

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

① *Handwritten notes*
 ② PCS

AID/W

PVO Co-Financing
 Save the Children (US) - SCF

PROJECT NUMBER: **388-0045-05** Bangladesh

EVALUATION NUMBER (Term: the number maintained by the reporting unit; e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No. beginning with No. 1 each FY)

REGULAR EVALUATION SPECIAL EVALUATION

b. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES			E. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING		7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION	
A. First PRC-AG or Equivalent FY <u>80</u>	B. Final Obligation Expected FY <u>81</u>	C. Final Input Delivery FY <u>82</u>	A. Total \$ <u>586,800</u>	B. U.S. \$ <u>204,800</u>	From (month/yr.) <u>September 1980</u>	To (month/yr.) <u>August 1981</u>
					Date of Evaluation Review <u>August 8, 1981</u>	

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

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., airgram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
1. Conduct indepth study of CBIRD methodology in Rangunia as input to phase-out from Kulkurmai village and one other village before end of Grant.	SCF/Westport	Nov.-Dec, '81
2. Provide USAID with a summary list of project target changes resulting from evaluation.	SCF/Dacca	November, '81
3. Correct tables II and IV of Evaluation Report.	SCF/Dacca	October, '81

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS

<input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan Targets	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify)
<input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T	
<input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify)
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P	

10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT

A. Continue Project Without Change

B. Change Project Design and/or Change Implementation Plan Targets

C. Discontinue Project

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)

PRO: ITBuxell *ITB*
 PRO: HSPlunkett *HS*

PRO: LKCrاندall *LK*
 SCF: KForman *KF*

12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval

Signature: *Frank B. Kimball*

Typed Name: **Frank B. Kimball**

Date: **September, 1981**

32

September, 1981

Save the Children (US) PES (cont.)

13. **SUMMARY:** The project evaluation review meeting focused on the self-evaluation SCF conducted of year one, Phase II activities. The project has had some difficulties in addressing the ambitious targets set for phase II. This past year SCF focused primarily on program planning, staffing and training, in addition to operating the ongoing village programs in the four impact areas of Mirzapur, Ghior, Nasiragar and Rangunia. Little progress was made in the task areas of phasing and outside relations. The following statement summarizes results and shortcomings.

The Program Trainee did not come on board until late January 1981, five months after phase II began. Hence, much of the data gathering and program planning was retarded and only now is beginning to take shape. Nevertheless, as part of the evaluation SCF has submitted statistical tables showing SCF project inputs, by sector, target groups and beneficiaries. The development of village project files for the Village Development Committees (VDCs), now almost finalized, will provide useful records for monitoring cost/benefits to village populations as well as data to assess SCF program impact next year for the in-depth Phase I and II evaluation. A concerted effort has been made to promote income earning projects for VDCs and village women as well as to increase replacing USAID/SCF funds for productivity projects. Two (Women's Programs and Health/Nutrition/FP) out of four sectoral strategies have been prepared; two out of four Advisory Committees have been established; but, area impact plans and village plans have not yet begun. Most planning activities related to training village workers (VDC Office assistants, H/N/FP counterparts, para development Workers). VDCs will later help prepare village and impact area plans. Villagers participated, as before, in preparing project plans. Occupational training was given to village women and youth; in-service training was provided to SCF women coordinators and the SCF Deputy Director.

As stated, phasing activities and outside relations received less attention than was planned. The result is that the targets for these activities have to be reduced and a summary list of revised targets needs to be submitted to USAID. Another evaluation follow-up activity is a study of Rangunia/SCF/Bestport intends to carry out to identify what aspects of the Community-Based Integrated Rural Development (CBIRD) approach were most successful and replicable for phasing. The Program

Trainee will remain with the project for one more year, but funded from SCF sources.

METHODOLOGY: It was decided this year SCF would conduct an internal or self-evaluation of the project. This was carried out through (a) visits by the Program Trainee to the four impact areas, with special emphasis on Rangunia where SCF intends to phase-out from the village of Kulkurnai, (b) discussions by SCF Field Staff on lessons learned from applying the CBIRD approach, and (c) assessment of progress made to date by SCF Program Staff. A first draft paper of the results of these reviews was presented at a SCF-USAID project evaluation review meeting. SCF then finalized the evaluation report and submitted it with statistical tables to USAID. This report provides details on progress to date as well as explanations on shortcomings and future changes. See attached.