PD-ABA-257
64250

APPENDIX D

A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY PART I

1. BEFORE FILLING OUT THIS FORM, READ THE ATTACHED INSTRUCTIONS.
2. USE LETTER QUALITY TYPE, NOT "DOT MATRIX" TYPE.

IDENTIFICATION DATA

A. Reporting A.I.D. Unit:

Mission or AID/W Office USAID/ RWANDA
(ES# _____)

B. Was Evaluation Scheduled In Current FY Annual Evaluation Plan?
Yes ☐ Slipped ☒ Ad Hoc ☐
Evaluation Plan Submission Date: FY 89 Q ___

C. Evaluation Timing
Interim ☒ Final ☐
Ex Post ☐ Other ☐

D. Activity or Activities Evaluated (List the following information for project(s) or program(s) evaluated; if not applicable, list title and date of the evaluation report.)

Project No.	Project /Program Title	First PROAG or Equivalent (FY)	Most Recent PACD (Mo/Yr)	Planned LOP Cost (000)	Amount Obligated to Date (000)
696-0126	Agriculture Surveys and Policy Analysis	1986	9/30/91	7,000,000	7,000,000

ACTIONS

E. Action Decisions Approved By Mission or AID/W Office Director

Action(s) Required	Name of Officer Responsible for Action	Date Action to be Completed
1. Create a distribution list and take steps to expand the distribution of SESA studies and production data.	SESA	9/1/89
2. Prepare near- and long-term work plans aimed at setting research priorities, taking into account SESA's research strengths and available resources.	SESA	11/1/89
3. Propose to the Minister a limited pilot study to determine the feasibility of harmonization (cost, type of system, level of exactitude necessary, etc.).	SESA	11/1/89
4. Review the need for low-level aerial photography.	SESA	9/1/89
5. Proposal to the Minister of Plan that the technical advisor to MINIPLAN be transferred from the D.G. Statistique to the Direction General Conjoncture et Prevision Socio-economique.	ADO	10/1/89
6. Revise the terms of reference for the MINIPLAN advisor.	DAI/Advisor MINIPLAN	11/15/89

(Attach extra sheet if necessary)

APPROVALS

F. Date Of Mission Or AID/W Office Review Of Evaluation: (Month) (Day) (Year)

G. Approvals of Evaluation Summary And Action Decisions:

	Project/Program Officer	Representative of Borrower/Grantee	Evaluation Officer	Mission or AID/W Office Director
Name (Typed)	Paul R. Crawford		H.M. Patrick	James A. Graham
Signature	Paul R Crawford		1/2/90	James A. Graham
Date	1/3/90			

ABSTRACT

H. Evaluation Abstract (Do not exceed the space provided)

COSTS

I. Evaluation Costs

1. Evaluation Team Name	Affiliation	Contract Number OR TDY Person Days	Contract Cost OR TDY Cost (U.S. $)	Source of Funds

2. Mission/Office Professional Staff Person-Days (Estimate) _____

3. Borrower/Grantee Professional Staff Person-Days (Estimate) _____

Action Decisions Approved by Mission or AID/W Office Director	Name of Officer Responsible for Action	Date Action to be completed
7. Combine the remaining resources from the ex-MINIFINECO unit of ASPAP with those available for the MINIPLAN unit and use to strengthen the Economic Analysis Unit of MINIPLAN.	ADO	11/1/89
8. Recruit a new project officer who will assume project management responsibility for ASPAP.	ADO	7/31/89
9. Organize a semi-annual project implementation meeting, to be attended by the Mission Director, the Rwandan project director, a MINIPLAN representative, the USAID project officers, and the contractor representative.	ADO	11/15/89
10. Organize bimonthly meetings of the Group Technique Mixte.	ADO	11/15/89
11. Develop terms of reference for a Comite de Gestion, which would include GOR data users and would be set up in order to get the input from outsiders on ASPAP's research agenda and program.	SESA	11/15/89
12. Approve the 1989 Workplan/Local Cost PIL. This PIL will modify the Project's financial procedures to establish a system of advances, rather than reimbursements, as the basis for financing local costs.	ADO	8/31/89
13. Recruit a financial manager/controller to work under the direction of the SESA director.	SESA/ADO	11/15/89
14. Review the local cost accounting system with the objective of improving its informativeness for both SESA and USAID.	ADO/SESA	11/15/89
15. Incorporate non-recurrent costs (e.g. salaries) into the calculation of the GOR contribution (through a PIL).	ADO	10/30/89
16. Detail the GOR contribution to the project to date in terms of non-recurrent costs (e.g. who has worked on the project and their annual salaries).	SESA/ MINIPLAN	10/30/89
17. Detail GOR estimated recurrent cost needs over remaining life of the project, and establish a basis for a gradual increase in GOR coverage of recurrent costs (based on a realistic contribution by the GOR and expressed in francs, not in a percentage of total costs, in order to facilitate budgeting).	SESA/MINIPLAN ADO	10/30/89 the
18. Prepare a cable to the Assistant Administrator requesting that an exception be made in the case of ASPAP to enable the project to continue to pay salary supplements "primes".	ADO	10/30/89
19. Translate the entire evaluation into French.	ADO	9/1/89

ABSTRACT

H. Evaluation Abstract (Do not exceed the space provided)

The Rwanda Agricultural Surveys and Policy Analysis Project (ASPAP) has carried on and expanded the work of another project (ASAP), which ran from May 1981 to September 1987. The first project is considered to have been highly successful. Before it began, there had been no agricultural census in Rwanda and no objective attempt to collect basic agricultural statistics. As a direct result of ASAP, an effective national structure for agricultural data collection and analysis was in place by 1985. There are now annual surveys, and the methodology is being continuously refined to make the survey more efficient and more accurate.

Both projects have primarily supported the national agricultural statistics service, the Service des Enquêtes des Statistiques Agricoles (SESA), which has recently been elevated within the Ministry of Agriculture (MINAGRI) to the status of a division under the Secretary General. Donors regularly turn to SESA to conduct special studies, as well as to provide good quality data on the agricultural sector. All of this has occurred in the relatively short period of eight years.

While ASAP worked exclusively with SESA, ASPAP has also worked with statistical units in the Ministry of Finance and Economy (MINIFINECO) and the Ministry of Plan (MINIPLAN). The MINIFINECO component of ASPAP has involved support to the Sector Studies Division of the Direction Générale de la Politique Economique, and has enabled that unit to complete a rural commune recurrent cost study. The MINIPLAN component has involved support for the Direction des Enquêtes Statistiques for the analysis of data generated by a 1983 national household budget and consumption survey (ENBC).

ASPAP's designers intended to move beyond data collection to economic analysis. They wanted to see studies feeding into the policy-making process. ASPAP's purpose is "to improve policy formulation for the rural economy by improving the quality and increasing the quantity of the information base from which policy is formulated and by strengthening the institutions responsible for provision of such information" The inputs considered necessary to achieve the purpose consist of two long-term agricultural economists (84 person months), a number of short-term advisors (112 person-months), long-term training (8 masters degrees), short-term training (50 person-months), construction of a new wing on SESA headquarters, 14 vehicles, $146,000 worth of computers and software, and $900,000 contribution to local costs.

COSTS

I. Evaluation Costs

1. Evaluation Team

Name	Affiliation	Contract Number OR TDY Person Days	Contract Cost OR TDY Cost (U.S. $)	Source of Funds
Charles Steedman	Center for Research on Development	29	20,325	Project
Christine Elias	PSC	18	11,000	Project

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

3. Borrower/Grantee Professional Staff Person-Days (Estimate) 24

In most respects the ASPAP project is a very good one. It is nonetheless to be expected that there are unresolved issues and a few problems. these should not obscure the tremendous gains that have been made. Compared to what lies ahead, the accomplishments to date have been the easier ones. Having an impact on policy formulation will be a longer and more difficult process than ASPAP's designers envisaged. This is true in part because there are no obviously bad policies that are candidates for immediate change. There is also a wide gap between good data collection and sound analysis on the one hand and having high officials use the results to formulate policies on the other. In Rwanda there is increasing openness to the idea of using data in this fashion, but the gap is still quite large.

Summary of Evaluation Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations

A. SESA

1. Encourage wider distribution of SESA products. The results of a number of substantive studies have been published by SESA. However, distribution of SESA's reports should be much wider. A first step would be the circulation of a comprehensive annotated publications list. SESA should also consider publishing a discussion paper series in addition to its current working papers and submitting articles for publication in local journals, such as Dialogue. To aid in this effort, SESA should make maximum use of the desktop publishing capability it is in the process of developing. At the same time, no formal mechanism has yet been established to disseminate the recurrent agricultural production data collected seasonally by SESA. SESA should, therefore, publish and distribute seasonal bulletins of agricultural production statistics.

2. Set research priorities SESA's capacity to conduct special studies has been recognized by donors and others. To data, however, SESA's research activities have been conducted largely on an ad hoc basis. Moreover, there is a danger of placing too much emphasis on consulting services. SESA's research may ultimately be driven more by donor's agendas (and its own financial needs) than by rational research plans developed by SESA in collaboration with data users. SESA needs to set its research priorities which take into account SESA's research strengths and available resources, as well as data user needs. This would entail the preparation of near- and long-term work plans for SESA as a whole and for each analyst.

3. Submit revised "harmonization" proposal to MINAGRI. Within MINAGRI, both SESA and the Direction Générale de Production Agricole (DGPA) collect agricultural production statistics. SESA's data are considered to be reliable but do not cover Rwanda's 141 rural communes. The DGPA's data are, in fact, traditional estimates by extension personnel (monagris) at the commune level. SESA cannot match this level of disaggregation with its scientific methods at reasonable cost. While it is generally accepted that any duplication of effort should be eliminated, there is far less agreement on how to obtain reasonably accurate, yet affordable, commune data. SESA has spent considerable time trying to develop a "harmonized" data collection system. Several proposals have been discussed, but the problem is still unresolved. To address the problem, SESA should propose a pilot test -- for example, SESA supervised and planned data collection using monagris in a single prefecture. The experience should be carefully evaluated, taking into account SESA's financial and manpower limitations, monagri performance, and the projected cost of expanding the program nationwide.

4. Reconsider aerial photography proposal. Aerial photography was envisioned in the original project design. The Project Technical Group (PTG), which drafts the annual work plan, is not convinced of its appropriateness for local conditions and therefore this activity has not been implemented. The evaluation team recommends reconsidering the latest proposal to use a low-altitude aerial photo sampling technique developed in Kenya. Representatives of two firms based in Nairobi might be brought to Kigali to explain their aerial point sampling methodology and to demonstrate their photo interpretation techniques. With the information obtained from these firms, staffing and budgetary costs to implement the survey can be weighed against expected benefits.

B. MINIFINECO Unit

Consolidate ASPAP support to the ex-MINIFINECO unit and MINIPLAN. The Sector Studies Division of the Direction Générale de la Politique Economique was dissolved in a GOR ministerial reorganization in April 1989 and most of its personnel and materiel resources were transferred to MINIPLAN. By that time the MINIFINECO unit has virtually used up (and in some cases exceeded) its allotment of project resources. The evaluation feels that the connection between the ex-MINIFINECO unit, and ASPAP should now be terminated. They recommended that any remaining resources be combined with those available for the MINIPLAN unit and used to strengthen a new, combined unit in the Economic Analysis Department of MINIPLAN.

C. MINIPLAN

1. Seek to transfer to LTTA elsewhere within MINIPLAN. To date, USAID (through ASPAP and other projects) has invested seven person-years to process and analyze only a part of the data collected under the rural household consumption study. Most of this work was actually done by project-funded TA. Even though USAID repeatedly requested, and MINIPLAN repeatedly promised to provide counterparts, a mere five person-months of the seven years were covered. As a result, no one remains at MINIPLAN who is trained to process data for the urban survey or to continue analyzing the rural data.

The most recent ASPAP contribution is a long-term agricultural economist who arrived in November 1988. MINIPLAN specified the following areas in which he would work: ENBC data analysis; planning and coordination of other surveys; and training of Rwandan staff. In fact, he has worked exclusively on cleaning, not analyzing, the ENBC urban data and has yet to be assigned a counterpart. In our view, this perpetuates the tremendously inefficient use of a Ph.D. economist.

USAID should review the current situation with the newly-appointed Minister and Secretary General of MINIPLAN at an early date, proposing to shift the LTTA to the Direction Générale de la Politique Economique.

2. Encourage productive utilization of existing MINIPLAN data. MINIPLAN has collected a large quantity of data, much of which may never be analyzed. ASPAP's involvement with MINIPLAN should be geared towards making better use of available data and should discourage the channelling of scarce resources into new surveys with hardly reference to the old ones.

D. Project Management

It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that ASPAP would be an even better project and would progress with fewer hitches if USAID/Rwanda were able to pay greater attention to several details of project management. This is not to say that all of the project's management problems can be laid at the door of the local mission. The obligation to use contracting and other management services located at the regional office in Nairobi has hindered project implementation.

1. Organize semi-annual project management meetings. Some part of the difficulty in project management can be attributed to poor communication between the USAID mission and Rwandan officials responsible for the project on the one hand and within the USAID mission on the other. The semi-annual meetings should be attended by the USAID Director, the Rwandan Project Director, the USAID project officers, the MINIPLAN unit representative, and the Contractor's representative. There should be an agenda drawn up and communicated to participants in advance. It should deal with recent project accomplishments, unresolved problems and plans for the next six months. This is in no way intended to replace PTG meetings or the annual work plan. The semi-annual meeting should focus attention on implementation problems and hasten their solution.

2. Simplify key project working documents. The annual work plan submission and the Project Implementation Letter which approves it should be simplified and clarified.

3. Improve project monitoring. The ADO office needs to find ways to keep closer track of project disbursements so that problems can be identified before they become too serious and so that unexpended funds in PIOs and PILs can be de-committed for use in other ways.

4. Relieve Contractor representative of administrative burden. As it improves its monitoring, ADO should attempt to relieve the Contractor's representative of administrative burdens that fall outside of contract implementation.

5. Locally hire a second assistant for Contractor representative. The Contractor's representative should spend more time on substantive work and less on administration. He should hire locally a second part-time assistant who would handle the logistical needs of STTA, accounting and monitoring duties, administration of the training program, etc.

6. Produce quarterly, rather than semi-annual, Contractor representative reports. The Contractor representative's semi-annual reports are complete, very well-done, and informative. They take too much of his time, however. Much shorter quarterly reports of 4-5 pages in length, plus tables, that focus on recent accomplishments, immediate problems, proposed solutions, and plans for the near future would be quite satisfactory.

E. Local Operating Costs

Local costs have been a matter of concern. In early 1989 a cash-flow crisis over local costs brought to a head two problems: (i) inadequate monitoring and delayed reimbursement of local cost expenditures from the project budget; and (ii) the difficulty of obtaining the GOR counterpart contribution to these operating costs. A comprehensive solution might include the following actions:

1. Reduce expectations for GOR cash contributions. The PP specified that the GOR share of local costs would processively increase, reaching at least 80 percent of local costs by 1990-91. The GOR does not have the resources to meet these targets. Nevertheless, since the GOR is paying salaries of project personnel as expected, there is little danger of the total GOR contribution falling below 25 percent of project costs. However, it would be appropriate to (i) insist on a detailed accounting of project staff salaries paid by the GOR to date, and (ii) push for SESA's inclusion in the GOR recurrent budget, rather than the development budget, now that SESA is a division of MINAGRI.

2. Eliminate percentage basis of GOR contributions. GOR cash contributions to local operating costs should be calculated on reasonable expectations of what GOR budgets may allocate, rather than on increasing percentages of the local cost total. Greater effort should be made to identify local costs that the GOR has actually paid for the MINIPLAN unit and to documenting these contributions.

3. Consider reallocation of project resources. A reallocation of project resources to supplement the current budget for local operating costs will be necessary in the last year of the project. If the aerial photography option were not pursued, there would be a saving of $250,000 which could be moved to local costs. A better alternative would be to cut the $120,000 budgeted for the University of Pittsburgh for in-country seminars at least in half (two seminars instead of four), if not entirely.

4. Improve monitoring of local costs. Immediate attention should be given to local cost budgeting and accounting for the project, which is entrusted to SESA. A better and more rigorous system appears to be needed. There are discrepancies and inconsistencies in the local cost accounting documents available at SESA. Whether the problem resides in the system being used or in a lack of accounting skills is not immediately evident. An outside consultant or accounting firm could be retained for a short period, two to three weeks to assess the current system and the skills of accounting staff, design a new system if necessary, install it at SESA, and train staff in its use.

F. Institutions

The PP discussion of the institutional framework of ASPAP leaves questions unanswered: (a) In practice, no senior GOR body provides guidance for ASPAP activities. (b) Project management has been skewed towards administrative matters at the expense of project content and direction.

1. Create a project management committee. The GOR institution to which the PTG was to be accountable, the Interministerial Coordinating Committee for Rural Development (CIC/RD), has had no role in ASPAP. Consideration should be given to creating a comité de gestion, such as exists for many other projects. This committee would meet at least twice a year to give direction to project research activities and approve the annual work plan before submission to USAID. It would also approve an annual report and would arbitrate, if necessary, between the project units.

2. Seek concensus on role of the PTG. The PTG mandate specified in the ProAg places a clear emphasis on overall planning of project activity and on substantive discussion of methodologies and results. In actuality, the PTG has met infrequently and has devoted almost all of its time to the division of project resources among the three participating units. The role of the PTG should be redefined and agreed to by USAID, SESA, MINIPLAN, and the newly created project management committee.

G. The Next Project

ASPAP has little more than two years to run and cannot be expected to achieve its policy-impact objectives in that time. A successor project should be designed in mid-1990.