

PD-ABS-192
90034

**STRATEGIC OPTIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL TECHNOLOGY
TRANSFER AND INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

(USAID Cooperative Agreement No. OTR-0158-A-00-0084-00)

FINAL EVALUATION

Grant Period: 1 July 1990 - 30 June 1995

Report Period: 1 July 1990 - 30 April 1994

**Conducted on behalf of the Agency for International Development
and the International Institute of Rural Reconstruction**

by

**Robert F. O'Brien, Ph.D.
International Consultant**

30 June 1994

PREFACE

This evaluation was undertaken on behalf of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and the International Institute of Rural Reconstruction (IIRR), in cooperation with Automation Research Systems, Limited (ARS). The International Institute of Rural Reconstruction, which has its global headquarters in the Philippines, cannot easily be divorced from its global network of Affiliates (NRRMs) and Alumni and Alumni Associations. The range and scope of IIRR's programs and activities goes far beyond the terms and conditions agreed upon under the terms of the 5-year Partnership Grant between USAID and IIRR. This evaluation, therefore, of necessity, touches upon a much wider spectrum of activities and programs than are specifically mandated in the Grant Agreement.

Readers must keep in mind the important distinction between a "Report" and an "Evaluation". IIRR has submitted regular "Reports" in the course of the Grant Period. This Evaluation has, insofar as possible, sought to avoid repetition of data and information previously reported to USAID (up to 31 Dec. 1993), and to emphasize evaluative information and judgments.

This evaluation would not have been possible without the extensive, supportive, open-minded and friendly cooperation provided by everyone. Special thanks are due to the IIRR President, Vice-Presidents, Division Chiefs, Regional Directors and Staff, and persons known and unknown in each of the countries visited, not only for their generous assistance, but for their sage counsel and patient "pointing-me-in-the-right-direction" and their thoughtful arrangements for accommodations, local travel and scheduling.

A prefatory note on the tone of this evaluation report is perhaps warranted. One might be concerned that the overall positive tone and the limited number of specific recommendations might compromise the usefulness of this evaluation. Evaluations, by nature, are supposed to be like school report cards: 'Can Do Better'. Certainly IIRR can do better. However, where criticisms, questions, or recommendations were felt warranted, they have been put forward. The IIRR performance, overall, merits the positive tone.

This evaluator was favorably impressed by what he saw, heard and read. He stands by this evaluation report, its recommendations and its tone.

Robert F. O'Brien, Evaluator.

LIST OF ACRONYMS/ABBREVIATIONS

ADB	- Asian Development Bank
AID/USAID	- U.S. Agency for International Development
AMREF	- The African Medical and Research Foundation
ACR	- Australian Catholic Relief
ARS	- Automation Research Systems, Limited
BARRA	- Bangladesh Rural Reconstruction Association
BIG	- Bio-Intensive Gardening
CGIAR	- Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CHRHN	- Community Health, Reproductive Health and Nutrition
CIDSE	- Coopération Internationale pour le Développement et la Solidarité
CRS	- Catholic Relief Services
CWS	- Church World Service
EARRA	- East Africa Rural Reconstruction Association
ENRA	- Environment, Natural Resources and Agriculture
ICB	- Institutional Capacity Building
ICBRD	- Integrated, Community-Based Rural Development
ICLARM	- International Center for Living Aquatic Resources Management
IDR	- Institute for Development Research
IDRC	- International Development Research Center (Canada)
IIRR	- International Institute of Rural Reconstruction
IRRI	- International Rice Research Institute
IRRM	- Indian Rural Reconstruction Movement
KENGO	- Kenya Energy and Environment Organization
KIOF	- Kenya Institute of Organic Farming
LWR	- Lutheran World Relief
NERRA	- Nepal Rural Reconstruction Association
NGO	- Non-Government Organization
NRRM	- National Rural Reconstruction Movement
PACT	- Private Agencies Collaborating Together, Inc.
PADEK	- Partnership for Development in Kampuchea
PO	- People's Organization
PRRM	- Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement
RED	- Rural Enterprise Development
REPPIKA	- Regional Program for the Promotion of Indigenous Knowledge in Asia
RRAA	- Rural Reconstruction Alumni Association
TRRM	- Thailand Rural Reconstruction Movement
UNCED	- UN Conference on Environment and Development
UNDP	- UN Development Program
UNESCO	- UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFPA	- UN Fund for Population Activities
UNICEF	- UN Children's Fund
UST	- Unnayan Shahagojy Team (Bangladesh)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page Nos.</u>
Preface	i
List of Acronyms/Abbreviations	ii
Table of Contents	iii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
PART ONE: INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	4
I. Background	4
II. Program Description	4
III. Purpose of Evaluation	5
IV. The Study: Principal Questions to be Addressed	5
V. Composition of Evaluation Team	6
VI. Methodology	6
VII. Work Plan	7
PART TWO: THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF RURAL RECONSTRUCTION 1989-1994: Years of Special Challenge	8
PART THREE: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	10
I. Overall Observations/Main Findings	10
A. Program Goal	10
B. Program Purpose	10
C. Impact of this grant for IIRR	11
D. Evaluation of overall effort	12
II. More Specific Observations/Findings	13
A. International Training	13
B. International Outreach	15
C. IIRR's Programs/Activities	18
III. PLANNING - 2000	22
IV. Organization/Management/Governance/Leadership/Staffing	23
V. Financial	24
VI. The Principal Questions/Answers	25
PART FOUR: RECOMMENDATIONS	28

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd)

PART FIVE: APPENDICES

1. Scope of Work
2. Itinerary of Evaluator
3. List of Individuals Contacted
4. Summary of Amended Logical Framework
5. Comparison of Accomplishments with Logical Framework Objectives
6. Geographic Distribution of Organizations Having Meaningful Relationships with IIRR in 1993
7. A Workshop Manual: Participatory Approach To Rural AIDS Education
8. List of KITS Produced by IIRR
9. IIRR Program Scenario by the year 2000
10. IIRR Board of Trustees
11. IIRR Mission Statement
12. IIRR Program Matrix Documents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This evaluation was undertaken on behalf of USAID and IIRR, and the terms of reference and Scope of Work were developed in close consultation with both organizations.

The evaluation was conducted during April-June, 1994, as a "Final Evaluation" of the AID/IIRR Partnership Grant Cooperative Agreement No. OTR-0158-A-00-0084-00), which will not conclude until June 30, 1995. It was preceded by an IIRR internal Mid-Term Evaluation, covering the period 1 July 1990 - 31 December 1992. This evaluation led to a Revised Logical Framework.

Since 1977, the International Institute of Rural Reconstruction (IIRR), with its global headquarters in the Philippines, its partners in Africa, Asia and Latin America, and its U.S. Office, has received support for its rural development programs from the Agency for International Development (AID) via its Development Program Grants, Matching Grants, and, currently a Cooperative Agreement (Partnership Grant), for the five-year period 1 July 1990 through 30 June 1995.

This Cooperative Agreement was designed to enable IIRR to increase its effectiveness in transferring development management capabilities to indigenous Third World organizations and to expand and strengthen IIRR's programs of international training and outreach and international field operations and research, in accordance with its participatory approach to development, encompassing health, education, livelihood and self-governance.

The goal of the Cooperative Agreement was to accelerate technology transfer and institutional development among indigenous development agencies in the developing world by training and strengthening IIRR's international network of partner and alumni organizations, and to contribute to the discovery, adaptation and use of new initiatives and related appropriate technologies critical to addressing the causes and consequences of poverty, hunger, disease, and civic inertia.

The purpose of the Cooperative Agreement grant was to support:

1. the development of national, regional and international rural reconstruction managers, specialists and field workers;
2. the building and enhancing of institutional capabilities for inter-agency collaboration and sharing between and among IIRR, the National Rural Reconstruction Movements (NRRMs) and Rural Reconstruction Alumni Associations (RRAAs), and other development agencies; and
3. adding to and updating knowledge and techniques in rural reconstruction, with a focus on a limited number of critical issues.

The external evaluator reviewed documents, conducted interviews, and engaged in field visits/meetings in four countries in addition to the global headquarters in the Philippines. Prior to his trip, he met for half-a-day with the IIRR Regional Director for Latin America in the New York office.

In each locale, the external evaluator endeavored to meet with IIRR Regional Directors (for extended amounts of time and for in-depth discussions), IIRR Training Program Alumni, Alumni Associations, principals and staff of NGOs who have collaborated with IIRR, principals and staff of NGOs who to-date have not had any experience with IIRR, USAID representatives, local government officials, international consultants, and representatives of groups/communities who have had experience with IIRR projects and technical assistance. The objective was to listen to a broad spectrum of relevant perspectives regarding IIRR, its plans, its programs, its strengths, its weaknesses, its potential and the importance which they attached to an IIRR presence/activity in their region.

The goal and the purpose of this Grant Agreement have been satisfactorily achieved. IIRR has conscientiously and satisfactorily performed the functions and carried out the activities to which it was committed by the Grant Agreement.

It is important to note that IIRR's activities, operations and programs during the course of the Grant Agreement were considerably broader than what the Grant Agreement supported. IIRR has successfully broadened the base of its support and reduced the percentage of the AID component of its support in each of the past three years. That being said, AID remains one of the two major funders of IIRR.

It is also important to note that both AID and IIRR were highly responsive to the 1989 evaluation findings and recommendations from IDR as this current Grant was planned and put into operation.

IIRR is a unique international network of Organizations and Movements in the developing countries, sharing a common philosophy and approach to development assistance. The network and IIRR itself are in transition, and are facing important challenges. IIRR and its partners have been energetically seeking to develop, restructure and strengthen themselves in order to help meet those challenges in a systematic way.

IIRR has developed a 7-year plan focussed on the Year 2000. In this endeavor IIRR has devoted itself, in a most participatory manner, to:

- Assessing needs and capabilities
- Setting strategic objectives
- Designing programs and activities
- Reorganizing
- Implementing programs
- Seeking to ensure sustainable achievements.

Five priority program divisions have been established; three functional program divisions and a number of support services departments have been organized into a detailed operations matrix. Gender and indigenous knowledge are cross-cutting themes for all program areas. At the Vice-Presidential level, responsibilities have been divided into Administrative and Program Sectors.

If planning, preparing for the future and reorganizing have characterized much of IIRR's efforts in the past three years, the Institute can be proud as well of its achievements in the field and its impact on the lives of the rural poor. The impressive accomplishments in the field and "with and for the people" have been documented in detail in the three prior Annual Reports submitted to AID (covering up to 31 Dec. 1993) and are not incorporated into this Evaluation Report.

The major accomplishments, as detailed in this evaluation report, were in the areas of :

- Strategic Planning
- Internationalization
- Reorganization
- Staff Strengthening
- Expanded and Improved Field Operations
- Training/Strengthening of institutional development and capability of indigenous institutions
- Finalization of new leadership
- Development of new avenues of technology transfer.

The recommendations are few in number and speak for themselves.

PART ONE: INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

I. Background

Since 1977, the International Institute of Rural Reconstruction (IIRR), with its global headquarters in the Philippines, its partners in Africa, Asia and Latin America, and its U.S. Office, has received support for its rural development programs from the Agency for International Development (AID) via its Development Program Grants, Matching Grants, and, currently a Cooperative Agreement (Partnership Grant), for the five-year period 1 July 1990 through 30 June 1995.

This Cooperative Agreement is designed to enable IIRR to increase its effectiveness in transferring development management capabilities to indigenous Third World organizations and to expand and strengthen IIRR's programs of international training and outreach and international field operations and research, in accordance with its participatory approach to development, encompassing health, education, livelihood and self-governance.

II. Program Description

A. Program Goal: The goal of the Cooperative Agreement is to accelerate technology transfer and institutional development among indigenous development agencies in the developing world by training and strengthening IIRR's international network of partner and alumni organizations, and to contribute to the discovery, adaptation and use of new initiatives and related appropriate technologies critical to addressing the causes and consequences of poverty, hunger, disease, and civic inertia.

B. Program Purpose: The purpose of the Cooperative Agreement grant is to support:

1. the development of national, regional and international rural reconstruction managers, specialists and field workers;
2. the building and enhancing of institutional capabilities for inter-agency collaboration and sharing between and among IIRR, the National Rural Reconstruction Movements (NRRMs) and Rural Reconstruction Alumni Associations (RRAAs), and other development agencies; and
3. adding to and updating knowledge and techniques in rural reconstruction, with a focus on a limited number of critical issues.

C. Principal Activities: To accomplish the above-stated goals and purpose, IIRR has planned and is carrying out activities to:

1. provide courses in rural reconstruction philosophy, techniques, and management for senior managers';

2. provide specialized training involving technology transfer for middle managers;
3. provide collaborative regional training programs, conferences, specialized training, and financial support for NRRMs and RRAAs;
4. establish linkages with other NGOs in new countries through an International Information Exchange Project;
5. conduct surveys and studies of a limited number of critical development issues, as well as collaborative research projects; and
6. analyze and synthesize issues and state-of-the-art technology adaptation and the generation and regular updating of cross-culturally relevant knowledge in rural reconstruction.

III. Purpose of this Evaluation

The purpose of this evaluation is to evaluate the management, structure, operations and program implementation of IIRR with specific reference to its five-year Partnership Grant with AID.

In 1993, IIRR submitted to AID its internal "Mid-Term Evaluation" covering the period July 1, 1990 - December 31, 1992 under the terms of the Cooperative Agreement. In the light of this internal evaluation, a revision of the Grant's Logical Framework was proposed by IIRR, and subsequently approved by AID.

The purpose of this April-May, 1994 evaluation is described in greater detail in the "Scope of Work" agreed upon by AID and IIRR (See Appendix 1).

It was agreed between AID and IIRR that the information contained in the first three IIRR Annual Reports to AID and in the Mid-Term Evaluation would not be repeated in this report. It was further agreed that an assessment would be included of how IIRR had responded to the Mid-Term evaluation findings and recommendations.

Finally, this study will seek to assess the impact which this Grant has had on IIRR, and the extent to which it has facilitated IIRR's achievement of the agreed-upon objectives.

IV. The Study

The principal questions addressed by the evaluator were as follows:

- A. What have been the principal achievements and obstacles throughout the course of the program and the project implementation as described in the agreed-upon program and sub-program areas?

- B. To what degree have each of the objectives stated in the Revised Log Frame been achieved?
- C. To what degree were the mid-grant revisions to the Log-Frame justified?
- D. To what extent (if any) has this Cooperative Agreement provided institutional strengthening to IIRR in terms of personnel, program planning, and program implementation activities?
- E. During the grant period, to what degree has IIRR been successful in implementing its strategy of "internationalization", including the establishment and use of Regional Offices?
- F. During the grant period, to what degree has IIRR successfully clarified its mission, and strengthened its governance (Board and Leadership), program support, and management support structures?

V. Composition of Evaluation Team

The external evaluator was Robert F. O'Brien, Ph.D. The external evaluator worked with an internal evaluation team from IIRR as agreed upon between AID and IIRR. (The IIRR internal evaluation team was extremely assiduous, and should be considered a full partner in this evaluation.)

The consideration and assessment of the progress made by IIRR during the course of this grant, as well as of IIRR's current situation in each locale, was facilitated and abetted by the evaluator's membership on the 1989 Evaluation Team, under the direction of IDR.

VI. Methodology

The external evaluator had primary responsibility for detailed design of the evaluation, collecting and analyzing data, developing preliminary assessments and recommendations, discussing these with both IIRR and AID, and preparing a Final Report.

The external evaluator reviewed documents, conducted interviews, and engaged in field visits/meetings in four countries in addition to the global headquarters in the Philippines. Prior to his trip, he met for half-a-day with the IIRR Regional Representative for Latin America in the New York office.

The detailed itinerary of the external evaluator is included in this report as Appendix 2.

In each locale, the external evaluator endeavored to meet with IIRR Regional Representatives (for extended amounts of time and for in-depth discussions), IIRR Training Program Alumni, Alumni Associations, principals and staff of NGOs who have collaborated with IIRR, principals and staff of NGOs who to-date have not had any experience with IIRR,

USAID representatives, local government officials, international consultants, and representatives of groups/communities who have had experience with IIRR projects/technical assistance. The objective was to listen to a broad spectrum of relevant perspectives regarding IIRR, its plans, its programs, its strengths, its weaknesses, its potential and the importance which they attached to an IIRR presence/activity in their region. The list of individuals contacted is included in this report as Appendix 3.

VII. Work Plan

- A. Agreement on Scope of Work**
- B. Review of Available Documents, including Annual Reports and the Mid-Term Evaluation**
- C. Preparation with IIRR, AID, and ARS of detailed itinerary and work plans**
- D. Data Collection:**
 - 1. Interviews and Observations in field**
 - 2. Presentation of initial findings to IIRR in Cavite**
- E. Analysis and Report Writing**
 - 1. Draft Report**
 - 2. Review of draft report with AID and IIRR.**
- F. Final Report**

PART TWO: THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF RURAL RECONSTRUCTION 1989-1994: Years of Special Challenge

There is a special challenge to be faced by a long-established, esteemed, international institution, initiated and long-endowed with (1) visionary leadership, (2) tested, people-centered, multi-dimensional, integrated strategies for sustainable development, (3) a cadre of experienced, devoted workers, and (4) a large, international roster of individuals trained over the years. This 'special challenge' is the result of changing political, environmental, economic, social, cultural and physical circumstances all over the globe. The 'special challenge' is to find a way to remain relevant, while not risking the loss of identity or capability.

The International Institute of Rural Reconstruction (IIRR) has carried on, for over three decades now, the 70-year-old rural reconstruction philosophy of Dr. Y.C. James Yen, a philosophy that is dedicated to improving the condition and the status of the rural poor throughout the world. IIRR's philosophy is based on the conviction that the most important priority of the rural poor must be not "relief" but "release", that is, releasing their potential power for personal, economic, social and civic growth...their potential to better themselves...their potential to become more self-reliant. "Go To the People", and the IIRR CREDO perdure as the "trademark" of IIRR. In practice, this translates into IIRR's "trademark training"...grounding its learning and its training in its activities and its programs with the rural people...in its so-called "social laboratories", striving to achieve a sustainable, integrated and people-centered development program based upon practical field experiences.

However, by 1989 the context and the circumstances, global and local, had changed and were changing radically. This constituted the "special challenge" for IIRR: How to learn from the past, to preserve the vital, identifying characteristics, to maintain the spirit of the Institution, to maintain and strengthen the linkages with the rural poor, while taking all necessary steps to remain current, viable, useful, needed in an important way.

The AID/IIRR evaluation, conducted by IDR in 1989, delineated steps to be taken by both IIRR and AID in order to insure that IIRR would be a strong, important and international institution during the final decade of the 20th century.

Two major outcomes precipitated by the IDR evaluation were: (1) the organization of a major 5-year program planning process within IIRR, and (2) the development of a proposal to AID for a 'Partnership Grant' for the period 1990-1995.

Both of these initiatives were aimed at meeting adequately and responsibly this 'special challenge'. Both of these initiatives resulted in a focussing of IIRR's potential, programs and organization, even as the institution retained its traditions, its identity, and its 'trademark' approach to sustainable development. The dominant themes of these initiatives were:

- (1) strengthen IIRR's INTERNATIONAL outreach;
- (2) focus IIRR's programs on contemporary "burning issues";

- (3) strengthen IIRR's traditional four-fold integrated approach to field-oriented, people-centered programs and training.
- (4) increase the capacity of development organizations, international and indigenous, to improve the lives of the rural poor;
- (5) review and restructure IIRR's organization and governance in order to facilitate the achievement of the above four objectives.

This evaluation seeks to report and to assess IIRR's efforts to accomplish these objectives.

PART THREE: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

I. Overall Observations/Main Findings

A. Program Goal

"The goal of the Cooperative Agreement is to accelerate technology transfer and institutional development among indigenous development agencies in the developing world by training and strengthening IIRR's international network of partner and alumni organizations, and to contribute to the discovery, adaptation and use of new initiatives and related appropriate technologies critical to addressing the causes and consequences of poverty, hunger, disease, and civic inertia."

This goal is being achieved not only in a satisfactory manner (that is, satisfactorily conducting the activities and producing the outputs stipulated in the Revised Logical Framework) but also to a degree that is impressive and highly encouraging for the future. This is the considered view of the evaluator and of most individuals interviewed in the countries visited.

B. Program Purpose

"The purpose of the Cooperative Agreement grant is to support:

- (1) the development of national, regional and international rural reconstruction managers, specialists and field workers.
- (2) the building and enhancing of institutional capabilities for inter-agency collaboration and sharing between and among IIRR, the National Rural Reconstruction Movements (NRRMs) and Rural Reconstruction Alumni Associations (RRAAs), and other development agencies; and
- (3) adding to and updating knowledge and techniques in rural reconstruction, with a focus on a limited number of critical issues."

This purpose is being accomplished satisfactorily in almost every regard. (Areas such as the adequate roles/involvement of women, and the degree of attention allotted to population limitation issues do require some qualification.)

Somewhat slow in getting the full range of agreed-upon programs up to speed, IIRR has now clearly articulated how it is conducting all programs, how it is adhering carefully to the terms of grant's implementation, and is meeting or exceeding the targetted outputs. IIRR's pragmatic and responsive approach to implementing the specific objectives is reinforced by its adherence to high standards of probity and professionalism.

C. What has been the impact of this grant for IIRR?

The impact of this grant on IIRR has been very significant. It has been the right type of grant at the right time. AID support to IIRR now spans more than 15 years, via a series of institutional, program development, matching and cooperative grants. With important input from the 1989 IDR evaluation, AID and IIRR succeeded in a collaborative effort to develop a Partnership Grant, which was not only supportive, but which was most timely and constructive.

The impact, the significant financial backing and program-direction support provided by this grant must be linked to a number of additional factors which have been most instrumental in contributing to the final "impact" of this grant:

- (1) The Board of Directors of IIRR strongly endorsed the INTERNATIONALIZATION thrust, and approved the strategy of having Regional Offices and Regional Representatives in the three regions.
- (2) Private and international donors recognized the value of and supported IIRR's programs, especially in the areas of Environment, Natural Resources, and Regenerative Agriculture.
- (3) IIRR committed itself energetically to long-term strategic planning. A 5-year (1990-1995) plan was produced. Subsequently, a 7-year (1994-2000) plan has been produced.
- (4) AID and IIRR, following a Mid-Term evaluation, concurred regarding an adjustment to the Grant Logical Framework, (principally to insure consistency between the Grant Agreement terms, and IIRR's long-term plans and priorities.)
- (5) IIRR experienced a major change of leadership. Dr. Anthony de Jesus, Executive Vice-President, was lost to IIRR following a lengthy battle with cancer. Dr. Juan M. Flavier, long-time and charismatic President of IIRR, submitted his resignation in order to join the Cabinet of the newly elected President of the Republic of the Philippines, as Secretary of Health.
- (6) A prolonged search process for a new President, while understandably creating concern for many, proved a blessing-in-disguise. In this interim period, the Board of Directors instituted a high-level reorganization, placing two senior Staff members, Conrado Navarro and Dr. Julian Gonsalves into newly created posts of VP for Administration, and VP for Program (with C. Navarro continuing his additional responsibility of Executive VP.) This realignment proved to be, over a year-long period, extremely propitious. Both administrative and programmatic dimensions of IIRR benefitted significantly. In particular, the strategic planning process for YEAR 2000, the hiring of additional professionally qualified Staff, the advancement of the INTERNATIONALIZATION process, and the mobilization of the Institute to focus on and to implement five major program areas constituted major achievements.

The five major program areas are:

- a) Environment, Natural Resources and Agriculture;
 - b) Community health, Reproductive Health and Nutrition;
 - c) Integrated, Community-based Rural Development;
 - d) Rural Enterprise Development;
 - e) Institutional Capacity Building.
- (7) The hiring and the advent of a new President, John Rigby, whose initial months at the helm of IIRR have generated confidence in his leadership, appreciation for his concerns to meet ALL IIRR people, to learn, to experience, to absorb and to retain Dr. Yen's insights, values and traditions, and to enhance IIRR's role as a significant member of the international community of NGOs committed to improving the social and economic situation of the world's rural poor. His has been an auspicious beginning.

Whatever the chemistry, these factors, in combination with the AID Partnership Grant, have resulted in an especially significant Grant impact. This AID Grant has been crucial in enabling the IIRR to make major strides in a most timely fashion.

The AID Partnership Grant has been critically important in facilitating IIRR's adjustments to the changed and changing Problematic/Environment, while successfully retaining its special identity and strengthening its capabilities.

IIRR is an "INSTITUTION IN TRANSITION", in the most positive sense of that term. With a sensitive awareness of the global changes occurring in the economic, socio-cultural, political and ecological context, the Institute, aided principally by this grant, has completed an in-depth series of strategic planning sessions, identified the priority programs to be worked on, and is mobilizing and organizing its people and its resources globally to implement its strategies.

IIRR, with its PLAN 2000, is poised to enter the 21st century as an important factor in meeting the challenges and responsibilities of the NGO community in improving the situation of the poor in the world. IIRR is "poised" in the sense that it is better focussed, more professionally staffed, and more strongly organized internationally.

The "transition" is not completed, but it is in no small part due to this AID grant that it is impressively begun and encouragingly advanced.

D. Evaluation of Efforts to Achieve Proposed Results

Performance, as evaluated by comparing targets proposed in the Revised Logical Framework (See Appendix 4) with actual achievements, is judged to be definitely acceptable and

generally superior. Most targets have been met or surpassed. The detailed comparison of Program accomplishments with Log Frame objectives through December 1993, was presented in The Third Annual Report to AID submitted in January, 1994 (See Appendix 5). In its accomplishments in Internationalization, Regenerative Agriculture, Integrated Community-based Rural Development, the Institute's performance has been outstanding. In major activity areas such as Training, Health, Communications, and Research, targets are definitely being met, problems are being realistically addressed, and, if the resources requisite to implement plans and recommendations can be found, the Institute's impact will be significantly enhanced. In a few activity areas (and these are priority areas- for example, population issues, and adequate involvement of and attention to women in development programs and processes,) while IIRR has carried out some programs, and recently, stepped up activities, and added personnel for these areas, performance and impact have been less than hoped for. The Staff and the members of the Board of Directors concur in this assessment. The Institute is committed to improving performance in these areas as early as possible, especially because they continue to be areas of priority concern.

II. More Specific Observations/Findings

This information and the comments in this section should be viewed as a complement to the detailed data provided in the Mid-Term evaluation, which covered the first two and one-half years of this grant, and in the first three Annual Reports to USAID. In addition, this section will provide a basis for assessing the degree to which IIRR has been responsive to the findings and recommendations of the Mid-Term evaluation.

A. International Training

It can be stated, without qualification, that under the terms of the AID grant agreement, IIRR's commitment to conduct a range of training courses, seminar workshops and conferences has been fulfilled. It should be noted that the numerical data on training activities, while accurately reporting on the major types of activities, risk overlooking a very important, on-going (almost daily) campus training activity for the poor people from the villages and communities in the vicinity of Cavite. Likewise, and very importantly, the IIRR reporting is focussed on the activities conducted much more than upon the outputs or effects of the activities.

There has been a significant increase in the number of individuals and organizations that have participated in IIRR's training activities.

In recent years, trainings in countries other than the Philippines have been markedly increased. In addition, Institute staff have provided more than 120 consultancies and workshops to more than 35 organizations in more than 15 countries.

Demand for IIRR's distinctive type of training (highly participatory, sharing, field-experience-oriented and international) continues to be high. As the International Field

Offices become operational (and thereby more visible), the requests for indigenous NGO trainings, topical conferences and collaboration are increasing as well.

Measurement of the 'effects' or 'impact' of the training activities has, on the one hand, received a great deal of attention, but, on the other hand, this continues to present something of a dilemma as well as a concern for IIRR, especially when the concern is to measure the 'impact' on the lives of the poor. Training activities, for the most part, are targetted on intermediaries, middle and senior level NGO managers and technicians. The 'Social Laboratory' experiences of IIRR with and for the rural poor are an extremely important input for the training activities. However, whereas the impact of the training on the intermediaries is more clear and direct, the impact on the rural poor directly is more difficult to measure. The problem might be characterized as one of ascertaining that "After this, is because of this."

Notwithstanding, IIRR's Training Division has been most actively engaged in seeking to find better evaluation techniques and better training methodologies. Participant Reactions/Observations have been regularly collected; curricula have undergone internal and external reviews and modifications; reports have been, in four recent cases, solicited from qualified, outside observers; studies of alternative training approaches have been analyzed, with a concern for future planning and organization; a detailed questionnaire was processed to the CEOs of 50 organizations that had sent trainees to IIRR within the past three years.

Overall, IIRR has sought to position itself as a source of information about concepts and techniques in participatory and sustainable rural development. Thereby, IIRR's goal is to assist NGOs to become more effective in designing and implementing poor-oriented rural development activities.

In view of the feedback from these efforts, IIRR has refined its criteria for selecting Trainees; has taken steps to create an improved learning environment; has revised and/or introduced new course curricula; has placed greater emphasis on conveying information in ways that Trainees can better understand, accept and utilize it; has strengthened the aspect of IIRR training which most identifies and distinguishes IIRR and which is most highly esteemed by past Trainees - the field-trip experiences, especially by making these more culturally specific; has sought to develop strategies to provide follow-up to reinforce the training; is endeavoring to improve its multilingual capability and its communications, media and research resources.

The Institute currently has a new, modern training-conference facility under construction on campus, with financial assistance from its major supporter, German Agro-Action, in Bonn, Germany.

Although IIRR Trainees have in the past been extremely accepting of IIRR's "modest" accommodations, this new facility has been designed not only to provide more, and more adequate accommodations for IIRR's Trainees, but also to attract outside groups, with a view to providing a source of income to IIRR via rentals to such groups at times when IIRR is not utilizing the facilities for trainings.

It should be noted that the responses of the IIRR Trainees to questionnaires regarding their views about the trainings have rarely included complaints about the "modest" facilities and/or accommodations, but have invariably spoken of the "spirit of warmth and hospitality" which they experienced.

B. International Outreach

IIRR's International Outreach programs and activities include overseas training, conferences, projects, collaboration with international and indigenous institutions, consultancies, net-workings and information dissemination. One of the principal objectives of AID in approving this Partnership Grant was the encouragement and facilitation of the internationalizing of IIRR's operations. Overall, and in spite of a rather slow start-up (attributable in no way to the lack of commitment, conviction or capability of the individuals appointed to be the Regional Representatives...but perhaps attributable to a certain degree of understandable 'hesitancy' re internationalization plans on the part of some in the Administration), The IIRR INTERNATIONALIZATION process has made impressive progress in the course of the last two years. As of June, 1994, the Latin American Regional Director has commenced programs and has opened an IIRR office in Quito, Ecuador; The African Regional Director has commenced programs and is about to open an IIRR office in Nairobi, Kenya; the Asia Regional Director has commenced programs and is expected to operationalize a Sub-regional office in Kathmandu, Nepal by the end of 1995. This international/regional presence, even in its early stages has resulted in a striking increase in options and opportunities and challenges for IIRR.

Institutionally this represents a MAJOR development for IIRR...a most fundamental change from its mode of operation in recent decades, but a change totally consistent with the goal and the vision of Dr. Yen.

This evaluator was particularly impressed by the fact that these Regional Directors are not only physically present and operational, but, perhaps most importantly, locally established and accepted as a desirable and needed presence in their respective NGO communities and regions. Although the evaluator heard no basis for a feeling of 'competition unwanted' or 'programs un-needed', he did sense that the concerns of very well-placed persons were perhaps well-founded: the need for IIRR, as it initiated programs and operations overseas, to be watchful and respectful of the "competition" issues, and to be very concerned to establish on-site credibility via demonstrating program capability, ability to attract resources, and respect from the established international and local NGOs to collaborate and to share resources. The important bottom line would seem to be that the welcome mat has been put out for IIRR and its distinctive approaches and strategies. Again and again persons interviewed stressed that there were most serious needs on the part of the small, indigenous organizations and of the newer, smaller, weaker, emerging governments, for training, information, planning, articulating vision and goals, and organizational and management skills, and a most genuine conviction that IIRR was specially, if not uniquely, geared to contribute to meeting those needs.

The present three Regional Directors are broadly experienced and well qualified individuals. They are indigenous to their regions. The degree of acceptance and respect shown to them by private and public officials alike in their regions was impressive.

For each of the three regions, IIRR has developed and approved a Program Strategy. Each strategy is appropriately tailored to the selected areas/communities/NGOs selected by IIRR for programs and activities in that region. The geographical distribution of IIRR's major Partners as of 1993-1994 is delineated in the diagrams presented in Appendix 5. The strategy for each region has been carefully and sensitively designed, with much consultation with local institutions; is understood by and acceptable to the NRRMs and Alumni Associations affiliated with IIRR (per formal and written Letters of Understanding in each instance); and is receiving important (albeit not yet fully adequate) back-up and support from IIRR's Global Headquarters in the Philippines.

In the regional strategies, the IIRR will be focussing on:

- I. Building up the technical competencies of indigenous institutions;
- II. Strengthening the managerial competencies of indigenous institutions,
- III. Forestalling the distancing of indigenous institutions from local people and communities.

Having spent considerable time with each of the three IIRR Regional Directors, and having visited people and projects in the Africa and Asia Regions, this Evaluator wishes to communicate to AID his unease at not including in this report more extensive details of the specific and very impressive strategies, plans, programs and projects which were presented in the course of his visits. These are well thought-out, sensitively attuned to the current realities, and doable. They are extremely well received locally. The final verdict, however, or what results are achieved must await implementation, and subsequent evaluation. The more/most important message to be conveyed is that IIRR's initiatives to make real the "International" in their title is progressing extremely well, and that it appears to be in good hands.

That being said, two very major problems remain to be faced and resolved:

(1) Organizational, (2) Financial.

- (1) **Organizational:** In principle the commitment of IIRR to Internationalization and to the Regional Director roles and operations is unqualified. However, there do not exist adequate organizational linkages between the IIRR Global Headquarters and the Regional Offices. Secretarial support, however competent (and it is that) is not enough. IIRR needs to create a new section/position with responsibility for overseeing, monitoring and coordinating the Regional Offices' operations with the Global Headquarters and its various program and support divisions, and representing them in the various administrative fora in Cavite.

- (2) **Financial:** The allocation of discrete "Budgets" and financial resources to the Regional Offices during 1993-1994 was a most important step for IIRR. This facilitated many programmatic decisions and programmatic commitments by the Regional Directors. However, one and all recognize that the budgeted levels of support are unrealistically low, and that a higher level of financial support will be required for each Regional Office in order to function per the agreed-upon strategy.

In the initial months of operation, the Regional Offices have been quite successful beginning to marshal local and international support for their activities. While it will be important to continue to develop and to increase this locally focussed support, IIRR must make a commitment to provide support to the Regional Office operations at a reasonably adequate level.

The IIRR "International Outreach" includes other activities and programs as well.

The Regional Program for the Promotion of Indigenous Knowledge (REPPIKA) has become fully operational under impressively competent leadership, and in collaboration with its global network...of which IIRR is an active member. This reflects IIRR's longstanding principle of drawing on the knowledge of local people in developing appropriate rural development techniques and strategies. The reports produced, conferences organized and effects on the IIRR staff are impressive, and have made an important contribution to the functioning of many of IIRR's programs.

IIRR continues to give priority to collaboration with and provision of services/support to the individual NRRMs and Alumni Associations. An important three-day meeting with these partners preceded the Annual Board of Trustees meeting in Cavite in March, 1994. A priority agenda for the development of policy papers and strategies for future collaboration were among the important outcomes of this meeting. It was generally agreed that the experiences of the NRRMs and of Alumni should be utilized to a far greater degree in the IIRR Training Courses, with a view to guaranteeing a more international character to the Courses' content and experience. Statistics on the sizable and extensive alumni network have been included in the Annual Reports and prior evaluations.

Further, while acknowledging a marked increase in IIRR's recent "outreach" to and "linkages" with other international institutions and efforts, many of the IIRR "family" expressed concern that IIRR was still relatively isolated from the major NGO efforts to maximize their influence through forming international, regional and national associations, and through "clustering" locally. The role of civil society and, in particular, of NGOs and of people's movements is increasing and increasingly accepted by governments. Impressive efforts are well underway to strengthen the NGO role via coalitions and coalescing. IIRR to-date has not been involved to an important degree. It is hoped that IIRR's international recognition in the Regenerative Agriculture and Environment areas (and its active participation in the international UNCED meeting) can be duplicated/expanded via broader participation in international NGO associations, and greater involvement in international NGO collaboration in such major problem/focus areas as Population, AIDS, Women in Development, et al. In a similar vein, a number of persons expressed a hope that IIRR could significantly enhance its

information-base by plugging into international data bases, such as INTERNET. This might enhance significantly IIRR's commitment to "Knowledge Sharings, Knowledge Acquisition, Knowledge Generation."

Finally, in the context of discussion of IIRR's "International Outreach" efforts, the concern of many of the longer-term staff and alumni that IIRR was abandoning its "CREDO" (Go to the people; Live with the people;...) appeared increasingly to this evaluator to be a false issue. In its strategic plan for Year 2000, IIRR is seeking to focus on where the people ARE, as opposed to where they have been. IIRR is faithful to its "Go to the People" mandate in its planning for the future. The "People" today are not where they were 20 or 40 or 60 years ago. Today, large numbers of the "People" are migrating to urban centers. More importantly, today the "People" are scrambling to find ways to become EMPOWERED, and to become more self-reliant. The "People" are seeking to do this via clustering and organizing into groups and organizations. All over the world, NGOs, POs, and Community Os are emerging...are proliferating. IIRR's stated intent to prioritize the encouragement, facilitation, capacitation and support of the "Institutional Development" of these efforts is, in fact, a Year 2000 version of the IIRR CREDO, wholly consistent with and faithful to Dr. Yen's philosophy.

The "vision" of IIRR as it approaches the Year 2000 is focussed on the "rural poor", where they are and where they are going. IIRR will work with these people to build sustainable human, social and economic foundations, to meet their basic needs and to promote their self-reliance. This is being and will be achieved by continuing on the courses of action developed in great part via this Partnership Grant with AID, and articulated in the 1994-2000 Strategic Plan. The overall goal will be to empower these people to realize their human potential with dignity and justice.

C. IIRR's Programs/Activities

IIRR has, since its founding in the 1960s, carried on its tradition of the Four-fold integrated program (livelihood, education and culture, health and self-governance) to confront the four basic and inter-locking problems facing the rural poor: poverty, ignorance, disease and civic inertia. However, "as the global community moves closer to the 21st century, the Institute recognizes that although the four basic and inter-locking problems are still with us, the sociocultural, political and ecological context in which they are embedded have changed. For example, there is an increasing number of professionals finding fulfillment in development work; a proliferation of development organizations of a range of size and expertise; a dwindling and deterioration of the natural environment on which most of the poor depend on for their health and livelihood and, a changing life style towards modernity and new expectations. It is with these changes in mind, that the Institute has planned for the next seven years.

In its series of strategic planning sessions in July and November 1993 and this first quarter of 1994, the Institute has identified five program areas to work on - not necessarily subsuming the four-fold program areas but more of expanding their scope. The five areas are: (1) Community Health, Reproductive Health and Nutrition; (2) Environment, Natural Resources

and Agriculture; (3) Institutional Capacity Building; (4) Integrated Community-Based Rural Development; and (5) Rural Enterprise Development. Major activities in training, research and communications are to be undertaken in each of these five program areas in various countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America." (Dr. Julian Gonsalves, Preface to IIRR "Program Papers" - March, 1994.)

In these five Program areas and three functional areas, IIRR has initiated a diverse and complex range of activities. These activities, the status of progress and development and statistical data have been reported in detail to AID in four documents:

1. First Annual Report: 7/1/1990 - 6/30/1991
2. Second Annual Report: 7/1/1991 - 12/30/1992
3. Third Annual Report: 7/1/1992 - 12/31/1993
4. Mid-year Evaluation: 7/1/1990 - 12/31/1992

This evaluator carefully reviewed these documents and the supporting documentation in the Cavite Global Headquarters files and can corroborate and vouch for the accuracy of the information presented.

However the following brief descriptions commentaries are offered as ILLUSTRATIVE of the overall achievements at the program, project and planning level.

1. IIRR has continued its outstanding performance in areas such as regenerative agriculture, Bio-Intensive Gardening, low-input rice production, agroforestry, integrated food modules, fisheries, upland farming and livestock/poultry. These and certain new areas such as water resources, coastal resources management, plant genetic resources conservation, et al. have now been consolidated into the "Environment, Natural Resources and Agriculture Program" (ENRA).
2. Similarly, IIRR continued to make important contributions to rural health improvement and to initiate new programs in "Reproductive Health and Population" under the "Community Health, Reproductive Health and Nutrition Program," (CHRHN). Mention should be made of the collaborative efforts with IRRM in India and BARRA and UST in Bangladesh, and of the successful workshops on AIDS and Family Planning conducted in Uganda (funded in part by the USAID-Partnership Initiative Fund for Africa), one output of which was the highly regarded "Workshop Manual-A Participatory Approach to Rural AIDS Education," which has now gone into a second printing in view of the popular demand (Appendix 7).
3. The functional departments (Training, Research, Communications) which have been reorganized, and added new professional staff, have successfully met, and in most instances surpassed the targets set in the Logical Framework. The production of training, briefing and educational KITS by the Communications Department was especially impressive, both in professional quality, cultural sensitivity and diversity. Several of the kits are being reproduced in other languages, including Khmer. (Appendix 8).

4. With important inputs from IIRR's Field Operations Staff, "sustainable self-reliance status" has been achieved in many of the 'Social laboratory' villages and regions in the Philippines, to the degree that IIRR is, with local concurrence, phasing out. The IIRR participatory, 4-fold integrated approach has, in each instance, been appropriately adapted, rather than simply adopted. The assurance of adequate access to government and External funding has been one important consideration. However, the key, deciding factor is their demonstrated ability to organize and manage their own affairs.
5. The success of this USAID grant in strengthening IIRR institutionally is evidenced by the increased and increasing appeal and acceptance of IIRR as a "Partner" in a range of international programs/projects by such institutions as IRRI, The World Bank, UNICEF, The Asian Development Bank, The Canadian Food Bank, The Canadian IDRC, ICLARM, The Ford Foundation, The Rockefeller Brothers Fund and a number of international NGOs.
6. IIRR's capability in and quality of planning and accountability has been impressively upgraded. A Program Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Office has been established. The experience of producing two major Strategic Plans has been gained due in no small way to the manner in which this grant has impacted IIRR. Further, not only is this office providing significantly improved data on performance, and on the accomplishment of the goals of the AID grant and of other grants, but it is performing an extremely important educational function for the staff of all Program Divisions regarding needs assessment, planning, monitoring and evaluation. The development of the capacity for impact assessment is a most important challenge for this office, one in which it will be working closely with the Research Department and other Departments, stimulating a vigorous, critical, searching internal professional dialogue.
7. Over the years IIRR has amassed considerable experience in the processes of strengthening the technical and managerial capacities of NGOs and other indigenous development organizations. IIRR's awareness of and concern for the organizational, technical and institutional development of the myriad organizations being formed in third world countries, has motivated it to designate a program on "Institutional Capacity Building" (ICB) as one of its five priority program areas. IIRR's ICB Program is putting emphasis on small to medium NGOs operating at grassroots level. Work with other development institutions (including governmental and academic) will be only to the extent that they affect the capacity development and development agenda of the NGOS.
8. The Rural Enterprise Development Program (RED) has been retained by IIRR as a priority activity following analysis of the reasons for less than expected outputs in the area during recent years. The 'Lessons Learned' were carefully documented, discussed with other institutions active in the field, and carefully integrated into the development of a new strategy.
9. Regional Activities - As intimated in the "International Outreach" section of this report, the "start-up" project results in the three geographical regions have been impressive.

These, for the most part, are detailed in Section IV, pp. 18ff of IIRR's Third Annual Report to USAID. While certain countries in each region have been designated "priority" countries, IIRR continues to collaborate with the National Movements and Alumni, and to conduct programs in certain other countries, such as China.

The testimonials of local private and public officials and of international NGOs were consistently positive. The comments of the Cambodia Country Representative of Catholic Relief Services (CRS) are typical:

"It is CRS's intention to establish a collaborative relationship with the International Institute of Rural Reconstruction (IIRR), an international non-governmental organization based in the Philippines, to provide training and technical support to project personnel, counterparts, and possibly farmer groups. IIRR is currently implementing a joint program with CIDSE and Australian Catholic Relief (ARC) to develop a set ('kit') of information material on sustainable agricultural technologies adapted to or indigenous to Cambodia.

"IIRR is well known throughout the region for their work in sustainable agriculture and participatory rural development. They have a large, professional staff involved in research and training on regenerative agriculture and other issues facing the rural poor. The Institute is an active member of the Southeast Asian Sustainable Agriculture Network and has considerable contacts with the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) institutes. A collaborative relationship with IIRR will provide CRS with direct access to experienced specialists on their staff as well as indirect access to new knowledge and agricultural technologies available throughout the world."

Likewise, in Cambodia, the Secretariat for Rural Development has officially solicited IIRR's assistance in formulating policy and in designing and implementing training programs for village-level extension workers. This initiative was strongly endorsed by the Department of Planning, Statistics and International Cooperation, which further recommended, as well, continuation of sending groups of middle and senior managers to Cavite for training.

Such endorsement by private and public administrators was confirmatory of similar comments made to this Evaluator in Kenya and Nepal. The one qualification made by several was that IIRR needed, in certain circumstances to "be more sensitive to the target groups' "absorptive capacity" when assisting the rural poor in these countries. IIRR received this feedback in a most positive way, acknowledging that "the rural people, the communities, the local governments have the responsibility and the opportunity to make the changes in their ENVIRONMENT." This again, reinforced a Dr. Yen tenet: "Outsiders can help, but Insiders must do the job." IIRR's greatest challenge is to eschew "doing the job" in favor of strengthening the capacities of the people, the communities and the governments "to do the job"...in favor of enhancing a developing country's ultimate resource, its people.

In conclusion, it is hoped that the above selected examples will suffice to ILLUSTRATE IIRR's plans and programs. Other examples might have been (or perhaps should have been)

included, such as Research, or the very key program division, "Integrated, Community-based Rural Development" (ICBRD) whose goal is to develop, demonstrate and promote globally adaptable rural reconstruction practices, practices which will lead to people-centered, integrated and sustainable development.

III. PLANNING - 2000

1990 was a major milestone in IIRR's history. In July, 1990, the Institute put into operation its first ever FIVE YEAR PLAN, covering the period 7/1/90 to 6/30/95. This plan was the product of almost a year of study, review and reflection involving the entire staff.

The twin goals of the FIVE YEAR PLAN were (a) to accelerate and broaden IIRR's international outreach, and (b) to enrich and expand its knowledge base in appropriate technology and integrated rural development management. These goals and this PLAN were totally consistent with the goals and projected outcomes of the AID-IIRR 5-year Grant Agreement, which likewise commenced on 7/1/90.

In 1993 IIRR initiated a second strategic planning process, with the objective of preparing the Institute for the challenges of the 21st century. The process started with a 3-day workshop of the Management Council (senior staff) and other key staff on 7/14-16/93 to review IIRR's mission statement and to determine the priority program thrusts for the next seven years. IIRR's Mission Statement was revised, and five priority program areas were identified.

Between July and November, 1993, program papers were written for these five program areas. On November 8-19, the July planning team, the new IIRR President, and the core staff held a second workshop to review and refine these program papers, and to draw up a "Scenario" for the year 2000 (see Appendix 9). Seven-year goals and sub programs for each program area were identified, and operational plans and budgets were agreed upon. In February, 1994 another intensive, highly participatory workshop was conducted in preparation for presenting PLAN 2000 to the IIRR Board of Trustees for review and approval during its annual meeting in the Philippines in March, 1994. The Board of Trustees (see Appendix 10) approved IIRR's Mission Statement (see Appendix 11) and this plan and thus the Institute is now be functioning according to its Seven-year Plan for the years 1994-2000.

The details of this Plan are presented in IIRR's Third Annual Report to AID (January, 1994) as Attachment 9, and will not be included here.

The conduct and completion of these strategic planning efforts constitutes a significant achievement for IIRR. It is, likewise, one of the clearest indicators of the important impact of this AID on The Institution. This grant has facilitated a range of institutional improvements, but none has been more important than the design and building of a consensus for these new strategies, systems and operations.

IV. Organization/Management/Governance/Leadership/Staffing

Each and every one of the categories listed in the title of this section were importantly affected by the strategic planning process.

First of all, IIRR now operates "through an organizational matrix, consisting of five program divisions, three functional divisions and three regional offices." This is succinctly presented and explained in a few pages produced in the planning workshops, and included in this report as Appendix 12. These divisions and offices are backed up by a number of support services.

The Institute's staff resources were greatly enhanced with the hiring of the IIRR president late in 1993. Also in 1993 the position Vice-President for Program which was created and became operational in 1992 was very instrumental in streamlining the program operations of the Institute. The overall management of IIRR thus resides in the three offices of the President, the Executive Vice-President/Vice-President for Administration, and the Vice-President for Program. These three individuals are all highly experienced, professionally capable, respected leaders. IIRR is fortunate to have such leadership.

Strengthening of the program and support divisions' staffs has been accelerated during the past two years. Senior and middle-level specialists have been successfully recruited. Staff requirements have been more specifically defined, and capabilities of existing staff have been assessed to determine how best they can fit into the IIRR plans and programs.

The leadership has been concerned to prepare the staff for the changes and challenges of the coming years. An annual reflection is conducted for all IIRR staff. However, perhaps as important as the profession qualifications and awareness of the new and the existing staff, is the continuation of the sense of commitment, dedication and enthusiasm which has and should continue to characterize the IIRR staff's attitude and approach to their work.

Furthermore, in the case of not a few members of the staff (in particular those who must travel extensively) considerable "overtime" is too easily accepted as a regular routine. This, combined with the reality that IIRR's remuneration levels rank somewhat lower than might be hoped for, put IIRR in a position of risking "burnout" or the loss of some personnel to alternative employers. The answer is not necessarily additional staff. The answer will definitely demand careful structuring and managing by IIRR's leaders.

The efforts by IIRR to continue to provide staff development opportunities and to offer more attractive retirement options for long-time employees are to be commended.

The "Governance" of IIRR resides in the Administration and the Board of Trustees. Over the past years, the Board has been strengthened by the addition of new members, and, under the capable Chairmanship of James Johnson, Esq., has carried out its responsibilities in a most exemplary manner. Most appropriately, three Board Committees: (1) Finance and Budget, (2) Program and Planning, and (3) Resource Development, have been appointed, in addition to the elected Executive Committee. Their degree of involvement to-date has been uneven and needs to be further and better operationalized.

In 1994, in the judgment of this Evaluator, IIRR is a better organized, better managed, better staffed institution than it was at the beginning of the current Grant Period.

V. Financial

The annual financial reports from IIRR to AID present, in this evaluator's judgement, a most adequate degree of accountability for the use of the AID grant monies in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Grant Agreement. Detailed Quarterly Reports on Program costs and the AID/IIRR Matching Requirements are prepared. The reports examined demonstrated a conscientious effort to use AID funds ONLY for the purposes stipulated in the Grant Agreement. The Matching Requirements have been satisfactorily met.

The changes in the Logical Framework did not involve any additional funding from AID. Certain modifications in the specific line items in the approved Grant Budget were recommended by IIRR in order to reflect IIRR's assessment of how the funds should best be allocated in order to achieve the modified outputs in pursuit of the goals and purposes of the grant, and to make these outputs more consistent with the IIRR 5-year strategic plan.

In the course of this Grant, the Financial Management System of IIRR has been significantly improved. More needs to be done, however. The Strategic planning concept papers specify a number of additional steps which should be taken to further improve the system. For example:

- The financial planning cycle should be coordinated with the annual program planning; and the financial plan should be coordinated with the program plan.
- In addition to a Core/Budget, the Program, Functional and Support Division Budgets should be allocated.
- Budgets should be included for the Project/Unit Levels and be under the control of the Unit Director.

In general, the Budget Process, Budgeting, and Budget Control are not adequately understood at the different levels. Accordingly IIRR too often faces the prospect and the pressures of a Budget Deficit, and is forced to revise the Budget repeatedly.

In the impressive Strategic Planning process there has not been sufficient attention, as yet, to the development of a Financial Resource Generation Strategy. The stated purpose is there, ("Generation and stewardship of financial resources in an amount and under the terms as required to enable attainment of IIRR's program and institutional Goal and Purposes."), but an adequate strategy and system for resource generation must be developed. In this regard the roles of the U.S. Office and the proposed European Committee of Rural Reconstruction need to be delineated. A final strategy might include:

- o Strategic Resource Generation Plan
- o Management Plan (with special attention to the roles of the Board of Trustees
- o Operational Plan
- o Marketing Plan

VI. The Principal Questions/Answers

In the preceding sections, the Evaluator was consciously seeking to provide the information requisite to provide answers to the six key questions listed in the "Statement of Work" section of the Scope of Work. Accordingly, the answers in this section will be brief, and, when necessary, complementary to what has been written earlier.

Q. 1 WHAT HAVE BEEN THE PRINCIPAL ACHIEVEMENTS AND OBSTACLES THROUGHOUT THE COURSE OF THE PROGRAM AND PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AS DESCRIBED IN THE AGREED-UPON PROGRAM AND SUB-PROGRAM AREAS?

A. Principal Achievements:

1. Successful Strategic Planning Process, producing a 5-year Plan (90-95) and a 7-year Plan (94-2000), and identifying five priority program areas.
2. Impressive achievements in "Internationalization" of IIRR programs;
3. Successful Reorganization, including a new Leadership team and addition of professional staff;
4. Establishment of Program Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Office.
5. Increases in outputs of Training programs, and development of additional curricula and programs, both in Cavite and internationally.
6. Increased productivity of Research and Communications Divisions;
7. Successful performance by and increased outputs by the ENRA Division, the ICBRD Division, and the CHRHN Division in field projects both in Cavite and internationally.
8. Increased interest in collaboration with IIRR on the part of major international institutions and NGOs.
9. Improved record of collaboration with NRRMs and Alumni Associations.
10. Success in broadening base of support (granted that more needs to be achieved).
11. Good "Partnership" experience with AID.

B. Principal Obstacles/Problems/Needs

1. While reporting on Activities has been excellent, IIRR needs to develop capability to assess outputs and impact of activities and programs.

2. Need to develop strategies for increasing even more the collaboration with NRRMs and Alumni and for capitalizing on their experiences and expertise.
3. Shortage of financial resources, especially "unrestricted" funding from non-AID sources.
4. Lack of adequate Resource Development/Fund-Raising Strategy component in 7-year Strategic Plan.

Q. 2 TO WHAT DEGREE HAVE EACH OF THE OBJECTIVES STATED IN THE REVISED LOG FRAME BEEN ACHIEVED?

IIRR has reached or exceeded almost all major targets.

Attachment 3, "Comparison of Accomplishments with LOGFRAME Objectives", included in IIRR's "Third Annual Report" to AID offers a point by point comparison of accomplishments and program objectives set forth in the revised logical framework, through December 31, 1993.

The involvement of and participation by women in the full range of activities and programs, while definitely improved, cannot be judged to have been satisfactory.

Q. 3 TO WHAT DEGREE WERE THE MID-GRANT REVISIONS TO THE LOG FRAME JUSTIFIED?

After reviewing the process and the rationale with many key IIRR Staff, the Evaluator judges that the revisions were fully justified.

Q. 4 TO WHAT EXTENT (IF ANY) HAS THIS COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT PROVIDED INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTHENING TO IIRR IN TERMS OF PERSONNEL, PROGRAM PLANNING, AND PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES?

The Evaluator hopes that the preceding report has demonstrated unmistakably that IIRR has been institutionally strengthened most significantly in the course of the past four years. The AID Cooperative Agreement has had a major influence and impact in the achievement of this institutional strengthening.

Q. 5 DURING THE GRANT PERIOD, TO WHAT DEGREE HAS IIRR BEEN SUCCESSFUL IN IMPLEMENTING ITS STRATEGY OF "INTERNATIONALIZATION," INCLUDING THE ESTABLISHMENT AND USE OF REGIONAL OFFICES?

IIRR has been extremely successful in the planning and implementation of its "Internationalization" strategy. This statement is substantiated in the preceding sections of this report.

Q. 6 DURING THE GRANT PERIOD, TO WHAT DEGREE HAS IIRR SUCCESSFULLY CLARIFIED ITS MISSION, AND STRENGTHENED ITS GOVERNANCE (BOARD AND LEADERSHIP), PROGRAM SUPPORT, AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT STRUCTURES?

To a significant degree these objectives have been achieved. The financial support still is less than is needed/wanted in order to implement all aspects of the Strategic Plan.

The intent of these "Principal Questions/Answers" is to assess the degree of success/failure of IIRR's implementation of the stipulated activities and achievement of the goal and purposes of this Grant.

Additionally, IIRR has utilized the occasion of this AID/IIRR Evaluation to assess itself and its own performance. IIRR has sought to judge itself on the basis of the elements of its foundation, capacity and performance.

IIRR's "foundation" is determined by its Mission and its Goals.

IIRR's "capacity" depends on its Leadership, its Resources and its Organization.

IIRR's "performance" is determined by its Activities/Programs, Relevance and Effectiveness.

The judgment of this Evaluator is that both assessment processes warrant the conclusion that IIRR has come through this Transition Period extremely well. The transition, while on-going, is largely completed. The final results and consequences will require time for full analysis and evaluation.

IIRR and AID, overall, should be most satisfied with the results of this five-year "Partnership" Grant.

PART FOUR: RECOMMENDATIONS

This study has resulted in the emergence of a number of suggestions/recommendations for enhancing the effectiveness of IIRR in the future. IIRR's very success is already posing challenges in the rapidly changing context of the globe and the developing countries. These suggestions/recommendations are offered in the spirit of "It may be wise to...:"

1. The highest priority should be given to extending the AID-IIRR Partnership for another 3-5 year period. Much has been accomplished in a relatively brief time span. Much remains to be done. The important objective is to "Get the job done." The most neglected factor in international development work is the "Time Factor." Deadlines of three and five years are worthwhile planning devices, but must be recognized as artificial, at best, when it comes to evaluating results and judging if the endeavor warrants longer-term support and "Partnership." This "Partnership" definitely warrants continued support. Continuing AID support will be the guarantee of the "payoff," of the hoped-for results.
2. IIRR should continue to give high priority to strategic planning and to internationalization (developing and clarifying IIRR's roles and assessing the viability and the impact of the program and the internationalization strategies).
3. IIRR should step up further efforts to involve NRRM's, Alumni and Alumni Associations' expertise and experience in IIRR's program, learning, sharing and training activities, recognizing that the roles of these groups were critically important in IIRR's internationalization.
4. IIRR should seek to develop its capacity to assess the results and impact of its activities and programs (over and above continuation of its high-quality reporting of activities), to analyze data (not merely collect data), and to set out further criteria for evaluating IIRR as an institution and its international, regional and local programs.
5. In view of IIRR's repeated commitment "to address critical global, economic, and social issues," IIRR needs to develop further its strategies and to increase further its activities in certain key areas, e.g. Population issues, Gender issues, AIDS, Migration/Urbanization,... Expressions of good intentions without visible follow-up activities will risk a loss of credibility for IIRR.
6. IIRR should plan and put into operation a strategy for a more active, broader role for members of the Board of Trustees. Specifically, the activities and inputs of the Resource Development Committee and the Program and Planning Committee should be brought to the level of the Executive Committee and the Finance and Budget Committee.
7. In the further development of Strategic Planning, special attention should be devoted to a number of aspects of FINANCE: Financial Management, Fund-Raising Strategy, Marketing Strategy, Budget/Budgeting Processes, et. al.

8. In its re-organization plan, IIRR should seriously consider the creation of a new section/position with responsibility for overseeing, monitoring and coordinating the Regional Offices' operations with the Global Headquarters, and representing them in the various administrative fora in Cavite.
9. In consideration of continuing support to IIRR, AID should give special attention to (a) strengthening IIRR's managerial competency within its broad international and institutional development agenda, and (b) supporting IIRR's new priority (very much on target) program "Institutional Capacity Building". This priority is finely attuned to AID's policy "to strengthen the NGO's capacity for effective and sustainable institutional, organizational and management operations and development, closely rooted to the needs of the grassroots communities."

--ooOoo--