PN-ABE-116

# SOCIAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ANALYSIS IN AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PROJECT ASSISTANCE

## SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT FROM AFRICA BUREAU EXPERIENCE

PATRICIA J. VONDAL
Science and Diplomacy Fellow
American Association for the Advancement of Science
Office of Rural and Institutional Development
Bureau for Science and Technology

SOCIAL/INSTITUTIONAL ANALYSIS WORKING PAPER NO. 2
Office of Development Planning
Bureau for Africa
March, 1988

## TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | | 3 |
| 1.0 | Introduction: The Context of the Report | 5 |
| 1.1 | Purpose of the Review: Evolving Concerns over Assistance to Sub-Saharan Africa | 5 |
| 1.1.1 | Africa Bureau Strategy for Development Assistance | 5 |
| 1.1.2 | The African Famine Recovery and Development Act | 5 |
| 2.0 | Methodology | 6 |
| 2.1 | Measures for Reviewing Social and Institutional Analysis in Project Assistance | 6 |
| 2.2 | The Rating System | 7 |
| 3.0 | Review of Social Soundness Analysis | 8 |
| 3.1 | Socio-Cultural Context | 8 |
| 3.2 | Socio-Cultural Feasibility | 8 |
| 3.2.1 | Obstacles to Implementation | 8 |
| 3.2.2 | Motivation/Incentive | 9 |
| 3.2.3 | Participation | 9 |
| 3.2.4 | Patterns of Communication and Interaction | 9 |
| 3.2.5 | Authority/Decision-Making Process | 10 |
| 3.2.6 | Organization | 10 |
| 3.3 | Spread Effects | 11 |
| 3.3.1 | Diffusion | 11 |
| 3.3.2 | Sustainability | 11 |
| 3.3.3 | Replicability | 11 |
| 3.4 | Benefit/Cost Incidence | 12 |
| 3.4.1 | Direct Beneficiaries | 12 |
| 3.4.2 | Indirect Beneficiaries | 12 |
| 3.4.3 | Negatively Impacted Subpopulation Groups | 12 |
| 3.4.4 | Equity of Access | 13 |
| 3.4.5 | Social Consequences | 13 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 4.0 | Review of Institutional Analysis | 13 |
| 4.1 | Institutional Identification | 13 |
| 4.2 | Institutional Culture and Context | 14 |
| 4.3 | Institutional Capability | 14 |
| 4.4 | Coordination/Linkages | 15 |
| 4.5 | Sustainability | 15 |
| 5.0 | Summary of Findings | 16 |
| 5.1 | Social Soundness Analysis | 16 |
| 5.2 | Institutional Analysis | 18 |
| 5.3 | General Findings: PID's, PP's, and Professional Social Science Input | 18 |
| 6.0 | Recommendations | 19 |
| ANNEX 1 | Projects Reviewed | 21 |
| ANNEX 2 | References Consulted | 22 |

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report examines the frequency, quality, and utility of social and instutional analysis in Africa Bureau project assistance as judged from PID's (project identification documents) and their corresponding PP's (project papers). Fifteen projects from FY's 1984 - 1987 in the agriculture and natural resources sector were chosen for this review. A list of these projects is found in Annex 1. This sector was specifically identified for review in support of the Bureau's strategy for Sub-Saharan Africa, which is to promote sustainable agricultural development and environmental regeneration as the basis for economic growth.

A major issue underlying the genesis of this report, is the evolving Congressional legislation regarding US development assistance to Sub-Saharan Africa. The African Famine Recovery and Development Act, as currently conceived, states that the purpose of assistance is to help the poor majority to participate in a process of long-term development that is equitable, participatory, environmentally sustainable, and self-reliant. Hence, in reviewing social and institutional analyses, another goal of the report was to identify what aspects of these analyses are not only most helpful to project design and implementation, but also to helping AID respond to Congressional mandates for development assistance to Africa.

Analyses were subjected to a review based on the existing guidelines found in Handbook 3 for conducting social soundness analysis in PID's and PP's. A rating system was created to assess both the quality and utility of the analysis, and examples of the best analyses are given for each criterion. There are no guidelines for conducting institutional analysis. Accordingly, a basic set of criteria for institutional analysis is presented in this report, and the projects were subjected to a review based on these criteria and accompanying rating system.

The following present some of the major findings and conclusions of this review.

SYNOPSIS OF FINDINGS

1. Social and institutional analyses which related the analysis back to the project goal and purpose, and provided recommendations and alternatives to identified problems, were reflected in the project design.

2. Major areas of analytical strength in both PID's and PP's were in identifying obstacles to project implementation and providing possible

solutions to these; increasing motivation and incentive for project involvement; and in assessing institutional capability for project activities.

3. Major areas of weakness found in these analyses were in assessing negative impacts, equity issues, communication issues, sustainability issues, and in providing recommendations to address these issues.

4. There are indications that the level and quality of analysis in PID's has a direct influence on the level and quality of analysis in PP's.

5. Review of the documents suggests that those projects which included professional social science input on the design team yielded higher quality analyses of greater utility to project design.

SYNOPSIS OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. A thorough social soundness analysis should continue to be carried out regularly with professional social science input in both the PID as well as the PP stage.

2. In support of Agency concerns with institutional development issues, all future projects should regularly contain an institutional analysis in the PID and PP designs utilizing professionally qualified expertise. The criteria utilized for reviewing institutional analyses in this report can be reviewed and utilized as interim guidance.

3. As a means of increasing the utility of social and institutional analyses for project design and implementation, all future analysts should be required to relate the analysis back to the project goal and purpose and to provide recommendations that address issues identified in the analysis.

4. Some of the potentially most useful criteria for social and institutional analysis in regard to assisting the Africa Bureau strategy for development assistance and in helping AID meet future requirements under the African Famine Recovery and Development Act are as follows: 1) communication patterns and interaction; 2) authority and decision-making patterns; 3) organizational linkages; 4) participation; 5) equity issues; 6) negatively impacted groups; 7) institutional culture; 8) institutional capability; 9) diffusion issues; and 10) sustainability issues. These particular criteria should be highlighted in PID and PP social and institutional analyses.

# 1.0 INTRODUCTION: THE CONTEXT OF THE REPORT

This report examines the frequency and quality of social and institutional analysis in Africa Bureau projects as found in project identifications documents and their corresponding project papers. The projects chosen for review were those developed from 1984-1987 in the agriculture and natural resources sector for selected countries in Sub-Saharan Africa.

## 1.1 Purpose of the Review: Evolving Concerns over Assistance to Sub-Saharan Africa

The purpose of this report is to review the current status of these analyses, identify where possible the extent of professional social science input, identify what about these analyses are most helpful for meeting the goals of project development and implementation, and suggest improvements in conducting social and institutional analysis in areas of identified problems.

### 1.1.1 Africa Bureau Strategy for Development Assistance

Projects in the agriculture and natural resources sector were chosen in support of the Bureau's strategy for Sub-Saharan Africa which is to promote sustainable agricultural development and environmental regeneration as the basis for economic growth (see USAID, "U.S. Assistance Strategy for Africa: 1987-1990"). Many of these recent projects are complementary with the African Economic Policy Reform Programs in the agriculture sector which together seek to improve the basic resources and conditions under which African farmers produce susbsistence and commercial crops, and African traders and transporters buy, sell and carry these and other necessary goods. The very complexity and variety of environmental conditions and social organization seen across the African continent calls for an African development strategy tailored to the unique situation of each region and each country. To that end, a professional social and institutional analysis contributes to better project design and to assuring project fit with local realities.

### 1.1.2. The African Famine Recovery and Development Act

The African Famine Recovery and Development Act, a major piece of legislation currently being developed in Congress, sets forth a policy of long-term development assistance for Sub-Saharan Africa. It states that the purpose of assistance is "to help the poor majority to participate in a process of long-term development that is equitable, participatory, environmentally sustainable, and self-reliant."

The legislation also would direct AID to consult closely with African, United States, and other private and voluntary organizations in order to gain the perspectives of the rural and urban poor of Sub-Saharan Africa, which are in turn to be factored into AID's country development strategies. Furthermore, it also directs AID to ensure that development activities incorporate African women's participation to reflect their central role in the agricultural sector. Other sections of the legislation discuss the importance of long-term, collaborative institutional development efforts for African research and higher education institutions, extension services, and local organizations which can assist in a development process that is increasingly self-reliant. Accordingly, another goal of this report is to ascertain how the required social and institutional analysis can help AID respond to this Congressional mandate.

## 2.0. METHODOLOGY

### 2.1. Measures for Reviewing Social and Institutional Analysis in Project Assistance

This report utilizes the existing guidelines for social soundness analysis found in Handbook 3 for PID's (project identification documents) and PP's (project papers) as the basis for reviewing the frequency and quality of social analysis in 15 Africa Bureau PID's and their corresponding PP's.

There are currently no AID guidelines for conducting institutional analysis. However, the necessity for long-term institutional development, which is perhaps the corner stone of an increasingly self-reliant country development process, has been recognized by AID and many other multilateral and bilateral donors as a critical and complex undertaking. This review found that a majority of the reports reviewed did include an institutional analysis reflecting perhaps the increasing prevalence and importance of this activity in AID projects.

This report puts forth a very basic set of criteria for institutional analysis, and subjects the documents selected to these criteria for review. These criteria were based on a number of recent publications on institutional development and on local organizations as intermediaries in development projects (see for example, Devres, 1987; DPMC and IDMC, 1987; Mason, 1987; Uphoff, 1986; Esman and Uphoff, 1984; Korten, 1983).

## 2.2 The Rating System

For each set of criteria delineated in the guidelines for Social Soundness Analysis and the suggested guidelines for Institutional Analysis, a numerical score is given which reflects the level and quality of the analysis in the documents reviewed. Briefly, the rating system is as follows: 0 - no mention of issue; 1 brief mention of issue, but no analysis; 2 - intermediate level of analysis of issue and its implications for the program; and 3 - full analysis of issue and some identified means of addressing it (i.e., providing alternatives, recommendations, etc.). This rating system was utilized for both the PID's and their corresponding PP's. The PID's and PP's were then summarized for the average score received under each critierion for social and institutional analysis. Examples of particularly effective project analyses are provided under each criterion to demonstrate how these analyses can be most useful. For the sake of brevity, only the analyses found in the project papers are discussed in the review that follows. Major strengths and weakness of analyses reviewed in PID's are summarized under the report of major findings in Section 5.0 of this report.

The major purpose of this rating system is to subject each analysis to a test of both quality and utility. A good analysis, then, is one which: 1) relates its findings back to the goals and objectives of the project; and 2) provides recommendations to improve or strengthen the project based on the outcomes of the findings derived from the initial analysis.

These two procedural steps were two of the major recommendations developed for improving the overall analytical quality and utility of social soundness analysis in the 1981 report "Social Analysis of AID Projects: A Review of the Experience (Ingersoll, Sullivan, and Lenkerd)." A more recent report recommends similarly that the social soundness analysis should be reformulated into a "project-specific socio-institutional analysis"

which could utilized, for example, to suggest modes of "...linking local populations, their natural resources, and organizational needs to higher level institutions (Mason, "Local Organizational Development for Sustainability,"1987: 10)."

## 3.0 REVIEW OF SOCIAL SOUNDNESS ANALYSIS

### 3.1 Socio-Cultural Context

The guidelines require a clear statement of current conditions in the project target area and how these affect the status and behavior of relevant population groups. It also requires a brief statement of how project goals and objectives relate to improving these conditions for the population/s living there. The average score received under this crieterion was 2.06 (out of a possible high of 3.0). Seven of the 15 analyses reviewed received a score of 3.

An example of a good analysis under this measure is included in the the Sudan Reforestation and Antidesertification project SSA. It provides a full yet concise discussion of the some of the forces that contributed to desertification in Sudan. In addition to prolonged drought conditions, population pressure, fragmentation of land ownership, and agricultural pricing policies have lead farmers to allocate more land and labor for cash crops, and to a process of deforestation. The project objectives and implementation plans are related back to this context which sets the scene for the remainder of the issues covered in the analysis.

### 3.2 Socio-Cultural Feasibility

#### 3.2.1 Obstacles to Implementation

Social analysis is required to identify factors that represent either opportunities or constraints to project implementation (political, socio-cultural, economic, religious, etc.). Those receiving a score of 3 discussed possible solutions to constraints that were identified, thus increasing the value of the analysis for project design and implementation. The average score received under this measure was 2.06; and 7 of the 15 analyses received a score of 3. An excellent example relating problems to proposed solutions is found in the Malawi Agricultural Research and Extension project which seeks to reorient the crop technology generation system toward the actual constraints faced by smallholders. The analysis notes the traditional reluctance of male extension workers to talk with female farmers, and a

tendency to focus on wealthy credit-using farmers in rural communties, and proposes several recommendations to overcome these tendencies in extension practice.

3.2.2 Motivation/Incentive

This measure requires the analysis to ascertain whether or not targeted project beneficiaries would be willing to participate in the project based on the incentives and motivations of the communty for the proposed activities. The average score received under this measure was 1.73 with only 5 of the 15 analyses receiving a score of 3. One of the best analyses discussed the various smallholder incentives for purchasing and using improved inputs for increasing cereal production to be provided under the Senegal Agricultural Production Support project, and suggests the extension of consumer credit to strengthen incentives to purchase these and increase their affordabilty. Since one of the project goals is to facilitate the privatization of input distribution and cereals marketing in Senegal, the analyst also discusses motivations for obtaining loans for inputs from private vs. public sources.

3.2.3 Participation

This measure requires the analyst to assess to what extent targeted beneficiaries and subgroups within are brought in to participate in various phases of the project; and to suggest how this can be best brought about. The average score received under this measure was 1.6, and only two of the 15 analyses reviewed received a score of 3. One of these was the Malawi Agriculture Research and Extension project which provides recommendations for the composition of professionals to participate in Adaptive Research Teams (ART's), and for recruiting farmers in target areas into the research to guarantee maximum participation of female-headed farms, and low-resource farms which have been excluded from research and extension efforts in the past.

3.2.4 Patterns of Communication and Interaction

Communication between government officials, project personnel, local organizations, and project beneficiaries is usually essential; however, in many countries status differentiation between socio-economic groups frequently constrains the close interaction and communications often called for in many projects (particularly in farming systems research and extension

improvement projects). A good analysis is able to recommend how communications can be facilitated between and within groups given the existing patterns, to forward project goals and objectives.

The average score received under this measure was 1.35, with three of the 15 analyses reviewed receiving a score of 3. An excellent example is provided by the Mali Farming Systems Research and Extension project. The analyst notes the problems of communication between extension workers and farmers, and between extension workers and researchers due to status differences and cultural norms that prohibit those of higher status being perceived as "information receivers" from those of lower status. The analyst was able to recommend institutional linkages for facilitating the upward flow of information from farmers to researchers.

3.2.5 Authority/Decision Making Process

This measure requires the analyst to determine what groups or individuals involved in the project have decision making and authority rights, and how this can either enhance or constrain project implementation goals. A good analysis is able to suggest how to work with local decision making processes and authorities for project implementation.

The average score received was 1.28. Four of the 15 analyses reviewed received a score of 3. The Zaire Area Food and Market Development project was one of these. The analyst describes the changes in traditional authority and decision-making patterns, the variation in decision-making patterns throughout Zaire, and the implications for land-use decisions which will affect project implementation. Because of the wide variation that exists from village to village in central Bandundu, the analyst recommends a study of this specific issue in relation to land use by the local intermediary organization chosen for project development in each region.

3.2.6 Organization

This measure asks the analyst to identify and analyze the basic organizational structures in the targeted beneficiary community through which project activities can be channeled. A good analysis should recommend how this process can be facilitated.

The average score received was 1.64, with 4 of the 15 analyses receiving a score of 3. The Rwanda Farming Systems Improvement project contained a thorough analysis of the existing agricultural research and extension system and its links locally to farmers and to the regional and national level. One of the strengths of this analysis is that it identifies where weaknesses occur in the system that will have to be improved under the

project to ensure that credible farming systems research and extension activities are undertaken.

## 3.3 Spread Effects

### 3.3.1 Diffusion

This measure requires the analyst to discuss the potential for diffusion of project activities into surrounding groups outside of the targeted beneficiary communties. A good analysis was one that was also able to recommend means by which the diffusion process can be assisted.

The average score received under this measure was 1.13, with only one analysis receiving a score of 3. Most of the project analyses only reiterated the assumptions of the project regarding how or why diffusion of introduced techniques and resources would occur, but they did not critique these assumptions or suggest ways to facilitate diffusion. One analysis that did this credibly was found in the Zaire Area Food and Market Development project paper which suggested several ways to faciltiate the diffusion of any new appropriate agricultural techniques developed during the project for increasing crop production.

### 3.3.2 Sustainability

This measure requires the analyst to address whether or not the project activities, impacts etc. are sustainable (as desirable) given the socio-cultural, economic, and political context. The best analyses were able to recommend the conditions necessary to achieving sustainability.

The average score received under this measure was only .60; none of the 15 analyses reviewed received a score of 3. The majority (9 out of 15) did not discuss this issue at all. While several analyses commented (briefly) on the sustainability of project activities, none of these were able to suggest the means to achieve this in the project development or implementation stage.

### 3.3.3 Replicability

This measure requires the analyst to assess whether or not the project could be repeated in similar locations with favorable results.

The average score received was .13, with 14 of the 15 analyses reviewed receiving a 0. By far this measure received the least amount of attention by project social analysts. One could say that perhaps a majority of social scientists in development believe that the unique interplay of socio-cultural organization, economy and environment in each region requires too

much adaptation of project design to make statements about replicability from one location to the next. This is just one hypothesis for the seemingly systematic by-passing of this criterion by analysts.

### 3.4 Benefit/Cost Incidence from Project Impacts

These measures are largely self-explanatory. They require the analyst to fully assess who the direct beneficiaries are and how they are likely to be benefit from the project, as well as population sub-groups who are likely to benefit indirectly. Subgroups likely to be negatively impacted should also be identified, and the analysis should suggest how these impacts could be mitigated in project design or implementation. These measures also require the analyst to examine how equitably various members of the target population are able to access project resources. Finally, the analyst is required to assess social consequences of project activities such as impacts on income, employment, migration, changes in power, rural displacement, etc. These measures are particularly important given the existence of socio-economic stratification, and the varying roles and status of women and children in many communties. Again, given the outcome of the analysis, alternatives or recommendations should be provided.

#### 3.4.1 Direct Beneficiaries

The average score received under this measure was 2.13. Five of the 15 project analyses reviewed received a score of 3. The Mali Farming Systems Research and Extension project provides one of the best examples of a realistic and thorough discussion of not only who can be expected to benefit from project activities, but how. Unlike some analyses in agricultural research projects which identify benefits for farmers only, this analysis also identifies benefits for researchers in the national agricultural research organization who will receive training under the project. These benefits are important for maintaining incentives for participation in project activities.

#### 3.4.2 Indirect Beneficiaries

The average score received under this measure was 1.20 with none of the analyses reviewed receiving a score of 3. Several mentioned what groups would benefit indirectly by the project, but none of the projects analyzed the conditions under which this would occur, or how it could be promoted.

#### 3.4.3 Negatively Impacted Subpopulation Groups

The average score received under this measure was 1.40. Three of the analyses reviewed received a score of 3. Most of the project analyses did not thoroughly analyze this issue although it has important implications for

project success and political relations. Those projects that received a score of 3, (Mali Farming Systems Research and Extension, Rwanda Farming Systems Improvement, and Senegal Agricultural Production Support projects), were able to provide recommendations that would prevent the possibility of negative impacts from occurring.

3.4.4 Equity of Access to Project Resources

The average score received under this measure was 1.46 with three of the 15 analyses reviewed receiving a score of 3. The best analyses under this criterion were able to recommend the means to improve equity of access in addition to assessing equity issues surrounding the project. The Malawi Agricultural Research and Extension project, and the Zaire Area Food and Marketing Development, and Agricultural Marketing Development projects provide the best examples by suggesting ways to increase access of women farmers and the most resource poor farmers (which are frequently found on farms headed by females) to project resources.

3.4.5 Social Consequences of Project Activities

The average score received under this measure was 1.93. Four of the analyses reviewed received a score of 3 by providing a full analysis relating possible increases in employment, income, and productivity (which are among the goals of most of these projects) to equity, nutritional status, migration trends and other social issues relevant to target communities.

## 4.0 REVIEW OF INSTITUTIONAL ANALYSES

### 4.1 Institutional Identification

This measure examines the extent to which all institutions (organizations) that will be involved in the project through each phase have been identified. It looks for a basic description of the organization's mandates and major activities, the basic personnel composition and organization, and which personnel and other resources of the organization will be tasked with project responsibilities. The analyst should also be able to identify and recommend, when necessary, local organizations for project participation based on their analysis of those organizations, or conversely, to recommend the creation of a new organization.

The average score received under this measure was 2.6. Eleven of the 15 analyses reviewed received a score of 3. Hence, for this most basic of criterion, most analyses did well. Those that received lesser scores of 1 occured in projects that did not include an Institutional Analysis section. The Cameroon National Cereals Research and Extension II report provided a

minimum of information under the Administrative Analysis, while the Senegal Reforestation and Conservation project provided a very partial identification under the Technical Analysis. The Western Sudan Agricultural Marketing Project did not include an Institutional Analysis section, but provided a very good (3) description and identification of institutions involved in the project under the Administrative Analysis for which Handbook guidelines do exist. Several project design teams among the projects reviewed evidently chose to expand this section to conduct a thorough institutional analysis.

## 4.2 Institutional Culture and Context

This measure assesses how well the analysis reflects an understanding of the various host country institutions that will be involved in the project activities. It should include an analysis of: a) the process of communication between departments and individuals; b) the departments, positions, etc. which have full authority to implement changes and make decisions as needed; c) institutional incentives for undertaking project activities; d) the relevant political context in which it operates (both internal and external).

The average score under this measure was 1.46. Two of the 15 analyses reviewed received a score of 3. The Niger Applied Agricultural Research project provides an excellent example with its analysis of decision-making, personnel relations, control, and communications within the National Agronomic Research Institute in Nigeria, the principle implementing institution for the project. It discusses how these processes may constrain the goals of the project and provides recommendations for improvement.

## 4.3 Institutional Capability

This measure reviews the assessment of institutional capability for such activities as project planning, implementation, management, administration, monitoring and evaluation, research and analysis (depending on which activities the institution has been tasked with). It should also examine the physical and financial resources currently available to that institution. In other words, it looks for a full assessment of feasibility that the institution/s targeted for project involvement will be able to undertake the assignments. The analysis should make recommendations for strengthening or improving any identified weaknesses.

The average score received under this measure was 2.2. Six of the 15 analyses reviewed received a score of 3. One of the best analyses of institutional capability is found in the Kenya National Agricultural Research

project . It's purpose is to develop a well-managed national agricultural research system capability for developing appropriate agricultural technologies to increase productivty among smallholders. The analysis of capability thoroughly examines existing management ability, manpower quality, research capability, planning and budgeting operations, and research-extension connections; and indicates identified areas of weakness for improvement under the project in support of the project goals.

4.4 Coordination/Linkages

This measure assesses the extent to which the analysis has taken into account issues that arise when several institutions are involved in project planning, implementation, and decision-making. Many agricultural research and extension projects require that information gathered during the research and development stages be communicated between some combination of local farmers and their organizations, extension services, farming systems research teams, research institutions, and possibly the Ministry of Agriculture as well. A good analysis was one which was able to suggest mechanisms to increase coordination and communication through institutional linkages.

The average score received under this measure was 2.06. Seven of the 15 analyses reviewed received a score of 3. The Liberia Agricultural Research and Extension II project provides a good example of analysis under this measure. The purpose of the project is to create an institutional capability to produce improved technological packages in the agricultural sector through adaptive research. The analyst provides several suggestions for creating linkages to facilitate communication and the diffusion of information between the major agricultural research institute, farmers, and extension workers.

4.5 Sustainability

This measure examines the extent to which the analyst has examined whether institutions and institutional linkages developed to carry out project objectives are able to sustain these activities beyond the life of the project itself (assuming the benefits/products of the project continue to be valued and needed). The analysis should consider the: a) degree of participation of beneficiaries and local implementing organizations in developing project activities; b) political support; c) horizontal and vertical linkages with other institutions for communications, political support, and resource support; d) incentives; and e) internal physical, financial and human resources. Existing literature on this subject suggests that the degree to which

sustainability measures are built into the project from the onset, has implications for the success of post-project sustainability of activities (see Mason, 1987; DPMC/IDMC 1987 for discussions).

The average score received under this measure was 1.26. Four of the 15 analyses reviewed received a score of 3. Seven of the analyses did not consider this issue at all, although all the projects reviewed contained a substantial institutional involvement or institutional development component. The Zambia Agricultural Training, Planning and Institutional Development II project provides an excellent example of the analysis of sustainability. It provides recommendations for a renewed emphasis on management, organization and systems procedures after identifying these as weaknesses, and assesses the government's budgetary allocations to the agricultural institutions targeted under this project for an indication of political will to sustain their development.

## 5.0 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

### 5.1 Social Soundness Analysis

1. The majority of the 15 projects reviewed covered approximately 90% of the criteria for conducting a social soundness analysis as set forth in the guidelines in Handbook 3 for PID's and PP's.

2. A major area of analytical strength in both PID and PP analyses was in defining possible obstacles to project implementation. Many provided several excellent recommendations and alternatives for overcoming socio-cultural, political, or economic obstacles in targeted project communties. On the other side of the coin is the issue of motivation and incentives for participation. While not all the PP analyses covered this issue, several of those that did provided full discussions and specified means to increase the incentive to participate. Those analyses that provided suggestions regarding obstacles and incentives were utilized in project design.

3. While most of the social analyses reviewed in the PID's and PP's broached the topic of participation, many did not deal with the feasibility of community participation in any phase of the project other than implementation activities (identifying groups who will participate in project activities only), and the majority are not providing specific recommendations for increasing participation of subgroups in project target areas in any phase. One issue that was at the very least raised in the majority of analyses was the participation of women. However, many analyses did no more than to specify that care should be taken to include representative samples of

women in project activities because of their importance in the agriculture and natural resources sector.

4. The majority of the projects reviewed (13 of 15) concerned activities to increase the capability of research institutions to conduct research on agricultural and resource management techniques, or the development of inputs appropriate to raising smallholder agricultural productivity, and to strengthen the link between research, extension, and local farmers for the development of more appropriate technology that will be readily adopted by farmers. A farming systems research approach is utilized in nine of these projects. However, in the analysis of communication patterns, authority and decision-making patterns, and local organizations, most social analysts did not provide recommendations which linked these analyses to the need for linking communication and decision-making issues between local people and their organizations, and research institutions. Those analyses which provided suggestions for forging communication linkages were utilized in the project design.

5. One of the two major areas of weakness and/or neglect that both PID's and PP's displayed was under the criteria for diffusion and replication of project activities. The majority of PID's reviewed (9 out of 14), did not analyze these issues. Correspondingly, project replicability was also the weakest area of analysis in the PP's (14 of 15 received a score of 0), with the issue of diffusion also receiving a very low level of attention.

6. The other major area of weakness for both PID's and PP's concerned the analysis of sustainability of project activities and benefits. Ten of the 14 PID's reviewed, and nine of the 15 PP's reviewed, did not even broach this important topic in the social soundness analysis.

7. In assessing the beneficiaries and social impacts of project activities, many PID and PP analyses provided thorough discussions of direct beneficiaries. However, in regard to indirect beneficiaries, the majority of PID's are not identifying these groups at all (8 out of 14). The PP analyses uniformly did better by at least identifying which groups would stand to benefit indirectly, but did not provide any analysis of the conditions under which this would occur. Overall, the analyses of negatively impacted groups and equity issues related to the distribution of project benefits were also lacking in thoroughness and in recommendations for lessening or avoiding negative impacts, and for increasing the equitability of access to project benefits. This was true for both PID's and PP's although the scores for PP's under these measures were slightly better.

## 5.2 Institutional Analysis

1. Although not a stated requirement in the Handbook for PID and PP development, all 15 projects contained some level of institutional analysis. Only four of the PID's reviewed did not conduct some preliminary level of analysis on any institutional issues.

2. After the identification and descriptions of institutions and organizations targeted for project participation (requiring the lowest level of analysis), the major area of analytical strength was in assessing capability to undertake project activities. Six of the PP analyses provided specific recommendations for strengthening weaknesses that they identified under this measure. This degree of analysis has a very high utility for project design as seen by the incorporation of recommendations in the body of the project papers.

3. As in the social soundness analyses, the analysis of sustainability issues was again very low in both PID's and PP's. Only four of the analyses provided suggestions that would increase the sustainability of institutions to continue desired project activities beyond the end of the project.

## 5.3 General Findings: Relationships Between PID's, PP's, and Professional

1. For all categories of criteria, the social soundness analyses and institutional analyses in PP's that were reviewed contained an improved level of analysis over that which was found in the corresponding PID's . In many cases this was because the PID analysis recommended that the particular criterion be further analyzed during the project development stage, and also because the analyses in the PP's, not surprisingly, more frequently contained recommendations for dealing with particular issues.

2. Analyses of criteria that were very weak in the PID's, or not covered at all, were similarly weak in the PP's. Conversely, issues that were well analyzed in PID's were also well covered in the corresponding PP's. This suggests that the level and quality of analysis in PID's has a direct influence on the level and quality of analysis in PP's.

3. Unfortunately no general comments can be made about the input of professional social scientists on design teams for PID's and PP's and the quality of the resulting analysis. The majority of the documents did not list team members and their professional titles. Some listed team members, but did not identifiy specialties. Rarely, were any team members identified as

institutional analysts. Individuals hired under the title of social analyst, anthropologist, or sociologists may have in some cases undertaken the social science analysis as well as the institutional analysis - but it is impossible to verify. However, in those cases where individuals defined as institutional analyst were listed (4 of the 15 documents), the ratings for the institutional analysis were the highest. Similarly, in cases where 2 or more social science professionals were listed in the project design team, (5 out of 15 projects), the overall ratings for the social soundness were highest. However, with only one exception, the project papers that listed team members and their positions did contain better social soundness analyses than those contained in project papers with no team identification. While there is no logical explanation for this finding, one can suggest that based on the review of these 15 projects, that design teams containing a greater degree of professional social science input will result in analyses of higher quality and greater utility for project design and implementation.

## 6.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

1. A thorough social soundness analysis covering criteria listed in the guidelines should continue to be carried out regularly with professional social science input in both the PID as well as the PP stage. Evidence suggests that the extent to which these criteria are covered in the PID design has bearing on the extent to which they are covered in the project design itself. Evidence also suggests that those analyses conducted by professional social scientists are of better quality and higher utility to overall project design and implementation.

2. All future projects should regularly contain an institutional analysis in the PID and PP stages. This type of analysis is necessary in projects which do not specifically include institutional development activities as central features of the project purpose as well as those in which these kinds of activities are highlighted. It is recommended that the criteria developed to review institutional analyses in this report be reviewed and utilized as interim guidance. Professionals with experience in conducting institutional analyses include rural sociologists, anthropologists, and political scientists.

3. As a means of increasing the utility of social and institutional analyses, future analysts should routinely be required to relate the analysis back to the project goal and purpose.

4. Analysts should also be required to provide alternatives or recommendations for overcoming any problems or weaknesses identified in

their analyses for incorporation into project design. The analysis should never be left at the level of description and/or problem identification.

5 Aspects of social and institutional analysis that should in particular be strengthened because of their utility to project design, implementation, and sustainability are: 1) communication patterns and interaction; 2) authority and decision-making patterns; 3) organizational linkages; 4) participation; 5) equity of access, and equitable distribution of project benefits; 6) negatively impacted groups; 7) institutional culture; 8) institutional capability; 9) diffusion issues; and 10) sustainability issues. While in general most of the criteria for social and institutional analysis could be conducted in a manner that better contributes to project design and implementation, analysis of the factors and concerns highlighted above can more specifically assist AID in meeting the requirements under the African Famine Recovery and Development Act. These analyses would also be most useful to the Africa Bureau's strategy for development assistance in Sub-Saharan Africa.

# ANNEX 1

## PROJECTS SELECTED FOR REVIEW
## PID'S AND PP'S

| Country | Dates | Project # | Project Title |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Liberia | 84-92 | 669-0118 | Agricultural Research and Extension II |
| 2. Somalia | 84-87 | 649-0109 | Livestock Marketing and Health |
| 3. Zaire | 84-86 | 660-0098 | Agricultural Marketing and Development |
| 4. Zaire | 85-92 | 660-0102 | Area Food and Marketing Development |
| 5. Sudan | 84-86 | 650-0069 | Western Sudan Agricultural Marketing Road |
| 6. Rwanda | 84-88 | 696-0110 | Farming Systems Improvement |
| 7. Cameroon | 85-93 | 631-0052 | National Cereals Research and Extension II (NOTE: PID not available) |
| 8. Malawi | 85-88 | 612-0215 | Agricultural Research and Extension |
| 9. Mali | 85-92 | 688-0232 | Farming Systems Research and Development |
| 10 Kenya | 86-89 | 615-0229 | National Agricultural Research |
| 11. Senegal | 86-87 | 685-0283 | Reforestation and Conservation |
| 12. Niger | 87-90 | 83-0256 | Applied Agricultural Research |
| 13. Senegal | 87-90 | 685-0269 | Agricultural Production Support |
| 14. Zambia | 87-91 | 611-0207 | Agricultural Training/Planning/ Institutional Development II |
| 15. Sudan | 87-92 | 650-0082 | Reforestation and Antidesertification |

# ANNEX 2

## REFERENCES CONSULTED


Cohn, E.J. "Social Criteria for Project and Sector Lending," PPC/PDA/CP, USAID, June, 1971.

Development Program Management Center and International Development Management Center "Increasing the Sustainability of Development Assistance Efforts: Lessons Learned and Implications for Donor Agencies," ST/RD/IDM, USAID, October, 1987.

Devres "Analysis of Institutional Sustainability Issues in U.S. Agency for International Development 1985-86 Project Evaluation Reports," PPC/CDIE, USAID, March, 1987.

Esman, M. and N. Uphoff, Local Organizations: Intermediaries in Rural Development. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984.

Ingersoll, J., M. Sullivan, and B. Lenkerd "Social Analysis of AID Projects: A Review of the Experience,: PPC/PDPR/HR, USAID, June, 1981.

Korten, D. "Learning from USAID Field Experience: Institutional Development and the Dynamics of the Project Process." Washington, D.C.: NASPAA, June, 1983.

Mason, J. "Local Organizational Development for Sustainability: Sustainability as a Framework for Analysis of Development Assistance," Draft report submitted to USDA/OICD/DPMC, June, 1987.

Uphoff, N. Local Institutional Development: An Analytical Sourcebook with Cases. Cornell University, West Hartford: Kumarian Press, 1986.

U.S.A.I.D., Handbook 3, Project Assistance Guidance, Chapters 2 and 3, Washington, D.C.: USAID.

U.S.A.I.D. "AID Policy Paper. Institutional Development," Washington, D.C.: USAID, March, 1983.

U.S.A.I.D. "US Assistance Strategy for Africa: 1987-1990," AFR/DP, March, 1987.