

PJ-ARE-172

1988 5 25 88

11

IMPROVING AFRICA PROGRAMS:  
RESPONDING TO AGENCY AND CONGRESSIONAL CONCERNS THROUGH  
SOCIAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ANALYSIS

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. 4  
Office of Development Planning  
Bureau for Africa  
May, 1988

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS	3
1.0 INTRODUCTION	4
2.0 GENERAL FINDINGS AND COMPARISONS	4
3.0 THE STATUS OF SOCIAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ANALYSIS IN AFRICA BUREAU DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE	9
3.1 Project Assistance: FY 1984-87	9
3.1.1 Methodology	9
3.1.2 Findings	19
3.2 Non-Project Assistance: FY 1985-88	12
3.2.1 Methodology	12
3.2.2 Findings	13
3.3 CDSS's and Action Plans, FY 1987-1989	14
3.3.1 Methodology	14
3.3.2 Findings	14
4.0 SUGGESTED AFRICA BUREAU STRATEGIES FOR ADDRESSING GAPS IN CURRENT PRACTICE AND CONGRESSIONAL CONCERNS	15
ANNEX 1: Recommendations	21
ANNEX 2: Suggested Guidelines for Social and Institutional Analysis in Non-project Assistance	24
INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED FOR REVIEW	28
DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	29
REFERENCES	31

## GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS

AEPRP	African Economic Policy Reform Program
CDSS	Country Development Strategy Statement
CIP	Commodity Import Program
CR	Continuing Resolution (FY 1988)
ESF	Economic Support Fund
PAAD	Program Assistance Authorization Document
PAIP	Program Assistance Identification Proposal
PID	Project Identification Document
PP	Project Paper
SIP	Social and Institutional Profile

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report provides an overall assessment of the state of recent social and institutional analysis in Africa Bureau programming. It is based on a desk review of such analyses in project assistance documents, non-project assistance documents, action plans, and country development strategy statements (see Vondal 1988a, 1988b, 1988c). The major premise of these reviews is that given the assumption that a well designed program or project increases the chances of successfully achieving its goals and objectives, it is axiomatic then that attention to program features impinging on social, institutional, and political issues must be part of the analysis incorporated into that design. Good social and institutional analysis, along with good political, environmental, and economic analysis, enhances the likelihood of feasible designs, the probability of successful implementation, and sustainability of benefits for the target population. At issue in this set of reviews, is the quality and utility of social and institutional analysis in Agency development assistance planning for Sub-Saharan Africa.

The first part of this report compares the quality of analysis found in each type of development assistance planning document, and suggests some of the probable explanations behind these findings. Because the African Economic Policy Reform Program has become the centerpiece of Agency strategy for Sub-Saharan Africa, major emphasis is given to the findings in planning documents associated with this type of assistance.

The second part of the report gives a summary of the methodology utilized to review social and institutional analysis in project and non-project assistance, and in CDSS's and Action Plans. It also presents some of the specific findings under each of these reviews.

The third part of the report combines recommendations for addressing the findings of these reviews, with suggested preliminary actions for properly responding to social concerns identified in the 1988 Continuing Resolution and proposed legislation regarding assistance to Sub-Saharan Africa. Specific recommendations for improving social and institutional analyses in each type of development assistance planning document are found in Annex 1. Annex 2 provides suggested guidelines for social and institutional analysis in non-project assistance.

## 2.0 GENERAL FINDINGS AND COMPARISONS

Overall, with some outstanding exceptions, the general quality and utility of social and institutional analyses in Africa Bureau programming as

reflected in these reviews is insufficient in light of need. Moreover, in instances where good analyses were done, they were frequently not incorporated into project, program, CDSS, and Action Plan designs. Yet this input is sorely needed in all forms of development assistance.

As the premise for economic growth, development implies changes in the behavior and accepted practices of individuals from Ministry level policy makers in capital cities down to women farmers in the most remote and poor villages. A sole reliance on any one disciplinary framework cannot in itself serve to move development forward. Clearly, designs reflecting multidisciplinary frameworks are called for which incorporate professional social, institutional, economic, political, and environmental analyses. A multidisciplinary approach is necessary for the design of all types of development assistance, including non-project and sectoral assistance which is rapidly growing in importance among many donor and lending agencies.

Notwithstanding the overall low frequency and quality of analysis reflected in design documents, there were important differences found in each type of development assistance. Compared to the analyses reviewed in non-project assistance, CDSS's, and Action Plans, social and institutional analyses in Africa Bureau project assistance are more frequently found and are of higher quality.

One of the major reasons for this is that specific requirements and guidance for this type of analysis have had a longer history in project assistance. There is a long tradition of projectized assistance in the Agency compared to other types of development assistance, and accordingly, there has been a corresponding formalization of guidance for systematic design and evaluation which explicitly provides for conducting social analysis. Guidelines for conducting a social soundness analysis for project papers were incorporated into Handbook 3 in 1975, and for project identification papers in 1981. The original impetus for these guidelines was the legislation of 1973 which mandated the Agency to focus development assistance on the poorest of the poor.

These detailed guidelines, which were recently singled out for their highly evolved state by the Development Assistance Committee's 1987 review of project appraisal criteria and procedures, have most certainly contributed to the higher incidence and higher quality of social analysis. This review also found evidence that the 1981 requirements for conducting a social soundness analysis in the PID stage may be contributing to a stronger and more useful analysis in the corresponding PP in those PID's for which a thorough analysis was done based on those guidelines.

In contrast, both the incidence and quality of social and institutional analysis in non-project assistance was rated fairly low. The review was based primarily on an examination of PAIP's and PAAD's for economic policy reform programs from FY 1985-1988. There are a number of reasons which may explain this finding. First, there is no guidance for social analysis tailored to the features of non-project assistance, and in particular to policy-based assistance, which is aimed at achieving broad-based economic growth. This is in part explained by the relatively short history of non-project assistance use of ESF, CIPs or Food-Aid for policy-based assistance, and by the major differences between project and non-project assistance.

Historically, non-project assistance was created as a mechanism for the quick dispersment of funds, commodities, or food aid based on specific needs. Missions requesting this type of assistance are required to demonstrate why the project form of assistance is not adequate to the situation. Once reason is established, this assistance (whether cash, food aid, or commodity) is made available without the more lengthy process required of project assistance which includes more specific up-front analyses (economic, social, administrative, and environmental), and the working out of a logical framework. The logical framework, which is the hallmark of project designs, requires a careful deliniation of project goal, purposes, objectives, assumptions, and criteria indicating progress made toward those objectives. The logframe thus has the capability of serving as a touchstone for analysts and designers representing various disciplinary backgrounds, and if used in a learning process fashion, can lead the actors to requestion their assumptions and means of achieving project goals and objectives throughout the life of the activity. These requirements then represent major differences between non-project and project planning and design; and are one of the major sources of differences found between the quality of social and institutional analyses contained in the respective documents.

The African Economic Policy Reform Program (AEPRP), begun in 1985, commonly falls under the category of program sector assistance, although these programs may encompass as well aspects covered under non-project assistance in cases where a particular sector is not highlighted. However, to date, economic policy reform programs, as well as other forms of non-project assistance, have been designed without the formal systematic guidance available for project design which includes the identification of purpose, indicators of achievement, and critical assumptions, and hence, explicit considerations of social and institutional issues. While guidance specific to the AEPRP is currently being developed, the Handbook 3 guidance for project assistance provides a good starting point for conducting

social analysis for these programs. However, there are several major issues and features of economic policy reform programs that these guidelines do not cover, yet which have major social and institutional implications. Specifically, it lacks guidance on the analysis of issues related to privatization and liberalization reforms which are central to many programs; and for institutional analysis on the level of large public sector entities or parastatals which are either charged with program implementation, monitoring, etc., or are the targets of policy reforms themselves.

A second reason explaining the low level of social and institutional analysis found in the design documents for these programs is the very short time period available to Missions for program design once funding decisions are made. In most instances, adequate and up-to-date social and institutional data relevant to economic policy reform design are lacking. Under conditions of little time in which to identify major issues, analyze data and trends, and to draft such programs, the lack of appropriate social and institutional data is a primary stumbling block. A major lacuna in the data base is local level data from which to project program impacts. Recent PFC and Africa Bureau guidance for the development of CDSS' and Action Plans requires Missions to begin collecting baseline data for monitoring and evaluation of program and project goals. This requirement may eventually help to fill in this gap.

There is a growing body of international development literature which indicates a great deal of concern regarding the impacts of structural adjustment and economic policy reform programs on social services, and the nutritional and economic status of various groups within the population. Seminars, conferences, and workshops continue to be held on the topic. A major concern is that the period of adjustment prior to the onset of positive effects resulting from such reforms is longer than anticipated. Accordingly, this protracted adjustment period and its resultant impacts may not only jeopardize the willingness of governments to continue with reforms, but may also have serious negative effects on populations least able to make their own "interim adjustments."

This literature and these conferences and seminars have spawned a great debate as to the exact nature of these impacts, which groups are actually experiencing negative impacts, and as to whether or not declines in economic and health conditions in nations undergoing reforms can be properly ascribed to such programs or to the conditions of deep recession prevailing in these nations prior to the adjustment programs. Until appropriate data are collected on the local level for continual monitoring

before, during, and after adjustment programs among the range of subpopulation groups believed to be impacted, this debate will continue. The Agency is one of the lead actors in beginning to collect such data along with several other donors and lenders in the international development community such as the World Bank and UNDP.

This debate notwithstanding, there is a growing agreement on the part of most donors and countries that while economic conditions are improving for some rural producers, for example, those with access to land, agricultural inputs, credit, farm to market infrastructure, and markets as a result of agricultural sector policy reforms, many still have not shared in that growth. There still exists a great deal of unemployment, underemployment, hunger, adverse health conditions, poor infrastructure, and inadequate schooling and training opportunities in many Sub-Saharan African nations. These conditions will negatively affect large parts of the population with or without structural reforms in the near term.

Projectized development assistance will continue to address these conditions and local currency generated from non-project assistance will continue to be utilized in a complementary fashion. In projectized assistance, social scientists can and should contribute to design teams by utilizing an increasingly problem-oriented (as opposed to descriptive) framework to collect data and to articulate their social and institutional analyses and attendant recommendations. Concomitantly, Missions should seek to utilize such problem-oriented social scientists who have specific qualifications related to features of the proposed project beyond the more general requirement for appropriate country-specific background.

The review of CDSS' and Action Plans also uncovered an insufficient incidence and quality of social and institutional analyses. Where these were conducted adequately, the findings were often not linked up with the resultant Mission country development strategy plan. Guidance for the conceptualization of these country-wide planning documents and supporting analyses are not as extensive as those found in Handbook 3 for project assistance. The guidance assumes that Missions are already cognizant of the major social, economic, and political issues currently relevant to the host country. Strategy documents are presumed to be based on the analysis of the major issues and conditions faced by that country within a given planning period.

While both explicit and implicit requirements for social and institutional analysis of major issues have been incorporated into guidance, these are not on the whole well reflected in the CDSS' and Action Plan

strategies reviewed. Recent PPC and Africa Bureau guidance for the planning year 1990 requires that monitoring and evaluation of the progress and impacts of CDSS strategies be undertaken on a "grass-roots" as well as national level, disaggregated by gender. With these data on hand, future social and institutional analyses may be more readily undertaken which should increase the likelihood that such analyses will be incorporated into the design of CDSS' and Action Plans.

### 3.0 THE STATUS OF SOCIAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ANALYSIS IN AFRICA BUREAU DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

This section of the paper presents the major findings on the status of social and institutional analysis in Africa Bureau as portrayed in both project and non-project assistance, and in action plans, and country development strategy statements for Sub-Saharan Africa. The assessment is based on a desk review of selected PID's, PP's (preparatory documents for project assistance); PAIP's, PAAD's (documents for non-project assistance); and CDSS's, and Action Plans (see Vondal 1988a, 1988b, 1988c) prepared during FY 1984-1988. In all cases, the starting point for reviewing the frequency and quality of social and institutional analysis in these documents was the existing Agency guidance for conducting this type of analysis as found in Handbooks 1, 3, and 4; the yearly guidance for CDSS's and Actions Plans issued by PPC, and the supplementary guidance issued by the Africa Bureau. The following represents a summation of those findings contained in the reviews that were conducted for each type of development assistance.

#### 3.1 Project Assistance FY 1984-1987

##### 3.1.1 Methodology

Fifteen projects from FY 1984 to 1987 in the agriculture/natural resource sector were identified for review. Decisions were made to focus on projects in countries that had been targeted by the Bureau to be of highest priority for Agency development assistance (Category I and II countries). Projects in the agricultural/ natural resources sector were specifically chosen for review in support of the Bureau's planning for Sub-Saharan Africa which highlights this sector as part of a strategy to promote sustainable agricultural development and environmental regeneration as the basis for economic growth (see USAID, "U.S. Assistance Strategy for Africa: 1987-1990"). Although the sample is small, it is believed that these 15 projects from FY 84-87 provide a good indication of the status of social and institutional analysis for projects in that sector.

The existing guidelines for social soundness analysis found in Handbook 3 for PID's and PP's were utilized as the basis for reviewing the frequency and quality of social analysis. There are currently no Agency guidelines for conducting institutional analysis. However, a majority of the reports reviewed did include an institutional analysis reflecting the increasing prevalence of institutional development related activities in AID development assistance. Hence, the review put forth a very basic set of criteria for institutional analysis based on a number of recent publications on institutional and organizational development and subjected the documents selected (the PID's and PP's) to these criteria for assessment. These project documents were then subsequently rated for the quality and utility of social and institutional analysis contained within. The analyses were given numerical ratings in which 0 - no mention of issue; 1 - brief mention of issue but no analysis; 2 - intermediate level of analysis of issue and its implication for the project; and 3 - full analysis of issue and some means of addressing it (i.e., providing alternatives, recommendations, etc.)

### 3.1.2 Findings

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

1. The project papers reviewed covered approximately 90% of the criteria for conducting social soundness analysis as set forth in the guidelines in Handbook 3. Criteria that were not covered in the majority of the social soundness analyses reviewed include issues related to project replicability and diffusion of project activities.
2. Areas of analytical strength in both PID and PP analyses were found in defining possible obstacles to project implementation; motivations and incentives of beneficiaries for project participation; assessing the direct impacts of project activities on the targeted beneficiaries; and in assessing the capability of institutions and organizations targeted for participation to undertake project activities. The two descriptions below provide brief examples of the value of these analyses to project design and implementation.

One of the best analyses defining motivations and incentives of targeted beneficiaries for project participation is found in the Senegal Agricultural Production Support project paper. The analyst discussed the various smallholder incentives for purchasing and using improved inputs for increasing cereal production to be provided under the project, and suggested the extension of consumer credit to strengthen incentives to purchase these and increase their affordability. Since one of the project goals is to facilitate the privatization of input distribution and cereals

marketing in Senegal, the analyst also discussed motivations for obtaining loans for inputs from private vs. public sources. A good example of an analysis of organizational capability is contained in the Rwanda Farming Systems Improvement project paper. It 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 identified 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. Areas of weakness found in both PID and their corresponding PP's was in the analysis of sustainability issues, of beneficiary participation in any phase of the project other than implementation activities; equity of access to participation or to project resources; and of negatively and indirectly impacted population groups.

4. A major issue for social/institutional analysis that was not well covered in the documents reviewed is the issue of communication whether in farming systems research and development projects, reforestation/conservation projects, and in agricultural research and extension projects. The issue arises because of the need for two-way communication between targeted beneficiary groups, intermediary organizations and field personnel, research institutes, and ministries.

Social scientists could provide significant contributions by suggesting means to facilitate communications in those projects which feature on-farm research and development, and in projects featuring the development and extension of productive technology that is environmentally, socially, and economically appropriate. For example, in the Mali Farming Systems Research and Extension project paper, 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.

5. Findings from social and institutional analyses were not consistently linked up with the project assumptions, goals, and objectives; nor were they consistently linked up with recommendations for project design. In cases where recommendations based on the analysis and project goals and objectives were made, these recommendations were utilized in the project design.

An excellent example of an analysis which did relate objectives and perceived problems to proposed solutions is contained in the Malawi Agricultural Research and Extension project which seeks to reorient the crop technology generation system toward 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 communities. The analyst proposed recommendations for the composition of professionals to participate in the Adaptive Research Teams, and for recruiting farmers in target areas into the research to guarantee maximum participation of female-headed farms and low-resource farms. These recommendations were accordingly incorporated into the project design.

6. Analyses of social soundness criteria that were 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.

### 3.2 Non-Project Assistance, FY1985-1988

#### 3.2.1 Methodology

The frequency, quality, and utility of social and institutional analysis in non-project assistance to Sub-Saharan Africa was based on a desk review of PAIP's and their corresponding PAAD's in 17 programs. Fourteen of these 17 programs were economic policy reform programs. The review of existing guidance for conducting social and institutional analysis for non-project assistance did not cover several issues specific to economic policy reform programs. Hence, criteria for conducting these analyses were constructed based on the existing guidance found in Handbooks 1, 3, and 4, and on social and institutional issues revealed from a reading of impact assessment studies in five African countries currently undergoing policy reform programs, and related documents (see Annex 2).

The impact assessment studies, contracted and published by the Agency, as well as other documents on the topic were utilized as sources of information regarding the range of possible social and institutional impacts and issues related to structural adjustment and policy reform programs. The findings from these studies and the issues raised in these and other documents, are clearly not generalizable to all such programs. While none of these studies specifically focus on the Agency's economic policy reform programs, their importance and their use in this study was in their utility

for beginning to frame criteria for social and institutional analysis in non-project assistance. These impact assessment studies were reviewed in regard to their major findings related to social and institutional issues along with their implications for policy reform programs in general.

The 17 programs were reviewed according to the constructed criteria discussed above, and they were then subsequently rated according to their level and quality of analysis. Briefly, the programs were given numerical ratings in which 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 to mitigate negative impacts, etc.).

Not all of the documents reviewed contained a section or annex of social and/or institutional analysis findings. Therefore, the entire document (both PAIP's and PAAD's) was subjected to these criteria and the rating system for any reflections of a social and institutional analysis found within the body of that document.

### 3.2.2 Findings

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

1. Existing evidence points to the fact that institutional capability is crucial to successful program implementation. The Zambia agricultural sector policy impact assessment provides a powerful argument for the necessity of analyzing institutional capacity to implement, monitor, and evaluate economic policy reform programs. All of the programs reviewed evinced an awareness of institutional issues; however, the quality of analysis of institutional capability is low.
2. Programs which require the transfer of specific economic functions from the public to the private sector must identify private sector alternative institutions or groups of people who would take over these activities and analyze their capability to conduct those functions. Of the programs reviewed, only one among the nine programs which required the reduction or elimination of public sector involvement in activities such as commodity marketing or agricultural input distribution, gave some analysis of capability.
3. Equity issues require analysis in programs involving new private sector arrangements for the provision and distribution of goods, or in instances where a new or expanded resource is being provided under an existing

institution. Among the few programs reviewed which mention equitability of access as an issue, there was no identification of which population groups are of concern, and no recommendations provided to address this issue.

4. There is an incomplete analysis of projected impacts from the reforms, goods and services that will be implemented under economic policy reform programs. The majority of the designs reviewed have not undertaken analyses of both negatively and positively affected populations for short-term and longer-term impacts. Yet this information is crucial for lessening the effects of negative impact during interim stages of program implementation; and for lessening the chances of civil unrest or cessation of political support for these programs.

### 3.3 CDSS's and Actions Plans, FY 1987-1989

#### 3.3.1 Methodology

The level and quality of social and institutional analysis in CDSS' and Action Plans developed for FY 1987 through 1989 for Sub-Saharan Africa was reviewed to determine the extent to which planning documents are incorporating social and institutional issues. A total of 11 documents were reviewed for the countries of Somalia, Liberia, Guinea, Madagascar, Niger, Zambia, Cameroon, Rwanda, and Mali. Guidance prepared by PPC and the Africa Bureau for developing CDSS' and Action Plans were utilized to review the analysis of social and institutional issues in these documents. The guidance documents themselves were also reviewed to ascertain the extent to which such analyses have been required.

#### 3.3.2 Findings

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

1. PPC guidance for FY 1990 CDSS's and Action Plans, and the Africa Bureau guidance for 1988-91 Action Plans, covers many of the concerns contained in the language of the Continuing Resolution regarding U.S. development assistance to Sub-Saharan Africa in respect to social and institutional issues.
2. The guidance requirements for a specific monitoring and evaluation section with plans for collecting gender-disaggregated base-line data as program progress indicators, precedes the possible passage of the African Famine Recovery and Development Act passed by the House. This Act would also require Missions to monitor and evaluate the performance of development assistance with special reference to the poor majority.
3. With the exception of the Niger, Rwanda and Cameroon CDSS's, there is

insufficient social and institutional analysis in the documents reviewed under the "Constraints to Development" section as required by CDSS guidance, and there is scant indication of prior social and institutional analysis in the restatement of problems and objectives required by the Action Plan guidance.

4. CDSS strategy implementation plans are only loosely connected to the problem statements and analyses of constraints to development in regard to social and institutional issues. Benchmarks for measuring progress toward CDSS objectives are not formulated in terms of progress made by population groups in any of the CDSS' or Action Plans, nor do they include indicators for change in the conditions of women and the poor.

#### 4.0 SUGGESTED AFRICA BUREAU STRATEGIES FOR ADDRESSING GAPS IN CURRENT PRACTICE AND CONGRESSIONAL CONCERNS

This section of the report provides several suggestions for actions and activities which would address the major analytical gaps discussed above. In addition to improving program assistance, they would also serve as a basis for directly responding to concerns by Congress reflected in the Continuing Resolution and the proposed African Famine Recovery and Development Act. Specific recommendations for improving both program and project assistance based on the review of social and institutional analysis in Africa Bureau planning documents (PAADs, PAIPs, PPs, PIDs, CDSSs and Actions Plans) are found in Annex 1.

The language of the Continuing Resolution evidences Congressional concern for the social and institutional effects of our assistance to Africa. It states that assistance made available "shall be used to help the poor majority in Sub-Saharan Africa through a process of long-term development and economic growth that is equitable, participatory, environmentally sustainable, and self reliant..." The CR furthermore states that assistance should also be used to overcome shorter-term constraints to long-term development, i.e., through promoting reform of sectoral economic policies to support the critical sector priorities of agricultural production and natural resources, health, voluntary family planning services, education, and economic opportunities; but that however assisted policy reforms "should take into account the need to protect vulnerable groups." Hence, to reiterate, these recommendations are based in part on redressing major analytical gaps uncovered by the review of social and institutional analysis in Africa Bureau programs and projects.

1. Non-project assistance should be designed under the direction of a Direct Hire Project Development Officer assisted by multidisciplinary teams providing the appropriate analyses. The Bureau should consider requesting PPC to review the design and analytical guidelines for non-project assistance in Handbook 4 to determine their current adequacy, and to formulate guidelines for the various participating disciplines as appropriate to non-project assistance issues. Suggested interim guidelines for conducting social/institutional analysis appear in Annex 2 of this report.

2. Strengthen the quality and utility of social and institutional analysis in Africa Bureau programs and projects. Two steps can be undertaken to improve analyses.

a. The Bureau can require by contract that social and institutional analysts link their analyses to the assumptions, goals, and objectives of the project/program, and to provide design suggestions and alternatives in response to highlighted problems and issues revealed by the analysis.

b. The Bureau should consider expanding its access to social/analytical expertise, particularly for proper oversight and quality control of the design, implementation, and evaluation of non-project assistance. Given the limitations on the numbers of direct hire personnel available to perform such oversight, the Bureau might consider one or more of the other modes it can utilize, e.g., IPAs, PASAs, PSCs, to secure such expertise. A social science resource matrix is currently being developed as a guide for accessing appropriate personnel.

3. Strengthen host Country institutional and organizational performance in projects and programs.

a. The basis for improved performance must start with an institutional analysis. The Agency and the Bureau may wish to formalize requirements for institutional analysis in all projects and programs, and to provide formal guidance on conducting institutional analysis. This is particularly important where institutional performance will be critical to successful implementation of a reform program, or where the private sector is expected to assume responsibilities for the provision of goods or services divested by public sector agencies. Such analyses are already incorporated into many projects and programs although they are not required.

b. Missions could provide focused management and administrative training and issues seminars to institutions targeted for project/program involvement based on the skills gaps and issues uncovered by the institutional analysis, and the agreed upon goals and objectives of the project/program they will be jointly involved in.

#### 4 Begin Applied Research on Critical Issues Highlighted by the Bureau's Africa Strategy and by the Continuing Resolution.

a. While the language in the Continuing Resolution and other proposed legislation specifically highlights the importance of recognizing the major role of African women in the development process, particularly in agriculture, the Agency should also recognize the important role of children and the aged. They are also key sources of agricultural labor, and their availability informs the basis of household production and marketing strategies as does the availability of adult women and men.

Missions, however, should begin by financing applied field research on women's existing agricultural technologies, practices, and daily time allocation for tasks. Such research may also begin to capture the roles of children and the aged. These field research data should then be utilized to develop technologies which are low-cost, labor-saving, and which increase the productivity and efficiency of women's work. This type of research could provide the basis of an improved WID strategy that is integrated into the realities of family and community life in Africa, and which could also link into country agricultural policies.

b. Privatization is at the heart of many Africa Bureau projects and economic policy reform programs. As a means of ensuring that economic, distributive, marketing, health, and other social services will be provided to populations with the dissolution of public agencies and parastatals or the removal of such activities from these entities, the Bureau can finance preliminary research on the private sector in the targeted country.

This should be seen as a two step procedure. The first step would be to identify organizations or groups of individuals in the private formal and informal sector who may be capable of taking over functions and activities of public sector entities. The second step would be to undertake a feasibility analysis to determine capabilities and willingness of identified alternative entities and individuals. Based on these identification and feasibility studies, Missions may choose to provide some targeted training and service activities to strengthen the capability of individuals and organizations to take over public sector functions. Accordingly, Missions may choose to promote a slower, phased reduction of public sector involvement in service provision until confidence in the private sector is gained.

#### 5. Strengthen assistance activities related to women's participation in development as students, researchers, and managers.

a. Given the emphasis on women's participation in development, the Bureau could begin to systematically support the development of African women researchers, managers, and administrators in the fields of

agriculture, natural resources management, social science, agricultural economics, environmental science, and the administrative and management sciences. Educational support would necessarily have to begin at the primary levels.

b. African women who are trained in the above areas could be hired more frequently and systematically for undertaking field research and management positions in support of the above activities.

6. Strengthen the role of social and institutional analysis in natural resource management, agriculture, reforestation, antidesertification projects, and other projects impacting on the environment.

a. The Bureau can improve the design and implementation of natural resource management projects and other projects impacting on the environment by utilizing social/institutional and technical analyses, along with economic analysis, to determine the most feasible interventions and the best institutional configurations to implement the activities.

b. For those projects involving environmental and natural resource management research, additional research on people's existing uses of resources, their reasons why, and the existing institutional mechanisms for regulating resource use should be added. This action could also begin to build a publishable record on successful natural resource management technologies and practices for the utility of Missions and other donors in the same regions, or in similar environments elsewhere.

7. Improve links with grassroots groups through encouraging PVO's and NGO's to take part in the management of local level projects

a. Missions could hire local African researchers to work in partnership with AID-experienced consultants with in-country knowledge to begin identifying and assessing NGO's. Assessments should include technical areas of strength, managerial capacity, knowledge of local community opportunities and constraints, degree of female representation, and degree of representation of socio-economic levels in the community. Based on this assessment, Missions can identify NGO's for future involvement in development activities. This information could be made available in the Missions to all donors.

b. U.S. PVO's with long-term African development experience, in partnership with large African PVO's, can be utilized as intermediaries between the Mission and local level NGO's for managing community-based projects. These US-African PVO partnerships may also be trained to provide NGO's with technical strengthening in such areas as equitable service delivery, project management, needs assessment, and financial management; thus building up local capabilities.

c. These U.S.-PVO partnerships can eventually help to build a

consortium of local NGO's which could be met with to provide a grassroots perspective, and a voice on local problems and successes regarding development activities. Funding could be provided to consortium representatives to meet with the PVO intermediaries on a biannual basis for this purpose. The findings of these biannual meetings could be utilized for Mission planning.

8. Support data collection and research efforts on the impacts of policy-based and other programmatic types of assistance. These data are urgently needed for projecting impacts in the design stage of programs. The Bureau could take the initiative by supporting research on the development of methodologies to assess economic policy reform and similar sectoral level programs. Some efforts are already underway as exemplified by a recent report prepared for PPC/PDPR (see Hood et al, "The Socioeconomic Impact of Macroeconomic Adjustment," 1988). The authors developed a conceptual framework for analyzing the socioeconomic impacts of macroeconomic adjustment, and carried out a preliminary analysis based on secondary data of four country cases.

8. The Bureau should better utilize the in-house resources it now has access to including the various means of access to social/institutional analytical expertise provided by several S&T projects.

a. The Social and Institutional Profile (SIP) program, initiated in 1982 by PPC/PDPR and now collaborated managed with S&T/RD, was conceived as a means of informing country strategy formulation with systematic analysis on social and institutional processes on which an assistance program might capitalize. It also provides information on the principal social and institutional constraints to development in a particular country. Profiles for 13 countries have been prepared between 1982 and 1987 under a program of matching central and mission funding. Missions without SIPs might want to consider the program for both CDSS development and as a resource for designing policy reform programs.

b. The Bureau and missions could utilize the services of S&T/RD for assistance on non-project activities. S&T/RD sponsors applied research and analysis efforts and consultancy services on several aspects of policy reform issues. A sampling of existing projects are mentioned here as examples. For instance, the Food Security project, managed and funded in conjunction with the Bureau for Africa, has examined farmers' food production and marketing strategies in a number of African countries. The project also assesses the impacts of changes in food pricing policies on these strategies, and in particular, the differential impact of price policies on net seller vs. net buyer households. Another example is the Employment and Enterprise Policy Analysis project. This project considers how to structure policy so as

to enhance productive and efficient employment and efficient enterprises. It assists countries in identifying policies to structure patterns of economic growth and business and employment opportunities that will be consistent with these objectives. The Performance Management project considers how to improve the management of development programs by host country organizations. Currently the project is undertaking public policy analysis on the managerial dimensions of policy reform in Zambia and Liberia. The SARSA (Human Settlements and Resource Systems Analysis) project, has recently analyzed institutional arrangements and policies for the management of river basins and water resources in a number of African countries. It examines the implications of these arrangements for sustainable resource use, intended beneficiaries, and impacts on various other groups.

## ANNEX 1

The following represent specific recommendations for improving program and project assistance through better social and institutional analysis based on a review of these analyses in Africa Bureau planning documents for non-project assistance, project assistance, and CDSSs and Action Plans.

### 1.0 Recommendations for Improving Non-Project Assistance

1. Missions should be required to undertake social and institutional analyses, in concert with economic and other appropriate kinds of analyses, for designing non-project assistance. A professional social science analyst should be included in the design team.
2. The draft guidelines (appearing here in Annex 2) should be reviewed, refined, revised, and adopted as interim guidance for conducting social and institutional analysis for non-project assistance. The existing guidance for conducting social soundness analysis in project assistance should be utilized while these revised guidelines are under review.
3. Future social and institutional analyses should not only constitute a separate annex or section in program design documents, they should also inform program design.
4. Impact studies of economic policy reform programs and other forms of non-project assistance should include examinations of social and institutional impacts below the national level. These data should be disaggregated for impacts on appropriate sub-population groups and by gender as one means of implementing mid-program adjustments and as a means of informing future program design.
5. Programs should include a clear monitoring and evaluation plan, and funding for the collection and analysis of baseline data in instances where data are lacking from which to predict and/or assess social and institutional impacts. These data should be analyzed on the local as well as national levels during the life of program implementation as well as at its conclusion.

## 2.0 Recommendations for Improving Project Assistance

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. 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. The Agency should consider preparing guidance for carrying out institutional analyses.
3. Future social soundness analyses should routinely be required to relate the analysis back to the project goal and purpose as a means of increasing its utility.
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.
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 all of the criteria identified under the social soundness analysis guidelines have relevance for most projects, analysis of the factors and concerns highlighted above can more specifically assist the Africa Bureau in its strategy for development assistance in Sub-Saharan Africa.

### 3.0 Recommendations for Improving CDSSs and Action Plans

1. CDSS and Action Plan implementation strategies should strive toward achieving a greater balance between macro level policy reform solutions including macro-institutional development, and local level solutions featuring greater participation and awareness of equity and gender issues, and existing conditions on a regional and sub-regional level.
2. The recent requirement for monitoring and evaluation plans, and the collection of gender-disaggregated baseline data on a grass-roots as well as national level for measuring and improving program performance deserves emphasis and continuing budget support. These data can also assist in informing future project and program development, and are crucial for understanding the link between micro-level and macro-level processes and changes. However, in addition to carrying out data collection activities, Missions should also consider employing professional social science expertise for the analysis of these data.
3. Missions should consider maintaining their own updated data banks or libraries on social, political, and institutional conditions in their host country for use in preparing planning documents, and in developing benchmarks for tracking program progress. These should include updated Social and Institutional Profiles from the SIP program, evaluations, data collections from projects, university theses, etc.

## ANNEX 2

### SUGGESTED GUIDELINES FOR SOCIAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ANALYSIS IN NON-PROJECT ASSISTANCE

The guidelines below are recommendations for writing a social and institutional analysis in non-project assistance (CIPs, Food Aid, Cash Grants, Economic Policy Reform programs). They are based on the review of social and institutional analyses in non-project assistance contained in this report.

#### 1.0 Understanding the Impact Population

1.1 What are the groups of people that are the intended beneficiaries of the proposed program? The characterization of these groups should include such features as location, approximate numbers, age and sex composition, and any other data that the analyst determines is relevant as it relates to the goals and objectives of the proposed program. What are the major constraints and incentives which affect the productivity and behavior of these groups which the program wishes to address?

1.2 If the program is one that primarily addresses the agricultural sector, the analyst should include a description of the relevant features of the farming system and the social organization of the populations engaged in it. This description should also include features such as age and sex composition, land ownership patterns, etc. for each socio-economic group that will be affected by the program (i.e., small holders, large land holders, estate owners, herders, etc.). The analyst should also identify the major issues affecting productivity in the sector such as labor constraints, poor farm-to-market roads, scarcity of productive land, credit availability, low farm-gate prices, and competing economic opportunities for the producer groups.

1.3 In programs that address marketing systems, the analyst should describe the existing marketing system with attention to individuals that participate and make their living through trade and marketing, and where they originate from. This may include individual small-scale traders, small organized family groups, firms, the producers themselves, truckers, boat operators, etc. How often and where are farmer markets held for the sale of commodities being addressed under the program? What bulking, storage, and transport methods are utilized? Where in the system is credit utilized and by whom? What are the major constraints and strengths in the system as it currently operates as expressed by different groups who

operate in it (i.e., poor storage facilities, poor roads, low export or import taxes, favorable credit availability)?

## 2.0 Program Impacts

2.1 Examine the credibility of program design assumptions regarding the nature of the planned impact on targeted beneficiaries. Discuss probable short and long term, direct and indirect impacts on all possible groups. The analyst should anticipate negative impacts as well, and recommend means to mitigate these. Briefly discuss the reasoning behind impact predictions based on what is known of the livelihood and status of impact groups.

## 3.0 Political Issues

3.1 What is the current political climate and factors that are affecting it which could either support or constrain program objectives and goals? These may include internal events such as student movements, or strong public support from recent elections; and external events such as regional warfare or sudden loss of overseas markets for critical commodities produced by the country. Recommend how the proposed program can take these events into account to ensure political support for reforms.

3.2 What are the likely host government reactions to conditionalities and covenants attached to program disbursement schedules of cash grants, food aid, and/or commodities (as appropriate)? What incentives do government figures have for meeting the proposed conditions? Recommend how government concerns be incorporated into the design of conditionalities as a means of gaining support for the program.

3.3 Assess the possibility of civil unrest in response to features of the proposed program. Include attention to such groups as political party members, university students, urban poor, trade unions, rural poor, civil servants, etc. Recommend means to reduce or eliminate negative program impacts that may result in civil unrest (i.e., specially targeted food aid packages for urban poor who may be affected by subsidy removal of basic foods, job training programs for released civil servants, etc.)

## 4.0 Institutional Issues

4.1 Describe the organizational culture of host country institutions that will be involved in program implementation, monitoring, evaluation,

and/or coordination. This should include lines of authority, communication systems, incentives for production, personnel advancement systems, political factions, etc. How can the relevant features of these institutions either enhance or constrain program implementation success? Recommend means for working effectively with the institution based on this analysis.

4.2 Assess the capability of available personnel of all institutions involved with the program in the areas of activity they are tasked with. These activities may include, for example: a) coordination, b) policy analysis, c) implementation, d) data collection and analysis, e) monitoring, f) evaluation, g) decision making for program readjustment. Provide recommendations for technical assistance or training that is needed to conduct program activities as identified in the assessment.

4.3 Assess the quantity and quality of financial and equipment resources available to the institution to conduct the activity it is tasked with. Recommend what additional resources may be necessary to conduct these activities.

4.4 Determine the institutions which must be involved in decision making and implementation of the program, and the necessity for coordination among these entities. If coordination is deemed necessary, what is the mechanism or institution that could provide this function? Recommend how this coordination should work.

4.5 Assess potential issues relating to the sequential ordering of program implementation when the program contains more than one measure. Will changing the order of implementation create negative social, political or economic impacts? Briefly analyze factors which would pressure or otherwise lead implementing institutions to make changes. Recommend to the extent possible how the program could take these factors into account.

4.6 Assess the ability of the relevant institutions to implement the program under the proposed timetable. What are the possible causes of delay or "speed-up;" and how might changes affect the success or failure of the program? Recommend how the program design could address these issues to the extent that they can be anticipated.

4.7 What organizations, groups of individuals, etc., are identified as alternative service providers under programs in which services of public entities are being reduced or phased out? What is the evidence that the

private sector alternatives have the capacity to provide these services? Recommend alternative organizations, or, means for strengthening the capacity of identified organizations, as appropriate following the above analysis.

4.8 Identify equity issues related to alternative institutional arrangements for service provision under the program. In instances where services are being expanded, such as increased availability of production credit under an existing bank or coop; or for the distribution of imported commodities under a Food Aid program or a CIP, what institutional mechanisms are in place to ensure equity of access? Should any subgroups of the population be especially targeted for equity concerns (i.e. women, small-scale traders, small-scale enterprise owners, etc.?) Recommend means for increasing equity of access to goods and/or services under the program.

4.9 Assess the possibility that host country implementors can sustain the program. This should include attention to such issues as institutional capacity and political support for the program. Provide recommendations to ensure sustainability of the program as appropriate. These may include such actions as ensuring the active participation of key ministerial officials in the design of program implementation plans; providing training in policy analysis for selected personnel; etc.

## 5.0 Incorporating Lessons Learned

5.1 What information on social, political, and institutional impacts or issues from similar programs are relevant and useful for the design of the current program? What evidence is there that these impacts or issues could arise under the proposed program? Recommend how such information should be incorporated into the program.

## 6.0 Data for Monitoring and Evaluation

6.1 Assess social, political, and institutional data needs for program monitoring and evaluation, and as a means for testing program assumptions. How should such data be analyzed and incorporated into possible program modifications? Recommend potential host country organizations and/or individuals who should be employed for data collection and analysis under the program.

INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED FOR REVIEWS OF SOCIAL AND INSTITUTIONAL  
ANALYSIS

USAID

Gerald Cashion, AFR/DP/PPE  
Edward Greeley, AFR/DP/PPE  
Gerald Wolgin, AFR/DP/PAR  
Carol Peasley, AFR/PD  
Emmy Simmons, AFR/DP/PPE  
Joan Atherton, PPC/PDPR  
John Grayzel, ST/RD/RRD  
Jerome French, ST/RD/IDM  
Christine Keller, LA

World Bank

Michel Noel  
Michael Cernea

**DOCUMENTS REVIEWED**

Africa Bureau Project Assistance, 1984-1987

Project Identification Documents (PID'S) and Project Papers (PP'S)

Liberia: Agricultural Research and Extension II  
 Somalia: Livestock Marketing and Health  
 Zaire: Agricultural Marketing and Development  
 Zaire: Area Food and Marketing Development  
 Sudan: Western Sudan Agricultural Marketing Road  
 Rwanda: Farming Systems Improvement  
 Cameroon: National Cereals Research and Extension II  
 Malawi: Agricultural Research and Extension  
 Mali: Farming Systems Research and Development  
 Kenya: National Agricultural Research  
 Senegal: Agricultural Production Support  
 Niger: Applied Agricultural Research  
 Zambia: Agricultural Training/Planning/Institutional Development II  
 Senegal: Reforestation and Conservation  
 Sudan: Reforestation and Antidesertification

Africa Bureau Non-Project Assistance 1985-1988

Program Assistance Identification Proposals (PAIP'S)

Mali Economic Policy Reform Program  
 Zaire Economic Policy Reform Program  
 Malawi Economic Policy Reform Program  
 The Gambia Economic Policy Reform Program  
 Tanzania Economic Policy Reform Program  
 Cameroon Economic Policy Reform Program  
 Uganda Economic Policy Reform Program  
 Niger Economic Policy Reform Program

Program Assistance Approval Documents (PAAD'S)

Malawi Economic Policy Reform Program  
 Zambia Commodity Import Program  
 Rwanda Economic Policy Reform Program  
 Mauritius Economic Policy Reform Program  
 Mali Economic Policy Reform Program  
 Malawi Parastatal Divestiture Program  
 Guinea Economic Policy Reform Support Program  
 Zaire Economic Policy Reform Program  
 Senegal Economic Policy Reform Program

Togo Cereals Trade Liberalization Program  
Zambia Auction Support Program  
The Gambia Economic Policy Reform Program  
Tanzania Economic Policy Reform Program  
Cameroon Economic Policy Reform Program

Africa Bureau Country Development Strategy Statements (CDSS'S) and  
Action Plans 1987-1989

Somalia Action Plan  
Liberia Action Plan  
Guinea Action Plan  
Mali Action Plan  
Liberia CDSS  
Madagascar CDSS  
Niger CDSS  
Zambia CDSS  
Cameroon CDSS  
Guinea CDSS  
Rwanda CDSS

## REFERENCES

- USAID Congressional Presentation, FY 1989, Annex 1, Africa.
- Continuing Resolution, Sub-Saharan Africa Development Assistance, H12433, December 21, 1987.
- The African Famine Recovery and Development Act, House and Senate Versions, 1987.
- Development Assistance Committee, DAC Review of Project Appraisal Criteria and Procedures, DAC/(87) 11, p. 58.
- Hood, R., J. McGuire, and M. Starr "The Socioeconomic Impact of Macroeconomic Adjustment," PPC/PDPR/RP, USAID, January, 1988.
- USAID "US Assistance Strategy for Africa: 1987-1990," AFR/DP, March, 1987.
- Vondal, Patricia, "Improving Non-Project Assistance Through Better Social and Institutional Analysis: Suggestions From Africa Bureau Experience," AFR/DP, 1988a.
- Vondal, Patricia, "Social and Institutional Analysis in Agriculture and Natural Resource Sector Project Assistance: Suggestions for Improvement from Africa Bureau Experience," AFR/DP, 1988b.
- Vondal, Patricia, "The Micro-Macro Connection in Country Development Strategies: A Review of Social and Institutional Analysis in Africa Bureau CDSSs and Action Plans," AFR/DP, 1988c.