

November 7, 1980

Mr. Constantine Michalopoulos
PPC/EA

Costas,

Please read this so that I can make any suggested changes Monday. I will be out of town from Tuesday afternoon, effectively through the 20th. I think this substantially covers the topics assigned to me and should be sufficient for the DCC report.



Bob Berg
AAA/PPC/E

Attachment: Draft for the 1981 DCC
Annual Report

cc: ✓ Nena Vreeland (w/attachment)
Dick Blue (w/attachment)

EVALUATION

((NOTE: This draft will address A.I.D. evaluation efforts and the DAC discussion on aid effectiveness. The other issues mentioned under the topic of "Evaluation," namely, early warning system, DAC joint reviews and evaluation of U.N. programs, will need to be supplied elsewhere since the A.I.D. Office of Evaluation has not been asked to be directly concerned with those subjects.))

A.I.D. Evaluation Efforts

1980 was a year of major activity in the field of evaluation for A.I.D. There has been important focus on evaluation, expansion of coverage, major publications and a major assessment of the entire evaluation field in A.I.D. These activities have involved all levels in the organization.

The programming of evaluation activities has become more systematic and thoughtful. A.I.D. now assesses annually its need for evaluation activity. All levels of management are involved in this. All bureaus with program responsibility compile an evaluation plan for activity under their authority. For the regional bureaus this means a careful dialogue with field missions and, in turn, this often means dialogue with host country officials concerning the carrying out of plans spelled out in project agreements. During 1980 A.I.D. bureaus took several steps to make sure the plans are reasonable to start with and are then carried out in good order. Several initiatives from regional

bureaus took place to assess country programs (Pakistan, Portugal, Tunisia, Senegal) and to look at policy issues of particular interest to particular regions. There was also an increase in the coordination within regional bureau programs of the substance of individual project evaluations so that region-specific policy issues could be enhanced by the decentralized evaluation activities of the regions.

All of this has resulted in a better managed system of evaluation during project implementation.

In last year's report it was announced that an effort was being launched to evaluate the impacts of selected development activities. One year's work has been completed and this has formed the most visible improvement in Agency evaluation activities. This effort was initiated by A.I.D.'s Administrator. It drew not only on the central evaluation office of A.I.D., but upon personnel throughout the Agency. The central premises of the impact evaluation programs were the following:

-- An emphasis on field observation of project results. The focus of examination was on socio-economic impacts.

-- Participation of A.I.D. professionals and interdisciplinary teams.

-- Every effort is made to choose team members who have not been previously associated with the activity to be evaluated.

- Brief, clearly written reports.
- Objectivity and independence of evaluation teams, and
- Responsibility through signed reports.

Work centered on specific topics identified through a consultative process with senior Agency executives. Most of the work involved impact evaluation of rural roads, rural electrification, rural water supply, rural health and small-medium scale irrigation. Major work also took place on agricultural research and on live-stock projects carried out among pastoral peoples.

Late in the fiscal year work commenced on evaluation of education projects and initial work on evaluation of certain private and voluntary organization projects and programs.

The general procedure for such studies is as follows: a review is made of the general portfolio to learn the extent of the portfolio and to identify major reports and evaluations done to date. Where useful, discussion papers are commissioned to raise issues which ought to be evaluated. Eight such discussion papers have been published. Then, in close consultation with constituent parts of the Agency, a sampling of the portfolio is made to select representative projects for evaluation. Criteria for selection include factors such as regional distribution, representativeness and potential impact. Ideally, a sector study program consists of at least two projects from each of A.I.D.'s four regional areas of concentration, and represents a range

of the type of projects implemented in that sector. Teams are then formulated to cover the major disciplines and area knowledge involved. Teams are given brief training in a workshop aimed at developing project-specific scopes of study which also answer to the need for addressing common concerns. Field work is then undertaken (usually of about three weeks' duration), a draft is prepared and carefully reviewed in the field. Once the team returns to Washington there is also careful review by the bureau involved, the Office of Evaluation and, this year, by the Administrator. Final responsibility for the content of the report remains with the team. Project reports are published individually. A sectoral summary report is then prepared which focuses on the policy and program implications of the foregoing process.

In the first year's work, 27 projects in 20 countries were evaluated. The total U. S. dollar contribution of the evaluated projects is \$420 million.

It is worth noting that a major effort has been made to publish the results of these studies and evaluations. Indeed, A.I.D. is unique in the donor community for the aggressiveness of its publications programs in evaluation. Publications are circulated widely within the Agency, to private and voluntary organizations, to other donors, to colleagues in the Legislative Branch and to a wide range of academicians and institutions. The demand for this material has been quite large, particularly considering the

fact that A.I.D. has not taken a number of steps which it could to market the studies. (There have been explorations aimed at the commercial publication of some of the published work.) The evaluation publications of A.I.D. are as follows:

AGENCY-WIDE EVALUATION PUBLICATIONS
(as of October 1, 1980)

PROGRAM EVALUATION DISCUSSION PAPERS

- No. 1: Reaching the Rural Poor: Indigenous Health Practitioners are There Already (March 1979), 2nd printing 1979, 3rd printing 1980. (French and Spanish versions are in process.)
- No. 2: New Directions Rural Roads (March 1979), 2nd printing 1979, 3rd printing 1980. (French and Spanish versions in process.)
- No. 3: Rural Electrification: Linkages and Justifications (April 1979), 2nd printing 1979, 3rd printing 1980. (French and Spanish versions in process.)
- No. 4: Policy Directions for Rural Water Supply in Developing Countries (April 1979), 2nd printing 1979, 3rd printing 1980. (French and Spanish versions in process.)
- No. 5: Study of Family Planning Program Effectiveness (April 1979), 2nd printing 1979, 3rd printing 1980.
- No. 6: The Sociology of Pastoralism and African Livestock Development (May 1979), 2nd printing 1979, 3rd printing 1980. (French version in process.)
- No. 7: Socio-Economic and Environmental Impacts of Low-Volume Rural Roads--A Review of the Literature (February 1980). (Expurgated and unexpurgated versions published due to restrictions of IBRD and IDB.)
- No. 8: Assessing the Impact of Development Projects on Women (May 1980). (French and Spanish versions in process.)
- No. 9: The Impact of Irrigation on Development: Issues for a Comprehensive Evaluation Study (publication planned October 1980).

EVALUATION REPORTS

Program Evaluations

- No. 1: Family Planning Program Effectiveness: Report of a Workshop (December 1979).
- No. 2: A.I.D.'s Role in Indonesian Family Planning: A Case Study with General Lessons for Foreign Assistance (December 1979). (French and Spanish versions in process.)
- No. 3: Third Evaluation of the Thailand National Family Planning Program (February 1980).
- No. 4: The Workshop on Pastoralism and African Livestock Development (June 1980). (French version in process.)

Project Impact Evaluations

- No. 1: Colombia: Small Farmer Market Access (December 1979), 2nd printing 1980.
- No. 2: Kitale Maize: The Limits of Success (May 1980), 2nd printing 1980.
- No. 3: The Potable Water Project in Rural Thailand (May 1980).
- No. 4: Philippine Small Scale Irrigation (May 1980).
- No. 5: Kenya Rural Water Supply: Program, Progress, Prospects (June 1980).
- No. 6: Impact of Rural Roads in Liberia (June 1980).
- No. 7: Effectiveness and Impact of the CARE/Sierra Leone Rural Penetration Roads Projects (June 1980).
- No. 8: Morocco: Food Aid and Nutrition Education (August 1980).
- No. 9: Senegal: The Sine Saloum Rural Health Care Project (publication planned October 1980).
- No. 10: Tunisia: Care Water Projects (publication planned October 1980)

SPECIAL STUDIES

- No. 1: The Socio-Economic Context of Fuelwood Use in Small Rural Communities (August 1980). (French and Spanish versions in process.)
- No. 2: Water Supply and Diarrhea: Guatemala Revisited (August 1980).

PROGRAM DESIGN AND EVALUATION METHODS

Managers Guide to Data Collection (November 1979), 2nd printing of 2500 copies done at request AID Training staff, 1980. (French and Spanish versions in process.)

Of particular interest has been a strong record of utilization of the results of these evaluations. A large number of programs have been directly improved. Follow-on investments have been encouraged within A.I.D. and by other donors through publication of successful projects. Developing countries and A.I.D. have agreed to postpone or drastically redesign proposals which might have repeated projects which evaluations showed less than successful. Country and project strategies in population, rural electrification, nutrition and other areas were changed due to evaluations completed. There have been a number of discussions between field missions and developing countries based on evaluation reports done in other areas. In all, the level and frequency of utilization has markedly increased.

On the basis of this record, A.I.D. has firmly decided to continue impact evaluation work. It is expected that the level of activity will increase in the future.

At the same time, A.I.D. has carefully assessed the effectiveness of its entire evaluation activities through a task force appointed by the Administrator. The conclusions of the task force were presented to the Administrator late in CY '80. The task force noted that a high level of evaluation, quantitatively, took place in A.I.D. than in almost any other part of the federal government. It recommended that fewer evaluations take place but that the quality of them increase. This recommendation was particularly aimed at the process evaluations carried out on a decentralized basis in A.I.D.

The task force also recommended that a stronger effort be made to program evaluations so that the cumulative impact of the efforts be greater. Similarly, the task force recognized the more complex nature of evaluation and recommended an increase in the level of training in evaluation given to A.I.D. employees. These recommendations are expected to be favorably acted upon shortly.

The result of all this activity has been noted by observers of the Agency. Four Congressional Committee reports lauded the major improvements made by A.I.D. in evaluation. In addition, A.I.D. has received letters from all over the country, particularly from professors who have found A.I.D. evaluation reports to be of great use in teaching development.

DAC Discussion of Aid Effectiveness

The first major meeting on aid effectiveness which the DAC has sponsored in over half a decade took place in April 1980. The U. S. performed a major role at that meeting. The meeting focused both on efforts of donors to evaluation assistance and on activities to inform the general public about international assistance. There was also discussion about the relationship of these two topics.

During the discussion it became clear that a number of DAC members follow evaluation practices similar to those of A.I.D. This, of course, is not surprising as there has been close cooperation between the donors over a long period of time. Thus, Canada, Germany and the Netherlands all spoke of their use of logical framework system (the method of design and evaluation pioneered by A.I.D.), the importance of benchmark data and the need for scheduled project evaluations. There were, however, a number of major DAC countries as yet without formal evaluation systems.

The United States contributed the main paper and introduced the topic of the use of developing country evaluation systems. The U. S. spoke with concern about the deleterious impact that separate donor planning and evaluation requirements can have on the public administration capabilities of recipients. The U. S. called on the DAC and its members for policies that place maximum reliance on recipients for needed evaluation work.

There was also considerable discussion about the need to better demonstrate the cumulative effectiveness of donor programs.

There were several outcomes to this meeting:

-- The DAC Chairman, believing that evaluation was one of the most important topics discussed by the DAC in 1980, called for the formulation of an ongoing informal group on evaluation within the DAC. This group is currently being formulated. The United States has promised full cooperation toward this initiative.

-- At the request of DAC members, there is a major and comprehensive chapter on aid effectiveness in the 1980 DAC Chairman's report. The chapter emphasizes the difficulty of assessing effectiveness, but points to several ways this can be done. It concludes by noting that good analysis will scale political expectations to a more realistic base and will highlight the difficulties of important development activities.

-- The concern by the United States and others that evaluation within developing countries be highlighted has led to the compilation, under United States leadership, of a directory of evaluation authorities throughout the world. This is but the start of a networking between national authorities. This concern by the U. S. has spurred major multilateral organizations to enhance their own activities regarding the evaluation authorities of developing countries.