

PD-ARF-612  
81705

**NARCOTICS AWARENESS  
AND  
EDUCATION PROJECT  
INTERIM EVALUATION**

**Prepared for:**

**THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT  
Bureau for Research and Development  
Washington, D.C.**

**Prepared by:**

**THOMAS A. MOSER**

**CREATIVE ASSOCIATES INTERNATIONAL, INC.  
5301 Wisconsin Ave., N.W.  
Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20015**

**MARCH 1993**

**Contract No. PDC-5832-I-00-0095-00  
Delivery Order No. 26**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	iv
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS .....	v
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	vi
I. BACKGROUND .....	1
II. EVALUATION PLAN and METHODOLOGY .....	3
III. PROJECT DESCRIPTION .....	4
A. Objectives .....	4
B. Components .....	4
C. Deliverables .....	5
1. Technical Assistance .....	5
2. Training .....	5
3. Information Dissemination .....	6
4. Operations Research .....	6
5. Evaluation .....	6
6. Policy Dialogue Tools .....	6
7. Other Deliverables .....	6
D. Project Management and Staffing .....	7
IV. FINDINGS .....	8
A. Overview .....	8
B. Project Components .....	13
1. Technical Assistance .....	13
2. Training .....	14
3. Operations Research .....	14
4. Information Dissemination .....	16
5. Evaluation .....	18
6. Policy Dialogue Tools .....	18
C. Other Project Deliverables .....	19
1. Emphasis Country Programs .....	19
2. Sustainability/Institutionalization .....	20
3. Annual Implementation Plan (AIP) .....	20
4. Quarterly Reports .....	20
5. Quarterly Financial Reports .....	20
6. Trip Reports .....	20
D. Contract Resources and Management .....	21
1. Financial Resources .....	21
2. Program Management .....	22
E. Achievement of Project Objectives .....	23
V. RECOMMENDATIONS .....	25

## **VI. ANNEXES**

- A. Evaluation Scope of Work**
- B. Interviews**
- C. Persons Receiving Training Through the NAE Project**
- D. NAE Applied Research Activities**
- E. Information Dissemination**
- F. Project Funding Table**
- G. Narcotics Awareness and Demand Reduction in LAC**

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

This external evaluation was undertaken at the request of the Office of Education, Bureau for Research and Development, Agency for International Development (A.I.D.). The evaluation was conducted by means of a contract with Creative Associates International, Inc. under contract #PDC-5832-I-00-0095-00, Delivery Order 26.

Creative Associates selected Thomas A. Moser, a former A.I.D. career officer with considerable experience over the past ten years in evaluating a wide range of development projects. The evaluation took place in Washington, D.C., during the period of October 25, 1992 to February 28, 1993.

The evaluator greatly appreciates the assistance of the staff of the Office of Education, R&D Bureau; the primary implementing contractor, Development Associates, Inc. and its three subcontractors -- the Academy for Educational Development, Porter/Novelli, and Macro International Inc. -- in carrying out this evaluation. He is also grateful to the many officials in the U.S. and abroad who provided valuable information by means of interviews, telegrams, and faxes as part of this assessment.

## **ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS**

<b>AED</b>	<b>Academy for Educational Development</b>
<b>A.I.D.</b>	<b>Agency for International Development</b>
<b>AID/W</b>	<b>Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C.</b>
<b>AIP</b>	<b>Annual Implementation Plan</b>
<b>CEDRO</b>	<b>Centro de Informacion y Educacion para la Prevencion del Abuso de Drogas</b>
<b>CESE</b>	<b>Central Educativo Sobre Estupefacientes</b>
<b>CTO</b>	<b>Cognizant Technical Officer (A.I.D.)</b>
<b>DINAPRE</b>	<b>Direccion Nacional de Prevencion</b>
<b>FUNDASALVA</b>	<b>Anti-Drug Foundation of El Salvador</b>
<b>INM</b>	<b>International Narcotics Matters, Department of State</b>
<b>LAC</b>	<b>Bureau of Latin American and Caribbean Affairs, A.I.D.</b>
<b>LAC/DR</b>	<b>Office of Development Resources, LAC</b>
<b>LAC/EHR</b>	<b>Office of Education and Human Resources, LAC</b>
<b>LAC/HPN</b>	<b>Office of Health, Population and Nutrition, LAC</b>
<b>LAC/SAM</b>	<b>Office of South American and Mexican Affairs, LAC</b>
<b>LDC</b>	<b>Less Developed Country</b>
<b>NAE</b>	<b>Narcotics Awareness and Education Project</b>
<b>NIDA</b>	<b>National Institute on Drug Abuse</b>
<b>OAS</b>	<b>Organization of American States</b>
<b>ONDCP</b>	<b>Office of National Drug Control Policy</b>
<b>R&amp;D</b>	<b>Bureau for Research and Development, A.I.D.</b>
<b>R&amp;D/ED</b>	<b>Office of Education, R&amp;D</b>
<b>SEAMOS</b>	<b>Sistema Educativo Anti Drogadiccion y de Movilizacion Social</b>
<b>TA</b>	<b>Technical Assistance</b>
<b>TAG</b>	<b>Technical Advisory Group</b>
<b>UNDCP</b>	<b>United Nations Drug Control Programme</b>
<b>USAID</b>	<b>United States Agency for International Development</b>
<b>USIA</b>	<b>United States Information Agency</b>
<b>USIS</b>	<b>United States Information Service</b>

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **I. BACKGROUND**

Production, trafficking and abuse of cocaine, opium, marijuana and other illicit substances present a global challenge to the economic, social and political stability of a growing number of countries, including many in the developing world.

A.I.D. has been involved in counter-narcotics activities for over twenty years and has provided assistance in this area to approximately twenty-six developing countries. Early projects focused on crop substitution activities which attempted to motivate farmers to cultivate licit rather than illicit crops. More recently, the agency's anti-narcotics portfolio has shifted from crop substitution to more diversified alternative development projects as well as awareness and education activities. This diversification grew from the realization that crop substitution programs had largely failed and more comprehensive approaches to strengthening and broadening the economies of developing countries were required to enable them to replace their reliance on the cultivation of illicit crops.

During the period 1980-1990, A.I.D. became increasingly involved in concert with other USG agencies in public education and awareness elements of anti-narcotics issues. However, these efforts did not represent a systematic effort to gain lessons learned from awareness and education activities overall nor to move the state of the art forward in this area. A central project was desired that would provide a more systematic and effective approach to planning, undertaking and evaluating drug awareness activities in targeted countries. This need led to the development of the Narcotics Awareness and Education Project (NAE), a \$25 million activity extending over a ten-year period, FY 90-99.

The first five years of the project are being implemented through a contract which commenced May 9, 1990, with Development Associates, Inc. as prime contractor, and the Academy for Educational Development, Macro International, and Porter-Novelli as subcontractors. This contract, DPE-5834-Z-00-0008-00, anticipates a total commitment of \$13,864,923.

The project focuses on drug demand reduction through public awareness and education and fits into an overall effort among USG agencies to promote demand reduction as an approach to reducing illicit substance abuse, production, and trafficking.

### **II. EVALUATION PLAN AND METHODOLOGY**

In October, 1992, R&D/ED requested Creative Associates International to provide an evaluation specialist to undertake the interim evaluation during the November 1992-February 1993 period. The evaluator was asked to make a fair and candid assessment of the contract during the two and one-half years of its existence.

The evaluation, which did not include a field visit, was drawn from interviews and reviews of key documents, some of which were especially prepared by the contractor for the evaluation. The evaluator interviewed a wide range of relevant A.I.D. personnel, contractor and subcontractor staff, and other U.S. Agency personnel as well as a cross section of public and private sector officials in countries participating in the project.

### **III. PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

This section of the evaluation report describes the project in some detail, the essence of which follows.

The objectives of the NAE project are:

- To refine methodologies for conducting effective drug awareness and education programs;
- To strengthen the capabilities of developing country institutions to design, implement, and evaluate effective drug awareness and prevention programs; and
- To affect the knowledge, attitude, behavior and practice of individuals in LDC's regarding drug abuse.

According to the contract, the objectives stated above are to be attained by means of working in six discrete but closely interrelated areas.

1. Technical Assistance for A.I.D. missions and host country public and private institutions which request narcotics awareness and education expertise.
2. Training to develop and strengthen the capacities of public and private organizations to operate effective drug demand reduction programs.
3. Information Dissemination to provide mission and host country organizations current information on scientific, epidemiological and program developments in drug abuse prevention.
4. Operations Research to enhance the understanding of effective drug abuse prevention interventions through small-scale operations research projects attached to operational programs.
5. Evaluation to help operators guide drug abuse prevention activities in their earlier stages (formative) and to assess the long term impact of such activities (summative) after the interventions are completed.
6. Policy Dialogue tools to sensitize and educate policy makers to become more precisely aware of the damaging consequences of narcotics production, trafficking, processing, and abuse on the social, economic and political objectives of their nations.

At least ten to fifteen countries were expected to request such support and the contract was designed with the expectation that requesting USAIDs and A.I.D. geographic bureaus would provide the bulk of funds needed to provide these services. It was also expected that at least five countries would seek to develop a more intensive long term relationship with the project in which there would be a mutual commitment for substantial financial buy-in support from the USAID missions and agreement from the contractor to work closely with the USAID and host country institutions on all stages of their awareness and prevention programs.

#### **IV. FINDINGS**

The report indicates that most clients are satisfied, some exceedingly so, with the quality and responsiveness of NAE services. Despite its many accomplishments, however, there have been problems in the project, primarily concerning how the contractor has pursued contract objectives. Some criticisms deal with content, others with manner or style. On the content side, shortcomings are largely related to the operations research component; on the manner or style side, criticisms have centered on the contractor's alleged aggressiveness in promoting project activities in what some consider to be a self serving manner.

It is important to balance these criticisms against the praise and many compliments the contractor has received from a substantial number of clients for its timely, effective and high quality TA products and services. It is also important to recognize that while Development Associates receives the brunt of criticism for these real or perceived shortcomings, the contractor is certainly not solely to blame in all cases. Indeed, it was difficult for the evaluator to understand the reasons for the negative reaction in several cases in which the contractor's product appears to be sound and responsive to the client's request. It may be that there are other issues at play including a) bureaucratic turf concerns where various agencies and organizations tend to be critical of any activity they may consider intruding into their area of expertise or authority, b) the style of the contractor (and possibly R&D/ED) in implementing the NAE project which appears to have lacked tact or good judgement on certain occasions, and/or c) basic misunderstanding by some parties as to the nature of buy-in projects. There may well be other reasons impeding a fuller acceptance and utilization of NAE.

The evaluator stressed that R&D/ED and the contractor must continue to attempt to identify and solve root causes of problems as a means to increase the project's utilization, especially with LAC/SAM, and that the latter office should do the same in its relationship to the project. Meanwhile, the evaluation report indicates that there is substantial activity in many countries which indeed are very satisfied with the quality and responsiveness of project services.

## **V. RECOMMENDATIONS**

The evaluation report concludes with a set of recommendations.

1. R&D/ED should:
  - a) Instruct the contractor to restructure its core staff in a manner that would provide at no extra cost an experienced operations research manager who would be responsible for strengthening this important project component.
  - b) Continue to urge the contractor to use subcontractor staff at every opportunity.
  - c) Instruct the contractor to involve the Technical Advisory Group to a greater extent in project activities.
  - d) Encourage the contractor to carefully review its project marketing and implementation style to improve its image in these aspects of project management.
  - e) Review with the contractor its information dissemination procedures to assure that interested parties in the U.S. and abroad are receiving relevant reports, studies and other documents of interest in a timely manner.
  - f) Encourage the contractor to develop baseline data to the maximum extent possible in order to establish benchmarks for measuring impact of project interventions.
  - g) Determine with the contractor if there is a need for a Management Information System as called for in the contract or if current reporting systems suffice.
2. R&D/ED should make an effort to increase core funds to enable the project to undertake more innovative interventions, especially in the area of operations research, that are beyond the interest and funding availability of the missions and bureaus which buy-in to the project.
3. R&D/ED should consider sponsoring a day-long workshop or retreat managed by an experienced facilitator, and involving the project's major participants, i.e. AID/W narcotics coordinators, USIA, NIDA, INM and ONDCP, along with Development Associates and its three subcontractors, to clarify NAE objectives and working relationships.
4. R&D and the LAC Bureau should develop a more effective working relationship in which both sides share a sense of ownership in the project. Both bureaus need to carefully analyze their respective project management styles and approaches, searching for ways to contribute to a more effective working relationship. This might begin with establishing a sense of co-ownership or co-management of the project by more firmly adhering to a schedule of bi-weekly joint management meetings related to LAC NAE

activities. The project might benefit from the sectoral perspective of LAC/HPN, and the evaluator encourages the LAC Bureau to consider their reengagement with NAE activities. If not feasible, engagement of LAC/EHR might be considered.

5. R&D/ED and LAC/SAM should review the specific tasks requested in the two LAC buy-ins with the intention of coming to a mutual agreement on a work plan to achieve the stated tasks and objectives.
6. R&D/ED should take the initiative in whatever form is required to remove the following conditions from the existing contact, hopefully without the need for a contract amendment:
  - Modify the reports requirement section to indicate that semi-annual reports serve the function of AIP updates and quarterly reports. (Appendix F2.3). Semi-annual reports suffice.
  - Modify the requirement for at least five emphasis country programs. There is only one at present and this might be all that can reasonably be expected over the balance of the contract period.
  - Delete the requirement for a computer presentation model (Appendix F2,4,6). Efforts in this behalf have proven futile and quite likely are not relevant to the project's success or failure.
7. R&D/ED should investigate with FM & the Contracts Office ways to make the contractor's monthly vouchers a more effective monitoring device.
8. R&D/ED should also ascertain from FM & the Contracts Office what, if anything, is required from the contractor beyond the monthly financial vouchers to meet the quarterly financial report stipulation in the Special Performance Requirements section of the contract.
9. R&D/ED should begin to lay the groundwork for an RFP to solicit proposals for the second five year period of the project's proposed ten-year life, on the assumption that there is sufficient buy-in demand to continue the project.

## I. BACKGROUND

Production, trafficking and abuse of cocaine, opium, marijuana and other illicit substances comprise a global challenge to the economic, social and political stability of a growing number of countries, including many in the developing world. Individuals involved in production and trafficking are often paid with the substances they produce or transport. These individuals must in turn sell the product to generate income, thereby developing a local market for use of the substance.

A.I.D. has been involved in counter-narcotics activities for over twenty years and has provided assistance in this area to approximately twenty-six developing countries. Early projects focused on crop substitution activities which attempted to motivate farmers to cultivate licit rather than illicit crops. More recently, the agency's anti-narcotics portfolio has shifted from crop substitution to more diversified alternative development projects as well as awareness and education activities. This diversification grew from the realization that crop substitution programs had largely failed and more comprehensive approaches to strengthening and broadening the economies of developing countries were required to enable them to replace their reliance on the cultivation of illicit crops.

During the period 1980-1990, A.I.D. had become increasingly involved in concert with other USG agencies in public education and awareness elements of anti-narcotics issues. In Asia, A.I.D. supported at least three major activities including a regional project that served eight countries. In LAC there were at least nine A.I.D.-supported projects in drug awareness. These activities reflected the growing recognition that drug prevention awareness and education are central to drug control efforts. However, these efforts did not represent a systematic effort to gain lessons learned from awareness and education activities overall nor to move the state of the art forward in this area. A central project was desired that would provide a more systematic and effective approach to planning, undertaking and evaluating drug awareness activities in targeted countries. This need led to the development of the Narcotics Awareness and Education Project (NAE), a \$25 million activity extending over a ten-year period, FY 90-99. Proposed funds include \$4.5 million in R&D central funds and up to \$20.5 million in estimated Mission and Regional Bureau buy-ins.

The first five years of the project are being implemented through a contract which commenced May 9, 1990, with Development Associates, Inc. as prime contractor, and the Academy for Educational Development, Macro International, and Porter-Novelli as subcontractors. This contract, DPE-5834-Z-00-0008-00, anticipates a total commitment of \$13,864,923.

The project focuses on drug demand reduction through public awareness and education and fits into an overall effort among USG agencies to reduce demand as an approach to reducing illicit substance abuse, production, and trafficking.

Responsibility for project management is exercised for the agency for International Development, Washington, D.C. (AID/W) by Dr. Anthony Meyer, the Cognizant Technical

Officer (CTO) in the Office of Education, Bureau for Research and Development (R&D/ED), with the assistance of Dr. Karen Moore, an A.A.A.S. fellow. Development Associates appointed Mr. John Garcia to be its Project Director. A Technical Advisory Group (TAG), made up of experts in disciplines relevant to combatting drug abuse, was established and meets annually to advise the contractor on the scientific and technical soundness of project activities. Regular project reporting is carried out through semi-annual reports, field trip reports, and special briefings as the need arises. The contract calls for one interim and one final evaluation.

## **II. EVALUATION PLAN AND METHODOLOGY**

In October, 1992, R&D/ED requested Creative Associates International to provide an evaluation specialist to undertake the interim evaluation during the November 1992-February 1993 period. The evaluator was asked to make a fair and candid assessment of the contract during the two and one-half years of its existence with special emphasis on:

- a) The quality and efficacy of services provided to the USAID missions and other buy-in clients;
- b) The adequacy and quality of contract resources and management; and
- c) The progress of the contract in achieving outputs.

The evaluator was also requested to assess whether the project purposes/objectives were being achieved through the contract and what lessons had been learned to date, along with any recommendations for: improving (1) contract implementation; (2) the use of this contract or other instruments to achieve the project purpose; and (3) any suggestions of future directions for the project.

The evaluation, which did not include a field visit, was drawn from interviews and reviews of key documents, some of which were especially prepared by the contractor for the evaluation. The evaluator interviewed a wide range of relevant A.I.D. personnel, contractor and subcontractor staff, and other U.S. Agency personnel and a cross section of public and private sector officials in countries participating in the project. He also attended the third annual TAG meeting, November 5-6, 1992. Communication with individuals at country project sites took place by phone or through correspondence. The draft report was distributed to a cross-section of LAC missions and AID/W narcotics coordinators for review, and their comments have been incorporated into the final report as appropriate. Annex A contains a full statement of the evaluator's scope of work. Annex B provides a list of people interviewed during the course of the assessment.

### III. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

#### A. Objectives

The objectives of the NAE project are clearly defined in the contract:

- To refine methodologies for conducting effective drug awareness and education programs;
- To strengthen the capabilities of developing country institutions to design, implement, and evaluate effective drug awareness and prevention programs; and
- To affect the knowledge, attitudes, behavior and practice of individuals in LDCs regarding drug abuse.

#### B. Components

According to the contract, the objectives stated above were to be attained by working in six discrete but closely interrelated areas.

1. Technical Assistance for A.I.D. missions and host country public and private institutions which request narcotics awareness and education expertise. Such TA is designed to enhance the capacity of host country public and private organizations to design and conduct effective narcotics awareness and prevention programs.
2. Training to develop and strengthen the capacities of public and private organizations and PVO's to operate effective drug demand reduction programs.
3. Information Dissemination to provide mission and host country organizations current information on scientific, epidemiological and program developments in the drug abuse area.
4. Operations Research to enhance the understanding of effective drug prevention interventions through small-scale operations research projects attached to operational programs.
5. Evaluation to help operators guide drug abuse prevention activities in their earlier stages (formative) and to assess the long term impact of such activities (summative) after the interventions are completed.
6. Policy Dialogue tools to sensitize and educate policy makers to become more precisely aware of the damaging consequences of narcotics production, trafficking, processing, and abuse on the social, economic and political objectives of their nations.

At least ten to fifteen countries were expected to request such support and the contract was designed with the expectation that requesting USAIDs and A.I.D. geographic bureaus would

provide the bulk of funds needed to provide these services. It was also expected that at least five countries would seek to develop a more intensive long term relationship with the project in which there would be a mutual commitment for substantial financial buy-in support from the USAID and agreement from the contractor to work closely with the USAID and host country institutions on all stages of their awareness and prevention programs. These emphasis countries were to receive comprehensive treatment in an integrated and targeted approach as contrasted to the more *ad hoc*, responsive approach the contractor was to take in relation to periodic requests for assistance from the remaining countries. While emphasis country programs were not to constitute a separate project component, they were to be conducted according to plans developed in advance with the respective USAID and host country collaborating institutions, which were to be updated annually. It was in these countries that there would be special focus on operations research and behavioral change strategies and interventions on which future country programs could be based. Several of the emphasis countries were expected to be in Latin America and it was hoped that there would be at least one candidate each from Africa and Asia.

In addition, the contractor was expected to develop a strategy paper addressing the issue of sustainability during the first year of the project and modified according to the results of the project evaluations scheduled in 1992 and 1994.

## **C. Deliverables**

Specific deliverables were stipulated in relation to the project components:

### **1. Technical Assistance**

- a. Development of the capacity of host country public and private organizations to design, implement and evaluate public awareness media campaigns and drug abuse prevention programs. (Not quantified.)
- b. Development of improved management systems to strengthen coordination and institutionalization of national public and private organizations working in the drug abuse field. (Not quantified.)
- c. Development of epidemiological research capabilities in five to seven countries to measure the nature and extent of drug abuse including the construction of indicators, e.g., frequency and percentage of abuse by population and sub-groups and characteristics of risk groups.

### **2. Training**

- a. A minimum of 1,200 persons working in the public or private sector in drug abuse awareness and prevention activities will be trained in country.
- b. A minimum of 300 key leaders and personnel involved in narcotics demand reduction activities from throughout the three regions will be trained at regional or outside-the-region events.

### **3. Information Dissemination**

- a. Development of materials for drug awareness and prevention activities, including guidelines for the application, design, implementation and evaluation of mass media, education and community drug abuse prevention programs. (No numbers specified.)
- b. The publication of a quarterly newsletter, and at least twenty reports, manuals, and training guides on aspects of drug abuse awareness and prevention.
- c. Publication of at least six articles in peer-reviewed professional journals over the five year period.

### **4. Operations Research**

Publication of results and field notes of the pilot and operations research studies on lessons learned in five to ten countries.

### **5. Evaluation**

- a. Formative evaluation plans for each field site.
- b. At least ten program evaluations.
- c. A synthesis report on major evaluation conclusions across sites throughout the project.

### **6. Policy Dialogue Tools**

As part of this component, a computer presentation model was to be created to help show policy-makers the social and political impact of the narcotics problem.

### **7. Other Deliverables**

As mentioned in B, above, the contract called for: a) the development of at least five emphasis country programs; and b) a strategy paper on project sustainability within the first year. The contract also stipulated that the contractor was to prepare within the first two months, a detailed implementation plan in collaboration with the CTO and collaborating USAIDs, to be updated each year thereafter. This plan, the AIP, was to be approved by the CTO prior to the obligation of funds for the coming year. The AIP, which would help to ensure that all parties involved were aware of their respective commitments and conditions, was to include for each collaborating country a statement of project objectives, progress and problems, budget and staffing plans. In addition to this annual plan, the contract called for the contractor to submit quarterly reports summarizing activities, accomplishments and problems. The fourth quarterly report each year was to serve as an annual report with broad distribution. A final report also was called for at the end of the contract summarizing overall project accomplishments. Further, the contractor was to submit quarterly financial reports according to A.I.D. requirements, and to submit trip reports in triplicate to the CTO within 21 days of trip completions.

## **D. Project Management and Staffing**

The contractor was to provide three core staff key professionals throughout the contract's five-year life: a Project Director, Training Specialist and an Operations/Research/Social Marketing Specialist. A junior level Librarian/Information Specialist was to be added in subsequent years. Sixty-eight person months of short-term technical services in a wide range of technical areas related to drug abuse awareness and education were also called for as part of the core staff as well as a much larger number of person months as a result of anticipated buy-in demand.

## IV. FINDINGS

### A. Overview

The NAE project has had an active two and one half years since its inception in May of 1990. During the first year or so the contractor organized its human and financial resources (core staff, subcontractors, TAG, financial and program management systems, etc.). Development Associates also disseminated information about NAE's objectives and capabilities within AID and abroad in the course of marketing the project to potential clients. The contractor, with the support of R&D/ED, performed these tasks with considerable diligence despite limited core funds available for promotional and organizational activities. Within the first six months, buy-ins totaling \$522,000 were obtained from the LAC Bureau (indirectly to support core costs), Bolivia, Brazil, and Paraguay and activities were undertaken in all six technical support areas. In the following six months a successful meeting of its newly formed TAG was held. Mission buy-ins increased by \$1,165,000 to a total of \$1,687,000 for the first year. Technical assistance missions were carried out in Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Mexico, and Paraguay in such areas as needs assessment, organizational development, project design, drug research, epidemiological survey design, training and evaluation. LAC/SAM and the A.I.D. Narcotics Coordinator also received project assistance on policy development matters.

Two Mission buy-ins stand out: Paraguay received support in both the public and private sector in developing a national narcotics awareness program which by the end of the first year had made considerable progress in training education and health workers on drug abuse prevention, had started a newsletter, and developed media materials. Bolivia initiated a major five-year narcotics awareness program involving two private and two public sector organizations. As part of this program NAE established a Resident Advisor and support staff to assume responsibility for providing and coordinating technical assistance to the participating country organizations, as well as USAID and the other elements of the U.S. country team concerned with counter-narcotics.

Marketing project services to potential clients continued apace in the project's second year. Buy-ins reached a peak of \$2,833,000 with new requests from Panama, Mexico, Guatemala, Brazil, Ecuador, Dominican Republic, PPC and LAC. Core funds grew to \$740,000 with total project funding reaching \$3,574,000 by mid-November 1991. Technical assistance visits involving activities in project design, drug research, training and evaluation were made to Jamaica, Bolivia, El Salvador, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Mexico and Paraguay during the May-November 1991 period.

While activity during the past year continued to emphasize project development and implementation in Bolivia, short term technical assistance also was provided to a wide range of countries in virtually all phases of the project. For example, a national drug prevalence survey was completed in November 1991. Further, LAC/SAM was assisted in designing a drug awareness project for Colombia and the Europe Bureau in undertaking a needs assessment in five Eastern European countries. Two editions of a project newsletter, *International Drug Prevention*

*Quarterly*, have been issued. Two additional meetings of the TAG also were held, the second of which generated strong interest and ideas in the area of innovative research, the project component which has been the most difficult to launch. Relevant to this need, a brainstorming workshop was held in July 1992 at the urging of R&D/ED, the purpose of which was to develop a research agenda and a priority list of proposed interventions. The contractor and each of the subcontractors submitted research proposals as a consequence of this session, one of which is being implemented, and a second is in the planning stage.

From November 1991 until the present, new buy-ins were received from El Salvador, Mexico, Bolivia, Brazil, and Jamaica totaling \$1,286,000, which raised the total buy-in figure to \$4,119,000. During this period core funds increased by \$400,000 to \$1,140,000. Total project funds through October 31, 1992 stand at \$5,259,000.

Most clients are satisfied, some exceedingly so, with the quality and responsiveness of NAE services. Some highlights follow:

- Technical assistance in the institutionalization/sustainability and training areas has been particularly effective on individual project interventions in Bolivia, Brazil, and Paraguay.
- Projections for in-country training have already been achieved, although regional and overseas training have not materialized, primarily due to the project's financial constraints. The impression one gains from reports and discussions with interested parties is that the contractor is performing well in providing training.
- The contractor's applied research efforts have been tied to buy-ins which either focused on problem definition or on those in which there were sufficient resources to undertake research activities. Bolivia is the only buy-in which provides sufficient resources to permit the design and conduct of a long term research program. PROINCO/DINAPRE, the principal government drug abuse prevention agency, has a research program that includes, among other things, an ethnographic study using focus groups, life histories and participant/observation to understand the relationship between street children and drug use. This study will assist in the design of drug prevention interventions directed at street children.
- The contractor has adopted a proactive approach to information dissemination designed to help host country organizations and institutions develop their own information collection and dissemination capability. Materials available from clearinghouses in the U.S. are made available. Additional information is provided through the NAE newsletter, *The International Drug Prevention Quarterly*, which is distributed to approximately 1500 organizations and individuals world-wide.
- The proposed number of twenty reports, manuals and training guides called for as a deliverable under the contract has already been exceeded if one includes the dozens of trip reports resulting from TA activities. Regarding the deliverable to produce at least six articles in peer-reviewed professional journals over the life of the contract, the contractor reports that one such article published in ACTA, an Argentine professional journal, won a coveted award among its peer publications.

- NAE has been actively involved in promoting and conducting training and providing technical assistance in the area of evaluation, with an initial focus on activities undertaken by FEMAP in Mexico.
- The contractor appears to be performing effectively in the policy dialogue area and deserves high marks for initiatives taken to sensitize various levels of the public to the negative consequences of the narcotics industry. Some of these initiatives include: establishment of a Project Coordinating Unit composed of GOB, USG, UNDCP and NGOs in Bolivia; establishment of a working group (which has evolved into a national coordinating committee) from the public and private sectors in Paraguay to coordinate drug awareness activities; and working with Cruz Blanca Panameña to publicize the results of the first household survey of drug use and attitudes in Panama. This latter effort led to recognition on the part of national authorities of the need for a public-private partnership to formulate a national drug prevention strategy.

Despite these accomplishments, there have been problems in the project. For example:

- LAC/SAM requested the contractor to undertake an analysis of drug awareness and education activities in the LAC region. LAC/SAM did not feel the draft report subsequently submitted by Development Associates was sufficiently analytical and innovative. While Development Associates believes they responded effectively to the LAC request (which was oral), the contractor's credibility was tarnished in the eyes of one of the project's most important clients, which has, in effect, placed a hold on further NAE buy-ins until they have a better impression of what the contractor is accomplishing and how the NAE project fits into the broader LAC narcotics awareness, education, and prevention strategy. (Despite the bureau's reported dissatisfaction with the survey, they have recently forwarded it to the USAID Missions for comment as part of a planned assessment they intend to make of all narcotics awareness activities in the region.)
- In Bolivia, the only NAE emphasis country, the contractor got off to a rough start, beginning with its initial needs assessment in the summer of 1990. The NAE team reportedly was not responsive to the U.S. Country Team's interest in how to treat overall narcotics issues in the country and it took at least another year to convince the U.S. Ambassador and other concerned senior USG officials that the NAE project should be allowed to operate there. A pre-project implementation workshop was carried out in La Paz by a U.S. training organization, primarily to work out the strains among the various counter-narcotics parties on the U.S. side including USAID, NAS, USIS, the Ambassador and Deputy Chief of Mission, and to agree on a strategy for project implementation. Working relations eventually became harmonious and the USAID/Bolivia Project Manager reports great satisfaction with current progress in the NAE project, particularly praising the outstanding performance of the contractor's in-country Chief of Party, Dr. Russell Stout. However, the memory of the disharmony lingers on in some quarters.
- The INM International Demand Reduction Coordinator claims that RD/ED and the contractor have refused to participate in a U.S. government wide coordinating publication titled *International Coordination Mechanism* which describes narcotics

awareness activities from September 1991 until December 1992. He claimed that virtually all other members of the narcotics awareness community were cooperating, e.g., UNDCP, PAHO, OAS, USIA, and NIDA. In discussing this issue with the CTO, he stressed that NAE was cooperating with INM's interest in obtaining information but not at the level of detail requested which the CTO considers to be unreasonable. Whichever the case, the situation does not make for the best working relationship with one of the central USG narcotics awareness and education organizations.

- A group of Latin American researchers, with technical assistance from USIA and NIDA, designed an epidemiological questionnaire and survey methodology which they had hoped would be used through-out the region to collect and treat standardized and comparable data. The contractor is perceived by some members of this group as having essentially ignored their efforts and proceeded on their own with an epidemiological survey in Bolivia. While the Development Associates staff, as well as the relevant USAID official, contend that they cooperated fully with the group, the situation was not resolved to all parties' satisfaction.
- The contractor undertook a brief field survey of five Eastern European countries, i.e., Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria, to assess the narcotics abuse situation and drug-related Human Immunodeficiency Virus infection. It was an ambitious undertaking, and most findings were of necessity anecdotal. Some readers of the draft report considered the follow-on recommendations to be self-serving. However, it was noted that the contractor responded fully to these criticisms and revised the draft report accordingly.
- The quality of two short-term technical assistance visits to one country led to the contractor not being invited by the USAID to bid on a subsequent project. The contractor was also criticized, as in other cases, with appearing to be as interested in promoting itself as the project which, in this case, the USAID felt was not justified by the quality of services rendered. While it is difficult to distinguish between the contractor and the project, a perception is held by some that Development Associates has on occasion used NAE to better its own interests. Although this criticism strikes the evaluator as unfounded, it suggests that something is amiss either with the nature of the project or the style in which the contractor is carrying out its activities, at least in these several situations. It may be that at least some of the critics are not sufficiently aware of the fact that the contractor was awarded the NAE contract competitively and that promoting/marketing project services is a major project element.
- The contractor recently prepared a project paper for a program in a particular country at the request of LAC/SAM. At the project review meeting, the paper reportedly was found to be sound in principle and, subject to several revisions, could be approved. LAC/DR, subsequently discovered the depth of interagency controversy/conflict about the design and determined that it should be postponed for future examination. Further, LAC/SAM indicated that it found the paper to be unsatisfactory on the grounds that it lacked rigor, imagination and creativity, and that it plans to redesign the proposed project.

It is important to balance these criticisms against the compliments the contractor has received from a substantial number of clients for its timely, effective and high quality TA products and services. It is also important to recognize that while Development Associates receives the brunt of criticism for these real or perceived shortcomings, the contractor is not solely to blame in all cases. Indeed, it is difficult for the evaluator to understand the reasons for the negative reaction in several cases in which the contractor's product appears to be sound and responsive to the client's request. It may be that there are other issues at play including a) bureaucratic turf concerns where various agencies and organizations tend to be critical of any activity they may consider intruding into their area of expertise or authority, b) the style of the contractor, and possibly R&D/ED, in implementing the NAE project which appears to have lacked tact or good judgement in certain cases, and/or c) basic misunderstanding by some parties on the nature of buy-in projects. There may well be other reasons impeding a fuller acceptance and utilization of NAE.

It is critical that R&D/ED address these issues as its highest priority, particularly its problems and relationships with LAC/SAM, but also those with other U.S. agencies as a means of increasing the project's image and utilization. The small LAC/SAM staff appears to the evaluator to be overburdened with work, as indicated by the difficulty experienced in finding time to complete interviews for this assessment. Other signs of this overwork include the inability for R&D and LAC to maintain a schedule of regular meetings or to hold more frequent informal meetings and the absence of LAC representation at the recent NAE TAG meeting which shed considerable light on project activities. Since LAC/SAM has been a major critic of NAE, and has indicated to the evaluator that it plans not to concur in further drawdowns of the LAC Bureau buy-in pending the results of an imminent assessment of overall narcotics awareness and education activities in the region, its participation in NAE discussions is all the more important. While there may well be good reason for LAC/SAM's limited participation in the cited instances, the project clearly suffers from a lack of greater collaboration and teamwork between the two offices.

A major constraint between the two offices appears to relate to the two LAC buy-ins. The first buy-in (\$100,000) essentially provided funds for the contractor to undertake strategy development trips to up to five countries and for an overview of narcotics awareness and education activities and approaches in the LAC Region. The contractor met the first objective but did not complete the second to the satisfaction of the buy-in client.

The second buy-in (\$250,000) was to provide TA to missions and A.I.D. representatives in LAC for needs assessments, definition and documentation of strategies, programs, and projects and other activities as mutually agreed between the two bureaus. The second buy-in also called for the maintenance of a database of A.I.D.-funded narcotics awareness and education activities and five to ten special reports each year generated from the database as requested by LAC/DR/HPN (now LAC/SAM) or LAC missions. In addition, up to four narrative reports were to be produced, such as the draft LAC Narcotics Awareness and Education strategy called for in the earlier LAC buy-in. Finally, the second buy-in called for two regional training workshops for host country counterparts involved with NAE activities. To the extent funds have been drawn down, it appears that the contractor has made progress in achieving the above objectives. However, approximately \$180,000 remains unused in the second buy-in for reasons stated elsewhere in this report so there is obviously much more that needs to be done. Progress has been made, especially in the needs assessment area. The contractor has submitted a draft

LAC strategy paper but, as in the case of the one requested under the first buy-in, it is not considered satisfactory to LAC/SAM, although the contractor has not been formally advised as to its shortcomings. With regard to the LAC database system, the contractor states that it supplied the LAC/SAM MIS contractor with considerable material for its use in the LAC MIS and has had no follow-up request in this area. With regard to the requirement for the regional training workshop, the contractor indicates that it requested approval to proceed but has not been given the green light by LAC/SAM.

The following section reviews in detail the major activities of the project on a component-by-component basis.

## **B. Project Components**

### **I. Technical Assistance (TA)**

Ideally, NAE's efforts start with a country's (or organization's) basic needs assessment i.e., objectives, desires, capabilities, and resources, and continue through the design, implementation and evaluation of a comprehensive drug abuse awareness program. No exact number of TA activities were specified in the contract except in the area of developing epidemiological research capabilities in five to seven countries. Four have already been undertaken and one or two more may take place in the near future. However, project emphasis is shifting from broad epidemiological surveys to more targeted interventions.

The contractor reports that TA in one or all of these stages has been provided to twelve USAID missions and Bureaus, including LDC governmental and non-governmental organizations. TA has covered topics such as 1) design and conduct of national epidemiological drug prevalence studies in Bolivia, Dominican Republic, Panama and Paraguay; 2) design and evaluation of individual host country projects and activities (Brazil, Paraguay, Panama, Mexico, Bolivia, Jamaica and Colombia; 3) design, implementation and evaluation of media campaign and other drug awareness and prevention programs (Bolivia, Paraguay, Panama, El Salvador, Guatemala); 4) development of management systems to strengthen coordination and institutionalization of drug awareness organizations (Bolivia, El Salvador, Paraguay); and, 5) strategic planning and sustainability strategies (El Salvador, Mexico, Paraguay, Panama).

It is difficult to assess the quality and efficacy of each of these efforts, particularly without the benefit of field visits. However, based on a review of documents and discussions with clients, it appears that, with few exceptions, high professional and technical standards were maintained. The contractor appears to have conscientiously responded to known needs in as timely and professional a manner as its resources and capabilities permitted. Perhaps the area of epidemiological surveys stand out as the contractor's most outstanding contribution to drug awareness and education, followed by effective TA in the institutionalization/sustainability and training areas. Individual project interventions, including media campaigns, have also been particularly effective, especially in Bolivia, Brazil and Paraguay.

## **2. Training**

Although the contract calls for training at three levels (in-country, regional and outside the region), the contractor has focused almost exclusively on in-country training related to specific host country needs. The projections for in-country training have already been achieved, indeed surpassed. Plans to reach the number specified (300) for regional or overseas training have not materialized, primarily due to the project's financial constraints.

In-country training has ranged from institutional team building for newly formed organizations to the design and evaluation of drug awareness messages and campaigns. For example, as part of a concerted effort to institutionalize a research capability within Bolivia's Direccion Nacional de Prevencion (DINAPRE), NAE conducted training courses on the design of national drug studies, focus groups, ethnographic studies, use of SPSS software, and data analysis. Other training activities in Bolivia included a week-long workshop on communication in drug awareness and education programs, and training on design and evaluation of communication messages.

In Paraguay, NAE conducted a week-long training course on communication, which provided participants an opportunity to actually design and conduct a public opinion and attitudinal survey and analyze the data. The results of this survey and a subsequent focus group study were used to develop drug abuse prevention materials in both Spanish and Guarani.

Training on evaluation techniques has been on-going in Mexico for the last year, with several follow-up sessions still to come. Additionally, a workshop on new approaches to community and school-based programs has been initiated. In Panama, NAE staff provided training on how to utilize the results of drug prevalence studies to inform the media and policy makers, and to develop appropriate drug abuse prevention messages. The Brazil buy-ins are strictly for training of drug abuse prevention providers and trainers. To date NAE has conducted two training sessions for a diverse group of regional professionals and policy makers designed to develop counter-narcotics policies. NAE also has designed additional training courses for individual governmental agencies and non-governmental organizations.

These training activities have been developed in conjunction with USAID missions and host country organizations. Annex C contains specific figures on numbers of people trained (by country and topic) directly through NAE workshops and seminars, and indirectly, through the multiplier effect.

As in the case of TA, it is difficult to assess the quality and long term impact of these training efforts without first-hand knowledge of the curricula, student body and post-training applications of new knowledge and ideas. However, the impression one gains from reports and discussing the various workshops with interested parties is that the contractor is performing well in this component. NAE has reached a wide audience with a variety of drug abuse awareness issues in a relatively short time.

## **3. Operations Research**

The contractor's applied research efforts have been tied to buy-ins which either focused on problem definition or on those in which there were sufficient resources to undertake research

activities. For example, buy-ins from USAIDs in the Dominican Republic and Panama were directed at conducting research to define the nature and extent of the drug abuse problem in each country. Buy-ins in Bolivia, Paraguay and Guatemala have provided funding for research activities. The buy-ins for Brazil and Mexico provide funding for NAE training in research, but do not provide funding for research, *per se*.

The contractor reports the following progress:

**Dominican Republic:** The buy-in called for a national household survey of drug use and for organizing a set of focus groups to provide formative research on the design of drug abuse prevention interventions. The study was completed and a report was presented at a national seminar in the Dominican Republic, sponsored by the National Drug Council. The data are being turned over to the National Council and other agencies for their use in the design of national prevention programs. The prevalence data are also being reanalyzed by NAE as part of a cross-national survey of drug prevalence.

**Guatemala:** This buy-in calls for the conduct of a series of prevention activities which will be subject to evaluation in order to test the efficacy of the various approaches. There are at least six such activities underway.

**Bolivia:** Bolivia is the only buy-in which provides sufficient resources to permit the design and conduct of a long term research program. Currently there are two research components: a national research effort by the principal government drug abuse prevention agency, PROINCO/DINAPRE, and formative and evaluative research by the private agency, SEAMOS, both of which receive technical assistance from NAE. PROINCO's research program in 1992 included an ethnographic study using focus groups, life histories and participant/observation to understand the relationship between street children and drug use which will assist in the design of drug prevention interventions directed at street children. PROINCO'S research also included the analysis of a national household survey designed by NAE. This survey included measurement of the nature and extent of drug use, opinions concerning drug use, production, and trafficking in Bolivia and various attitudinal measures. The survey serves to set the baseline for national drug prevention evaluation while also providing the formative research to define future interventions.

SEAMOS has conducted focus groups as part of the pretesting of a series of documentary television programs directed toward drug production, trafficking and use in Bolivia. They are also conducting a national survey of decision-makers and opinion leaders. This survey will provide data for the design of future awareness programs directed at opinion makers as well as assisting in evaluating those programs by creating a baseline. NAE is providing TA in the design and implementation of the focus groups and the survey.

While the above examples reflect considerable activity, the operations research component of the project leaves much to be desired, with the possible exception of activities in Bolivia. Underlying the problem is the virtual non-existence of core funds to carry out the kind of innovative research contemplated in the contract. Except in Bolivia, there is little opportunity to pursue innovative efforts through the buy-in process as there is barely enough money in core funds to meet the contractor's basic payroll and operating expenses. This situation places a severe constraint on initiating meaningful research efforts. Even so, innovation in shaping local

applied research activities through TA and incorporating formative evaluation studies in the work plan for buy-ins could go far in providing NAE with its applied research opportunities and findings. The contractor pointed out that formative research has been built into the action plan of several countries, e.g. Bolivia, Paraguay, and Mexico. However, there is limited evidence of progress.

The problem is not simply one of funding. Even if funds were available, there is a question as to whether the contractor, as now organized, possesses sufficient understanding of this critical project component. Indeed, some of the examples provided by the contractor would not necessarily meet the project's definition of operations research. For example, Development Associates' substantial efforts in identifying "...the nature and extent of the drug problem ..." is an epidemiological assessment rather than operations research. The contractor has made limited progress in this component, even after the second TAG meeting in November, 1991, in which research was stressed and after the R&D/ED-inspired July 1992 research brainstorming session. Recently Development Associates has increased the involvement of two of its subcontractors, i.e., Porter/Novelli and AED, in its applied research efforts which should enhance its research capabilities. In the remaining years of the contract, it is essential for the contractor to recognize that it must as a matter of highest priority initiate more innovative research activities which can either be paid for from existing funds or presented to R&D/ED for supplemental funding.

The deliverable called for in the contract of publishing the results and field notes of operations research studies on lessons learned in five to ten countries is behind schedule. Perhaps two efforts of the contractor might qualify in this regard, i.e., the cross-national study of drug abuse and the report on drug use in Paraguay, but there has not been enough field work undertaken to meet the publication goal.

In discussing the operations research issue with the contractor's Project Director, he acknowledged that the project does not yet have much to show in this component. However, he stressed that it takes time to set the stage for host country organizations to be in place, and capable and willing to undertake operations research activities. He claims that this factor, in addition to the scarcity of core funds, has dictated the choices the contractor has had to make. See Annex D for a matrix of the contractor's current and proposed research activities.

#### **4. Information Dissemination**

In addition to developing appropriate materials for specific training and technical assistance activities, the contractor reports that it utilizes existing materials in many of its training and technical assistance efforts. Materials considered to be appropriate to host country populations are translated and provided to them, primarily as reference materials. For example, a communication training manual developed under the former Asia/Near East Regional Narcotics Education Project was translated into Spanish by the NAE/Bolivia office staff and into Portuguese by Brazilian counterparts. In Brazil, an important component of all training events is the development of relevant drug abuse training and prevention materials. These materials are being prepared by host country individuals with the help and oversight of NAE staff.

NAE has also developed a quarterly newsletter, *The International Drug Prevention Quarterly*, only two editions of which have been issued to date. The newsletter has been distributed to approximately 1500 organizations and individuals world-wide. Favorable comments on its utility have been received from Pakistan, Nepal, Thailand, and Rome, where the USIS PAO, who used to be stationed in Peru, saw a copy and requested additional copies for distribution to local Italian drug awareness and education programs.

Semi-annual progress reports are disseminated to selected A.I.D. bureaus and missions throughout the world. Reports on drug prevalence studies and special papers are distributed to select individuals and organizations. These reports include the drug prevalence studies conducted in Bolivia, Dominican Republic, Panama, and Paraguay, as well as studies conducted by the contractor outside the NAE project. Special reports include: *The Use of Data in Drug Policy Formulation*, *The Role of Applied Research in Public Awareness and Policy Development*, and *Applied Behavior Change: A Framework for Behavior Change Interventions and Research*. Also in process is a special report on "Sustainability" which should be available in the near future.

The contractor is actively assisting host country organizations and institutions develop their own information collection and dissemination capability. In addition to providing technical assistance in the development of documentation center systems and procedures, the staff has assembled a basic packet of materials available from drug abuse prevention clearing houses for distribution to the organizations with which NAE works. Annex E contains a listing of NAE project materials, including those developed for specific events, special reports, and research study reports. Annex E also contains a list of materials developed by other institutions that were deemed to be useful, and were distributed to host country organizations.

Though the number of support materials for drug abuse awareness and prevention activities was not specified in the contract, Annex E gives ample evidence of the magnitude of contractor efforts in this regard. The proposed number of twenty reports, manuals and training guides has already been exceeded if one includes the dozens of trip reports resulting from TA activities. Regarding the deliverable to produce at least six articles in peer-reviewed professional journals over the life of the contract, the contractor reports that one such article published in *ACTA*, an Argentinian professional journal, won the 1991 ACTA Prize awarded annually for the best scientific study in Latin America, and that another is in the works.

Although the contractor clearly has been disseminating project-related information to appropriate audiences, some of the people interviewed in the Washington area claim to have sparse knowledge of NAE activities. Several of the AID/W Narcotics Coordinators indicated that little information reaches them on the project and that they would like to be kept better informed on a continuing basis, despite the lack of project activity in their respective regions. Based on overseas interviews, information dissemination appears to be more comprehensive and effective abroad. However, there does not appear to be a systematic information dissemination strategy for disseminating lessons learned to the interested parties here or abroad. The weakness in information dissemination has been especially noted by LAC/SAM which is the office most in need of being kept informed.

While it has been noted that the quality of some of the contractor's reports, memoranda, etc. is uneven and might not project the highest professional standards, this is considered a

minor and easily correctable problem. Overall, the contractor seems to be performing well in this component.

## **5. Evaluation**

As indicated above, NAE has actively promoted and conducted training and provided technical assistance in the area of evaluation. In addition to training and technical assistance, the NAE has also been requested to conduct evaluations of drug abuse prevention programs. These evaluations include:

The Narcotics Sectoral Assessment for Ecuador--a cross-cutting evaluation of USAID/Ecuador's drug awareness programs, Fundacion Nuestros Jovenes Project, Fundacion Guayaquil, and the Ministry of Education's National Drug Education Program. Additionally, the assessment included a review and description of the status of the government's National Drug Council (CONSEF) and the development of a directory containing an institutional review of governmental and non-governmental organizations active in narcotics awareness, education, and prevention. The NAE team also developed a proposed drug awareness and education strategy for the Mission's consideration.

Organizational Assessment of the Anti-Drug Foundation of El Salvador (FUNDASALVA)--an assessment to ascertain whether FUNDASALVA's first year Action Plan contained activities and objectives that were consistent with the Cooperative Agreement between USAID and FUNDASALVA. Also required was a determination as to whether, if met, the Action Plan targets would lead to measurable progress towards achievement of overall project purposes and objectives. In addition to reviewing the Action Plan itself, the evaluation team also reviewed the various components and activities being carried out by FUNDASALVA. The results were discussed with FUNDASALVA staff and recommendations made that would improve the organizational structure, program activities, and the Action Plan itself.

Mid-Term Evaluation of USAID/Jamaica Drug Abuse Prevention Project--under this mid-term evaluation, an NAE team assessed progress and capabilities of the Jamaican National Council on Drug Abuse, Jamaica/Western New York Partners, and the Kingston Restoration Company, all funded directly or indirectly by USAID/Jamaica. The final report on this evaluation which was submitted to Jamaica on October 30, 1992, includes a proposed follow-on drug strategy for Jamaica.

There appears to be considerable activity in the evaluation area. While the deliverables specified in the contract are not completely on schedule, they might well be achieved by the end of the fifth year. Formative evaluation activities are underway. Program evaluations really cannot be undertaken until programs have been completed and the third requirement, a synthesis report on major evaluation conclusions across sites, obviously is premature. However, the stage needs to be set now to accomplish these deliverables at the appropriate time.

## **6. Policy Dialogue Tools**

The contractor reports that it has placed considerable emphasis on this component in order to raise the awareness of LDC policy makers regarding the damaging impact of narcotics production, trafficking, and use on the social and economic fabric of their countries.

Recognizing that such awareness must emanate from the populace itself, NAE works closely with local drug awareness professionals to help them educate and inform community and public opinion leaders and other policy makers on the dangers of drugs and drug-related activities. In Bolivia, the Mission and NAE have established a Project Coordinating Unit composed of GOB, USG, UNDCP and non-governmental organizations which meets monthly. In Paraguay local drug prevention program professionals meet regularly with members of Paraguay's legislative assembly to discuss the problem. In addition, the results of the national drug prevalence study conducted in Paraguay were released at a public ceremony attended by media and key government leaders. During the most recent technical assistance visit to Paraguay, the NAE staff member was instrumental in the establishment of a working group from the public and private sectors to coordinate drug awareness activities. This working group has now evolved into a national coordinating committee comprised of governmental and non-governmental entities whose objective is to develop and implement a national drug plan.

In Panama, NAE worked closely with the Cruz Blanca Panameña, a local private voluntary organization, to publicize the results of the first household survey of drug use in that country. The release was made in a major public presentation to national authorities, private sector organizations and the press. An immediate outcome of this presentation was recognition on the part of national authorities of the need for a public-private partnership to formulate a national prevention strategy. A similar presentation was made in the Dominican Republic, where the National Drug Council co-sponsored the public event releasing the results of the household study in that island.

In Bolivia and Brazil, NAE staff are working with local institutions to provide the necessary contracts and activities designed to inform policy makers. Extensive use is made of television spots in Bolivia and workshops with the press are an ongoing activity. In the case of Brazil, NAE staff are working directly with Sao Paulo and Ceara State government officials to develop policies and programs to address counter-narcotics issues. The NAE Project Director has also entered into preliminary discussions with the United Nations Drug Control Programme representative in Brazil to look at training needs in the design of a national drug plan.

The contractor appears to be performing very effectively in the policy dialogue area and merits commendation for its efforts in making the public aware of the negative consequences of the narcotics industry. However, the deliverable calling for a computer presentation model to help sensitize policy makers on the social and political impacts of narcotics has not been undertaken. Attempts were made earlier in the project to obtain funding for this activity but proved to be of no avail. Moreover, many A.I.D. and contractor staff feel that such a model, similar to RAPID which is used in the population area, is probably not now feasible in the field of narcotics awareness and education.

## **C. Other Project Deliverables**

### **1. Emphasis Country Programs**

While not a project component *per se*, the contract calls for at least five emphasis country programs to maximize the project's impact in targeted countries. Only one, Bolivia, has reached this status. (Paraguay comes close but quite likely will not buy-in to the degree necessary to

become an emphasis country in the sense intended in the contract.) At this stage it does not appear that any other country will become a major participant in NAE. The contractor should not be criticized for not attaining the five country goal, given A.I.D.'s current program focus and concentration, which does not include narcotics, as well as the shortage of funds for, and alternative approaches to, narcotics awareness, e.g., bilateral projects, funding from other donors, etc.

## **2. Sustainability/Institutionalization**

The strategy paper on sustainability called for by the end of the first year has not been issued although it is in final draft form. While the paper should be completed as soon as possible, the contractor is especially strong in the area of sustainability/institutionalization which it considers to be a *sine qua non* if NAE is to have any long term impact.

## **3. Annual Implementation Plan (AIP)**

Development Associates prepared the initial AIP called for in the contract which was approved by R&D/ED. While not submitted within the two months stipulated in the contract, it appears to be a comprehensive statement containing the specified contractual requirements and has proven helpful in guiding project start-up activities. Updates to the plan for subsequent years have primarily been in the form of individual country scopes of work as buy-ins come in. There have been no additional comprehensive AIPs. R&D/ED indicated that it does not need such a document given its daily interaction with the contractor and that the semi-annual report presently serves this review and projection function and is more timely. Further, the CTO contends that an essentially responsive buy-in project such as NAE does not lend itself to AIPs. However, LAC/SAM indicated that it would benefit from a more structured, organized work plan from the contractor whether it took the form of an AIP or semi-annual report.

## **4. Quarterly Reports**

While the contract called for both quarterly and semi-annual reports in different sections, it was agreed by the CTO in February 1991 that semi-annual reports would suffice, along with regular updates as necessary. Four semi-annual reports have been prepared and a fifth one is scheduled in the near future. The contractor claims that these reports receive wide distribution but not many people interviewed seemed aware of them. They contain detailed accounts of project accomplishments presented in a somewhat upbeat, public relations mode. These reports quite likely would have greater credibility if they treated more of the constraints and problems the project faces along with its successes and accomplishments.

## **5. Quarterly Financial Reports**

Development Associates submits monthly financial vouchers but has not received guidance or requests from A.I.D. for financial reports on a quarterly basis. A separate financial audit is underway and will possibly address this subject.

## **6. Trip Reports**

The contractor, with few exceptions, has been proficient in meeting this contract requirement.

Overall, the contractor is doing a good job meeting its project deliverables and, with one or two exceptions, should have no problem meeting its contract requirements.

The contract indicated that A.I.D. expected to undertake a separate interagency agreement with the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA). This has not come to pass primarily due to a shortage of core funds. Not as a deliverable but as part of the project review and evaluation process, the contract also called for the contractor to develop and maintain "a management information system which would provide information regarding fulfillment of interim objectives and the functioning of the systems created to meet those objectives." There is no indication that this requirement has been met in a formal sense. The CTO is satisfied with the management information flow he receives from the contractor and, as in the case of the AIP, does not believe the level of effort involved in developing an MIS is justified or necessary in the case of NAE. However, given the comments from several respondents that they would like more information on project activities, R&D/ED needs to revisit this issue and assure itself as well as other interested parties that a systematic flow of information is available, whether it is provided through a formal MIS, AIPs or strengthened semi-annual reports.

## **D. Contract Resources and Management**

### **1. Financial Resources**

Core funds have been tight since the project began. Indeed, the principal A.I.D. project designer had to seek funds from the Policy Bureau to launch the project since no funds were available in his bureau at the time and subsequent buy-ins from LAC were indirectly used to support core costs. R&D/ED has been able to come up with \$400,000 each year in core funding while approximately \$650,000 is estimated to be needed to meet the contractor's basic staffing and operating costs. It is intended that this shortfall will be made up by tapping buy-in funds. Based on the current buy-in rate, approximately twenty percent of buy-in funds would have to be applied across the board to meet core costs. While the contractor has been able to keep afloat by carefully husbanding available funds and applying creative financial management, there is little left to apply to innovative activities in the operations research area, which are considered vital to the success of the project. Both the contractor and R&D/ED deserve high marks for accomplishing so much with so little in the way of core resources. The willingness of LAC to supply buy-in funds to undertake needs assessments in the LAC region was also important to the project's launching.

A total of \$5,259,000 has been obligated through October 31, 1992, of which \$1,140,000 was provided by R&D/ED for core costs. The balance of \$4,119,000 represents the total amount of buy-ins from USAID missions and AID/W bureaus. See Annex F for a project funding table. This ratio of core to buy-in funding is unusually heavy on the buy-in side. A Contracting Officer who is familiar with the project indicated that this is the only centrally-funded project to his knowledge in which core activities are, in effect, subsidized by buy-ins to meet basic project costs. In his experience, the reverse is true, i.e., centrally-funded projects not only are funded to meet core costs but traditionally provide additional funds to meet innovative state of the art interventions which represent the *raison d'etre* for R&D projects in the first place.

Another unique feature of NAE is that most buy-ins have taken the form of modification agreements rather than the more traditional delivery order process which requires the contractor to prepare budgets and negotiate contracts with the Contracts Office prior to undertaking project activity. Of the twenty-one buy-ins to date in NAE, sixteen have been modifications and only five have taken the more common delivery order route. This poses a mixed blessing: modification agreements are far simpler to execute but delivery orders provide greater checks and balances on contractor's plans and proposed expenditures, e.g., salaries of proposed short-term personnel. The CTO contends that the major difference between the two modes is that, in the case of the modification agreements the responsibility for negotiating contract activities lies with the CTO whereas in the case of delivery orders the Contracts Office is responsible. The CTO further stated that he is comfortable assuming these responsibilities and that, in any event, he has no control over the buy-in mechanisms used by the Missions or the A.I.D regional bureaus.

A generic issue in A.I.D. contracts is the difficulty a CTO has in attempting to monitor contractors' expenditures by reviewing their monthly vouchers. It is virtually impossible to match line item expenditures against program activities.

## **2. Program Management**

While R&D/ED and the contractor appear to be performing well in a difficult bureaucratic environment, there are areas in which improvements can be made in their management style. Whether the criticisms the project has received are caused by faulty perceptions by the critics rather than poor judgement or action on the part of R&D/ED and/or the contractor is less important than trying to understand how or why such problems occurred, and how they can be avoided in the future. The image of the project is not as favorable as it should be, especially in the Washington area, and the CTO and contractor must address the root causes of this issue as a highest priority.

Development Associates is a strong, self-directed and experienced contractor that appears to be trying with a sparse budget to respond to the multifarious and sometimes conflicting demands of its clients. The contractor's Project Director is a well organized, experienced and conscientious manager who is held in high respect by his colleagues and associates. He reacts positively to suggestions for project improvement and continually strives to the best of his ability to make the project a success. The remaining core staff members and subcontractor staff appear equally dedicated and conscientious in the pursuit of their respective roles and assignments. R&D/ED has a small, highly professional staff who believe more in macro-management than day-to-day operational control. It has been suggested that R&D/ED might allow the contractor too much freedom in implementing the project. While this assertion is understandable given that Development Associates is a forceful contractor and that the project has had difficulties, the evaluator believes the overall policy direction and management style of R&D/ED in relation to the contractor is effective and appropriate in the context of this project. Indeed, R&D/ED has intervened on occasions to assure that the contractor is performing to the best of its ability. For example, R&D/ED has persistently prodded the contractor to improve the project's research agenda; it persuaded the contractor to more fully engage its subcontractors whose skills were needed in certain areas; and R&D/ED advised the contractor to pay more attention to the quality of its reports and memoranda to strengthen the project's credibility.

Project management might be improved if the CTO were more involved on a day-to-day basis in project activity. Virtually all respondents indicated that the AAAS Fellow who has been carrying the bulk of operational responsibility is intelligent and productive. However, several commented on the Fellow's limited bureaucratic experience and lack of direct-hire A.I.D. status which appear to make it difficult for her to function in some situations as the *de facto* CTO without seemingly greater participation from the actual CTO. The impression is held that the CTO is not sufficiently present at important meetings or participating in project-related field trips which he delegates to the Fellow and that this has occasionally caused or contributed to problems. (The fact is that there are no funds available for CTO travel). The evaluator has observed a good working relationship between the two officers and believes the CTO's tendency to delegate is a deliberate, gradual one and that the AAAS Fellow reports to and is advised by the CTO to a greater extent than the concerned parties are aware. However, in the evaluator's view, the CTO should become more active and visible in day-to-day project operations, particularly in the inter-agency arena.

## **E. Achievement of Project Objectives**

It is beyond this scope of the evaluation to ascertain future demand for buy-ins to the project with any precision in terms of specific countries, dollar amounts and timing. For that matter, most missions are not in a position to predict funding availability two years hence. However, based on telephone interviews, faxes, and telegrams received from a wide range of overseas organizations, especially those received from missions that responded to the draft report, it seems reasonable to expect a volume of buy-in activity sufficient to warrant the continuation of the project throughout the balance of the five-year period. For example, R&D/ED expects new buy-ins from Mexico, Ecuador, Paraguay, Brazil, Bolivia, and Guatemala. There is also a possibility of buy-ins from El Salvador and Sri Lanka. R&D/ED estimates that approximately \$3 million in buy-in and core funds may become available during the remaining contract period. This would result in a total of \$8 million project funding compared to the \$13.8 million estimated at the outset of the contract. The shortfall is primarily related to the limited interest in NAE outside the LAC region.

With regard to the three major areas of concentration: a) refining methodologies for conducting effective drug awareness and education programs; b) strengthening the ability of public and private LDC institutions to design, implement, and evaluate state of the art programs; and c) affecting the knowledge, attitudes, behavior and practices of the LDC public regarding narcotics; considerable progress has certainly been made in b). The contractor contends that there has been progress in all these areas. For example, Paraguay's use of focus groups in drug awareness activities and its development of drug awareness messages for public consumption are cited as evidence of progress in the a) and c) categories. Despite these limited examples, there is a pressing need for the contractor to increase the quality and quantity of interventions in these two areas of concentration. One must bear in mind that the contractor primarily responds to Mission buy-in requests, greatly hindering its ability to initiate integrated coherent strategies to apply and test in targeted areas. The very nature of the project might limit its potential impact to individual country interventions and the synthesis of these interventions into lessons learned for use in other areas. However, unless there is an increase in core funding, a more concentrated, focused approach might prove to be unattainable. Yet, even without funding increases ways must be found to increase whatever proactive possibilities might exist, especially in the applied research area which is an essential project component. A fundamental need is for

the contractor to increase his emphasis on building benchmarks into current activities in order to have a more solid basis for eventual impact evaluation on various interventions.

Several respondents expressed ambiguity as to precisely what A.I.D. (including this project) is trying to accomplish. Is it part of a larger USG public relations campaign to assist in reducing the overall production, trafficking, processing, and consumption of illicit drugs or is it limited strictly to narcotics demand reduction, awareness and education? If it is the former, the project should be free to undertake virtually any or all elements of narcotics education programs wherever USG interests are involved. However, if it is the latter, some critics ask why is the project functioning in countries with little or no known drug consumption problem while not operating in other countries where consumption problems are severe?

As mentioned above, LAC/SAM recently sent a telegram to the LAC USAID Missions announcing an evaluation they intend to conduct on all narcotics awareness, education and prevention activities in the region to date. They hope to gain sufficient insight from this evaluation to develop LAC Bureau guidelines for future activities. The Bureau indicates that some 45 million dollars has been or will be committed to narcotics awareness, education, and prevention activities in the LAC region alone over the next four years (which presumably includes Mission buy-ins to the NAE project) and that it is time to assess the use of these funds. (See Annex G for an informal breakdown of the funding commitments prepared by the LAC Bureau.) The results of this assessment conceivably could affect the future of the NAE project inasmuch as NAE operates almost exclusively in the LAC region, despite its global framework. LAC/SAM hopes to have the results of the evaluation in early 1993, which should enable R&D/ED to benefit from its findings during the balance of the contract period.

A question has been raised regarding the appropriateness of implementing an R&D centrally funded project which effectively functions in only one geographic region. The evaluator believes that it behooves the agency to retain NAE on a global basis because a) it is an established, ongoing activity, and b) there is always the possibility that other regions will want to buy-in in the future, which is a relatively simple task so long as the centrally-funded mechanism remains in place.

It will soon be time for R&D/ED to begin looking beyond the original five-year contract to the second five-year period proposed in the NAE project paper. While interviews with overseas clients in the conduct of this interim evaluation support the need to continue such efforts, funding availability is more problematic. However, assuming the project is to continue, which the evaluator expects will be the case, it will be necessary by the end of 1993 for R&D/ED to determine if the second five-year project period will require a revision of the governing project paper or whether any changes needed in the second phase can be covered adequately in a new Request for Proposal.

## V. RECOMMENDATIONS

Specific recommendations resulting from the above analysis follow.

1. R&D/ED should:

- a) Instruct the contractor to restructure its core staff in a manner that would provide at no extra cost an experienced operations research manager who would be responsible for strengthening this important project component.

Such realignment will require reducing the level of effort of one or more of the other core staff members to offset the additional expense for the position of an Operations Research Manager. Short of such realignment, it is doubtful that the project will be able to produce the quality of operations research called for in the contract.

- b) Continue to urge the contractor to utilize subcontractor staff at every opportunity.

While there has been increased subcontractor involvement in the past year, e.g., two subcontractor staff members have been seconded to NAE core project staff, Development Associates should continuously be encouraged to assign contractor staff on short term TA and training assignments.

- c) Instruct the contractor to involve the Technical Advisory Group to a greater extent in project activities.

Attendance at yearly meetings does not give adequate opportunity to apply the available expertise to operations. There should be greater interplay between meetings among contractor staff and TAG members by means of minutes, follow up memoranda and reports, telephone contact, etc. Greater use of TAG members in the technical assistance component also would be a good way of applying their expertise directly to project activities in the field.

- d) Encourage the contractor to carefully review its project marketing and implementation style to improve its image in these aspects of project management.

Inasmuch as it is a responsibility of the contractor to promote project buy-ins, there is no reason why there should be criticism of its efforts in this behalf. Perhaps there are stylistic changes in its marketing and implementation approach that would improve the contractor's, hence the project's, image.

- e) Review with the contractor its information dissemination procedures to assure that interested parties in the U.S. and abroad are receiving relevant reports, studies and other documents of interest in a timely manner. It is especially important that AID/W narcotics staff as well as members of INM, USIA, NIDA and ONDCP are kept abreast of project activities. It would also be useful for Development Associates to begin preparing and disseminating a "lessons learned" booklet on its experience with

different interventions which could be periodically updated as more experience is gained.

- f) Encourage the contractor to develop baseline data to the maximum extent possible in order to establish benchmarks for measuring impact of project interventions.
  - g) Determine with the contractor if there is a need for a Management Information System as required in the contract, or if current reporting systems suffice.
2. R&D/ED should strengthen its efforts to increase core funds, at least to the originally proposed \$650,000 per year level, to enable the contractor to undertake more innovative interventions, especially in the area of operations research that are beyond the interest and funding availability of the missions and bureaus which buy-in to the project, but are an essential project component.

While it is believed that more innovative work can be accomplished within the current funding structure, especially if Recommendation #1a) is adopted, it is doubtful that the contractor will be able to do all that was expected at the time the contract was signed without additional core funding. Indeed the \$650,000 was proposed for the first year with incremental increases in subsequent years.

3. R&D/ED should consider sponsoring a day-long workshop or retreat managed by an experienced facilitator involving the project's major participants, i.e., AID/W narcotics coordinators, USIA, NIDA, INM and ONDCP, along with Development Associates and its three subcontractors.

The purpose of this session would be to establish a clearer focus on what NAE is doing, what it has accomplished, how it fits into the broader USG narcotics reduction community and how its mechanisms might be improved to increase cooperative and collaborative efforts among the concerned parties. This interim evaluation report might be one of the documents that could be used as a resource to guide the discussion. Equally useful might be the results of the proposed LAC Bureau evaluation of overall narcotics awareness, education and prevention activities.

4. R&D and the LAC Bureau need to develop a more effective working relationship in which both sides share a sense of ownership in the project.

Most importantly, both bureaus need to analyze their respective project management styles and approaches (along with the contractor), searching for ways which would contribute to a more effective working relationship. This might begin with establishing a sense of co-ownership or co-management of the project by more firmly adhering to a schedule of bi-weekly joint management meetings related to LAC NAE activities. More effective project reporting on the part of R&D/ED and the contractor in the form of AIPs or improved semi-annual reports would also be a constructive step. An improved systematic flow of pertinent information on field trip reports and other documents describing specific project activities in the LAC region is also needed. There is a need to continue a dialogue on NAE project purposes and objectives which often appear vague to LAC/SAM, e.g., why carry out demand reduction activities in countries with negligible illicit drug abuse problems?

The project might benefit from the sectoral perspective of LAC/HPN, and the LAC Bureau may wish to consider their possible reengagement with NAE activities. If not feasible, engagement of LAC/EHR might be considered as an alternative means to enhance technical expertise as well as to relieve workload on the overburdened LAC/SAM narcotics staff.

While it is beyond the scope of this evaluation to address how the LAC Bureau should carry out its project management, the issue is being raised because, in the view of the evaluator, effective communication and collaboration between R&D and the LAC Bureau is essential to the long term success of NAE and the current relationship is not satisfactory. In whatever form it takes, new mechanisms need to be devised which will result in the two bureaus working more harmoniously in guiding the implementation of the NAE project. Such teamwork might well lead to renewed participation and availability of funds from LAC/SAM which indicated to the evaluator that it does not plan to concur in any further drawdowns on the existing buy-in until it has a better appreciation of what is going on in the overall narcotics awareness, education and prevention area in the LAC region and how NAE fits into this overall picture. While there is sufficient buy-in activity from the LAC Missions to continue the project without the support of the LAC/SAM, it is obviously in the best interests of both R&D and the LAC Bureau to collaborate in implementing NAE inasmuch as it is the major umbrella narcotics awareness and education activity in the region.

5. R&D/ED and LAC/SAM should review the specific tasks requested in the two LAC buy-ins with the intention of coming to a mutual agreement on a workplan to achieve the stated tasks and objectives. Such a review should hopefully assist in freeing the balance of funds remaining in the second buy-in.
6. R&D/ED should take the initiative in whatever form is required to remove the following conditions from the existing contract, hopefully without the need for a contract amendment:
  - Modify the reports requirement section to indicate that semi-annual reports serve the function of AIP updates and quarterly reports. (Appendix F2.3). Semi-annual reports suffice.
  - Modify the requirement for at least five emphasis country programs. There is only one at present and this might be all that can reasonably be expected over the balance of the contract period.
  - Delete the requirement for a computer presentation model(Appendix F2,4,6). Efforts in this behalf have proven futile and quite likely are not relevant to the project's success or failure.
7. R&D/ED should investigate with FM & the Contracts Office possible ways of making the contractor's monthly vouchers a more effective monitoring device.

This is a generic problem in no way unique to NAE but if enough CTOs were seized with the possibility of utilizing the review of the monthly contractors' vouchers as a project monitoring mechanism, perhaps revisions could be made in the presentation.

8. R&D/ED should also ascertain from FM & the Contracts Office what, if anything, is required from the contractor beyond the monthly financial vouchers to meet the quarterly financial report stipulation in the Special Performance Requirements section of the contract.
9. R&D/ED should soon begin to lay the groundwork for the second five years of the project's proposed ten-year life, if indeed the need develops for the second five-year period.

The results of the imminent LAC/SAM evaluation of all narcotics awareness, education and prevention activities as well as this interim evaluation of NAE should be helpful in determining the future direction of the project. Assuming it is decided to proceed with the second five years, it should be clear by the end of the year whether there are sufficient changes in the project's direction to warrant a revised project paper or whether the new request for proposal (RFP) will suffice.

## **ANNEX A**

### **Scope of Work**

Narcotics Awareness and Education  
(936-5834)  
First External Evaluation  
Scope of Work

A. BACKGROUND

The Narcotics Awareness and Education Project (NAE) is a \$25 million project extending a ten-year period, FY90-99. Project funds consist of \$4.5 million in R&D central funds and up to \$20.5 million in Mission and Regional Bureau Buy-ins.

The first phase of the project is being implemented through a five-year contract commencing May 9, 1990, with Development Associates as prime contractor, and the Academy for Educational Development, Macro Systems International, and Porter-Novelli as subcontractors. This contract, DPE-5834-Z-00-0008-00, estimates a total cost of \$1,950,000 in R&D central funds and up to \$11,914,923 in Buy-in funds, for a maximum dollar ceiling of \$13,864,923.

The purpose of the project is to refine methodologies for conducting effective drug awareness and education programs, to strengthen the ability of public and private institutions in LDCs to design, implement, and evaluate programs using state-of-the-art methodologies, and to affect the knowledge, attitudes, behavior, and practices of individuals in LDCs regarding drug use. The project focuses on drug demand reduction through public awareness and education and fits into a coordinated effort among USG agencies to promote demand reduction as an approach to reducing illicit substance abuse, production, and trafficking.

Overall responsibility for project management is exercised for AID/W by the Cognizant Technical Officer (CTO) in the Bureau for Research and Development, Office of Education, in consultation with the R&D/ED Director and personnel of other concerned Bureaus. Management for Development Associates is by the Project Director. A Technical Advisory Committee, made up of experts in disciplines important to combatting drug abuse, meet annually to advise the Contractor on the scientific and technical soundness of project activities.

Regular reporting is carried out through annual workplans, annual and semi-annual reports, trip reports, and special briefings. In addition, the contract calls for one interim and one final evaluation of which this is the interim evaluation.

B. EVALUATION OVERVIEW

The external interim evaluation should offer a fair and candid assessment of the implementation of the contract for the Narcotics Awareness and Education Project (Contract No. DPE-5834-Z-00-0008-00). The evaluator should read the contract and meet with relevant AID and contractor personnel to assess the

following:

- 1) The quality and efficacy of services provided to missions through the five project components: (a) technical assistance; (b) training; (c) applied research; (d) information dissemination; and e) evaluation and policy dialogue tools.
- 2) The adequacy and quality of contract resources and management.
- 3) The progress of the contract in achieving outputs.

Overall, we are interested in knowing whether the project purposes are being achieved through the contract and what lessons have been learned to date. We are also interested in recommendations for improving (1) contract implementation; (2) the use of this contract or other instruments to achieve the project purpose; and (3) our understanding of future directions for the project.

#### C. METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The NAE CTO will serve as control officer for the evaluation and will facilitate travel and other approvals as necessary, and will be assisted in this by A.A.A.S. Fellow, Dr. Karen Moore.

In general, the evaluation will be drawn from interviews and reviews of key documents. The evaluator will meet with the R&D/ED office director, as well as other relevant members of the R&D Bureau. Those interviewed shall include representatives from Regional Bureaus, Mission project officers, project implementors, in addition to members of public and private organizations which are the recipients of assistance in the areas of any of the project components. Communication with individuals at country project sites will take place by phone or through written correspondence.

The evaluator will meet with individuals involved with the NAE project at the contractor's office as well as with relevant individuals at the subcontracting agencies. The NAE contractor will gather documentation and supporting evidence responding to the evaluation issues. The NAE contractor will receive the evaluation agenda in advance of a meeting with the evaluator and be encouraged to prepare responses to the issues being addressed.

The evaluation will commence on or about October 1, 1992. The evaluator will make three trips to Washington D.C. During the first trip he/she will spend three weeks for the purpose of gathering documents and interviewing appropriate NAE contractor and A.I.D. personnel. A second trip will be made to review the draft of the evaluation. The third trip will be made to present the final report. The final report should be submitted to the Office of Education no later than February 19, 1993.

### C. TOPICS OF REVIEW

As the evaluator assesses the progress made in implementing the NAE contract it will be important for him/her to remember that the ability of the contractor to provide technical assistance and conduct additional activities described in the contract is dependent on the amount of buy-in and core funding obtained. With that limitation in mind, we ask that the evaluator assess:

1. The quality and efficacy of services provided to Missions through the five project components:

#### (a) Technical Assistance

- Has technical assistance been provided to Missions and host country organizations in a timely, effective manner, according to the requirements provided in the contract?

#### (b) Training

- What kinds of training activities have been conducted under the NAE project? Have the training activities been responsive to the needs of Missions and host country organizations conducting drug awareness and education programs?

#### (c) Applied Research

- Has an applied research framework for the project been clearly articulated? What is it?
- What progress has been made in conducting applied research and is this adequate for achieving the project purpose?

#### (d) Information Dissemination

- Have support materials (such as guidelines or manuals for the design, implementation, and evaluation of mass media, education, and community drug abuse prevention programs) been developed for drug awareness and prevention activities?
- Has progress been achieved regarding the publishing of a quarterly newsletter, reports, manuals, and training guides on aspects of drug abuse awareness and prevention?

#### (e) Evaluation and policy dialogue tools

- To what extent has the contractor been able to conduct formative and program evaluations?
- Have activities been undertaken to raise the awareness of LDC policy makers regarding the damaging impact of narcotics production, trafficking, processing, and abuse on the social and economic objectives of their countries?

57

2. The adequacy and quality of contract resources and management.

- How well has the contractor arrangement (of a prime, with three subcontractors) served project activities? Are the subcontractors represented in project activities in a manner reflecting their proposed contribution to the project? Have there been unmet needs related to the contractor arrangement?
- What is the evaluator's assessment of the adequacy of the contractor performance, management, and implementation?
- Do the contractors respond in a thorough and timely manner to Mission, Bureau, and R&D/ED requests?
- To what extent has the project involved the proper level of expertise for the tasks to be accomplished? To what extent has adequate technical assistance been available when needed?

3. The progress of the contract in achieving outputs.

- Is the contractor making appropriate progress regarding project deliverables?

4. How well is contract implementation achieving the purpose of the project and how could this be improved?

D. DELIVERABLES

A draft report of the evaluation should not exceed 30 single spaced pages and will be due no less than 30 days prior to submission of the final report. Ten copies of the final evaluation report shall be submitted to the Office of Education no later than February 19, 1993.

**ANNEX B**  
**INTERVIEWS**

## **AID/WASHINGTON**

**Bundy, Bernadette G., Deputy Director, Counter Narcotics, LAC/SAM**

**Champagne, John L., Director, NE/ME**

**Countryman, Illona K., Program Operations Assistant, Asia/DR/TR**

**Dabbs, Carol, LAC/DR/HPN**

**Gayoso, Antonio, Social Science Research Officer, R&D**

**Mallay, Kathy, FA/OP/B/HNE**

**Meyer, Anthony J., CTO, R&D/ED**

**Moore, Karen, American Academy for the Advancement of Sciences, Fellow, R&D/ED, A.I.D.**

**McDonald, Ann W., Director, Counter Narcotics, LAC/SAM**

**Mc Donald, Kathleen S., Health Officer, EUR/DR/HR**

**Rea, Samuel S., Chief, Office of Education, R&D**

**Rugh, Michael A., Acting Narcotics Coordinator, POL/PAR**

**Thompson, Carrie, LAC/DR/FA**

**Wilson, Dwight T., Program Analyst, AFR/DP/PAB**

**Yeandel, Orion W., FA/OP/B/AEP**

25

## OVERSEAS

Alcocer, Jaime R., Chief, National Unit of Communications, La Paz, Bolivia

Baldivieso, Laura, CESE, La Paz, Bolivia

Brown, Betsy H., Chief, HPN, USAID/Jamaica

Capul, Rosendo, USAID/Philippines

Chiavaroli, Gene, AAO/Nigeria

Clary, John H., Program Officer, USAID/Panama

Cohn, Rebecca W., Narcotics Coordinator, RDO/Caribbean

Dosh, Steven K., Program Officer, USAID/Guatemala

Ferrando, Delicia, Pathfinder, Lima, Peru

Hartenberger, Paul H., HHR, USAID/Bolivia

Hill, Alexandra, FUNDASALVA, El Salvador

Laufer, Jacques, Research Director, Fundacion Nuestros Jovenes

Leddy, Ellen, Chief Officer for Democratic Institutions, USAID/Ecuador

Mc Duffie, Patrick M., A.I.D. Representative, Belize

Nelson, Richard B., A.I.D. Representative, Paraguay

Pielemeier, John, A.I.D. Representative, Brazil

Retana, Rafael, Narcotics Coordinator, USAID/El Salvador

Rodriguez, Jaime, Director, Subdesal, La Paz, Bolivia

Shaik, Jorge A., Cruz Blanca Panamena

Sherwood, Lisa, Narcotics Coordinator, A.I.D. Representative/Mexico

Thomas, John H., Development Officer, USAID/Dominican Republic

## **OTHER UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT OFFICES**

**Amsel, Zili, NIDA**

**Browne, Thom, International Demand Reduction Coordinator, INM**

**Comolli, J.C., ONDCP**

**De La Rosa, Mario, NIDA, HHS**

**Houghton, Arthur, ONDCP**

**Johnson, Lee, USIA (retired)**

**Louis, Marshall, USIA**

**Lindblad, Richard, Chief of International Programs, NIDA, HHS**

**Smela, Barbara, USIA**

## **CONTRACTORS**

**Braun, Juan, R. Communications/Social Marketing Specialist, Academy for Educational Development**

**Davis, Peter B., President, Development Associates**

**Day, Harry R., Operations Research Specialist, Development Associates**

**Edwards, Daniel B., Training Resources Group**

**Garcia, John L., Project Director, NAE, Development Associates**

**Jutkowitz, Joel M., Senior Research Adviser, Development Associates**

**Kirsch, Henry W., Design Program and Evaluation Specialist, Development Associates**

**Mathes, Donald E., Senior Associate, Macro International, Inc.**

**Middlestadt, Susan E., Research Director, Academy for Educational Development**

**Perez, Elva A., Training Specialist, Macro International, Inc.**

**Porter, Robert, Senior Associate, Porter/Novelli**

**Ramah, Michael L.E., Vice President, Porter/Novelli**

**Smith, William A., Executive Vice President, Academy for Educational Development**

**Stout, Russell, Chief of Party, NAE, Bolivia**

**Zheng, Xiaoyie, Information Specialist, Development Associates**

13

**ANNEX C**

**Persons Receiving Training  
Through the NAE Project**

## PERSONS RECEIVING TRAINING THROUGH THE NAE PROJECT

<u>Country</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Direct<sup>1/</sup></u>	<u>Indirect<sup>2/</sup></u>
<b>*Bolivia</b>	Promotores		70
	Prevention for Parents, School and University students, and Community Institutions		10,000
	Prevention for Communications Workers		9
	Prevention for Community Workers		90
<b>Brazil</b>	Communications	43	
	Communications	50	
<b>Guatemala</b>	Teacher Training		166
	Student, Teacher, Parent and Health Professionals Training		1,191
	Health Professionals and Teacher Training		425
	Unification of Criteria	40	
<b>Mexico</b>	Community Prevention	14	
	Planning and Evaluation of Prevention Programs	25	
<b>Panama</b>	Census Bureau Interviews	10	
	Evaluation of Prevention Programs	5	
<b>Paraguay</b>	Communication/Prevention	33	
	Developing a National Prevention Strategy	21	
	Communication Strategy Design	24	
<b>TOTAL</b>		<u>265</u>	<u>11,951</u>

<sup>1/</sup> Persons trained by NAE project personnel

<sup>2/</sup> Persons known to be trained by host country organizations receiving TA from NAE

\* Bolivia: Numbers reflect all persons trained up to May 31, 1992.

20

**ANNEX D**

**NAE Applied Research by Country, Task,  
Agency, Status and Products**

## NAE APPLIED RESEARCH BY COUNTRY, TASK, AGENCY, STATUS AND PRODUCTS\*

COUNTRY	RESEARCH TASK	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY	STATUS	PRODUCTS
BOLIVIA	NATIONAL HOUSEHOLD SURVEY OF KNOWLEDGE, ATTITUDES, PREVALENCE REGARDING DRUG PRODUCTION, TRAFFICKING AND USE	CIEC & DINAPRE/PROINCO WITH NAE/TA	SURVEY COMPLETED PRINCIPAL RESULTS DISSEMINATED	1. MONOGRAPH ON OPINIONS/KNOWLEDGE PUBLISHED BY DINAPRE, OCT. 1992 2. MONOGRAPH ON PREVALENCE PUBLISHED BY DINAPRE, NOV. 1992 3. NATIONAL PRESS CONFERENCE PLANNED LATE NOV. 1992. 4. COMPREHENSIVE MONOGRAPH ON STUDY SCHEDULED FOR COMPLETION IN DEC. 1992
	ETHNOGRAPHIC STUDY OF DRUG USE AMONG STREET CHILDREN AND COCHABAMBA	DINAPRE/PROINCO WITH NAE/TA	STUDY COMPLETED PUBLICATION FORTHCOMING	MONOGRAPH ON STREET CHILDREN AND DRUG USE SCHEDULED TO BE PUBLISHED DEC. 1992
	NATIONAL SCHOOL-BASED SURVEY ON DRUG PREVALENCE AND ATTITUDES AMONG INTERMEDIATE AND HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS	DINAPRE/PROINCO WITH NAE/TA	STUDY DESIGN COMPLETED SURVEY SCHEDULED MAR. 1993	MONOGRAPH ON SURVEY RESULTS 9/93
	RURAL HOUSEHOLD SURVEY ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DRUG PRODUCTION, TRAFFICKING & USE	DINAPRE/PROINCO WITH NAE/TA	STUDY DESIGN COMPLETED SURVEY SCHEDULED MAY 1993	MONOGRAPH ON SURVEY RESULTS 12/93
	OPINION LEADERS PANEL STUDY OF ATTITUDES TOWARD DRUG PRODUCTION, TRAFFICKING AND USE	SEAMOS WITH NAE/TA	STUDY IN PROGRESS SCHEDULED FOR COMPLETION JAN. 1993	MONOGRAPH ON OPINION LEADERS ATTITUDES TOWARD THE DRUG PROBLEM, JANUARY, 1993
	YOUTH, SPORTS AND DRUG PREVENTION INTERVENTION!	SEAMOS WITH NAE/TA	STUDY DESIGN BEING FORMULATED MATERIALS BEING DEVELOPED SCHEDULED FOR COMPLETION, 12/93	YOUTH INTERVENTION PROGRAM TESTED; MONOGRAPH ON LESSONS LEARNED, 12/93
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	NATIONAL URBAN SURVEY OF DRUG PREVALENCE AND ATTITUDES	NAE WITH ASISA/OMSA UNIVERSITY OF SANTO DOMINGO	STUDY COMPLETED RESULTS DISSEMINATED	STUDY REPORT DISSEMINATED 9/92 NATIONAL PRESS CONF. HELD 9/92
	YOUTH BASED PREVENTION INTERVENTION	HOGARES CREA WITH NAE/TA	INTERVENTION IN PROGRESS TO BE COMPLETED 10/93	INTERVENTION APPROACH TESTED REPORT 10/93

\* FOR A DISCUSSION OF THE OPERATIONS RESEARCH COMPONENT OF THE NAE PROJECT, PLEASE SEE PAGE 12 OF THE EVALUATION REPORT.

27

NAE APPLIED RESEARCH BY COUNTRY, TASK, AGENCY, STATUS AND PRODUCTS

COUNTRY	RESEARCH TASK	IMPLEMENTING AGENCY	STATUS	PRODUCTS
GUATEMALA	EVALUATION OF NATIONAL PROGRAM OF PREVENTION INTERVENTIONS	CONAPAD WITH NAE/TA	EVALUATION TO BE COMPLETED IN DECEMBER, 1992	A SERIES OF INTERVENTIONS TESTED REPORT ON RESULTS, 12/92
MEXICO	COMMUNITY BASED DRUG INTERVENTIONS	FEMAP WITH NAE/TA	INTERVENTIONS, RESEARCH IN PROGRESS	REPORT ON ACTIVITIES, LESSONS LEARNED 3/93
PANAMA	NATIONAL SURVEY OF DRUG PREVALENCE AND ATTITUDES	NAE WITH CRUZ BLANCA AND CELA	STUDY COMPLETED REPORT DISSEMINATED	MONOGRAPH PUBLISHED APRIL 1992 NATIONAL PRESS CONFERENCE MAY 1992
PARAGUAY	NATIONAL URBAN SURVEY ON DRUG PREVALENCE & ATTITUDES	FUND. MARANDU WITH NAE/TA	STUDY COMPLETED RESULTS DISSEMINATED	STUDY PUBLISHED MARCH 1992
CROSS NATIONAL	CROSS NATIONAL STUDY OF PREVALENCE IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN FROM HOUSEHOLD SURVEYS	NAE	DATA GATHERED FINAL DRAFT BEING EDITED	STUDY TO BE PUBLISHED FEB. 1993 JOURNAL ARTICLE SUBMITTED FEB 1993
	CROSS NATIONAL STUDY OF PREVALENCE IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN FROM SCHOOL-BASED SURVEYS	NAE	DATA BEING GATHERED	STUDY TO BE PUBLISHED APRIL 1993 JOURNAL ARTICLE SUBMITTED APRIL 1993
	THEORY OF REASONED ACTION AS AN APPROACH TO PREVENTION DESIGN IN THE DOMINICAN REP. PANAMA AND BOLIVIA	NAE	DATA GATHERED ANALYSIS UNDERWAY	STUDY TO BE PUBLISHED JUNE, 1993 JOURNAL ARTICLE SUBMITTED JUNE, 1993

28

**ANNEX E**

**Information Dissemination**

**NAE Project Materials**

Information Dissemination

**NAE PROJECT MATERIALS**

**Special NAE Project Reports**

- Jamaica Drug Abuse Prevention Project Mid-Term Evaluation, October 1992
- National Study of Drug Prevalence and Attitudes Towards Drug Use in Haiti, June 1991
- Guatemala Needs Assessment, April 1991
- NAE Technical Advisory Group Meeting Report, December 1990
- NAE Technical Advisory Group Meeting Report, November 1991
- Survey on Drug Prevalence and Attitudes in the Dominican Republic, September 1992 (English and Spanish versions)
- NAE Semi-Annual Report #1, May - November, 1990
- NAE Semi-Annual Report #2, November 1990 - May 1991
- NAE Semi-Annual Report #3, May - November 1991
- NAE Semi-Annual Report #4, November 1991 - May 1992
- Narcotics Sectoral Assessment for Ecuador, August 1991 (English and Spanish versions)
- Encuesta Sobre Prevalencia de Drogas y Actitudes in Panamá Urbana, Abril 1992 (English and Spanish versions)
- Needs Assessment of the Drug Problem in Eastern Europe, March 1992
- The Uses of Data in Drug Policy Formulation, August 1992
- Applied Behavior Change: A Framework for Behavior Change Interventions and Research, January 1991

45

- Report on the Status of Drug Abuse Awareness and Prevention Activities in Latin America and the Caribbean, May 1992
- Organizational Assessment of the Anti-Drug Foundation of El Salvador (Fundasalva), October 1991 (English and Spanish versions)
- The Role of Applied Research in Public Awareness and Policy Development - The Case of Drug Use in Panama, June 1992
- Final Report - Alternative Development in Bolivia - A Public Opinion Study, May 1992 (English and Spanish versions)

### **Manuals**

- Prevención en la Comunidad: Nuevos Enfoques y Alianzas
- Planificación y Evaluación de Programas de Prevención
- Manual de SPSS y Estadística
- Manual de Evaluación de Programas de Comunicación para la Prevención del Uso Indebido de Drogas
- Manual de Comunicación y Prevención del Uso de Drogas

### **Translations in Support of Specific Training and Technical Assistance Events**

- Communication Manual for Drug Abuse Prevention Programs
- Selected passages from Prevention Plus II: Tools for Creating and Sustaining a Drug-Free Community
- Selected passages from Prevention Plus III: Assessing Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention Programs at the School and Community Level
- OSAP Prevention Monograph 8 - Preventing Adolescent Drug Use: From theory to Practice

### **Selected drug abuse prevention information/publications/reports**

In addition, selected drug abuse prevention information/publications/reports from various sources such as NIDA, OSAP, NCADI and others, have been disseminated to the following countries:

4/4



- Indonesia BERSAMA
- Jamaica USAID/Jamaica
- Mexico FEMAP: Ciudad Juárez, Monterrey, Tijuana
- Panama Cruz Blanca Panameña
- Paraguay Marandú
- Phillipines Dangerous Drugs Board, University of Philippines
- Poland Dr. Marta Dziedzic, AIDS Program, Ministry of Health
- Sri Lanka SLANA
- Thailand Office of Narcotics Control Board

\*A list of these materials is attached to this document.

**ATTACHMENT**

## LIST OF DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION MATERIALS FOR STARTER SET

- AIDS and Intravenous Drug Use Among Minorities**  
Papers from a NIDA-sponsored technical review on the combined impacts of drug use and AIDS in minority communities
- Alcohol and Health: Seventh Special Report to the Congress, 1990**  
A comprehensive review of progress being made in all areas of alcohol research in the U.S.; footnoted; indexed.
- A Parents Guide to Prevention**
- Breaking New Ground for Youth at Risk: Program Summaries, (OSAP Technical Report 1)**  
A review of prevention strategies (Goodstadt); an overview of the OSAP/HRY grant program; and 130 brief program summaries.
- Citizen's Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention Directory: Resources for Getting Involved.**  
Prevention is defined; U.S. Federal agency programs described; national PVOs listed; State prevention groups identified.
- Communicating About Alcohol and Other Drugs: Strategies for Reaching Populations at Risk, (OSAP Monograph 5)**  
Discussions of needs and methods for reaching At-Risk groups; How to work through parents, physicians, and PVO's.
- Como Actuar: Escuelas Sin Drogas**  
Spanish Language version of School Without Drugs, a pamphlet on school approaches to drug abuse prevention in the U.S.
- Conference Highlights**  
National Conference on Drug Abuse Research & Practice
- Consequences of Maternal Drug Abuse, (NIDA Monograph 59)**  
Studies of the effects on offspring of heroin, methadone, and cannabis use during pregnancy are presented.
- Drug Abuse Services Research Series**
- Drug Prevention Curricula**
- Getting It Together - Promoting Drug-Free Communities**
- Helping Your Students Say No (Dark Pink, English and Spanish)**
- InTouch Training Resource Materials Packet (Illinois P.R.C.)**  
Training materials, small group exercise forms, graphic representations, and short papers

on drug abuse prevention.

**Learning to Live Drug Free**

**Making Health Communications Programs Work: A Planners Guide  
Mass Communications, Health Education, and Social Marketing Theories, Models and  
Practices; How to do it guidance.**

**National Commission on Drug-Free Schools**

**OSAP Prevention Monograph 1      Stopping Alcohol and Other Drug Use Before It Starts: The  
Future of Prevention**

**OSAP Prevention Monograph 4      Research, Action, and The Community: Experiences in the  
Prevention of Alcohol and Other Drug Problems**

**OSAP Prevention Monograph 5      Communicating About Alcohol and Other Drugs: Strategies  
for Reaching Populations At Risk**

**OSAP Prevention Monograph 7      Social Drinking Contexts**

**OSAP Prevention Monograph 8**

**OSAP Prevention Monograph 10      A Promising Future: Alcohol and Other Drug Problem  
Prevention Services Improvement**

**Prevention Plus II**

**Tools for Creating and Sustaining Drug-Free Communities**

**Prevention Plus III**

**Assessing Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention Programs at the School and Community  
Level**

**Proceedings of a National Conference on Preventing Alcohol and Drug Abuse in Black  
Communities**

**A series of very readable, largely narrative presentations of theories, models.**

**Research No. 57 -      Self-Support Methods of Estimating Drug Use**

**Research No. 59 -      Current Research on the Consequences of Maternal Drug Abuse**

**Research No. 63 -      Prevention Research: Deterring Drug Abuse Among Children and  
Adolescents**

**Research No. 80 -      Needle Sharing Among Intravenous Drug Abusers**

51

- Research No. 83 - Health Hazards of Nitrite Inhalants
- Research No. 85 - Epidemiology of Inhalants Abuse An Update
- Research No. 93 - AIDS and Intravenous Drug Use: Future Directions for Community-Based Prevention Research
- Research No. 100- Drugs in the Workplace: Research and Evaluation Data
- Research No. 110- The Epidemiology of Cocaine Use and Abuse
- Research No. 118- Drug Abuse Treatment in Prisons and Jails
- Research No. 119- Problems of Drug Dependence 1991: Proceeding of the 53rd Annual Scientific Meeting
- Self-Run, Self-Supported Houses for More Effective Recovery from Alcohol and Drug Addiction
- Ten Steps to Help Your Child from Using Alcohol or Other Drugs
- The Future By Design - A Community Framework for Preventing Alcohol and Other Drug Problems Through a System Approach
- Turning Awareness Into Action
- What Works - Schools Without Drugs
- The Challenge - Schools without Drugs

**ANNEX F**

**Project Funding Table**

PROJECT FUNDING TABLE  
(As of October 31, 1992)

ANNEX F

FUNDING SOURC	DATE	AMOUNT OBLIGATED	PURPOSE
RD/ED	05/09/90	\$327,000.00	CORE
LAC 1	06/07/90	\$100,000.00	Technical Assistance/Needs Assessment
BRAZIL, PHASE I	07/03/90	\$100,000.00	Training of Trainers - to expand capacity of local organizations
PARAGUAY, PHA	07/03/90	\$200,000.00	Project Development - Needs assessment, planning, project design, training and technical assistance
RD/ED	07/27/90	\$13,000.00	CORE
BOLIVIA, PHASE I	09/26/90	\$122,000.00	Technical Assistance - Project administration, procedures development, project coordination
RD/ED	03/11/91	\$400,000.00	CORE
DOM.REP.	04/24/91	\$65,000.00	Prevalence Study - National household study of drug use, attitudes, behaviors
BOLIVIA, PHASE I	05/02/91	\$1,100,000.00	Long-term Technical Assistance - On-site assistance to four host country organizations
PARAGUAY 2	05/24/91	\$200,000.00	Project Development - Technical assistance, training, financial support for project activities
ENE	05/24/91	\$66,500.00	Needs Assessment - On-site study of drug-related organizations in Eastern Europe
PANAMA	06/27/91	\$50,769.00	Prevalence Study - Household study of drug use, attitudes, behaviors in three cities
MEXICO	06/27/91	\$96,050.00	Technical Assistance/Training - Support to FEMAP and its affiliates in five cities
GUATEMALA*	06/27/91	\$100,000.00	Technical Assistance/Training - Support for host country agencies
BRAZIL, PHASE II	06/27/91	\$250,000.00	Training - Continuation of phase I and expansion to additional organizations
ECUADOR	08/02/91	\$59,947.00	Evaluation - Cross cutting evaluation of USAID/Ecuador drug programs
PPC	08/09/91	\$30,000.00	Strategy Papers - In support of the Drug Advisory Committee
LAC 2	08/09/91	\$250,000.00	Training/Needs Assessment - Training, needs assessment, development of reports
DOM.REP.	08/09/91	\$14,207.00	Prevalence Study - In support of national household survey
JAMAICA	08/30/92	\$44,993.00	Evaluation - Evaluation of USAID-Supported National Drug Abuse Council Program
EL SALVADOR	08/30/91	\$29,036.00	Evaluation - Assessment of FUNDASALVA First Year Action Plan
EL SALVADOR	03/04/92	\$16,592.00	Technical Assistance - Development of five year strategy document
RD/ED	03/06/92	\$100,000.00	CORE
RD/ED	07/08/92	\$300,000.00	CORE
MEXICO	08/25/92	\$83,844.00	Technical Assistance/Training - Continuation of assistance to FEMAP program
BOLIVIA	08/25/92	\$990,000.00	Long-term Technical Assistance - Continuation of assistance to USAID/Bolivia
BRAZIL III	09/11/92	\$150,000.00	Training - Continuation of training in Sao Paulo and CEARA States
TOTAL		\$5,258,938.00	

\*Does not include \$100,000 contract with Development Associates for the conduct of a needs assessment and drug prevalence and attitudes study, which was awarded and carried out before the existence of the NAE Project.

54

**ANNEX G**

**Narcotics Awareness and Demand Reduction  
in  
Latin America and the Caribbean**

15

**NARCOTICS AWARENESS AND DEMAND REDUCTION  
IN  
LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN**

Since the Cartagena Drug Summit in February 15, 1990, and over the next four years, A.I.D. has or will be funding narcotics awareness and demand reduction activities in fourteen (14) countries in Latin America and the Caribbean. The following is a breakdown of the funding information we have to date:

	(000)	
Belize	\$1,700.0	
Bolivia	13,520.0	<u>1/</u>
Brazil	300.0	
Colombia	5,500.0	<u>2/</u>
Costa Rica	500.0	
Ecuador	2,730.0	
El Salvador	1,500.0	
Guatemala	130.0	
Haiti	1,150.0	
Jamaica	500.0	
Mexico	1,869.5	
Panama	300.0	
Paraguay	400.0	
Peru	14,500.0	<u>3/</u>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>44,599.5</b>	

- 1/ Includes (a) \$1.9 million project which closed at the end of the first quarter of FY 92, and (b) \$2.4 million in PL 480 Trust Fund.
- 2/ Includes (a) \$1.5 million for cooperative agreements for two indigenous PVOs which terminated in FY 92, and (b) the \$4.0 million proposed for the new project.
- 3/ Includes \$8.5 million proposed for a new project.  
BBUNDY/DOCS/WILLIAMS.IAD