

## memorandum

P. J. M. 331

DATE: September 26, 1983

REPLY TO  
ATTN OF: Fred C. Fischer, Director, ASIA/PNS

SUBJECT: Evaluation of the Development Services and Training Project  
(#383-0044)

TO: Sarah Jane Littlefield, Director, USAID/Colombo

As you know, I have spent most of the past seven days conducting an evaluation of two of the sub-projects under the Development Services and Training (DS&T) project: the financing of the Mahaweli Environmental Assessment (MEA) and support for the Sri Lanka Institute of Development Administration (SLIDA).

Attached are written reports of my findings and conclusions, with SLIDA at TAB A, and MEA at TAB B. The reports are specifically directed to the questions that were spelled out in USAID Colombo's cable number 6025 of September 12, 1983, subject: DS&T project, scope of work for evaluation.

Per USAID instructions, I have not prepared an Executive Summary for each sub-project. I understand an Executive Summary will be prepared later, when the overall DS&T project evaluation (of which my evaluations have been a part) is completed.

One week is not much time to conduct an in-depth evaluation. On the other hand, I was able to have discussions with more than a dozen people on each of the sub-projects, and to read through what I believe to be all of the relevant documents for each sub-project. Thus I doubt that I would have uncovered much new data, or come to any other conclusions, if I had been able to spend more time on this exercise.

Everyone I contacted on this evaluation, Sri Lankan and American, was most frank and forthcoming. Their names are listed in annexes to the two reports. I should like to gratefully acknowledge their co-operation and counsel.

Attachments: as stated

AID:FFischer:ms



AN EVALUATION OF U. S. ASSISTANCE  
TO THE SRI LANKA INSTITUTE OF  
DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION (SLIDA)

Fred C. Fischer  
ASIA/PNS. for

BASIC EVALUATION DATA

Name of Subproject : Sri Lanka Institute of Development Administration (SLIDA)

Implementing Agency (Subgrantee): Sri Lanka Institute of Development Administration

Funding : USAID \$150,000<sup>1/</sup>  
GSL -  
Other -

USAID Disbursements to date : Est. \$96,187<sup>1/</sup>

Date started : February 16, 1982

PACD : - 2/

Actual Completion Date : - 2/

Type of Commitment Document used : Letter of Understanding 2/

GSL Project Manager : V. T. Navaratne, SLIDA

USAID Subproject Officer : R. L. Chamberlain, HPHR

1/ In addition to this amount, AID has provided \$25,000 in central AID/W funds (FY 1980) for two short-term consultants to conduct an institutional review of SLIDA, and \$61,000 prior to 2/16/82 from DS&T's general participant training component.

2/ Letter of understanding covers provision of non-project, interim assistance pending an anticipated request from SLIDA for project assistance.

## I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The Sri Lanka Institute for Development Administration (SLIDA), located in Colombo, was established in November of 1979.<sup>1/</sup> Its primary purpose is to improve the skills, knowledge, and attitudes of public sector employees, and thus contribute to the country's overall development effort. In addition to its training role, SLIDA has been mandated functions in the areas of management consultancy, applied research, and publications.

SLIDA's training courses cover organizational effectiveness, personnel and financial management, managerial development, environmental analysis, operations research, project management, policy development, development administration, and English and French language. Training is specifically directed to problems and programs in rural development.

A very quick and unscientific poll<sup>2/</sup> indicated that Sri Lankans think well of SLIDA as a training institution. The Director of the External Resources Division of the Ministry of Finance considers it extremely important that Sri Lanka have its own in-house development administration institution, given the high cost of such training abroad, and reduced donor funding for training.

## II. USAID ASSISTANCE TO SLIDA

It is generally recognized by the Government of Sri Lanka (GSL) and by the donor community that one of the main constraints to the development process is the lack of management skills on the part of many of the GSL officials involved in the design and implementation of development projects.

Thus, in view of the critical role which SLIDA can play in alleviating this constraint, and in keeping with the AID emphasis on institutional development, USAID Colombo has been providing assistance to SLIDA since 1981. Initial assistance was in the form of a centrally-funded (S&T Bureau) grant for two consultants to advise on SLIDA's services, staffing, and program review procedures.

Subsequent aid to SLIDA has been provided as a "sub-project" under USAID's Development Services and Training Project (#383-0044). Disbursements to date have totalled \$96,187, divided into two major categories :

- 1) \$17,600 for a U.S. consultant to assist SLIDA in preparing a three-year Corporate Plan; and
- 2) The remaining funds to finance various academic training and observation tours for members of the SLIDA faculty.

For more information on the two consultant studies, and specifics on the eight individual training programs, please see Annex #2. The sections of this report which follow correspond to the "questions to be addressed in evaluating DS&T sub-projects", as spelled out in the USAID's cable of September 12, 1983 (Colombo 6025).

<sup>1/</sup> It had previously been known as the Academy of Administrative Studies, which dated back to 1966.

<sup>2/</sup> Conducted in phone calls to a number of influential Sri Lankans by Oswin Silva of the USAID Colombo staff. Please see Annex #1 for the details.

III. IMPACT. WHAT DID THE SUB-PROJECT ACCOMPLISH ? DID IT MEET ITS OBJECTIVES ? WHAT CHANGES RESULTED FROM THE SUB-PROJECT ?

Unfortunately, the objectives of this sub-project have never been spelled out in any written documents. There is no sub-project "agreement". The closest thing to a "commitment" document that can be found in the USAID's files is a "letter of understanding", dated February 16, 1982, from the USAID's sub-project manager to the SLIDA Director.

But that document doesn't establish any objectives for U.S. assistance. It launches right into the types of assistance the U.S. is prepared to provide, e.g., long and short-term training, observation tours, and consultant services.

On the other hand, the USAID letter does specify certain conditions precedent for U.S. aid., e.g., the establishment of SLIDA as a Corporation, the development of a long-term plan of operations, and a formal faculty and staff development and training plan.

However, four of the eight faculty training programs were approved and funded prior to the "letter of understanding" being sent to SLIDA using the Mission's normal training procedures under the DS&T project. The record does not show any criteria against which these training programs were judged, nor objectives which they were intended to achieve.

In any event, there are clearly identifiable changes and accomplishments as a result of this sub-project :

- All of the conditions precedent contained in the "letter of understanding" (and originally recommended in the S&T - funded consultancy) have -- or are about to be -- fully met.
- In May of 1982 SLIDA was granted Corporate status, a move designed to provide the institution with greater autonomy and operating flexibility. One very practical advantage of Corporate status: SLIDA can offer its faculty and staff high salaries than GSL pay scales allow.
- With initial impetus from the USAID-funded consultant, SLIDA has now completed a comprehensive Corporate plan for the next three years (1984-86). It includes a faculty and staff development plan. The Corporate Plan envisions an ambitious expansion of SLIDA's facilities and services. It is expected to receive official GSL approval momentarily.
- The eight faculty members who have received training represent almost one third of the total SLIDA faculty. Unfortunately, two of the eight have since left SLIDA for new positions in GSL Ministries. However, while their full-time services have been lost to SLIDA, both continue to teach courses on an ad hoc basis.
- Most of the recommendations contained in the consultant's report have been implemented by SLIDA, including improvements in the physical facilities, e.g. library and cafeteria. But SLIDA officials admit that the consultant's recommendation that each member of the faculty publish at least one management piece every year has not yet been realized.

IV. WHAT GROUPS HAVE BENEFITTED, DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY, FROM THE SUB-PROJECT ? HOW MANY BENEFITTED ? HOW DID THE SUB-PROJECT CONTRIBUTE TO ACHIEVING THE OVERALL DS&T PROJECT PURPOSE ?

The most direct beneficiaries at the input level have been the eight faculty members who have received training. One is a female. Brief conversations with five of them indicated that they are all highly satisfied with their training experience. All expressed the view that they had learned much of direct use in the courses which they are now teaching. All five seemed highly motivated. A quick glance at the grades they received at U.S. academic institutions showed that they had been excellent students.

The ultimate beneficiaries of this sub-project are the hundreds of GSL officials who are being trained by the SLIDA faculty who were trained in the U.S. This very-difficult-to-measure impact is just being felt, since most of the faculty training has just been completed.

As far as the intended beneficiaries of the overall DS&T project are concerned, "GSL officials who will receive training" are the main beneficiaries from this sub-project. Eventually, as these GSL officials do a better job, then the "rural poor who will be resettled under the Mahaweli program" and "farmers in the dry zone," will also benefit.

In any event, this sub-project has contributed directly to the DS&T project purpose of "strengthening GSL capabilities to carry out a development program."

V. WAS THE SUB-PROJECT WELL DESIGNED AND DOCUMENTED TO PERMIT BOTH AID AND THE SUB GRANTEE TO IMPLEMENT IT EFFECTIVELY AND ON SCHEDULE ? WERE GSL AND MISSION MONITORING ADEQUATE DURING IMPLEMENTATION ? WHAT WERE AID AND GSL RESPECTIVE CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE SUB-PROJECT ? WERE THE INPUTS COMMENSURATE WITH THE SUB-PROJECT RESULTS ?

As noted earlier, this sub-project was not well documented. There are no formal design documents or implementation agreements. There are no "schedules". The sub-project files, which are not very orderly, contain mostly correspondence reflecting piecemeal decisions, and ad hoc implementation actions.

In truth, there has been very little "monitoring" of this sub-project. The USAID's sub-project manager states candidly that he has been unable to devote much time and attention to SLIDA matters. He -- and top mission management -- consider his other project management responsibilities to have a higher priority.

It should also be noted that USAID officials consider SLIDA to have been rather slow in coming up with its training requests. They also believe SLIDA should have been able to move more rapidly in preparing its Corporate Plan.

All of the AID inputs to this sub-project have already been noted, except the provision of some "free" training materials from AID/W, and advice on how SLIDA can procure additional training materials in the future. SLIDA has made no direct "contributions" to this sub-project.

VI. HOW EFFECTIVE WAS THE SUB-GRANTEE IN MEETING THE REPORTING REQUIREMENTS CONTAINED IN THE SUB-PROJECT AGREEMENT ? HOW HAVE USAID AND OTHERS USED THESE REPORTS. IF RECOMMENDATIONS WERE MADE AS A RESULT OF THE SUB-PROJECT WERE THE RECOMMENDATIONS ACTED UPON ? WERE THE GSL AND USAID EFFECTIVE IN FOLLOWING UP ON RECOMMENDATIONS ?

This set of questions has in the main already been answered. There is no sub-project agreement. There are no reporting requirements, and thus no reports to follow up. The major recommendations have, as noted, been acted on by SLIDA.

VII. WHAT CHANGES, IF ANY, SHOULD BE MADE IN THE SELECTION AND MANAGEMENT OF FUTURE DS&T SUB-PROJECTS ? SHOULD USAID UNDERTAKE SIMILAR ACTIVITIES OF THIS KIND IN THE FUTURE :

Though this sub-project has not been particularly well designed nor managed, it seems to have contributed in a modest way to strengthening the capabilities of an important GSL institution. While the faculty training has been useful, probably the most important impact of U. S. assistance has been in assisting SLIDA in the development of its long-range Corporate Plan, and encouraging SLIDA to focus on its own training and development needs.

The key question - which USAID Colombo must shortly address - is what level of assistance to provide SLIDA in the future. The USAID's February 16, 1982, letter implies that the U. S. will provide more aid, though it doesn't explicitly commit the U. S. to do so. Having now met the U. S. conditions precedent in that letter, SLIDA officials certainly expect more U. S. assistance to be forthcoming.

Is SLIDA worthy of further support ? SLIDA's own pamphlets describe it as "the leading public sector training institution in Sri Lanka," with "spacious and pleasant surroundings" and excellent facilities. However, SLIDA still appears to have a long way to go before it is capable of fully responding to its broad training, research, and publications mandate. Thus far, for example, only SLIDA's training function has received serious attention.

SLIDA's physical plant and equipment are not very impressive. Millions of dollars could be invested in upgrading facilities, and further developing SLIDA's institutional capabilities. Ideally, one donor would take on SLIDA as a major project and provide the additional millions. But, irrespective of AID's priority emphasis on institutional development, such an investment is out of the question for USAID Colombo, given its other commitments. However, a continuation of the USAID's current modest level of support for SLIDA seems warranted.

At first it seemed that the singular lack of USAID time and attention to this sub-project argued rather strongly for its being discontinued. But, on further reflection, it appears that with very little investment of time and money, the USAID has managed to contribute to the strengthening of SLIDA as an institution. Further, modest USAID inputs - of additional technical assistance in curriculum planning and the development of SLIDA's research capabilities, plus more faculty training - can be expected to continue that strengthening process.

One final note in closing: it would be very useful to formalize further U.S. assistance in a sub-project agreement with SLIDA. This will eliminate the current ad hoc nature of U.S. aid, which is not very conducive to project planning or monitoring (or evaluation!) by USAID or SLIDA.

To: Mr. Fred Fischer  
From: Oswin Silva  
Subject: Views on SLIDA

Chairman of a Corporation:

It has a good reputation. My officers who come back after training, show a great deal of enthusiasm. In addition to being exposed to new trends, which is most important, especially because the reading habit is not wide-spread, they also meet officers from other Departments, which makes inter-departmental work very much easier.

Additional Director, Budget Division,  
Ministry of Finance & Planning.

It has a good name, especially programs for the senior and middle level officers. The programs of longer duration are excellent. There is, however, a need to take a hard look at the shorter programs because in trying to pack too much into these shorter programs, participants learn very little and find the program very exhausting.

Additional Secretary of Ministry of Agriculture (Administration)

The program for the senior and middle level officers are very productive. Participants come back with lots of new ideas and enthusiasm. The curriculum in some of the programs need to be revised.

General Manager, Paddy Marketing Board:

SLIDA is well thought of in the Public Sector. It is a leading training Institute.

Senior Officer, A.R.T.I:

Now that NIBM is become highly commercialised, SLIDA is definitely the best Institute for training for the Public Sector. Its programs are very good.

USAID Training Officer:

I myself attended the Seminar for senior level officers as a GSL employee and found it most beneficial. Their biggest constraint upto now is that most of their officers left after they were trained, but since 50 percent of the staff are to be put on a permanent basis, the Institute is bound to perform better.

DS&T - FUNDED  
TRAINING FOR SLIDA FACULTY AND STAFF

1. 383-044-1-00030  
 Mr. E. M. Perera  
 Coordinating Consultant  
 SLIDA  
 Public Management Development Program; and  
 Training and Education for National Development  
 Program conducted by the Institute of Public Service  
 the University of Connecticut, Sept 19, 1980 -  
 August 14, 1981.  
 \$24,257
2. 383-044-1-10004  
 Mr. A. E. Nanayakkara  
 Training and Research Associate  
 SLIDA  
 Seminars on Project Planning and Evaluation  
 conducted by the Graduate School of Public  
 and International Affairs, the University of  
 Pittsburg, Feb 2 - April 24, 1981.  
 \$10,157
3. 383-044-1-10033  
 Mr. S. H. Manamperi  
 Training and Research Associate  
 SLIDA  
 Public Management Development Program with  
 Specialization in Personnel Management conducted  
 by the Institute of Public Service, The University  
 of Connecticut, Sept 18, 1981 - April 15, 1982.  
 \$17,475
4. 383-044-1-10036  
 Mr. T. Thiruloganathan  
 Consultant  
 SLIDA  
 Project Analysis and Management  
 Program conducted by Arthur D. Little Management  
 Education Institute Inc., Sept 18 - Nov. 13, 1981.  
 \$9,211
5. 383-044-1-20015  
 Ms. G. N. Fernando  
 Librarian  
 SLIDA  
 Specialized training in library science and  
 documentation at the University of Hawaii,  
 August 23, 1982 - August 12, 1983.  
 \$16,133
6. 383-044-1-20057  
 Mr. C. T. Eiangasekera  
 Coordinating Consultant  
 SLIDA  
 Harvard's Edward S Mason Program in Public Policy  
 and Management in Developing Countries for the  
 academic year 1982 - 83.  
 \$34,396

7. 383-044-1-20071

Mr. A. S. Gunawardene  
Head of the General Management Division  
SLIDA

- i. An observation and study tour to Universities in the US: The University of Connecticut for participation in workshops and seminars on Rural Community Development; the Cornell University for specialized session on Community Development, University of Nebraska and University of Minnesota, Feb 13 - April 7, 1983.
- ii. The study of on-going regional and rural development programs and current research and training in regional and rural organizational and institutional development being conducted by leading institutions in Philippines and Indonesia, GSL arranged this program. April 10 - 25, 1983. \$12,381

8. 383-044-1-30001

Mr. K. S. Perera  
Consultant  
SLIDA

Specialization course work in Personnel Management, the specialization portion of Public Management Development Program conducted by the Institute of Public Service, the University of Connecticut, Nov. 15, 1982 - April 29, 1983. \$16,677

Sub Total: \$140,687

CONSULTANTS

1. (S&T Project No. I

Jan Mayo Smith, Univ. of Connecticut  
John E. Kerrigan, Univ. of Nebraska  
(Lincoln)

Short term consultancy to conduct ;  
an institutional review of SLIDA's  
a) concentration of services; b) staff  
recruitment and development; and  
of procedures for course and program/  
review evaluation

Est. \$ 25,000<sup>1/</sup>

2. 383-0044-3-20022

John E. Kerrigan, Univ. of Nebraska  
Two-month Consultancy to assist

Persons contacted on SLIDA Sub-project:

Government of Sri Lanka

V. T. Navaratne, Director, SLIDA  
J. V. Thambar, Additional Director, SLIDA  
A. E. Nanayakkara, Training and Research Associate, SLIDA  
C. T. Elangasekera, Coordinating Consultant, SLIDA  
K. S. Perera, Consultant, SLIDA  
A. S. Gunawardene, Head of the General Management Division, SLIDA  
A. Mohamed, External Resources Division, MOF  
S. Kuruppu, External Resources Division, MOF

USAID Colombo

Sarah Jane Littlefield, Director  
William P. Schoux, Deputy Director  
Ralph M. Singleton, Chief, Project Development & Special Programs Office  
Christina Schoux, Project Development & Special Programs Office  
John M. Miller, Chief, Program Office  
Robert M. Chamberlain, Chief, Health, Population & Human Resources  
Oswin Silva, Special Assistant to the Director  
N. Mahesan, PVO Office, Program Office

Major Source Documents

Planning Proposals for the Sri Lanka Institute of Development  
Administration, John E. Kerrigan, August 1982

SLIDA Corporate Plan, 1984-86

SLIDA Prospectus, 1983

SLIDA Annual Report, 1981

USAID Colombo SLIDA Sub-project files



**AN EVALUATION OF U. S. ASSISTANCE  
FOR PREPARATION OF THE MAHAWELI  
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**

•  
**Fred C. Fischer  
ASIA/PNS for  
USAID Colombo  
September 26, 1983**

11

BASIC EVALUATION DATA

Name of Subproject : Mahaweli Environment Assessment  
Implementing Agency : Ministry of Mahaweli Development

Funding : USAID \$ 776,119  
GSL\*  
Other

USAID Disbursements to date : \$ 728,483

Date Started : December 26, 1978

PACD : July 15, 1980

Actual Completion Date : August 1980

Type of Commitment Document Used : PIO/T (No.383-0044-1-90003)

GSL Project Manager : Malcolm Jansen

USAID Subproject Officer : Jeffrey Evans

\* Financial data on GSL inputs not available. GSL provided office space, limited secretarial support, and field travel.

## I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The Accelerated Mahaweli Program (AMP) is the largest and most ambitious development effort currently underway in Sri Lanka. Covering almost a third of the country, the AMP involves the construction of major dams, reservoirs and irrigation canals in the Mahaweli River Basin, and the opening of thousands of acres of previously arid land for settlement and rural development.

When completed in the late 1980's - with substantial assistance from the international donor community - the AMP will provide new lands for approximately one million settlers, and substantially increase Sri Lanka's agricultural production and hydroelectric power output.

Included in the 421,000 hectare AMP area in the eastern and northern parts of the island are five forest reserves of approximately 80,000 hectares. Five wildlife reserves totalling another 82,000 hectares are also fully or partly within the AMP area.

These forest and wildlife reserves are prime habitat for a variety of fauna and flora. The construction of water works and other physical infrastructure for rural development is expected to reduce the prime wildlife habitat by about 27,000 hectares.

The potentially severe adverse impact of the AMP on the natural environment of the affected areas was recognized by the Government of Sri Lanka (GSL) and, beginning in 1979, it began to take appropriate measures to mitigate that impact. The first major measure was the preparation of an Environmental Assessment, covering the entire AMP.

## II. USAID ASSISTANCE FOR THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

As one of the major donors participating in the overall AMP effort, the U.S. agreed in FY 1979 to provide a grant of \$750,000 for preparation of the Mahaweli Environmental Assessment. Funding came from USAID Colombo's Development Services and Training Project (383-0044) with the sub-project purpose stated as follows :

"To study the environmental impact of the Accelerated Mahaweli Development Project; (and) to identify follow-on investigations and projects which would mitigate negative impacts and strengthen positive impacts."

The Assessment was prepared for the Ministry of Mahaweli Development by the U.S. firm of Tibbets-Abbott-McCarthy-Stratton (TAMS) during the period August 1979 through October 1980. The Sections of this report which follow correspond to the "questions to be addressed in evaluating DS&T sub-projects, as spelled out in the USAID's cable of September 12, 1983 (Colombo 6025).

III. IMPACT. WHAT DID THE SUB-PROJECT ACCOMPLISH ? DID IT MEET ITS OBJECTIVES ?  
WHAT CHANGES RESULTED FROM THE PROJECT ?

By all accounts, the Environmental Assessment prepared as a result of this sub-project has had a tremendous positive impact, probably even more than its designers had expected or hoped. Not only did the assessment fully accomplish its immediate purpose of establishing a blueprint for action on environmental impacts throughout the AMP, but it has become a seminal document in terms of stimulating a sensitivity to environmental concerns throughout the public and private sectors of the country.

Some 160 specific recommendations were contained in the TAMS report (the Assessment). As amplified in Section VII below, approximately 145 of these recommendations were accepted by the GSL. They have either already been implemented, or are being implemented as new zones of the AMP area are being developed.

Not all of the recommendations in the Assessment were originated by the TAMS team. In a number of instances their report endorsed recommendations already under consideration within the GSL. What the Assessment did was give added weight and validity to those recommendations, and facilitate their acceptance and implementation.

For example, the "overall general recommendation" was that the GSL form a national "Coordinating Agency for Natural Resources". This was done with the establishment in 1981 of a Central Environmental Authority. The effort to get such an Authority established had already been underway; the TAMS report provided a final impetus for its establishment.

Also, as a direct result of the Assessment:

- The Mahaweli Authority commissioned TAMS to prepare an Environmental Plan of Action for the AMP. That Plan, completed in November of 1981, assigns specific responsibilities to various GSL agencies to address environmental impacts in various sectors, e.g. fisheries, forestry, fuelwood plantations, wildlife preserves, etc.
- A new Environmental Division was established within the Mahaweli Authority to coordinate all AMP environmental activities, and to interact with the new Central Environmental Authority.
- The World Bank included a requirement for an Environmental action plan as a condition precedent for its assistance in the development of AMP's System C.

For its part, USAID Colombo has followed up its support for this sub-project with a number of further actions :

- Included consideration of environmental concerns in the terms of reference of the System B design and supervision funded under its Mahaweli Basin Development I Project (383-0056);
- Required that the consultant's team include an environmental planner;
- Earmarked \$400,000 in the Mahaweli I project for measures designed to mitigate impacts on the environment, particularly wildlife (and particularly elephants);

- Designed a new \$5 million Mahaweli Environment project, which was authorized in September of 1982. Its focus is on establishing four national parks, as well as upgrading the Department of Wildlife Conservation as an institution.

Last but not least, preparation of the Assessment - and its acceptance by the GSL - has muted previous criticism and concern by various U.S. environmental groups about adverse impacts from the AMP, particularly on Sri Lanka's wildlife.

IV. WHAT GROUPS HAVE BENEFITTED DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY FROM THIS SUB-PROJECT? HOW MANY BENEFITTED? HOW DID THE SUB-PROJECT CONTRIBUTE TO ACHIEVING THE OVERALL PROJECT PURPOSE?

The intended beneficiaries of the DS&T project include "the rural poor who will be resettled under the Mahaweli; and farmers in the dry zone." These groups are precisely the ultimate beneficiaries of this sub-project.

How many have thus far directly benefitted is impossible to say. But their eventual numbers will include the one million new Mahaweli settlers, and the thousands of farmers already living in the AMP areas.

It should be noted that the Environmental Assessment focussed on the environmental impacts of the AMP on both the human and natural environments. While the TAMS report recommends measures to safeguard the wildlife of the affected areas, it also includes numerous recommendations concerning human life in the area, covering drinking water supplies, potential increases in malaria and water borne diseases, sources of fuelwood, use of grazing land, and orientation programs for new settlers.

Of equal importance in assessing the overall benefits of this subproject, given that an overall purpose of the DS&T project is institutional development, is the fact that several GSL institutions have been strengthened as a result of this sub-project. They include the Ministries of Agriculture, Health and Fisheries; the Departments of Irrigation, Forestry, and Wildlife Conservation; and all of the GSL's Mahaweli agencies.

V. WAS THE SUB PROJECT SUFFICIENTLY WELL DESIGNED AND DOCUMENTED TO PERMIT BOTH AID AND THE SUB-GRANTEE TO IMPLEMENT IT EFFECTIVELY AND ON SCHEDULE? WERE GSL AND MISSION MONITORING ADEQUATE DURING IMPLEMENTATION?

The sub-project design and documentation appear to have been fully adequate to the task. The final, four-volume TAMS report was delivered on schedule, and within budget.

Nevertheless (and perhaps surprisingly, given the ultimate success of this sub-project) there were initially some serious communications problems in implementation. Not all of the TAMS team members, for example, were aware of the absolute requirement for a full dialogue and close collaboration with the GSL officials for whom they were preparing the assessment.

However, GSL and USAID monitoring managed to pick up these problems at an early stage, and appropriate actions were quickly taken. The remainder of the implementation period then proceeded smoothly.

VI. WHAT WERE AID AND GSL RESPECTIVE CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE SUB PROJECT (FUNDS, STAFF TIME, ETC.) ? WERE THEY COMMENSURATE WITH THE RESULTS ? BASED ON THE SUB PROJECT, WHAT CHANGES, IF ANY, SHOULD BE MADE IN THE SELECTION AND MANAGEMENT OF FUTURE DS&T SUB PROJECTS ? SHOULD USAID UNDERTAKE SIMILAR ACTIONS OF THIS NATURE IN THE FUTURE ?

The other inputs to this sub-project (in addition to the USAID grant) included the time and attention of USAID and GSL officials responsible for project monitoring, plus the GSL provision of office space, some secretarial services, and field travel for the TAMS team. These inputs appear to have been fully commensurate with sub-project results.

Indeed, it is hard to escape the conclusion that this sub-project represents \$750,000 and some other minor USAID and GSL inputs that have been extremely well spent. The positive results of this project are clearly way out of proportion to its costs. While a similar sub-project is no longer necessary in Sri Lanka, it would be most appropriate for application elsewhere.

VII. HOW EFFECTIVE WERE THE SUB-GRANTEES IN MEETING THE REPORTING REQUIREMENTS CONTAINED IN THE SUB-PROJECT AGREEMENT ? HOW HAVE USAID AND OTHERS USED THE REPORTS ? IF RECOMMENDATIONS WERE MADE AS A RESULT OF THE SUB-PROJECT, WERE THE RECOMMENDATIONS ACTION ON ? WERE THE GSL AND USAID EFFECTIVE IN FOLLOWING UP ON RECOMMENDATIONS.

As noted earlier, the TAMS report contained some 160 recommendations, of which approximately 145 were accepted by the GSL. The approved recommendations are now reflected in the Mahaweli Environmental Plan of Action, which is currently being implemented by various GSL ministries, and includes :

- Watershed management for the Mahweli Basin's 316,000 hectare catchment, including plans for diversified forest and crop planting, engineering works, a management program and a draft of a national soil conservation law;
- Controlled logging and clearing plan to prevent unnecessary elimination of forests and increased soil erosions;
- Establishment of fuelwood plantations to meet projected demands for new settlers;
- Development of wildlife reserves to conserve endangered species including wildlife management needs, buffer zones adjacent to cropland and park infrastructure planning;
- Control and utilization of aquatic weeds;
- Fisheries development for new reservoirs and fish farming on small irrigation tanks;

- Monitoring programs for soils, water and pest control;
- Rural water supply and sanitation schemes;
- Control of malaria through specific conservation flow designation;
- Detailed settler orientation and training programs; and
- Standardization of land use and classification systems and recommended areas for preserving critical habitats, providing for grazing land, cultivation, and reforestation.

At this writing, some of the TAMS recommendations have been fully implemented. Others are being continuously implemented, as the AMP opens up new zones for development. Many of the recommendations with respect to wildlife, forestry, and watershed management will be implemented through USAID Colombo's follow-on Environmental and Reforestation projects.

The names of the persons contacted and the documents read - in the course of this evaluation are listed in Annex #1.

**AID:FFischer:mf**

PERSONS CONTACTED ON MEA SUB-PROJECT

Government of Sri Lanka

L. Godamunne, Secretary General, Mahaweli Authority  
M. Jansen, Mahaweli Authority Environmental Office  
Dr. Abeywickrema, Member of the Board, Central Environmental Authority  
A. Mbhamed, External Resources Division, MOF  
T. Samarasekera, Director-General, Greater Colombo Economic Commission  
P. Dias, President, Sri Lanka Chamber of Small Industries

USAID Colombo

Sarah Jane Littlefield, Director  
William P. Schoux, Deputy Director  
Christina Schoux, Project Development and Special Programs Office  
John M. Miller, Chief, Program Office  
Vitus Fernando, Project Development and Special Programs Office  
Gilbert N. Haycock, Mahaweli Project Officer

Others

Michael T. Sobczak, Tibbets-Abbett-McCarthy-Stratton (TAMS)

MAJOR SOURCE DOCUMENTS

Environmental Assessment, Accelerated Mahaweli Development Program,  
Volume I, Main Report, October 1980.

Environmental Plan of Action, Accelerated Mahaweli Development Program,  
TAMS, November 14, 1981.

USAID Colombo MEA Sub-Project Files.

21