

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET

1. CONTROL NUMBER
PN-AAK-482

2. SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION (695)
DCCO-DECO CCCC

3. TITLE AND SUBTITLE (240)

First annual report; PPC evaluation studies

4. PERSONAL AUTHORS (100)

5. CORPORATE AUTHORS (101)

AID/PPC/E

6. DOCUMENT DATE (110)

1980

7. NUMBER OF PAGES (120)

42p

8. ARC NUMBER (170)

9. REFERENCE ORGANIZATION (130)

PPC/E

10. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES (500)

11. ABSTRACT (950)

12. DESCRIPTORS (920)

project analysis
projects
project evaluation
project impact evaluation
project design

13. PROJECT NUMBER (150)

—

14. CONTRACT NO.(140)

PPC/E

15. CONTRACT TYPE (140)

16. TYPE OF DOCUMENT (160)

68



PN-AAK-482

FIRST ANNUAL REPORT

PPC EVALUATION STUDIES

October 1980

7 OCT 1980

INFORMATION MEMORANDUM FOR THE ADMINISTRATOR

THRU: ES

FROM: AA/PPC, Alexander Shakow

SUBJECT: Evaluation Studies: One Year's Work.

When the Office of Evaluation was established a few years ago, the rationale was that the Agency needed to increase its accountability to itself and the public. In this spirit, we believe it useful to account for our own activities and we propose to do so rather completely on an annual basis.

Our first annual report takes on more than usual importance since you charged us at the beginning of FY '80 to produce 20 to 30 impact evaluations during FY '80 as a test of an approach to learning what among AID's development initiatives has worked and what has not. Of course, your own close involvement with what has become known as "Bennet" impact evaluations has already given you many opportunities to judge the effectiveness of these studies. But, we wanted to summarize this and related studies, and provide you information on the scope, cost, accomplishments and problems involved. As well, we think it useful to take this opportunity to present ideas of what might take place next year.

We also intend this paper as a report to the Evaluation Task Force which you appointed. When they complete their report and you act on it, we plan to supplement this paper by presenting for formal executive consideration our proposed FY '81 evaluation work plan, hopefully as part of a total FY '81 Agency evaluation work plan.

Attached are a summary of FY '80 impact evaluation work; a status report of other PPC evaluation studies, and an outline of five topics for evaluation study we not only propose, but are taking initial action on. It is worth noting that over the next few weeks we shall be canvassing most of the AAs about their ideas for central evaluation topics. We will test out the five ideas outlined herein, add other ideas suggested by them and prepare for a meeting of the executives (probably in late October or early November) at which we will prepare a list of possible central evaluation topics. The list will purposely be longer than what we are able to take on, i.e., we'll ask for a selection from among the options.

We should add that it has been exciting to work on these subjects. The test before us all is to see if valid lessons can be identified and incorporated in Agency work.

Attachments:

- A. Summary of FY '80 Impact Work
- B. Status Report of Other Evaluation Studies
- C. FY '81 Program of Evaluation Studies: Initial Proposals

Distribution: Executive Staff

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'RJB', is written over the word 'Staff' in the distribution line.

AAA/PPC/E:RJ Berg:cl:10/3/80:22000

ATTACHMENT A

SUMMARY OF FY 80 IMPACT WORK

I. Introduction

The overall scope for the FY 80 impact evaluation program was established in a memorandum dated October 24, 1979, from the Administrator to the Executive Staff. It stated:

"I attached high priority to establishing an ex-post facto project evaluation process that will:

- furnish information we need for designing future projects;
- enhance policy and program planning;
- encourage project managers to get lasting results; and
- contribute to training and broadening AID staff.

"Rather than relying on massive, expensive, in-depth academic studies performed by outside specialists, I want to build an in-house capacity to evaluate our work on a regular basis and to produce simple reports which will be of use primarily to us, but also to our host countries, the larger development community, and the Congress.

"As a first step in establishing a continuing system for project impact evaluation, 20-30 projects will be evaluated for impact over the next 12 months, with as many as feasible being completed in the early part of this period. These evaluations will be concentrated in a few representative sectors, using comparable scopes to ensure cumulative results, and concluding with a summary evaluation for the sector."

(The complete text of the memo is Appendix 1.)

While earlier in 1979 ex-post studies had been conducted by the Studies Division (e.g., Sierra Leone Roads, Kenya and Thai Water, Indonesia Population) and while preparatory work had taken place in

five sectoral topics (rural roads, rural electrification, rural water supply, rural health, and small/medium scale irrigation), the level of activity called for by the Administrator called for a greatly increased pace of activity and a good deal of innovation.

II. Summary Results to Date

Impact evaluations have taken place in the five sectoral topics listed above. Five other topics have been added during the year. Because of great interest in three regional bureaus, agricultural research was added as a topic on which impact studies have been done. PPC and AFR have jointly sponsored work on livestock projects among pastoral peoples. A discussion paper was prepared and a conference was held. As yet, no field work has taken place.

Late in the fiscal year, the following topics were added which will involve field work in FY 81:

- evaluation of education projects (added at the request of the Administrator's Office); and
- evaluation of certain PVO projects and programs (added at the request of the Administrator's Office); and
- evaluation of DS/RAD programs (added at the request of AA/DS).

The general procedure for studies is as follows. A review is made of the general portfolio to learn the extent of the portfolio and to identify major reports and evaluations done on it to date. Where useful, discussion papers are commissioned to raise issues which ought to be evaluated. Then, in close consultation with regions and missions, a sampling of the portfolio

is made to select representative projects for evaluation.* Field work is then undertaken with each field report carefully reviewed in the field, by the bureau involved, by PPC/E and the Administrator. Project reports are published individually. A sectoral summary report is then prepared and reviewed prior to publication.

The status of the impact evaluation work can be statistically summarized by noting that the Administrator's original objective of 20-30 project impact studies will be met. As of September 30, field work has been almost entirely completed on 27 projects in 20 countries. With the exception of only two studies in the Near East region, a good regional distribution has been achieved with six studies in Africa, nine in Asia and ten in Latin America.

In terms of U. S. foreign assistance dollars spent, the individual projects range from \$300,000 to \$92 million. In many cases, teams were able to evaluate more than one loan or grant agreement. For example, Philippines Irrigation covered two AID loans for the same activity; Liberia Roads looked at two different road loans. Similarly, Tunisia Water, Honduras Roads, Kenya and Thailand Roads all examined more than one discrete project. The total U. S. dollar contribution to all projects evaluated is \$420,000,000.

*Criteria of selection included factors such as regional distribution, representativeness, and potential impact. Ideally, a sector study program contains at least two projects from each region, and represents a range of the type of projects implemented in that sector. In fact, only the roads sector comes close to this ideal. In other sectors, such as rural electrification and irrigation, projects tended to be concentrated in one or two bureaus. For example, in the rural electrification sector, all but one study will be done in Latin America. Also, because of the type of sectors selected for study, relatively few projects in the Near East Bureau have been studied.

The status of each sectoral topic is as follows:

<u>SECTOR</u>	<u>PREPARATION WORK</u>	<u>FIELD STUDIES COMPLETED</u>	<u>FIELD STUDIES REMAINING</u>
<u>Agricultural Research</u> (Twig Johnson, Sector Coordinator)	Document Analysis	Kenya ROCAP Guatemala	Thailand Nepal 3-4 Other Cases to be added.
<u>Education</u> (Marion Kohashi, Sector Coordinator)	List of proposed evaluations for 2nd quarter 1981 now being circulated among education offices throughout Agency. Review of evaluations/literature under way by DS/EHR.	Nepal in process.	Thailand - Nov. Kenya - Nov. Other studies to be done 2nd and 3rd quarter 1981 (including possible Ecuador and Guatemala field or desk studies).
<u>Rural Electrification</u> (Gary Wasserman, Sector Coordinator)	Pattern Analysis, 1978. Discussion Paper published April 1979. Nathan Report on AID Documentation, Sept. 1979.	Philippines Bolivia Ecuador	Costa Rica (under way)
<u>Rural Health</u> (Graham Kerr, Sector Coordinator)	"Framework for Health Evaluation" produced Oct. 1980. Health Sector Review, Final Draft, Oct. 1980.	Senegal	Tanzania Korea Additional cases to be selected by Intra-Agency Health Education Group and PPC/E/S during Oct. 1980.

<u>SECTOR</u>	<u>PREPARATION WORK</u>	<u>FIELD STUDIES COMPLETED</u>	<u>FIELD STUDIES REMAINING</u>
<u>Irrigation</u> (David Steinberg, Sector Coordinator)	Pattern Analysis, published 10/80. Literature Survey, published 10/80. Working Paper on Sahelian-Sudanic Zones, published 10/80.	Philippines Korea Indonesia	Pakistan Senegal Guatemala El Salvador (security permitting) <u>Irrigation and Area Development</u> Indonesia Haiti Jordan Valley (tentative) Afghanistan Helmand Valley (desk study)
<u>Pastoral Livestock</u> (Twig Johnson, Sector Coordinator)	Discussion Paper, published 7/79. Conference held and publication resulted 6/80. Review of AFR and NE evaluations completed 9/80.		Proposal expected.
<u>Nutrition</u> (Graham Kerr, Sector Coordinator)	Initial work under way.	Morocco Colombia	About 6 more cases to be added.
<u>Rural Roads</u> (G. William Anderson, Sector Coordinator)	Pattern Analysis, 1978. Discussion Paper, published 4/79. Review of Socio- Economic Impacts published 2/80.	Sierra Leone Colombia Liberia Jamaica Thailand Philippines Honduras Kenya	None
<u>Potable Water</u> (Daniel Dworkin, Sector Coordinator)	Pattern Analysis, 1978. Discussion Paper, published 1979. Special Study published 8/80.	Tanzania Kenya Tunisia Thailand Panama Korea (on- going)	Peru Haiti Yemen Ghana (tentative) Another African country to be added.

We have indeed been fortunate that a large number of talented people have been involved in these studies. In a sense, the Office of Evaluation is the tip of the iceberg on these studies. The team members sacrifice over six weeks each for the work (including preparation and edit/review). Information sources in AID/W provide extensive time. Field colleagues, host country officials, intended and unintended recipients (and 'impactees') all find themselves providing significant amounts of time toward advising team members about the project. But, one must return to the role of the team members, as their efforts are central to the effort. We list the team members involved in FY 80 work both to acknowledge with gratitude their time and hard work, as well as to give an indication of the sources which contributed talent to the studies.

TEAM MEMBERS

(TL = Team Leader)

AFRICA

Frank Moore, DR (TL)
Matthew Seymour

ASIA

Charles Johnson, DP (TL)
Gerald Hickey, TR
Susan Holloran, DP (TL)
Ray Van Raalte, PD (TL)
Jack Hamilton, AA (TL)
Michael DeMetre, PD
John Roberts, TR (TL)
Barbara Pillsbury, PD

NE

David Mandel, PD (TL)
Edward Butler, TECH (TL)
Melvyn Thorne, TECH
Carol Adelman, TECH
Robert Morrow, TECH
Peter Sellar, DP (TL)
Virgil Miedema, DP

LAC

Robert Maushammer, DR
Richard Weber, SA (TL)
John Massey, DR
Tim Mahoney, DP
Irwin Levy, DR (TL)
Clarence Zuvekas, DP
Norman Chapin, DR
Geroge Hoover, DR

DS

Keith Byergo, AGR
Harlan Hobgood, RAD (TL)
Rollo Ehrich, AGR
Ken McDermott, AGR (TL)
Anthony Meyer, EHR
Gilbert Corey, AGR
Palmer Stearns, ENG
Richard Sutter, AGR
Eric Chetwynd, UD (TL)
Robert Meehan, PO (TL)
David Sprague, ED

GC

Judd Kessler, LAC (TL)
Lisa Chiles

PDC

Judy Gilmore, PVC (TL)
Jim Philpott, PMS (TL)
Robert McClusky, PVC
Ross Bigelow, PVS (TL)

PM

Mark Lindenberg, TD/DSP
Richard Cobb, TD/DSP (TL)
Caroline Bledsoe, TD/DSP
Robert Hunt, TD/DSP

PPC

Emmy Simmons, PDPR
Patricia Fleuret, PDPR
Gary Wasserman, E
David Bathrick, PDPR
Peter Allgeier, EA
Karen Poe, PB
Graham Kerr, E
Herbert Smith, E
Elizabeth Hunt, E
David Steinberg, E (TL)
Doug Caton, PDPR
G. William Anderson, E
Steven Singer, E
Robert Berg, E (TL)
Cindy Clapp-Wincek, E
Daniel Dworkin, E (TL)
Anamaria Viveros-Long, E
Paula Goddard, WID (TL)

A.I.D. Field Missions

Janet Ballentyne, Lima
Joseph Stepanek, Jakarta
Ben Severn, Panama

U. S. Universities

Judith Tendler, (PPC/E Consultant)
Michael Horowitz (PPC/E Consultant)
Leedon Lefferts, Drew University
Charles Alton, Texas A&M Experiment
Station
Lee Fletcher, Iowa State
David Brokensha, University of
California at Santa Barbara

U. S. Consultants

Mark Oberle, Center for Disease
Control
Josi Colon, Stanford University
Charles Vandervoort, U. S. Dept.
of Transportation
Charles Stevens, Consulting Engineer
Polly Harrison, Consulting Social
Scientist

Non-U.S. Consultants

Carleen Gardner, Consulting
Sociologist (Jamaica)
Gustavo Gomez, Consultant in
Rural Finance (Nicaragua-U.S.
Resident)

Although the impact evaluation program began as something of a "crash" effort, we believe the fundamental premises of the program are sound. These are:

- emphasis on field observation of project results;
- participation of AID professionals in interdisciplinary teams;
- brief, clearly written reports;
- objectivity and independence of evaluation teams; and
- responsibility through signed reports.

By adhering to these principles, we believe that the teams are producing a high quality, readable, and timely product. The value of the exercise has already been recognized in four recent Congressional Committee reports.* For example, the House Appropriations Committee report accompanying the 1981 Appropriations Bill states:

The Committee applauds and supports AID's expanded effort to investigate the results of its projects through "impact evaluations." Only through hard-hitting examination of the actual impacts of projects on poor people can AID (as well as other donors) discover how to help poor people more effectively. (pp. 34-35.)

We have also recorded a number of instances where missions and regional bureaus have responded to the issues raised and lessons learned in these reports. (See Appendix 3.)

But the real challenge for A.I.D. as evaluation evidence accumulates is to assure a higher level of use, that is, to be

*SFRC; HFAC; HAC and House Government Operations.

assured that Agency policy utilizes these findings and that bureau and mission program decisions use the new policies and the evaluation evidence more than in the past.

III. Management Aspects

Getting the teams organized has been a major management task for the Studies Division. The impact evaluations have involved 66 AID personnel and only 13 outside consultants.

Each team was supported by the Studies Division with documentation retrieval and search services; administrative and budgetary support; and, in some cases, secretarial support. Because the Division was asked to coordinate these studies, a sector coordinator/manager was appointed within the office for each topic area drawing upon staff substantive and methodological skills. Sector coordinators organize the overall study, including preparatory work, negotiation of team composition, guidance to teams and review of team reports.

Each team went through a three-day workshop where they met with the Administrator or his special assistant, and were briefed as to purpose, methodology, and logistics. A total of six workshops were held in addition to a number of special briefings for teams whose departure timing prevented them from attending the formal workshops. A guidance handbook has been prepared which covers all steps of the process. It has become the "bible" for each team as it conducts its field research and writes up its report.

Using Agency personnel for these evaluations did result in a special burden on the operating expense budget of the Agency.

The operating expense set-aside for impact evaluations originally was \$425,000, later reduced to \$262,700. This set-aside to date has been jointly managed by PPC/E and FM. Through what proved to be a fairly cumbersome process, designated travel funds for impact studies were advanced to each bureau which had people participating in the effort. When the Agency faced a severe operating expense problem in the second quarter of FY '80, the number of studies were reduced and AID participants were limited to two persons per team. This constraint was relaxed later when Congress passed a supplemental appropriation, but by that time it was too late to organize more teams for FY '80. Program expenses have been less of a problem, being funded from PPC/E's program budget.

The average Operating Expense cost per team has been \$10,200, and average Program cost \$6,800, for a total average cost of \$17,000. Program money has been used to hire LDC professional assistance to augment and assist teams and, in some cases, to hire expertise from American universities and firms when such expertise was not available in AID. The program expense to date has been \$184,900 and, as noted, Operating Expenses of \$276,400 have been spent. Thus, a total of \$461,300* of incremental costs has been spent to evaluate \$420 million of U. S. assistance to LDC development efforts. This is about one-tenth of one percent of the value of the U. S. contribution. If the multiple benefits derived from the program are taken into account, this has been a very inexpensive effort.

*This figure includes the "Bennet" set-aside and additional operating expense support contributed by PPC. It does not include fairly significant direct-hire salary costs.

IV. Publication and Distribution

Upon return from the field, the team has to circulate its draft report. It briefs the regional bureau, PPC and finally the Administrator. The final edit takes into account all comments and is approved for stylistic conformity by PPC/E. It is then sent to the printer to be published in the Agency's Impact Evaluation Series, one of several series coordinated by the Office of Evaluation. The average length of time from completion of field work to sending an approved report to the printer was about four months when we first began the series. We have succeeded in reducing this period by about two months by requiring teams to have a good first draft finished and reviewed by the mission before leaving the field. The most recent teams to return did just that. For example, the Korea irrigation team returned from the field July 25. A report was ready for the Administrator's review on August 25.

We have also improved our guidance to the teams by providing them with a style manual prepared by the PES Division of the Office of Evaluation. It should be noted that while the Studies Division is substantially responsible for the production of the reports, a major role has been played by the entire staff of the Office of Evaluation in getting the reports ready for final publication.

The following table shows our production progress as of this writing.

IMPACT STUDIES - October 1, 1980

Published	8
With Printer	2
In Prep. for Printing	5
With Administrator for Review	1
Drafting	8
Field	3
	<u>27</u>

In addition to the Impact reports, we also produce a two-page summary called "Lessons Learned" which is based on the executive summary of each report.

The Office of Evaluation has developed a distribution list for three major categories of readers: AID field missions and Washington offices, other donors and PVOs involved in development, and a growing list of public and private institutions and individuals such as university centers and academics who have asked to be placed on the mailing list. The latter includes research institutions in other countries such as the Institute for Development Studies at Sussex, England. Fifteen hundred copies are initially printed. We are in the second printing of the first two impact reports, and in the third printing of the first six discussion papers. Finally, a mailing list of LDC evaluation offices is being compiled by PPC/E at the request of the DAC Secretariat and the World Bank.

The two-page "Lessons Learned" is more widely distributed. Copies of all reports and "Lessons Learned" are sent to 60 key people on the Hill in accordance with a list compiled by AA/LEG.

At the same time, a number of other important publications have been issued (a total of eight discussion papers, four program evaluation reports and a guide to data collection). French and

Spanish editions of some reports are also being produced. A complete listing of Agency evaluation publications coordinated by PPC/E is found in Appendix 2.

With all this effort, it is clear that working level knowledge of evaluation reports is inadequate. A survey of mid-level AID/W staff we commissioned found, to our considerable surprise, that 43% of those interviewed were not familiar with the Agency's impact evaluation efforts and reports. We must assume that field knowledge is even weaker.

Since the job of maintaining mailing lists and distributing the reports is very labor-intensive (e.g., the total printing of Agency-wide evaluation reports runs to over 30,000 copies in the last 16 months and that much more is planned over the next four months), we are looking into the possibility of using a contractor such as ARDA for distribution of these reports outside AID. (PPC/E is also exploring options for commercial publication.)

V. Issues

Although we feel that the program is successful, it has not been without problems. These have been of two types: procedural and substantive problems.

Substantive problems have to do with the quality of the reports, the conclusions about AID's performance and lessons to be learned. They include criticisms of methodology. The most serious difficulty with the approach is in making sure that a large number of independent studies add up to something more than

just their number. A certain minimum level of comparability must be attained. This has been difficult because each team is formed of people who have different backgrounds, and perspectives. It also presumes that because a project deals with rural roads in Honduras, and another with the same activity in Jamaica that they are comparable. On many impact issues country situations may vary so greatly as to overwhelm the similarities.

Efforts to secure comparability have been handled in several ways. First, the PPC/E Sector Coordinator is the "guiding expert" for the sector. Second, in many cases an intra-agency working group helps to define the core issues for the sector and advises the teams; third, during the preparatory workshops the new teams are briefed by the sector coordinators and by previous team leaders and members on the questions which at minimum must be asked. But words of advice and instruction received in Washington workshops may pass from memory when a team is faced with actual field research. Questions easy to answer in one context are difficult in another. Something may emerge which no one anticipated that captures the imagination and attention of the team. We will continue to stress the need for comparability, but we recognize that we cannot achieve this to the degree we would like, without giving up the broad participatory nature of the process.

Another problem associated with the quality of the information is rooted in a long-standing debate about scientific method in social science. These studies have been criticized

because they do not conform to the canons of scientific evaluation research. This is true. But is it relevant? It will be if we claim that the information produced by these reports has equal or greater scientific or statistical validity than information gained by normal scientific research. On the other hand, we have made every effort to be rigorous, systematic and unbiased in the preparation of the reports. Judgments and impressions of one observer are balanced by others on the teams. Ultimately, the approach we have taken is more than a compromise between the need for speed, brevity, and low cost and the concern for quantitative information, carefully controlled experimental designs, and many successive observations over a long period of time. The validity of the approach is based on the assumption that a large number of experienced people engaged in intensive first-hand observation of the results of projects can produce the type of information which can be used, will be read and absorbed, and is substantively better than the information which usually determines most policy and programmatic decisions. It can, therefore, give us directions. In fact, recent theoretical work in evaluation methodology has begun to recognize the validity of the type of approach AID is now using in its impact evaluation work. Some leading theorists now say that consistent findings among a set of quasi-experimental tests (i.e., examinations of experimental cases in the absence of control groups, even when such cases do not have rigorous baseline information) may well be valid since the cumulative probabilities of alternative explanations may be much weaker than the findings shown by such studies. Finally, it should be noted that a number

of studies (e.g., Morocco Nutrition Education) came up with "scientific" evidence which was quite remarkable and should meet even strict tests of evaluation research.

Of course, as noted above, the major substantive concern must be whether AID will take the accumulated evidence from these evaluations and translate them effectively into policy and program actions. This is not yet an "issue" since the project case evidence is still being accumulated and the Agency has not yet been faced with broad policy recommendations drawn from this evidence. But, the time will soon come when sectoral evidence is presented along with policy recommendations. The Agency must recognize that it will then be faced with the task of discerning whether that evidence is persuasive, deciding whether to accept recommended policy implications derived from accepted evidence; and then, the key task, translating these policies into actions. There will be considerable internal and external interest in assuring that the process just described takes place smoothly and effectively.

Procedural problems are conceptually easier to deal with, but difficult to correct. The main problems are:

- getting team leaders and teams together;
- striking the right balance between team autonomy and conformity to both substantive and stylistic guidance;
- timely completion of the reports after field work;
- overall lack of experience on our part in running an editorial and publication service.

The problem of the selection of team leaders and members has been far more time-consuming and arduous than anticipated. Many want to participate, but competing demands on people often interfere forcing selection of new teams and team leaders. Initially, each bureau was asked to nominate four senior officers for the job of team leader. This was done, but for many reasons we have not used everyone on the original list, and have had to recruit others. Unfortunately, this has meant that the Africa Bureau has contributed only one team leader, while Asia has contributed five, and both DS and PPC have contributed four. The quality of team leaders has been high, although the range of development experience has varied from very extensive to quite limited. At least two of the team leaders have already become, or are about to become Deputy Mission Directors. However, there are a number of people at the Office Director and Division Chief levels who have not participated. Renewed efforts must be made to recruit the kind of people who, in the Administrator's words, are the future leaders of the Agency.

More difficult to solve is the problem of mission involvement. In the missions there are very competent people who could contribute and benefit from participation in the studies. We would like field staff to experience examination of projects with which they have not been associated. To include them, however, would mean the release of a substantial amount of their time to prepare for the evaluation, do the field study and write the report. The advantage of a Washington-based team is its ability to communicate with each other during the preparation and revision stages. It

would be much more difficult with mission personnel if they were to be co-authors. And, it would be far more expensive in travel costs as it would entail trips to Washington and to third countries.

The problem of striking a balance between team autonomy and conformity to guidelines is complicated. At the outset, it should be noted and underscored that teams have taken their task with great seriousness. Producing a signed report, read by the Administrator and distributed to the Congress, is serious business. Naturally, each team and team leader sees their report as a special, unique product. And, each one is. At the same time, the Studies Division and the Office of Evaluation would like to be in a position to do sectoral and cross-cutting analysis of results. This tension has often been creative and is basically a useful process.

Completing the reports has been difficult for most teams. All have tried to leave the mission with a first draft, but few have succeeded in producing something that they feel comfortable with, so rewriting begins. As people get back to their jobs, the time available for the write-ups gets difficult to find. Sometimes controversy over conclusions holds up a team, sometimes simply processing the data is the problem. Considering the fact that these teams are doing this outside their regular line of responsibility, delays are not surprising. The situation has improved with experience, but it remains a problem.

Another part of the problem has been getting the report in print after the Administrator's review. In one case, a report

was approved, but a technical appendix which the team leader felt was necessary was delayed for several weeks. The report went to press two months after the Administrator's approval. Much of the delay derives from our own inexperience in publishing. Few of us are experienced editors, and errors in a manuscript sometimes are overlooked, only to be recalled later causing still another retyping of the draft. Adding a word processor to the office has helped immensely, and an improved quality control system has helped us to catch mistakes early.

Underlying some of these problems is the fact that teams feel that they must write for three audiences when preparing these reports. The first audience is the Administrator, who wants a report that an informed layperson can read and understand in 30 minutes to an hour. A 15-page limit and a certain kind of style has been recommended and, in many cases, achieved. But, to the professionals who sign their names to these reports, there is also the audience of their Agency peers. Nearly every team member understands how easy it is to make a development project look bad. A question such as, "How far do we go in criticizing this project when we know our criticism will make life difficult for the mission?" is one of the more difficult decisions faced by the authors. Finally, there is another kind of peer audience, the "professional" audience of fellow nutritionists, or engineers, or social anthropologists. Some team members may well feel that they are the most important audience, and the "technical" appendices are, therefore, as important as the 15-page main document. The

consequence of these overlapping audiences for the writers is to slow down the process.

The very fact that a number of reports have been published makes it easier for teams to see what is expected of them in terms of style, but we still hope to maintain flexibility and substantial creativity in terms of content by fostering freedom in the drafting process.

As noted above, PPC/E faced a variety of problems as a new "editing and publishing" house. We expect these problems to increase as we both produce reports and edit/manage a number of growing Agency publications series concerned with evaluation.

AID's evaluation publications have met with great interest and support from intended audiences: AID staff, the Hill, academics, PVOs and the interested public. But, the volume of work threatens to overwhelm sector coordinators, research assistants and managers with questions of editing, production and distribution.

We desire both an expansion of the number of reports in AID's evaluation series (largely by channeling worthy reports produced throughout the Agency into these AID series) and to expand their distribution in LDCs and within the U. S. To do all this while maintaining our own workflow and at the same time to live within a budget is difficult. We shall explore two options over the coming months:

- commercial support in editing and preparation of manuscripts so that our focus can be substantive and less time will be needed on production questions;

- commercial publication of major Agency program evaluations so that a wider audience can be reached at no additional cost to AID.

- APPENDICES:
1. Administrator's Memorandum to Executive Staff of October 24, 1979
 2. Status of Evaluation Publications
 3. Utilization of Results: Some Examples

PPC/E:RBlue/RJBerg

ATTACHMENT A

Appendix 1

Text of Administrator's Memorandum to Executive Staff
October 24, 1979

I attach high priority to establishing an ex-post fact project evaluation process that will:

- furnish information we need for designing future projects;
- enhance policy and program planning;
- encourage project managers to get lasting results; and
- contribute to training and broadening AID staff.

Rather than relying on massive, expensive, in-depth academic studies performed by outside specialists, I want to build an in-house capacity to evaluate our work on a regular basis and to produce simple reports which will be of use primarily to us, but also to our host countries, the larger development community, and the Congress. As the first step in establishing a continuing system for project impact evaluation, 20-30 projects will be evaluated for impact over the next 12 months, with as many as feasible being completed in the early part of that period. These evaluations will be concentrated in a few representative sectors, using comparable scopes to ensure cumulative results, and concluding with a summary evaluation for the sector.

The success of this effort will depend on the people involved. Evaluation team leaders will be selected from among the Agency's top talent. Teams will consist of approximately 3 members each representative of different disciplines and regional backgrounds. While comprised mostly of AID Direct-Hire staff, drawn on an Agency-wide basis, the teams should, where desirable, include host country and outside contract professionals. Team leaders will be assigned to projects that are generally outside their own regional bureaus to ensure both the fact and appearance of objectivity. Membership on an evaluation team should provide a stimulating opportunity for learning and for career development.

The projects to be evaluated will be those that have terminated during the previous 12-18 months or where substantial portions of the activity have been completed. Evaluations will generally require 2-3 weeks or less in the host country, with perhaps an additional week for preparation and completion of the report. All evaluations must be written in clear, concise, simple language to enhance the chances that they will be used. Maximum length should be about 15 pages, with such annexes as necessary for purpose of illustration. Photos are welcome. Anecdotal beneficiary reactions should be included where appropriate to give a sense of local community feelings with respect to impact.

Evaluations must report on impact, as opposed to simply reporting effectiveness or success in delivering inputs. While baseline data will not be available for most projects, we assume that the best people in AID, even in the absence of sophisticated statistics, can report sound and useful impressions. We must be prepared to realize that this exercise will not yield scientifically precise (or even consistent) results, but I believe it will offer us much that is useful. The bureaus have been asked to identify potential team leaders. PPC, in consultation with the bureaus, will identify projects to be evaluated. PPC will review scopes of work, prepare guidance on core issues, nominate team leaders and assemble teams with an Agency-wide perspective, and review the final reports (which I will then read). PPC will also provide appropriate, concise evaluation orientation and collect all necessary background materials for each evaluation. The other concerned bureaus will each identify a special coordinator and assist in selecting projects, preparing background materials, and insuring mission and field support.

I recognize that over and beyond this process, individual regions and missions will continue to conduct a variety of evaluations of different types for their own internal management purposes. To ensure that we have one central information point for AID evaluations, all Agency evaluation plans and completed reports should be shared with PPC, even in cases where coordination is being provided elsewhere.

In concluding, I want to emphasize my commitment to an ongoing, objective, intellectually stimulating evaluation process that can help those of us who participate in it and those of us who must make decisions based on its results. This need not be just another bureaucratic exercise; it can help us get to the heart of what AID can do for the countries and peoples with whom we work. I look forward to your wholehearted cooperation and to being personally involved as we proceed.

Douglas J. Bennet, Jr.

AGENCY-WIDE EVALUATION PUBLICATIONS
(as of October 1, 1980)

PROGRAM EVALUATION DISCUSSION PAPERS

- No. 1: Reaching the Rural Poor: Indigenous Health Practitioners are There Already (March 1979), 2nd printing 1979, 3rd printing 1980. (French and Spanish versions are in process.)
- No. 2: New Directions Rural Roads (March 1979), 2nd printing 1979, 3rd printing 1980. (French and Spanish versions in process.)
- No. 3: Rural Electrification: Linkages and Justifications (April 1979), 2nd printing 1979, 3rd printing 1980. (French and Spanish versions in process.)
- No. 4: Policy Directions for Rural Water Supply in Developing Countries (April 1979), 2nd printing 1979, 3rd printing 1980. (French and Spanish versions in process.)
- No. 5: Study of Family Planning Program Effectiveness (April 1979), 2nd printing 1979, 3rd printing 1980.
- No. 6: The Sociology of Pastoralism and African Livestock Development (May 1979), 2nd printing 1979, 3rd printing 1980. (French version in process.)
- No. 7: Socio-Economic and Environmental Impacts of Low-Volume Rural Roads--A Review of the Literature (February 1980). (Expurgated and unexpurgated versions published due to restrictions of IBRD and IDB.)
- No. 8: Assessing the Impact of Development Projects on Women (May 1980). (French and Spanish versions in process.)
- No. 9: The Impact of Irrigation on Development: Issues for a Comprehensive Evaluation Study (publication planned October 1980).

EVALUATION REPORTS

Program Evaluations

- No. 1: Family Planning Program Effectiveness: Report of a Workshop (December 1979).
- No. 2: A.I.D.'s Role in Indonesian Family Planning: A Case Study with General Lessons for Foreign Assistance (December 1979). (French and Spanish versions in process.)
- No. 3: Third Evaluation of the Thailand National Family Planning Program (February 1980).
- No. 4: The Workshop on Pastoralism and African Livestock Development (June 1980). (French version in process.)

Project Impact Evaluations

- No. 1: Colombia: Small Farmer Market Access (December 1979), 2nd printing 1980.
- No. 2: Kitale Maize: The Limits of Success (May 1980), 2nd printing 1980.
- No. 3: The Potable Water Project in Rural Thailand (May 1980).
- No. 4: Philippine Small Scale Irrigation (May 1980).
- No. 5: Kenya Rural Water Supply: Program, Progress, Prospects (June 1980).
- No. 6: Impact of Rural Roads in Liberia (June 1980).
- No. 7: Effectiveness and Impact of the CARE/Sierra Leone Rural Penetration Roads Projects (June 1980).
- No. 8: Morocco: Food Aid and Nutrition Education (August 1980).
- No. 9: Senegal: The Sine Saloum Rural Health Care Project (publication planned October 1980).
- No. 10: Tunisia: Care Water Projects (publication planned October 1980)

SPECIAL STUDIES

- No. 1: The Socio-Economic Context of Fuelwood Use in Small Rural Communities (August 1980). (French and Spanish versions in process.)
- No. 2: Water Supply and Diarrhea: Guatemala Revisited (August 1980).

PROGRAM DESIGN AND EVALUATION METHODS

Managers Guide to Data Collection (November 1979), 2nd printing of 2500 copies done at request AID Training staff, 1980. (French and Spanish versions in process.)

UTILIZATION OF RESULTS: SOME EXAMPLES

Philippines Rural Electrification. On July 11, 1980, AA/ASIA wrote to the Mission Director of USAID/Indonesia informing him that the proposed second phase (RE II) in Indonesia was being eliminated from the FY 81 budget and put in the FY 82 budget. He cited as part of his reason the serious questions raised by the Philippines evaluation "...about the impact of the project on the lives of the poor in the Philippines and on the economic productivity effects." Thus, he called for a comprehensive evaluation of RE I in Indonesia before going ahead with RE II.

On August 19, 1980, Alexander Shakow wrote to Mr. Sullivan noting that while the Amendment to the Bangladesh RE I project was approved, based on the issues raised by the Philippines evaluation, a number of unresolved issues "...need to be explored in more depth and satisfactorily addressed before any additional rural electrification activities are developed."

Bolivia Rural Electrification. In a September 18, 1980, letter Acting Mission Director Malcolm Butler points out the "implications for future programs in Bolivia" contained in the evaluation. The Mission will now give high priority to avoiding problems noted in the evaluation such as serving low population density areas and not exploiting the investment through other government programs. He concludes, "Directly, it helped us get a grip on our past and future energy programs, but more importantly it helped us understand what an evaluation should be about and how valuable a management and planning tool a good evaluation can be."

Senegal Rural Health. Very rapid redesign of the project undertaken jointly by Mission and Government of Senegal has taken place. Several delinquent appointments were made rapidly by GOS. (The report has been used extensively in PPC's review of a PID for a similar project in Zaire. PPC recommended disapproval of the \$4.0 million plus project.) A request for an additional \$500,000 which was circulating in the Mission while the team was in Dakar was never forwarded to Washington.

Morocco Nutrition/Education. USAID/Morocco has done entire nutrition strategy for Morocco - to be reviewed early October. NE/TECH has told Mission to go ahead with larger nutrition project. USAID/Tunisia has asked for extra copies of report to help their nutrition planning. USAID/Jordan has asked for similar analyses of their nutrition projects to be done.

Philippines Rural Roads Impact Evaluation. Findings of the impact evaluation were used by the Asia Bureau and the Mission to revise a \$10 million Amendment to Rural Roads II. The Mission submitted a revised PP for the Amendment which incorporated a number of the evaluation team's recommendations regarding lower design standards, inclusion of an experimental labor-based construction component, change in the Fixed Amount Reimbursement system to enable poorer provinces to participate, and attention to integration of road construction with other development activities.

The Mission did not initially respond significantly to the team's recommendation that site selection procedures be strengthened to insure that more of the project's benefits reached the rural poor. However, at the Asia Bureau project review meetings (7/3 and 7/10/80) the issue of the need to improve road selection was raised, and the guidance cable to the Mission stated the need to allocate some funds for local-level (barangay) roads and to use the A&E firm to oversee government site selection.

Sierra Leone Rural Roads Impact Evaluation. At a pre-PID Africa Bureau meeting (9/9/80) to discuss preliminary proposals for feeder road maintenance in Sierra Leone, the issue of feeder road maintenance was one of the principal issues raised in the impact evaluation and recommendations were made regarding institutionalizing such maintenance.

Colombia Rural Roads. After our impact evaluation was written, the IDB became interested in supporting Pico y Pala activity rather than traditional rural road construction. An IDB appraisal team is back from the field and is preparing an appraisal report. Colombia has requested a \$25 million program for 600 km. of construction. What appears likely, if the Colombian Congress raises the national foreign indebtedness ceiling, is an \$18 million loan (with \$7-8 million in counterpart funds) for 450 km. of road construction. The IDB recently reported to us that AID's experience in this area and our impact evaluation were very helpful to their efforts.

Potable Water Project in Rural Thailand. The Thailand Mission asked the evaluation team leader to return to Thailand to take part in a study to help develop a rural water sanitation strategy for Thailand. This study has been completed and will provide the justification for a new environmental and nutrition project.

The Thai Government is considering revising its water policy based on the evaluation report and will probably announce a new policy for servicing rural piped water systems that builds upon the conclusions of this report.

Tunisia CARE Water Projects. Both USAID/Tunisia and the NE Bureau incorporated lessons learned from the evaluation report into design and review process of a new rural water project (CTRD Rural Potable Water, 664-0312.7) authorized in July 1980.

The NE Bureau has sent the evaluation report to all its missions advising them to consider the lessons learned from the Tunisia project.

STATUS REPORT OF OTHER EVALUATION STUDIES

Special Studies

1. Water Supply and Diarrhea: Guatemala Revisited
 - a. Subject: re-analysis of data from an AID-funded research project on health impacts of clean water.
 - b. Manager: Dan Dworkin
 - c. Author: Dan Dworkin with Judith Dworkin. Technical assistance provided by BUCEN.
 - d. Estimated Completion: published August 1980
2. Study of India Potable Water Data (title to be determined)
 - a. Subject: re-analysis of data on impact of potable water programs in India. Data originally collected by GOI Program Evaluation Office.
 - b. Manager: Dan Dworkin
 - c. Author: Dan Dworkin with Bill Menth, BUCEN
 - d. Estimated Completion: still in preliminary stages. Completion will depend on access to raw data from India.
3. A.I.D. - Bolivia Oral History Project
 - a. Subject: a history of A.I.D.'s program in India from the post War II period. Based on a review of documents and extensive interviews with AID officers involved, more interviews are planned with Bolivians if circumstances permit.
 - b. Manager: Twig Johnson
 - c. Author: Richard Sinkin, University of Texas
 - d. Estimated Completion: a preliminary report is expected October 1980. Field interviews of Bolivians will depend on circumstances.

4. Upper Volta: Rural Enterprise Development
 - a. Subject: a preliminary assessment of AID/PVO supported small rural enterprise development.
 - b. Manager: Bill Anderson
 - c. Author: Bill Anderson
 - d. Estimated Completion: paper in draft. Will be reviewed for possible publication November 1980.

Program Evaluation Discussion Papers

1. Impact of Irrigation on Development: Issues for a Comprehensive Evaluation Study
 - a. Subject: a review of evaluations and other literature on irrigation, with special emphasis on water management and environmental issues.
 - b. Manager: David Steinberg
 - c. Author: Len Berry, et. al., Clark University
 - d. Estimated Completion: ready for printer, October 1980
2. Socio-Economic and Environmental Impacts of Low-Volume Rural Roads--A Review of the Literature
 - a. Subject: a review of AID and World Bank reports and other literature.
 - b. Manager: Bill Anderson
 - c. Author: Devres, Inc.
 - d. Estimated Completion: two versions, one for external and one for internal use. Published February and October 1980.

Working Papers

1. Pattern Analysis of Small and Medium Scale Irrigation Projects
 - a. Subject: a review of AID experience with irrigation projects with emphasis on common patterns of project performance.
 - b. Manager: Cindy Clapp-Wincek
 - c. Author: Checchi, Inc.

- d. Estimated Completion: full report ready for printer. We are awaiting a revised summary version from the Asia Bureau to determine which would be most suitable for publication. We expect to complete October 1980.
2. Drought Impact in the Sahelian-Sudanic Zone of West Africa: A Comparative Analysis of 1910-15 and 1968-74
 - a. Subject: a comparative analysis based on review of original English and French sources.
 - b. Manager: Cindy Clapp-Wincek
 - c. Author: Professor Kates, Clark University
 - d. Estimated Completion: ready for printer, October 1980
3. Congressional Mandate on Evaluation
 - a. Subject: a review of Foreign Assistance Acts and Committee Reports for legislative guidance on evaluation of AID programs.
 - b. Manager: Twig Johnson
 - c. Author: Warren Weinstein
 - d. Estimated Completion: completed and circulated within AID, July 1980.

Other Studies Not Classified

1. Analysis of Impact Study Participants
 - a. Subject: a comparison of attitudes and behaviors (self reported) of participants in impact study program with a control group. Purpose is to test effect of participation in evaluation program.
 - b. Manager: Graham Kerr (with Dick Blue)
 - c. Author: Hugh Snyder
 - d. Estimated Completion: November 1980 (partial draft received September, final draft expected October 1980).

2. India History Project

- a. Subject: an overview of AID relationship with India from 1951 to present. Purpose was to review and assemble data and begin initial characterization of program.
- b. Manager: Dick Blue
- c. Author: Lou Rudel
- d. Estimated Completion: draft completed with limited circulation for comment. No further plans at this time.

3. Comparative Study of Health Projects

- a. Subject: a comparative analysis and review of evaluative material on three major AID-supported health projects in Ghana, Thailand and India.
- b. Manager: Graham Kerr
- c. Author: original contractor became ill and could not complete the report. The contract has been de-obligated.
- d. Estimated Completion: we are seeking another contractor in hopes of completion March 1981.

4. AAAS Study on Kenya and Tanzania Social Ecological Zones

- a. Subject: organization and mapping of social and ethnographic material on sub-regions of Kenya and Tanzania.
- b. Manager: Dick Blue (initiated by Allen Hoben)
- c. Author: Priscilla Reining, et. al., AAAS
- d. Estimated Completion: November-December 1980.

ATTACHMENT C

FY '81 PROGRAM OF EVALUATION STUDIES: INITIAL PROPOSALS

The main tasks for central evaluation studies in FY '81 will be to complete sectoral work commenced in FY '80 and to add new subjects of inquiry which accurately reflect Agency needs for major evaluation work. In this section we review plans for completing the FY '80 topics and present some options for FY '81. These options are going to be discussed with AAs over the coming weeks with the aim of presenting a fuller list to a meeting of the Executive Staff relatively early in the fiscal year. Not all options will be able to be carried out, hence the need to choose among many interesting proposals.

I. Completing the Work Commenced in FY '80

Although the individual impact evaluation reports have been the major product to date, they remain a series of case studies. Rich in insight, containing useful qualitative and in many cases quantitative data, the studies will be even more valuable as the empirical basis for a program summary program evaluation report. During FY '81, the Studies Division plans to finish work in each sector, after which a comparative analysis of the reports will be made, combined with a review of the major issues raised in discussion papers and pattern analyses prepared by the Office of Evaluation for that sector. These summary evaluations will be published under the Agency's Program Evaluation Series. In addition, work has begun on a series of "cross-cutting" issues

papers. These will look at all projects, regardless of sector, to determine what A.I.D.'s experience has been with respect to such core issues as involving the participation of the poor, providing improved access and benefits to women, reducing negative impacts on the environment, managing recurrent cost problems, and others.

The planned schedule of completion of the Sector Summaries is as follows:

- A. Rural Roads (Sector Coordinator - Bill Anderson)
 - 1. Project Impact Evaluations completed October 1 (8 studies)
 - 2. Summary Analysis completed by November 1
 - 3. Conference to be held November 15
 - 4. Final report target date - December 1980
- B. Rural Electrification (Sector Coordinator - Gary Wasserman)
 - 1. Project Impact Evaluations completed by October 10 (4 studies)
 - 2. Summary Analysis by December 2
 - 3. Conference (to be determined)
 - 4. Final report target date - December 1980
- C. Rural Water (Sector Coordinator - Daniel Dworkin)
 - 1. Project Impact Evaluations completed by March 1981 (9 studies)
 - 2. Summary Analysis by May 1981
 - 3. Conferences - June and July 1981
 - 4. Final report target date - September, 1981
- D. Agricultural Research (Sector Coordinator - Twig Johnson)
 - 1. Project Impact Evaluations completed by May 1, 1981 (9 studies)
 - 2. Summary Analysis by July 1981
 - 3. Conference - July-August 1981
 - 4. Final report target date - October 1981

E. Irrigation (Sector Coordinator - David Steinberg)

1. Project Impact Evaluations completed by January 1981 (9 studies)
2. Summary Analysis by September 1981
3. Conference (to be determined)
4. Final report target date - November 1981

F. Health (Sector Coordinator - Graham Kerr)

Concentration on Health Delivery Projects started after the Basic Needs strategy was articulated (FY '73). These projects have long maturation periods, making it difficult to observe impacts for some time. However, the Health Evaluation Working Group feels strongly that interim evaluations of Health programs which attempt to record intermediate measures of impact or potential impact are necessary. Otherwise, it will be impossible to demonstrate effectiveness or to make mid-term corrections. Therefore, we propose to maintain a relatively low-level effort in this sector, building on the Colombia and Senegal studies conducted during 1980. In addition, we propose to split off nutrition projects from health, and reorganize it as a major sector for impact evaluations in 1981. Although health is the goal, nutrition projects tend to raise different issues which make them difficult to compare with health programs.

1. Two studies completed in FY '80; four more in FY '81.
2. Summary Analysis (to be determined)

During 1981 we will complete several "cross-cutting" issue papers. Based on an analysis of all impact evaluations, the Studies Division will attempt to draw lessons on subjects which do not fit into a sector heading, such as the role of participation in project design and implementation, the impact of A.I.D. projects on rural women, and the issue of long-term sustainability of project benefits. These papers will be done by Studies Division staff where possible.

New and Continuing Initiatives in 1980

Long-range planning is desirable but sometimes policy issues emerge which cannot be predicted, but require immediate attention. Three such initiatives have developed over the last several months. One is a request from the Administrator's Office to evaluate the impact of our efforts in primary, vocational and adult education. A second is a request from AA/DS to evaluate the programs of the Office of Rural Development and Development Administration, Bureau for Development Support (DS/RAD); involved is management of a program evaluation of that office's innovative efforts to harness the expertise of American universities to the program and project planning needs of A.I.D. missions. The third is a request from the Administrator's Office to begin work on various aspects of A.I.D.'s support of PVO programs of development assistance.

In the education sector, we have already organized two impact teams to study projects in Nepal and Kenya, with a third team in preparation for work in Thailand. In addition, we are reviewing existing evaluation material on several projects in Latin America which have been extensively studied in order to synthesize "lessons learned" about project impacts. Although we plan to continue studies in the education sector throughout 1981, an interim report will be prepared for the Administrator in early CY '81.

The DS/RAD evaluation is now in the initial stages. The focus of this study will be on the effectiveness of the office's cooperative agreements as an instrument for delivering high quality

technical assistance to the field missions. The DS/RAD office has a program which attempts to both sensitize missions to come to grips with such difficult programming issues as participation and off-farm employment while at the same time harnessing qualified technical experts to the planning and design needs of the missions. The Studies Division will examine the coherence and quality of this effort from a program perspective. We have set a completion date of March 1981 for this evaluation report.

The Studies Division's work in the PVO area will be carried out in close collaboration with the PDC Bureau and will produce three major products. First, and most immediate, is an evaluation criteria assessment to provide guidance in reviewing the performance of the matching grant program and its recipients. Although this program is relatively new, it has evolved from earlier efforts to support PVOs through a centrally funded program. We expect to complete this in December 1980. The second effort will be an evaluative synthesis of the evaluation reports on the performance of OPG recipients. The purpose of this paper is to assess the quality of PVO self-evaluations, and to define issues of special interest to A.I.D. and PVOs which receive OPGs. The final effort will be an impact evaluation series which focuses on a sector which has a variety of PVO projects. We note several such sectors which would be suitable for a study which would combine both a sectoral emphasis, such as small-scale enterprises, with an appropriate range of PVO implementation efforts. We do not believe that a study of PVO performance in general is a very useful

way to proceed. By concentrating on one sector or problem area, however, we will be able to compare different PVOs with each other and with other means of implementing projects in the same sector.

The Studies Division began work in the Livestock and Pastoralism sector in 1979 with a series of papers culminating in a successful conference last fall. Based on that conference, and the published report ("The Workshop on Pastoralism and African Livestock Development," Program Evaluation Report No. 4, May 1980) in collaboration with the Africa Bureau we are developing a proposal for field studies in this important rural development sub-sector. As part of this preparation we have in process an assessment of existing evaluations and project papers. This assessment will be completed by November 1980. Depending on the magnitude of the proposed work plan being developed, we expect to complete the field work by the end of CY '81.

Other Projects

The Studies Division continues to support work which is complementary to the main purpose of the impact program. A number of discussion papers, working papers and special reports are being produced. One example is a re-analysis led by Daniel Dworkin (PPC/E/S) of the AID-funded Guatemala potable water study. We believe this work may be quite important in establishing the linkage between increased quantity of water to improving the basic health problem of diarrhea in LDCs. Two preliminary papers on AID and other donors' experience in irrigation will soon be published. Attachment B is a complete listing of these special efforts.

Completing the work begun in 1980 will be a major objective for the Studies Division during FY '81. In quantitative terms, the following table summarizes the expected output resulting from the completion of the FY '80 schedule.

Expected Products	
Studies Division--1980/81 Schedule	
Impact Reports*	32
Sector Summaries	7
Discussion Papers	6
Working Papers	2
Special Reports	3
Conferences	5
Cross-Cutting Issues Papers	3
Final Reports	6

We expect the program and policy consequences of this work will become most apparent during 1981.

II. Proposals for Additional Topics in 1981

The scope for new activities for the Studies Division in 1981 is constrained by the necessity to finish in good order the 1980 agenda, and by available personnel. In some measure, the demand for Studies Division efforts in different sectors has already begun to be voiced; for example, the education, PVOs, DS/RAD evaluations, noted above. It is time now to present options for an agenda for FY '81-82. We have prepared reasonably detailed information to support each proposal. Realism dictates that this overview simply summarize each proposal. Additional detail is available.

Resources which can be applied to new proposals are limited in FY '81. We can begin work on five or six sectors/problems during the coming year.

*Does not include reports for which field study was completed in 1980.

In addition, we would propose that for any new sector or problem the staff expertise of the office be used to carry out the initial studies, supplemented by "Bennet"-type teams on a reduced scale. If, for example, we were asked to carry an evaluation of housing programs, an interdisciplinary team from the Studies Division would do the preliminary analysis, carry out the first two field studies, then move to include broad participation of Agency officers. We think that this will help to ensure substantive comparability in the findings. It will also reduce some of the burden on the rest of the Agency.

Each sector/problem proposal will be briefly summarized. The origin of the proposals vary. Some have come from the interests and skills of Studies Division staff, others from our understanding of AID/IDCA priorities. Still others have been developed on the suggestion of other units of AID. The proposals are:

A. Housing Sector

Since 1970, Housing Guaranty projects have grown steadily in value from an authorized amount of \$300 million to \$1.2 billion in 1979. One hundred and eleven projects were authorized and under contract in 1979, of which 78 were in Latin America.

The housing sector should be included in the impact evaluations for five reasons: 1) housing guaranty projects are provided from non-appropriated funding and in periods of restricted budgets may represent an increasing share of the Agency budget; 2) IDCA is interested in housing as a priority area; 3) housing is one of the more difficult to implement under the New Directions

policies of the Agency; 4) housing projects are sometimes the urban equivalent of integrated rural development involving water, electricity, roads--sectors which the Studies Division is analyzing; and 5) the need for housing is increasing and the problems of inadequate housing are exacerbated by the high rates of urbanization in the Third World, particularly in the more advanced Third World countries.

B. Small-Scale Enterprise Projects

Between 1973 and 1982 the Agency expects to complete 37 small-scale enterprise projects for a total value of \$148 million. Most of these projects (21) are in Latin America. Many of them are being implemented by Private Voluntary Agencies (PVOs), including CARE, Technoserve, Partnership for Productivity and Accion/Aitec.

The small-scale enterprise sector should be included in spite of its relatively small size (in dollars and projects) for the following reasons: 1) AID has responded to Congressional interest by promising to carry out such evaluations; 2) the number of landless and near landless are growing, and may represent 30 to 40 percent of the non-farm work force in rural areas. Small-scale industries are one of the few things we may be able to do about this problem; 3) It is one of the areas where PVOs have been active and, unlike rural water supply which seems to be dominated by CARE, this sector has a range of PVOs trying out different approaches. This sector, if recommended, would permit us to deal with an important future problem, rural industry, and the PVO issue, as well.

C. Agricultural Credit Programs

Between 1972 and 1982 the Agency will have invested \$246 million in 22 different countries, of which eight are in Latin America, nine in Africa and five in Asia. The dollar amounts (\$181 million) are by far the largest in Asia. A U.S. PVO, the Global Projects Office of the Credit Union National Association (CUNA) has been responsible for at least 12 additional projects. (Note: the above data are based on a preliminary computer run by DS/DIU and seem to underestimate the amount and number of projects.)

We recommend agricultural credit programs for two main reasons: 1) the Agency has a long history of involvement with credit programs, many were reviewed during the 1973 Spring Review and the academic literature is rich with AID-financed studies. We know a lot, what difference has it made in our projects? 2) Evaluations done by the Studies Division and others point to credit as a major constraint for small farmers, and small rural entrepreneurs, in their ability to take advantage of infrastructure investments such as roads, irrigation and rural electrification. AID will likely continue to allocate the majority of its resources to agricultural and rural development and will likely continue to rely on credit schemes (see the recent \$45 million Tanzania proposal) to energize rural development. Impact evaluations of a representative set of agricultural credit schemes are needed to improve a basic and continuing category of AID's activities.

D. Area Development Studies

The Studies Division has found that the single sector approach (roads or rural electrification) too narrowly defines

the linkage between development intervention and development impact. Rarely is the "impact" or change which occurs in an area the consequence of one single factor. More often, it is the result of a number of influences. The Agency has recognized this multi-dimensional nature of the development process by funding "integrated" rural development schemes. In other cases, we and other donors have occasionally followed on one project with another in the same area. Examples of the former include the Luwu project in Indonesia, Bicol in the Philippines, and many smaller-scale development efforts implemented by PVOs such as HACHO in Haiti. In the latter category, which we might call complementary development activity areas, we have found several examples which might be worth studying. These include Lofa County, Liberia; the Sudan Upper Nile area which includes Rahad Dam and Irrigation; the Aguan Valley in Honduras where AID built some roads at an early stage and where considerable development investments subsequently have been made; and the Jordan Valley which combines major roads, irrigation and schools in several different projects. The dollar value of this category is not known, but it will be very substantial.

The reasons for investigation this "problem" are:

- 1) While most everyone recognizes that many things must go together to achieve development, there is considerable controversy about the effectiveness of the "integrated development project" approach, wherein the project designer tries to organize a set of simultaneous interventions which are systematically designed to cover the major

elements of a development strategy. By studying AID's experience with integrated projects, and comparing them with areas which have demonstrated considerable developmental success without "integrated programs," we may be able to shed light on strategy options for AID; 2) We have begun work on small-scale irrigation, but we find that larger works, and many smaller ones, are simply one part of a more comprehensive project. By expanding our view to those multi-purpose projects, we would greatly increase our universe of AID projects in a difficult programming area; 3) Conceptually, it is more interesting and analytically more powerful. Instead of asking, "What is the impact of this road on this area?", we ask, "What has been the record of development success or failure in this area, and how can we explain it?" By selecting areas where AID has a long record of investment, we should be able to get a much more comprehensive understanding of the total impact of a program.

E. Self-Help Community Development Programs

Since 1974, the Agency has supported over one thousand self-help community development projects. Many of these projects are small, implemented by PVOs and have as their main theme an effort to achieve, through relatively unstructured support, maximum participation and self-help by the people involved. Of special interest in this area is the extent to which AID or its intermediaries fosters the development of information and monitoring systems by which people at the local level can record and manage their own development process.

Self-help Community Development projects should be the subject of impact evaluations for the following reasons: 1) the

admonition to expand participation is an inherent part of the Foreign Assistance Act and AID policy. The impact evaluations already completed demonstrate that most projects are still very much "top down" in design and implementation. Yet, there is scattered evidence to suggest that local participation is one element of project success, and without participation, the probability of long-term success appears more limited; 2) It would be useful to examine, therefore, those projects which had as a clear purpose self-help and local involvement to determine their success and the relative benefits from this approach; 3) This is also an area where the unique capabilities of PVOs are presumed to exist.

F. Nutrition Sector

The relationship between nutrition and development is now well recognized--malnutrition deters overall development. This recognition has been recent in the development agencies and is still not accepted by all governments, especially those of low-income countries. There is an estimated one billion malnourished people in the world and AID is concerned about them.

The Nutrition Office in AID is one of the youngest sectoral offices, dating from the late 1960s. By September 1979, 46 nutrition projects had been completed at a cost of \$33.5 million. There were at that time 72 active projects solely concerned with nutrition or with nutrition components.

Funding for nutrition projects, since the articulation of the basic needs strategy has been as follows:

A.I.D. NUTRITION PROGRAM FUNDING AND NUMBER OF PROJECTS*

(millions of dollars)

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Centrally Funded Projects (DS/N)</u>		<u>Bilateral/Country Specific Projects</u>		<u>Total Amount</u>
	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Number</u>	
1973	\$1.4	5	\$ 1.7	3	\$ 3.1
1974	3.7	12	4.7	6	8.4
1975	3.3	5	11.0	10	14.3
1976	5.6	8	26.0	16	31.6
1977	6.0	6	unknown	9	-
1978	8.1	3	7.0	23	15.1
1979	5.2	4	24.8	13	30.0
1980	6.0	N/A	4.0	N/A	10.0
1981 (proposed)	4.4	N/A	N/A	N/A	
1982 (proposed)	5.7	N/A	N/A	N/A	

AID's approach to the nutrition problem is multi-sectoral and recognizes that programs in agriculture, health, family planning, education, rural development, appropriate technology, Food for Peace, as well as those primarily concerned with nutrition, all affect people's nutritional status. Programs range from those providing village-level technology to protect and process locally produced foods, and developing safe water supplies, to innovative nutrition education programs using mass media to change attitudes and practices about food, and to applying basic nutrition research findings.

The Nutrition Office has used a number of mechanisms for implementing nutrition projects, including a large number of PVOs, contracts with universities and commercial contractors, IQCs, cooperative grants, and personnel services contracts.

*The number of projects is taken from a DS/DIU printout. The funding figures were provided by DS/N. A relatively high proportion of projects, in all except two years, have been centrally funded and largely aimed at providing technical assistance to host governments and AID missions for project design and development

The sector provides a wide range of issues and topics for evaluation. We will concentrate upon projects designed to directly affect people's nutrition. Illustrative topics for evaluation include:

- a. The role of AID projects in increasing the awareness of the relationship between nutrition and development and also in assisting LDCs with nutrition planning.
- b. The impact of programs upon maternal and infant nutrition, especially among the rural poor.
- c. PVOs and nutrition projects--a comparative analysis of mechanisms for conducting projects.
- d. The relationships between bona-fide nutrition projects, and Food for Peace, Food for Work, PL 480, Title II programs.

G. Non-Starters and Slow-Movers

In preparing for work in a number of sectors, the Studies Division did research on each sector to determine the universe of projects and the rate of expenditure for those projects which, by the end of the loan or grant period, should have been completed. To our consternation we began to surface a number of projects in all categories which either were significantly delayed, or for which funds had been spent but upon further inquiry we would be told by the mission that "there wasn't much to see." The refrain, that the project was a "non-starter" was puzzling, since we believed that an elaborate project review process would eliminate "non-starters" before they started. Then we sent a team to do an impact evaluation of the Senegal Rural Health project and found it (in spite of very positive recommendations in AID/W as to impact) in such disrepair as to be in danger of collapsing altogether. This led us to conclude

that there is a "problem." At that point we began to accumulate some examples. We don't know what the universe is, or the reasons for, but we think something may be learned about our design, review and implementation procedures by focusing on the non-starters and slow-movers. A cautionary note: least we be accused of looking only at bad projects, we shall make an effort to identify and analyze particularly innovative projects.

PPC/E/S(particularly R. Blue)