ATTACHMENT I

SAVE THE CHILDREN

CHILD SURVIVAL V
HEADQUARTERS PROJECT

FINAL EVALUATION - PHASE 1

Agency for International Development

Cooperative Agreement No. OTR-0500-A-00-9149

Submitted By:
Roy I. Miller

July, 1995

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary ii

Introduction 1

Background 1

Assess ProMIS based on the DIP and the Midterm Evaluations 2

- The DIP 2
- The First Midterm Evaluation 4
- The Second Midterm Evaluation 5

Develop criteria with SC staff 6

Quality and usefulness of the ProMIS User's Guide 8

Summarize the achievements in the development of the ProMIS software 8

Next steps for software dissemination and future use 9

- Dissemination 9
- Future use 11

Appendix A: References 12

Appendix B: Persons Interviewed 12

Appendix C: Scope of work 13

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Phase 1 of the final evaluation of Save The Children's Child Survival V-Headquarters Project is limited to an assessment of the ProMIS software developed as part of this project. Initially, ProMIS was envisioned as a user-friendly, field-based computer system to manage the large volume of data emerging from the type of intervention employed by Save The Children (SC), an intervention calling for an initial census of all individuals in a designated impact area and the subsequent follow-up of target groups within that area in need of selected services.

The ProMIS software meets the original criteria specified in the Detailed Implementation Plan for the project and has been modified successfully in response to recommendations made during two, distinct midterm evaluations. It is easy to use; it is designed to protect the data against computer and/or electricity failure in developing countries; it offers flexibility in defining geographical areas as well as services to be monitored, and it has an extract feature allowing users interested in more advanced statistical analysis to extract the data and transfer it to a statistical software package.

A series of criteria, developed with the SC staff, can be applied in independent evaluations of other SC field projects using the software. These criteria are expressed as questions to be asked of system users covering attributes of the system including: timeliness, accuracy, reliability, completeness, cost and usefulness.

The operation of the system is sufficiently straightforward that the reviewer was able to explore ProMIS without using the ProMIS User's Guide but, when questions did arise, the Guide served well as a reference in that it explained the issues giving rise to those questions.

In order to address the important question "What's Next?", an issue raised in both midterm evaluations needs clarification. ProMIS was designed for use in the particular type of intervention used by SC and, only occasionally, by a few other PVOs. Any plans for further development and/or dissemination of ProMIS should assure that the system is disseminated in the type of setting for which it was designed. ProMIS was not envisioned as a universal panacea for the data management problems of the PVO community -- it was envisioned as a tool to help SC manage data emerging from a program built around a village census.

Three possible courses of action are identified for the further dissemination of ProMIS: a) SC distributes the source and object code for the program but has no further obligation to service other users, b) SC continues to be responsible for periodic modifications of the software and for service to other users with funding from USAID or through funds provided by the other PVOs using the system, and c) responsibility for the software is transferred to a third party who is given the right to charge potential users for training, service and/or program modification.

In the future, three aspects of ProMIS could be explored: a) use of ProMIS in the absence of a parallel manual system, b) enhancement of the software to enable more diverse report generation including graphics, and c) analysis of the data stored within ProMIS to address questions which have not been satisfactorily answered by the international development community because of a lack of high quality, complete, time series data on a single geographical area.

INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes Phase One of the Final Evaluation of Save The Children's (SC) USAID funded project known as Child Survival V-Headquarters Special Projects. The Scope of Work for Phase 1 was limited to an assessment of the ProMIS software as observed at SC Headquarters. Five specific objectives were identified for this four day effort:

1) Assess the computerized system ProMIS based on targets established in the Detailed Implementation Plan (DIP), midterm evaluation recommendations and specifications developed over time -- from the original set to those developed after the midterm evaluation;

2) Develop a set of criteria with SC staff and assess the effectiveness of ProMIS to maintain longitudinal data in an easy user-friendly manner;

3) Assess the quality and usefulness of the ProMIS User's Guide;

4) Summarize overall achievements in the development of the ProMIS software package -- both expected positive and negative effects of project activities;

5) Provide recommendations on next steps for software dissemination and possible future uses of ProMIS;

This report will address each of these points and, in addition, comment on ways in which Phase 2 of this evaluation might be carried out as effectively as possible.

BACKGROUND

Early in 1989, Save The Children (SC) submitted a letter proposal to what was then the FVA/PVC office of USAID which led to a highly unusual award for a "headquarters" grant to enable SC to improve headquarters support to field offices, to carry out a special project to develop computer software to manage the data in the field which is so much a part of the SC approach to community development, and to document SC's methods to make them more accessible to other PVOs.

SC was a pioneer in applying an approach to working at community level built around a complete census of a designated "impact" area and the subsequent follow-up of individuals in the target groups to insure that those individuals receive essential services. Using rosters of beneficiaries growing out of the initial census and maintained through systematic home visits, service providers in the "impact" area are able to target scarce time and resources to individuals and/or villages with particular needs and/or special problems. At the time of the letter proposal, this approach was implemented through a manual (paper and pencil) system in most countries; however, in one SC field office a computerized system had been developed to manage the high volumes of data that this approach generates.

The success of that system stimulated demand for a computerized version of the manual system; however, the initial system was not designed for widespread export and was built using software that had a tendency to "crash" and lose data in developing country settings where electricity is inconsistent and hardware failures not uncommon. As the information system plays such a key role in SC interventions, a part of SC 5 was dedicated to the development of a more durable and generalizable software package which could be used in any project setting based on the SC approach to intervention.

This report focuses on that computer system, known now as ProMIS.

SCOPE - ITEM 1: Assess ProMIS based on the DIP and the Midterm Evaluations

1) Assess progress based on targets

The DIP

The targets in the DIP for developing ProMIS appear on page 6 of the document. The short duration of Phase 1 of this evaluation precluded tracking the progress by the dates of the achievements as specified; however, the initial software was developed and field tested, suggestions for major modifications grew out of both the field tests and the two midterm evaluations and these modifications were made and incorporated into the latest version of the program.

As it currently operates, the software meets the original criteria specified in the appendix to the DIP.

a) The software is easy to use.

Within 15 minutes of sitting in front of a computer with the system operating, this reviewer was able to grasp the fundamentals of its operation and perform the basic functions of data entry and roster and report generation. Once the concept of operation is understood, the menus and screen guides help the user find his/her way through the system.

b) The system is written in a common computer language and is expandable.

ProMIS is written in CLIPPER V, a programming language created for use with the popular dBASE file structure. Anyone with the knowledge of dBASE can access the data independent of the system, if necessary. Most competent programmers can learn to work with CLIPPER readily.

One of the more interesting features of the current system is the ease with which it can be expanded using the generic module capability following the mid-term evaluation. This will be discussed in more detail in discussing that evaluation.

c) The system will be faster than the system currently in place.

As the system designated as "current" when the DIP was written was not accessible to this reviewer, no comparison based on speed was possible. However, on a 486/50 laptop, there were no troubling delays in any of the operations of the ProMIS system.

f) The system will have a flexible geographic structure.

During program installation the user specifies the nature of the geographical structure of the impact area including the number and names of the geographical levels needed to characterize that area.

g) The safety of the files is insured by design.

The program is written so that the data files (and index files) are open for the shortest time possible during data entry thus protecting them well against power outages and surges. The use of the dBASE file structure instead of the structure built on a series of pointers as used in the prior version facilitates reconstruction of the data in the rare event of a hardware failure at a critical moment.

h) The ability to extract data for analysis.

Anyone who knows dBASE can extract data for analysis quite easily. The current version of the program has an export feature to help non-dBASE users extract the data. However, there is on weakness in this export feature. ProMIS is elegant in that it saves only the minimal amount of data necessary to calculate interesting indicators with which to monitor program performance, such as the vaccination coverage rate or the percentage of children malnourished. For example, ProMIS stores the date and weight of the child at each weighing. When the nutritional status of the child is needed for a report within ProMIS, the system recalculates that derived variable. Upon export, only the raw data stored is exported. The user would have to recalculate the nutritional status outside of ProMIS. (Or, the user would have to recalculate the age at time of vaccination outside of ProMIS.) For an experienced computer user, this should not be a problem; however, for some users in the field, the export option might be more "user friendly" if it could export some of the calculated variables as well.

ProMIS itself is limited in its built-in statistical and graphical capability, an attribute of the system which led to the recommendation that the export feature for non-dBASE users be created.

i) The system will use current system data from the old system.

This question was not examined during this review.

The First Midterm Evaluation (July 1992)

Child Survival V and, therefore, ProMIS was subjected to two midterm evaluations six months apart. The first was the "regular" midterm evaluation done for all USAID grants to SC while the second was a special evaluation initiated by FHA/PVC/CSH to explore the special nature of Child Survival V; that is, the fact that it was a headquarters grant.

The first evaluation, completed in July of 1992, featured a number of "major findings" as well as "recommendations" pertaining to ProMIS. Some of these findings and recommendations addressed the wisdom of the "impact" area census as compared to other methods of collecting data such as a survey. Discussion of this issue is beyond the scope of this report which can (and should) address only the question of whether ProMIS performs as envisioned when the census approach is taken. Regarding ProMIS itself, the evaluation found that the SC Headquarters based system was "not customized to the reporting needs of the field office", led to "frequent delays in the solution of operational problems", allowed "only one data entry terminal which has unnecessarily prolonged the time needed to complete data entry", and "program managers ... make little use of the computerized data".

The first two "findings" cut to the heart of an issue of importance for USAID as well as for SC; specifically, is it better to invest in one system to be shared among somewhat diverse users or is it better to let each user develop a custom system. These two "findings" identify two good arguments for the latter choice of allowing each user to develop a custom system. However, the current version of ProMIS goes a long way towards alleviating some of the basis for these arguments in the SC case. The new version enables the user to create new modules quickly and without the need for on-site programming skills and the export feature allows the user to move the data into other software for further analysis or the generation of additional reports. Nonetheless, ProMIS itself still offers only a limited range of reports, a limitation that may continue to be a problem in some field sites where computer skills in other software packages are limited. Regarding the time delays, the new version seems to suffer from relatively few operational problems in the field (based on responses to a questionnaire administered by SC to its field offices in June of this year). Nonetheless, should problems arise, the fact that there is currently only one programmer at SC Headquarters with in-depth knowledge of the software, could cause delays.

In presenting its arguments, the midterm evaluation ignored the often observed reality which follows the decision to develop customized systems. Frequently, when different systems people set out to accomplish similar ends, there is much duplication of effort and, therefore, unnecessary expense. Also, some (many) customized efforts fail altogether due to the inadequacies of available on-site staff or, more common, their departure from their field posting. It is the opinion

of this reviewer that in the SC case, where similar programs are mounted in all field offices, the benefits to be derived from having one HQ developed system which works outweigh the disadvantages associated with independent, custom efforts at system development. (As this issue arises in the second midterm evaluation, it will be discussed on more detail later in this report.)

The problem of being able to enter data from only one data terminal remains. (This problem arises due to the mechanism embedded in the program to identify and keep track of individuals. The program assigns a hidden, internal identifier to each individual during data entry. If the program was run separately on two computers, the uniqueness of those identifiers would be lost.) Following the midterm review, a merge routine was written to enable the entry of data at two work stations; however, subsequent changes in the data file structure to enable the user to create new modules renders that routine inoperable because it cannot know, in advance, what new modules the user has defined and, therefore, it cannot know what to merge. (Flexibility in one area is the enemy of flexibility in another!) Following discussions of this issue with the SC System Designer, this reviewer concluded that in situations where data entry is backlogged, steps could be taken to allow the merger of data entered from multiple computers by a skilled computer person using dBASE software (or other software which uses dBASE files). In situation where it becomes necessary to use more than one terminal, the two (or three or four) separate ProMIS data bases so created could be forwarded to SC Headquarters for merging or merged on-site by an experienced data base person who understood ProMIS. As long as there are relatively few instances where multiple data entry is required, this stop-gap measure could help field offices overcome this software limitation.

Finally, the fact that program managers make little use of the data may still be a problem. Without more extensive contact with the field, it is difficult to assess either the magnitude of this problem or the reasons for it. However, on can speculate that since the SC policy has been to run both the manual and computer systems in parallel, field offices concentrate on the manual system which governs field operations and puts comparatively little time into understanding the power of aggregating the data offered by the computer. In discussing next steps for software dissemination, this reviewer will make some suggestions that will facilitate greater use of the system in the field.

The specific recommendations regarding ProMIS made in the first midterm evaluation have been addressed by the SC staff. As noted, a facility to export data has been built, the capacity to create new modules has been added facilitating the addition of new variables; however, there remains some limitations on the ability of the user to generate custom reports from his/her own modules.

The Second Midterm Evaluation (January 1993)

The second evaluation, completed in January of 1993, concluded that "ProMIS met the specifications as originally drawn-up by the Health Unit and the PC Group". Due to the special nature of this evaluation (its focus on the efficacy of a Headquarters grant), the report went beyond this simple assessment to address the issues of whether ProMIS as designed

accomplishes what SC had set out to do, whether it is sustainable and whether it can (and should) be exported to other PVOs.

The second midterm evaluation team concluded that, in fact, ProMIS "accomplished what it set out to do, particularly in demonstrating that with an adequate Health Information System, equity in health care can be achieved" (p. 11). The evaluation team went on to address a number of broader questions, relevant to their charge to consider the efficacy of a Headquarters grant. Specifically, the evaluation team turns to the question of sustainability of a computerized system such as ProMIS and its application by other PVOs.

The team concluded that the system would collapse without continuing support from SC. This reviewer has heard the same argument applied -- with reason -- to most interventions in developing countries built around an infusion of technical assistance and/or commodities not available locally. USAID, in general, and the PVO community, in particular, has applied a variety of effective strategies for avoiding the collapse of an intervention following the withdrawal of external assistance including the purposeful transfer of skills to local residents during the implementation phase and the institution of cost-recovery mechanisms to enable local communities to take over the financing of important activities and the purchase of needed inputs. The special skills and equipment required to sustain the operation of a computer-based system call for extraordinary efforts along these lines. Although not based on hard and fast evidence, this reviewer shares the skepticism of the midterm evaluation team regarding the possibilities of local communities to keep skilled computer users at home and to generate the resources necessary to maintain the hardware required to maintain a computer system.

The team goes on to suggest that SC experiment with simpler community based information systems. This reviewer supports the notion that the PVO community needs simpler information systems; however, it is not clear that SC, perhaps, the leading PVO when it comes to the type of system represented by ProMIS should be the organization charged with experimentation with other systems too. This reviewer believes that USAID should continually encourage different PVOs to experiment with a variety of information systems and should develop a "lore" of information systems for community-based interventions which would guide PVOs in selecting appropriate strategies depending on the settings in which they are working.

The specific recommendations of the team pertaining to ProMIS address the issue of the dissemination of the system more than the issue of the quality of ProMIS itself. As this subject will be addressed in the last section of this report, no more will be said here.

SCOPE - ITEM 2: Develop criteria with SC staff

Initially, three questions summarize what SC and USAID need to know to assess the effectiveness of ProMIS.

a) To what degree does the software do what it what was originally envisioned (as well as the additions to that original vision growing out of the mid-term evaluation)?

b) Does the software, as it exists today, work well in the SC field offices and does it meet their needs?

c) Is there a larger role for the software today (not envisioned six years ago) within Save the Children, the PVO community or for USAID?

During conversations with the SC staff, the focus for developing criteria was narrowed a bit to address criteria which might be applied during the evaluations of the other USAID funded SC field projects currently using ProMIS. Thus, the remainder of this section of the report presents questions to guide evaluators of field projects in their assessment of the role of the ProMIS system in those projects. (The criteria themselves introduce the questions and are shown in upper case letters.)

1) TIMELINESS - As currently designed, is the field office able to keep the data base current? What is the lag time between the time the sheets from which data entry is done arrives at the computer site and the time the data is in the computer?

2) ACCURACY - When rosters are printed from the ProMIS system and compared to the roster maintained manually, are there many corrections that have to be made in the computer system (what is the frequency and nature of the corrections?) and, similarly, does the computer system help field workers identify problems in their own rosters.

3) RELIABILITY - Are there "bugs" within the system which are not yet corrected? Are there other problems (for example, the limitation to one data entry terminal) which cannot be solved with available local support?

4) COMPLETENESS - Are there data elements of your manual system which cannot be captured in ProMIS? Are there activities included in your program which are not tracked by either the computer system or the manual system?

4) COST - Approximately what percentage of all staff time is dedicated to operating the system (and what percentage of your budget?) and what level of individual is required to make it work? Have you derived measurable savings from having implemented the system?

5) USEFULNESS - Are the reports (not the rosters) generated by ProMIS printed out, are they used (if so, for what?), and are they returned to the villages for their review?

6) USEFULNESS - Has the data within the system been used in any kind of special inquiry; for example, to compare the vaccination status of malnourished children to those of well-nourished children? (If not, why not?)

7) USEFULNESS - What does the system add (if anything) to your ability to help villages that the manual system alone cannot provide?

8) OTHER - How might the system be improved to make it more useful for you (for example, more extensive reports, a graphic interface, linkages between the modules, etc.)?

If this set of questions is used in the field, the interviewer should be encouraged to probe the respondents. This set of questions is not likely to yield quantifiable results to be subjected to statistical analysis. Thus, full explanation of the answers should be sought, even if the interviewer must prompt the respondent.

SCOPE - ITEM 3: Quality and usefulness of the ProMIS User's Guide

Due to the short duration of Phase 1 of the Final Evaluation of the Child Survival V-Headquarters grant, very little use was made of the User's Guide. As noted earlier, in order to get into the system quickly, the author of this report relied on a brief introduction by the designer of system. With that introduction, it was quite easy to access all aspects of the system and reference to the User's Guide was limited. It should be noted, however, that shortly after this reviewer presented a series of questions to the system designer, the reviewer discovered all of the answers in the Guide.

Upon further scrutiny of the Guide in order to respond to this item in the Scope of Work, this reviewer concluded that the Guide is a complete and understandable reference for ProMIS users. It is important to realize that the Guide is intended as just such a reference, a guide to the software. It does not and was never intended to address broader issues surrounding the system such as the appropriate context for its use or the steps required in the field to create a timely and error-free flow of data from the villages to the computer. And, given its current length, this is as it should be.

SCOPE - ITEM 4 Summarize the achievements in the development of the ProMIS software

The ProMIS software does what was originally intended and more. Once installed, it can be operated effectively by persons without special skills in using computers. It has a number of "built-in" checks for the internal consistency of the data which help prevent too much "garbage" from going into the system. It is designed in such a way as to minimize the possibilities of losing data once entered due to hardware failure or power outages. It can be disseminated in a "compiled" form so that prospective users need not purchase other software in order to use it. It was designed to run on older computers (with 286 processors) and, therefore, will run on the more current systems without the user experiencing noticeable delays.

The system would benefit greatly from an enhanced reporting capability. The export feature enables analysts with knowledge of other computer software to do additional analysis of the data;

however, to increase the potential for people in the SC impact areas to make better use of the data, additional reporting and analytic functions might well be incorporated directly into the system.

5) Next steps for software dissemination and future use

Before identifying possible next steps for the dissemination of the ProMIS software, this reviewer wants to underscore a point made earlier in this paper. ProMIS was designed to meet a need growing out of the type of village-based intervention implemented by SC in its field projects. The SC approach is relatively labor intensive, both in its outreach component and in its data collection (and, therefore, data entry). SC maintains that the intensity of effort required to do a complete census of their impact areas is cost-effective in the long run in that savings are accrued when delivering service due to the availability of a good data base to guide those responsible for providing the service. The proof of this assertion is beyond the scope of this brief evaluation of the ProMIS software.

However, it is within the scope of this brief evaluation to issue a warning. There is a tendency for individuals or organizations without a great deal of experience with computers to attempt to use existing software (or, in most cases, the software they know) to solve problems that the software was not intended to solve. (This reviewer has seen countless colleagues over the years struggle trying to use one type of software to solve a problem easily handled by another -- for example, spreadsheet software for a data base application -- merely because they did not know of the existence of better software to tackle their particular problem or just did not have the time to learn how to use it.) This could happen to ProMIS. Other PVOs might be tempted to use ProMIS in situations where the strategy of intervention employed by those PVOs is quite different from SC's merely because ProMIS works for SC (or because USAID recommends it). In these situations, ProMIS will not work, not because of weaknesses in the system but because it is the wrong tool.

<u>Dissemination</u>

Owing to its charge to consider the efficacy of USAID grants to PVO Headquarters, the second midterm evaluation addressed the issue of dissemination of the ProMIS software to other PVOs. The first recommendation on page 27 of that evaluation document suggests that "ProMIS ... be made available to all interested organizations on the understanding that further enhancement of the product is in progress and individual linkages between SCF's responsibility vis à vis the product and the respective organization needs to be worked out ahead of time."

Despite the warning above, this reviewer endorses fully this recommendation made at project midterm. Still, the question of responsibility for the continuing operation of the software must be resolved before broad dissemination is considered. Even though the current version of ProMIS runs relatively error free, as more users attempt to apply the software in different settings, there will, no doubt, be an increasing number of requests of SC to "fix" the software if it

breaks down and, more importantly, to modify it slightly to fit particular situations. SC has neither the manpower nor the mandate to become a software maintenance house in this fashion.

This reviewer sees three possible courses of action for USAID and SC at this time if ProMIS is to be widely disseminated.

a) The least service, least cost option. SC disseminates not only the compiled version of the software but also the source code to anyone who wants it[1]. The recipient agrees that SC has no further obligation to them if the software breaks down or is not exactly what they needed. Under this option, SC might continue to develop the software for its own use in parallel with the efforts of the new users to develop it for their own use. This option creates the situation alluded to above where standardization is lost and duplicative effort is expended; however, every ProMIS user will be able to customize the system.

b) The moderate cost, moderate service option. SC disseminates only the compiled version of the program but is funded (by USAID, with its own funds and/or by transfers from other PVOs) to maintain the system at its HQ. SC would have to increase the size of its systems group to be able to provide continuing service. Annually, there should be a user's meeting where priorities are set for the next round of changes in the system. SC provides field support according to the availability of its staff and the level of demands placed upon it. This option is feasible only if SC agrees to take on this type of responsibility.

c) A high cost, high service option. A third party takes over ProMIS; for example, a centrally funded USAID contractor or a company specializing in software development. (There are organizations who are both, software companies and USAID contractors). They must agree to give out the current system free to interested PVOs but are given the rights to charge for any requests for additional training or for any other service on the system. In this model, individual PVOs are spared the agony of trying to develop in-house capability but they have to pay a higher premium for service and/or system modification.

Given the current funding environment of USAID, the reviewer suggests that Option c) be explored further. It might be best to place development of the system in a marketplace type of environment rather than to count on continuing external funding for system development.

---

[1] In generating a computer program, the programmer writes what is called source code. Another programmer can read that source code and modify it thereby changing the program. Once a program "works", it can be compiled. The compiler creates object code which runs faster than the original and cannot be changed by another programmer. If only object code is disseminated, the user cannot change the program. With the source code, the user can run the original version or can attempt to make his/her own changes. Once any changes in the source code are made, the programmer of the original code can no longer be held responsible for the operation of the program.

Future Use

In the near future, three aspects of ProMIS could be explored. First, an experiment might be launched to test the feasibility of using ProMIS in the absence of a parallel manual system. An intervention in an urban or peri-urban setting might be ideal for such an experiment because the distance (and, therefore the time) to link the field site to the computer could be minimized. In such an experiment, the computer would generate all rosters and reports rather than duplicating those already prepared by the staff. If the use of the computer system can be shown to reduce the labor required for manual record keeping freeing up staff for additional effort in the delivery of essential services, the perceived value of ProMIS would be enhanced. (SC field staff argue that the maintenance of the manual system gives pride of ownership to the field workers. Any experiment to use the computer to replace the effort of the field staff should be conceived with a conscious effort to give that staff the feeling of ownership over the computer system.)

Second, the capacity of the system to generate interesting reports, including simple graphics, should be enhanced and experiments run to see if reports can be designed to provide rapid feedback to the villages and health workers in a fashion calculated to stimulate better performance. In a site where some SC staff have the computer skills to export and work with data, this experiment could be run without actually modifying the current ProMIS program. After the experiment indicates the types of reports which provide useful and stimulating feedback to the periphery, those reports could be incorporated into ProMIS itself for use in sites where such computer skill is lacking.

Third, the data generated in ongoing field projects should be analyzed in an academic fashion. This reviewer began his career in international working on a USAID funded project designed to analyze community-level interventions to determine what makes them work. Much of the time and energy was spent creating data sets from poorly designed manual systems for recording field data. A functioning ProMIS has data that is probably cleaner (more complete, error-free and internally consistent) than any of the data sets used in that study. A number of interesting questions should be explored using this wealth of data; for example, what is the seasonality associated with nutritional status data in a typical developing country setting? and, is there replacement mortality in communities in developing countries (are children who are vaccinated and are given appropriate treatment for diarrheal disease dying of other causes)?

APPENDIX A: References

Letter Proposal from Save The Children to FVA/PVC. February 9, 1989

Roy I. Miller. Review of the Save The Children Health Information System. Trip Report, February 21-23, 1989.

Save The Children Headquarters, Health Unit. Child Survival V: Detailed Implementation Plan, September 1989 - August 1994. March 1990

Save The Children, Home Office Headquarters. Child Survival V: Midterm Evaluation. July 1992.

Richard L. Podol and Helga Morow. Evaluation of Save The Children Federation Child Survival V Headquarters Grant Funded by AID/FHA/PVC. January 1993.

Save The Children. Child Survival 5 Headquarters Project Annual Report, October 1992 - September 1993. October 28, 1993.

Save The Children/US. Child Survival 5 Headquarters Project Annual Report, October 1993 - September 1994. October 28, 1994

Save The Children Office of Health Population/Nutrition and the Management Information System Unit. ProMIS II (Program Management Information System) User's Guide. June 1995.

APPENDIX B: Persons Interviewed

At Save The Children:

1) M.I.S. Unit; Ken Herman

2) Office of Health/Population/Nutrition; Karen LeBan, David Marsh, Jim Sarn, Ahmed Zayan

3) USAID/PVC (By Telephone); Jean Capps