

OUTLINE OF BASIC PROJECT IDENTIFICATION DATA

1. Country: Nepal
2. Project Title: Resource Conservation and Utiliation Project²
3. Project Number: 367-0132
4. Project Dates: August 31, 1980[^]
 - a. First Project Agreement:
 - b. Final Obligation Date: FY88/FY88 (planned/actual)
 - c. Most recent Project Assistance Completion Date (PACD):
1/15/89
5. Project Funding: (amounts obligated to date in dollars or dollar equivalents from the following sources).

	(\$000)
a. A.I.D. Bilateral Funding (grant)	US\$ 26,998
b. Other Major Donors	US\$
c. Host Country Counterpart Funds	<u>US\$ 5,061</u>
Total	US\$ 32,059
6. Mode of Implementation: A.I.D. direct contractor.
7. Project Designers: (organizational names of those involved in the project, e.g., the Government of Nepal, USAID/Nepal, and SECID.)
8. Responsible Mission Officials: (for the full life of the project).
 - a. Mission Director(s): Samuel H. Butterfield
Dennis J. Brennan
David M. Wilson
 - b. Project Officer(s): Tony Gany
1983 Jack Huxtable
1985 George Taylor
1988 Burt Levenson

-A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY PART I

(BEFORE FILLING OUT THIS FORM, READ THE ATTACHED INSTRUCTIONS)

<p>A. REPORTING A.I.D. UNIT (Mission or AID/W Office)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">USAID/Nepal (ES & ARD Office)</p>	<p>B. WAS EVALUATION SCHEDULED IN CURRENT FY ANNUAL EVALUATION PLAN?</p> <p>yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> slipped <input type="checkbox"/> ad hoc <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>C. EVALUATION TIMING</p> <p>interim <input type="checkbox"/> final <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ex post <input type="checkbox"/> other <input type="checkbox"/></p>												
<p>D. ACTIVITY OR ACTIVITIES EVALUATED (List the following information for project(s) or program(s) evaluated; if not applicable, list title and date of the evaluation report)</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 10%;">Project #</th> <th style="width: 45%;">Project/Program Title (or title & date of evaluation report)</th> <th style="width: 15%;">First PROGRAM or equivalent (FY)</th> <th style="width: 10%;">Most recent PACT (month)</th> <th style="width: 10%;">Planned LOP Cost ('000)</th> <th style="width: 10%;">Amount Obligated to Date ('000)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">367-0132</td> <td>Resource Conservation and Utilization Project (RCUP)</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1980</td> <td style="text-align: center;">7/88</td> <td style="text-align: right;">27,498</td> <td style="text-align: right;">26,998</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Project #	Project/Program Title (or title & date of evaluation report)	First PROGRAM or equivalent (FY)	Most recent PACT (month)	Planned LOP Cost ('000)	Amount Obligated to Date ('000)	367-0132	Resource Conservation and Utilization Project (RCUP)	1980	7/88	27,498	26,998
Project #	Project/Program Title (or title & date of evaluation report)	First PROGRAM or equivalent (FY)	Most recent PACT (month)	Planned LOP Cost ('000)	Amount Obligated to Date ('000)									
367-0132	Resource Conservation and Utilization Project (RCUP)	1980	7/88	27,498	26,998									

<p>E. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Action(s) Required</p> <p style="text-align: center;">None - Final Evaluation</p> <p>Evaluation will be used as guideline for design and implementation of field oriented resource management activities in all current and future USAID/Nepal projects.</p>	<p>Name of officer responsible for Action</p> <p style="text-align: center;">N/A</p>	<p>Date Action to be Completed</p> <p style="text-align: center;">N/A</p>
<p>(Attachments, if necessary)</p>		

<p>F. DATE OF MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE REVIEW OF EVALUATION</p> <p>no <u>5</u> day <u>24</u> year <u>88</u></p>	<p>G. APPROVALS OF EVALUATION SUMMARY AND ACTION DECISIONS:</p> <table style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: bottom;"> <p>Project/Program Representative of Borrower/Grantee</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>J. Clary</i> J. Clary</p> </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: bottom;"> <p>Evaluation Officer</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>R. Thurston</i> Mission or AID/W Office A/ Director Robert V. Thurston</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p>Project/Program Representative of Borrower/Grantee</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>J. Clary</i> J. Clary</p>	<p>Evaluation Officer</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>R. Thurston</i> Mission or AID/W Office A/ Director Robert V. Thurston</p>
<p>Project/Program Representative of Borrower/Grantee</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>J. Clary</i> J. Clary</p>	<p>Evaluation Officer</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>R. Thurston</i> Mission or AID/W Office A/ Director Robert V. Thurston</p>		
<p>Signature Typed Name Date</p>			

The Resource Conservation and Utilization Project (RCUP) began in 1980 with the design and approval of a 5 year, \$32 million project and was extended on an annual basis for another three years. The Government of Nepal (GON) and the USAID contractor, the Southeast Consortium for International Development (SECID), implemented the project during the first 5 years; USAID then worked directly with GON during the last three years. The purpose of the project has been to assist GON "in the protection and restoration of the soil, water and plant resource base upon which the rural population is totally dependent". With the project scheduled to end on July 15, 1988, USAID commissioned a final evaluation report focusing primarily on the last 3 years of the project by outside consultant assistance, a local consultant and a representative of GON. The major findings are:

- o The small watershed approach of the last three years of the project has been more successful than the previous RCUP implemented activities.
- o Where the critical conditions for sustainability (i.e., technical appropriateness, local participation, economic efficiency, and a bottom up technical assistance strategy) were met, project activities were more effectively meeting objectives, more efficiently doing so, and had greater likelihood of being sustained.
- o The GON is moving in the right direction with its efforts to decentralize, as shown by some of the more participatory and sustainable approaches to natural resource management implemented by GON in RCUP's last three years.

The evaluation team noted the following major lessons:

- o Where activity objectives were more focused and attainable, where the geographic focus was more on the panchayat level, and where incentives and assistance to encourage more self-reliant local level natural resource management were evident, USAID's efforts are more likely to have positive impact over the long-term.
- o USAID should require that project designers and implementors meet the most critical conditions for sustainability--technical appropriateness, economic efficiency, user group participation, and a bottom up technical assistance strategy.

I. EVALUATION COSTS

1. Evaluation Team

Name	Affiliation	Contract Number OR TDY Person Days	Contract Cost OR TDY Cost (US\$)	Source of Funds
J. Kathy Parker (Team leader)	TR+D	40	-	project
William Fleming	TR+D	40	50,000	
Richard Calnan	USFS	31	3,000	
M.D. Joshi	GON	40	-	
Shiva Achet	Local Contractor	40	3,000	

2. Mission/Office Professional Staff Person-Days (estimate) 120

3. Borrower/Grantee Professional Staff Person-Days (estimate) 50

A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY PART II

J. SUMMARY OF EVALUATION FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS (Try not to exceed the 3 pages provided)

Address the following items:

- o Name of mission or office
- o Purpose of activity (ies) evaluated
- o Purpose of the Evaluation and Methodology Used
- o Findings and Conclusions
- o Recommendations
- o Lessons learned

1. Mission: USAID/Nepal

2. Purpose of Project: To assist the Government of Nepal "in the protection and restoration of the soil, water and plant resource base upon which the rural population is totally dependent".

3. Purpose of Evaluation and Evaluation Methodology Used: USAID commissioned this final evaluation to focus primarily on the last 3 years of the project, during which the focus was changed from the earlier diffuse large watershed approach to a smaller watershed approach which implemented activities with more focused and attainable objectives. The Scope of Work requested the team to look at field activities in resource management that were considered to be successful, to provide independent confirmation of the successes, to determine the reasons for success or failure, and to provide recommendations on potential replica of successful activities. The evaluation team used the following methodology: meetings with GON officials before going to the field, development of minimum data sets to provide guidelines for data collection through field observations and interviews; development of an evaluation matrix to rank and compare activities with regard to critical technical, economic, social and institutional indicators' analysis of data from matrix and data collected in the field. Purpose of methodology--to systematically analyze individual activities and to compare and contrast all activities focusing on indicators for impact, participation, sustainability and replica.

4. Findings and Conclusions:

- o The small watershed approach of the last three years of the project has been more successful than the previous RCUP-implemented activities.
- o Where the critical conditions for sustainability (i.e., technical appropriateness, local participation, economic efficiency, and a bottom up technical assistance strategy) were met, project activities were more effectively meeting objectives, more efficiently doing so, and had greater likelihood of being sustained.
- o The GON is moving in the right direction with its efforts to decentralize, as shown by some of the more participatory and sustainable approaches to natural resource management implemented by GON in RCUP's last three years.

Date this summary prepared: _____

5. Major Recommendations: While the RCUP Final Evaluation Report includes many recommendations, the major ones that USAID should use to guide its current and future natural resource management portfolio and use in its on-going and future policy dialogue with GON are:

- o USAID should insist that formation of user groups and other more participatory approaches be involved in activity conception, activity initiation, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation, as a condition for GON support.
- o USAID and GON must require that project designers and implementors meet the most critical conditions for sustainability--technical appropriateness, economic efficiency, user group participation, and a bottom up technical assistance strategy.
- o Based on the RCUP experience in natural resource management, USAID should be required to include the following salient features in project design and implementation: modest and well-focused objectives; more focus on panchayat level activities; incentives and assistance to encourage more self-reliant local level natural resource management; flexibility in leveraging existing opportunities where appropriate; execution of activities where ever possible through small local contractors' appropriate monitoring and evaluation of field programs and processes with special focus on the interaction of people and natural resources.
- o To improve the impact of natural resource management activities, GON should give high priority to protection and management of existing natural forests and grazing lands, with the cooperation of local people as a preferred protection method. Additionally, GON must develop new criteria to guide site selection and choice of design for gully rehabilitation at the planning stage. Economic analysis must ensure that benefits exceed costs and that least cost solutions are chosen.
- o Realizing that limited funds for soil conservation and watershed management dictate a careful choice of priorities, GON should give lowest priority to the use of gabions for river training and gully control because of technical ineffectiveness and economic inefficiency.
- o USAID must insist that GON, through its Institute of Forestry Project, the Forestry Development Project, and others to continue its efforts to enhance the role of women in natural resource management, through such means as training of Women Development Officers and paratechnical training for women farmer motivators.
- o USAID must assist GON in reorienting its delivery of technical assistance from a top down to a bottom up, more extension

oriented approach that works with local people to develop, manage, and maintain their natural resources.

- o USAID must give higher priority to in-country training for professionals, especially on participatory approaches to natural resource management, and technical training for technicians, paratechnicals, and local farmers to improve the use of existing resources.
- o No "blue print" for replication of specific activities, technologies, and processes exists, therefore USAID and GON must carefully investigate the potential for replicating the conditions that will ensure the success of activities, technologies, and processes at specific sites.

6. Lessons Learned:

- o Where activity objectives were more focused and attainable, where the geographic focus was more on the panchayat level, and where incentives and assistance to encourage more self-reliant local level natural resource management were evident, USAID's efforts are more likely to have a positive impact over the long-term.
- o USAID should require that project designers and implementors meet the most critical conditions for sustainability--technical appropriateness, economic efficiency, user group participation, and a bottom up technical assistance strategy.

ATTACHMENTS (List attachments submitted with this Evaluation Summary; always attach copy of full evaluation report, even if one was submitted earlier)

1. Evaluation Report

COMMENTS BY MISSION, AID/W OFFICE AND BORROWER/GRAVTEE

None

9