

A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY - PART I PD-ABS-170
 12A 89955

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

IDENTIFICATION DATA

A. Reporting A.I.D. Unit: Mission or AID/W Office <u>USAID/HONDURAS</u> (ES# <u>FY94-4-B</u>)	B. Was Evaluation Scheduled in Current FY Annual Evaluation Plan? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Slipped <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ad Hoc <input type="checkbox"/> Evaluation Plan Submission Date: FY <u>94</u> Q <u>2</u>	C. Evaluation Timing Interim <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Final <input type="checkbox"/> Ex Post <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/>
--	---	---

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

Project No.	Project /Program Title	First PROAG or Equivalent (FY)	Most Recent FACC (Mo/Yr)	Planned LOP Cost (000)	Amount Obligated to Date (000)
522-0296	Strengthening Democratic Institutions (SDI) - Component II Legislative Enhancement * Totals for Component II include only T.A. and Commodities. Does not include Project Management costs. Note: Total SDI Planned LOP cost: \$21,800; Amount Obligated to Date: \$19,900.	1987	8/95	\$1,898	*\$1,879

ACTIONS

E. Action Decisions Approved By Mission or AID/W Office Director Action(s) Required	Name of Officer Responsible for Action	Date Action to be Completed
Component II - Legislative Enhancement		
1. Urge Congress to improve administrative functions.	USAID	Completed
2. Proceed with the establishment of CIEL, the Legislative reference service.	USAID	Completed
3. Undertake a systematic analysis of the need for, and cost of, obtaining the various data bases being proposed by Legislators for inclusion in the CIEL.	USAID	Completed

(Attach extra sheet if necessary)

APPROVALS

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

G. Approvals of Evaluation Summary And Action Decisions:

	Project/Program Officer	Representative of Borrower/Grantee	Evaluation Officer	Mission or AID/W Office Director
Name (Typed)	<i>Emily Leonard</i> EMILY P. LEONARD		LORRAINE SIMARD CARMEN ZAMBRANA	MARSHALL D. BROWN
Signature	<i>Emily Leonard</i>		<i>Lorraine Simard</i>	<i>Marshall D. Brown</i>
Date	8/3/94		8/11/94	

ABSTRACT

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

*The goal of the Strengthening Democratic Institutions (SDI) (522-0296) Project is to strengthen Honduran democracy. The purpose is to improve the capability of key democratic institutions, improve local political leadership, and increase the knowledge and participation of the Honduran populace in the democratic process. The objective of the Legislative Enhancement Component is to improve the effectiveness of the Honduran Congress in formulating and passing laws and to increase contact with the public. This component was implemented primarily by Georgetown University (GU) and three subcontractors. The midterm evaluation (8/87-9/90) was conducted by a Development Associates, Inc. team on the basis of: a review of project documents; interviews with project personnel in Honduras and Washington, D.C. and others conversant with the project. The purpose of the evaluation was to measure progress made, examine design validity, and provide guidance for midcourse adjustments.

The major findings and conclusions are:

- * The design for a legislative support center (CIEL) was completed in December 1989; however, the proposed center has less autonomy than contemplated in the MOU and has not become functional. The CIEL automation proposals were controversial.
- * Project implementation lagged because of contracting delays and staffing problems.
- * The assumptions and planned outputs of this component remain valid.

The evaluators noted the following "Lessons":

- * The three main components of the SDI Project (Administration of Justice, Congress, and National Elections Tribunal/National Registry of Persons) are sufficiently different that they should have been separate projects.
- * More systematic and regional sharing of information about programs and actions being taken would be of great assistance to deal with fairly common problems and issues in the process of strengthening democratic processes.
- * Given A.I.D.'s inexperience with this type of project, it would have been advisable to use more outside experts in the design and implementation of such projects. A multi disciplinary advisory committee should follow project progress and participate in deliberations on important project decisions.

COSTS

I. Evaluation Costs

1. Evaluation Team		Contract Number OR TDY Person Days	Contract Cost OR TDY Cost (U.S. \$)	Source of Funds
Name	Affiliation			
	Development Associates		*	
James L. Roush	Team Leader	39	21,619	Project 522-0296
Mitchell Seligson	Lat.Am.Specialist	26	14,598	
James Rowles	Legal Specialist	26	14,598	
Joseph Alessandro	Training Specialist	26	12,805	
Carlos Ferro	Procurement Specialist	11	4,811	
* Costs are for entire project.				
2. Mission/Office Professional Staff Person-Days (Estimate) <u> 80 </u>		3. Borrower/Grantee Professional Staff Person-Days (Estimate) <u> 12 </u>		

SUMMARY

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

Address the following items:

- Purpose of evaluation and methodology used
- Purpose of activity(ies) evaluated
- Findings and conclusions (relate to questions)
- Principal recommendations
- Lessons learned

Mission or Office:

USAID/HONDURAS

Date This Summary Prepared:

JULY, 1994

Title And Date Of Full Evaluation Report:

Strengthening Democratic Institutions Project
II-Legislative Enhancement. December, 1990.

1. PURPOSE OF THE PROJECT

Civilian rule returned to Honduras in the 1980s after an extended period of military dictatorship. Thus, in 1987 when the project was designed, the democratic process was incipient and key support institutions were extremely fragile. The project purpose was "to improve the capability of key democratic institutions (the Judiciary, the Congress, and the National Elections Tribunal/National Registry of Persons), develop local Leadership, and increase the knowledge and participation of the Honduran populace in the democratic process". Legislative Enhancement is Component II of this project, the objective of which was to improve the effectiveness of the Honduran Congress in formulating and passing laws and to increase contact with the public. Initial priority in the legislative component was given to four tasks: (a) establishing a National Center for Legislative Support Services designed to provide legislators with more and higher quality information; and (b) improving the functioning of the congress by: (i) enhancing the current administrative structure; and (ii) streamlining the legislative process.

2. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION AND METHODOLOGY USED

The purpose of the midterm evaluation was to assess accomplishments to date against the planned outputs, analyze problems and constraints, analyze the continuing validity of the logical framework, and provide guidance for midcourse adjustments. This evaluation (8/87-9/90) was conducted by a Development Associates, Inc. team on the basis of: a review of project documents; and interviews with project personnel (the Honduran National Congress) and others conversant with the project in AID/Washington, USAID/Honduras, Georgetown University (GU) and its subcontractors, Clapp and Mayne (CM), Futures Group (FG) and Central American Business Administration Institute (INCAE).

3. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Overall, implementation performance has been minimal, primarily due to the delays within USAID/Honduras in contracting the prime contractor.

- (a) Legislative Career Service: Conditions Precedent (CPs) and Covenants in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) have not been complied with. The evaluators found no evidence that this issue had been brought to high levels of the Government of Honduras (GOH); thus, it is not clear whether there is a political will to carry out what appears to be the single most important action under the project, to strengthen democratic principles and create public confidence in the three counterpart organizations.
- (b) The only significant achievement was the design of a Legislative support center (CIEL) in December 1989; however, it has less autonomy than proposed and had not become functional. USAID/Honduras should accept the CIEL in its present form as meeting the spirit of the MOU, even though it is not a separate institution as called for in the MOU.

The CIEL automation proposals were controversial. The team recognizes, however, that the particular software provides a means of eliminating the need for an extended and detailed technical analysis. Given that, and the general delay in project implementation already encountered, the proposal currently under

consideration appears reasonable under the circumstances. There appears to be within the Congress too much faith in computer hardware and too little appreciation for what it takes to build and utilize data systems. Exaggerated and unrealistic expectations can turn very quickly to disillusionment and non use.

- (c) GU subcontractors have effectively carried out studies on streamlining Congressional operations. The Holt recommendations, from one of these studies, offer possibilities for improving the effectiveness of Congress comparable to those afforded by a functioning CIEL and could probably begin to show results in less time. Mr. Limardo of Clapp & Mayne submitted a report to USAID/Honduras in June of 1989 recommending actions to strengthen the organizational structure for the administrative offices and functions of the Congress. It is unclear whether this report was ever forwarded to the Congress by USAID/H.
- (d) GU subcontractor, Pat Holt, prepared a report providing recommendations for strengthening the committee structure. The report was submitted to the Congress in July 1989, but there appears to have been no follow-up on the part of either the previous or current Congressional leadership.
- (e) Training activities to date under the project have been minimal. Two management training workshops for members of Congress and one orientation retreat for new deputies were conducted. Management training has been discontinued due to insufficient interest in the Congress. The CIEL is not far enough developed to warrant training planned for this area, however, Congress should establish a training committee to work with the contractor in developing a training needs assessment for carrying out the large amount of training that will be needed once CIEL activities are underway.

Congress has not established a training position, as covenanted in the MOU. USAID/Honduras has been remiss in not either obtaining compliance with this covenant or agreeing with Congress on its revision.

- (f) Project Design Validity: The design of this component remains valid. However, the indicator at the purpose level "increased number of bills initiated in Congress" is inadequate and inappropriate. The types of bills introduced by Deputies and the quality and review of the bills under consideration would be more relevant. The institutional analysis in the Project Paper remains valid.

The recurrent cost analysis in the Project Paper projects an increase in recurrent costs from \$650,000 to \$1 million annually, or two to four percent of the then current Congressional budget. Present indications are that the CIEL alone will have recurrent costs of over \$1 million. This begs the question of whether the expansion in the Congressional outlays would be the best use of the limited budgetary resources.

- (g) Policy Issues: The Condition Precedent requiring the passage of enabling legislation and approval of guidelines to allow the implementation of an administrative career service and a career service for the CIEL has not been met. USAID/Honduras has been remiss in not either obtaining compliance with this Condition Precedent in the MOU or agreeing with the Congress on its revision.
- (h) Impact on Women: The potential impact of the project on women was not discussed in the Project Paper or the MOU, and the team found no indication that it had been considered during the implementation of the project up to mid-1990. In the evaluation scope of work, however, USAID asked the team to suggest mechanisms that could be incorporated into the project to measure the impact on women. The team found two issues related to women that should be of concern to USAID/Honduras. One relates to the openness of the political system to women who may wish to run for Congress; the other relates to whether women will have equal access to employment possibilities in the career systems being established with project assistance.

4. PRINCIPAL RECOMMENDATIONS

- (a) Urge Congress to improve committee operations and other functions as well as proceed with the establishment of CIEL, the legislative reference service.

- (b) Get current with the Conditions Precedent of the Memorandum of Understanding before proceeding with CIEL procurement.
- (c) Undertake a systematic analysis of the need for, and cost of, obtaining the various data bases being proposed by Legislators for inclusion in the CIEL.
- (d) Fund a study to ascertain the degree of openness of the electoral and party system to women participation; monitor the hiring policies for the career service of the Congress.

For a complete list of recommendations and Mission responses, see Attachment II.

5. LESSONS LEARNED

- * The three main components of the SDI Project (Administration of Justice, Congress, and Elections Tribunal/National Registry of Persons) are sufficiently different that they should have been separate projects; as a minimum, election support should be separate because its rigid time schedule causes it to take priority over everything else.
- * More systematic regional sharing of information about programs and actions being taken would be of great assistance to deal with fairly common problems and issues in the process of strengthening democratic processes.
- * Given A.I.D.'s inexperience with this type of project, it would have been advisable to use more outside experts in the design and implementation of such projects. A multi disciplinary advisory committee should follow project progress and participate in deliberations on important project decisions.

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

Please note that the evaluation report titled Strengthening Democratic Institutions Project, II-Legislative Enhancement was forwarded to USAID/W on July 18, 1991.

Attachment I : Outline of Basic Project Identification
Attachment II : Complete List of Recommendations
Attachment III: Evaluation Report

COMMENTS

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

This evaluation needs to be considered within the historical context in which project implementation began. The August, 1987 signing of the Project Agreement was followed by an unusually complex contract negotiation process with the project's primary contractor. The Honduran presidential campaign was in full swing when the GU contract was finalized one and a half years later. As a result of the campaign, politics permeated the Congress's decision-making process and thereby greatly hampered the implementation efforts of both USAID and GU in all areas of the project.

The evaluators were mistaken in their statement that there was no evidence of progress on career service in the three components. The December, 1989 law creating the congressional research center clearly establishes the career service as defined in the MOU. The MOU was intentionally not amended in order to continue pressure on the Congress. A law providing rights and benefits to permanent Congressional/Center for Information and Legislative Studies' employees was passed in 1993, and a comprehensive draft of a career law and regulations was submitted to congressional leadership in August 1993 and is expected to be presented to the Congress in 1994.

The Mission agreed with evaluators' comment that the indicator at the purpose level of a "increased number of bills initiated in Congress" seems inadequate and has changed the indicator to the number of requests made to the CIEL.

The evaluation team implied that the Congress may not have been informed by the Mission of studies that recommend actions to strengthen the organizational structure for the administrative offices and functions of the Congress. The Mission's attempts to encourage the Congress to undertake these actions were ongoing and both the Executive Secretariat and the Accounting/Personnel functions of the Congress have been modernized.

The evaluators commented that the \$1 million annual recurrent cost estimated for the CIEL begs the question of whether this is the best use of limited budgetary resources. The Mission and the Congress believe that the CIEL will serve several Honduran government agencies and thereby justifies the associated recurrent costs. So far, 67 reports over 9 months have been prepared by the CIEL as a result of requests from legislators.

Although the evaluators were required to measure project implementation progress against the outputs called for in the Project Agreement, the Mission believes that allowances should have been made for unexpected political events that impeded project implementation. That the Mission was successful in getting legislation for the CIEL passed during an election year is a credit to the Mission.

Due to the lack of interest by the Congress, the committee activity was dropped.

An additional lesson learned, that came to light through this evaluation, is that Democratic Initiatives projects need to be designed flexibly enough to allow project implementation to keep step with changes in the political environment.

BASIC PROJECT IDENTIFICATION DATA

1. Country: Honduras
2. Project Title: Strengthening Democratic Institutions
Component II - Legislative Enhancement
3. Project Number: 522-0296
4. Project Date:
 - a. First Project Amendment: 8/10/87
 - b. Final Obligation Date: FY94
 - c. Most recent Project Assistance
Completion Date (PACD): 8/31/95
5. Project Funding: US\$21,800,000
 COMPONENT II - Legislative Enhancement Funding:

a.	USAID Bilateral Funding (grant and/or loan)	US\$ 1,879,596
b.	Other Major Donors	US\$
c.	Host Country Counterpart Funds	<u>US\$</u>
	Total	US\$ 1,879,596
6. Mode of Implementation: USAID Direct Contracts
with Georgetown University
7. Project Designers: USAID/Honduras and the
Government of Honduras
8. Responsible Mission Officials:
 - a. Mission Directors: John A. Sanbrailo (11/22/86 to 08/91)
Marshall D. Brown (08/91 to present)
 - b. Project Officers: Anthony Volbrecht (08/87-02/89)
John Fasullo (02/89-5/89)
Roberto Figueredo (05/89-11/90)
Emily Leonard (11/90 to 11/92)
Karen Otto (11/92 to 03/94)
Emily Leonard (04/94 to present)
9. Previous Evaluations: None

**COMPONENT: II. LEGISLATIVE
ENHANCEMENT**

RECOMMENDATION

A. Mid-Course Adjustments

1. Increased attention should be given to improving committee operations and functions of the Congress, while maintaining a high level of priority for the establishment and functioning of CIEL.

2. (a) USAID should agree to converting MOU Condition Precedent (2) (2) to a covenant with target dates for implementation in 1991; however, b) it should insist on detailed plans and targets to meet Condition Precedent (2) (1) and Covenant (1) before agreeing to go ahead with procurement for CIEL.

B. Development of Data Management Systems

1. USAID should request the contractor to add a systems expert to its in-country staff to coordinate the system development work in the Congress, the Court, and possibly TNE/RNP and arrange for training of systems personnel and potential users of the automated data systems.

**COMPONENT: II. LEGISLATIVE
ENHANCEMENT.**

RESPONSE

Mid-Course Adjustments

Ongoing.
Due to lack of interest by the Congress, the Committee activity was dropped in 1993; however, development and computerization of administrative functions has been completed and direct support has been provided to the Congressional Committee on Women's issues. In early 1994 the Congress has reinitiated request for Committee Strengthening using the CIEL.

Completed.
(a) Project PIL No. 20 deleted condition precedent (2) (2) from the MOU because a similar condition remains in force under the TNE/RNP component. The same PIL converted condition precedent (2) (1) to a covenant to be implemented over the LOP.
(b) Recommendation not accepted. USAID does not agree that it should insist on detailed plans and targets to meet covenant (1) before agreeing to go ahead with procurement for the CIEL.

B. Development of Data Management Systems

Completed.
Subcontractors were used for this work.

4

2. Hardware procurement should be stretched out over the remaining period of the project, being spaced as the capability develops to use it.

Completed 8/91.

3. Priority should be given to undertaking a systematic training needs assessment for the balance of the project and carrying out the large amount of training that will be needed.

Completed 11/90.

4. Undertake a systematic analysis of the need for and cost of obtaining the various data bases that have been proposed for inclusion in the Congressional automated system; this is needed to establish priorities for data development.

Completed 3/94 during CIEL implementation and budget development studies. Priorities emphasized development of the four major data bases NJUR, BIPE, MATE and DISC.

C. Training

C. Training

1. USAID should encourage the Congress to establish a training position, as covenanted in the MOU; in the interim, the Congress should establish a training committee to work with the contractor and others in developing a training needs assessment for the balance of the project and carrying out the large amount of training that will be needed.

Not accepted as stated. The training needs have been adequately addressed in previous studies. No additional position was needed. Project officers and the contractor formed an Ad Hoc training committee during the course of implementation resulting in successful training programs in all Congressional activities.

2. Assuming that the logjam in activity in Components I and II is now broken, USAID should authorize the Contractor to add a training coordinator to its staff in Honduras to coordinate the extensive training that will be needed by the Congress and the Court and to provide quality control over the contracted trainers and the training programs.

Not accepted. Institutional Contractor's Chief of Party and the contractor's project implementation manager adequately fulfilled this role using sub-contractors.

.a'

D. Impact on Women

There are two issues related to women that should be of concern by USAID. One related to the openness of the political system to women who may wish to run for Congress; the other relates to whether women will have equal access to employment possibilities in the career systems being established with project assistance.

1. USAID should fund a study to ascertain the degree of openness of the electoral and party system to women participation and evaluate any obstacles encountered.

2. USAID should monitor the hiring policies established for the career service of the Congress.

D. Impact on Women

Based on competitive selection criteria, women have fared well in achieving equal access to employment possibilities in the career systems being established with project assistance.

No additional activities in this component are planned after November, 1993 national elections. However USAID completed a GCID Report to Congress in 1993 which received LAC praise for its analysis of obstacles encountered.

Closed. The first step towards a career service was taken through the USAID financed development of a Career Law - associated gender neutral regulations. However, no additional activities are planned in this component.