

PD-ABL-595

rev 9/29/94

**Midterm Evaluation
of the Technical
Assistance and
Support Project,
India**

Prepared for the U.S. Agency for International Development under contract number
AEP-5451-I-08-2059-00

Dennis De Santis
Dr. N.C.B. Nath

October 1994



7250 Woodmont Avenue, Suits 200, Bethesda, Maryland 20814

ABSTRACT

The midterm evaluation of the Technical Assistance and Support Project (TASP 386-0515) was conducted in September 1994 by an evaluation team comprised of Dennis DeSantis, Development Specialist from Development Alternatives, Inc., and Dr. N.C.B. Nath, Economist, from the Foundation to Aid Industrial Recovery, New Delhi. TASP was authorized in 1988 with \$18 million to support the Government of India (GOI) in its development goals. Through August 1994, TASP authorized \$13.9 million in 21 grants covering a broad spectrum of the U.S. Agency for International Development's (USAID's) strategy components and implementation methods. The midterm evaluation was to review TASP's grant activities and make recommendations regarding increases in the authorization and an extension of the Project Assistance Completion Date.

The evaluation team reviewed the 21 TASP activities, described the progress and accomplishments of the project, developed a methodology for an analysis of impact, reviewed the project management, and presented findings and recommendations in an oral debriefing and written report. The project has been extremely flexible and successful in spanning a period from 1988 to 1994 in which the relationship between the GOI and USAID has improved and the GOI has embarked on a series of far-reaching economic reforms aimed at liberalizing India's economy. However, the project is burdened by the lack of a clearly stated purpose and strategy statement. The principal conclusions of the midterm evaluation were that TASP should develop a clear strategic direction in terms of whether the project should remain as an implementation mechanism or continue its evolution into a technically oriented project in support of economic liberalization. If the second option is true, the project should be extended if a strategy and well-defined project objectives are established to guide the project into sustainable, high-impact activities and efficient project management.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	vii
 SECTION ONE	
THE USAID STRATEGIC RESPONSE TO ECONOMIC LIBERALIZATION	1
PROGRAM OBJECTIVE: ACCELERATING BROAD-BASED ECONOMIC GROWTH	1
PROGRAM OBJECTIVE: STABILIZING POPULATION GROWTH	3
PROGRAM OBJECTIVE: PROTECTING THE ENVIRONMENT	3
 SECTION TWO	
THE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT PROJECT	5
GOAL AND PURPOSE	5
FOCUS	6
PROGRESS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS	7
Stage 1: Pre-Economic Reform: (September 30, 1988-April 1, 1991)	14
Stage 2: Early Economic Reform: (November 14, 1991-January 25, 1993)	14
Stage 3: Later Economic Reform (June 23, 1993-January 1, 1994)	15
MEASUREMENT OF IMPACT	15
USAID TASP MANAGEMENT	20
Organization	20
Grants and Grantees	21
 SECTION THREE	
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	23
FINDINGS	23
Project Goal, Purpose, and Focus	23
Project Progress and Accomplishments	24
Project Selection of Activities and Grantees	25
Project Activity Monitoring and Management	25
Project Direction and Strategy	26
RECOMMENDATIONS	26
Project Goal, Purpose, and Focus	26
Project Progress and Accomplishments	26
Project Selection of Activities and Grantees	27
Project Activity Monitoring and Management	27
Project Direction and Strategy	28

SECTION FOUR		
FUTURE DIRECTIONS		29
GOALS AND ISSUES		29
METHODS		30
PERFORMANCE AND IMPACT		31
GRANTEE MANAGEMENT		31
BIBLIOGRAPHY		33
ANNEX A:	DESCRIPTIONS OF ALL TASP GRANTS	A-1
ANNEX B:	STATUS REPORT OF TASP GRANTS	B-1
ANNEX C:	THE CONTEXT: THE INDIAN POLITICAL ECONOMY	C-1
ANNEX D:	STATEMENT OF WORK	D-1
ANNEX E:	EVALUATION TEAM, METHODOLOGY, AND WORK PLAN	E-1
ANNEX F:	LIST OF PERSONS AND ORGANIZATIONS CONTACTED	F-1
ANNEX G:	TASP FINANCIAL STATUS	G-1

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Project Summary Sheet	2
2	TASP Activity by USAID Program Component	9
3	TASP Activity by Method	10
4	Chronology of TASP Activities	12
5	TASP Impact Rating Sheet	18
6	Impact Indicator of TASP Activities	19

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Technical Assistance and Support Project (TASP) is an \$18 million umbrella project designed and implemented in 1988 to provide the India Mission of the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) with a flexible contract mechanism to assist the Government of India in its development policy by funding technical assistance, feasibility studies, small grants, and exchange programs. TASP's Project Assistance Completion Date (PACD) is September 30, 1996. By August 1994, TASP had funded 21 activities for a total authorization of \$13.9 million. This project evaluation was conducted in September 1994 to determine more closely what developmental impact had been achieved in the life of the project. The evaluation provides guidance to project and Mission management to facilitate a decision on the extension of the project authorization and the PACD.

The evaluation was conducted by Dennis De Santis of Development Alternatives, Inc. and Dr. N.C.B. Nath of the Foundation to Aid Industrial Recovery. Grantees, collaborators, and USAID activity managers in Washington, D.C., New Delhi, and Bombay were interviewed. These interviews, supplemented by a review of the project documents and selected activity outputs, enabled the evaluators to view TASP from several different perspectives. An impact rating scale was developed based on five impact indicators developed in conjunction with USAID staff. They are (1) effectiveness in support of policy and institutional reform, (2) influence on target groups, (3) sustainability of the activity, (4) capacity development in the grantee, and (5) collaboration for a U.S. institution. Each of the activities was rated on a three-point scale for each of the indicators. The evaluators developed a rating scale in an attempt to measure impact; a low impact rating is not meant to imply that an activity was poorly managed or implemented.

The absence of predetermined performance and impact indicators, and the broad diversity among the 21 subproject activities invite criticism of the evaluation methodology as being too qualitative. However, the situation left few options. For additional guidance, the evaluation used the "redirection memo," PIL No. 29: "Future TASP Support," November 3, 1992, to the Indian Department of Economic Affairs, which advised that TASP would concentrate on "policy and institutional reforms in the economic and financial sectors "

TASP is a difficult project to understand and evaluate for three main reasons: (1) its original description of project goal, purpose, and objectives is vague; (2) it is the sum of 21 diverse subproject activities; and (3) it spans a six-year period from 1988 to 1994 that witnessed dramatic changes in India, USAID, and the Indo-U.S. relationship.

TASP was designed and implemented as a mechanism to permit USAID and the Government of India (GOI) to fund diverse activities that were within the scope of the limited GOI-USAID relationship of 1988. Beyond the reference to USAID assisting the GOI with the implementation of a development plan, no reference is made to objective, or to performance and impact criteria. In an attempt to define the original intent, the Project Paper was analyzed to identify critical areas of USAID project intervention by sector, type of institution, target population, and method employed. The analysis revealed that TASP was spread broadly within and among these critical areas to the extent that it was impossible to identify the project with any one USAID strategic component or implementation method.

Over the life of the project, 21 activities for \$13.9 million in program authorizations were funded. These activities were classified by strategic program component, method used in implementation, current status, size, duration, chronology, and method of selection. It became evident early on that the range of TASP activities was extremely broad. Although economic growth activities predominated the strategic

component, there were activities concerning the environment, food policy and food relief, public administration, and scientific and educational exchanges. Methods used in implementation included policy analysis and research, direct technical assistance, training seminars, dissemination conferences on various topics, and participant training. Activity funding varied from the smallest at \$9,000 to the largest at \$3 million; duration ranged from one week to six years. Although the classification methodology provided a convenient and interesting way of analyzing the projects, it revealed little about impact.

Some trends did emerge. The higher-impact activities have been those stemming from the technical redirection toward the promotion of economic growth. Activities that have used TASP as an implementation mechanism have scored lower, possibly because they lacked an individual or technical office that had ownership of or interest in them from conception through implementation. Smaller activities of shorter duration that have involved seminars and dissemination have tended to score lower on the impact rating sheet. A complete set of findings and recommendations can be found in Section Three of the following report. Findings are grouped by project goal, purpose, and focus; project progress and accomplishments; project selection of activities and grantee; project activity monitoring and management; and project direction and strategy.

The evaluators believe that the most significant findings and recommendations have to do with the refocusing of TASP and its future direction. The project has been used successfully as an implementation vehicle to fund a diverse set of activities. It has thereby met the original purpose established in 1988. However, times change, and USAID/India's relationship with the GOI in 1995 is vastly different than in 1988. To be more effective and accountable in the 1990s and to move from an implementation vehicle to a technical project, TASP must articulate a project strategy that includes specific objectives, financial and management resource requirements, a fixed implementation period, and impact and performance indicators. TASP has made a good beginning in its conversion to a technical project by focusing on economic growth and liberalization policies. It could continue by more clearly defining its purpose and explaining its role to both USAID/India and project clients.

The evaluators recommend that TASP be extended, but also recommend that the project develop a written strategy including project objectives, an implementation plan, and monitoring and evaluation criteria that clearly define TASP as a technical project for the promotion of economic growth and liberalization.

SECTION ONE

THE USAID STRATEGIC RESPONSE TO ECONOMIC LIBERALIZATION

USAID/India has responded well to the changes instituted by the Government of India (GOI) and to the programmatic changes in USAID in Washington. The economic liberalization program started by the GOI in 1991 has provided an opportunity for USAID to address an area in which it and the U.S. foreign assistance community have considerable knowledge and expertise: promoting economic growth through the private sector. This area has been added to USAID's India program objectives, along with the vital strategic goals of stabilizing population growth and protecting the environment. Its addition forms a strategic core of three interlocking components broad enough to address sufficiently India's development problems, but narrow enough to manage and focus. By concentrating on these three program areas, USAID/India builds on its existing portfolio, while addressing new opportunities for development support.

The USAID/India Strategic Framework for FY 1994-2000 represents a long-range strategic vision for sustainable development that closely correlates with both the GOI's development goals and the United States's global economic, environmental, and population concerns. The Strategic Framework is a well-conceived and -implemented plan to take the Indian Government and USAID through the end of the century. The plan's goal is to help India achieve sustainable development to improve the standard of living for all its citizens. This goal is supported by the three program objectives noted above, namely acceleration of broad-based economic growth, stabilization of population growth, and protection of the environment. Table 1, taken from the USAID/India Program Summary, presents the project authorization for the three strategic components.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVE: ACCELERATING BROAD-BASED ECONOMIC GROWTH

This component involves the following program interventions:

- Strengthening financial markets;
- Supporting enterprise deregulation; and
- Accessing technology and business skills.

The component uses the following project portfolio:

Project	PACD	Authorization Grant
ACE	9/30/98	\$20.0 million
CTD	7/31/95	\$10.0 million
FIRE	9/30/98	\$20.0 million
Housing Finance	9/30/96	\$4.3 million
PACT	7/31/95	\$21.2 million
TASP	9/30/96	\$18.0 million

TABLE 1
PROJECT SUMMARY SHEET
As of August 31, 1994
(\$000)

Project Number	Project Title	ProAg. Date	P A C D			TDD	Authorization Grant	Obligations Grant	Status of C/Ps	PDIT Officer	Project Officer
			Original	Revised							
1	PACER	08/31/87	06/30/93	08/31/97	05/31/98		20,000	17,000	Met	KCK	N. Seshadri
2	PACT*	08/30/85	07/31/90	07/31/95	04/30/96		21,224	21,024	Met	KCK	R.K. Berry
3	Center for Technology Dev.	07/29/89	07/31/95	06/30/93	03/31/99		10,000	6,300	Met	KCK	R.K. Berry
4	PVOH-II**	08/31/87	09/30/95	08/31/97	05/31/98		10,000	10,000	Met	NR	Rajni Veda
5	Plant Genetic Resources	09/31/83	09/30/95	09/30/97	06/30/98		18,700	17,200	Met	KCK	D. R. Arora
6	Quality Control of Health Tech.	09/24/90	09/30/93	-	06/30/99		13,300	5,000	Met	NR	K. Sudhakar
7	TASP	08/31/83	09/30/96	-	06/30/97		18,000	17,100	Met	NR	Madhumita Gupta
8	EMCAT	06/28/91	03/31/97	-	12/31/97		20,000	9,541	Met	KCK	N. Seshadri
9	ACE	08/23/91	09/30/93	-	06/30/99		20,000	5,200	Met	KCK	FMantajga
10	Housing Finance System	04/30/92	09/30/96	-	06/30/97		4,300	3,300	Met	KCK	L. Elmendorf
11	AIDS Prevention & Control	09/30/92	09/30/99	-	06/30/00		10,000	2,320	Met	NR	R. Mahantani
12	Innovations in Family Planning Services	09/30/92	09/30/02	-	06/30/03		325,000	42,250	Met	NR	I. Rogosch
13	Trade in Environmental Services and Technologies	09/30/92	09/30/97	-	06/30/93		25,000	7,700	Met	KCK	A. Ray
14	Financial Institutions Reform and Expansion	09/27/93	09/30/98	-	06/30/99		20,000	3,300	Met	SN	JORourke
TOTAL.							535,524	170,235			

* Includes Unilateral obligations (Facility Funding): PACT-\$0.958

** Includes Indian Rupees 7,770,000 (equivalent to \$300,000) of SFCA Rupee decb/enb.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVE: STABILIZING POPULATION GROWTH

This component involves the following program interventions:

- Empowering women;
- Introducing family planning interventions; and
- Upgrading child survival programs.

Under this objective, the project portfolio includes the following:

Project	PACD	Authorization Grant
AIDS Prevention	6/30/00	\$10.0 million
Family Planning Services	6/30/03	\$325.0 million
Quality Control of Health	6/30/99	\$13.3 million
PVOH-II	5/31/98	\$10.0 million

PROGRAM OBJECTIVE: PROTECTING THE ENVIRONMENT

This component involves the following program interventions:

- Improving air quality;
- Enhancing energy efficiency; and
- Strengthening biodiversity preservation.

The project portfolio for this objective includes the following:

Project	PACD	Authorization Grant
EMCAT	3/31/97	\$7.2.0 million
PACER	6/30/96	\$20.0 million
Plant Genetic Resources	9/30/97	\$18.7 million
Environmental Services and Technologies	9/30/97	\$25.0 million

Because TASP, with the approval of India's Department of Economic Affairs (DEA), was directed in 1991 to support policy and institutional reforms in India's economic and financial sectors, the section below looks more closely only at the portfolio of the economic growth component. The analysis that follows indicates the areas in which TASP can best complement the economic growth portfolio.

Agriculture Commercialization and Enterprise (ACE). ACE will improve the operating environment for private agribusinesses in horticulture through financial institution support, improved management and business association policy dialogue, and increased investment by private firms.

Center for Technology Development (CTD). CTD is stimulating the process of technology development and commercialization by bringing together representatives of industry, academia, and finance.

Financial Institutions Reform and Expansion (FIRE). This project will address the overall financial system by strengthening the regulation and function of the capital markets through improved investor participation and the development of a debt market to finance infrastructure.

Housing Finance System Expansion Project (HFSP). HFSP assists the National Housing Bank (NHB) by providing technical assistance and training and management support. It complements the Housing Finance System Expansion Program by working to strengthen the financial system by providing capital for institutions to lend to low-income households.

Housing Finance System Expansion Program (HFSEP). This program promotes the growth of private shelters and the development of the financial system by making \$100 million available in lending capital, increasing the number of private Housing Finance Companies (HFCs), improving the management of HFCs, and expanding the supply of housing finance to low-income households.

Program for Advancement of Commercial Technology (PACT). PACT provides financing for the preproduction research and development costs of Indo-U.S. joint ventures. The project will accelerate the pace of technological innovations in products and production processes to help build a market-oriented R&D capacity in India's private sector.

As Section Two shows, TASP's flexibility and broad scope are a natural fit with the program intervention for promoting economic growth.

SECTION TWO

THE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT PROJECT

Since its inception in 1988, and its redirection in 1991, TASP has exhibited strengths that stem from its flexibility and its ability to adapt, as well as weaknesses caused by a lack of an identity and programmatic strategy. This section of the evaluation report will describe TASP, discuss its advantages and disadvantages, and describe and analyze the activities the project has undertaken.

TASP has been variously defined and used as either a mechanism for the implementation of diverse sub-project activities, some of which have had little relation to overall Mission goals; or as a technical project for the advancement of specific Mission strategy in the promotion of economic growth. Prior to 1991 TASP was generally perceived to be a vehicle for implementation available for creative, innovative, or experimental activities to address unmet challenges in the Mission development portfolio. The danger of this approach is that financial and management resources can be dissipated and result in little, if any, sustainable contribution to economic development. Since 1991, and the dawn of a new period in the history of USAID objectives and USAID relations with the GOI, TASP goals and objectives of supporting development policy in India were more narrowly applied to economic growth objectives, resulting in more technically oriented activities with more easily measured sustainability and impact.

GOAL AND PURPOSE

TASP is an \$18 million umbrella project designed to provide USAID/India with a flexible vehicle to assist the GOI in its development policy through the funding of technical assistance, feasibility studies, small grants, and exchange programs. The grantee is the GOI, with the grant managed by the DEA of the Ministry of Finance. TASP's Project Assistance Completion Date (PACD) is September 30, 1996. As further stated in the Project Grant Agreement, TASP falls "entirely within the bilateral program," but, as a successor to the Regional Technical Collaboration Project, it will "respond to the requests of the grantee to finance activities considered inappropriate under traditional bilateral projects."

The Project Grant Agreement defines TASP's goal as being "to contribute in a collaborative manner towards strengthening the GOI's ability to improve its development plan." The purpose of the project is "to improve the efficiency, effectiveness, and timeliness of the GOI, USAID, and, potentially, other donor efforts to identify, design, implement, and evaluate development investments for the public and private sectors." However, the Project Paper purpose statement is "to provide an easily accessible source of foreign exchange for the GOI and USAID/India to fund collaborative efforts and pilot project activities, and to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of USAID/India and, potentially, other donors to identify, design, implement, and evaluate development investment proposals from both the public and private sectors." The definition of a "development investment" is left open to interpretation, and does not appear again in the document. However, the Project Paper is explicit in its desire to support activities that are related to the GOI's development plan and USAID/India's strategic objectives. The language is general enough that the reader can find scope to allow nearly any type of activity for any type of collaborative development activity.

FOCUS

TASP started on an unclear path because of the early inconsistencies involved in being a bilateral project working outside of traditional bilateral programs, and because of the differing aforementioned purpose statements and subsequent interpretations of the statements. The Project Paper and Grant Agreement provided even less direction when addressing the targets of TASP's objectives and activities. To identify critical targets, the evaluation team conducted a detailed analysis of the first eight pages of the TASP Project Paper. They found the following four targets.

- **Sectors**

Social and economic development, health, biotechnology, agriculture, food processing, resource management, GOI policy analysis, and GOI technology resources.

- **Institutions**

Government, private enterprises, private voluntary organizations (PVOs) and nongovernmental organizations, universities, national laboratories, and scientific agencies.

- **Target populations**

Scientific, academic, professional, and entrepreneurial groups; rural people; and women.

- **Methods**

The identification, design, implementation, and evaluation of innovative pilot projects, studies, collaborative research, and projects with demonstration effects; and the use of short- and long-term technical advisors.

The Project Paper describes the first activities (see Annex A) and funding amounts to be granted under TASP. They are the Gandhi-Reagan Indo-U.S. Fellowship Program (later referred to as the Scientific and Technical Fellowship, or STF), \$3 million; the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) and the Indian Center for Agricultural Research (ICAR), for research collaboration, \$2.5 million; the PVO Private Sector Initiative with International Executive Service Corps (IESC I and II), \$1.5 million; and the World Food Programme (WFP) monitoring and evaluation assistance under the Women in Development initiative, \$375,000. These activities appear to be consistent with the GOI's development plan and with USAID/India's strategy for the late 1980s. TASP's broad scope and purpose appeared to be the ideal vehicle to fund these four diverse activities.

Several interpretations of the wording and the grants included in the Project Paper are possible. In perspective, it appears that TASP, though vague, is consistent with the development approaches and strategies of the U.S.-Indo collaboration of the late 1980s. TASP was envisioned to improve the bilateral collaboration between the GOI and USAID, and to strengthen the human resource development of the Indian scientific and technological community, the latter being the chief thrust of GOI-USAID/India's development strategy at the time. In general, the all-encompassing flavor of the Project Paper reflects the times, in which the GOI-USAID/India relationship was growing but still restricted. The first TASP activities were designed to meet diverse objectives in the contemporaneous band of acceptable programmatic activities.

A great many changes have occurred in the world and in USAID since TASP began in 1988. Worldwide and regional geopolitical changes have strengthened the Indo-U.S. collaborative relationship, and redirected the GOI-USAID/India development strategy from human resource development of the scientific and technical community to the promotion of economic growth, stabilization of the population, and protection of the environment. Changes within USAID/Washington have also led to the refinement of the agency and, subsequently, Mission objectives (for example, recent agencywide reviews have focused attention on the hazards of having multiple and overlapping objectives). The changes in GOI and USAID culture have been beneficial in that they have promoted a narrowing of focus to deliver resources so that they will have the most utility and impact.

TASP's redirection in 1991 to focus more closely on the USAID/India strategic component of promoting economic growth is also consistent with the direction the GOI has taken. In fact, the redirection appears to be a natural progression, especially since India's economic liberalization reform effort has been spearheaded by the Ministry of Finance, under which the DEA manages TASP. The redirection seems responsive to the GOI's lead, and consistent with the original intent of the Project Paper for the project to be flexible and supportive of the GOI's development goals. The redirection is also consistent with USAID/Washington and the emphasis on a narrowing of overall program goals.

PROGRESS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Since its inception in 1988, TASP has funded 21 activities for a total of \$13.9 million against a Life of Project Authorization of \$18 million and a PACD of June 30, 1996. Individual case studies of each activity can be found in Annex A. The case studies contain an analysis of the grantee, the purpose of the grant, the methods employed to achieve the purpose, collaborating institutions, the activity period, the TASP inputs, the expected outputs, the correlation with USAID objectives, and the activity's score on the impact index (see "Measurement of Impact," later in this section).

The 21 TASP activities are extremely heterogeneous whether sorted by USAID program objectives, method employed, grant size, duration, or impact. Of the activities, 8 have been completed and 13 are current. The projects range in grant size from that of the Sankat Mochan Foundation (SMF) at \$45,000 to the Scientific and Technical Fellowship (STF) at \$2.7 million. The average grant size is \$664,000, not including the four smallest to Berkeley, Harvard, Salzburg, and Kellogg, all \$26,000 or under. The duration for the projects is equally broad: the technical assistance to the Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) was a one-month activity, while the first activity grant, made to IFPRI on September 30, 1988, is scheduled to be completed at the end of 1994. The four shortest activities, those by Berkeley, Harvard, Salzburg, and Kellogg, had a duration of two weeks or less. The average duration for the remaining activities is just over 28 months.

The evaluation team's analysis of the TASP activities by the categories noted above proved inconclusive, because activities from the smaller and larger ends of the grant size spectrum, as well as from the shorter and longer ends of the duration spectrum, were relatively evenly distributed in the final impact ratings. Because of the broad diversity in the activities by grant size, duration, and status (current or completed), the team categorized the activities by USAID program objectives, method employed, and chronology to determine whether any patterns existed. Program objectives were defined as one of the three existing USAID components: stabilizing population growth, protecting the environment, or promoting economic growth. A fourth category, "other," was added, primarily to include those activities implemented prior to adoption of the current USAID program components. "Method" refers primarily

to three broad classifications: research and policy analysis; technical assistance; and training, inclusive of actual training, dissemination activities, and scientific and technical exchanges. The chronology analysis is simply an organization of activities by date of implementation, as opposed to the traditional USAID classification of activities as completed or ongoing. The chronological analysis is in many ways the most revealing because it indicates the changing focus of TASP.

Table 2 indicates that there have been 15 activities in which the principal USAID program component could be described as promoting economic growth. Of the 15, 1 — by IFPRI — is focused on national agricultural policy, but it is grouped with the economic growth activities. In regard to methods employed in the economic growth program, 5 activities are or were principally policy analysis oriented, 4 are or were primarily oriented to the delivery of technical assistance, and 6 provide or provided training either through conferences and seminars, or established training courses in the United States or India. Nine of the economic growth activities are current.

Three activities are or were conducted in the environmental program component. Two small activities, those of SMF and Harvard (HIID), were classified as training because they involved conferences and seminars. The third, the automated water treatment plant (AWTP) supported by the GOI's Department of Electronics, is a complex activity providing technical assistance to a water treatment plant. The three remaining activities in Table 2 fall outside the current USAID program strategy. They include the WFP activity, which provides technical assistance to improve the management of a United Nations food aid activity; activity under STF, which is an exchange program for the Indian and American scientific and technical communities; and the National Institute of Urban Affairs (NIUA) activity, which entailed research in public administration and municipal development.

Ten of the 11 highest-rated TASP activities were in the economic growth program component. However, activities associated with economic growth alone cannot be classified as successful solely on that basis.

Table 3 classifies the 21 TASP activities according to the predominant mode of implementation, or method: policy analysis and research, technical assistance, or training. Training has been broadly defined to include seminars, dissemination, and educational (academic) exchanges. As in other aspects of TASP, there is great diversity in the methods employed. Of the 21 activities, 6 have been predominantly analytically oriented, 9 predominantly training oriented, and 6 focused on the provision of technical assistance. The 6 policy analysis activities have been predominantly in the area of economic policy (all but 1 are or were in the economic growth component); the sixth, NIUA, was a policy analysis and institutional-strengthening activity in public administration. It was completed in 1993.

TABLE 2
TASP ACTIVITY BY USAID PROGRAM COMPONENT

ECONOMIC GROWTH		ENVIRONMENT		OTHER	
Name	Method	Name	Method	Name	Method
IFPRI	Policy Analysis	SMF	Training	WFP	Technical Assistance
IESC-I	Technical Assistance	HIID	Training	STF	Training
ICRIER	Policy Analysis	AWTP	Technical Assistance	NIUA	Institutional Strengthening
Kellogg	Training				
SHCIL	Technical Assistance				
FICCI	Training				
Berkeley	Training				
DT	Training				
Salzburg	Training				
IIFT	Policy Analysis				
ICEG	Training				
IRIS	Policy Analysis				
IFMR	Policy Analysis				
SEBI	Technical Assistance				
IESC-II	Technical Assistance				
TOTALS:					
15	5 Policy Analysis 4 Technical Assistance 6 Training	3	0 Policy Analysis 1 Technical Assistance 2 Training	3	1 Policy Analysis 1 Technical Assistance 1 Training

TABLE 3
TASP ACTIVITY BY METHOD

POLICY ANALYSIS		TRAINING*		TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	
Name	Program Component	Name	Program Component	Name	Program Component
IFPRI	Econ. (Ag. Policy)	STF	Other (Science & Tech.)	IESC-I	Econ.
NIUA**	Other (Pub. Adm.)	SMF	Env.	WFP	Other (Pop./Dev. Mgmt.)
ICRIER	Econ.	Kellogg	Econ.	SHCIL	Econ.
IIFT	Econ.	FICCI	Econ.	SEBI	Econ.
IRIS	Econ.	Berkeley	Econ.	IESC-II	Econ.
IFMR	Econ.	HIID	Env.	AWTP	Env.
		DT	Econ.		
		Salzburg	Econ.		
		ICEG	Econ.		
TOTALS:					
6	5 Econ. 0 Env. 1 Other	9	6 Econ. 2 Env. 1 Other (S&T)	6	4 Econ. 1 Env. 1 Other (Food Policy)

* Training includes seminars, dissemination, and academic exchanges.

** Institutional strengthening activity.

Six of the nine training activities are in the economic growth program component, including the completed four small training activities (Berkeley, Harvard, Salzburg, and Kellogg). One of the economic training activities is the Development Management Training (DT) activity, which provides short-term training in a variety of economic and business issues in the United States. International Center for Economic Growth (ICEG) is classified as training because its primary function is the provision of distinguished speakers for economic policy conferences and discussions. FICCI, also classified under training activities, is disseminating information on economic reforms to its membership. One small activity, by the SMF, is included in the environment program component under training, and one, the STF, in the "other" program component category.

Four of the six technical assistance activities are in the economic growth program component, including the two IESC grants, which provided technical assistance to individual enterprises. Two other activities, those of SEBI and the Stock Holding Corporation of India (SHCIL), provided technical assistance to the capital markets in Bombay, and are also classified as a part of the economic growth portfolio. The remaining technical assistance activities are those by the WFP, and the technical assistance to the AWTP, which is classified as part of the environment program component.

The policy analysis activities and the technical assistance activities tended to score higher than the training activities. This is partly because many of the latter, with the notable exception of the educational exchanges, were of short duration. Activities of shorter duration tended to score lower in the overall ratings.

Table 4 is a comprehensive list of the TASP activities by the order which grants were approved. The table also provides grant dates and duration, the grant amount, the corresponding USAID program component, and the impact cluster. (The impact cluster will be discussed separately under "Measurement of Impact," later in this section.)

The chronology of TASP activities breaks naturally into three stages:

- **Stage 1, Pre-economic Reform** (September 30, 1988-April 1, 1991). Stage 1 occurred from the project's inception in September 1988 until just before the time economic reforms were announced in June 1991. Stage 1 was dominated by large activities, which are described more fully in the Project Paper.
- **Stage 2, Early Economic Reform** (November 14, 1991-January 25, 1993). Stage 2 occurred soon after India's economic liberalization program was announced. Stage 2 was characterized by short-term training activities with a focus on dissemination of information regarding the economic liberalization process.
- **Stage 3, Later Economic Reform** (June 23, 1993-January 1, 1994). Stage 3 began when the last grant was approved, and was dominated by activities with an economic growth policy focus. Stage 3 activities make up the bulk of the portfolio.

TABLE 4
CHRONOLOGY OF TASP ACTIVITIES

Chron.	Activity	Grant Date (Start/End Months)	Grant Amount \$	Status	Method/USAID Program Component	Impact Group
STAGE 1						
1.	International Food Policy Research Institute/Indian Center for Agricultural Research (IFPRI/ICAR)	09/30/88 - 12/31/94 75	2,215,000	O	Research/Economic; Agriculture/Policy	1
2.	International Executive Service Corps I (IESC I)	07/30/90 - 12/31/93 41	1,478,000	C	TA/ Economic	1
3.	Indo-U.S. Science and Technology Fellowship (STF)	02/04/91 - 12/23/94 46	3,000,000	O	Exchange/HRD/Other; Science and Technology	2
4.	National Institute of Urban Affairs (NIUA)	03/15/91 - 06/30/93 27	208,000	C	Research/Other; Public Administration	1
5.	World Food Programme (WFP)	04/01/91 - 03/31/96 60	375,000	O	TA/Other/Food Aid; Development Mgmt.	2
STAGE 2						
6.	Sankat Mochan Foundation (SMF)	11/14/91 - 03/31/92 04	45,000	C	Training/ Environment	2
7.	Indian Council for Research on International Economic Relations (ICRIER)	01/22/92 - 06/30/94 29	475,000	O	Research/ Economic	1
8.	J.L. Kellogg Graduate School of Management, Northwestern Univ.	04/12/92 - 04/17/92 .25	26,000	C	Training/ Economic	2
9.	Stock Holding Corporation of India (SHCIL)	04/20/92 - 02/19/93 10	1,023,000	C	TA/ Economic	1
10.	Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry (FICCI)	06/11/92 - 12/31/94 30	1,137,000	O	Training/ Economic	1
11.	University of California, Berkeley	12/08/92 - 12/15/92 .25	17,500	C	Training/ Economic	2
12.	Harvard Institute for International Development (HIID)	01/05/93 - 01/10/93 .25	12,900	C	Training/ Environment	2

TABLE 4 -- Continued

CHRON	ACTIVITY	GRANT DATE Start/End months	GRANT AMOUNT \$	Status	METHOD/USAID PROGRAM COMPONENT	IMPACT GROUP
13.	Development Management Training	01/93 - 12/94 24	900,000	O	Training/ Economic	2
14.	Salzburg Seminar	01/25/93 - 01/30/93 .25	9,000	C	Training/ Economic	2
STAGE 3						
15.	Indian Institute of Foreign Trade (IIFT)	06/23/93 - 06/22/95 24	228,000	O	Research/ Economic	1
16.	International Center for Economic Growth (ICEG)	08/23/93 - 08/22/95	579,000	O	Training/ Economic	1
17.	Institutional Reform and the Informal Sector (IRIS)	09/30/93 - 11/30/94 14	307,000	O	Research/ Economic	1
18.	Institute for Financial Management and Research (IFMR)	09/30/93 - 06/22/95 30	118,000	O	Research/ Economic	1
19.	Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI)	09/30/93 - 10/30/93 01	50,000	C	TA/ Economic	1
20.	International Executive Service Corps II (IESC II)	11/15/93 - 12/31/94 13	719,000	O	TA/ Economic	1
21.	Automated Water Treatment Plant (AWTP)	01/01/94 - 06/30/96 30	1,200,000	O	TA/ Environment	2

• STAT'IS

C = Completed

O = Ongoing

Stage 1: Pre-Economic Reform (September 30, 1988-April 1, 1991)

Four of the five Stage 1 activities are referred to in the Project Paper, those by IFPRI, IESC I, STF, and WFP. The fifth activity, NIUA, was a continuation of an activity previous financed under another USAID mechanism. Three of the five original activities are still current (IFPRI, STF, and WFP), with a fourth, IESC I, having been refinanced under a separate TASP activity as IESC II.

Stage 1 activities can be characterized as the largest and most diverse of the three stages, and are the least congruent with current USAID program strategy. The five activities totaled \$7.4 million in grant authorizations, or 53 percent of total authorizations, averaging \$1.48 million each. The activities were evenly spread by method, including two research activities, two technical assistance activities, and one training activity. No two of the five activities were in the same program component: The IFPRI research study is in agricultural policy, IESC I was technical assistance in economic growth, NIUA was research in public administration, WFP is technical assistance in food aid, and STF is an exchange program in science and technology.

Stage 1 comprises a predetermined set of activities (none of which was large enough for a separate project) that were in need of a method of implementation. TASP emerged as a likely mechanism, and the start of the project was dominated by the establishment of these activities. However, the activities developed as nearly full-blown projects, if not in financial terms, certainly in terms of duration and accumulated management time. Little thought appears to have gone into a strategy for TASP in terms of either program component or method. It seems that at this point TASP was regarded solely as an implementation mechanism.

Stage 2: Early Economic Reform: (November 14, 1991-January 25, 1993)

The nine Stage 2 activities were dominated by seven training activities, including the four small training activities (Berkeley, Harvard, Salzburg, and Kellogg) and those of SMF, FICCI, and DT. The group also included a research activity by the Indian Council for Research on International Economic Relations (ICRIER) and a technical assistance activity by SHCIL. Excluding the four smallest training activities, the grant funding amounts ranged from \$45,000 for the SMF to \$1.14 million for FICCI's training, for a total of \$3.74 million or 27 percent of grant authorizations. The average grant size (excluding the four smallest) was \$735,000. The activities were clustered around the economic growth program component, with seven activities related to economic or commercial interventions. Two activities, those of SMF and Harvard, were in the environment program component. Of the nine activities, two (by FICCI and DT) are current.

The Stage 2 activities can be characterized as being very diverse in their scope and overall developmental impact. The short-duration, low-cost activities such as those of Kellogg, Berkeley, and Salzburg permitted a limited number of government officials and businessmen to participate in international seminars. Although they may have been valuable to the individuals, it is difficult to attribute widespread attitudinal change in the government and business sectors to these activities. The policy analysis and research programs with ICRIER and FICCI had much greater impact. These important interventions with a leading research institute and leading business association helped embark the GOI and USAID on a collaborative effort in jointly promoting economic liberalization.

The technical assistance delivered to SHCIL appears to have been especially successful in terms of its quality and its impact on future programming in the economic growth program component.

Significantly, the incubator concept originally designed in TASP emerged more fully as the SHCIL activity eventually led to the development of the FIRE project. It is worthy to note that the NIUA is also involved in the FIRE project. The NIUA was one of the first activities undertaken under TASP, so the antecedents of TASP as an incubator can be traced to the beginning of the project.

Stage 3: Later Economic Reform (June 23, 1993-January 1, 1994)

In Stage 3, TASP seems to have decided what it wanted to do. In this period, TASP began the transition from a mechanism to a technical project. The seven activities conducted during this stage were characterized by their emphasis on the economic program component, with only one, the AWTP, falling outside that area into the environmental program component. Stage 3 used a mix of methods, with three activities — Institutional Reform and the Informal Sector (IRIS), one by the Institute for Financial Management and Research (IFMR), and one by the Indian Institute of Foreign Trade (IIFT) falling under research — and three, those of SEBI, and IESC and the AWTP, falling under technical assistance. Stage 3 included one training activity, that by ICEG.

Stage 3 activities totaled \$2.64 million, or 19 percent of grant authorizations, with a range from the smallest (SEBI) at \$50,000 to the largest (AWTP) at \$1.2 million, for an average of \$377,000 per activity. This is the smallest average among the three stages. Six of the activities are ongoing, with only the SEBI technical assistance activity having been completed.

MEASUREMENT OF IMPACT

Beyond the Project Paper's stated goal for TASP — to improve the GOI's ability to implement its development plan — no other performance or impact indicators are suggested in the Project Paper or in subsequent project documents. In the absence of predetermined performance or impact indicators, what is at best a subjective process of evaluation quickly recedes into the realm of speculation about what TASP was supposed to achieve, and about the utility of what the project did achieve. Not having a baseline, the evaluation team used the redirected TASP goal, as stated in PIL No. 29: "Future TASP Support," dated November 3, 1992, and addressed to the Deputy Secretary of the DEA. This goal advocated support for the GOI's "policy and institutional reforms in the economic and financial sectors." The evaluation team, with the approval of the USAID Mission, adopted this policy redirection as the basis for developing evaluation indicators with which to measure TASP's success.

As noted earlier, the TASP portfolio includes a wide range of activities cutting across several program sectors and employing a variety of implementation methods. This diversity in activities created an assortment of intended impacts that differ from one another in ease and specificity of measurement. For example, in the case of the AWTP, the measurement of the number of gallons of water treated and the cost of treatment per gallon can be mathematically derived, but in ICEG's activity, the awareness created by the distinguished speaker series defies quantitative measurement.

For each TASP activity, the evaluation team ascertained the perceptions of key people involved to develop an impact index. The team also consulted pertinent reports and deliverables. The resulting index is qualitative and is intended to provide a subjective analysis of what has been done under TASP so far. By more fully understanding what has happened, the evaluators hope to suggest appropriate future steps.

The evaluation team developed the following impact indicators to apply to each of the TASP activities:

- **Effectiveness in support of policy and institutional reform**

This indicator measures (a) whether the policy analysis or research conducted under an activity contributed to the grantee's ability to analyze or recommend economic reform policies; (b) whether the technical assistance provided identified or tested economic policy reforms; and (c) whether the training provided strengthened key individuals' or groups' perceptions or economic policy reform. Activities were rated against their principal method of implementation (see Table 5). A positive impact suggests the findings of the activity have validity and are generally accepted.

- **Influence on target groups**

This indicator measures whether the results of the activity have reached key decision makers, and whether the decision makers have reacted to the findings. A positive impact suggests that key government and private sector decision makers have reviewed and accepted the results, conclusions, or findings of an activity.

- **Sustainability of the activity**

This indicator measures the likelihood of the nature of the activity continuing after the grant expires, by assessing whether the grantee or collaborator will continue to work in the same or a related field or subject area. Awareness creation and opinion building efforts require sustained effort. A positive impact suggests that the subject matter of the activity will be advanced by the grantee or another institution.

- **Capacity building within the grantee**

This indicator measures the degree to which the grantee has been strengthened through the acquisition of skills, knowledge, staff, or technology. A positive impact indicates that the grantee has benefited and has been strengthened institutionally from the activity.

- **Collaboration with U.S. institutions**

This indicator measures whether a successful "twinning" occurred with a U.S. institution during the activity. It determines whether a lasting institutional or individual relationship was established and built with a U.S. collaborator. A positive impact suggests a successful and lasting institutional relationship.

Table 5 provides the impact ratings for each individual TASP activity. Each of the activities, grouped by whether they are completed or ongoing, was ranked by the evaluators in each of the above five categories. A three-point scale was used, with "0" indicating little or no impact, "1" indicating doubtful or limited impact, and "2" indicating positive impact. A total score, with a possible range from 0 to 10, is indicated in the total column. Some caveats are in order concerning this methodology: As often stated in this report, TASP has no predetermined impact or performance indicators, and its 21 heterogeneous activities vary significantly whether classified by size, duration, program component, or

implementation method employed. In light of these circumstances, any evaluation methodology to be applied to the activities and project is suspect.

The evaluation ratings are highly qualitative, based on the subjective findings of the evaluators after discussing the activities with USAID managers and both Indian and American participants. The ratings depend in large part on the "fit" and contribution of the activity to a larger body of work dedicated to the promotion of sustainable economic growth. Thus, the ratings are not meant to indicate the need, utility, or management performance of an individual activity, but are more an indicator of the appropriateness of the activity to attaining the strategic technical goal of promoting economic growth, as set forward in 1991. The Evaluation SOW specifically asked for a historical perspective on TASP and a review of its activities to determine exactly what has been done over six years. This information is meant to help plan TASP's future.

Table 6 lists TASP activities by overall impact ranking based on their attainment of the strategic goal of promoting economic growth. The table divides the 21 activities into two groups. Group One includes 11 activities with an impact rating of 7 or above, indicating positive overall impact. Group Two contains 10 activities with a score of 4 or under, indicating less overall impact. Impact ratings by grant size are inconclusive: although the 5 smallest activities are in Group Two, so are the 2 largest. This does indicate, however, that in terms of sustainable impact, short, one-time seminars contribute little unless they are highly targeted, with strong follow-on activities. This grouping also shows that large grants do not necessarily make large impacts. Economic growth activities dominate Group Two, but 66 percent of all TASP activities were in the economic growth area, so a focus on economic growth is not necessarily an indicator that an activity will have high impact either. The method employed is evenly spread through both groups and also is inconclusive as an impact indicator.

Table 6 adds another category of classification of TASP activities that is significant and that perhaps can be taken as an indicator of higher-potential impact. The category is "selection method," and refers to how the activity came to be implemented under TASP. Under this category, the word "implementation" refers to an activity that was first conceived and developed and then implemented under TASP because TASP was a convenient mechanism for implementation. The word "technical" in Table 6 refers to an activity that was knowingly designed and implemented as an activity to be implemented specifically under TASP. The difference is subtle, but telling. Technical activities constitute 9 of the 11 higher-impact activities, whereas implementation activities make up all 10 of the lower-impact activities. The reasons for this are unclear. It may be that the technical activities have a closer strategic fit with USAID development strategy. Perhaps the technical activities benefited from having a "champion" — one person or technical office that assumed ownership of the activity and guided it from conception to implementation. Alternatively, perhaps the management lines in technical activities are more direct, with less coordination involved. Furthermore, implementation activities were often imposed on TASP, and often have had no synergistic linkage to other TASP activities.

TABLE 5
TASP IMPACT RATING SHEET

Activity		Effectiveness in policy and institutional reform	Influence on target groups	Sustainability of the activity	Capacity building within the grantee	Collaboration with a U.S. institution	Total	Comments
1.	<u>Completed</u> SMF	0	1	1	0	0	2	very small; no follow-on
2.	HIID	0	1	0	0	0	1	small; no follow-on
3.	Berkeley	0	1	0	0	0	1	small; no follow-on
4.	Kellogg	0	1	0	0	1	2	small; no attribution
5.	Salzburg	0	0	0	0	0	0	small; no follow-on
6.	NIUA	2	1	2	2	1	8	good results
7.	SHCIL	2	2	2	2	1	9	positive TA
8.	IESC I	1	2	2	1	1	7	needs more focus & better communication
9.	<u>Current</u> ICRIER	1	2	2	2	2	9	good institution & effectiveness
10.	IFPRI	1	1	1	1	0	4	disappointing result
11.	WFP	1	1	0	2	0	4	not a good fit with redirected TASP
12.	DT	1	2	0	0	1	4	little institutional dev.
13.	STF	0	2	1	0	0	3	little institutional dev.
14.	FICCI	2	2	2	2	0	8	needs better communication
15.	IIFT	2	2	2	2	2	10	positive activity
16.	AWTP	0	1	1	1	0	3	not a good fit with redirected TASP
17.	ICEG	2	2	2	1	2	9	widely acclaimed
18.	IRIS	2	2	1	1	1	7	collaboration needs strengthening
19.	IFMR	1	1	2	2	1	7	needs further attention
20.	SEBI	1	2	2	2	0	7	positive TA
21.	IESC II	1	2	2	1	1	7	needs more focus and better TA

Notes and Explanations

- 0 = little or no impact
1 = doubtful or limited impact
2 = positive impact

TABLE 6
IMPACT INDICATOR OF TASP ACTIVITIES

Rating	Project	Grant Amount \$	Status	Program Component	Method	Selection Method
GROUP ONE						
10	IIFT *	228,000	O	Economic	PA	Technical
9	ICRIER	475,000	O	Economic	PA	Technical
9	SHCIL	1,023,000	C	Economic	TA	Technical
9	ICEG *	579,000	O	Economic	Training/ DIS	Technical
8	FICCI	1,137,000	O	Economic	Training/ DIS	Technical
8	NIUA	208,000	C	Public Admn.	PA	Implementation
7	IRIS	307,000	O	Economic	PA	Technical
7	IESC I	1,478,000	C	Economic	TA	Implementation
7	IESC II	719,000	O	Economic	TA	Technical
7	IFMR *	118,000	O	Economic	PA	Technical
7	SEBI	50,000	C	Economic	TA	Technical
GROUP TWO						
4	IFPRI	2,215,000	O	Agr. Policy	PA	Implementation
4	WFP *	375,000	O	Food Policy (Dev. Mgmt.)	TA	Implementation
3	AWTP *	1,200,000	O	Environment	TA	Implementation
3	STF	3,000,000	O	Science & Tech.	TR/ (Exchange)	Implementation
2	DT	900,000	O	Economic	TR/ (Exchange)	Implementation
2	Kellogg	26,000	C	Economic	TR/Seminar	Implementation
2	SMF	45,000	C	Environment	TR/Seminar	Implementation
1	HIID	13,000	C	Environment	TR/Seminar	Implementation
1	Berkeley	17,500	C	Economic	TR/Seminar	Implementation
1	Salzburg	9,000	C	Economic	TR/Seminar	Implementation
TOTAL						

USAID TASP MANAGEMENT

Organization

TASP poses several challenges to USAID management. Although TASP represents less than 5 percent of the total dollar authorization of the USAID project portfolio, it has consumed a disproportionate amount of management time and effort. As an implementation vehicle spanning the technical offices of USAID/India, TASP has developed layers of management not required by more traditional technical projects. Since the diversity of TASP activities has been beyond the technical capacity of any one Project Officer, TASP has required several activity managers to oversee its activities. The activity managers in turn have hailed from several technical offices, with each manager reflecting the interests and management style of his or her office. Furthermore, TASP activity managers have been caught between a technical director and the TASP Project Officer, often having to report the same information twice. They often find directions unclear as to who gets what and how much information concerning the activity. These errors of duplication or omission are difficult to avoid and overcome without a concerted effort at coordination, like that required in a matrix mode of organization.

Organizational matrix systems work best in "flat" hierarchies in which there is a clearly defined goal that is understood and implemented by the staff. Yet, TASP does not yet have a clearly defined and accepted strategy, which muddles attempts to implement a matrix organization for the project. Management and monitoring of TASP activities consume disproportionate amounts of time because activity managers, technical office directors, and the TASP Project Officer may each have a different vision of how the project or one of its activities should be implemented; what the reporting requirements are; and how, why, and when data, results, and problems should be reported. It is not entirely clear where the decision to implement an activity, management responsibility, and problem-solving authority ultimately rest.

One additional factor compounds TASP managers' difficulty in managing their time efficiently: 21 activities have been assigned to 19 different grantees, plus myriad U.S. and local collaborators, placing a burden on the contracts and financial offices. These offices are often unsure of where relevant information is held; they are unsure whether to contact the Project Officer or the activity manager for information. Even a small TASP grant of \$100,000 can consume large blocks of time for several managers within the technical and administrative offices of the Mission.

Several alternatives for reducing management time are viable, depending on the ultimate strategic direction of TASP. If the option of moving TASP into a technically oriented project is selected, the number of technical offices involved can eventually be reduced to one. This will decrease the required number of technical activity managers and their directors, making coordination of all activities much easier. In some activities, the TASP Project Officer could double as both the technical activity manager and the project administrator. The Project Officer, as administrator, could collect and monitor administrative reports, ranging from those that measure project performance and impact to those that review the matching grant contribution. In this role, the Project Officer would serve as the single point of contact with the contracts and accounting offices.

Grants and Grantees

Lost in the turmoil and debate surrounding TASP, its purpose, and how it is managed are the individual grantees. Nearly all of the local, Indian grantees are new to the USAID system. They are unsure of how to respond to grant applications, how to administer USAID grants, what is expected of them, and how to interpret the signposts in USAID's bureaucratic system. Indian institutions are not strangers to bureaucracy, they simply have not yet learned how to understand and speak the language of the USAID bureaucracy. As a result, they are confused by the system, are reluctant to get fully involved, misunderstand the system, and are misunderstood. If the grants are to continue and to achieve maximum efficiency and impact, greater effort should be expended to manage the grant application process and implementation.

Management of the grant process should be centralized under one person, either the technical office director or the TASP Project Officer, who can serve as a "marketeer" of TASP and handle client relations. This outreach effort would identify potential grantees and potential areas of involvement for future TASP activities. Although time certainly would be required to begin this type of activity, subsequent grant and grantee management time could therein be reduced through better understanding of the process. Time-saving measures could thus be employed from the beginning. These could include descriptive requests for grant applications that provide thorough details on what is involved in winning and implementing a grant. Grant application seminars could be implemented to reach several potential grantees at once.

SECTION THREE

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

FINDINGS

Project Goal, Purpose, and Focus

1. The core of the debate over TASP is whether the project should continue as an implementation vehicle or evolve into a technical project with its own defined objectives.
2. The stronger collaborative relationship between the GOI and USAID in 1994 than in 1988 gives rise to a need to update and sharpen the objective of TASP. The goal and purpose of TASP in the 1988 Project Paper were designed to correspond to the GOI-USAID relationship and the USAID operational strategy of USAID/India of the 1980s.
3. The goal, purpose, and objectives articulated in the original Project Paper are ambitious and broad. They reflect a trend in the 1980s to have large, loosely defined implementation projects that could be shaped by Missions or implementers.
4. TASP's flexibility as an implementation vehicle has allowed it to respond to changes in direction in the GOI and to accommodate a USAID/India strategic component — promoting economic growth — that was unimaginable at the time the project was designed and implemented.
5. The informal decision to focus TASP on technical issues, primarily economic growth, is rational and is in many ways a natural evolution based on four factors:
 - The GOI's economic liberalization policy;
 - The comparative advantage USAID has in working with free-market systems;
 - The USAID/India project portfolio featuring an economic growth component through 2000 and;
 - A trend in USAID toward better-defined projects and narrower objectives.
6. TASP was redirected in 1991 toward a technical goal of promoting economic growth; however, it still lacks specific technical objectives and a strategy for achieving them.
7. TASP has demonstrated its potential as an "incubator" — that is, as a relatively low-risk method of testing project ideas or potential collaborators before they are incorporated or relied on in a full-fledged project.
8. TASP has provided USAID/India with the rare opportunity to develop direct linkages with Indian institutions, thereby improving the overall collaborative relationship among the United States, the GOI, and indigenous groups, as well as improving USAID's knowledge of India.

Previous Page Blank

9. TASP has suffered from the negative trade-off between implementation flexibility and technical focus. The lack of a clearly defined technical component and identity leads to misperceptions, uncertainties, and criticism, especially in an era in which USAID resources are under review and are being reallocated.

Project Progress and Accomplishments

1. TASP has funded 21 heterogeneous activities by program component and method for a total of \$13.9 million from inception in 1988 through January 1994. The funding range was from \$9,000 to \$3 million (average \$606,000), and the duration from 2 days to 76 months (average 28 months).
2. TASP activities have included an equally diverse mix in terms of strategic program component and method.
3. TASP implementation has fallen into three distinct periods:

Stage 1, Pre-Reform (September 30, 1988-April 1, 1991), was strictly implementational and without a specific technical direction. Large diverse activities were funded.

Stage 2, Early Reform (November 14, 1991-January 25, 1993), saw the emergence of the technical approach to economic growth. Training and dissemination activities predominated.

Stage 3, Later Reform (June 23, 1993-January 1, 1994), was focused primarily on technical issues of policy analysis and technical assistance in support of economic growth.
4. TASP has been extremely valuable in helping disseminate new concepts regarding both economic liberalization and Indo-U.S. collaboration on development.
5. Comparative studies, including policy analyses and outside speakers, are valuable for the dissemination of broad concepts but require an Indian context and institutional ownership to be effective.
6. The overall project and many of its activities suffer from "the capital syndrome," the tendency to focus policy analysis, technical assistance, training, and dissemination on New Delhi, Bombay, and Calcutta.
7. Many of the seminars, conferences, workshops, and dissemination efforts "preach to the choir," or convene the same group of people who are already knowledgeable and in favor of economic liberalization.
8. Several Indian grantees perceive that USAID steers the results of policy analysis toward a predetermined outcome and that the work is not objective.

Project Selection of Activities and Grantees

1. Within the Mission there is uncertainty as to what type of activities are appropriate to fund under TASP, how they will be selected, how they will be managed, and what their overall objectives should be.
2. There is considerable lack of knowledge among both U.S. and Indian institutions as to the purpose of TASP, the type of proposals that will be funded, the evaluation criteria, and the award process.
3. As an implementation mechanism, TASP has not had exclusive control over the choice of activities to fund. Many activities — from its first five in 1988 to the AWTP in January 1994 — have been conceived elsewhere and given to TASP for implementation or "lodged" with TASP.
4. Approximately 50 percent by number and nearly 79 percent by dollar volume of TASP activities have been lodged implementations. The other 50 percent can be considered technical activities of TASP.
5. The activities that have been developed as technical activities by TASP have tended to have higher scores on the impact rating, possibly because of more clearly defined management responsibilities and the presence of a "project champion" that followed the activity from conception to implementation.
6. Many Indian grantees believe that detailed proposal guidelines and evaluation criteria are not made available to institutions seeking grants under TASP.

Project Activity Monitoring and Management

1. TASP is rather small in funding, but makes a disproportionate demand on Mission management time and effort.
2. TASP activities are dispersed across USAID strategic components, requiring an activity manager for each activity in addition to the Project Officer. Management input from Contracts and Accounting is required in the selection, approval, and monitoring of each of the activities.
3. The monitoring and management functions related to the collection of tangible outputs, the tracking of matching contributions, the measurement of performance and impact indicators, and management assistance to the grantee are inconsistent from activity to activity.
4. The cross-office nature of TASP, with activities spread among offices and strategic components, makes management, administration, and monitoring difficult. Many people are involved in the collection of different but related, and sometimes overlapping, information.
5. Many activities lack performance and impact indicators to measure progress toward objectives. The absence of these indicators, or the development of them after activities have been started, makes the management, monitoring, and evaluation less effective.

Project Direction and Strategy

1. As an implementation project, TASP did not have a clear programmatic strategy; however, a strategy focused on the promotion of economic growth and reform is now emerging as TASP becomes more technically oriented.
2. TASP should continue to use a variety of methods to achieve the strategy, including policy research and analysis, technical assistance, training, and dissemination.
3. Until now, much of the work done under TASP to promote economic growth has focused on discussion and dissemination of liberalization policies. As the reform process matures, more emphasis should be on the development of specific policies addressing key issues.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Project Goal, Purpose, and Focus

1. If TASP is to move from an implementation mechanism to a technical project, it should have a project strategy that includes specific objectives, financial and management resource requirements, implementation period, and impact indicators. The strategy for TASP should also include projections for the number and size of the activities to be extended and funded.
2. TASP should continue to focus its resources on the Mission strategic component of Promoting Economic Growth by funding activities that combine policy analysis, technical assistance at the operational level through work with business associations and enterprises, and training and dissemination activities for key public and private sector personnel.
3. TASP should be extended beyond its PACD of September 30, 1996, with an increase in the authorized funding if two conditions are met: (a) the project clearly defines technical goals, and (b) the project formulates a strategy and implementation plan that more precisely define the activities to be funded. The funding amount should be dependent on the financial and management resources required based on the number, size, and type of current activities that will be extended and the number of new activities that will be funded.
4. The new TASP strategy should also work to identify key institutions, issues, and methods of collaboration that will be employed in subsequent activities.

Project Progress and Accomplishments

1. TASP could increase its overall effectiveness by establishing a clearer direction and sense of purpose, and by better explaining its role to both its clients and USAID/India.
2. TASP should improve its client relationships by working to establish closer ties to the institutions that are receiving grants. These institutions are unaccustomed to working with USAID, and USAID experience with them is limited. The communication channel between TASP and these "clients" has to be widened to overcome misperceptions on both sides. More site visits should be made.

3. TASP should begin to define proactively the size, duration, purpose, and impact of the next project activities.
4. In the TASP economic growth activities, the emphasis should shift from discussion of economic liberalization to more narrowly defined areas of reform and potential impact. Dissemination efforts should be broadened to reach a larger population than the government and business elite.

Project Selection of Activities and Grantees

1. Determine the internal course TASP will take, either to remain as an implementation mechanism or to continue to evolve into a technical project, and develop a clear set of operational guidelines regarding project selection and implementation to reduce confusion and improve operating efficiency.
2. Publicize the availability of TASP grants to selected U.S. research institutes and PVOs, who will then identify Indian collaborative institutions.
3. Define the preferred sector, institutions, and methods to be employed in successful TASP applications. Prepare the evaluation criteria and a transparent grantee selection process and schedule, and publicize them.
4. TASP should develop proposal guidelines and evaluation criteria that include an overview of TASP objectives, budget guidance, required reporting, and implementation plan and schedule. Priority should be given to activities that:
 - Build capacity in a local institution;
 - Contribute to sustainability either in ongoing nature of the work or in the generation of subsequent independent work;
 - Include a collaboration plan between a U.S. and an Indian institution;
 - Have a high degree of compatibility between the activity selected and the Indian institution being asked to implement it;
 - Have the ability to reach and influence key target groups; and
 - Have the ability to translate policy analysis into firm recommendations that support policy or institutional reform.

Project Activity Monitoring and Management

1. The Project Officer should maintain responsibility for the assembly of cumulative project data and serve as a single point of contact for other parts of the Mission.
2. The Project Officer should be responsible for the request for proposals, the evaluation, and the award. His or her role should be one of project promoter and marketer. More site visits should be made.

3. Activity managers should have technical oversight and the authority and responsibility to ensure that the activity proceeds as expected. Clear lines of responsibility, authority, and reporting have to be established to reduce the redundancy of management and improve the flow of information. Better project ownership has to be generated.
4. Management time in the approval and selection process can be decreased by adopting strategies that include the following:
 - Making consecutive grants to institutions;
 - Collaborating directly with U.S. institutions that are required to find Indian partners;
 - Developing subcontractors to select and audit local institutions; and
 - Marketing the project by conducting proposal preparation courses for prospective grantees.
5. Project management should more closely monitor and systematize matching grant contributions made by local grantees to ensure that the 25 percent overall project match component, as mandated by law, is being met.

Project Direction and Strategy

TASP should identify key areas in economic growth to address through targeted activity interventions that are supportive of USAID strategy and that address specific constraints, issues, or problems introduced by the economic liberalization process. A partial list of relevant topics follows:

- Achieving economic growth with equity: the fair distribution of economic benefits by state, sector, and class.
- Redefining the roles of the public and private sectors and their interaction as the political economy becomes more market and globally oriented.
- Exploring issues of privatization: what, how, and when should central and sub-central entities be privatized?
- Exploring the social costs of reform, especially redundant employees of government, and exit policy for public and private enterprises.
- Determining the effects of globalization on domestic industries, the legal system, and the financial system.
- Identifying relevant sectoral issues and their impact on the overall economy. Such issues include
 - Technology;
 - Environment;
 - Small-scale enterprises;
 - Banking and financial system;
 - Infrastructure; and
 - Trade and foreign direct investment.

SECTION FOUR

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The core question regarding TASP is whether the project should continue as an implementation mechanism or as a technical project. In either case, a strategy and implementation plan to guide the project should be developed. On the basis of this project strategy and plan, a rational determination could be made for future funding levels and project extensions.

TASP has successfully used its flexibility as an implementation mechanism to adapt to changes in the GOI and the USAID relationship and in the USAID program strategy. The informal decision to focus TASP on technical issues concerning the GOI's economic liberalization program is a rational decision based on USAID/India's strategy and comparative advantage in the development of free-market systems. The impact analysis in Section Two indicates that TASP activities managed as technical activities focusing on the economic growth and liberalization component tended to have higher developmental impact. However, TASP implementation is still burdened by the lack of a formal strategy statement, clear objectives, and an agreed on course of action for achieving them.

In the absence of a formal strategy, Mission debate regarding TASP has flourished. The appropriateness or inappropriateness of activities and their fit to TASP and the Mission, the methods of implementation, the grant size and duration, the management resource demands and responsibility, and the performance and impact of activities are all debated on the basis of the sketchy guidance provided in the Project Paper. These issues are unresolved and will remain unresolved and consume management resources until a strategy is in place.

With the completion of the midterm evaluation, the way is now clear for the technical office and the Project Director to develop a more focused project strategy and implementation plan. Assuming the technical approach is accepted, the project strategy should deal with the issues raised in this evaluation, specifically those in the above paragraph. The strategy should strive to be as specific as possible in the identification of specific goals and issues to be addressed; the methods, grantees, and financial and management resources to be employed; and the measurement of the results achieved.

It is beyond the scope of this report to offer a complete project strategy. Those responsible for TASP have signaled that the project will henceforth work in the broad area of economic growth and economic liberalization. They must now develop a strategy based on the identification of what the project will accomplish, what resources will be utilized, and what the expected results will be. Some suggestions follow.

GOALS AND ISSUES

It is not sufficient to say only that TASP will address economic growth and liberalization issues. TASP directors should identify two or three important issues related to economic growth that the project has the capacity to affect. Financial and management resources should then be concentrated on them. Ideally, TASP strategy and objectives should be integrated with other Mission activity in promoting economic growth so that the overall impact of the project is maximized.

Possible issues on which to focus goals include the following:

- Achieving economic growth with equity;
- Redefining the role of the public sector in a free-market economy;
- Promoting privatization (specific sectors or issues);
- Investigating social costs of reform;
- Identifying effects of globalization; or
- Resolving the issues of redundant government employees.

METHODS

The target areas should be well defined, with a rationale that explains why they have been selected and how their inclusion will advance the overall objectives of USAID and TASP. Qualitative and quantitative objectives should be established for each of the project target areas. Clear objectives at this stage can serve the project well as a broad guideline for the selection of activities and grantees and the subsequent evaluation of performance and impact.

Following the development of obtainable objectives, a thoughtful implementation plan must be developed for the project. The best features of TASP as a flexible, experimental project can be maintained through funding of selected grantees with scopes of work that advance the project objectives, whatever methodology is used. The implementation plan would offer guidance as to the tools and processes that would be employed. A fertile area to address in the implementation plan is the preference for methodologies to be employed: is the project focus on policy analysis and research, technical assistance, and training, or on a combination of all three? The implementation plan could also address the question of the basic approach to implementing policy change. The project may want to experiment with influencing policy from the top down by working with research institutions to identify and implement policy change. The project may also want to test policy by assisting groups at the operational level through contacts with financial institutions, business associations, and industry groups.

In the implementation plan, questions regarding staffing and staff roles and responsibilities would be spelled out. Clearer definition of the roles of the Project Manager and the Activities Managers would make the project more efficient by eliminating both duplication and gaps in the management of activities.

To reduce the overall management burden of TASP, the strategy should include numerical targets for prospective activities, grantees, and funding amounts. Annual estimates of the number and level of activities would enable better forecasting of staff utilization of technical, contracting, and accounting staff to assist in the evaluation, award, and management of existing and new grants. The strategy and implementation plan would have to make assumptions about the number of ongoing and new grants that are possible to manage in the course of a year. For example, if \$12 million is available over the course of four years, and the average grant size is \$500,000, are staff resources available to develop and manage 24 new grants by 1998? This exercise would be invaluable for charting the course of TASP, as well as for providing a baseline to evaluate the project.

PERFORMANCE AND IMPACT

TASP, and individual activities carried out under it, should be managed with a clear set of performance and impact indicators in place. Performance indicators measure management and implementation of the project by tracking the various components of the overall project and activities. They include the easily observable measurements related to amount of funding, number of grants, level of effort, intended project inputs, project and activity deliverables, and project reports. Impact indicators require a more thoughtful approach. The impact indicators should be related to the goal and strategy of the project and the activities. The indicators should reflect what the project is designed to accomplish and how its success will be measured. The impact indicators developed for this evaluation can be a starting point. With a more narrowly focused activity and clearer objectives, sharper impact indicators could be developed to measure the results of the project.

GRANTEE MANAGEMENT

The TASP strategy and implementation plan should also address the recruitment, selection, award, and management of the grantees responsible for the implementation of the project. A marketing plan should be developed that would include the identification of prospective grantees, and their training in USAID grant application and management. Many of the current and most of the prospective grantees do not have a clear understanding of the application and award process. An outreach plan could be developed to include visits with and interviews of prospective grantees, and seminars to provide an overview of the grant application and award process. The early investment in time and resources would streamline the process and make for better working relationships between grantees and project management.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Deolalikar, B.R. *Potential Proposals for Supporting Implementation of GOI's New Economic Policies*. New Delhi: U.S. Agency for International Development/India, October 1991.
- Deolalikar, Bapu R. *TASP Strategy and Program Development*. New Delhi: U.S. Agency for International Development/India, March 1992.
- The East Asian Miracle: Economic Growth and Public Policy*. London: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Freundlich, Steven J. *Technical Assistance and Support Project (TASP), (386-0515), Project Agreement, dated August 31, 1988, Project Implementation Letter (PIL) No. 5: Basic Procedures*. New Delhi: U.S. Agency for International Development/India, October 3, 1989.
- Gupta, Madhumita. *Scope of Work: Mid-Term Evaluation Technical Assistance and Support Project (TASP: 386-0515)*. New Delhi, U.S. Agency for International Development/India.
- India Technical Assistance and Support Project Paper*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Agency for International Development Cooperation Agency/Agency for International Development/New Delhi, August 30, 1988.
- Joshi, Vijay and I.M.D. Little. *India: Macroeconomics and Political Economy, 1964 - 1991*. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank, 1994.
- Levy, Brian, et al. *Developing the Private Sector: The World Bank's Experience and Approach*. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank, 1991.
- Mahoney, Timothy M. *Technical Assistance and Support Project (TASP), (386-0515), Project Agreement, dated August 31, 1988, Project Implementation Letter (PIL) 29, Future TASP Support: Enhancement of training and revision in budget*. New Delhi: U.S. Agency for International Development/India, November 3, 1992.
- O'Rourke, Jon. *Message No. 1522*. New Delhi: U.S. Agency for International Development/India, April 7, 1994.
- Project Grant Agreement between the President of India and the United States of America for Technical Assistance and Support: A.I.D. Project No. 386-0515*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Agency for International Development Cooperation Agency/Agency for International Development/New Delhi, August 31, 1988.
- Status Report: TASP Project (386-0515)*. New Delhi: U.S. Agency for International Development/India, March 15, 1994.
- Tarter, Jerry D. "Technical Assistance and Support Project (TASP) 386-0515: Project Authorization Amendment to Increase Life of Project (LOP) by 3.0 Million". *Action Memorandum*. New Delhi: U.S. Agency for International Development/India, August 10, 1993.

Previous Page Blank

USAID India: Program Summary. New Delhi: U.S. Agency for International Development/India, January 1994.

USAID India: Strategic Framework, FY 1994-2000. New Delhi: U.S. Agency for International Development/India, December 1993.

ANNEX A

DESCRIPTIONS OF ALL TASP GRANTS

1.	Sankat Mochan Foundation	A-3
2.	Harvard Institute for International Development	A-4
3.	University of California, Berkeley	A-5
4.	J. L. Kellogg Graduate School of Management, Northwestern University	A-6
5.	Salzburg Seminar	A-7
6.	National Institute of Urban Affairs	A-8
7.	Stock Holding Corporation of India	A-10
8.	International Executive Service Corps	A-12
9.	Indian Council for Research on International Economic Relations	A-14
10.	International Food Policy Research Institute	A-15
11.	World Food Programme	A-16
12.	Indo-U.S. Scientific and Technical Fellowship Program	A-17
13.	Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry	A-19
14.	Indian Institute of Foreign Trade	A-20
15.	Government of India, Department of Electronics	A-21
16.	International Center for Economic Growth	A-22
17.	Institutional Reform and the Informal Sector (IRIS), University of Maryland	A-23
18.	Institute for Financial Management and Research (IFMIR)	A-24
19.	Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI)	A-25
20.	National Council of Applied Economic Research (NCAER)	A-26

1. GRANTEE: SANKAT MOCHAN FOUNDATION, VARANASI, INDIA

The Sankat Mochan Foundation is an Indian NGO campaigning for cleaning the pollution of the Ganges River. The director of SMF is a professor at Benares Hindu University.

Purpose: To conduct a seminar in Varanasi on pollution control of the Ganges River. The seminar will exam the present system of wastewater management and suggest a permanent solution to the problem of wastewater management in Varanasi and the Ganges River pollution. The seminar will provide a forum for technical consultation and discussion among Indian wastewater management experts, government officials, and specialists from the United States.

Method: The seminar will have 30-50 participants of various government and scientific backgrounds. They will address: 1) the technology, known as deep water system, for moving wastewater and stopping the flow into the Ganges; 2) examine and suggest techniques for storing, moving, or separating storm water from sewage during the monsoons; and 3) develop ideas for handling insufficient surface drainage in the city.

Collaborating Institutions: Friends of the Ganges, from Oakland, California.

Activity Period: 11/1/91- 3/31/92.

Inputs: TASP Funds, \$45,000.

Expected Outputs: 1) Written seminar report, 2) written policy recommendations concerning alternatives for stopping the flow of waste water into the Ganges at Varanasi, and 3) Development of a plan for a cleaner Ganges at Varanasi.

USAID Program Objective: Protecting the environment.

Impact: Impact as measured by the evaluation team appears minimal. There is little in the way of continuing USAID involvement and sustainability. In all probability, the attendees of the seminar engaged in serious discussion of the problem, but the scope and potential impact of this small, isolated, activity were far too small to be considered viable under the TASP Project.

**2. GRANTEE: HARVARD INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT:
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS, USA**

Harvard, one of the leading academic institutions in the United States is involved in international economic development through the Harvard Institute for International Development (HIID). HIID is involved in research and technical assistance worldwide on a variety of economic and public administrative issues.

Purpose: To organize a workshop on, "Urban Solid Waste Management," in New Delhi.

Collaborating Institutions: No others.

Activity Period: 1/5/93-1/10/93.

Inputs: \$13,000 TASP Funds.

Expected Outputs: Increased awareness through publication of proceedings.

USAID Program Objective: Protecting the Environment.

Follow-on Activity: There has been no follow-on activity.

Impact: There is no measurable impact. TASP involvement of \$13,000 with no further involvement and follow-on activity, no development of further collaborative institution relationships, combined with the enormity of the problem of urban waste management in New Delhi, indicate that TASP money and USAID management resources would be better applied in broader activities with stronger collaborative institutional relationships.

**3. GRANTEE: UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY
(U.S. UNIVERSITY)**

Purpose: To conduct a two-day Conference on "Economic Liberalization in South Asia." The audience is 30 representatives from the academic community, civil servants and social scientists from the international community, South-Asian business and financial community in the United States, and the U.S. corporate community currently conducting or anticipating business in South Asia.

Collaborating Institutions: Several Fortune 500 enterprises.

Activity Period: 12/8/92-12/15/92.

Inputs: TASP funds \$17,500.

Expected Outputs: 1) Five Indian speakers' participation in the conference, and 2) reportage of the conference proceedings for distribution.

USAID Program Objective: Promoting economic growth.

Follow-on Activity: There has been no direct follow-on activity.

Impact: There is no measurable impact. The activity did little or nothing to build capacity in an Indian institution, establish lasting collaborative institutional linkages, or have any attributable impact on policy formulation or business expansion in India. The activity was attended principally by resident Indians of the United States. While residents Indians have returned or invested in India, there is no attribution possible to this conference.

4. GRANTEE: J. L. KELLOGG GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT,
NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS.
(U.S. UNIVERSITY)

Purpose: To organize two conferences entitled, "Advantage India-Trade Infrastructure and Business Strategies," in Chicago and Orlando, Florida. The conferences will explain the experiences of U.S.-India collaboration and business relations including licensing, technology transfer, and contract manufacturing. The audience will be made up of Chief Executive Officers or Senior Vice-Presidents from Fortune 500 companies, senior Government of India officials from the Department of Economic Affairs, multilateral donors, and the academic community.

Collaborating Institutions: No others.

Activity Period: 4/12/92-4/19/92.

Inputs: TASP Funds \$26,000.

Expected Outputs: 1) Government of India officials' participation, and 2) a reportage of the proceedings.

USAID Program Objective: Promoting economic growth.

Follow-on Activity: There has been no follow-on activity.

Impact: There is no measurable impact attributable to this activity. There has been no institutional collaboration, capacity building in an Indian institution, or sustained interest on the part of the grantee. While there is continuing interest in the subject matter of the seminar, other activities are more involved in the promotion of Indo-U.S. trade and joint ventures. While several of the attendees have invested in India through the establishment of joint ventures or subsidiaries, it is impossible to attribute attendance at the conference as the reason for making the investment in India.

5. GRANTEE: SALZBURG SEMINAR, AUSTRIA

Purpose: To conduct a seminar on, "Economic Restructuring for Growth," in Salzburg, Austria for three participants from the Indian government.

Collaborating Institutions: Government of India, Department of Science and Technology.

Activity Period: 1/25/93-2/7/93.

Inputs: TASP Funds \$9,117.

Expected Outputs: Three participants attended the conference in Salzburg.

USAID Program Objective: Promoting economic growth.

Impact: No significant impact can be measured for this activity. It did nothing to establish collaborative relationships, or build capacity in an Indian institution. While the opportunity to travel and share ideas with others is a worthwhile endeavor, and beneficial to the participants in allowing them to increase their overall understanding of a complex subject such as economic liberalization, it probably would be best to fund this type of activity from another source rather than TASP.

6. GRANTEE: NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF URBAN AFFAIRS (NIUA), NEW DELHI, INDIA

NIUA is an indigenous institute for urban research, providing technical services and assistance to urban and regional development authorities. NIUA, in conjunction with Research Triangle Institute (RTI) jointly submitted an unsolicited proposal in 1989. During that period, USAID mission strategy included an urban development and capacity building component. According to the strategy of the period this activity appears to have been closely linked with overall mission strategy and objectives. In 1993, a housing finance proposal from NIUA and RTI was rejected by USAID on the basis of being inconsistent with USAID program strategy.

Purpose: To develop and apply new research techniques and information technologies for urban resource management in India; and to strengthen the capacity of NIUA to undertake applied research on urban development problems.

Method: 1) provision of technical assistance from U.S. experts in urban development; 2) short-term training and professional development activities in the United States and India; and 3) implement information software technology for municipal financial management, property tax record system, and municipal expenditure and revenue analysis.

Collaborating Institutions: Research Triangle Institute, North Carolina. A nonprofit research and technical assistance institution affiliated with the University of North Carolina, North Carolina State University, and Duke University. RTI is a well-known and widely respected institution for its research and technical assistance in municipal development.

Activity Period: 3/15/92- 6/30/93 (27 months).

Inputs: TASP Funds \$240,000.

Expected Outputs: 1) Strengthen capacity NIUA to formulate research programs, develop and apply research methodologies, adapt and apply new information management technologies, and disseminate the findings.

Actual Outputs: The project is widely perceived to have met the operational goals. It is believed to have: 1) contributed to the decentralization of municipal services from the central and state to local governments, 2) increased the role of the private sector in the delivery of public services, and 3) improved capacity of municipalities to plan and operate municipal services.

USAID Program Objective: The activity related to prior mission strategy for capacity building in municipal development. It does not relate directly to the articulated USAID strategy for 1994-2000, however, improved public administration has important impacts on promoting economic growth, stabilizing the population, and protecting the environment.

Follow-on Activity: There probably will not be direct follow-on activity. NIUA will play a small role in the FIRE project.

Impact: In addition to achieving positive outputs mentioned above, the activity appears to have played an important role in strengthening both the institutional capacity of the NIUA, and the research methodologies and equipment used by the professional staff. NIUA and RTI have an ongoing collaborative relationship. NIUA has entered into a multi-year \$5 million cooperative agreement. The NIUA now has the operational capacity to meet standard project accounting standards, has a professional staff trained and equipped with six desktop computers.

The goals of the mission have changed and subsequently the interest in municipal development and public administration has declined. Unfortunately, this has reduced the overall impact of a creditable activity because in the current environment there will be no further follow-on activity.

A new director of NIUA is also credited with good management and defining a specific research agenda.

**8. GRANTEE: INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE SERVICE CORPS (IESC) ,
CONNECTICUT AND NEW YORK, USA**

IESC is a nonprofit organization providing technical assistance to individual enterprises through short-term consulting assignments conducted by senior executive volunteers with extensive experience in the private sector.

Purpose: To improve the technical and managerial capabilities of private sector enterprises through short-term technical assistance in the areas of production, finance, marketing, and related areas, and to increase productivity, efficiency, and profitability.

Method: Two grants were made to continue support for an IESC office established in 1986. The office is staffed by a country director to identify private sector clients, diagnose a broad range of business related problems in production and management, and arrange for technical assistance. Technical assistance is targeted toward small and medium sized enterprises. Most of these enterprises have approximately Rupees 3 million (\$100,000) in capital assets, exclusive of land, inventory, receivables, and other assets. Enterprises receiving assistance share the cost of the volunteer executive by providing accommodation and expenses during the volunteer's stay in India.

Collaborating Institutions: Industrial Services Development, Ltd.; provides office and logistical support.

Activity Period: First grant 7/13/90-12/31/93. Second grant 11/15/93-12/31/94.

Inputs: First TASP funds \$1.48 million; second \$.72 million. Total \$2,220,000. This is in addition to the original grant in 1986 of approximately \$500,000.

Expected Outputs: Short-term managerial or technical assistance will be provided to approximately 35 enterprises per year. Enterprises are expected to improve productivity, efficiency, and profitability.

Actual Outputs: Over 150 enterprises received technical assistance from approximately 175 visits by volunteer executives. Several enterprises received repeat visits.

USAID Program Objective: Promote economic growth.

Follow-on Activity: IESC has submitted a request for additional grant.

Impact: The IESC program had clear objectives established to deliver a variety of technical assistance to small and medium-sized enterprises. Performance indicators focused on the number of enterprises assisted and the number of volunteer executives delivering technical assistance. These numerical performance indicators established in the grant agreement have been maintained and achieved by IESC. Impact indicators are a little more elusive. Impact as measured by a cost-benefit analysis or measurement of increases in productivity, profits, or jobs created are unavailable with insufficient time for the evaluation team to fully develop them. There is anecdotal evidence that the IESC program has helped to save or create numerous jobs, and that it has helped to establish or upgrade several technologies with high demonstration and replication effects. It would greatly behoove the IESC program to develop and communicate impact indicators to USAID and TASP managers.

The current IESC program is very broad in scope in an attempt to secure ongoing funding by addressing the various components of the overall USAID strategy. In the opinion of the evaluators, a

43

favorable activity such as the IESC India program would be strengthened by a narrowing of the focus to address the economic growth strategy of USAID. Impact of the IESC program could be leveraged by targeting assistance to financial institutions, business associations, or enterprises employing new technologies or processes that have a high demonstration effect. Other possibilities for technical assistance are among enterprises which have targeted a growth in exports, or another identified policy area being addressed by other aspects of the USAID economic growth portfolio. IESC would then be better able to participate as an operational laboratory to test the impact of policy changes at the enterprise level, and to identify policy constraints for further analysis.

The evaluators have noted that communication and understanding of IESC by USAID, and of USAID by IESC could be greatly strengthened. There is a long collaborative history between IESC India and USAID India that is not being fully exploited.

44

9. GRANTEE: INDIAN COUNCIL FOR RESEARCH ON INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC RELATIONS (ICRIER), NEW DELHI, INDIA

A nonprofit social science research center studying the interaction between the international environment and India's national development. ICRIER undertakes consultancies and studies across a wide spectrum of international economic relations.

Purpose: To conduct a comprehensive research program, entitled "Indo-US Trade and Economic Cooperation-Optimizing Relations," to identify the existing constraints to a) the development of trade in goods and services, b) increased investment and financial services, and c) increased technology exchanges between India and the United States.

Method: Four studies will be completed: 1) Nominal and effective protection in merchandize and services international trade, 2) Analysis of Comparative Advantages, 3) Trends and Future Potential of Foreign Direct Investment in India, and 4) Agreements and Laws, Policies, Guidelines, Regulations, and Practices.

Collaborating Institutions: Indian Institute of Foreign Trade. Numerous advice from U.S. and Indian academic institutions, businesses, and donors.

Activity Period: 1/22/92- 6/30/94 (29 months).

Inputs: TASP Funds: \$475,000.

Expected Outputs: 1) Written reports and presentations of research results; 2) development and use of analytical methodologies, 3) establishment of collaborative networks between United States and India, and 4) dissemination of various reports, conclusions, synthesis documents.

Actual Outputs: The report due 6/30/94 has not been delivered, but is reported to be nearing completion.

USAID Program Objective: Promoting economic growth.

Follow-on Activity: ICRIER is also involved with the ICEG TASP Grant.

Impact: The overall impact of this activity appears to be strong. ICRIER, as a leading and respected research institution will attract the ear of the GOI when the policy analysis is completed, thus insuring that there will be effective dissemination of the findings to the target audience. ICRIER has solidified a collaborative relationship with Georgetown University in Washington, D.C. The collaboration began with an individual contact but has grown to a larger institutional collaboration. While the current research relationship is dependent upon funding, institutional and personal bonds have been established between the two institutions. ICRIER has identified an ongoing list of research topics that indicate a sustaining interest in the work that was funded under the TASP grant. These topics, such as equity issues in the reform process, and the definition of the role of government in a de-regulated economy, are directly linked to the original research and were generated from work conducted under the grant. Finally, the capacity of ICRIER has been increased because the work and the building of the collaborative relationship would have been prohibitively expensive to ICRIER without the TASP grant. The TASP grant was approximately 25 percent of the operating revenue of ICRIER. ICRIER also reports that the international focus and impact of the domestic work that they do has been strengthened because of their international collaboration. There is greater attention to and understanding of the tax policy and investment policy.

**10. GRANTEE: INTERNATIONAL FOOD POLICY RESEARCH INSTITUTE (IFPRI),
WASHINGTON, D.C., USA**

IFPRI is a leading nonprofit research institute dedicated to food and agricultural policy research worldwide, and funded by a variety of bilateral and multilateral donors.

Purpose: To develop an analytical understanding of key policy issues affecting future agricultural growth in India and its direct and indirect contributions to the development of the overall national economy. To strengthen policy analysis in indigenous institutions, and contribute the analytical basis of a national agriculture policy.

Methods: Five analytical components: 1) Intensifying Irrigation and Management Implications, 2) Technology Transfer in Agriculture, 3) Future Growth in Fertilizer Use, 4) Rural Infrastructure and Agricultural Growth, and 5) Economic Efficiency in Agricultural Growth.

Collaborating Institutions: GOI through Indian Center for Agricultural Research, and several other Indian institutions which have supplied researchers.

Activity Period: 9/30/88-12/31/94.

Inputs: TASP Funds: \$2,215,000.

Expected Outputs: Approximately 20 published research results; 15 workshops, seminars, and conferences, and training of graduate and post-graduate students. The final synthesis of the studies has been repeatedly delayed and are now ready for final relapse. The activity will be terminated at the end of 1994.

USAID Program Objective: Agricultural policy analysis.

Follow-on Activity: It is unlikely that there will be continued collaboration between ICAR and IFPRI.

Impact: The impact of this long and expensive activity does not to be equal to the extended effort put into the activity. The results of the agricultural and policy analysis are reputed to lack new insight, and will have little effect on policy makers. The impact on the sustainability or the capacity of ICAR is doubtful or limited, and the collaboration between the two institutions will probably not be extended to other areas.

11. GRANTEE: WORLD FOOD PROGRAMME (WFP) NEW DELHI, INDIA

Purpose: To support monitoring and evaluation, training, and applied research activities, of a U.N.-sponsored food commodity program supplying supplementary nutrition. The target beneficiaries are pregnant and lactating women, and children under six.

Method: The design and implementation of a computerized program to allocate and track food commodity distribution. The program will was planned to: 1) strengthen monitoring and evaluation of warehouses and ports, train functionaries at all levels in the states, carry out pilot projects , and conduct special studies and research.

Collaborating Institutions: The United Nations and the Integrated Child Development Program-2206, five Indian states (Assam, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, and Uttar Pradesh), and numerous other groups.

Activity Period: 4/1/91-3/31/96 (60 months).

Inputs: TASP Funds: \$375,000.

Expected Outputs: Improved field handling and distribution of food commodities.

USAID Program Objective: Difficult to classify. Could be considered food policy, development management, or health and population.

Follow-on Activity: The activity has been extended. It was one of the original projects named in the Project Paper.

Impact: The purpose of this grant falls in the development management area of practice rather than in the food distribution practice. By focusing on the management and administration of food the monitoring and evaluation system implemented under the grant had positive performance in several areas: 1) more accurate and efficient measurement of the food allocation and ration; 2) more efficient method of tracking food allocation to various sites and depots; and 3) improved performance of field staff through training in monitoring and evaluation and in field reporting.

The project has had little impact in terms of instituting collaboration, and sustainability of interest. It is unlikely that USAID-United Nations collaboration will grow as a result of this activity. The activity does not fit well within the current and future portfolio of TASP. The activity probably could have been funded in the population program.

**12. GRANTEE: INDO-U.S. SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM (STF)
PROGRAM OF DEPARTMENT OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY,
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA**

Academy for Educational Development, Washington, D.C.

A nonprofit institution engaged in the provision of training and technical assistance to developing countries.

Purpose: The exchange of Indian and U.S. scientists to undertake scientific and technological research. This program will facilitate the stay of Indian scientists in the United States and U.S. scientists in India.

Method: Seventy Indian scientists to spend 6-12 months at selected U.S. universities and research institutes. Twenty U.S. scientists will be selected to be sent to India for 3-9 months. The scientists were approved by the Department of Science and Technology. The individual scientists contacted and managed the institutional arrangements, supported by AED as manager of the logistical arrangements.

Collaborating Institutions: The Department of Science and Technology. A broad range of academic and research institutions across the United States.

Activity Period: 2/4/91-12/23/94 (46 months).

Inputs: TASP Funds AED \$2,179,000; STF \$2,374,000; Other 195,000; Total \$2,748,000.

Expected Outputs: Scientific and technical exchanges with 70 Indian scientists traveling to the United States, and 20 U.S. scientists traveling to India.

USAID Program Objective: Development of Science and Technology Research.

Follow-on Activity: There will be no follow-on activity beyond the usual reporting and data collection conducted among the returned participants.

Impact: Conceived during the administrations of Ronald Reagan, and Rajiv Gandhi, the STF began in 1990, and operated on what was then safe and solid political cooperation in acceptable scientific and technical exchanges. The scientific and technical exchange has less relevance to the USAID portfolio of 1994.

AED reports well-known and accomplished members of the Indian scientific community participated in the program. The subject matter was broad, but limited in the sense that most exchanges were in highly specialized research specialties. The participants under the grant probably benefitted from the scientific and cultural exchange by gaining exposure to new ideas and methods, and by forming lasting personal collaborative relationships. One reported general advantage was an exposure to the more closely linked scientific and business community in the United States. Exposure to this system by leading scientist in India may help to establish the collaborative relationships between academia, government, and the private sector which are required to speed the transfer of technology from the theoretical to the applied. On an institutional level, the grant did little establish long-term collaborative institutional relationships, influence key decision makers, while it did help to build institutions by strengthening staff capabilities. Successes in this activity are highly individual rather than institutional.

43

The activity was not as successful in helping to place the 20 American scientists in Indian institutions. Approximately 10 of the desired 20 were placed primarily over difficulties in the placement criteria which included a requirement that the scientist be employed by an American institution which would continue to pay their salary while they spent a year in India.

13. GRANTEE: FEDERATION OF INDIAN CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY (FICCI), NEW DELHI, INDIA

FICCI is the apex organization of an association of Chambers of Commerce and Industry and business associations from all parts of India. There are approximately 2,000 institutional members with membership representing diverse trade, manufacturing, and industry specific groups. FICCI is an promoter of business and an advocate of business interests to the Government of India.

Purpose: The TASP grant was used to help create an environment conducive to successful implementation of the GOI economic liberalization policy reforms. This will be done by 1) conducting a nationwide sensitization and education program on the aims and benefits of the new economic policies, and 2) facilitating a process of consultation and interaction between regional and industrial groups and policy makers concerning the productive sector.

Method: Approximately 65 one- or two-day seminars were held in all states of India to disseminate information on economic liberalization and encourage debate. The seminars were attended by representatives of private enterprises, state and local government, trade unions, and the media. In addition, six seminars were held in the United States to inform American business interests of the economic liberalization in India.

Collaborating Institutions:

Activity Period: 6/11/92-6/22/95 (36 months).

Inputs: TASP Funds: \$1,137,000.

Expected Outputs: 1) Dissemination and debate of economic reform issues in India; and 2) promotion of Indo-U.S. organizational linkages and collaboration and cooperation in commercial activities.

Actual Outputs: Sixty-five Indian seminars, and six U.S. seminars were held.

USAID Program Objective: Promoting economic growth.

Impact: Approximately 5,000 people attended the 65 seminars held around the country. Opinion is mixed on the value of these seminars. While the FICCI seminars helped to disseminate the new economic policies from the central government and the capital to the state governments, critics claim that they were poorly attended and rather poorly presented. However, it is significant that FICCI conducted seminars throughout the country including the in the most left-leaning states of Bengal and Bihar. In addition to the seminar attendees, the seminars were covered by the local and national media, further contributing to the dissemination process. FICCI reports that the seminars contributed strongly to the economic policy debate by disseminating liberalization policies to trade unionists, and local government officials.

Other important impacts include a change in the attitudes of the leadership of FICCI. They have become more attuned to the membership and are better able to represent the members from the smaller more remote areas of India. The leadership has also been "internationalize," becoming vastly more aware of the global market and the requirement that Indian industry and manufacturing will have to improve their capacity to compete. They are communicating this to their membership.

The six seminars conducted in the U.S. were heavily attended by the Indian community in the U.S. helping to disseminate changes in national policies. Since economic liberalization began, U.S. trade and investment in India has increased. How much of the increase, if any, is impossible to attribute to the FICCI seminars.

5

14. GRANTEE: INDIAN INSTITUTE OF FOREIGN TRADE (IIFT), NEW DELHI, INDIA

IIFT is a nonprofit organization, and one of the leading institutes engaged in consultancy, research, and training activities focusing on international trade and business. IIFT has contributed to the government of India's policy debate, and has relationships with government, academia, and business.

Purpose: The TASP grant was made to undertake policy analysis, research, and training activities in the areas of fiscal, monetary, and economic policies concerning foreign trade.

Method: Two collaborative studies and workshops: 1) An Indian study focusing on the export management system, including import-export finance, import policy and tariff regime; and 2) A comparative study on foreign direct investment investigating the locational choice matrix employed by multinational enterprises and the policy adjustment required to make India a desired location. Other countries included in the study are Thailand, Indonesia, Philippines, Indonesia, and Pakistan. Investment in India.

Collaborating Institutions: Export Import Bank of India, National Institute of Public Finance and Policy, and the Ministry of Finance, Government of India. Professor Brewer of Georgetown University in Washington, D.C.

Activity Period: 6/23/93-6/23/95 (24 months).

Inputs: TASP Funds: \$228,000.

Expected Outputs: Policy analysis and dissemination on the above topics.

USAID Program Objective: Promoting economic growth.

Follow-on Activity: IIFT envisions future collaborations with Rutgers University, Ohio State University, and Stanford University to analyze Indo-U.S. trade relationships.

Impact: IIFT has been effective in getting the GOI to accept and act on its findings in the trade policy area. The GOI acted on their recommendation to reduce the capital goods tariff which will result in higher GOI revenues from taxation rather than from the tariff on imported capital good. Collaboration with Georgetown University is currently on an individual basis, but IIFT has a better established network and is seeking further institutional collaboration. The director of IIFT reports that IIFT is much more outward looking in its thinking and perspective, and is much more inclusive of the trade policy community in government, academia, and the private sector than it was before the grant.

**15. GRANTEE: GOVERNMENT OF INDIA, DEPARTMENT OF ELECTRONICS
(ALSO KNOWN AS AWTP)**

Purpose: To provide support towards the construction of India's first automated water treatment plant (AWTP), located in Haiderbur, on the outskirts of New Delhi.

Collaborating Institutions: GOI, Department of Electronics.

Activity Period: 1/1/94-6/30/96.

Inputs: TASP Funds \$1,200,000.

Expected Outputs: When completed, this pilot project be the first fully automated water treatment plant in India. It will be capable of treating and supplying 100 million gallons of treated water per day.

USAID Program Objective: Protecting the environment.

Follow-on Activity: It is not clear if there will be other follow-on activities.

Impact: This is a pilot project to determine if water quality and cost efficiency can be improved by automating the water treatment system. The technical assistance supplied to the plant will come from competitive bidding from the U.S. contracting community. USAID management has implemented a performance-based disbursement system that reduces management time to monitor the project.

This activity is difficult to evaluate by the impact indicators that have been established for the overall TASP projects. It stands apart from other activities undertaken by TASP in its technical aspects and program component.

16. GRANTEE: INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH (ICEG)

Purpose: To publicize examples of international experience in economic liberalization and its application in India.

Method: To organize seminars and conferences on "India Structural Adjustment and policy Reforms: Lessons from International Experiences."

Collaborating Institutions: University of Hawaii's East West Center; Indian Council for Research in International Economic Relations.

Method: Distinguished Author Series includes nine speakers on the Indian economic structural adjustment, seven joint research projects, program workshop, international conference, and publications and dissemination.

Activity Period: 8/23/93-8/22/95.

Inputs: TASP Funds \$580,000.

Expected Outputs: The distinguished speakers.

Actual Outputs: Five speakers have participated in a series of speeches, conferences, interviews, and meeting with GOI officials. The speakers and their principal topics included:

- 1) Professor Arnold Harberger, UCLA, raising productivity.
- 2) Dr. T. N. Srinivasan, Yale University, economic liberalization.
- 3) Mr. Rolf Ludders and Mr. Jacques Rogozinski, Director of Department of Privatization, Government of Mexico, privatization.
- 4) Dr. Anne Kruger, V.P. World Bank, structural adjustment.
- 5) Dr. Jeffery Sachs and Dr. Wing Thye Woo, Harvard University, comparative economic reform.

USAID Program Objective: Promoting economic growth.

Impact: The grant succeeded in attracting notable speakers to India to help publicize the economic reform measures. The example of Dr. Sachs' visit to India is notable for both his celebrity, and his activities in India. Dr. Sachs spoke in New Delhi, traveled to Calcutta and Bombay where seminars with approximately 175 government officials, research institute associates, senior managers from large private sector corporations were in attendance. Dr. Sachs also held private meetings with the GOI Ministers of Finance, Commerce, and Industry. Mr. Sachs speeches and seminars received widespread television and newspaper coverage in both the English and vernacular medium.

While the effectiveness of the distinguished speakers is difficult to measure in terms of its actual impact on changing economic policy, there is little question that the speakers have reached their audience and carried the message of reform to them.

Collaboration between ICEG and ICRIER is somewhat doubtful or limited but appears to be increasing as the number of speakers increases.

**17. GRANTEE: INSTITUTIONAL REFORM AND THE INFORMAL SECTOR (IRIS),
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, USA**

Purpose: To fund policy research by Indian scholars to support institutional structure necessary for economic growth.

Method: IRIS at the University of Maryland will fund Indian scholars to conduct research and policy analysis of institutional and public policy issues. Indian scholars were asked to submit research proposals for funding.

Collaborating Institutions: National Institute for Public Finance and Policy.

Activity Period: 9/30/93-11/30/94.

Inputs: TASP Funds: \$307,000.

Expected Outputs: Collaborative policy analysis between U.S. and Indian scholars.

USAID Program Objective: Promoting economic growth.

Follow-on Activity: There remains a possibility of repeated collaboration.

Impact: Several papers have been completed, and while there has not been much collaboration in the first phase, the approach has been improved for the second phase. In the second phase, both NIPFP and IRIS will evaluate and select research proposals for funding under the grant. It is this collaboration that will stimulate interest in the United States, and help to improve Indian research capacity in the studies undertaken.

54

**18. GRANTEE: INSTITUTE FOR FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND RESEARCH (IFMR),
MADRAS, INDIA**

Research and Training Institute established by Industrial Credit and Investment Corporation, and the Kothari Group. Focus has been on corporate finance, public finance, and capital markets.

Purpose: To study: 1) the process of disinvestment of equity by the public sector commercial enterprises through issues relating to the valuation of initial offerings, and 2) financial implications of nonperforming assets of the State Financial Corporations and the examinations of policy options in freeing them of the burden of nonperforming assets.

Collaborating Institutions: Georgetown University.

Activity Period: 9/30/93-3/31/95.

Inputs: TASP Funds \$118,000.

Expected Outputs: 1) Detailed reports on research findings including the methodology, conclusions, and recommendations, 2) two national seminars to disseminate the findings, and 3) establishment of collaborative linkages with U.S. institutions.

Actual Outputs: Dissemination of findings, national seminars.

USAID Program Objective: Promoting economic growth.

Impact: The activity has helped to introduce discussion concerning privatization into the overall debate on the Indian economic liberalization program.



19. GRANTEE: SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA (SEBI), BOMBAY, INDIA

SEBI, chartered in 1988, is a government regulatory body whose primary objective is to ensure that there is a fair, equitable, and transparent exchange in the capital market system to protect investors.

Purpose: The TASP Grant funded seminars on stock futures and options.

Collaborating Institutions: No other institutions.

Activity Period: 9/30/94 (1 month).

Inputs: TASP Funds: \$50,000.

Expected Outputs: Seminars for staff training and dissemination, and training in the United States.

Actual Outputs: Eight staff from SEBI have been trained in the United States at the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), and in training classes in Washington and Chicago. Two seminars were held attended by approximately 175 people from all parts of the country representing the regional exchanges, financial institutions, and legal, financial, and management professionals.

The following speakers were involved in the seminars:

- 1) Professor William Smith, University of Rochester.
- 2) Mr. Nicholas Ronalds, Chicago Mercantile Exchange.
- 3) Mr. Richard Dufour, Chicago Board of Options Exchange.
- 4) Dr. S. P. Kathari, University of Rochester.
- 5) Mr. Gerard Okkema, European Options Clearinghouse, Amsterdam.
- 6) Mr. Paul Lo, Securities & Futures Commission, Hong Kong.

USAID Program Objective: Promotion of economic growth.

Follow-on Activity: The Financial Institutions Reform and Expansion Project (FIRE) will continue the original work begun with SEBI. The project will focus on: 1) Regulatory Environment Framework, including technical assistance to SEBI from U.S. experts, and the training of SEBI personnel in the United States; 2) Operating Environment, the operation of the stock exchange focusing on transparency; and 3) Debt Market, the establishment of a secondary debt market to eliminate the negative impact on infrastructure (roads, power, and telecommunications).

Impact: SEBI reports that as a new regulatory body, they are faced with severe resource constraints, and a rapidly changing market, as the capital markets of India continue to grow rapidly. The assistance provided under the TASP Project has proved helpful in addressing the above constraints by providing opportunities for staff training, and dissemination of SEBI activities.

The sustainability of the activity is apparent in the role of the eight middle managers that participated in the training in the United States between 1992 and 1994. All eight of the attendees were SEBI professionals in the legal, financial, and management areas of the organization. They remain employed as middle managers at SEBI. The activity, while having no direct impact on policy, influenced the senior management through an improved understanding of what a securities regulatory body does, and through closer working relationships with USAID. TASP fulfilled its role as an incubator by conducting a small activity with an institution that has led to a far larger involvement.

20. GRANTEE: NATIONAL COUNCIL OF APPLIED ECONOMIC RESEARCH (NCAER)

NCAER, is a nonprofit independent economic research institution specializing in applied economic surveys and is supported by consultancies, government grants and some donor funds.

Purpose: The purpose of the grant is to permit an analysis of the impact of economic reforms in trade, with respect to shifts in labor and capital employed in different sectors, and the effect on outputs. NCAER will simulate the impact of alternative trade policy scenarios and disseminate the findings to reinforce positive effects of the liberalization process.

Method: The grant will enable collaboration between NCAER, and the University of Michigan, which is a leader in the field of economic modelling. UM has established a multi-country, multi-sectoral model to simulate the effects of trade policy of NAFTA. The modelling exercise and subsequent dissemination will be carried out by a joint team of NCAER and UM economists.

Collaborating Institutions: University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA.

Activity Period: The activity has not yet begun.

Inputs: TASP Funds \$100,000.

Actual Outputs: Not yet conducted.

USAID Program Objective: Promotion of economic growth.

Impact: From the design of the activity it appears that it will have impact. Collaboration is built into the activity since the University of Michigan has already agreed to work with NCAER. The institution can reach the target audience of policy decision makers and the field of study is one that is closely aligned with their previous body of work. The activity is threatened by the excessive delays in the selection and approval process, which has already put the work plan behind schedule and, in the eyes of the grantee has raised questions about the operating efficiency and interest of USAID in the activity.

51

ANNEX B
STATUS REPORT OF TASP GRANTS

**STATUS REPORT
TASP PROJECT (386-0515)**

- A - STATUS OF COMPLETED ACTIVITIES**
- B - STATUS OF CURRENT ACTIVITIES**
- C - STATUS OF INVITATIONS FOR APPLICATIONS**
- D - STATUS OF UNSOLICITED PROPOSALS**
- E - STATUS OF TRAINING ACTIVITIES: FY 1994**
- F - STATUS OF COMPLETED TRAINING ACTIVITIES: FY 1993**

TASP PROJECT OFFICER: MADHUMITA GUPTA

DATE OF REPORT: AUGUST 31, 1994
(All Financial Data is as of 06/30/94)

59

A - STATUS OF COMPLETED ACTIVITIES - TASP

(in U.S.\$)

NO.	ACTIVITY (STATUS);(TYPE OF AGREEMENT) (GRANT NO.)	DATE GRANT - SIGNED - EXPIRES (DURATION)	AUTHORIZED EARMARKED	As of June 30, 1994 CO's Report			RESPONSIBLE OFFICERS	Latest Information Available	STATED OBJECTIVE - PROGRESS
				AMOUNT OF GRANT (\$)					
				COMMIT.	ACCRUED EXPENDITURES (Actual Payments)	UNEXP. COMMIT.			
(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)			
1.	SANKAT MOCHAN FOUNDATION (SMF) (LNGO)/(GRANT) (386-0515-G-00-2009-00)	-11/14/91 -03/31/92 (4 months)	45,094	45,094	45,094 (45,094)	0	MCGUPTA JO'Rourke	<u>To organize a seminar on Ganga Pollution Control in Varanasi</u>	- Activity implementation completed. Action for closing out Grant to be initiated.
	-- GRANT		7,723	7,723	7,723	0			
	-- INVITATIONAL TRAVEL		37,371	37,371	37,371	0			
2.	HARVARD INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT (HIID) (FNGO) (INVITATIONAL TRAVEL) (N-T-3-074)	-01/05/93 -01/10/93 (1 Week)	12,941	12,941	12,941 (12,941)	0	NNagpal JO'Rourke	<u>To organize workshop in Delhi on Urban Solid Waste Management</u>	- Four member team from HIID organized a workshop in New Delhi on "Urban Solid Waste Management" (Jan.7-9). Invitational travel plus per-diem involved. M.Reddy from TDE attended the workshop and found it useful. Activity completed. Close-out action to be initiated.
3.	UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA (BERKELEY) (FNGO) (GRANT) (386-0000-G-00-3100-00)	-12/08/92 (1 Week)	17,500	17,500	16,471 (0)	1,029	MCGUPTA JO'Rourke	<u>To organize conference on economic liberalization in South Asia.</u>	- A two day conference on "Economic Liberalization in South Asia" was organized by Prof. Pranab Bardhan in April 1993 in USA. \$17,500 of TASP funds utilized to support travel costs for Indian citizens. Activity completed. Close-out action to be initiated.
4.	JL KELLOGG GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT, NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY (FNGO) (GRANT) (386-0515-G-00-3114-00)	-04/12/92 (1 Week)	26,000	26,000	26,000 (26,000)	0	MCGupta JO'Rourke	<u>To organize a 3 conference program on trade infrastructure and business strategies in India.</u>	- A 3 conference program was organized between 4/13/93 and 4/20/93 in the U.S. Senior cabinet minister's attended from India. Topics covered include: Financial Institutions/Services; Export Orient Manufacturing Strategies; and Product & Service Marketing Strategies. UNDP and AID co-sponsored the program. Activity completed. Close-out action to be initiated.
5.	SALZBURG SEMINAR (FNGO) (INVITATIONAL TRAVEL) (N-T-3-123 thru 125)	-1/25/93 (2 Week)	9,117	9,117	9,117 (9,117)	0	TRSabherwal JO'Rourke	<u>To support travel cost for 3 persons to participate in a seminar on "economic restructuring for growth" in schloss Leopold.</u>	- A seminar on "Economic Restructuring for Growth" was held in Schloss Leopoldskron, Salzburg between 2/2/93 - 2/12/93. Invitational Travel Orders for three participants from India were prepared, for a total cost of \$10,140. Final report received. Activity completed. Close-out action to be initiated.

B-4

5

SRL NO.	ACTIVITY (STATUS)/(TYPE OF AGREEMENT) (GRANT NO.)	DATE GRANT - SIGNED - EXPIRES (DURATION)	AUTHORIZED EARMARKED	AMOUNT OF GRANT (\$)			RESPONSIBLE OFFICERS	STATED OBJECTIVE - PROGRESS
				COMTED.	ACCRUED EXPENDITURES (Actual Payments)	UNEXP. COMMITT.		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	
6.	NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF URBAN AFFAIRS (NIUA) (NGO)/(GRANT) (386-0515-G-00-1146-00)	-03/15/91 -06/30/93 (27 months)	208,250	208,250	208,250	0	NBhatnagar CBiland	<u>To strengthen NIUA's research, information and technical capability.</u> - Due to unavailability of RTI staff to meet with NIUA staff as per stated schedule, the grantee requested and Mission approved a no cost extension from 3/14/93 to 6/30/93. Activity completed. Close-out action to be initiated.
7.	STOCK HOLDING CORP. OF INDIA (SHCL)		(1,500,000) (b) 1,366,038	1,366,038	1,351,254	14,784	NNagpal JO'Rourke	<u>To develop SHCIL's capability to manage national clearing and settlement system.</u>
	-- PRICE WATERHOUSE (PW) (FNGO)/(BUY-IN) (PDC-2206-Z-00-8191-00)	-04/20/92 -02/19/93 (10 months)	1,022,938	1,022,938	1,022,938	0		To complete a feasibility report for a national stock and bond market & depository system and a national clearing and settling system. Engage in dissemination activities with industry personnel and training of SHCIL staff. Carry-out a U.S. study-tour for key senior Indian securities market executives. This was to include training for Indian industry representatives in U.S. on depository, clearance and settlement systems.
	-- TRAINING		41,100	41,100	26,316	14,784		- PW completed all components of activity to the satisfaction of USAID. Close-out action initiated.
	-- NYIF TRAINING		302,000	302,000	302,000	0		
8.	INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE SERVICE CORPS I (IESCI) (FNGO)/(GRANT) (386-0515-G-00-0207-00)	-07/13/90 12/31/93 (48 months)	(1,478,000) 1,478,000	1,478,000	1,478,000	0	RBerry FMonteiga	<u>To provide help of U.S. volunteers to increase productivity of Indian business especially small and medium through short-term TA.</u> Following a three month no-cost extension, the IESC activity came to a close on 12/31/93. Close-out action to be initiated.
TOTAL			3,162,940	3,162,940	3,147,127	15,813		

B-5

19

B -- STATUS OF CURRENT ACTIVITIES -- TASP

(In U.S.\$)

----- As of June 30, 1994 CO's Report -----

----- Latest Information Available -----

RL NO.	ACTIVITY (STATUS)/(TYPE OF AGREEMENT) (GRANT NO.) (2)	DATE GRANT -- SIGNED -- EXPIRES (DURATION) (3)	AMOUNT OF GRANT (\$)				RESPONSIBLE OFFICERS (8)	STATED OBJECTIVE -- PROGRESS
			(AUTHORIZED) EARMARKED (4)	COMTED. (5)	ACCRUED EXPENDITURES (Actual Payments) (6)	UNEXP. COMMITMENTS (5-6) (7)		
1.	INDIAN COUNCIL FOR RESEARCH ON INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC RELATIONS (ICRIER) (LNGO)/(COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT) (386-0515-A-00-2052-00)	-01/22/92 -06/30/94 (28 months)	(499,829) 475,379	475,379	475,379	0	KSawhny JO'Rourke	<u>To study Indo-U.S Trade/Investment flows and economic Cooperation and disseminate results.</u> - ICRIER requested & USAID approved additional funding of \$156,400 (collab: Prof Van R. Whiting, Univ. of CA, San Diego to study the dynamics of FDI. No cost extension provided upto June 30, 1994 to facilitate successful completion of Prof. Whiting's work. Subsequent to two interim workshops final workshop held in June 94. Final workshop was inaugurated by Minister of State for External Affairs, Mr. R.L. Bhatia and addressed by the U.S. Charge d'Affairs, a.i., Mr. Kenneth Brill. ICRIER and Van Whiting in process of finalizing the two final reports.
2.	INTERNATIONAL FOOD POLICY RESEARCH INSTITUTE (IFPRI) (INGO)/(GRANT) (386-0515-G-00-8334-00)	-09/30/88 -12/31/94 (75 months)	(2,215,420) 2,215,420	2,215,420	1,943,139	272,281	KSawhny JO'Rourke	<u>To Promote 15 studies in 4 areas i.e. technology, fertilizer, irrigation, infrastructure in Agriculture. Research nearing completion.</u> No-cost extension granted upto Dec. 31, 1994 to share findings with policy makers through conferences. First workshop held in May, 1994. Around 50 papers presented at the workshop. Mr. Peter Hazell and Mr. Vanamall attended from IFPRI. Preceding and following the workshop detailed discussions were held between Mr. Hazell/Vanamall and USAID. Final workshop, focussed on policy, scheduled for October 1994.
3.	WORLD FOOD PROGRAM (WFP) (INGO)/(GRANT) (386-0515-G-00-1133-00)	-04/01/91 -03/31/96 (59 months)	(375,000) 375,000	375,000	206,800	168,200	HRamaswamy HGoldman	<u>To provide monitoring and evaluation support to WFP thru training, research and documentation during 5th Expansion of Project 2206 (i.e. to assist GOI to provide supplementary nutrition thru ICDS scheme).</u> - A no cost extension provided, extending PACD by 2 years to 3/31/96. After almost 2 years the Government of Rajasthan finally approved the special studies component under the grant.
4.	INDO-U.S. SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM (STF)	-02/04/91 -12/23/94 (46 months)	(3,000,000) (a) 2,264,993	2,374,938	770,899	1,604,039	TRSabnarwal JDarter	<u>To promote a scientific exchange program between U.S. and Indian scientists</u>
--	ACADEMY OF EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT (AED) (FNGO)/(GRANT) (386-0515-C-00-1058-00)		2,179,286	2,179,286	1,153,589	1,025,697		- AED requested and Mission approved additional funding of \$89,271 (in Feb. '93) to carry out activity through Dec. 94. In Aug. '92, Mission had approved of an add-on extension of \$409,015. To date 58 Indian scientists and 11 U.S. scientists approved under the program.
--	MISSION TRAVEL		85,707	195,652	181,136	14,516		

B-6

52

----- As of June 30, 1994 CO's Report -----

----- Latest Information Available -----

SRL NO.	ACTIVITY (STATUS),(TYPE OF AGREEMENT) (GRANT NO.)	DATE GRANT - SIGNED - EXPIRES (DURATION)	AMOUNT OF GRANT (\$)		UNEXP. COMMIT. (5-6)	RESPONSIBLE OFFICERS (8)	STATED OBJECTIVE - PROGRESS
			AUTHORIZED/ EARMARKED (4)	COMTEd. (5)			
5.	FEDERATION OF INDIAN CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE & INDUSTRY (FICCI) (NGO)/(GRANT) (365-0515-G-00-2153-00)	-06/11/92 -12/31/94 (30 months)	(1,137,000) 1,137,000	1,137,000	872,182	264,818	RBerry FMantelga <u>To create an environment conducive to successful implementation of the GOI industrial policy reforms through approx. 40 workshops in India and 6 in the U.S.</u> - Under a one year no-cost extension, FICCI launched its new set of presentations. The program has now been extended to the East-Coast, i.e. Calcutta in an effort to engage a larger number of state governments more directly in the liberalization process. The promotion component in the U.S. has been dropped under the no-cost extension.
6.	INDIAN INSTITUTE OF FOREIGN TRADE (IIFT) (NGO)/(GRANT) (365-0515-G-00-3210-00)	-06/23/93 -06/22/95 (24 months)	(253,840) 228,250	228,250	44,977	183,273	MGupta JO'Rourke <u>To conduct studies and seminars on "Policy Impediments to Increased Trade and Foreign Direct Investment in India."</u> - Second Steering Committee meeting (SCM) held on July 29/30, 1994 at the Rajiv Gandhi Foundation, New Delhi. Twenty four attended the SCM including 7 Steering Committee members. Mr. Abid Hussain, Chairperson, SCM offered to host an interim workshop to disseminate preliminary findings. IIFT in the process of finalizing paper on Trade/FDI Impediments for the interim workshop. Subsequent to workshop, Prof. T.L. Brewer, Dept. of Economics, Georgetown U. spent one week with IIFT, advising them on the subject studies. Project Director shortly to visit U.S. for further collaboration with U.S. Institutions/experts.
7.	AUTOMATED WATER TREATMENT PLANT (AWTP) (NGO)/(GRANT) PIL # 43	01/01/94 06/30/96	(1,233,000) 633,000	633,000	369,999	263,001	YPKumar JTarter <u>To Provide TA support towards the construction of the first automated treatment plant in India.</u> - Mission made initial commitments of \$633,000. First benchmark has been achieved. As per Mission decision a performance based disbursement will be followed under this activity.
8.	INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH (ICEG) (NGO)/(BUY-IN) (POC-0095-A-00-0061-00)	-08/23/93 -08/22/95	(579,600) 579,600	579,600	90,000	489,600	MGupta JO'Rourke <u>To organize seminars/conferences on "India's Structural Adjustment and Policy Reforms: Lessons from International Experiences."</u> - Prof. Jeffrey Sachs, Harvard U. and Prof. Wing Thyee Woo, U of CA presented a seminar on "Comparative Analysis of Economic Reform and Performance Results in Latin America, Eastern Europe, former Soviet Union and the Far East with some Implications for India" on 8/23/94 in New Delhi. Approx. 200 participated in the Seminar - including reps. from the GOI the public sector, Indian research institutes, the private sectors, foreign missions and the media. Both preceding and following the seminar Dr. Sachs held lengthy discussions with senior GOI officials including the Finance and Commerce Ministers. This is the 4th in the Distinguished Authors Seminar Series. Five experts have already presented seminars under this series: Prof. Harberger (U of CA), Prof. T.N. Srinivasan (Yale U), Dr. Luders (former Finance Minister, Chile), Dr. Rogozlinsky (Head, Office of Privatization, Mexico) and Dr. Ann Krueger (former Vice-President, World Bank). Prof. Helen Hughes (U. of New South Wales, Australia) will be the next speaker under the ICEG-ICRIER seminar series.

B-7

61

SRL NO.	ACTIVITY (STATUS)/(TYPE OF AGREEMENT) (GRANT NO.) (2)	DATE GRANT - SIGNED - EXPIRES (DURATION) (3)	AMOUNT OF GRANT (\$)			UNEXP. COMMIT. (5-6) (7)	RESPONSIBLE OFFICERS (8)	STATED OBJECTIVE - PROGRESS
			AUTHORIZED EARMARKED (4)	COMMITTED (5)	ACCRUED EXPENDITURE (Actual Payments) (6)			
9.	INSTITUTIONAL REFORM AND THE INFORMAL SECTOR (IRIS) (INGO)/(BUY-IN) (ANE-0015-B-00-1019-00)	09/30/93 11/30/94	(307,600) 307,105	307,105	85,000	222,105	KSawhny JO'Rourke	<u>To provide grant support to 7 Indian Institutes to study the present institutional and incentive structures appropriate for economic reforms in India and identify the changes required to support and sustain the reform process.</u> - An 18 months activity on Incentives and Economic Reforms: A research program for India* has been initiated. The first conference based on research completed in the first six month was held in New Delhi in May. IRIS has requested for a 3 year/\$2.6 million extension to expand the present SOW. PRO recommends a 18 month/\$800,000 extension.
10.	INSTITUTE FOR FINANCIAL MGT. AND RESEARCH (IFMR) (NGO)/(GRANT) (386-0515-G-00-3341-00)	09/30/93 03/31/95	(118,500) 118,500	118,500	25,883	92,617	M3husnurmath JO'Rourke	<u>To study policy implications of disinvestment of PSEs equity and the financial implications of non performing assets of SFCs.</u> - An 18 month activity on "Financial Restructuring in Public Enterprises: Some Aspects" is underway. A seminar is scheduled to be held in early January 1995 to discuss the findings of the Study.
11.	SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA (SEBI) (GO/GRANT) PIL # 41	09/30/93	50,000	50,000	24,175	25,825	AKJha JO'Rourke	<u>To provide U.S. technical assistance in various areas of securities and market regulations.</u> - SEBI requested USAID to fund SEC consultants (7/30/92) DEA concurrence received to use upto \$50,000 of TASP funds for this purpose Four consultants provided expertise to SEBI ON Futures & Options. SEBI has indicated that it may use the unexpred commitment to invite SEC experts on insider trading to come to India to provide their expertise.
12.	INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE SERVICES CORPS. II (IESC II) (FNGO/GRANT) (386-0515-G-00-4018-00)	-11/15/93 -12/31/94 (13 months)	(719,295) 719,295	719,295	299,678 (0)	419,617	PKBerry FManteiga	<u>To provide TA through U.S. volunteers to increase productivity of India business (small and medium) firms.</u> By December 1994, 40 VECs will have been sponsored under the activity. IESC has requested for another add-on extension of \$247,000. Mission recommends that IESC focus on areas related to environment, reproductive health, energy and agribusiness under the extension. PIO/T under circulation for Mission clearance.
TOTAL			9,103,542	9,213,487	5,208,111	4,005,376		

Note: (a) \$2,600,000 authorized for Indo-US STF program as per Proag. (PIL #44), of which \$2,358,619 has been earmarked so far.
(b) \$1,500,000 authorized for SHCL, of which \$1,383,584 has been earmarked to date.

C - STATUS OF INVITATIONS FOR APPLICATIONS (IFAs) - TASP

(in U.S.\$)

----- Latest Information Available -----

SRL NO. (1)	ACTIVITY (STATUS),(TYPE OF AGREEMENT) - PROPOSED TITLE - PROPOSED TIMETABLE - ESTIMATED COST (2)	DATE OF: - IFA - RESPONSE - NATURE OF RESPONSE (3)	RESP. OFFICERS (4)	REMARKS (5)
1.	NATIONAL COUNCIL OF APPLIED ECONOMIC RESEARCH (NCAER) (NGO)/(GRANT)	-04/29/92 -09/25/92 -affirmative	MGupta JO'Fourke	Two proposals and one concept paper received to date.
	-- "A Proposal to Study and Support the Implementation of India's Economic Reforms"			The proposal to "Study and Support the Implementation of India's Economic Reforms" was reviewed by PIC (10/16/92). PRO (Madhumita) drafted letter to NCAER recommending extensive modifications in the subject proposal. Proposal inactive.
	-- "Computable General Equilibrium Analysis of India's Domestic and Foreign Trade Policy Reforms" -- 24 months -- US\$ 883,518			Subsequent to discussions with NCAER and Dr. Robert Stern, Univ. of Michigan, a one year/ approx. \$100,000 proposal was re-submitted by NCAER. PRO (Madhumita) drafted SOW and P/O/T. Proposal, SOW and P/O/T reviewed by PIC (02/24/94). Following Mission approval, final P/O/T and budget forwarded to RCO for negotiation of cooperative agreement.
2.	INDIAN STATISTICAL INSTITUTE NEW DELHI (ISI-ND) (NGO)	-04/02/92 -affirmative	MGupta JO'Fourke	ISI-ND (Dr. Dilip Mukherjee and A. Das Gupta) Informally communicated to PRO (Madhumita) to expect a proposal from ISI. Proposal received on December 7, 1993 and reviewed by PIC (02/24/94). PRO (Madhumita Gupta) drafted letter to ISI-D, requesting for additional information/clarifications. Response awaited.
	-- "Technology Transfer and Foreign Investment: What is Holding it Back" -- 24 months -- US\$ 279,485			
3.	INDIAN INSTITUTE OF MGT. BANGLORE (IIM/B) (NGO)/(GRANT)	-07/27/92 -affirmative	MGupta JO'Fourke	PRO received a 3 yr.--\$212,575 proposal from IIM/B on 04/16/93. Informal review indicated that a more focussed, detailed proposal is required. Given the "institutional focus" of the proposal, it has been forwarded to IRIS for further review. Subsequently PRO (Madhumita) informed by IIM/B (Dr. Bokil) that he is in touch with IRIS (Dr. Kahkonen) with respect to subject proposal.
	-- "Research in Trade Liberalization" -- 36 months -- US\$ 212,575			
4.	INDIAN INSTITUTE OF MGT. CALCUTTA (IIM/CAL) (NGO)/(GRANT)	-05/14/92 -05/25/92 -affirmative	MGupta JO'Fourke	PRO received a 3 yr.--\$500,000 proposal from IIM/CAL on 01/13/93. Proposal to be reviewed by AID and found to be unsuitable for TASP funding.
	-- Grant Proposal -- 36 months -- US\$ 500,000 (25% HCC)			

5

SRL NO.	ACTIVITY (STATUS)(TYPE OF AGREEMENT) - PROPOSED TITLE - PROPOSED TIMETABLE - ESTIMATED COST	DATE OF: - IPA - RESPONSE - NATURE OF RESPONSE	RESP. OFFICERS	REMARKS
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

5.	INDIAN INSTITUTE OF MGT. AHMEDABAD (IIM-A) (NGO)/(GRANT)	- 04/02/92 - 07/24/92 - affirmative	MGupta JO' Bourke	Five proposals received to date.
	-- "Energy and Environ. Tech. Pol. for Competitiveness of Elect. Power, Steel and Aluminium Industries" -- Timetable n.a. -- US\$ 1.2 mill.		MGupta JO' Bourke	PIC discouraged proposal as it falls outside TASP objective. Response drafted (Madhumita) and faxed to IIM/A on 10/30/92.
	-- "Research Proposal on Econ. Policy and Industry Performance" -- 36 months -- US\$ 900,000		MGupta JO' Bourke	Subsequent to PIC review of proposal (11/05/92). PRO (Madhumita) drafted response requesting IIM/A to resubmit proposal in closer conformity with IFA Guidelines and suggesting a meeting between IIM/A and AID to emphasize the importance of following IFA Guidelines. Draft response with JOR.
	-- "Operationlising the Demand Side Management (DMS) of Elec. in India" -- Timetable n.a. -- US\$ 5.8 mill.		MGupta JO' Bourke	PIC reviewed proposal on 11/05/92 and found it failed to conform to the TASP objectives. PRO (Madhumita) drafted response discouraging IIM/A. Draft response with JOR.
	-- "Economic Restructuring and Competitiveness of the Indian Industry" -- 60 months -- cost n.a.		MGupta JO' Bourke	Proposal circulated to PIC members for comments. Weak response. PRO (Madhumita) drafted response discouraging IIM/A. Draft response with JOR.
	-- "Indian Capital Markets in Transition: Regulatory and Institutional Reforms" -- 36 months -- US\$ 285,000		AKJha JO' Bourke	IIM/A resubmitted proposal on 12/14/93 to study and recommend the major institutional and regulatory reforms required for the Indian Securities Market. PRO (Madhumita) drafted a response indicating possible funding of proposed study. PRO (Nina) indicated modifications required. Requested modifications submitted 3/15/93. PIL and PLOT already prepared. Sep. 93 decision made to fund subject activity under FIRE.

SRL NO.	ACTIVITY (STATUS)/(TYPE OF AGREEMENT) - PROPOSED TITLE - PROPOSED TIMETABLE - ESTIMATED COST	DATE OF:		RESP. OFFICERS	REMARKS
		- IPA	- RESPONSE		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	
6.	INSTITUTE OF ECO. GROWTH (IEG) (NGO)/(GRANT) -- "Programme of Research Relating to Economic Reforms" -- 36 months -- cost n.a.	-05/14/92 -07/14/92	-affirmative	MGupta JO'Rourke	IEG submitted a 3-year partial proposal relating to economic reforms in the areas of FDI, trade, financial sector, and privatization. Subsequently, proposed budget and a revised proposal received on 02/04/93 & 03/30/93 respectively. Informal review indicate that a more focussed, detailed proposal is required.
7.	NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC FINANCE & POLICY (NIPFP) (NGO)	-04/02/92 -04/29/92	-affirmative	MGupta JO'Rourke	In Nov. 92, NIPFP (Dr. Sudipto Mundle) informally communicated to PRO (JOR, Madhumita) to expect two proposals from NIPFP (on macro-economic policies/inflation and urban housing finance, respectively). Proposal still awaited.
8.	CONFEDERATION OF INDIAN INDUS. (CI) (NGO)/(GRANT) -- Proposal on Economic Reforms: Developmental Issues in Restructuring -- 60 months -- US\$ 7,000,000	-05/14/92		FManteiga	A three page outline for a 5 year/7 million dollar outline of proposal received from CI - focussing on promotion of state to state/enterprise to enterprise linkages between the US and India; facilitation of transfer of technology; and linkages between the US and India for third country business opportunities. Mr. Bollinger/Mintz/Mahoney/Grayzel/Maheshwari/JOR, Madhumita met with CI team on 12/16/92. The AID team again met with CI on 1/19/93. Mission Director to respond to CI.
9.	INDIRA GANDHI INST. OF DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH (IGDR) (NGO)	-04/29/92 -n.a.		MGupta JO'Rourke	PRO (Madhumita) paid a visit to IGDR in Oct., 93 and clarified. Some of the conditions stated in the IFA/IGDR (Dr. Jyoti Parekh) should interest in submitting a proposal on labour policy issues.
10.	DELHI SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS (DS) (NGO)	-05/14/92		MGupta JO'Rourke	PRO received a concept paper from DS. Paper to be reviewed by Mission.
11.	INDIAN STATISTICAL INSTITUTE CALCUTTA (ISI-CAL)	-05/14/92 -affirmative		MGupta JO'Rourke	No proposal received to date.

SRL NO.	ACTIVITY (STATUS);(TYPE OF AGREEMENT) - PROPOSED TITLE - PROPOSED TIMETABLE - ESTIMATED COST	DATE OF: - IFA - RESPONSE - NATURE OF RESPONSE	RESP. OFFICERS	REMARKS
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

- | | | | | |
|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 12. | UTI INSTITUTE OF CAPITAL
MARKETS (UTI/CM)
(NGO)/(GRANT)
-- "Establishing a Financial Derivatives
Market in India"
-- 24 months
-- US\$ 210,000 | -04/29/92
-affirmative | AKJha
JO'Fourke | Proposal received from UTI/CM on 12/17/92. to study and determine the regulatory, operational and technology environment required for introducing stock and related derivatives instruments in the Indian markets. Subsequent to RC review on 1/11/93 PRO (Nina) drafted a response indicating possible funding under TASP subject to certain modifications. Requested modifications received. In Sept.'93 decision made to fund subject activity under FIRE. Action memo PIO/T and RL prepared. |
| 13. | INDIA ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF COLLEGE
OF INDIA (ASCI)
(NGO) | -05/14/92 | AKJha
JO'Fourke | A joint activity between CFED in Washington, D.C. and ASCI in Hyderabad may be funded under FIRE. |
| 14. | ASSOCIATED CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE
& INDUSTRY OF INDIA (ASSOCHAM)
(NGO)/(GRANT)
-- Proposal on:
(a) Environmental Management
(b) Private Part. in Power Generation
-- 24 months
-- US\$ 740,000 | -05/14/92
-07/30/92
--affirmative | ARay
RGoldman | Draft proposal received by TDE from ASSOCHAM. Following internal review and discussions with ASSOCHAM, TDE has decided to pursue the ASSOCHAM proposal in its modified form under the Private Power Initiative. Therefore, the subject proposal to be deleted from list of potential TASP activity. |
| 15. | BUSINESS INDIA (BI)
(NGO) | -05/14/92 | AKJha
JO'Fourke | BI informally advised that they will not submit a proposal, but they passed the IFA to CRISIL which has written to USAID. |
| 16. | CENTER FOR POLICY RESEARCH (CPR)
(NGO) | -04/02/92
-04/29/92
-negative | MGupta
JO'Fourke | Negative response received to IFA. |

Total IFAs: 18
of which: - 2 activities are under implementation;
- 1 activity (NCAER) shortly to be funded under TASP;
- 4 activities proposed to be transferred for funding under other Projects.

B.WK3 (08/26/94)

D – STATUS OF UNSOLICITED PROPOSALS – TASP

(in US \$)

----- Latest Information Available -----					
SRL NO.	ACTIVITY (STATUS)(TYPE OF AGR.) (PROPOSED TITLE) (PROPOSED DUR.) (COST ESTIMATES)	DATE OF: INITIAL CORRESP.	DATE OF: PROPOSAL ACKNOWL.	RESP. OFFICERS	REMARKS
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1.	International Center for Economic Growth (ICEG)			MGupta JO'Rourke	Estimated Amount/Duration – \$150,000/3 month. Proposal to design a short-term training/dissemination program on 'Economic Development and Reform' for senior level GOI officials. Received in Jan'94. SOW and PIO/T drafted by PRO (Madhumita) and reviewed by PIC (02/24/94). PIO/T forwarded to AID/W in June'94 for contract negotiation.
2.	Dept. of Public Enterprise (DOPE) Seminar on Privatization			MBhusnurmath JO'Rourke	Estimated Amount/Duration – \$120,000/3 month. Proposal received from DEA, MOF, for INTRADOS to design and jointly with DOPE hold a one-week seminar on Privatization in consultation with the Administrative Staff College of India (ASCI) in Hyderabad. Proposal actively under consideration.
3.	Tax Improve Tax Collection, audit and investigation of GOI.			MBhusnurmath JO'Rourke	Estimated Amount/Duration – \$1 million/2 years. Tax Reform Program requested by GOI on 'Upgradation and Modernization of withholding of Tax System and Tax Instalment System' and on 'Upgradation and Modernization of Tax Audit and Investigation Technique' Initial proposal was for a 2 year/\$10 million program. Mission contacted and received from IRS a proposal on the proposed tax reform program Awaiting response from DEA.
4.	Telecommunication (ICICI)			MGupta JO'Rourke	Estimated Amount/Duration – \$100,000. To study and recommend: (a) a regulatory structure for Indian Telecom industry; (b) ways and means of additional resource mobilization in the Telecom Sector; and (c) entry-level conditions for private firms in rural Telecom. Proposal inactive.
5.	Telecommunication Training (Local)			MGupta JO'Rourke	Estimated Amount/Duration – \$100,000. Local training on Telecom; possibly to be offered by INTRADOS. Expecting proposal from the Dept. of Telecom.
6.	Van Whiting			MGupta JO'Rourke	Estimated Amount/Duration – \$300,000/one year. Proposal on Information Technology – A Demand Side Approach, received from Dr. Whiting in June'94. Awaiting further clarifications prior to review.
7.	Telecommunication (Center for New Economics)			MGupta JO'Rourke	Estimated Amount/Duration – \$150,000/15 months. To examine all aspects of Indian Telecom towards a new Telecom Policy with special emphasis on privatization.
8.	Telecommunication (Center for Telecom Management and Studies)			MGupta JO'Rourke	Estimated Amount/Duration – \$2,000/4 months. To study entry – level conditions for private enterprises into the provision of Rural Telecom Service.
9.	Business Economics Services Team (BEST)			MGupta JO'Rourke	Estimated Amount/Duration – \$2,100,000/2 years. Orientation of opinion leaders/makers on economic reforms through seminar and workshops.

B-13

169

SRL NO.	ACTIVITY (STATUS)/(TYPE OF AGR.) (PROPOSED TITLE) (PROPOSED DUR.) (COST ESTIMATES)	DATE OF:	DATE OF:	RESP. OFFICERS	REMARKS
		INITIAL CORRESP.	PROPOSAL -ACKNOWL.		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)

----- Latest Information Available -----

- | | | | | | |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|--|---------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 10. | Procter & Gamble (P&G) | | | MGupta
JO'Rourke | P&G met with JOR on 1/4/93 and recommended IGIDR, Berkely (Shankar), University of Michigan (Stern and Deardoff) and a local Indian Chamber of Commerce collaborate on a CGE model for trade. USAID awaits proposal from IGIDR. Meanwhile, NCAER has also shown interest and has submitted a proposal. P&G proposal inactive at present. |
| 11. | Bombay Stock Exchange
(NGO)/(GRANT) | -06/04/92 | | AKJha
JO'Rourke | BSE requested USAID funding for consulting assistance in area of futures and options market. Chicago Board of Option Exchange (CBOE) expressed interest in collaborating with AID and provided SOW for feasibility study. To be considered under FIRE. |
| 12. | The Credit Rating Information Services
of India Limited (CRISIL)
(NGO) | -12/04/92 | | AKJha
JO'Rourke | PRO informally received a draft proposal from CRISIL on 12/4/92. Proposal not approved. |
| 13. | Industrial Credit & Investment Corps.
of India (ICICI)
(NGO) | | | JO'Rourke | ICICI thought piece/proposal received. Mission decision to request informally that ICICI flesh out the idea piece into a proposal. No further action taken. Proposal inactive at present. |
| 14. | Over-the-Counter Exchange of India (OTC)
(NGO) | | | AKJha
JO'Rourke | OTC requested USAID to fund technical assistance in the area of information technology, training system and market operations at a total cost of \$120,000. To be funded under FIRE. |

Total # of Proposals received to date: 14

A:C.WK3 (08/26/94)

E - STATUS OF TRAINING ACTIVITIES: FY 1994

(in U.S.\$)

1) NAME OF COURSE (2)	DATE/DURATION INSTITUTION/LOCATION - OBLIGATED - EARMARKED - COMMITTED (3)	DATE COURSE - IDENTIFIED BY AID - DISBURSED - ACCRUED (4)	NO. OF PROPOSED PARTICIPANTS - UNEXPENDED OR UNEXP. COMMITMENTS (5)	NAME OF PARTICIPANTS (6)
--------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------

Element 29: Development Training
PIL386-0515-29
PIO/P386-0515-1-10084

- 550,000

The following areas have been identified under Development Training for the next 12 months: (a) privatization related areas, (b) foreign trade, (c) foreign direct investment and (d) fiscal reform, and taxation.

(MGupta/JO'Rourke)

Deregulating/Privatizing the Telecommunications
Sector and Building Strategic Alliances

Cancelled due to Union
Budget

02/15/94

Information Technology for Fiscal Systems

04/17/94 to 05/13/94
Harvard Univ.

No. of persons attended - 3

(Mr. Ajai Singh, Commissioner of Income Tax, Income Tax Dept; Kishore David Mankar, Dy. Commissioner, Central Board of Excise & Customs/MOF, and; Kulwant Singh Bhatti, Commissioner of Income Tax, Dept. of Income Tax)

Enterprise Restructuring: Strategies and Techniques for
Market Based Competition

05/02/94 to 05/13/94
CFED/Wash. D.C

02/15/94

Five

No. of persons attended - 2

(Messrs Kush Verma, Dir, Min. of Industry; Shaheer Ahmad, Dy. Gen Manager (Per & Mgmt), Bharat Aluminium Co. Ltd., Korba, Madhya Pradesh)

Privatization: Strategies for Workforce Retraining and
Deployment in Privatized Economies

05/02/94 to 05/27/94
AMI/Atlanta

02/15/94

Eight

No. of persons attended - 3

(Messrs S.S. Sharma, Jt Secy. Min. of Labour; Yasvir Kumar Talwar, Ex. Dir, National Fertilizers Ltd., and; Ved Prakash, Dy. Dir, National Airports Authority)

Private Sector Development
Building Strategic Alliances

05/02/94 to 05/20/94
Int'l Inst./Wash. D.C.

02/15/94

Four

(1)	NAME OF COURSE (2)	DATE/DURATION INSTITUTION/LOCATION (3)	DATE COURSE - IDENTIFIED BY AID (4)	NO. OF PROPOSED PARTICIPANTS (5)	NAME OF PARTICIPANTS (6)
	Restructuring Ownership of Public Companies: Strategies for Corporate Governance and Commercial Success	05/16/94 to 05/27/94 CFED/Wash. D.C.	02/15/94	Five	
	Promotional Strategies for Marketing a Country in the Global Economy	05/30/94 to 06/24/94 10/31/94 to 11/25/94 AMI/Atlanta	02/15/94	Four	No. of persons attended - 3 (Messers S.K. Ray, Dy. Dir, Federation of Indian Export Organizations, Calcutta; Balbir Ram, Dy. Secy. Min. of Commerce, and; A.K. Sood, Under Secy. & Member Secy, Hotels and Restaurants Approval & Classification Committee, Dept. of Tourism)
	Analysis and Negotiation of BOO and BOT Projects: Alternative Strategies for Infrastructure Development	06/06/94 to 06/17/94 CFED/Wash. D.C.		Four	No. of persons attended - 3 (Mrs. Surjit Kaur Sandhu, MD, The Pradeshia Indl & Investment Corpn, Lucknow; Praveen Bagai Mehta, Dy. Dir., DEA, and; Ms. Mira Saxena, Principal Chief, Controller of Acts, Central Board of Direct Taxes)
	Twentieth International Workshop on Public Enterprise Policy and Management in Developing Countries: Public Enterprise Program	06/13/94 to 07/22/94 Cambridge, Massachusetts		Four	No. of persons attended - 1 (Mr. Harminder Raj Singh, Director, Dept. of Heavy Industry, Min. of Industry)
1.	Workshop on Macroeconomic Adjustment and Food/ Agricultural Policy	06/27/94 to 08/05/94 HIID/Cambridge, Mass	02/15/94	Two	No. of persons attended - 4 (Messers B.P. Sinha, Eco. Adv., DEA; M.D. Kaurani, Jt. Secy, Dept. of Agriculture & Cooperation, Min. of Agri; Surender Kumar, Jt. Secy, Dept. of Food, Min. of Food, and; Mrs. Malti S. Sinha, Dept. of Agri. & Coop., Min. of Agri)
1.	Public Enterprises: Restructuring & Privatization	07/11/94 to 07/29/94 Int'l Law Inst/Wash. D.C.	02/15/94	Eight	No. of persons attended - 4 (Messers Anup Mukerji, Jt. Secy., Min. of Ind.; K. Parthasarthy, Dy. Commissioner, Dept. of Fert; S.C. Chhatwal, Dir, India Tourism Dev. Corpn, and; Mukul Bhattacharjee, Under Secy., Min. of Civil Aviation)
2.	Second International Workshop on Performance Contacts	07/18/94 to 07/9/94 Boston/Massachusetts		Two	No. of persons attended - 4 (Messers Anish Madan, Dy. Superintending Engg., Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Utpal Ghosh, Dir, Dept. of Public Enterprises; P.N. Shal, Jt. Advisor, Planning Commission, and; R.P. Singh, Gen. Manager, Power Grid Corpn of India)
1.	Promoting Global Trade and Investment: Strategies for Competing Effectively in the 1990s	07/18/94 to 07/29/94 INTRADOS/Wash. D.C.	02/15/94	Four	No. of persons attended - 5 (Messers Siddhartha Behura, Jt. Secy. Dep. of Indl Dev., Min. of Industry; Ashok Kumar, Dy. Dir. Federation of Indian Export Orgns.; Des Raj Vilasa, Desk Officer, DEA; Rajeev Mittar, Dir, DEA/MOF and; Rajendra Kumar Gupta)

(1)	NAME OF COURSE	DATE/DURATION INSTITUTION/LOCATION	DATE COURSE -IDENTIFIED BY AID	NO. OF PROPOSED PARTICIPANTS	NAME OF PARTICIPANTS
	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)

4.	Management of Privatization: Concepts, Approaches and Strategies	08/01/94 to 08/26/94 AMI/	02/15/94	Four	
5.	Privatizing Power in Emerging Economies: Structure & Finance Public/Private Partnership through BOT Schemes and Divestiture	08/22/94 to 09/02/94 INTRADOS/Wash D.C.		Six	
6.	Foreign Investment Negotiation	09/06/94 to 09/30/94 Int'l Law Inst./	02/15/94	Five	
7.	Entrepreneurship: Development and Rehabilitation of Small and Medium Sized Businesses	09/06/94 to 09/30/94 AMI		Four	
8.	Managing Public Accountability	10/31/94 to 11/18/94 AMI		Four	

.WK3 (08/26/94)

NAME OF COURSE (2)	DATE/DURATION INSTITUTION/LC-ATION (3)	DATE COURSE - IDENTIFIED BY AID (4)	NO. OF PROPOSED PARTICIPANTS (5)	NAME OF DEA NOMINEES (DATE) (6)
Privatization Management & Implementation	03/08/93 to 03/19/93 INTRADOS/Wash. D.C.	- 12/23/92	Five	No. of Persons attended - 3 (Messrs. N.N. Prasad, Dep. Secy/MOI; P. Hota, Jt. Secy/MOI; K.V. Eapen, Under Secretary/Min. of Civil Aviation & Tourism).
Analysis and Negotiation of BOO and BOT Projects	03/08/93 to 03/19/93 CFED/Wash. D.C.	- 12/23/92	Ten	No. of persons attended - 13 (Messrs. I.K. Ahluwalia, Dir./Central Electricity Authority; D.D. Vilasa, Dy. Secy./Min. of Power; B.N. Puri, Dir./Dept. of Surface Transport; V.K. Sahni, Dy. Secy./Dept. of Surface Transport; P.K. Dubey, Dir./Dept of Surface Transport; S. Kumar, Dir./DEA; & Ms. A. Moraes, Dy. GM/Bombay Telephone; A.C. Padhi, Dir./DOT; A.K.M. Nayak, Commissioner/Bangalore Dev. Auth.; Sarin Bhatia, Dy. G.M./RITES; M.S. Srinivasan, MD/Madras Metro Water & Water Supply; S. Bhavani, Dir. MOI; K.S. Pandav, Fin. Adviser/CIDCO).
Capitalizations on Risks and Opportunities in Emerging Markets: Strategies and Techniques for Issuers and Investors	04/12/93 to 04/23/93 CFED/Wash. D.C.	- 02/03/93	Five	No. of persons attended - 1 (Messrs. A.K. Doshi, Addl. Dir./Dept of Co. Affairs).
Information Technology for Fiscal Systems	04/15/93 to 05/14/93 JFK Sch. of Gov't Harvard University Cambridge, Mass.	- 02/03/93	Four	No. of persons attended - 4 (Messrs. M.H. Kherawala, Commissioner/Dept. of Rev., Lucknow; B.C. Rastogi, Member/CBEC, MOF; S. Kapoor, Dir./Income Tax Dept., MOF; Mrs. A. Mehra, Commissioner Dept. of Revenue).
Managing the Privatized Enterprise	04/19/93 to 04/30/93 INTRADOS/Wash. D.C.	- 12/23/92	Five	No. of persons attended - 3 (Messrs. A. Chatterjee, Dep. Secy/MOI; K.P. Krishnan, P.S. to Minister/Mins of Public Grievances & Pensions; S.K. Verma, Under Secy/MOF).
Third Annual International Institute for Securities Market Development	04/26/93 to 05/02/93 The SEC/Wash. D.C.	- 12/04/92	Six	No. of persons attended - 3 (Messrs. S. Murthy, Exe. Dir./SEBI; P. Joseph, Jt. Dir./MOF; C.B. Bhava, Sr. Exe. Dir./SEBI).
Private Participation in Power Development: Market Based Approaches to Project Analysis and Finance	05/12/93 to 05/23/93 CFED/Wash. D.C.	- 02/10/93	Three	No. of persons attended - 2 (Messrs. E.A.S. Sarma, Adv./UPC; Ms. R. Teotia; Dep. Secy./Energy & Petrochemicals Dept., Gandhinagar).
Securities Market Management in Emerging Economies	05/17/93 to 05/28/93 INTRADOS/Wash. D.C.	- 12/04/92	Six	No. of persons attended - 6 (Messrs. P.R.D. Prasad, Dep. Dir./MOF; R. Pal, Dep. Dir./MOF; R. Sridharan, OSD/MOF; K.K.B.S.K.S. Ranikanth, Officer/SEBI; R. Narayan, Dep. G.M./IDBI; Mrs. S. Sarathi, Dep. Dir./MOF).

NAME OF COURSE (2)	DATE/DURATION INSTITUTION/LOCATION (3)	DATE COURSE — IDENTIFIED BY AID (4)	NO. OF PROPOSED PARTICIPANTS (5)	NAME OF DEAN NOMINEES (DATE) (6)
-----------------------	----------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

Valuation Strategies and Techniques: Critical Factors for Successful Privatization Transaction	06/07/93 to 06/18/93 CFED/Wash. D.C.	— 02/05/93	Five	No. of persons attended — 5 (Messrs. V. Ramachandran, Jt. Controller/MOF; D.K. Saraf, Jt. Dir/ONGC; L.A.K. Sinha, Co. Secy./SAIL; S.R. Narayanamurthy, Ch. Manager/SBI Capital Markets Ltd.; L.P. Sonkar, Dep. Adv./UPC).
* Infrastructure Development with Private Participation: BOTs, Bonds issues and cost sharing schemes	06/14/93 to 06/25/93 INTRADOS/Wash. D.C.	— 12/24/92	Five	No. of persons attended — 6 (Messrs. S. Ullas, Sr. Manager/IL&FS; A. Joshi, Jt. Secy/Mins of Surface Transport; P. Kumar, Manager/IDBI; V.K. Sadhu, Dep. Secy/ Mins. of Civil Aviation and Tourism; P.L. Rao, Dept. Econ. Adv/MOI; Mrs. J. Jayaraman, Dep. Secy/MOI).
Performance Contracts: An Approach to Improving Public Enterprise Performance	06/28/93 to 07/07/93 Boston Inst. for Dev.Econ. Boston, Mass.	— 02/03/93	Eleven	No. of persons attended — 9 (Messrs G.P. Joshi, Dir/Dept. of Finance, Gandhinagar, S. Dash, Secy/Govt. Secretariat, Trivandrum; G. Balagopal, Sp. Secy/Dept. of Indus. Reconstruc. & Public Undertakings, Calcutta; S. Kumar, Sp. Secy/ Dept. of Rev., Lucknow; N.M. Kataria, Dir./Mins. of Petro & Natural Gas; S. Soni, Dep. Secy/ Min. of Coal; A.K. Gupta, Dep. Secy/ MOI; S. Chakravorty, Priv. Secy/Govt. of A.P; R.H. Pawar, G.M./RCF Ltd., Bombay).
1993 Workshop on Public Enterprise Policy and Management in Developing Countries	06/14/93 to 07/23/93 HIID/Cambridge, Mass.	— 02/10/93	Three	No. of persons attended — 3 (Messrs. A.H. Jung, Jt. Secy/MOP; A.Sinha, G.M./POPC; S. Niyogi, Dir./Andrew Yule)
Budgeting in the Public Sector	06/28/93 to 08/06/93 HIID/Cambridge, Mass.	— 02/05/93	Three	No. of persons attended : 2 (Messrs. P.N. Bhattacharya, Addl. Budget Officer/MOF; J. Sinha, Dep. Dir. IOF).
Intellectual Property Summer Institute and Advanced Licensing Institute	06/14/93 to 07/23/93 07/26/93 to 07/30/93 Franklin Pierce Law Center, Concord, NH	— 12/24/92	Four	No. of persons attended — 4 (Messrs. R. Singh, Jt. Secy/Mins. of Law; R.V. Yadav, Asst. Registrar/Trade Marks Registry, Madras; G.K. Kawatra, Jt. Secy/ FICCI; N.K. Agrawal, Addl. Indus. Adv./ DGTD). (Prof. Bibek Debroy — cancelled)
1. Program on Investment Appraisal and Management	06/21/93 to 08/03/93 Harvard Univ., Cambridge		Two	No. of Persons attended — 1. (Mr. Vinod Valsa, Jt. Secy. Ministry of Chemicals & Petroleum)
1. Facilitating Capital Market Development in Emerging Economies	07/19/93 to 07/30/93 INTRADOS/Wash., D.C.		Five	No. of persons attended — 5 (Messrs Ajay Sharma, Dy. Manager, UTI, Bombay, Vijay Ranjan, Divn. Chief SEBI, Bombay; Arun Chandra, Under Secy. Min. of Finance, New Delhi; Dr. K. Ramanathan Director, RBI, Bombay; and Mrs. Jean Chugh, Manager, ICICI, Bombay).
Restructuring Strategic Alliances in the Civil Aviation Industry	08/23/93 to 09/03/93 INTRADOS/Wash. D.C.	— 02/03/93	Five	No. of persons attended — 4. (Messrs M. Bhattacharjee, Under Secy., Dept. of Civil Aviation; V.J. Menon, Under Secy., Dept. of Civil Aviation; A.K. Goyal, Sr. Dy. Commercial Manager, Indian Airlines; and Mrs. L. Indumathy, Under Secy., Dept. of Civil Aviation.

NAME OF COURSE (2)	DATE/DURATION INSTITUTION/LOCATION -- OBLIGATED -- EARMARKED -- COMMITTED (3)	DATE COURSE -- IDENTIFIED BY AID -- DISBURSED -- ACCRUED (4)	NO. OF PROPOSED PARTICIPANTS -- UNEXPENDED OR UNEXP. COMMITMENTS (5)	NAME OF DEA NOMINEES (DATE) (6)
Promoting Global Trade and Investment: Strategies for Competing Effectively in the 1990s	09/27/93 to 10/08/93 INTRADOS/Wash. D.C.	02/03/93	Six	No. of Persons attended - 5. (Messrs H.L. Kadabaju, Dy. Commissioner, Kankar Free Trade Zone; J.M. Mauskar, Director, Min. of Commerce, Pradeep Puri, Director, MOF; Yogesh Chandra, Adtl. Economic Advisor, MOF and Ms. Lipi Pal, Sr. Executive, ASSOCHAM.
Privatization Management and Implementation	09/27/93 to 10/08/93 INTRADOS, Wash., D.C.		Five/Six	No. of persons attended - 6 (Messrs Abha Anand Kishore, Dy. Secy. and D.K. Pandey, Under Secy, Min. of Industry R. Mandal, Jt. Advisor, Planning Commission; M/s H. Prabhakar Rao, Chief Controller of A/c, Min. of Finance; M. Nath Verma, Sr. Vice-President, ITDC; J.B. Divale, Director BEML
Federal Reserve System/World Bank Seminar for Senior Bank Supervisors	10/18/93 to 11/05/93 FRS / World Bank	-12/23/92	Four	No. of persons attended - 2. (Messrs M.S. Aradhey, Dy. chief Officer, RBI, Bombay and M.G. Bakre, Manager, IDBT.
Securities Market Management in Emerging Economies	11/29/93 to 12/10/93 INTRADOS/Wash. D.C.	-02/03/93	Five	Nominations not received from GOI/MOF. Course cancelled.
Bank Restructuring through Regulations & Supervision	11/01/93 to 11/12/93 INTRADOS/Wash., D.C.		Six	No. of persons attended - 2. (Mr. R.N. Buch, Dy. G.M., Dena Bank; Ms. V. J. Sharma, Dy. Ch. Off/RBI.
Bank Restructuring through Management Initiatives	11/01/93 to 11/12/93 INTRADOS/Wash., D.C.		Six	No. of persons attended - 4. (Messrs P. Sen, Pvt. Secy to Mon of State for Finance/New Delhi); V. Murali, OSD/DEA; M.M.S. Rekhrao, Jt. Ch. Off/RBI; A.M. Arondekar, Jt. Zonal Mgt./ Bombay Metro zone).
Total # of Courses/Total # of Proposed Participants/ Actual No. of persons attended	28 / 134 / 116			

ANNEX C

THE CONTEXT: THE INDIAN POLITICAL ECONOMY

78

ECONOMIC LIBERALIZATION: PHASE I

Since the Technical Assistance and Support Project (TASP) began operations in 1988, political and economic changes have swept across India. One of the most dramatic of these changes occurred in 1991. In June of that year, the Government of India announced a significant economic reform program designed to liberalize the country's stagnant economy from burdensome policy. The objective of the program was to replace a predominantly regulatory system with an enabling policy environment supportive of the private sector and responsive to the demands of the marketplace, a process widely described as economic liberalization. Since 1991, and likely into the foreseeable future, the Government of India has continued to focus on economic liberalization. With such backing, support of the economic liberalization program will likely be a major factor in both bilateral and multilateral aid programs.

Indian economic reform has been a much discussed subject. Various perceptions prevail about its viability and future course, and significant problems need to be addressed. However, one major stream of thought is optimistic about what has happened and what is likely to occur in the future.

Economic reform in India has been accepted with relative ease by government, business, and academia in India. Other countries experiencing economic reform have experienced considerable conflict, dissent, and widespread debate. To the benefit of the reform movement in India, impassioned conflict and dissent has not occurred, while debate is focused on the implementation of reform rather than acceptability of reform.

The acceptability and smoothness of India's change have raised concern that if circumstances warrant, the move back to regulation could be equally as easy. The prevailing view in and out of government, however, is that the direction of reform is unlikely to change, even if political upsets occur. What could change are the speed and sequencing of reform.

India's recent economic history is complex, and a number of facets to the recent past support the argument that the direction of economic liberalization in India is irreversible:

- Unlike in many other countries attempting liberalization, India's economic reform did not stem from a change of philosophical thinking by a new political party that came into power on a reform agenda. Rather, the country's acceptance of economic reform was an imperative imposed by a deteriorating external payments situation; the Indian government felt it had no other option. In that sense, liberalization is a top-down administrative change.
- In the long history of Indian government regulation, there have been other periods when attempts have been made to liberalize the economy. Some of these attempts have involved procedural rationalization, and some a hesitant move to integrate the economy with the rest of the world (some of these modalities adopted were unwise, such as growth through external borrowing). Thus, the problems of bureaucracy and economic isolation have long been recognized in India.
- India's post-independence development philosophy was neither autarkic nor cast in the mold of a command economy. Increasing regulations were a political response to consolidate power in response to domestic and regional situations.
- After 1980, Indira Gandhi took hesitant steps to lessen the rigorosity and irrationality of economic controls. These were hastened by Rajiv Gandhi. The gradual evolution of a more

outward-looking economy was upset, however, by the political misadventures of successor governments. A suspect government, a perception of a nonperforming economy, and a rush of international obligations changed India's environment absolutely and irrevocably in 1991.

- Beginning in 1989, Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union experienced major political and economic changes associated with the rejection of a planned economy and economic regulation. India consequently lost its international economic role models.

ECONOMIC LIBERALIZATION: PHASE II

As a government-instituted administrative reform, Indian economic liberalization needed to be accepted by the various interest groups in society. Not surprisingly, in the last three years, the focus of economic liberalization has been on the dissemination of the reform message and on tackling comparatively easy problems, such as external trade reform, delicensing, and other actions that the central government could undertake unilaterally. There is a growing realization that in the future the reform process will have to manage more difficult and demanding issues, whether they entail changing the mindset of the unconvinced who were beneficiaries of the earlier regime, or finding socially acceptable solutions to economic equity issues such as labor redundancy in government regulatory bodies and implementation of exit policies for unviable enterprises and employees.

As India embarks on its second phase of liberalization, the agenda for reform varies depending on the interest group. Government has one set of ideas, industry another, and academia yet a third. Although commonalities exist among these ideas, the variations are significant. Whichever agenda is adopted will demand much greater political will and support than have been devoted to past reforms.

What seems to be emerging as the next priority in India's economic reform is institutional reform viewed as organizational development and public administration—organizational development to improve the management of specific organizations, and public administration to improve the functioning of the overall system.

In terms of organizational development, a significant area of near universal concern is the need to establish appropriate methods for disassembling regulatory systems that are no longer required. For example, the erstwhile regulators who are rendered functionless in reform require retraining, reassignment, or outplacement. If this process is not conducted quickly and in an equitable manner, the displaced could organize opposition to reform efforts.

The efficacy of public administration has a significant role to play in the progress of economic reform. Strengthening public administration should begin with an examination of the role of the public sector in a market economy. Once that role is clarified, attention should focus on the effective and efficient management of public resources for the public good. The most effective reform interventions of the future should be anchored in the provision of responsive public administration for India's citizens. Reform in public administration should cover many elements, from philosophy to attitudinal change to appropriate structures, with a built-in transparency to ensure acceptance by the citizenry.

The Indian industrial and service sectors have reacted positively to the current economic reform program, but have displayed only a rudimentary understanding of the potential effect of liberalization on their industries and associations. Government remains a major player in the industrial sector, but despite a desire to respond to market conditions, it is weighed down by administrative rigidities, slowing the

overall pace of industrial reform. Furthermore, a huge disparity exists between the capacity and desire of state governments to promote and attract both foreign and domestic industries. This is evident in a comparison of the successes of Maharashtra with the failures of Bihar. Only some in private industry have recognized that market reform requires business both to look outward and to strengthen its technological capabilities. The possibility of international competition affecting the business sector's domestic markets is perceived only vaguely. The shift in thinking by Indian industry to become internationally competitive to service both domestic and foreign markets has not yet occurred.

Reform of financial institutions remains a recognized priority in India to provide the lifeblood of finance to growing businesses. Yet although there are signs of change, little of significance has been implemented. India's financial institutions remain closely integrated structures mostly in the public sector. Their reform carries with it the prospect of both the dismantling of public functions and the growth of private activities. Perhaps economic reform would have followed a speedier track had stock market misdemeanors not surfaced early in its history.

India's small industry is a colossus representing a third of all industrial production in India. Within this sector are the small businesses that, by virtue of admirable entrepreneurial skills and "street smarts," have contributed a disproportionate amount to the country's economic growth. The small industry sector also includes the neglected subsistence sector. By virtue of the sheer numbers of people in the subsistence sector, a large proportion of national resources remains locked in the pursuit of survival objectives rather than in an effort to make significant contributions to national economic growth. Economic reforms addressing both the small business and subsistence sectors may yield high returns in the improvement of economic conditions in India.

Taken together, the industrial and service sectors have made a patchy response to economic reform, leaving large sections of industry, whether by region, sector, or size, relatively untouched.

Indian agriculture, in contrast to industry, has been an all-private effort. It is dominated by the small-scale farmer, and has yet to graduate into viable off-farm agribusiness. What is required to promote the agribusiness sector is the ability to acquire technological inputs, which will be partially relieved by reducing constraints to the importation of technology and capital equipment. A supportive policy environment, and a responsive financial sector, are also principal requirements. A white paper on Government of India agricultural policy has been commissioned to address the country's agriculture and agribusiness sectors, but is yet to be finalized.

DONOR INVOLVEMENT

Indian economic reform has attracted much international support and attention. Because of the amount of aid India has received, each donor must choose an appropriate niche suitable to the context corresponding to its own geopolitical interest.

International donor efforts serve as supports at the margin; that is, their impact and efficiency perhaps need to be measured as marginal. The synergy these efforts help to develop could well be a measure of effectiveness, however. If creating synergy is the objective, it seems that institution-building measures are preferable to focused project support. This is not to deny the relationship between the project and the capacity building of institutions, but the focus on the latter should be distinct. In such efforts, the project is the modality, and institution building is a near-term objective.

One aspect of India's institution-building process is the formal cooperation between Indian and U.S. research entities that could be considered a useful partnership for providing sustainable international support. In the Indian reform context this emphasis on collaboration could be most meaningful. Nonetheless, collaboration among institutions is not easy, given the inward-looking culture of many academic institutions in India. Although most better-known Indian academics have personal contacts with U.S. institutions, institutional relations have been at arm's length. Project interventions could provide important support for the broadening and deepening of India's institutions. In the long term, such an effort would back other, sustainable efforts to support policy formulation that could promote economic reform.

In the last few years, there have been considerable inputs to improve policy analysis and policy formulation (a national effort supported by many international donors), but there seems to be a very limited effort to build advocacy skills. The evaluation team has seen much good policy research become no more than just an intellectual effort — another "report in the archives," so to speak. The link between analysis and formulation of policy perhaps needs to be strengthened. As it is strengthened, the government will be better served by more reasoned and immediate input from policy analysts and researchers. Once this link is improved, project assistance could contribute substantially to economic reform and growth, which is what India's liberalization effort is all about.

ANNEX D
STATEMENT OF WORK

ATTACHMENT I

Page 1 of 7

STATEMENT OF WORK1. BACKGROUND

The Technical Assistance & Support Project (TASP) is an outgrowth of the Regional and Technical Collaboration Project (RTCP). It is an umbrella project designed to support a wide range of activities such as feasibility studies and pilot activities, collaborative scientific exchange and development training in the areas of priority for both GOI and USAID as they emerge.

As articulated in the authorized Project Paper, the purpose of the project was very broad; i.e. to improve the efficiency, effectiveness and timeliness of GOI and USAID efforts to identify, design, implement and evaluate development investments of both public and private sectors. The goal is similarly broad, i.e. to contribute in a collaborative manner towards strengthening of GOI's ability to implement its development programs and policies.

The life of project (LOP) at present is from 08/31/88 to 09/30/96, during which a grant of \$18 million from USAID and a contribution equivalent of \$6 million from GOI will have been made available to support various activities. (The initial authorization was for \$15 million, but by mid-1993, \$3 million was added because approximately \$14.8 million had already been obligated and nearly \$14 million has been reserved for specific project activities and approximately \$11 million was committed through signed contract, grants, cooperative agreement etc. documents. As of 9/30/93, accrued expenditures totalled approximately \$7.5 million.

Immediately after the GOI initiated its new economic policy reforms and USAID adopted its new strategy with improvement in financial and regulatory environment as one of the major objectives, the TASP project was reviewed internally and with GOI/MOF/DEA. This occurred in September, 1992. It was jointly decided at that time to thereafter focus TASP project activities on helping the GOI to implement improvements in India's financial and regulatory environment and to initiate new activities if they are directly focused on this Mission strategic objective. At this time it was also decided to add a project element development training, particularly for senior and middle level GOI administrators/managers who are responsible for the implementation of various aspects of economic policy reforms.

2. EVALUATION PURPOSE

Since the Project was authorized there have been two formal studies on the TASP project although there has not been a formal mid-term evaluation. These studies are entitled: "International Executive Service Corps: A Study by B.R. Deolalikar, May 1991 and "TASP Strategy and Program Development" also authored by B.R. Deolalikar in March 1992. Since the start of the project years ago, numerous sub-project activities have been completed, numerous others are underway and a large number of proposals are in the pipeline. By June of 1993 it became clear that the project was running out of money after

64

nearly fully obligating the initial total authorized level of \$15 million. It was therefore decided to increase the authorized level by \$3 million to \$18 million and to consider further increases beyond this \$18 million amount and beyond the current PACD only after reviewing the mid-term evaluation. The Mission Director has the authority to increase the total authorization to \$30 million and extended the PACD to 8/31/98.

The purpose of this mid-term evaluation is:

- i) To determine appropriateness of increasing the authorized funding level beyond the current maximum of \$18 million and extending the PACD.
- ii) To review the progress made and results achieved in the individual sub-projects and activities funded by the TASP project
- iii) To review the progress made towards the stated goal, purpose and new focus of the project;
- iv) To suggest mid-course corrections and provide future directions in order to enable USAID and the GOI to achieve the stated project purpose, goal and focus during the remaining life of the project.
- v) To make recommendations for improvements in managing the project (e.g. activity selection, approval, implementation, monitoring etc.)

3. EVALUATION ISSUES

The following is an illustrative list of evaluation issues which will be examined critically by the evaluation team:

A. Project Goal, Purpose and Focus

- i) How valid is the original project purpose of improving the effectiveness of GOI and USAID efforts and the goal of strengthening GOI's ability to implement its development programs and policies? Does it need amendment at the present time?
- ii) Are the activities supported under the project contributing or likely to contribute to the project purpose and Mission's strategic objectives?
- iii) Is the revised project focus valid and consistent with the original project focus?
- iv) If the answer to question (iii) is negative, then what should be the TASP focus?

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- i) Describe and evaluate the progress made and the results produced by the various activities funded so far under the project?

- i) Are the project's accomplishments that might impact on India's financial and regulatory environment and policy-reforms significant?

3. Selection of Activities and Responsible Entities

- i) Describe and evaluate the process of identifying and selecting activities appropriate for funding under TASP. Identify areas where improvements can be made.

D. Activity Monitoring and Management

- i) Describe and evaluate the effectiveness of USAID's internal system of financial controls for TASP project activities and for the project as a whole.
- ii) Are project outcomes, reports and deliverables documented by activity managers, including reports of conferences, status reports, and other documentation of the funded activity?
- iii) Describe and evaluate the effectiveness of the GOI and USAID in identifying appropriate personnel for the development training component of the TASP project.

E. Project Direction/Strategy

- i) Identify (only if necessary and recommended) and justify any reallocation, realignment, increase or decrease in funding resources for TASP activities.
- ii) Identify (only if necessary and recommended) and justify any proposed mid-course corrections and future directions required to achieve the stated project purpose and goal effectively and efficiently?

4. EVALUATION TEAM

A four-member team will be required to examine the evaluation issues. Their nationality, specialty and experience is indicated below.

<u>Nationality</u>	<u>Specialty</u>
1. U.S.	Legal and Institutional Framework & privatization (Microeconomics)
2. U.S.	Trade and Foreign Investment (International Trade/Finance)
3. Indian	Financial and Capital Markets Framework (Financial Markets)
4. Indian	Implementation of Policy Reforms & Training (Macroeconomics)

96

The team must have a strong background in the management of foreign aid supported policy-oriented activities and projects and in the evaluation of bilateral or multilateral projects which are focused on policy-oriented collaborative activities such as studies, workshops, seminars, conferences and training, as effective means of accomplishing economic reforms.

The team should be able to work in a collaborative manner with each other, with key GOI personnel and with Mission personnel to evaluate the overall effectiveness of the projects, past activities and to suggest conceptually sound, pragmatic recommendations for the future course of the project. The team will judge objectively and in collaboration with USAID officials the relevance and utility of TASP activities to GOI's policy reforms and USAID's strategic objective of supporting the implementation of GOI's policy reforms. The team will suggest mid-course corrections, if necessary, and future directions in order to achieve the project purpose and goal effectively and efficiently. One of the U.S. specialists with excellent leadership and report writing skills will function as a team leader and will be responsible for the overall coordination of evaluation and finalization of the report.

The team will submit its draft report (including a summary of findings conclusions and recommendations) to USAID in draft prior to departure from India and consolidate and submit a final report after receiving USAID and GOI comments on the draft report.

The evaluation team will receive guidance and support from the TASP Project Officer on evaluation-related matters during the period of evaluation.

5. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluation team will follow the following methods:

- A. *Review of Documents:* The evaluation team will review the proposals, monitoring and progress reports and other deliverables or documents that are available for various TASP activities. These files are located in the USAID PRO office, PDIT office and other technical backstop offices. They will also study original project paper, project agreements, project amendments, relevant project implementation letters and minutes of project implementation review meetings.
- B. *Meetings and Discussions:* The evaluation team will conduct interviews and discussions with all concerned USAID and GOI officials who are responsible for identification, review, approval, design, implementation, management, monitoring and overall coordination of TASP activities. The team leader will coordinate these activities and provide the USAID Project Officer with the proposed list of interviews prior to conducting them.
- C. *Site Visits and Discussions:* The evaluation team will visit at least 10 organizations which are engaged in TASP funded activities, discuss the evaluation issues with responsible persons and collaborators, collect relevant documents emerging out of TASP activities. The U.S. experts will visit at least 3 T.A.A. funded U.S. collaborating organizations before coming to India and solicit the views of these organizations with Indian team members.

1. *Briefing and Debriefing:* Once the evaluation issues and methods are clearly understood in the first two days in India, the evaluation team will brief the Mission Director's office on the team's work plan and proposed evaluation methodology and suitably incorporate the suggestions and concerns that emerge from these meetings. At the end of site visits, the evaluation team will informally share their tentative findings, conclusions and recommendations as they emerge with the Project Officer and related USAID Mission personnel, and incorporate suggestions from persons and others connected with TASP into the team's draft report.

The team will prepare a draft report which will include a detailed summary of (a) findings, (b) conclusions and, (c) recommendations. Once the draft report is ready, the evaluation team will present their draft to the concerned USAID and to GOI officials and seek and incorporate their comments and suggestions. Subsequently, final debriefing with Mission Officials will be arranged to share and discuss the findings and conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned.

E. *Other appropriate Methods:* It is expected that the evaluation team will list out specific questions required to probe into each issue, develop an appropriate interview protocol and data collection strategy and suitably modify the evaluation methodology on their own. They may like to conduct a case study, document some successes or failures and use their own criteria or indicators to judge the relevance and utility of TASP activities for the project purpose and Mission objective.

5. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The evaluation team will jointly prepare the report. This report will be finalized by the contractor within 10 days from the receipt of comments from GOI and Mission officials. As per the AID requirements, the team will cover all evaluation issues and produce a report which will include the following sections:

- Description of the project, including its goal purpose focus and summary of activities funded to-date.
- Evaluation issues and questions
- Evaluation team and work plan
- Evaluation methodology
- Evaluation findings and conclusions (issue-wise)
- Recommendations and lessons learned

Evaluation team will also prepare the evaluation abstract (one page) and executive summary (4-5 pages) which will provide a summary of all sections of the report in the same order as mentioned above.

The contractor will formally submit to USAID one original and 20 duplicate copies (along with diskette) of the final report. The final report will have a cover, a preface, a table of contents, a list of tables, acronym and persons and institutions visited, documents and reports reviewed and relevant technical or analytical annexes supporting the main findings, conclusions and recommendations contained in the

report. Scope of work, project identification data sheet, log-frame and basic details of TASP activities will all be included in the annexes for ready reference.

ANNEX E
EVALUATION TEAM, METHODOLOGY, AND WORK PLAN

EVALUATION TEAM AND METHODOLOGY

The purpose of the mid-term evaluation of the TASP Project is to review the completed and current projects to determine both their individual and collective effectiveness, impact, and appropriateness to the development strategy of the Government of India and the USAID mission. Inherent in the conduct of the evaluation, the evaluation team will: 1) determine the appropriateness of increasing the authorized funding level beyond the current maximum of \$18 million and extending the current Project Anticipated Completion Date (PACD) beyond 9/30/96; 2) make recommendations in the management of the project; 3) suggest mid-course corrections and recommend future directions for the for the remaining life of the project.

The evaluation will be completed between August and October 1994, in both the United States and India. In the United States, interviews will be conducted with grantees and collaborating institutions, many of which are located in the Washington, D.C. area. Grantees and collaborating institutions outside of the Washington area will be contacted and interviewed by telephone. In India, the body of work will be completed in New Delhi, in which most of the grantees maintain offices. A two-day trip to Bombay to interview three grantees and a potential grantee. The sole grantee located in Madras will be interviewed by telephone.

The evaluation team consists of Development Specialist, Dennis De Santis and Policy Reform Specialist, Dr. N.C.B. Nath. Mr. De Santis, Director of the Development Policy and Management Group of Development Alternatives, Inc. (DAI) has considerable experience in AID private sector projects, evaluation, and experience with policy concerning the private sector in emerging market economies. Dr. N.C.B. Nath, an economist, is the Chairman of the Foundation to Aid Industrial Recovery. He has extensive experience in academia, and in both the public and private sector. He is well versed in development management, policy analysis and is especially knowledgeable of government policy affecting economic liberalization.

The evaluation team will employ the following methods:

- 1) **Review of documents:** The team will thoroughly acquaint themselves with the relevant project documents including the Project Paper, amendments, and individual grant agreement and scopes of work, as well as a sampling of reports, and research documents completed under the grant agreements. They will familiarize themselves with USAID India mission strategy and goal statements.
- 2) **Meetings and discussions:** For the majority of grants, the project team will interview the USAID project manager and activity manager assigned to the grant, the Indian or U.S. grantee, and the Indian or U. S. collaborating institution. Appropriate mission management and GOI Department of Economic Affairs personnel will also be interviewed.
- 3) **Briefing and Debriefing:** Upon arrival the team will brief the mission management, project management, activity managers, and other USAID personnel on the objectives of the evaluation. The team will meet with and advise the project officer on the status of the evaluation, the evaluation outline, methodology, and findings in progress. Three days prior to departure, the team will present a preliminary draft report on the findings and recommendations to the Project Officer and Office Director. The day after the team will hold a debriefing with the AID mission, including AID management, project directors, and activity managers. The following day an exit interview will be held with the Project Office and Office Director to provide guidance for the draft report.

4) Methods: The TASP project, began in 1988, has made 20 grants for sub-projects, with an additional Development Training Grant and one other grant under review. Several of these projects have been completed, others are nearing completion, and still others have just begun. A wide body of work in research, policy analysis, scientific and business exchanges, training, and technical assistance has been completed. Several of the projects have reports, research documents, and publications numbering well over 100, making it impossible to review each document. Instead of dwelling on mechanical counting of persons trained, seminars held, and research document published, the team will assess the individual and collective impact of the project based on an evaluation criteria that will include: 1) the collaboration, 2) sustainability (of interest), and 3) the capacity building.

The evaluation team will use qualitative analyses to assess the data and information gathered from USAID personnel, grantees, and a random sampling of project reports, research, and publications. A classification method will be devised to facilitate the analysis. The classification will be on the basis of date, size, method employed, and program component.

WORK PLAN

- Aug 22-Aug 26: Washington/De Santis: review of documents and visits to Washington area grantees: IFPRI, IRIS, AED, INTRADOS, PIET, IESC, Georgetown University.
- Aug 28-Sept 3: New Delhi/De Santis & Nath: Meet with TASP Project Officer, Director of PRO, and TASP Activity Managers; begin interviews of New Delhi Grantees (IFT, IESC, NCAER, ICRIER, ICEG, NIUA, ICAR, FICCI, WFP, NIPFP, DST, CPR); submit evaluation report outline.
- Sept 4-Sept 6: Bombay/De Santis: Interviewed Bombay based grantees: SCHIL and SEBI.
- Sept 6-Sept 9: New Delhi/De Santis & Nath: Continue with AID and Grantee and GOI interviews.
- Sept 9-Sept 13: New Delhi/De Santis & Nath: Begin report writing, complete final interviews
- Sept 13-14: New Delhi/ De Santis & Nath: Submit preliminary draft for mission discussion and review. Conduct mission debriefing.
- Sept 15: De Santis Departs for Washington.
- Sept 19-23: New Delhi/Nath: Conducts final interviews and site visits to grantees in new Delhi. TASP Project Officer and PRO office provide comments on draft, as needed, to De Santis in Washington.
- Sept 26-30: Washington/De Santis: Conducts final interviews and telephone contacts with U.S. grantees. Completes Final Draft report, and submits to USAID/I.
- Oct 1-Oct 7: Washington: Final comments received and final report prepared, with 20 copies sent to USAID/I.

ANNEX F

LIST OF PERSONS AND ORGANIZATIONS CONTACTED

17

List of U.S. Organizations

Prof. Mancur Olson
Principal Investigator & Chairman of
Dr. Satu Kahkonen
Institutional Reform and the
Informal Sector (IRIS)
Univ. of Maryland
2105 Morrill Hall, College Park
Maryland 20742
Tel # 301-405-3110
Fax # 301-405-3020
(Activity: IRIS)

Mr. Hasmukh Shah
Indo-American Business Time
P.O. Box 33364 Farragut Station
Washington DC 20033
Tel # 301-572-6067
Fax # 301-572-7233
(Activity: FICCI)

Prof. T.L. Brewer
Georgetown University
Dept. of Economics
37th & O Streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20057
Fax # 202-687-4031
(Activity: IIFT)

Prof. Van R. Whiting
Graduate School of International Relations
and Pacific Studies
Univ. of California, San Diego
9500 Gilman Drive
La Jolla, CA 92093-0519
Tel # 619-534-6074
Fax # 619-534-3939
(Activity: ICRIER)

Prof. Reena Agarwal
Associate Professor of Finance
Georgetown University
Dept. of Economics
37th & O Streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20057
Tel # 202-687-3784
Fax # 202-687-4031
(Activity: ICRIER)

Mr. Peter Hazell
Director
Environment & Production Technology Division.
International Food Policy Research
Institute (IFPRI)
1200 17th Street
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel # 202-862-8151
Fax # 202-467-4439
(Activity: IFPRI)

Ms. Jeanine Greene
The Academy for Educational
Development (AED)
1255 23rd Street, N.W.
Wash. D.C. 20037
Tel # 202-884-8000
Fax # 202-884-8400
(Activity: STF)

Mr. Richard Breen
Price Waterhouse
Int'l Privatization Group
1801 K. Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
Tel # 202-296-0800
Fax # 202-467-4405
(Activity: SHCIL)

Margaret Ghadar
President
INTRADOS International
Management Group
2020 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20008
Tel # 202-667-8270
Fax # 202-223-8791
(Activity: Short-term Development. Training)

Ms. Marta A. Oyhenart
President
Center for Financial Engineering
in Development
1899 L Street, NW
11th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel # 202-728-2983
Fax # 202-728-1865
(Activity: Short-term Development. Training)

95

Ms. Tammy Shamwell
Placement Specialist
Partners for International
Education & Training (PIET)
2000 M Street, NW, Suite 480
Washington DC 20036
Tel # 202-429-0810
Fax # 202-429-8764
(Activity: Short-term Development. Training)

Prof. Seiji Naya
International Center for
Economic Growth (ICEG)
Dept. of Economics
Univ. of Hawaii at Manoa
Room 542, Porteus Hall
2424 Maile Way, Honolulu
Hawaii 96822
Tel # 808-956-8730
Fax # 808-956-4347
(Activity: ICEG)

Dr. Nicolas Ardito Barletta
General Director
International Center for
Economic Growth (ICEG)
P.O. Box 7737
Panama Zone 9, Panama
Tel # 507-64-0040
Fax # 507-64-0040

Mr. Harvey Wallendar
International Executive Service
Corps (IESC)
P.O. Box 10005
Stamford, Connecticut 06904-2005
Tel # 203-967-6000 or 202-686-4899
Fax # 203-324-2531
(Activity: IESC I & II)

Daniel L. Gotz
Research Triangle Institute
P.O. Box 12194
3040 Cornwallis Road
Research Triangle Park
North Carolina 27709, USA)
Tel # 919-541-6383
Fax # 919-541-6621
(Activity: NIUA)

9/0

Dr. Steven M. Poulos
Vice-Chairman
Center for South Asia Studies
201 Moses Hall
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720-2310
Tel # 510-642-3608
Fax # 510-643-5793
(Activity: Berkeley Seminar)

Prof. Bala V Balachandran
J.L. Kellogg Graduate School
of Management
Northwestern University
Leverone Hall 2001 Sheridan Road
Evanston, Illinois 60208-2002
Tel # 708-491-3427
Fax # 708-467-1202
(Activity: Kellogg Conference)

Ms. Elizabeth L. Power
Special Assistant
The Marble Works
P.O. Box 886, Middlebury
VT 05753
Tel # 802-388-0007
Fax # 802-388-1030
(Activity: Salzburg Seminar)

James B. Hom
Executive Director
Institute for Tax Administration
Hilton Center, Suite 624
900 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Tel # 213-623-1103
Fax # 818-842-3930
(Activity: Short-term Development. Training)

Mr. S. Ramakrishnan
Harvard Institute for International
Development
One Eliot Street, Cambridge
Massachusetts 02138
Tel # 617-495-4324
Fax # 617-495-0527
(Activity: HIID)

Ms. Fran Peavy
President
Friends of the Ganges
3181 Mission Street Suite # 30
San Francisco, California
CA 94110
Tel # 415-428-0240
Fax # 415-601-5683
(Activity: SMF)

Prof. Reena Agarwal
Associate Professor of Finance
Georgetown University
Dept. of Economics
37th & O Streets, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20057
Tel # 202-687-3784
Fax # 202-687-4031
(Activity: IFMR)

List of Indian Organizations

Dr. Dinesh Mehta
Director
National Inst. of Urban Affairs (NIUA)
11 Nyaya Marg, Chanakyapuri
New Delhi 110021
Tel # 3010489/3014580/3011510
(Activity: NIUA)

Prof. B.B. Bhattacharyya
Director
Indian Institute of Foreign Trade (IIFT)
B 21, Qutab Inst. Area
New Delhi
Tel # 657558
(Activity: IIFT)

Dr. Rao Ayagari
Director
Dept. of Science & Technology
Ministry of Science & Technology
Technology Bhavan, New Mehrauli Road
New Delhi 110016
Tel # 653695
(Activity: STF)

92

Mr. V.K. Laroia
 Country Director
 C/o Industrial Development Services (P) Ltd.
 Kanchanjunga Building, Barakhamba Road
 New Delhi 110001
 Tel # 3312287/3313469
 (Activity: IESC)

Dr. S.L. Rao
 Director General
 National Council of Applied
 Economic Research (NCAER)
 Parsila Bhavan
 11 Indraprastha Estate
 New Delhi 110002
 Tel # 3317861 to 3317868
 (Activity: NCAER)

Dr. Amit Mitra
 Secretary General
 Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry
 (FICCI
)
 Federation House, Tansen Marg
 New Delhi 110001
 Tel # 3319251 to 3319261
 (Activity: FICCI)

Dr. G.C. Pant
 Director General
 Indian Council of Agricultural
 Research (ICAR)
 Dept. of Agriculture Research and Education
 Ministry of Agriculture
 Krishi Bhavan
 New Delhi 110001
 Tel # 388991/382629
 (Activity: IFPRI)

Mr. H.N. Gupta
 Director
 Dept. of Economic Affairs
 Ministry of Finance
 North Block
 New Delhi 110001
 Tel # 3012883

Dr. Purnima Kashyap
Asst. Program Officer
World Food Programme
53 Jor Bagh
New Delhi 110003
Tel # 4694381
(Activity: WFP)

Dr. S.P. Gupta
Director & Chief Executive
Indian Council for Research on
International Economic Relations (ICRIER)
40 Lodi Estate
New Delhi 110003
Tel # 4627447 & 4698862
(Activity: ICRIER)

Dr. S.P. Gupta
Director & Chief Executive
Indian Council for Research on
International Economic Relations (ICRIER)
40 Lodi Estate
New Delhi 110003
Tel # 4627447 & 4698862
(Activity: ICEG)

Dr. Krishan Kant
Director
Dept. of Electronics
Electronic Niketan
6 C.G.O. Complex, Lodi Road
New Delhi 110003
Tel # 4363112
(Activity: WTP)

Mr. R.H. Mewawala
Vice-President
(National Depository)
Stock Holding Corporation India Ltd. (SHCIL)
Glaxo Bldg., No. 72,
Plot No. 248B, Sudam Kalu Ahire Marg
Worli, Bombay
Tel # 022-4928071/4928336
(Activity: SHCIL)

Mr. Ravi Mohan
Chief Executive
Over the Counter Exchange of India (OTCEI)
92 Maker Towers F, Kuffe Parade
Bombay 400005
Tel # 022-2188164/2188511
(Activity: OTCEI)

Mr. C.B. Bhave
Sr. Executive Director
Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI)
Mittal Court 'B' Wing
224 Nariman Point
Bombay 400021
Tel # 022-2855385/223886/242826/242787
(Activity: SEBI)

Prof. P. Ramaswamy Aiyar
Director
Institute of Financial Management
and Research (IFMR)
30 Kothari Road, Nungambakkam
Madras 600034
Tel # 044-8273873/8273801
(Activity: IFMR)

Dr. M. Govinda Rao
Senior Fellow
National Institute of Public
Finance and Policy
18/2 Satsang Vihar Marg
Special Inst. Area, (Near JNU)
New Delhi 110067
Tel # 669303/669780/653421
(Activity: IRIS)

Dr. Kirit Parikh
Director
Indira Gandhi Institute of
Development and Research (IGIDR)
General Vaidya Marg, Goregaon (East)
Bombay
Tel # 022-8400918/8400919
(Activity: ICEG/IRIS)

Dr. Isher Ahluwalia
Center for Policy Research
Research Professor
Dharma Marg, Chanakyapuri
New Delhi 110021
Tel # 3015273/3015276
(Activity: ICEG/IRIS)

USAID Activity Managers

Mr. R.K. Berry
USAID
Office of Environment, Energy & Enterprise
Room No. 209
Tel. Extension 2204
(Activity(s): IESC, FICCI)

Mr. N. Bhattacharjee
USAID
Office of Regional Housing & Urban Development
USAID
Room No. 202
Tel. Extension 2207
(Activity(s): NIUA)

Ms. Mythili Bhusnurmath
USAID
Office of Program Planning, Budget & Evaluation
Room No. 108
Tel. Extension 2113
(Activity(s): IFMR)

Mr. Charles J. Billand
USAID
Office of Regional Housing & Urban Development
Room No. 203
Tel. Extension 2055
(Activity(s): NIUA)

Mr. Jerry Tarter
USAID
Office of Project Development Implementation & Training
Room No. M02
Tel. Extension 2129
(Activity(s): STF, WTP, Training)

12

Mr. Y.P. Kumar
USAID
Office of Project Development Implementation & Training
Room No. M04
Tel. Extension 2122
(Activity(s): WTP)

Mr. T.R. Sabharwal
USAID
West Building
Room No. 202
Tel. Extension 2060
(Activity(s): Salzburg, STF, Training)

Mr. Felipe Manteiga
USAID
Office of Environment, Energy & Enterprise
Room No. 208
Tel. Extension 2252
(Activity(s): IESC, FICCI)

Mr. Jon O'Rourke
USAID
Office of Program Planning, Budget & Evaluation
Room No. 104
Tel. Extension 2147

Mr. Karan Sawhny
USAID
Office of Program Planning, Budget & Evaluation
Room No. 107
Tel. Extension 2205
(Activity(s): IFPRI, IRIS, ICRIER)

Ms. Madhumita Gupta
USAID
Office of Program Planning, Budget & Evaluation
Room No. 109
Tel. Extension 2106
(Activity(s): ICEG, IIFT, NCAER, Training)

Mr. A.K. Jha
USAID
Office of Program Planning, Budget & Evaluation
Room No. 106
Tel. Extension 2009
(Activity(s): SHCIL, SEBI, OTCEI)

Ms. Hema Ramaswamy
USAID
Office of Food for Development
Room No. G08
Tel. Extension 2211
(Activity(s): WFP)

ANNEX G
TASP FINANCIAL STATUS

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE & SUPPORT PROJECT (TASP)
FINANCIAL STATUS
(As of August 25, 1994)

	\$
1. Life of Project Authorization	18,000,000
2. Total Obligations	15,800,000
3. Total Controller Office Earmarks Against Planned Projects	14,099,925
4. Total Commitments (i.e. Signed Contracts, Grants, etc.)	13,903,695
5. Total Accrued Expenditures (Estimated)	11,000,000
<hr/>	
1. Current Amount of Unearmarked Balance	1,700,075
2. Additional FY 1994 Obligations	1,300,000
3. Estimated FY 1995 Obligations	900,000
<hr/>	
Total Available for Programming for Remainder of LOP (After FY 1995 Obligations)	3,900,075