

A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY - PART I

POABE 447
JSH 9/92

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

IDENTIFICATION DATA

A. Reporting A.I.D. Unit: Mission or AID/W Office (ES# _____) <u>USAID/INDIA</u>		B. Was Evaluation Scheduled In Current FY Annual Evaluation Plan? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Slipped <input type="checkbox"/> Ad Hoc <input type="checkbox"/> Evaluation Plan Submission Date: FY <u>90</u> Q <u>3</u>	C. Evaluation Timing Interim <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Final <input type="checkbox"/> Ex Post <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/>
--	--	--	--

D. Activity or Activities Evaluated (List the following information for project(s) or program(s) evaluated; if not applicable, list title and date of the evaluation report.)

Project No.	Project /Program Title	First PROAG or Equivalent (FY)	Most Recent PACD (Mo/Yr)	Planned LOP Cost (000)	Amount Obligated to Date (000)
386-0503	Vaccine and Immunodiagnostic Development	1987	07/93	6,000	4,000

ACTIONS

E. Action Decisions Approved By Mission or AID/W Office Director		Name of Officer Responsible for Action	Date Action to be Completed
Action(s) Required 1. Encourage more applied/downstream activities which are not sensitive to Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) issues and which can be implemented/completed before the PACD. 2. Provide technical assistance to Joint Working Group to facilitate discussion on downstream activities. 3. Make Department of Bio-technology and U.S. Public Health Service aware of AID/W's centrally funded vaccine development project and AID/I's PACT project to provide needed support and continuity after the PACD.		HPN/BRT	November 30, 1991
		HPN/BRT	November 30, 1991
		HPN/BRT	November 30, 1991

(Attach extra sheet if necessary)

APPROVALS

F. Date Of Mission Or AID/W Office Review Of Evaluation: (Month) September (Day) 05 (Year) 1991

G. Approvals of Evaluation Summary And Action Decisions:

Name (Typed)	Project/Program Officer	Representative of Borrower/Grantee	Evaluation Officer	Mission or AID/W Office Director
	Rekha Masilamani		B.R. Patil	Walter G. Bollinger
Signature	<i>R. Masilamani</i>		<i>B.R. Patil</i>	<i>W.G. Bollinger</i>
Date	<u>4/14/92</u>		<u>4/14/92</u>	<u>5/7/92</u>

ABSTRACT

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

1. Project Purpose: The purpose of this project was to develop and expand the range of vaccines against childhood communicable diseases; to develop accurate, and inexpensive diagnostic techniques to improve the quality of patient care and to generate valuable information necessary to improve the efficacy of immunization program.
2. Evaluation Purpose: The purpose of this mid-term evaluation was to examine what has been accomplished during the first 4 years and explore the appropriate future direction.
3. Evaluation methodology: A four-person team reviewed relevant documents, interviewed concerned officials and scientists both in U.S. and India, visited all eight sites receiving grants and collected pertinent information to provide answers to issues and questions raised in the scope of work and make practical recommendations.
4. Findings: The evaluation team found that:
 - i) initial negative press coverage restricted the program's "downstream" activities and forced it to concentrate on "upstream" activities involving basic research in the development of vaccines and diagnostic probes.
 - ii) despite very complex review and implementation structures and procedures the project has been effectively managed so far.
 - iii) scientists from both U.S. and India benefitted from the project, as Indians gained access to leading U.S. scientists, state-of-the-art techniques and vital equipments and Americans gained prestige within the scientific community in India, gained an opportunity to work on diseases and materials that are not available in the U.S.
 - iv) although there are some possibilities of developing new findings on rotavirus infections, greater understanding of hepatitis E and its impact on pregnant women, it is unrealistic to expect development of a vaccine in any of the priority diseases during the life of the project.

COSTS

I. Evaluation Costs

1. Evaluation Team		Contract Number OR TDY Person Days	Contract Cost OR TDY Cost (U.S. \$)	Source of Funds
Name	Affiliation			
Mr. David F. Pyle	John Snow Inc.	PDC-5929-I-00-2109-00	40,945	Project
Mr. Paul F. Basch	John Snow Inc.	-do-	40,945	-do-
Mr. K. P. Gopinathan	Purchase Order	360-0503-0-001140	5,744	-do-
Mr. S. K. Jain	Purchase Order	360-0503-0-001142	2,710	-do-
2. Mission/Office Professional Staff Person-Days (Estimate) _____		3. Borrower/Grantee Professional Staff Person-Days (Estimate) _____		

7

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

Mission or Office:
USAID/INDIA

Date This Summary Prepared:
March 1992

Title And Date Of Full Evaluation Report:
Mid-term Evaluation: Vaccine & Immunodiagnostic Development Project (May 1991)

1. Project Purpose: The purpose of this project was to develop and expand the range of vaccines against childhood communicable diseases; to develop accurate, inexpensive diagnostic techniques to improve the quality of patient care and to generate valuable information necessary to improve the efficacy of immunization program.

2. Evaluation Purpose: The purpose of this mid-term evaluation was to examine what has been accomplished during the first 4 years and explore appropriate future direction.

3. Evaluation methodology: A four-person team reviewed relevant documents, interviewed concerned officials and scientists both in U.S. and India, visited all eight sites receiving grants and collected pertinent information to provide answers to issues and questions raised in the scope of work and make practical recommendations.

4. Findings: The evaluation team found that:

- i) the negative press coverage restricted the "downstream" activities and forced to concentrate on the "upstream" activities focusing on the development and testing of vaccines and diagnostic probes.
- ii) despite initial difficulties and the complex management structure, the secretariates in the U.S. and India have established procedures providing the researchers with all the support required and made reasonable progress.

3

- iii) scientists from both U.S. and India benefitted from the project, as Indians gained access to leading U.S. scientists, state-of-the-art techniques and vital equipments and Americans gained prestige within the scientific community in India, opportunity to work on diseases and materials that are not available in the U.S.
- iv) scientists involved were highly qualified and experienced and were carrying our more balanced collaborations with their counterparts.
- v) although there are some possibilities of developing new findings on rotavirus infections, greater understanding of hepatitis E and its impact on pregnant women, it is unrealistic to expect development of a vaccine in any of the priority diseases during the life of the project.

5. Recommendations:

- i) The period of receiving funds should be increased by 8 months for Americans so that it is coterminus with that for Indians.
- ii) Information on research activities under the VIDX project should be shared by means of a newsletter and meetings of researchers.
- iii) Budgets for the Indian grantees should include a line item for institutional overhead, the incorporation of an inflation factor each year, the provision of support for equipment maintenance and adequate travel advance when travelling to the U.S.
- iv) "Bridging funds" to support the travel and per diem cost of collaborating researchers should be provided to ensure that momentum gained is not lost.
- v) The Joint Working Group should reorient the project to more applied activities by sponsoring workshops that emphasize "downstream" researches, by bringing together the researchers and private sector representatives, by giving serious consideration to funding a project to produce hepatitis B vaccine, by producing and testing immunodiagnostic reagents and recombinant DNA probes for priority diseases that have been developed in the laboratory and by funding a study on the feasibility of producing fetal bovine serum in India.

The evaluation team suggested three options for AID/India to consider within the context of Intellectual Property Rights i.e.

- i) Do not obligate additional funds and complete the 8 projects already funded.
- ii) Obligate \$2 million remaining funds to support 2-4 additional projects and downstream activities.
- iii) Develop a follow-on project focused on applied research with private sector involvement.

In general the evaluation team felt that the project is a valuable and effective vehicle for international cooperation derived from a sound concept and effective planning and deserves continued financial support.

5

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 systematically.
2. Practical difficulties of collaborating scientists/institutions have been brought out and important suggestions are made to remove them.
3. Useful recommendations are made to move the project "downstream" with focus on applied ones.
4. Three options with possible implications are suggested for the Mission to reconsider about the future of project.
5. Most of the recommendations are practical and acceptable.