# BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET

1. CONTROL NUMBER
PN-AAJ-652

2. SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION (695)
DA00-0000-0000

3. TITLE AND SUBTITLE (240)
Social analysis of AID projects: a review of the experience

4. PERSONAL AUTHORS (100)

Ingersoll, Jasper; Sullivan, Mark; Lenkerd, Barbara

5. CORPORATE AUTHORS (101)

| 6. DOCUMENT DATE (110) | 7. NUMBER OF PAGES (120) | 8. ARC NUMBER (170) |
|---|---|---|
| 1981 | 110p. | 338.91.I47 |

9. REFERENCE ORGANIZATION (130)
Ingersoll

10. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES (500)

11. ABSTRACT (950)

12. DESCRIPTORS (920)

Social impact analysis
Social implications
AID
Project impact evaluation
Social soundness

13. PROJECT NUMBER (150)

14. CONTRACT NO.(140)
AID/otr-147-80-79

15. CONTRACT TYPE (140)

16. TYPE OF DOCUMENT (160)

AID 590-7 (10-79)

F50
338.91
I47

PN-AAJ-652

# SOCIAL ANALYSIS OF AID PROJECTS:

# A REVIEW OF THE EXPERIENCE

By Jasper Ingersoll, Mark Sullivan and Barbara Lenkerd

June 1981

## Acknowledgments

Like other reports of its type, this report could never have been written without generous, discriminating help and cooperation from a large number of busy AID officials. Mentioning any of them creates an ungrateful distinction between them and the larger number seemingly ignored. The study team is very grateful to that larger group for endless bits of guidance, suggestions, and sensible advice.

Special acknowledgment and thanks are due to:

David Steinberg for initial wise thoughts and brokering of ideas and AID procedures;

Nena Vreeland for competently and very quickly using her capabilities with computerized AID data to produce large numbers of projects in appropriate categories for initial sample selection;

Twig Johnson for effectively channeling rough ideas, and people with varied interest in them, toward a task to be done;

Patrick Fleuret for taking an idea he had already had, shaping it with the concerns of many other offices, capably shepherding it through the countless rocky pastures that contract officers know how to negotiate, and keeping the task open to modification and improvement throughout;

Carole Scherrer for wisely suggesting that David Hess, on her staff, work with the team as part of his intern orientation;

David Hess for not simply helping the team in review of projects but for contributing substantially to shaping of the task in its early stages;

Joan Atherton for assuming responsibility as contract officer of a long delayed birth, gathering critiques of the first draft and providing a very incisive, thorough organization of her own and others' ideas.

# SOCIAL ANALYSIS OF AID PROJECTS:

# A REVIEW OF THE EXPERIENCE

## General Table of Contents


| Chapter | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| One | Executive Summary | 1 |
| Two | Objectives and Methods | 7 |
| Three | Review of Data | 14 |
| Four | Summary of Findings | 59 |
| Five | Recommendations | 65 |

Appendices

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Suggested Revised Guidelines for SSA (for Handbook 3, Annex 4 a) | 1.1 |
| 2 | Criteria for Assessment of Social Soundness Analyses | 2.1 |
| 3 | Projects and Project Documents Examined for This Study | 3.1 |
| | List of Projects and Documents Reviewed | 3.1 |
| | Table of Projects by Region and Year | 3.8 |
| | Table of Projects by Sector and Year | 3.9 |
| 4 | List of Individuals Consulted for This Study | 4.1 |
| 5 | Scope of Work for This Contract | 5.1 |
| 6 | Footnotes | 6.1 |

SOCIAL ANALYSIS OF AID PROJECTS:

A REVIEW OF THE EXPERIENCE

Detailed Table of Contents


| Chapter | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| One | Executive Summary | 1 |
| | Major Findings | 2 |
| | Major Recommendations | 3 |
| Two | Objectives and Methods | 7 |
| | I Objectives | 7 |
| | II Background | 7 |
| | III Methods | 10 |
| | IV Limitations | 12 |
| Three | Review of Data | 14 |
| | I Factors Affecting the Quality of Social Soundness Analyses | 14 |
| | Introduction | 14 |
| | A Socio-Cultural Context: Statement of the Problem | 16 |
| | B Mutual Adaptability | 17 |
| | 1 Features of Social Environment | 17 |
| | a Patterns of Behavior | 19 |
| | b Differential Access to Resources and/or Opportunities | 21 |
| | c Patterns of Communication and Interaction | 22 |
| | d Patterns of Authority and Decision-Making | 23 |
| | e Views and Values | 24 |
| | f Socio-Political Forces | 25 |
| | 2 Implementation Constraints | 27 |
| | C Spread Effects: Diffusion, Sustainability, and Replicability | 29 |

Chapter Page

1 Diffusion. . . . . 29

2 Sustainability . . . . . 31

3 Replicability. . . . . 32

D Benefit/Cost Incidence . . . . . 32

E Participation. . . . . 36

F Identification of Other Necessary Data . . . . . 37

G Major Findings and Recommendations Highlighted in Social Analyses . . . . . 38

H Final Observations

II Factors Affecting the Utility of Social Soundness Analyses . . . . . 40

Introduction . . . . . 40

A The Objectives of AID. . . . . 41

B The Role of Social Analysis in the Project Design Process . . . . . 44

C Timing . . . . . 50

D Summaries of Social Analyses . . . . . 52

E Scopes of Work . . . . . 53

F Mode of Contracting. . . . . 56

Four Summary of Findings. . . . . 59

Major Findings . . . . . 59

Detailed Findings. . . . . 61

Five Recommendations. . . . . 65

Major Recommendations. . . . . 65

Detailed Recommendations . . . . . 69

## Chapter One

## Executive Summary

As part of its response to the New Directions legislation for development assistance established by Congress in 1973, AID made social soundness analysis (SSA) a regular component of its project process. The basic objective of this study is to review AID's experience with social soundness analysis to derive lessons for improving the contribution of such analysis in that process. The study was not designed to evaluate individual social analyses. Rather, it was designed to:

1. Identify those features of social analyses that seem most useful during the project process
2. Determine ways in which AID procedures encourage or discourage the use of social analysis during this process
3. Recommend new guidelines for social analysis for inclusion in the revised Project Assistance Handbook 3, Annex 4 A.

The findings and recommendations presented in this report were derived from a systematic review of 48 sets of project documents, as well as conversations and interviews with 35 producers and consumers of social soundness analyses in AID. Projects reviewed during the study, 12 from each of the four regional bureaus, included many different types of projects for the years between 1976 and 1980. The conversations and interviews with AID officials also provided a great deal of information as well as clarification with regard to many of the issues discussed in this report.

In addition to more detailed findings summarized in Chapter 4, the following are our major findings regarding factors affecting either the quality or utility

of social soundness analyses in AID. Each of these major findings has a corresponding set of recommendations listed in the same numerical sequence in the final section of this chapter.

## Major Findings

1 At least 25% of the 48 social analyses in our sample (at least three from each regional bureau) significantly influenced the design of proposed projects. Good examples of such analyses include those prepared for the following projects: Guinea Bissau, Rice Production; Sri Lanka, Mahaweli Water; Panama, Managed Fish Production; and Egypt, Urban Health Delivery System. These analyses, and our background interviews, both illustrate that social soundness analysis can and has played a useful role in the design of AID projects.

2 Our review of 48 sets of project documents revealed substantial differences in the quality of first generation social soundness analyses.

3 This study has also found substantial differences in the usefulness of first generation social analyses.

4 Project papers serve at least three purposes: <u>analysis</u> of project settings, <u>design</u> of appropriate project features, and <u>justification</u> of projects in terms of U.S. and host government policies. These three purposes are essential, legitimate, and interdependent, but they are also diverse and sometimes conflicting. Conflicts among these purposes are the cause of many of the complications and frustrations experienced by members of project design teams.

5 AID's recently established emphasis on more careful identification, design, implementation, and evaluation of projects has produced a

better working environment for social analysis than that which existed when the social soundness analysis requirement was initially established.

6 Although there may be significant costs involved in preparing social analyses of proposed projects, the costs incurred if such analyses are not prepared, in terms of less than optimal project performance, may be even greater.

Major Recommendations

1 Social soundness analysis should remain an essential component in AID's project design process, despite suggestions that such analysis be performed primarily at the program or sectoral level, because it can and has performed a valuable role in the design of AID projects.

2 The following steps should be taken to improve the overall quality of social soundness analyses:

- AID should consider adopting the suggested guidelines for social soundness analysis presented in Appendix 1 of this report for the revised version of The Project Assistance Handbook currently being prepared. These suggested guidelines have incorporated the lessons derived from this study.
- AID should systematically review project evaluations, especially Impact Evaluation Reports, to derive specific lessons for improving project analysis and design. These lessons could be summarized in a brief guide prepared for members of project design teams.
- AID should identify, collect and disseminate information about conceptual and methodological innovations used in

social soundness analysis which have proven to be exceptionally useful. Information regarding these innovations could be summarized in a brief manual to be made available to all individuals preparing social soundness analyses.

3 The following steps should be taken to improve the usefulness of social soundness analysis by making it a more integrated part of AID's project process:

- AID should extend recent initiatives to make social analysis a continuing part of the entire project process;
  - beginning at the CDSS stage, and
  - continuing at any point in the process--either before or after the PID or PP stages--where additional social data are required.
- AID should send social analysts to the field earlier, and for somewhat longer periods of time, when complex social issues must be dealt with in the design of proposed projects.
  - 'front-end' studies could be conducted to insure that attention be focused on potential problems early in the project design process.
  - additional time for field research should be granted to insure that social analysts have adequate time for data collection as well as consultation with other members of project design teams.
- Scopes of work for social analysts should be both realistic and flexible.
  - they should include clear statements of all the duties and responsibilities which social analysts can reasonably be expected to perform.

- they should be flexible enough so that they can be revised by mission project officers or project team leaders and social analysts in light of host country limitations and opportunities.

- Social analysts should, while still in the host country, draft both their full analyses for PP appendices and, in consultation with other project team members, summary statements of their reports for inclusion in the text of project papers.

4 AID should prepare a brief guide to the project design process for social analysts, indeed all project analysts, explaining each of the essential, yet sometimes conflicting functions in that process. This guide should include a clarification of the multiple purposes of project papers--analysis, design, and justification--and the consequent roles of design team members.

5 AID should maintain its recently established emphasis on careful identification, design, implementation, and evaluation of development projects. This emphasis provides a good working environment for social soundness analysis which, in turn, increases the likelihood that such analysis can make a useful contribution to the project process. Given the policy preferences of the new administration (agriculture, nutrition, rural development, population, institution building, technology transfer and adaptation, and the like) and given the high economic, social and political costs of project failures, maintaining this balanced emphasis on each phase of the project process offers rich opportunities for cost-effective and innovative policies and programs. In addition to maintaining this emphasis;

- AID should devote significant effort, by experienced staff and comparable consultants, to an examination of each stage of the project process to find ways to improve performance at other stages of that process. One way of conducting such an examination would be to begin with project evaluations and work back to earlier stages of the project process. Impact Evaluation Reports and other evaluation studies could be examined to find ways to improve project implementation. Information about project implementation could then be used to improve the project design process, which in turn, could be examined to find ways to improve the project identification process.

  (This recommendation clearly exceeds the scope of work for this study, but it seems legitimate to suggest that social analysis would be improved by a careful examination of its relationship to each phase of the project process.)

6 AID should compare the costs of preparing different kinds of project analyses with the political, economic and social costs incurred when projects fail for whatever reason. This examination should attempt to determine the most effective yet least-cost procedures for project preparation, and it should serve to create a more realistic perspective of the economies involved in using or not using such procedures when designing development projects. (This recommendation also exceeds the scope of work of this study but it does influence the prospects for most of the other recommendations listed above.)

## Chapter Two

## Objectives and Methods

### I Objectives

The basic objective of this study has been to review AID's experience with social soundness analysis to derive lessons for improving the contribution of such analysis in AID's project design process. The study was not designed to evaluate individual social analyses. Rather, it was designed to:

1. Identify those features of social analyses that seem most useful during the project process
2. Determine ways in which AID procedures encourage or discourage the use of social analysis during this process
3. Recommend new guidelines for social analysis for inclusion in the revised Project Assistance Handbook 3, Annex 4 A.

### II Background

In response to the U.S. Foreign Assistance Act of 1973, AID began a reformulation of its project procedures to adapt them more closely to the objectives of the New Directions legislation. As a result of this reformulation an airgram was sent to all AID missions in April of 1975 calling for the preparation of social soundness analyses for all proposed AID projects. Guidelines for such analyses presented social factors, not as "hoops through which the project must jump" but rather, "as real features of the terrain on which the project is proposed to operate."[1] These guidelines, incorporated later in 1975 in AID Project Assistance Handbook 3, established three criteria for assessing the "social soundness"

of proposed projects. These criteria include: (1) compatibility of the project with the life of intended beneficiaries, (2) a potential for project benefits to spread, and (3) an equitable distribution of project benefits and burdens among the people affected.

AID staff reactions to the new guidelines varied, but missions began preparing social analyses of proposed projects in the summer of 1975. In some instances these analyses made explicit, written and regular what some missions had long been doing on an informal basis for particular projects. Early social analyses had no real precedent, however, and they varied widely in terms of both quality and utility. In addition AID staff complained about the new social analysis procedures, which expectably, were not so sophisticated, or easily carried out as those associated with the more traditional cost/benefit analysis. Perhaps even more significant, AID professionals, with long experience designing and modifying economic and technical inputs, were skeptical about social issues as "real features of the terrain" with influence on project outcomes.

During the first few years following the establishment of the social analysis requirement there were few professionals available who were competent in both social analysis and AID project procedures. By 1978, however, a new group of direct-hire and contract specialists began emerging with both of these competencies. In addition, several hundred AID officials eventually became familiar with social analysis, and other New Directions-related issues, in the course of their normal Agency activities and in AID's Development Studies Program.

Thus, by 1980, five years after the first airgram, social analysis had become a routine, although still controversial, aspect of AID's project design and justification process. The objective of this study is to review a sample of social soundness analyses and other project documents, and to

interview AID staff and others who have produced and used such analyses, to derive lessons for improving social analysis in AID. The preliminary proposal for this study, submitted to the Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination in May, 1980, soon reached officers concerned with the revision of Project Assistance Handbook 3, which provided a natural working environment for this study.

The scope of work for this study (see Appendix 5) evolved during several discussions between the contract officer, the contractor, and several interested AID social scientists. Initially the intent was to select a sample of 120 social analyses from the four regional bureaus. This sample was to include social analyses prepared for a variety of different types of projects designed during each of the years following the establishment of the social soundness analysis requirement.

A few days after the contract was awarded the research team met with the contract officer and a group of social scientists in AID to discuss practical ways to implement the scope of work. The consensus established at this meeting was that the intended sample size was too large given the limited amount of time available for the study and the enormous difficulties likely to be encountered in attempting to locate all of the necessary documents. The contract officer therefore agreed that the sample size should be reduced to 48 projects. These projects again were to be selected from each of the four regional bureaus and, to the extent possible, they were to include different types of projects from each of the years following the establishment of the social soundness analysis requirement (for details on the projects and project documents examined for this study see Appendix 3).

Several other modifications were made in the scope of work early in the study when it was found that documentation needed to answer all of the

original research questions either was not available or did not exist. For example, scopes of work for social analyses were extremely difficult to locate. Thus we were not able to examine the relationship between scopes of work and either the quality or utility of individual social analyses, which was one of our original research objectives. We had also hoped to examine post-implementation evaluations of projects in the sample to see how well social analyses had anticipated potential problems. We were not able to carry out this task because most of the projects in the sample were either still in operation, or only recently terminated, so post hc project evaluations were not available. All modifications in the original scope of work were made in consultation with the project officer.

## III Methods

This report is based on a systematic review of 48 sets of project documents, 12 from each of the four regional bureaus, as well as conversations and interviews with 35 AID personnel and contractors who have been involved with social analysis in AID. The sample of documents eventually reviewed was neither randomly selected, nor large enough to be statistically representative of all the different types of AID projects designed between 1976 and 1980. Recognizing that our small sample size would prevent us from obtaining a representative sample of all such projects the research team asked bureau personnel to help select a "judgmental sample" of project documents. This sample was to include both "good" and "bad" examples of social analyses; and to the extent possible, it included analyses from as many different types of projects as possible for the years between 1976 and 1980 (Appendix 3 contains a list of all projects and project documents reviewed as well as tables illustrating the distribution of projects by region, year, and sector). Thus our sample probably includes more examples

of especially "good" analyses and especially "poor" analyses than would be expected in a purely random sample of project documents. For the purpose of identifying useful and non-useful features of social analyses, however, this judgmental sample has been particularly appropriate.

The social analyses in our sample were reviewed in order to develop a set of criteria identifying the most useful features of social analysis. An original set of criteria was developed in collaboration with interested AID officials (for a summary of these criteria see Appendix 2). These criteria were continually elaborated and redefined as we developed more insight into factors affecting the quality of social analyses from our review of project documents and our background interviews. This continual evolution of our criteria has prevented us from summarizing many of our findings in terms of descriptive statistics because we did not have time to reassess analyses already reviewed as our criteria evolved. A brief discussion of spread effects should illustrate this point. At first we simply asked if social analyses described the potential spread effects of proposed projects. After reviewing numerous social analyses, however, we realized that more useful social analyses not only described potential spread effects; they also discussed the conditions under which such effects could realistically be expected to occur. This observation, and others, led to numerous revisions in our original criteria as the study progressed.

Assessment of all of the social analyses in our sample in terms of our original criteria might have allowed us to use more statistics in our study but it did not seem compatible with our more important objective of building cumulatively on our review of project documents and interviewing to determine what constitutes good social soundness analysis. Thus, although these analyses were reviewed in terms of our criteria (see Chapter Three,

Review of Data),our primary objective was not to evaluate individual social analyses. Rather it was to review these analyses as part of an effort to improve social soundness analysis in AID. Recognizing this we allowed our criteria for social analysis to develop as the study progressed. Readers interested in seeing how the criteria evolved need only compare the original criteria presented in Appendix 2 with the revised guidelines for social analysis presented in Appendix 1. These revised guidelines were prepared only after all the data collected during this study were summarized and analyzed.

Data for the study were also collected by the team during conversations and interviews with 35 AID officials and contractors (for a complete listing of people contacted during the course of this investigation see Appendix 4). Data were also collected during several meetings held by the research team, the contract officer, and interested AID officials. In some cases we consulted informants on several different occasions; in others our contacts with informants were limited to single encounters. Discussions with informants ranged from brief telephone conversations to lengthy interviews. Information collected from individuals involved with social analysis in AID contributed substantially to our original criteria, and provided us with a great deal of background as well as clarification with regard to many of the issues discussed in the text of this report.

## IV Limitations

There are several limitations inherent in this study beyond those already mentioned as being responsible for the modification of the original scope of work. First, our small sample size raises the possibility that we do not have an adequate number of examples of all of the different types of social analyses prepared for the various kinds of projects designed by AID

since 1975. Difficulties involved in obtaining project documents may also have prevented us from acquiring all of the potentially pertinent documents for each of the projects examined during this study. As Appendix 3 illustrates, however, we made a conscientious effort to overcome both of these problems by selecting a wide range of projects for which sufficient documentation was available.

The high mobility of AID personnel has meant that we were not able to consult with individuals involved with all of the particular projects included in our sample.

Having many different types of projects in our sample tended both to complicate our analysis and to allow for some useful generalizations. In addition to projects covering many different sectors--agriculture, health, and the like--we also found other useful ways to distinguish the projects. There were projects targeted for relatively homogeneous populations, as well as projects targeted for relatively large, yet diverse groups of people. The sample included complex multi-sector projects, as well as relatively simple single-sector projects. Some projects called for radical changes in participants' lifestyles, while others required very little change. We reviewed social analyses prepared for "umbrella projects" and for "pilot projects" as well as social analyses prepared for security assistance projects. While some types of projects have their own special set of questions and problems, our review suggests that all good social analyses must deal with certain essential issues regardless of the particular type of project being analyzed.

Although the amount of time available for carrying out this investigation was extremely limited (Aid funded only six weeks of full-time work for three researchers) we feel that we have been able to develop an informed appreciation of AID's experience with social soundness analysis from this study.

## Chapter Three

## Review of Data

### I Factors Affecting the Quality of Social Soundness Analyses

#### Introduction

After drawing up criteria for reviewing social soundness analyses the team had a common standard which all four members used to review the social analyses in our sample. The objective was to assess social analyses, not as an end in itself, but as a means of codifying the experience since 1975, to derive lessons for improving social soundness analysis in AID.

The criteria finally agreed upon for social analyses of high quality are that they clearly and succinctly:

A define development problems in terms of people and their needs and resources, in relation to the socio-cultural context of the proposed project;

B examine the mutual adaptability between pertinent features of the social environment and elements of the proposed project system, by:

1 identifying the main features of the current social environment and the ways they are likely to interact with elements of the proposed project system, and

2 anticipating potential implementation problems or constraints likely to result from incomplete adaptation between the proposed project system and the existing social system;

C describe the potential for project benefits to spread by: diffusion to additional people, being sustained through time, and being replicated in other settings;

D examine carefully the way project benefits and costs are likely to be distributed among the project population and the implications of this distribution for consideration of equity;

E describe the participation of potential project beneficiaries in various phases of the project cycle and the various types and levels that such participation could take;

F contribute to, and draw from, other aspects of project soundness analysis (economic, environmental, administrative, technical);

G identify the gaps in data still needed for later stages of project implementation, monitoring, and evaluation and propose project inputs to secure such needed data;

H summarize the principal findings and recommendations for project design and planning.

These criteria are: (1) empirical, (2) consistent, (3) cumulative, and (4) realistic. (1) They are empirical in that the contractor had previously done social soundness analyses, and had read others, the team read a number of project documents before jointly drafting the criteria, and about a dozen AID social scientists generously contributed their professional experience to expand and improve the criteria. (2) They are consistent in that they provided the team with a logically coherent standard for drawing general lessons from very diverse project analyses. (3) They are cumulative in that they derive from, and expand upon, the

basic criteria in the original 1975 social soundness analysis guidelines; and we continued to modify them in the course of reviewing documents and interviewing. (4) They are realistic in that we found examples of every criterion being successfully met in one or more of the projects reviewed.

A Socio-Cultural Context: Statement of the Problem

Some social analyses in our sample included clear statements of the development problems which proposed projects were designed to help overcome, as well as brief discussions of the basic logic of proposed projects. These analyses (Guinea Bissau:Rice Production, 1980 and Panama:Managed Fish Production, 1980 provide good examples) provided brief descriptions of current conditions in project areas, as well as concise explanations of how proposed projects would try to change those conditions over time.

Although we do not have enough numbers for broad assertions, our clear impression is that social analyses lacking a clear focus on development problems tended to be less well-organized, and to present more irrelevant, useless ethnographic information, than analyses containing such a focus. In addition, analyses which did not review the basic logic of proposed projects seemed to be less able to anticipate potential implementation problems or constraints than analyses reflecting a thorough understanding of that logic. And finally, social analyses which did not review the basic objectives and logic of proposed projects seemed less attentive than other analyses to the possibility that similar, if not better, results might be achieved with modifications, or possibly major alterations, in basic project design. In sum, a review of development problems and the logic behind proposed projects appears to be a crucial indicator of better social analyses.

Few of the social analyses reviewed included a serious critique of basic project goals and purposes. This was not surprising because in

almost all of the projects in our sample, basic development problems, and project goals, were clearly stated in terms of people and their basic needs. This finding clearly supports the utilization of "logical frameworks" in the project planning process. Nevertheless, in a few projects in the sample basic project goals were questionably defined. The goal of one of these projects, for example, was to "achieve a more rational utilization of land" in the project area. Such statements of goals are likely to lead to projects which treat people as objects within, rather than actors upon, project settings. The basic logic behind the project referred to above was not questioned by the social analysis. This illustrates a telling phrase by Robert Merton, recently quoted by Jonathan Silverstone, about "the quest for continually improved means to achieve carelessly examined ends."[2] The social soundness of proposed projects can be assessed only by examining both the means and the ends of those projects.

Proposed projects seldom attempt to deal with the full range of development problems likely to be encountered in project areas. A few of the analyses in our sample, however, briefly reviewed other development problems not covered by proposed projects and they described other projects, either in planning or implementation stages, designed to help overcome or mitigate these problems. Such analyses, Bolivia:Agricultural Credit (1980) is a good example, provide important background information on proposed projects; information which may later be helpful in mitigating implementation constraints.

B Mutual Adaptability*

1 Features of the Social Environment

*The term 'mutual adaptability' seems more dynamic and realistic than the older term 'socio-cultural compatibility.' A project design must fit with the social organization of the people concerned; but both must be (or must become) adapted to each other in successful projects. Since both modify each other through time, it seems advantageous to look for points and channels of mutual adaptability rather than the more static relationships of 'compatibility.'

To assess the potential socio-cultural feasibility of a proposed project a social analysis needs to determine how that project will fit into an already existing social environment. To make such a determination the analysis must look at how elements of the proposed project system will interact with features of the social environment, and it must attempt to determine how their interaction will facilitate or inhibit the achievement of project purposes and goals. While a complete listing of social features likely to interact with proposed project systems is probably not feasible given the wide range of projects and social environments encountered in development work, there are some features of social environments that will almost invariably affect and be affected by proposed projects. These include: patterns of behavior relevant to basic delivery systems; differential access to opportunities and/or resources; patterns of communication interaction and decision-making; views, values, and the reward system underlying those views and values; and finally the complex swirl of socio-political forces which both supports and denies the need for change in the project areas. An additional problem complicating social analysis is that each of these factors may become significant with regard to proposed projects at local, regional, national, as well as supranational levels.

We assessed each of the social analyses in our sample with regard to their treatment of the social factors listed above. Many social analyses did a good job of describing <u>some</u> of these factors, but very few analyses appeared to have done a good job of assessing how <u>all</u> of these factors would affect or be affected by proposed projects. In fact only one of the analyses in our sample was rated as having done a good job of analyzing all these social factors (Chad:Human Resources Development 1977). We would not recommend that this analysis be used as a model, however, as other

factors--poor organization, bulkiness, etc.--make it difficult both to read and digest. It is also significant that although many of the analyses examined social features carefully at local and regional levels, very few analyses appeared to have considered how proposed projects would affect or be affected by such factors at national and supranational levels. One noteworthy exception was the social analysis prepared for the Afghanistan Basic Health Services Project (1976). This analysis includes a lengthy discussion of the influence of international drug companies in the Afghan pharmacological system.

The social analyses cited in the following sections provide good examples of how each of the major features of social environments outlined above have been handled by social analysts. Although the original guidelines do not explicitly call for analysis of these features, our review of project documents demonstrates the value, as well as the possibility and manageability, of attempting to do so. It should also be emphasized that <u>if</u> significant variability exists within the project population with regard to any of these social features, for example if subsistence practices vary widely within the project population, this variability should be documented by social analysts. A good example illustrating how such variability can be handled is provided by the social analysis prepared for the drylands and irrigation components of the Central Tunisia Rural Development Project (1978). This social analysis is also especially noteworthy because of its discussion of the dynamic relations between relative socio-economic status and different subsistence practices.

a Patterns of Behavior

Slightly over one half of the social analyses reviewed (26 out of 48) were rated as 'good' in terms of describing and discussing how traditional patterns of behavior were likely to affect and be affected by proposed

projects. In our review we used a simple range of three categories "good", "fair" and "poor" when assessing social analyses with regard to particular points. We rated analyses as having done less than a good job in terms of major features of the social environment when relevant points seemed to have been overlooked or when social analyses raised questions which they did not attempt to answer.

Analyses which did not receive good ratings in terms of patterns of behavior generally did not describe patterns of behavior targeted explicitly or implicitly for change; or they did not discuss how these behaviors could be expected to change as a result of proposed projects. Two examples illustrate these points. In the first, a social analysis prepared for an irrigation scheme, no information is presented on traditional patterns of behavior or decision-making regarding the use of agricultural resources. In the second, an analysis prepared for a potable water project, there is a lengthy description of how people traditionally obtained their household water, but no discussion on how they will actually distribute such water when it is made available at centralized water facilities in local villages. Both of the social analyses failed to address important issues which had a great deal of potential for affecting the outcome of proposed projects.

Several social analyses in our sample provide excellent illustrations of how social analysts have handled the potential relationships between traditional or current patterns of behavior and project systems. For example, the Bolivian Rural Access Roads Project (1978) includes analysis of the current agricultural practices of farmers compared to those expected at the end of the project. Using data collected from a similar project nearby, the social analysis attempts to predict the differential impacts of the project on the main productive activities of the people as a function

of their distance, in actual traveling time, from marketing centers. The analysis demonstrated that the proposed project implied different types of changes in behavior in response to different degrees of access to towns. Other examples of social analyses that handled these issues well are those prepared for the following projects: Egypt:Urban Health Delivery System, 1978; Yemen:Tahami Basic Health, 1979; Guinea Bissau: Rice Production, 1980; and Sri Lanka:Mahaweli Water, 1978).

b Differential Access to Resources and/or Opportunities

The social analyses in our sample generally placed much stronger emphasis on the fact that prospective project beneficiaries were poor than on the structural disparities in access to opportunities and/or resources which usually exist within project populations. Such disparities are usually significant in poor countries in terms of both understanding the overall nature of poverty and the etiology of specific development problems. Failing to deal with these disparities, when they exist, is a major deficiency in social soundness analyses. Not knowing if social analyses were deficient when they did not mention such disparities, however, and given our lack of familiarity with conditions in most project areas, we did not assess the analyses in our sample with regard to how well they had handled this issue. Nevertheless, several excellent examples in our sample illustrated how such disparities could be handled.

The social analysis for the Central Tunisia Rural Development Project (1978) and the project itself, focused explicitly on this disparity and made it central to project design. Combining several closely related subprojects, this project included, among other things, tube-wells for farmers where subsoil water was available, as well as inputs for dry-lands farming where it was not. The analysis and design proceeded from an acknowledged environmental and societal disparity in access to water and evolved a

complex plan to try to reach people who had limited access to water with other packages of development assistance. The project could thus be addressed directly to a central povercy problem of unequal access to resources on the part of different participants.

c Patterns of Communication and Interaction

A great deal of communication and cooperation is necessary for the successful implementation of development programs. This is why patterns of interaction and communication between government officials, project personnel, and potential project beneficiaries are important with regard to the outcome of proposed projects. In many societies differential access to opportunities and/or resources is reflected in rigid, highly stratified social relationships. Yet we rated only 1/3 of the analyses in our sample (16 out of 48) as 'good' in terms of analyzing the vexing, sometimes potentially embarrassing, issue of hierarchical relationships and their potential implications for proposed projects. Analyses rated as 'fair' or 'poor' in this respect either did not discuss such patterns at all, (we felt that analyses should indicate that patterns of communication and interaction were not potentially problematic if that was the case) or having indicated that potential problems existed, they did not follow up with any discussions or recommendations regarding ways to overcome or mitigate such problems. The social analysis for the Egyptian Urban Health Delivery System Project (1978) provides an excellent example of handling this issue. In this project social distance between project officials and local people, doctors and patients, government staff and local mid-wives, as well as the need for effective communication strategies to help overcome this distance, were major issues in the social analysis. Even though problems of social hierarchy and communication are endemic to development projects, this analysis, by directly addressing the issue,

was able to make a number of specific recommendations regarding ways to enhance the possibility that the project would succeed.

d Patterns of Authority and Decision-Making

Recognizing that the original guidelines included an item entitled 'patterns of leadership and authority' it was not surprising to find that most of the analyses reviewed contained some discussion of authority and decision-making behavior among potential project beneficiaries. Twenty-nine of the 48 analyses reviewed were rated as 'good' or 'fair' in terms of handling this difficult question.

Although social analyses often included brief descriptions of traditional or current patterns of authority and decision-making, they frequently failed to relate those patterns to important project related issues. For example, in one potable water project the social analysis briefly described current leadership and decision-making patterns but failed to discuss how these patterns related to the problem of water distribution within local communities--a problem never addressed in the project paper.

One of the best social analyses in this regard was prepared for the Sri Lanka:Mahaweli Water Project (1978). This analysis examines the implications of existing authority and decision-making patterns in the farming, settlement, and caste systems. To maintain local decision-making regarding land and water use the analysis recommends that the project delegate responsibility for water allocation and ditch maintenance to local "turn-out groups", and that members of these groups be encouraged to select their own leaders as well as their own representatives to higher-level farmers' associations. The analysis then goes on to recommend that these higher-level associations be given primary responsibility for larger sections of the overall irrigation system. Many of the potential

beneficiaries of this project were to be voluntarily resettled from other areas of Sri Lanka. The analysis recommends that these resettlers be given the opportunity to participate in the design and construction of irrigation facilities and that they also be allowed to plan the designs for their newly established villages. The social analysis also recommends that the project attempt to re-establish a traditional role in local communities: one member of the local community is given primary responsibility for overseeing the daily operation as well as routine maintenance of all irrigation facilities.

Another good example of how a social analyst focused on this issue is provided by the Guinea Bissau Rice Production Project (1980). The social analysis recommended that potential beneficiaries be involved in all decisions affecting the proposed project at the local level, that project personnel work through traditional community groups and leaders, and that a conditional timetable be adopted for all local level project activities so that the project would not impact on local communities without the explicit consent and cooperation of those who live in those communities. The project paper suggests that each of these recommendations be adopted by those responsible for implementing the project.

e Views and Values

Twelve of the 48 social analyses in our sample were rated as having done a poor job of discussing how the views and values of participants in proposed projects would affect or be affected by those projects. Analyses rated as poor in this regard either did not discuss views and values at all, or they did not relate them to project related issues. For example, the views and values of people in one resettlement project were never discussed even though it appeared that the majority of these people were being resettled involuntarily. The better social analyses in our sample

did discuss views and values and their potential implications for proposed projects, and in some cases they provided specific recommendations regarding ways to design projects so that they would be more reflective of, or responsive to, the views and values of potential beneficiaries.

A good example of how social analysis has helped project planners understand the views and values of potential beneficiaries is provided by the Togo Rural Water Project (1979). One of the objectives of this project was to improve the health of rural Togolese by reducing the incidence of water borne diseases. This was to be done by drilling wells to supply clean water, and digging latrines, to reduce infection. Social analysts, however, after making brief trips to the field at both the PID and PP stages, concluded that rural Togolese would value wells, because of their convenience, but not latrines, because they lacked a germ-theory of disease. The project eventually took the peoples' views and values as a basis for, rather than an obstacle to, project design. Recognizing that health improvements required latrines as much as they did wells, but that latrines would become valued only after they had been in use for some time, the project was designed so that villagers first had to agree to build latrines before they became eligible to receive wells. The project was also designed to employ local people to disseminate information on the sanitary advantages of both of these new types of facilities. Thus the villagers' desire to acquire wells was used to help introduce the use of latrines in participating communities.

f Socio-Political Forces

The potential effects of volatile socio-political forces are widely recognized and discussed in the oral tradition, but 'tactfully' and perhaps necessarily muted in the written tradition of AID project design. Potentially significant, unpredictable, only obliquely mentioned in the

1975 guidelines, and embarrassing for foreigners to discuss, these forces were rarely treated overtly or realistically in the social analyses reviewed. In fact although many social analyses offered some, usually minor comments on socio-political forces we rated only six of the 48 analyses in our sample as "good" in terms of dealing with such forces, and 16 analyses as "fair".

Several of the social analyses in our sample can serve to illustrate how social analysts have occasionally ignored as well as dealt with socio-political forces. In the first, the documents prepared for an irrigation project include no mention of ethnic or regional conflicts even though local insurgents with outside support had been active enough to discourage financing of another irrigation project in the same area. In contrast, the social analysis prepared for the Sri Lanka Mahaweli Development Project (1978) included a lengthy discussion of the long-standing conflict between Sinhalese and Tamils, as well as more recent conflicts created by large-scale migration of new settlers into the project area. It included specific recommendations for project officials who would be responsible for dealing with these conflicts.

Another good example is the Panama Managed Fish Production Project (1980). The social analysis for this project points out that the proposed project will take place within a long-standing socio-political-economic context of "rural dependency". A few of the project inputs will have to come from the cities; but the project can still build toward local self-sufficiency in the long term. The social analysis makes the case that it would be unrealistic to expect a fully self-sufficient project to develop in the short run in that social context.

The difficulties involved in handling socio-political forces are magnified by the fact that social analyses eventually appear in official

documents, documents that serve three essential, interdependent, yet potentially conflicting functions--analysis, design, and justification--simultaneously. The analyses cited, however, suggest strongly that avoiding discussion of socio-political problems is neither a necessary nor a desirable solution to these difficulties. We realize that these difficult issues may be verbally discussed much more than the written documents reflect.

2 Implementation Constraints

From both our interviews with AID personnel and review of project documents, it is evident that social analyses which identified potential implementation problems or constraints, as well as potential solutions to those problems, were significantly more useful in the design phase of the project process than those which did not. Social analyses which specifically focused on potential problems were much more likely to be reflected in project designs than those which did not. An excellent example of this relationship is in the Guinea Bissau Rice Production Project (1980). The social analysis for this project spends a great deal of time focusing on potential implementation problems. The design of the project reflects a thorough awareness and concern for these problems. In fact the project paper (PP) goes so far as to suggest that many of the social analysts' recommendations for dealing with identified problems be enacted during the implementation phase of the project.

We rated 26 of the 48 social analyses "good" in terms of identifying potential implementation problems and providing suggestions or recommendations for overcoming or mitigating such problems. Suggestions or recommendations for dealing with potential problems sometimes called for modifications in project inputs, occasionally called for modifications in basic project design, and in one case included a recommendation that a

quite different project design be considered, a design that the social analyst believed had a better chance of achieving the basic project goals (Jordan:Jordan Valley Farmers' Association n.d.).

In several cases social analyses evaluated alternative methods of dealing with potential problems to identify those most appropriate for achieving certain types of objectives. For example, in the social analysis for the Tunisian Small Farmer Credit Project (1977) there was a discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of alternative methods of extending credit to small farmers. Discussions such as these can be especially valuable during the design phase of the project process.

Several social analysts examined the basic assumptions of projects, as articulated in the logical framework. In some cases this step enabled them to identify potential implementation problems, which they might otherwise have been unable to anticipate. These analyses demonstrated that a critical review of project assumptions is a crucial part of the process of attempting to identify potential implementation constraints.

A few social analyses in our sample developed specific indicators which could be used to determine if potential problems were in fact arising during project implementation. For example in Egypt:Urban Health Delivery System (1977), the social analysis suggests that indicators such as the number of visits to neighborhood clinics be periodically monitored as one method of determining if particular problems were arising. Thus a specific focus on potential problems in social analyses may provide information which can be of great value during the implementation phase of the project.

A significant improvement since 1975 is evident in social analyses with regard to anticipating and dealing with potential implementation problems. More recent analyses tended to do a markedly better job of

anticipating and dealing with such problems than did analyses of 1976-78. The task of identifying potential implementation problems is usually much more difficult for complex multi-sector projects, such as regional integrated rural development schemes than for single-sector projects, such as potable water schemes. Similarly the more extensive the changes entailed in a project, the more difficult is the task of anticipating social problems or constraints which may arise during the course of implementation.

Our data suggest strongly that anticipating implementation constraints can be done adequately only after first carefully defining development problems in terms of people and their needs, views, and values. Furthermore, anticipating implementation problems can only follow from a thorough examination of the complex interrelationships between features of the social environment and elements of a project system. Thus each of these analytical tasks is not only essential in its own right, but is mutually interdependent with other tasks in the social analysis process.

C Spread Effects: Diffusion, Sustainability, and Replicability

In the course of assessing the basic strengths and weaknesses of proposed projects, social analysts are asked to discuss the potential spread effects of such projects. To determine the spread effects of proposed projects the original guidelines for social analysis imply that such analysis should determine the potential diffusion, sustainability, and in some cases the replicability of project benefits.

1. Diffusion

Diffusion of project benefits relates to the extent to which project benefits are likely to spread to people not originally designated as beneficiaries of a project. Such people may live inside as well as outside the immediate project area, and some AID projects are designed without regard to particular geographic areas.

An appreciable majority of the analyses reviewed, while writing in general about project benefits diffusing, did not discuss the conditions under which such benefits could be expected to diffuse; nor did they specify the linkages which would facilitate such diffusion in the first place. Furthermore, very few social analyses provided concrete recommendations regarding ways to increase the likelihood of project benefits diffusing. Rather, they provided optimistic projections about the likelihood of project benefits diffusing while providing very little background information about those projections.

Social analyses which did provide good treatments of potential spread effects discussed not only how project benefits were likely to diffuse, in terms of specific linkages, but also the conditions necessary for the diffusion to occur. For example, in the analysis prepared for one project, (Tunisia:Small Holder Irrigation 1978) increased agricultural production was projected to raise the demand for consumer goods in the project area. This in itself would provide an indirect benefit to local merchants. The social analysis pointed out, however, that for this benefit to occur small farmers would first have to be able to sell their increased output in markets where the prices they received for their products were sufficiently inelastic to guarantee them real increases in disposable income.

Some social analyses also provided specific recommendations with regard to how project design or project inputs could be modified to enhance or increase the likelihood of project benefits diffusing. In the Tunisian Small Holder Irrigation scheme the social analysis recommended that small farmers be encouraged to form agricultural cooperatives to coordinate production and marketing activities, and that these cooperatives be assisted in obtaining small trucks to increase their access to more distant, more profitable, urban markets. Implementation of this

recommendation would help to insure a real increase in farmers' disposable incomes, but by increasing the food supply in urban markets, it would also help to insure that project benefits diffused beyond the immediate project area.

2 Sustainability

The potential sustainability or durability of project benefits is a second important consideration in assessing the spread effects of proposed projects. One of the most vivid images conveyed during our background interviews came from an agency official who described abandoned, rusted-out, handpumps which were the only legacy of a less than successful AID-sponsored potable water project. The message behind this image was that even the simplest projects may fail without careful planning and implementation.

Yet while almost all of the social analyses in our sample stated that the potential benefits of proposed projects were sustainable, only a few analyses provided any background information on the assumptions behind such claims, or on the conditions necessary for them to be realized. An example of such an analysis is the Sri Lanka:Mahaweli Water (1978), in which a great deal of attention is paid to factors which may limit the long-term success of the project.

We rated more highly those social analyses that provided specific recommendations regarding ways to enhance the potential durability of project benefits. For example, in one potable water project (Togo:Rural Water Supply 1979) the social analysis recommends that only very simple handpumps be utilized and that local beneficiaries be given the spare parts and training necessary to perform all routine maintenance as well as repairs on such pumps.

3 Replicability

Many of the social analyses reviewed stated that proposed projects were potentially replicable, that is, that they could be repeated in similar locations with comparable results at some point in the future. In fact some of the analyses reviewed were for "seed projects" or "pilot projects" where one specific objective was to gain experience so that similar projects could be planned and mounted in other areas. Claiming that proposed projects are replicable, however, requires a very careful analysis of both the unique and generalizable characteristics of those projects with regard to both their socio-cultural and natural settings. Few of the analyses in our sample seemed to reflect such analysis. And it is doubtful if claims to replicability can legitimately be made before a project is first implemented.

Thus in terms of the potential spread effects of proposed projects our review suggests that terms like 'replicability', as well as 'diffusion' and 'sustainability', or their equivalents, are often used in social analyses in a rather casual fashion. In this light, projections, or predictions, regarding potential spread effects in such analyses often seem to reflect optimistic hopes or attempts to justify the project rather than critical analysis.

D Benefit/Cost Incidence

Although almost all of the analyses in our sample had done a good job in terms of identifying and describing potential project beneficiaries with regard to such things as age, sex, and relative socio-economic status--several went further and included minimum participant profiles. Few analyses appeared to adequately deal with the costs which individuals or groups were likely to incur as a result of their participation in proposed projects. Failing to identify such costs gave the impression that potential

project beneficiaries did not have to give up anything or make any significant sacrifices to benefit from the projects.

Project costs, and benefits, may be both direct and indirect. They may also be social or human as well as economic or technical in nature. For example, a project which introduces new seed varieties may provide real economic benefits to farmers if their incomes rise as a result of increased agricultural yields. If this increase in farmers' incomes produces an increase in their demand for consumer goods, small merchants may also benefit. In this case we have both direct as well as indirect economic benefits from a project. If these same farmers are encouraged to form cooperatives to acquire the new seeds, as well as other agricultural inputs, however, there may also be social benefits from the project. Forming cooperatives may foster a stronger sense of community among participants, while also increasing each individual farmer's personal sense of efficacy. Clearly these should be seen as social benefits from the perspective of project planners.

On the other hand, there may be very real economic and social costs accrued as a result of participating in proposed projects. If the new seed varieties require labor-intensive production techniques farmers may find that they have less time for other productive activities, a real economic cost. If the participants are not familiar with the new seeds, or the technology needed to grow them, farmers may experience significant increases in stress and anxiety during the initial years of the project, a very real human cost. This example, taken from the social analysis for the Tunisian Small Holder Irrigation Project (1978) illustrates that to acquire a complete and balanced appreciation for the overall benefits of a proposed project it is necessary to examine all of the costs and benefits, both direct and indirect, associated with that project. Very few

analyses appeared to adequately deal with all the costs likely to be incurred as a result of proposed projects.

Our review of project documents also revealed that most discussions regarding benefit/cost incidence dealt primarily with conditions expected at the end of projects rather than with benefits and costs at each successive stage of project implementation. The latter can be extremely important because even with substantial long-term benefits, the costs of participating during early stages of the project may be so high that individuals or groups may be unable or unwilling to assume them. The social analysis prepared for the Sri Lanka Mahaweli Water Project (1978) provides a good example of how a social analyst dealt with costs and benefits at each major phase of project implementation.

One of the more serious flaws in several of the social analyses reviewed was that they claimed that communities would benefit from proposed projects but they did not explain how the benefits of those projects would actually be distributed among the different groups or strata within those communities. For example, one potable water project was favorably assessed because it would increase the overall quality and quantity of water in local communities. The social analysis, however, included no discussion of how this water was to be distributed within those communities. Without knowing how the water was to be distributed, it is impossible to assume that everyone within those communities would benefit equally, if at all, from the proposed project.

This last observation raises the question of equity. Almost all of the analyses in our sample described how projects would increase the overall equity of income and resource distribution within host-countries by improving the lot of the usually-rural poor. But few projects affect everyone within a project area equally. Some people may benefit a great

deal, some very little, and others not at all. Some social analyses discussed how different groups or individuals within project areas would benefit differentially from proposed projects. They identified potential beneficiaries, those adversely affected, as well as those not affected by proposed projects, and in some cases they discussed how the distribution of project benefits related to consideration of equity within the project area. Equity is an issue which social analysts should consider even if it is only to include an observation like the following taken from the Central Tunisian Rural Development Project Paper (1978); "The limited distribution of the most essential resource of the area, sub-soil water, makes inequitability an inevitable consequence of the region's ecology" (page 11).

Our review led to several additional observations about cost/benefit assessment in social analyses. First, almost all of the social analyses reviewed included discussions of how proposed projects potentially affected women. Later analyses, however, tended to handle this issue more adequately than earlier ones. Second, project personnel and government officials were seldom included among those identified as potential beneficiaries of proposed projects. This was somewhat surprising as such personnel often play very crucial roles in project implementation, and they often stand to gain more than anyone else from participating in such projects. Third, social analyses for relatively simple, single-sector projects usually dealt more adequately with the question of benefit/cost incidence than social analyses prepared for highly complex multi-sector projects. And finally, as would probably be expected, those social analyses which had done the best job of assessing benefit/cost incidence were those prepared for projects in which benefits were more-or-less evenly distributed among relatively homogeneous populations.

In summary, most social analyses tended to focus primarily on benefits while largely ignoring costs. Most did a better job of handling direct as opposed to indirect costs and benefits. They also tended to focus primarily on economic as opposed to social or other types of costs and benefits. It appears that the question of benefit/cost incidence is not one which social analysts have handled with a great deal of rigor. To be fair, however, it must be pointed out that the original guidelines for social soundness analysis put more emphasis on identifying potential project beneficiaries than on determining the overall costs and benefits of proposed projects.

E Participation

Although Congress specifically mandated efforts to improve and increase the level of participation of people in their own development, the social analyses reviewed provided very little background information about the actual extent of people's participation or involvement in proposed projects. Nor did most social analyses tend to talk about ways to increase that participation over time. Stating that there had been and would continue to be a great deal of local participation in proposed projects, most of the social analyses provided little information as to the identities of local participants, their reasons for participating, or their actual contributions to decision-making processes.

A few exceptional analyses did describe the way local participants were involved in decision-making regarding essential features of proposed projects (Sri Lanka:Mahaweli Water 1978, Guinea Bissau:Rice Production 1980). One analysis even reviewed the extent of people's participation during each phase of the proposed project, and it included a specific list of recommendations to increase the level of local participation during each of these successive phases (Yemen:Tahami Basic Health 1979, page 23 of social analysis).

F Identification of Other Necessary Data

Given the limited amount of time available to prepare social analyses it was not surprising to find that many of those reviewed included recommendations regarding the need to collect additional social data in support of proposed projects. In fact 23 of the analyses in our sample were rated as having done a good job in terms of identifying gaps in the existing data base and describing how these gaps could be filled by later investigations.

In some cases social analyses recommended that the complete design of proposed projects not be finalized until additional social data was collected (Bolivia:Agricultural Credit 1980). In others, social analyses simply tried to indicate which types of data would be the most useful for monitoring and evaluating project performance or to determine if particular problems were in fact developing during project implementation (Egypt:Urban Health Delivery System 1978). One social analysis included a complete plan of research which identified not only the best methods available for collecting and analyzing needed data, but also the agency most suited for carrying out the recommended data collection and analysis procedures (Tunisia:Central Tunisia Rural Development 1978).

Several AID officials suggested all social analyses should discuss the types of additional social data needed to support project implementation and evaluation, as well as the best available methods for collecting and analyzing that data. This was not called for in the original guidelines for social soundness analyses and is not now being done in any systematic fashion. We agree that this would increase the utility of social analyses and have included this suggestion in the proposed guidelines for SSA's. (See Appendix 1.)

G Major Findings and Recommendations Highlighted in Social Analyses

Among agency personnel one of the most common criticisms of social analyses was that they frequently failed to get their message across in a clear and concise fashion. Even more important was the commonly heard criticism that such analyses often fail to highlight potential implementation problems, or that when they do identify such problems, they often fail to provide specific recommendations regarding ways to overcome or at least mitigate these problems.

One way of overcoming these criticisms would be to have all social analyses include final sections which summarize their major findings and recommendations regarding the design of proposed projects or potential implementation problems or constraints. A good example of how this could be done is provided by the social analysis prepared for the Portuguese Agricultural Development Project (1980). In this analysis there is a final section which reviews potential implementation problems mentioned earlier in the report, while also reviewing specific recommendations for overcoming or at least mitigating these problems. Although sections highlighting major findings and recommendations are commonly found in government reports they were seldom included in the social analyses reviewed for this study.

H Final Observations

Several of the project proposals in our sample contained projections about potential project benefits, levels of participation, and the like, that did not seem at all realistic in terms of other material presented in those same proposals--information often related to the dismal results of earlier, often similar, projects mounted in project areas. Social analysts, however, have often failed to question these extremely optimistic projections. While we can appreciate the value of optimism in development,

we do not feel that social analysts should contribute to an inflation of expectations regarding proposed projects. Several of the analyses in our sample (Peru:Rural Enterprises II, 1979 is one example) provided illustrations of ways in which more realistic appraisals of such projects were also more useful appraisals of those projects.

As reported earlier, most of the social analyses reviewed included discussions of the role of women in proposed projects. In several cases these discussions were presented as separate, self-contained sections of social analyses. Although such sections were often highly valuable, it appeared as if a better approach was one wherein women's issues were not treated separately, but were maintained as a focus in each of the major sections of analyses. Keeping a focus on women's issues as an integral part of social analysis appears to be a more useful strategy for dealing with such issues than covering them in separate, unrelated, sections of social analyses.

Social analysts generally provided little specific information on the research undertaken for their reports. They rarely included information about the location or duration of their own fieldwork--indeed in some cases we were not able to determine if they had in fact done any fieldwork--and they frequently did not describe or discuss any of their own data collection and analysis procedures. In fact only eight of the analyses reviewed provided "good" descriptions of data collection and analysis procedures (16 analyses were rated as "fair" in this regard). We suggest that social analysts describe their data collection and analysis procedures because these procedures vary widely and they provide the basis for the analytical and interpretative judgments presented in social analyses.

Social analysts also frequently failed to provide specific references to secondary sources cited in the texts of their reports. When host-country social scientists had done research of particular relevance to social analyses, however, or when they had otherwise contributed to such analyses, their contributions were generally acknowledged.

Although we have presented numerous criticisms of the social analyses in our sample, we should point out that we rated only 10 of the 48 analyses as "poor" in terms of adhering to the original guidelines for social soundness analysis. Most of the issues raised by those guidelines were more-or-less covered by most social analysts. Adherence to the guidelines, however, was not necessarily an indication of the overall quality of social analyses. In fact, several of the analyses in the sample covered all of the points in the original guidelines but did so in such a boilerplate fashion that their value was, in our judgment, rather limited.

## II Factors Affecting the Utility of Social Soundness Analyses

### Introduction

The previous sections of this chapter--derived almost entirely from our review of project documents--dealt primarily with factors which contributed to, or detracted from, the analytical quality and professional calibre of social analyses. As illustrated below, however, the quality of such analyses is not the only factor affecting the usefulness or utility of social soundness analysis in the project process. To identify and examine other factors affecting the usefulness of such analysis the research team interviewed AID/W and field staff as well as outside consultants involved with social soundness analysis in AID. (For a complete listing of those interviewed or otherwise consulted during this study, n=35, see Appendix 4.)

What these people told us was that since 1975 AID had made significant progress in establishing a new project design system--social analysis is only one of several novel ingredients in this system--in response to the New Directions Legislation enacted by Congress in 1973. During this time appreciation for social soundness analysis has quite evidently grown in the Agency. Indeed our interviews provided numerous indications of support for such analysis from AID/W and mission personnel, support which has often contributed to such analysis in significant ways.

On the other hand the new analysis and design system has not been uniformly embraced by everyone in AID. Several of the social analysts interviewed expressed frustration with the new system because they often felt that they were not given sufficient time to conduct adequate analyses of proposed projects. Others resented being pressured to provide favorable assessments of proposed projects when they were sometimes still uncertain or skeptical about the potential results of such projects.

Some consumers of social analyses, mission personnel, etc., have also expressed dissatisfaction with the new project system. Apparently unimpressed with those social analyses which they have seen, and skeptical of the value of social analysis in general, such individuals have in some cases been neither supportive of, nor receptive to, social analyses. Evidence of this lack of receptivity to social analysis was uncovered early in our interviews. We heard stories about the reports of social analysts being discarded, and in one case, saw such a report abridged--by whom we do not know--to the point of distortion. Indeed we were told that one mission officer refused to approve a social analyst's departure until he, the analyst, changed his assessment of a proposed project.

Recognizing that social analysis is not really useful unless it is reflected in project designs, such incidents, isolated though they may be,

strongly suggest that social analysis has not always been equally useful, or should we say influential, in the design phase of the project process. Our own review of project documents also tends to support this conclusion. In some of the projects in our sample (at least 25%) it was evident from the documents that social analysis had had a great deal of influence in terms of the design of proposed projects. Guinea Bissau, Rice Production; Sri Lanka, Mahaweli Water; Panama, Managed Fish Production; and Egypt: Urban Health Delivery System provide excellent examples. In others, the social analysis appeared to have very little and in some cases almost no effect on the design of proposed projects.

Some of the factors affecting the utility of social analysis can be associated with the basic structure and objectives of AID. Others are more clearly related to the role of social analysis in the project process or the behavior of social analysts and others with whom they interact in that process. As will be illustrated below, some of these factors are interrelated; others are changing over time. We have undoubtedly missed some problems, and our remarks may be slanted by both our own and our informants' biases. We present this discussion, however, because our interviews turned up some creative solutions or at least partial solutions to almost all of the problems cited below.

A The Objectives of AID

Several of the people interviewed during this study suggested that one factor limiting the usefulness of social analysis in AID has been that, until relatively recently, the Agency paid greater attention to, or put more emphasis on, the design and funding of development projects than on the careful implementation and evaluation of such projects. Pointing out that AID staff are under pressure to identify, design, and obligate funds for projects, and that they have traditionally been rewarded for

such activities, these informants went on to note that mission staff are seldom rewarded for careful implementation or the achievement of "good" (however defined) results from projects. Indeed, as these people pointed out, those responsible for the identification and design of proposed projects seldom remain in missions long enough to see any evaluations completed on those projects.

Continuous pressure to turn out projects in the face of congressional appropriation schedules, budgetary deadlines, and the like, and the socialization of project generalists--desk officers, mission personnel, and others--to this demanding working environment, are evident factors inhibiting the utility of rigorous social analysis in the project process. Pressed to identify projects and get them approved, it is easy to understand why some agency personnel only reluctantly comply with, and apparently still resent, the policy directive calling for social soundness analyses of proposed projects. Such analyses add one more step to, and therefore make even more problematic, the already complicated process of project design and approval. It is also apparent that in this type of working environment social analyses which provided favorable assessments of proposed projects, as well as information needed to help justify such projects, were more likely to be well-received than analyses which questioned either the structure, the logic, or the potential consequences of proposed projects. Yet for social analysis to be useful for project implementation it must critically examine such facets of proposed projects.

It did become evident from our interviews, however, that AID has been paying more attention to the implementation and evaluation of projects in recent years. This increased attention to the long-run consequences of projects has apparently increased Agency staff's receptivity to social analysis, especially when such analysis attempts to identify potential

implementation constraints, which are crucial to project success. It was clear from interviews that social analysis could contribute more to projects as AID kept emphasizing careful identification, design, implementation and evaluation of projects.

B The Role of Social Analysis in the Project Design Process

The data reported in this section naturally refer to social analysis, given the scope of this study. Lacking explicit comparisons with other forms of project analysis, no claim is made here that these points apply exclusively to social analysis or to social analysts. Our recommendations, drawn from review of project documents and from suggestions of interviewees, address the main problems reviewed in this section (See Chapters One and Five).

A working consensus within AID regarding the place of social analysis in the project analysis does not yet appear to have emerged. This lag should not be surprising, given the relatively few years of implementing the New Directions, and given the complexities and frequent sensitivities of social data. Those whose memories of development assistance reach back to the 1950's and 1960's can attest to the remarkable progress in AID since 1975. After a mixture of substantial contributions and frustrating experiences, social analysis is still in search of a fully institutionalized, routine place in the project process.

It became very clear from the language and basic logic of project papers, but <u>not</u> from our interviews with producers and consumers of social analysis, that the task of PP's (and thus of social analysis as well as the other forms) entails three <u>essential</u>, <u>legitimate</u>, <u>interdependent</u>, yet <u>potentially conflicting functions</u>:

- analysis: critical examination of a proposed project to determine potential consequences of implementation, and to anticipate implementation problems and constraints,
- design: incorporation of insights from analysis into an emerging project design, and careful consideration of possible alternatives to improve implementation,
- justification: presentation of social data to help demonstrate that a proposed project meets certain congressional, Agency and host government criteria.

Bearing in mind that all members of a project team probably must cope with these three diverse functions, the particular hazards for social analysts appear to be related to the accounts interviewees gave us of occasional strained working relationships between social analysts and other project team members. Mission staff and team leaders have apparently been receptive to social analysts when they have offered good social justifications for a project and when they have suggested social features useful for project design. But these same people, under pressure to identify projects and get them approved, have been less receptive to social analysts when the latter have expressed doubts or questions about the social soundness of a proposed project. Social analysts and their action-minded critics are both bound by the perverse uncertainties and pitfalls in the social domain of proposed projects to lessen problems of poverty: it avails little to murder the messenger who brings disturbing news.

Social analysts have also sometimes fallen into conflict with design teams by questioning long-term projections supporting project assumptions and design. AID has been obliged to project programs some years into the future for areas like the Sahel and the South American altiplano, where very little is known about the human

long-range implications of specific development interventions. In this working environment, social analysts suggesting more "likely" or "realistic" future prospects, are not always favorably received by people attempting to design project bridges over troubled waters.

As stated by one regional bureau informant--and echoed by others--"AID overdesigns projects. No one knows enough to plan three to five, or even one year ahead. Why pretend that we can?" These informants agreed that AID would do better to put more money and effort into implementing experimentally and learning step by step, rather than over-committing funds and plans for a remote, unknowable point in the future.

Another factor sometimes causing a strain on working relationships between social analysts and others on project design teams, a strain which limits the usefulness of social analysis, is that some Agency personnel apparently do not recognize the legitimacy of the advocacy role on behalf of project beneficiaries assumed by many, if not most, social analysts when they are examining proposed projects. Trained to identify projects which are possible, manageable, and likely to succeed, some AID staff members do not like what one referred to as "the negativity of some social analysts." They want to see a "positive approach" to project design, an approach that does not look for the worst possible scenario as a reason for making changes in proposed projects; and they do not want to hear that proposed projects should be radically redesigned or cancelled simply because some small minority stands to lose out. Emphasizing that few projects benefit everyone in project areas, these individuals seem to feel that some social analysts could benefit by looking more at the good points of proposed projects rather than continually focusing on what they perceive to be the bad points.

Yet most social analysts apparently feel that they must examine proposed projects with a very critical eye because they define their role in the project process as being that of the peoples' advocate; an advocate who must champion the cause of those who may not otherwise have anyone to represent their interests. Most project analysts are performing legitimized advocacy roles of one sort or another. Specialists are called in to assess proposed projects to see if they make sense in terms of economic, technological, administrative, and environmental parameters. The essential task of the social analyst is to make sure that such projects make sense in terms of social parameters, that is people.

Our interviews suggest, however, that while few Agency personnel question the value of other types of analysis--economic, technical, etc.--there are still some within the Agency who are not inclined to accept the advocacy role of social analysts, especially when such analysts express skepticism regarding the social soundness of proposed projects. Indeed, when such skepticism has been expressed by social analysts, other members of project design teams have occasionally acted as if they, the social analysts, were letting the team down or compromising the project process. For social analysts who adopt this advocacy role, however, the primary goal is not to get projects approved. Rather, it is to make sure that projects seem realistic, or feasible, not in terms of yearly budgetary schedules and the like, but in terms of the people they are being designed to help.

In view of the importance of the design function among the three discussed here, some interviewees underscored the usefulness of social analysts learning to follow up all discussions of problems and constraints with <u>recommendations</u> for overcoming them. These interviewees thought that this simple step would contribute to improving the team working

relationships between social analysts who express skepticism regarding proposed projects and those who feel pressured to identify such projects and get them approved. Recognizing that social analysts must perform each of these functions, and that they generally do, and should, assume an advocacy role when doing so, may not alleviate all of the conflicts, but it may reduce them to more manageable, and possibly more productive, proportions.

Of course a lack of consensus within AID regarding the most appropriate role for social analysis in the project process is not the only factor putting a strain on working relationships between social analysts and other members of project design teams. In some cases it appears as if working relationships have deteriorated because of legitimate, and probably expectable, disagreements over the best way to interpret and respond to specific development problems. Occasionally, however, conflicts seem to have involved more than simply basic differences of opinion. Several people reported that social analysts have sometimes made little effort to work with other members of project design teams. Failing to consult with fellow team-members to see how they could be of greater assistance in the project design process, such analysts are soundly criticized for their "Lone Ranger" behavior by mission personnel. We have also heard that some social analysts have acted like "know-it-alls" and that such analysts have occasionally generated very bad feelings by being overly critical of proposed projects without offering constructive recommendations for improving those projects. We were also told that social analysts employed on short-term contracts occasionally had little idea of what AID is all about, and that such analysts sometimes made little effort to remedy that situation. We have also learned that some people in AID have not been very happy working with some of the anthropologists

employed to do social analyses. These people think that many anthropologists have neither the background nor the skills needed to analyze large-scale projects, that many anthropologists are "too hung-up with the whole idea of appropriate technology", and that anthropologists, or at least some of them, place more value on traditional features of developing societies than do the people who actually live in those societies. This "nostalgic outlook", as one person referred to it, is seen as evidence that some anthropologists are not really getting in touch with the aspirations and ambitions of people potentially affected by proposed projects. This is seen as a real source of conflict with other members of project design teams who generally assume, and act on the assumption, that AID's legitimate role is to initiate change.

Our interviews did not provide us with sufficient data to assess the frequency with which these types of problems interfered with the establishment of good working relationships. They did, however, turn up some particular strategies for overcoming, or at least mitigating, some of these problems. For example, AID could prepare a "basic guide to the Agency"--outlining the Agency's basic objectives and project procedures--for social analysts, indeed for all project analysts, employed on short-term consultancies. This guide could also be used to acquaint project analysts with their basic roles in the project process as well as their responsibilities to other members of project design teams. In addition, as several of our informants have stressed, social analysts should be encouraged to look for constructive solutions to potential problems whenever such problems have been identified in the course of examining proposed projects.

The major problem with strained working relationships is that they have the potential for decreasing the usefulness of social analysis in

the project design process. During our interviews we also heard how some social analysts have developed effective strategies for improving working relationships within design teams as one method of increasing their influence in the project design process. Most of the tactics utilized by these social analysts involve the development of closer collaborative relationships with other members of design teams so that the other members of these teams will become more aware of the concerns of the social analysts and more willing to respond to those concerns before it becomes time to finalize project designs. Supporting others' interests in the design process, these analysts have also been able to generate additional support for their interests in that process. One social analyst from the Africa Bureau described it as a basic strategy of bargaining. In the Near East Bureau social analysts are developing very close collaborative relationships with those individuals who do environmental impact assessments. Environmental impact analysts have real power in the project process because without their approval proposed projects cannot be approved by AID/W. By working closely with such analysts some of the direct-hire social analysts in the Near East Bureau have created additional support for their recommendations in situations where they might otherwise have been overlooked.

Nevertheless, a lack of clarity and consensus about the role of social analysis in the project process, and a lack of good working relationships between social analysts and others on project design teams, are unresolved factors inhibiting the usefulness of such analysis in AID.

C Timing

Another set of factors affecting the utility of social analysis revolves around the question of timing. During our interviews we heard

several accounts of mission personnel not being open to social analysts' recommendations for modifications in proposed projects. Indeed, one of the most commonly heard complaints of social analysts is that they are frequently called in to analyze proposed projects only after the major features of those projects have already been more-or-less determined. A commonly heard recommendation for overcoming this problem would be to increase the involvement of social analysts at earlier stages of the project process. Such a strategy could be accomplished by having social analysts conduct "up-front" studies of proposed projects before project design teams meet for the preparation of final project proposals. Several AID social scientists have recommended that this type of strategy be adopted wherever feasible because it would increase the likelihood that social data would be collected in time to make a significant contribution to project design. There are numerous indications of AID social scientists getting increasingly involved at both the CDSS and PID stages of the project process to achieve this objective.

Another common complaint of social analysts is that when they are called in at the PP stage of the project process they are not given sufficient time to conduct adequate analyses of proposed projects. This lack of time to conduct adequate analyses is especially significant for social analysts because they frequently need more time for field research than other members of project design teams. Yet time spent in the field is often time spent away from design teams and missions, and it is in the dialogue within these teams that important decisions regarding essential features of proposed projects usually take place. If social analysts are not able to participate in these deliberations because they are out in the field, they may not develop a full appreciation for the designs

of proposed projects, which usually emerge only after a lengthy process of study, planning, and negotiation, and they certainly will be less able to influence that process.

The most commonly encountered recommendation for overcoming this problem is bringing social analysts in earlier, and for longer periods of time, than other members of project design teams. Giving social analysts one to two weeks longer in-country would allow them to begin their preliminary fieldwork before other members of design teams arrive at missions, while also insuring that they would still have the opportunity to participate in deliberations with the members of those teams. Social analysts who have had a chance to make preliminary field observations might also be considerably more useful to other members of design teams when they arrive at missions.

D Summaries of Social Analyses

We have described some of the difficulties encountered by social analysts attempting to perform two of their essential functions--analysis and design--because in many instances these two functions require them to be in two different places, i.e., in the field and in the missions. We learned that in some cases social analysts have spent almost all of their time in the field, leaving their reports for others to summarize for inclusion in final project proposals. Such analysts have occasionally maintained only minimal contact with other members of project design teams. Both our interviews and our review of project documents suggest that this is not a very effective strategy for social analysts to adopt. In addition to the problems created by not maintaining contact with project design teams, we found that summaries of social analyses have not always accurately reflected ideas contained in the originals of those analyses. In fact, in several of the cases in our sample there

were significant differences or distortions between original analyses and their summaries.

Summaries of social analyses in project papers have not always dealt adequately with potential deficiencies in project designs highlighted by social analysts. In addition, they have occasionally failed to contain any mention of remarks made by social analysts about features of the social terrain which they, the analysts, thought might pose real threats to project success. And finally, summaries of analyses have sometimes presented somewhat more optimistic projections regarding the potential effects of proposed projects than those originally presented by social analysts. For example, one social analyst wrote about the "potential spread effects" of a proposed project. By the time his report had been summarized for inclusion in the project paper, however, the word "potential" had been left out and the impression conveyed was that such spread effects could be expected if the project was approved.

Given these observations it appears that one way to increase the usefulness of social analysis would be for scopes of work to require social analysts to prepare summaries of their reports for inclusion in final project papers. Some social analysts, especially those who make it a point to work closely with other members of project design teams, have been doing this for quite some time. Although we do not have the hard data to prove it, we suspect that such analysts have been much more effective in terms of influencing proposed projects than their "Lone Ranger" counterparts.

E Scopes of Work

Another set of factors potentially affecting the usefulness of social analysis involve scopes of work. Scopes of work are formal agreements between social analysts and AID which define, to a large

extent, the responsibilities of the former in the project design process. Although we were not able to obtain many scopes of work for the projects in our sample, we did learn from our interviews that scopes of work, reflecting the Agency's orientation to get the most amount of work for the least amount of money, sometimes place unrealistic demands upon social analysts. Missions have not always specified in scopes of work the full range of activities that they expected, or would have liked, social analysts to undertake in the project process. This has, in a few instances, caused real problems because the social analysts have found that their expectations regarding their role in the project process are not always the same as those of mission personnel.

Scopes of work usually require social analysts to cover certain points or do certain things in their analyses. Often, however, they do not require such analysts to take an active role in preparing final project proposals. Yet social analysts have frequently contributed to the preparation of these proposals. They have occasionally taken responsibility for drafting major sections of project proposals. Indeed, we found several instances where social analysts have assumed almost total responsibility for the preparation of such proposals, and on many occasions they have helped prepare evaluation programs and the like for proposed projects. Assisting with such activities is an excellent way to improve working relationships between social analysts and other members of project design teams. More importantly, however, it is also an effective way to increase the influence of social analysis in the project design process. This seems to be widely recognized by direct-hire social analysts. In fact we have heard that many missions prefer to use direct-hire social analysts when they need to have social analyses done because they know that such analysts frequently take on many of the tasks involved

in preparing final project papers. When social analysts who are not familiar with informal agency procedures are utilized, however, it would be wise to specify the full range of activities which missions expect, or would like, such analysts to undertake to avoid disagreements which have hindered good working relationships in project design teams.

One suggestion made to us by an Agency official, would be for AID/W and the missions to establish some sort of consensus--a consensus reflected in scopes of work--with regard to the total range of responsibilities which social analysts may be expected to undertaken in the project process.

Another factor possibly causing some Agency people to question social analysis may relate to the uneven quality and utility of social analyses. There are currently no standardized procedures for carrying out such analyses, or standardized formats for presenting their findings. As a result, individual social analysts have used different approaches and methods while conducting their analyses, and there are substantial differences in both the quality and the utility of their reports. There is no general agreement within AID on the kind of report which a social analyst is expected to prepare. In some cases social analysts have prepared lengthy reports on their research findings, reports filled with ethnographic details on the people potentially affected by proposed projects. In others they have condensed their findings into 10 to 15 page reports which are easily appended to project papers.

If mission officials knew more about what to expect and ask from social analysts, they might be able to work with them more smoothly. We will list here several recommendations derived from this study for increasing both the quality and the uniformity of social analyses. The first is for AID/W to identify and collect some of the methodological

and conceptual innovations developed for doing social analysis. These ideas could then be made available to all social scientists employed by the agency to do social analyses. Scopes of work might also specify that particular formats be utilized by social analysts when preparing their final reports. Revising the guidelines for social analysis might help increase the uniformity as well as the quality of social analyses.

If more mission personnel were aware of some of the significant contributions which social analysts have made to proposed projects they might also be more receptive to, and supportive of, social analysis. During the course of this investigation we came across some outstanding examples of what social analysis can accomplish--outstanding in terms of developing an understanding of the implications of proposed projects, and providing constructive recommendations for improving such projects. The social analyses prepared for the Sri Lanka Mahaweli Basin Project (1978) and the Guinea Bissau Rice Production Project (1980) are two such examples. Analyses such as these should be cited by the Agency as examples of what social analysis can accomplish if it is both carefully done and given the full support of mission personnel.

F Mode of Contracting

One question posed to the research team by AID staff was whether or not the mode of contracting for social analysts had any effect on either the quality of or the utility of social soundness analysis. It was in fact impossible, given our time constraints, to determine the mode of contracting for many of the social analyses in our sample. Thus we could not determine if there were any consistent relationships between mode of contract and either the quality or the utility of social analyses. Nevertheless we did gather some interesting observations regarding this point during our interviews.

Although there are actually at least half a dozen different modes of contracting, Agency personnel often speak as if there are only two different types of social scientists doing social analyses at AID. These are direct-hire personnel employed by AID and outside social analysts brought in by the Agency as temporary consultants. There seems to be a general agreement among AID personnel with whom we spoke that direct-hire social analysts are more likely to produce the kind of document needed to get projects approved than outsiders, because insiders frequently have a much better working knowledge of AID jargon and procedures. As one individual expressed it, "An academic might produce a very professional and profound document, but it might not be very bureaucratically useful." Several of the people we consulted also seemed to feel that insiders are more likely than outsiders to have a significant effect on the project design process, because insiders are more likely than outsiders to understand the intricacies of that process. Several AID personnel expressed the belief that direct-hire personnel tend to work out better than outside consultants because they, the insiders, have more accountability, and they frequently take more responsibility for the final product, the project paper, than do outsiders. As one person explained it to us, "Outsiders just turn in their papers and get out."

We must emphasize again that we do not have sufficient data to determine if there are significant differences in social analyses with regard to one mode of contracting as opposed to others. Nor could we determine whether or not there were any significant differences in social analyses done by insiders as opposed to outsiders. It should also be emphasized that Agency personnel were quick to point out that outsiders frequently do produce high-quality social analyses, and they readily admit that insiders have sometimes produced rather low-quality analyses. We also

heard about very productive working relationships which had developed between certain missions and outside consultants, who were then called in on several occasions. Thus, although it is to AID's advantage to utilize social scientists who have some familiarity with Agency procedures, this study cannot suggest that relying on one mode of contracting more than others, or consistently utilizing inside as opposed to outside social analysts, will necessarily improve either the overall quality or utility of such analyses.

## Chapter IV

## Summary of Findings

Included in this chapter are the major findings generated by this study, as well as a detailed list of findings regarding factors affecting the quality of social soundness analyses derived from our review of project documents. For each of these findings there are corresponding recommendations presented in the same numerical sequence in the next and last chapter of this report.

### Major Findings

1 At least 25% of the social analyses in our sample (at least three from each regional bureau) significantly influenced the design of proposed projects. Good examples of such analyses include those prepared for the following projects: Guinea Bissau, Rice Production; Sri Lanka, Mahaweli Water; Panama, Managed Fish Production; and Egypt, Urban Health Delivery System. These analyses, and our background interviews, both illustrate that social soundness analysis can and has played a useful role in the design of AID projects.

2 Our review of project documents revealed substantial differences in the quality of first generation social soundness analyses.

3 This study has also found substantial differences in the usefulness of first generation social analyses.

4 From the language of PPs and the nature of AID's project review and approval procedures it is evident that project papers serve at least three purposes. These purposes include: <u>analysis</u> of project settings, <u>design</u> of appropriate project

features, and justification of projects in terms of U.S. and host government policies. These three purposes are essential, legitimate, and interdependent, but they are also diverse and sometimes conflicting. Social analysts, like other members of project design teams, must contribute to the performance of each of these purposes with regard to proposed projects. This study suggests that social analysts have sometimes experienced serious tension as a result of conflicts among these three purposes. This tension appears to be a result of social analysts' relative lack of experience with AID's project procedures, their lack of involvement with proposed projects until late in the project process, and the complex, and in some cases, sensitive nature of social data.

5 Documents examined during this study, and our background interviews, both indicate that AID's recently established emphasis on more careful identification, design, implementation, and evaluation of projects has produced a better working environment for social analysis than that which existed when the social soundness analysis requirement was initially established.

6 Among the more frequently encountered criticisms of social soundness analysis is that it is expensive and adds one more step to an already complicated project process. During the course of this investigation, however, and during many previous years of experience in development related activities, practically no one has been heard to compare the costs of preparing different types of project analyses with the costs

political, economic and social -- of project failures. This short term sense of economy can only perpetuate an incisive finding of Steinberg et al. to the extent that

> A.I.D. analysis in project papers has been overly and unnecessarily optimistic and has resulted in unrealistic expectations for performance.[3]

Thus, although there may be significant costs involved in preparing social analyses of proposed projects, the costs incurred if such analyses are not prepared may be even greater.

## Detailed Findings

The following list of detailed findings regarding factors affecting the quality of social analyses has been derived from our review of project documents. These findings deal primarily with what we have found to be the more useful features of social analyses. All of these features were found in at least some of the social analyses included in our sample.

1 Several of the social analyses reviewed included clear statements of the development problem or problems which proposed projects were being designed to overcome--statements which defined development problems in terms of people and their basic needs--and they discussed how such projects would in fact help to overcome those problems.

2 Social analyses generally did not critique the basic goals and purposes of proposed projects, even though such goals and purposes were not always clearly defined in terms of people and their basic needs.

3 Some social analyses reviewed other development projects--either in planning or implementation stages--designed to help overcome similar as well as related development problems in project areas.

4 Although there were some excellent discussions in the social analyses reviewed of how specific features of social environments were likely to affect and be affected by proposed project systems, social analyses did not always pay adequate attention to important features of the social terrain, features which can, and usually do interact with elements of projects systems.

5 Several of the social analyses in our sample attempted to identify potential implementation problems and constraints in a very systematic fashion. Such analyses often included specific suggestions and recommendations regarding ways to overcome or mitigate potential implementation problems and in a few cases they identified specific indicators which could be used to determine if anticipated problems were in fact developing during project implementation.

6 In attempting to identify potential implemantation problems or constraints few social analyses critically examined the assumptions of proposed projects, or the basic logic of projects, as articulated in logical frameworks.

7 Social analyses have often presented optimistic projections regarding the likelihood of project benefits diffusing without discussing either the specific mechanisms, or linkages, which would facilitate such diffusion, or the conditions under which it could be expected to occur. Some social analyses did include such discussions as well as specific recommendations regarding ways to increase the possibility that project benefits would diffuse.

8 While most of the social analyses in the sample stated that the potential benefits of proposed projects were durable or sustainable, such analyses did not always provide background information on the assumptions behind such claims, or the conditions necessary for them to be realized. Some social analyses did discuss these issues and a few provided specific recommendations regarding ways to enhance the potential durability of project benefits.

9 Although some social analyses concluded that proposed projects were potentially replicable, that is that they could be repeated in similar areas with comparable results, few analyses presented evidence to back up such a conclusion.

10 In assessing the benefit/cost incidence of proposed projects several social analyses reviewed all of the costs--direct and indirect, social as well as economic--likely to accrue to individuals and groups at different stages of the project process.

11 Where groups or individuals stood to benefit differentially from proposed projects, social analysts have not always discussed how the distribution of project benefits related to considerations of equity within the project population.

12 Although social analyses often claimed that there had been and would continue to be a good deal of local decision-making regarding essential features of proposed projects, few analyses adequately identified local participants, their reasons for participating, or their actual contributions to decision-making processes. A few social analyses, however,

did describe the way local participants were involved in the planning of proposed projects, and in several cases they included specific recommendations for increasing local participation during each stage of the project process.

13 Several of the social analyses reviewed contained specific recommendations regarding additional investigations needed to support proposed projects. Such recommendations occasionally identified the types of data needed, the best methods available for collecting and analyzing that data, and the agencies or individuals best suited for carrying out the recommended data collection and analysis procedures.

14 A few of the social analyses in the sample included final sections which reviewed and highlighted their major findings and recommendations.

15 Finally, social analysts did not always describe their own data collection and analysis procedures, and they often failed to provide specific references for other research efforts or studies cited in their reports.

## Chapter V

## Recommendations

This chapter contains the major recommendations derived from this study as well as a list of detailed recommendations designed to improve the overall quality of social soundness analyses. These detailed recommendations, presented in the concluding section of the chapter, have been incorporated in the proposed revised guidelines for social soundness analysis presented in Appendix 1 of this report.

### Major Recommendations

1 Social soundness analysis should remain an essential component in AID's project design process, despite suggestions that such analysis be performed primarily at the program or sectoral level, because there is evidence that it can and has performed a valuable role with respect to the design of AID projects.

2 The following steps should be taken to improve the overall quality of social soundness analyses:

- AID should consider adopting the suggested guidelines for social soundness analysis presented in Appendix 1 of this report for the revised version of The Project Assistance Handbook currently being prepared. These suggested guidelines have incorporated the lessons derived from this study.
- AID should systematically review project evaluations, especially Impact Evaluation Reports, to derive

specific lessons for improving project analysis and design. These lessons could be summarized in a brief guide prepared for members of project design teams.

- AID should identify, collect and disseminate information about conceptual and methodological innovations used in social soundness analyses which have proven to be exceptionally useful. Information regarding these innovations could be summarized in a brief manual to be made available to all individuals preparing social soundness analyses.

3 The following steps should be taken to improve the usefulness of social soundness analysis by making it a more integrated part of AID's project process:

- AID should extend recent initiatives to make social analysis a continuing part of the entire project process;
  - beginning at the CDSS stage, and
  - continuing at any point in the process--either before or after the PID or PP stages--where additional social data is required.
- AID should send social analysts to the field earlier, and for somewhat longer periods of time, when complex social issues must be dealt with in the design of proposed projects.
  - 'front-end' studies could be conducted to insure that attention be focused on potential problems early in the project design process.

- additional time for field research should be granted when necessary to insure that social analysts have adequate time for data collection as well as consultation with other members of project design teams.

- Scopes of work for social analysts should be both realistic and flexible.
  - they should include clear statements of all the duties and responsibilities which social analysts can reasonably be expected to perform.
  - they should be flexible enough so that they can be revised by mission project officers or project team leaders and social analysts in light of host-country limitations and opportunities.
- Social analysts should, while still in the host country, draft both their full analyses for PP appendices <u>and</u>, in consultation with other project team members, summary statements of their reports for inclusion in the text of project papers.

4 AID should prepare a brief guide to the project design process for social analysts, indeed for all project analysts, explaining each of the essential, yet sometimes conflicting functions in that process. This guide should include a clarification of the multiple purposes of project papers--analysis, design, and justification--and the consequent roles of design team members.

5 AID should maintain its recently established emphasis on careful identification, design, implementation, and

evaluation of development projects. This emphasis provides a good working environment for social soundness analysis which, in turn, increases the likelihood that such analysis can make a useful contribution to the project process. Given the policy preferences of the new administration (agriculture, nutrition, rural development, population, institution building, technology transfer and adaptation, and the like) and given the high economic, social and political costs of project failures, maintaining this balanced emphasis on each phase of the project process offers rich opportunities for cost-effective and innovative policies and programs. In addition to maintaining this emphasis:

- AID should devote significant effort, by experienced staff and comparable consultants, to an examination of each stage of the project process to find ways to improve performance at other stages of that process. One way of conducting such an examination would be to begin with project evaluations and work back to earlier stages of the project process. Impact Evaluation Reports and other evaluation studies could be examined to find ways to improve project implementation. Information about project implementation could then be used to improve the project design process, which in turn, could be examined to find ways to improve the project identification process.

(This recommendation clearly exceeds the scope of work for this study, but it seems legitimate to suggest that social analysis would be improved by a careful examination of its relationship to each phase of the project process.)

6 AID should compare the costs of preparing different kinds of project analyses with the political, economic, and social costs incurred when projects fail for whatever reason. This examination should attempt to determine the most effective yet least-cost procedures for project preparation, and it should serve to create a more realistic perspective of the economies involved in using or not using such procedures when designing development projects. (This recommendation also exceeds the scope of work of this study but it does influence the prospects for most of the other recommendations listed above.)

## Detailed Recommendations

The following detailed recommendations have been developed for improving the overall analytical quality of social soundness analyses. As mentioned previously, all of these recommendations have been incorporated in the suggested guidelines for social soundness analysis presented in Appendix 1 of this report.

1 Social analyses should include clear statements of the development problems which proposed projects are being designed to overcome--statements which define development problems in terms of people and their basic needs--and they should discuss how such projects will in fact help to overcome those problems.

2 Social analysts should critique the basic goals and purposes of proposed projects, particularly if these goals and purposes are not clearly defined in terms of people and their basic needs.

3 Social analysts should also review other development projects--either in planning or implementation stages--designed to help overcome similar or related development problems in project areas.

4 Social analyses should identify and describe those features of the social environment most likely to interact with elements of project systems at local, regional, national, and supranational levels, and they should discuss how those features are potentially likely to affect and be affected by proposed projects.

5 Social analyses should attempt to identify potential implementation problems or constraints wherever possible. They should also discuss specific indicators which can be used to determine if particular problems are in fact developing, and they should assess alternative ways of dealing with such problems should they eventually arise.

6 In attempting to identify potential implementation problems or constraints social analysts should critically examine the assumptions of proposed projects, as well as the basic logic of those projects, as articulated in logical frameworks.

7 In dealing with spread effects social analysts should discuss the possibility of project benefits diffusing to people outside the immediate project area, or to people within the project area not originally identified as project

beneficiaries; they should identify the linkages facilitating such diffusion as well as the conditions necessary for it to occur. Social analysts should also make recommendations wherever possible for increasing the overall diffusion of project benefits.

8 Social soundness analyses should attempt to determine the potential sustainability of benefits from proposed projects. They should also identify the conditions necessary to achieve that level of sustainability and they should include recommendations wherever possible for increasing the overall durability of project benefits.

9 Social analysis should assess the potential replicability of proposed projects by examining the unique and generalizable characteristics of those projects in relation to their particular socio-cultural and natural settings.

10 In assessing the benefit/cost incidence of proposed projects social analysts should identify all of the costs--direct and indirect, social as well as economic--which will accrue to individuals or groups at different stages of the project process.

11 If groups or individuals benefit differentially from proposed projects, as is usually the case, social analysts should discuss how the distribution of project benefits and costs relates to considerations of equity within the project population.

12 Social analyses should summarize the extent of participation of local people and officials, including those who may benefit as well as those who may not, during project

identification and design; and they should propose means of continuing or increasing the participation of these people during project implementation and evaluation.

13 Social analysts should identify additional social data if such data is needed for the design, implementation, or evaluation of proposed projects, the most efficient methods available for collecting and analyzing that data, and the individuals or agencies most suited for carrying out the recommended data collection and analysis procedures.

14 Social analysts should always include brief sections in their reports summarizing their major findings with regard to potential design or implementation problems as well as their recommendations for overcoming or dealing with those problems.

15 Finally, social analysts should describe their own data collection and analysis procedures and provide specific references for other research efforts or studied cited in their reports.

Appendix 1

## Proposed Revised Guidelines for Social Soundness Analysis For Appendix 4 A of Handbook 3

The task of social analysis at the PP stage of the project process is to analyze the potential interaction between features of social systems and the major elements of proposed project systems in terms of the major criteria for social soundness: (1) mutual adaptability between the people and the project design, (2) realistic opportunity or likelihood that the people will participate in the project, (3) prospects for project benefits to spread, and (4) equitable distribution of project benefits and costs among the various types of people affected. By examining social systems and project systems in relation to each other, social analysis can provide an improved understanding of the potential socio-cultural consequences of project approval. Social analysis can also make substantial contributions to project design. Social analysis, when well done, is a practical way of improving the cost effectiveness of proposed projects.

These guidelines present a rationale and strategy for social analysis of AID projects, with the presumption that analysts will use the approach as appropriate and modify it when it does not seem appropriate. Every social analyst must make difficult judgments about which features of social environments may or may not affect the outcomes of proposed projects. The rationale presented here may help social analysts identify those social features likely to affect and be affected by such projects.

The rationale also presents, for the benefit of AID project officers as well as social analysts, a simple framework for thinking about development projects in relation to people's lives. The framework focuses upon the

ordinary coping and delivery systems in which people are organized to pursue their interests, seek their livelihoods, and simply survive. These systems can also be usefully analyzed by other members of a PP team, but these guidelines emphasize the social analytical task. The rationale, an argument composed of six points, is followed by a strategy for an analytical program for carrying out the basic ideas of the rationale. The strategy is for guidance for social analysts and is intended to assist generalists to understand more thoroughly the work and approach of social analysts.

I Rationale for Social Soundness Analysis

1 Most development projects attempt to improve incrementally people's ability to provide one or more aspects of their livelihood which they are already pursuing on their own: farming, fishing, herding, land use, water use, marketing, credit, transportation, nutrition, sanitation, health care, family planning, education, and the like. People have long been organized in pursuit of these various aspects of their well-being. Although these existing systems entail production, distribution, delivery, and consumption of goods and services, they will, for convenience simply be referred to here as 'coping systems.

2 These existing traditional systems may be quite limited in performance, but they generally consist of several interrelated aspects: technical, economic, environmental, managerial, political, and social. Changes in any of these dimensions are likely to stimulate changes in others.

3 The social aspects can be identified in a network of people engaged--directly or indirectly--in some common undertaking, such as health care or farming. The participants may cooperate or conflict, communicate or conceal information, and trust or suspect

each other. In any case, they influence each other in their participation, as in the kinds of care provided, amount of crops raised, distribution of benefits among them, and the like.

4 In proposed projects where a social analyst finds a network of people maintaining their coping system, the social aspects most pertinent to project design are the following:

a the main patterns of activities carried out by people in their different roles in the coping system;

b differential access of people in these roles to material and human resources;

c stratification in the relations among participants, including officials, in their different roles;

d patterns of authority and decision-making among participants;

e knowledge, views, and values of participants regarding their coping system;

f the main positive rewards (incentives, yields, results, health, security . . .) and negative rewards (deprivations, penalties, corruption, risks . . .) for participants in the current system; and

g patterns of communication among participants and with people outside the coping system.

5 Sustained development can occur only as people are able and inclined to improve the performance of their own coping systems. Such change can occur only as they modify their present patterns of activities, and they can do so only as they modify some or

most of the other six interdependent aspects of those systems listed above. People can make such changes, but only when they see a good prospect of improving their own rewards from an improved coping system (better yield, health care, access to water . . .) in ways they understand and value, within their limited means, and at acceptably low risk; and only when they have control over the resources necessary.

6 This view of change--people modifying their behavior in anticipation of rewards perceived in their own terms--supports a rationale for social design and social analysis of AID projects. The crucial task for social design of projects is translating project resources into gains institutionalized in a people's existing system(s) well enough to provide them with the incentives to make and sustain the changes in their own system(s). The prior task for social analysis of projects is to provide the information needed for such translation.

It is thus the task of the social analyst to identify and describe briefly the main social aspects of the existing system, and to analyze the main types and levels of change in those aspects of the system likely to occur if the project were successfully implemented. Careful analysis of such projected changes, as they would affect people in different positions in the existing system, would provide essential insight into the human benefits and burdens of a proposed project for particular types of poor rural people.

Some proposed projects may have implications for people's lives that seem broader or more diffuse than one or several of their existing coping systems, such as complex river basin projects. In such cases, the

social analyst may have to identify the main features of the social environment in a more general way. But the analyst could still try to focus on what rewards (positive and negative) the people seem to get from their efforts, then analyze project inputs and design to suggest how they could best be modified to provide the people with realistic incentives. The strongest bridge between a proposed project and the lives of its intended beneficiaries is the potential capacity of the project resources to develop opportunities and rewards valued by the people in their own terms. It is the task of social analysis to examine this bridge and suggest ways to strengthen it. Finally, the emphasis on existing coping systems and on rewards in these systems as strengthened by projects, offers a common focus of interest to technical, economic, administrative, and environmental analysts fully as much as to social analysts.

## II Strategy for Social Analysis

Given the wide variety of development projects and the great diversity of social and cultural conditions in which they must operate, social analysts might usefully follow the approach presented here to the extent possible and appropriate in the given country setting, and adapt to that setting as necessary. Within these realistic limits, a social analysis should try to provide succinct answers to the following questions. (The sequence of these questions is a suggestion for the general format of the written SSA rather than the sequence of gathering data.)

### A Socio Cultural Context: Statement of the Problem in Human Terms

1 In terms of the way of life and basic needs of the people who would be affected by the project, <u>what are the primary problems of poverty and development with which the project would try to deal?</u> A social analysis will be of much greater significance and use if it begins by trying

to get at the heart of the problems of the people for whom the project would be designed and does so in terms of their values and socio-cultural organization. Other analysts will define the problems in technical, environmental, economic, and administrative terms; it is for the social analyst to try to do so in human terms which both the people themselves and development officials could recognize. Some useful information may be found in the needs assessment section of the PID for the same project. This initial discussion of people's problems and needs should include some identification of the types of people who would be affected by the project: ethnic or tribal minorities? men migrated away looking for work? farmers and pastoralists? landless farmers?

2 In what ways would or could the project attempt to deal with these problems of the people involved? Having begun with the problems and needs of the people, the social analysts would next examine the general ways in which the project would be a solution to some of their problems and needs. Some possible alternative solutions could be presented here and elaborated later.

3 What are the basic goals, purposes, and assumptions of the project? Are they adapted to the task of solving or easing the problems and needs of the intended project population? If not, how could project goals, purposes, and assumptions be modified to fit better in the social environment? The social analyst can find the project goals, purposes, and assumptions stated in the logical framework of the project. If it has not yet been formulated, the analyst could initiate such a discussion with the design team and mission. In any case, a preliminary statement of project objectives can be found in the PID, which social analysts should read for background guidance. Following the two previous questions, it is essential that the basic project 'logic' be critically examined from a social perspective.

4 · What other development projects, in either planning or implementation stages, are designed to deal with similar development problems for the same general project population? In many countries projects by various sponsors may touch the same, or nearly the same, intended beneficiaries. Social analysts should try to take these related efforts into account in the course of assessing the human implications of any project.

B Mutual Adaptability

1 Features of the Social Environment in Relation to the Project

What features of the people's lives are most likely to affect and be affected by the project? In particular, which of their existing coping systems (farming, fishing, herding, land use, water use, marketing, credit, transportation, nutrition, sanitation, health care, reproduction, education . . .) are likely to interact with the project? A crucial step in selecting pertinent social features is identifying the existing system(s) of the project population that would be affected by the project. This would include people affected both positively and adversely. As stated earlier, coping systems are compound systems of interrelated technical, economic, administrative, political, environmental, and social aspects. The social aspects are to be found in the action and interaction of the network of people engaged in pursuing the activity. The social analyst should examine the network at the levels most relevant to the proposed project: local, regional, national, and even supranational, as needed.

Having identified the system(s) most likely to be affected by the proposed project, the social analyst should search for its main strengths and weaknesses in providing participants with the relevant basic needs, such as food, employment, health, and the like. It is more realistic to treat

existing coping systems as changing, rather than stable, even without the project. Careful treatment of this section should present a clear, detailed picture of the current coping roles of women, men, children, the aged, migrants, and ethnic or special groups.

Brief analyses should be done, as appropriate, of the following seven social aspects of the coping system(s) under study, noting both the current condition of each aspect and the changes likely to occur in each aspect if the project were implemented.

a Patterns of Activities

What are the major patterns of activities of people in different roles in the coping system, by sex, generations, and occupations (including officials)? When are they employed in these activities?

b Differential Access to Resources

What different types and levels of access to, and control over, the main material and human resources do people in different roles have? The social analyst should look particularly carefully at this issue, since it might reveal something of the pattern of hierarchy and an indication of any exploitation or oppression of some people by others. Such patterns would be a critical part of the structure of poverty in that society.

c Relationships Among Participants

What is the general ranking of different roles in the system? How stratified are the relationships among the people in these roles? What are the main bases for this ranking? What are the main social institutions of the people (in the project area) and of the local and regional government? How do they relate to each other?

d Patterns of Authority and Decision-Making

How is authority distributed among people in different roles in the coping system? How do they reach decisions in operating the system? How

dependent are they on decisions made outside the system? How much control do they have over their resources and over their own system?

e Views and Values of Participants

What sorts of knowledge do participants in various positions have regarding their own activities in their system? What views do they hold regarding the significance or meaning of their activities? What values do they hold which may guide their choices or preferences regarding the operation of their system?

f Rewards of the Coping System

What are the main positive incentives or rewards (yields, wealth, security, health, prestige, freedom . . .) and negative rewards (deprivation, risks, insecurity, bribes, illness, vulnerability . . .) for participants? How are these rewards distributed among people in different roles - by sex, age, occupation and the like: How do participants appear to feel about the current pattern of rewards?

g Patterns of Communication

What are the main types of information which participants exchange, or withhold? How important is information exchange in their system? Are the participants more dependent on information from each other, or from external sources? Where do they get their most important information for their coping system?

h Socio-Political Forces

The previous seven points have been specifically focused on social aspects of people's existing coping systems likely to affect and be affected by development projects. This focus has the advantage of centering analysis on a few social issues of major significance to the project. But people, especially poor people, live in a turbulent world in which many indirect

forces also impinge on project success. The social analyst should try to assess the potential impact on projects of such forces as: ethnic or tribal politics, dissident or irridentist political movements, border unrest, official corruption or oppression of regional groups, class or caste stratification, migrations of people, population pressure, and the like. Although relationships between project operation and these forces cannot be analyzed so clearly as with the earlier seven points, such volatile forces should be realistically acknowledged if not precisely assessed.

2 Implementation Constraints

Given the changes that would occur during project implementation in the operation of the people's system(s), and given the socio-political forces noted above, what difficulties in implementing the project can be realistically anticipated? In particular, what practical difficulties can be expected in efforts to transform project resources into institutionalized rewards in the people's coping system, as they change (or if they changed) their activities in the directions implied by the project purposes? What changes in project design features, or what alternative project design features, might help make these changes by the people more rewarding in their own terms?

If the logical framework of the project is prepared, what social constraints can be inferred from, and should be included in, the project assumptions? If the logical framework is not yet prepared, what project assumptions regarding implementation can the social analyst anticipate from discussion with design team and mission staff? Can social analysis help make these assumptions more realistic for project implementation? Can social analysis suggest ways of mitigating the obstacles to implementation inferred from the project assumptions? What social indicators could be suggested to guide later monitoring of social constraints during project implementation?

C Participation

What sorts of participation did various types of local people and officials have in the identification project? What sort of participation are they having in the design phase, and are they likely to have in implementation and evaluation phases? What resources have they contributed? What evidence exists that they have been consulted? What additional forms of participation could be proposed for project design? Given the analysis above of their participation in their current coping system, how are the different types of people and officials actually apt to take part in determining and maintaining the project-related activities? How will active participation be distributed among men and women, young and old, local people and outside officials, among ethnic groups, and the like? What socially realistic proposals can be made in project design to strengthen the participation of those less likely to be favored?

Specifically mandated as a policy priority of Congress, active participation of people in their own development efforts is a crucial means of increasing the mutual fit between their lives and the project, and thus of enhancing the equitable distribution of benefits among the people, and thus of ensuring the greater durability of project results. Participation of people in their own development is thus an issue to which social analysis can make a substantial contribution to project design. It includes another congressionally mandated priority: participation of women in development. By handling this issue as suggested in the previous paragraph the social analyst can provide a critical assessment of women's participation along with other types of people, treating the place of women with others in the society rather than treating it as a subject apart from others.

D Benefit/Cost Incidence

How would the benefits and burdens of the project be distributed among the different types of people in the project population? Of these different types of people (by sex, age, ethnic group, occupation, wealth . . .) who would benefit, who would lose or suffer, and who would not be affected? In addition to types of individuals, would some types of institutions or communities tend to benefit, lose, or be unaffected by the project? What secondary or indirect benefits and costs are likely to flow from project implementation, and which types of people are likely to receive these benefits and incur the costs? In addition to material benefits and costs, what main sorts of psychological and social costs and benefits are likely to result from project implementation, and what sorts of people are likely to become the recipients? How might this change during different stages of the project?

In the light of the issues discussed above, what is the potential of the project for equitable distribution of benefits and burdens among the people to be affected? What realistic social recommendations can be made to improve the equity of distribution of project benefits and burdens among the people affected?

E Spread Effects: Diffusion, Sustainability, and Replicability

What are the prospects for project results diffusing through space and being sustained through time? More specifically, what are the realistic possibilities of project benefits diffusing to people within the project area but not originally included as beneficiaries, and to people living outside the project area? Given the special and general characteristics of the project in its social setting, what are the prospects of project results being replicated outside the primary project area? Given the degree of fit of the project design in its social setting, what is the potential for

sustained project results beyond the projected end of AID assistance? What realistic recommendations can be made to enhance the diffusion and durability of project benefits?

Given the natural tendency of project designers toward optimistic, hopeful projections, social analysts should be especially careful to base their assessment of the future potential of projects on critical analysis of current conditions and realistic appraisal of future trends.

F Future Project Investigations

The social analyst should point out gaps in existing social data that should be filled before project implementation, laying out any needed program of investigation to support the implementation phase. Based on experience at the design phase, the social analyst might suggest major issues and social indicators to be used in project monitoring or evaluation.

G Major Findings and Recommendations

To ensure full use of the social analysis by AID, the analyst should indicate the most significant findings and the major recommendations stemming from the social analysis. This section would highlight items for action and increase the likelihood of follow-up.

H Methods of Work

Social analysts should briefly ina. . s the sources and methods used in gathering and analyzing data for the social analysis. In addition to the PID and any other project documents, they should use other pertinent project social analyses and any other pertinent social research done in the country or on similar development problems. Given the limited knowledge of social research among AID personnel, social analysts should append a list of pertinent research sources, especially those available <u>in the country</u>, for the use of other AID people and for later social monitoring or evaluation people.

## Appendix 2

### Criteria for Assessment of Social Soundness Analyses

As stated in Chapter Two (Objectives and Methods), these criteria were refined during the course of the study. This version is the one modified by the criticisms and suggestions of the social scientists in AID meeting with the contract team in July 1980. Continuing refinements during the subsequent review of project papers and interviews contributed significantly to the proposals for revisions of social soundness analysis guidelines for Handbook 3 (see appendix 1). A brief criticism and defense of these criteria can be found at the end of the introduction to Chapter Three (Review of Data).

I The nature of the project participants

Does the SSA identify the types and social organization of people who would be affected by the proposed project?

A Does the SSA clearly identify the number, location(s), and relevant social characteristics (social roles, sex, age, occupations, ethnic groups, main institutions . . .) of the people who would be: beneficiaries, benefactors, not affected, adversely affected?

B Does the SSA analyze the nature of poverty of the project people, or the development problem which the project addresses?

II Mutual adaptability between the life of participants and the project design

Does the SSA analyze the main features of the people's lives <u>in relation to</u> the main features of the project design so that:

- the possibilities and limitations for mutual adaptations between them are evident?
- guidance is provided for modifying project design?

A Does the SSA characterize local, regional, national and supra-national institutions most likely to interact with the project? Including such features as:

1 Patterns of people's behavior pertinent to the project, such as food production, food consumption, marketing, transportation, health care, reproduction, child care, land tenure, water use, herding, education . . .

2 Ways in which people allocate their time in different seasons of the year in activities pertinent to the project

3 Settlement and mobility patterns

4 Authority and decision-making patterns regarding source allocation and use as well as conflict management

5 Stratification among participants--farmers, project staff, district officials, merchants . . .

6 Main rewards and values which support participants' current behavior and institutions

B Does the SSA characterize current socio-political forces impinging on people in the project area and the effects these forces may have on their lives?

C Does the SSA provide analysis and guidance on interactions between the lives of the project population and the project design, in terms relevant to decisions which AID and host country managers must make:

1 considering alternative project design features?

2 modifying project design to adapt to current conditions in the people's lives which they seem unable or unwilling to change?

3 refining project inputs to become more realistic incentives to the types of change implied in project purposes?

D Does the SSA discuss the social implications of changes likely to occur in project implementation, such as new activities, values, and relationships to resources and resource owners and managers?

E Does the SSA critique or clarify the definition of project goals and purposes, in addition to project outputs and inputs?

1 Does the SSA examine linkages, in terms of people's resources and limitations, among these four project levels?

2 Does it question, discuss or clarify--in terms of the lives of the people--any assumptions of the project logical framework?

3 How quickly does the SSA get to the 'main point', to the 'heart' of the project?

F Does the SSA contribute to, or draw from, the administrative, environmental, economic and technical analyses of the project?

G Did the SSA anticipate any social issues which were later discussed in project evaluations?

H Does the SSA analyze any social issues which might become resources for, or constraints to, project implementation?

I Does the SSA identify gaps in current social information or issues that need further planning study as a first phase of project implementation, or of project monitoring or evaluation?

J Does the SSA cite and use existing analyses or previous relevant project studies to document its findings?

III Diffusion, sustainability, and replicability of project benefits

A Does the SSA discuss the possibility of diffusion of project benefits to populations living outside the area of project activity or to people within the original area who were not included originally as beneficiaries?

B Does the SSA assess the potential for sustained positive results from project activities? Does the SSA propose means for increasing the likelihood of sustained positive results from project activities?

C Does the SSA assess the degree of replicability of positive results of project activities by examining the unique and generalizable characteristics of the project in relation to its social setting?

IV Equitable distribution of project benefits and burdens

A Does the SSA identify the potential for equitable distribution of project benefits and burdens between groups within the population, including those of different income levels, social classes, ethnic groups, sexes and ages?

B Does the SSA propose means to increase the equity of distribution of direct and indirect benefits and burdens to groups involved with the project?

V Participation in project process

A Does the SSA summarize the extent of past participation of local people and officials, including those who may benefit and those who may not, in project identification and design?

B Does the SSA propose means for continuing or increasing the level of participation of these people in project implementation and evaluation?

VI Linkages and conflicts

A Does the SSA identify and evaluate both linkages and conflicts among the four preceding criteria-- utual adaptability, diffusion-sustainability-replicability, equity and participation?

B Does the SSA propose means to support the linkages and mitigate conflicts among these four criteria?

Appendix 3

## Projects and Project Documents Examined for This Study

### List of Projects and Documents Reviewed

**Africa**

Chad:Comprehensive Human Resource Development in Chad 1977 (677-0005)

PP prepared by Action Programs International, Santa Monica, California

SSA in PP

Guinea Bissau:Rice Production 1980 (657-0009)

PP

SSA annex of PP (by Abe Waldstein, Anthropologist/Consultant, University of New Hampshire)

Kenya:Agriculture Systems Support Project 1978 (615-0169)

PP

SSA in PP

Kenya:Rural Roads 1977 (615-0168)

PP

SSA in PP (by Ned Greeley, Anthropologist, REDSO/E)

Lesotho:Rural Water Supply/Sanitation 1978 (632-0088)

PP

SSA in PP (by Piers Cross, Anthropologist/Consultant)

Mali:Operation Mils-Mopti Phase II 1979 (688-0202)

PP

SSA annex of PP

Niger:Improving Rural Health 1978 (683-0208)

PP

SSA in PP

Senegal:Casamance Regional Development 1978 (685-0205)

PP

SSA in PP (by Sheldon Geller, Sociologist/Consultant)

Senegal:Rural Health Services Development 1977 (685-0210)

PP

SSA in PP

Tanzania:Masai Range Management Project 1980 (621-0093)

PP

SSA in PP (completed with assistance from Hamilton, Hatfield, Hess, Hoben and Jacobs, Anthropologists)

Togo:Rural Water Supply 1979 (693-0210)

PP

SSA in PP

Upper Volta:Women's Roles in Development 1977 (686-0211)

PP prepared by Development Alternatives, Inc.

SSA in PP

**Asia**

Bangladesh:Food for Work II 1979 (388-0017)

PP

SSA in PP

Indonesia:Luwu Agriculture Development Loan 1975 (AID-DLC/P-2092)

PP

SSA in PP

Indonesia:Rural Electrification I 1977 (497-0267)

PP

SSA Social Soundness Analysis of the Indonesial Rural Electrification Project (by Ferdinand Okada)

Nepal:RAD/RCUP Design Project 1978 (367-0133)

PP

SSA in PP

Nepal:Rural Area Development; Rapati Zone Project 1980 (367-0129)

PP

SSA in PP

Philippines:Barangay Water 1978 (492-0291)

PP

SSA Social Soundness Analysis of the Barangay Water Project (by Kenneth Orr, Anthropologist/Consultant, Experience, Inc., Washington, D.C.)

Philippines:Food and Nutrition Outreach 1979 (492-0320)

PP

SSA Beliefs, Behavior, and Perceptions of Participants in a Philippine Nutrition Program (by William H. Jansen II, Anthropologist, USAID)

Philippines:Panay Unified Services for Health (PUSH) 1978 (492-0312)

PP

SSA Social Soundness Analysis for the Panay Unified Services for Health (by Dionesia A. Rola, Nenita A. Cabalfin and Joy Riggs)

Philippines:Small Scale Irrigation 1975 (AID-DLC/P-2094)

PP

SSA Social Analysis: Small Scale Irrigation Project II (by Kenneth Orr, Anthropologist/Consultant, Experience, Inc., Washington, D.C.)

Sri Lanka:Mahaweli Basin Development Phase I 1979 (383-0056)
(Maduru Oyo-System B Design and Supervision)

PP

SSA in PP (by Randy Cummings, USAID, and Thayer Scudder, Anthropologist/Consultant, California Institute of Technology)

Sri Lanka:Water Management 1979 (383-0057)

PP

SSA in PP

Thailand:Lam Nam Oon Integrated Rural Development 1977 (493-0272)

PP

SSA in PP

Latin America

Bolivia:Agriculture Credit 1979 (511-0538)

PP

SSA Alternative Banking and Institutional Systems for Agricultural Credit Delivery to Bolivian Campesinos, separate annex to PP (by Wendy DeMegret, AMARU IV)

Bolivia:Rural Access Roads II 1978

PP

SSA annex of PP

Columbia:Small Farmer Training 1976 (514-0192)

PP

SSA in PP

Guatemala:Primary School Reconstruction 1976 (520-242)

PP

SSA in PP

Honduras:Aquan Valley Rural Electrification 1977 (522-0138)

PP

SSA annex of PP

Jamaica:Agricultural Marketing Development 1979 (532-0060)

PP

SSA Social Soundness Analysis of the Agricultural Marketing Development Project (by Carleen Gardner)

Nicaragua:Rural Health Services 1976 (524

PP

SSA in PP

Panama:Managed Fish Production 1980 (525-0216)

PP

SSA annex of PP (by Polly Harrison, AID Social Science Coordinator for Central America and the Carribean)

Panama:Watershed Management 1978 (525-0191)

PP

SSA annex of PP (by Abby Bloom, USAID, and John Kelly and Francis Herrera, Anthropologists)

Peru:Development of Sub-Tropical Lands 1978 (527-0163)

PP

SSA in PP (by Abby Bloom, USAID/Panama and Teofilo Altamirano, Universidad Catolica, Anthropologists)

Peru:Rural Enterprises II 1979 (527-0176)

PP

SSA Small Enterprise Loans Through the Banco Industrial del Peru: An Evaluation of the Fondo de Desarrollo Rural with Case Studies from Junin and Cuzco (by Charlotte Miller, Anthropologist/Consultant)

Near East

Afghanistan:Basic Health Services 1976 (306-0144)

PP

SSA in PP

Egypt:Urban Health Delivery System 1978 (265-0065)

PP

PP (amended) Egypt:Urban Health Delivery System (Amendment No. 1) 1979

SSA The Urban Health Project in Egypt: A Socio-Cultural Report (by Soheir Sukkary)

Jordan:Amman Water and Sewerage 1978 (278-0220)

PP

SSA A Social Soundness Analysis of the Amman Water and Sewerage Systems (by Jarir S. Dajani, Civil Engineering/Consultant, Stanford University, California)

Jordan:Jordan Valley Farmer's Association 1977

PP

SSA Social Soundness Analysis: The Jordan Valley Farmer's Association (by Robert A. Fernea, Anthropologist/Consultant, University of Texas at Austin)

Portugal:Agriculture Production Program 1980 (150-0023)

PP

SSA Environmental and Social Soundness Analysis of the Portugal Agriculture Production Program (by Steve Lintner, Environmentalist, AID)

Syria:Provincial Water Supply 1979 (276-0024)

PP

SSA Environmental and Social Soundness Analysis of Syria Provincial Water Supply (by Peter Benedict, Anthropologist, and Steve Lintner, Environmentalist, AID)

Syria:Rural Roads 1979 (276-0033)

PP

SSA Environmental and Social Soundness Analysis of the Syria: Rural Roads Project (by Peter Benedict, Anthropologist, and Steve Lintner, Environmentalist, AID)

Tunisia:Central Tunisia Rural Development Project 1978 (664-0312)

PP

SSA Social Soundness Analysis of the Drylands and Irrigation Components of the Proposed Central Tunisia Rural Development Program (CTRD) (by Nicholas S. Hopkins, Anthropologist/Consultant, American University, Cairo, Egypt)

SSA Social Soundness Analysis of the CTRD Potable Water Sub-Project (by Carole Steere, Anthropologist/Consultant, AYAD)

Program for Research for CTRD (by Nicholas S. Hopkins)

Tunisia:CTRD Rural Potable Water 1980 (664-0312.7)

PP

SSA Social Soundness Analysis of the CTRD Potable Water Sub-Project (by Carole Steere, Anthropologist/Consultant, AYAD)

Tunisia:Small Farmer Supervised Credit 1977 (664-0302)

PP

SSA in PP (PP and SSA prepared by Dick Frankel, Anthropologist, USAID)

Tunisia:Small-Holder Irrigation Development Sub-Project Paper 1978 (664-0312.3)

PP

SSA Social Soundness Analysis of the Drylands and Irrigation Components of the Proposed Central Tunisia Rural Development Program (CTRD) (by Nicholas S. Hopkins, Anthropologist/ Consultant, American University, Cairo, Egypt)

Yemen:CRS (Catholic Relief Services) Tihama Primary Health Care Project 1979 (279-0065)

PP

SSA Social Soundness Analysis of the Proposed CRS Basic Health Services, separate annex to PP (by Diane Ponasik, USAID/Sana)

## Distribution of Projects by Region and Year

REGION

| YEAR | AFRICA | ASIA | LATIN AMERICA | NEAR EAST | TOTALS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1975 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 1976 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| 1977 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 1978 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 14 |
| 1979 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 13 |
| 1980 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 |
| TOTALS | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 48 |

## Distribution of Projects by Sector and Year

| TYPES OF PROJECTS | YEAR | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1975 | 1976 | 1977 | 1978 | 1979 | 1980 | TOTALS |
| Integrated Rural Development | 1 | | 2 | 4 | | 1 | 8 |
| Rural Roads | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 3 |
| Rural Electrification | | | 2 | | | | 2 |
| Rural Enterprises | | | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Agricultural Production | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Irrigation | 1 | | | 1 | 2 | | 4 |
| Agricultural Extension | | 1 | | | | | 1 |
| Agricultural Credit | | | 1 | | 1 | | 2 |
| Agricultural Marketing | | | | | 1 | | 1 |
| Range and Watershed Management | | | | 1 | | 1 | 2 |
| Fish Production | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Health Care Delivery | | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | | 7 |
| Water and Sanitation | | | | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| Nutrition | | | | | 1 | | 1 |
| Family Planning | | | | | 1 | | 1 |
| Food for Work | | | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | | | | | | |
| Capital Intensive Infrastructure | | | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Women in Development | | | 1 | | | | 1 |
| Education | | 1 | 1 | | | | 2 |
| TOTALS | 2 | 4 | 9 | 14 | 13 | 6 | 48 |

## Appendix 4

### Individuals Consulted for This Study

| | |
|---|---|
| Atherton, Joan | PPC/PDPR/RD |
| Benedict, Peter | NE/TECH |
| Berg, Robert | PPC/E |
| Blue, Richard | PPC/E |
| Calavan, Michael F. | PM/TD |
| Chapin, Norman Mac | LAC/DR |
| Dutto, Carl | USAID/Jakarta |
| Fanale, Rosalie | PPC/PDPR/HR |
| Fedel, Robert F. | NE/PD |
| Fleuret, Patrick | PPC/PDPR/HR |
| Fort, Catherine | NE/TECH |
| Goddard, Paula | PPC/WID |
| Greeley, Edward H. | REDSO/EA |
| Green, Edward | Consulting Anthropologist |
| Hess, David | AFR/DR/ARD |
| Hickey, Gerald | ASIA/TR |
| Hoben, Allan | Research Fellow, Overseas Development Council |
| Jacquette, Jane | PPC/WID |
| Jansen II, William H. | DS/POP |
| Johnson, Pamela | NE/TECH |
| Johnson, Twig | PPC/E/S |
| Kerr, Graham | PPC/E/S |
| Keyser, James | AFR/DR/EHR |
| Lintner, Stephen | NE/PD |
| Mahoney, Timothy | LAC/DP |
| Maxwell, Dayton | AFR/SFWA/SDP |
| Miller, Charlotte | Consultant, USAID/Lima |
| Moore, Frank | AFR/DR |
| Morton, Alice | DS/RAD |
| Pillsbury, Barbara | ASIA/DP |
| Scherrer, Carole | AFR/DR/ARD |
| Seymour, James Matt | AFR/DR/EHR |
| Silverstone, Jonathan | PPC/PDPR/CP |
| Steinberg, David | PPC/E/S |
| Vreeland, Nena | PPC/E/PES |

## APPENDIX 5

### Scope of Work for this Contract

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 9 REQUISITION OFFICE ▶ Office of Policy Development and Program Review (PPC/PDPR/HR) | | 10 REQUISITION NO PURCHASE AUTHORITY | |
| 11 F O B POINT | 12 GOVERNMENT B/L NO | 13 DELIVERY TO F O B POINT ON OR BEFORE | 14 DISCOUNT TERMS |

15. SCHEDULE — See reverse for rejections

| Item No (a) | Supplies or Services (b) | Quantity Ordered (c) | Unit (d) | Unit Price (e) | Amount (f) | Quantity Accepted (g) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | I. Products.<br><br>The contractor will prepare and deliver by October 15, 1980, a report on AID experience with project-specific social analysis since 1975. The report will adhere to the following format:<br><br>A. Executive Summary<br>B. Statement of Major Findings<br>C. Recommendations for AID:<br><br>1. Recommended changes in the PP-stage social soundness guidance for AID to consider as part of Handbook III (project design).<br>2. Other recommendations growing out of answers to the questions listed in (II-D) below.<br><br>D. Data Review (to be based on procedures outlined in sections II-A, B and C below). | | | | | |

FUNDS RESERVED BY

POSTED SER/FM/CSD

16 CLASSIFICATION: ☐ SMALL BUSINESS ☒ OTHER THAN SMALL BUSINESS ☐ MINORITY BUSINESS ENTERPRISE

15 (h) Total from continuation pages ◀

SEE BILLING INSTRUCTIONS ON REVERSE

| 17 SHIPPING POINT | 18 GROSS SHIPPING WEIGHT | 19 INVOICE NO |
|---|---|---|
| | | |

20 MAIL INVOICE TO (Include ZIP Code)
See "Ship to"

15 (i) GRAND TOTAL ◀

21 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY (Signature) L. E. Stanfield

22 NAME (Typed) L. E. Stanfield
TITLE (CONTRACTING/ORDERING OFFICER)

**ORDER FOR SUPPLIES OR SERVICES** 147-107

STANDARD FORM 147 (REV. ...)
Prescribed by GSA, FPR (41 CFR) 1-16.603

| ITEM NO. | SUPPLIES OR SERVICES | QUANTITY ORDERED | UNIT | UNIT PRICE | AMOUNT | QUANTITY ACCEPTED |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

E. Appendices:

1. One copy of the scope of work under which the work was done.
2. A catalogue of all social analyses examined, organized by region and by country, stating project title, project number, title of social analysis, author of social analysis, and author's area of expertise.
3. Other appendices as appropriate.

If practical difficulties prevent adhering to this format, the contractor will make changes in consultation with PPC/PDPR/HR.

II. Procedures.

In preparing the report the contractor will:

A. Consult with AID social scientists and technical officers in each Bureau to learn how social analysis is regarded by those who produce it and by those who use it. To the extent possible, the contractor will consult with AID social scientists working overseas and with persons who have done social analysis under contract with AID. This interview material is designed to produce general background information.

B. Based on these consultations and on information in the AID files (e.g., those maintained by DS/DIU and PPC/E/SD), the contractor will select a judgemental sample of 120 projects for careful review.

The contractor will select projects so as to:

1. Give roughly equal representation to each of the regional bureaus.
2. Include projects drawn from each of the following sectors of activity:

   a. Capital intensive physical infrastructure
   b. Livestock
   c. agricultural research
   d. rural roads
   e. irrigation
   f. primary health care delivery
   g. family planning delivery

Projects may be drawn from other sectors such as agricultural production/extension, rural electrification and rural water supply as appropriate.

**ORDER FOR SUPPLIES OR SERVICES**

**SCHEDULE—CONTINUATION**

MARK ALL PACKAGES AND PAPERS WITH ORDER AND/OR CONTRACT NUMBERS



| DATE OF ORDER | CONTRACT NO (If any) | ORDER NO |
|---|---|---|
| 7-3-80 | | AID/OTR-147-80-79 |

| ITEM NO | SUPPLIES OR SERVICES | QUANTITY ORDERED | UNIT | UNIT PRICE | AMOUNT | QUANTITY ACCEPTED |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 3. Include projects for which the social analysis was done under each of the following contracting modes: | | | | | |
| | a. Agency direct hire personnel | | | | | |
| | b. consulting firms | | | | | |
| | c. personal service contracts | | | | | |
| | d. title XII agreements | | | | | |
| | e. DS/RAD cooperative agreements | | | | | |
| | f. other arrangements as appropriate. | | | | | |
| | 4. Include projects beginning in each of the years 1976, 1977, 1978, 1979, and 1980. | | | | | |
| | If practical difficulties prevent conforming to the project selection criteria outlined in (II-B-1, 2, 3 and 4), adjustments will be made in consultation with PPC/PDPR/HR. | | | | | |
| | C. For each of the projects selected in (II-B), the contractor will assemble and review the following items (where they are not classified or otherwise restricted): | | | | | |
| | 1. The PP and subsequent amendments, if any. | | | | | |
| | 2. All available evaluations. | | | | | |
| | 3. The summary social analysis which is usually included in the body of the PP. | | | | | |
| | 4. The complete social analysis which is usually a backup paper submitted simultaneously with but separately from the PP. | | | | | |
| | 5. The scope of work, if any, which guided the person who performed the social analysis. | | | | | |
| | 6. The professional area of expertise of the person who did the social analysis. | | | | | |
| | Again, practical difficulties may dictate adjustments, which will be made in consultation with PPC/PDPR/HR. | | | | | |
| | D. Based on the data collected in (II-A, B and C), the contractor will write a review of AID project-specific social analysis answering these questions (which are intended to guide but not limit the review): | | | | | |
| | 1. What are the distinguishing features of useful social analysis? | | | | | |
| | 2. What are the distinguishing features of social analysis that is not useful? | | | | | |

TOTAL CARRIED FORWARD TO 1ST PAGE

| ITEM NO. | SUPPLIES OR SERVICES | QUANTITY ORDERED | UNIT | UNIT PRICE | AMOUNT | QUANTITY ACCEPTED |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

3. What differences emerge in a comparison of the summary social analyses included in PPs and the complete social analyses submitted separately?
4. To what extent are social analyses observations and recommendations reflected in project design?
5. To what extent do project evaluations identify problems that were or should have been identified in social analysis?
6. What is the frequency with which social analysis is done under the various contracting modes listed under (II-B-3) above, and does this factor (mode contracting) make any difference in the utility of the resulting social analysis?
7. To what extent do social analyses follow the current social analysis guidance? Are social analyses that do follow the guidance more likely to be useful or not useful as discussed in (II-D-1 and 2) above?
8. What is the relationship, if any, between characteristics of the scope of work which guided the socia- analysis and the utility of the resulting social analysis?
9. To the extent possible using project-specific data, comment on how project development procedures encourage or discourage the use of social analysis in project design.
10. How do the answers to questions 1-9 above vary by regional bureau, by year, and by sector?

It is foreseen that the answers to questions 1-10 above will inform the recommendations which the contractor puts forward regarding the social analysis appendix to the PP chapter of the Handbook III.

III. Reporting.

The contractor will report to AID upon the following occasions:

A. When the contract is awarded, the contractor will attend a general meeting of interested AID personnel for purposes of initial consultation in implementing the project.
B. Within two weeks of award, the contractor will prepare a preliminary list of criteria by which social analyses may be judged. The list will be refined in consultation with PPC/PDPR/HR and other concerned AID offices, including each of the regional bureaus.

**ORDER FOR SUPPLIES OR SERVICES**

**SCHEDULE–CONTINUATION**

MARK ALL PACKAGES AND PAPERS WITH ORDER AND/OR CONTRACT NUMBERS



| DATE OF ORDER | CONTRACT NO (If any) | ORDER NO |
|---|---|---|
| 7-3-80 | | AID/OTR-147-80-79 |

| ITEM NO. | SUPPLIES OR SERVICES | QUANTITY ORDERED | UNIT | UNIT PRICE | AMOUNT | QUANTITY ACCEPTED |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | C. Within six weeks of award, the contractor will present to PPC/PDPR/HR 10 copies of the report described in (1) above. This will be considered a preliminary draft and will be reviewed by PPC/PDPR and other concerned AID offices, including each of the regional bureaus.<br>D. Within one month of receiving AID comments on the preliminary draft, the contractor in consultation with PPC/PDPR/HR will produce a final draft that reflects so far as possible the comments received.<br>E. When the final report is accepted by PPC/PDPR/HR, the contractor will attend a general meeting of interested AID personnel to present and discuss the product of the contract. | | | | | |

## Appendix 6

### Footnotes

[1] AID Project Assistance, Handbook 3, Appendix 4 A., p. 1.

[2] Jacques Ellul, The Technological Society, Alfred A. Knopf, 1964, p. vi in the Foreward by Robert Merton.

[3] David I. Steinberg, Team Leader, Philippine Small Scale Irrigation, Project Impact Evaluation Report No. 4, AID, 1980.

BLANK PAGE