

CLASSIFICATION PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

Report Symbol U-47

1. PROJECT TITLE Technical Assistance in Water Resource Economics: Planning and Policy Analysis for Irrigation		2. PROJECT NUMBER 931-0236.09	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE DS/AGR/EPP
		4. EVALUATION NUMBER (Enter the number maintained by the reporting unit e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No. beginning with No. 1 each FY) 81-29 6/30/81	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION	

5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES			6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING	7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY <u>79</u>	B. Final Obligation Expected FY <u>82</u>	C. Final Input Delivered FY <u>83</u>	A. Total \$ <u>813,000</u> B. U.S. \$ <u>813,000</u>	From (month/yr.) <u>September, 1979</u> To (month/yr.) <u>December, 1980</u> Date of Evaluation Review <u>December, 1980</u>

8. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., airgram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
1. Obligate remaining funds already approved.	R. Suttor, DS/AGR	12/31/81
2. Request and justify unfunded extensions of cooperative agreements.	K. Easter, UM R. Young, CSU	3/1/82
3. If justified, arrange unfunded extensions of cooperative agreements.	R. Suttor, DS/AGR	4/30/82
4. Develop the conceptual basis for a long term extension and additional funding or, if such extension cannot be agreed upon, develop plans for orderly phase out of project.	R. Suttor, DS/AGR K. Easter, UM R. Young, CSU	12/31/81

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS			10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper	<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) <u>Cooperative Agreement Extension</u>	A. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PIO/T	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify)	B. <input type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or
<input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C		<input type="checkbox"/> Change Implementation Plan
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P		C. <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinue Project

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)		12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval	
Richard E. Suttor, Project Officer RES		Signature <u>Donald R. Fiester</u>	
Clearances: DS/AGR/EPP: <u>10 Hare</u> TJO 5-20-81 DS/AGR: <u>Mozyński</u> MCW 5-28-81 DS/AGR: <u>DFiester</u> DFiester		Typed Name <u>Donald R. Fiester, DS/AGR</u>	
		Date <u>6/30/81</u>	

Project Summary Statement

The project was initiated in September 1979 with funding approved for three years. The project paper anticipates at least two additional years in the life of the project.

The activities specified in the project paper have occurred as planned, except that it has taken more time than anticipated to establish the country research sites. At this point in project implementation, it appears that planned outputs can be achieved with the approved funding if the project termination date is extended.

Since the project is on track, the first action decision is to obligate the remaining funds already approved. The second and third action decisions are scheduled to insure timely unfunded extensions of the two cooperative agreements.

The fourth action decision is intended to deal with the longer term question of whether to fund the project beyond the already approved amount. A key to the longer term design process is the definition of technical assistance.

The term "technical assistance" as used in the project paper has been bothersome and a source of confusion. It has been interpreted by some that the project stands ready to provide on short notice whatever type of professional expertise in the general area of water resources is requested by USAID missions. Judged by that criterion, the project will necessarily fail because (a) not all water resource disciplines are represented by project personnel, and (b) even if the requested expertise is included under the project, it is often impossible to meet the rather rigid schedules of mission requests because of teaching and other commitments of project personnel. Thus, we should not promote the idea that the project will fill unsolicited requests from missions.

The project must, however, generate more field activity if it is to be extended much beyond the present termination date. The suggested strategy for doing this is to identify specific problems encountered in a number of LDCs, write scopes of work for addressing these problems, and then propose the implementation of these scopes of work in selected LDCs. Three topics were tentatively identified: (a) Institutional arrangements for controlling water logging and salinization; (b) Relative benefits and costs of small scale irrigation schemes; (c) Alternative rules for allocation of water among farmers along irrigation canals. During the next few months scopes of work will be developed, reviewed and modified as necessary.

The longer term future of the project will depend upon the quality of those scopes of work and the reactions to them by the missions. It is anticipated that by the end of December 1981 we will either have the conceptual basis for further funding or will have decided to phase out the project with the expenditure of already approved funds.

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART II

Project Title: Technical Assistance on Water Resource Economics:
Planning and Policy Analysis for Irrigation

Project Number: 931-0236.09

Cooperative Agreement Numbers: AID/ta-CA-3 (UM) and AID/ta-CA-4 (CUS)

Cooperating Institutions: University of Minnesota - Dr. W. William Easter
Colorado State University - Dr. Robert A. Young

Project Manager: Richard Suttor

Evaluation Team: DS/AGR, Mary Mozynski
DS/AGR/RNR, Gill Corey
LAC/DR/RD, Gene Miller
NE/TECH/ED, Robert Morrow
LAC/DR/RD, Raymond Meyer

13. SUMMARY

This project was designed to improve the knowledge base and increase the technical talent available for irrigation policy formulation, project design, and implementation. The combined efforts of two universities have and will continue to focus on the information and technical expertise needed to improve the planning and operation of irrigation systems in LDCs. The name appears to be somewhat of a misnomer with respect to the emphasis of the project as given both in the narrative and by the principals involved.

The project's first phase was to concentrate on the general literature survey and synthesis, selection of countries, establishment of linkages between the contract team, USAIDs, and cooperating country institutions. Procedures for the country analyses and the preparation of a work plan for the balance of project life were also to be completed. The phase is considerably behind the 9-10 months allocated for it; which was unrealistic.

The case study methodology is an accepted and appropriate research technique, but it does have certain limitations. One of the most serious deficiencies of this technique is that it may not accurately reflect any set of circumstances beyond that studied. However, due to time and budget constraints, this technique is deemed satisfactory for this project.

It appears that only two principle field research sites may result and thus a heavy burden will be placed upon these two case studies to generate new primary knowledge. Additional knowledge may be derived from review and analysis of secondary data in Pakistan and Egypt and possibly more effort should be expended in this effort using the resources originally programmed for the third field site and technical assistance.

Thailand

The project identifies two major problem areas that restrict effective water resource development.

- 1) Ineffective utilization of the current water distribution system during the dry season.
- 2) Non-participation in water user associations.

To determine the underlying reasons; the operation, management, and investment strategy of small-scale water projects in northeast Thailand will be analyzed with focus on the economic and social factors impacting on efficient water resource development.

The basic methodology to be employed is case studies of a range of size and performance in existing water projects. Actual selection of sites will be based on criteria developed as the project moves forward.

The plan of work developed involves two researchers from Kasetsart University, Bangkok and a technician from the University of Minnesota.

Egypt

The linear programming model proposed for Egypt seems appropriate as a technique for illustrating possible impacts of alternative water allocation and utilization schemes. However, the quality of the data base is critical and any L.P. results would need to be interpreted with great caution. As mentioned in the research proposal a debate rages on whether farmers are over-using water with respect to optimal production. It seems clear that production responses to different water use regimes are not known. Answers to such questions should be already at hand, and not debatable, in order to build real world models. If the topic is still truly debatable it will likely be resolved only by time consuming and extensive field research. The models developed by this project may be useful "first cuts" and serve to give new insights into possible changes in water allocation policy. If they do this; then useful purposes will have been served but the models will likely have to be used with considerable reservation.

India

While project progress is satisfactory, the main constraint has been and continues to be country clearance. Assuming clearances will be obtained, activities as outlined in the plan of work will be able to answer the two key questions of;

- 1) What are the potential returns for new tank development?
- 2) What is the potential benefit from rehabilitation and improved operation of existing tanks?

They have made the initial contacts and tentative agreements with the collaborating Indian University and with AID/I for preliminary concurrence and are waiting for GOI clearance.

The two areas of tank irrigation to be studied have been designated, with the University to collect basic water management data. There is also a good possibility of coordination and support from funded Ford projects.

In summary, it would appear the project can make a contribution to the stock of knowledge on performance of irrigation systems and perhaps on methodologies, although no new or unique methodologies were indicated. The research team needs to finalize their work plan in order not to delay the project to any greater extent.

14. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The activity paper provides for three major evaluations. The first evaluation was to be carried out at the completion of Phase I activities. It was to be designed primarily to verify that the country/sites selected for study and the preliminary analytical scope of work for Phases II and III were consistent with project objectives. Also that appropriate linkages between UM/CSU and the respective AID Missions and host government agencies could be established.

The evaluation team was comprised of representatives from DSB/AGR and the Regional Bureaus. The evaluation was based on presentations by the project co-directors from UM/CSU, the project activity paper, the annual report and miscellaneous cables and documents from the missions.

15. EXTERNAL FACTORS

There has been a major change in the setting of the activities from that anticipated in the original design. The project has been decreased in scope and has become less "international". The major cause has been delay in host country clearance and AID Mission concurrence. External factors will affect the outputs but will probably make them more realistic based on levels of funding and time. Most of the assumptions cannot be evaluated as yet although the assumption of missions being willing to pay for I. A. travel and per diem does not seem to be viable.

16. INPUTS

Inputs were to provide for 30 mm of direct technical assistance and case studies of 2-4 countries. The inputs appear to be satisfactory for the project as currently visualized.

17. OUTPUTS

Indicated outputs in the activity paper were:

- 1) Series of reports synthesizing information gathered through literature reviews and the case study analyses.
- 2) Series of workshops and seminars involving project research staff, AID staff, and LDC planners and policy makers.
- 3) Short-term direct technical assistance in water policies and pricing to USAID field missions and LDCs.

The outputs appear to be on target as of this time. It is expected that the SOAP will represent a significant contribution to the development literature by organizing previously known ideas and incorporating them into a common frame work of definitions and concepts and testing them in real cases of irrigation projects. Considerable effort will have to be expended to make sure that managers at the operational level will become familiar with the contents of the reports. Learning must take place by AID Project Managers and host country project staff as well as the contractor employees.

18. PURPOSE

The purpose as stated was:

- This seems
out of context
so far* →
- 1) For selected irrigation projects analyze water policies originating at different levels of aggregation viz.; national, sector, and project levels in terms of service area, economical and financial performance.
 - 2) To analyze impacts of alternative types of management institutions on service area income (including income distribution).
 - 3) To identify data and methodological requirements for improved understanding of irrigation water development in selected LDCs.
 - 4) To provide technical economic assistance to AID/W, USAID Missions and the various LDCs in carrying out their programs and projects for water resource development and utilization.

It seems too early to evaluate progress at this point.

19. GOAL/SUBGOAL

Goal - Strengthen LDC capacity to define, assess, and solve problems which lead to inefficiencies and distributional inequities associated with water resource development in agriculture.

- Subgoal --
- 1) To determine the economic costs of returns of water allocation procedures including pricing policies for specific (representative) irrigation projects in LDC locations.
 - 2) To ascertain the role of selected water institutions and management procedures in the operation of those projects.
 - 3) To estimate economic impacts of LDC water policies relating to project scale and geographic dispersement.
 - 4) To identify critical factors for improving project output and benefit distribution.

Subgoals one and two seem to be readily attainable through the methodology being employed, however, 3 & 4 may be difficult, or impossible, to achieve in as much as a total geographic disbursement study is not anticipated and identification of critical factors affecting benefit distribution may not be revealed. Actual progress cannot be evaluated at this point.

20. BENEFICIARIES

Small farmers in LDCs are the ultimate beneficiaries. Intermediate benefits to selected LDC planning institutions, USAID Missions, and Regional Bureaus of AID/W will accrue in the form of improved project planning, design, implementation, and evaluation. To date it is not known to what extent the information generated by the project will be useful to or accepted by host governments.

21. UNPLANNED EFFECTS

Not pertinent at this time.

22. LESSONS LEARNED

- 1) The activity paper should be more explicit in outputs, inputs, EOPS, and a time frame analysis for work and budget. There should be more uniformity of the narrative with the log frame.
- 2) More help should be given by AID/W in this type of project to identify the countries interested, determine extent of interest, and obtain clearance so that work can be initiated.
- 3) This type of project should be completely self-contained without reliance on inputs from the missions.
- 4) Evaluation would be helped by number one above.
- 5) Technical assistance components of the project should be reduced because of insufficient personnel and funds in the project to warrant much diversion from the research component.
- 6) There should be better coordination between this and other related DSB activities.

On the face of it, combining the separate functions of research and service projects has some appeal since it appears the immediate relevance of the project would be enhanced. The usefulness of this approach is questioned on the basis of the project under evaluation. The findings may be similar with other projects with combined functions of research and service.

- a) This particular project purports to be a technical assistance project while it is mainly a research project. Any combined project might have a similar identity crisis. While identity per se might not be important it would seem of significant concern to the implementing institutions to know what they are primarily responsible for.
- b) If the project is a research effort - which this project is - then the interests of the key personnel on the project are most likely in doing research - not in providing technical assistance which may be viewed as a fire fighting or rat killing operation.
- c) If a project is a research project the mix of skills available (i.e. the research team) may be quite different than what is needed by host governments and USAID Missions. In the present case the research team are primarily "agricultural social scientists" whereas addressing host government and mission irrigation problems usually require a much broader mix of skills - engineers, irrigation specialists, agronomists etc.

While a university may be able to organize a team of diverse skills, either from among its own staff, or from sister universities, the present project leaders do not perceive that sort of operation as a major part of the project. In addition, developing a team of specialists for mission and host governments requires a fitting of the teaching and research schedules of professors against overseas needs. This has proven to be a difficult fit and commercial engineering or consulting firms are more responsive to AID requirements and, of course, they can draw from universities.

Since research and provision of technical services are separate activities they should be contracted for separately. Thus, the scope of work and level of effect could be more appropriately developed for each set of needs, thus clarifying what is to be done and who is to do it.

23. SPECIAL COMMENTS

The project design was overly optimistic in what could be achieved within the time frame and budget.

The Cooperative Agreement calls for two workshops and/or conferences. Usually these "meetings" result in the same technicians (mostly U.S.) taking part with little to no real accomplishment for LDC technicians. If these are to be carried out they should be planned in detail so the next evaluation team can study the plans to determine if, in fact, they should be held.

Workshops need to be within the country to make information directly applicable to the local situation. Workshops and issue papers must be directed to technical people involved in interpreting results and doing further studies, but possibly more importantly, also to non-technical people involved in making decisions in development.

DS/AGR should not approve projects which do not, in their design determine the research sites. Eighteen months have elapsed, at considerable expense, and the project sites are still not firm. This appears to be an exceedingly high price to pay for site selection and it should not be necessary.

The choosing of sites based on past experience by the contractor precludes the broad international research activity envisioned in the project design. Sites should have been selected for opportunity they provide to learn and assist. It is a general weakness in AID, very much exemplified by this contract that missions operate on the basis of sovereignty, and as a result much of the potential benefits of contractor research and TA is lost.

As in the case of evaluating any specific project a problem arises if one lacks knowledge of the total portfolio which DSE/AGR and AID has on a given subsector. A given project may seem to make sense (or perhaps not make sense) on its own merit, whereas if seen in the context of everything else which AID is financing in the subsection one might come to different conclusions.

24. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) The project should discontinue the "search" for a location in which to do research. With Thailand, India, and Egypt definite locations for work it seems unlikely that, given the project funding and lack of full-time participants, intensive data collection can be accomplished in the sites already selected.
- 2) If possible, project personnel should determine and develop the commonalities among the selected sites and focus data collection and analysis on those commonalities e.g., returns on investment, water pricing, institutional frame work, policy.
- 3) Methods of data collection and analysis should be described. To date the project gives the impression that some data will be collected but there does not appear to be a rationale for doing so. One gets the impression that the methodology involves collecting all data possible and then determining if, by any analysis, conclusions can be made. Perhaps this is a reasonable methodology but, if so, one wonders what problem the project is addressing.
- 4) Detailed work plans should be developed for each project site so that AID/W, the USAID, and host government all know exactly what the project proposes and will accomplish. The work should be programmed such that local extensions of the projects beyond the time of this project should be funded by the USAID's in question.

The next evaluation at the two thirds point of Phase II is critical. Certainly, much more information must be available.

- 1) Detailed time frame of activities and finances.
- 2) Direct relationships between activities and objectives.
- 3) Relationship between activities and previous information.
- 4) Applicability of information obtained to other areas and countries.
- 5) Dissemination of results.

More details should be given on how activities will actually "... improve the knowledge base and increase the technical talent available for irrigation policy formulation and project design and management work in LDC's..."

Does not seem to be reflected in the Facilitator

STATE - AID - USIA
NOMINATION FOR INCENTIVE AWARD
 Submit in an original and five (5) copies

DO NOT USE THIS SPACE

STATE	AID	USIA
HONOR NO.	CASH NO.	
DATE REC'D. BY AWARDS COMMITTEE		

PART I - NOMINATION

1. NAME OF NOMINEE (Last, First, Middle Initial)	2. ORG. SYMBOL OR POST
--	------------------------

3. PRESENT POSITION TITLE AND GRADE	4. POSITION HELD DURING PERIOD COVERED BY NOMINATION, IF DIFFERENT THAN PRESENT
-------------------------------------	---

5. TYPE OF AWARD RECOMMENDED				
A. Secretary's Award	C. Distinguished Honor Award	E. Meritorious Honor Award		
B. Award for Heroism	D. Superior Honor Award			

6. BASIS FOR AWARD			7. ESTIMATED 1ST YEAR TANGIBLE BENEFITS	8. INTANGIBLE BENEFITS	9. RECOMMENDED AWARD
A. Special Act					
B. Superior Performance					

10. JUSTIFICATION FOR NOMINATION (Include a concise 3 or 4 line statement pinpointing the achievement that could be used on the honor award certificate)

(Continue below, if necessary)

STATE - AID - USIA
NOMINATION FOR INCENTIVE AWARD
 Submit in an original and five (5) copies

DO NOT USE THIS SPACE		
STATE	AID	USIA
HONOR NO.	CASH NO.	
DATE REC'D. BY AWARDS COMMITTEE		

PART I - NOMINATION

1. NAME OF NOMINEE (Last, First, Middle Initial)	2. ORG. SYMBOL OR POST
--	------------------------

3. PRESENT POSITION TITLE AND GRADE	4. POSITION HELD DURING PERIOD COVERED BY NOMINATION, IF DIFFERENT THAN PRESENT
-------------------------------------	---

5. TYPE OF AWARD RECOMMENDED			
A. Secretary's Award	C. Distinguished Honor Award	E. Meritorious Honor Award	
B. Award for Heroism	D. Superior Honor Award		

6. BASIS FOR AWARD	7. ESTIMATED 1ST YEAR TANGIBLE BENEFITS	8. INTANGIBLE BENEFITS	9. RECOMMENDED AWARD
A. Special Act			
B. Superior Performance			

10. JUSTIFICATION FOR NOMINATION (Include a concise 3 or 4 line statement pinpointing the achievement that could be used on the honor award certificate)

(Continue below, if necessary)

STATE - AID - USIA
NOMINATION FOR INCENTIVE AWARD
 Submit in an original and five (5) copies

DO NOT USE THIS SPACE

STATE	AID	USIA
-------	-----	------

HONOR NO.	CASH NO.
-----------	----------

DATE REC'D. BY AWARDS COMMITTEE

PART I - NOMINATION

1. NAME OF NOMINEE (Last, First, Middle Initial)

Neville, Katherine C

2. ORG. SYMBOL OR POST

DS/FO/PR

3. PRESENT POSITION TITLE AND GRADE

Clerk Typist, GS-05 (Part Time)

4. POSITION HELD DURING PERIOD COVERED BY NOMINATION, IF DIFFERENT THAN PRESENT

5. TYPE OF AWARD RECOMMENDED

A. Secretary's Award

C. Distinguished Honor Award

E. Meritorious Honor Award

B. Award for Heroism

D. Superior Honor Award

6. BASIS FOR AWARD

A. Special Act

7. ESTIMATED 1ST YEAR TANGIBLE BENEFITS

8. INTANGIBLE BENEFITS

9. RECOMMENDED AWARD

B. Superior Performance

10. JUSTIFICATION FOR NOMINATION (Include a concise 3 or 4 line statement pinpointing the achievement that could be used on the honor award certificate)

(Continue below, if necessary)