PN-ABI-721
ISN 72763

A NUMERICAL RATING OF A.I.D. PROJECTS COVERED IN A.I.D. IMPACT EVALUATION REPORTS

WORKING PAPER NO. 65

by

RAYMOND COHEN

PPC/E-DIU

June 1984

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The AID Impact Evaluation (IE) program, during the four year period 1979-1983, produced a substantial number of IE and other reports. Forty-five of the IE reports evaluating 73 projects seemed to have enough in common, e.g., in terms of kinds of impact looked at and kinds of projects evaluated (essentially Development Assistance funded), to warrant the reports being treated as a database for an attempt to assess AID accomplishment performance in numerical terms.

Toward the objective of conducting such an assessment, 11 accomplishment indicators or factors were established (covering such matters as delivering benefits to the poor and training needed manpower); a rating or "scoring" scale running from 1 (worst) to 10 (best) was also established. The factors were then scored for each project by this writer and, in a roughly estimated 50% of the aggregate of factors, by a second person. The data (scores) were then computerized and analyzed.

On the basis of these ratings, it seems clear that AID's accomplishment performance over the years has been very good. In broadest or overall terms, 13 projects (18% of the 73 projects included in this report) were judged in the IE reports to be Marginal or Unsatisfactory; the remaining 60 projects (82%) were evaluated as Satisfactory or better.

~~In addition,~~ only six of the 73 projects (8.2%) were evaluated as being Marginal or Unsatisfactory in terms of their impact on poor people; for institution building and manpower training impact the Marginal and Unsatisfactory performance level was almost as low: 14.0% and 12.5% respectively. Put postitively, 91.8%, 86.0% and 87.5% of the evaluated projects were rated Satisfactory or better in terms of benefiting the poor, establishing or up-grading institutions and training needed manpower.

The level of performance was equally good in two other areas, technology transfer and - perhaps suprisingly - what is generally referred to as "sustainability." Sixty-two of the 72 projects rated in the latter area (86.1%) scored Satisfactory or better.

On the other hand, about a third of the rated projects scored Unsatisfactory to Marginal in terms of their impacts on women and on the physical environment.

Performance was also low in two other areas, impact on host government policies, in which one of four projects fell in the Unsatisfactory or Marginal categories; and impact on the host country private sector in which 27.5% of the rated projects fell in those two categories.

The data extracted from the IE reports seem sufficient to support reasonably firm judgements regarding AID's overall accomplishment performance. If these kinds of judgements can be useful to the Agency (and perhaps others) means might be developed and employed both to broaden the base of information used in reaching such judgements and to increase their relevance, reliability and credibility. The Conclusions and Recommendations sections of this report outline ways by which the Agency might move in that direction. In brief, these center on a cooperative effort involving, to the extent desired by them, both other Executive Branch agencies and Congressional staff personnel, and using scientific sampling and polling techniques. The effort would be intended to numerically rate a fairly substantial number of projects (perhaps 100) each year for several years in a cost effective and widely accepted manner.

When the accomplishment data presented in this report are considered and analyzed in terms of their apparent relationship to selected project defining charcteristics, e.g., duration, sector, and level of funding, other details of performance are suggested. For example, when aligned with project start dates the accomplishment ratings suggest that projects started in the 1950s and 1960s performed better than those started in the 1970s. Even more interesting (and, I believe, in need of further examination), projects started in 1973 and prior years were rated higher than projects started in 1974 and later years in terms of both overall project performance and in such specific accomplishment areas as

benefitting the poor, institution building, and affecting policy.

Equally interesting (and, for me, provocative) is the apparent relationship between the level of participation (by targetted or actual beneficiaries) and the level of project accomplishment (success). Analysis of the data in this study suggests an inverse correlation, i.e., the higher the level of particiaption the lower the level of accomplishment. Similarly, the analysis of data in this report suggests that there is not necessarily a positive connection between the number and intensity of a projects problems during its implementation and that project's eventual accomplishments.

More within the realm of conventional expectations, projects at the highest funding level (AID input) and the longest duration scored highest while, in both instances projects at the opposite extreme (lowest funding level - $1.0 million or less - and shortest duration - five years or less) scored lowest.

more analysis of these kinds could be done even with the existing and very limited data available in this study. If additional data were generated through evaluative ratings of additional projects, more extensive and sophisticated analysis might be attempted. However, the practical applications and utility of such analysis and conclusions flowing from it are uncertain, as indeed is the very basic "linkage" and "causal" analysis attempted in this report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Executive Summary i

Table of Contents v

Foreword vi

List of Impact Evaluation Reports viii

I. Objectives 1

II. Background 2

III. How the Study Was Conducted 6

IV. Analysis and Discussion 14

Introduction 14
Profile of Projects in the Study 16
All Projects 18
Regions 25
Sectors 31
Project Start 41
Project Duration 47
Kinds and Levels of Funding 55
Beneficiary Participation 59
Elapsed Time after Completion 64

V. Conclusions 67
Regarding Accomplishments 67
Relationships between Accomplishment Factors, Project Characteristics and Performance 73

VI. Recommendations 76

Annex A A-1

FOREWORD

This study was undertaken in the summer of 1983, following discussions and agreement between the then management of PPC/Evaluation (PPC/E) and this writer about the feasibility and utility of "translating" issued Impact Evaluation narrative reports into numerical ratings as a means for providing Agency middle and higher management with readily available data and supportable judgements regarding AID's performance. Two such attempts had previously been undertaken. One, an academic work, was in process when the study by this writer was begun. The other, an earlier effort by PPC/E's then Director was aborted because of the pressures of other work requirements and for other reasons.

This study has evolved into the development and demonstration of a "test" or "prototype model" for an approach to accomplishment performance assessment. It is hoped that this "model" will be examined and, if found potentially useful, improved and employed by AID management and staff for the limited, but important, purposes to which it seems suited. These purposes are intended, broadly, to facilitate and strengthen AID's communication in-house and with others regarding our past performance.

The study also indicates (and domonstrates) some kinds of analysis regarding the relationships between project characteristics (e.g., length and funding level) on the one hand and project accomplishments on the other which might be pursued using the model outlined in this report. The potential utility of this analysis is not clear.

The cooperation of colleagues throughout the Agency, particularly in sharing their knowledge and understanding with me is much appreciated.

List of Impact Evaluation Reports Used in this Study

Report No.	Report Date	Country	Project(s)
1	12/79	Columbia	Small Farmer Market Access
2	12/79	Kenya	Kitale Maize
3	05/80	Thailand	Potable Water
4	05/80	Philippines	Small Scale Irrigation (2)
5	05/80	Kenya	Rural Water Supply
6	06/80	Liberia	Rural Roads III (2)
7	06/80	Sierra Leone	Rural Penetration Roads
8	08/80	Morocco	Food Aid & Nutrition Education
9	10/80	Senegal	Rural Health Care
10	10/80	Tunisia	Care Water Projects (4)
11	11/80	Jamaica	Feeder Roads
12	12/80	Korea	Irrigation
13	12/80	Thailand	Rural Roads
14	12/80	Central Amer.	Small Farmer Cropping Systems
15	12/80	Philippines	Rural Electrification (4)
16	12/80	Bolivia	Rural Electrification (2)
17	01/81	Honduras	Rural Roads (2)
18	03/81	Philippines	Rural Roads III (2)
19	05/81	Nepal	US Aid To Education (10)
20	05/81	Korea	Potable Water System
21	06/81	Ecuador	Rural Electrification (3)
22	10/81	Costa Rica	Rural Electrification
23	09/81	Nigeria	Teacher Education
24	10/81	Peru	Water Health Services
25	10/81	Thailand	Mobile Trade Training Units
26	01/82	Kenya	Rural Roads (2)
27	01/82	Korea	Agricultural Research

List of Impact Evaluation Reports Used in this Study - Cont'd

Report No.	Report Date	Country	Project(s)
28	01/82	Philippines	BICOL Integrated Area Develop (4)
29	02/82	Indonesia	Small Scale Irrigation
30	02/82	Guatemala	Institute of Ag Science and Tech
31	03/82	Sudan	RAHAD Irrigation
32	05/82	Panama	Rural Water (2)
33	05/82	Nepal	Food Grain Technology
34	05/82	Thailand	Agricultural Research
35	06/82	Pakistan	On-Farm Water Management
36	06/82	Korea	Health Demonstration
37	08/82	Kenya	Radio Correspondence Education
38	09/82	Philippines	Low Cost Alt. To Primary Ed.
40	12/82	Francophone Africa	Entente Fund African Enterprise
41	03/83	Panama	Housing Guarantee Program (2)
42	04/83	Bangladesh	Small Scale Irrigation
43	04/83	Egypt	Rural Improvement Services
44	05/83	West Africa	West Africa Rice R&D
46	06/83	Paraguay	Rural Education Development
48	10/83	Tunisia	Wheat Development

I. OBJECTIVES

The review of the entire body of completed IE reports on which this report is based was undertaken with the limited expectation that it might help to clarify some Agency views regarding its past performance in terms of development results or accomplishments achieved. (These views tend to be harsh, not only self-critical but broadly negative - at times even cynical - as well). Peformance in "accomplishment" terms, i.e., as used in this report, is distinguished from performance in terms of implementation matters, e.g., project or program adherence to time schedules and budgetary guidelines. Similarly, performance in terms of accomplishments as used in this report is both more general than and distinguished from performance in traditional macro-economic areas related, for example, to trade, balance of payments or economic growth rates.

In line with this limited expectation, the main objective of this report is to provide some numerical measures of AID accomplishment performance over the years as that performance was assessed in the Agency's series of IE reports prepared during the four year period 1979-83 on selected AID-assisted projects. This report also attempts to analyze the "measured" performance in terms of broad project characteristics (such as sector and duration) which might correlate or be associated with better or worse than average accomplishment performance levels.

II. BACKGROUND

In 1979, AID-initiated a new and fairly substantial effort (the IE program) to evaluate AID-assisted projects grouped into several major sectors or sub-sectors selected by AID management. The main "product" of the IE program was (and remains) a series of individual IE reports each dealing (usually) with one project. While the Agency has conducted and continues to conduct other project evaluations, the IE program is unique in its world-wide focus, its methods and its products.

From inception of the IE program in late 1979 through 1983 the Agency conducted 61 IE studies in 34 countries (and for three regional entities) representing all four AID geographic bureaus: Africa, eight countries and two regional entities; Asia, 10 countries; Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC), 11 countries and one regional entity; and Near East/Nort Africa (NENA), five countries. Fifty-two of these studies resulted in individually issued IE reports covering 26 countries (and two regional entities) and again, distributed among all geographic bureaus.

Forty-eight of these reports were completed in time to be reviewed as part of this study. However, only 45 of them, each of which (with one exception) deals with Development Assistance (DA) projects, were included in this report. The three IE reports excluded deal with PL480 Title I programs. We concluded (after considerable deliberation) that the exclusion was

called for because of differences in the kinds and range of primary objectives and methods of implementation between DA projects and Title I programs. On the other hand, we did include one IE report which deals with two Housing Investment Guaranty projects because their objectives, implementation and time-focus seemed to give them much in common with the DA projects for the purposes of this study.

All of the IE studies covered in this report were conducted and their reports prepared primarily by AID direct-hire staff, representing virtually all major units of the Agency, in cooperation with selected American academic and commercial contractors, direct-hire employees of other USG agencies and academics and government employees of cooperating host countries. The reports therefore, reflect a broad range of viewpoints and a tendency toward balanced, objective assessment. (Put differently, the reports impress this writer as being informed, in tone and substance, more by a critical skepticism and realism than by a charitable or congratulatory indulgence or defensiveness).

A range of topics to be covered in the IE reports dealt with here and a general report format, including a preferred length were ~~have been~~ prescribed by AID/W (PPC/E). However, no attempt was ~~has been~~ made either to standardize these reports to facilitate comparative (inter-report or inter-project) analysis or to have the ~~reports~~ present direct quantified assessments or measures of impact in terms of either planning document-stated objectives or other

BEST AVAILABLE

desired or perceived objectives. While the quality of the reports is, inevitably, varied, virtually every one of them is well-focused and thoughtful and presents information, insights and opinions that would seem to reward careful reading.

On the other hand, it should perhaps be noted that while the reports might yield a strong, i.e., operationally convincing consensus on ~~many~~ some matters, there are many development issues treated in the reports on which significant differences of views are argued and remain beyond that kind of consensus. From the relative importance and validity of "equity" or "wealth redistribution" as an AID objective to the role of market forces in education activities to the "need" for or value of government subsidies, differing positions are taken, and strongly advocated. The reports make it clear (to me, at any rate) that ~~certainty~~ uncertainty (of needs, objectives, problems, required actions and results) will inevitably characterize AID efforts in the "real world", and often frustrate our attempts to distill our highly varied experience into generalized theories or "lessons" to guide our future actions. At the risk of being taken to task for moralizing, I would suggest that we (AID) learn to be more comfortable with this circumstance and less taken with the notion that we can and must change it. We should accept the truism that "theory follows practice" and appreciate our forward position and role as innovative (if self-doubting) practitioners of the fine art of aid in circumstances of incredible diversity, complexity and difficulty.

The 45 IE reports covered in this study evaluate 73 projects, most of which fall into six sectors (or subsectors), with project starting dates as early as 1954 and as recent as 1978. Funding levels, completion dates, durations and other project characteristics are also quite varied. Thus, while the reports deal with only an extremely small selection from AID's cumulative project portfolio and do not collectively comprise a scientifically determined (or statistically validated) "sample" of that portfolio, they do present data on what seems a representative cross section of AID development activities and accomplishments randomly distributed in time, place, size and substance.

In the summer of 1983, PPC/E decided to conduct a study designed to "grade" or "score" AID's past accomplishment performance using the available IE reports as the information source. The study as conceived and conducted is based on a rendering of the narrative assessment of project impact presented in 45 of those reports into quantified numerical ratings for a number of major indicators of accomplishment, e.g., delivering benefits to the poor, affecting policies, training people. These ratings were then reviewed and analyzed in terms of several major (and obvious) project "defining" characteristics such as field of activity (sector or sub-sector) and funding level. Again, the chief aim of the study was simply to gain a "documented" sense of or feel for the quality of Agency performance in terms of impact or

accomplishment; an attendant, almost "de rigueur", aim was to try to identify relationships between that performance and some common project characteristics.

A subordinate objective -- to assess the usefulness of the IE reports -- was introduced after the study was underway, represents, essentially, an informal addition to it and is, therefore, treated separately. See Annex A to this report).

III. HOW THE STUDY WAS CONDUCTED

As a first step in conducting the study, a set of standards or generalized accomplishment factors (a "report card") was developed consisting of 11 basic development results-oriented conditions or indicators by which AID traditionally has defined its institutional and work objectives and measured its activity effectiveness or accomplishments. The 11 indicators or factors as I have chosen to call them, do not, of course, comprise an exhaustive list of broad accomplishment indicators. They do comprise a list of what this writer and AID staffers with whom he has consulted consider both among the most "important" factors and the most useful within the practical constraints imposed by information available in the IE reports and the previously stated objectives of this study. The list of 11 factors, with a brief description or definition of each, follows.

A. General Impression, a broad summary perception of the overall project impact; not an average of the other 10 factors. (For some aspects of the analysis, General Impression is treated separately from the other 10 factors).

B. Benefits Delivered to or Impact on the Rual Poor (defined in broad terms, i.e., not necessarily limited to the "poorest of the poor" or the "poorest 10% - 20% of the population").

C. Benefits Delivered to or Impact on Women, particularly but not exclusively, poor rural women.

D. Effect on Host Government Policies, including technical, social, political and economic ones of local or central authorities; in this context "effect on" could include "support for" as well as "changes in" existing policies.

E. Effect on Host Country Institutions and Capabilities, in physical, procedural or other terms.

F. Effect on the "Stock" of Trained Manpower and Skills, whether resulting from efforts in-country, in the US or in third countries.

G. Appropriateness and "Take" of the Technology that project was intended to transfer.

H. Effect on the Host Country Private Sector in terms of either increasing its capabilities or utilizing it in the project or on other development activities.

I. Effect on the Physical Environment (whether direct or indirect). This factor was often ~~evidenced~~ considered as a "second generation" condition and was evaluated largely in damage limitations terms, e.g., a road project that caused little or no erosion or drainage problems might warrant a relatively high rating).

J. Substantive Activities/Benefits of Project Are Continuing to be implemented/delivered to the target population and/or other poor people. (Sustainability).

K. Substantive Objectives of Project Are Being Pursued or Planned in other locations without AID assistance and using project in whole or in part as a model. (Replicability).

For any project not yet completed when the IE study of it was done, the factors were rated, as appropriate, on the basis of expected/prospective rather than achieved impact as reflected in the relevant IE report.

In addition to these 11 factors, a Project Average (or average of factors) score is also used to consider project performance. As the term implies, the Project Average (preferably) or factors average score simply represents the averaging of the 11 factors (or some lesser number in some circumstances where all factors could not be scored/rated) for a given project.

While the 11 indicators or factors used here are traditional in the sense that they represent long standing AID values and perceptions of its objectives, they also appear to this writer as being reflective of both 1973 "New Directions" and current AID conceptions of its role, capabilities and directions.

Separate reviews of the IE reports were then conducted by this writer and, where feasible, (for approximately half of the reports) by one person representing the team which had prepared the report under consideration. On the basis of these two reviews, two separate sets of ratings of the factors were prepared using a rating scale of 1 to 10, with a "1" rating being warranted where the project concerned was terminated

because of the negative impact of the factor under consideration (which did not occur in this set of 73 projects) and "10" where the positive impact of the factor was extremely high (superior or outstanding). These two rating sets were then reviewed by this writer and a consolidated rating or "report card" prepared by him.

The closeness or similarity of the two separate rating sets for most individual factor scores and factor score patterns by project was striking and, among other things, made quite easy the task of resolving differences between the two score sets, largely by averaging. In only a very small number of cases was consultation between the two raters necessary; in an even smaller number of instances this writer exercised the right of last review by using a score for a factor based on his personal knowledge of the project. Beyond this, the closeness of the two separate score sets reflects creditably and importantly, I believe, on the straight-forwardness and communication effectiveness of the IE reports.

The stops on the 10 point scale used in this study are simply and loosely defined as follows:

- 1: project terminated for cause related to the considered factor;

- 2: significant net negative impact;

- 3: very unsatisfactory;

- 4: unsatisfactory;

- 5: marginal;

- 6: satisfactory;

- 7: fully satisfactory;

- 8: highly satisfactory;

- 9: superior; and

-10: outstanding.

Where a particular factor was not relevant, i.e., the concerned project did not attempt to effect the factor and/or did not have a perceived impact on that factor, a "not applicable" was used. Where a factor was affected (or "impacted") by the project, even if unintentionally so, a numerical score was given to the factor.

After all 73 projects were "scored" for each accomplishment factor (or as many as information in the relevant IE report warranted in the view of this writer and, where one existed, the second "scorer"), another scale was developed to condense

the 10 point scale into one with a lesser number of stops, each defined in verbal terms. This was done primarily to try to simplify and facilitate communication about the ratings analysis. The verbal scale has five stops or categories: Unsatisfactory (which equates with numbers 1-4 on the 10 point scale); Marginal (number 5); Satisfactory (6); Highly Satisfactory (7&8); and Outstanding (9&10).

As a device for achieving maximum simplicity, we then established a two point scale: Satisfactory (6-10 on the 10 point scale) and Unsatisfactory (1-5).

Next, seven basic or traditional project-defining characteristics e.g., sector and level of funding, were selected against which to review the factor and Project Average scores in an effort to identify significant relationships between them and that might assist AID staffers in future project planning and in clarifying notions regarding the affect of these characteristics on Agency accomplishment performance. Again, this list of characteristics is both meager and obvious; though we believe each of the characteristics is important, others, e.g., implementor (PVO, university, private firm) and level of host country commitment (in funding, staffing & policy terms) are equally important and "deserving" of consideration.

The composition of the list used in this report was determined, to a very large extent, by information available in the IE reports. The seven characteristics used are:

- Geographic Region of project;
- Project Sector (or sub-sector);
- AID Funding Level and Kind of Funds (grant, loan, mixed);
- Project Duration;
- Beneficiary Participation Level;
- Elapsed Time Since Project was Completed; and
- Year of Project Start (by decade and by pre and post- New Directions Mandate period).

Beyond this, some thought was given to establishing a small number of project implementation characteristics against which to review the accomplishment factor scores. The chief implementation characteristics in which we were interested dealt with budgets, staffing, and scheduling. However, there was insufficient data in the IE reports to enable us to pursue this line of analysis. Nonetheless, it seems to this writer that an examination and evaluation of AID project and program performance in terms of implementation with a view to gaining

an improved understanding of the relationships between "good" or "bad" implementation and good or bad accomplishment (in both quantitative and qualitive terms) might be useful.

All of the data generated through the above outlined process was then computerized and subjected to a comprehensive statistical analysis (including both parametric and non-parametric analysis of significance and confidence). That statistical analysis constitutes the basis for this report. (The computer print-outs of the statistical analysis are available in PPC/E). The use in this report of the computerized data and analysis is limited largely to comparing individual accomplishment factor and Project Average scores with other accomplishment factor and Project Average scores within a project defining characteristic and with World Wide (i. e., all 73 projects) scores. Throughout the report, the rating averages are carried to two decimal places. This is not intended to convey a sense of (non-existent) preciseness; rather it reflects the judgement that two decimal places is both minimal and sufficient to reveal the kinds of differences and distinctions under consideration.

IV. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

Of the 73 projects included in this study, 50 (68%) were evaluated by teams which included one or more non-AID persons. The lowest scoring of the 73 projects had no non-AID members; the highest scoring did. Of the four lowest scoring projects

(rated under 5.0, i.e., Unsatisfactory) three had outside (non-AID) members and one did not; of the five highest scoring projects (above 9.0, i.e., outstanding) four had outsiders and one did not. Finally, the average score of the projects evaluated with outside team members was almost identical to that of the projects evaluated by teams comprised of AID staff only; both were, of course, very close to the World Wide Project Average score. In statistical terms (and in practical ones as well) the presence (or absence) of non-AID persons on the IE teams seems to have had no rating scores significance.

As indicated earlier, about half the 73 projects were numerically scored by two separate raters working independently and using to a large extent, only the relevant IE report. These separate ratings were very similar for most accomplishment factors within any individual project and within the entire sample.

All of the above suggests that the IE reports individually and collectively, represent professionally objective, balanced

and reliable assessments of the projects considered. In effect, the reports constitute a "database" which serves the main purpose of this study and might readily be expanded to serve other purposes related to the provision of information on AID performance to interested AID and non-AID groups and individuals.

On the other hand, it should be noted that the ratings for some factors in most projects are, in fact, based on extremely limited information or views in the IE reports; such ratings are, to a large extent based on impression rather than judgement derived from analysis of textual data. It should also be noted that the 73 projects comprising the "sample" for this study represent an extremely small proportion of the projects comprising the AID portfolio in any one year let alone the roughly 30 years covered by the IE program and thus this study.

Profile of Projects in the Study

The 73 projects treated in this study are distributed among 29 countries in four regions: Africa, 13 projects in 8 countries; Asia, 35 projects in 7 countries; LAC, 18 projects in 11 countries; and NENA, 7 projects in 3 countries.

The 73 projects represent six discrete sectors and sub-sectors (63 projects) and one miscellaneous or "Other" category. The 63 projects are distributed among the six

sectors as follows: Agricultural Research, 8 projects; Education 15; Irrigation 8; Potable Water 10; Rural Electrification 10; and Rural Roads 12.

Thirty-six of the projects (virtually 50%) were started in FY 73 and prior years. The other half, those started since 1974, represent the "New Directions Mandate" generation of projects. By decade: five projects were started in the 1950s; 19 in the 60s; and 49 in the 70s, all in 1978 and prior 70's years.

In terms of duration, 22 projects (30% of the sample) lasted (in funding terms) five years or less; 36 (about half the sample) lasted 6-10 years; and 15 (about 21%) lasted more than 10 years.

The US funding level varies substantially among the 73 projects: 18 projects (25%) were funded at $1.0 million or less; 37 projects (50%) were funded at $1.1 - 10.0 million; and 18 projects (25%) at more than $10.0 million (11 projects (15%) at $10. - 20.0 million and 7 projects (10%) at $20.1 million or more).

Thirty-four of the projects in the study were financed (AID input) with grant funds only; 30 were financed with loan funds only and the remainder, nine projects, were financed with a mix of grant and loan funds.

Seventeen of the 73 projects (23%) were not yet completed at the time their respective IE study was conducted. Of the remaining 56 projects, 25 (35% of the 73 project total) had been completed from one month to three years; 22 (30%) had been completed four to eight years; and the remainder, nine projects (12%) had been completed eight years or more.

Finally, 24 of the 73 study projects (33%) were considered to have had little (or low) beneficiary participation in terms of project planning or implementation; 21 projects (29%) had a moderate (medium) degree of beneficiary participation; and 19 projects (26%) a good or better (high) degree of participation. No judgement on beneficiary participation was reached on the remaining 9 projects.

World-Wide (All Projects)

The World-Wide Project Average score (covering all 73 projects and all factors where rated) on the 10 point rating scale is 7.28, i.e., between fully and highly satisfactory. This score is virtually identical to the World-Wide Factor A, General Impression, average score of 7.29. The closeness of these two scores would seem to validate the "realism" of the General Impression rating which was intended as a broad "sense" or judgement of the project's overall impact, reached independently and (unlike the Project Average) not by an

averaging of the scores of the other factors.

Immediately below is Table I which lists in rank order the 10 factors (the eleventh factor, General Impression, is excluded) and the World Wide average score of each.

Table I

World Wide Factor Ranking and Scores

Rank	Factor	World Wide Average Score
1.	Factor F, Effect on the Stock of Trained Manpower	7.86
2.	Factor J, Substantive Activities/ Benefits of Project Are Continuing (Sustainability)	7.64
3.	Factor B, Benefits to Poor	7.60
4.	Factor K, "Replicability"	7.59
5.	Factor E, Effect on Host Country Institutions	7.49
6.	Factor G, Appropriateness of Technology	7.15

7.	Factor D, Effect on Host Government Policies	7.14
8.	Factor H, Effect on Host Country Private Sector	6.76
9.	Factor C, Impact on Women	6.48
10.	Factor I, Effect on the Physical Environment	5.84

As shown in Table I, the highest scoring factor World Wide is Factor F, Effect on the "Stock" of Trained Manpower and Skills, with an average score of 7.86. This factor scored highest in three of the four geographic regions. (See the "Regions" section below). Despite the factor's high score, very few of the IE reports devote much attention to the matter of training, either its accomplishments or problems. Similarly, very few of the reports offer "lessons learned" or recommendations dealing with training. The entire area seems to be dominated by a widely accepted (if not fully articulated) set of attitudes centered on the ideas that training is close to an absolute good and necessity in development terms; AID is handling it well; and AID and the concerned LDCs are getting good pay-off from it. The matter generally seems shielded from the high "adrenalin flow" argumentation that seems to attach to many other aid (and AID) matters.

Table I also shows that the lowest scoring factor World Wide is Factor I, Effect on the Physical Environment, with an average score of 5.84. The second lowest factor score, 6.48, is recorded by Factor C, Benefits Delivered to or Impact on Women. Both of these factors scored at or near the bottom in all four regions with one exception for Factor C.

The relatively low score achieved by Factor I seems to reflect, among other circumstances, the newness of physical environment as a subject within our common everyday consciousness and the attendant lack of (or weak) understanding regarding the environmental implications of many projects, particularly older ones. The effects of certain road or irrigation projects, for example, on land stability, distribution (of ownership) and use were apparently not adequately anticipated or appreciated (nor could they have been) during the planning and implementation of those projects; nor were the social and economic dynamics and their subsequent effect on the physical environment adequately understood and factored in. The raising of these kinds of issues (or, often, "second generation" problems) in a number of the IE reports is encouraging; it seems to reflect (and will likely further stimulate) a "raised consciousness" level within AID and might offer some prospect of improved performance in this area in the late 1980s and beyond by the portfolio of projects started in the 1970s and later years.

The evidence available in the IE reports used in this study is not sufficient to account for the relatively low ranking achieved by Factors H, Effect on Host Country Private Sector; D, Effect on Host Government Policies; and G, Appropriateness of Technology (ranked eighth, seventh and sixth respectively among the 10 factors). Nor do the reports provide sufficient indications of possible "trade-offs" between different kinds of accomplishments or likely changes in their relative and absolute performance in he future.

The newness of the first two mentioned factors (H & D) as areas of open, deliberate and articulated emphasis (as opposed to the uncertain and almost "covert" manner in which they were generally treated in the past) might be part of the explanation. Another contributing circumstance might be the widely-held perception of short-term inconsistancies between the pursuit of these kinds of accomplishments, on the one hand, and those centered on the direct delivery of benefits to the poor, on the other. Until perhaps a few years ago the Agency tended to try to resolve these "inconsistencies" (as a matter of generalized perference) in favor of the latter kind of accomplishments or objectives.

In this regard, the majority of the IE reports appear to be supportive of the concept of aid as an instrument to help improve the conditions of life of the poor immediately and directly and to achieve some improved degree of economic equity through redistribution of wealth. However, a number of reports (with varying degrees of apparent defensiveness) suggest broad alternative (and equally traditional and quasi-ideological) concepts, i.e.,aid as a means of helping to create increasing and lasting opportunities for the poor or, a variation, aid as a means for facilitating development processes. Some of the reports dealing with Agricultural Research, Feeder Roads, Rural Electrification and (even) Potable Water make points to this effect.

The view is well stated in a report on a roads project which argues that while "A road does not change a social system (redistribute wealth) ... it (does) widen the range of opportunities. The opening of the roads has made nobody worse off; but the rich have obviously gotten richer. They were in a better starting position. However, in terms of percentage of disposable income - of ready cash - that of the poorest people has quite likely incresed most and they, rather than the more affluent, are newly within reach of health, credit and technical service for their farms, and education for their children." And, finally on this point (and quoted also because of its implied caution regarding our sometimes facile reading of others' expectations), an IE report that states: "... there

are (in Thailand) clearly recognized patron-client relationships, mutual obligations in a wide range of social and economic situations, which place no stress on equal access to the benefits of economic development ... The rich and -- with or without great means -- the ambitious and the venturesome have more quickly and more successfully taken advantage of opportunities created by new all weather roads dramatically increasing the range and volume of effective transfer of goods, and of ideas. But the poor have also gained. Indeed in terms of relative gains theirs may be the greater ...."

A study - I would suggest it be done by a university or private "think-tank" with good sociology/anthropology/economics capability under a three to five year AID contract - of the real and apparent differences in these concepts or approaches and of AID's application of them, would, I believe, be instructive and helpful.

On the five point verbal scale, "translated" or compressed from the 10 point scale, five projects (7.0% of the 73 project base) were rated Unsatisfactory; eight (11%) were rated Marginal; 11 (15%) were Satisfactory; 44 (60%), Highly Satisfactory; and five (7.0%), Outstanding.

Condensed into a simple Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory assessment, 60 of the total 73 projects (82%) were Satisfactory (or better) and 13 (18%) were Unsatisfactory (Marginal or worse on the five and 10 point scales).

Regions

Table II shows the Project Average and General Impression factor scores by Region and World-Wide.

Table II

Project Average and General Impression Scores by Region and World-Wide

Region	Project Average	General Impression
World-Wide*	7.28	7.29
Africa	6.45	6.46
Asia	7.50	7.45
LAC	7.88	8.17
NENA	6.21	6.00

*The World-Wide "scores" for Project Average, General Impression and the other factors are derived from the averaging of the individual project scores in each of those categories. The World-Wide scores therefore do not represent an average of scores by Regions as shown in this table or by Sectors or by other project characteristics as shown in other tables and narrative sections throughout this report.

As can be seen in Table II, the Asia and LAC scores in both the Project Average and the General Impression factor are higher than the corresponding World-Wide scores; the Africa and NENA scores are lower.

It will also be noted from Table II that the General Impression score is higher than the Project Average score in LAC and lower in NENA. This might reflect, among other things, a relatively high sense of development movement and promise in LAC (the "general impression" is that the project, the actionable and controllable part of the abstraction, development, is working or has worked, perhaps better than any individual accomplishment or aggragation of accomplishments, might suggest). The opposite (a kind of ~~limited~~ low expectations attitude) might help to explain the reverse relationships of the Project Average and General Impression factor scores in NENA.

Table III shows the Region and World-Wide scores by factor and Project Average; it also shows the rank position of each of the 10 factors (10 rather than 11 since Factor A, General Impression, is excluded).

Table III

Region and World-Wide Factor and Project Average Scores and Ranks

FACTOR	WORLD WIDE*	AFRICA	ASIA	LAC	NENA
B, Impact on the Poor					
Score	7.60	6.77	7.66	8.67	6.14
Rank Among Factors	3	4	6	1	5
C, Impact on Women					
Score	6.48	6.00	6.43	7.89	5.43
Rank	9	8	8	5	9
D, Effect on Host Government Policies					
Score	7.14	6.23	7.86	6.78	6.14
Rank	7	6	4	9	6
E, Effect on Host Government Institutions					
Score	7.49	7.17	7.79	7.50	6.57
Rank	5	2	5	8	2
F, Effect on Trained Manpower					
Score	7.86	7.38	8.39	7.50	6.57
Rank	1	1	1	7	1
G, Appropriateness of Technology					
Score	7.15	6.77	7.09	8.11	5.71
Rank	6	5	7	3	8
H, Effect on Host Country Private Sector					
Score	6.76	5.75	6.38	8.24	5.00
Rank	8	9	9	2	10
I, Effect on Physical Environment					
Score	5.84	5.20	5.75	6.50	6.00
Rank	10	10	10	10	7
J, Sustainability					
Score	7.64	6.25	8.09	8.11	6.57
Rank	2	7	2	4	3
K, Replicability					
Score	7.59	6.90	8.03	7.54	6.57
Rank	4	3	3	6	4

* See "*" footnote to Table II

In all the regions, except LAC, the highest single factor score was achieved by Factor F, Trained Manpower and Skills. In two of these regions, Africa and Asia, the score for this factor was substantially above the respective region's Project Average score: in NENA it was moderately higher. In LAC, Factor F ranked only seventh among the 10 factors, scoring 7.50 compared to the LAC Project Average of 7.88. Measured against the World-Wide average for this factor of 7.86, only Asia with an 8.39 did better.

Factor B, Benefits to poor and Factor C, Benefits to women were ranked by the LAC Bureau first and fifth respectively among the 10 factors. Factor B scored 8.67, well above the LAC Project Average and the World Wide average for this factor. Asia also scored above both its Project Average (modestly) and the World Wide average (barely) in this factor. The Africa bureau's Factor B score was modestly higher than its Project Average; the NENA score was slightly lower. Both scored below the World Wide average for this factor.

LAC's score of 7.89 for Factor C, Benefits to Women against a LAC Project Average of 7.88 and a World Wide average for Factor C of 6.48 was quite good relative to the scores for this factor achieved in the other regions. Asia's Factor C score of 6.43, like the Africa and NENA scores in this factor, was below both the region's Project Average and the World Wide average for the factor.

The scores and the consequent rank among the 10 factors (excluding Factor A) achieved by those two factors (B & C) in all regions except LAC were disappointing and surprising to this writer, in the case of Factor B, and disappointing (but not surprising) in the case of Factor C.

To this writer's pleasant surprise, all regions scored well, (with one or two partial exceptions) in Factor J, Sustainability and Factor K, Replicability which ranked second and fourth among the 10 factors on a World Wide basis.

While inter-region comparisons do not seem warranted within the context of the limited data available, some patterns of accomplishment factor scores might be noted.

- The LAC pattern seems quite different from those of Africa and NENA particularly and that of Asia to a lesser degree. For example, LAC did poorest (excluding the Physical Environment factor) in terms of impact on Policies, Institutions and Trained Manpower. The other three bureaus did either best or well in these three accomplishment factors.

- On the other hand, LAC scored very well in terms of impact on the Poor, Women, the Private Sector, and Technology while the other three scored only poor to fair in these areas.

- Despite variations in their scoring patterns, the LAC and Asia projects did well in virtually all factors relative to the World-Wide scores. And, of course, Africa and NENA did poorly in comparison with those scores (and even more poorly relative to the LAC and Asia scores themselves).

The IE reports do not provide much information, direct or indirect, that would help to explain this pattern variation. One obvious line of speculation (supported to some extent by a perhaps too careful reading of the reports) suggests that because of the LAC region's relatively advanced institutional and manpower infrastructure, and its long history of and familiarity with the substance, purposes, processes and rhetoric of US assistance, the LAC Bureau/Region tended to under-emphasize the institutional factors in favor of more direct delivery of benefits to the poor and women. To a lesser extent, the same situation and reaction seem to have prevailed in Asia.

Viewed simplistically, perhaps, this suggests that institutional and trained manpower capability (and, some would argue, physical infrastructural support) function, among other ways, as something of a precondition for or "enabler" of successful efforts to provide benefits directly to targetted poor populations. In a sense, one might note a correspondence (suggested to me orally by an IE team member) between this view

and the old aphorism that "it takes money (in this instance institutional, skills and physical infrastructure capital) to make money (in this instance benefits delivered to the rural poor)."

The "phenomenon" of substantially higher levels of all accomplishment factor scores achieved by LAC and Asia compared with those achieved by Africa and NENA appears significant and perhaps warrants further study. If sufficient data were available by country and region (as was not the case in this study) inter-country and inter-region performance comparisons/analysis might be warranted and would probably be helpful in trying to assess the value of universal as opposed to country - specific aid strategies.

Sectors

Sixty-three projects (86% of the 73 project universe) are rather evenly distributed among six major sectors: Agricultural Research, 8 projects; Education, 15 projects; Irrigation, 8; Potable Water, 10; Rural Electrification, 10; and Rural Roads, 12. The remaining 10 projects (primarily in Health, Nutrition and Area Development) comprise a miscellaneous "Other" category or sector. (Ten of the 15 Education projects were covered in one IE report on one country).

Table IV shows the Project Average and General Impression factor scores by Sector and the rank among sectors.

Table IV

Project Average and General Impression Scores by Sector and World-Wide Averages

Sector	Project Average	General Impression
Agricultural Resarch	7.37 (3)	7.50 (2)
Education	7.99 (1)	7.93 (1)
Irrigation	6.54 (7)	6.83 (6)
Potable Water	6.60 (6)	6.30 (7)
Rural Electrification	7.82 (2)	7.40 (3)
Rural Roads	7.14 (4)	7.25 (5)
Other	7.01 (5)	7.33 (4)
World-Wide*	7.28	7.29

* See "*" footnote to Table II

In terms of both Project Average and General Impression, the Education sector (primarily non-higher and informal education) ranked highest among the seven sectors, including the "Other" sector. (This high ranking could, of course, be taken as evidence of AID's past "success" in this sector and, by extension, as an argument for assignment of high priority to it). Education was followed in score rank by Rural Electrification in terms of Project Average and Agricultural Research in terms of General Impression. Potable Water and Irrigation ranked lowest in both categories. (It is of interest to note that Potable Water and Rural Electrification, two sectors about whose development effectiveness and priority there is considerable disagreement within AID, both scored noticeably lower in General Impression than in Project Average, suggesting perhaps a vague Agency wariness about projects in these areas - a wariness apparently supported by the Project Average and factor rank position of Potable Water and refuted by the comparable rank positions of Rural Electrification). The sector scores compare with the World Wide Project Average and General Impression scores of 7.28 and 7.29, respectively. Excluding the "Other" sector, three sectors scored above the World Wide averages and three below.

Table V provides an opportunity to review the individual factor scores by sector.

Table V

Factor Scores by Sector

SECTOR	Project Average	Factors A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
Ag Research	7.37	7.50	7.38	6.50	6.38	7.88	9.29	7.50	7.17	7.00	7.25	7.00
Education	7.99	7.93	8.40	6.87	8.53	8.27	8.53	7.53	6.33	5.00	8.00	8.21
Irrigation	6.54	6.83	7.00	4.80	6.83	6.40	5.75	6.60	5.00	4.80	7.50	7.50
Potable Water	6.60	6.30	6.50	6.20	6.90	6.67	7.00	6.40	6.00	5.40	6.70	7.25
Rural Elec.	7.82	7.40	7.90	8.00	7.60	8.10	8.67	7.20	7.60	6.00	8.90	8.71
Rural Roads	7.14	7.25	7.58	6.43	6.67	7.50	7.78	7.33	6.82	5.57	7.17	7.45
Other	7.01	7.33	7.75	6.17	6.63	7.13	6.83	7.25	7.25	7.75	8.29	7.29
World-Wide	7.28	7.29	7.60	6.48	7.14	7.49	7.86	7.15	6.76	5.84	7.64	7.59

As reflected in Table V, the Education sector scored particularly well in Factor D, Effect on Host Government Policies and Factor F, Training Skilled Manpower, each of which scored 8.53. This sector also did very well in Factor B, Helping the Poor; Factor E, Effect on Institutions; and Factor K, Replicability. These scores all in the "8" range) might be compared with the World Wide averages in the cited factors (all in the "7" range).

The Education sector scored worst in Factor I, Effect on Physical Environment, (5.00 against a World Wide score for this factor of 5.84) and Factor H, Effect on Host Country Private Sector, (6.33 against a World Wide score of 6.76).

The Rural Electrification sector (or sub-sector) scored best and very well (in the "8" range) in factors: J, Sustainability; K, Replicability; F, Trained Manpower; E, Institutions; and C, Impact on Women (in this last, scoring 8.00 - the highest score among the sectors for this factor and

quite high when measured against a World Wide score in this factor of 6.48). The Rural Electrification sub-sector scored worst in Factors I, Environment and G, Appropriateness and Take of the Applied Technology. Suprisingly and disappointingly to this writer Factor H, Effect on the Host Country Private Sector ranked only eighth among the sub-sector's 10 factors, (though with a score of 7.60 it was significantly higher than the World Wide score of 6.76 for this factor).

The Agricultural Research sector did remarkably well in Factor F, Trained manpower, scoring 9.29 (against a World Wide average of 7.86) which was the highest score for any single factor in the sector cut or arrangement. This sector also did well in Factor E, Institutions and Factor G, Technology. It did least well in Factor D, Policies, Factor C, Women and Factor K, Replicability, which might indicate a need to reduce the pace of centralized agricultural research institution building and high level manpower training relative to the pace of effort in extending research activitiy/results and benefits to the local level and targetted groups. Further analysis in this "popular" sector seems called for.

Nine of the 11 factor scores in the Rural Roads sector set were very close to their corresponding World Wide factor average scores (three slightly above and six slightly below).

In the remaining two factors J, Sustainability and D, Policies, the sector scored appreciably lower: 7.17 compared to 7.64 for Factor J and 6.67 compared to 7.14 for Factor D.

The Irrigation sector scored below the World Wide average in all factors and substantially below (more than a full integer) in serveral, including (surprisingly, I believe) Factor C, Impact on Women. Within the sector's own factor rankings it did best (and respectably, i.e., close to the World Wide scores) in Factor J, Sustainability; Factor K, Replicability; and Factor D, Impact on Policies.

The Potable Water sector also fell short of the World Wide averages in all factors. Within its own set it did best with factors K, Replicability and F, Trained Manpower. It did least well with factors I, Environment and H, Private Sector. Another low scoring factor (surprisingly) was Factor C, Benefits to Women which ranked eighth among the sector's factors.

The low score of Factor C, Impact on Women in the Potable Water sector might reflect the general circumstance expressly noted in one of the IE reports: "Women were not a specific source of concern in the planning of the project." It might also reflect a problem confronting virtually all efforts to assess substantive accomplishments. This has to do with

determining the point (in terms of time and consequences) at which a condition is viewed as an achieved accomplishment (as opposed, say, at its most extreme, to a cause of a subsequent disbenefit). This point is treated instructively in two separate IE reports on potable water projects. The first of these reports rates Factor C very high and supports this rating by such statements on the matter as "By bringing water closer to rural households, the new water systems made life easier for women." Also, women "appreciated the convenience of having sufficient water for personal and household needs and they expressed satisfaction to be participating in the amenities of modern life."

The second report rated Factor C as fair. This rating was justified by an extension of the line of reasoning given above. As presented in the report, the potable water project resulted in "... three hours of released time for each housewife in the village. Most of the women reported using this time for household chores and child care ..., for tending animals ..., for their families ... (and others might add for farming or second-income generating chores)."

In another report, on feeder roads, the evaluators go so far as to say they are not sure we can ever accurately guage the success of a project in a final sense. Whether verbally or numerically measured, our accomplishments can be judged only tentatively at any point in time. Not only our accomplishments but even our attempted "solutions" to development problems

should be seen as highly tentative and, (even more potentially discouraging), over time and from varied perspectives, perhaps "counter productive." From the perspective of an early worker in the field of evaluation (an academic cum politician) AID should accept this "ordering" of things; it reflects the real but uncertain context in which "practitioners" of development assistance are constantly challenged for "true solutions;" yet development "like politics requires (timely) accommodation and not (permanent) solutions which are the frequent, if misguided object of research."

On the five stop verbal scale the Potable Water and the "Other" sectors were the only ones to record "Unsatisfactory" projects: four of the 10 Potable Water projects fell in this category and one of the "Other." Eight additional projects were rated "Marginal": one each in Agricultrual Research, Rural Roads and "Other" (a Nutrition project); two in Potable Water and three in Irrigation.

Of the remaining 60 projects, 11 were rated "Satisfactory," 44, "Highly Satisfactory" and five, "Superior." The following Table VI shows the incidence and percentage in each performance category by Sector.

Table VI

Sector Performance on Five Stop Scale

Sector	Unsatisfactory	Marginal	Satisfactory	Highly Satisfactory	Superior
Ag Research					
No. of Projects	-	1	2	4	1
%	-	12.5	25.0	50.0	12.5
Education					
No.	-	-	1	14	-
%	-	-	7.0	93.0	-
Irrigation					
No.	-	3	1	4	-
%	-	37.5	12.5	50.0	-
Potable Water					
No.	4	2	-	1	3
%	40.0	20.0	-	10.0	30.0
Rural Electrification					
No.	-	-	-	9	1
%	-	-	-	90.0	10.0
Rural Roads					
No.	-	1	5	6	-
%	-	8.0	42.0	50.0	-
Other					
No.	1	1	2	6	-
%	10.0	10.0	20.0	60.6	
Totals					
No.	5	8	11	44	5
%	7.0	11.0	15.0	60.6	7.0

Project Start

Table VII shows the various factor scores by decade of project start, i.e., the 1950s, '60s and '70s; Table VII-A shows the factor scores by pre and post "New Directions" project start, i.e., by projects started in 1973 and prior years and projects started in 1974 and later years.

Table VII

Factor Scores by Decade of Project Start

Decade of Project Start	Proj Avrge	Factors A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
1950	7.57	7.40	8.20	6.50	7.80	8.20	8.80	6.80	5.50	-	7.80	7.00
1960	8.06	8.11	8.37	7.00	7.89	8.26	9.07	7.74	7.70	5.67	8.47	8.44
1970	6.95	6.96	7.24	6.28	6.78	7.11	7.27	6.96	6.59	5.86	7.29	7.33
World Wide	7.28	7.29	7.60	6.48	7.14	7.49	7.86	7.15	6.76	5.84	7.64	7.59

Table VII-A

Factor Scores by Pre and Post New Directions

Project Start

Start	Prog Average	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
Pre-New Directions (1973 & Prior)	7.64	7.64	8.08	6.93	7.50	8.00	8.52	7.31	6.86	5.70	8.03	7.79
Post-New Directions (1974 & Later)	6.94	6.95	7.14	6.00	6.78	6.79	7.15	7.00	6.70	5.90	7.27	7.41
World Wide (all projects all years)	7.28	7.29	7.60	6.48	7.14	7.49	7.86	7.15	6.75	5.84	7.64	7.59

As Table VII indicates, projects started in the 1950s had a Project Average score of 7.57 and a Factor B, Benefit to the Poor score of 8.20. Comparable scores for the 1960's and 1970s were 8.06 and 6.95 for Project Average and 8.37 and 7.24 for Factor B. Thus the 1960 projects scored highest in Project Average and in Benefitting the Poor; the 1950 projects ranked second in these two areas and the 1970 projects last. The same ranking applies to factors: C, Women; D, Policies; E, Institutions; F, Trained Manpower; and J, Sustainability. In factors: G, Technology and K, Replicability the 1970 projects ranked second, ahead of the 1950 projects, but by a small margin in the case of Factor G and a moderate margin in Factor K.

Comparing projects started in FY 73 and prior years with projects started in FY 74 and subsequent years (a 36-37 split) much the same ~~unexpected~~ pattern emerges. The pre-73 projects score higher in 10 of the 11 factors (including Factor A, General Impression) and in Project Average. In Factor B, Benefits to Poor, for example, the pre-73 projects score 8.08 and the post-73 projects 7.14. In factors: C, Women; D, Policies; E, Institutions; and F, Trained Manpower, the '73 and prior years scores are substantially/significantly (almost a full integer - or more) higher than their post-73 counterparts.

The reason (or reasons) for this "unexpected" situation are not evident. Two circumstances or hypothesis do suggest themselves and would seem to warrant further consideration. The first of these has to do with the idea of "benefits maturation." There is considerable anecdotal evidence (this writer is not conversant with the relevant literature) suggesting that development project achievements tend to increase as the elapsed time after project completion increases or extends. A number of the IE reports, for example, expressly make this point. If the point is valid, it would seem to argue that a realistic reading of the impact of AID-assisted projects begun in the 1970s might not be available before, say, the mid- to late- 1980s. The data in this report appear to support that view. For example, the Project Average score for projects which had been completed more than eight years when their IE reports were done was 7.99 while for projects completed three years or less at the time their IE reports were issued it was 6.81.

In the same vein, the idea that benefits increase after the project is completed might suggest the need for a more positive assessment of the "sustainability" record of (and prospects for) AID-assisted projects. While there are, I understand, numerous indications (or "horror stories") in apparent support of the opposite view (consistent with AID's perennial concern with and pessimism regarding this "question of sustainability"), the evidence in the IE reports seems to

support the positive view. Of the 11 factors (including Factor A, General Impression) rated on a world wide basis, Factor J, Sustainability ranked second highest, following only Factor F, Trained Manpower in factor scores. It scored or ranked first among factors in three of the seven sector ratings and second, third and fourth in Asia, LAC and NENA respectively in their regional ratings; (it ranked only seventh in Africa).

The second "hypothesis" centers on the still more complex and controversial idea that pre-1973 projects, precisely because they were geared (arguably) to more attitudinal and contextual developmental changes, to longer term development objectives, and to more indirect delivery of benefits to poor people than their post-73 counterparts, did at least as well in a number of currently high priority achievement areas. Put another way, a way suggested by several IE reports: "...the trickle-down theory does work" and the pursuit of "deeper" (contextual, attitudinal, institutional, "development-gearing-up") objectives might be as "effective" as more direct, "frontal" attempts to provide benefits to the poor, for example.

Looked-at in yet another way, a variation of the above, the 1973 and prior years accomplishment performance might reflect the constancy and soundness of AID's purpose or mission and the dependable realization of accomplisment results over time based

on that mission. In effect, this perspective suggests that the general development assistance approach followed by AID in FY 74 and later years was in many (perhaps most) essentials much the same as that followed in earlier years. To the extent there were differences, they tend to reflect matters of emphasis and conceptual formulations (rhetoric, perhaps) rather than fundamental substance.

In any case, it might be appropriate and timely to begin soon to develop a long term plan (running say for five to 10 years starting in 1985 or 1986) designed to assess the differences and relative merits of pre-and post 1973 conceptual and practical approaches to LDC economic development and AID assistance thereto. The same study or, more likely, series of studies, might also review and assess another matter that is touched-on in a number of IE reports: the success of AID efforts to achieve "wealth redistribution" (as opposed - if opposition is inherent in development situations/strategies/ objectives - to "increasing national wealth") and the appropriateness of "redistribution" as an AID objective.

Project Duration

Under this characteristic, projects were organized into three categories, essentially Short, Medium and Long. The first of these covers projects of five years duration or less (22 projects); the second, those of six to 10 years (or medium) duration (36 projects); and the third, those of 10 years or more duration (15). Table VIII records the factor scores arranged by project duration.

Table VIII

Factor Scores by Project Duration

Project Duration	Project Average	Factors A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
Short:												
5 Years or less	6.93	7.05	7.18	5.89	6.95	7.20	7.13	6.57	6.21	5.50	7.14	7.30
Medium:												
6 to 10 years	7.40	7.36	7.64	6.92	7.33	7.53	7.97	7.53	6.93	6.05	7.75	7.78
Long:												
More than 10 years	7.51	7.47	8.13	6.40	6.93	7.80	8.64	7.07	7.13	6.00	8.14	7.55
World Wide	7.28	7.29	7.60	6.48	7.14	7.49	7.86	7.15	6.76	5.84	7.64	7.59

The Table VIII data indicate a consistant association of lowest scores and Short duration projects. In every factor but one (Factor D, Policies) the Short duration category scored lower than either the Medium or the Long categories. The association is, however, mixed regarding the Medium and Long categories with six factors recording their highest score in the Long duration category and five in the Medium one.

In terms of Project Average and Factor A, General Impression, the Long duration category scored best (7.51 and 7.47 respectively), the Medium category second, and, of course, the Short category, last.

Similarly, the Long duration projects scored best and the Medium projects second best in Factor B, Benefits for the Poor; Factor E, Institution Building; Factor F, Manpower Training; Factor H, Effect on Host Country Private Sector; and Factor J, Sustainability. In these five factors (and in the Project Average and Factor A, General Impression factor) these two duration categories scored above and the short duration category below the corresponding World Wide averages.

In four of the remaining five factors: C, Women; D, Policies; G, Technology; I, Environment; and K, Replicability, the Medium category scored highest and the Long second. And again, in these five factors the two longer duration categories scored above and the shortest

duration category below the corresponding World Wide averages. Only in Factor D, Policies, did the Short duration category score above either of the other two categories, scoring marginally higher than the third place Long category. The association of Long duration projects with high scores (in the 8 range) in Factor B, Delivering Benefits to Poor and Factor J, Sustainability (as well as Factor F, Training) seems particularly noteworthy.

The strong correlation between highest Project Average and several factor scores, particularly those dealing with benefits for the poor, institution building and developing trained manpower (as mentioned above), on the one hand, and the longest duration projects on the other, seems to support the view offered in several IE reports to the effect that a major reason for "success" is the steady AID commitment and applicaton of resources to the project (or program) over an extended period of time. This view calls into question the currently prevailing attitude that merit attaches to project "shortness" of duration and the consequent greater quantitative availability of "opportunities for intervention." It would also seem to have implications regarding the soundness of AID's traditional practice of terminating its involvement in AID-assisted projects as soon as possible after AID funds have been expended. In this regard, at least one IE report recommends that AID maintain some involvement in completed projects for an indefinite time even if AID has no plans to provide further assistance to any of those projects themselves or to potential follow-up projects. It might be useful to

examine the manpower requirements for maintaining some kind of continuing involvement in selected projects and other costs and benefits likely to result from it. Such an examination might help to explain the apparent "cultural" reluctance of AID (and others) to seek incremental benefits from incremental investments in support of past investments and accomplisments flowing from them in favor of undertaking new activities - essentially an expression of the dominance in AID of a "production" over a "use" orientation. This matter, i.e., our bias for new activities or "challenges" and against long term commitment and "staying power" (in project terms as opposed to development generally) has implications also for the important matter of recurrent costs which might also be addressed in an examination of "post-project" matters.

The top ranking of the Medium duration projects in Factor D, Impact on Policy, combined with the "good" performance of the short category in this area (relative to the other two duration categories) suggests that some advantages might lie with shorter projects. In this particular instance, one might speculate that AID can "reach" policy makers in shorter periods of time than is required to effect, on a sustained basis, other kinds of impact. A similar conclusion might be ventured regarding our objectives of delivering benefits to women and demonstrating and achieving some replication of technology, i.e., less time might be required to obtain results (accomplishments) in these matters than in others, e.g., benefitting the poor and building institutions.

The point here may well be simply that merit or value does not attach to any particular project length; it is incumbent on us therefore to make judgements regarding project duration on the basis of specific, i.e., primarily activity, sector and other country-level circumstances and independently of pre-conceived notions or Agency policies regarding desirable length.

It might also be noted that the shortest duration projects category had the highest portion of its portfolio implemented by PVOs. The implications of this association (of accomplishment and implementator) might be worth exploring. In this particular instance (not examined closely), the relatively poor performance of the short duration projects might reflect the inherent difficulties of PVO kinds of projects, the limited resources applied in them and the (often) mixed objectives which they expressly or implicitly pursue, e.g., social-cultural-technological, PVO capability strengthening, relief, "religious," "experimental," developmental.

Beyond this, it should be noted that while the two longer project duration categories scored above the World Wide averages in all factors, the scores of factors: C, Women; and I, Environment, particularly, and D, Policies and H, Private Sector in one or the other category, were not "good" relative to the other factor scores in these duration categories.

In terms of the five "stop" verbal scale, five projects (23%) of the 22 projects in the short duration category were Unsatisfactory (three projects) or Marginal (two). This compares with no Unsatisfactory projects in the other two duration categories and one Marginal in the Medium category and none in the Long. The distribution of projects among the five stops are shown in Table IX.

Table IX

Project Distribution by Duration on Five Stop Scale

Project Duration	Total	Unsatisfactory	Marginal	Satisfactory	Highly Satisfactory	Superior
Five Years or Less						
No.	22	3	2	3	6	8
%	100.0	14.0	9.0	14.0	27.0	36.0
Six to 10 Years						
No.	36	-	1	4	22	9
%	100.0	-	3.0	11.0	61.0	25.0
Ten Years or More						
No.	15	-	-	3	3	9
%	100.0	-	-	20.0	20.0	60.0
World Wide						
No.	7.3	3	3	10	31	26
%	100.0	4.00	4.00	14.0	42.00	36.00

- At the Satisfactory level the percentages were fairly close in all three categories: 14.0, 11.0 and 20.0 respectively.

- At the next highest level (Highly Satisfactory) the Medium group registered 61.0% (22 of 36 projects) while the Short group, registered 27.0% (six of 22 projects) and the Long group 20% (three of 15 projects, the same as at the Satisfactory level).

- At the Superior level (the highest) the over 10 years projects registered 60.0% (nine of 15 projects), the six to 10 years group, 25.0% (nine of 36) and the five years or less group, 36.0% (eight of 22).

- Combining the two highest categories, (as Highly Satisfactory or better), the ranking of the three categories by percentage of projects is: five years or less, 63.0%; over 10 years, 80.0%; and six to 10 years, 86.0%.

Kinds and Levels of Funding

The 73 projects included in this study were grouped into three funding level categories, essentially Small, Medium and Large. The categories (and their dollar definition) and the project distribution among them are as shown in Table X following.

Table X

Project Distribution Among Funding Levels

Funding Level	LOP Dollar Amount	No. of Projects
Small	Less than $1.0m	18
Medium	$1.0 - 10.0m	37
Large	More than $10.0m	18

The factor scores by funding level are shown in Table XI.

Table XI

Factor Scores by Funding Level

Funding Level	Project Average	Factors A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
1. Small	6.74	6.61	7.22	6.00	6.72	6.65	7.21	6.17	5.89	5.29	7.11	7.19
2. Medium	7.58	7.73	7.92	6.81	7.32	7.86	8.10	7.54	7.17	6.33	7.73	7.87
3. Large	7.39	7.06	7.33	6.37	7.17	7.53	8.00	7.35	6.46	5.44	8.00	7.44
World Wide	7.28	7.29	7.60	6.48	7.14	7.49	7.86	7.15	6.76	5.84	7.64	7.59

The data presented in Table XI indicate a consistant pattern of association between accomplishment level and project size. That is, all 11 factors plus the Project Average record their lowest scores at the Small funding level (less than $1.0m); their middle level scores at the Large funding level (with one exception); and their highest scores at the Medium funding level (also with one exception - Factor J, Sustainability in which the Large funding level category scored highest among the three funding categories and the Medium level

second). In addition to Factor J, the Large category also did very well (at the 8.00 level) in Factor F, Training. The Medium category did very well in Factor F (8.10) and Factor B, Impact on the Poor (7.92). That last is interesting, I believe, especially when coupled with the Large category's below World Wide score in this factor (7.33 vs 7.60), for it seems to decouple funding size and accomplishment levels. The decoupling seems reinforced by the Large category scores in Factor C, Impact on Women and Factor K, Replicability both of which were lower than their comparable World Wide scores.

In terms of the kinds of AID funds used (grant, loan or mixed), loan funded projects (30 of them) scored highest in Project Average and Factor A. Grant only projects (34) scored second in these two areas. This writer was extremely surprised by (and continues to regard with some skepticism) the lowest rank achieved by mixed grant/loan projects which scored 6.99 in Project Average and 6.78 in Factor A, both scores significantly below the World Wide scores in these areas of 7.28 and 7.29. (Three of the nine projects in the grant/loan category were in the Irrigation Sector and all three scored poorly, as did the

sector as a whole relative to the other sectors. Also, seven of the nine projects were started in the "low-scoring" 1970s).

As shown in Table XII below, the rankings of the 11 individual factors by the three kinds of funding categories do not reveal a discernable pattern (unless the apparent haphazardous of the rankings is itself seen as the pattern).

Table XII

Factor Scores by Kind of Funding

Funding Category	Project Average	Factors A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
Grant	7.23	7.18	7.44	6.48	7.29	7.64	8.07	6.97	6.12	6.08	7.38	7.71
Loan	7.43	7.57	7.93	6.67	6.93	7.31	7.58	7.52	7.32	6.07	7.83	7.25
Grant/Loan Mixed	6.99	6.78	7.11	6.00	7.22	7.56	7.75	6.67	6.00	4.60	8.00	8.13
World Wide	7.28	7.29	7.60	6.48	7.14	7.49	7.86	7.15	6.76	5.84	7.64	7.59

The Mixed (grant/loan) category scores highest and very well (in the 8 range) in Factor J, Sustainability and Factor K, Replicability. Loan projects score second in Factor J, and third in Factor K while Grant projects reverse that rank, scoring third in Factor J and second in Factor K. (The third rank in each factor is below its corresonding World Wide score). Some further exploration of likely reasons for

the good performance of the Mixed projects in Factor J and Factor K might be revealing.

In other factors, Grant only projects scored highest in factors: D, Policies; E, Institutions; and F, Training. Loan projects scored highest in B, Benefits to Poor; C, Women; G, Technology; and H, Private Sector.

Within the individual funding categories, Grants scored best in Factor F, Training; Factor K, Replicability and Factor E, Institution Building. Loans scored best in factors: B, Benefits to Poor; J, Sustainability; and G, Technology. (The relationship of Factor B, Benefits to Poor to kinds and levels of AID resource inputs should perhaps be examined more thoroughly). The mixed funding category did very well, as mentioned above, in Factors J and K. It also did well (7.75) in Factor F, Training.

Beneficiary Participation Level (BPL)

The data for this project characteristic (as shown in Table XIII below) seem so contrary to common expectations that I suspect they are in error, or in need of more sophisticated analysis than can be performed at this time. The 73 study projects were grouped into three categories under this project characteristic: those projects with a high level of beneficiary participation (19 projects), those with a medium level of beneficiary participation (21 projects) and those with a low

 BEST AVAILABLE

level (24 projects); there were nine projects for which no judgement ~~was~~ could be made regarding the level of beneficiary participation in the planning and/or the implementation of the concerned project. Table XIII shows factor scores by the level of beneficiary participation.

Table XIII

Factor Scores by Beneficiary Participation Level (BPL)

Beneficiary Participation Level		Factors										
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
Low	7.95	8.13	8.33	7.35	7.92	8.26	8.33	7.86	7.53	6.56	7.92	8.38
Medium	7.59	7.14	7.52	6.40	7.71	7.90	8.35	7.71	7.00	6.11	8.30	8.21
High	6.07	6.95	6.53	5.56	5.74	6.11	6.60	5.78	5.81	5.31	6.32	6.16
World Wide	7.28	7.29	7.60	6.48	7.14	7.49	7.86	7.15	6.76	5.84	7.64	7.59

Within the BPL framework shown in Table XIII, the high BPL category scored 6.07 and 6.05 in Project Average and Factor A, General Impression respectively; the medium BPL category scored 7.59 and 7.14 in these two areas; and the low BPL 7.95 and 8.13. The high BPL category scored below the other two BPL categories and below the World Wide averages in Factor B, Benefits to the Poor and every other factor. The low BPL category scored above the World Wide averages in every factor and very well (above 8.00) in Factor B (8.33); Factor E,

Institution Building (8.26); Factor F, Manpower Training (8.33); and Factor K, Replicability (8.38).

In the five point verbal scale (see Table XIV below) high BPL projects had nine of its 19 projects (47.0%) rated Marginal or Unsatisfactory; six projects (32%) rated Satisfactory; and four projects (21%) Highly Satisfactory; no high BPL projects were rated Superior.

The medium level BPL category registered two projects (9.5%) Marginal or Unsatisfactory; two projects (9.5%), Satisfactory; 17 (81.0%), Highly Satisfactory; and none Superior.

The low BPL category had two projects (8.3%) rated Marginal or Unsatisfactory; three (12.5%) Satisfactory; 14 (58.0%) Highly Satisfactory; and five (21%) Superior.

Table XIV

Project Distribution by BPL on Five Stop Scale

Project Duration	Total	Unsatisfactory	Marginal	Satisfactory	Highly Satisfactory	Superior
Low						
No.	24	-	2	3	14	5
%	100.0	-	8.0	12.0	59.0	21.0
Medium						
No.	21	1	1	2	17	-
%	100.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	81.00	-
High						
No.	19	4	5	6	4	-
%	100.0	21.0	26.0	32.0	21.0	-
World Wide						
No.	64	5	8	11	35	5
%	100.0	8.0	12.0	17.0	55.0	8.0

From a different perspective, the data in Table XIV show that four of the five Unsatisfactory projects (80%) in the 64 project sample were in the High BPL category, as were five of eight at the Marginal rating, six of 11 at the Satisfactory level and only four of 35 (about 12.0%) at the Highly Satisfactory level; there were no High (or Medium) BPL projects at the Superior rating level.

The scores and rankings outlined above are contrary to this writer's expectations (and current - if somewhat shaken - convictions). I am not able at this time to offer an explanation for the apparent reversal of results inherent in projects having better performance when beneficiary involvement is low rather than high. One thought which suggests itself as a contributing factor has to do with the kinds of projects included in this sample. For example, one might speculate that high capital intensive (say road) projects, for example, or projects focussed on developing central institutions (e.g., agricultural research projects), might indeed do best with little beneficiary participation.

Another potential explanatory factor might have to do with the imprecise way the characteristic was formulated and imposed on the accomplishment factors. It is perhaps worth noting also that at least two of the IE reports suggest that too much is often made of the merit of or even need for a high level of beneficiary participation (one report states that projects with a high level of beneficiary participation "are often poorly designed and executed"). These reports suggest that attention to beneficiary participation should be a function of the kind of project to be implemented and many other host country circumstances, including local sociological and even political perceptions on the matter rather than a function of AID policy. Opposed to this view is that strongly presented in another IE report and which states that "The development of physical

infrastructure should be ancillary to social and political institution building (among other things to serve as) a corrective for those who would add 'a dash of participation to project designs.'"

Elapsed Time between Project Completion and IE Study

Under this "characteristic" projects were grouped into four categories with the distribution of projects among them as shown in Table XV. Factor scores by elapsed time categories are shown in Table XVI.

Table XV

Project Distribution by Elapsed Time

Elapsed Time Category	Length of Elapsed Time	No. of Projects
1 None	Projects not yet completed	17
2 Short	Three years or less	25
3 Medium	Four-eight years	22
4 Long	More than eight years	9

Table XVI

Factor Scores by Elapsed Time

Elapsed Time		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
1 None	6.83	6.82	7.29	6.69	6.65	6.94	6.64	7.00	6.27	6.00	7.38	7.60
2 Short	6.81	6.76	6.96	5.63	6.56	6.83	7.56	6.83	7.00	5.58	7.04	6.87
3 Medium	7.88	7.86	8.23	7.06	7.68	8.27	8.78	7.45	6.92	6.17	8.27	8.35
4 Long	7.99	8.22	8.44	6.63	8.33	8.33	8.50	7.56	7.00	5.00	8.22	8.00
World Wide	7.28	7.29	7.60	6.48	7.14	7.49	7.86	7.15	6.76	5.84	7.64	7.59

In fine conformance with this writer's expectations, categories 3 (Medium elapsed time) and 4 (Long elapsed time) took all rating honors. Category 4 scored highest in the Project Average, Factor A, General Impression and five of the other 10 factors: B, D, E, G and H; category 3 scored second in each of these factors. In addition, category 3 scored highest in the five remaining factors: C, F, I, J and K while category 4 scored second in all of them, except one, Factor I, Environment in which category 4 scored lowest among the four categories and below the World Wide average. This last mentioned scoring phenomenon might constitute a clue to the thought expressed in several IE reports (particularly those dealing with roads and irrigation) to the effect that, over

time, circumstances surrounding a completed project change in ways that are often unexpected and contribute to the deterioration of the physical and social environment, e.g., through altered land use and soil erosion and changes in traditional social attitudes and arrangements.
The relationships of this "hypothesis" to the one mentioned previously regarding "sustainability" of benefits and the idea that AID should continue its involvement with projects after they've been completed might warrant further consideration.

As something of an "anomaly," from this writer's perspective, category 1 (projects not yet completed) scored higher than category 2 (elapsed time of less than three years) in all factors but two. A partial explanation for this situation might reside in the "optimism of expectations" with which AID staffers (and apparently others) are often afflicted. Because of this we tend to view not-yet completed projects as always rich in potential. Similarly, we seem often to suffer a deflation of expectations regarding project results in the very short-run (often justified, perhaps, due to the complexities and difficulties of project management transfer and of integrating results/benefits into host country bureaucratic and other "systems").

V. CONCLUSIONS

Regarding Accomplishments

- While universal or even widely accepted standards for measuring donor accomplishment performance are not available beyond the limited techniques of benefit-cost analysis, the evidence available in, or "interpreted" from, the series of AID IE reports strongly suggests that AID performance has been "good" in terms of the broad accomplishment objectives to which AID is committed. The main indicators supporting that judgement are the high ratio of satisfactory or better to marginal or worse performance ratings, 60 to 13 (82% to 18%) in terms of projects and seven to one (87% to 13%) measured in terms of AID funding inputs. It seems significant in this regard also that 49 of the 73 projects studied (67%) were considered to be Highly Satisfactory or better, with only 11 projects (15%) simply Satisfactory. While these data do not (can not) quantify the development benefits delivered, they do indicate that a substantial level of such benefits, or "beneficial impact," was achieved. (No attempt was made to distinguish between intended and unintended benefits or impact; both were "toted-up" for purposes of this report).

- AID performance has been fairly consistent over the past 30 years; however, there has been some apparent decline during the past decade and this should perhaps be examined and, if possible, accounted for.

- The constancy of AID performance has occurred against a relatively constant set of Agency objectives as reflected for example in intended beneficiaries, sectors (and sub-sectors) of major attention and key elements of articulated rationales for aid generally and for individual projects and programs. While there have been changes over the years in the relative emphasis placed on particular objectives and our rhetoric of justification, the essential Agency mission has remained remarkably constant. More pronounced, perhaps, have been changes in our implementation strategies and procedures, e.g., virtually total movement toward use of non-AID staff for project implementation, an increased emphasis on technical assistance at the expense of capital assistance type activities, and the increasing emphasis on planning at all levels - project, sector, country, region, Agency.

One key indicator of the constancy of our mission may be seen in the relationship between project selection and success, on the one hand, and "political" considerations on the other. Despite several changes in Agency (and US Government) administration during the past 30 years or so, only two of the 73 projects studied in this report were expressly related by

the evaluation teams to political considerations, in one instance benignly and in the other in a negative way unflattering to AID, i.e., a project was selected and implemented solely because perceived political considerations arugued for it and despite expressed technical arguments against it. This is, of course, an extremely complex issue in itself and is not, in fact, adequately defined simply in terms of "political considerations"; diplomatic, strategic, trade and other interests are also important. Yet, on the basis of a review of the IE reports (which were admittedly and, I would guess, by design, not intended to address this complex issue) it appears that AID actions in the areas of project development (selection) and implementation, are largely free of direct (or even pronounced indirect) influence by these kinds of interests/considerations. In effect, despite some rhetoric and effort to the contrary, AID appears to have (and is generally perceived by host governments and other donors in the field as having) a "pure play" economic development rationale and program. The "real" advantages and disadvantages to the U.S. and to economic development of both this perception and the "reality" which supports it might perhaps warrant further study.

The broad constancy of Agency values and objectives over time is striking and seems to conflict with what seems to be a widely held notion that AID's values and objectives have changed frequently in the past and remain subject to substantial, even dramatic, variation on short notice. An examination of the reasons for and meanings of this

constancy/inconstancy, reality/perception dichotomy might yield some interesting and helpuful ideas, for example, in the area of how AID communicates with others in the Executive Branch and with Congress about AID.

- The "credibility" of the IE reports and the evaluation teams who prepared them is a central matter in determining the validity of the judgements regarding AID performance as outlined in the conclusions above. It is clear to this writer that the diversity of persons and organizations represented on the evaluation teams which prepared the IE reports, by itself, argues convincingly for their objectiveness and reliability. The generally critical tone of the reports and the sometimes demanding standards they set for the evaluated projects also suggest their credibility and balance - albeit slightly tilted against the project and AID. Some idea of what I mean by demanding in this context can be conveyed by these quotes from several of the IE reports (my underlining): "(The project) ...resulted in a smaller number of residential and productive consumers <u>than was possible</u>;" "Perhaps the major shortcoming of the project is its failure to have an impact <u>throughout ...(the country)</u>;" "Programs such as ... (this one) can provide substantial benefits for the rural poor, but <u>can not achieve redistribution of wealth</u>;" "Farmers generally feel their lives have been improved but ...(we do not) understand why <u>farmer income fell far short of what it might have been</u> ..." (This severity of standards or demands on evaluated projects might have contributed to something of an under-rating of some projects by this writer).

- A very cursory look at the matter of implementation - accomplishment relationships during the conduct of this study suggests there is not a necessary positive correlation between, say, "good" implementation, i.e., adherence to staffing, budget, scheduling, and coordination plans and requirements on the one hand and a good level of accomplishment on the other. The correlation seems particularly uncertain with projects of which technical assistance is a significant part and in which changes in social and cultural attitudes and practices are sought (expressly or by implication). In effect, it appears that the numoer and intensity of problems frequently encountered during implementation of AID-assisted projects are not, in themselves, reliable indicators of the quantity, quality or sustainability of likely or eventual project accomplishments. A study of the relationships between implementation and accomplishment, including an examination of the relationships between AID project planning processes and documents, on the one hand, and implementation problems encountered and accomplishments achieved, on the other, might provide useful insights/guidance on AID planning and implementation needs, objectives and processes. (This last (AID processes) is seen by some - both in and out of AID - as being both overly demanding in terms of functional or operational needs and objectives and too optimistic in terms of our expectations regarding the accuracy of plans, i.e., our predictive capabilities).

Regarding this last - what I, for one, see as an Agency addiction to and inflated confidence in detailed plans and planning - several reports express a view to the effect that "flexibility" regarding all aspects of project plans (but objectives and timing for example, and resource uses, more so than, say, resource levels) in the face of implementation realities is central to achievement of good accomplishment performance. Put negatively, one report concludes that "The evauation calls into question the utility of ridgidly structured development schemes." Another report states that "The basic assumption of institution building projects should be that they will evolve in ways unforeseen during the design phase." And, finally, from a report whose rated project received one of the highest scores, "The project as designed on paper bore little resemblance to the implemented project ...."

- Independently, of the content of the conclusions regarding AID performance there is, in my view, a need to consider the following questions:

-- Are conclusions (and the information on which they are based) regarding AID aggragate performance likely to be useful (however defined) to AID management and/or staff?

-- If such conclusions and information are to be useful, to what extent must they be based on a wider or larger sample of AID activities to assure a wide acceptance of their validity?

-- How might AID best (cost effectively and reliably) obtain information and conclusions regarding AID aggregate performance?

Responses to these questions are attempted in the Recommendations section of this report.

Relationship between Accomplishment Factors, Project Characteristics and Performance

- The number of rated projects covered in this report comprises an extremely ~~a very~~ small portion of the project portfolio of any of the four geographic regions, particularly the Near East and North Africa regions, and of any sector "portfolio." In most respects and for most purposes that portion strikes this writer as too small to support a satisfactory degree of confidence in conclusions based on inter- (or even intra-) region or sector analysis. The same situation pertains to the other project characteristics (funding level, project duration, etc.) with which this report deals. The analysis contained in this report regarding relationships between the factors, characteristics and performance is therefore, presented with considerable reservation and caution. Indeed, the analysis itself, and conclusions drawn from it should be viewed more as a suggested or illustrative analytical framework or approach and an indication of the kinds of information and relationships which might usefully be examined if a "sufficiently" large base

of evaluated projects were available. To a lesser extent conclusions might be seen as "clues" which should perhaps be pursued through more extensive ratings and more extensive and thorough analysis. I would estimate a minimally "sufficient" number of projects for a good ratings analysis at say 100 a year, with few or no "characteristics" having less than, say, 20-30 incidents. Below I suggest a method by which such a relatively large number of projects might be evaluated numerically at relatively low-cost and with good effect in terms of accuracy and warranted potential-user confidence.

- As indicated above, I can not at this time confidently suggest operational or policy actions based on the scores and rankings outlined in the Analysis section above. More analysis, first of all, would have to be done from both a project characteristics and an accomplishment factors perspective in order to understand these data better. But beyond this, I am not now convinced that these kinds of analysis and conclusions derived from them have utilitiy in terms of future project and program planning. They might be too general to have specific relevance or applicability. That is to say, that even if these data indicate, for example, that in the past, education projects did very well, particularly "moderately-priced" (say $1.0 to 10.0 million) education

projects lasting six to 10 years and having low beneficiary involvement, we would not know why those projects did very well; nor would our ability to forecast how future education projects would do in any particular (unique, really) LDC environment be improved. Only a variety of country specific and current analysis are likely to be helpful in this regard. In brief, it seems likely that numerical ratings analysis and conclusions aimed at discovering or suggesting causal relations between project characteristics and accomplishments might be inherently either so conventional and broad, i.e., already widely understood and appreciated by AID, as to be of little specific operational or policy utility or so contentious and broad as to have proponents on both (or all) sides of the issue under consideration and thereby to be, again, of little direct practical use.

All of this is not to suggest that this kind of analysis and conclusions drawn from it can not be intellectually stimulating and useful to academics, say, and to AID staff, in expanding their understanding and sensitivities. Because of this, I would not, at this time, foreclose the possibility of further analysis of expanded numerical data and submission of that analysis to a wide range of AID colleagues for review. Helpful guidance for the future might, with that kind of input, be realized.

As opposed to my concern or reservation, as indicated above, I believe that the kind of data presented in this report can be useful in serving the main purpose of this report, i.e., providing AID management and others a "documented sense" of how well we've done in the past with regards to some important accomplishment objectives. If my positive view on this matter is accepted, I would recommend an alternative means for providing, and maintaining on a current basis, the needed "documentation." In brief, I would recommend employment of scientific sampling and polling techniques on an extensive basis (say 100 projects a year), using the kinds of project characteristics, accomplishment factors, and rating scales used in this report (all to be carefully reviewed and modified as appropriate).

VI RECOMMENDATIONS

- After distribution of this report, discussions should be held within AID to determine required "next steps," if any.

- Assuming AID concludes that the major objective to which this report is intended to contribute (i.e., to improve our own and others' sense of our performance in terms of accomplishments), is sufficiently important to pursue and that the numerical analysis approach is a feasible one in pursuing that objective, AID should consider discussing with key Cogressional committees (presumably, Appropriations and Foreign

Affairs/Relations) and possibly the NSC and OMB their participation in an AID accomplishment performance evaluation program. Their participation would consist of their provision of staff needed to work with AID staff in implementing that program. (If necessary, AID could/would conduct the program without their participation). The main element of this program calls for the fielding of teams of evaluators comprised of, say, three to four persons each, drawn from eight major sources: US Congressional staff, other Executive Branch staff, US academic staff, US private business firms, cooperating LDC academics, cooperating LDC government staff, cooperating LDC private business community staff and AID. Perhaps four or five teams drawn from these sources would be fielded each year, each team for about three months - one month of study in the US and one month of fieldwork followed by one month of debriefings and report preparation in the US.

The month of study in the US would be used by each team primarily to become conversant with the country (selected by PPC/E) in which it will work; to help select, say, 10 to 20 completed AID-assisted projects for numerical rating from a list prepared by AID (and with a view to contributing to the annual aggregate rating or evaluation of say 100 completed projects that would constitute a reasonably representative sample of completed AID projects in terms of basic project defining characteristics, e.g., sector and funding level; to prepare a list of perhaps two to 10 persons per project to be interviewed in the cooperating country, each person regarding

one or more of the selected projects (and with PPC/E and the cooperating USAID primarily responsible for developing the "master" country list of potential interviewees from among host government, private sector, academic and USAID candidates as well as actual or potential beneficiaries); to become thoroughly familiar with the sets of project characteristics and accomplishment factors and the rating scales by which the factors will be "measured"; and to become familiar with preferred interviewing and information recording procedures.

The month in the field would be used to conduct the interviews and prepare the project ratings.

The final month in the US would be used to prepare the rating material for computerization and for debriefings/ discussions with a wide range of Congressional, other Executive Branch and AID persons and to discuss the contents of a brief summary report.

Responsibility for preparing the analysis of the team's ratings and a brief report centered on it would rest with the AID member of the team and the PPC/E Coordinator for the sector. Responsibility for gaining some substantive use of the report would also be a prime responsibility of the PPC/E Coordinator.

Considerable refinement of the above outlined approach will be needed if it is to be tried or tested as a systematic and

potentially long term continuing effort that will benefit the development process.

- Consideration should be given to undertaking studies of or efforts dealing with some of the matters indicated in earlier parts of this report. These might include:

-- development of a plan for a series of evaluations of "New Directions" (post - 1973) projects with a view to comparing their performance with that of earlier projects.

-- a study, closely related to the one immediately above, of the rationale, objectives and (loosely) requirements of the basic pre- and post '73 aid concepts and strategies, their real and apprarent differences and commonalities and AID's understanding and use of them.

-- an analysis of the relationships between implementation problems encountered in already completed AID - assisted projects and the accomplishment results achieved by those projects.

-- a study of the relationships between project implementator in selected projects and the accomplishment (and perhaps implementation) performance of those projects.

-- an analysis of the relationship of "beneficiary participation" in various kinds of projects and the performance of those projects.

-- an assessment of the feasibility of continued AID involvement in "completed" projects.

-- a study of host countries' and other donors' perceptions of AID directions and motivations and the advantages and disadvantages to AID and development objectives of those perceptions.

Most (or perhaps all) of the studies listed might be done most usefully by non-AID staff or contractors, including, if feasible, the GAO and perhaps DAC member countries as constractors with substantial inputs from AID staff. Host country contractors should also have major inputs particularly to the last two mentioned studies.

- Assuming the IE program is continued in much its present form, consideration should be given to having the IE teams use the numerical rating approach as a supplement to their present relatively free style narrative approach and product, i.e., the IE report.