

PD-ABP-372

94637

**FINAL REPORT ON THE INTERIM EVALUATION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SELF-GOVERNANCE**

(Cooperative Agreement No. PDC-0095-A-00-0061-00)

March 4 1994

Submitted to:

Orest Koropecy G/ECON GROWTH/SMIE
Agency for International Development



600 Water Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20024
USA

202/484-7170
Fax: 202/488-0754

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
PROJECT IDENTIFICATION DATA SHEET	10
1. INTRODUCTION	11
2. FINDINGS	14
A. ICSG Goal, Strategies and Objectives	14
B. Description of ICSG Programs	17
C. Indicators of Program Quality	21
D. Indicators of Demand for ICSG Programs	25
E. Comparisons to Similar USAID Projects	27
F. Impact of ICSG Programs	28
G. Efficiency of ICSG Resource Use	28
H. Management, Planning and Staffing of ICSG	28
I. Management of Cooperative Agreement by USAID/G/ECON GROWTH/SMIE	31
3. CONCLUSIONS	34
4. RECOMMENDATIONS	36
5. ANNEX. COMMENTS BY ICSG	
6. APPENDICES	
APPENDIX A. SCOPE OF WORK	
APPENDIX B. DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	
APPENDIX C. INTERVIEWS	
APPENDIX D. SURVEY RESPONDENTS	
APPENDIX E. SURVEY	
APPENDIX F. ICSG PRODUCTS	
APPENDIX G. ICSG BOOK SALES	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. INTRODUCTION

A. Brief History of the Cooperative Agreement

On May 18, 1990 the Institute for Contemporary Studies submitted a "Proposal for the Expansion of Program on Economic Policy Making for Growth and Human Development" to USAID/PPC/EA. A Cooperative Agreement (CA), based on the above proposal, was negotiated and signed on August 7, 1990, to expire on May 31, 1995. Though the CA was negotiated and awarded by USAID/PPC/EA, it is currently administered by USAID/G/EG/SMIE, as a result of two significant reorganizations of USAID since 1990.

The CA provided support for the continuation and geographic expansion of the then ongoing activities of the International Center for Economic Growth (ICEG) and funded a new activity, the Institutional and Policy Reform Project, which, by June 1, 1991, became known as the International Center for Self-Governance (ICSG). An interim evaluation of ICEG was conducted in 1992. Therefore, this evaluation is focussed exclusively on ICSG activities under the subject CA.

The CA anticipates the provision of \$16,000,000 of USAID funding to ICS, in support of ICEG and ICSG activities, over the five-year period (1990-95). ICS has adopted the practice of allocating approximately 78% (\$2.5 million) of annual funds received to ICEG and 22% (\$700,000) to ICSG. ICS has maintained the above ratio in allocations to ICEG and ICSG despite repeated pressure from PPC/EA and SMIE that it shift additional funds to ICEG, at the expense of ICSG.

2. FINDINGS

A. ICSG Goal, Strategies and Objectives

ICSG's goal, strategies and objectives have evolved considerably from those envisioned in the Cooperative Agreement. Evolution has been guided by the experiences of project implementation and consistent requests by USAID for further specification and narrowing of goals and objectives.

ICSG defines its mission as promoting "the self-governing and entrepreneurial way of life in developing countries." In pursuit of this mission, ICSG seeks to:

1. Translate sound theory: Primary emphasis on translation of sound theories into practical tools for encouraging self-governance is complemented by translation of both theoretical and practical works into other languages.
2. Develop and disseminate materials: The core of the program that has evolved is concerned with development and dissemination of books, videos, workshops and training materials.

3. Act as wholesaler: ICSG does not have the resources, nor the knowledge of variations in local conditions and cultures, to "retail" its products. It seeks partnerships with those who may be able to retail its products.
4. Networking with Advocacy Non-Governmental Organizations: Workshops and training materials are specifically aimed at "activist" or "advocacy" LDC Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs).

B. Description of ICSG Programs

The evaluation team has categorized ICSG's activities into seven programs for ease and coherence of presentation.

1. Books and Monographs

ICSG has sponsored publication by ICS Press of 8 books and 1 monograph.

2. Workshops

ICSG has organized and delivered two "regional" workshops on self-governance and entrepreneurship. The workshops are designed to teach participants about the concepts and practices of self-governance and the entrepreneurial way of life. Each workshop consists of didactic presentations, participant workgroups for application of principles learned and field visits to functioning community organizations that represented various degrees of self-governance and entrepreneurship.

3. Networking

ICSG has engaged in several activities which it refers to as "networking." The principal activity, which has been repeated from year to year, is attendance by ICSG representatives at professional conferences in order to disseminate information about ICSG and its activities. Other networking activities have included "marketing" trips to various USAID Missions and aid recipient countries, looking for venues for future workshops.

4. International Network

ICSG has gradually built up an International Network, whose members are primarily advocacy NGOs in developing countries. There are currently 27 network members from 18 countries. Most members are from Latin America and Spanish speaking Caribbean nations.

5. Training Materials

ICSG has made a significant effort to develop original training materials, largely derived from a few of the books that they have published or intend to publish in the future. Development of training materials is an area of both high promise and substantial difficulty for ICSG. It is an area of high promise in that, to our knowledge, it is a rather unique undertaking, which, if

successful, has the potential to have a substantial multiplier effect on ICSG's efforts to promote self-governance. It also appears to have the potential to be commercially viable over the long-term, which could mean that the development of new materials would be sustained long after USAID funds are exhausted. The fact that materials are being produced in a variety of media (print, experiential exercises, videos) and a variety of languages is a critical aspect of potential commercial viability. Such potentials are not common in USAID funded activities.

ICSG has experienced substantial difficulty in actually producing the products intended and both ICSG and USAID seem to underestimate the difficulties involved. Very few of the promised training activities and materials have been delivered in the time-frames originally anticipated.

6. Newsletter

ICSG has published nine issues of its newsletter, Self-Governance. The first issue was published in English, in Fall, 1990. No issues were published in all of 1991. Quarterly publication commenced in January, 1992, again in English only. The next issue, April, 1992 was published in English and French. The August, 1992 issue and all subsequent issues have been published in English, French and Spanish. Total distribution for the latest issue (Fall, 1993) was 6,122 copies. The newsletter is visually attractive, reads well and contains varied and useful information.

7. Seed Money Grants

ICSG has established a program in which it makes small grants (a maximum of \$5,000 per grant) to members of its International Network. Six grants had been awarded through January 31, 1994.

Though these grants are "billed" as "seed money," it is clear, from project documents and the activities funded to date, that a variety of activities have been supported. Only one of the grants awarded to date (to Instituto de Economia de Libre Mercado, Peru) appears to have been used as seed money.

C. Indicators of Program Quality

The quality of the books, monographs and newsletter published by ICSG were relatively easy to assess and were found to be of high quality as measured by published reviews, readers opinions and sales/circulation figures.

Assessing the quality of other ICSG programs is made difficult by a lack of sufficient experience with products of the program in question. This is the case, for example, with ICSG's efforts to publish printed Training Materials. There is simply no experience of these materials being used in the "stand alone" manner intended by ICSG. Therefore, it is nearly impossible to assess their quality at this point in time. ICSG has conducted just two workshops during the course of the CA. Both workshops were evaluated favorably by their target audience, but the evaluation team is reluctant to unconditionally endorse current workshop content and format, given the limited experience.

Finally, assessing the quality of ICSG's Networking, International Network and Seed Money Grant activities is made difficult by the lack of clear specification of purpose for these activities. In each of these activities, ICSG has either failed to clearly and consistently specify purposes or it has conducted the activities in ways which clearly vary from the specified purposes.

D. Indicators of Demand for ICSG Programs

In general, the demand for support for "self-governance" in LDCs should be favorably influenced by the increasing emphasis on democratization in USAID and other donors and lenders. Certain of ICSG's services are "big ticket" items --- for example, workshops and the intended local action foundations. Demand for these services is crucially dependent on donor/lender funding. Developing country NGOs are not likely to be able to afford these services in the absence of donor/lender support. There may be an effective NGO demand for individual ICSG products (books, training materials, videos, etc.) in the absence of donor/lender support.

E. Comparisons to Similar USAID Projects

The evaluation team found no USAID projects which were judged to be substantially similar to ICSG.

F. Impact of ICSG Programs

ICSG's books and video are having an impact. This impact is largely on the dialogue about self-governance. It is a premise of ICSG's efforts that the books must be "translated" into practical tools before they can have impact in the lives of ordinary LDC residents seeking self-governance. The volume of ICSG's translated materials is still small. Impacts to date are very specific and limited because of the small volume of completed work.

G. Efficiency of ICSG Resource Use

ICSG has often failed to deliver products on time and for the costs projected, but this does not automatically mean that ICSG is inefficient. The only way to provide a reliable answer to the efficiency question is to have reliable comparative data on a similar effort to produce comparable products. There are too many variables and unknowns to make reliable, specific comparisons to other known programs.

H. Management, Planning and Staffing of ICSG

Several problems in ICSG's management, planning and staffing were identified by the evaluation team. Problems of management include (1) the lack of an institutionalized role for the ICSG Advisory Group; (2) potential conflicts of interest for some Advisory Group members; and (3) a failure to develop institutionalized procedures in the administration of other ICSG activities.

ICSG's annual and five year plans consist of a listing of intended products and "round numbers" cost estimates. These "plans" fail to grapple with the complexities of timing and scheduling. No "critical path" is identified. Resources are frequently only specified in dollar terms, with no

explicit identification of critical skills or materials. No identification of and planning for critical contingencies is evident. There is no sense of strategy, nor comparison of the costs, benefits and risks of alternative strategies.

ICSG had staffing difficulties in the earlier years of the CA. A continuing difficulty is the lack of sufficient staff expertise in the theoretical areas relevant to self-governance -- institutional analysis and design, political economy, institutional economics, etc. This staff weakness is compounded by ICSG's failure to use its Advisory Group for program guidance.

I. Management of Cooperative Agreement by USAID/G/ECON GROWTH/SMIE

USAID's management style might be characterized as "arms length." This style is more appropriate for a contract. Cooperative agreements are often used in situations where there is a perceived mutuality of interest, but the exact dimensions of beneficial products are not known. The cooperative agreement is an agreement to join in exploring the dimensions of this mutual interest, to see what products make the most sense and what the costs of producing them might be. USAID's position is one of substantial participation in a joint endeavor, not, strictly speaking, one of external manager.

3. CONCLUSIONS

1. The content that ICSG seeks to communicate through its books, videos, training materials, etc. is fundamentally sound and relevant to the problems of self-governance. There is widespread interest amongst survey respondents and some USAID staff in the concepts of self-governance.
2. Both the content and strategy of ICSG's work are unique. We found no danger of redundancy and overlap between ICSG's work and that of "similar" projects.
3. ICSG has been slow to define its program in a focused manner and in defining a strategy that is appropriate for its resources.
4. Elements of ICSG's strategy are debatable. Among the elements which we question are the following:
 - a. Over-reliance on advocacy NGOs;
 - b. The belief that adequate translation (theoretical concepts to practical tools and into various languages) will lead to "stand alone" products;
 - c. The failure to anticipate and structure desirable roles for international donors and host country government agencies;
 - d. The failure to fully develop and explain how the contemplated Local Action Foundations will function; and

- e. Excessive reliance on the "International Network" for feedback and learning by ICSG.
5. Both SMIE and ICSG have fallen into an almost adversarial management style that adds difficulty for both. In part, technical knowledge of, and interest in, self-governance and democracy is limited on the part of SMIE project managers. Given a certain lack of expertise and interest, it is more difficult for SMIE to make a positive contribution to resolution of difficult conceptual issues that ICSG faces.
 6. Products produced by ICSG have been favorably evaluated by the target groups. This is true of books, video, workshops, materials used in the workshops, the International Network and the newsletter.
 7. ICSG publications have had appreciable impact on the intellectual debate concerning development and self-governance. This is particularly true of Elinor Ostrom's work concerning self-governance of irrigation systems.
 8. Due to difficulties in translation of theory into practical tools and the consequent small amount of completed training materials, impact on "grass roots" self-governance is minimal at this time.
 9. Internal management and planning of ICSG's program is not sufficiently institutionalized. To some degree, personal management occurs instead of rule-ordered relationships.
 10. We have very little evidence, other than book sales data, concerning demand for ICSG's services. In particular, we take the small number of workshops produced to date, not as evidence of lack of demand, but as evidence of a hesitant marketing effort by both ICSG and SMIE. Demand for future ICSG products is also hard to determine given the rightsizing of USAID and the limited funds/crowded agendas of Mission offices.

4.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. As the search for a new home for ICSG continues, SMIE should reorient its management of the Cooperative Agreement, providing support to the marketing of ICSG's viable products. In our mind, viable products include books, a video, the "Enabling Environment" workshop and its associated training materials, the International Network and the newsletter. Distribution and use of these products should be fully supported.
2. In the short-run, USAID project management should include at least some USAID representatives who are fully informed about USAID's work in supporting democracy. As a minimal interim step, proposed annual work plans and other significant written products should be reviewed by appropriate persons from the Democracy Center. In the long run, USAID project management should be moved to an appropriate office of the Democracy Center.
3. ICSG should fully articulate its strategic vision of the process of diffusion of the tenets of self-governance, paying particular attention to the concerns expressed in Conclusion 3. The ultimate objective is a "strategy paper" that captures the essence of how ICSG envisions this process working; identifies strategic actions to be taken and who will have to take them and gives some sense of timing; and assesses the capacities of the various actors to perform the necessary actions.
4. Appropriate persons from USAID should be involved with the pilot-testing of ICSG training materials. They should serve as a review function for analyzing the development content of proposed training materials.
5. ICSG should improve its strategic and management planning processes. The Advisory Group should be given an explicit, institutionalized role in planning processes. All plans should include realistic assessments of monetary and non-monetary resource needs; fully reflect possible problems of timing, sequencing and coordination; and specify remedial actions to be taken when anticipatable problems emerge.
6. ICSG should constitute some equivalent of a Board of Directors. ICSG managers should not be making important project decisions in a policy vacuum. A revitalized "Advisory Group" would be acceptable only if ICSG can demonstrate that the ICS Board of Directors, or a sub-committee thereof, is deeply involved in and fully understands ICSG operations.

BASIC PROJECT IDENTIFICATION DATA

1. Country: United States
2. Title: International Center for Self-Governance
3. Cooperative Agreement Number: PDC-0095-A-00-0061-00
4. Cooperative Agreement Dates:
 Cooperative Agreement signed: August 7, 1990
 Cooperative Agreement expires: May 31, 1995
5. Cooperative Agreement Funding by USAID: \$700,000 per year
6. Mode of Implementation: Cooperative Agreement with the Institute for Contemporary Studies (ICS)
7. Designers of Cooperative Agreement: ICS
8. Project Officer: Orest Koropecy, G/ECON GROWTH/SMIE
9. Previous Evaluation: None

1. INTRODUCTION

A. Brief History of the Cooperative Agreement

The activities being evaluated are one result of a May 18, 1990 proposal made by the Institute for Contemporary Studies to the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). The proposal, entitled "Proposal for the Expansion of Program on Economic Policy Making for Growth and Human Development," proposed a number of activities for funding by Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination, Office of Economic Analysis (PPC/EA), only some of which are being evaluated herein.

The Institute for Contemporary Studies (ICS), based in San Francisco, is a long-established domestic policy institute, including a respected, policy-oriented publishing house. Among the organizational subdivisions of ICS are (1) the Center for Self-Governance, (2) the International Center for Self-Governance (ICSG), (3) the International Center for Economic Growth (ICEG) and (4) the ICS Press. The Center for Self-Governance promotes self-governance and the entrepreneurial way of life in U.S. domestic affairs. ICSG has a similar mission on an international level. The purpose of ICEG is "to quicken economic growth rates in poor countries through the dissemination of information about rational economic policy design directly to policy makers and through correspondent institutes." (Rottenberg, 1992: iii) Worthwhile documents produced by the various ICS activities are published by the ICS Press. ICSG, and especially ICEG, have underwritten a very substantial number of ICS publications.

ICEG was established in 1985 with a major USAID grant, which supported ICEG activities through May 31, 1990. The Cooperative Agreement (CA) that is the subject of this evaluation was signed August 7, 1990 and will terminate, unless extended, on May 31, 1995. The terms of the CA provide for a continuation and geographic expansion (earlier ICEG activities were concentrated in Latin American and the Caribbean) of ICEG's activities and the establishment of an "Institutional and Policy Reform Project;" which, by June 1, 1991, became known as the International Center for Self-Governance. ICEG's activities under the current CA were evaluated in 1992 (Rottenberg, 1992) and are therefore excluded from this evaluation. This evaluation focusses exclusively on ICSG activities under the CA. Though the CA was negotiated and awarded by USAID/PPC/EA, it is currently administered by the Global Bureau, Economic Growth, Office for Small, Micro and Informal Enterprise (SMIE), as a result of two significant reorganizations of USAID since 1990.

The CA anticipates the provision of \$16,000,000 of USAID funding to ICS, in support of ICEG and ICSG activities, over the five-year period (1990-95). If full funding is forthcoming (The first four years have been fully funded.) and equal from year-to-year, ICS will receive \$3.2 million per year. ICS has adopted the practice of allocating approximately 78% (\$2.5 million) of annual funds received to ICEG and 22% (\$700,000) to ICSG.

ICS has maintained the above ratio in allocations to ICEG and ICSG despite repeated pressure from PPC/EA and SMIE that it shift additional funds to ICEG, at the expense of ICSG. Most of the attempts by USAID overseers to direct increments of funding to ICEG have been in the context of projected shortfalls of Agency and Bureau funding. ICEG, as the relatively

established, successful program, generated a certain "following" within PPC/EA and, subsequently, SMIE. Large measures of uncertainty and generally declining funding for USAID over the period have exacerbated tensions over ICEG-ICSG funding ratios.

Though ICSG formally started as a mere "project" of ICEG, it was soon given an independent organizational stature, equal to that of ICEG, within the ICS. Due, in part, to the continuing tensions concerning ICEG-ICSG funding ratios and the perception, on both SMIE and ICSs' part, that SMIE may not be the most appropriate administrative home for activities concerned with the promotion of self-governance, ICS is exploring the possibility that any follow-on activities be based in separate cooperative agreements for ICEG and ICSG, possibly with different administrative units of USAID.

B. Methodology of the Evaluation

This evaluation has been prepared by Management Systems International (MSI) under contract to SMIE. A copy of the Scope of Work for this evaluation is contained in Appendix A. This evaluation is based on the following activities undertaken by MSI:

1. Review of relevant documents provided by SMIE and ICSG (See Appendix B);
2. Face-to-face interviews of 37 persons (See Appendix C);
3. Telephone interviews with 17 persons (See Appendix C);
4. Completion and return of a survey questionnaire by 15 knowledgeable persons (See Appendix D for a list of persons completing questionnaires and Appendix E for a sample copy of the survey instrument);
5. Analysis of ICSG products (See Appendix F).

Face-to-face interviews and review of documents were the preferred methods of data gathering. Telephone interviews and the survey instrument were used as a relatively economical method of reaching geographically dispersed persons thought to be knowledgeable about ICSG and its activities. Face-to-face interviews were conducted in the Washington, D.C. area; San Francisco; Santo Domingo and Guatemala City.

The survey was developed as a tool to elicit information from International Network members and participants in ICSG's two workshops. (Costa Rica and Dominican Republic). The survey is comprised of six sections to determine the following: basic information about the participant and their organization; the extent and nature of contact with ICSG; the value of ICSG workshops, publications and materials; the quality of ICSG's ability to deliver services; comparison with other organizations; and a narrative section for further comments and suggestions.

Surveys were sent to 55 International Network members and participants. This was the total number of network members and workshop participants with either correct addresses, fax numbers, or phone numbers. (Surveys were not sent to ICS or USAID officials who attended

the workshops.) Of the 55 surveys sent, MSI received 15 (27%). Eight responses were from International Network members and the remaining seven were from workshop participants.

SMIE, ICSG and the MSI team have worked cooperatively to produce this report. SMIE and ICSG staff generously gave their time to this endeavor, including participation in an all-day Team Planning Meeting (Washington, D.C., Dec. 10, 1993), an all-day Interim Briefing (Washington, D.C., Jan. 21, 1994) and a Final Briefing (Washington, D.C., Feb. 22, 1994). MSI appreciates the efforts made by ICSG and SMIE to improve this report. Final responsibility for the accuracy and utility of this report is, of course, assumed by MSI.

2. FINDINGS

A. ICSG Goal, Strategies and Objectives

After over three and one-half years of activities by ICSG, a careful reading of the several documents ostensibly describing ICSG goals, strategies and objectives reveals continuing vagueness as to these goals, strategies and objectives. This is due, in part, to evolutionary changes in goals, strategies and objectives as ICSG experience revealed the need for changes. It is also due, however, to a continuing debate, within USAID, within ICS-ICSG and between USAID and ICS-ICSG, over appropriate goals, strategies and objectives.

Detailed exploration of all nuances of the dialogue, as represented by what has been written down by proponents of various viewpoints at different points in time, is beyond the scope of this evaluation. What may be useful and feasible is to call attention to two contrasting (though the contrast is largely unacknowledged) viewpoints presented in various project documents. We feel that the key difference between the two viewpoints consists in what is assumed to be the state of knowledge about how self-governance institutions are fostered and the consequent need for research into this matter.

Early descriptions of ICSG's (IPRP's) work and purpose included the following:

Institutional and Policy Reform Project. ICEG developed this program as it became clear that economic reform required fundamental change in the institutions of government. Developed to create a systematic approach to institutional and policy reform, the project's purposes are to foster the development of local centers for self-governance and institutional development world-wide; develop alternative strategies for institutional reform and self-governance in a variety of country settings; sponsor a research and demonstration program designed to generate policy and institutional change; and disseminate knowledge of innovative approaches to institutional reform, decentralization, privatization, and government world-wide through a publication series encompassing both theory-building works as well as practical case studies and applied research. (Proposal..., 1990:14)

A somewhat similar view of ICSG is presented in a June 19, 1991 memorandum from Bob Hawkins, President of ICS, to Lawrence W. Bond, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination. Hawkins' memo occurs in the context of PPC's then current review of the IPRP component of the proposed ICEG year-two work plan and is addressed to describing the "state of knowledge" and the "state of practice" in institutional analysis and development. The memo is worth reading in its entirety; however, we will cite only two short sections here, because it is the contrast with later descriptions of ICSG's work that we seek to emphasize. Hawkins states that the goal of IPRP is "to increase the capacity of A.I.D. field personnel, Less Developed Countries (LDC) officials and private sector interests for using institutional analysis in bringing about successful institutional development." He later states "...the most important information this program can develop and disseminate is generated by means of critical experiments that attempt to create institutions for development. That is the standard by which this program should be judged."

The above view of ICSG may be contrasted with the view presented in ICSG's Year-Four Workplan:

Mission: The mission of the International Center for Self-Governance (ICSG) is to promote the self-governing and entrepreneurial way of life in developing countries.

Objectives: 1. Translate the best academic works about self-governance and entrepreneurship into practical tools for use in developing countries. 2. Build the capacity of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to train men and women in developing countries in self-governance and stimulate local activities. 3. Establish a network of NGOs to exchange ideas and distribute materials... ICSG's activities are focused on three functions--producing practical training materials, building a participatory network of activists and entrepreneurs, and publishing the best works on self-governance and entrepreneurship. These functions serve to advance ICSG's work in two areas--the enabling environment for self-governance and entrepreneurship and the management of common property/natural resources.

ICSG is not a research organization, and thus does not provide research grants. Rather, in the interest of developing case studies and training materials, ICSG is focused on obtaining the results of field research that is relevant to self-governance and entrepreneurship. These results are "translated" by ICSG into materials that NGOs in developing countries can use to build the capacity among men and women in their own communities to manage their own affairs.

A number of differences between earlier and later descriptions of ICSG's goals, objectives and strategies are evident. The earlier descriptions focussed heavily on institutional analysis and institutional development to achieve policy reform to promote economic growth. The project proposed "to increase the capacity of A.I.D. field personnel, LDC officials and private sector interests for using institutional analysis in bringing about successful institutional development." The project was to specifically include a research and demonstration program and "critical experiments that attempt to create institutions for development." The information resulting from the proposed experiments "is the standard by which this program should be judged." (Emphasis added)

Later descriptions are focussed on "self-governance and the entrepreneurial way of life," with no particular reference to institutional analysis and development. Policy reform is sought to improve "the enabling environment for self-governance." ICSG translates good academic work into practical tools, but is specifically "not a research organization." It will instead obtain the results of field research done by others, presumably, at least in part, by "exchanging ideas" with developing country NGOs.

Both SMIE and ICSG recognize that the goals, strategies and objectives embodied in ICSG's approved annual work plans vary from the goals, strategies and objectives in earlier documents. ICSG suggested, during the summer of 1993, that the CA be amended to fully reflect then current

goals, strategies and objectives. SMIE generally concurred with the notion that the CA should be changed, but felt that due to administrative bottlenecks in the USAID Contracts office, the impending evaluation of ICSG and the relatively short time remaining on the Cooperative Agreement that amendment wasn't worth the bother.

In practice, ICSG's program has reflected a blending of the two contrasting views, with a decided emphasis on the latter, promotion of self-governance, view. The ICSG program can be characterized as:

1. Translation of sound theory: Primary emphasis on translation of sound theories into practical tools for encouraging self-governance is complemented by translation of both theoretical and practical works into other languages. English, French, Spanish and Bulgarian works have been supported by ICSG. ICSG has engaged in or supported almost no research. The single possible exception being the "Mali Mapping" work cited as product number 7 in Table I, Appendix F.
2. Materials development: The core of the program that has evolved is concerned with development and dissemination of books, videos, workshops and training materials. There is a notable attempt to develop "depth" in particular areas, for instance self-governance of irrigation systems and self-governance of common property resources. This is normally done by deriving subsidiary products from books. That is, the central ideas of a previously published ICSG book become the basis for a video, workshop and/or training materials on the same subject.
3. Wholesale role: ICSG does not have the resources, nor the knowledge of variations in local conditions and cultures, to "retail" its products. It seeks partnerships with those who may be able to retail its products.
4. Networking with Advocacy Non-Governmental Organizations: Derived products, particularly workshops and training materials, are specifically aimed at "activist" or "advocacy" LDC Non-Governmental Organizations. Newsletters are replete with references to the work of NGOs in promoting self-governance. For a time, only Non-Governmental Organizations could be members of ICSG's international network. This formal restriction has been eliminated, but the bulk of network activities continue to be with and for NGOs actively engaged in promoting self-governance.

B. Description of ICSG Programs

The evaluation team has categorized ICSG's activities into seven programs for ease and coherence of presentation. These categories differ moderately from the categories described in ICSG annual work plans.

1. Books and Monographs

ICSG has sponsored publication by ICS Press of eight books and one monograph. One additional book and one monograph are currently in the publication process. Authors and titles of these

publications are detailed as product numbers 11, 26, 43, 45, 46 and 49 in Table I, Appendix F. Seven of the books and the published monograph are original works, published for the first time. However, some like Elinor Ostrom's Book *Crafting Institutions for Self-Governing Irrigation Systems*, were written with funds from other USAID projects. One book is a revised version of an out of print book published originally by ICS Press under ICEG sponsorship in 1988. One book was published in both an English and Spanish version. Publication activities were a larger percentage of total activities in the first year or two of the project. USAID has discouraged significant additional publication initiatives.

2. Workshops

ICSG has organized and delivered two regional workshops on self-governance and entrepreneurship. The first workshop was presented in Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic, May 4-6, 1992 with 52 trainees in attendance. The second occurred in San José, Costa Rica, March 3-5, 1993 with 25 trainees in attendance. A third regional workshop, for South Asia, was planned for December, 1993 in Nepal, but it was postponed (cancelled?) when the incumbent USAID Mission Director was unexpectedly reassigned, making the Mission's support for the workshop less clear. Another workshop (in this case for a single country) is scheduled for March 1 - 3, 1994 in the Philippines.

The workshops are designed to teach participants about the concepts and practices of self-governance and the entrepreneurial way of life. Each workshop consists of didactic presentations, participant workgroups for application of principles learned and field visits to functioning community organizations that represent various degrees of self-governance and entrepreneurship.

The two workshops implemented were presented in English, with simultaneous translation to Spanish, the native language of the vast majority of participants. All costs of both workshops were borne by ICSG, including travel and per diem costs for all participants. These workshops are virtually costless for the sponsoring USAID Missions and participants. This is an uncommon financial arrangement in centrally-funded projects. SMIE has suggested that ICSG be more active in seeking co-financing of workshops and other activities in order to multiply the impact of SMIE dollars.

3. Networking

ICSG has engaged in several activities which it refers to as "networking." The principal activity, which has been repeated from year to year, is attendance by ICSG representatives at professional conferences in order to disseminate information about ICSG and its activities. In some cases, formal presentations, such as the showing of the video on *Crafting Institutions for Self-Governing Irrigations Systems*, have been made. The annual conference of the International Association for the Study of Common Property has been attended at least twice in this manner. Other networking activities have included marketing trips to various USAID Missions and aid recipient countries, looking for venues for future workshops. ICSG has also contacted the Inter-American Development Bank, the Inter-American Foundation, the World Bank, the National Democratic Institute and the International Republican Institute as part of its networking activities.

4. International Network

Enclosure Two of the Cooperative Agreement states that IPRP (ICSG) will build an international network of "established groups with programs in the areas of institutional reform and self-governance" and that "At the end of the first year, IPRP expects to have affiliates in at least 30 countries around the world." Establishment of the network was a priority task of the first grant year and was to be accomplished by "(1) Evaluating members of the ICEG network to determine how many of them would qualify, (2) Working with A.I.D. missions to identify in-country groups that may be interested in such issues, and (3) Distributing the working documents described above to an international audience through the ICEG newsletter." (CA, Enclosure Two:5)

The "30 countries by the end of the first year" target was reduced to "30 countries by the end of the second year" in the Year Two Plan (no page numbers) and further delayed to "30 countries by the end of the Cooperative Agreement" in the Year Two Workplan (p. 11). In its evaluation of ICEG-affiliated institutions, ICSG determined that:

Although a number are interested in the work of ICSG and will be included in ICSG's dissemination efforts, it was determined that the ICSG network must be broadened to include businessmen, bankers, entrepreneurs, and non-government officials. This is due to the multidisciplinary nature of self-governance that extends beyond the field of economics, and is based on the behavior, knowledge, and needs of individuals in developing countries. (ICSG, Year Two Workplan:11)

We are unable to find in the record any systematic effort to work "with A.I.D. missions to identify in-country groups that may be interested" in self-governance as was posited above. Nor were the "working documents" distributed as intended. The principal working document, the handbook, was only very recently completed.

We are also unable to find any criteria explaining who is eligible for network member status. In the initial stages of development, ICSG surveyed the 3,000 ICEG members. Of the 44 replies, 25 ICEG members expressed interest in joining ICSG. For reasons unknown to the evaluation team, these 25 were not added to the network. To date, there are no clear, consistently applied criteria for membership in the International Network.

The development of the International Network has proceeded relatively slowly, but is nearing its revised target. There are currently 27 network members from 18 countries. The project record contains very little analytic discussion of who or what organizations should be members of the network. In fact, network membership is largely composed of advocacy NGOs with strong sympathies for self-governance, but little in the way of "programs for institutional reform."

5. Training Materials

ICSG has made a significant effort to develop original training materials, largely derived from a few of the books that they have published or intend to publish in the future. Of the roughly

49 products identified in the Cooperative Agreement and subsequent annual workplans, 16 involve training activities or production of training materials.

Development of training materials is an area of both high promise and substantial difficulty for ICSG. Training materials are defined as two manuals currently being produced for training on the enabling environment and self-governance and natural resource management and self-governance. It is an area of high promise in that, to our knowledge, it is a rather unique undertaking, which, if successful, has the potential to have a substantial multiplier effect on ICSG's efforts to promote self-governance. It also appears to have the potential to be commercially viable over the long-term, which could mean that the development of new materials would be sustained long after USAID funds are exhausted. The fact that materials are being produced in a variety of media (print, experiential exercises, videos) and a variety of languages is a critical aspect of potential commercial viability. Such potentials are not common in USAID funded activities.

ICSG has experienced substantial difficulty in actually producing the products intended and both ICSG and USAID seem to underestimate the difficulties involved. Very few of the promised training activities and materials have been delivered in the time-frames originally anticipated. For example, training materials concerning self-governance of natural resources and the environment (Table I, product numbers 15, 22 and 30) have yet to be delivered, though they were originally promised before May 31, 1992. Similar difficulties exist with the materials concerning the enabling environment for self-governance and entrepreneurial activity (Table I, product numbers 17, 21 and 31). A handbook on self-governance (Self-Governing and Entrepreneurial Solutions: A Handbook), originally promised as a working paper before May 31, 1991, was published at the end of January, 1994.

Causes for these delays are complex and varied. In the case of the materials on natural resources and the environment, two previous sub-contractors failed to produce materials acceptable to ICSG. At times, ICSG has included production of training materials in its annual workplans before it had the completed parent academic work (book) in hand. Delays in book writing, a very common occurrence, explain some of the delays in materials production. But the most general explanation seems to be that ICSG frequently underestimates the difficulties of translating complex academic works into the useful, accessible training materials envisioned.

6. Newsletter

ICSG has published nine issues of its newsletter, Self-Governance. The first issue was published in English, in Fall, 1990. No issues were published in all of 1991. Quarterly publication commenced in January, 1992, again in English only. The next issue, April, 1992 was published in English and French. The August, 1992 issue and all subsequent issues have been published in English, French and Spanish. Total distribution for the latest issue (Fall, 1993) was 6,122 copies. Almost two-thirds of the total was in English (3,914 copies), with most of the remainder in Spanish (1,973 copies). However, Spanish readership is growing most rapidly, having increased from 308 to 1,973 during the last year. French circulation is modest, but growing, having increased from just 90 to 235 during the last year. The newsletter is visually attractive, reads well and contains varied and useful information.

7. Seed Money Grants

ICSG has established a program in which it makes small grants (a maximum of \$5,000 per grant) to members of its International Network. Six grants had been awarded through January 31, 1994.

As far as the evaluation team can determine, no general announcement of this program and solicitation of proposals has ever been made. The program was briefly described in a single paragraph of an August, 1993 newsletter article describing the growth of the International Network. However, the article did not invite readers to apply for grants, publish eligibility criteria, or offer an address for further inquiry.

In response to a request from the evaluation team for documentation of the program, ICSG sent the team a copy of a letter to a network member inviting that member to apply for a grant. We don't know whether similar letters were sent to all network members. We do know that half (4 of 8) of the network members responding to our survey replied "No" when asked "Are you familiar with seed money grants?" The in-person interviews yielded similar results.

Though these grants are billed as seed money, it is clear, from project documents and the activities funded to date, that a variety of activities have been supported. Only one of the grants awarded to date (to Instituto de Economia de Libre Mercado, Peru) appears to have been used as seed money. The letter, referred to above, inviting application from a particular network member, states that grants are "to help you or your organization conduct a critical experiment in self-governance and/or develop a strategic plan for the implementation of such an experiment." It further states that ICSG does not fund research and that:

our funds are intended to assist you in moving from the idea or planning stage to having an implementable project design for which other funding may be obtained, if needed. Alternatively you may be interested in a discrete project, such as a workshop or case study, that you are ready to conduct right away. This type of project would also qualify for seed money.

Comparing this language to the descriptions of projects funded to date only induces confusion. Only one of the funded projects appears to involve something resembling an experiment (Rural Resource Information Experiment, Nepal). One of the funded activities appears to be research (Study on Self-Governance and Irrigation, Guatemala), despite ICSG's statement that they don't fund research.

The purposes of this program are unclear. The bottom line seems to be that the grant award process is not based on objective criteria, or, at least not these criteria. The activities don't have coherence and are unlikely to have a cumulative impact.

C. Indicators of Program Quality

1. Books and Monographs

The books and monographs published to date by ICSG are a valuable resource for scholars and practitioners of self-governance. In many cases, the value of an individual book is enhanced and complemented by other books in the series. There are themes that run through the series--for example, three books that deal with self-governance of water management and five (including the water management books) that deal with self-governance of natural resources. There are also four books that analyze the macro-institutional characteristics of "the state" or specific states. Most, but not all, of the works employ a "rational choice" analytic perspective, a fact that lends additional coherence to the series.

One approach to assessing the quality of the books and monographs published by ICSG is to examine the number of published reviews, the comments made in those reviews and the quality of the journals in which the reviews were published. A very limited effort to locate reviews of books in the series revealed a total of 23 published reviews of "series" books, with 22 of those reviews presenting very positive assessments of the book under review. Elinor Ostrom's *Crafting Institutions for Self-Governing Irrigation Systems* was reviewed in ten publications, ranging from leading academic journals (*Public Choice*, *Journal of Economic Literature*, and *Review of Social Economy*) to applied/practitioner newsletters (*Farmer Managed Irrigation Systems Newsletter*, *Forests, Trees and People Newsletter* and *Common Property Resource Digest*). Vincent Ostrom's *The Meaning of American Federalism* was favorably reviewed in 7 publications, including *Journal of Economic Literature*, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* and *American Politics*.

Another measure of quality is the number of translations to other languages that have been completed or are underway. *Crafting Institutions for Self-Governing Irrigation Systems* (book and video) was translated to Spanish by ICSG with financial support from USAID/Santo Domingo. *On Liberty and Liberalism* and *The Quest for Community* were translated to Bulgarian with financial support from ICSG, U.S. Information Agency (USIA) and Oxford University Press. *The Meaning of American Federalism* has been translated to Russian, Polish and Chinese by interested parties without any financial support from ICSG. A French commercial publisher, MAXIMA, has paid a two thousand dollar advance royalty to ICSG for the right to publish *The Culture of Entrepreneurship* in French. Only the very best academic works are translated to another language; so this demand for translations is very impressive.

Book sales are a third measure of quality and, although we have no sales figures for comparable books and thus must make subjective judgements, the figures for the ICSG series seem respectable. ICSG had sold a total of 6,707 books through Dec. 1, 1993, generating revenues of \$87,930.07. Total sales for each book can be found in Table II, Appendix G. (Sales figures given in this document include books that are discounted and/or given away.)

Lastly, an indication of popularity and to some extent, demand, are the survey results on publications read. Of the 12 publications listed in the survey, seven are listed by network members and workshop participants as works with which they are familiar. (Of the five not listed as having been read, two were Bulgarian translations. No surveys were sent to Bulgaria.) However, for each book, the number of participants who stated that they had read the book was relatively low. The three most popular publications are *The Culture of Entrepreneurship*, *The Meaning of Federalism*, and *Rethinking Institutional Analysis and Development*. Only four

participants (26%) listed each of the above as publications they had read. Only one person stated that they had read the Spanish version of *Crafting Institutions for Self-Governing Irrigation Systems*. However, a high percentage (69%) did respond "Yes" when asked if they would like to see more translations of ICSG publications.

2. Workshops

In our in-person interviews and in the survey questionnaire we asked persons who had participated in workshops to evaluate that experience. The in-person interviews with former workshop participants conducted in the Dominican Republic and Guatemala yielded nearly unanimous praise for the workshops attended. Participants felt that the workshops were well presented, dealt with important topics and generally felt that the ideas presented in the workshops were applicable in their own work. However, very few of them could identify instances in which they had applied something learned at the workshop in their own work since attending the workshop. One person expressed concern that, although the presenters encouraged a high degree of participation, participation was inhibited by the dependence on simultaneous translation between English and Spanish. ICSG is aware of this constraint and is making strong efforts to make its materials available for "stand alone" use in other languages.

Two kinds of relatively strong criticism were expressed in the survey results and face-to-face U.S. interviews. These results are reported here because they were strongly expressed by a small number of persons, not because they represent widely held views. It is important to note that the persons who hold these views are highly trained and experienced U.S. professionals who attended one or more workshops. They are not from the workshop target group, members of Less Developed Country NGOs. A small number of such participants in one workshop felt that ICSG staff presenting the workshop had their own agenda and were unwilling to respond to a different agenda articulated by some workshop participants. A second criticism, from other respondents, was that the understanding of social institutions conveyed in the workshop was so simplistic that it represented a caricature of social reality, rather than useful knowledge.

3. Networking

We find assessing the quality of ICSG's networking activities to be very difficult. The intended purposes of this work are not clearly articulated in project documentation. Networking activities seem to us to be relatively close to the input side of ICSG's work and, therefore, difficult to evaluate in terms of their contribution to outputs or impacts. We are aware that the intended publication of a book, and follow-on video, dealing with self-governance of forest resources is a result of ICSG's continuing networking with the International Association for the Study of Common Property. However, indicators of the quality of this work remain elusive.

4. International Network

Assessing the quality of the international network, and ICSG's efforts to build this network, is also dependent on an understanding of the intended purposes of the network. Networks are frequently multi-purpose and that does seem to be the case here. However, even when purposes

are multiple, they should be specific, rather than vague. One gets the feeling that the purposes of ICSG's International Network may not have been fully examined.

Basically, this is revealed by the shifting definitions of network membership and purposes that one finds in various ICSG announcements and publications. The network has been presented as a network of "established groups with programs in the areas of institutional reform and self-governance" (C.A., Enclosure Two:5) and as a network of "individuals and institutions from developing countries who are committed to furthering the principles of self-governance and building local capacity for sustained institutional development." (ICSG, Year Two Workplan:11) The network is frequently referred to as a "network of NGOs" in newsletter articles. Though these definitions are not necessarily contradictory, they are also not very illuminating. One definition refers only to "groups," the other speaks of "individuals and institutions from developing countries." Nowhere in the project record do we find a discussion of the merits of any of the proposed memberships. What are the pluses and minuses of a network of individuals? Of a network of institutions? Of limiting membership to individuals and institutions from developing countries? For a time, there were two categories of membership in the network; "general," for "all international groups legitimately interested in the issues of self-governance and entrepreneurship" and an unnamed category for "those seriously committed to stimulating critical experiments for policy reform." We understand that separate categories of membership have been eliminated, but no rationale for creating the categories or removing them was ever presented. As far as we can tell, none of this has been systematically examined by ICSG.

Perhaps membership has not been seriously analyzed because purpose is also unclear beyond the simple need to network. The network is seen as a means to identify new training materials, test recently produced materials, as a potential channel for commercial distribution of materials and as the possible basis for somehow launching the intended 20 to 30 Local Action Foundations. There is reference to a requirement for a complementary network of supportive USAID Missions. What is the envisioned relationship with these USAID Missions? ICSG has apparently not yet seriously analyzed questions of purpose and strategy with regard to the proposed network.

Despite all of the above reservations, the evaluation team identified two measures which we believe might reflect the quality of ICSG's work in building the International Network. The first of these was horizontal contact among network members. That is, are network members stimulated by membership to pursue interchanges with other network members? This reasoning is based on an assumption that network members have a great deal to learn from each other as well as from the network center, ICSG. Unfortunately, our interviews in the Dominican Republic and Guatemala revealed very little contact among member organizations and very little knowledge of each other's work. The scant contact and knowledge that does exist is based on social relationships and local associations of NGOs that pre-date network membership. In fairness to ICSG's international network, it should be stated that the network may simply be too new to stimulate such effects at this point in time.

A second measure of quality might be the emergence of periphery-center communication in ICSG's newsletter. The hypothesis here is that a more vital network will stimulate members to participate in defining the information exchanged in the network by writing articles for the newsletter. On this measure, there does seem to be some indication that network members are

responding. Our quick count shows that approximately 50 articles or features have been published in the newsletter in its nine issues. As one would expect, the overwhelming majority (46) have been written by ICSG staff members or U.S. consultants to ICSG. However, there is a slight trend (we didn't test for statistical significance) for increasing contributions from LDC network members. The first non-ICSG item appeared in the fourth issue (Aug., 1992). The second appeared in the eighth issue (Aug., 1993) and two appeared in the ninth issue (Fall, 1993). These are small, but encouraging signs.

Network members do generally seem interested in the work of ICSG and in continuing the relationship. According to the survey, 60 percent stated that the ICSG network is either very effective or effective. Network members listed "material exchange" as their primary use of the network. However, there is a demand for increased future use. Network members stated that they would like to see increased communication amongst members such as meetings of the network, increased participation with ICSG, and more seminars developed. Other suggestions include training of trainers in self-governance and entrepreneurship; financing community development programs; and visits to other network institutions.

Only two of the eight responses from network members were from outside Latin American and the Caribbean. Their responses differed slightly from the rest of the respondents reflecting feelings of being "left out". When asked "How would you evaluate the quality of staffing demonstrated by ICSG staff?", one respondent stated: "Have only met Elise Paylan who impressed me as a good and efficient worker. I am assuming that she is understaffed and/or with others who are not interested in Third World countries really."

5. Training Materials

The big problem in evaluating ICSG's training materials is that, excluding books published, only a few of the intended products have actually had wide usage. Only those products used in "The Enabling Environment for Self-Governance and Entrepreneurship" workshop and, to some degree, the "Irrigation" video have been exposed to use. Reactions from the vast majority of workshop participants, particularly the intended target audience, to workshop materials are very positive. Reactions to the video are also quite positive. The best indication of quality will eventually be market demand in the form of sales of materials.

6. Newsletter

Newsletter recipients are almost universally pleased with its contents and usefulness. This was true in both interviews and survey results. For network members, the newsletter is the most frequent point of contact with ICSG and its activities. For non-members, it is, in many cases, the only point of contact. Spanish speaking recipients report that the Spanish version is very readable. Three-quarters of those surveyed reported that they re-distributed copies of the newsletter to others. This was also reported by three of the 11 Guatemalans and Dominicans interviewed.

D. Indicators of Demand for ICSG Programs

The determinants of demand for support for self-governance are an under-explored subject. However, it is safe to say, in ICSG's case that one important determinant of demand is the degree to which democracy, particularly the strengthening civil society approach to democracy, is an important component of the agenda of USAID and other donor or lender groups. A second component of demand, given ICSG's current advocacy NGO focus, might be the degree to which USAID and others see NGOs, both U.S. domestic and LDC, as valuable partners in development and in democratization. Over the last decade the spreading of democracy has been increasingly legitimated as an USAID objective and funds have been committed to this objective. Democracy has also gained dramatically increased acceptance in aid recipient countries in recent years. U.S. development NGOs have considerable, and possibly increasing, influence over USAID funding. Therefore, these determinants of macro-demand are favorable and would suggest an expanding demand.

The highest quality information that we have about indicators of demand for ICSG programs is the sales figures for books and videos. This is relatively close to quantified, price sensitive data concerning demand for this particular program. The data are encouraging. However, it is still too early to assess demand, as these books and videos have been available for a relatively brief period. A more detailed analysis of these data would be quite useful. It would be interesting to have an indication of, for example, how many of these books are actually reaching LDC readers and how many of those readers are associated with the advocacy NGOs targeted by ICSG. If the demand for these products is largely coming from the developed country academic community, it might be less encouraging, or indicate that developing country impact will require a relatively long time to accomplish. If the demand has a substantial LDC component, but is composed largely of persons associated with universities and/or policy institutes, it might indicate that ICSG needs to rethink its strategy for building the international network. The fundamental point is that these sales data are the best data concerning demand that is available and there is beginning to be enough of it to be worth analyzing.

Our discussion of indicators of demand for other ICSG programs is tempered by the realization that expressed demand, to this point in time, has been "demand" for an essentially costless good. We are referring here to workshops, training materials, the newsletter and services provided through the international network. We have very little information about the willingness of potential consumers to pay for these goods. We do know that 46% of the survey respondents said price was a factor in requesting ICSG publications or videos.

1. Demand by USAID and other donors/lenders

Some of the services offered by ICSG, for example, complete workshops and, eventually, Local Action Foundations, are big ticket items. Because of their high per unit cost, it is likely that donor or lender funding will be necessary for their production in the near and intermediate term. Diffusion of knowledge of ICSG's programs within USAID and similar organizations is therefore an important requirement for generating effective demand.

Interviews with USAID staff lead us to believe that knowledge of ICSG and its products is not currently widely diffused within the Agency. There is a vague awareness of ICSG's existence and a vague sense that their ideas are "good" among some Washington-based, mid-level managers

of activities potentially related to self-governance, but no real familiarity with ICSG's programs and certainly no impulse to pick up the phone and order services. Many of these potential clients and important sources of referrals to the USAID Missions have no knowledge of ICSG's services.

ICSG doesn't seem to have clearly articulated its intentions with respect to supplying services to USAID Missions. ICSG contacts with AID Missions have typically been in the context of trying to arrange a venue for a workshop or, infrequently, permission to film a mission-sponsored activity to be included in a video. As far as we are aware, ICSG has not sought to become involved in the Missions' own activities, for example, project design or policy reform efforts. There may be considerable demand for self-governance expertise in these areas, but ICSG has not expressed an interest in this type of activity.

ICSG has had more contact with USAID/Santo Domingo than any other Mission. ICSG presented a workshop in Santo Domingo, filmed part of its "irrigation" video in conjunction with a USAID irrigation project and translated a book and video soundtrack to Spanish with direct financial support from the Mission. These activities dwarf ICSG's activities with any other Mission. Five USAID/Santo Domingo staff members were interviewed for this evaluation. All of them spoke highly of ICSG's services and indicated that, if they had need for similar services in the future, they would certainly contact ICSG. However, when asked for specific plans to use ICSG in the future, none of them had any specific plans or possibilities in mind. This seemed odd until one of them explained that ICSG planned to hire the then current Mission Director, which meant that all Mission employees had to avoid even the appearance of conflict of interest in doing business with ICSG. Most staff will simply avoid doing business with ICSG for the time being. Of the other Missions and USAID/Washington staff interviewed, only one person has plans to use ICSG services. Others USAID staff expressed interest in ICSG but time and money are major constraints.

2. Demand by NGOs/PVOs

In theory, it should be possible for ICSG to turn the favorable opinions of former workshop participants and members of the international network into demand for ICSG products and services. Survey respondents express an interest in working with ICSG in the future. However, NGO demand is based on an assumed willingness and ability to pay for services and respect for intellectual property rights. Whatever the level of demand that eventually materializes, it seems likely to be demand for products (books, training materials, videos, etc.) rather than services (training, technical assistance, etc.), because of the tendency for services to be lumpy, big ticket items. We presume that NGOs generally lack the capacity to pay for services. ICSG's service delivery to NGOs is likely to require a donor or lender intermediary well into the future.

E. Comparisons to Similar USAID Projects

In the written survey and in the Dominican and Guatemalan interviews, we asked respondents to compare ICSG's services with services from the following USAID-funded projects:

- Institutional Reform and the Informal Sector (IRIS)
- Institute for Policy Reform (IPR)

- Inter-American Institute for Human Rights
- Decentralization, Finance and Management (DFM)
- Any USAID funded activity that the respondent saw as similar.

Eight of 15 persons responding to this question in the survey stated that they were not familiar with any of the above projects and didn't name any other project that they thought was similar to ICSG. There were three respondents who were familiar with one or more of the above projects and who were mixed in the responses as to how well ICSG services compared with services from the above projects. Results of the interviews were roughly similar to the survey results. In a sense, the question about how ICSG's services compare with services from other projects is moot if knowledge of the several projects isn't widespread among potential users of those services. Users will seek services from the one or two projects that they are familiar with rather than the "best" source of services. The best source is the one that you know about.

We are convinced that ICSG's services and products are unique among USAID projects. IRIS and the IPR are similar to ICSG in that they are idea driven, but both are focussed on economic growth rather than self-governance. The Inter-American Institute for Human Rights works closely with local NGOs, but focuses only on human rights issues. DFM deals with questions of democracy and governance, is in many respects analytic and driven by theory and ideas, but doesn't focus on NGOs to the same extent, isn't trying to build an enduring international network and has very substantial buy-in funding.

F. Impact of ICSG Programs

ICSG's books and video are having an impact. This impact is largely on the dialogue about self-governance. It is a premise of ICSG's efforts that the books must be "translated" into practical tools before they can have impact in the lives of ordinary LDC residents seeking self-governance. The volume of ICSG's translated materials is still small. It might be argued that these include the workshop materials used in the two workshops given to date, the video and nine issues of the newsletter. Appreciable impact is dependent on the production and high volume use of these and additional translated materials.

This is not to say that ICSG's work has not produced impacts or does not have the potential for impacts. However, the impacts to date are very specific and limited because of the small volume of completed work.

G. Efficiency of ICSG Resource Use

ICSG has often failed to deliver products on time and for the costs projected. Does this signify inefficiency of resource use? Or might it signal habitual excessively optimistic projections? The only way to provide a reliable answer to the efficiency question is to have reliable comparative data on a similar effort to produce comparable products. There are too many variables and unknowns to make reliable, specific comparisons to other known programs.

It is clear that substantial delays in product delivery have raised opportunity costs. ICSG compounds these costs by its non-entrepreneurial budgeting behavior. Once funds are pledged

for a particular activity, they are set aside for that activity no matter how long that product might be delayed. This causes ICSG to have a relatively large pipeline.

H. Management, Planning and Staffing of ICSG

1. Management

Project documentation and interviews with ICSG staff present a somewhat blurred or incomplete picture of ICSG's management. A particularly anomalous situation is found concerning ICSG's Advisory Group. Both an Advisory Board and an Advisory Group were announced, but the formal functions of both groups have been left undefined and neither group meets regularly. In fact, the Advisory Board has never met and the Advisory Group has met once, about eighteen months ago. A meeting of the Advisory Group is planned for Spring, 1994, but the purpose of this meeting is unclear.

ICSG's Director claims that she consults frequently with some members of the Advisory Group, but admits to ignoring those whom she finds unresponsive. The fact that the Director consults directly with some members of the Advisory Group is confusing because Enclosure Two to the Cooperative Agreement states: "IPRP (ICSG) will be guided (sic) its development by a small board of advisors (15-20 people) under the direction of the President of the Institute for Contemporary Studies." (p. 5) This statement is buttressed by the following statement in ICSG's Annual Report, June 1, 1990 to May 31, 1991: "IPRP (ICSG) is governed by a board of advisors consisting of 15 members, and is under the direction of Robert B. Hawkins, Jr." (p. 1)

It is clear, from the names of some of the members listed immediately after the above quote, that this passage refers to the "Advisory Board" that has never met. What is unclear is how this "Board" or the current "Advisory Group" could have any influence on, let alone govern, ICSG; since their functions have never been defined and only one meeting has occurred in over three and one-half years of program activities!

We interviewed several members of the Advisory Group and found most of them to be only vaguely aware of ICSG's current plans and activities. Some members feel ignored and abused by ICSG and are among the harshest critics of ICSG that we interviewed for this evaluation. Others were pleased with their relationship with ICSG and were supportive of the concepts behind ICSG. However, Advisory Group members, as a whole, almost exclusively have limited interactions with ICSG, for example when ICSG publishes a member's book.

A further issue regarding the Advisory Group is that its current membership includes several persons who have potential conflicts of interest. Some have been involved in sub-contracts from ICSG. Others have had books published by ICSG. The existence of these potential conflicts of interest emphasizes the need for well-defined, institutionalized mandates and procedures for the Advisory Group and other aspects of ICSG's program. Clearly this is one aspect of ICSG's management that needs improvement.

The Advisory Group (Board) is just one example of a broader tendency to "fly by the seat of one's pants" at ICSG. The Seed Money Grant program seems to involve substantial

administrative discretion as to who gets grants; rather than being based on a widely publicized, criteria based, competitive selection process. A further instance of failure to follow sound institutionalized procedure was observed with respect to the Natural Resources and the Environment training materials produced by the Coverdale Organization. A three person Academic Advisory Group had been set up to insure quality control over the final product. When these materials were submitted to ICSG's Director, she made a unilateral decision that the materials weren't up to standard without ever showing them to the Academic Advisory Group. In our opinion, the Director doesn't have obvious academic or experiential credentials to make this decision; especially in light of the procedure that had been agreed to in advance.

2. Staffing

In the earlier stages of the CA, ICS seems to have had considerable difficulty staffing ICSG activities. ICSG's first Director, John Sullivan, worked only part-time on ICSG affairs and left ICS early in 1991. Since ICS didn't receive its funding until September, 1990, Sullivan effectively worked on ICSG activities for only three or four months. Elise Paylan became the first full-time Director of ICSG in September, 1991. Between Sullivan's departure in January and Paylan's arrival in September, the Director's position was apparently vacant with several persons handling various matters in an ad hoc manner. Due to the perception at PPC/EA of a lack of focus in ICSG's program, Norman Nicholson, a direct-hire USAID employee, was detailed to ICSG for one year, starting in mid-1991.

The current ICSG staff is small, but composed of accomplished people. The single greatest weakness has been, until recently, a lack of development and developing country experience on the staff. With the addition of Bill Schoux, in a consulting capacity, and the planned addition of Ray Riffenberg to the ICS staff, this weakness should be completely overcome.

The ICSG staff does not include persons with sufficient academic preparation in the theoretical areas relevant to self-governance--institutional analysis and design, political economy, institutional economics and so forth. ICSG has to rely on Robert Hawkins, President of ICS, for theoretical input in this area.

3. Planning

Early in this evaluation we asked for and received copies of the ICSG's Annual Plans. Late in the evaluation, when we realized that our Scope of Work contained a specific item dealing with ICSG's long-range plans, we inquired about the availability of such longer-range plans. It was difficult for ICSG to respond to this request. After some hesitation, they provided us with two memorandae, which they emphasized were very preliminary drafts. The first (in chronological order) of these documents was a draft five-year plan, while the second document outlined a procedure to designed to turn the draft into "a bold plan that will catch the eye of the USAID people..."

ICS has a well-articulated, bold five-year plan for its own development; so one cannot doubt that the capacity exists within the organization. However, both the Annual Plans and the draft five-year plan for ICSG share some recurring weaknesses. Both types of plans boil down to a listing

of intended products and some round numbers cost estimates. The products are loosely connected to ICSG's now well-established objectives:

1. Translate the best academic works...
2. Build the capacity of non-governmental organizations...
3. Establish a network of NGOs...

In this rather uninspired scheme of things, a five-year plan is simply five one year plans placed side by side, with some effort to balance the work load from one year to the next. Both types of plans fail to grapple with the complexities of timing and scheduling. No "critical path" is identified. Resources are frequently only specified in dollar terms, with no explicit identification of critical skills or materials. No identification of and planning for critical contingencies is evident. There is no sense of strategy, nor comparison of the costs, benefits and risks of alternative strategies.

In the specific case of the current draft five year plan, it is disappointing to observe that the draft plan, concentrating on products and dollars, was produced before thought was given to making it bold. This planning process started at the back end. A truly bold plan would start by being explicitly based in a set of values and openly questioning the appropriateness of the old objectives.

I. Management of Cooperative Agreement by USAID/G/ECON GROWTH/SMIE

From August, 1990 until October, 1991 the CA was administered by PPC/EA. Due to a reorganization of USAID, administration of the CA was passed to PRE/SMIE in October, 1991. Administration has remained with SMIE since that time, but another reorganization of USAID in November, 1993 saw SMIE incorporated into the Economic Growth Unit of the Global Bureau.

There have been a number of difficulties in ICS-ICSG's relationships with the responsible USAID administrative unit. A large contributor to the problem seems to stem from the fact that ICEG was an established activity with a successful track record at the commencement of the current CA. The activities of ICEG, improving economic policies in order to increase economic growth, were well within the mainstream concerns of PPC/EA and SMIE. ICSG, on the other hand, was a new, unproven activity using a methodology and language that was unfamiliar to its overseers. USAID managers have, therefore, been uncertain about, even doubtful of, ICSG's potential to contribute to the central pursuits of USAID.

ICSG's perception is that USAID managers have (1) tended to favor ICEG over ICSG and (2) failed to support the marketing of ICSG services and products. There is evidence that on several occasions, USAID's project managers have requested ICS to shift additional funding from ICSG to ICEG. In its very first annual review of ICSG's work, PPC/EA proposed to limit ICSG's funding for the second grant year to no more than 10% of core funding. (See La Pittus to Barletta letter, April 29, 1991:2) Fortunately for ICSG, PPC/EA was overstepping its bounds when it attempted to dictate allocation ratios between the two programs and ICS was able to maintain its preferred 22% allocation to ICSG. Concerns about, and attempts to influence, the ICSG/ICEG

funding ratio continue throughout project documentation. (An excellent example is the memorandum from Bob Young, SMIE to ICS, Bob Hawkins et al, dated December 14, 1992.) Though it is not documented in the project records, both SMIE and ICSG report that a senior manager from the Private Enterprise Bureau proposed that ICSG be "zeroed out" of FY94 funding at an ICEG Board of Overseers Meeting, May 25, 1993.

The project records are less conclusive as to USAID's willingness to support marketing of ICSG services. There are brief references to SMIE's willingness to arrange marketing sessions with USAID Regional Bureau personnel. For example, the letter from Bob Young to Elise Paylan, dated Dec. 4, 1992, page 2 states:

Lets also think about the value at that time of a presentation and discussion with USAID regional and other bureaus (e.g., R&D) of the needs for your proposed outputs. What do you think? Would you rather discuss potential priorities with them earlier?

However, no USAID Worldwide cable has ever been sent (more than three and one-half years into the project) announcing ICSGs availability to USAID Missions.

There is some controversy concerning the reporting cable sent to Latin American missions after the Dominican Republic workshop. In a Sept. 2, 1992 letter to Robert B. Hawkins, ICS, Bob Young stated:

In contrast with the relatively smooth functioning of ICEG, we sense that ICSG still has growing pains. After the D.R. workshop, in consultation with Bill Schoux, we sent out a cable to our missions in Latin America (1 June 92), summarizing the meeting and indicating that we would be sending them published proceedings. In spite of repeated requests for this report, we still have not seen a draft, although four months have passed since the workshop and three since the cable.

One point of controversy is that Bill Schoux claims that it was his office, not SMIE, that sent the referenced cable. SMIE claims that they modified and approved the cable. Such cables are a standard tool used by USAID central bureaus to market the services of central bureau projects. However, if this kind of cable was not followed-up with the promised Proceedings, it would not be an effective marketing strategy.

The record is clear that SMIE was concerned by ICSG's failure to get organized and to produce products as promised. It wouldn't have been unreasonable for SMIE to be cautious in marketing ICSG services if it perceived that ICSG wasn't ready. There are three pieces of correspondence from Bob Young, SMIE to ICS-ICSG (memo to Hawkins et al, Jan. 9, 1992; letter to Robert B. Hawkins, Jr., Sept. 2, 1992; and letter to Elise Paylan, Dec. 4, 1992) in which SMIE's concerns are identified in detail. Among these concerns are concerns over ICSG's failure to deliver products promised. Concerns are also repeatedly expressed over a perceived lack of focus in ICSG's program and ICSG's failure to incorporate its Advisory Group into project decision making.

These concerns by USAID over ICSG's lack of focus and delay in producing products have existed since the inception of the program. Conversations with the first AID project officer and other AID employees show that, from USAID's perspective, there was a consistent lack of focus in defining ICSG's goals and objectives from the beginning. This lack of clarity seemed to be based on both the wide philosophical scope of ICSG and the lack of adequate staff for ICSG in the initial stages.

At bottom, there is a sort of a "Which came first? The chicken or the egg?" quality to this argument. USAID didn't aggressively market the project and USAID did try to shift funding to ICEG. This could conceivably have negatively effected ICSG's production. However, it is equally true that ICSG delivered many products late and completely failed to deliver others. This could easily have undermined USAID's faith in the project. A prudent manager might well have tried to cut back funding.

The USAID-ICSG relationship is complicated by the fact that this is a cooperative agreement rather than a contract. USAID's management style might be characterized as "arms length." This style is more appropriate for a contract. Cooperative agreements are often used in situations where there is a perceived mutuality of interest, but the exact dimensions of beneficial products are not known. The cooperative agreement is an agreement to join in exploring the dimensions of this mutual interest, to see what products make the most sense and what the costs of producing them might be. USAID's position is one of substantial participation in a joint endeavor, not, strictly speaking, one of external manager.

3. CONCLUSIONS

1. The concepts that ICSG seeks to communicate through its books, videos, training materials, etc. are fundamentally sound and relevant to the problems of self-governance. There is widespread interest amongst survey respondents and some USAID staff in the concepts of self-governance.
2. Both the content and strategy of ICSG's work are unique. We found no danger of redundancy and overlap between ICSG's work and that of "similar" projects.
3. ICSG has been slow to define its program in a focused manner and in defining a strategy that is appropriate for its resources.
4. Elements of ICSG's strategy are debatable. Among the elements which we question are the following:
 - a. Over-reliance on advocacy NGOs;
 - b. The belief that adequate translation (theoretical concepts to practical tools and into various languages) will lead to "stand alone" products;
 - c. The failure to anticipate and structure desirable roles for international donors and host country government agencies;
 - d. The failure to fully develop and explain how the contemplated Local Action Foundations will function; and
 - e. Excessive reliance on the "International Network" for feedback and learning by ICSG.
5. Both SMIE and ICSG have fallen into an almost adversarial management style that adds difficulty for both. In part, technical knowledge of, and interest in, self-governance and democracy is limited on the part of SMIE project managers. Given a certain lack of expertise and interest, it is more difficult for SMIE to make a positive contribution to resolution of a difficult conceptual issue that ICSG faces.
6. Products produced by ICSG have been favorably evaluated by the target groups. This is true of books, video, workshops, materials used in the workshops, the International Network and the newsletter.
7. ICSG publications have had appreciable impact on the intellectual debate concerning development and self-governance. This is particularly true of Elinor Ostrom's work concerning self-governance of irrigation systems.

8. Due to difficulties in translation of theory into practical tools and the consequent small amount of completed training materials, impact on "grass roots" self-governance is minimal at this time.
9. Internal management and planning of ICSG's program is not sufficiently institutionalized. To some degree, personal management occurs instead of rule-ordered relationships.
10. We have very little evidence, other than book sales data, concerning demand for ICSG's services. In particular, we take the small number of workshops produced to date, not as evidence of lack of demand, but as evidence of a hesitant marketing effort by both ICSG and SMIE. Demand for future ICSG products is also hard to determine given the rightsizing of USAID and the limited funds/crowded agendas of Mission offices.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. As the search for a new home for ICSG continues, SMIE should reorient its management of the CA, providing support to the marketing of ICSG's viable products. In our view, viable products include books, a video, the "Enabling Environment" workshop and its associated training materials, the International Network and the newsletter. Distribution and use of these products should be fully supported.
2. In the short-term, USAID project management should include at least some USAID representatives who are fully informed about USAID's work in supporting democracy. As a minimal interim step, proposed annual work plans and other significant written products should be reviewed by appropriate persons from the Democracy Center. In the long run, USAID project management should be moved to an appropriate office of the Democracy Center.
3. ICSG should fully articulate its strategic vision of the process of diffusion of the tenets of self-governance, paying particular attention to the concerns expressed in Conclusion 4. The ultimate objective is a "strategy paper" that captures the essence of how ICSG envisions this process working; identifies strategic actions to be taken and who will have to take them and gives some sense of timing; and assesses the capacities of the various actors to perform the necessary actions.
4. Appropriate persons from USAID should be involved with the pilot-testing of ICSG training materials. They should serve as a review function for analyzing the development content of proposed training materials.
5. ICSG should improve its strategic and management planning processes. The Advisory Group should be given an explicit, institutionalized role in planning processes. All plans should include realistic assessments of monetary and non-monetary resource needs; fully reflect possible problems of timing, sequencing and coordination; and specify remedial actions to be taken when anticipatable problems emerge.
6. ICSG should constitute some equivalent of a Board of Directors. ICSG managers should not be making important project decisions in a policy vacuum. A revitalized "Advisory Group" would be acceptable only if ICSG can demonstrate that the ICS Board of Directors, or a sub-committee thereof, is deeply involved in and fully understands ICSG operations.

Annex A Comments by ICSG

March 3, 1994

**COMMENTS BY THE INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SELF-GOVERNANCE ON
ITS INTERIM EVALUATION
(UNDER COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT PDC 0095-A-00-0061-00)**

ICS/ICSG is pleased that the evaluation of its program recognizes the importance of self-governance -- the capacities of individuals and organizations to make the fundamental decisions that effect them -- in development efforts.

The evaluation rightly indicates that ICSG's strategies for implementing its mission have changed over the life of the project. The program has evolved substantially from the early descriptions in ICS's 1990 proposal and the Cooperative Agreement. This evolution took place through the annual workplans that described the updated objectives (as well as annual outputs). Each workplan was approved by the AID project office of PRE/SMIE.

ICSG, with the approval of its AID project office, has elected to adopt a strategy to develop high quality products that can be translated into training materials and then delivered to NGOs at the local level in developing countries. The evaluation report states that the quality of what we have done is quite high and that ICSG has a number of viable products -- books, a video, the Enabling Environment workshop and its associated training materials, the International Network, and the newsletter. ICSG has developed good products and is now working on their delivery. The next steps in ICSG's program strategy will increase the production of ICSG goods and services and the proper market thereof.

By and large, ICSG finds the recommendations valuable and their adoption will improve the overall performance of the program.

Recommendation 1

ICSG, with the consultation and support of its USAID/Washington project office, will more aggressively market its existing products to USAID missions and other donor agencies. ICSG's training materials -- designed for activist NGOs in developing countries -- can be modified to be a useful tool for USAID missions in understanding and implementing the Administrator's "Principles on Participatory Development." Two sets of products that can be developed fairly rapidly and marketed to missions are:

1. A training program for mission personnel that will enable them to recognize and build participation into their programs.
2. A training program for NGOs currently working with missions that will enable them to actively and positively contribute to mission efforts in implementing participatory development. The training will include a component by which the mission can evaluate the capacity of NGOs for self-governing activities and programs.

Recommendation 2

ICSG's relationship with its project office, AID/PRE/SMIE, has been difficult due to the nature of the program and PRE/SMIE's lack of interest in governance and participation issues. The project office's lack of support has been manifested in funding difficulties and no active marketing of ICSG's services and products. ICSG would welcome a relationship with an office, such as the proposed Democracy Center, that advocates the strengthening of civil society.

Recommendation 3

ICSG and ICEG are already in their five month strategic planning phase. A strategy paper will be ready by June 1, 1994. The five year plan will take into account the new mission statements of USAID, particularly those involving USAID's strategies for democracy and participation. Another critical planning requirement is the integration of certain complementary ICSG and ICEG activities. Both programs are working on the UN's Social Indicators project. The five year plan will also address linking national economic and institutional change oriented NGOs with more grassroots oriented NGO network members.

Recommendation 4

A good advisory group would assist ICSG's efforts. The current advisory group as a whole is not workable, although particular individuals have been extremely helpful to ICSG. ICSG will reconstitute its advisory group so that its members better complement ICSG's goals and that a stronger program results.

It is true that ICSG had a slow start both in terms of staff and expenditures of money. It should be noted that, while the project has been in operation for three and one half years, its real productivity in terms of funds spent is two and one half years. The first year was spent assessing strategies and developing our publications program. The second year, with the hiring of Elise Paylan, marked the actual production of products that could be used in the field. Due to resource concerns, an administrative assistant for the program was not hired until October 1992. A Project Coordinator was hired December 1993.

ICS and ICSG have already taken steps to strengthen their management and implementation capabilities. In March, Raymond Rifenburg, presently Mission Director, USAID Dominican Republic, will become the coordinator for both of ICS's programs under the cooperative agreement. Mr. Rifenburg will focus on strategic planning and marketing of ICSG programs to missions. Likewise, William Schoux, a former USAID officer with twenty six years of development experience, is beginning his second year as a consultant to ICSG in which he contributes to increasing ICSG's capacity to implement and deliver products to missions and NGOs.

Recommendation 5

ICSG's current advisory group includes David Nething (North Dakota State Senate), who also serves as a member of the ICS Board of Directors. Senator Nething's role as dual member is to involve himself in and understand ICSG's operations and report to the ICS Board.

Appendix A Scope of Work

Evaluation of the INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SELF-GOVERNANCE

SCOPE OF WORK

BACKGROUND:

Evolving definition of program: The International Center for Self-Governance (ICSG) is an affiliate of the Institute for Contemporary Studies (ICS), with which AID PRE/SMIE (hereafter: PRE/SMIE) has a cooperative agreement (CA). Early in the CA (which covers the period 1Jun90-31May95), ICSG was called the Institutional and Policy Reform Project (IPRP); and, the CA stated that IPRP was an activity of the International Center for Economic Growth (ICEG), the other affiliate of ICS included in the CA.

For the first year, the CA specified the tasks of ICSG (then IPRP) as developing the following:

- a small board of advisors;
- basic directional documentation (statement of purpose, brochure, and a "working paper of institutional reform and self-governance to define the Center's mission");
- a network of affiliates in at least 30 countries around the world;
- a strategy for institutional and policy reform;
- two or three small funded "pilot test alternative approaches to self-governance and institutional reform";
- a training program for one of three potential clientele (AID staff; host country officials; or members of the international network); and
- a dissemination program including a conference, newsletter, books, and monographs.

Since, there has been a realignment in ICSG'S program orientation, with current emphases including the following:

Mission: to promote the self-governing and entrepreneurial way of life in developing countries.

Objectives:

1. Translate the best academic works about self-governance and entrepreneurship into practical tools for use in developing countries.
2. Build the capacity of non-government organizations (NGOs) to train men and women in developing countries in self-governance and stimulate local activities.
3. Establish a network of NGOs to exchange ideas and distribute materials.

In subsequent discussions with PRE/SMIE and in its work plans, ICSG has agreed to focus its program further, with PRE/SMIE understanding the emphases to include the following:

- training materials concerned with the enabling (institutional) environment, common property, the physical environment,

- natural resources, and particularly, the self-governance and management of related production-oriented organizations, such as private enterprises and cooperatives;
- networking, with emphases on Asia and Latin America; and
 - a program of publications, including the newsletter and documentation relating to natural resources, self-governance, and institutional analysis.

As ICSG specifies that it "is not a research organization", it will not make research grants but instead "translate" the "results of field research that is relevant to self-governance and entrepreneurship ... into materials that NGOs ... can use to build the capacity among men and women in their own communities to manage their own affairs."

AID funding for ICSG: The annual core-funded obligation to ICS was expected to be \$3.2m p.a.; but, the possibility of PRE/SMIE core funding cutbacks may necessitate lower annual spending levels in the current year and in the future. These core resources are provided to ICSG and ICEG on a 22/78% split (or \$0.7/2.5m for the planned \$3.2m), respectively.

The evaluation's delay: Originally, the CA called for an evaluation of ICS's program at the end of the second year. While ICEG was evaluated during the third year, the evaluation of ICSG was postponed until the present due to delays in the implementation of programs and a sense that a little more time would furnish a sufficient track record to engage evaluators.

PROGRAM OF WORK:

To carry out the evaluation, the contractor will complete, with supporting documentation, the following activities:

- review the concept, program and focus of ICSG both as spelled out in the CA and as developed operationally, subsequently, between ICSG and PRE/SMIE, considering annual workplans and documentation for the proposed CA amendment, the latter covering modifications like references to ICSG replacing those to IPRP, changed purposes and changed program statements;
- assess the quality of ICSG's program, as planned as well as implemented, reviewing reports, videos, and teaching or other materials (e.g., the newsletter) generated;
- analyze the demand for ICSG's services, past and future, including the extent to which they fill an important gap (if any) in the academic or training-materials literature; analyze, in particular, the demand for these services by AID field missions and Washington bureaus, comparing them, whenever possible, to the services of similar AID projects;
- estimate (however, not in an econometric sense) the impact and value-added of ICSG's past and future programs; consider in these connections the receptivity of NGO's and private,

academic and public communities in both developing and developed countries, as well as important reviews, inclusions or citations in print media;

- assess the efficiency with which ICSG has applied resources at its disposal, that is, were its outputs and impacts generated with a reasonable mix of cost, time, quantity and quality if compared with other programs in the self-governance, democracy, community and organizational-management fields;
- evaluate ICSG's plans for the future, their focus, feasibility and comparative advantage in the light of both ICSG's demonstrated capabilities and probable resources available from AID;
- review and comment on the quality of management, planning and staffing demonstrated by ICSG;
- specify conclusions and appropriate recommendations for improving the quality, impact and efficiency of ICSG's program.

The deliverables to be reviewed or considered by the evaluator(s) will include annual reports, workplans and budgets, newsletters, publications, videotapes and the like. Deliverables still in draft form and not yet delivered need not be reviewed; however, the reasons for delay should be discussed with ICSG.

The principal evaluator(s) will hold discussions with representatives of AID/W, AID missions, ICSG, ICSG clients, including potential clients, and the self-governance, consultant/academic community. Some field contacts will involve only telecommunications. Brief questionnaires will be used to obtain supplementary feedback from selected AID missions, regional bureaus and relevant experts regarding the ICSG program.

Meetings to be provided: Early in the evaluation, the contractor will arrange a planning meeting, with participants from the contractor, ICSG, and AID. This meeting will launch the planning of the evaluation and clarify any unresolved issues with regard to the objectives, methodology and outputs.

Other key meetings will include an interim briefing and a final report presentation. Both would have similar participation. The former would be held to inform the interested parties about the progress of the analysis and preliminary findings. The latter would be a presentation of the principal findings, including significant results from the field work and communications with collaborating missions.

All meetings will be held in AID facilities to constrain cost.

Period of Work: The contractor will complete the scope of work within 90 days of the receipt of a signed work order from AID's Office of Procurement.

Reports: The contractor will deliver 10 copies of a substantially complete, draft-final report to PRE/SMIE between 60 and 70 days after receipt of the signed work order. PRE/SMIE will return the draft report with its comments to the contractor within 10 days after that. The contractor will then produce and deliver the final report in 10 copies by the end of the contract period.

The draft-final and final reports should have an executive summary of 3-5 pages (10 pitch, single-spaced, one inch margins), a comprehensive table of contents (including pagination), and consist of no more than an additional 25 typewritten pages of text, with the option of appendices for those topics requiring more depth.

Qualifications of the Evaluator(s):

The areas of expertise needed to accomplish the tasks described include: developing-country experience in project design, evaluation and implementation, especially experience with participatory projects and projects involving non-government organizations; field experience in the application of principles to concrete situations; experience with self-governance and democracy-building activities; ability to interview in Spanish by at least one of the evaluators.

Other desirable qualifications include: advanced degree(s) in development administration, international relations or one of the social sciences; experience in carrying out consulting assignments in developing countries; field experience in Latin America and Asia.

Appendix B Documents Reviewed

Reports, Letters and Memorandae

Bond, Laurance W., Letter to Robert B. Hawkins, Jr., June 13, 1991.

Costello, Edward T., Letter to Jerry Jenkins (Draft), October 10, 1991.

Harper, Sam T., Letter (with attachments) to Robert C. Young, December 7, 1992.

Harper, Sam T., Letter to Robert C. Young, January 28, 1993.

Hawkins, Robert B., Letter to Jerome R. LaPittus, May 10, 1991.

Hawkins, Robert B., Memorandum to Laurance W. Bond re "Review of the Institutional and Policy Reform Program (IPRP) component of the proposed ICEG year two work plan, as referenced in your letter of June 13, 1991," June 19, 1991.

Hawkins, Robert B., Letter to Lawrence Bond, June 25, 1991.

Hawkins, Robert B., Letter (with attachments) to Lawrence W. Bond, September 12, 1991.

Hawkins, Bob, John Sullivan and Sam Harper, Memorandum to USAID Project Review Team re "Institutional and Policy Reform Program," October 3, 1990.

Hawkins, Robert B., Sam T. Harper and Elise Paylan, Memorandum to Mike Farbman and Bob Young. Subject: Revised Year-Two Workplan for ICSG, February 4, 1992.

Institute for Contemporary Studies, "Proposal for Expansion of Program on Economic Policy Making for Growth and Human Development," Institute for Contemporary Studies, May 18, 1990.

Institute for Contemporary Studies, Institutional and Policy Reform Program (IPRP), Annual Report, June 1, 1990 to May 31, 1991. (No date).

Institute for Contemporary Studies, Institutional and Policy Reform Program (IPRP), Year Two Plan. (No date).

International Center for Self-Governance, Year-Two Workplan (No date).

International Center for Self-Governance, Year-Three Workplan (No date).

International Center for Self-Governance, "Year-Four Workplan (June 1, 1993 -- May 31, 1994) & Annual Report for Year-Three," May 26, 1993.

Jenkins, Jerry, Letter to Edward T. Costello, October 9, 1991.

La Pittus, Jerome R., Letter to Dr. Nicolas Ardito-Barletta (Draft), April 29, 1991.

La Pittus, Jerome R., ACTION MEMORANDUM FOR THE ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR, PPC, Subject: Second Year Funding for ICS: Institutional and Policy Reform Program. June 25, 1991

Morfit, Michael, Memorandum to Jerome LaPittus and Ed Costello, June 21, 1991.

Schoux, Elise, Memorandum to Orest Koropecy, Subject: ICSG Funding Requirements, November 5, 1993.

Schoux, Elise, Letter to Ed Connerley, January 27, 1994.

Schoux, Elise Paylan and Sam Harper, Memorandum to Robert Young and Michael Farbman, Subject: Amendment to the Cooperative Agreement, July 30, 1993.

Young, Bob, Memorandum to Bob Hawkins et al, Subject: Follow-up to our Meeting on December 13. January 9, 1992.

Young, Bob, Memorandum to Bob Hawkins, Subject: ICS FY93 Funding Level, November 10, 1992.

Young, Bob, Memorandum to Bob Hawkins, Sam Harper, Nicolas Ardito-Barletta and Elise Paylan, Subject: Budgets, work plans, pipelines and all that, December 14, 1992.

Young, Robert C., Letter to Robert B. Hawkins, September 2, 1992.

Young, Robert C., Letter to Elise Paylan, December 4, 1992.

Books

Bromley, Daniel W. (ed.) Making the Commons Work: Theory, Practice and Policy San Francisco: ICS Press, 1992

Himmelfarb, Gertrude On Liberty & Liberalism: The Case of John Stuart Mill San Francisco: ICS Press, 1990

Nisbet, Robert The Quest for Community: A Study in the Ethics of Order & Freedom San Francisco: ICS Press, 1990

Ostrom, Elinor Crafting Institutions for Self-Governing Irrigation Systems San Francisco: ICS Press, 1992

Ostrom, Vincent, David Feeny and Hartmut Picht (eds.) Rethinking Institutional Analysis and Development: Issues, Alternatives, and Choices San Francisco: ICS Press, 1988

Sawyer, Amos The Emergence of Autocracy in Liberia: Tragedy and Challenge San Francisco:
ICS Press, 1992

Tang, Shui Yan Institutions and Collective Action: Self-Governance in Irrigation San Francisco:
ICS Press, 1992

Appendix C Interviews for ICSG Evaluation

Telephone Interviews:

William Ascher, Duke University
Ed Costello, Inter-American Development Bank
David Feeny, McMaster University
Bob Healey, Duke University
Joseph Leafe, Former Mayor, Norfolk, VA
Jawara Lumumba, TRG Inc.
Debra McFarland, USAID/LAC/DI
Dan Miller, USAID/Kathmandu
Wayne Nilsesteun, USAID/LAC/DR/RD
Riall Nolan, University of Pittsburgh
Elinor Ostrom, Indiana University
Gordon Rausser, University of California at Berkeley
Mike Rock, EPAT
Louis Siegel, Associates in Rural Development, Inc.
Richard Whitaker, USAID/ASIA/DR/TR
Ken Wiegand, USAID/Quito
Humberto Yap, Utah State University

In-person Interviews:

Washington, D.C.

Mike Farbman, USAID/G/EG/SMIE
Catherine Goddard, Coverdale Organization, Inc.
Kelly Kammerer, A/AID
Orest Koropecy, USAID/G/EG/SMIE
Diane La Voy, USAID/PPC/SP
Norman Nicholson, USAID/PPC/POL/IDP
Toby Pierce, USAID/ANE/ASIA/SA/NS
Sher Plunkett, USAID/LAC/DR/RD
Bob Shoemaker, USAID/AFR/ONI/DG
Heriberto Suarez, Inter-American Development Bank
John Sullivan, CIPE
Bob Young, USAID/AFR/ARTS/EA

Guatemala City, Guatemala

Alejandro Barrios, Fundación FADES
Ing. Amílcar Burgos, Fundación Centroamericana de Desarrollo
Ron Carlson, USAID
Palma Armando Velasquez, FUNDESPE
Dr. Miguel Von Hoegen, Instituto de Invesitgaciones Economicos y Sociales

Santo Domingo, D.R.

Doug Chiriboga, USAID

Dr. Andrés Dauhajre, Fundación Economía y Desarrollo

Enrique A. Fernandez, Consejo de Fundaciones Americanas de Desarrollo

Larry Laird, USAID

David Luther, Instituto Dominicano de Desarrollo Integral, Inc.

Richard Mangrich, ENTRENA

Modesto Antonio Peralta, Grupo de Apoyo a la Documentación

Odelise Perez, USAID

Bolivar Po, ENTRENA

Miguelina Soto, USAID

Adriano Miguel Tejada, Grupo Financiero Nacional

ICS/ICSG

Sam Harper

Robert Hawkins

Bill Schoux

Elise Paylan Schoux

Appendix D Survey Respondents

Adolfo Arrocha, Asociacion Nacional de Desarrollo Economico

Leni Berliner, Independent Consultant

Enrique A. Fernandez, SOLIDARIOS

Ramon Alberto Castro Gonzalez, ACORDE

Darin Gunsekera, Wiros Academy

Miguel Von Hoegen, ASIENS

Jorge Jimenez, CDEE-ICESI

David Luther, IDDI

Lidieth Madden, Asociacion Andar

Hamidou Magassa, Yeredon Foundation

Reichmuth Markus, FUNDES

David Nething, U.S. State Senator

Rodrigo Varela, ICESI

Armando Velasquez, FUNDESPE

Juan Hector Vidal, ANEP

Appendix E Survey

EVALUATION FOR INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SELF GOVERNANCE

Section 1. Basic Information

1.1 Your name: _____

1.2 Name of your organization: _____

1.3 Type of organization:

- Private Voluntary Organization (PVO)/ Non Governmental Organization (NGO)
- USAID Mission University
- Research organization Government agency
- Other (specify) _____

1.4 Type of work conducted:

- Democracy/Governance Government
- Community development Research
- Association of PVO/NGO's Policy Institute
- Academic Other (specify) _____

1.5 Your telephone number: _____

1.6 Your facsimile (fax) number: _____

1.7 Have you or your organization had any contact with ICSG?

- Yes
- No

If yes, please continue questionnaire. If no, please return questionnaire to MSI.

Section 2. Contact with ICSG

2.1 How much contact have you or your organization had with ICSG?

- Substantial (eg: attended workshop(s), use ICSG publications, receive newsletter, have a seed money grant, use lessons learned, etc.)
- Moderate (eg: attended workshop(s), receive newsletter, etc.)
- Minimal (eg: receive newsletter, etc.)

2.2 How much future contact do you anticipate between your organization and ICSG?

- Substantial (eg: will attend workshop(s), use ICSG publications, receive newsletter, apply for grants, use lessons learned, etc.)
- Moderate (eg: will attend workshop(s), receive newsletter, etc.)
- Minimal (eg: will receive newsletter, etc.)
- No contact

2.3 If you anticipate future contact, please briefly explain what that contact will be.

2.4 How important is your contact with ICSG in meeting your or your organization's program goals? (ie: helps in education, in defining program needs, in providing training, etc.)

- Very important
- Important
- Not important
- Not applicable to your organizational program

2.5 If your organization works with community groups and local PVO/NGO's, how important is your contact with ICSG in meeting goals specific to PVO's and community groups?

- Very important
- Important
- Not important
- Not applicable to your organizational program

Section 3. ICSG Workshops, publications and materials

Below, please evaluate how useful ICSG workshops and materials are for you or your organization.

3.1 Workshops:

- Very useful
- Useful
- Not useful
- Did not attend a workshop

3.1.1 Please list date and location of workshop(s) that you attended: _____

3.1.2 If you attended a workshop, please briefly list lessons learned from the workshop

3.1.3 How many people in your organization have used workshop materials or lessons learned from the workshop? _____

3.1.4 To how many people outside your organization did you recommend workshop materials or lessons learned from the workshop? _____

3.1.5 How useful are the training materials or lessons learned in meeting program goals?

- Very useful
- Useful
- Not useful
- Not familiar with the training materials or lessons learned

3.2 Videos:

The following video was produced in both English and Spanish. If you are familiar with both videos, please comment on both.

3.2.1 *Crafting Institutions for Self-Governing Irrigation Systems*

- Very useful
- Useful
- Not useful
- Not familiar with this video

How many people in your organization saw this video? _____

How many people outside your organization did you recommend this video to? _____

3.2.2 *Diseno de Instituciones Para Sistemas de Riego Auto-Gestionarios*

- Very useful
- Useful
- Not useful
- Not familiar with this video

How many people in your organization saw this video? _____

How many people outside your organization did you recommend this video to? _____

3.3 Publications: Please check the ICSG publications below as **very useful, useful, or not useful.**

Title of ICSG Publication	Have you read this book? (Please check)		How useful is this book? (Please check)		
	Yes	No	Very Useful	Useful	Not Useful
<i>Making the Commons Work: Theory, Practice, and Policy</i> ed. D.Bromley					
<i>The Culture of Entrepreneurship</i> ed. B.Berger					
<i>The Emergence of Autocracy in Liberia: Tragedy and Challenge</i> by A.Sawyer					
<i>An Institutional Theory of Communist Regimes: Design, Function, and Breakdown</i> by A.Kaminski					
<i>Meaning of American Federalism</i> by V.Ostrom					
<i>Institutions and Collective Action: Self-Governance in Irrigation</i> by S.Y.Tang					
<i>Dividing the Waters</i> by W.Blomquist					
<i>Rethinking Institutional Analysis and Development</i> ed. Ostrom, Feeny, and Picht					
Bulgarian translation of <i>The Quest for Community</i> by R.Nesbit					
Bulgarian translation of <i>On Liberty and Liberalism</i> by G.Himmelfarb					
<i>Crafting Institutions for Self-Governing Irrigation Systems</i> by E.Ostrom					
<i>Diseno de Instituciones Para Sistemas de Riego Auto-Gestionarios</i> by E.Ostrom					

57

3.3.1 Please briefly comment on what you liked or disliked about the above publications

3.3.2 How many people in your organization have read any of the above books? _____

3.3.3 How many people outside your organization did you recommend any of the above books to? _____

3.3.4 Would you like to see more translations of ICSG publications?

Yes

No

If yes, please list books you would like translated and the language

3.4 Newsletter:

3.4.1 *Self-Governance*

Very useful

Useful

Not useful

Not familiar with newsletters

3.4.2 Do you re-distribute the newsletters regularly?

Yes

No

If yes, to how many people? _____

3.4.3 How many people in your organization regularly read the newsletter? _____

3.5 Seed Money Grants:

3.5.1 Are you familiar with the seed money grants?

Yes

No

3.5.2 Have you ever applied for a seed money grant from ICSG?

- Yes
- No

3.5.3 If yes, how many times have you applied? _____

3.5.4 Do you plan to apply for seed money grants in the future?

- Yes
- No

3.6 Networking (ie: newsletter, seed money grants, workshops, etc.):

3.6.1 Are you or your organization a member of the ICSG international network?

- Yes
- No

3.6.2 What benefits have you received from using network?

3.6.3 How effective is the ICSG network as far as benefits your organizations receives through increase networking?

- Very effective
- Effective
- Not effective
- Not familiar with network

3.6.4 How do you use the network?

3.7 How useful are ICSG materials for local community groups and local PVO's.

- Very useful
- Useful
- Not useful
- Do not receive materials

3.8 How often has your organization used ICSG materials or lessons learned from these materials?

- Frequently (ie: once a month)
- Occasionally (ie: once every six months)
- Rarely (ie: once a year or less)
- Not at all

3.9 How often has your organization used ICSG materials or lessons learned from these materials in work with local PVO/NGO's?

- Frequently (ie: once a month)
- Occasionally (ie: once every six months)
- Rarely (ie: once a year or less)
- Not at all

Section 4. Delivery of Services (ie: seed money grants, publications, workshops, etc.)

4.1 Has your organization used any of ICSG's services?

- Yes
- No

If yes, please comment on the delivery of ICSG services

4.2 How well presented were the ICSG workshops?

- Workshop was very well presented
- Workshop was moderately well presented
- Workshop was not well presented
- Did not attend a workshop

4.3 How timely is the information in the newsletter?

- Very timely, on the cutting edge in this field
- Timely
- Old

4.4 How obtainable is information on the seed money grants?

- Information is very obtainable
- Information is moderately obtainable
- It is difficult to obtain information on seed money grants

4.5 Is price a factor in you or your organization requesting publications or videos?

- Yes
- No

4.6 Overall, how would you evaluate ICSG's ability to deliver its services?

- Very good
- Moderate
- Poor
- Not familiar with any ICSG services

4.7 How would you evaluate the quality of planning demonstrated by ICSG staff?

- Very high
- Moderate
- Poor
- Not familiar with ICSG planning

4.8 How would you evaluate the quality of staffing demonstrated by ICSG staff?

- Very high
- Moderate
- Poor
- Not familiar with ICSG staffing

Section 5. Comparison with other organizations

5.1 The following USAID supported projects are thought to provide similar services as ICSG:

Institutional Reform and the Informal Sector
Institute for Policy Reform
InterAmerican Institute for Human Rights
Decentralization, Finance and Management

Please list other USAID supported projects organizations that you know of that provide similar types of services as ICSG or work in similar areas of interest.

5.2 How does ICSG compare to the above organizations?

- Superior to similar organizations
- Comparable to similar organizations
- Inferior to similar organizations
- Not familiar with above organizations

5.3 Do you feel that ICSG can be substituted by any of the above organizations?

- Yes, it would be easy to substitute
- It would be moderately easy to substitute
- No, there is no substitute for ICSG
- Not familiar with the above organizations

5.4 Do you feel that ICSG complements the above organizations?

- Highly complements
- Moderately complements
- Does not complement above organizations
- Not familiar with the above organizations

5.5 Do you expect to use ICSG services in the future?

- Yes
- No

Please briefly explain why or why not

Section 6. Narrative

6.1 How did you learn about ICSG?

6.2 If you attended a workshop, what made it a success? How can the workshops be improved?

6.3 Do you have any suggestions for any improvements in future videos, newsletters, or books?

6.4 Do you have any suggestions on how ICSG services can be more useful?

6.5 Do you have any further comments?

Thank you for your prompt assistance in filling out this questionnaire. Please send responses to **Julia Nenon, MSI, at 202-488-0754.**

Appendix F Table 1 ICSG Products

PRODUCTS PROMISED AND DELIVERY STATUS			
Product	Deadline	Date Delivered	Comments
1. Board of advisors	05/31/91	05/31/91	Board was established during first year of CA. An "Advisory Group," with different membership, was established in second year. Advisory Group met once, Nov. 15, 1991. Neither "Board" nor "Group" meets regularly, nor are functions defined. Current intention is to reconstitute a Board, with enhanced representation of international network of cooperators.
2. Statement of purpose	05/31/91	06/92	
3. Brochure	05/31/92	06/92	
4. Working paper of institutional reform and self-governance	05/31/91		Never published or disseminated as "Working Paper." Evolved into "Handbook for Self-Governance" by Blomquist. See product No. 13, below.
5. Network of affiliates (at least 30 countries)	05/31/91		Year two Workplan decreases proposed membership to twelve countries. Network currently has 27 member institutions from 18 countries.
6. Strategy development workshop	05/31/91	02/22-23/91	Consensus on strategy was not achieved.

7. Two or three funded pilot tests of alternative approaches to institutional reform	05/31/91	12/21/90, 04/91 and 06/11/91	Three small grants made: (1) support of Bulgarian workshop on "Democratic Change and Stability in Eastern Europe"; (2) support for mapping of formal political jurisdictions versus traditional cultural institutions in Mali. The Mali work has been held up by civil unrest. However, a first draft report, in French, has been completed; and (3) translation of two books into Bulgarian (co-financed by USIA Book Program and Central and East European Publishing Project, Oxford).
8. Training program for one of three potential clientele (USAID Staff, host country officials or network members)	05/31/91		This was not done and is not currently contemplated.
9. Dissemination: International conference	05/31/91		This was cancelled, with concurrence of USAID (Costello). No further work is contemplated.
10. Dissemination: Newsletter	11/01/90	11/01/90	Target was to "begin publication of Kiplinger-style newsletter." One English language issue published Fall, 1990.

11. Dissemination: Books and Monographs			
V. Ostrom, <u>The Meaning of American Federalism.</u>	05/31/91	07/91	Target was to publish 6 books and/or monographs in first grant year. Eight books and one monograph have been published to date. None of them were published within the first grant year. ICSG believes that products not delivered in Year 1 are related to delayed funding by USAID. Though CA grant year started June 1, 1990, first funding was received September, 1990.
Berger (ed.), <u>The Culture of Entrepreneurship.</u>	05/31/91	11/91	
E. Ostrom, <u>Crafting, Institutions for Self-Governing Irrigation Systems</u>	05/31/91	02/92	
Kaminski, <u>An Institutional Theory of Communist Regimes.</u>			
Tang, <u>Institutions and Collective Action: Self-Governance in Irrigation</u>	05/31/91	03/92	
Sawyer, <u>The Emergence of Autocracy in Liberia.</u>	05/31/91	04/92	
Bromley (ed.), <u>Making the Commons Work: Theory, Practice and Policy.</u>	05/31/91	04/92	
	05/31/91	10/92	
12. Informational Pamphlets (short and longer versions)	05/31/92	06/92	Produced in English and Spanish
13. Handbook for Self-Governance	05/31/92		Expanded version of Product No. 4, "Working paper of institutional reform and self-governance". Work on this product continued during grant year two, but the product was not completed. See product No. 42, below.
14. Quarterly newsletter			Published quarterly since January, 1992. Currently available in English, French and Spanish.
15. Training Materials: Natural Resources and the Environment	05/31/92		Not completed during grant year two. Based on Bromley (ed.) <u>Making the Commons Work</u> . See product Nos. 11, 22 and 30.

69

16. Training Materials: Video, "Crafting Institutions for Self-Governing Irrigation Systems."	05/31/92	08/92	Based on E. Ostrom monograph of same name. See product No. 11, above.
17. Training Materials: "The Enabling Environment for Self-Governance and Entrepreneurial Activity"	05/31/92		Not completed during grant year two. See product Nos. 21 and 31.
18. Training Materials: "Establishing a Local Action Foundation."	05/31/92		Strategy document done. Further development "On hold" due to threatened funding cuts and uncertainty re demand for finished product.
19. Networking: Regional workshop, The Dominican Republic.	05/31/92	05/4-6/92	
20. Networking: Professional association outreach	05/31/92	09/92	Special session organized at the annual meeting of the International Association for the Study of Common Property, Washington, D.C. Also, several domestic and international membership lists for associations of NGOs have been entered into ICSGs data base.
21. Training materials: "The Enabling Environment for Self-Governance and Entrepreneurial Activity"	05/31/93		Not completed during grant year three. Guidelines for these materials were developed at a Nov., 1992 meeting. Draft training materials were pilot tested in the Costa Rica regional workshop, March 3-5, 1993. See product Nos. 17 and 31.
22. Training materials: Natural Resources and the Environment	05/31/93		Not completed during grant year three. See product Nos. 11, 15 and 30.
23. Training materials: Local Action Foundation	05/31/93		Not completed during grant year three. Not currently working on this, due to uncertainties of USAID funding.
24. Networking: Two regional workshops "assumed."	05/31/93		One regional workshop (Costa Rica, March 3-5, 1993) was held.

19

25. Networking: Panels and special sessions at professional meetings.	05/31/93	09/92 and 05-06/92	Panel was sponsored at the annual meeting of the International Association for the Study of Common Property. Asia trip was taken by Elise Paylan and Norman Nicholson.
26. Publications: A monograph, <u>Self-Governance in the Forestry Sector</u>	05/31/93		Draft received by ICSG, January, 1994.
27. Publications: Translation of <u>The Meaning of American Federalism</u> into Polish and Russian	05/31/93		Cancelled due to uncertainties of "stop and go" USAID funding.
28. Publications: Publication of the ICSG quarterly newsletter in English, French and Spanish.	05/31/93		All quarterly issues published as scheduled.
29. Publications: French and Spanish translations of ICSG informational pamphlets and the Handbook for Self-Governance	05/31/93		Only Spanish translation completed during grant year three. See product Nos. 42 and 44.
30. Training materials: Circulate a working draft and begin to field test training materials on "Natural Resources and the Environment."	05/31/94		Work in progress. No date projected for circulation of working draft.
31. Training materials: "The Enabling Environment for Self-Governance and Entrepreneurial Activity." Publish and disseminate the ICSG training design in a workbook format.	05/31/94		Draft received by ICSG, Jan. 28, 1994.
32. Training materials: "Enabling Environment Video"	05/31/94		Work will start January 10, 1994. Completion date not yet projected.

33. Training materials: Continue to test and refine workshop design with regional workshops in Asia, Fall, 1993 and Spring, 1994.	05/31/94		Fall, 1993 workshop was not held due to reversal of interest by USAID, Kathmandu. This loss may be recouped with Spring, 1994 workshop in Bangladesh or Nepal. Spring, 1994 workshop will occur during the week of Feb. 28th in Manila. This will not be a regional workshop. At the request of USAID, Manila, all attendees will be Phillipino.
34. Training materials: Self-Governing Forestry video and instructor's manual. Video will be based on <u>Self-Governance in the Forestry Sector</u> . Instructor's manual will be useable with either book or video. Video will be available Winter, 1993.	05/31/94		A draft of the book was received by ICSG, Jan., 1994. Some shooting has been done on video. No work has been done on Instructor's Manual. Manual will not be completed by May 31, 1994.
35. Networking: Increase the number of "General" network members from 8 to 30.	05/31/94		January 1, 1994 "General" membership stands at 27. A total of 30 seems well within reach by May 31, 1994.
36. Networking: Work with network members and other interested parties to adapt the training design for the "Enabling Environment for Self-Governance and Entrepreneurship" to country-specific workshops in Latin America. 3 country specific workshops anticipated.	05/31/94		Locally adapted workshops planned in Colombia, Dominican Republic and El Salvador, partially supported by seed money grant to NGO in each of the three countries.
37. Networking: Seed Money Grants. Eight grants anticipated.	05/31/94		Six grants awarded through Jan. 31, 1994.
38. Networking: Assistance to members in obtaining political and economic support from international donor organizations.	05/31/94		No specific activities cited.
39. Networking: ICSG Advisory Group Meeting, Spring, 1994	05/31/94		Still anticipated.

69

40. Networking: Attending professional meetings, sponsoring panels, and visits to developing country NGO's and USAID missions.	05/31/94		ICSG representatives attended the annual meeting of the International Association for the Study of Common Property (Manila, June, 1993) and a meeting with USAID, Manila.
41. Publications: Continue publication of <u>Self-Governance</u> , the ICSG newsletter.	05/31/94		Scheduled quarterly issues published in English, French and Spanish.
42. Publications: Revise, reprint and disseminate the ICSG Handbook in English and Spanish	05/31/94	01/94 (English)	This product resulted from product Nos. 4 and 13. Published title of English version is <u>Self-Governing and Entrepreneurial Solutions: A Handbook</u> . Spanish and French editions are anticipated by May 31, 1994.
43. Publications: A monograph, Ascher, <u>Self-Governance in the Forestry Sector</u>	Summer/94		Draft manuscript received by ICSG. Publication still anticipated by Summer, 1994.
44. Publications: Translation of ICSG informational pamphlet/brochure to French	05/31/94		Completion anticipated by March 30, 1994. See product No. 29.
45. Publications: Reprint the paperback edition of V. Ostrom, D. Feeny and H. Picht (eds.), <u>Rethinking Institutional Analysis and Design</u> .	05/31/94	06/93	
46. Publications: N. Uphoff (ed.), <u>Puzzles of Public Sector Productivity</u>			Publication expected May, 1994. Publication of this book has not been proposed or approved in a previous work plan.
47. Publications: E. Ostrom, <u>Diseño de Instituciones para Sistemas de Riego Auto-Gestionarios</u>		09/93	Spanish translation of <u>Crafting Institutions for Self-Governing Irrigation Systems</u> . See product No. 11, above. Translation paid for by USAID/Santo Domingo.
48. Video: "Diseño de Instituciones para Sistemas de Riego Auto-Gestionarios."		09/93	Spanish version of "Crafting Institutions for Self-Governing Irrigation Systems" video. See product No. 16. Production of Spanish version paid for by USAID/Santo Domingo.
49. Publications: Blomquist, <u>Dividing the Waters</u>		10/92	Publication of this book was not proposed or approved in a previous work plan.

Appendix G Table 2 ICSG Book Sales

Sales for Lifetime Ending 11/93

Book Title	List Price	Date Publish	Net Quantity	Net \$
<i>Crafting Institutions/Self-Governance Irrigation</i> (Span)	9.95	7/93	54	535.31
<i>Crafting Institutions/Self-Governance Irrigation</i> (p)	9.95	2/92	1209	6747.34
<i>Crafting Institutions/ Self-Governance</i> (Video)	29.95	9/92	81	2288.18
<i>Crafting Institutions/Self-Governance</i> (Video-Span)	29.95	3/93	16	473.21
<i>Culture of Entrepreneurship</i> (cl)	29.95	12/91	749	16009.72
<i>Dividing the Waters</i> (cl)	44.95	12/91	346	11148.48
<i>Dividing the Waters</i> (p)	14.95	10/92	618	6385.89
<i>Emergence of Autocracy/Liberia</i> (p)	15.95	4/92	141	1716.74
<i>Emergence of Autocracy/Liberia</i> (cl)	29.95	4/92	757	8133.30
<i>Institutions and Collective Action</i> (p)	9.95	4/92	395	3011.04
<i>Institutional Theory/Communist Regimes</i> (cl)	29.95	3/92	164	2427.83
<i>Institutional Theory/Communist Regimes</i> (p)	15.95	4/92	206	2486.47
<i>Making the Commons Work</i> (cl)	44.95	11/92	253	6238.16
<i>Making the Commons Work</i> (p)	14.95	11/92	590	6904.92
<i>Meaning of American Federalism</i> (cl)	24.95	7/91	1083	14810.62
<i>Rethinking Institutional Analysis, rvsd</i> (p)	18.95	6/93	142	1374.25