunology Project  
(February 1991)

1. Project Purpose: The Contraceptive Development and Research in Immunology Project (CD&RI) was authorized in 1988 as a three-year continuation and expansion of the Contraceptive Development: Reproductive Immunology (CD:RI), initiated in 1985. The CD&RI Project was designed to support Indo-U.S. collaborative research project in contraceptive development and disease-related immunology at participating Indian institutions (four to six), and to finance Young Investigators Awards (including Re-entry and Re-visitation Grants), Science Management Training Awards, and Core Support Awards.

2. Evaluation Purpose and Methodology: The three-week midterm evaluation was conducted in late June and early July 1991 to assess the current status of the project and to explore implications for the future. The four-person team reviewed pertinent documents, interviewed researchers and administrators as well as USAID and Government of India (GOI) personnel, and visited three of the four participating Indian institutions.

3. Findings: The evaluation found that (1) six of the eleven collaborative research proposals submitted by investigators from the four participating institutes had been jointly approved and funded, (2) seven new collaborative research relationships had been established, (3) eight research fellowships had been awarded and three fellows had traveled to the U.S., (4) one participating institute, National Institute of Immunology (NII), had procured scientific equipment, and (5) several scientific publications had been prepared.

The evaluation noted that (1) the collaborative research projects submitted for funding were conceptually very good and scientifically significant, (2) the researchers involved in the CD&RI Project were qualified and motivated and were carrying out the proposed research, and (3) the four participating Indian research institutes had good infrastructure and research capabilities.

Perceptions of the purpose of the CD&RI project were not different, since both USAID and GOI want to have collaborative links established and the research groups strengthened. The differences are mainly due to the way these are implemented. There was, for example, a fundamental difference of opinion on the definition of a "research center." The team also found that the U.S. and Indian secretaries may have inadequately communicated to participating institutions the decisions of the Joint Working Group (JWG). This delayed the development of the center plans and research proposals and affected the quality of what was submitted.

The project has had major implementation problems. A number of activities took a long time to complete: (1) defining the structure for managing the day-to-day activities of the project; (2) submitting center plans and grants; (3) peer reviewing the collaborative research proposals, especially in immunology, and (4) executing the Participating Agency Services Agreement (PASA) with the Office of International Health/ National Institute of Allergies and Infectious Diseases (OIH/NIAID). Others remain obstacles to implementation: (1) the definition of intellectual property rights (IPR); (2) the procurement of U.S. scientific equipment; (3) the transfer of funds to the GOI by USAID/India. These difficulties have significantly delayed the initiation and completion of the activities proposed under the project. Three years after project launch, Indo-U.S. collaborative research is just beginning.

For unclear reasons, the CD&RI Secretariat did not systematically implement the instructions of the JWG and give the project continuous, focused attention at critical points. It took a less than active role in promoting the project among the participating Indian institutions and expeditiously addressing critical managerial and procedural issues. The JWG gave explicit instructions but did not designate the party responsible for implementing the instructions.

4. Recommendations: It is recommended that:

- i) the project coordinators from USAID/India and the Department of Biotechnology (DBT) meet to develop in written form a draft of the management procedures and communication strategies applicable to the implementation of the CD&RI project.
- ii) the JWG meet at least annually during the remaining period of the project.
- iii) the project be given a no-cost extension; September 30, 1994, is proposed as the new project assistance completion date (PACD). In the time remaining, however, no new collaborative research proposals should be entertained.
- iv) two of the outstanding implementation issues -- procurement of U.S. scientific equipment and the transfer of U.S. funds to the GOI -- be discussed and resolved at a workshop that should take place as early as possible.
- v) unless language on intellectual property rights that is mutually agreeable to the U.S. and the GOI can be developed prior to the next JWG meeting, the Central Drug Research Institute (CDRI) (Lucknow) collaborative research proposal should be dropped and the funds reallocated among the other participating institutes.

Lessons Learned: Significant lessons have been learned in the course of implementing the CD&RI project.

1. A program design that has dual scientific foci (in CD&RI, contraception and disease-related immunology) complicates the management structure, divides scarce resources and reduces the prospects for achieving significant results in either area.
2. Project designs should be consistent with the time frame of the project and the funds available.
3. When multiple agencies are involved in project implementation, e.g., USAID/India, DBT, A.I.D. Contraceptive Research and Development (CONRAD) Program, NIAID, the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD), etc., the roles and responsibilities of each must be clearly defined and systems for communicating information and coordinating activities must be fully elaborated and closely followed.
4. Projects sponsoring collaborative research require that procedures and timelines for peer review, approval and funding should be defined at the start of the project and strictly followed.
5. Access to a flexible, centrally funded project like CONRAD provides a bilateral project with the assistance required to facilitate implementation and enhance project impact.
6. If intellectual property rights issues cannot be resolved satisfactorily during the definition of a project, USAID must re-think the focus of collaborative applied research projects. Instead, these projects might focus on training young investigators and strengthening the research capabilities of selected institutions throughout the course of implementation.

ATTACHMENTS

K. Attachments (List attachments submitted with this Evaluation Summary; always attach copy of full evaluation report, even if one was submitted earlier; attach studies, surveys, etc., from "on-going" evaluation, if relevant to the evaluation report.)

Copy of the report

COMMENTS

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

1. Evaluation issues/questions are addressed adequately.
2. Findings concur with those of AID and GOI officials.
3. Implementation and IPR issues were carefully handled.
4. Lessons learned have significant implications for design and implementation of similar project in future.
5. IPR issue was carefully handled.
6. Most of the recommendations are practical and acceptable.

6