

# A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY PART I

(BEFORE FILLING OUT THIS FORM READ THE ATTACHED INSTRUCTIONS)

<p><b>A. REPORTING A.I.D. UNIT</b> (Mission or AID/W Office)</p> <p>(ES # 86-1 )</p>	<p><b>B. WAS EVALUATION SCHEDULED IN CURRENT FY ANNUAL EVALUATION PLAN?</b></p> <p>yes [X] slipped [ ] ad hoc [ ]</p>	<p><b>C. EVALUATION TIMING</b></p> <p>interim[X] final [ ] ex-post [ ] other [ ]</p>												
<p><b>D. ACTIVITY OR ACTIVITIES EVALUATED</b> (List the following information for project(s) or program(s) evaluated; if not applicable, list title and date of the evaluation report)</p> <table border="1" style="width:100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width:15%;">Project #</th> <th style="width:40%;">Project/Program Title (or title &amp; date of evaluation report)</th> <th style="width:15%;">First PROAG or equivalent (FY)</th> <th style="width:10%;">Most recent PACD (mo/yr)</th> <th style="width:10%;">Planned LOP Cost (‘000)</th> <th style="width:10%;">Amount Obligated to Date (‘000)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>492-0340</td> <td>Training and Development Issues</td> <td>FY 1983</td> <td>12/88</td> <td>\$4,500</td> <td>\$639</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Project #	Project/Program Title (or title & date of evaluation report)	First PROAG or equivalent (FY)	Most recent PACD (mo/yr)	Planned LOP Cost (‘000)	Amount Obligated to Date (‘000)	492-0340	Training and Development Issues	FY 1983	12/88	\$4,500	\$639
Project #	Project/Program Title (or title & date of evaluation report)	First PROAG or equivalent (FY)	Most recent PACD (mo/yr)	Planned LOP Cost (‘000)	Amount Obligated to Date (‘000)									
492-0340	Training and Development Issues	FY 1983	12/88	\$4,500	\$639									

<p><b>E. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Action(s) Required</p> <p>Action Agreed Upon: Sept. 23, 1986</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A panel of NEDA/TDI-PMO and USAID representatives will meet quarterly to discuss current implementation issues/problems. During this joint consultative meeting, Training and/or Development Issues proposals submitted during the preceding quarter will be discussed prior to formal endorsement to USAID.</li> <li>2. TDI-PMO will review various options to facilitate management of DI component. These are:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. detailing or hiring of one or two full time personnel to manage DI component activities;</li> <li>b. contracting with research institutions to oversee or manage a cluster of research projects;</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. TDI Project will hold the second research agenda workshop on or about November 1986, to review the current program areas for research, revise the agenda accordingly, and solicit proposals for review and implementation in CY 1987.</li> </ol>	<p style="text-align: center;">Name of Officer responsible for Action</p> <p>F. Pante, NEDA Proj. Director</p> <p>W. T. Oliver Chief, PRO</p> <p>W. G. Nuqui, NEDA Proj. Man, DI</p> <p>W. G. Nuqui</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Date Action to be Completed</p> <p>As needed</p> <p>1st Qtr. CY 1987</p> <p>4th Qtr. CY 1986</p>
--	---	---

<p><b>F. DATE OF MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE REVIEW OF EVALUATION</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;">mo <u>7</u> day <u>16</u> year <u>1986</u></p>					
<p><b>G. APPROVALS OF EVALUATION SUMMARY AND ACTION DECISIONS</b></p> <table style="width:100%;"> <tr> <td style="width:25%; text-align: center;"> <p><i>William T. Oliver</i> Project/Program Officer</p> <p>William T. Oliver 11/28/86</p> </td> <td style="width:25%; text-align: center;"> <p><i>Filologo Pante</i> Representative of Borrowing Agency</p> <p>Filologo Pante</p> </td> <td style="width:25%; text-align: center;"> <p><i>Dominic D'Antonio</i> Evaluation Officer</p> <p>Dominic D'Antonio</p> </td> <td style="width:25%; text-align: center;"> <p><i>Frederick W. Schieck</i> Mission or AID/W Office Director</p> <p>Frederick W. Schieck</p> </td> </tr> </table>		<p><i>William T. Oliver</i> Project/Program Officer</p> <p>William T. Oliver 11/28/86</p>	<p><i>Filologo Pante</i> Representative of Borrowing Agency</p> <p>Filologo Pante</p>	<p><i>Dominic D'Antonio</i> Evaluation Officer</p> <p>Dominic D'Antonio</p>	<p><i>Frederick W. Schieck</i> Mission or AID/W Office Director</p> <p>Frederick W. Schieck</p>
<p><i>William T. Oliver</i> Project/Program Officer</p> <p>William T. Oliver 11/28/86</p>	<p><i>Filologo Pante</i> Representative of Borrowing Agency</p> <p>Filologo Pante</p>	<p><i>Dominic D'Antonio</i> Evaluation Officer</p> <p>Dominic D'Antonio</p>	<p><i>Frederick W. Schieck</i> Mission or AID/W Office Director</p> <p>Frederick W. Schieck</p>		

Action(s) Required	Name of Officer Responsible for Action	Date Action to be Completed
4. TDI-PMO and USAID will review the membership and functions of the Steering Committee. Proposed membership will be at the Deputy Minister level. Proposed functions of the Steering Committee will focus on policy guidance but exclude review of proposals	F. Pante W. T. Oliver	1st Qtr. CY 1987
5. TDI-PMO and USAID will review the contracting procedures used in the ESIA-WID project to determine their applicability to the TDI project.	J. Legazpi, NEDA Asst. PM, DI S. Poco Proj. Off., DI	4th Qtr. CY 1986
6. TDI-PMO Project Director will have greater discretionary powers to approve research proposals along agenda approved by the Steering Committee without further seeking approval of USAID and the Steering Committee, on the condition that the proposals are in accord with all applicable USAID regulations and the funding required is below \$15,000 and the total amount of all such proposals shall not exceed \$100,000 per year.	W. T. Oliver S. S. Poco	4th Qtr. CY 1986
Similarly, the TDI-PMO Project Director will have greater authority to initiate on his own, within topic guidelines approved by the Steering Committee and USAID, consultancy contracts, under similar conditions described above.		
7. TDI-PMO will review the current training priority areas, the results of which will be discussed in the first joint NEDA/TDI/PMO-USAID consultation meeting tentatively scheduled late in 1986.	R. Peves, NEDA Proj. Man., PT	1st Qtr. CY 1987
8. TDI-PMO will develop a medium-long term training plan which will be used as criteria for allocating training funds by subject area and by institutional recipient.	S. Kawi Proj. Off., PT	1st Qtr. CY 1987
9. The USAID project officer will request extension of the PACO to December 31, 1990.	W. T. Oliver	1st Qtr. CY 1987

NEDA and USAID will prepare PILs and other documents, as necessary, to implement the actions required.

H EVALUATION ABSTRACT (do not exceed the space provided)

TDI Evaluation Abstract

The project aims to improve the capability of the GOP and other Philippine institutions to analyze development issues and make sound and timely development-related decisions. This is to be accomplished through the use of training, research, fora, technical assistance, among others, focusing on development issues in the Philippines. The project is being implemented by the National Economic Development Authority. This process evaluation (June 1986) was conducted by a team composed of a Philippine consultant and a USAID Philippines personnel, using project documents, interviews of project and Mission personnel as main information source. The major findings, conclusions and recommendations are:

1. Overall project progress is slow, however, current evidence supports continued usefulness of project towards objective of building institutional capacities for development policy analysis and related decision making. Because of slow progress, full implementation of project within current PACD is unlikely.
  2. Slow progress of non-training component explained by basic interpretational differences between implementing agency and Mission on implementation procedures. Differences are traced to project design stage and to communication problems during implementation.
  3. Priority areas for research and related activities are too broad, consequently project activities and potential impact tend to be diffused.
  4. Implementing procedures for non-training component is time consuming, effectively ruling out use of project for immediately needed policy-related studies.
  5. Although training component is largely on schedule, it can be improved to enlarge training benefits and broaden access to other GOP agencies and to regional participants. Based on findings and conclusions, the evaluation recommends that PACD be extended and that improved implementation guidelines and structures be agreed upon. It is also recommended that the Research Agenda be further refined, and in addition, implementation procedures modified to allow greater discretionary power to the implementing agency. Regarding the training component, the evaluation recommends adoption of improvements which the implementing agency has identified, in addition to a reassessment of the distribution of fields of training. Furthermore, the monitoring system of the Training Component should be established.
- This evaluation stresses need for collaborating effort in project design, as well as maintenance of good communications between implementing agency and the Mission during implementation phase.

1. EVALUATION COSTS

1 Evaluation Team Name	Affiliation	Contract Number OR TDY Person Days	Contract Cost OR TDY Cost (US \$)	Source of Funds
Harry Pasimio	Independent Consultant		\$2,800	Project
Paul Deuster	USAID/Philippines	N/A	N/A	N/A

2 Mission Office Professional Staff Person Days (estimate) \_\_\_\_\_

3 Borrower/Grantee Professional Staff Person Days (estimate) \_\_\_\_\_

# A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY PART II

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

Address the following items:

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

### Evaluation Summary

#### A. USAID PHILIPPINES

B. Project Purpose: The purpose of the TDI Project is to improve the capability of the Philippine Government and other institutions to analyze development issues and to make sound and timely development-related decisions.

C. Purpose of the Evaluation: The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the progress of implementation of the Training and Development Issues Project, identify problems and issues that may have hampered project progress, and recommend measures to maximize project impact on the development efforts of the new government.

#### D. Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations:

1. Overall project progress has been relatively slow. While training (Participant Training Component and the training element of the Development Issues component) has been proceeding by and large on schedule, progress of the non-training elements (research, fora, technical and management assistance and equipment and commodities) of the Development Issues component has been painfully slow.

This notwithstanding, however, current evidence supports the continued usefulness of the project towards its expressed objective of building up institutional capacities for development policy analysis and related decision-making. The potential value of the project is further enhanced by (a) recent decisions of the TDI-PMO that would tend to not only improve the pace of project implementation but also expand project benefits and impact; and (b) the positive climate under the new government.

The slow progress of the project to date, however, renders unlikely the full implementation of the project within the current PACD.

Accordingly, the following major recommendations are herein made.

#### Recommendation 1

The project should be continued, and the PACD extended by two years to December 1990.

#### Recommendation 2

Should the recommendation for a two-year extension of the PACD be approved, another evaluation of the project should be undertaken in the first half of 1988.

Date this summary prepared:

SUMMARY

### Recommendation 3

To contribute to the easing of the country's debt-servicing difficulties, and in consideration of the diffused social benefits of the project, the entire unearmarked loan allocation to the project should be converted to outright grant.

2. The slow progress of the non-training elements has been rooted mainly in basic interpretational differences between the TDI-PMO and the USAID Mission on the approach to project implementation and the related issue of extra compensation for government personnel. This in turn is indicative of problems in the communication process between the two parties. At the design stage, more extensive discussions were prevented by time pressures brought on by approaching U.S. budgetary deadlines. At the implementation stage, effective communication was hampered by: (a) again interpretational differences, specifically with respect to USAID's membership in the Project Steering Committee; and (b) the fact that on both the USAID Mission and the TDI-PMO ends, competing claims on staff time rendered it difficult for closer attention to be devoted to project concerns.

In light of the foregoing, the following recommendations are made:

### Recommendation 4

To enhance smooth and timely implementation of the project as a whole and, in particular, of the non-training elements of the Development Issues component, a clear resolution of the problem issues should be made and agreements reached clearly set out in project implementation letters. Also, to the extent needed to resolve uncertainties or ambiguities concerning administrative aspects of project implementation, PILs should be issued that clearly set out USAID guidelines and procedures (including exemptions that may be mutually agreed upon).

### Recommendation 5

To the extent needed for smooth implementation, officials concerned with management of the project at both the TDI-PMO and the USAID ends should devote more time to the management of the project. More time is clearly needed in the immediate future to resolve basic issues, clarify regulations and establish routine procedures.

### Recommendation 6

In the specific case of the non-training elements of the Development Issues component, it is recommended that at least a portion of the management duties be transferred to the Philippine Institute for Development Studies (PIDS) which has experience in the management of research and in USAID procedures.

3. The October 1985 workshop on the TDI Research Agenda has produced very encouraging results in terms of submissions of responsive research proposals. As a consequence, the TDI-PMO has decided to convene similar workshops in the future on a regular basis, possibly twice a year. This decision is strongly endorsed.

In addition, however, parallel action will need to be taken in other related areas to further improve project implementation and enhance project impact.

a) The six areas that have been selected as priorities for research and related activities, for instance, are deemed so broad that project activities and impact would tend to be too diffused. Accordingly,

Recommendation 7

A finer focusing of the Research Agenda should be undertaken such that project activities are limited to a small number of development issues deemed critical under the new government. Thereby, the technical resources of a larger number of institutions can be applied to a particular issue, produce more extensive as well as more in-depth analysis, and altogether maximize project impact.

b) While current implementation procedures covering the non-training elements of the Development Issues Component are designed to promote the competitive nature of awards, encourage broad participation and ensure consistency with project purpose, their time-consuming character tends to effectively rule out use of the project for urgent, short-term policy issues and their rigidity limits the ability of project management to initiate quickly relevant consultancies. Accordingly,

Recommendation 8

Implementation procedures should be modified to allow greater discretionary powers to the TDI-PMO. Specifically, the TDI-PMO should be authorized to approve, without further need of either Steering Committee or USAID approval, proposals and contracts on topics that have been previously cleared as well as on new relevant topics that may be of immediate urgency. This authority, however, should, be limited both as to the amount of any individual contract, say \$15,000, and to the total amount of all such contracts for a given year, say \$100,000.

4. While training activities have been proceeding largely on schedule, there exists scope for improvement in component operations to enlarge training benefits and broaden their distribution.

a) While a scheme for prioritizing beneficiary institutions and fields of study has been drawn up and largely followed, the absence of a detailed program of training activities has resulted in certain imbalances in their distribution: among agencies within priority groups, among priority fields of study, and between central and regional offices. It has also enabled the accommodation of agencies as well as fields of study that were outside of established priorities.

As earlier noted, however, the TDI-PMO has recently approved specific proposals to correct these imbalances. These include: (i) formulation of a more detailed program for training for the rest of the project duration, with implementation to closely adhere to the formulated programs; (ii) partial shifting of the training budget from overseas to local training, with upward adjustments in stipend rates, book allowances and research/thesis allowances under local training grants to enhance their attractiveness; (iii) expansion of funding support under the project to include training in suitable fields in selected regional institutions of learning in the country; and (iv) broadening institutional and regional participation in the training component.

Recommendation 9

All of the foregoing recommendations are herein endorsed. In addition:

Recommendation 10

A reassessment of the distribution of fields of training, specifically between the general and the more sector-specific policy analysis study programs, should be undertaken to ensure that the latter type of need is indeed being adequately addressed through this project in combination with other donor-assisted projects. If not, some shifting in proportions should be effected.

b) While the establishment of a system for monitoring of training participants both during and, more importantly, after training was envisioned in the project design, to date, the system has yet to be set up.

Recommendation 11

To enable continuing assessment of the extent to which project objectives for the training component are being achieved, the monitoring system envisioned under the project should be immediately established and activated.

ATTACHMENTS

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

TDI Evaluation Report

L. COMMENTS BY MISSION AID/W OFFICE AND BORROWER/GRANTEE

The NEDA-TDI Project Management Office and USAID Mission view the evaluation to be thorough and responsive to the management needs of the project. Action arising from the recommendations are expected to hasten and improve project implementation.

MISSION COMMENTS ON FULL REPORT

24 July 1986

FINAL REPORT

EVALUATION REPORT

TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT ISSUES PROJECT  
A.I.D. Loan No. 492-V-069  
A.I.D. Project No. 492-0340

Evaluation Team

Harry Pasimio - Team Leader  
Paul Deuster - Member

WP0627P

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i-iv
I. BACKGROUND	1
II. PROJECT STATUS	2
Financial Status	2 - 4
Activity Status	4
III. NON-TRAINING ELEMENTS OF TDI	5
A. Divergence of Views on Approach to Project Implementation	6 - 7
B. Communication Problems	8 - 10
C. Component Management	11
D. Implementation Procedures	12
IV. TRAINING	13
A. Pace of Implementation	13
B. Objectives of Training Activities	14
C. Overall Consistency with Priorities	15 - 17
D. Areas for Improvement	18 - 19
E. Usefulness of Training	20
V. PROJECT SIGNIFICANCE AND OUTLOOK	21 - 23
VI. RECOMMENDATIONS	23 - 29

### LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Financial Analysis: Loans and Grants
Table 2	Financial Analysis: Training and Non-Training
Table 3.	Training Funded Under TDI: Distribution by Agency
Table 4	Training Funded Under TDI: Distribution by Field of Study

ANNEXES

- A. Financial Analysis Table
- B. Prioritization Scheme for Training
- C. Training Funded Under TDI
- D. Status of On-going TDI Research Projects

APPENDICES

- 1. Scope of Work for Evaluation
- 2. List of Persons Interviewed
- 3. Key Documents Reviewed

BASIC PROJECT IDENTIFICATION DATA

1. Country: Philippines
2. Project Title: Training and Development Issues
3. Project Number: A.I.D. Project No. 492-0340  
A.I.D. Loan No. 492-V-069
4. Project Dates:
  - a. First Project Agreement: July 29, 1983
  - b. Final Obligation: FY 84
  - c. Project Assistance Completion Date (PACD): December 31, 1988
5. Project Funding:
  - a. A.I.D. Bilateral Funding: Grant: \$1,200,000  
Loan: \$3,300,000
  - b. Other Major Donors: None
  - c. Host Country Counterpart Funds: \$1,500,000

T O T A L \$6,000,000
6. Mode of Implementation: Host Country
7. Project Design: USAID Philippines and the Govt. of the Philippines
8. Responsible Mission Officials: (For the full life of the project)
  - a. Mission Director(s): Frederick W. Schieck (FY 84 - Present)  
Anthony M. Schwarzwald (FY 83 - 84)
  - b. Project Officer(s): Dominic A. D'Antonio (FY 86 - present)  
Richard E. Rhoda (FY 83 - 86)
9. Previous Evaluation(s): None
10. Cost of Present Evaluation:

	<u>Person Days</u>	<u>Dollar Costs</u>
a. Direct Hire:		
(1) AID/W TDY:		
(2) USAID staff:	28	
b. Contract:	28	\$2,800
c. Other:		

LIST OF ACRONYMS  
USED IN EVALUATION REPORT

EPRS	Economic Planning and Research Staff
ESIA-WID	Economic and Social Impact Analysis/Women In Development Project
GPT	General Participant Training
NEDA	National Economic and Development Authority
PACD	Project Assistance Completion Date
PIDS	Philippine Institute for Development Studies
PIL	Project Implementation Letter
TDI	Training and Development Issues Project
TDI-PMO	Training and Development Issues-Project Management Office
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### A. PURPOSE OF EVALUATION

The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the progress of implementation of the Training and Development Issues (TDI) Project, identify problems and issues that may have hampered project progress, and recommend measures to maximize project impact on the development efforts of the new government.

### B. PROJECT PURPOSE

The purpose of the TDI Project is to improve the capability of the Philippine Government and other institutions to analyze development issues and to make sound and timely development-related decisions.

### C. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Overall project progress has been relatively slow. While training (Participant Training Component and the training element of the Development Issues component) has been proceeding by and large on schedule, progress of the non-training elements (research, fora, technical and management assistance and equipment and commodities) of the Development Issues component has been painfully slow.

This notwithstanding, however, current evidence supports the continued usefulness of the project towards its expressed objective of building up institutional capacities for development policy analysis and related decision-making. The potential value of the project is further enhanced by (a) recent decisions of the TDI-PMO that would tend to not only improve the pace of project implementation but also expand project benefits and impact; and (b) the positive climate under the new government.

The slow progress of the project to date, however, renders unlikely the full implementation of the project within the current PACD.

Accordingly, the following major recommendations are herein made.

#### Recommendation 1

The project should be continued, and the PACD extended by two years to December 1990.

#### Recommendation 2

Should the recommendation for a two-year extension of the PACD be approved, another evaluation of the project should be undertaken in the first half of 1988.

Recommendation 3

To contribute to the easing of the country's debt-servicing difficulties, and in consideration of the diffused social benefits of the project, the entire unearmarked loan allocation to the project should be converted to outright grant.

2. The slow progress of the non-training elements has been rooted mainly in basic interpretational differences between the TDI-PMO and the USAID Mission on the approach to project implementation and the related issue of extra compensation for government personnel. This in turn is indicative of problems in the communication process between the two parties. At the design stage, more extensive discussions were prevented by time pressures brought on by approaching U.S. budgetary deadlines. At the implementation stage, effective communication was hampered by: (a) again interpretational differences, specifically with respect to USAID's membership in the Project Steering Committee; and (b) the fact that on both the USAID Mission and the TDI-PMO ends, competing claims on staff time rendered it difficult for closer attention to be devoted to project concerns.

In light of the foregoing, the following recommendations are made:

Recommendation 4

To enhance smooth and timely implementation of the project as a whole and, in particular, of the non-training elements of the Development Issues component, a clear resolution of the problem issues should be made and agreements reached clearly set out in project implementation letters. Also, to the extent needed to resolve uncertainties or ambiguities concerning administrative aspects of project implementation, PILs should be issued that clearly set out USAID guidelines and procedures (including exemptions that may be mutually agreed upon).

Recommendation 5

To the extent needed for smooth implementation, officials concerned with management of the project at both the TDI-PMO and the USAID ends should devote more time to the management of the project. More time is clearly needed in the immediate future to resolve basic issues, clarify regulations and establish routine procedures.

Recommendation 6

In the specific case of the non-training elements of the Development Issues component, it is recommended that at least a portion of the management duties be transferred to the Philippine Institute for Development Studies (PIDS) which has experience in the management of research and in USAID procedures.

3. The October 1985 workshop on the TDI Research Agenda has produced very encouraging results in terms of submissions of responsive research proposals. As a consequence, the TDI-PMO has decided to convene similar workshops in the future on a regular basis, possibly twice a year. This decision is strongly endorsed.

In addition, however, parallel action will need to be taken in other related areas to further improve project implementation and enhance project impact.

a) The six areas that have been selected as priorities for research and related activities, for instance, are deemed so broad that project activities and impact would tend to be too diffused. Accordingly,

Recommendation 7

A finer focusing of the Research Agenda should be undertaken such that project activities are limited to a small number of development issues deemed critical under the new government. Thereby, the technical resources of a larger number of institutions can be applied to a particular issue, produce more extensive as well as more in-depth analysis, and altogether maximize project impact.

b) While current implementation procedures covering the non-training elements of the Development Issues Component are designed to promote the competitive nature of awards, encourage broad participation and ensure consistency with project purpose, their time-consuming character tends to effectively rule out use of the project for urgent, short-term policy issues and their rigidity limits the ability of project management to initiate quickly relevant consultancies. Accordingly,

Recommendation 8

Implementation procedure should be modified to allow greater discretionary powers to the TDI-PMO. Specifically, the TDI-PMO should be authorized to approve, without further need of either Steering Committee or USAID approval, proposals and contracts on topics that have been previously cleared as well as on new relevant topics that may be of immediate urgency. This authority, however, should be limited both as to the amount of any individual contract, say \$15,000, and to the total amount of all such contracts for a given year, say \$100,000.

4. While training activities have been proceeding largely on schedule, there exists scope for improvement in component operations to enlarge training benefits and broaden their distribution.

a) While a scheme for prioritizing beneficiary institutions and fields of study has been drawn up and largely followed, the absence of a detailed program of training activities has resulted in certain imbalances in their distribution: among agencies within priority groups, among priority fields of study, and between central and regional offices. It has also enabled the accomodation of agencies as well as fields of study that were outside of established priorities.

As earlier noted, however, the TDI-PMO has recently approved specific proposals to correct these imbalances. These include: (i) formulation of a more detailed program for training for the rest of the project duration, with implementation to closely adhere to the formulated programs; (ii) partial shifting of the training budget from overseas to local training, with upward adjustments in stipend rates, book allowances and research/thesis allowances under local training grants to enhance their attractiveness; (iii) expansion of funding support under the project to include training in suitable fields in selected regional institutions of learning in the country; and (iv) broadening institutional and regional participation in the training component.

Recommendation 9

All of the foregoing recommendations are herein endorsed. In addition:

Recommendation 10

A reassessment of the distribution of fields of training, specifically between the general and the more sector-specific policy analysis study programs, should be undertaken to ensure that the latter type of need is indeed being adequately addressed through this project in combination with other donor-assisted projects. If not, some shifting in proportions should be effected.

b) While the establishment of a system for monitoring of training participants both during and, more importantly, after training was envisioned in the project design, to date, the system has yet to be set up.

Recommendation 11

To enable continuing assessment of the extent to which project objectives for the training component are being achieved, the monitoring system envisioned under the project should be immediately established and activated.

## I. BACKGROUND

The Training and Development Issues (TDI) Project was designed to improve the capability of the Philippine Government and other institutions to analyze development issues and to make sound and timely development related decisions. This objective was sought to be achieved mainly through training and the conduct of research and related activities on a small number of issues deemed critical to the sustained pursuit of Philippine development.

The project was conceived to address perceived gaps in the USAID assistance program to the Philippines. First, most previous research activities had not focused on developing the information needed for effective decision-making and policy review. Second, general participant training projects had lacked specific focus and supporting activities, thereby limiting their impact. And third, sectorally focused institutional development projects often could not fully achieve their development objectives because many key policy related factors affecting project success were beyond the control of the implementing agency.

Under the Project Agreement which was signed on 29 July 1983, USAID committed to provide a total of \$4.2 million in loans (\$3.3 million) and grants (\$0.9 million). Of this amount, \$2.5 million was allocated to the Development Issues Component and \$1.6 million to the Training Component, with \$100,000 set aside for evaluation. USAID funding for the project was subsequently raised by a \$300,000 grant that brought the total USAID commitment to \$4.5 million. Government counterpart funding amounted to \$1.5 million. PACD was set at 31 December 1988.

The National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA), the central coordinating authority for the planning and implementation of Philippine socio-economic development, served as the Government implementing agency for the project.

The design of the project provided for the conduct of possibly two evaluations, one at approximately mid-term of implementation, and a final evaluation at the end, subject to mutual agreement by both parties on the need for it. This report represents the result of the mid-term evaluation, the Scope of Work for which is attached as Appendix 1.

## II. PROJECT STATUS

### A. Financial Status

As of 31 March 1986, USAID funds that had been earmarked for specific project activities amounted to \$935,000, representing 21 per cent of the total \$4.5 million obligated for the project<sup>1/</sup>. Funds actually committed amounted to \$839,000 or 19 per cent of total funds obligated. Elapsed time for the project as of the same date was 32 months from the date of signing of the Project Agreement, representing 49 per cent of the total project duration of 65 months. Reckoned from the date of acceptance by USAID of all Conditions Precedent (4 November 1983), elapsed time as of 31 March 1986 was 29 months or 47 per cent of the balance of the project duration of 62 months.

---

<sup>1/</sup> For details, see Annex A.

Table 1  
Financial Analysis: Loans and Grants  
(Cumulative \$000)  
As of 31 March 1986

	Obligations	EARMARKED		COMMITTED	
		Amount	Percent of Obligations	Amount	Percent of Obligations
TOTAL USAID	<u>4,500</u>	<u>935</u>	<u>20.3</u>	<u>839</u>	<u>18.6</u>
Grant	1,200	430	35.8	337	28.1
Loan	3,300	505	15.3	502	15.2

As may be expected particularly in light of the unusually tight balance-of-payments situation of the Philippine economy, the grant portion of the project has been moving proportionately faster than the loan portion. Of the \$1.2 million grant allocation, \$430,000 had been earmarked (representing 36 per cent of total grant allocation) and \$337,000 committed (28 per cent). Of the loan allocation of \$3.3 million, on the other hand, \$505,000 had been earmarked (15 per cent of the total loan allocation) almost all of which had also been committed (\$502,000).

Significantly, much of project funding as of the same date has been for training, representing 82 per cent of total earmarked funds and 91 per cent of funds committed. Of the total funds that had been committed amounting to \$839,000, non-training activities<sup>2/</sup> have taken up only \$77,000. Viewed in another way, of the total allocation of \$1.82 million for non-training activities under the entire project, less than 10 per cent had been earmarked and less than 5 per cent committed.

---

<sup>2/</sup> Research, technical and management assistance, fora (conferences, workshops and seminars) and equipment and commodities.

Table 2

Financial Analysis: Training and Non-Training  
(Cumulative \$000)  
As of 31 March 1986

	Obligations	EARMARKED		COMMITTED	
		Amount	Percent of Obligations	Amount	Percent of Obligations
TOTAL USAID	<u>4,500</u>	<u>935</u>	<u>20.8</u>	<u>839</u>	<u>18.6</u>
Training	2,580	766	27.7	763	29.6
Non-Training	1,820	169	9.3	77	4.2
Evaluation	100	-	-	-	-

B. Activity Status

The activities for which commitment of project funds had been made as of 31 March 1986 are as follows:

1. Participation of a total of fifty-nine (59) Filipino scholars in various educational programs in the U.S. (34) and in the Philippines (25).<sup>3/</sup> Of these, 34 have been or are in programs of one year or longer, and 25 in programs of shorter duration. In addition, the project funded a special training on micro-computers for TDI-PMO staff.
2. Research undertakings covering:
  - a. Evaluation of Ten Years of Bilingual Education in the Philippines (2 sets of studies);

---

<sup>3/</sup> Detailed List attached as Annex C. See also Tables 3 and 4 below for breakdown by agency-beneficiary and by field of training.

- b. Philippine Tax Administration and Compliance; and
  - c. Development of a Framework for the Sectoral Classification of Trade and Investment Data.
3. Participation of three (3) American geologists as resource persons in a mineral deposit modelling symposium and the travel of one American expert to conduct a conference-workshop on conciliatory skills and techniques;
  4. One workshop on the TDI Research Agenda; and
  5. Procurement of a photocopying machine.

In addition, funds have been earmarked to provide supplementary financing for the Family Income and Expenditures Survey.

### III. NON TRAINING ELEMENTS OF TDI

The preceding section clearly shows that progress in the non-training elements of the TDI Project, all of which fall under the project's Development Issues Component, has to-date been painfully slow. In fact, it had extreme difficulty in getting started, with the very first USAID concurrence for the project to enter into contract for research <sup>4/</sup> taking place only towards the end of 1984; this was formalized through PIL 2(c) dated January 3, 1985. Prior to this, a number of proposals for use of non-training Development Issues funds were not favorably acted on.

---

<sup>4/</sup> With the Linguistic Society of the Philippines for the Institutional Profiles Component of the Evaluation of the Philippine Bilingual Education Program.

21

A. Divergence of Views on Approach to Project Implementation

The slow start of the non-training elements of the Development Issues Component of the TDI Project, and its relatively slow progress to-date, is reflective of a fundamental divergence of views between the USAID Mission and the Philippine Government implementing agency for the project, the NEDA, on the approach to project implementation. Specifically, while both agree on: (a) the project objective of building up institutional capacities for the analysis of and subsequent decision-making on key development issues, and (b) on the conduct of research undertakings (including conferences and fora) to bring this about, they disagree on the matter of payment for those involved in the conduct of such research undertakings, reflecting a difference in approach to the attainment of the project's objective.

The USAID Mission's expectation was that the objective would be approached by focusing government personnel attention on particular issues, within the context of their normal functions and thus without additional compensation, as well as by opening up the policy formulation process to a broad spectrum of participants from outside government, thereby enriching the process itself and the policy recommendations that subsequently emanate from it. The outputs being a distillation of hopefully some of the best minds in (and, as necessary, out of) the country, policy-makers would be better-equipped for decision-making on critical issues. This would be supplemented by funding provisions for training in issue-related fields. From the foregoing, the Mission expectation was that government personnel would be actively involved in the project without extra compensation so that much if not most of the funds for non-training Development Issue Component activities would be paid out to non-governmental institutions.

The GOP/NEDA expectation, on the other hand, was a more direct approach to capacity-building, i.e., for concerned government institutions to themselves directly undertake issue-related research activities, not as part of their normal duties but as additional workload that therefore justifies extra compensation, and in the process, build up internal capacities for policy research and analysis; this would likewise be supplemented by issue-related training.

Much of the specific problems that have slowed down progress of the non-training elements of the Development Issues Component, and thereby the TDI Project as a whole i.e., competitive procurement, contracting with government entity, and honoraria for government personnel, represent concrete manifestations of this fundamental divergence in viewpoint and expectations on the approach that should be taken to achieve the project's objectives. The four research activities currently on-going have involved TDI-PMO request for and, after much deliberation, USAID approval of seven waivers covering the above three items.

In addition to the basic difference in expectations on the approach to project implementation, there have been other less fundamental and less problematic issues that have partly contributed to the generally slow progress of the project. These include: the time perspective of policy issues on which specific research activities can be undertaken (include very long-term, i.e., year 2020, or confine to issues of immediate to medium-term relevance?); type of equipment eligible for procurement under the project; and an initial lack of familiarity, particularly by the management of the Development Issues Component, with USAID guidelines and procedures.

24

B. Communication Problems

The fact that the project's principal problems are rooted in basic interpretational differences would seem to indicate problems in the communication process between the USAID Mission and the Philippine Government through its implementing agency, the NEDA, concerning the project. Indeed, for various reasons, this appears to have been the case from the design stage to at least the early stages of project implementation.

1. Project design stage

Because of pressures brought on by approaching U.S. budgetary deadlines in mid-1983, there was little opportunity for any extensive discussion between the Mission and the NEDA on the Project Paper which was prepared by the Mission Staff. Indications of the basic differences in expectations with respect to the approach to project implementation thus began to surface only in the course of implementation itself, as the TDI-PMO based at NEDA began to endorse for the Mission's clearance/approval specific proposals to use project funds for non-training activities, including equipment procurement.

On this particular issue, it may be pointed out that the language of the Project Paper was by no means unequivocal. In the discussion of "Submission of Issue Proposals and Selection of Issue Activities", paragraphs 1 and 2 of p. 11 state that ...

"A wide variety of organizations are expected to submit proposals and thus be eligible for implementing activities. These include: (a) units within NEDA; (b) GOP agencies; (c) Local governments; (d) Government

corporations, (e) Research and education institutions; (f) Private non-profit organizations; (g) Combination and joint ventures among any of the above.

"The organization submitting the proposal need not be directly responsible for activity implementation. For example, a proposal from a GOP agency may include activities which would be undertaken by contract private research or training organizations with proven capability."

The foregoing passages clearly do not convey the USAID expectation that much if not most of the funds for the issue-related activities would be paid to non-governmental institutions. On the other hand, they do provide basis for the TDI-PMO's difficulty in appreciating, in the course of implementation, the Mission's reservations about paying government institutions and personnel for implementing specific activity proposals.

The point being made here, however, is that if extensive discussions had taken place at the design stage between the respective staffs of the GOP/NEDA and the USAID Mission such fundamental differences may have surfaced and thus could have been ironed out prior to implementation. In any case, this is a central issue that still needs to be clearly spelled out and agreed on for the future implementation of the non-training elements of the Development Issues Component.

## 2. Implementation Stage

While communications, both formal and informal, did take place between the two parties in the course of project implementation, these were insufficient to identify and resolve outstanding issues that could or that were hampering project progress. Perhaps, each side was too presuming of the other's understanding. Or perhaps, too many other demands on the time of the parties kept them from focusing on this project.

Two specific situations contributed to the insufficiency of communications. Firstly, the NEDA TDI-Project Management and the USAID Mission differed on the particular issue of USAID representation in the Project Steering Committee. The Mission had expected to be an ex-officio member of the Committee; the TDI-Project Management's position, on the other hand, was that, since the USAID's role in the Steering Committee as specified in the Project Agreement was advisory, USAID participation in Steering Committee meetings would be strictly on a need basis.

Secondly, neither the USAID nor, more importantly, even the NEDA TDI-PMO was devoting much time to the project.

For example, Project Implementation Letters setting out pertinent USAID implementing guidelines and procedures were not issued early on. The only issuance of this nature (PIL No. 3) came in January 1985, seventeen (17) months after signing of the Project Agreement, setting out the mechanism for financing the Development Issues Component. (This represents a sharp contrast to the Economic and Social Impact Analysis-Women in Development (ESIA-WID) project in which, within a little over three (3) months of the date of signing of the Project Agreement, at least five (5) PILs had been issued, setting out among other things, criteria for satisfactory compliance with conditions precedent, guidelines for contracting and exemptions thereto, and procedures and documentation for requesting and liquidating AID peso advances.) Perhaps, this was due to USAID presumptions as to the extent of the project personnel's awareness of USAID rules and procedures.

C. Component Management

As it turned out, the management of the Development Issues component, the Economic Planning and Research Staff (EPRS) of NEDA, had not had any prior experience in managing USAID-assisted projects and were thus groping on the guidelines and procedures. The relative lack of familiarity of the EPRS with USAID guidelines and procedures was compounded by the comparatively heavy normal workload of the staff. As a consequence, TDI project activities tended to be addressed largely on a residual basis.

From this standpoint, selection of the EPRS to manage the Development Issues Component may be viewed as representing a weakness in the TDI management structure. It is to be noted that the project management structure as set up represents a departure from that envisioned in the Project Paper, under which the External Assistance Staff (whose Director at the time had earlier effectively managed the ESIA-WID project) would administer TDI project implementation, drawing upon other NEDA units for technical and sectoral expertise as needed.

This is not to say that project progress would necessarily have been better if the latter structure had been followed. In fact, it may be argued that, since NEDA is not in the business of managing research, then management particularly of the Development Issues component, and more specifically, the non-training elements of the component, should not have been assigned to NEDA but more appropriately to an institution that was in the business of research management, and preferably one that had extensive prior experience with USAID-assisted projects. On the other hand, choice of the EPRS to manage the Development Issues Component was, from a substantive standpoint, logical. As the unit of NEDA that is principally responsible for the coordination of

Philippine development planning, it is in a particular vantage point to assess and prioritize policy research issues and proposals that bear on Philippine development.

D. Implementation Procedures:

Following from the USAID premise of the broadest possible participation in the policy formulation process, the implementation procedures set out in the Project Paper envisioned extensive use of seminars and conferences (about 30 to 40) in the entire course of project implementation, from issue selection to the presentation of research findings and recommendations. These procedures were adopted in the Implementation Plan of the Development Issues Component.

In the implementation of the project to-date, however, only one such workshop-conference has been held, and this in October 1985, more than two years from the date of signing of the Project Agreement. The purpose of this workshop, attended by representatives of various research institutions, was to publicize, generate interest in and hopefully speed up research formulation under the Development Issues Component of TDI.

Significantly, post-workshop response to the project has been encouraging, with additional proposals having already been received on topics in the Research Agenda as well as on others related to it. Still others are currently under preparation. From this standpoint, much improvement may be expected in the pace of implementation of at least the research element of the Development Issues Component within the coming months.<sup>5/</sup>

---

<sup>5/</sup> The Steering Committee was scheduled to meet on 14 July 1986, at which approval of research proposals with a total cost of just under \$200,000 is expected.

Rigid selection and approval procedures and requirements have also caused delays in the implementation of this component and noticeably reduced the usefulness of the project. The procedures mandate a submission of proposals, technical reviews, steering committee approval of proposals costing over \$100,000, and USAID approval of all proposals regardless of cost. Such procedures do help to promote the competitive nature of the awards, encourage broad participation, and ensure consistency with project purpose. As such, for medium-and long term development issues, such time consuming procedures are acceptable. However, they also effectively rule out the use of the project for short-term policy issues and limit the ability of project managers to initiate quickly relevant consultancies.

#### IV TRAINING

##### A. Pace of Implementation

As earlier noted, most of the earmarkings and commitment of USAID funds for the project has been for training (82 per cent and 91 per cent respectively of total funds earmarked and committed as of 31 March 1986). The \$280,000 grant allocation for training has in fact been almost entirely (93 per cent) earmarked and committed, the loan allocation, however, substantially larger at \$2.3 million, has been earmarked and committed only to the extent of 22 per cent.

In terms of number, beneficiaries of training under the TDI Project have, as of the same date, numbered fifty-nine (59). Of this number, thirty-four (34) have been in overseas training and twenty-five (25) in-country.

Coincidentally, thirty-four (34) have been in long-term (one-year or more) programs and twenty-five (25) in shorter programs.

Based on the foregoing, the training component of the TDI Project has to date been proceeding by and large on schedule. This notwithstanding, however, it needs to be asked whether the component (including the training element of the Development Issues Component) has been operating in a manner consistent with the training objectives of the project.

#### B. Objectives of Training Activities

As designed, the training component of the TDI project was not only to build upon but to improve on the General Participant Training (GPT) Program of the 1970s. Specifically, while the GPT Program was observed to have lacked focus on particular development issues or on specific human resource and institutional development objectives that thereby limited its overall impact, training activities under the TDI project would support the institutional objectives of requesting organizations, contribute to improving manpower skills critical to national and regional development, and enhance capacities related to the issues selected under the Development Issues Component.

Towards this end, a survey of training needs of socio-economic development-related government institutions was undertaken in the early stages of the project. On the basis of criteria approved by the project Steering Committee, survey responses were analyzed to come up with a prioritization of agencies and of fields of study for funding under the project.<sup>6/</sup>

---

<sup>6/</sup> Attached as Annex B

C. Overall Consistency with Priorities

In terms of agencies that received training support, project implementation has been largely consistent with the priorities established. (Table 3). Of the eighteen (18) institutions that have received funding support to date, ten fall under the category of first priority institutions for such support, receiving forty-three (43) of the fifty-nine (59) slots that were made available. Four (4) others were in the second priority list, accounting for seven (7) of the slots.

In terms of fields of study priorities were likewise by and large observed (Table 4) with Economics Planning and Public Policy Analysis topping the field (28), followed by the related areas of Management, Public Administration and Statistics (16). Study grants in more specialized areas, particularly in the area of social development, accounted for the balance (15).

TABLE 3  
 TRAINING FUNDED UNDER TDI  
 Distribution by Agency  
 (Earmarked as of 31 March 1985)

	<u>Overseas</u>	<u>Local</u>	<u>Total</u>
T O T A L	<u>34</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>59</u>
<u>First Priority</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>43</u>
NEDA	11	11	22
OBM	3	2	5
MOF	3	-	3
MTI	3	3	6
Educational/Research Institutions (6)	6	1	7
<u>Second Priority</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>7</u>
MOLE	3	1	4
MHS	-	1	1
MECS	-	1	1
MSSD	-	1	1
<u>Third Priority</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
MLG	1	4	5
<u>Non-Priority</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>4</u>
MMC	1	-	1
DBP	1	-	1
Regional Trial Courts	2	-	2

Table 4  
TRAINING FUNDED UNDER TDI  
DISTRIBUTION BY FIELD OF STUDY  
(Earmarked as of 31 March 1986)

FIELD OF STUDY	Degree			Total
	Ph.D.	Master s	Non-Degree	
Economics	1	8	5	14
Planning	2	2	2	6
Public Policy	1	5	2	8
Management/Public Ad	1	4	8	13
Statistics		1	2	3
Science & Technology (incl Engineering)		2	1	3
Labor	-	1	1	2
Law and Justice			3	3
Other Social Development	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>7</u>
TOTAL	<u>9</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>59</u>

#### D. Areas for Improvement

The foregoing general observations notwithstanding, however, there are definite areas for improvement in the operation and implementation of training activities.

To begin with, the prioritization scheme adopted, while useful in guiding the evaluation of specific requests for training assistance, leaves too much room for flexibility in decision-making. While the need for and the value of flexibility in a program of this nature is recognized, too much of it could easily lead to distortions in program results. That this has tended to be the case is evident from the following:

- a) The predominance of NEDA itself as recipient institution of the training grants. Of the fifty-nine (59) slots that had been made available twenty-two (22) or more than a third went to NEDA officials and employees. Relative to the slots that went to institutions in the first priority list (43), the proportion is even higher at slightly over half. While a large proportion of project training funds going to NEDA staff may be justifiable in terms of the institution's central role in Philippine development planning and policy-formulation, such a high proportion of resources going to a single agency is rather excessive.
- b) Relatedly, the predominance of fields of a general development nature i.e. Economics, Planning Management and Public Administration and Statistics in the fields of training supported under the project. These accounted for forty-four (44) of the fifty nine (59) slots. Again, while the value of a broad perspective in policy-formulation is recognized, three-fourths of the training allocation going into this

type of general training would seem to unduly undervalue the need for more specialized types of policy analysis called for in many areas of Philippine development. It is of course possible that these needs are already being addressed through projects other than the one under consideration. If so, then the present allocation under the TDI Project may well be justified. Unfortunately, time constraints have not enabled closer investigation of this matter.<sup>7/</sup>

- c) Funding of programs in Law and Justice which, though related to socio economic development policy formulation, is at best only distantly so. Participation, for instance, in programs on American & International Law as well as in the U.S. Legal System by members of the Regional Trial Courts is, to say the least, difficult to justify under this project. However, support towards Master's degrees in Engineering, of which there are two, probably is justifiable as these may be classified among the manpower skills critical to national and regional development.
- d) Relative imbalance in the distribution of training slots between participants from central offices and those from the regions. Of the fifty-nine (59) slots made available less than ten have gone to participants from the regional offices. Considering the thrust of the present government towards genuine regionalization, including NEDA's own interests, improvements in this regard are especially called for. For instance, the new government is strengthening the role of the Regional Development Councils and, therefore, these may be additional training needs.

---

<sup>7/</sup> According to the Manager of the Participant Training Component, this was in fact the case.

The second broad area for improvement is in monitoring. The establishment of a system for monitoring of training participants both during and, more importantly, after training was envisioned in the project design. The first batch of trainees who went through one year programs in SY 1984 have been back on the job for a year, and those who underwent shorter programs have been back for a longer period. To date however, no back to office monitoring has been undertaken, rendering difficult the assessment of training impact relative to objectives.

#### E. Usefulness of Training

Towards this end, however, limited interviews of immediate supervisors of returned trainees were carried out in this evaluation to obtain some feel for the usefulness of training to the sponsoring institutions.

In general, the assessment of training impact has been very positive, with significant improvements observed in the overall depth and breadth of analytical outputs of returned trainees. In one instance however, even before the outset of the training program the participant was transferred to another unit to which immediate applicability of the training eventually received was minimal though nonetheless potentially useful.

On the transfer of knowledge/skills acquired to other personnel of the sponsoring institutions, the general approach has been through informal discussions on the job.

V. PROJECT SIGNIFICANCE AND OUTLOOK

Implementation problems notwithstanding, current evidence supports the continued usefulness of the project towards the objective of building up institutional capacities for policy analysis and decision-making in the Philippine bureaucracy. The Tax Administration and Compliance Study, for instance, though still in the process of finalization, has already contributed significant inputs to the recent formulation of a new Tax Reform Package. Outputs of the on-going research on Sectoral Classification of Trade and Investment Data are already being programmed for use in the current drafting of the Philippine Development Plan for 1987-1992. Limited interviews have also established the positive contributions of training supported under the project in terms of improved overall quality of analytical work of returned trainees.

The potential impact of the project is further considerably enhanced by the fact of a new government which is seriously engaged in a broad-ranging effort to review and, as needed, recast the whole gamut of policies, structures and procedures that intimately affect both the current and the future life of the nation.

In terms of project operations, recent developments augur well for improvements not only in the pace of project implementation but also in terms of broadening the project's overall impact. In the case of the Development Issues Component, mention has already been made of positive expectations resulting from the workshop on the Research Agenda conducted in late 1985. Significantly, because of the materially improved response that resulted from the workshop, the TDI-PMO has decided to convene similar workshops on a regular basis, possibly twice a year.

Proposals for improvement of the training component have also been approved in principle, with operational details currently in the process of being worked out. These include:

(a) Formulation of a more detailed program for training for the rest of the project duration, with implementation to adhere as closely as possible to the formulated program. Towards this end, a reassessment is to be undertaken of: (i) agencies' priority training needs to ensure continued consistency of the program with current government thrusts; and (ii) the prioritization of agencies with a particular view to broadening institutional access to the training opportunities available.

(b) Partial shifting of the training budget from overseas to local training. Considering the significant cost differential between overseas and local training, the proposed move is again designed to enlarge project benefits by expanding available training slots. Relatedly, to enhance the attractiveness of local training, the stipend rates, book allowance, and thesis preparation allowance are all proposed to be upgraded to levels that are at least comparable to those offered under other donor programs.

(c) In line with the foregoing, and with a view to broadening the geographical spread of benefits within the country, funding support under the project is proposed to be expanded to include training in selected fields in regional state universities such as the University of the Philippines at Los Banos, the Central Luzon State University and the Central Mindanao University. Also, the possibility of supporting the development of a Master's Program in Development Economics at the U.P. in Diliman is to be explored.

3. While current prospects for improved project implementation appear favorable, however, the relatively long period of painfully slow project progress, particularly in the case of non-training activities, renders highly

unlikely the full implementation of the project within the current PACD. Furthermore, the proposed modifications in the operating scheme of the training component would also take some time to work out. Accordingly, the TDI-PMO is expected to put forward to USAID a request for a two-year extension of the current PACD. If the project is extended, then there will be need for another evaluation in two years.

## VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of all of the foregoing, the following recommendations are herein made with respect to the TDI project:

1. The project should continue, and the PACD extended by two years to December 1990.
2. Should the preceding recommendation be approved, another evaluation of the project should be scheduled in the first half of 1988.
3. To contribute to the easing of the country's debt servicing difficulties, and in consideration of the diffused social benefits of the project, the entire unearmarked loan allocation to the project should be converted to outright grant.
4. To enhance smooth and timely implementation of the project as a whole and, in particular, of the non-training elements of the Development Issues Component, a clear resolution of the issues that have herein been identified as having largely held back project progress should be made and agreements reached should be clearly set out in project implementation letters.

Critical items in this regard are the whole approach to project implementation, and the related question of compensation for government personnel, and the issue of USAID membership in the Project Steering

Committee. Additionally, even at this relatively late stage, PILs should be issued that clearly set out USAID guidelines and procedures (including exemptions that may mutually be agreed upon) concerning the more administrative aspects of project implementation, such as procurement, disbursement, etc, about which any uncertainties or ambiguities still exist.

Towards contributing to the resolution of the main issues, the following views are herein advanced.

a) On the approach to project implementation, the view of the Evaluation Team is that, in general, the involvement of Philippine Government institutions and personnel in the project forms part of the their normal functions and respective terms of reference and as such does not warrant extra compensation. Since the development issues that are selected for research and related activities are determined by Government itself to be of high priority, the Government itself through its agencies and instrumentalities should assume responsibility for the conduct of such activities and deploy its own resources for the purpose. What the project does is to make available funds to enable Government to procure such additional resources (mainly technical expertise) to assist its own personnel in the satisfactory conduct of these activities. As such, it is principally for these additional technical resources (and related activities) that project funds should be used.

There are four possible exceptions to this general principle:

(i) government research institutions which, though government-owned, function largely outside of the ambit of normal government operations and have no explicit responsibility to program their research activities on the selected development issues. As such, their involvement in project activities would be additional to that of regular government agencies and would thus justify compensation. Research units based in government educational

institutions would clearly fall under this category. Persons working for such institutions, either on full-time or part-time detail, would hence be eligible for salary compensation, provided there was no double payment.

(ii) The engagement of government officials and personnel for such discrete activities that produce specific tangible outputs, such as the preparation of concept/issue papers, which activities, though falling within the particular areas of expertise of the officials and personnel concerned clearly fall outside of their normal terms of reference and involve additional workload outside of regular work hours.

(iii) The participation of government officials and personnel in conferences, workshops and such other fora as may be convened under the project. For this purpose, expenses normally incurred (i.e., transport and room and board) in such participation can be funded out of project resources.

(iv) Reimbursement for travel, per diem, and miscellaneous research costs even where the government official is not eligible for personal compensation under the project, provided the costs were not otherwise reimbursed and were directly related to a specific research task.

b) On the issue of USAID membership in the Project Steering Committee, it is our view that, the Project would stand to benefit from regular participation of USAID persons in the selection of topics and proposals. Such participation would introduce yet another point of view on substantive deliberations as well as provide a conduit for clear and early response to administrative questions. However, alternative arrangements are possible to the inclusion of a USAID person in the deliberations of the Project Steering Committee. One possibility would be the formulation of a joint NEDA-USAID committee, above the Steering Committee, where policy

implementation issues and proposals could be formally discussed. Still, another alternative, which the evaluation team prefers, is to incorporate into the selection process for proposals consultations with and solicitation of opinions from USAID. The best spot for this seems to be after the TDI-PMO has done preliminary evaluation of proposals, but before they are formally submitted to the Steering Committee.

5. Given NEDA's central role in Philippine development planning and policy formulation, NEDA should retain overall management of the project. Under the overall direction of a project director, the two broad elements of the project, i.e., training and non-training, should continue to be managed separately, given the different experience requirements and processing procedures involved in management of the two broad classes of activities. Because of these differences, the training aspect of the Development Issues Component should be handled by the management unit of the Participant Training Component. Since a significant proportion of training is intended to address the development issues selected under the DI component, however, close consultations between the component management units should be maintained.

6. Given its long-years of experience in the administration of donor-supported training programs, the External Assistance Staff of NEDA should continue to serve as the management unit of the Participant Training component (which should now include training elements of the Development Issues Component). Some expansion of the unit directly involved, however, will be called for as the monitoring system provided for under the project comes on stream and as the impending improvements begin to bring about the expected significant expansion in program participation.

7. For reasons that have already been indicated elsewhere in this report, at least the management of part of the procedures of the Development Issues component (which now excludes training) should be transferred or subcontracted to the Philippine Institute for Development Studies (PIDS) which has considerable experience with managing research and working with USAID.

8. To improve the implementation of the development issues component:

(a) The Steering Committee, especially in light of the priorities of the new GOP administration, should focus and prioritize the Agenda of Areas of Research. This should be done with the intent of selecting only a limited number of development issues in order to concentrate efforts, involve more institutions in the same topic, and culminate through a series of activities in concrete policy recommendations.

(b) TDI-PMO should implement present plans for more frequent workshops and advertisements to solicit research proposals and to broaden participation.

(c) In addition, high level NEDA officials should continue to endeavor to involve directly other ministers and deputy ministers in the selection of development issue topics, research assignments and discussions of results. NEDA should continue to make readily available TDI resources to other ministries.

(d) The regular selection process should be made simpler and quicker through such steps as greater discretionary power to the NEDA-TDI Project Manager to approve proposals on already cleared topics without further approval of the Steering Committee or USAID, up to a limit of, say, \$15,000 per proposal.

(e) An alternative mechanism for selecting consultants should be designed to meet immediate short-term needs. The NEDA-TDI project manager

should have greater authority to initiate on his own, within topic guidelines approved by the Steering Committee and USAID, consultancy contracts. This authority should be limited both as to amount of any individual contract, say \$15,000, and to the total amount of all such contracts for the year, say \$100,000.

9. The Evaluation Team endorses the TDI-PMO proposals for improving the overall effectiveness and impact of training activities. Specifically:

(a) A more detailed training plan for the balance of the project duration should be prepared, based on an updated assessment of institutional training needs. The team feels that, in this assessment, special attention should be given to the needs of regional offices. Further, while maximum adherence to the formulated plan is desirable, provision for some degree of flexibility should also be allowed to enable the project to respond to unforeseen but urgent training requirements that may arise in the course of implementation. For this purpose, ten (10) per cent of the uncommitted balance of the training allocation could remain unprogrammed and availed of largely on a need basis.

(b) Institutional participation in the training component should be broadened not so much, however, by increasing the number of participating institutions (although possibly that too) but more through the provision of proportionately more slots to institutions that have been determined to rank high in the institutional prioritization scheme.

(c) Participation from the regional levels should be increased and perhaps even given priority.

(d) Extension of funding support to training in suitable fields in selected regional training institutions in the country should be undertaken.

In this regard full consideration should be given to including training programs at private educational institutions. The proposal to explore the development of a Master's Program in Development Economics at the U.P. in Diliman is similarly endorsed.

10. In addition to the foregoing, a reassessment of the distribution of fields of training, specifically between the general and the more sector-specific policy analysis study programs, should be undertaken to ensure that the latter type of needs is indeed being adequately addressed through this project in combination with other donor-assisted training programs. If not, then some shifting in proportions should be effected.

11. Finally, to enable continuing assessment of the extent to which project objectives for the training component are being achieved, the monitoring system envisaged under the project should immediately be established and activated.

ANNEX A

Financial Analysis Table  
as of 31 March 1986  
(Cumulative \$000)

	Obligations	EARMARKED		COMMITTED	
		Amount	% of Oblig.	Amount	% of Oblig.
TOTAL USAID	<u>4,500</u>	<u>935</u>	<u>20.8</u>	<u>839</u>	<u>18.6</u>
GRANT	<u>1,200</u>	<u>430</u>	<u>35.8</u>	<u>337</u>	<u>28.1</u>
Training	280	261	93.2	261	93.2
Fora	200	2	1.0	2	1.0
Tech. & Mgt. Assistance	220	89	40.5	10	4.5
Research	330	73	22.1	60	18.2
Equipment/Commodities	70	5	7.1	5	7.1
Evaluation	100	0	0	0	0
LOAN	<u>3,300</u>	<u>505</u>	<u>15.3</u>	<u>502</u>	<u>15.2</u>
Training	2,300	505	22.0	502	21.8
Tech. & Mgt. Assistance	300	0	0	0	0
Research	500	0	0	0	0
Equipment/Commodities	200	0	0	0	0

TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT ISSUES PROJECT  
Participant Training Component

TRAINING<sup>1/</sup> WHICH MAY POSSIBLY BE SUPPORTED

I. FIRST PRIORITY

A. NATIONAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY AUTHORITY

1. Science Policy Formulation and Administration
2. Information Science
3. Technology Assessment/Evaluation
4. Industrial Project Feasibility Study
5. Research Program Development, Evaluation and Management
6. E c o n o m i c s
7. Public Administration
8. Development Planning and Administration

B. MINISTRY OF FINANCE

1. Public Finance
2. E c o n o m i c s
3. Public Administration
4. Tax/Revenue Administration
5. Development Planning and Administration

C. OFFICE OF BUDGET AND MANAGEMENT

1. Public Finance
2. Public Administration
3. Government Budgeting
4. Government Accounting
5. Project Planning, Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation
6. Development Planning and Administration

D. MINISTRY OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY

D.1 Bureau of Industrial Development

1. Industrial Development and Management
2. E c o n o m i c s
3. S t a t i s t i c s
4. Price Stabilization Policy Analysis and Formulation
5. Identification and Promotion of Industrial Investment Projects
6. Development Planning and Administration

<sup>1/</sup> Prioritized in accordance with the approved criteria for the evaluation of training needs.

D.2 Bureau of Domestic Trade

1. Economics
2. Public Administration
3. Statistics
4. Development Planning and Administration
5. Project Planning, Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation
6. Price Stabilization Policy Analysis and Formulation

D.3 Bureau of Foreign Trade

1. Economics
2. Statistics
3. Public Administration
4. Development Planning and Administration
5. Trade Negotiation Techniques
6. Trade Facilitation Fundamentals

D.4 Bureau of Small and Medium Industries

1. Industrial Management
2. Economics
3. Policy Analysis and Formulation
4. Project Planning, Implementation/Management, Monitoring and Evaluation
5. Market Research
6. Public Administration

E. NATIONAL ECONOMIC AND DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

1. Development Planning and Administration
2. Public Administration
3. Economics
4. Statistics
5. Public Finance
6. Industrial Development and Management
7. Public Policy Analysis and Formulation
8. Project Planning, Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation
9. Urban and Regional Planning

F. MINISTRY OF ENERGY

1. Project Planning and Management
2. Development Planning and Administration
3. Public Administration

G. RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS<sup>2/</sup>

H. TRAINING INSTITUTIONS<sup>2/</sup>

<sup>2/</sup> Specific institutions and priority training needs to be determined.

## II. SECOND PRIORITY

### A. MINISTRY OF TRANSPORTION AND COMMUNICATION

1. Policy Analysis and Formulation
2. Urban Transportation Development
3. Transport Economics
4. Transport Management
5. Project Planning, Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation
6. Communications Engineering
7. Public Administration

### B. MINISTRY OF PUBLIC WORKS AND HIGHWAYS

1. Infrastructure Project Management
2. Equipment Management
3. Labor Intensive Highway Maintenance
4. Construction Management
5. Materials Engineering and Quality Control
6. Financial Management and Control
7. Civil Engineering

### C. MINISTRY OF SOCIAL SERVICES AND DEVELOPMENT

1. S o c i o l o g y
2. D e m o g r a p h y
3. Human Resources Development
4. Manpower Planning/Forecasting
5. Development Planning and Administration
6. Public Administration

### D. MINISTRY OF HUMAN SETTLEMENTS

1. Urban and Regional Planning
2. Strategic Planning
3. Shelter/Housing Project Development Management
4. Project Planning, Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation
5. Environmental Science and Technology
6. Information Systems
7. Agribusiness Management

### E. MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, CULTURE AND SPORTS

1. Education Planning
2. S t a t i s t i c s
3. Development Planning and Administration
4. Management Information Systems
5. Project Planning, Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation
6. Management Information System

F. MINISTRY OF LABOR AND EMPLOYMENT

1. Economics
2. Statistics
3. Public Administration
4. Development Planning and Administration
5. Management Information System
6. Project Planning, Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation

G. MINISTRY OF AGRARIAN REFORM

1. Agrarian Studies/Management
2. Rural Sociology
3. Agricultural Project Planning, Implementation Monitoring and Evaluation
4. Rural Development and Settlement Management
5. Management Information Systems/Land Records Management System
6. Irrigation Project Development and Management
7. Agricultural Land and Water Resources Development

H. OFFICE OF THE PRIME MINISTER

1. Economics
2. Development Planning and Administration
3. Public Policy Analysis and Formulation
4. Foreign Policy Analysis and Formulation
5. Project Planning, Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation
6. Management Information System

III. THIRD PRIORITY

A. MINISTRY OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT

1. Development Planning and Administration
2. Project Planning, Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation
3. Management Information Systems
4. Financial Management
5. Urban and Regional Planning
6. Rural and Community Development

B. MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND FOOD

1. Project Planning, Analysis and Implementation for Agricultural Development
2. Strategic Planning and Management
3. Policy Formulation and Analysis for Agricultural Development

C. MINISTRY OF NATURAL RESOURCES

1. Forest Resource Management
2. Resource Development and Management
3. Ecological Analysis for Natural Resource Management

D. MINISTRY OF HEALTH

1. Health Program/Project Development, Implementation,  
Monitoring and Evaluation
2. S t a t i s t i c s
3. Management Information Systems

E. OTHER AGENCIES

## ANNEX C

TRAINING FUNDED UNDER TDI  
(earmarked as of 31 March 1986)

	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Field of Study</u>	<u>Date of Training</u>	
I. COMPLETED*				
A. <u>Overseas Long-Term</u>				
1.	Julio Ragraio	DBP	MS Public Policy and Management	6/28/84-7/28/85
2.	Adelfo Gaffud	OBM	MA Development Econ.	6/6/84-6/6/85
3.	Veronica Guzman	NEDA	MA Development Econ.	6/6/84-6/6/85
4.	Elisa Agomaa	OBM	MS Public Policy & Management	6/24/84-6/23/85
5.	Ofelia Bulaong	BOI	MS Public Policy & Management	6/24/84-6/23/85
6.	Gilda Reyes	OBM	MA Development Econ.	5/30/85-5/30/86
7.	Theresa Coronel	NEDA	MA Development Econ.	5/30/85-5/30/86
8.	Camilo Jose Lim	NEDA	MA Development Econ.	5/30/85-5/30/86
9.	Edmundo Martinez	Ateneo U	MS Public Policy & Management	7/1/85-6/2/86
10.	Antonio Basilio	MTI	MS Public Policy & Management	7/1/86-6/2/86
B. <u>Overseas Short-Term</u>				
1.	Paz Suarez	BIR	Int'l Tax Admin.	10/1-11/9/84
2.	Regino Veridiano	RTC Br. XXXI	American and Int'l. Law	6/3-6/13/84
3.	Chita Angeles	BOI	Investment Negotiation	6/10-7/24/84
4.	Filemon Uriarte	NIST	R&D Institute Mgt.	6/4-6/29/84
5.	Luz Mier	NEDA	Public Enterprise Policy	7/1-8/18/84

\* As of end of SY 1985-86

6.	Joseph Alabanza	NEDA	Population and Dev.	7/1-7/14/84
7.	Lydia de Villa	MMC	Executive Management	5/2-6/15/85
8.	Teresita Manipon	NEDA	Statistical Packages for Microcomputers	5/30-7/15/85
9.	Lermy Concepcion	NEDA	Price Index Construct- ion and Analysis	6/26-8/2/85
10.	Antonio Roman, Jr.	MOF	Int'l. Loan Negotiation and Renegotiation	10/ -11/85
11.	Cecilia Tanchoco	NEDA	Economic Growth, Income Distribution & Poverty	5/13-6/28/85
12.	Daniel Pabellon	NEDA	Advanced Management	7/28-9/21/85
13.	Gaudioso Sosmena, Jr.	MLG	Neighborhood Justice	9/8-10/9/85
14.	Jasmin Centina	MOLE	Development Project Evaluation	9/16-9/27/85
15.	Rafael Espiritu	MOLE	Development Project Evaluation	9/16-9/27/85
16.	Santiago Ranada, Jr.	TRC Br.	U.S. Legal System	7/16-8/10/85
17.	Miguel Chavez, Jr.	MOLE	Labor Statistics Analysis for Policy Formulation	10/15-12/6/85
18.	Flordeliza Javier	UPLB	Plant Biotechnology	9/2/85-2/21/86
C.	<u>Local Long-Term</u>			
1.	Presentacion Gonzales		Ph. D. Education (Dissertation only)	SY 1985-86
D.	<u>Local Short-Term</u>			
1.	Sismundo Cater	MTI	Development Economics	8/84-4/85
2.	Elena Lardizabal	MTI	Development Economics	8/84-4/85
3.	Tim Fernandez	NEDA	Development Economics	8/84-4/85
4.	Rose Nepomuceno	NEDA	Development Economics	8/84-4/85
5.	Ottomama Benito	Prov. Board Lanao Sur	Development Management	2/17-3/14/86
6.	Moises Dalisay, Jr.	Prov. Board Lanao Norte	Dev. Management	2/17-3/14/86

II. ON-GOING

A. <u>Overseas Long-Term</u>				
1.	Eduardo Gonzales	DAP	Ph.D. Public Policy	7/26/84-7/26/87
2.	Clarita Lantican	NEDA	Ph.D. Sociology	8/12/84-8/12/87
3.	Lirio Abuyuan	NEDA	Ph.D. Urban & Regional Planning (Dissertation only) (Extended)	8/14/85-2/15/86
4.	Gabriel Gaerlan	UPLB	MS Mechanical Eng'g.	9/23/85-9/24/86
5.	Celia Reyes	PIDS	Ph.D. Economics	SY 1985 - 88
B. <u>Overseas Short-Term</u>				
1.	Gil Beltran	MOF	Public Enterprise	6/16-7/25/86
C. <u>Local Long-Term</u>				
1.	Araceli de Vera	MECS	Ph.D. Education	1985-88
2.	Cecilia Celestino	FNRI	Ph.D. Nutrition	1985-88
3.	Sixto Tolentino	NEDA	Ph.D. Urban & Regional Planning	1985-88
4.	Teresa Laiz	NEDA	Ph.D. Public Adm.	1985-88
5.	Anecita Castillo	OBM	MA Public Adm.	1985-87
6.	Rosana Bautista	MLG	MA Public Adm.	1985-87
7.	Ruel Lucentales	MSSD	MA Social Work	1985-87
8.	Dante Quindoza	MTI	MA Public Adm.	1985-87
9.	Agnes Cargamento	NEDA	MA Urban & Regional Planning	1985-87
10.	Genero Abia	NEDA	MA Social Work	1985-87
11.	Yelito Alimanza	MOLE	MA Labor Economics	1985-87
12.	Eulito Bismark	MHS	MS Statistics	1985-87
13.	Julita de la Cruz	OBM	MA Public Adm.	1985-87
14.	Oscar Mia	NEDA	MA Urban Regional Planning	1985-87
15.	Ruth Paul-Cruz	NEDA	MA Economics	1985-87

16.	Honorina Tannueco	NEDA	MA Economics	1985-87
17.	Winfred Villamil	NEDA	MA Economics	1985-87
18.	Corazon Garcia	NEDA	MS Engineering (Completion only)	1986-87

TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT ISSUES PROJECT EVALUATION  
SCOPE OF WORK FOR EVALUATION

I. THE PROJECT

Title: Training and Development Issues Project (492-0340)  
Project Start: July 29, 1983  
PACD: December 31, 1988  
Funding: \$5,000,000 (TOTAL)  
\$4,500,000 (AID-funded)  
\$1,200,000 (Grant)  
\$3,300,000 (Loan)  
\$1,500,000 (GOP)

Purpose: The purpose of the project is to improve the capability of Philippine Government and other institutions to analyze development issues and to make sound and timely development-related decisions.

Current Status: The above-mentioned purpose is pursued through the implementation of two project components namely (1) Participant Training Component and (2) Development Issues Component. As of 31 December 1985, a total of 29 overseas and 15 local training participants have been supported by the Participant Training Component. Meanwhile, the Development Issues Component has directed efforts toward the development of the technical base for effective policy analysis through the conduct of three researches under the broad development issues identified for project attention, preparation of concept papers on development planning and policy issues, and provision of support for 4 overseas and 34 local training participants. As of the same date, the Participant Training Component has obligated 60.9 per cent of the total loan appropriation it has received so far and 96.7 per cent of its total grant budget. The Development Issues Component, on the other hand, has obligated 43.7 per cent of the total loan appropriations and 16.4 per cent of its total grant budget.

II. PURPOSE AND TIMING OF THE EVALUATION

This evaluation will assess the progress of the implementation of the TDI Project and make recommendations for maximizing the project's impact on the development efforts of the Aquino Government. It will identify the successful project activities and attempt to explain the advantages these have over less successful activities. It plans to investigate the problems and issues which appear to have hampered or delayed implementation of the less successful and to determine mechanisms to avoid or resolve them. The evaluation also will identify and assess new approaches for using project resources to achieve project objectives.

More specifically, it will focus on five general areas:

- a. the current status of project implementation;
- b. expectations and perceptions of TDI project by NEDA and USAID; and
- c. factors affecting project implementation;
- d. selection of DI component issues and Training component participants; and
- e. opportunities and mechanisms for improving the project.

As scheduled in the project paper, the first evaluation will be conducted in FY 85.

Based on the findings, the evaluation should recommend whether basic changes in the project design and implementation procedures are necessary. The recommendations should indicate the advantages and disadvantages of the design and procedural changes advocated.

### III. QUESTIONS FOR THE EVALUATION TEAM

#### A. Current Status

Is implementation of the TDI Project proceeding as planned? What are the variances between projected and observed schedules for implementing the training and development issues components of the project? If such variances exist, what are their probable impact on the overall implementation plan? Is it likely that the project purpose will be achieved by the PACD?

#### B. Expectations and Perceptions

What are NEDA's and AID's expectations and perceptions regarding the project design, implementation procedures, factors hindering implementation, beneficiary groups, etc.? What are AID's expectations of the NEDA TDI-Project, Management Office (TDI-PMO) regarding the latter's implementation procedures? What are TDI-PMO expectations of USAID regarding project support/backstopping? How do NEDA's and AID's perceptions compare with actual implementation procedures? Are both sides satisfied with the manner by which the implementation process is proceeding? If not, what are the areas and reasons for dissatisfaction?

#### C. Factors Affecting Project Implementation

What factors explain the progress or lack of progress of both the training and development issues components? What are the major factors contributing to delays in project implementation? Are the delays a function of project design? How were the guidelines in the PP and other governing documents applied? Are the assumptions underlying the project design and implementation plans valid? How can the NEDA TDI-Project Management Office (TDI-PMO) further raise its institutional capability, e.g., staff availability and appropriate organizational structure, to implement the plan as scheduled? How can USAID further improve its backstopping for the project? Are there external factors, e.g., lack of interest in potential participant organizations, affecting implementation? Are there budget-related problems, such as provision of

AAs and CDCs, hampering implementation? Are GOP or AID regulations or operating procedures hampering implementation? What have NEDA and AID done to resolve the known problems thus facilitating project implementation? How successful were the solutions?

#### D. Selection Processes

Do TDI-PMO and AID agree on the general issues selected for DI component focus and on the process used to select these issues? Do TDI-PMO and AID agree on the more specific interpretation of these issues and the procedures for eliciting research proposals and choosing project proponents? If there are contrasting interpretations, do these differences affect implementation of the DI component? Is access to the DI component widely known to potential individual/institutional participants? Do TDI-PMO and AID agree on the process used to select training participants? What factors are the most important in the participant selection process? Does TDI financed training focus on the development issues facing the country?

#### E. Mechanism for Improving the Project

What basic changes in project design or NEDA and AID procedures are required to achieve project objectives? What changes are needed to improve implementation? Should the project improve the process of identifying sub-issues for research, identifying research institutions, soliciting proposals for issues research and training, or selecting training activities? Should project resources be shifted between components? Are additional grant or loan funds required? Should the project be continued? What alternative project approaches could be used to better achieve project objectives?

### IV. TEAM COMPOSITION:

The evaluation team must exhibit a thorough understanding of the following subject areas:

1. Operations of the GOP, specifically of NEDA and OBM;
2. Philippine development issues and how these relate to policies;
3. Mechanics of A.I.D. and USAID/Philippines; and
4. The nature of the relationship between USAID and NEDA.
5. The development priorities and opportunities of the Aquino government.

The team's composition should represent expertise in the fields of organizational planning and management, policy-making, evaluation, and management of research and training activities. Given the sensitivities surrounding this project and the importance of this evaluation, the team should not only be experts in the subject areas above, they should also be well known and respected by both NEDA and AID. A team is expected to be composed of a mix of Philippine and U.S. consultants or Mission/AID Washington personnel.

The team will not have to collect and analyze a great deal of information because there have been very few implementation actions to date. Thus, a small team of perhaps three or maybe four highly qualified persons should be sufficient.

V. METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

The team will complete all evaluation-related activities in four weeks. The following chart includes a list of activities, the timetable and team members expected participation in each of the activities. Although the list is illustrative, nonetheless, the evaluation team is expected to adhere to the 4-week constraint; the use of project documents and interviews with GOP, USAID and project recipients as primary sources of data; and to the requirement to discuss preliminary findings with NEDA-USAID prior to finalizing the report.

Activity	Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4	Team Members Involved
	Day No. <u>1/2/3/4/5/6</u>	Day No. <u>1/2/3/4/5/6</u>	Day No. <u>1/2/3/4/5/6</u>	Day No. <u>1/2/3/4/5/6</u>	
<b>A. Preparatory Activities</b>					
1. Team Org.	XXX				A11
2. Redesign of Eval scope	XXXXX				A11
3. Review of doc.	XXXXXXXXX				A11
<b>B. Data Collection</b>					
1. Interview: USAID Project Staff Program Officer Director's Office	XXXXX				A11
2. Interview: GOP NEDA Senior Management NEDA-TDI-PMO EAS EPRS PIDS OBM	XXX	XXXXXXXXXXXX			A11
3. Interview: Recipients	XXX	XXXXXXXXXXXX			A11
<b>C. Data Analysis and Report Writing</b>					
		XXXXX	XXXXXXXXXXXX		A11
<b>D. Submission of draft report and discussion of findings with NEDA and USAID</b>					
			XX		A11
<b>E. Draft Revision</b>					
			XXXXXXXXXX		A11
<b>F. Submission of final report to NEDA and USAID</b>					
				XX	TL

## VI. FUNDING

An estimated \$6,100 in project funds will be used for the evaluation. The estimated budget is presented in Annex B.

## VII. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

- A. The final report, which is to be submitted at the end of the fourth week, will use the regular format for AID evaluations. It will contain the following sections:
  1. Executive Summary - a two-page single-spaced summary which includes the project's statement of purpose and the objectives of the evaluation;
  2. Basic Project Identification Data Face Sheet - (the format will be provided during the evaluation);
  3. Statement of Conclusions and Recommendations - the conclusions should be concise and topics identified by subhead, while recommendations should correspond to the conclusions, mentioning which agency/ies have responsibility for recommended action;
  4. Body of Report - should include a description of the country context in which the project was developed and provide the information on which conclusions and recommendations are based;
  5. Appendices as necessary (including the evaluation's scope of work, brief description of methodology, list of persons interviewed and key documents reviewed, list of acronyms)
- B. The Preliminary Report, which is to be presented to and discussed with NEDA and USAID after the third week, consists of a draft of the findings and recommendations.
- C. The evaluation team leader is responsible for furnishing NEDA and USAID with draft copies of the preliminary report prior to its presentation and discussion with the two agencies. In like manner, he is responsible for the submission to NEDA and USAID of the final report as scheduled and in a format acceptable to USAID.

## Appendix 2

### LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

#### A. Philippine Government Officials

##### NEDA

1. Mr. Florian Alburo, Chairman, Steering Committee, TDI
2. Mr. Filologo Pante, Jr., Project Manager, TDI
3. Mr. Wilfredo Nuqui, Manager, Development Issues Component
4. Mr. Romeo Reyes, Manager, Participant Training Component
5. Ms. Julieta Legaspi, Assistant Manager, Development  
Issues Component
6. Mr. Vicente Salazar, Assistant Manager, Participant  
Training Component
7. Ms. Remedios de Leon, Director, Industry and Utilities Staff
8. Ms. Carol Guina, Assistant Director, Policy Coordination Staff
9. Ms. Luz Bautista, TDI Project Staff
10. Ms. Flordeliza Dizon, TDI Project Staff
11. Ms. Ciosena Ungson, TDI Project Staff
12. Ms. Carmen Viray, TDI Project Staff
13. Ms. Guida Capellan, Officer-in-charge, NEDA  
MIS-Data Bank Unit

OBM

Mr. Romeo de Vera, Director, Financial Planning Staff

PIDS

Mr. Mario Feranil, Director

USAID

1. Mr. William T. Oliver, Chief, Program Office
2. Mr. Richard E. Rhoda, Dep. Chief, Program Office
3. Mr. Sulpicio Roco, Sr. Program Specialist, Program Office
4. Mr. Sibley Kawi, Training Officer, Information &  
Training Division

63

KEY DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

1. TDI Project Paper
2. Project Loan and Grant Agreement for the TDI Project
3. Detailed Implementation Plans for Development Issues and for Participant Training Components
4. Project Implementation Letters
5. USAID Quarterly Progress Reports on TDI Project
6. TDI-PMO Periodic Status Reports
7. Minutes/Agenda Folders for Steering Committee Meetings
8. TDI-PMO Research Agenda
9. Training and Financial Plans for Participant Training
10. Folder of Communications on TDI between USAID and TDI-PMO
11. Pertinent ESIA-WID Project Implementation Letters
12. Evaluation Report on General Participant Training II